

# Leadership

## as a Personal Journey of Consciousness

*An Interview on Leadership,  
by Stephen Gilligan PhD, and Daniel Charleton-Guitteaud*

### **Foreword**

In late Spring, whilst in Paris, I had the unique opportunity to speak with Stephen Gilligan's on the subject leadership. Whilst this topic is discussed with increasing recurrence, it is one which Stephen rarely gives interviews about and thus a source of burning curiosity for me. The need to balance this with discretion reminded me of the Japanese notion of Ma. This term will be well-known by martial arts practitioners and refers to the search for the correct physical gap and timing. When interviewing Stephen I was conscious of my desire to find the right distance to step into the conversation so that I might both clarify and reframe his thoughts (which are sometimes quite complex) and to let myself be guided by his extraordinary learning.

During our conversation Stephen demonstrated his amazing ability to be centred, present, open and welcoming, even after a long training session. His example naturally invites me to do the same.

In these recent years, Stephen Gilligan's approach has focused on generative consciousness and on the methods

to awaken the vast potential for creativity and generativity that is available to each of us. He highlights the role of consciousness in creating reality, and, in my perspective, this was a major starting point for this conversation with him on leadership. I assumed that one of the key questions for a leader should be : how can I be more aware of my states of consciousness ? Because through them I create my world, having an effect on other people.

By this approach, leaders have a special responsibility in understanding if their consciousness is sustaining a generative state : for example, if they have resilience, flexibility, the skills to adapt to different contexts, the strength to inspire others and to recover after failures and crisis... All these resources, and many more, have a powerful impact. Here we are looking for some answers about how we can make the difference between ego-centered, (or power-centered) leadership, and generative leadership. And surely, thanks to his wide and deep experience of the human soul, Stephen Gilligan gives us a different perspective on the goals, the action and the new consciousness that leaders need to embody in today's world.



Stephen Gilligan PhD  
[www.stephengilligan.com](http://www.stephengilligan.com)



Daniel Charleton-Guitteaud  
[www.gefira-leadership.com](http://www.gefira-leadership.com)

**Daniel: Steve, I'm very grateful to you and I feel very honoured that you accepted this interview. I really feel deeply honoured.**

Steve: Thank you Daniel, I'm glad to be here, glad to be talking with you.

**My very first question is: you rarely talked about leadership and I'm really curious to know your first definition of leadership. Who is a leader?**

You know, it isn't something that I formally talk about, so I don't know if I can give you the most clever definition, but, obviously, I think a common definition as a leader is somebody who is able to bring a group of people into some collective vision that then gets implemented and actualized into the world. I think we can say that generally. So it's somebody who brings people together and then leads them across a bridge: so to speak, from some present state to some desired state.

---

*I think a common definition as a leader is somebody who is able to bring a group of people into some collective vision that then gets implemented and actualized into the world.*

---

**Do you make a difference between leadership and leader, or is it the same thing for you?**

I haven't thought about that question... You know, there is obviously an important difference between a merely charismatic leader and somebody who has a leadership that brings people to a place beyond the leader by himself or herself. I would say it seems to be one of the most important ways to rely to a leader.

If we look at the United States, for example, I have been sort of intrigued, but perplexed, if you look at somebody like Bill Clinton: Clinton was a very charismatic leader, and in many ways a very effective leader, somebody that I personally supported a lot, but if you ask what was the legacy that Clinton left, I think that we would be quite challenged to say (once he was gone and his charisma, which was extraordinary) that the people that he was leading had anything to do beyond that.

As another example: Ronald Reagan, who was not somebody I was personally fond of or whose policies I personally supported, but it's very interesting to me in the United States as a political leader: Reagan was able to provide a leadership that continued to have an influence after he departed from the scene, that Reaganomics or this sort of approach to government that he crystallized, and somehow it seems he was in the right place at the right time for that group. It lived beyond him. So that is very interesting to me.

**So if I understand, you make a difference between the charisma of a leader and the legacy?**

Absolutely. The charisma is important to attract people, to motivate people, but I think a leader also has to have a set of values and a vision, and a sense of this sort of plans by which means are people going to realize that vision. So the charisma is very important, but it's also very seductive. We were talking in class this afternoon about the notion of archetypal energies, and if you look at, for example, great performers, whether it's in entertainment, somebody like Michael Jackson, or history, somebody like Adolf Hitler, they had tremendous charisma – so when they were on stage, everybody's attention was absorbed deeply and enhanced in some way, but whether it was beyond this sort of a cult of the leader, I think is a crucial, important question.

**For you, is Tony Robbins a leader in the category you just mentioned?**

You know, talking about leadership, we say in what ways are you leading people or what do you try to get people to do, and there are many, many different ways that you can lead people. There's a short term or a narrow view of what you are leading people to do, and then there can be a much more longer term.

Tony, I like him personally a lot, you know, I've worked for him on a number of occasions, I think he is congruent, I think he has a lot of integrity. I think what he is trying to get people to do, is really intensely break through their learned limitations about what's holding them back, so that they can live beyond those fears.

I think he has several limitations. Having said that, I respect him and I think he is a good, decent human being. He has enormous charisma – but the first [limitation] is the medium that he is working in, these big, relatively short-term arenas now, where people are total strangers who are not really sharing a vision, *except* Tony Robbins, you know, is that they are coming together and he is pumping them up very enthusiastically, and what people have as their shared focus in those places is Tony Robbins. So there is not the sense of a group that has shared values, or a vision, to move as a group – it's more like, "What can I get out of this individually?"

The second thing, is what is the person's style by which they are leading people. I think Tony, basically, is in the tradition of the Bible Belt revivalist Christian meetings through the United States, where you get people together and you whip them up into a feverish pitch and you use positive thinking to overcome all perceived negativity. And I think it's in some ways a rather distinctive American orientation to ignore the shadow, and if you are just enthusiastic enough you can have no shadow and all light. So I think for that reason, is that there will be shortcomings.

**Thank you for the clarity of this first answer, that provided a bridge for the next question, about collective intelligence. Daniel Goleman developed the research about the crucial role of emotional intelligence. Today many people, academics, consultants, coaches, everyone talks about it.**

**What should be the crucial behavior and mind-set for a leader, in order to develop a collective intelligence?**

In the work that I do, we talk about three basic minds, or three basic types of filters that we work through in order to create human experience, and the first and the most basic one is the somatic: that's the primary motivator. So we reach people from our somatic energy to another person's somatic energy.

The second mind is what we might call the cognitive or the intellectual mind, if you will. Developmentally, not individually but from a human point of view, it's a fairly late coming, it is a secondary sort of intelligence. In healthy development, these things work in harmony with each other – what we would call the mind-body unity or the mind-body connection. Unfortunately, what has happened, and particularly through the industrial revolution in the West, is that we have this severe mind-body disconnection. We are educated and we live with this disconnection of our mind from our body. So if we try to just communicate to people intellectually, we won't get very far, because it's only when it's in the bones or in the body or in the felt sense that people feel motivated and people can actually get anything done. That pattern has its own style of intelligence and I think what we call somatic intelligence is just a skilled way of being attuned to that first way of knowing that we have as human beings.

If you talk about training leaders, we get to this point we were leading to before, I'd say if you look at most generative leaders (for example from the NLP point of view, sometimes they say you can do modeling and you can learn by modeling) if you look at any creative person and

---

*So somebody who is a really good leader, I think, has that natural sense of, "I feel a deep connection to myself and to the world, I feel a deep connection to the group of which I'm a part and I have this calling and interest to be able to bring all of us to a better place".*

---

ask, "How did you become excellent in your field?", they would say something like, "Don't try to model anybody else, be yourself".

Of course we have influences, mentors, but ultimately you have to intuitively, passionately, authentically be able to get down into yourself and not be trying to intellectually control it. Leadership today is so overcontrolled by consultants – you see it particularly in politics, that it becomes a very cynical sort of head-game of selling people, you know, these group-tested sort of ideas. And the people that are being led and those you lead are increasingly cynical about the whole process. So somebody who is a really good leader, I think, has that natural sense of, "I feel a deep connection to myself and to the world, I feel a deep connection to the group of which I'm a part and I have this calling and interest to be able to bring all of us to a better place".

**Could you give an example of limiting beliefs that a leader could overcome in order to strengthen his community ?**

I guess the first belief would be something about "I can do it but I don't have the right, I can't make a difference" or "What I think and what I say really doesn't make a difference". We hope to call people to this sense that how you lead your life, you have the power to make a contribution in the world, and what you do with your life will either make the world a little bit worse, or at least a little bit better. So you have not only that capacity but you have that calling to be able to make a difference. And that, I think, is the first thing to be able to clear the way.

Perhaps the second belief is that people are unwilling or unable to create positive change as a group. You think, "It's been tried before, probably won't work, people don't really want to change in the end..." so that people have this capacity that if you're properly connecting and reflecting and speaking to it, they can do it, they can be able to make that difference.

***And, especially in times of crisis, are there any particular beliefs they need to embody or any particular belief they have to put away?***

I think that obviously there are many types of crisis. If you look at a great leader like Nelson Mandela, the apartheid crisis was a crisis about this horrible injustice and this societal organization that had to be resisted and had to be overthrown – so what would be the leadership that would call for a different set of values, a different set of visions, a different embodied sense of values ? Now we have an economic crisis and the economic crisis might be more a reflection of greed and corruption and short-sighted thinking, and leaders not properly representing the collective needs. Of course you could describe this in different ways, but the point is that the economic crisis is a different set of crisis than, say, something like what was happening in South Africa.

So, what would be good leadership is always expressed in a context of what leadership is needed. If you look at somebody like Winston Churchill, he's really interesting because he was such apparently a rigid guy, and he was such a fundamentalist that when England was not at war he was a bad leader and people didn't want him, and when they were in total crisis and you had to have this steely nerve and this sense of, "We will resist these bastards and we will survive", he was extraordinary!

***Is it about situational leadership?***

Totally. And it's often been said that the one who brings the revolution is never the one to govern afterwards, what makes that important change, then you need perhaps more of a managerial leadership, you need to be able to get the managerial context and that's a different type of leadership.

***You have just said that Winston Churchill was at the right place at the right moment. Some leaders appear to be constantly successful, while some are less and they go through many ups and downs. In your view, what can be the factors of success?***

It depends, again – succeed, at what? Sometimes the goals that are the most relevant goals for a leadership are easier to deal with. If you look at somebody like Nelson Mandela, you could say that he didn't succeed for almost forty years. I think in that situation you couldn't have any-



body, probably, to have succeeded, particularly in the way that he succeeded : he not only overthrew apartheid, but did it in a way that laid down a structure for a shockingly non-violent post-apartheid rule in South Africa. Relatively speaking, in any measure you wouldn't expect that to happen. So, what changes are you called to make, and there's no fixed definition of what success means, but I think a good leader is somebody who has a lot of resilience, so that through this period they continue to hold this energy that attracts people and inspires people and gives them something to focus on, that lets them know it's possible, it's possible to continue in this process, it is something that I want to give my effort to, it is something that I can believe in, because I see it embodied in that leader, is that they are reflecting the best of who we are.

***Is Nelson Mandela for you a good example of resilience?***

Yes, and you see how he's changed. On the one hand he's had this underlying beauty in his soul, you know, I read his autobiography and they said though they tried hard as they might, his jailers tried as hard as they could to stay hateful of him... On one hand, he was so much of a warrior spirit absolutely insisting for the end of apartheid, on the other

---

*I think a good leader is somebody who has a lot of resilience, so that through this period they continue to hold this energy that attracts people and inspires people and gives them something to focus on.*

---

hand he was such a decent human being that his oppressors would come to really like him as a friend. You see him now, (I don't know how old is he, ninety or something?) he's got this sort of sweetness to him, he's supposed to sort of leading people across the barrier and that's a beautiful form of leadership, so you see across the developmental life of a leader they need to go through many different changes.

***What could be the key drivers for successful leaders, do they they have a stronger identity than others ?***

I think that a lot of the best leaders never seek leadership, they find themselves in the situation where they feel a calling and they need to do it, because something needs to be done – so it's not their ego ideal, they don't set out, "Now I'm going to be a leader". What they set out to do is live by certain values and to be able to be in a community where those higher human values are realized. And then they come into places where they are not being realized in some ways, in a business, in a community, or in a larger context and it could be they are outraged by it, it could be from an experience of being rejected by it or seeing others, it's that something inside, some energy, brings them forth to take a stand. And I think that's where natural leadership is born, where people feel called to make a stand, where

"We can do better than this, life can be better than this", and then of course is that inevitably you are going to find resistance of some sort.

And that calls somebody in a leadership to find a way to stay centered, to continue to build their strength and their resilience even in the face of hostility to their leadership. I suspect that most people, if they knew what they would have to face, they'd probably be much more hesitant!

But I think it's the sense of a commitment to these higher values that leads you on this unfolding path, where you're so committed to it, that other people begin to look to you for leadership.

***Talking about the idea of reality, can we consider that being a successful leader is something real, something tangible? How could we measure tangibly a leader's success ?***

I'm not quite sure what do you mean by that. One additional thought in terms of what I was just saying: today we were talking in the group about these two levels of reality, one is the individual and the other is the collective field. I think that ultimately a really good leader feels an equal identity in both fields simultaneously.

So the person who thinks, "I'm a leader and therefore I've got to lead those people out there to some place", they don't feel that in their bones because they are not equally a participant, they are not equally a member of the community that is embodying and sharing and feeling the strivings and the sufferings and the motivations of the rest of the people, so I'd probably get a little bit suspicious when somebody starts talking about themselves as a leader.

---

*I think that a lot of the best leaders never seek leadership, they find themselves in the situation where they feel a calling and they need to do it, because something needs to be done.*

---

Maybe it's my Irish-Catholic background! But it's because of that sense of, "I'm not separate from everybody else, and once I see I have those responsibilities I know I have to conduct myself in a certain way because a lot of eyes are upon me, but I can't forget that I'm just like everybody else. I'm just a member of the group."

And I think that people feel that, people feel that resonance. What you referred to as "emotional intelligence", requires that. If you feel that you are in a position to have emotional resonance, you'll always do it in an artificial way. Like it would be so easy for a politician, "I'll just act like I'm in rapport with this person" in order to motivate them, or get their vote or whatever.

***After a crucial failure, some very successful leaders can sink, others instead rebuild themselves and become even more effective than before. What is the difference that makes the difference between the two?***

I think any time you have a static, fixed identity, your success will be short-lived, whether that's as a leader, or any particular social identity. So, if we think that what leadership is, is a constant – is a constant set of patterns, is a constant set of values, I think that's absolutely wrong. What leadership was in one period, is going to change entirely in terms of the next developmental period that you're in, the next developmental period that the group is in, so you have to go through this series of deaths and rebirths.

I really like to study the lives of artists, and one of the things I really like to see is across the arc of their unfolding, of their life, how many different epics, how many different periods they went through.

We have talked about Picasso, the blue period, or if you look at somebody like Milton Erickson... or I like musicians a lot, or writers, and you can't say that they are performing in the same way than thirty or twenty or ten or even five years ago. So you have to have this sense of appreciating it's very organic, and you may maintain the same sets of principles, but the way that you embody and experience and express those principles has to change significantly over the course of your professional life, your personal life.

---

***A leader is somebody who resonates to the wound and says, "I feel the suffering too, and something must happen and it's not right."***

---

***We have seen the difference between the two kinds, the ones that never renew themselves and the ones that constantly tried to renew and to adapt to the context.***

Absolutely. If you can't renew yourself, you will try to hold on the pattern and this is what happens with a lot of leaders, whether they are political leaders or business leaders, because things are always changing and the value that you had at one time is not the value that's needed the next time.

So if you try to hold on, it's always very seductive because leadership brings its rewards: you get money and power and all the perks and so forth, and now you feel threatened: "I have a lot to lose". You know, when you were young and hungry you weren't thinking of protecting what you had, because you didn't have much! So I think that really courageous leaders appreciate that it's not just a public, external position, it's a personal journey that you are on.

And that's precisely what you are calling other people to do, is to make this part of your deep life journey and that's where you get the real motivation, that's where you get the resilience. If you have this ego-sort of thing, like, "Oh if you do this you'll be richer or you'll throw out the guys who were in power" or... you know, that there will be something in it for you personally, that's not going to happen, they will stay in power.

***The next question is about something you know very well, it's about traumas: there are people who bring in their leadership style some personal traumas they have experienced and over time, that can take them to failure: how do traumas affect leadership and the way to express it?***

I think traumas are an integral part of effective leadership. There is an old saying in traditional cultures: you don't want the young to be in a major leadership position because they haven't been wounded enough. Now we think, "Young, that's better", but I think the idea is that until you have been wounded you can't sufficiently feel the suffering of other people and have the compassion to be able to effectively lead them without misleading them.

I think a good example from my own country is George Bush. I think a big problem with George Bush is that he never was deeply wounded. He always led a very protected life, so I don't think he could really feel the connection to most of the country, or the world, that he was charged to lead, because he had not true woundedness. I don't mean that woundedness that you have to have self-pity or have to fall into this pathetic sense, but to be a human being is to be wounded, is to experience a lot of setbacks, is to experience a lot of barriers, and that brings you a greater sobriety, and also brings you this greater sense of connection with your fellow human beings.

So I think wounds are integral, but the question for a good leader is: are they able to heal their wounds, because once you move into positions of power, one of the problems is, you are not as accountable as when you are not in a leadership role. So, who is going to challenge you when you are not operating with integrity, who is going to challenge you if you are doing addictions, who is going to challenge you when there is a problem?

You know, Bill Clinton, when they found him with all of this womanizing, he was in a position where nobody could hold him accountable. Then the wound can, I think, start to take you down. We have a lot of examples of leaders with their shadow side or their wound really taking them down. On the other hand, it's what opens you up to the deeper consciousness, to the collective unconscious. So the integrity of a leader as a human being, to be able to connect with the wound and do the healing of the wound as a way not only to help themselves but to help the community that they are leading, I think is a really important issue.

***How can a leader support a community who has been through traumas, or through a big trauma?***

Well, I think that the first thing is to name it and to be able to have an embodied connection with it, and to speak some truth about it. I think this naturally happens if we are talking about political leadership or leadership of groups: one of the big motivators is that there has been a wound, and a leader is somebody who resonates to the wound and says, "I feel the suffering too, and something must happen and it's not right".

So there could be a naming of an injustice, or something that needs to be changed, or something that needs to be challenged. When you articulate, you've got a lot of people connected with you. But now you have this sort of ethic, or challenge of integrity, in terms of what leadership that you provide – what is possible is the leadership that you provide is violence: an obvious example would be somebody like Hitler.

Gregory Bateson used to say that the Second World War began with the signing of the treaty of Versailles, with this

sort of injustice, or what we might call the humiliation of the Germans after the First World War. They felt so humiliated that they had a wound that was very difficult to heal. And out of the unconscious came this third-rate painter that the unconscious seized upon, who said, "I feel this, there's something terrible happened". And the collective energy just rose, and then he said, "The reason is because of *those bastards over there!*" You know, the Jews and all the other groups. And, "We can heal, we can change this injustice, if we do violence against the other". This is a significant type of leadership, the scapegoating, the projection, onto this negative other and then there is leadership to do violence. This is to me the major leadership that is happening in the United States right now, against Islam, or against immigrants, or it's always the other that is responsible for us losing the "golden period" that really never existed. But we can be able to achieve this fantasy-higher-state if we do violence against this negative other.

***And coming back to another question you have answered before, would you like to give a definition of resilience? It could be interesting.***

Resilience means that you are able to not only survive, but *thrive* despite significant and even severe setbacks. So whether it's a physical setback or else... take somebody like Milton Erickson, my teacher, who had severe polio at the age of seventeen. You know, a lot of people would have given up at that point and become hopeless, but not only did he survive, but he thrived and he used the setback to get stronger, to get more committed and to come more deeply into life.

So I think it is this commitment, along with a capacity to take the worst of life and to continue to step into life with this determination and this commitment to keep opening and growing. And that is a central characteristic of a great leader.

---

*Any creative performer knows this, that the training and the discipline to not only grow, but to be able to maintain the level at which you are operating, is a daily process.*

---

***In your view, what are the key features of a woman leader, if any – are they basically different from those of a man?***

I don't know! Collectively speaking, it's an emergent phenomenon. Of course there's always been here and there a female leader, but now we see a significant increase and I think it's a curiosity for a lot of people, would this make a difference? I think that's probably less important than we would hope, because it's the system itself that is moulding the leaders to a significant extent.

On the other hand, I was seeing on the internet many photos of Obama with world leaders – I think there were maybe forty – and I was genuinely surprised to see how many were women. I think there must have been at least eight or nine out of about forty, and it was very refreshing to be able to see that.

If we look also at issues such as colour, everybody thought it was such a monumental thing, for we had the first African-American president, and would that make a difference? I think that made a *huge difference* at some cultural level, that there had been something that shifted. You could see a lot of people were so excited about that, people crying, I mean, I was crying that night, for what that moment represented.

In terms of the type of leader that Obama has been, I think many of us have been disappointed, it's sort of like he's more of the same. It's been a little puzzling, I think, for some of us who are more on the progressive side, because we saw in him this capacity to communicate something that's really important to great leadership, which is to communicate in this embodied way this vision of what's possible.

And I think if you look at political leadership, you have at least these two different things: one is what are the specific things you can accomplish, what are the legislative programs that you can be able to pass, and if you look at Obama's first term, he actually got a fair amount, I think he got a lot of that, but in terms of what I would say is more *needed* in the United States, get back to this sense of what kind of leadership is needed at what point, I think the type of leadership is to call people to remembering the best of the American vision, he showed that capacity and as a leader I don't think he's been able to deliver on.

He has basically taken on a conciliatory, managerial role as a leader. And if we were at peace and our economy was good, there wasn't social unrest, that would be the ideal, he'd be great, because he is a really intelligent guy and he is a really decent human being and he is really kind-hearted. But we are on times where his opposition just sees that and savages him, they just take advantage of him.

Maybe he could go see Tony Robbins! You may know that Clinton called him. Stephen Covey and Tony Robbins, he called them. I think it was a great move in terms of, "I don't know how to occupy this space, in terms of holding this space – please help me" and that can be done in a non-cynical way, to help the energies that are true to you be able to be expressed in a way that really arises, that fits well for this new place that you are in.

***You have mentioned Milton Erickson. Now, talking also about Gregory Bateson, both of them have been your most important teachers and were exceptional mentors. Could they also be considered as great leaders in their respective fields?***

I think so, and very, very different. Jeff Zeig, who is a close friend of mine and was one of Erickson's major students, I've heard him say on a number of occasions that there were many good psychotherapists besides Milton Erickson: what made Milton Erickson extraordinary was the number and the quality of his students. So, if you look at how many students of Erickson came up, particularly in the last part of his life, when he was in the traditional passing on, he had an extraordinary number of students and the way that they talked about his work was so diverse.

You read these books by Erickson's students and they say, "Here's what Erickson said", next person says, "Here's what Erickson said" and you think, "They're talking about different guys!"

So, the fact that he was able to inspire not only high-quality multiple students but they were able to take that work and spread it in a much more diverse way, I think is an exceptional example of leadership.

Bateson was not an embodied motivator. Milton Erickson was this little guy, who really liked to socially connect and



you *felt* his presence, you felt compelled to act in some way, as a result of an engagement. Gregory was this aloof, British excentric, aristocratic Buddhist. He was very shy, he didn't like to challenge people, he was very clear-minded, so people were inspired by the quality of his thinking, and the originality of his thinking, and then were moved in their own way to be able to spread that, so a lot of people, you know – Bateson is considered one of the founders of the systemic revolution in thinking.

So, again, they're such different examples. If you were going to a leadership school and they were teaching you the Ericksonian way of leadership, for most people it wouldn't work, because Milton Erickson was finding his own authentic, unique self and using that to try to make a difference in the world, where Bateson was doing the same, where every leader, I think, is called to do that. And of course there's a lot of training that could be able to help you in that, but there's no substitute for stop talking, stop thinking and feel underneath it all, feel the energy that is you, and what you feel called to do and speak from that place. And then discover what happens!

***From the Buddhist perspective, everything is considered impermanent. How can leaders sustain their energy so as to keep their focus, define and reach their goals in an environment of turmoil?***

Related to the different questions: the first is about Buddhism, the second is about impermanence, and I think any good leader knows that you are only as good as your last action, that nothing remains static, so that you can create an outcome, but you can't rest, I mean, you can't rest in the sense of thinking, "We're done". If you are really involved in collective action, out in the real world, it is a constant process, and what you are able to create is always in dynamic action, and if you step away from it, oftentimes you will lose it. Any creative performer knows this, that the training and the discipline to not only grow, but to be able to maintain the level at which you are operating, is a daily process. So you know, all really good leaders they are really hard workers, they really give it their all and they are out in action a lot.

Buddhism, you know, we talked about leadership and change, and it's sort of a mixed bag. I have a very strong affinity for Buddhism, but Buddhism in a lot of ways doesn't believe in this intense change, if you will. From some points of view, many of us would say that it falls short as a complete approach.

We were talking about the transpersonal writer Ken Wilber and how he likes to say, from a psychological point of view, that one of the great conversations of our time is between Buddha and Freud, between the values of a collective timeless field where all can experience oneness, and where *all form is emptiness and all emptiness is form*, and on the other hand of every life being unique and the value and the importance of the developmental unfolding of a life – not only of the individual, but of the community, of a culture, and that means there's a process of progressive change. I don't think Buddhism singularly really can support that sort of progressive action in the world. So, my own personal sense is that while it is an extremely helpful approach, is not a complete approach if you want to live deeply in the real world.

***The very last question is about Master Ueshiba, the founder of aikido. He considered as a goal of aikido the accomplishment of human being. For you, is the purpose of a leader to help people grow, to accomplish something bigger than themselves?***

That's one of the core values that a leader could have. If you are asking me personally, do I have that, I'd say yes, because we often see this dichotomy between social change activists and personal transformation people. What we often see in the social change world, acted by people who are just about, "Change the world, change the world, change the system, change the external world", is first of all you have burn out, and second is that once you got in the power is that the new group is sort of: meet the new boss, same as the old boss.

So I deeply believe that these two worlds, this interior world of consciousness needs to be growing and transforming right alongside the external social systemic realities and it's only when we have change in both worlds that we are going to have any true transformation and change.

And so that means it is each person's responsibility to have this commitment to becoming a better human being, to reach our most high ideals. So, *sensei* was beautiful about that, and of course he was connected to a lot of the Japanese spiritual traditions, in the Shinto tradition. As he died and the next generation came, some people followed that, some did different, and in some ways that's the way it's going to be, but he gave that example, that it's not just about becoming a master at being able to control the external world – it's about becoming a better person inside.

And that's what then allows your actions to become a little less influenced by corruption and by greed and by all the pathologies that power inevitably brings to human consciousness.



[danielcharl444@gmail.com](mailto:danielcharl444@gmail.com)  
[www.gefira-leadership.com](http://www.gefira-leadership.com)