
Subject: UAW

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 21:36:38 GMT

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

They successfully killed the Detroit automakers and the Michigan economy.

How did they do it, you ask? They're a fucking labor union; it's quite obvious how they did it. They're greedy, arrogant, idiotic bastards who think that auto workers deserve a lot of money for a job that any fucking 3 year-old could figure out how to do. THEN, when they are asked to take pay cuts in order for the "Big 3" to get a \$14 billion loan from the government, they refuse! They won't take a pay cut until their contract ends in 2011!

What is the result of this? Well, for one thing, GM is cutting 250,000 vehicles from being made in the 1Q 2009, and most of the North American plants will be shut down for January.

How ARROGANT must you be to refuse pay cuts for people who are OVERPAID as it is in order to keep your jobs? Oh, maybe because then they'd have to admit that they're the ones who have continually bankrupting Detroit for 70 years with stupid demands and over-the-top accommodations for workers that don't have to be smarter than your average 13 year-old.

I hate unions with a passion. In fact, I would almost say that I have murderous rage towards labor unions. At the core, they have good intentions and are even reasonable. Once they get going, though, they get greedy and oh so arrogant. They continue to strip away the rights of corporations and make it so that the corporations, themselves, are the ones blamed.

Don't think that I'm defending corporations. I hate corporatism, too, but in this situation the majority of the blame can be put on the UAW. They are at fault.

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [danpaul88](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 22:04:39 GMT

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

I think this is partly why the unions in the UK have almost no power these days. Last time the unions got out of hand the government basically stripped all their power away to solve the problem.

I don't exactly know much about it as it happened before my time, so that may not be 100% accurate, but it's roughly what happened.

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 22:16:26 GMT

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

Seriously. Unions suck. Let's go back to REAL Industrialism, like England in the 1800s lol

From what I heard, the UAW being NOT total morons, did not decline and are going to be heading to the bargaining table. Can I suggest you check your sources again? If you're right, maybe I need to check mine.

And having such a rage at the UAW discounts the bad business practices and huge, out-of-proportion compensation that the leadership of the "Big Three" are receiving? You want greed? There's greed. A better-than-average salary at \$20/hour isn't worth murderous rage. 75+mil a year for running a company into the dirt, however, is.

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 22:29:35 GMT

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

Quote:Republicans, breaking sharply with President George W. Bush as his term draws to a close, refused to back federal aid for Detroit's beleaguered Big Three without a guarantee that the United Auto Workers would agree by the end of next year to wage cuts to bring their pay into line with U.S. plants of Japanese carmakers. The UAW refused to do so before its current contract with the automakers expires in 2011.

http://www.mlive.com/business/index.ssf/2008/12/14b_auto_bailout_dies_in_senat.html

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 22:49:45 GMT

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

I hope GM files for Chapter 11, and does so quickly. This means that they will finally be able to trim the UAW, and eliminate so much of the stupidity that accompanies unions.

It costs General Motors around seventy-five dollars an hour per employee, whereas Toyota does it at under thirty-five. In many cases, General Motors is as, or is more efficient than Toyota, and the 'imports' . It's embarrassing.

One dude I know who 'used' (he got bought out) to work for GM, said that the culture of the workplace was against productivity. For example, if an assembly line worker got a device stuck in the vehicle, or whatever, they would have to bring a totally different guy down, have him punch in the time, and then fix the task which takes seconds. A regular employee could do this, but no, the UAW insists that it's someone else; if you do a little extra in the workplace, you get shit for it.

I too, used to work for a union, and it was the same shit. I nearly got fired from an old workplace because I helped a guy from a different department take out his garbage; turns out one of his co-workers was the union rep, and he threatened me because I exceeded my jurisdiction.

I love General Motors. My truck is a GMC, and it's almost as old as I am, and I have yet to ever have a problem with it. Meanwhile, my neighbour has owned three Toyota trucks within the same time frame, and each one has had problems, be it with the engine, frame, or other internals. Every

GM my family has owned has been rock solid; compare that to our old Mercedes, which starting fucking up within three years due to shitty electronics.

The cars they build are excellent, and meet or surpass the competition. (Same goes for Ford.)

Hopefully, GM will be able to recover, and come out swinging. It'll be a shame for such a storied company, which has contributed so much to the North American economy, and other world economies, and America's defense, not to mention our driveways... to end up dying.

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 22:57:06 GMT

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

MLiveHourly wages for UAW workers at GM factories are about equal to those paid by Toyota Motor Corp. at its older U.S. factories, according to the companies. GM says the average UAW laborer makes \$29.78 per hour, while Toyota says it pays about \$30 per hour. But the unionized factories have far higher benefit costs.

GM says its total hourly labor costs are now \$69, including wages, pensions and health care for active workers, plus the pension and health care costs of more than 432,000 retirees and spouses. Toyota says its total costs are around \$48. The Japanese automaker has far fewer retirees and its pension and health care benefits are not as rich as those paid to UAW workers.

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 12 Dec 2008 23:33:08 GMT

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

I still find it hard to believe that a union alone can sap a company dry single-handedly. These are agreements being reached, after all. If someone needs to take a paycut, it's the person not doing his job right. According to nikki, the cars are made fine. Maybe it's whoever's idea it was to keep pushing crappy, boring, gas-guzzling trucks?

Toyota hasn't been in Michigin nearly as long as GM and Ford have -- It's basic logic that retirement for their employees costs less. They have less retirees.

Conservifags loev to haet unions, but in the end a company is responsible for it's own business decisions and the contracts it voluntarily enters.

Should the UAW have given in at this moment? Probably. At the second senate hearing they said they were willing to compromise, but just because they refused to cut their wages by 50% (!!) as asked this time around doesn't mean they're going back on their word. That's a very large cut to swallow. Likewise, they can't be blamed for single-handedly destroying a major industry. To do so is to absolve bad business practices and nearly a decade of failed economic policy of any blame.

Then again, who's "fault" it is doesn't matter much, does it?

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sat, 13 Dec 2008 03:31:41 GMT

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

Yes, but the union auto workers are an extremely powerful union. If they don't get what they want, the entire Detroit automaking industry is screwed until the UAW is happy. I'm a conservative, I recognize the value of unions from 50 years ago, but I think that they have run their course and are now just hanging around because they can. If GM, Ford, and Chrysler didn't have to support the people that have retired that were in the unions, they'd be doing better than they are now. Unions were valuable back in the early 1900s up to about 1942, then they just became redundant because of the war and the rising wages of the 50s.

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Sat, 13 Dec 2008 22:10:06 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 12 December 2008 15:36 They successfully killed the Detroit automakers and the Michigan economy.

How did they do it, you ask? They're a fucking labor union; it's quite obvious how they did it. They're greedy, arrogant, idiotic bastards who think that auto workers deserve a lot of money for a job that any fucking 3 year-old could figure out how to do. THEN, when they are asked to take pay cuts in order for the "Big 3" to get a \$14 billion loan from the government, they refuse! They won't take a pay cut until their contract ends in 2011!

What is the result of this? Well, for one thing, GM is cutting 250,000 vehicles from being made in the 1Q 2009, and most of the North American plants will be shut down for January.

How ARROGANT must you be to refuse pay cuts for people who are OVERPAID as it is in order to keep your jobs? Oh, maybe because then they'd have to admit that they're the ones who have continually bankrupting Detroit for 70 years with stupid demands and over-the-top accommodations for workers that don't have to be smarter than your average 13 year-old.

I hate unions with a passion. In fact, I would almost say that I have murderous rage towards labor unions. At the core, they have good intentions and are even reasonable. Once they get going, though, they get greedy and oh so arrogant. They continue to strip away the rights of corporations and make it so that the corporations, themselves, are the ones blamed.

Don't think that I'm defending corporations. I hate corporatism, too, but in this situation the majority of the blame can be put on the UAW. They are at fault.

you are just like lou dobbs

you fucking hate everything

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 15 Dec 2008 04:01:36 GMT

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

Yup, I'm an equal opportunity hater.

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 15 Dec 2008 09:18:30 GMT

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

That's not a good thing, cheese. Lou Dobbs is a douchebag. When you hate everything, you stand for nothing and nobody can take you seriously.

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Mon, 15 Dec 2008 10:01:58 GMT

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

OMG, Dover actually has a point I agree with... HOLY SHIT!

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 15 Dec 2008 17:22:47 GMT

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

I thought you and I agreed plenty, Demin. We both know the internet is SRS BIZNIS.

Subject: Re: UAW

Posted by [reborn](#) on Tue, 16 Dec 2008 13:01:45 GMT

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

danpaul88 wrote on Fri, 12 December 2008 17:04 I think this is partly why the unions in the UK have almost no power these days. Last time the unions got out of hand the government basically stripped all their power away to solve the problem.

I don't exactly know much about it as it happened before my time, so that may not be 100% accurate, but it's roughly what happened.

Thatcher became the first woman Prime Minister.
Thatcher stole the little kids milk.
Thatcher ass-rammed the Unions.
Thatcher survived my assasination attempt on her.
Thatcher handed over her mess to John Major when she resigned.

I don't follow America's Union action very much at all, but in the UK they really have little power (other than the railway worked union), I wish they had more clout. I'm constantly screwed becuae of the lack of Union influence in my work place.
