

II. On the Way to LBQ

1. Componentize – Divide et Impera – Divide and Conquer

Divide and conquer! I am almost positive that Louis XI of France uttered that phrase around 1480, but a few seniors among us boast that they had already heard it from Caesar. The principle is: Give every provincial ruler a bit of power and rule over them all. Playing them off against each other helps.

In the realm of computer science, “Divide and conquer” refers to that handy construction principle of dividing large tasks into smaller ones that can then be solved separately or even on other computers.

Here, I divide cut rum into water, ethanol and genuine rum!

Lean Brain Management rigorously divides all work into the routine part and the intelligent part. The routine part can be performed by anyone after brief training, while the intelligent part can only be carried out in the presence of sufficient intelligence, preferably in the system.

Now we are all going to begin to examine all jobs for their minimum level of intelligence. We will reorganize the work such that almost all of it consists of routine! Then, perhaps just a smidgen of intelligence or genuineness will be necessary for the rest! When exercising power, for instance, one king is enough for everyone. In religion, one single faith of one prophet defines the faith of all others. That should be our model for LBQ. If power need only be present in one person, and if there can only be one rich person per country, why can't there be just one intelligent person?

For instance, we divide the acquisition of items into “going shopping” and “getting something at the store”. The former is done by

two wives, the latter by a husband alone. That makes the other husband completely superfluous! Do you see? Going shopping is an art form, whereas getting something at the store is work. Normally, however, four individuals go shopping, two of them groaning because they have no clue as to how to shop. Later, they then have to take care of the routine work (getting something at the store) and mow the lawn. After the shopping trip, the husbands are surprised to discover that the many hours their wives spent trekking through stores has resulted in nothing more than a bit of cream-colored underwear. "We couldn't find anything." Men simply write down what they absolutely need to get onto a shopping list. Black or red underwear, for example: A man could find them in seconds.

In auto body shops, several mechanics repair our defective, fendered friends. The true talent in this realm is having a nose for faults. Some mechanics never find the fault, not even in the cozy round of fellow mechanics. "The car won't start but according to everything we know, it should run." Then the wife of the head mechanic comes in, smells the vehicle and immediately orders the replacement parts. She is intelligent. Hour after hour, routine work is performed. The only intelligence is found in the diagnosis. That is where the genuine can be found! With any luck, someone will actually find out the cause! "Your car cannot be fixed because we can't find the fault. So, as a last-ditch effort, we've replaced the engine. Your insurance will pay for it, and you're back in the passing lane."

Have you ever been sick but not known yourself what the matter was? You went from doctor to doctor. "Mr. Dueck, you are evidently ill. But we can't find anything, so please don't worry. If a doctor can't find anything wrong, you must be healthy. Strictly speaking, disease doesn't begin until after the diagnosis." – "And what if the diagnosis is wrong?" – "Then you are suffering from the wrong disease." – "Well, then I hope you diagnose a disease that's not so serious." – "If we don't know what you are suffering from, we like to take the most serious illness you could possibly have. Then we'll completely renovate you. It's like replacing your engine." – "So what you're saying is, you earn more because you haven't got a clue?" – "Yeah, sure. Your insurance will pay for it." – "So intelligence is harmful?" – "Harm only needs to make you rich, not smart." Well now. After the diag-

nosis comes nothing more than the handiwork: writing prescriptions, massaging, and adding general admonitions to the bill urging you to take care of yourself.

In the case of software development, a couple of specialists need to know what the overall product is to be (and hopefully the design is good), how the project is to be managed, how much it will cost and how long it should take. And we also need a few charming masters of the programming language who understand what lies very deep in the program. The rest is a part-time job for trained high-school seniors. “We were a fantastic team, but unfortunately the software doesn’t work.” – “Oh? Will our insurance pay for that?”

Do you understand my point? That eternal piece of wisdom?

Almost no intelligence at all is necessary! But the intelligence that we do require is more or less absent.

2. Who is better than a fake?

The goal of Lean Brain Quality is to very cheaply imitate something genuine in such a deceptively genuine way that it looks real. Fake! Fakularization! That is the only truly efficient way to go!

Who bakes cake anymore today? Betty Crocker. Can you make a better Bundt? Do you make your own frosting or spread on the stuff from the can? Ask yourself this: Can you make a better soup than Campbell’s? And let’s face it, cracking open eggs isn’t everyone’s forte. I personally would prefer a six-pack of Fried Egg Helper, with their moist, yellowish-white discs that always come out right, just like those mashed potatoes made from real imitation potatoes. I like foamed plastic sausages with a self-browning coating, and vitamin-enriched pressed-meat cutlets shaped like a kidney table. Why do you even still try to cook? (“I’m going to try a rabbit dish for the first

time. I've already skinned the rabbit and cooked the rump in yesterday's asparagus water for one hour. Should I add some lemon grass powder? Then I could use it up, since it's quite old.") I was at a little restaurant in the German Harz region with my parents. It had six small tables. The menu listed 130 game dishes, including "lion fricassee" (yes, as in a fricassee of lion meat), and a fried ostrich egg for 10 people – plus all of the European fauna you could think of. My parents liked to eat there because they felt everything was freshly prepared.

"Ma, they have six tables here. The probability that someone is going to order lion is slight. It can't be more than twice a month. If twenty people come here per day, and everyone orders a different animal – does that mean that they have to slaughter an entire circus every day?" – "What are you trying to say?" – "Ma, they're going to serve us ready-made meals. Like when I go to the supermarket where they stock all of the most popular Ben & Jerry's flavors but not Banana Split. That means I have to go to a scoop shop and buy it as an overpriced scoop. Do you know what I mean, Ma?" – "The probability of what? Get to the point!" – "Ma, I think there is a company that makes instant Lion Helper and Lobster Claw Helper, but they only sell them to restaurants! And we like the taste of lion so darn much because it has all of the flavor enhancers you can get in Hamburger Helper." – "Oh, dear boy, what an imagination you have! Everything tastes good here. Everything! They just have a variety of special spices, of course! The only thing that's instant here is the waiter. He brings the food so fast that my stomach hardly has time to rumble."

The fakes are becoming so good that cooking for oneself has become a risk. LBQ has triumphed! Only a small amount of intelligence is required in the realm of the microwave. Restaurants have all but completely given up on making ice cream in the face of Ben & Jerry's. Salmon and spinach pastry pockets from the freezer are fine for the party. Have you ever tried frozen, peeled white asparagus? It's better than asparagus that you've overcooked yourself! And cheaper than fresh, unpeeled asparagus. You can get ready-made salads and instant dressings, pancakes from a spray can ... it's all fake! That's LBQ! Everything is ready, without the effort, without the thought, without the wait.

This has practically rendered cooking a moment in LBQ history. Whoever still wants to cook must measure up to the fakes, a feat best left to the masters.

When I was little and living on the farm, a woman named Klaere Stoppel would come by every couple of months. I called her Auntie Stoppel. She brought fabrics with her and worked in our home as a seamstress for a couple of days. We got everything tailor-made! I would sit with her and use the fabric remnants to sew clothes for my Teddy bear. He still has a loincloth from those days. Those were good times with Auntie Stoppel.

And it makes me wonder: Do you still sew?

Some people still buy zucchini plants for twenty cents and grow zucchini in their garden. That attracts caterpillars, as far as I know. Anyway, one industrial zucchini sprayed with caterpillar protection costs 39 cents in the supermarket, ready to use. So I ask you: Do you still grow your own plants? Do you really still want non-vegetarian apples from a tree? Your own raspberries crawling with little white dots?

Everything will soon be LBQ. The ready-made is the better choice. Always. Everywhere. Here is a taste of things to come: Why do we go to the dentist once a year with gritted teeth? How many braces and crowns and lab orders do we groan about paying for on top of it? Today, a complete set of artificial teeth can still cost up to \$30,000. In mass production it would cost \$10,000. At some point, everyone at age 20 would receive such a set of mass-produced teeth to replace their crooked natural teeth that have gone untreated and are full of cavities. One dental treatment at age 20, and you're set for life. That is much less expensive than the awful system we have now! Ready-made breasts in sizes A, B, C, D with an exchange option, ready-made hair, nose, ears, artificial corneas ... a savings account at a Body Modding Bank. People who continue to try to be human would seem like an apple off the tree in comparison to a waxed Golden Delicious. And besides: They wouldn't be able to afford it because fakes are cheaper.

Global competition will rally around such questions as: What economy can produce the cheapest possible A-1 humans?

Well, perhaps I got a bit carried away there. But you will shudder in delight to see how far LBQ *could* get us.

With time, the fake will become better than the faked. The fake is better and cheaper.

(Can you think of any other examples besides boil-in-bag foods?)

If all restaurant food were to be made in boil-in-bag packages, the entire human food chain could be rationalized in a magnificent way. We would only require one lion bag supplier, one for kangaroo meat, and one for Babi Panggang. That one supplier would supply exactly that one product to the entire world.

Basically, then, restaurants could offer every dish in the world. I would order any dish and a bicycle courier would rush off from the city warehouse to the restaurant with my food bag. Instead of cooks, we would only need heater-uppers.

I would have each individual dish be designed by 5-star chefs. So, there would be a couple of cooks planning all of the freezer bags, and we would have nothing other than warmed-up genius food.

Warmed-up food from a genius tastes better than your average, freshly cooked meal.

This principle is slowly taking hold of pop music. Average groups cover former hits. And how about scientific papers? They often largely consist of the warmed-up quotes of great thinkers. Quoting people takes the place of lecturers, scientists or politicians expressing their own opinions. That's extremely annoying, isn't it? Yet the thought that these people would want to then express their own opinions is even more dreadful.

The original fake or the original model is something like the genuine rum in a cut rum blend. A couple of star chefs will suffice to style all frozen meals or hamburger recipes for the whole world. A couple of

originals, such as Mozart, Bach, Mahler, Wagner or Bruckner, are enough for centuries of music!

Thus, it is hardly comprehensible why every priest in every small town would bother to give Sunday sermons. Sometimes they sound so horrible that one would have to assume the preachers had thought them up themselves. Compulsive sleeping in churches, which is spreading in epidemic proportions, is a sure sign: Average thoughts from the minds of average people can bore people almost to death, in contrast to the video message of a genuine cardinal. Just as the five-star chefs design fake originals, let's let a couple of skilled preachers write good sermons that would then be read aloud by high dignitaries. (Or they could receive headsets – then churchgoers would remain uncertain about who is actually doing the talking.) Church equals message and message equals information and information equals Internet content. Can you think the rest through for yourself?

That is why, in the new Lean Brain World, all that is self-made must be judged to see if a good fake is better. If so, self-thought should be prohibited because it would surely lead to unacceptable results!

Attempted intelligence should be considered a crime!

3. Think Once, For All, and Forever!

“Oh, so that's what you *thought*, eh? You don't get paid to think! You get paid to do what I tell you. That is enough! Where would we be if everyone started thinking?” People have been saying this since the beginning of time. Lean Brain Management really means it. It prohibits personal intelligent action.

There are tons of cases in which people have tried something intelligent for lack of a clue and nevertheless – and this makes offenders out of them – did not use a cheap fake. I will address these individual cases further on in the book. Here, I simply want to explain the principle.

Examples of attempted intelligent action despite the fact that fakes were available include:

- Making a speech or giving your own sermon
- Establishing a political agenda
- Thinking up strategies for commercial enterprises
- Making your own music, writing your own poetry
- Selecting fitting individual clothing in a department store
- Writing diploma theses
- Thinking up something completely without the use of Google
- Selecting creative gifts
- Sitting in meetings and solving problems
- Planning and executing projects yourself
- Having normal sex
- Etc., etc.

It's too bad you're not here with me; I'm sure you could contribute even more examples. However – again – we need to shed light on the principle.

I'll give you an example. There is approximately one single possible corporate mission which has actually already been presented to the world in a Dilbert book by Scott Adams. It can be varied at will, and each variation sounds something like this:

“We are the best company and have the best employees and the most satisfied customers and the best products and the (as)best(os) factories and the least bribable controllers.”

After weeks of factionalist argumentation regarding what the mission should be, this is the mission selected by practically every company in the world. Often, years go by before people have even determined what a mission is and if one should be adapted. Then, as if that were not enough, stock analysts demand that a company know what it is doing. Sad but true, those are the hard rules of capital markets. A company must have a mission, whether it actually has one or not. So everyone sits around and lets the brain sparks fly. The cheapest method is to give an analyst \$100,000 and have him quote to you that mission statement which will be best rewarded on the stock market. Then the analyst reads aloud from the Dilbert book

and cons us with the best mission. That is the best solution for him, as well. You wouldn't have to keep thinking and re-thinking. So stop it! Everything has already been thought out!

Simply take the best ready-made element and give it a little, personal touch! Just like when we would vary copied sentences in school so that they would look like our own. So, if you must think of a corporate mission, forget the months of meetings and arguments. Just take the generally valid fake and give it your own touch. My suggestion: Lovingly change your company's mission statement, cited above, to include the name of your company in the statement.

For instance, we could change the first word, "we" to "Cowmulch Incorporated" to thus read: "Cowmulch Incorporated is ..." Get it? This process is called individualization. If we place our name in the mission statement, it cannot be used by any other company in that form! That is known as differentiation on the market. Through a small Lean Brain trick that costs nothing, we have turned something hackneyed into something special. When people see that, they will immediately ask with interest: "So what does Cowmulch Incorporated produce, anyway?" And then you'll have made a good impression and can immediately begin advertising for your leftover food production. You'll also need a red and brown logo – but that's getting carried away.

Do not try to be the best if everyone can be the best through *Lean Brain*.

Do not talk yourself, do not build any pine wood tables! It's all already there! However, put your name on everything, like a dachshund spraying his scent on trees! Then you won't be just a template! Even though you actually are! That is how to preserve your inimitable identity, even though yours is just like the next person's.

4. Standardization and Global Uniformity (One Size Fits All)

Lean Brain Management must raise the standard of standards to the level of an idol. Everything must be normed, classified and uniform. One person proposes, the Standard disposes.

We need the same electrical currents, uniform mobile phone frequencies, one Internet protocol, one type of wall socket, and the same size jeans.

I'm not trying to bore you. Of course you know all of this already.

Many things indicate that the Lean Brain movement will succeed in going a far step beyond these initial, trivial steps. Basically, we also need uniform opinions, views, philosophies and attitudes toward life – because it usually costs too much to have a variety. I'm consciously emphasizing the cost point. Today, the individuality of people is principally expressed in one's ring tone, for which people spend a great deal of money and which they select in a complex series of self-awareness experimentations involving being called. For people, a ring tone is approximately as important as a logo is to a company or a flag is to a nation. That is not to say that the ring tone can't be changed, for instance at the start of a new romantic relationship. Companies change their logos, too, so that they can profit from the resulting upswing. On the contrary, if we would pep up national flags from time to time, the world would probably be a better place. And how about sports teams? Ice hockey clubs used to have boring names like "Hockey Sports Association" or "Ice Foot Club." Think of the huge successes to be enjoyed by the entire branch through a mass renaming of teams to "The Double MacWhoppies" or the like.

Please always keep in mind the fundamental concept of the perfect fake. In the Lean Brain sense, we, all people, firms or nations, strive to make everything completely uniform, so that it will be cheaper on the whole. We orient everything toward the cheapest fake! However, in order for people to have that profit-stimulating feeling of being real, they get a shot of the genuine as well. That is what the ring tones and logos are for.

If Lean Brain Management is to really be successful, it must, above all, standardize people. There will be a strong headwind – namely from intelligent people who always have to put in their two

cents. Intelligent people, as I've noted, are not really dangerous because there is only a tiny, pitiful minority of them. However, they incite the other people – especially those who repeatedly try to be intelligent! And such people exist in alarming numbers.

I would like to provide some background information to illustrate this disastrous conflict of the Lean Brain movement using the example of an unspeakable book dripping with attempts at intelligence, in which the author shows that his heart is moved and stirred by his own views without once taking into consideration the consequences of the *cost issue* of his thoughts. The author of the book wishes to campaign for “horseness.” His arguments are very convincing. It is extremely surprising just how cleverly he has evaded the actual issue of the costs of non-standardization. In this way, many pseudo-intelligent people have surely been taken by him down the garden path.

The said author, whom I will shortly cite, works as a manager at IBM, according to him, and wrote a book years ago with the presumptuous German title *Omnisophie* (“*Omnisophy*”). In that book, he brags that his company was able to engage Monty Roberts, extremely popular among the few intelligent people, as a speaker to appear before the heads of the firm. He reports on this lecture as if it were a global sensation. He probably only wanted to show off about being allowed to be present. While reading, listen to how skillfully such typical intellectuals play with and tempt the emotions. The subject is horses. However, today, horses are generally better understood than people because they are well liked and kept only for reasons of luxury. They cost less than children. The author does not disclose this fact, and constantly indirectly refers to horseness but means all of us.

Here is an excerpt from *Omnisophie* in translation:

I myself know horses from our farm. I was moved to tears when Monty Roberts spoke before the executives of IBM about his life, his life with horses.

Monty Roberts's father had the occupation of taming or "breaking" horses, as it is called. To do this, the horses are "treated" for a couple of weeks. They are first driven into a lock so that they can be approached closely enough to attach a halter. A rope is attached to the halter, with which each horse is tied to a thick post.

Then a rope is tied to a heavy sack which is thrown or beaten about the horse's back and legs, causing the animals to become terrified. Injuries are par for the course. This procedure is often called "sacking out," and lasts several days, serving to break the will of the horse and its rebellious spirit. Subsequently, the horse is made to stand on three legs in order to weaken its will. For this, one leg is tied up in the air (usually beginning with the right rear leg and alternating to all four legs). They are further treated with the sack. The horses give up faster on three legs. Finally, the saddle is attached and the procedure with the tied leg starts anew. Sack treatment until emotional capitulation. The process up to this point takes 8-10 days. Pressure marks, deep scrapes and more or less severe leg injuries often cannot be avoided.

Once the horses are "ready," they are untied and equipped with a hackamore (which is a bridle without a bit that lies on the nose like a lever and is fairly painful, as it must be used very gently, which is truly difficult to do. Pulling on the reins too hard results in extreme pressure on the horse's highly sensitive nose). Then, the horses are moved with long reins for another week so they can become accustomed to the "gas and brake pedals". Finally, they are ridden for the first time with diagonally-tied legs so they cannot buck. If they resist, they are kicked or whipped.

If they are then not yet ready to be ridden, they stand with a leg tied up until they are tame. The whole procedure takes at least three weeks.

Monty Roberts was born in 1935, and at age seven, knew everything about horses except for how to break them. His father showed him two young horses in 1942. They would become Monty's trade test objects. Monty was shocked and asked for a week to think it over. In answer to his father's disquieting question as to why, Monty claimed he wanted to get to know the horses first. His father shook his head. "If you don't hurt them,

they'll hurt you." Monty stole around the horses until they were no longer afraid. After a few days, he tried to put a saddlecloth on them. They allowed him to do so. Like a bolt of lightning, he dashed with excitement into the house, called his father out and showed him. At first, his father was speechless. Then he asked: "What am I raising?" He grasped an iron chain, grabbed his son and beat him bloody. Monty was taken to the hospital due to an extremely serious horse accident. Now he knew what breaking was. From then on, his father was a bleeding wound on his soul.

Later, as soon as he could, he perfected a new method of taming horses. This method required just a half hour to gently tame a horse. Perhaps you have seen it on television. There was a period when several reports on the method were aired. A horse is let into a round fence made of corrugated metal having a diameter of more than 10 yards, and the trainer (Monty or you) stands in the middle and basically waits to see what the horse does. The trainer tenderly swings a long rope toward the horse. The horse trembles with fear and runs wildly in the circle around the trainer, who rotates slowly along with the horse, and eventually slows down. The trainer in the middle speaks appeasingly and quietly to the horse. After about 15 to 20 minutes, the horse, now exhausted, stands still and looks at the trainer. And then comes the part that makes me misty when I watch the film: The horse suddenly gets a completely different expression on his face – and trots over to the trainer! It was incredibly moving to me (and believe me, I'm not that type). The trainer embraces the horse, speaks kindly to him, and they become friends. After ten minutes, the trainer throws a saddlecloth on the horse. It bucks in panic and begins running around in circles again. This time, the horse slows down more quickly, once again approaches the center of the circle and allows himself to be embraced and patted. After about 35 minutes, the trainer mounts the horse, stroking him all the while.

That's it.

Just about everybody who can pat a horse can break wild horses after a couple of weeks of practice. Monty Roberts showed us a film on the subject with an "early student" who was trembling

more than the horse. It took her just a few minutes longer than it had taken Monty.

Monty Roberts showed his method to everyone. He traveled around, taming thousands of horses at a thirty-minute pace. His father continued running his business in the traditional manner. He did not believe in Monty.

Nobody believed.

Monty Roberts was considered a miracle worker whom horses coincidentally obeyed; an oddity.

He spent virtually decades preaching, to no avail, a message that went something like this: “Humans are fight animals! Horses are anxious flight animals! Horses are good animals; they are only afraid of us, nothing else.”

In 1942, his father beat him with a chain. In 1988, a curious English queen invited him to do a presentation, which took place in 1989. Queen Elizabeth II saw and believed. She found a ghost-writer for Monty Roberts and requested a book. It was ultimately published in an amazingly small run. *The Man Who Listens to Horses* became an international bestseller, and then there was a Hollywood film and book (not by Monty Roberts) called *The Horse Whisperer*, which more or less missed the point or lost it. Someday soon in the real world, torturing horses may well end. Who knows?

The point is that all people had and still have the wrong idea about horses. I mean extremely wrong. You would think such a father of a small boy like Monty would have been cut to the quick for having misunderstood everything around him! He should have whispered: “That’s a GREAT idea!”

I have discussed Monty Roberts with executive managers of several companies that had seen him. Most of them said: “Interesting. Of course I see the analogy between horses and employees. That is probably why we had to watch the film. It shows that you should be nice to employees from time to time; that really helps. I myself am often nice to them, but it was important for some co-workers to see the film, although they wouldn’t even relate it to themselves.” Most of the people with whom I spoke saw the

moral of the story in the notion that more carrot and less stick would be appropriate.

However, the message is: Horses are good. Or at least: Horses are like natural humans! (Perhaps they have neither an awareness of themselves nor a notion about what a system is!)

In a positive atmosphere, that is, like horses that are free and feel well, they allow themselves to be ridden after 30 minutes, but in a negative atmosphere they become broken creatures in four weeks.

The message is: People are good even when they are free.

In a positive atmosphere, they don't mind working day and night. In a negative atmosphere, they will only work as broken, burned-out wretches under permanent stress, pressure and the threat of bonus payment plans that dangle the carrot very high.

The argument as to whether or not people are truly so evil due to the original-sin laden, Freudian id, and thus must be systematically broken via "sacking out" is as old as the culture itself. Children's wills are broken, although not quite as explicitly today as in the past.

After millennia of error, it has finally been formally proven: The evil in a horse was not always there. At best, it occurs by breaking the soul, which fades into the background. Then the newly-created creature works like a horse, without actually still being one. Evil is in the core of the system of breaking horses, in the superego, in the id of the traditional horse culture. The culture of breaking horses, that is to say the system, is evil. Evil is not in the horse. Monty Roberts has proven this. For decades, no one believed him. Without the Queen, no one would still believe him to this day. Proof or no proof.

In the book *Why Work* by Michael Maccoby, there is the following historical comment: "[T]he term manager comes from the Italian *maneggiare*, to handle, to wield, to touch, to manage, to deal with, to break in horses, to handle horses – to train and direct animal force." Thus, people are trained and directed like animals. Whoever is capable of this is a manager.

Omnisophy! The author's heart is breaking! He is moved! Those poor horses! Self-proclaimed intellectuals always argue in the same

way as that author. They say something about horses, thereby suggesting that the will of us humans is also being broken – *like animals!* They imply that our education system and work organization fundamentally operate insufficiently and are all but destroying humans. In all of these fairy-tales, the individual person and the cute, individual animal are always considered. Of course, individually you can achieve a lot of things better. Management and especially global Lean Brain Management, however, have much higher goals – the improvement of the entire system, not only the individual. Yet intellectuals never talk about the system.

Did you note the hitch in the cited emotional stirrings? I've got three words for you:

The Pony Express.

Right?

Now you can see it, too, right?

In average daily life, horses are not simply lap dogs or substitute boyfriends for expensive daughters. They – as normal people too – have work to do. In the past, horses in the Pony Express served to transport goods and people. Ever since Ferguson invented the steel plough, they have also been good for plowing work, previously done by the stronger yet slower oxen. While working, horses served several laborers, postmasters, and hired riders.

Working humans and production animals must be able to be treated in a standardized way by third-party masters or systems. They must fit into teams and be able to be utilized flexibly in a number of positions.

That is why horses cannot be simply brought up lovingly like fairy-tale princes. They must be able to be ridden by any unfamiliar person without further empathy or familiarization processes. So that riders do not need to learn anything and will find a ready-to-use horse, it is absolutely necessary that all horses learn the conventions that make them useful animals. All horses must react in the same way to spurs and whips. Similarly, a person at work must immediately know what he has to do if a random manager wearing a telltale

red tie orders him to hurry up. There is no time to ask questions! A manager, who often changes departments and must repeatedly take over new tasks, cannot be constantly adapting and getting used to new people. Teachers also cannot afford to do this with so many students. Their responsibility is simply too large. At war, an officer must send his soldiers into deadly situations. They must immediately depart for such missions and cannot suddenly start a discussion in such an emergency. That is why soldiers are drilled, just as horses are broken. That is why strict discipline applies to all. Everything must be standardized and calculable. Everything must be treated in the same way. A horse is a horse, of course! A hammer is a hammer, all over the world. A person must be a person, anywhere in the world, otherwise he or she is not of Lean Brain Quality.

5. Creation by Product – Creation by Instruction

My mother-in-law made the best marinated beef in the world. It became a custom in my family to enjoy it on the first day of Christmas. She died very suddenly and unexpectedly, leaving behind only a vague recipe. She was a great cook and thus did not exactly know what she was doing: “Just put in a handful,” she would often exclaim when pressed. She was one of those people who could really cook and never faked. One-hundred percent genuine. She spent a great deal of time doing so, and she loved it.

For private people, this sort of thing must, of course, be accepted. However, in the Lean Brain sense, it is absolutely intolerable. My mother-in-law’s procedure can be summarized as “Creation by Product” or “Copy by Product.” She knows what she wants to cook and prepares it in a new way each time. “Let’s see what’s in the fridge. Okay, I can use the low-fat sour cream instead of the full-fat, no problem. As long as it tastes as wonderful as ever.” And it did always taste wonderful.

Luckily, my wife was able to worm something like a list of ingredients from her mother a long time ago. That meant we did not need to start at square one. I myself am the sort of person that never cooks with a cookbook but rather according to the “Copy by Prod-

uct” method. I’ll eat something in a restaurant and then try to cook up something that, in my opinion, could be the perfect artistic form of the whole. One-hundred percent. Anyway, I gathered the ingredients that were on the list and stood at the stove. In my mind, I conjured up the taste of days gone by on my tongue. Then I cooked everything as I thought it should be. Gisi, my sister-in-law and major critic in all things edible, at least recognized the taste. She corrected the nuances (“Sweeter, please!”), and for a couple of years/Christmases now, we have all been in agreement that the marinated beef is once again perfect – and we think of my mother-in-law. I still have no true idea as to what the recipe could be. It depends on the stock, the vinegar, how long the meat has aged, how well it absorbs the marinade. Why should I have a recipe? I have to achieve the taste that is in my memory. The taste is the end product.

Many mathematicians, programmers, and technicians work in this way. They proceed intuitively; a different way each time, as the situation requires. Again: This is absolutely appalling in the Lean Brain sense. The Lean Brain process prefers “Copy by Instruction” or “Creation by Recipe”. There must be a recipe.

Per serving, take 1 egg, ½ cup flour, ½ cup milk, 2 tablespoons sparkling water, 1 teaspoon sugar, a pinch of salt, a pinch of cardamom, a dash of orange blossom water, and a pat of margarine per crepe for preparation in a coated Teflon pan. Whisk until smooth, allow to stand for one hour, then make thin pancakes or crepes out of them. So says the tenet. According to Taylor, this is the only correct order of procedure with which any bumbling beginner can make a good pancake. He simply has to do exactly what the instructions say!

Then they always make the batter lumpy, those bumbling beginners, although I have forbidden them to do so, or they can’t find cardamom in their spice rack, or they are fresh out of orange blossom water! That won’t do! I want it done exactly – according to the recipe! No deviations! If there is no cardamom, then there will be no crepes!

This recipe is not as precise as it looks. There are various types of flour, different sizes of eggs. It would be much better if the recipe stated “King Arthur Unbleached All-Purpose Flour” and “Large eggs not more than one week old.” Then the recipe would be even more

reliable, but less practical to reproduce because you only have generic flour in your pantry or only medium-sized eggs or old eggs that have to be used up. In some households, people make crepes *because* the eggs are old. The recipe could be supplied with an appendix containing a list of acceptable flours, just as there are certain permissible tires for cars or allowed toxins for baby food. The way the ingredients are to be used needs specification: First the flour, then slowly mix in the milk. Otherwise the batter will be terribly lumpy, you know. And the sparkling water goes in last, and is stirred in by hand, not electrically, lest the flavor-enhancing bubbles be destroyed. Use an 11-inch pan that was not previously washed with dishwashing liquid. The best pan is a crepe pan that has only ever been wiped clean. Of course this pristine state is ruined if you have burned something in the pan. So don't ever let anything burn in the pan! You'll have to cook the first crepe longer than the others – don't ask why: That's just the way it is. After that, they don't take as long. Be careful, and do not go away from the stove! The first side of the crepe will take longer than the second. Pay close attention. Turn down the heat from 6 to 5 (this applies only to approved Siemens or Miele stoves made in the year ...). We would have to fill in the correct information for our own stove. Only then is it a genuine recipe.

Got it?

Try this Google search on the Internet: Type in crepes flour recipe. Just try to find anything that looks remotely as good as what I have just written.

I immediately find a recipe that states: “2 ladles of flour, 3 eggs, sugar to taste, enough milk to make the batter thin.” In the Lean Brain sense, this is exasperatingly bad. It was written by people who can cook for people who can cook. That's the way I do it, too. I know what is meant by “thin”. A Lean Brain crepe, however, cannot know this! The recipe must be correct! Beginners will pour in the milk all at once, which is much too much. They run the risk of making steamed milk cutlets. Then they throw in too much flour, which makes the batter too thick. More milk! More flour! Ultimately, the entire town has to come over for breakfast.

Thus, if you are 100 % sure what a crepe is, a rough description will suffice. Otherwise, you need a meticulously derived plan that can apply globally.

Traditional, stupid management produces relatively tolerable, so-called specialists that can manufacture a desired product using rough guidelines.

Lean Brain Management, however, shifts intelligence entirely to the system, and in this case, to the recipe. Subsequently, any human can execute a job that would be considered difficult. All he needs to and must do is follow directions. The outcome required by the recipe will always be the same: uniform Lean Brain quality.

Lean Brain avoids like the plague all things “approximate.” Lean Brain assumes that a machine could basically proceed according to the recipe if it were physically capable of doing so. Lean Brain must, once and for all, precisely record recipes or methods, without exception. Lean Brain must enforce the adherence to every recipe without so much as one millionth of a percent of deviation. Then everything will work out fine. Everyone must be able to do it without thinking. Nobody may do anything else. But above all, nobody may think anything else or even want to do something better.

6. Process Orientation and Working by the Book

Cyril Northcote Parkinson once asserted that the fact that following the rules can make the instigator appear ridiculous is a wonderful punch line of bureaucracy.

Today, opponents of the system threaten: “Systems treat us people like animals! We will resist brutally! We will thus resort to extreme measures and work by the book.”

The very existence of modern systems can thus be threatened if one proceeds exactly according to its instructions. For in reality, all of these systems are only colossally insipid, and the people working for it are much too smart. The stupid systems therefore rely on the

intelligent people saving it. I have already bemoaned this point profusely.

Lean Brain Systems, however, contain all of the necessary intelligence inside them. They *themselves* are intelligent and operate with robot-like, cheap standard humans who are best when not allowed to be intelligent because otherwise they will do all sorts of ridiculous things to shine in their jobs. In Lean Brain Systems, only the system shines, and nothing else. Lean Brain Systems define clear instructions for every possible person. We could put it blithely: Lean Brain instructions are foolproof.

Foolproof rules are *for* fools, not *by* fools!

This is an important principle in Lean Brain Management. Today's systems unfortunately operate with polished, laterally intelligent people in the staff departments (whoever wishes to be promoted does not work there!), who, in one-hour meetings, issue instructions like "Two ladles of flour and milk until batter is thin" and think that it will work without Teflon pans. These rough, useless instructions will then confuse the working humans. All kinds of products will result except for crepes. That will anger staff heads considerably. They thus accuse the working people of laziness and scrutinize them closely to make sure they all work quickly and diligently according to the bad, useless instructions. They make ridiculous accusations towards the workers, cut their pay and "motivate" them, as they call it. The grass roots will not know what to do and start making crepes themselves so they'll stop being mobbed. Unfortunately, each worker makes his own crepes, such that, at least crepes are being produced, but at very different levels of quality, homemade, on-site. This angers the controllers even more because they assume that the lack of uniformity was caused by carelessness on the part of the workers, when all the while, it was only their intelligence which had resurfaced in an emergency situation under the pressure to survive. Unfortunately, controllers never think of the notion that the system's instructions are not crepe target-oriented.

Thus, they never change the crepe recipe but rather test in an ever harsher manner whether all of the workers can make uniform pan-

cakes even without good instructions. That is why they now very precisely describe the desired diameter and degree of browning of the resulting crepe and define its required minimum flavor. Thus, they define the target, that is to say the end product. In doing so, they tempt the workers to switch from a “Creation by Instruction” to a “Create by Product” method. The simple workers then morph into primitive hobby chefs, when all the while they only need to manufacture professional, standard crepes according to standard instructions. The workers, who should be serving as crepe robots, are now attempting to employ their own intelligence. They have thus become culpable in the eyes of the system, not to mention with regard to the basic ethical principle of the Lean Brain concept!

Controllers usually obsessively monitor the precise adherence to insipid rules. Controllers, however, should be controlling whether or not the instructions are idiotic. That would be easy – they would simply have to try out the instructions a couple of times, that is, to work. Yet controllers only note the red numbers until they are either blue in the face or the numbers black.

If you want to write good instructions for crepes, you must know your stuff. You must be familiar with stoves, egg sizes and consistencies. In the last section, I explained how much the recipe for intelligent cooks (“2 ladles of flour plus milk”) deviates from a truly good, detailed recipe that is foolproof. If the system does not take the trouble to issue good, foolproof recipes, the result will inevitably be irregular quality. What’s more, a good deal of local intelligence will be necessary in order to produce the desired product. Stupidity in the system forces local intelligence in its workers.

Lean Brain Management, however, requires intelligence in the system and operates locally with any sort of humans.

From the viewpoint of Lean Brain Management, the greatest inanity is the method of “Management by Objectives”, practiced by almost all contemporary managers, which is to say managing according to stated goals. Employees are told exactly what minimum numbers are to result. In our example, then, the employees would be told how many crepes are to be produced, and nothing more. This number is

determined by controllers who have never even seen flour or eggs but rather, if they're lucky, only crepes. They have no notion of the recipes and tools. Thus they can only define the goal but not the path, that is, the instructions. Ultimately, Management by Objectives states: "Make lots of crepes; we don't care how. You are the expert, not me." That is how all managers today are running their companies straight into the ground.

Lean Brain Management only produces good crepe instructions one single time, which are then executed millions of times, just as it has been the case for hamburgers for decades now. To achieve this, you just need one single higher intelligence that can produce the best original fake, for instance the best cheap thing that looks like a crepe, can be easily described in a foolproof way, and tastes like a crepe. For this, the higher intelligence would generate the necessary foolproof instructions. Then everyone can start cooking. One single intelligence can virtually oversee several global concerns at the same time.

Let me ask you as the reader: Do you conduct your corporate processes at 100 % of that for which they are designed? Or are there deviations? Do you sometimes have to be intelligent and creative to rescue the situation? You see! That is pretty stupid!

Let me repeat the standard phrase of the manager leading his company to hell: "I don't care how you do it, you're the expert, not me." With this directive, the manager is allowing his employee to use his own intelligence – in fact he is provoking it. If he has to resort to such methods, says Lean Brain Management, then all is lost. The manager will then often sigh and complain: "The processes are holding us up, the controllers are torturing us." Yet this simply means that the system is unintelligent.

Good business processes categorically exclude further intelligence because they are foolproof in the Lean Brain sense. Management by Objectives, that is, management through setting goals, provokes and requires intelligence in order to reach the goals. Companies that *simultaneously* rely on goals and moderately intelligent business processes are doomed. Such companies treat their employees like fools but pay them like experts.

Two contrary halves always add up to one whole inanity.

7. The Moronization of Organizations

Political scientist Richard Wiggins says that government activity is politics en masse, while administrative activity politics in detail. Aha. It looks like the government decides what is to be done. For instance: Make crepes today and not mussels in a white wine garlic sauce. The administration or bureaucracy then translates this wholesale decision into detailed activity. They make crepes. Right.

But does anyone ever *ask* how to make crepes? Does everyone know? Does the executive know this in detail? Here – precisely here – is where intelligence must enter the system. Somebody must issue perfect guidelines with which any fool, especially all bureaucrats, can make crepes. These guidelines must be checked circumspectly. Can someone who has adhered to all of the guidelines ever produce anything but the desired product? Is the process foolproof?

The process of transforming a job into a foolproof chain of instructions is called foolproofization or moronization. The Greek word *moros* means “brainless, inane, simple,” and can be found in the English “moronic.” Moronization is the most important work step of a Lean Brain Manager. It transforms a roughly issued order into an exact sequence of instructions that are always goal-oriented.

The moronization of our society has already taken hold in non-working environments. Television is moronizing people. “TV dumbs down,” as we say. Soap operas and reality shows trivialize people. People like us squabble on television as boorishly as we do at home. We are becoming used to how commonplace it all is. We are learning that there is really nothing else beyond this trivial life. The rest is just art made to win an Oscar. The rest are attention-junkie millionaires skilled in special feats – they play soccer the best, can sing pop songs well or have inherited a hotel chain. However, the people, we the people, are becoming moronized. Poor suburbs, blue-collar neigh-

borhoods and settlements of the unemployed are cropping up. Everything is becoming clearly simplified and vulgarized.

Who is moronizing whom? Many employees are so stressed by today's demoralizing work environment that all they want to do when they get home is "hang out". They watch music, sports, variety and reality shows and soaps. That is all they want. The TV does not offer anything else anyway. The moronization of private life, the transition to a world of raw fun and emotion follows the overload in the work environment. A few system critics call the Western form of society a "morony". (On the Internet, someone innocently asked if moronization was the same as Americanization. I had to laugh, even if it was an unfair comparison. It has to start somewhere. And TV comes from the USA. You can't argue with that. I think that in Japan more people sit in front of their cell phones. That is probably a reasonable equivalent. I'm sure that trend will arrive in Germany in a couple of years.) The morony supplies us with bromidic satisfaction.

Lean Brain Management has nothing to do with such a brutalization of rivaling tendencies. For Lean Brain Management, moronization is the indispensable link between order and implementation, government and bureaucracy, between strategy and execution. Moronization programs the strategy in intelligence-deprived series of hand movements and makes it possible to execute even the most difficult tasks with cheap unskilled workers that have had absolutely no training. The system can thus save money and personnel. It then practically operates autonomously. In doing so, it increasingly frees itself from people. Of course, Lean Brain managers can work well with moronized people; there is no question of that. They are not going to want to complain about any governmental morony. Basically, a morony officially accelerates the Lean Brain movement substantially – because if humanity is vulgarized, systems can only survive with Lean Brain Management since there are no more experts to save the system with individual, expensive, and intelligent efforts. That is why Lean Brain Management is not only the best thing in a morony but probably the only thing. The fall of education in the population is currently dramatically improving the situation with regard to the Lean Brain movement. Soon, education will be so poor that we will no longer need education systems. We will get by with what is offered on moronized television.

8. Effective, Practical, and easily understood Advice for Managers

As a manager, you will now gradually have to familiarize yourself with the total redesign of your business procedures.

All of your processes must be prudently moronized. Imagine Taylor's or Ford's assembly line as an ideal for your company.

- Determine an extremely precisely described series of instructions for everything.
- Make sure that absolutely every person can execute each and every one of those instructions without any previous knowledge whatsoever.
- If someone carries out the instructions but does not arrive at the desired goal, the error is not his but is rather rooted in a bad series of instructions.
- Nevertheless, have some confidence in people. For instance, hardly any person is so stupid that he or she cannot drive a car. Thus, you can certainly have some expectations for your employees, except for intelligence, which, however, is not required to drive a car, and if it is used nonetheless, leads to traffic jams or accidents.

Still, there are loads of things people can do incorrectly. This is not due to intelligence but rather to a normal scatterbrained state. I don't know if you have ever made coffee yourself as a manager. You have to put water in the machine, put the right amount of ground coffee in the filter, turn it on, wait, and drink coffee. During this process, the following errors can occur, usually in the morning:

- Forgot ground coffee + filter (symptom: muddy water from yesterday's grounds).
- New filter but forgot to add ground coffee (hot water).
- Forgot water (nothing happens).
- Amount of water and coffee do not match (coffee tastes like water or cardiac arrest).
- Added ground coffee but forgot filter (clean everything).
- Put in water twice (wipe up everything).
- Forgot to turn on machine.

- Forgot to turn off machine (building burns down; nagging fear upon leaving for your trip).
- Forgot to put the coffee pot in the machine (coffee starts brewing, depending on model, there will be a mess or not).
- Filter paper has not been properly inserted (folds in on itself; light, crumbly brew).
- Incorrect brewing program selected.

I am noting this with lots of detail because you, as a manager, probably pay your secretary a lousy salary and do not understand all of the things that need to be taken into consideration. A vending machine, on the other hand, does not make such mistakes. It only breaks down all the time. Coins get stuck in it, it runs out of change, the water does not heat properly, etc.

What I am trying to say is that moronization is work in itself and can require an incredible amount of intelligence. You almost never find such intelligence in normal company departments. That is why the processes are generally so badly set up. Corporate planners will at best have a brief look at how coffee is brewed when they are working on the description of the coffee-brewing process. Yet at least one year of hard coffee brewing work is needed until they have made every one of the errors mentioned above. So you see that, for the moronization process, *scatterbrained* intelligences are the most suitable, since they make the most amazing mistakes that would never occur to people of normal intelligence.

The best moronizers are highly-intelligent scatterbrains, dopes, absent-minded types or, well ... morons. They usually tend toward a course of study in mathematics anyway, and can be easily enthused for questions regarding the demonstrably complete list of coffee brewing errors.

While it is true that departmental controllers find all errors, they do not *invent* any. Their intelligence often does not suffice to do so. A baking spatula can spread errors onto a cake, but it cannot make any original errors because it is not creative. Nevertheless, management usually assumes that the people who find all the faults should be the best individuals to create new business processes. For instance, man-

agers assume that a person well versed in English grammar could also write well. How foolish that is! Such foolishness originates in the fact that controllers think they can design new processes themselves, but managers take away this duty from them because it never occurs to the managers that scatterbrains are the best people for the job. Managers themselves can never describe processes because they generally live “content-free”. Managers generate structures such as org charts and they put teams on the job. They hold cookie-cutter lectures and pressure everyone else into unpaid overtime with their content-free communication. They will never utter anything with content like: “You make structural errors in Java programs a lot ...” Instead, they would say something content-free, such as: “Be careful! Put some effort into it! It’ll be good! Be responsible! Work hard! Use some elbow grease! It’ll be worth it! I’m going to be the Director! Be careful! Just be careful!”

Let me warmly recommend to you, as a manager, to leave moronization to the experts. To achieve this, you will have to agree to the establishment of a new profession, the moronorg.

A moronorg or moronorgess (the latter probably being hard to find – scatterbrained women!) should ideally have worked once themselves and left behind chaos. If such chaotic people, who can’t help but stand out, should also happen to be intelligent, then they are ideal. I myself have often tested the programs in my department. I sometimes entered negative numbers or Egyptian hieroglyphics instead of yes/no answers, with amusing results.

9. Take-aways, Control Questions and Exercises

I have illustrated the difficult problem of moronization using two examples: making crepes and brewing coffee.

- Did you find that rather lame?

If so, then you are either not intelligent or too generic, that is, too much of a traditional manager. Listing factual content is too specific for managers and makes them nervous. It involves explicit knowl-

edge, which is only present in operating instructions, lexica, manuals or eccentric techies. Managers love lists, which form the heart of all presentation programs. However, they list earnings and promises, that is, fakes and not facts. A typical page of a manager's presentation looks like this:

- Proposal for the project IAMTHEBEST (for example: International American Modern Tool Hub for Electronic Bold Ethics Standards)
- IAMTHEBEST will raise turnover.
- IAMTHEBEST will lower costs.
- IAMTHEBEST will increase profits.
- IAMTHEBEST will save humanity.
- IAMTHEBEST requires a 10-billion dollar investment, which I want.
- IAMTHEBEST is good for our image.
- IAMTHEBEST will lead to a promotion for my boss.
- What is best for my country is best for IAMTHEBEST.

This is an example of a generic project proposal that can be applied universally. If you still want to use another or even your own proposal, you are bad in the Lean Brain sense. Use this one. I have prepared it especially for you as a take-away. It is the perfect moronization of a highly complex project proposal. You just have to name your project accordingly such that its abbreviation reads IAMTHEBEST. You can change the dollar amount if you need more money. Or if, for instance, you need 50 billion dollars, you could hold the presentation five times.

As a manager, you are used to this content-free form of communication.

In the sense of moronization, this proposal is absolutely useless. The generic aspect of this content-free approach only defines the *structure* of the procedure and then requires *intelligence* in its implementation.

Let me remind you of my comparison of a manager with a spoiled child. The child screams: "I want it to snow!" That is also exactly what a proposal does, only it screams: "I want money for my project!" It is assumed that the executing authority (the child's parents

or employees) then has enough experience and intelligence to get the project done.

Since intelligence is not contained in the plan but only in the goal, amount of expenses and prescribed timeframe, intelligence must be supplied by the employees working on the project. The manager considers the goal and the will toward the goal as the essential element. He gives the go-ahead (“I want it to snow!”), which today of-ten sounds like this:

“The process has been defined and is in place, the structures have been generated, the controllers are already waiting for employee errors. Everything is ready. Now it all just has to be infused with life.” If you say something like that as a manager, you harbor a secret reluctance toward my meticulously exact instructions in dealing with crepes and coffee. In that case, you are a manager and not a moronorg.

Lean Brain and moronization bank on foolproof precision structures that already contain all intelligence. The foolproof element must be placed in the hands of moronorgs.

By now you should understand that only moronorgs should use intelligence and that moronorgs must employ a great deal of it! *They* are the ones who construct the system. Managers goad and controllers measure the yield. (Employee errors can no longer occur in the moronic system because the system itself is intelligent.) Employees either operate that moronic system or are used by it. (Just imagine unskilled workers in call centers for complex products that only need to establish contacts or question customers regarding satisfaction. All of the intelligence is contained in the call center itself; no other intelligence is needed – more on that later.) In the moronic system, the human is part of the form and no longer the content. The content is in the instructions.

Put your own company to the test! You probably already have bad instructions from people who have no clue and idiotically intelligent employees. If this is the case, you will hear voices in your firm that assume that managers have made the processes with which the em-

ployees must work. That is not true. Managers haven't the faintest idea of the processes. Only those who have made processes can understand them, yet they in turn know nothing of the work involved in reproducing the processes. Thus, everyone complains in this manner:

"Those guys up there have no clue about reality."

"The processes have more exceptions than rules."

"The processes generate more work than they accomplish."

Intelligent people think, for example, that the Ten Commandments were made by God. If, then, the Ten Commandments are unsatisfactory at regulating life, then the intelligent people will squabble with God and ask Him indirectly for new and improved Commandments. Other people approach this problem with their faith in God. They establish theories as to how one should live differently so that the Commandments will be exactly optimal for that new life – because God is almighty and must have handed down optimal Commandments which therefore themselves cannot be altered.

I have never heard of the doubtless correct view that God did not think up the Ten Commandments himself, but that he had them hammered out by a staff angel who had previously never lived as a human. According to this view, God did not design the Commandments but rather only issued them. That is an act of power, not an act of creation.

That is why we humans, despite God's non-exhaustive Commandments, now try to lead halfway intelligent lives, which doesn't truly make us happy. We envy the animals that, due to their automated instincts, are completely internally moronized. They work according to fixed processes which allow them no room for freedom. Unfortunately, these processes are not good either, which is why animals suffer, too. Most likely, the staff angel thought he had to improve the bad instinctive processes of animals through the grace of freedom and intelligence of humans. Ultimately, though, all he passed on to humans were the consequences of his carelessness. It would have been better if the staff angel had moronized humans really well. Oh well, hindsight is 20/20. Now we can solve the problem ourselves through Lean Brain Management.



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-540-71837-6>

Lean Brain Management

More Success and Efficiency by Saving Intelligence

Dueck, G.

2008, VII, 226 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-540-71837-6