Consolidated Reflections of 46-60 Theses Statements of the
Cluetrain Manifesto

Alberto Nel R. Mateo V

De La Salle-College of Saint Benilde

Abstract

This study is a consolidation of the reflections based on how the author understands the 46th to 60th theses statement of the Cluetrain Manifesto. Every reflection looks at the implication of the thesis statement to the market and companies. It also gives some key point on how far does the company and markets are able to do now according to the 95 Theses of the Cluetrain Manifesto. This study, deals about on how the markets communicate using their human voice and some key points on how should the companies react in order to relate and gain profit to them.

Thesis 46: A healthy intranet organizes workers in many meanings of the word. Its effect is more radical than the agenda of any union.

This statement is telling us that the intranet should be use in order to produce conversations from discourses and not to prevent them. It is because if conversation among the employees is always present in the internet, the employees can understand the concerns of each and every one of them. This helps them to be united in their bargain with the company. That is the reason why the statement states that it organizes workers in many meanings of the word. It's because the employees learn many opinions and perspectives about a certain problem of theirs. This makes them open to new ideas on solving their problems which they can subscribe to their co-employees within their company. The statement also provides the probable effect of a healthy intranet. The statement says that this effect is more radical than the agenda of any union. This sentence only tells us that when the employees are engage in conversation, they are also able to form relationships which cannot be created by mere meetings in a union. That is why the companies must realize the importance of the voice that circulates in the intranet when it provides the means to become possible. They should listen to these voices for they can learn on it. They must realize the reason behind it before the worst case happens. It is because the employees are also human beings that have the right to express themselves. The company just needs to help them in exercising that right with the help of their intranet.

Integrative Questions:
- What is a healthy intranet?
- What is the effect of a healthy intranet?
- How would the employees benefit from it?

Thesis 47: While this scares the company witless, they also depend heavily on open intranets to generate and share critical knowledge. They need to resist the urge to "improve" or control these networked conversations.

We all know that companies needs to get information about their markets in order to understand the needs of their market. One of their sources of this information is their employees who often interact with their intended market. But those same companies that rely on their employees for information source are also the ones that are restricting the employees to interact with themselves. It is ironic is it? Why would they hinder their employees to create conversation with themselves when the company greatly depends on them in their information gathering? It is really a question that the company should answer in order for them to solve the problem which they are the ones who create. That is where the second part of the statement enters. It says that they must resist the urge to "improve" or control these networked conversation. It pertains to the security of the intranet itself in which the company try their best to improve which makes it more difficult for the employees to engage themselves in conversation in which the company depends for information resource. That is why this statement tells us that we, as human are social being that has freedom to express our thoughts. No one can hinder us from doing it much more of a human creation. This is what the companies should realized that

when they restrict their source to gather information, it is them that will have a poor output in the end just because of their anxieties and worries about the confidential information of the company..

Integrative Questions:
- Why company does depend on open intranet for their information gathering?
- Which aspect does the word "improve" refer?
- Who is responsible on the rise of this problem?

Thesis 48: When corporate intranets are not constrained by fear and legalistic rules, the type of conversation they encourage sounds remarkably like the conversation of the networked marketplace.

When we are talking to other people, it is always a question on how we can talk to them in which we can exchange information at most. This is where this statement relates its meaning. In the real world, we can't express our ideas fully when we are in a formal conversation isn't it? We are worried that our idea might not be enough for them to be accepted. We also doubt that the information that we are receiving might only be a scripted one. We would prefer to communicate in a normal way in which we can say what we want without any worries. The same goes for the company. If their intranet would allow normal conversations in it, it would be a benefit for both of them. On the side of the employees, they can exercise their right of speech in a normal manner. On the other hand, the company also benefits by obtaining reliable information about their products and their market. If companies can only implement this kind of deployment in their products in which it would be deployed first in their core employees before to the public. They can collect information about what their employees can say with their product that could help them enhance it before its public release. It can increase the end-user acceptance to their product. The companies should remember that conversation starts from the problem of the people. If these problems can be discussed in the intranet normally, it would give them the idea they need in order to find a solution for it.

Integrative Questions:
- What is the benefit of normal conversations in the intranet to the company?
- What is the benefit of normal conversations in the intranet to the employees?
- Who is the one in control of the conversations in the intranet?

Thesis 49: Org charts worked in an older economy where plans could be fully understood from atop steep management pyramids and detailed work orders could be handed down from on high.

In a certain organization, we all know that positions reflect the chain of command. When you are at the highest position, you hold more responsibility but not to the point of doing them hands-on. Oftentimes, you just think of a plan and order your subordinates to execute it. This is where the problem starts. The one in the higher position doesn't really engage himself/herself to the actual work. That is why his plans are not accurate enough to meet the requirements and consider all the limitations. The same is happening on most

of the companies. The executives create plans for their company but don't consider the capacity of their company itself. They always reason that they pay people in order to find solutions and not to complain with the plans they give. But they are forgetting something. It is that everything has its own limits. Even the people they hire and the equipments they used have its own limits that are already out of their control. That is the reason why those executives are now nothing but a mere position only. It is for the reason that they fail to listen to the people who is responsible in creating the products of the company. What matters is the ability of the person in executing the work and not the one that only relies on his/her position. People don't judge a certain work based on its strategies and processes but rather the output or results produced from the inputs that they used.

Integrative Questions:
- What does position reflects in an organization?
- What is the problem on the ones that are in the higher position?
- What is more important in the organization in terms of delivering a product?

Thesis 50: Today, the org chart is hyperlinked, not hierarchical. Respect for hands-on knowledge wins over respect for abstract authority.

In our country, most of the jobs require formal studies like graduating a 4-year degree course or a Bachelor's degree. It is for the reason that most of the people in our state believe that the higher education you gain, the more things you can do. But is that really always the case? If we are on the basis of creating a product, it is not right to say that a person with higher intellect could really proves his theory in creating the product than a person with a lesser intellect but has experience of doing the product using the available theories of creating it. This also reminds us that experience is still the best teacher especially when it comes to the reality of life. It's like that the person who creates the product is more appreciated that the person who spend the day of thinking how to create the product. It's just a matter of determining the one that has greater capabilities in creating the desired product. The thing here is that the company should also do the same way of determining who is a more capable person. They must base their comparison in terms of experience which is concrete rather that pure ideas that only show abstraction. They should also realize that their company might be better with those that have the experience needed rather than those who only talked about the strategies to deliver their products but end up with nothing even a single product for the company to sell.

Integrative Questions:
- How org chart do become hyperlink?
- Where should the company base their comparison of capabilities?
- What is the advantage of hands-on-knowledge against abstract authority?

Thesis 51: Command-and-control management styles both derive from and reinforce bureaucracy, power tripping and an overall culture of paranoia.

From our government down to the business world, everyone imposes a command-and-control management. As defined by thefreedictionary.com, it is the exercise of authority and direction by a properly designated commander over assigned and attached forces in the accomplishment of the mission. It may be of a different setting, but our government has a hierarchy of power while the companies have the org chart for the flow of their authority. But sad to say, most of them don't know how to exercise that authority and direction properly which makes this method ineffective. As the statement says, this method is derived from reinforce bureaucracy, power tripping and culture of paranoia. It is a reinforce bureaucracy because they impost authority which are not needed. They also create committees that the only function is to transfer a document from one place to another. It only creates costs and decreases the efficiency of the process. It is power tripping because as discussed on the previous theses, there are still a number of people that clings to their positions which only reflects their authority and not their capability. As defined in urbandictionary.com, power tripping is having a particular obsession with or unrealistic view of one's power. Those people view their authority as a measurement of their skills which should not be the case. The last is that it is from an overall culture of paranoia which only tells us that the higher management doubts about their employees whom they depend in their information gathering. It is because they are worried that their employees would leak the company information to their competitors. That's why this statement addresses the company that the command-and-control management style destroys their relationship with their employees.

Integrative Questions:
- What is Command and Control?
- Where does the command and control style derived?
- What is Power Tripping?

Thesis 52: Paranoia kills conversation. That's its point. But lack of open conversation kills companies.

As discussed in the previous statement, paranoia is an attitude of fear and distrust to a person. It is also defined in merriam-webster.com; it is a tendency on the part of an individual or group toward excessive or irrational suspiciousness and distrustfulness of others. Thus it would kill conversations. It is for the reason that in a conversation, there should be trust on what the other party is telling and vice versa. There should also be understanding between the two parties in order to have a conversation. If the companies continue to put fear in their hierarchy, they prevent conversations to exist which should help the company to survive. Thus when the conversations are absent, they company will suffer from it and eventually die. The reason behind it is that paranoia creates barriers between the company and market. These barriers prevent the market from telling the company what they need which make the company unknowledgeable on providing the right products that the market needs. As paranoia increases in a company, the barriers also increase. This makes the company to gamble on the products that they create. As

they do gamble, they take risk that might lead them to failure. As the company fails to cater the needs of the market, they also lose profit. This is the time they imposed power tripping to their employees to which they threat them that they would be fired when loses of the company are too much and can't be recovered. That is why this statement still insists that the model to be used is the hyperlinked one and not the hierarchal.

Integrative Questions:
- What is Paranoia?
- What is the effect of Paranoia to conversations?
- What is the effect of the absence of conversations to the company?

Thesis 53: There are two conversations going on. One inside the company. One with the market.

It is good to see people when they can express themselves to other in a natural way that they are free to say what they want. Starting from their problems up to their good experiences in life, they can share it without any fear in mind. Imagine that this kind of conversation is happening between the company and markets. It will surely give both parties great outputs in return. A product or service that suits their need for the market and profit for the company would be the good returns on both parties. It is sad to say that what we want to imagine is still like a dream until now. It is because there are still two conversations that were happening. The one is the conversation on the intranet which is inside with the company. The other one is on the internet on which the markets are the one doing conversations. We might be wondering on why they can't crossover each other. It is because the one that create the barriers between the two is the intranet of the company. Of course we all know that internet is available to the public so the company can also connect there. But on the other hand the markets can't connect to the company's intranet because of the security restrictions set by the company. It is the one that serves to be the barrier between the intranet of the company and the internet of the market. The only thing that the company should do is to open up their networked which would also benefit them in the end.

Integrative Questions:
- Where do the two conversations take place?
- Which conversation has a barrier between the two?
- What can the company do in order for the two conversations to meet up?

Thesis 54: In most cases, neither conversation is going very well. Almost invariably, the cause of failure can be traced to obsolete notions of command and control.

It is discussed in the previous statement, the command-and-control management styles brings forth fear among the employees. But this command-and-control thing doesn't end on that kind of effect. It also prevents the employee on engaging themselves on conversations. We might be wondering how and why it happens in a company. The answer might be found on what the command-and-control style implies. In a typical quarrel of siblings, the most common cause of it is misunderstanding about something. This misunderstanding is brought by their voices that can't be heard by the other party. It

is because there is a barrier that prevents them from hearing the voice of the other party. This barrier is the so-called authority of a person over the other. If the elder one thinks that his decisions are absolute and there is this younger sibling arguing about his decision, his pride won't accept that fact. Same goes for the younger one thinking that his decisions can't also be argued or the fact that his pride can't accept that there is his elder sibling having a greater authority over him. Thus, their quarrel will only continue. This kind of situation is not far from what is happening to some companies. If the employees notice that there is something wrong, they still can't speak out because the higher management prevents them from doing so. The market also thinks that there is something wrong. They can't speak about it freely but no one bothers to listen to them. It is because the implication of authoritarianism in the company that branch out from the command and control style. It is the one that prevents the conversation from going flawlessly. This thing should be forgone a long time ago. The companies must be the one to encourage people to speak and listen to everything in any place, time and manner.

Integrative Questions:
- What does command and control brings to the employees?
- What is the barrier that command and control brought to the conversation?
- What is it that should be done in order to make conversations go smoothly?

Thesis 55: As policy, these notions are poisonous. As tools, they are broken. Command and control are met with hostility by intranetworked knowledge workers and generate distrust in internetworked markets.

　　　In this statement, the command and control style is again tackled but not as a management style or method but as an idea and tool. It only not sounds to be a policy because it is a real one. It is a policy that is derived from distrust and suspicion to others. It is a lie to say that rules are rules which is to be followed whether you like it or not. It's for the reason that even the one who implements it doesn't follow it absolutely. They also break this policy in one way or another. All of these are the ones that make command and control a poison to the company as an idea and a broken tool. It is poisonous because no one wants to accept it. Who would prefer to be told of the things that you should do when those things are the ones you hate to do most. This makes the command and control to be more hated by the people. If the company also tries to break their policies in a way or two, they should be more eager to break their ruler of having barriers with their markets. This kind of attitude would only lead them to trusting the ones they thought are their allies but their enemies instead. Their arrogance on persisting to implement such method would only lead them to greater loses. This loses could actually increment to the point they can't recover. It's because they used force on their employees to do their twisted ideals. They also create barriers against their market which actually has the better ideals for them to use in their approach to business. That is the more reason that the ones which are destined to die are those that have enough pride to not listen to markets.

Integrative Questions:
- Why is command and control become a poisonous tool?
- What does this method pushed unto their employees that is to be done?
- Where the company's arrogance does lead them?

Thesis 56: These two conversations want to talk to *each other*. They are speaking the same language. They recognize each other's voices.

       In the earlier thesis, the result of having the two conversations be linked together is a better return for both. But we can't deny the barriers which are present that makes it impossible for the two to meet up. These barriers could be in the form emotion, physical disability and the mentality of not engaging into conversations. The last form of barrier mentioned is the one that reflects the company's created walls against their employees and market. It happens even though their employees already want to spread the news of communication to the outside world. The same goes for the market. If the company can open their walls even to only one customer, it can make a lot of money. It is for the reason that markets always links themselves to others. No matter what kind of barrier is present, those people know their voices which make them linked to one another. Thus, it renders any kind of obstruction useless against them. No matter how the much the company denies, they already know the fact that their walls are soon to be broken. That is why the only thing they can do now is to accept the fact the two conversations are bound to have dialogues with each other. Aside from accepting the truth about the two conversations, they should also learn from it in order to become better providers for the market. It's because if they still persist with their twisted ideals, they would only die as the most stubborn company that existed ever.

Integrative Questions:
- What are the considerable forms of barriers based on the statement?
- What links the two conversations together?
- What should the company do in order to become better providers for the market?

Thesis 57: Smart companies will get out of the way and help the inevitable to happen sooner.

       In the earlier thesis, it is discussed how the two conversation would meet up no matter how the company prevents it. The walls that the company creates will soon to be destroy by the people who don't want to be under the company's command and control style management. Thus companies can't do anything about it. Now this statement is telling us on how the company can be considered as a smart one when we know that their arrogance is already enough for them to die. Those companies that realize the importance of the conversation of the two are the ones that are to be considered as smart. It is for the reason that they will only let their walls crumble in front of themselves without doing anything. They may not be fully open to the market but they now consider the power of the two conversations. This would serve as their way out of their destined death as a business. They will now listen to those voices whom at first they prevent to hear. The will now also acknowledge and learn from these conversations for them to be a better

provider to the markets. As good as it is, we still know that there are still some companies that won't do it. That's why the statement considers those who do such things as a smart one. A single word is already enough for them to take corrective actions and rectify their mistakes. It's because they don't want having the second word to be spoken to them again for it might already be their punishment of their arrogance.

Integrative Questions:
- What is a smart company in the context of this thesis?
- What is the reaction of the smart companies on the meeting up of the two conversations?
- What are the steps done by the companies do in order to be considered as a smart one?

Thesis 58: If willingness to get out of the way is taken as a measure of IQ, then very few companies have yet wised up.

Conversations are important to all human beings for the reason that it is a way to relay our messages to other people. It could be to our family, friends, relatives and other love ones. These messages could start from a simple greeting to an emergency life and death situation. All of these conversations are considered to be happening in the corporate intranets. But if it is allowed in the company, it can also be in the web like the forum sites. But this statement implies some conditions for it to happen as it says that "But only when conditions are right". This could mean that companies can prevent these conversations to start from taking place. It is because the companies have the control on the internet in which they can filter message according to their regulations. That's why employees wonder when they are sure that they have sent the email but the recipient told them that they weren't receiving the message. That is why this security is the one that increases the distance of the employees to the companies by increasing the barriers and walls of communication. That is why the point of this statement is for the companies, which controls the accessibility of their intranet, to be knowledgeable in knowing which messages are to be filtered. They should know when the security is badly needed. It's because it might just be their worries that their employees would be the source of information leakage of their company to the outside.

Integrative Questions:
- What is the condition referred by the statement?
- How does conversation take place on the corporate intranets?
- Who is the responsible in making the said conditions?

Thesis 59: However subliminally at the moment, millions of people now online perceive companies as little more than quaint legal fictions that are actively preventing these conversations from intersecting.

In all the discussions about the barriers that prevent us to communicate, there is one outcome that has been forgotten. As the companies prevent the conversations from occurring, it is not only that they incur damages or die. They could also be ignored by their own employees and the market. As of today, people are now networked and can gain information in a blink of an eye. But as for the companies, what are they now after all the changes that occur in this world. They still remain to be a company because they are only entities created and can be destroyed by the law of every state. If they are only created law, they are artificial beings that try to hinder human beings to exercise our rights to communicate. That is why we can easily ignore them. It's because humans tend to ignore beings that can't relate to them. That is the more reason why those companies need to be smart nowadays.

In the line of being smart, allowing the conversation is not only the thing that they can do. As stated in the previous thesis, they should also learn from it. They must learn to innovate themselves as to their markets have done. If they can succeed in changing their ideas, they can now have a better chance in relating themselves to us. They should also throw away their mundane policies that they also try to violate. With all of this they are now following their markets to a better world. That is the more reason why they should change, change for the better.

Integrative Questions:
- What is the forgotten outcome when companies prevent conversation from occurring?
- What makes the company an artificial being?
- What is the thing that the company should learn from their market?

Thesis 60: This is suicidal. Markets *want* to talk to companies.

As much as the company wants to disagree with it, the complaints of their customer are the means of the market in engaging themselves in conversation with the company. This conversation can create a great difference in which the only thing that the company should do is to listen. Markets are the ones that don't want these companies to die just because they choose not to listen. They wouldn't speak to the companies if it is their intention at the first place.

The truth behind it is that the companies are the ones that fail to listen to their markets. This resulted to the disappearance of the confidence of the market to the companies. That is why the companies are the ones that give their markets the reason for them to be ignored. As they continue to do this to their markets, it became the starting point for the company to gradually die. This is what this statement wants to say about being suicidal. They are losing their markets because the pushed them away. As they gradually lose their markets, they also gradually die. If they totally lose their markets,

they can't excel in their industry and they can't recover their expenses. Thus, they are nothing without their markets in which they do generate income.

The outside world offers many options for a certain company to start their business operations. But before they analyze the outside world, they should look at themselves first, about the things they need to change with them. This is for them to be able to create interactions not only within themselves bur also with their markets as well.

Integrative Questions:
- What is the means of the markets to engage themselves in conversation with the companies?
- What is the mistake of the company that leaves the market a sole option which is to ignore them?
- What should the companies do in create interactions with their markets?

References

- Command and Control. (n.d.) In *thefree*dictionary.com Retrieved from http://www.thefreedictionary.com
- Power Tripping. (n.d.) In *urbandictionary*.com Retrieved from http://www.urbandictionary.com
- Paranoia, (n.d.) In *merriam-webster*.com Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com