

## Leadership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Thrival and Thrivability

### Peter Ellyard

In my work I try to help people to get to the future first. Success will go to those who achieve it. I am reminded of comments the President of Columbia University made in the 1890s. He noted that there are a few people who *make things happen*, that there are rather more who *watch things happen* and that there is the rest of humanity who say *what happened?*



Much of my own work is dedicated to working with those individuals, organisations, communities and nations who find themselves in the third category and who would like transform themselves so that they can comfortably live in the first category and thrive from doing so...

To get the future first one must make three journeys. The first of these involves *insight*, understanding oneself.

*The secret to a successful life is to understand one's destiny and to do it.*

Such simple but important words by that father of mass manufacturing Henry Ford.

Destiny has two elements what one is good at, aptitude, and what one loves doing, passion. Fulfilling one's destiny defines ones *work*, doing what gives meaning to one's life. The route to success involves turning one's *work* into one's *employment*, to generate a living from doing one's work and fulfilling one's destiny. When you make a life's journey it is insight and self knowledge which increases to accompany accomplishments in the outside world. You develop your own capacity to make a difference as you learn how to fulfil your destiny.

The second journey is *foresight*: using one's imagination to travel into the future in order to access knowledge about emerging possibilities, opportunities and threats.

The third journey we must take is to reflect on where we have come from, and how we arrived at where we are now. We must understand our own history and experience; *hindsight*, learning from past success and failure. I think that Australians, compared with many other cultures, have considerable difficulty in learning, becoming wise, from experience and from reflection on their experience.

George Santanya said:

*Those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it.*

How often do you contemplate and reflect after making a mistake or fail to realise an aspirations, and seek to learn and make changes which result from this learning. How often do you accept responsibility for our mistakes and discuss these openly with your

colleagues, partners, friends and families: not as a blame exercise but as a learning exercise.

One of the key issues we must understand is why we humans find that dealing with change so difficult, why a common response to change is to resist it

We humans do not like change. For Palaeolithic humanity change meant floods, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, famine, wars and epidemics. Our biological inheritance is to fear change; it is encoded in our genes.

Biologically speaking we are much better at being than becoming, and I think we all need to be become better at learning to become including learning how to get to the future first. This is not a prescription for joining a dog eat dog competitive society as some have accused me of advocating. In nature there is competition but there is also cooperation. In life we need to become good at both of these and also become wise enough to know when it is better to be competitive and when to be cooperative.

Therefore if we wish to make a difference in our own lives and for the lives of others, both in work we undertake what I call *destiny probe (insight)*, *futures quest (foresight)* and *wisdom search (hindsight)*...

By fully embracing *insight* and *foresight* a person can transform themselves from a life as *future taker* and *path taker* to one of *future maker* and *path maker*. Many successful people do just this, such as great entrepreneurs and artists. What is inside is expressed by actions in the outside world. Insight must precede and accompany foresight.

Because I am a futurist many young people ask me to help them make decisions about their careers. They want to know where the jobs will be in the future so that they can plan their career path. I tell them that 70 % of the job categories at the time when they are in mid career have yet to be invented and many current job categories will have disappeared by then. The more auspicious and effective way to develop your career paths is to first look inside yourself, discover your destiny, and seek to make your career pathway around fulfilling your destiny. Fulfilling one's destiny defines one's work, that which one does to give meaning to one's life. The next step is to then turn one's work into one's employment, thereby generating financial security from one's work. This you do by matching your work to emerging industries, job markets and job categories; thereby developing a fulfilling career path from realising one's destiny.

My destiny is doing what I am now doing: encouraging people to use their own self knowledge and combine this with imagination and strategic action: take their dreams and aspirations seriously and to develop and implement strategies to make them come true. My work over last 15 years has focussed on finding better ways to do this and showing what I have learned to others.

Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote:

*Do not follow where the path may lead  
Go where there is no path and leave a trail*

I don't claim that this should be the journey for everybody. Many of us are content to take life as it comes, and I personally make no judgments about anybody's chosen way of living. I know that there is much one can and should do to embrace the present and to be fulfilled in the present, smell the roses, achieve a harmonious balance between *being* and *becoming*. Much of my own work has been directed towards getting this balance right in myself.

However without of a sense of *becoming*, of forward purpose incorporating self transformation and growth, and through this sensibly preparing for the future, we will be swept up and away, be disadvantaged by the unprecedented rate of change around us. The current rate of change means that if one wants to make a difference then one must commit oneself *to become* as well as *to be*. We will either shape our future or the future will shape us.

We humans do not like change. For Palaeolithic humanity change meant floods, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, famine, wars and epidemics. Our biological inheritance is to fear change; it is encoded in our genes.

Biologically speaking we are much better at being than becoming, and I think we all need to be become better at learning to become including learning how to get to the future first. This is not a prescription for joining a dog eat dog competitive society as some have accused me of advocating. In nature there is competition but there is also cooperation. In life we need to become good at both of these and also become wise enough to know when it is better to be competitive and when to be cooperative.

The future is part change part choice. How much of each of the proactive or reactive approach to strategic action we prefer to embrace in our lives is a personal decision.

But Goethe in *Faust* pointed out that the bold inherit the Earth: it is better to be victor than victim: and the journey from *change taker* to *change casualty* can be a short one.

### **Growing leadership...**

In the last ten years I have therefore become involved in the development of leadership: in all of us not just some of us. The difference between *change taker* and *change maker* is about the difference between each of us as manager and leader. Each of us are both but we each choose to balance between them in our lives and work. This is due to the different ways we think, how we use our *head power*, and whether we are right or left brain dominant, I encourage my clients to assess their thinking and learning styles by utilising the Hermann Brain Dominance Instrument, which for me is the best diagnostic tool available to assess our relative strengths as manager or change taker versus leader or change maker.

### **Imagination in foresight; Walking into the future...**

It we are to move from *future taker* to *future maker* we must also recognise is the importance of imagination.

Those who do not live in the future toady will live in the past tomorrow.

Albert Einstein said:

*Imagination is more important than knowledge.*

Here is a scenario which illustrates how ones uses imagination to understand the future:

The year is 2010 and you are going to buy a new car. There are two cars on the showroom floor. This is a petroleum-powered car and it is a fine piece of European technological excellence. It is quite environmentally friendly and emits only sixty percent of the carbon dioxide that was emitted by cars manufactured ten years previously. It is also very safe. The second car is a solar/hydrogen-powered vehicle. If everybody in the world drove one of these cars, our cities would have much cleaner air and no photochemical smog, and the rate of climate change would be reduced by 40%. Which car will you buy?

By visiting the future this way, in your imagination you can tell a great deal about how you would react in different future circumstances.

Traditional market analysis emphasises trend projections into the future: a form of what I call *probable futurism*. This assumes that the future will mostly be composed of a continuation of past trends, whether this is desirable or not, and that one must be a manager and respond to these probable-future projections, rather than be a leader who sets out to realise a preferred-future. This 'walking into the future' scenario operates in a totally different way. You are asked to walk out into the future and to utilise two facts which you know to be true. The first fact is your recognition that values change slowly. You can take your own values, intelligence and intuition a little more than a decade into the future and know that your values will be only slightly different. The second fact is that you recognise that technology changes fast, so it is possible to take your present values seven years ahead and confront a totally different technological scenario.

### **Mindsets: enabler or disabler of foresight...**

I have many interesting conversations with people who want to explore their future options, and to examine their hopes and aspirations, and their fears as well. People bring with themselves widely different mindset related to their perceived capacities to either shape or be shaped by the future. This is baggage caused by their natural mindsets and their experiences. Two years ago I had a regular spot on ABC radio. As part of this work each week I played a series of popular songs about the future each of which provide an aspect about how people perceived the future and discussed its meaning. Some of the songs were:

1. *Que sera, sera*  
*Whatever will be will be*

*The future's not ours to see  
Que sera, sera.*

*2. Happy talk, talking happy talk  
Talk about things you'd like to do  
You got to have a dream  
If you don't have a dream  
How you gonna have a dream come true*

*3. Climb every mountain,  
Ford every stream  
Follow every byway  
'till to find your dream*

The list goes on: *Dream the impossible dream* from the *Man of la Mancha*. There are many more.

So there are many ways we perceive the future, from being fatalistic and impotent, to being an interventionist Superhuman. Edward de Bono believes that the vast majority of mistakes we make are due to mistakes of perception. Our views about the future are moulded by our natural thinking styles and by how and what we learn from our experiences.

Some perceptions of the future disempower, some empower. Some are the mindsets of victims; some are the mindsets of victors. Even if we have superb insight and foresight, these basic world views, whether we are optimistic, pessimistic, sceptical or cynical will colour our perceptions and advance or hinder our capacity to make a difference.

In 1988 I moved from Adelaide to Melbourne with my family to take up, the position of Executive Director of the Australian Commission for the Future. In Adelaide and before that in Papua New Guinea, I had spent 12 years as the CEO of government departments concerned with environment and planning, and industry and technology. If one is the head of a government department, one has a considerable capability to make a difference, but this capability is always being undermined by the excessive caution built into the political environment. The priority of most Ministers and bureaucrats as much about avoiding making mistakes as accomplishing a positive outcome. In my bureaucratic days I always had to fight other bureaucrats and some ministers who were terrified that I would make a mess which would reflect badly on them. Like much of the Australian corporate sector, most bureaucracies are risk adverse. I found this world stifling. I am not a gradualist and when I was younger yet already holding a very powerful and responsible position, I terrified many of the people with whom I worked. I didn't want to leave legacy of merely avoiding trouble. I always have wanted to do positive things to make good things happen, not merely prevent bad things from happening. I was shocked to learn how few people thought like I did, and how many were happy to ka make a difference by seeking to stop bad things from happening control or regulation) rather than make good things happen (facilitation ). I learned a great deal about how people perceived their capacity to make a difference

## **Risk management in foresight: being cautious or careful?**

Later on when I developed my methodologies in leadership and management, I understood that management is primarily about doing what we are already doing while preventing bad things from happening, while leadership is primarily about doing new things, making good and significant things happen. I recognised that when I was trying to be leader in an administrative environment that wanted everybody, even CEOs, to be managers. I came to understand that Australia is an over managed and under led country.

Those bureaucrats and ministers who spent too much their time trying to stop me from being effective in my work didn't understand the difference between being *cautious* and being *careful*. Goethe in *Faust* showed that it is the bold who are the successful. My aim was be *careful and bold*, be *carefully bold*, *boldly careful*. I wanted to develop a methodology for leadership and management which involves taking themselves and their organisations on carefully bold journeys into the future.

Most of us do not spend enough time shaping our own lives and our own futures let alone those of others: making a big difference for ourselves or others. We live timidly in a society which seldom encourages us to develop the capabilities to make a difference. Indeed the opposite is true; people are encouraged to take the safe option.

It is now at least as safe to be a job maker as to be a job taker. The job making entrepreneur had a high risk life compared with an employee in a large organisation. I don't think that is true any more, and a bold entrepreneur with highly developed strategic thinking capabilities can stand on ground as firm as that occupied by an employee in a bank or a large manufacturing plant. In an era of downsizing in traditional industries it is now at least as secure to create your own work, your own career path in a new emerging industry. Most of the new industries, the new job categories are created by brave people setting out to do something for themselves. I now have the view that as the 21<sup>st</sup> century progresses this will become more so. Success will go to those who get to the future first, who boldly seek to realise their own destiny while remaining aware of emerging values and opportunities.

## **Developing new *foresight* methodologies...**

When I came to the Commission for the Future (CFF) in 1988 I wanted to develop some methodologies and programs to help individuals, communities and organisations to become more successful makers of their own futures and effective partners with others in seeking to making a difference and leaving a heroic legacy: transform themselves from future takers to future makers, to understand that if you not seek to shape the future the future will shape you. The future is part chance part choice. Too many people do not maximise the choice aspect: they live by *Que sera, sera* when they should be seek to make their dreams come true.

To achieve this they should develop better *insight* about themselves, and develop better *foresight* about what the future could offer them. If they develop these capabilities they will achieve both *thrival* and *thrivability* in that future. I wanted to develop these methodologies

and processes to achieve this and the methodologies of futurism at that stage lacked this capability.

I left the CFF in 1991 and went to the private sector. While at the CFF I did not have the time to develop this know how, although I made good start in many ways. I spend the next 10 years developing this methodology, while continuously testing my developing concepts out on a large number of clients in companies, non government organisations and communities, and developing countries through the UN system. I wrote books and book chapters and gave perhaps a thousand public addresses on my work.

In 1990 when I undertook a review of the methodologies used by traditional futurism, I found it wanting, even irrelevant to most situations. I wondered that the alternative scenario process used by most futurists could have so much credibility and yet be so divorced from the process most people actually use to plan for the future. In its desire to be rational and analytical, it had forgotten the emotion encapsulated in all those songs, that humans have longings and aspirations, and they are able to envisage and realise a more heroic future for themselves. It had forgotten that the future is largely shaped by bold aspiring people, that it just doesn't unfold or happen.

I recognised that traditional scenario foresight, traditional futurism was dominated by the way of the manager rather than the leader. The way of the manager develops a series of scenarios assuming a number of different conditions. This is what most traditional scenario planning involves. In many years of undertaking this kind of scenario planning, I have never felt totally involved in the process. The process has always seemed to me to be too analytical, academic and remote. What traditional scenario planning lacks is heart. It ignores the fact that humans yearn, have aspirations, that emotions are involved in futurism. As a result, in my own work I set out to develop a scenario and strategic development process which recognises that heart and hope both play a critical role in determining one's destiny, and in developing effective strategies for achieving success in the future.

Thrival: this is a word which is not any dictionary, at least just yet. There wasn't a word which described setting a goal to thriving rather than merely surviving in the future. So I created the word thrival as an aspiration, for individuals, communities and corporations, even whole nations. And the word thrivability accompanies it: developing the tools and the mindsets, the heart stuff and the head stuff to thrive.

Destiny searching, aspiring for thrival and growing thrivability are some of the early concepts I developed to help people to make a difference for themselves and others. I knew what is inside us as well as what is out there is critical if one wants to be an effective shaper of ones own future. And I knew that most futurism did not consider these issues at all and that it ignored aspirations and hopes, the very feelings which actually are at the centre of all those songs about the future. That seemed to be totally unbalanced, even crazy.

During my years as a CEO of government departments I had written and co written many strategic visions for governments. I was always being told that many of these strategic visions were not pragmatic enough, they aimed too high.

I learned something else from this. I know the importance of realism and pragmatism; I also know how lack of vision and failing to commit oneself and one's organisation to lofty and inspiring goals can result in mediocrity and pedestrian achievement. There are some people who are uncomfortable with designing idealistic visions and seeking to realise them. My answer to such people is to ask them to try to understand the difference between the setting of goals and the evaluation of outcomes. One should always be idealistic and bold about goal-setting, if one lowers one's aspirations under the pressure of pragmatism one will quickly find that the energy and commitment to realising one's goals also diminishes. It is always important to keep the commitment level high. However, it is also important to be pragmatic about outcomes. If only half a loaf is the outcome when a whole loaf was anticipated, celebrate the fact that there is half a loaf and redouble one's efforts and work smarter to try to gain the other half of the loaf. It is important never to temper your goal-setting with pragmatism, only your results.

These differences of approaches can be seen in how we relate to physical planning. I had several major differences with others about the future of some of our cities, and about our different views about the importance of trend projections of future population growth as an informant of future development. Most planning involves projecting present population trends into the future, predicting a *probable future* population and then deciding where and how these additional inhabitants should be accommodated. The result is a self fulfilling prophecy, whether or not this was the *preferred future* for the particular city.

An alternative strategy might involve deciding that the city is growing too fast already, or what an optimum population might be. Then policy might be directed to trying to slow down this trend or even reversing and negating it, while persuading would-be city dwellers to live in a regional centre instead. Policy then is directed at attracting people to other locations rather than housing the projected population in the city. I had huge difficulties convincing various ministers to be boldly careful to create a marvellous preferred future rather than dedicating policy making towards making a probable future merely less awful.

When I looked at the work of other futurists around the world I found some were *what will be* futurists such as Hermann Kahn. These are the prophets, the forecasters. They believe in predicting what will happen, what I call the *probable future*.

Others were *what should be* futurists, such as Buckminster Fuller. They are the visionaries. They outlined what should or could be the future: the *preferred future*.

George Bernard Shaw said;  
*Some people see things as they are and ask why,  
I see things as they could be and ask why not.*

We all have various degrees of powerlessness and powerfulness at different stages in our lives, and in different situations, such as being powerful at home and powerless at work. Irrespective of how powerful we are now, how much of each *future maker* or *future taker* we are currently, we can always become better at shaping the future.

### **Leader and manager, probable and preferred futures, foresight...**

Now much of my work is concentrated on the development of leadership. Leaders are future makers and path makers, while managers are future takers and path takers. All of us are part leader, part manager. It is important that all people learn the difference between them and to utilise both of these roles in their lives, not just one of them. The most important act of leadership is leadership of self. We cannot hope to lead others effectively if we are unable to lead ourselves. I know many so called leaders who try to lead others while making a total mess of their own lives. Australia is currently an over-managed and under-led country. It constantly puts managers in positions where leaders are needed. Many Australians fail to understand this critical difference between leadership and management. Education should first focus on encouraging students to become effective leaders of self before they become effective leaders of others. Leadership refers as much to how we plan our lives as it does to planning the work of others and responding to the world around us.

*Managers respond to change, and solve problems, while leaders shape change, and create opportunities.*

Managers are concerned about doing the *thing right*, while leaders are concerned about doing the *right thing*.

Managers reflect about *fate*. Managers reflect about *destiny*.

Managers *control*, Leaders *facilitate*.

Managers work *in* the organisation, while leaders work *on* the organisation.

Managers and Leaders also have different kinds of visions and ask different questions about the future.

The manager in each of us is most comfortable asking "What will the future be like?" I call this the Probable Future or *que sera* question. In over managed and under led Australia it is the question most Australians are comfortable with.

An alternative question is "What should the future be like?" I call this the Preferred Futures question. It is the question leaders tend to ask. It is also the question that the average Korean, Japanese, Malaysian or Chinese will ask. It is the question for people who let their dreams play a role in how they think about the future.

You will appreciate that there is a big difference between these questions.

Managers are *Probable Futurists*, Leaders are Preferred Futurists

What people who ask the probable future question are really indicating is that they have very little influence on the future of Australia. It is a fatalistic view, based on the thought that

the future will just happen, and that one cannot shape the future, merely not get run over by it, or if one is smart, make a dollar out of it.

A second way people look at the future involves not the destinations which are envisaged, but the strategies required to get there. The current approach of most people most of the time is a *Problem Centred* one. This is usually the way of the manager. This involves working towards a future where present problems are lessened or removed. The aim is to remove or lessen present "bads" from the future rather than positively create "goods". The alternative way is to take a *Mission Directed* approach to the future: to create "goods" in the future, to set out to create a positive future. This is the way of the leader. As it is with the imbalance between probable and preferred futures, there is an imbalance between Problem Centred and Mission Directed approaches. The excessive weight given to Problem Centred approaches makes it very difficult to achieve anything like an optimal result. Again all of this involves using management skills where leadership skills are needed, or because we appoint managers to positions of leadership.

Managers are *Problem Centred* people, Leaders are *Mission Directed* people

There are many other examples of imbalances between Problem Centred and Mission Directed approaches. The emphasis of medical approaches to health over health promotion is one, the emphasis on becoming less unsustainable rather than more sustainable is another. In the area of structural adjustment of our economy, most of the concentration goes to the Problem Centred *repairing the old* (modernising the existing industrial structure and infrastructures), rather than the Mission Directed *creating the new* (designing and building new industrial structures, industries and enterprises appropriate for the 21st century).

Many of the so-called economic and unemployment problems of Australia have neither economic causes nor economic solutions. They are cultural problems with economic, social, cultural and environmental consequences, and the solutions must be found at the cultural level. The biggest problem is the imbalance between Probable and Preferred Futures thinking, and between Problem Centred and Mission Directed approaches to the future.

I know recognise that people tend to change their behaviour because of two fundamental emotional groups, one is the axis of hope and fear and their more extreme soul mates, desperation and inspiration (or related anger from hopes dashed). Both hope and fear can trigger major changes of direction. The second pair of reasons are the emotional alternatives of love and hate (or related anger from rejection) In other words changing one's own strategic direction is base on some very simple emotional foundations., Fear and desperation are the tools used too often by the manager to create change. Hope and inspiration are the tools of the leader.

The leader uses the following process to create change: they develop vision, which is used to create hope, hope is used to create inspiration, and inspiration is used to create commitment.

Two people who have discussed the importance of commitment are W. H. Murray and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe.

W. H. Murray wrote: *Until one is committed, there is hesitancy, the chance to draw back, always ineffectiveness. Concerning all acts of initiative, there is one elementary truth the ignorance of which kills countless ideas and splendid plans: that the moment one definitely commits oneself, then Providence moves too.*

Johann Goethe wrote: *Whatever you can do or dream you can, begin it. Boldness has genius, power and magic in it. Begin it now.*

If young people enter adulthood after being given the opportunity to grow their leadership capabilities as well as their management capabilities they will be able to first determine their own destinies and shape their own future. This is more important now than ever before, in a transforming global society where governments are becoming less important, and communities and individuals are becoming more important.

### **The heart of the leader...**

Leadership is also affected by *heart power*: the amount and kind of heart power we embody defines the kind of leader we are.

Leadership involves what I call 'neck down' components including the heart, as well as the intellect. The leader embodies six qualities which come from the heart rather than the head. The leader should be...

*confident*: having self belief but without hubris.

*courageous*: going where others dare not, overcoming self interested opposition.

*committed*: doing what must be done, being assertive not aggressive.

*considerate*: listening and responding to the opinions and views of others.

*courteous*: showing respect in conversation.

*compassionate*: responding with empathy to victims and the disadvantaged.

Only a Nelson Mandela or a Don Dunstan is marvellous at all of these. Most of us are good at some, weak at others. With this list we can assess our capabilities in each of these and decide where more work is needed to grow our leadership capability

Management on the other hand is largely 'neck up', an intellectual exercise. It does not seek to engage the emotions in work. To these six C's we can add two more Cs which are necessary for effective leadership. This is the ability to:

*conciliate*: building and nurturing interdependence and relationships by facilitating compromises which realise win-win outcomes in negotiations.

*communicate*: articulating with both head and heart, ensuring both non verbal and verbal forms of expression convey the same message. Leadership therefore embodies eight qualities and capabilities: confidence, courage, commitment, consideration, courtesy, compassion, compromise and communication.

## **The leader in action: the six Vs...**

I have already mentioned the eight Cs of leadership—the internal characteristics of good leadership: confidence, courage, commitment, consideration, courtesy, compassion, conciliation and communication. This is what the leader is. However it is also the performance of a leader, what the leader does, which is equally critical. A leader who does not get results, or only gets them in ways which alienate the crew or undermine the long term capacity and capability of the crew, is a poor leader.

I want to describe the leader in action by using a metaphor: the leader as a commander of a spaceship leading a culturally diverse and interdependent crew on a mission to a chosen destination

The leader is the facilitator of mission-directed/preferred-future strategies, of mission building. The critical components of mission building are:

**Vision:** this involves choosing one's destination. The first task is to develop the preferred future destination: 'Where do we want to go and when do we want to get there?' The journey is being made in an environment of change that is driven by both external processes and internal mindsets and behaviours. The second task is to understand and recognise that the spacecraft is already journeying to the probable future, which will be the destination if current trends ("business as usual") are pursued and an alternative destination is not chosen. The leader will also recognise, however, that the leader and the crew are not omnipotent and do not have unlimited resources. Although the leader will undertake measures to improve organisational capacity (financial resources available) and capabilities (human resources available), it may not be possible to achieve the preferred futures goal within the required time-frame. The leader and crew might, therefore, need to select a possible future destination based on a recognition of limitations imposed by the capacities and capabilities as well as by the competition.

**Values:** this involves asking the questions of 'What are the shared beliefs of the crew?' and 'What are the rules which determine how the crew behaves and relates to one another during the mission?' Some of these values will be desirable for the completion of the mission and some will not be desirable. It is important that the leader and the crew explore the core values (both desirable and undesirable) which define the ethos of the crew and the rules which govern relationships between crew members and between the crew and the external world. For example, 'tall poppyism', "cargo cultism" or "cultural cringingism" would not be desirable. Without a clear understanding of shared values, a culture of mutual trust and interdependence will not develop between the crew members, and commitment by the crew to the realisation of the mission will not follow. The crew and leader should examine core values (both desirable and undesirable) and develop strategies to nurture the desirable ones and transform the undesirable into more desirable. Before a crew can determine what virtues it will actually practice, it must first determine what its core beliefs are and assess them in terms of both ethics and performance. Values which undermine or elevate ethical behaviour or which will diminish or improve performance should be specifically identified. Then strategies for nurturing the desirable and transforming the undesirable would then become part of the capability building strategy to be discussed below under 'Vehicles'.. It is

the role of the leader to stretch and challenge values which are no longer appropriate for future needs or which are undermining desirable transformations in behaviour, and to advocate value shifts which can enhance future thriving. A leader who merely reflects current values, or even a time warp of past ones, and encourages people to be “relaxed and comfortable” with them, such as Australian Prime Minister John Howard will not earn respect. People know that rapid change is always challenging and stretching values and that know they need guidance making value shifts which necessary. They know it is a delusion to sit comfortably holding on to old and dated value systems in a rapidly changing world. The leader must challenge and stretch value systems.

**Virtues:** these are desirable values that are practised unquestioningly and automatically. They must be desirable and appropriate for the development of a successful mission. Behaviour can be perceived by others but inner beliefs cannot be seen; other people cannot see one’s values but they can see one’s virtues. Virtues involve behaviour rather than beliefs. It is possible that a leader can harbour an undesirable value such as racism, but this is not of consequence unless this value influences the leader’s behaviour. Virtues are values which are actually practiced: even if they are not believed. It is important to take core desirable values and ensure that these become practised virtues. The leader must be a practicing exemplar of organisational virtues. A leader who does not “walk the talk” or “practice what the leader preaches” will earn disrespect. This is the flaw of President Clinton: he is a good leader in terms of the seven C’s but is not virtuous: he fails in practice. The leader must be a practitioner/advocate of these virtues, and work to ensure that desirable values become practiced virtues and undesirable values remain unpractised. In the context of ensuring prosperity and thriving in the twenty-first century these virtues should include the values of Planetism.

**Venturers:** answer the question ‘Who will participate in the mission or support the purposes of our mission as allies?’ People change behaviour or direction or commit themselves to undertaking a mission for two basic reasons: fear and hope. Fear is the tool of the manager and is over-used; it undermines trust. The creation of an environment of hope is the major tool of the leader. Provided there is trust, vision leads to hope, and hope leads to inspiration. Inspiration will lead to the making of a commitment to the mission. Commitment comes from the heart not from the head, therefore the leader must be able to move the hearts of his crew and this, in turn, delivers the energy required for commitment. The head then comes into the commitment process by bringing intelligence to assess the wisdom of making a commitment. So both head and heart are involved. Management involves the head but not the heart. It is therefore not surprising that the majority of mission statements developed by management gather dust on shelves. They have been developed without an attempt to gain the commitment which comes from the heart.

The leader should promote a climate of organisational interdependence between venturers. There are two particularly important groups of venturers who are critical to the success of any mission. The first group consists of *champions* who are the ‘true believers’ among the crew, the most strongly committed to the mission and those who will try to ensure other crew members become equally committed. The second group of venturers are external to the crew but are equally committed to the mission. These are *allies* of the mission who are committed to working towards the same or a similar destination. They will provide external

support, intelligence and knowledge and wisdom for the mission. They are also a group who have vested interests in the mission and can be used to counteract vested interests against the mission who might try to stop it or slow it down.

**Voyages:** involve asking the question ‘What course should the spaceship take and through what environment?’ Many events occur during the voyage. Futurists often use a process called ‘backcasting’. This process describes a journey into the future but it is written as a history from the perspective of the future. It is the opposite of forecasting which identifies major events and their timing and weaves them into a narrative. In this ‘Future History’ of the voyage there are four kinds of actions: obstacles, initiatives, improvements, and heritages. They are described in the past tense as events which have occurred and are being detailed after the mission is completed:

- *obstacles* are constraints and barriers that stopped, slowed down or side-tracked the mission and which were overcome. Descriptor words which can be used include reduce, abolish, overcome, annul, cancel, negate, retard and extinguish;
- *initiatives* are new infrastructures and actions which were developed and implemented, and qualities, opportunities and facilities which were created during the mission. The descriptor words include establish, initiate, organise, found, increase, encourage, achieve, attain, negotiate and elevate.
- *improvements* are the changes we make to existing infrastructure, qualities, facilities and opportunities to improve performance and outcomes. Descriptor words include improve, redesign, renew, revitalise, better, enhance, enrich, amplify, fortify and strengthen.
- *heritages* are priceless elements and qualities relating to the mission, the crew and its culture which must be nurtured and treasured during the mission and for the future. We need to do this so that we do not throw out babies with bath water while we are changing
- *everything else* includes descriptor words such as protect, defend, nourish, enhance, bolster, support, care for and sustain.

**Vehicles:** involve answering the question ‘Which vehicle(s) do we use to reach our destination?’ To answer the question we must decide the means by which the mission will be achieved, including the development of new innovations to provide those means. Many of the means will already exist, but it would be foolish to assume that they are all that will be available to the crew. New means will be created in order to realise the mission and these, in turn, will create new opportunities. The Apollo mission, for example, led to the creation of many new innovations. One of the most exciting aspects of mission building is to recognise that mission building is a process of design and innovation. There are two kinds of innovation:

- there are innovations to the crew itself. These are called *capacities* and *capabilities*. They serve to improve the ability of the crew and their allies to complete the mission. Capacities refer to additional resources such as financial and technological resources which are identified and utilised to improve the success of the mission. Capabilities involve improving the human resources element, the skills, knowledge and experience of the crew, so that the crew—both as individuals and as a collective—are able to perform at a higher level. A combination of improving capacity and capability will assist the crew to arrive at the *preferred future* destination, or to move a *possible future* destination closer to a *preferred future* destination. The development and maintenance of learning and innovation cultures are important factors relating to capacities and capabilities. Without these cultures the crew

will not have the capability to renew and reinvent itself, to adapt, to develop new tools, new means and new resources to fulfil the mission.

- there are innovations which need to develop to realise the mission. The two major vehicles are *ways* and *wares*. *Ways are the social innovations which are needed*. These include the shifts in values, virtues, ethics, beliefs, paradigms, behavioural patterns, customer preferences and professional practices which are necessary to complete the mission. Many of these ways can be developed through learning and the most effective way to do this is to develop a learning culture. Ways can also be shaped or limited by laws which promote, permit or prohibit actions or things. Incentives and disincentives, both financial and non-financial, are other means of promoting appropriate ways and discouraging inappropriate ways. *Wares are the physical innovations which are needed to accomplish a task or complete a mission*. These include designs, products, services and technologies which will be needed to realise the mission. The development of ware will be most successful if an innovation culture is nurtured. Different ways and wares can be developed for different strategic purposes and their development will provide opportunities for the innovative and enterprising. For example, the ways required to realise a sustainable future can be called 'green' ways, while the ware for the realisation of a sustainable future can be called 'green' wares. Likewise, we can have health ways and health ware, learning ways and learning wares, and so on.

The way of the leader therefore involves embodying the eight Cs internally and practicing the six Vs externally. It involves creating a climate of hope as the major causal agent of change, instead of utilising a climate of fear. It involves adopting mission-directed, preferred future strategies instead of problem-centred, probably future strategies, or the way of the manager. The world needs management and managers—but not as commanders of spaceships.

### **Values probing: understanding emerging possibilities and opportunities...**

Even if we have *insight* about our own aptitudes and passions ourselves through *destiny searching* and we have *become* an effective leader of self through *preferred* envisioning we still need to utilise *foresight* to examine the emerging world of possibilities. The more we can anticipate what will happen and the more understanding why the future is unfolding the way it is, the better. I already said the world is part chance and part choice. Our choices are based on both insight and foresight; on who we are, our destiny, and on seeking to understand emerging possibilities, opportunities and threats are emerging so that can position ourselves for thrival and thriving. The more we maximise choices the more we minimise the role chance will play in our future. Of course we are not omniscient and omnipotent, and we always have to be adaptable and responsive to an unanticipated change. However there is more that we can do to position ourselves to ensure future success and become more effective at making a difference than the think.

We can understand what is unfolding through a process of what I call *Values Probing*. If we know what the major values of 2020 will be, in turn know what people will value and find to be valuable. What they find to be valuable they will want more of, what they want more of

will define what is made, bought and sold. And these same core values will define what is virtuous and ethical in human behaviour.

Much of my work is spent on trying to understand how collections of values, or paradigms, are changing. To understand these emerging values means that I must walk out into the future in my imagination. As I was originally educated to become a scientist, a biochemist, this involves using the scientific method: construct hypotheses of what is likely to happen, then to make predictions of what might happen and then test out prediction through an experiment. This way I find if my hypothesis wrong or not.

I have now developed a whole hypothesis about the emerging paradigm called *Planetism*, which I test daily in my interaction with others. I don't get verification whether I am right or not, but I learn from others whether or not my hypothesis makes sense from the point of view of how they see the world helps them understand the emerging future from their own pint of view. Planetism the planetary version of nationalism, it involves having first allegiance to the planet.

### **The birth of Planetism...**

Here I can only give a short version of this global story. My book *Ideas for the New Millennium* has a complete discussion as have many other papers I have written over the last five years.

There are three major global forces which collectively are shaping our future: namely Globalisation, Tribalisation and Technological Change.

Globalisation is the increasing interconnectedness, and the increasing awareness about and concern for others including those we don't even know. It is driven by increasing trade between people in different parts of the planet. Trade has now become a weapon which is used to punish the planetary wicked. A trade ban on a recalcitrant rogue state (eg Iraq, Burma, Afghanistan under the Taliban), or a global consumer boycott on a rogue company, is now common and is increasingly more so. If these entities are breaching global ethical values this means that there is now something emerging we can call *global public opinion*. This is something which is totally new. If there are disagreements between nations these are often about means rather than ends. The views about destination (ends) are often similar. For example most agree that we must collaborate to slow and stop climate change, confront a rogue government, manage the refugee crisis, or remove trade barriers, but we disagree on the means and about the urgency/priority of doing it.

The changes after 11 September 2001, the responses to the acts of terrorism in Bali, and the war against Saddam Hussein were all aimed at collectively cooperating to remove the dangers posed by global terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. While many of us were opposed to the unilateralist position taken by the Bush administration and preferred a multilateralist position around the UN, this was a disagreement about means not ends... We all agreed that Saddam Hussein posed a danger and should be neutralised, hopefully with

minimum collateral damage to the people of Iraq and the Middle East.

We agree about such things because we recognise that we share and that we are condemned to coexist on a small blue and white planet which we first saw in a photograph from Apollo 8 in 1967, what R. Buckminster Fuller called *Spaceship Earth*. This recognition that we share a common home and future world is being facilitated by increased trade and interconnectedness, shared environmental vulnerability, and by the revolution in communications and information technology. There is a greater emphasis on need for building long term productive and respectful relationships, and on cooperation as well as competition.

The European Community now embraces all of Western Europe except Switzerland and Norway. Ten counties in Eastern Europe will join in 2004, and more in 2007. In North America, economic union is also coming. The leaders of the USA, Canada and Mexico have signed the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which is the first stage of a single economic community, "from Alaska to Argentina" which will be completed by 2005 at the latest. In South America the Mercusor Agreement creating a common market between Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay has begun its operations. In our own region, the Bogor Declaration in 1994 committed the APEC region to complete economic and trade integration by 2020.

The Planet is not only being globalised by trade, environmental awareness and technology, it is also being tribalised. As the world interconnects more it is at the same time breaking up into smaller, national entities. At the opening of the 1996 Atlanta Olympics, 197 states were represented, many of which were not represented in Barcelona four years earlier. At the 2000 Olympics in Sydney there were three more, including athletes from East Timor. Slovenia and Lithuania have broken from the old Serbian- and Russian-dominated empires and have completed the transition from dependence to independence, and they will soon be joined by others including Kosovo and Montenegro. These will then seek to become the members of the European Community—the new Luxembourgs. It is likely that Indonesia and China will split into their old component parts, just as the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia have done. Each component will want to develop a direct relationship with other members of the emerging global society, rather than be controlled by the Han-dominated Chinese empire or the Javanese-dominated Indonesian empire. An emerging global public opinion favours those who seek to leave their old imperial masters and seek self determination. Diversity is increasing, and being increasingly treasured and respected as we all come closer together.

By 2020 there will likely be about 350 members of the UN, most of them tribal states locked into global and regional interdependence.

The dominant paradigm of the 20th century was *Modernism*. This was so deeply entrenched that we have took it for granted. *Modernism* meant the triumph of the western European way over everything else. It crushed cultural diversity through the forces of colonialism, religious evangelism and the power of western science and technology. A component of *Modernism* has been the concept of *progress*, which for most of this century has been

something which we felt we shouldn't or couldn't stop. As the century proceeded, the attitude accompanying the utterance that "we can't stop progress" changed from unbridled enthusiasm in the 1950s to increasing scepticism, even cynicism and sarcasm, in the 1970s. By the 1980s, we needed to modify *Modernism*, as its dark side had become too significant to ignore, so we invented *Post Modernism*, in which we borrowed deconstructed parts of previous eras and built them into the new. We had recognised that some forms of progress involved throwing out babies with bath water. We recognised that modern ideas and *Modernism* and their basis in western thinking and science and technology, did not hold all the answers. Therefore we began to listen and to learn about the wisdom of indigenous people, the very people we has been hell bent on crushing, and we borrowed ideas from the East and incorporated them into our Western mandates. *PostModernism* is the process to reconstruct *Modernism* into something more appropriate to a globalised tribalised planet, and for creating a new paradigm which will consolidate in the early 21st century. I call the new and coming paradigm *Planetism*.

Today in the early 21st century humanity is mid way through a transition between what can be recognised as a disappearing 19th and 20th century *Cowboy Culture* and an emerging 21st century *Spaceship Culture*. We can now recognise the Cowboy Culture as an unsustainable society and the Spaceship Culture as a sustainable society. The *Cowboy* and *Spaceship* Cultures have the following characteristics:

<b>Cowboy Culture/Modernism (1960)</b>	<b>Spaceship Culture/Planetism (2020)</b>
Individualism	Communitarianism
Independence	Interdependence
Autocracy	Democracy
Humanity separate from nature	Humanity part of nature
Unsustainable production	Sustainable production
Patriarchy	Gender equality
Intercultural & inter-religious hostility	Intercultural & inter-religious tolerance
Conflict resolution through confrontation	Conflict resolution through negotiation
Safekeeping through defence	Safekeeping through security

The 19th century was the century of dependence, most of us lived in colonies. The story of the 20th century has been one of independence. The last European empires, the Russian and Serbian empires crumbled, and others such as China and Indonesia could follow. The story of the 21st century will be one of interdependence, living and collaborating on a networked planet. The word interdependence is a key word to describe our evolving just-in-time, environmentally sensitive society: interdependence between men and women, between tribes and nations, between enterprises, between employer and employee in our work places, and between humanity and nature.

The world's religions are like everyone else, they are divided between adherents of the cowboy culture and adherents of the spaceship culture. For example the battles over issues such the ordination of women represent a major challenge to church cowboy patriarchy. Therefore we have two kinds of religions on the planet, dominated by what I call religious cowboys, the fundamentalists who are seeking a return to the security of the past and the

religious cosmonauts who are seeking to adapt religion to the emerging nature of the 21st century.

Equally Tribalism is developing in two streams, what we can call Cowboy Tribalism and Cosmonaut Tribalism. In a place such as Bosnia we have the two living side by side, but it is the Cowboy Tribalists who are doing the damage and it is the emerging Cosmonaut majorities in the developed world who are seeking to place Cosmonaut order and tolerance on these Cowboy Tribalists.

The emergence of the spaceship culture is advantaging women. I believe this is one of the main reasons girls are now outperforming boys in schools. They were massively disadvantaged in the Cowboy culture, but they are more at home than men in the emerging Spaceship Culture. Feminists, who until recently, have focussed on the development of gender equity and on moving women from dependence to independence, are now beginning to move on to interdependence, at least in those part of the planet where the Spaceship culture is already beginning to dominate. In the remainder of the Planet which is still dominated by the cowboy culture, women are still in as much trouble as they ever were; they are still caught in the web of dependence

Here is a tool which provides some insights about how I think the world is being shaped by emerging value systems. These systems will inform the development of new innovation, products and services, and emerging ethics.

### **Some sources of knowledge and inspiration...**

Over the last 12 years I have had many conversations with people who made destiny based career choices. Many of these people are scientists, artists and entrepreneurs. I wanted to know and understand what makes them do what they do, and understand how they first developed self insight and then acted to utilise this insight to shape their career and life paths. I wondered if this knowledge could be taught to and learned by others so that there will be many more individuals, organisations and communities and who are able *make things happen* and *make a difference*. I have only scratched the surface.

I was educated and began my career as a biochemist and I know that many scientists are like this. They are usually driven by a need to understand the world around them and how it works, and aspire to leave behind them a legacy of advanced knowledge with perhaps some practical applications of this knowledge. However for many the need for practical outcomes is not a priority. I was not content merely to advance knowledge. I wanted to make a difference on the ground as well. That is a reason why I am no longer a biochemist. I know artists who become artists because they are also answering a calling from within. I lived for 26 years with a painter Heather Shain Ellyard, a beautiful woman who is the mother of my two daughters who has also been my most significant mentor in matters emotional and spiritual. Heather is a painter because this is something she **MUST** do, even if it means living a life full of financial insecurity. Many artists and scientists have told me that their work is a calling, a fulfilment of destiny. Too many people undertake their life paths from looking around them, without self knowledge which comes form insight or foresight of

what could be. Those who choose a pathway from among the limited options will also be a life which will be less likely to make a difference will live a life which is less fulfilling.

My parents were always wonderful at encouraging me and my four brothers and sister to make choices of our own life. My parents were both teachers/school principals. They knew how to work with young people, how to mentor. My skills of mentoring were learned from my parents. They knew that the best decisions are those one makes oneself and accept responsibility for making.

A major part of my work is involves our relationship with and treatment of the environment. I first studied agricultural science at Sydney University. This gave a good scientific understanding of how nature worked and how humans could use nature productively while nurturing the basic resources of soil, water and plants and animals. After graduating I went to Cornell University where I studied first micrometeorology and later biochemistry. In my thesis for the Ph. D I studied the biochemistry of photosynthesis in plants. I worked as a biochemist briefly but I was not cut out to be laboratory scientist even though I loved creating new scientific theories, and attempting to explain what was not yet understood. Through my scientific career I gained confidence in using my imagination and creativity to explain what could not yet be explained and skills at devising strategies and plan experiments. I learned to have confidence in my ideas, and express and justify them to others, and to believe that even radical ideas should be taken seriously. I have never regretted taking the years I took to accomplish what I did. I began to understand something which is at the core of my futures work, that today's marginal idea is tomorrow's mainstream idea, today's ratbag is tomorrow's prophet. As I biochemist I became a confident systems thinker. One cannot understand biochemical phenomena without understanding biochemical systems, some of the most subtle of all systems, now I can understand how all systems work, including ecosystems, financial systems, economic systems and trading systems.

I was in the USA during the decade of the 1960s. It was a marvellous decade to be there, and a good time to be away from a very dreary decade in Australia. I was influence by the thinking of two people in particular. One of these was Buckminster Fuller. A true genius, he taught me how to think about what should be rather than what will be, and he taught me to see the Earth as a spaceship. He, and Kenneth Boulding, an economist, created the concept of Spaceship Earth. Then there was Joseph Campbell. He taught me about myths and heroic journeys. I know that my futures work is heavily influenced by him, as his journeys are primarily about the transformation which occurs to the journeyer while he is undertaking the journey. These two people have been my gods.

### **My next steps...**

I am now following an entrepreneur's path. I am establishing two new vehicles to which will facilitate my capacity to leave a legacy: two new not-for-profit organisations, the *Preferred Futures Institute* (PFI) and the *Sustainable Prosperity Foundation* (SPF). I have been trying to raise some large financial resources to fund the work of these foundations at a reasonable level until they become self sustaining. I have a business plan which aspires to

enable them to become self sustaining in 5 years. This has been a huge struggle. At this writing I have nearly succeeded, but not quite

These two organisations will enable me to role out my futures shaping methodology around the world. The PFI will teach these methodologies to other facilitators and license them to use my methodology in their work. The SPF will provide funding to enable disadvantaged communities in developed and developing countries alike to implement the program on the ground and change their capacity to determine and shape their own future. I am also involved in a new international organisation called the *Gentle Sphere* which will provide funding to the PFI and the SPF, to fund projects in disadvantaged communities all over the world.

I know that there is a growing demand and market and need for the kind of work I am doing. Provided one has the right mindsets, openness to learning, and insight and foresight, one can become empowered to shape one's own future and then those of others. This in turn involves developing one's own leadership capabilities. Therefore leadership education has also become a major part of my work. I am now moving on to the next stage. Therefore in this coming phase of my life I will be working with whole countries and communities as well as individuals and organisations to help them shape their own future, and to make things happen for themselves.

I am now beginning to explore the core motivation behind decisions about the future. This will become a major phase of my work from now on.

The outside reasons are varied, but I am now recognising that inside there are just a few core reasons which motivate behaviour. Recently I asked a group of people involved in the tourism industry why do people become tourists. I was shocked to find that nobody in the room had ever asked themselves this question, even though all agreed that it was a very critical question to ask. I suggested that there were three major reasons why people become tourists, and these basic reasons don't change much. People become tourists in order to appreciate and understand nature, appreciate and understand culture, or to achieve and understand wellbeing. What is meant by these three phrases does change through time, but the reasons themselves don't change. While I have life in me there is plenty to do.

Dr Peter Ellyard  
Executive Director, Preferred Futures.  
Adjunct Professor of Intergenerational Strategies  
University of Queensland.  
Chairman, Preferred Futures Institute, Sustainable Prosperity Foundation

For more information on Dr Peter Ellyard, please call Sandra Rogerson on (03) 9811 3500 or email her at [srogerson@saxton.com.au](mailto:srogerson@saxton.com.au)