
Subject: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Thu, 21 May 2009 02:52:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/

Look like Chrysler is going to the "rightful owners." If I recall correctly, the UAW's job is to make sure the workers aren't screwed over, not run the company. WHY THE FUCK ARE YOU DOING THIS OBAMA!!!! I AM FUCKING SICK AND TIRED OF YOU GIVING STUFF AWAY TO THE "RIGHTFUL OWNERS". THE FUCKING UNIONS AREN'T THE ONES THAT RUN THE COMPANY, ITS THE EXECUTIVES. IT'S THEIR JOB TO MAKE SURE THAT THE WORKERS DON'T GET SCREWED OVER. Now they will just sit on the board making the wages go up even more. 2010 can't come soon enough. I hope GM, Chrysler, and Ford get rid of them. Once that happens, then the auto companies can lower the wages from ridiculous to moderately high. You don't hear about the Japanese auto workers in the South complaining about what their wages are. I know what I want to say and what I'm thinking, I just can't express it.

/endrant

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Thu, 21 May 2009 03:10:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

be quiet rush limbaugh

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 21 May 2009 03:14:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In a crisis, the government always gains power and abuses it. This, certainly, is no exception. Add that with the fact that it's a Democratic president with a Democratic legislative branch, only bad things can happen.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Thu, 21 May 2009 04:40:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I can write in pink text too.

And btw in all reality it is the unions that run the company. If the american auto industry would tell the unions to go fuck off they would be in a lot better shape.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 21 May 2009 05:18:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The trust fund is for health and pensions. The unions will in no way exert control any differently than they do now.

Besides, I'm not huge on unions myself, but it's not as if the government or the union could do a worse job than what ChryCo did to themselves when totally private.

For what it's worth too, the employees for non-union automakers benefit from the UAW indirectly, because those companies generally match the salaries anyways. The reason brands like Toyota (which posted a larger loss than GM last quarter) pay lower wages is because they have fewer retirees, and their retirement plans are different.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 21 May 2009 10:33:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Muad Dib15 wrote on Wed, 20 May 2009
19:52http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/

Look like Chrysler is going to the "rightful owners." If I recall correctly, the UAW's job is to make sure the workers aren't screwed over, not run the company. WHY THE FUCK ARE YOU DOING THIS OBAMA!!!! I AM FUCKING SICK AND TIRED OF YOU GIVING STUFF AWAY TO THE "RIGHTFUL OWNERS". THE FUCKING UNIONS AREN'T THE ONES THAT RUN THE COMPANY, ITS THE EXECUTIVES. IT'S THEIR JOB TO MAKE SURE THAT THE WORKERS DON'T GET SCREWED OVER. Now they will just sit on the board making the wages go up even more. 2010 can't come soon enough. I hope GM, Chrysler, and Ford get rid of them. Once that happens, then the auto companies can lower the wages from ridiculous to moderately high. You don't hear about the Japanese auto workers in the South complaining about what their wages are. I know what I want to say and what I'm thinking, I just can't express it.

/endrant

I've heard this same retarded rant from another fat basementdweller. Who was it, again? Oh, right;

This line here was extra lulzy:

Muad Dib15 wrote on Wed, 20 May 2009 19:52...THE EXECUTIVES. IT'S THEIR JOB TO MAKE SURE THAT THE WORKERS DON'T GET SCREWED OVER.

I'm not sure if you're naive enough to actually believe this is the way it works or you're trying to convince others to adopt this flawed worldview. With a few very rare exceptions, executives aren't payed or judged based on how happy their employees are, and as a result their focus tends to be more on shareholders and less on employees. If executives truly had the best interests of their employees in mind, there would be no niche for a union to fill. Ever wonder why you never hear

any complaints out of whatever union it is that people who work for Google belong to?

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 21 May 2009 12:21:03 GMT

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

Dover! I'm not sure if you're naive enough to actually believe this is the way it works or you're trying to convince others to adopt this flawed worldview. With a few very rare exceptions, executives aren't payed or judged based on how happy their employees are, and as a result their focus tends to be more on shareholders and less on employees. If executives truly had the best interests of their employees in mind, there would be no niche for a union to fill. Ever wonder why you never hear any complaints out of whatever union it is that people who work for Google belong to? He... wasn't talking about the executives. He said that it's the executives' jobs to run the company and the union's job to work for the workers (though, they tend to only work for themselves when you go to the size of the UAW or Teachers' Union).

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination

Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 21 May 2009 20:31:02 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 21 May 2009 05:21: Dover! I'm not sure if you're naive enough to actually believe this is the way it works or you're trying to convince others to adopt this flawed worldview. With a few very rare exceptions, executives aren't payed or judged based on how happy their employees are, and as a result their focus tends to be more on shareholders and less on employees. If executives truly had the best interests of their employees in mind, there would be no niche for a union to fill. Ever wonder why you never hear any complaints out of whatever union it is that people who work for Google belong to? He... wasn't talking about the executives. He said that it's the executives' jobs to run the company and the union's job to work for the workers (though, they tend to only work for themselves when you go to the size of the UAW or Teachers' Union).

Did he? He should've been more clear in his post next time.

In any case, if I read the article he posted correctly, the UAW doesn't plan on "running" the company for very long, so he has nothing to BBAAAAWWWWWWWW about.

Edit: Evidence'd!

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"...But it appears that the union would rather be in the back seat.

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"But that doesn't mean the union will be calling the shots at either company. In fact, UAW president Ron Gettelfinger said the union hopes to sell its stake in both companies quickly because he is more interested in raising cash to cover retiree health care costs than having an ownership stake in GM

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"Since the trust fund, and not individual union members or the union itself, will own the stakes in GM and Chrysler, it is expected that the UAW will not use its newfound role as a large shareholder to push for major changes at either company.

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"The trust fund will only name one member of Chrysler's new board, even though it will have a majority stake in the company. Italian automaker Fiat, which is also getting a stake in Chrysler as part of its bankruptcy, is expected to make the key decisions on the direction of Chrysler.

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"But the union's reluctance to take an active ownership role in either company is nothing new. When the UAW got a more direct stake Chrysler during a federal bailout of that company in the 1980s, it also sold the stock as soon as possible to compensate members for concessions they had made in labor contracts.

The UAW also has never pushed for board membership in negotiations, even when it was being asked for wage concessions.

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"Gettelfinger has insisted the union will not be making decisions at the automakers. The union, which is currently involved in labor talks with GM, said the union will still have its traditional role of protecting workers and jobs, not making decisions about product development, marketing or allocating company resources.

"Those kinds of [decisions] do not belong to us. [They] never have and they don't now," he said.

Experts in employee ownership agree that the UAW is unlikely to shape future corporate strategy at either Chrysler or GM.

It seems the article and Mad_Dib15, while having the same source material, are reaching opposite conclusions. I'd speculate the "why" is because crying "WAHH WAHH OBAMA WAHH!!!" is easier than actually reading.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [appshot](#) on Thu, 21 May 2009 22:22:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

maud dib is an idiot.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Fri, 22 May 2009 01:38:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

appshot wrote on Thu, 21 May 2009 17:22Muad dib is an idiot.

As are you.

No, Dover you don't seem to understand. The unions aren't content with having a little and just

settling back, they will continue to try to take more and more away from the people who should be running the company and do it them selves.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 22 May 2009 01:53:07 GMT

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

Muad Dib15 wrote on Thu, 21 May 2009 21:38appshot wrote on Thu, 21 May 2009 17:22Muad dib is an idiot.

As are you.

No, Dover you don't seem to understand. The unions aren't content with having a little and just settling back, they will continue to try to take more and more away from the people who should be running the company and do it them selves.

That's conservative loony talk.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 22 May 2009 02:16:03 GMT

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

The unions do not want control. Here's a couple reasons why.

1) Unions do not know how to run a business. They may give the impression that they know what's good for the company, but privately, the last thing they want to do is be fully responsible for laying off people, cutting wages, or even ruining the operation. The reasons unions survive is because that's what the corporate types do.

2) PR. Unions aren't really popular in North America. Would people buy vehicles from a company owned by a union? I'm betting not too many would. So the company would have a nightmare unloading cars, and would be in financial ruin.

3) If the union runs the show, who will bargain against the union? Disgruntled employees will associate unions as a bunch of corporate fat cats, and either create their own union to protest against the union, or they'll seek jobs elsewhere.

4) Efficiency. As I noted in #1, unions don't know how to run a business when it comes to administration. Bureaucracy is the name of their game, but turning a former non-union environment into a union one will create major headaches. Can you imagine the entire white-collar/design staff/accounting/human resources/etc. portions of the company being organized into separate unions with their own bargaining, and pensions, and wages? There'd be so much insanity that it'd make Ron Gettelfinger donate to Sarah Palin's 2012 campaign just to get her elected so she could break the company up again.

Unions aren't dumb. The reason they've existed this long is because they pretend to run with the 'little guy,' and if they abandon that image, they'll lose membership, and dollars.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 22 May 2009 04:38:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Muad Dib15 wrote on Thu, 21 May 2009 18:38No, Dover you don't seem to understand. The unions aren't content with having a little and just settling back, they will continue to try to take more and more away from the people who should be running the company and do it them selves.

Oh, I'm sure that comes from the article you posted, like these few lines:

Dover wrote on Thu, 21 May 2009

13:31"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"...But it appears that the union would rather be in the back seat.

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"But that doesn't mean the union will be calling the shots at either company. In fact, UAW president Ron Gettelfinger said the union hopes to sell its stake in both companies quickly because he is more interested in raising cash to cover retiree health care costs than having an ownership stake in GM

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"Since the trust fund, and not individual union members or the union itself, will own the stakes in GM and Chrysler, it is expected that the UAW will not use its newfound role as a large shareholder to push for major changes at either company.

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"The trust fund will only name one member of Chrysler's new board, even though it will have a majority stake in the company. Italian automaker Fiat, which is also getting a stake in Chrysler as part of its bankruptcy, is expected to make the key decisions on the direction of Chrysler.

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"But the union's reluctance to take an active ownership role in either company is nothing new. When the UAW got a more direct stake Chrysler during a federal bailout of that company in the 1980s, it also sold the stock as soon as possible to compensate members for concessions they had made in labor contracts.

The UAW also has never pushed for board membership in negotiations, even when it was being asked for wage concessions.

"http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/19/news/companies/uaw_ownership/"Gettelfinger has insisted the union will not be making decisions at the automakers. The union, which is currently involved in labor talks with GM, said the union will still have its traditional role of protecting workers and jobs, not making decisions about product development, marketing or allocating company resources.

"Those kinds of [decisions] do not belong to us. [They] never have and they don't now," he said.

Experts in employee ownership agree that the UAW is unlikely to shape future corporate strategy at either Chrysler or GM.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sun, 28 Jun 2009 03:43:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

When you say things like "Who would buy a car from a company owned by a union? I dont think many would" it makes me wonder how you've never seen the millions of trucks in America with the UNION or Teamster bumper stickers. BUY UNION MADE. Proudly Made in the USA BY Union Workers. On and on. There are tons of varieties. I think you are severely underestimating just how many union workers there are in the US. A shit-ton.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sun, 28 Jun 2009 08:57:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not to mention the term "owned by a union" doesn't come even close to the truth.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Fri, 17 Jul 2009 00:22:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Meet the new boss, same as the old boss.

Subject: Re: Hey look, another Obamination
Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 17 Jul 2009 05:21:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ITT: faggotry, lies, and homosexual untruths.
