

# MURPHY'S TWENTY SIX LAWS OF BAD PERSONNEL AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT

(or: How NOT to implement Total Quality Leadership

or: Everything you ever wanted to know about bad management but were afraid to ask your boss)

1. Crap (a euphemism for S\_\_\_T) rolls down hill. Crap includes:
  - 1.1. Blame
  - 1.2. Overtime or travel to get the job done
  - 1.3. Dog work that nobody else wants to do
  - 1.4. Responsibility
  - 1.5. Accountability
  - 1.6. Risk, and the blame and punishment that goes with taking it when things go wrong
2. You'll always be in the valley at the bottom of the hill, helplessly getting crap dumped all over you and piling hundreds of feet deep above your head as long as you AREN'T the person who controls MOST of the money, and at least SOME of the important information.
3. When it comes to producing crap, bad managers are trained **EXPERTS** at producing more than enough crap to keep everyone within a ten mile radius committed for 60 hours per week for the next ten years. Producing crap is one of a BAD manager's primary functions in life.
4. Kudos (and good stuff) roll up hill. Good stuff includes:
  - 4.1. Kudos and acclaim
  - 4.2. Gratitude and friendship from the sponsor
  - 4.3. Credit/credibility for authorship
  - 4.4. Funding
  - 4.5. Sponsorship
  - 4.6. Authority
5. Knowledge doesn't roll anywhere---it stays right at the top with the manager. Like diodes and check valves, bad managers will always ensure that information flows in only one direction whenever subordinates have discussions with them. For instance: managers will always want a full and complete accounting from subordinates on how they spend every second of the day and every penny of the project manager's money but never want to tell subordinates (or be held accountable) for what they have been doing or how they spent project funds, which really don't belong to the manager at all, but are the sponsor's funds under the stewardship of the manager. If you doubt this, walk up to your manager/boss and ask him (the same way he frequently asks you) for a full report on how he spent the day and see what kind of reaction you get (incidentally, I wouldn't recommend this technique prior to the start of performance evaluation time unless you want to be butchered!)
  - 5.1. Evidence that your boss plays the information hiding game is abundantly found when you hear him say things like:
    - 5.1.1. "*Who did you find that out from?*" or "*How did you find that out?*". He probably wants to go back to the source and shut down the information leak. Tell him you don't want to discuss the source because you don't want to violate the confidence of a friend.
    - 5.1.2. "*Why do you want to know?*" When he says that, ask: "*Why do you want to know why I want to know? Are you trying to hide something. We're part of a team and teams share information, don't they?*"
    - 5.1.3. "*Please leave the meeting. You AREN'T invited!*" He doesn't want you having the same view of the big picture that he has and is probably trying to keep you from finding out anything in item 12.4 below.
    - 5.1.4. "*Can I get a copy of that?*" He wants to make sure you never learn more about what is going on than his subordinates know.
  - 5.2. Tactics you can use against bosses who like keeping secrets to gain competitive advantage on subordinates include:
    - 5.2.1. When you learn something important that you think your boss doesn't want you to know, ask your boss a question to reveal what it is as a litmus test to find out whether: 1. He is willing to share the answer with you; 2. He restricts what he is willing to tell you; 3. He is trying to hide something. If he won't reveal it, then he is a competitor who is trying to hurt you.
    - 5.2.2. Keep your ears out for project-related meetings and when they happen without you being invited, then ask why you weren't invited.
      - 5.2.2.1. If your boss says the meeting isn't important, then ask him why he went!
      - 5.2.2.2. If your boss says you ought to be working and are wasting his money attending meetings he

doesn't want you at, then tell him you are willing to take personal leave to attend, because you view the meeting as a training exercise. If he still gets upset that you want to go, then you know he is a competitor who wants to make your life difficult and habitually oppress you.

- 5.2.3. Ask for copies of meeting minutes and attendance list for all project-related meetings the boss attends. If he says you can't have them, then fill out a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to get the copies, which legally obligates him to give them to you.
- 5.2.4. Scan the paper recycling bin periodically. Bosses indiscriminately throw out a lot of things that they don't share with their subordinates.

- 6. Risk is or should be proportional to return. The more you benefit financially and the more power and control you have by being in charge of a project, the more risks and responsibilities your sponsor expects you to accept.
  - 6.1. This rule is very commonly talked about in financial circles, but it applies equally well to management circles as well.
  - 6.2. Types of RETURN include:
    - 6.2.1. Power
    - 6.2.2. Control over:
      - 6.2.2.1. Money
      - 6.2.2.2. Knowledge
      - 6.2.2.3. People
      - 6.2.2.4. Property
  - 6.3. The possible adverse consequence of accepting RISK include:
    - 6.3.1. Blame when things don't work out right
    - 6.3.2. Devastated credibility and reputation
    - 6.3.3. Demotion and/or removal from your current job
    - 6.3.4. Loss of a sponsor
  - 6.4. Bad managers will always try to subvert and violate this rule by pursuing rule # 1:
    - 6.4.1. They will often abuse their power by making subordinates in effect accept all the risks that really deserve to belong to the manager. This tactic is called "making your people into the fall guy to protect your rear end." In the game of chess, this is called "sacrificing your pawn for a rook."
    - 6.4.2. Evidence that your manager is pulling this trick is abundantly found when it is time to make an important and far-reaching decision that could have serious and long-lasting consequences:
      - 6.4.2.1. Instead of making the important decision himself based on informed advice, and accepting the full blame and responsibility for the decision, the manager instead will schedule a meeting and invite as many gullible people as he can, and ESPECIALLY his political opponents/enemies.
      - 6.4.2.2. He won't try to straw-man a solution BEFORE the meeting. Instead, he will just call the meeting without much thought and act as the facilitator for the meeting. He will let his subordinates instead of himself propose a solution FIRST and he will get angry if people ask HIM or expect him to propose a solution FIRST, before everyone else has. Instead of starting the meeting by saying:

*"I would like to solve this problem and I have thought a lot about how. Here is my proposed solution but I wanted your advice before I proceed."*

he will instead simply present the problem and use it as a neuce for his gullible subordinates to hang themselves on and if they are too experienced or too shrewd to let the boss hang them on it, then the manager will call them troublemakers who don't have anything constructive to say and don't belong in the organization, or he will hire a contractor gullible enough or hungry enough to hang instead!
      - 6.4.2.3. He will then propose the solution that someone else recommended but tell everyone he won't go with it until EVERYONE IN THE ROOM AGREES, that way, if things go wrong he will tell the sponsor he had bad counsel (blame it on everyone but himself). Then this same manager will scour his notes to find the scoundrel subordinate gullible enough, courageous enough, and dedicated enough to put his credibility on the line and propose a solution and HANG HIM INSTEAD (the fall guy)! In reality, however, the full blame really belongs to the manager who controls the money. Then, if the decision turns out to be good one, that same duplicitous and sneaky manager will take all the credit and not mention the real person who made the recommendation!
      - 6.4.2.4. The more challenging and difficult the decision is, the more homework the decision requires, and

the lazier and more dishonest your boss is, the more likely it is that he/she will use this tactic.

6.4.3. As a subordinate, your best defense against this tactic by your manager is as follows:

6.4.3.1. When the meeting starts, and before any subordinates have a chance to offer suggestions, ask the boss HIS solution is and write it down IN PEN in your notebook. Lock up your notebook or it just might mysteriously disappear if things go wrong! I wonder who might take it?

6.4.3.2. Say that the amount of blame and responsibility you are willing to accept is proportional to the amount of money you control, and since you don't control any of the money or resources assigned to the task, then you want NOTHING to do with accepting the risks associated with making the decision.

6.4.3.3. Ask your boss what a meeting is about before you consent to go, and if the purpose of the meeting is to reach an important decision, then find some excuse for not going if he has the habit of passing the buck.

6.4.3.4. Be completely silent, don't shake or nod your head, and don't share any opinions other than 6.4.3.1 above if you get railroaded into one of the meetings against your will. Just say "Uh ha...Uh ha"...that's a safe noncommittal answer.

7. The boss is always right. He who fears for his job ALWAYS observes this rule.

8. When the boss is wrong, refer to rule number 7 above, unless, of course, you want to be out on the street pushing a shopping cart around.

9. To the manager, it is always more important to LOOK good in front of the sponsor (and to hell with looking good in front of subordinates) than it is to BE good. BEING good takes humility, skill, hard work, careful planning, good judgment, maturity, and a desire to do the job yourself while LOOKING good can be had with lots of money for a good contractor, procrastination until the last minute, and deceit through ill-gotten credit for a job you didn't do that was done by the contractor.

10. Managers will always make rules that apply to everyone but them. The favorite phrase of managers is: "Do as I say, not as I do." This trait is called HYPOCRISY.

11. In any situation between managers and subordinates, old age, incompetence, tyranny, treachery, deceit, arrogance, and irrationality will always win out over youth, skill, loyalty, humility, reason and logic respectively (The NICE GUY principle: Nice guys always finish last). For instance, when faced with a self-evident truth pointed out by a subordinate that makes the manager look bad, the manager will always hang/crucify the messenger rather than try and correct the very real problem that caused the embarrassing failure/situation to begin with. It's always easier for managers to tyrannically abuse their power by arrogantly trampling and discrediting dissenters than it is to humbly admit to their shortcomings and work hard to overcome them, thereby setting a good example for their subordinates (The old age principle: What managers lack in youth they more than make up for with treachery).

12. KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION are power and ignorance is powerlessness. He who controls the production and distribution of knowledge and information controls power and has power (The Mushroom Principle: Use fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) to control and manipulate people by keeping them in the dark and feeding them shit). Bad managers will exploit this rule to the maximum advantage. Implications of this rule include:

12.1. HOW MUCH you know and especially WHO you know determines how far your career will go in any organization. Therefore, knowledge becomes a strategic weapon used by bad managers to subdue anyone who challenges or threatens their empire.

12.2. The more you know, the less you fear, and people without fear are difficult for managers to control and manipulate. That is why bad managers favor subordinates who are politically ignorant and don't see the big picture...because they make good PUPPETS!

12.3. The tactic of using knowledge and information as a weapon is commonly called INFORMATION WARFARE and is frequently talked about in the halls of the Pentagon and SPAWAR. The idea is that you can't win a conflict or competition with the enemy unless you continually have more and better quality information (intelligence) than they do and unless you make a concerted effort to deny your enemy of his most valuable information sources.

12.4. Types of information that are important that bad managers will try to keep subordinates ignorant on include, ordered in descending order of importance, include:

12.4.1. Who is the sponsor.

12.4.2. What does he want, and when does he want it.

12.4.3. How much money does he/she have to spend.

12.4.4. What is the next big opportunity or project coming along that he/she wants done and when does he want it.

12.4.5. When and where are meetings with the sponsor over current and future projects being held and who is invited, and more importantly, who ISN'T invited and why.

12.4.6. What is going on within the profession and specialty that you work in.

12.4.6.1. What are the hottest technologies that people are willing to pay big money to have.

12.4.6.2. Who makes these technologies.

12.4.6.3. Who makes the best products in a every class within your industry.

13. **MONEY (and control over it) is power and poverty (or lack of control over money) is powerlessness.** He who controls the production and distribution of money controls power and has power (*The Golden Rule: He who has the gold rules*). Most of the time, money and having control over it is THE most important aspect of maintaining power and control in a business setting. Bad managers will exploit knowledge of this rule to maximum advantage and they realize that control over money is more important than control over knowledge. It is more important than knowledge because:
- 13.1. Managers can use it to insert themselves into the information food chain by denying it to people who don't give them the information they need to perpetuate their empire.
  - 13.2. Managers can use it to travel and market themselves in a way that few subordinates who don't have their own money or project can. This keeps the money coming in that sustains their empire.
  - 13.3. Money can be used by managers to buy skills and capabilities with contractors that they don't natively have in their organization, allowing them to compete more successfully with their own subordinates and to terrorize them into submission by keeping them starving for work and on overhead when they don't worship and suck up to the king who has all the gold. Sometimes, however, this can backfire because their sponsor can do the same thing to them too!
14. **Bad managers enslave subordinates and perpetuate their empire using KNOWLEDGE and INFORMATION as a tool/weapon** by:
- 14.1. Making sure that subordinates never meet or talk directly to sponsors.
  - 14.2. Perpetuating the ignorance of subordinates thereby creating the fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) necessary to get people to cooperate in expanding the manager's political empire.
  - 14.3. Locking file cabinets that contain unclassified information to conceal information and control distribution of it.
  - 14.4. Ignoring the career development of subordinates.
  - 14.5. Intimidating subordinates with things they know nothing about and making sure they never know enough to NOT be intimidated.
  - 14.6. Acting annoyed when subordinates ask questions. This prevents embarrassment of the manager and discourages further questions.
  - 14.7. Never having time to answer questions from subordinates.
  - 14.8. Never volunteering information about projects or programs unless asked a specific question about them.
  - 14.9. Meetings:
    - 14.9.1. Not having meetings to inform subordinates of what is going on in the business.
    - 14.9.2. Not inviting subordinates to existing meetings (or telling them about the meeting).
    - 14.9.3. Closing the door when there is a meeting.
    - 14.9.4. Not distributing meeting materials to subordinates after the meeting.
    - 14.9.5. Promptly terminating a meeting if an uninvited subordinate shows up.
    - 14.9.6. Punishing subordinates who invite themselves to meetings (even if it is on their own personal time) that managers don't want them attending.
    - 14.9.7. Not inviting subordinates working on one of the manager's project to attend any of the project meetings for other projects that the manager is involved with.All of these tactics have the effect of concealing important information that would help subordinates be more effective at their job and give them just as much knowledge/power as the manager.
  - 14.10. Handing new work and all the valuable knowledge and learning gained doing it to contractors instead of subordinates.
  - 14.11. Discouraging independent thought and action, which require a broad spectrum of knowledge and experience to implement, and which is a necessary prerequisite to becoming a good and credible manager.
  - 14.12. Denigrating the credibility of subordinates by exposing their failures and shortcomings in public while concealing the manager's own sins and then punishing subordinates who attempt to discover management transgressions or discuss/expose them once discovered.
  - 14.13. Classifying and locking up documents that might expose unfavorable, unethical, or illegal conduct of the manager while punishing and/or firing subordinates for doing the same.
  - 14.14. Firing/purging older or more experienced employees who know too much and therefore threaten the manager's power or position.
  - 14.15. Dividing duties/knowledge among several subordinates to spread knowledge throughout the organization instead of allowing it to concentrate and collect in one spot with one subordinate (even though it concentrates in one spot with the project manager...hypocrisy), which would make that person dangerous and threaten the manager. This

tactic is called “dividing and conquering” and it was used quite successfully to build the gigantic Roman Empire.

- 14.16. Not allowing employees to rotate or exchange duties to gain the knowledge or experience necessary to threaten the manager’s job.
- 14.17. Creating powerful information system tools and databases that only managers have access to, and then making an example out of anyone who:
  - 14.17.1. Lets subordinates know they exist
  - 14.17.2. Reveals their contents.
15. **Bad managers enslave subordinates and perpetuate their empire using MONEY as a tool/weapon** by:
  - 15.1. Permitting NO subordinates to have complete control over how money is spent on a project they are working on.
  - 15.2. Keeping subordinates ignorant and concealing information about the following very significant facts:
    - 15.2.1. Who the sponsors are, where the money comes from, and how and where to find new sources of money.
    - 15.2.2. The rules/laws for handling and spending money within the organization.
    - 15.2.3. How money is being/was spent on a particular project.
  - 15.3. Preventing subordinates from purchasing tools that will make them more productive and more effective at their job than the manager.
16. **Attitude of managers toward their subordinates and the workplace:**
  - 16.1. In the eyes of managers, subordinates are frequently wrong and their credibility is (and must be) continually questioned and open to suspicion (of course there frequently wrong...the boss never tells them anything about important aspects of things that are going on!). The credibility of subordinates MUST be continually questioned (but not developed or improved) by managers because people with credibility and knowledge are dangerous, difficult to control, and force managers to compete for the attention and acclaim of sponsors, peers, and subordinates. Therefore, managers will do everything in their power to limit and denigrate the credibility of their employees in the eyes of sponsors, coworkers, and other managers in order to keep their subordinates/troops compliant and under control. Furthermore, since credibility is gained by experience and political exposure, managers will limit credibility by limiting the involvement of subordinates in worthwhile efforts and projects that produce new knowledge, political exposure to sponsors/customers, and credibility. As a subordinate, your only defense against these tactics is:
    - 16.1.1. Defend your credibility to the death. Do your utmost not to make mistakes and to produce the highest quality and most consistent work you know how to.
    - 16.1.2. Maintain a detailed journal of all the embarrassing faux pas of your manager and coworkers and when he or they attack your credibility, pull out your notes and give him/them a dose of his/their own medicine, and if he does it in public then make sure you do too!
  - 16.2. When subordinates begin thinking of promotions and advancement and want to expand their horizons and become part of management, managers will suddenly come up with all kinds of NEGATIVE reasons why they can't do it. They will use every scare tactic in the book to change the subordinate’s mind about trying to advance to the stature of the manager, and the more valuable the employee is, the harder the manager will try to change their mind. The attitude will be “Man...we’ve got to keep this guy in his cage and make sure it stays locked. He does good work for me but I won’t have him around to make me look good if he advances. Not only that, if he advances, then I’ll have to find someone else as good as he is to replace him, and he’ll use what he learned working for me to compete successfully with me, which would make me have to work twice as hard to do the same job I already do, and I don’t want that, so I better scare him into staying where he is!” Common tactics used in this situation by scared managers to instill terror, fear, and doubt in their subordinates include:
    - 16.2.1. Threatening to fire the subordinate, transfer him, or take something away that they want to keep, like involvement in a particular effort.
    - 16.2.2. Piling more work on the subordinate so they don’t have time to look at the bigger picture or think about improving their career.
    - 16.2.3. Procrastinating the decision, telling the subordinate: “You’ve got plenty of time to worry about that later. In the mean time, we’ve got work to do, get busy!”
    - 16.2.4. Denying requests by the subordinate to attend educational events that would improve their chances of promotion. Such courses might include: 1. Technical presentation skills workshops; 2. Toastmasters; 3. Program manager’s courses.
    - 16.2.5. Not mentioning what the subordinate does to higher management so they aren’t well-known in management circles and therefore won’t be considered for future advancement by higher-ups.
    - 16.2.6. Denying pay raises and point awards to subordinates who take positive steps to advance their career.
  - 16.3. Sometimes, bad managers have no choice but to promote subordinates, even though they would rather not because it threatens their empire. This could happen because: 1. All of the scare tactics they used to discourage subordinates from pursuing advancement don’t succeed; 2. The project has grown too big for them to manage

on their own. When bad (insecure and paranoid) managers get into this very uncomfortable predicament of having to promote a subordinate, then they will try to limit the damage he can do to their empire by:

- 16.3.1. Only considering candidates for promotion who will never threaten him or at least select those that threaten him least. The least threatening types of people to the boss are those people who have some kind of fatal professional or character flaw that ensures that they will never graduate to higher levels of authority or take over the boss' job because, for instance:
  - 16.3.1.1. They are too timid, passive and too nice to ever challenge or question authority. Timid and passive people avoid and try to hide from the big picture because they don't want to become political casualties or lose their job by asking too many probing questions.
  - 16.3.1.2. They aren't engineers, don't have a degree, or don't have a very good resume, so they probably won't ever advance further or be trusted enough to be given a lot of additional responsibility because they either:
    1. Don't have a bachelor's degree or advanced education (never paid their dues);
    2. Can't communicate effectively;
    3. Don't look good enough to sell to sponsors and upper management;
    4. Don't have enough experience.Examples of these type of flawed people who make good puppets that don't ever advance include:
    1. Technicians;
    2. Secretaries;
    3. New or inexperienced personnel;
    4. Foreign-born engineers who can't write or speak well enough to be considered seriously for management.
- 16.3.2. Appoint a Machiavellian YES man who will make a good puppet and won't ever argue with the boss (in which case why do you need him in the first place!).
- 16.4. In spite of the paranoid tactics of managers toward employees who want to advance, if the subordinate calls a spade a spade and exposes the political agenda (mentioned above) of the manager to them openly and in front of his peers when he attempts to implement or promote it, and rattles the cage the manager has him locked up in, the BAD manager will, as a self-defense tactic:
  - 16.4.1. Say the subordinate is being NEGATIVE (not REALISTIC, mind you, but NEGATIVE) and that they have nothing but the best intentions toward the subordinate and his advancement goals. This is usually the most favorable approach, when it works, but it doesn't work if subordinates respond by saying: *"Sounds to me like you are being NEGATIVE about NEGATIVE people. Maybe I'm not the only one around here who needs a negative attitude readjusted."*
  - 16.4.2. If the approach in 16.4.1 doesn't work, then the manager will become obsessed with discrediting, ostracizing, and terrorizing the messenger. He feels he has to do this because exposing the manager's political agenda destroys his credibility, which is the most important thing he has. He will do this in a way that is as indirect as possible so he doesn't have to admit or take responsibility for his actions, their consequences, or openly acknowledge his political agenda and his dislike for people who expose it.
  - 16.4.3. Begin keeping the subordinate under a microscope looking for the slightest infraction (while ignoring the subordinate's peers or turning a blind eye toward them). The manager will watch and wait, like a ruthless predatory lion on the African plains, gathering all kinds of ammunition to use against the guy later without even telling the guy he's being singled-out or watched or even warning him that he better keep his whistle clean. ***This is called workplace terrorism, and it happens all the time!*** It's a popular but dubious and unethical way to "defang" your opponents. It's brutal, it's unfair, and it's TOTALLY HYPOCRITICAL. It's unfair because the guy is being singled-out and is having to live by different or more stringent rules than his peers, or because he gets monitored and watched more closely than the rest of his peers.
  - 16.4.4. When the manager finds something to nail the subordinate (unfairly for, of course), he makes an example out of the guy in front of everyone to show all of his peers that the manager won't tolerate the same kind of political gamesmanship from his subordinates that the manager practices EVERY MINUTE OF THE DAY! That's the height of hypocrisy as a manager, of course, but that's the way bad managers function. This tactic is called "MAKING AN EXAMPLE OUT OF TROUBLEMAKERS." Subordinates quickly learn by observing situations like this that:
    - 16.4.4.1. It's more important to play games and SUCK UP to the boss than it is to tell the truth, be honest, or be realistic.
    - 16.4.4.2. Politics are more important to subordinates than knowledge or a good work ethic.
    - 16.4.4.3. Managers want good ROBOTS who follow orders, don't ask any prying questions, and don't think independently, which are precisely the OPPOSITE skills you need to be an effective manager.
  - 16.4.5. Quarantine politically savvy subordinates to contain the infectious spread of political awareness and the malcontent that it brings. Limit their interaction with other project members so that their political awareness doesn't spread and cause trouble or a mutiny for the manager. This is most often done by:
    - 16.4.5.1. Making sure that people on the same project don't share an office together.

16.4.5.2. Dividing instead of sharing project tasks to minimize personal interaction.

16.4.5.3. Asking opinionated and politically savvy employees to remove political paraphernalia from their walls or cubicles.

16.4.5.4. Giving subordinates their own office or cubicle so they don't interact as much with other coworkers.

16.5. Managers will often complain to others that their people:

16.5.1. "Lack motivation, inspiration, or creativity, and therefore have to be oversupervised to ensure that the job gets done." Of course they lack motivation...when they try to exercise the ultimate in personal responsibility, creativity and motivation by expressing an interest in running their own project or a bigger piece of the manager's project, they are swiftly and viciously made into an example in front of their peers. Hypocrisy!

16.5.2. "Have tunnel vision, and don't spend enough time looking at the big picture or how they fit in it, and that's why we need a manager." Yet, when these same subordinates try to look at the big picture around them and all the political gamesmanship that goes on every day and expose it, they are viciously crucified by the boss for doing so. Hypocrisy!

Obviously, the above criticisms of subordinates in most cases are just a smoke screen for the REAL problem, which is that subordinates stay in the cage the boss has them lockup up in and don't venture out because the MANAGER WANTS THEM THERE, WHERE THEY CAN DO THE LEAST HARM AND THE MOST GOOD TO HIS EMPIRE AND HIS POLITICAL AGENDA! To the manager, you're either a slave to him and his empire or a competitor. The manager will try to make your cage as comfortable as possible because he doesn't want you to know that you are in it, but if you try to escape from your cage (naughty boy), then you will be viciously and mercilessly beaten with the nearest blunt instrument by him to teach you a lesson. You can't be a partner or an equal or superior team player to him because he doesn't want to share his power. It's only natural then that he would look for ways to perceive his subordinates as vulnerable, codependent, weak, undermotivated slaves to his own political agenda and empire. That's the way he justifies his existence!

16.6. Bad managers believe that money (NOT people, developing them, or treating them with respect) is the answer to EVERY problem. They believe, for instance, that:

16.6.1. The love of money is the root of all evil.

16.6.2. All people are basically evil, so they love money and would do anything to get more than their more than their fair share of it, including:

16.6.2.1. Overlooking the hypocrisy of the boss.

16.6.2.2. Never making the boss look silly, even if he deserves it sometimes and even if he does it to his underlings frequently!

16.6.2.3. Never expecting the boss to fill out the SAME kind of trip reports and meeting minutes (and distribute them to his subordinates) that he expects his subordinates to complete when they go on a trip without him.

16.6.2.4. Never disobeying the boss, even if he made an obviously STUPID decision and is later proven wrong.

16.6.2.5. Never expressing any personal or political opinions in the workplace, and especially in front of the boss, because they might be shunned for their next pay raise, even if those same political opinions have NOTHING whatsoever to do with how valuable the employee is to the organization or how productive he/she is.

16.6.2.6. Being dishonest. That is why the boss never trusts his/her employees and always questions everything...because he believes that they are just as devious, decrepit, and deceitful as he is!

16.6.3. "Anyone who thinks that money can't buy happiness obviously never had much of it."

17. As a subordinate, your biggest enemy is your own ignorance and laziness, as well as managers and coworkers who want to keep you ignorant, powerless, and not in control of any of the money. Ignorance and laziness enslave while knowledge, organization, education, and disciplined, focused effort enlighten, empower, and liberate.

18. As a manager, your biggest enemy is subordinates/sponsors who know more about your job than you do, who insist on managing the money and resources spent on tasks you assign to them, who insist on interfacing directly with sponsors, and who share the credit (and the blame) for everything they do with NO ONE. Subordinates and sponsors like this make managers unnecessary and/or turn them purely into marketeers.

19. Election of managers to office:

19.1. The world is a very competitive place. Since management positions are in short supply and management compensation is high as an inducement for people to become managers, then:

19.1.1. The people most likely to become managers are the most competitive. This is especially true if the list of applicants for the position is long.

- 19.1.2. Because candidates have to be competitive to get selected, they are probably ruthless and brutal opponents who have a high degree of political awareness and sensitivity and know exactly which asses are the right ones to kiss!
- 19.1.3. The only way to avoid being competitive and still get selected for a management position is to:
  - 19.1.3.1. Play golf with and suck up to the right important people.
  - 19.1.3.2. Hear about a new opening from these golf-buddy, good-old-boy network friends at the top BEFORE it gets advertised.
  - 19.1.3.3. Get selected for the position and move in for the kill before anyone else who could compete for it even finds out there is an opening. Is that fair to the other candidates?
- 19.2. Wanna-bees who lust after money, power, and control and who flatter, complement, and befriend people in high places for their own selfish personal gain will almost always be elected (by their buddies at the top) to fill open manager positions. These people, however, *always* make the *worse* managers because they end up being tyrants and dictators who are despised and shunned by nearly everyone in the organization. They become managers out of spite to retaliate against the whole world for treating them like the human excrement (trash) they really are.
- 19.3. Nice guys with integrity who least want to be managers make the best managers but ironically will seldom be elected to managership. These people despise bad bosses, but see management as a necessary evil that must be exercised with empathy, humility, and restraint. They are well-liked by their subordinates because they don't suck up to people in power, don't accept special favors or perks, and don't play vicious games with their subordinates, but instead befriend "ordinary" people. They are "nice guys" in the truest sense of the word but as the saying goes, nice guys finish last and sadly are too nice and not aggressive/intimidating enough to be successful as a manager in the eyes of their superiors.
- 20. When new employees must be hired by managers to fill vacant or new positions, publicized qualifications for the open position will be far beyond what the job requires and far beyond the qualifications of the even the manager who is doing the hiring. This is an intimidation mechanism designed to ensure that:
  - 20.1. Prospective new employees will feel intimidated by and subservient to their prospective new manager.
  - 20.2. Once intimidated, prospective new employees will be: 1. Far less resistant to accepting a low wage offer; 2. Far less likely to ask too many probing questions about the manager or the business. This will save the manager LOTS of money and guarantee his job security.
  - 20.3. The manager has a convenient excuse to fire the new employee if things don't work out by telling him/her that he didn't meet the requirements of the job without having to explain the REAL reason for firing him, which is probably that he:
    - 20.3.1. Knows more than the boss.
    - 20.3.2. Questions authority too much.
    - 20.3.3. Is too aggressive or competitive
    - 20.3.4. Has irreconcilable personality conflicts with the boss or other employees, in many cases caused NOT by his people skills or lack thereof, but EXCLUSIVELY and ONLY because he is so competitive that no one wants to share any information with him.
- 21. Work rules of managers:
  - 21.1. Managers who want to cut costs will implement work rules preventing employees from discussing wages and promotions amongst themselves. This will prevent putting the manager in the awkward position of having to justify such things as:
    - 21.1.1. Why he/she pays some employees more than others (has favorites).
    - 21.1.2. Why there is such a big disparity between what new hires make now and what new hires made a few years back (inflation adjusted).
    - 21.1.3. What the exact performance/seniority criteria is for receiving a particular wage.
  - 21.2. Managers will justify the wage discussion prohibition by saying that privacy of individuals needs to be protected, even though:
    - 21.2.1. The employee you may want to know about may be willing to give you permission to know what he/she makes.
    - 21.2.2. The manager could publish depersonalized, qualitative/quantitative information that lists salaries, rankings, promotion statistics over the years WITHOUT linking them to specific individuals, thus ensuring that privacy is protected while conveying the information that employees want to know about salaries, promotions, and the reasons behind them.
  - 21.3. As a way to cut costs when the workload is heavy, managers would rather make existing employees perform copious amounts of UNCOMPENSATED overtime than to hire new employees to fill the void. This keeps overhead down but destroys morale and employee loyalty, not to mention making their family lives unbearable and unpleasant.

22. Bad managers are more insecure and competitive loners than team players within their respective organizations. Teams share information but shrewd and insecure managers don't like to. They have to be this way because their basic insecurity about their position feeds their obsession with perpetuating their empire, and this obsession leads them to be secretive about everything they do out of fear that if they aren't secretive, they just might shoot themselves in the foot by providing their subordinates with the information they need to eventually eclipse the boss and eliminate the need for dependence on him altogether. Instead of pursuing job security by simply WORKING HARDER or BETTER than anyone else, BEING SMARTER, BEING MORE FRIENDLY AND HELPFUL than their peers, and setting a good example (which is what Capitalism is supposed to be all about and which is the most ethical and respectable way to stay on top), they will instead abuse their power and privilege to stack the deck and rig the game in their favor so that they will always win. They do this by:
- 22.1. Appearing to share some information with subordinates, but only if it is needed to get the job done.
  - 22.2. Being very careful not to allow any of their subordinates to have the same view the BIG picture (and all the projects and sponsors) that they do. They do this by dividing and conquering. You divide and conquer by splitting duties up among subordinates and making sure that the subordinates don't talk to each other, compare notes, or attend each other's meetings (network), so they never see the BIG picture as completely as the manager.
  - 22.3. Talking privately with people working on a project (without other subordinates around, instead of in group meetings) so that the audience for information is strictly limited. Open meetings and publicly shared status reports/emails are a better vehicle for sharing status and problem resolutions, but insecure loner managers don't like these vehicles because it gives subordinates the same information that the boss has.
  - 22.4. Being very competitive, but trying to hide their competitiveness from subordinates so it doesn't destroy their credibility. Disinterest, apathy, laziness, and a lack of curiosity on the part of subordinates allow the manager to conceal his competitiveness and create the information vacuum necessary to maintain it without anyone noticing. Because of this, managers will unequally or unduly reward people (favoritism) who don't pry too much into what they do with carrots like:
    - 22.4.1. Treating them with more respect and flatter them more often.
    - 22.4.2. Giving them better or more interesting work than people who ask too many questions.
  - 22.5. Treating everyone who works for them as a competitor, in spite of the fact that the very essence of having an organization like a branch is that they SHARE information and work together better as a team than they do apart as individuals. Synergy happens through INFORMATION SHARING. Information sharing allows knowledge and experience to be efficiently reused and recycled many times over by many people in the organization, instead of collecting dust in the head of only one insecure project manager and the one person doing the actual work who he trusts with that information. You may as well not even have branches if you don't have this kind of synergy and INFORMATION SHARING across projects and across branches. Remember the following:

**T**ogether  
**E**veryone  
**A**chieves  
**M**ore

23. Bad managers will take the position that competition within an organization destroys the organization and ought to be avoided. This statement is obviously a falsehood, and is like saying that we ought to put an end to marriages so we can bring the divorce rate down or that we ought to kill all newborns so we can put an end to dying of old age. They have to take this position, though, because they don't want to be upstaged by competitive subordinates. Competition within an organization is NOT, however, in and of itself destructive or harmful at all. **What IS destructive and harmful to an organization is not COMPETITION, but in HOW PEOPLE IN THE ORGANIZATION REACT TO AND DEAL WITH IT. If the REACTION to competition is bad, then the consequences are bad, but COMPETITION is not the cause of the bad reaction.** This leads to the following conclusions:
- 23.1. Competition is what drives us to do our best and be our best in all situations, and especially in the business world. Excellence is chiefly the direct result of competition. It motivates and forces us to be productive, efficient, hard-working, well-educated, and smart in everything we do in the business world.
    - 23.1.1. It strengthens organizations, builds new businesses, and opens up promotional opportunities for the strong, smart, hard-working, and able in the fight for survival of the fittest.
    - 23.1.2. It dooms the lazy, weak, and ignorant to a life of poverty, economic slavery, and dependence.
  - 23.2. Competition is the very fundamental thing that our entire natural biological world is built on. Darwin's theory of evolution is based on the idea that only the fittest, healthiest, smartest, and best adapted species will survive. Weaker species that aren't as aggressive, smart, and strong will eventually die out because they aren't as successful at competing for limited food supplies. Why shouldn't the workplace be the same?
  - 23.3. COMPETITION is the engine that fuels the capitalist economy that we enjoy in the United States. Capitalism is

the system that allows and even encourages competition to flourish under controlled conditions, and it is the most efficient and ruthless political engine of progress and prosperity that the world has ever known chiefly because it encourages competition.

- 23.4. Only simple, mediocre minds would survey the damage that a BAD REACTION to competition causes and react violently by saying: "It was COMPETITION that did this damage, and we ought to outlaw it!" That is a band-aid, knee-jerk reaction that you are likely to hear from a bleeding-heart socialist liberal that eliminates the symptoms but allows the underlying sickness (depravity) to persist.
- 23.5. Competition is destructive to an organization and leads to a bad reaction ONLY when the organization has a merit-based pay system and people in the organization are:
  - 23.5.1. Lazy and don't want to work harder than their coworkers. Lazy people resent coworkers who work harder than them and who get all the pay raises. Instead, they selfishly think that pay raises ought to be given to people regardless of how hard they work and do everything they can to spread harmful gossip about competitive coworkers.
  - 23.5.2. Ignorant and don't like having to be forced to learn new things or improve how they do their job to make it more efficient than their coworkers.
  - 23.5.3. Proud and rebellious and don't like having their life regulated by what other people say and do better than them within the organization.
  - 23.5.4. Underachievers who never do useful, important, or productive things and who resent coworkers that do get results on time and in budget.
- 23.6. Clearly, only the weakest, most depraved people in society with the basest motives loathe competition and try to avoid and prevent it, and that is why only BAD managers loathe competition. Bad managers, instead take the following attitude toward competition:
  - 23.6.1. The workplace ought to be harmonious and everyone BUT THE BOSS, OF COURSE, ought to share power, control, and money to minimize conflict. This ensures that everyone but the boss is expendable.
  - 23.6.2. Competition only causes conflict within a GOVERNMENT organization. Nothing good ever comes out of it, unless it is competition among NONGOVERNMENT contractors for work...and then it is good because it puts more money in the pocket of the boss and doesn't threaten the boss' empire.
  - 23.6.3. Competition in the workplace ought to be prevented, and it is the duty of managers to PREVENT IT. When employees are found to be competitive and aggressive, they ought to be separated from the rest of the less motivated, less productive, weaker employees so that conflict, name-calling, jealousy, and harmful gossip don't result, even though all of these are usually instigated mainly by jealous employees who want more than they deserve.
  - 23.6.4. When around subordinates, pretend like competition doesn't exist or downplay its significance, so that subordinates never realize just how much of a wolf among sheep that their bad boss really is. Keep saying that subordinates are "part of a TEAM", even though you know you aren't a team player yourself because you won't share control over project funds or certain information about the project, and won't invite subordinates to the most important meetings regarding the project.
- 23.7. GOOD managers, on the other hand, see COMPETITION as a tool that can be invaluable as a very effective way to motivate and encourage employees to:
  - 23.7.1. Work harder.
  - 23.7.2. Work smarter.
  - 23.7.3. Be more responsible and proactive.
  - 23.7.4. Be productive.
  - 23.7.5. Pursue continuing education.
  - 23.7.6. Subscribe to trade journals.
  - 23.7.7. Attend trade shows.
24. EGO and PERSONAL PRIDE is the main motivation behind most of what bad managers do. Everything they do has to build up their ego and personal pride and make them feel LESS insecure and when it doesn't, they get REALLY upset. They act this way in spite of the fact that the bible says about pride/ego: "*Pride cometh before destruction, and haughtiness before a fall.*" Managers build up their egos through the following tactics:
  - 24.1. Surrounding themselves with "YES" men...people who never do anything but agree with them and complement and flatter them for being so wonderful and who never share ANY personal opinions. This leads to the following consequences:
    - 24.1.1. YES men are ass-kissing, scum suckers with no integrity whatsoever who are despised by most of the people with integrity who work with them. This creates a bad working environment for subordinates who AREN'T YES men. They feel like there is favoritism in the organization and this inevitably leads to envy and strife.

- 24.1.2. YES men also are usually more politicians than producers and if the organization attracts too many of them, then nothing ever gets done and the sponsor will eventually get tired of waiting for results and find someone else to do the job.
- 24.1.3. Managers will pursue corporate policies which make it easier to fill the organization with YES men. You create YES men by putting subordinates in the most vulnerable position possible...making their position far more vulnerable (to firing and pay cuts) and precarious than that of the manager. This situation can be created by:
  - 24.1.3.1. Giving the manager all the flexibility in the world to hire and fire whoever he/she wants.
  - 24.1.3.2. Making most of the worker bees into contractors instead of federal employees like the boss is. Therefore, the more contractors your organization has, the more likely it is that the boss likes YES men.
- 24.2. Stealing credit or not giving credit for new knowledge/discoveries produced by subordinates.
- 24.3. Discouraging/punishing subordinates for being critical of the manager's ideas, even if the criticality is deserved because the manager is in error and just about everyone who works for him will acknowledge it.
- 24.4. Asking subordinates to take their name off work they produce, so the boss can present it at the next project meeting as his own. This is especially true if the work produced is of very high quality. The higher the quality of the work produced by subordinates, the more likely the manager is to want to take credit for it. This unethical tactic is called "Selling your troops down the river."
- 24.5. The Not Invented Here (NIH) syndrome:
  - 24.5.1. If another competitive outside organization does something better than he or his people, the proud ego-maniac manager will denigrate it instead of complement it so that he still looks better than the competitive organization. If you can't make yourself look better by BEING good, then you have to make everyone else around you look comparatively worse.
  - 24.5.2. If a subordinate does better work than the manager and insists on taking full credit and responsibility for what he did instead of the manager taking credit away from him, this makes the manager look bad. Therefore, the manager will find some excuse to get rid of this person (punish success) while at the same time complaining about why his people don't take more pride in their work or work harder for him. Hypocrisy!
- 24.6. You can expect bosses with the biggest EGOS to have the strongest negative reaction to what is said here.
- 25. The successful application of all of the management tactics described above depends on STEALTH and TERROR. If subordinates know about the political agenda and motives of bad managers described above, then they will lose any trust or respect they had for the manager, which destroys any chance of a harmonious or productive work environment. Managers are painfully aware of this, because it negatively affects their bottom line and undermines their authority within the organization. Consequently, rather than solving the perception problem directly by improving their own personal character and attitude when subordinates discover and expose their political agenda (the best way to do it), the bad manager will instead become a workplace terrorist by reacting to these questions with the following harmful damage control measures (which incidentally will destroy morale in the workplace even further):
  - 25.1. If the manager is honest and doesn't want to lie, he will take great pains to ensure that he doesn't discuss ANY of his motives for doing or saying things with subordinates. That way, he can continue to pursue his own selfish and destructive (to subordinates) agenda while creating the appearance that he is a team player and doesn't want to hurt anyone. As a subordinate, you can fight this tendency through the following tactics:
    - 25.1.1. Saying to the manager: "WHY do you want to do that...I don't understand how any good can come out of that? What constructive purpose is accomplished by this act?"
      - 25.1.1.1. If he/she refuses to give an answer, then you can be sure that the answer he doesn't want to give you would probably make him/her politically unpopular with subordinates.
      - 25.1.1.2. The stronger and the more threatening the reaction of the manager to squelch subordinate's questions about motives for doing or saying things, the more likely it is that the manager is up to no good.
      - 25.1.1.3. The strongest reaction to a question or inquiry from a subordinate about motives, of course, is to fire an inquisitive subordinate or whistle-blower.
    - 25.1.2. If your manager refuses to answer, speculate on your own to try to come up with the most likely management motive and then either:
      - 25.1.2.1. Present it to your manager and see how he/she reacts (if you have a lot of courage and are considering a new line of work). The angrier he gets when you propose an idea, the more likely it is that you hit the nail on the head and that he is trying to hide something.
      - 25.1.2.2. Play detective by gossiping and comparing notes with your coworkers to see if other statements or behaviors they have observed from your manager corroborates the motive you suspect.

- 25.2. If the manager is dishonest, deceitful, or irresponsible, and is put in the awkward position of explaining his selfish political agenda, he will probably:
  - 25.2.1. Invent a red herring explanation of his motive that:
    - 25.2.1.1. Improves the image of the manager in front of subordinates.
    - 25.2.1.2. Seems likely and probable.
    - 25.2.1.3. Works best if the subordinates are ignorant. The more they know, the harder it is to fool them.
    - 25.2.1.4. Is really just a DEVIOUS LIE carefully crafted to mislead subordinates and give them a false sense of trust for him. This is called playing dirty pool.
  - 25.2.2. If he can't come up with a deceitful explanation of his devious political motives and actions that makes him look good and sounds credible, then his last ditch defense tactic against questions by subordinates of his motives will be to:
    - 25.2.2.1. Deceitfully deny every behavior and motive described here but not explain or elaborate on why it is incorrect, because he can't if he wants to tell the truth and be honest with himself. He will deny any of the negative motives described here even though just about everyone you encounter will agree with most of what you read here. He will probably also say that he doesn't have time to talk about it, and if you pressure him to commit to a time to talk about it, he will do everything in his power to weasel out of it.
    - 25.2.2.2. Pretend like you're being negative and try to portray you as a troublemaker for promoting or agreeing with what you read here. This will discourage subordinates from inquiring further and put them on notice that the boss doesn't like it when you expose the game he is playing.
    - 25.2.2.3. Terrorize the life out of you to try and scare you away from the organization so he doesn't have to worry about discrediting you anymore and so you don't contaminate the attitudes of the rest of yes-men that he STILL has working for him and hasn't fired yet.
- 26. The litmus test for bad bosses. The following guidelines are designed as a litmus test for you to determine whether your boss is a bad/selfish/competitive one or a good one who is a team player. The column that has the most check marks is the kind of boss you have.

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>Bad boss/tyrant</i>	<i>Good boss/team player</i>
1. Meetings	Doesn't have meetings with all the people who work for him, because he doesn't like his subordinates to see the big picture. Closes the door when he has meetings or has them in a place where subordinates won't overhear or even know about the meeting. When people ask why they weren't invited, he will use the excuse that it would be wasting project funds and hours on nonproductive meetings, but then, if the meeting is unproductive, ...why does the BOSS attend! You can tell if your boss is this type by volunteering to take personnel leave to attend the meeting, and if he STILL refuses, then he is a selfish loner who is building an empire at your expense.	Has regular meetings and invites ALL the people who work for him because he wants them to be well-informed about what is happening in the marketplace, with the sponsor, and with the delivery schedule. Minimizes the length of the meeting to ensure that project funds are not wasted. Ensures that meetings are short and productive as possible.
1.1 Meeting minutes	Doesn't take meeting minutes if he does have a public meeting because he doesn't want anyone knowing what he is up to.	Religiously takes meeting minutes and makes sure that people who couldn't attend also get a copy by email. He does this, again, because he wants to keep his people informed and is a TEAM player.
1.2 Invitation	If he has to have a meeting, strictly limits who gets invited to the smallest possible subset of people who can be productive and address his needs directly. Even when there are other highly motivated people who would like to contribute to the project and could do a better job than the people actually doing the work, he won't invite them, won't take meeting minutes, and if he does, won't give them a copy because he doesn't want them becoming a competitor.	Invites even nonproductive team members who are highly motivated to produce because he views meetings as training evolutions to educate and develop subordinates, because this will increase their value and give them an opportunity to contribute the NEXT TIME the group does a similar thing.
1.3 Meeting handouts	Doesn't give meeting handouts to any subordinates but the people who attended, because he doesn't want anyone who works for him to be a competitor to him.	Gives copies of meeting handouts (or lets subordinates make their own copy) to every subordinate one who asks for them and offers them an opportunity to ask by telling them there was a meeting (through meeting minutes). He does this because he wants to develop and educate his employees about the big picture.
2. Email	Very strictly limits the audience for important emails so that the smallest group of people receives it, again, because he doesn't want anyone knowing as much about the big picture as he does and doesn't want any kind of	Shares ALL important emails (from the sponsor, for instance) with ALL subordinates who are doing work for that sponsor (not just selected subordinates) so they stay tuned in to what the sponsor wants. This eliminates the need for a lot of meetings

	competition in his workgroup.	and also encourages subordinates to share what they know with everyone as well.
3. Trip reports	Doesn't do trip reports because he doesn't want his subordinates knowing as much as he knows. Makes excuses for why he shouldn't do them. If he makes excuses, offer to do them for him on your own time (even though he should be doing them anyway on project funds). If he still says no, then you know what his real motives are.	Consistently does trip reports and makes sure that everyone who works directly for him gets a copy. He also expects his subordinates to do them too.
4. Character	Breaks promises and often deliberately deceives subordinates to incentivise them enough to give him what he wants. Gets upset when subordinates do the same. Doesn't work very hard or set a hard-working example, but instead expects subordinates to do all of the hard work and views this work as TRIVIAL and BOTHERSOME.	Never lies to or deceives subordinates. Handshake is as good as gold. Continually works very hard and sets the best example possible for subordinates. Highly motivated to roll-up sleeves and help out with anything in the project. Tells the WHOLE truth, instead of the part of the truth that is politically popular.
5. Hypocrisy	Makes rules that only apply to subordinates and not to himself.	Follows all the same rules that he sets for his subordinates.
6. Achievement	Rewards and encourages ONLY things that make the boss look good.	Rewards and encourages achievement, even if it doesn't benefit the boss directly but instead benefits the organization and/or the people who work for him.
7. Attitude	Criticizes subordinates and complains about them behind their backs, especially to important people like sponsors and upper management. Has negative expectations about subordinates that become self-fulfilling.	Complements subordinates for good work. Has positive expectations about subordinates that become self-fulfilling.
8. Project management	NEVER lets subordinates manage any of the money, contracts, or people, because he doesn't want to lose or shrink his empire. This leads to subordinates who are ineffective and dependent on the boss for everything. Shows no VISION or INSPIRATION, and focuses on MANAGING instead of LEADING	Splits up tasks and gives subordinates the BIGGEST piece they can handle, INCLUDING managing the money, contracts, and personnel assigned to the task, but only if they want to. Shows VISION and INSPIRATION in everything he does, and this inspiration readily infects subordinates.
9. Promotion	NEVER promotes subordinates to project management/branch management status. Punishes people who ask for greater responsibility. This hurts the organization in the long run and puts it at the mercy of the boss, so that when he retires, everything comes caving in. If the management above your boss is continually obsessed with what they are going to do when your boss retires, then this is definitely the kind of boss you have. Appoints puppet YES MEN to positions of leadership, but only when he has to. Delegates responsibility but NEVER authority or especially control over project funds. Gets angry at subordinates who make themselves indispensable (like the boss does) and who won't train their replacement as a way to protect their job security, even though he hypocritically isn't willing to train or grow HIS own replacement or subordinates and isn't willing to create new positions of authority for them to "grow up into." Wants to be the ONLY person in the organization who has job security and is indispensable and hypocritically isn't willing to give any subordinate the same privilege.	Continually prepares and develops subordinates to prepare them for the day when the boss won't be around anymore because he retired. This helps the organization and makes it more survivable by preparing other people to assume the responsibilities that the boss has when he leaves.
10. Contracts	Contracts out most of the important work, so that he doesn't have to be burdened with training or developing subordinates. Uses contractors as a weapon to terrorize subordinates by telling them that they will be replaced by a contractor if they don't play by HIS rules, which of course are going to perpetuate HIS empire. Doesn't share what the contractors do, how much they make with subordinates because he doesn't want them being too competitive. Contracting out most of the work makes subordinates complacent, keeps them from complaining about having to work too hard, and pacifies the natives so they don't get restless. In the long run, however, it devastates the character and reputation of the organization because eventually, the sponsor will cut out the middle man (the boss and all his people) and go directly to the contractor if he is smart.	Uses contractors sparingly, and tries to keep most of the work, and especially the important work, in-house. This builds corporate knowledge, value, and expertise and helps the organization tremendously in the long run. It also encourages and builds teamwork within the organization. Shares information about contractors with subordinates who are interested, such as: 1. Statement of work; 2. Amount of money spent and for what. This teaches subordinates about the big picture.
11. Education/career	Ignores career development and education in the goals	Sets clear goals and objectives oriented around career

development	and objectives of subordinates or as a criteria for awarding points. Thinks goals and objectives and education is a waste of time. If the requisite skills don't exist in house to do the job, then he gives the job (and all the valuable knowledge gained doing it) to a contractor instead of growing people in-house who can do the job. This shifts the center of gravity for corporate knowledge to the contractor, which eventually hurts the organization because contractors are just a fickle as their sponsors and jump ship frequently to find better pay and benefits. The boss will then be high and dry the next time he needs that particular skill again, because now his contractor has to go on another man-hunt to find the right guy to do the job. It also wastes a ton of money reeducating yet another person to do the same old job.	development and educational advancement and uses these as a criteria for awarding points. This may make him unpopular with subordinates, but he doesn't mind being unpopular if he is doing the right thing for the organization. Thinks education and career development of subordinates is CRUCIAL to the survival of the organization. Approves training and seminar requests if they are career related. Grows employees by rotating responsibilities so that everyone gets a chance to learn every part of the business, INCLUDING management. Hands people new tasks even if he knows they can't do it, and offers lots of help until they can stand on their own two feet, because he wants them to grow.
12. Loyalty	Has more respect and regard for contractors than he does for his own people. Rejects work accomplished by subordinates in favor of the contractor's, rather than critiquing, developing, and improving it because he doesn't want subordinates to know more than he knows.	Has more respect and regard for his own people than for contractors. If a subordinate produces work inferior to contractors, he tries to diplomatically critique, improve, and develop it until it is of the highest quality and will satisfy the sponsor's requirements.
13. Tolerance and respect	Very arrogant, rigid, and intolerant...especially if political views of subordinates are uncomplimentary or unflattering of the boss or management. Punishes and ostracizes subordinates for their political views. Reacts VERY strongly to any subordinate who puts this document on their wall.	Has a high tolerance level. Respects the rights of subordinates to have political opinions of their own and doesn't punish them for expressing them, even if they are unfavorable. Doesn't complain when subordinates put political posters on the wall promoting their beliefs. Doesn't care if subordinates put this document on their wall.

**NOTE THAT WE ARE ONLY DESCRIBING THE BEHAVIOR OF BAD MANAGERS HERE, NOT ALL MANAGERS. GOOD MANAGERS DON'T DO THESE THINGS, AND BY THE WAY...DON'T SHOOT THE MESSENGER! I DIDN'T INVENT THE MESSAGE PORTRAYED HERE. THIS DOCUMENT MERELY DESCRIBES AND EXPOSES THE TOOLS OF INTIMATION AND OPPRESSION THAT BAD MANAGERS WHO LACK CHARACTER HAVE USED AGAINST THEIR SUBORDINATES FOR HUNDREDS OF YEARS. THESE TRICKS ARE OLDER THAN THE OLDEST PROFESSION ON EARTH, AND I THINK YOU KNOW WHAT THAT IS!**