
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 BBAAAAWWWWWWWWWW 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!!1!" is easier than actually reading.
