

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 06 Jul 2004 20:15:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yes, John Edwards has been chosen by John Kerry to run as VP.

And in the polls, President Bush is 12 points below a Kerry/Edwards ticket.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP

Posted by [Riftgarde](#) on Wed, 07 Jul 2004 04:05:32 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

He'll help balance out Kerry's face.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 07 Jul 2004 12:31:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

lol...and I really mean it.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP

Posted by [htmlgod](#) on Wed, 07 Jul 2004 14:00:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm not much of an Edwards fan. Edwards was a Tort lawyer before he got into politics, mostly malpractice. For those of you who don't know, medical Tort law involves getting together dozens of alleged cases of wrongdoing, and then suing the doctors at fault in one big case, for millions of dollars. John Edwards claims that he wants to help the little man, but he takes 50 to 60% off the top of the awards that he wins for his clients, hence his immense personal wealth. If John Edwards really wanted to help the little man, he would be doing pro bono work for wrongly evicted families or something.

Instead he is suing in huge medical malpractice cases, and only hurting the 'little man.' By suing allegedly negligent doctors, he forces the doctors to need more insurance. As a result, doctors must pay more in insurance premiums (and some doctors even refuse to practice, or perform deliveries, which is where Edwards made his money), so the doctors must be paid more. In turn, hospitals charge more. John Edwards doesn't help the little man, he screws him by contributing to the already expensive medical bills that Americans have to pay.

In short, the moral hypocrisy in John Edwards' past have lost the democratic party my vote. (Aside from the fact that Kerry doesn't have a platform or any kind of plans, just pipedream promises to cut the national deficit, as well as the intention of raising the already outrageous gas prices by a 10 cent tax per gallon of gas. )

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 07 Jul 2004 14:30:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh my god, he was a tort lawyer! Republicans are trying to spread the lie that he was a bad tort lawyer who sued just so he could get money and didn't care about whether his cases actually deserved it. Here's something. Go through his cases and find which ones seem morally wrong to you.

htmlgodhe takes 50 to 60% off the top of the awards that he wins for his clients

Oh? What's the normal lawyer cut?

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 07 Jul 2004 16:42:01 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Edwards was a Tort lawyer before he got into politics, mostly malpractice.

Thanks, that's all I needed to know right there. No way is he or his boss getting my vote- not for a million dollars.

Quote:Oh my god, he was a tort lawyer! Republicans are trying to spread the lie that he was a bad tort lawyer who sued just so he could get money and didn't care about whether his cases actually deserved it.

I can honestly tell you from personal experience that most malpractice cases are a ton of horse shit- a person sues a perfectly good and decent doctor for any number of things the doctor has no control over- such as genetic birth defects, terminal illnesses, and other things of that nature, even when the doctor being sued wasn't anywhere near the patient- and the lawyer takes the case because the payout is generally an enormous sum of money. If those lawyers actually gave half a damn about their client's credibility, most malpractice cases wouldn't ever get off the ground.

I haven't taken the time to review Edwards' cases, so I can't tell which are and which aren't legitimate, but I'll bet every penny I own that his morals are no better than those of any other lawyer in the country. Just offering a different perspective; I'm biased by my family's experience with malpractice suits, and I'd find it very difficult to believe anyone who would argue for the plaintiff in such cases.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 07 Jul 2004 22:02:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

...Before you pretend Edwards is a tort lawyer who takes all the bad cases with big payouts, LOOK AT HIS FUCKING RECORD AND STOP PRETENDING! Just betting isn't good enough - you have to actually think and find things out

Nukelt15Thanks, that's all I needed to know right there. No way is he or his boss getting my vote-not for a million dollars.

Because you're acting like a blindfolded moron assuming untruths to be the truth.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 00:41:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Apparently, reading is not your strongest area, so I'll just go ahead and repeat myself for you, ok?

Quote:I haven't taken the time to review Edwards' cases, so I can't tell which are and which aren't legitimate, but I'll bet every penny I own that his morals are no better than those of any other lawyer in the country. Just offering a different perspective; I'm biased by my family's experience with malpractice suits, and I'd find it very difficult to believe anyone who would argue for the plaintiff in such cases.

Read carefully, and you'll find that I have made only one assumption: That Edwards' morals are no better or worse than any other lawyer. I have not made any false accusations, or pulled any faulty information out of my ass, or anything else of the sort. I said I would bet money that he's no more saintly than the next guy. Frankly, if you drew any other conclusion from that, I pity your lack of skill with the english language.

Two things have been established which influence my opinion of Edwards:

1. He was a lawyer, and
2. He took malpractice cases.

Since my family has had, and is having some rather foul experiences with bullshit malpractice cases, I have a rather foul opinion of lawyers who are involved in them. Because of that, I refuse to vote for anyone who is, or ever has been a lawyer who took the plaintiff's side in a malpractice case- I do not care what their record is or how legitimate their case was. Yes, that means even if every one of those plaintiffs was telling the 100% solid rock truth.

Since I already said I know next to nothing about Edwards' record in my previous post, I think your flaming is rather unnecessary. I admit to it- my own experiences have given me a prejudice. Gee whiz, I'm so sorry for being human! Had I presented any lies or faulty evidence, you'd have something to bitch about, but right now you're flaming thin air.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 02:08:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

But you're just assuming he is no better than the next tort lawyer, which is stupid and wrong.

Edwards actually took care to be on cases that he believed were of merit. And malpractice law is still very important. It's the one place where the common man can stand up, toe to toe with a big important company. And it needs to be there, too. Malpractice incidents only affect one or two percent of the medical area, but that's necessary in a place like this where occasionally doctors will perform an operation drunk, blah de blah.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 04:03:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

SuperFlyingEngiAnd malpractice law is still very important. It's the one place where the common man can stand up, toe to toe with a big important company. And it needs to be there, too. You're too idealistic. It's absolutely true that the laws need to be there in the event of a truly negligent doctor hurting someone, but you fail to realize just how badly medical malpractice laws are being abused.

The ideal: the "little guy" can stand up to "big and bad business" if he is hurt through carelessness or intention.

The reality: people are suing completely innocent doctors and companies just to get the big payout (i.e. lard-asses suing McDonalds for being fat blubber-butts (not a medical malpractice lawsuit, but falls along the same lines as it not being the company's fault)).

Quote:Malpractice incidents only affect one or two percent of the medical area, but that's necessary in a place like this where occasionally doctors will perform an operation drunk, blah de blah.

Malpractice incidents affect far more than you know. Because of millions of dollars paid out to people in phony malpractice lawsuits, doctors are forced to raise their price in order to compensate. You end up screwing the "little guy" instead of helping.

Now, you're going to say John Edwards had no hand in making things worse by not ever, not even once, by picking up and running with a case in which the doctor was obviously innocent and the plaintiff obviously full of shit just because the payout was huge? Try not to let your idealism blind you.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 12:22:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm still all for the Democrats (not that I can vote for him, being Dutch ), but I heard Edwards speak on CNN a bit, and ouch, does his accent make him sound dumb.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [htmlgod](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 12:29:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ok, I will give an example of one of Edwards' cases. This was a case tried in 1985, over the birth of Jennifer Campbell.

Before, things you should know: Cerebral palsy affects a very low percentage of all births. In 7 out of 8 Cerebral Palsy cases, the cause of cerebral palsy is never discovered (after extensive investigation). In a handful of those 1/8 of the cases of Cerebral palsy, the cause is believed to be linked to the brain receiving too little oxygen during birth. In some of these cases (less than 50%), the cause for the oxygen deficit is the baby coming out feet first, leaving it unable to breathe for a few minutes at a time when it should begin breathing on its own. There is a procedure called a Cerebral Section (AKA C-Section) whereby the birth canal is widened, and even if the baby is coming out feet first, the birth canal is wide enough that either the doctor can reverse the baby's position, or sometimes the doctor doesn't need to because the increased birth canal allows the feet-first baby to get enough oxygen. However, performing C-Sections can be quite dangerous to the mother. In some cases the C-Section causes immense blood loss, a transfusion must be performed, and the bleeding must be stopped. Many mothers have bled to death because the doctor has been unable to stop the bleeding caused by the Cerebral Section. Additionally, it is often impossible to detect whether a C-Section is necessary until it is too late to prevent the baby from being unable to breathe properly.

So you see, doctors try to avoid performing C-Sections unless they know that they will be necessary, because it is only rarely needed, and for most births, it's just an added risk and cost.

John Edwards sued on behalf of a family whose baby was born with Cerebral Palsy. Edwards blamed the doctor for the baby's Cerebral Palsy, and he made the argument to the jury, that had the doctor performed a C-Section, the baby would have been born healthy. The plaintiff was awarded 6.5 million dollars by the jury.

Now first let's look back at the facts real quick:

- In only 1/8 of the cases of Cerebral Palsy can the cause be identified (it was not identified in this case)
- In only some of those 1/8 of the cases is the cause established as lack of oxygen, there are other causes as well.
- C-Sections are dangerous to the mother, and expensive, so they are usually avoided if possible.
- The doctor performed a C-Section as soon as he discovered that there might be a complication in the delivery, but sadly, this was too late.

I think we can all agree that having a baby be born with Cerebral Palsy is a huge tragedy, but there isn't always someone to blame when it happens. The doctor, who probably earned about 225,000 in a year before taxes, had to pay 6.5 million, only a small amount of which was covered by his insurance policy. THEN Edwards went back and threatened to sue Jennifer Campbell's Obstetrician, but the obstetrician settled for 1.5 million.

Furthermore, a recent study showed that the increase in C-Section deliveries, from 6% of all deliveries in 1970 to 26% of all deliveries today has failed to decrease the occurrence of Cerebral Palsy, at all! In the end, John Edwards took more than 30% of the awards that he won for the Campbell Family.

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [kadoosh](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 16:35:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Basicly, you are for someone suing doctors so your insurance goes up. So this is the hopes of the demoncratic party? I see, make me pay more for health insurance and swear allegiance to france at the same time. Woo hoo sign me up to cancel out your vote.

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [htmlgod](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 16:56:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm not a decided voter, but Kerry's choice of Edwards has tilted me more towards Bush, regardless of Bush's previous mistakes.

I also found this. Granted, it was on the George W. Bush website, but it is still all based on direct quotes from Kerry.

<http://georgewbush.com/KerryonIraq/>

I thought this was pretty interesting. It seems like Kerry is a 'fair-weather fan,' meaning that he supports things when they are popular (IE war on Iraq when we thought there were WMD's stockpiled), but then doesn't hesitate to change his opinion when popular public opinion changes (He changed to drastically anti-Iraq war about 1/2 way through.) I don't know about you guys, but to me it means a lot for a politician to have a solid platform and basis of beliefs. Repeated self-contradiction and flippity-flopping from one side of a debate to the other indicate to me that a candidate is just trying to do whatever it takes to get him into office. Now granted, Bush isn't a real great candidate either, but he has his basis of beliefs, and he does what he thinks is right. Most of the time I agree with him. Kerry, on the other hand, to me just seems like he's trying to get into office just for the sake of getting into office (Not for the sake of making things the way he thinks they ought to be), and is sacrificing his beliefs in exchange for those that will buy him the presidency.

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 20:34:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 22:22:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Edwards actually took care to be on cases that he believed were of merit. And malpractice

---

law is still very important. It's the one place where the common man can stand up, toe to toe with a big important company. And it needs to be there, too.

Here's the problem: you can sue your doctor if he/she doesn't work miracles. Here's an example- Someone is dying of a genetic condition which has no known cure. They proceed to die...the family sues the doctor for not saving them. Not only that, then they sue for the lost wages of the dead person- who could not have possibly lived any longer than they did, no matter what the doctor did. The amount of money being asked for is somewhere in the ballpark of \$10 million if the case goes to trial. Here's the real kicker- the doctor isn't even in the hospital when that person dies...in fact, the doctor works in the emergency room, only saw that person once, and recommended that they be admitted to the hospital.

That's a real case. In the interest of privacy, I won't give you the names of the people involved. That's how badly malpractice law is being abused. And that isn't the exception, it's the rule. Lawyers do not take malpractice cases because they believe in the merit of them, they take them because there is a huge payout- many times, more than the doctor's insurance will cover.

Furthermore, malpractice is not a chance for "the little guy" to stand up to "big important companies"- the hospital is not getting sued, the doctor is. Most of the time, the doctor winds up as being a convenient money bag for someone to reach their greedy hands into- or a scapegoat, a convenient person to point the blame at when there really is no one at fault.

I may not know much about Edwards, but I am not naive enough to assume that his record is pure. Obviously, from html's post, he's not.

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [htmlgod](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 22:50:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 08 Jul 2004 23:57:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

htmlgodThe doctor, who probably earned about 225,000 in a year before taxes, had to pay 6.5 million, only a small amount of which was covered by his insurance policy.

Doctors have malpractice insurance.

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Fri, 09 Jul 2004 00:06:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And you're a fool if you think it's cheap. Car insurance ain't got nothing on what doctors pay to protect their livelihood. In some places, the average annual income of a middle-lower class family is lower than the price for malpractice insurance. Most of those insurance policies run in the \$2-5 million range. And the insurance company always tries their hardest to reduce the amount they have to pay out, even at the expense of the policy holder.

And every time some dipshit decides to sue, the premiums skyrocket.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [htmlgod](#) on Fri, 09 Jul 2004 00:07:50 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Yeah. The insurance is the problem created by the lawyers - its expensive, which is why malpractice is so bad - doctors have to be increasingly well paid, so that they can cover their own insurance costs to protect against money-whoring lawyers such as John Edwards.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [MrBob](#) on Fri, 09 Jul 2004 01:17:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

NHJ BVI'm still all for the Democrats (not that I can vote for him, being Dutch ), but I heard Edwards speak on CNN a bit, and ouch, does his accent make him sound dumb.

So southerners are dumb? Thanks for your stereotypes. :rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [NHJ BV](#) on Fri, 09 Jul 2004 17:10:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

MrBobNHJ BVI'm still all for the Democrats (not that I can vote for him, being Dutch ), but I heard Edwards speak on CNN a bit, and ouch, does his accent make him sound dumb.

So southerners are dumb? Thanks for your stereotypes. :rolleyes:

I said his accent made him sound dumb. If all southerners have the same accent then yes, I will probably think they sound dumb either.

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Sun, 11 Jul 2004 03:56:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

They have better hair, what can you do about it?

---



Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Thu, 22 Jul 2004 13:21:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Alright, check this shit out.

My view on malpractice:  
It is a Bad Thing.

Now, if it is a Bad Thing, then people doing it should be Punished. Right now, Punishment mean being sued in court. This, I feel, is also a Bad Thing. Why? Because so many lawsuits are frivolous, and still, somehow, the doctors lose.

What is my solution? Make it a criminal issue (which it kinda is already, but ...). Rather than being sued, in court, with a jury of laymen who know JACK SHIT about medicine, what's expected, proper operating procedure, etc, it should be tried in a criminal court. The jury should be made up of medical practitioners, who know what should be done, what is expected, and what you can't help. And if you think they'd go too easy on each other, you're wrong. The only thing a doctor hates more than a malpractice lawyer is another doctor who's actually committing malpractice.

God, I hate Americans. There's no fucking concept of personal responsibility anymore. Fat people blame McDonald's. Smoker's blame the tobacco company. If someone dies, blame the doctors.

Wanna know what's really funny? The people who expect the doctors to cure anything and know everything are the same people who want to cut money given to doctors and medicinal research. "You can't have any money to do research, but if I die, I'm charging your ass for it." It's no wonder doctors are leaving the profession in record numbers. Soon no one will have any medical care, and who will fix your bleeding hearts then?

(As you can tell, I have an opinion or two on this matter...)

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [mahkra](#) on Thu, 22 Jul 2004 14:24:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

ViperFUD(As you can tell, I have an opinion or two on this matter...)

I agree with you entirely, but don't you think you might be taking this issue a bit personally?

---

---

Subject: Edwards Running as VP  
Posted by [ViperFUD](#) on Fri, 23 Jul 2004 02:49:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

mahkra

I agree with you entirely, but don't you think you might be taking this issue a bit personally?

GODDAMN SHIT ASS MOTHAFUCKING STRAIGHT.

after all ...

---