

CONTENTS

Preface

Comments (Foreword / Testimonials about the book)

1. Darkh Ma'nag-er

- 1.1. Managing people
- 1.2. Basics of management
- 1.3. *Vox populli* and trust
- 1.4. Divide et impera
- 1.5. "God syndrome" and rebellion of slaves

2. Bad managers

- 2.1. Development of bad managers
 - 2.1.1. People are not good
 - 2.1.2. Guiding hand or democracy
- 2.2. Types of bad managers
 - 2.2.1. Incompetent and/or uninterested
 - 2.2.2. Bounded
 - 2.2.3. Too fast
 - 2.2.4. Too slow
 - 2.2.5. Inconsistent
 - 2.2.6. Unblended
 - 2.2.7. Heartless
 - 2.2.8. Corrupted
 - 2.2.9. Narrow-minded
 - 2.2.10. Evil
- 2.3. Roots of evil
- 2.4. Bad managing
- 2.5. Managing fear
- 2.6. Blurring
- 2.7. Ideal board of directors
- 2.8. Prejudices against female bosses
- 2.9. How to become a (bad) manager?
 - 2.9.1. Craftsmen as managers
 - 2.9.2. Sons and daughters as managers
 - 2.9.3. Slimes as managers
 - 2.9.4. Hawks as managers
 - 2.9.5. Bullies as managers
 - 2.9.6. Biro crates as managers
 - 2.9.7. Blackmailers as managers
 - 2.9.8. Criminals as managers
 - 2.9.9. Politicians as managers
 - 2.9.10. Good workers as managers
- 2.10. How to reach a goal?

3. Bad followers

- 3.1. Why do you need a team?
- 3.2. Good excuses
- 3.3. Bad followers
 - 3.3.1. Being ones
 - 3.3.2. The grey eminence
 - 3.3.3. Evil ones
- 3.4. The need that makes followers

4. Managing bad managers

- 4.1. Types of bad managers
 - 4.1.1. Direct assaulter
 - 4.1.2. Hidden assaulter
 - 4.1.3. Explosive individuals
 - 4.1.4. Nagging individuals
 - 4.1.5. Pessimists
 - 4.1.6. "I-Know-Everything" individuals
 - 4.1.7. "I-think-I-Know-Everything" individuals
 - 4.1.8. Silent fish
- 4.2. Influence of bad managers on workers behavior
 - 4.2.1. Creating unpleasant environment
 - 4.2.2. Creating anxiety
 - 4.2.3. Creating fear
 - 4.2.4. Creating dejection and grief
 - 4.2.5. Creating stress
 - 4.2.6. Creating and encouraging aggressiveness
 - 4.2.7. Effecting others behavior
- 4.3. What are you doing here?

5. Murder of motivation

- 5.1. Unengaged workers
- 5.2. Motivation of unengaged ones
 - 5.2.1. Four types of motivation
 - 5.2.2. Mixed motivating systems
- 5.3. Fairytale about promotion
- 5.4. Wrong people at wrong places
 - 5.4.1. Second to none in everything equals second to none in nothing
 - 5.4.2. Getting to the level of your own incapability
- 5.5. Offence punishments in Croatia

6. Three riders of Darkhokalips

- 6.1. Stress
 - 6.1.1. Stress as a result of conflict
 - 6.1.2. Gossips and talks
 - 6.1.3. Stress at work
 - 6.1.4. How to survive in dog eat dog business world?
- 6.2. Mobbing
 - 6.2.1. What is mobbing?

- 6.2.2. Mobbing individuals
- 6.2.3. Mobbing small groups
- 6.2.4. Mobbing big groups
- 6.2.5. Mobbing phases
- 6.2.6. The silence of the lambs

7. Conclusion

- 7.1. Story about the chair with four legs
- 7.2. God, evil and occurred questions

About author

1. Darkh Ma'nag-er

In a galaxy very close to us a little blue planet was comfortably settled and it rotated without any disturbance around the Sun. This planet was called Earth. There was enough oxygen for the development of life, while the sun and the rain alternated at regular intervals, optimal for variety of animal and plant species.

The inhabitants of the planet were acting as every other creature in the Universe; they were working, sleeping, losing their lives in wars, giving birth and education to their children, waiting in queues and, above all, they loved each other; all of that till the rest of their lives. They were happy, as much as it was possible, given the circumstances and there wouldn't be anything interesting for us in this story if one day a leader dressed in black, called Darkh Ma'nag-er hasn't taken control over the planet.

Under the mask which amplified numerous expressions of dissatisfaction on his face, was hidden a man who ran the entire planet in the same way as the company from which he was sent- firmly, without compassion, with help of his followers that took over another companies and dominant positions in order to keep inhabitants of the planet in obedience.

The followers of Darkh Ma'nag-er were obligated to dress similarly to their leader and mentor, watch the central informative programme at 19:84¹ o'clock and not to pop-out from given directions for running a company. When communicating with superiors, they were expected to behave subserviently, on the other hand, in communication with subordinates they needed to be rough. They were regularly rewarded for that kind of behavior by accomplishing a small part of their personal goals in higher interests of others and the law wasn't very rigorous towards them if they ruined a couple of companies or an employee committed suicide or one of their children, due to careless driving ran over a member of lower class with slow reflexes.

Darkh Yvan Groznius (Awfulniuss, Horriblius, Terriblius, Terrorius???) ran one of the well known production companies in the city and its surroundings. He made quite an effort in satisfying the expectations of his lord as well as being in line with the wishes and doctrine of the mighty Darkh Ma'nag-er. He was successful in terrifying his employees from the moment he entered the firm. His projects were unrealistic and absurd, but his employees were obligated to accomplish the goals nevertheless, which included working overtime (unpaid, of course). He was wasting precious time in meetings that had no real purpose, but there he was able to point out the smallest details and isolate bad workers. And for the things to be even worse, without any fear of superiors' criticism he was very successful in making his employees' lives miserable by giving them small, unnecessary assignments that prevented them in accomplishing the essential ones without nervousness and stress.

Darkh Yvan never missed the opportunity to tap on the back his «well-kept» female assistants and workers, and with the most attractive ones he used to spend pleasant moments in a nearby motel, allowing them generously to play a little with his light sword (that began to lose vitality lately, frankly). He was extremely careful in preventing his beloved (but dangerous) wife from finding out anything because he couldn't afford a scandalous divorce and the embarrassment of being caught in a lie by a woman.

Every workers' attempt to organize a labor-union in order to claim their rights were destined to fail because there was no law in which at least some of

¹ In our story, one hour counts 100 minutes on this planet

the workers' rights were defined. As a consequence of a sudden attack of kindness, Darkh Yvan decided to let his employees have a 5 minute-break once a day and another break for satisfying their basic physiological needs. His colleagues considered it to be a sign of Darkh's weakness, but, what the heck, it was a very successful day, the profit rose by 122 % so he was able to allow the employees a bit of luxury.

Consumers were extremely dissatisfied with the products and services of his company, but Darkh considered this fact the ultimate prerequisite to earn a place on Darkh Ma'nager's list of his most loyal followers and to settle comfortably in the most beautiful part of Darkh' hell after his death, where the most meritorious go. He sincerely hoped, in case he didn't earn the desired place on hard work and sweat of his subordinates, his results wouldn't be left unnoticed and that he would be able to work his way up through several managerial levels and salary grades.

Unfortunately, regardless of the huge effort that Yvan made, the company's results were going slack, hurriedly and misteriously. The accounts were emptying and almost all meritorious workers gave notice, regardless of the fact they got accustomed to the everyday mistreatment and even accepted it as a well-intentioned concern for their health and working habits.

Workers that stayed were those who smiled to him all of the time, always waiting faithfully for him to give them orders where to go and what to do, who nodded humbly and reported their colleagues that had any initiative. Unfortunately, those qualities weren't able to achieve better business results so Darkh Yvan had to roll up his slaves and try to save what could be saved.

Slowly, like in a movie where characters of minor importance are being frozen (the rest of the workers stiffened waiting for his instructions), the company stopped and the superiors invited Darkh Yvan for a cup of a «friendly» talk. As to be expected, none of his explanations were accepted, even though the superiors agreed that the people Yvan led were to blame for everything that had happened. They told Yvan that, as a consequence of his unsatisfying results, a new manager would take control over the company.

The new manager was Darkh Mat'te Groznius (Hisawfulniuss, Morehorriblius, Moreterriblius, Moreterrorius???), whose reputation of a bad manager was well known all around the world, and horrible stories of peoples' screams that could be heard from the previous companies he ran were told whispering and with respect. The company advertised vacancies in newspapers and soon it was crowded with ambitious young people who had no idea what would happen to them in near future. Darkh Mat'te Hisawfulness concluded that there was enough room for improvement and expected the company to begin making profit very soon. To begin with, he redecorated his office and fired his old secretary. Naturally, before he showed the door to the incapable secretary (she knew a lot about business, but she didn't distinguish herself in special consultations at the motel room), he had squeezed all the information about Yvan's bloody regime out of her. He organized a meeting with all the departments' managers and threw all freedom-loving thoughts out of their minds with one plain sentence: «If you've ever asked yourselves if there was God, today you got your positive answer.». Of course, he didn't tell them that it's the only positive thing that will happen to them in their private and personal life from that moment on. He closed the door of the conference room to prevent screams to be heard outside.

However, Darkh Yvan was given another chance. He was degraded to a department manager, but with assurance that, in case he had outstanding

results, he would be promoted to a manager of another company and all of his prior sins would be forgotten. Darkh Yvan showed that he had learned his lesson the very first day when two unfortunate employees were taken from their workplace straight to the cemetery (one had a stroke, and the other a heart-attack), a few others went away wobbling to get help at the nearest doctor's office and the nearby pharmacy sold piles and piles of tranquilizers. Darkh Yvan felt good about himself-he was back in shape, fear was taking control over the department which led to the first satisfying results. He heard that the rumors of his recovery came to the boss himself.

Somewhere high, at the top of a dark business tower, Darkh Ma'nag-er has just received the good news from the field. The profits rose yesterday a couple of times and a small group of rebel managers, who wanted to lead people according to the book «A Human Side of Management», was prevented by a very successful action. Although authors of the inappropriate text escaped, their capture is the matter of days.

At one point, underneath the dark mask, his face pulled into something we could call a smile. The dark side of management led the population into the right way once again.

1.1. Managing people

The history of mankind is a history of acting in a group. People used to associate in order to hunt bears and mammoths, to feel safe and strong, to squeeze together in cold nights to get warm; even Defoe² had mercy on Robinson and gave him Friday somewhere in the middle of the book because it became obvious that even the world's most famous shipwrecked sailor wasn't able to do everything only by himself.

Among basic needs that all people share, food and safety are the first two. That's why you need someone to grow food and someone to build houses. To manage both, you need raw materials and tools, a certain amount of time, and concerning the fact that time represents the most valuable human belongings, you have to compensate it to producers. As compensation, people usually use money, which they have to earn by selling their qualifications on the market.

People also have a need for transportation. While buying a car you also pay workers for the time spent on sketches, tests, manufacturing all the necessary parts and composing everything together. Finally, you pay mine-workers for the time spent on digging out iron ore and bauxite. This part is quite simple and perfectly understandable. Now we talk about exchange and group work.

Things get complicated when people have freedom of choice. Today, for every kind of food you have a great variety of products on the shelves of department stores, due to the high level of demand for flats and houses, number of construction companies increases daily and you can also drive lots of different types of automobiles. Every supplier of products and services that you use has the privilege to get all the necessary materials from a variety of different sources and due to the fact that time is so valuable, the one that spends his time the most efficiently, gets an extra reward. This is what we call competition and in reality it means competing everybody with everyone. Each and every job, and in a way, each and every individual, competes with others. We are all

² Daniel Defoe (1660.-1731.), an english writer, author of the book Robinson Crusoe, in which he describes adventures of a shipwrecked sailor that was left alone on a small island, lost in the blueness of the ocean.

manufacturers. We are all also consumers. Everybody produces something that somebody else uses. We take our pick from an endless list of supply.

The true complexity is derived from all possible interactions. Who bought what and from who? Who is more efficient and spends his time better, at the same time working for his own benefit and for the benefit of his consumers? With this large number of people involved, everything looks like a pile (or accumulation of piles) in which everybody communicates with everybody. How to choose adequate associates, who offer exactly the things you need, at the price you are willing to accept and with the consequences that give you pleasure? How to unite them in a group that combines their qualities together with yours and surpasses substantially individual contributions? How to manage successfully and develop such a group for a long period of time?

When two people decided to accomplish something together it meant that from that very moment on one of them would manage this new-made partnership. This is called allocation of work. Discovery of allocation of work enabled culture, science and art to come into being, but on the other hand authority and oppression appeared as well. As revenue kept growing through a certain period of time, individuals were able to engage in activities that had nothing to do with pure survival (e.g. priests, artists) while the others imposed as managers of the ones who worked (e.g. kings, gentry and soldiers). Although progress helps people to make their lives easier to live, it also allows individuals to use other people for accomplishment of their personal goals.

As every other human activity, allocation of work creates prosperity in some places, but at the same time rows and envy elsewhere. This happens because people do jobs that cause differences among people to be more visible. There is more to share in wealth in general; distinguishing diligent from lazy ones, or capable from the incapable becomes insufficient. What becomes clear to all is that high revenues aren't always followed by diligence or capability, but in some cases are achieved using frauds, brutality, covetousness and aspiration for power.

People haven't made up any new, unknown feeling in the last couple of millenniums. They have loved, hated, respected, despised, supported or attacked each other for years, since ancient Egyptians, Romans and Greeks. They are willing to follow a charismatic leader, burn or throw stones (literally and metaphorically) at anyone whose idea jeopardizes the existing order and system, report a neighbor to authorities (so e.g. neighbour's cow or Picasso's painting can «accidentally» be moved to their barn or wall), double cross a partner if it meant more money in one's own pocket and, finally, make a slave, peasant, servant or employee to work in impossible conditions if it brought profit in accordance with the boss' or shareholders' expectations.

People have always gathered in groups, some of them have always managed others and that's the basic point of any consideration about teamwork. We can talk about three phases in teamwork:

- 1) Adequate choice of members of groups (teams) and merging their individual capabilities into one joint force (forming a group)
- 2) Good communication among members of groups and the person that manages the group and uses his authority to resolve tasks and accomplish goals of the entire group as well as the individuals who form it (managing a group)
- 3) Distributing results (or prey) in shares acceptable to all parties interested (maintaining a group).

Thanks to a moment of exceptional generosity I could say that the first task, creating or forming a group, can be successfully carried out by 30-40% of all those who are registered or like to consider themselves to be managers. The percentage of those who know how to manage a group is not higher than 20-25% among managerial population. Finally, there are no more than 5% (with the lowest possible criteria) of those who know how to maintain a group.

It's often considered that managers are powerful and all round strong. Power and strength can come from different sources (personal, group, materialistic, etc.), but we can never claim an individual to be strong unless there are people willing to appreciate his strength or even help him create it. That's why we can talk about a network or a pyramid of bad management, where the manager himself creates a pattern of bad behavior that than is fulfilled and transferred further on by his employees, who tend to "enrich" their head's behavior with larger or smaller contributions.

Why is that important? Well, someone's success can be defined by a number of criteria. They can be material, social, personal, but, according to me, the only real criteria is duration of success. A number of managers managed in some way (with personal engagement or pure luck) to accomplish a certain goal and than relaxed thinking that they've reached the sky. How does it usually function in our region?

Let's use a case of an average local entrepreneur. He did some good first job(s) and certain amount of cash pours into a firm. The first thing manager would do is to run as fast as he can to the nearest store to buy a BMW (or Mercedes), which he has had in his dreams since the earliest childhood and a set of golf clubs to fill up the trunk of his new machine and show his friends that he's made it to enter to the first league. He even took a glimpse at a yacht, although a few meters shorter than the one owned by local big shots, but still a yacht.

In the most optimistic scenario, he barely thanked people who made it possible for the money to find a path to his accounts, maybe he even gave them some small bonus (after all, they worked hard, right?), and yet there were more than a few of those who did no such thing, but bawled at their employees asking how is it even possible to do any work done with such morons. Next, they would speed up the production and shorten deadlines, because even more work needed to be done in order to pay installments for the yacht that started piling every month. At this point on begins the end of success.

During the first month of such regime two of his best workers will left the firm, in the next three weeks another three and suddenly, installments for the BMW and the yacht became huge, too huge to be able to bear. Workers that decided to remain will keep on working, but their results are going to worsen daily, replacements won't justify given trust and success will change into failure. And why is that? Just because this jackass didn't figure out that his success is success of the entire group of people who worked, and that they should get some credit for it, as well as an adequate compensation, in order to make them satisfied and loyal employees. This way, the story of his journey to success, planned to at least 100 episodes of some «business» soap opera, will fill only 2-3 episodes and will remain just that – soap bubbles.

Management doesn't exist in vacuum, but has its own context in which it takes place, and serves both managers and his followers as an excuse for everything that has or hasn't been done. When we talk about bad management, we mustn't overlook readiness of followers to expand this kind of behaviour to departments and people they hold convenient.

1.2. Basic of management

History of human race is filled with violence and suffering, so the fact that we managed to survive all those wars, inquisitions, dictators and stay normal (more or less) is a miracle. Israeli statesman Abba Eban³ once said, "History teaches us that men and nations behave wisely once they have exhausted all other alternatives." This is the reason why we now, in the 21st century, after all that years, centuries and milleniums of man-is-a-wolf-to-man behaviour desperately need educated people that would bring and develop new business and social ideas and that are raised to understand that only good relationships among group members are suitable to bring innovation, development, positive results and long-term success.

An industry that creates managers (educational institutions, economic operators, political parties etc.) intercedes for creating good managers in belief that management is a subject that can be studied and taught as any other skill. This is only partially true. If you studied managerial skills, you would probably be successful in your job, but how is it possible that barely educated people, with elementary school only, without one minute spent in renowned business schools, also know how to act as outstanding managers?

The fact is (yet, not a rule): the lower level of education of the one who manages people, worse results of his leadership. Most people with lower level of education refuse (out of fear) to employ people who know more than they do, they are more sceptical in accepting and implementing technological innovations, have problems in communication with subordinates and business partners and are inclined to think as "gastarbajters"⁴ (all the people in my surrounding don't accept me, they envy me, so if I worked hard, gave up all luxuries and saved, I would save enough money to buy a house, a car and show everyone my real value). In a countries and times, when good jobs are hard to find, that kind of people can successfully run their companies beacuse people are affraid to loose the job.

The higher level of education (especially concerning business schools in which positive approach to managing people is being trained) leads to a higher probability for the manager to be aware that only if relationships in the group that he leads are good, he can expect good results to be long-term.

To be understood, there are many examples when high level of education hides primitive instincts of predators. A tie around one's neck, an expensive suit and shiny leather shoes can demonstrate only external values of a person. Someone's degree shows nothing but the fact that he visited a couple of lectures, passed obligatory exams one way or another, wrote (by himself or with someone else's help) his master's thesis but nothing else. A piece of paper hung on the wall, even if name of a well-known faculty is written on it, cannot reveal all that happens in one's head (even if it is laurelled with some fancy title). Furthermore, I know personally some teachers and professors (with Ph.D. degree) whose belittling approach to learners and students shows that they maybe got their educational and scientific titles on paper, but haven't learned a thing about good human relationship.

Why is this relationship important? A certain percentage of people simply refuse to be managed and they are entitled to it. They know the ropes and perform their job well. The optimal way to lead these kinds of people is not to

³ Abba Eban (1915-2002), Isreali diplomat and politician, born in South Africa.

⁴ People who leave their homes and go to a foreign country where they get employed and earn for a living

control them, but to give them support in achieving goals in their line of duties. Metaphorically said, they are like auto-mechanics who repair the engine lying beneath a car and a manager passes all the necessary tools in order to finish the job successfully. The most exceptional results are achieved by those who have the knowledge and capability of self-managing, but are still very aware that they can't get all the work done by themselves; that's why they merge into groups with equally capable and responsible individuals.

There are people who aren't willing to give much thought and want someone else to make their decisions. They are satisfied when there are well-known and capable people working in their company or when they are a part of a group that achieves outstanding results. Lying under a vehicle, they expect advise from the manager, to pass them tools and, without any insight in real condition of the vehicle, give them instructions what to do. This kind of people achieves results thanks to the movement which direction is determined by someone else.

A well-managed organization is able to accomplish the majority of both personal and common goals of the individuals who are lucky to be part of it. A bad-managed organization is going to cause failure, disappointment and rage to all who had certain expectations and wanted to create something.

A term "micromanager" can help us explain how everybody begins with the first step- from self-management. In your own "micro world" you are your own manager and your job is to manage a group that's consisted of only one member-yourself. This way a manager can be good himself and towards himself. For being a good manager, he needs no one but himself-to start with he needs to be a good organizer, a good leader and he needs to take care of himself.

A bad manager (assuming that no one is crazy enough to treat himself badly) needs to have victims on which he can demonstrate and prove his bad management. The followers wit their own weaknesses will contribute to his force, but part of them will, with their negative activities towards weaker members of the group, make his force grow even stronger and more terrifying. Since no bad manager has the time or strength to completely devote to every victim personally, the majority of his dirty work is done by his followers.

In order to keep a clear perspective, we must acknowledge the fact that there are good managers as well as bad managers. Likewise, there are good and bad followers. Machiavelli⁵ had no trouble in his attempt to fight the idea of a bad-as mandatory-people management. He simply assumed it as a normal fact. The fact that people do both-right and wrong is our reality and he took it as such, so his advice to monarch of his time was: "Cruelty can be considered correctly implemented (under the assumption that it's allowed to speak well of evil) when it is being implemented in one moment only, and not continued, but restrained as much as possible". That's what we would call determination to reach your goal with minimal number of victims as possible.

Machiavelli continues: "Cruelty that cannot be justified in any way is the one that begins as minimal, but grows and develops with time⁶." How many politicians, businessmen, family members and neighbors do you know who first mistreated people around them and than "grew", got political and/or financial strength to ruin lives of many people, in majority of situations, with the help of society and its institutions? The fact is, if a person knows how to manage himself, with appropriate knowledge of the job he does and ability to

⁵ Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), Italian writer and politician, a man of practise and genuine thinker, advisor of many monarchs and aristocrats during Renaissance

⁶ Niccolo Machiavelli, The lord (Il Principe), Publishing Institute Globus, Zagreb, 1998.,page 37-38.

communicate with others, he will be capable to manage others. And vice versa, if he doesn't know how to manage himself, a simple label saying "head director" on his office door, won't enable him to achieve good communication with his employees.

If a significant number of organizations (especially political ones), that have a certain tradition of glorifying their eminent members or their actions (and not allowing by any chance a slightest thought of them being incapable), stopped wasting our time, as well as their own, trying to convince everyone that they are sacred and that the others are corrupt, things might begin resolving faster and more efficiently. If you got involved in fairytales such as: our politicians are innocent, our athletes are spotless, our children are like angels, our mother have never cursed, our fathers have never got drunk, our workers are very hardworking and never goof off, it's impossible for our companies to fail; basically all that is ours, can't be bad, bad happens to others, there's nothing else but to wake up shocked by the reality that surrounds you and the consequences of your own deception. Bertolt Brecht⁷, a German writer, had a nice way to put it: "A country without heroes is a poor country. But, even poorer is a country that needs heroes."

These are very simple things that we encounter in our everyday lives. Just as in nature exist day and night, life and death, summer and autumn, in such a manner exist good and bad people. Everyone who knows about "yin and yang" also knows that in every good person exists a dark side, and something good can be found in every bad person. There are people who create and the ones who destroy. No one can, with complete certainty say that it's impossible for him/her to do something bad, regardless of the circumstances. Every man has his price, in some cases it's very low which causes him to go over to the dark side as a result of the first temptations, while other people need to experience a terrible trauma, strong enough to alter their entire lives, in order to replace good with evil.

The only difference is a degree of tolerance on evil.

1.3. Vox populi and trust

The results of Gallup's⁸ global poll "Voice of the people", presented in the year 2004. at The world's economic forum in a Swiss town called Davos, showed an awful image that managers (business leaders) and politicians (political leaders) carried:

Image (what people think about them)	ma nagers	pol iticians
They are incapable and incompetent	22 %	39 %
Their behavior isn't ethical	39 %	52 %
They succumb to the pressure of those more powerful	49 %	47 %
They have too much power		

⁷ Bertolt Brecht (1898.-1956.), a German writer, persecuted during the nazi domination in Germany, author of works: Mutter Courage und ihre kinder, Der kaukasische kreidekreis, Der gutte mensch von Sezuan, etc.

⁸ Gallup is an american consultant company, founded in 1935., as an American institute for public opinion. The founder and leader of well-known sociometric lines of questioning was George Horace Gallup (1901.-1984.)

	49 %	60 %
They are dishonest	43 %	63 %

Answer to a question: "Are political leaders honorable?" gave defeating results. On global level 63 % people questioned said that politicians were dishonorable. Their opinion was shared by 46 % inhabitants of Western Europe, 49 % inhabitants of Central and Eastern Europe, 50 % inhabitants of North America, 60 % inhabitants of the Middle East, 73 % inhabitants of Asia and Pacific, 82 % of Africans, 84 % inhabitants of Western Asia and 87% inhabitants of South America.⁹ So, all of this taken into consideration, it looks almost impossible to educate our children to be honorable, obey the law and live properly. How to convince them in considering love and goodness to be beautiful human virtues when many of them grow up without any of the two?

Do we trust the people associated with institutions that are to lead in goodness, honor, humanity and taking care of others? Data coming from field implicate that relations between Croatians and the institutions they pay in order to have decent lives worsen on annual basis. A research that was conducted in April 2004 showed that 33.3 % of the examinees trusted the Catholic church the most, President of the Republic deserved 21.8 % of the votes, than the Croatian military force (10.2 %), Croatian Parliament (7.6 %), Government (7.6 %), police (5.3 %), system of justice (2.2 %) and 12 % of the examinees trusted none of the above mentioned.

June, 2005 the situation worsened – the poll showed that the President was trust worthy for about 26.7 % examinees, the Catholic church for 23.8 %, the Government for 7.4 %, the Croatian Parliament for 6.8 %, the Croatian military force for 4.8 %, system of justice for 3.2 %, the police for 2.3 % and none of the above mentioned institutions is trust worthy for about 25 %, or every 4th examinee¹⁰, which is twice as may as in the year 2004. No wonder that the optimism index¹¹ for august 2005 fell to 38.6 (on a scale from 0 to 100), reaching the lowest possible level since September 2003. when optimism of Croats was first measured.

When faced with such results, a man's first impulse is to barricade in the safety of his own home, let no one in except the people closest to him and stay there for a long period of time. But, it has always been like this - the strong were in charge of the weak, someone was always a leader, others followed, and in spite all of this, mankind managed to survive. How can we apply this fact on today's situation?

Each and every one of us possesses a certain knowledge which distinguishes him from others and if we manage to sell this knowledge on the labor force market, we can survive bad managers as well as bad politicians. How come? Because, in that case, we don't need guidance in order to work well, earn sufficiently and live properly. When you have aims defined and know the path to get to them (legally, of course), you simply don't have a need for someone to hold your hand and harass you in the process. You have the advantage and "guides" need you, because only with your help they can accomplish their own goals. It's up to you-whether to accomplish your own goals (usually feeling great in the process) or accomplish someone else's goals (usually feeling awful).

⁹ Source: Gallup International Association – Voice of the people 2004.

¹⁰ For the Croatian business daily paper Poslovni dnevnik, polls conducted monthly by the Henda Agency

¹¹ Jutarnji list (Croatian daily newspapers), 20 .09. 2005.

1.4. Divide et impera¹²

One of the basic managerial functions is to lead people in their attempt to accomplish someone else's goals. Accomplishing such goals can be defined as a process conducted by a manager, member of the entire human population on Earth, which means that he goes through everything typical of human race. Since there are other people involved in a group managed by him, during the process of accomplishing the initial, main goal, numerous individual goals tend to appear.

One of these goals, shared by the majority of those who take part in group activities, is to benefit from their work. Their prize can be material, emotional or information, but most people tend to emphasize the material aspect of the term wealth. From the very beginnings of socialization among people, it's been considered appropriate to evaluate people according to their salary (or prey), model of their car (or carriage), location and size of their flat, house (or castle), so no wonder that nowadays people's first association of getting rich are bills and coins. And now we've come to a certain paradox. A person who has potential of getting rich often consciously (or unconsciously) ruins the system in which he accomplishes his goals. How is that possible?

In case he tried to deceive members of the group that had contributed in creating his wealth, and keep everything for himself, they would probably die of hunger (in the most drastic case) or they'd be dissatisfied and leave the group leaving the manager on his own, incapable of repeating such results in the future. And if he refused to pay tax to the same society in which boundaries he had managed to create wealth, that same society wouldn't be able to function properly (e.g., pay for teachers, doctors, police officers or soldiers). As a consequence, it will get harder and harder for the manager to find skilled co-workers (because education system has no resources to create adequate conditions for quality education of future generations), his health might be at risk (because he or a member of his family will be treated by a doctor who doesn't have required knowledge or equipment), he can get robbed or murdered (because a police officer nearby isn't interested in getting killed for disgracefully low salary that he receives monthly), and after all, even the state can fall under someone else's influence, under whose authority our manager won't be able to make profit (assuming that the military force won't have enough resources to defend the country, while diplomats and other politicians are more likely to look after their personal interests than the national welfare). Finally, if he didn't share his wealth (one way or another) with other people, some of them would probably attempt to take it away from him.

This model can be applied to the entire state as well, that practically enforces hi-quality entrepreneurs, scientists, athletes and other highly educated experts to leave the country and try to pursue their luck elsewhere, just because some individuals who take part in authority refuse to think further than their own pocket. The model can be applied to families where children will leave their parents as soon as they become adults, due to their parents' selfishness during their childhood. Finally, is it possible for a symphony orchestra to play meeting

¹² First divide, than rule (lat.)

high standards if the conductor thinks only how to be seen among all of them? Turn around, give it some thought and you'll see numerous examples of failed societies and groups that enabled their managers to become rich, who then decided not to share their wealth with others.

1.5. "God's syndrome" and rebellion of slaves

There are numerous examples in history supporting the fact that famous people aren't always immune to the "God's syndrome"-a feeling that they have a right to make decisions of other peoples' lives and destinies just because they have control of their existence. You've probably never read that the religious reformer Martin Luther¹³, who apart from his religious activities, with his documents and translation of the Bible laid the foundations of a unitary standard German language, showed incomprehensible intolerance towards those beneath his class. In one occasion, when his wife objected him that he treated the servants roughly, he answered: "We must treat them as the Turks treat their slaves; if they are willing to work, they'll eat, if they don't work, let them die."

A famous inventor Thomas Alva Edison¹⁴ thought that "there is no room for ethics in the business world". Every businessman needs to take care of his own interest, and who cares about the others. Even when he, due to his inventions, became so rich that he was able to own a laboratory with numerous engineers, technicians and employees, he made them work 10 to 12 hours a day, without paid overtime and the basic wages they received were the lowest possible at the time.

Another example of mistreatment towards group members is an American explorer Robert Edwin Peary¹⁵ who became famous in 1909. being the first man on Earth to reach North pole, but treated despicably the people who helped him fulfil his biggest dream. He used every possible chance to humiliate members of his expedition and he addressed his coloured companion as "stupid nigger", ignoring the fact that this "nigger" saved his life carrying him on his back long distance on their way home. Later, with some lame excuse, Peary fired Hensen, who died in misery, while he made a fortune with his memoirs and lectures.

The concentration of global wealth in pockets and on accounts (as well as in heads, concerning the process of negative selection on colleges) of only a handful of people is the one that has disastrous consequences on the company and the entire society in which profit is being made, not the capital itself. Making profit implies that the individuals in society will become even richer, and the economy poorer. The final consequence of such negative selection will provoke reactions of the rest of the team, in range of resigning to (e.g. October¹⁶) revolutions.

In the late 16th century, Spain was ruled by Philip II, who was known among people as greater catholic than the pope¹⁷ himself. He persecuted all heretics (that's what he called people of different beliefs, even better to say – of different goals), in reality part of his citizens who regularly paid taxes and

¹³ Martin Luther (1483.-1546.), founder of Protestantism in Germany and one of the leaders in reformation of religion

¹⁴ Thomas Alva Edison (1847.- 1931.), american inventor. His most famous inventions are: microphone, megaphone, fuse etc.

¹⁵ Robert Edwin Peary (1856. – 1920.), engineer, the first man to reach North pole (06. 04. 1909.) where he spent 30 hours with his associates

¹⁶ October revolution took place in 1917. in contemporary Russia, when peasants and workers, totally exhausted with wars and hunger, dethroned the emperor and established socialism (in their opinion more righteous), but (historically proven) inefficient system, that lasted for about 70 years

¹⁷ leader of the Catholic church

financed his various appetites. If they refused to deny their "heresy", they would risk dying at the stake in terrible pains. Even in Netherlands, that was included in Spanish territory at the time, he executed his reign of terror trying to destroy Protestantism.

The Protestants who lived at north of the country, under the leadership of Willem of Oranje, fought against such terror and by the year 1581. managed to win their independence. They justified all actions taken using these words: "People will never go against their leader, but the leader needs to obey the will of his people, because if it weren't for them, he would never obtain such an honourable function. His main purpose is to rule justly. In case he failed to do so, and treated his citizens as slaves, he would become a tyrant instead of a leader. That's why we dear to abnegate any authority of the Spanish king over Netherlands, and liberate all accountants, the government, vassals and population from loyalty and obedience towards the Spanish Crown."

Do you know a story about Matija Gubec¹⁸ and his fight against feudal system, and for higher life quality for peasants? If you do, forget that version of the story. Matija Gubec encouraged peasants to rise against the tyranny of Franjo Tahij¹⁹, a cruel and greedy feudal lord, who made the peasants work very hard and kept pushing them over their limits in order to accomplish goals of his own. Instead of putting reasonable requests in front of the peasants, he exhausted them totally, leaving them no other option but to rebel. Tahij was, due to his behaviour, the one to blame for the rebellion, not the entire feudal system that functioned faultlessly when conducted by a reasonable squire. The majority of managers haven't passed the school of life to be aware of the fact that if you owned a sheep and wanted a long-term benefit from it, you wouldn't skin it, but trim it. If you decided to kill a sheep, you probably earned more by getting everything usable: meat, skin and wool, but the sheep would be dead, gone forever. If you decided to trim your sheep regularly, you would benefit even more because even milk and lambs would be at your disposal. Of course, this is metaphorically said, I don't equalize people and sheep (although in some cases it wouldn't be wrong to do so); the goal is to emphasise the fact that you can exhaust your employees with unrealistic expectations, incorrect behaviour and insufficient communication. During this period of terror it's possible for them to surpass your expectations, but in most cases, after accomplishing your goals, you won't be able to count on them any more. They'll probably resign, become inactive or purposely sabotage your activities.

Some companies on the market have only one main goal-to maximise profits of the owner. Their main characteristics are making others accept extremely high risk and total insensibility of the problems they cause to their employees and consumers. Their only goal is to increase profit, one way or another. The managers who accept and implement this philosophy, tend to become insensitive as well, not realising that they would be the first to go and leave the company in case something went wrong. They usually learn from experience that companies tend to go down the drain, but people remember. According to a research²⁰ conducted in Croatia, 32% of the examinees expressed personal dissatisfaction with the management in their companies and the fact that conflicts with managers are the most frequent (88.8%) reasons that

¹⁸ leader of peasants' rebellion at Donja Stubica (a town in Croatia), which ended tragically, in blood on February, the 9th 1573

¹⁹ Feudalist who acted ruthlessly towards peasants and provoked their rebellion in1573

²⁰ Research named «The boss of 2004» published on the web page [www. moj-posao.net](http://www.moj-posao.net) (the best head hunting web page/company in Croatia)

professionals allege when leaving their job in a company.²¹When the situation becomes critical and problems of being uncompetitive on the market (stagnation of growth, uncompetitive products and reduction of market share) cannot be ignored any more, managers begin a very painful process of what they call restructuring- attempts to save the company by tossing off useless parts. The idea is to extract so called adipose tissue and amputate unprofitable affairs, but the process usually results only with closing down workplaces and diminishing the rights (as well as salaries) of remaining employees. Such managers usually try to convince the workers that they are the greatest value their company owns, but they feel being undersold and treated as expendable goods.

Although a polite way to define decisions of such managers is reconstitution of processes, rationalization of portfolio and downsizing, it all adds up to downsizing – cutting costs and laying off workers. Instead of laying themselves off in the name of efficiency and productivity, because usually companies go down the drain due to bad and incompetent management, they become real experts in destroying lives, families and entire society in which their rejected former employees live.

One of the inevitable effects of downsizing is demoralization. Employees listen to stories about huge importance of human resources, while they're being destroyed at the same time. In such companies existing doubt is horrible – if you didn't become more efficient, you'd lose your job, but if you became more efficient, the company would be in such bad shape due to incompetent managers, that you'd lose it anyway.

Managers rarely know how to recognize to which extent restructuring can be conducted and set a limit which divides company's "fat" that needs to be removed and "muscles" that mustn't be touched. Any restructuring focused on changing the existing situation, without entering any innovation, new ideas or new managers, in most cases is a path without return.

²¹ a questionnaire on www.moj-posao.net showed that 49.2% of the workers leave their jobs for the intolerance of bad management, while extra 39.6% consider to do the same

2. Bad managers

Management should be (this is where the most positivisticly oriented authors and managers agree) a proces of creating and preserving an ambience in which individuals, by working together in groups, can achieve selected goals efficiently. Ever since people started gathering in groups in order to achieve the goals that they couldn' t possibly achieve as individuals, they needed managers that were required in organizing the coordination, planning, leading and control.

There are managers that are focused on results and those focused on people. In order to combine these two assignments, they need to make sure that the selected goals are achieved and that they are succesfull in managing the groups of people they are in charge of. A good manager will accomplish the goals and manage the people properly. A bad manager, on the contrary:

- a) won't accomplish the goals, but will take care of people
- b) will accomplish the goals, but wont' take care of people
- c) will neither accomplish the goals nor take care of people

Bad managers can be divided into two basic groups. When we talk about bad managers, we can say that they can be incapable or unethical. The difference between these two types isn't theoretical, but practical. In some situations, however, the incapable ones end up as unethical, and the word that is usually used to designate the results of companies run by bad managers is failure.

The incapable management cannot accomplish the goals that are set up. There are many reasons for this, among others, lack of knowledge and managerial skills, which lead to wrong strategies, poor implementation of tactics as well as lousy contracts with business partners and complete failure of the group run by these managers. This kind of behavior, expressed by managers isn't necessarily intended. It's often the consequence of ignorance, inadvertence or negligence, but regardless of these facts, this kind of managers is extremely dangerous, in some case even fatal for business. Generally, all the things that are expected of good managers, the bad ones aren't able to do for the lack of knowledge, eagerness or competence.

Unethical managers don't set a limit between the right and wrong. While ethical managers place the needs of their followers in front of their owns', the unethical ones don't tend to to the same. Ethical managers demonstrate virtues like courage and determination, unlike the unethical ones. Finally, one of the main results of ethical managers' activities is definitely common good, a term unfamiliar to unethical managers.

If managers tend to use the resaurces that are at their disposal inadequately (or don't use them at all) and the final result isn't satisfying, they are called incapable. Many of them set the goals which are accepted only by one part of the group, while to the others they sound completely irrational. These actions reveal an incapable manager early, during the process of planning.

Basic assumptions for performance of bad managers:

- a) every manager is characterised by a certain degree of incapability which can vary from negligible (visible only in certain situations and details) to extremely acute (when the entire attitude of the manager is extremely negative, including communication with subordinates as well as decision-making and implementing).

b) a great deal of managers most of the time aren't aware of the dark side of their personality nor the incapability that effects their behavior

c) personal incapability, in any sense, can be a motive which leads an individual to make an effort and attain managerial objectives and can also be the cause of significant business mistakes.

A typical boss of the early 20th century wanted to see fear on his employees' faces. As the years passed that same boss began to understand that his employees were his most valuable capital. He began focusing on them instead of piling up walls, machines and equipment. A quick rewind of history to today's companies shows that great deal of managers still lives in the climate of barbarian penetrations into Europe, wanting to see fear on their employees' faces, leaving behind ruined companies, disappointed people and penniless investitures. The progress, when it comes to this kind of managers, happened all around them; the cars that they drive are better and more comfortable, communication is faster (if they know anything other than pressing keys on the cellular phone) and their chairs are far more comfortable.