

Consolidated Reflections of 76-95 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 76th to 95th 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 76: We've got some ideas for you too: some new tools we need, some better service. Stuff we'd be willing to pay for. Got a minute?

In the study of marketing, it is a must for a company to find a need for something. But in my point of view, why is there a need to find it? They can simply engage themselves with the conversations that are occurring in the market or even inside their companies. It would help them save time and increase the relevance of the information that they could extract from it. Thus, their necessity of finding a need is already gone. Saves time and money isn't it? But it might be a question as to why these companies don't implement it in their organization at the first place? They can just coordinate it with the things they can provide using their own capabilities. They can just also align those needs to their goals and objectives as a company of provider. The possible reason as to what they are doing is that they don't listen to what we are saying to them. We are open to tell them our need for them to provide the solution for it. But they only let those words flew in the air as if nothing has been said. If those companies value time like the money that they can't spend some it in talking to the markets, we are also thinking the same. The markets also value their time like the money that they spend in acquiring certain products. That's why they also can't lose even a portion of it doing nothing. If those companies still don't get that idea, then it's time for them to say goodbye to their precious business. It's because their deeds only makes their image worst which is equivalent to death. That's why companies should take the responsibility of listening to their markets seriously.

Integrative Questions:

- Is there really an importance of finding a need?
- What is wrong with the companies according to this statement?
- What is that resource that both companies and markets value the same as money?

Thesis 77: You're too busy "doing business" to answer our email? Oh gosh, sorry, gee, we'll come back later. Maybe.

This statement could be related to the previous one in which companies doesn't intend to listen to their market about their concerns and other inquiries. But this statement implies the possibilities of what can happen if those companies continue to do this to their markets. It is explicitly stated in this statement. It says that "well come back later, maybe". It only means that there is a possibility that the market would look for another company that would appreciate on listening to their concerns and would be able to provide the solution for them.

This may be not a lost on the side of the company because they assume that they still have plenty of customers that are willing to wait that long. But they should also remember that those actions would give them a bad image to that specific customer that they have ignored. That impression can easily spread to the total market because as the previous theses had stated, markets are now connected in a networked way. This makes information flow rapidly. Thus, it creates trouble to the companies especially that the competition in these times is tight that negative impressions can make them lose a huge amount of money. There are plenty of players that appear everyday in a certain industry. With the way the company does things, they just increase the damage they are doing to themselves.

Integrative Questions:

- What does this statement implies?
- What is the thing that can make companies lose a huge amount of money with the existing competition?
- What is the effect of these actions undertaken by the company to them?

Thesis 78: You want us to pay? We want you to pay attention.

When we are in a certain store, it is absolute that we need something in which we do hope that certain store can provide. What if that store offers you a product that you would not need and doesn't suit your preference? Of course you are in a disappointed mood that you regret that you bought that product. But then again, you are more disappointed that you believe what that salesperson has told you. It is for the reason that you assume that what he/she has told you is correct even the opposite is what that person meant in the first place. It is fine if that is the situation because we also have shortcoming on our side. But if those salesperson tries to make you buy the product without listening to your other inquiries, that is the time that you can say that they are mistaken on what they are doing. It is because they shouldn't do it in the first place. They are the ones asking you to buy their product and yet they have the guts to put you under pressure? They should have the manners to ask their customers. They should also cater every concern that their customer has about their product. It's for the reason that even they had successfully sold their product, when that customer had complained against that product; it is the company's image which is damaged. That damage can't be easily handled and resolved. That is why companies should know how to put their attention to their customers in order to gain profit. That can be done by just solely listening to them.

Integrative Questions:

- What does this statement want to tell the companies?
- What is the thing that is damaged to the company by customers' complains?
- What is that potential that the companies should realize?

Thesis 79: We want you to drop your trip, come out of your neurotic self-involvement, join the party.

It is somehow wondering that companies do their operations in a very secretive way. This could be brought up by the tight competition in their industry. We can't blame them for that. But the thing here is that they should not close themselves to the people they intend to serve. These people are the markets. These markets are the ones that have the largest potential on teaching these companies on the things they must do. Rather than being secretive on their strategies, why don't they interact with the markets? They might learn something in one way or another. It's because while their research and development are trying their best to create or modify their product/s, we, the markets, are continuously learning on what, where and how to buy stuff that we need in our daily living.

This statement tells those companies to join the party that is occurring within their market. This party is the symbol of innovation that is happening in the market. It's because in a literal party, there are changes that makes people satisfied. Same goes for the changes in the market itself. We don't want to let those kings that are still in the past which don't know their position and still assumes that they are always on top of us. We want the change to start now. We'll be introducing new notions that these companies must do even their pride can't take it. There will be no arguments on this. If they don't want to join this change, then they should now be preparing for their incoming death.

Integrative Questions:

- Why do companies do their operations in secret to their markets?
- What is the symbol of the party in this statement?
- What is it that the markets want to start immediately?

Thesis 80: Don't worry, you can still make money. That is, as long as it's not the only thing on your mind.

It is a typical situation when companies are starting a project. They are always onto the projection of sales and return on the investments. The same goes for the government projects. Both of them always prioritize money in order to operate. It is really different when we say that money is needed in order to operate a business. The reason is simple. When money is needed to operate it means that it is one of the important components in operation. On the other hand, when money is the priority to operate, it means that money is the most important component of operations. See the difference now?

There are many way in order to make money. What the companies need to do is to be open. Open on the great ideas that can be used to produce money. This is aside from putting pressures to your customers in order to earn. But as the previous statements had said, those companies are already busy to notice and put some attention on those things. That's why in the end, they don't care about it.

It is saddening that because of what they have done, they will be really busy not on earning money, but on packing their things and calling some construction company to demolish their building that they already can't afford to pay. That's why the fame only goes to the smart ones that learns to listen and made the correct prioritization on their operations. They are the ones that likely consider money as only one of those important components and not the most important.

Integrative Questions:

- What is the first thing that a company asks when launching a project based on the statement?
- What is the similarity between the companies and government in terms of prioritization on money?
- What should these companies do in order to make money without considering it as the most important component in their operations?

Thesis 81: Have you noticed that, in itself, money is kind of one-dimensional and boring? What else can we talk about?

In the previous thesis, it is discussed there that money should be considered as the most important component in the operation. It is for the reason that this kind of thinking is the one that makes money a kind of one-dimensional and boring. It is one-dimensional because they perceive money in only one aspect which is the priority in operations. It became boring because every time they talk about money, it is always operations and earnings that are on their mind and nothing more. That is the reason why this statement is also asking on what else they can talk about.

The main point here is that if those companies could have the courage to broaden their thinking, they would realize that there are others things that they were earning in their operations aside from money alone. Examples of which are quality reputation, customer loyalty and good image to the social community. These things can be considered as far better than just profit alone isn't it? So has the bulb light already sparked in your heads? I hope that's what happened. It is for the reason that customers wouldn't be loyal to a certain product if that product doesn't suits their need. It is also neither they would become loyal by just forcing them to buy the product. It is better to say that they would become loyal when you prove that your product has the best quality in time. That is where they can say that they can drive their customer to buy their product without forcing them to do so. The company doesn't create their names by merely forcing people to know it but by doing things that they would appreciate which you earn.

Integrative Questions:

- What is the reason why money becomes one-dimensional and boring?
- Why is money a kind of one-dimensional?
- What are some things that can be considered as earnings aside from money?

Thesis 82: Your product broke. Why? We'd like to ask the guy who made it. Your corporate strategy makes no sense. We'd like to have a chat with your CEO. What do you mean she's not in?

Typically, when a certain product that we had bought suddenly broke because of malfunctioning, we tend to look for our warranty papers that are sure to be troublesome. After all those findings, we will go to the store where we bought it and claim for that warranty (assuming that warranty is still valid). Those things are not wrong but when that warranty is not accepted for some terms and conditions that they had created, we always want to talk to their manager about it. But unfortunately it is most likely the situation wherein the manager is not in the location. That's how the scenario always looks like in most of the time.

When we talk to those that are directly involve in creating the product or the one that manages it could be considered as far better than just getting your stuff back like its dump. It is also better than not knowing what happens after they replace your product or if that products gets to be replaced in the first place. It is not like that anyone bothers to ask but it is the thing that no one knows where to ask or if they know, would they be able to speak with that person. It only tells us that there are too many hindrances on the conversation within the market and the company. Those conversations that are supposed to help both companies and markets are restricted in many ways for it to occur. These restrictions get more and more irritating as time passes. I hope that they can do something about it.

Integrative Questions:

- What is the typical scenario when a product is broken?
- What is a better way than just getting your stuff back like its dump?
- What is the problem between the conversation of market and companies?

Thesis 83: We want you to take 50 million of us as seriously as you take one reporter from *The Wall Street Journal*.

It is quite a wonder that when companies are doing press conference, they always invite so many reporters and journalist. But do they bother to invite even one of their potential markets? It is funny to think that those reporters and journalist are the ones that have the capability to assess the company's product when the truth is that they are only one who will write something about that product on newspapers and other media. The thing here is that the markets are still the ones that have the last say on a certain product that is to be introducing onto them. It's because literally, those journalist wouldn't be their most potential market the first place. It is still best when the appropriate people are the ones that will judge a candidate rather than relying on someone that will do it with their belief that it is not the best way of doing what they really want. In comparison to the journalist and reporters, companies shouldn't rely on their assessments because their real job is to write something about it while their markets are the people which have the largest possibility of using it.

The fifty (50) million is to one (1) that is stated in the thesis is really something. It doesn't prohibit the company on inviting press reporters and journalist on their press conference (that is why it is called press conference right?). This only means that those companies should prioritize their markets as the primary evaluator of their products over those press people that were not onto really becoming their potential buyers.

Integrative Questions:

- Why do companies invite many reporters and journalist in their press conference?
- What is the function of those reporters and journalist in a press conference?
- Who is to be considered as the primary evaluator of the company's product?

Thesis 84: We know some people from your company. They're pretty cool online. Do you have any more like that you're hiding? Can they come out and play?

It is typical that people have acquaintances within a certain company. That is why they may have small amount of information about the company. The best part is that when those people from the outside have the same amount of information about the company with the employees of the company itself. It is for the reason that the amount of information they exchange between them is also large. It only means that the percentage of learning relative information is also huge. They can also access that information easily because they are now networked with the help of the internet. That is the more reason why the possibilities are almost infinite when the people from the inside (the employees) can freely communicate with people outside (the markets).

The best example of it is when a person is inquiring about their internet service with a certain company provider. The customer service agent would always apologize for the inconvenience that their company has done to that specific customer. Then they would add that they are already doing their best to serve the problem. But the thing here is that their customers would have already notice that the things they were telling them might also be a part of those scripted language that the company has given them. That's the more reason that the markets wants to talk directly to those people (employees). They are hoping that the things those people told them over the phone are their real voices that they would use when they converse outside. It is fortunate that those people within are also willing to converse with the ones outside. This would bring a great change and could be able to make the business world far better than what it is today.

Integrative Questions:

- What is the importance of this statement to the market and companies?
- What is the best thing brought by the conversation between companies and markets?
- What is the good part on the side of the company in terms of this conversation?

Thesis 85: When we have questions we turn to each other for answers. If you didn't have such a tight rein on "your people" maybe they'd be among the people we'd turn to.

When we are visiting different forums at the web, we can somehow conclude that most of the inquiries there are about problems about their acquired products. These inquiries can be on the technical part or on the other. But when we try to review some answers to those inquiries, we may notice that most of the answers out there are based on the opinion of the user. It can also be based on the experience of the one answering the inquiry. Would it be better if the answers we can get have the higher reliability and accuracy on our end? Of course it is possible, but only if the one who answers the question is the person that is directly involve on that product. It is not that the answers coming from the market are wrong but it should be noted that those in the markets are different people with different experiences on that specific product (if there is). That is why it became less reliable and accurate in comparison if the one who answers are the people that are really involve on the product itself.

This is what the statement wants to say. It wants to tell those company that why should they prevent their people from speaking to the market when in fact those people of them have the most accurate answers for the discourses of their markets. There shouldn't be any barrier preventing that thing from happening. People from around the globe need answers to their problems. Same goes for the markets. That's why those companies shouldn't be the one to prevent but rather to be the source of the answers that the markets want to find.

Integrative Questions:

- What are the typical things that we can see in a forum?
- What is the basis of the answers in the inquiries of the people in the forum?
- What is the task that the company should undertake in order to help their markets solve their discourses?

Thesis 86: When we're not busy being your "target market," many of us *are* your people. We'd rather be talking to friends online than watching the clock. That would get your name around better than your entire million dollar web site. But you tell us speaking to the market is Marketing's job.

In a specific networked, there are restrictions that are implemented. These restrictions are used for security purposes so that the important information about that network wouldn't fall on the wrong hands. But it is quite exaggerated that these restriction also lessens the productivity of its users. If the case is like this, then that is a problem.

A good example of it is my class in ENTDBAS last Saturday dated November 14, 2009. It is supposed to be our midterm examination but that day becomes a very unproductive day for all of us. It is for the reason that many problems occur. But the worst problem is that the database software that we are using was uninstalled. Wow what a scenario it is! It is sure a frustrating one for all of us (hope it is). It is because no one told us that they had maintenance work before that day. Unfortunately, our database software was one of the programs which are uninstalled. But the thing is that no one bothers to inform us even our professor. By that time we don't have a choice but to do the installation again (good for me that software was not uninstalled in my workstation). That's how out midterms goes in other words. The thing here is that they should at least tell us about that and should have installed that program they deleted at the first place. Of course with the restriction of the network, it didn't become easy for the others to install that software.

In relation to the statement, it would be true that we can be there people when we are not their markets by that time. If they just allow us to know the appropriate things ahead, then their name wouldn't be damage indirectly. It only reminds us that the markets can also help those companies. What those companies should do is to give them the needed information and that's it. All is set to spread the news.

Integrative Questions:

- What is the purpose of restrictions in a certain network?
- When this restriction does became a problem for the users?
- What is that thing that the company must realize from their markets?

Thesis 87: We'd like it if you got what's going on here. That'd be real nice. But it would be a big mistake to think we're holding our breath.

This statement wants to tell us how better it is for the market to separate from those companies and create their own. The reason for it is because those companies created by the markets are the ones that can satisfy their genuine needs and able to solve their discourses. If these companies of old can also do the same, then it is a positive development for them. This development should be sustained so that they can continue to be in the right track. But they should keep in mind that they should not hope too much that they are doing the right thing. Like many people say, "Everything that is too much is also bad".

These companies are engaging themselves in a relationship with their customers. This relationship is not far from the typical ones. There is a need for trust and understanding in order to survive. But same with the common relationships that occur, it is inevitable for it have some damages because of hard times. These damages cannot be erased but can be repaired. But once the damage has occurred, it already means it. It can be repaired but its memories already created a mark. Same goes on the relationship between the company and markets. While the companies continue to ignore us, they are also continuing to inflict damage to the relationship between them. Surely they will try to fix it as far as they can. But as mentioned earlier, once something is done, then so be it. It can't be turn back. There we lose our confidence on those companies believing that they can solve our discourses by providing solutions for it. That does why this statement reminds them to act now, solve the problems of their markets now because if they don't it will just be a greater problem in the end.

Integrative Questions:

- What does this statement want to tell us?
- Where the company does engaged it with their customers?
- What can the companies do to avoid the damage that they might inflict to their relationship with their customers?

Thesis 88: We have better things to do than worry about whether you'll change in time to get our business. Business is only a part of our lives. It seems to be all of yours. Think about it: who needs whom?

This statement is referring to the way how the companies are becoming just an extra in the lives of the markets. It is for the reason that this statement already hits the spot. That spot is mention in the statement in a form of the question “who needs whom?” Here we can both ask the side of the markets and the companies in which we could find out who is the real one in need of such. Is it the markets? Or is it the companies?

The information that is explicitly available can already tell us that it is the company that needs us. First, business relies to their markets but we don't because we are already their markets at the first place. Secondly, both of us need money in order to survive but we as markets can create money with the use of interaction with other markets like us. As for the companies, they need their markets in order to create income and eventually create money. The last thing that can be asked on this problem is that can the markets exist without the markets? It can even be asked in its vice-versa. As for the markets, it is obvious that we can exist without them because markets can create companies on their own. These companies can be the ones to provide their needs and solve their problems. While as for the companies, they can't create markets because they don't understand them at the first place. In other words, it is the company that needs the markets and not the market that needs them.

This statement may look unjust to the side of the companies. But all these things are also cause by the companies themselves. We are open on telling them our problems and needs but what they do about it? They just ignored us. This should be the time to do something about it. It's because we are already fed up on what they are doing up until now. These deeds only lead to their worst death in their industry.

Integrative Questions:

- Where the statement does refers?
- Who is the one really in need of the other?
- Which is really to be blame why the statement looks unjust to the companies?

Thesis 89: We have real power and we know it. If you don't quite see the light, some other outfit will come along that's more attentive, more interesting, more fun to play with.

This statement is telling us that companies should do their transition as early as now. It's because it is not their top management that drives the company to its success. But rather it is their employees and intended markets that they can serve. As a previous thesis says, these smart markets, if they are really smart, should already realize that their markets are already gone and so they are. It looks good on the part of the markets that they are already excluded from the target of the company. It's for the reason that they can now find another company that can solve their problems. As for the company, it is a bad scenario for they will now have fewer customers in which they gain profit.

These things are already happening because the companies nowadays should now be evolving into a market-driven one. It is in which that the company prioritize the needs of their market which could eventually be their source of income at the latter part. This kind of competition is now where those companies should win against their competitors. It's because if they can't compete in this way, it will only prove that they can't compete at all. These days, it is now how good you advertise your product or how excellent your people are in your organization. But it's rather how they see your product as something that satisfies their need. It is the very reason as to why the markets have the power over the companies nowadays. Got it?

Integrative Questions:

- What the statement wants to tell us?
- What is the thing that has to happen now in the companies?
- What is the reason why the markets have the power now over the companies?

Thesis 90: Even at its worst, our newfound conversation is more interesting than most trade shows, more entertaining than any TV sitcom, and certainly more true-to-life than the corporate web sites we've been seeing.

If we imagine that there is no conversation on all human beings, what do you feel? Definitely you would say that it is a nonsense joke that is just crack from an underworld. Hello? How can a human being progress if he/she is just a creature that is not expressing his/her thoughts to other? It's because through this conversation, we learn, share and grow. Thus it is an essential for a human being to be engaged in conversation. There is no kind of proposal, strategies that can replace our conversation to others. It's because people are still the one that judge the works of that artificial being called company.

This conversation of ours is produce from our human voice that we are sharing to other people. With the help of the web, it is now improved. Our voices can now reach greater heights and are now becoming in depth with their meanings. These voices that we have are the ones that serve as our very own product that we promote to our fellow markets. This product is something that companies should realize and learn how to appreciate. They should also learn from it. It is the main reason why we are interested on these voices. It's because it's unique from every other and we can make a lot from it. It provides a lot of ideas and interest that those companies can use in their business. Unfortunately, they only respond with their scripted speeches and complex reports which only aims to fool us in the end. But they are mistaken on that assumption. It's because they are they ones that should realize their place because if they don't, they are just continuing to be on their hopes of being in our place.

Integrative Questions:

- What can we get from conversations?
- Where this conversation does came from?
- What does the human voice provides to us?

Thesis 91: Our allegiance is to ourselves—our friends, our new allies and acquaintances, even our sparring partners. Companies that have no part in this world, also have no future.

In this statement, it reminds me of another thesis that tells us that companies should be able to determine the limit of their corporate culture. It sounds true because those cultures are the ones that hinder the company from changing. It's because those culture are still based on their assumption that companies are still higher than their people and market which shouldn't be the case. This assumption is already obsolete because that is only applicable on the time of the industrial revolution which is way back the 18th to 19th century. But the time now is different; it is now the time where companies should prioritize their market to earn. Thus, time is a major factor for change to occur. We can also say that it is already 21st century. Thus, its already 2 centuries at most by the time that business model is applicable. Sad to say, those companies are still sticking to that kind of model like implementing the command and control management style. These things only worsen the damage that is inflicted to the company again as the time passes. See how important time is?

Belonging to the market, we also value the time because we want change to happen. A change that would make the companies joined too. That's the very reason as to why the company created by the markets exists. Those companies are the ones that were able to solve at least a single problem of their customer. With the presence of commitment, partnership and sharing of our ideas, there is no old company that can compete. The ones that have the chance to compete on that kind of company is also the company of the same kind. It only means that it is also a company coming from the market. If this kind of idea will be brought out, it will create a great change on the way people do their reasoning.

But as we push that through, there is still a chance that it would just be included on the mundane cycle of most companies. It's because it is still a company that we try to create. What is need is a new structure, characteristic that will come from us. This thing will be the key to the change we want. It will be effective as long as it come from us. The closer we get there; we are more like to change those old and even the new companies. That is to say if the are willing to.

Integrative Questions:

- What is an important factor for change to occur?
- What kind of company can compete with the market-driven companies?
- Where should the change come from?

Thesis 92: Companies are spending billions of dollars on Y2K. Why can't they hear this market timebomb ticking? The stakes are even higher.

When it is the height of the Y2K, companies are the ones that are in an urgent need of bug fixes. It is for the reason that they can't afford to lose all their records because their system can't leap from year 1999 to year 2000. The very reason for it is because they set their year with the last two digits. Thus after 99 (1999) is 00 (2000). See? Going back to zero all over again. What a mess is that? Thus, these companies spend much money in order to upgrade their systems and correct that bug.

In connection to the statement, they think that they need something more than what they used to do like their TV ads and other marketing strategies. But the thing here is that they don't notice that there is something which is a greater problem than that of the Y2K. It is the market timebomb that ticks every second. This timebomb is an indicator of the confidence of the market towards the company. In comparison, the Y2K gives them zeros because of resetting. On the other hand, the market timebomb gives them negative figures which are far lower than zero. Which means market timebomb inflicts greater damage to the company. Sad to say that they don't notice it because as a previous statement says, "They are busy doing business".

It is to say that all are busy in this time. But the markets are also busy conversing to others and enjoying themselves while those companies are busy with one thing, profit. Until at least a single person realizes that the markets have already free from corporate reliance, those companies are better to be dead than alive.

Integrative Questions:

- What is the problem in the Y2K?
- Which inflicts greater damages to the companies?
- Where the company does become busy with?

Thesis 93: We're both inside companies and outside them. The boundaries that separate our conversations look like the Berlin Wall today, but they're really just an annoyance. We know they're coming down. We're going to work from both sides to *take* them down.

Does it matter if we are paths are separated, one being on the outside (markets) and one being inside (employees)? I don't think it matters anymore. It is for the reason that we can still be connected in one way or another. Those employees can use internet when they are at home. There they can share their ideas, speak with their human voice and learn from others. Companies can't prevent them on doing that because it is not on their jurisdiction anymore. They can now be freely connected to the market as long as they are not in the company building. In other words that building is just an obstruction to the employees.

That how the power of human voice is, even that huge building is just like a stone that is to be thrown in the deep sea. It gets more powerful as it interacts with other voices, in the community thru the web. Nothing can hinder it but rather it can change things the way it is. Thus, we are free to speak and shows are capabilities to the world without doubt.

Like what I mention before, those companies are just like the obstructions which they themselves are root of it. They are just trouble compared to their employees that they were paying for. Thus, this statement reminds us that we can be connected to others wherever and whenever we want. That is a great thanks to the web. See? We can destroy walls, can those companies do that? Hope they can someday.

Integrative Questions:

- Does it matter if markets and employees are walking at different paths?
- How human voice does get more powerful?
- In what thing does the company is similar to according to this statement?

Thesis 94: To traditional corporations, networked conversations may appear confused, may sound confusing. But we are organizing faster than they are. We have better tools, more new ideas, no rules to slow us down.

When we try to observe in our very own community, it is only typical that we see problems and quarrels. But when we got home, even those kinds of things are still present; we can say that our home is the place where we want to be. It is for the reason that we trust our other family members and have the benefit of security. We have our own organization skills which are far better than when we are at the larger circle of the community. It is rapid enough for us to adapt on the changes that are happening in our environment. We can determine the opportunities and threats in our community and identify the strengths and weaknesses of our family. It became as such because of our trust, attitude, obedience and our very own voices. We can produce many things in a short span of time. Thus, we can do things in a faster way. In contrast to the companies, they create their plans in months, years in order to start it and actually decade/s in order to implement it. It is such a waste of time for them. These things rarely happened to a typical family unless when it is in terms of insurance purposes.

It is not a factor if one is simple and the other is complex; one is small and the other is huge. The main point is that both of them are still in progress which is a unique characteristic of a human being. It is that even there are many obstructions that happen to us which might slow down our plans; it doesn't reach the point wherein we stop. It is even who or what stops us from doing so. Knowing that we, humans, are also the cause of all these companies, we are also the ones that can cause these companies to change. We are the enablers of this change and as a human characteristic; nothing can stop us from doing it because we know it is the right thing to do at the first place.

Integrative Questions:

- What are the factors that make our organization skills better?
- What is the main point of this statement?
- Who will be the possible cause for these companies to change?

Thesis 95: We are waking up and linking to each other. We are watching. But we are not waiting.

When we hear the word World Wide Web or simply the Web, we already have multiple interpretations on it aside from the web coming from the spiders. It catches our interest because that Web is now the one that connects us to the whole world. Now that we have Web 2.0 and Semantic Web, things just got more interesting. The websites can now translate languages to our very own. They are also providing innovative services and websites across the internet. In those things, we learn a lot. But it is not only learning that we've got from it. We can also share our opinions about a certain topic to whom we want, when we want and where we want to. Great isn't it? That's how people perceive the Web at present. Do the companies have the capacity to do that? They could provide you with the hosting of your site but it is still possible that you can do it yourself. Thus spending even a single coin is not needed.

The very examples of it are the social networking sites. There we are able to communicate with only a few strokes in our keyboard. We can send an email to our provider with only a simple click or a two. That's how simple it is. This simplicity belongs to us and not to those companies. It may be a fact that companies are still the ones that created those social networking sites and it's a compliment to them for a job well done. But for most of them, we still watch over them if they would accept the change we offer to them. We will just continue to watch over them and not to interfere with them unless they allow us to do so. The time has change and everything around is also changing in order to adapt. It is only the companies that prevent themselves on changing for the better. Quite the truth it is.

Integrative Questions:

- Why the Web does catch our attention?
- What is the very example of the sites where we can communicate?
- What is it that prevents the company on changing for the better?

References

<http://www.cluetrain.com>