Emergence of a Global Misleadership Council
misleading as vital to governance of the future?

Introduction

The challenges of the future are widely acknowledged to be complex. Whilst people, including potential leaders, are increasingly well informed, it is not clear that information alone is sufficient to respond effectively to the foreseen challenges and to those that may emerge unexpectedly (cf Nassim Nicholas Taleb, *The Black Swan: the impact of the highly improbable*, 2007).

The need for appropriate leadership is also widely acknowledged -- as are controversial assessments of global leadership in respect of intervention in Iraq and of non-intervention in regions where wholesale massacre continues unabated on the largest scale since World War II. Such strategic decisions may be interpreted as skillful leadership or misleadership otherwise to be characterized as incompetence.

However it is also the case that strategic leadership calls for the ability to mislead opponents in order to outmaneuver them, notably through surprise. Where followers cannot be fully informed of the strategy in order to maintain surprise, or where they cannot be expected to fully comprehend a complex strategy dependent on a wide range of factors, leadership also requires skillful misleadership of followers.

The following argument explores the interplay between such dimensions of leadership and misleadership. It is not an apology for misleadership and seeks to avoid entrapment in a binary logic defining leadership as necessarily "good" and misleadership as necessarily "bad". It seeks to raise the question of what is to be learnt from the different framings of the Iraq debacle -- for leaders and for followers. Will the capacity to respond be more appropriate on the next occasion?

This exploration develops arguments of an earlier paper (*Sustainability through the Dynamics of Strategic Dilemmas -- in the light of the coherence and visual form of the Mandelbrot set*, 2005) and its annexes (*Psycho-social Significance of the Mandelbrot Set: a sustainable boundary between chaos and order*, 2005; *Imagination, Resolution, Emergence, Realization and Embodiment: iterative comprehension ordered via the dynamics of the Mandelbrot set*, 2005). As the most complex mathematical object discovered, it is appropriate to explore the use of the Mandelbrot set as a means of ordering humanity's ability to comprehend and respond appropriately to its most complex strategic dilemmas. The argument also points to the significance of traditional strategic insights from Asian cultures.
In the light of the above factors, the purpose of the paper is to frame the question of whether the present times are seeing the emergence of what amounts to a Global Misleadership Council. Whether or not this is the case, how should misleadership be cultivated, and distinguished from that of a more incompetent or malevolent form? What then are the complementary considerations for misfollowership under different forms of misleadership?

Essential ambiguity of leadership and misleadership

There is a danger to the binary judgemental logic whereby it is assumed that "leadership" is "good" and "misleadership" is "bad". This is especially the case since the leadership representative of one perspective tends necessarily to be perceived (and defended) as "well-intentioned" and that of any opposing group as "mal-intentioned" (or incompetent) -- and readily to be cited as a case of "misl"

It is useful to be clear of the ambiguity associated with notions of leadership:

- the capacity to bring together and hold together diverse groups and to motivate and focus their energy in an enterprise for their collective betterment
- the capacity to move ahead of others, with or without perspicacity and whether or not the action inspires others to follow

There is similar ambiguity in the case of misleadership:

- as incompetent or inappropriate leadership unable to achieve a strategic objective
- as misleading (or deceiving) supporters or opponents in order to achieve a strategic objective that would otherwise be held to be virtually impossible

Leadership is typically associated with risk taking under conditions of uncertainty. In such circumstances, unfortunate failure may be inappropriately framed as "misl" -- although a pattern of failures may over time be so considered (more appropriately). Irrespective of setbacks, and the assessment by others of the leadership as "misl", the ultimate test is whether a challenging situation can be "turned around" -- a capacity much appreciated in business, whatever its sense of social responsibility.

Learning is itself more closely associated with failure than success. Failure raises questions that may result in new action; success merely reinforces patterns already learnt. This is presumably equally true of collective learning whatever the support offered to any leadership, or elicited by it. Misl may therefore offer the fastest learning track (cf Engaging with Questions of Higher Order: cognitive vigilance required for higher degrees of twistedness, 2004).

Significant learning through which new patterns of order emerge may be understood in terms of the self-referential dynamics of enantiodromia -- through which an initiative partakes of the nature of that which it initially opposed (cf Psychosocial Energy from Polarization within a Cyclic Pattern of Enantiodromia, 2007).

It is also the case that under certain conditions "not-leading" -- which may indeed then be interpreted as "misl" -- may be considered the most effective way of ensuring emergence of more appropriate forms of order (cf The Quest for the Socio-Economics of Non-Action, 1993). This is to be contrasted with forms of leadership (and micro-management) that involve degrees of control that may be considered excessive -- again to be considered as "misl". This is the issue of the appropriateness of "more government" or of "less government".

In summary, leadership is about running the risk of being assessed as misleadership -- before during and after the fact. Misl is a requisite of effective leadership. But misleadership is also to be understood as unsuccessful leadership, or successful leadership judged inappropriate from some perspective of the appropriate direction (perhaps long after the moment of decision when consequences become apparent). As with crime, evidence of any intent assessed (notably by opponents) as "malign" may significantly refra their leadership as misleadership.

Strategic leadership as essentially a "shell game" with potential opponents, followers and dissidents?

The following Figure 1 endeavours to hold and interrelate the ambiguities indicated in the previous section. It does not adequately distinguish the condition in which apparently competent leadership (in terms of strategic effectiveness) is subsequently judged to have been inappropriate to the challenge -- and as such a case of misleadership. To do so, "leading" in the table should be understood to be evaluated in the shorter term of immediate outcomes (Bush's "Mission Accomplished"), whereas "misl" should be understood as including historical assessment in the longer-term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leading (strategic operacy)</th>
<th>Misleading (subterfuge, secrecy, (re)frameing, (re)presenting &quot;reality&quot;, re-visioning, image cultivation of attractors and repellers)</th>
<th>Misleadership Inappropriate (incompetent)</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Appropriate (competent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate (competent)</td>
<td>Skilful leadership rendered unattractive (and non-credible) by (mis)representation of challenges and opportunities</td>
<td>Competent leadership vulnerable to inattentive cultivation of image and attractive alternatives</td>
<td>Competent leadership skilfully reframing complex challenges and opportunities to render attractive and feasible (seemingly unacceptable) new forms of action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal (&quot;non-action&quot;)</td>
<td>Inappropriate framing of &quot;hands-off&quot; leadership</td>
<td>Laissez faire</td>
<td>Skilful framing of the appropriateness of lack of leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Interdependencies of "leadership" and "misl"
The table is indicative of the challenge to leadership of "things being other than they seem", whether the represented challenges, the actual resources, or the nature of potentially (emergent) new forms of order. It is in this sense that leadership is understood to be a "shell game" in which the opponents are deliberately misled to enable success -- and followers and dissidents are beguiled and distracted because of the difficulty of communicating in a timely manner the real nature of the challenges and opportunities (and the need for secrecy to avoid leakages and ensure surprise). Classic Chinese and Japanese texts (still favoured in military academies and business schools) have focused on the necessary stealth required for successful strategy:

- Gao Yuan. *Lure the Tiger out of the Mountains: the thirty-six strategems of ancient China* (see Figure 2a and 2b)
- Miyamoto Musashi. *The Book of Five Rings*, 1645

### Table: Invention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertion</th>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>Assertion with denial</th>
<th>Neither assertion nor denial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross the sea by fooling the sky [1]</td>
<td>Relax while the enemy exhausts himself [4]</td>
<td>Seal the firewood from under the cauldron [19]</td>
<td>Befriend distant state while attacking neighbour [23]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Rigidity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertion</th>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>Assertion with denial</th>
<th>Neither assertion nor denial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretend to take path A while taking path B [8]</td>
<td>Sacrifice the plum tree for the peach tree [11]</td>
<td>Point at the mulberry and curse the locust [26]</td>
<td>Deck the tree with bogus blossoms [29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch the fires burning across the river [9]</td>
<td>Take the opportunity to pilfer a goat [12]</td>
<td>Play dumb while remaining smart [27]</td>
<td>Make the host and guest exchange places [30]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Ambiguity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertion</th>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>Assertion with denial</th>
<th>Neither assertion nor denial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beat the grass to startle the snake [13]</td>
<td>Snag the enemy by letting him off the hook [16]</td>
<td>Use a woman to ensnare a man [31]</td>
<td>Inflict injury on self to win enemy’s trust [34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise a corpse from the dead [14]</td>
<td>Cast a brick to attract jade [17]</td>
<td>Fling open the gates to the empty city [32]</td>
<td>Chain together the enemy’s warships [35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lure the tiger out of the mountains [15]</td>
<td>Catch the ringleader to nab the bandits [18]</td>
<td>Let enemy’s own spy sow discord in enemy camp [33]</td>
<td>Run away [36]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Figure 2a: Table of Strategems

Adapted from Gao Yuan: *Lure the Tiger Out Of The Mountains: the thirty-six strategems of Ancient China* (London, Piatkus, 1991) (*Encyclopedia of World Problems and Human Potential*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invention</th>
<th>Rigidity</th>
<th>Ambiguity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

### Figure 2b: Table of Confidence Plays

Pattern of confidence plays essential in the processes of governance responding to challenges. (*Encyclopedia of World Problems and Human Potential*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When holding superiority</td>
<td>Denial of issue (possibly without recognition of its promoter)</td>
<td>Denial of issue, delaying any covert determination of its significance</td>
<td>Denial of issue with covert token monitoring of its significance</td>
<td>Denial of issue with covert long-term monitoring of little significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny Ignore Repress [1]</td>
<td>Discrediting and harassment of issue and promoter to ensure lack of action</td>
<td>Discrediting and harassment of issue and promoter to delay covert action significantly</td>
<td>Discrediting and harassment of issue and promoter to legitimate any token action</td>
<td>Discrediting and harassment of issue and promoter to legitimate other inappropriate programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Acknowledge [3] | For confrontation | For gaining ground | **Figure 2a:** Table of Strategems

Adapted from Gao Yuan: *Lure the Tiger Out Of The Mountains: the thirty-six strategems of Ancient China* (London, Piatkus, 1991) (*Encyclopedia of World Problems and Human Potential*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invention</th>
<th>Rigidity</th>
<th>Ambiguity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
To the extent that the leadership team can embody or encompass the pattern of what can be asserted and denied, the true function of leadership can emerge as the orchestration of shifts within that pattern -- a shifting pattern of light and shadow. The shadow however may be both in the relationship to the followers and in the blindspots of the leadership group at any one time. For governance in a media-oriented society, this gives a new angle to the old concept of a shadow play.


There has been a lot of concern in recent years about political deception and spin under successive governments. But the more the electorate expects from the politicians they elect, the more likely it is that politicians will be economical with the truth... Such deception where it is in the public interest may be the price of a healthy democracy.

The challenge is exemplified by some extreme cases:

- the extent of classified (secret) information maintained by governments and other institutions for reasons justified in terms of national or economic "security" or potential "embarrassment" to living persons (including those currently in power) or their relatives -- or "avoiding public panic" (Varieties of the "Unsaid" in sustaining psycho-social community, 2003). This is notably the case with intergovernmental institutions (such as the United Nations and the EU). The issue has been highlighted in the past in relation to the highly controversial Echelon electron surveillance facility (European Parliament Report on ECHELON, 2001), the complementary Frenchelon, and NATO's Operation Gladio (European Parliament resolution on Gladio, 1990). The Gladio motto is Silently I Serve Freedom. More recently the focus has been on complicity of governments in rendition (European Parliament: Condemn Complicity in Illegal CIA Activity, 2007). The issue is exacerbated by the purported size of (inter)governmental budgets whose use is subject to no democratic political oversight.

- the classic study by Niccolo Machiavelli (The Prince, 1532)

- the response of Bhagwan Sri Rajneesh to an interviewer questioning his encouragement of sexual promiscuity amongst his followers. He argued that sex engages and moves otherwise apathetic people; and only once they are moving can they be appropriately and fruitfully guided.

- as stated by Hermann Goering at the Nuremberg Trials:

> ...people can always be brought to do the bidding of the leaders...All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce (opponents) pacifists for lack of patriotism.

- as stated by Joseph Goebbels, Nazi Minister for Propaganda: If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it. The lie can be maintained only for such time as the State can shield the people from the political, economic and/or military consequences of the lie. It thus becomes vitally important for the State to use all of its powers to repress dissent, for the truth is the mortal enemy of the lie, and thus by extension, the truth is the greatest enemy of the State.

As a consequence of the intelligence debacle surrounding the "weapons of mass destruction" in Iraq, many commentators have raised the question as to whether the threat of terrorism, and related secrecy, is to be understood as part of a "shell game" by international leadership (cf Promoting a Singular Global Threat -- Terrorism Strategy of choice for world governance, 2002; Destructive Weapons of Mass Distraction vs Destructive Weapons of Mass Destruction, 2003). The threat of "bogeymen" is a technique used by many parents to mislead small children into preferred patterns of behaviour (the stick component of the carrot-and-stick technique in which Father Xmas is the carrot). The term "lies-to-children" describes a form of simplification of material for consumption by children; it is itself a simplification of certain concepts in philosophy of science. Small children (in rural areas) and cowboys use surprising techniques to mislead them in a preferred direction. Some strategies are therefore termed "cowboy strategies".

In the emerging information and knowledge societies, the strategic challenge of misleadership will not only be reframed in terms of "information warfare" (now so evident in terms of "news management") but more subtly in terms of "semantic warfare" and "memetic warfare" -- especially with the emergence of the semantic web (Missiles, Missives, Missions and Memetic Warfare: navigation of strategic interfaces in multidimensional knowledge space, 2001). It is to be expected that analogues to modern weaponry may be developed to that end -- notably "stealth" weapons with "cloaking devices" (popularized by science fiction) that offer the capacity to operate "under the radar" of opponents. Ironically "think tanks" may already be understood as adapted to that end (cf "Tank-thoughts"
The nature of the "shell game" is perhaps clarified by the distinction now made between "faith-based" and "reality-based" decision-making at the highest level, as noted in a much-cited article by Ron Suskind (Without a Doubt, The New York Times, In The Magazine, 17 October 2004) regarding an exchange with an aide in the decision-making circle of President Bush:

"The aide said that guys like me were "in what we call the reality-based community," which he defined as people who "believe that solutions emerge from your judicious study of discernible reality." I nodded and murmured something about enlightenment principles and empiricism. He cut me off. "That's not the way the world really works anymore," he continued. "We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality -- judiciously, as you will -- we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do."

In the light of recent history there is an amazing irony to the preferred abbreviation descriptive of the neoconservatives pursuing the Project for the New American Century -- "neon". Their declared belief is that "American leadership is both good for America and good for the world". Of course "con" could be understood as "confidence trick" or "conspicacy".

Avoidance of reference to misleadership

It is curious that, despite widespread reference to the need for "leadership", there is so little reference to the extent of "misleadership" as such -- notably following the failure of many national and international initiatives. The challenge of "misrepresentation" is a similar problem in the case of democratically elected "representatives". Is this an example of trying to respond to a problem by avoiding any reference to it and focusing on what is assumed to be desirable -- namely a form of misleadership in its own right? (cf Being Positive Avoiding Negativity: management challenge of positive vs negative, 2005)

Those references that exist tend to take the form of commentary rather than the extensive studies and programmes proposed in relationship to "leadership". In contrast to the above-mentioned challenge of ambiguity, such commentary typically frames all forms of "misleadership" as "bad" -- thereby falling into a trap of binary logic.

Some indicative references to "misleadership" include:

- Blogs:
  - On misleadership, 2 May 2007
  - Misleadership, 28 April 2007
  - Brook K. Baker, Global Fund Misleadership - Yank Feachem's License, 24 June 2002
  - Mike Hersh, Right Wing "Misleadership" alienates Republicans. American Politics Journal, 28 March 2001
  - Patrick C. Doherty, DLC Misleadership, TomPaine.Com, 8 April 2005
  - Pascal Fervor, Malevolent Misleadership, 16 April 2006
  - Al Gore, Environment Misleadership, Moscow Times, 22 April 2002
  - James Warren, Thirty-seven Years of Non-struggle Leadership Black Commentator, 17 March 2005, #130:
    - If you strip away the nasty language and the fatalism from the dominant voices in Hip-Hop you will hear the values of the Black middle class. Get rich or die trying. Get money, make money, I ride this, I wear that, I live in a mansion, I own big bling; these youth see Black elected officials, the so-called Black leaders, and the Black middle class doing the same thing they are doing. But unlike the misleadership class, the youth can change and many will. What they need is to see a movement for social change that they can become a part of. These youth do not see their parents as role models - they are following the lead of the Black mis-leadership. Quit slamming the youth, you reap what you sow.

The World Economic Forum's Global Leaders for Tomorrow (GLT) Environment Task Force presented an Environmental Sustainability Index (ESI) in 2001, which was developed in cooperation with the Earth Institute's Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN) at Columbia University, and the Yale University Center for Environmental Law and Policy. The New Economics Foundation, a London based NGO, called the report "global misleadership" and "a severe case of statistical abuse." (A spin too far ranking US in top fifteen most environmentally friendly economies, 2001).

The Common Good Coalition in the USA articulated an (undated) Common Good Covenant as "a summary of national goals and programs to revitalize the society, economy and the environment of the United States". Therein it is noted that:

- Mismanagement and misleadership of the executive and legislative branches resulted in major national and world problems, which may be summarized in the eight national deficits of: world leadership, citizen participation, moral values, federal budget, trade, infrastructure, social, environmental.

Unrecognized phenomena?

The nature of the references to "misleadership" suggests that it has only recently emerged into awareness as a generic phenomenon, despite widespread familiarity with "misleading" and being "mislided". This is in curious contrast to the promotion of the concept of "leadership" over past decades and especially its enthusiastic espousal by the military and business worlds for whom strategic failure is a mark of inadequate leadership. Given the inspiration offered to those preoccupations by classical Chinese and Japanese strategic texts (The Art of War, etc), it is also curious that they too only identify the phenomenon in terms of its absence and as an explanation for
failure -- and as a mark of the "loser".

The Rice University Neologisms Database comments on "misleadership" (in relation to commentators on the Bush administration in 2005) as follows:

This word gives an example of intentional (although satirical) amelioration of the word mislead. Mislead carries a negative connotation, but when altered to resemble the very positive word leadership, it takes on a subliminally positive quality. The word misleadership was formed as a blend, but it also makes sense as a derivation, mis-lead-er-ship, from the morphemes mis (wrong), lead (the root), er (one who is acting), ship (the art of). Thus we get the art of leading wrongly, an appropriate definition.

In association with "misleadership", the phenomenon of a "misleader" has also been recently recognized -- again much stimulated by the strategic management of George Bush. Early use of the term was made by Simon Tisdall (America's Great Misleader, Guardian Unlimited, 8 October 2002) regarding the strain on the limits of plausibility of Bush's arguments to justify war on Iraq. As a project of MoveOn.org, the Misleader is "a daily chronicle of Bush administration distortion" and offers a "misleader archive". It was launched with a letter by Robert L. Borosage (The Misleader, 14 September 2003). An editorial of The Nation (13 October 2003) is entitled Bush the Misleader.

An organization of Swedish sceptics (Vetenskap och Folkbildung, VoF) periodically attributes an award of "Misleader of the Year" to those academics who have most notably misled the public on some controversial aspect of science (cf Erland Lagerroth, Who are the misleaders?).

In a fundamentalist comment on a number of Biblical quotations, Edmund J. Roache (The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand, 2004) argues:

Also, the present world leaders are misleaders; they spend no time truly addressing our global problems such as overpopulation, pollution, environmental degradation, rapid loss of biologic species, ongoing ozone depletion, global social and political unrest, and increasing nuclear weapons proliferation.

However, in contrast with the limited references to the skill set of misleadership, debate on many issues (climate change, sustainability, etc) frequently frames those arguing an opposing position -- of whatever persuasion -- as "misleaders".

Similar issues might be raised with respect to "followership", "misfollowership", "misfollower" and "misfollowing" -- all poorly documented. Although, as Charles Sullivan (The Apostles of Deception, World Prout Assembly, 2007) argues, for example:

Of course, followers require leaders, and that makes them vulnerable to charlatans and frauds. The trouble with leaders and followers is that leaders often mislead and followers obediently trail them to the very gates of hell.

It is appropriate to recall that followers "get the leaders they deserve" -- emerging from their midst through a form of self-organization around leaders as attractors. But it is also the case that misleadership, whether appropriate or inappropriate, emerges by a similar process. Followers evoke from leaders, to some degree, the degree of misleadership that best responds to their collective circumstances. Unconsciously followers may not wish to be conscious of the challenges and decisions the (mis)leader feels is appropriate. They effectively evoke misleadership by their desire to avoid any obligation to comprehend and act "out-of-the-box" -- namely other than in the manner to which they are habitually accustomed.

Glenda Armstrong (Followership, 2005) has compiled a bibliographical checklist of resources on followership for the military. There is no reference to "misfollowership" or to "misleadership" -- which might be considered of great strategic significance when misleaders successfully persuade a population (or the military) to engage in dubious initiatives that they later come to regret. This is the issue of blindly following inappropriate orders -- and how such inappropriateness is to be distinguished and challenged within an authority structure. It is exemplified by Adolf Eichmann in relation to the Holocaust and by Kofi Annan's role in relation to the massacres during his mandates (Perplexing Symmetries in Obedience to Orders: exploring dubious equivalences in the moral abdication of Adolf Eichmann and Kofi Annan, 1998).

More problematic with respect to the challenges of the future is when misleaders persuade a population not to respond to emerging issues -- a failure to act that they later come to regret. Climate change, overexploitation of resources, or overpopulation are typical of such issues. It is characteristic of misleadership to promote the denial of emerging challenges and promote secondary threats more amenable to narrow focus and technological investment (Promoting a Singular Global Threat -- Terrorism Strategy of choice for world governance, 2002). Again it could be argued that the long-recognized phenomenon of "misleading" has become explicitly central to modern governance through news management and spin -- notably as assiduously practiced by the Bush and Blair regimes (cf Destructive Weapons of Mass Distraction vs Distractive Weapons of Mass Destruction, 2003)

If the hitherto "missing" terms are now to be understood as indicative of a widespread phenomenon, some questions follow:

- Why have the terms been missing despite the ubiquity of examples and exemplars?
- Why is "leadership" ("followership"), let alone "misleadership" ("misfollowership"), so challenging to translate into other languages, even other European languages (where the English word "leadership" often has to be used untranslated)?

Criteria of misleadership
It is vital to be clear that neither leadership nor misleadership are to be judged by ethical or moral standards. They are best understood to be value neutral. If the ethical dimension is to be highlighted then both should be qualified:

- **ethical leadership**: as exemplified by political campaigns for "clean" governance and against "skelaeze", typically endangering the proponents. A notable advocate was the UK Foreign Secretary Robin Cook, whose political career was so suddenly terminated.

- **ethical misleadership**: such a term might be applied to institutional leadership which, although operationally unsuccessful, was nevertheless based on (the highest) ethical principles, notably transparency and openness. Critics might argue that many poorly managed nonprofit organizations could be appropriately considered in this light. On the other hand, bodies like Greenpeace thrive on stealthy strategies that enable them to spring surprises on those whose actions they oppose.

A "great leader" convinces, motivates and gets things done irrespective of what it costs. To be clear, leadership is therefore a question of value-free efficacy in getting a job done. Any question of unforeseen, unwelcome or unfortunate consequences -- notably collateral damage -- is irrelevant to the assessment of effective leadership. Edward de Bono has given focus to this dimension through use of the neologism "operacy".

To that end a leader must be capable of:

- evoking a sense of honour amongst followers in relation to their expectation that they may well die in the fulfillment of their commitment -- whether or not the "death" is physical, emotional or spiritual (as with "dying to the world")
- framing any collateral damage -- possibly involving the death of others, the destruction of family relationships, etc -- as appropriate to what needs to be achieved
- sustaining respect for those pursuing the mission -- whether the followers or the leader -- at all costs

Ensuring that honour is sustained is complex in situations where the relationship between forms of leadership and misleadership is ambiguous in the eyes of those called upon to be honourable or calling for action in terms of honour. Especially problematic is the possibility of a disconnection which undermines the existential triggers and motivations associated with honour or leads to their perversion, notably as "blowback" (cf Honour Essential to Psycho-social Integrity: challenge of dishonourable leadership to the nameless, 2005)

Following from the earlier comments (and as presented in Figure 1), a fruitful distinction between leadership and misleadership is therefore to be based on some combination of:

a. success in the intended task, possibly by significantly misleading (deceiving or "tricking")
   - opponents (typically extolled as strategic skill)
   - followers (possibly reluctant) -- as a way of enabling them to surpass themselves
   - the leader mindset -- thereby avoiding entrapment in habitual, patterned, predictable response to evolving challenges (as characteristic of an unimaginative instrumentalist logic)

b. success in accomplishing an inappropriate task, however well leadership is demonstrated (Bush's "Mission Accomplished")

c. failure to accomplish the intended task through incapacity to lead and incompetence

d. systematically misleading (irrespective of success or failure):
   - supporters (whether malevolently or not) in support of a hidden agenda (of which they might not approve)
   - oneself (as well as others) regarding one's own leadership capacities and limitations

Expressed metaphorically and simplistically in an era of faith-based governance, the capacity of "Satan" to persuade, mobilize and lead people is legendary -- as is his capacity to mislead them (hence his reputation as the Great Deceiver). The challenge for any corresponding "Messiah" is in the nature of the complexity (and the capacity of those potential followers who make little effort to understand it) -- and who desperately seek for deliverance from their problems through simple, comprehensible solutions they perceive as more credible (see Strategic Briefing for Satan -- based on professional insights from preemptive news and image management, 1999, in comparison with Strategic Briefing for the Messiah -- based on professional insights from preemptive news and image management, 1999).

### Exemplars of misleadership

To clarify the nature and significance of misleadership, it is useful to indicate exemplars or domains in which such issues are usefully raised:

- **George Bush**: as noted above, the Bush administration has helped dramatically to highlight the ambiguous nature of misleadership -- perhaps the most significant legacy of George Bush and his neocon supporters
- **Tony Blair**: as the chief agent and collaborator of George Bush, the distinction between his acknowledged skills of persuasion, and their disastrous use, offers an exemplary case for clarifying the distinction between leadership and misleadership
- **Davos vs Porto Alegre**: separately and by comparison these two contexts help to clarify the distinction between misleadership and leadership. Davos exemplifies strong and efficacious leadership and the regular gathering of those with such characteristics (irrespective of their misleadership qualities), whereas Porto Alegre exemplifies another style of effective leadership, notably tortured by an inability to get its act together -- and thereby misleading many through the hope it offers (with little demonstrable proof) on which it has yet been unable to deliver (cf All Blacks of Davos vs All Greens of Porto Alegre: reframing global strategic discord through polyphony? 2007)
- **Denial and reframing of evident and emergent issues**: as a class of responses, this offers a valuable context within which to identify misleadership by identifying controversial issues and exploring those at the root of inaction upon them (notably by their justification of inaction or token action): climate change, overexploitation of resources (energy, fishing, oil, water, etc),
overpopulation, unemployment, disease, massacre

- **Dictators** (and their supporters) also offer a means of distinguishing between leadership and misleadership:
  - Saddam Hussein (especially in the light of the inability to govern the region after removing him)
  - Adolf Hitler
  - Augusto Pinochet (especially in the light of the support by Margaret Thatcher); Saddam Hussein (especially in the light of his early support by the USA); Robert Mugabe (especially in the light of his early support from the World Council of Churches)
  - Fidel Castro (especially in the light of the quality of health, education and disaster preparedness in comparison with neighbouring countries)
- **Declared "terrorists"** (as a means of clarifying the validity of the distinction between the means and ends of leadership, in contrast with the use of those same means by misleaders, cf *Varieties of Terrorism: extended to the experience of the terrorized*, 2004):
  - Jomo Kenyatta, Nelson Mandela and Menachem Begin were all denounced as terrorists but all proved to be successful political leaders of their countries and were recognized as good friends of the United Kingdom. (Lord Desai *Hansard, House of Lords* 3 September 1998)
  - George Washington, held to have been viewed as a terrorist by the British in the period 1770-1780 (but see *Sickening Moral Equivalence From NBC Anchor Brian Williams*, 1 July 2005; Tom Donelon, *One Terrorist is not someone's Freedom Fighter*, 14 July 2005; Timothy Noah, *Yasser Arafat and George Washington: how to tell them apart*, 5 April 2002; Todd Alan Kreamer, *Sons of Liberty: Patriots or Terrorists? How a secret society of rebel Americans made its mark on early America*, *Early America Review*, Fall 96)
  - Osama bin Laden (especially as supported by the CIA throughout the 1980s [more]), Ho Cho Minh
  - Arguments for or against "moral equivalence" are of course pure exercises in scholasticism to those terrorized by unrestrained violence -- irrespective of the belief of those perpetrating it
- **(Mis)leaders of religious movements and sects** (as a means of highlighting the extent to which misleading followers may be a factor distinct from leading them):
  - Tele-evangelists with problematic financial and sexual associations (*Jimmy Swaggart*, etc), or calling for the assassination of leaders of neighbouring countries (*Pat Robertson*)
  - Rejection of scientific evidence: as with the 400-year procrastination by the Catholic Church in rectifying the well-intentioned misleadership associated with the Galileo affair).
- **Emblematic figures and bodies of the international institutional community**
  - UN Secretaries-General: Kurt Waldheim (as a former Nazi who concealed his past); Kofi Annan (in relationship to the massacres, during his period of office, in which he was complicit with authority in failing to act, and to the actions of his son, Kojo Annan in relation to the oil-for-food scandal)
  - European Commission, under Jacques Santer, forced to resign in 1999 following allegations of a pattern of corruption. In 2003 the Commission was faced with further allegations regarding corruption in its statistical agency (Eurostat) raising the interesting question -- of relevance to the relationship between "real" and "imaginary" -- as to whether vested interests, including some member states, were involved in massaging real European data into imaginary forecasts. The significance of such incidents is compounded by the fact that for 12 years the European Union's auditors have refused to endorse the EU's audit is bad news -- funded by citizen taxpayers (Stephen Mulvey, *Why the EU's audit is bad news, BBC*, 24 October 2006)
  - Paul Wolfowitz forced to resign as President of the World Bank Group
  - Corruption of officials in UN oil-for-food programme (cf *The United Nations: corrupt, ineffective, dangerous*, 22 June 2007)
  - With respect to the openness of the European democratic process, the failure to consult citizens regarding modifications to the EU treaty was appropriately illustrated by the staging by *Open Europe* of an 'alternative family photo' at the EU summit on 21 June 2007. This featured life-size models of all 27 EU leaders with their fingers in their cars - symbolising the determination of Europe's politicians to avoid giving their followers a say in referendums on the new constitutional treaty. [The photo is admirably complemented by the widely touring Finnish men's choir *The Shouters*, who dress in a manner identical to that of summit ministers, and shout national anthems and texts of international treaties -- including the EU Amsterdam Treaty (video)]

**Framing the interplay of leadership and misleadership**

See [Annex 1]

- **Figure 3**: Possible 8-fold Positive-Negative Hybrid Conditions
- **Figure 4**: 8-fold Pattern of Non-Neutral Relationships
- **Figure 5**: Coaction cardioid
- **Figure 6**: Transactional game patterns defining a coaction cardioid
- **Figure 7**: Adaptation of the approach of Figure 6 to leadership and misleadership
- **Figure 8**: Rendering of Mandelbrot set (using in- and out-colouring of image to highlight complexity)
  - **Figure 8a**: Illustration of alternative colouring conventions inside the M-set
  - **Figure 8b**: Progressive emergence of M-set through succession of iterations
- **Figure 9**: Tentative combination of features of preceding tables, using a simplified rendering of Mandelbrot set, to highlight role of
imaginative perception in distinctions between leadership and misleadership

Distinguishing forms of leadership and misleadership
"Hidden" dynamic
"Real" vs "Imaginary"

Framing the interplay of (mis)leadership and (mis)followership

See Annex 2
Leaders vs Followers (Figure 10)
Misleadership and misfollowership as characteristics of faith-based governance?
Image makeovers for misleaders
Principles of misleadership
Misleadership and misfollowership training for potential followers?

Humanity's need for great misleadership?

As noted above, aside from strategic skills by which to outmaneuver opponents, a great leader enables (typically reluctant) followers to surpass themselves and go to places they only later come to understand and appreciate. Appropriate leadership is therefore a judicious blend of leadership and misleadership -- where followers may only be only be persuaded to follow by being misled. Such leadership requires a combination of skills typical of:

- a persuasive salesperson (who can "sell anything to anyone"),
- a diplomatically skilled negotiator or statesperson,
- a charismatic personality,
- a source of wisdom (exemplified by a Zen master offering a transformative koan)

It could be argued that the evolution of the global situation is such that the capacity of leadership as currently framed is inadequate to respond to a situation which is effectively "blocked" -- except in terms of a widespread pattern of tokenistic responses to create the impression of effective action and postpone recognition of failure. The "way forward" is typically articulated in rational instrumentalist terms that reinforce obsolete styles of thought and patterns of behaviour -- possibly on the assumption that their inadequacy will be compensated by faith-based governance and divine intervention.

The paradoxical nature of the situation may be better framed in terms of the possibility that the only viable "way forward" is better described as a non-linear pathway -- of the kind better represented with the tools of the complexity sciences, such as the Mandelbrot set (cf Walking Elven Pathways: enactivating the pattern that connects, 2006). Various questions are raised by this argument:

- What indications are there that such self-referential tools are being adapted to this purpose? (cf Consciously Self-reflexive Global Initiatives: Renaissance zones, complex adaptive systems, and third order organizations, 2007)
- If the essential nature of global community is characterized by a degree of trust based on mutual confidence, paradoxically associated with a degree of confidentiality, is a great leader required to be a "confidence artist" -- both in relation to followers and to opponents?
- Does humanity need a "misleader" more than a "leader" -- someone (or some group) who can "trick" it into a new and more appropriate behaviour pattern?
- As with any magician, or skight-of-hand artist, is there a need to work with "inappropriate identification" by followers and with the cathartic surprise they can anticipate?
- To what extent do strategies in response to problematic conditions -- with or without supporting vested interests -- depend on deception in order to be effective?
- Under what circumstances can deception-free strategies succeed -- other than when openness is itself used to mislead opponents into self-defeating assumptions?
- Does the possibility of non-deceptive, transparent strategies depend on analogues to economic assumptions regarding a perfect market system -- itself dependent on appropriate dissemination of information?

Such questions call for a more attentive focus on the role of confidentiality in relation to the confidence essential to community confidence-building -- otherwise framed as the "battle for hearts and minds". The challenge is that confidentiality is essential to strategic surprise (and associated issues of timing), prudence regarding potentially controversial impacts (collateral damage), and any intention of acquiring or controlling (intellectual) property, including the "moral high ground".

The systematic work of the International Society for Panetics, founded by Taoist R G H Sia (Panetics and Dukkha: an integrated study of the infliction of suffering and the reduction of infliction, 1993) resulted in a quantitative measure of suffering (dukkha). A "megadukkha" represents the order of magnitude of suffering sustained by 1,000 persons for about 10 hours a day, for a year, with severe stomach ulcers and without medication (cf Johan Galtung, Panetics and the Practice of Peace and Development, 1999). This suggests the possibility of an analogous quantitative measure for misleadership in terms of "megamayas" (for example) -- the degree of illusion (maya) sustained in a Potemkin-style society (Globalization within a Global Potemkin Society: a strategic challenge to proactive participation in society, 2000). The "megamaya" would be based on a measure of the number of (classified) documents to which citizens do not have ready access -- as envisaged under freedom of information acts.

The challenge for followers (and the unpersuaded) however is how to distinguish whether the new pattern, as it becomes apparent (rather than as presented), is more appropriate or less, more constructive than destructive. How can the future be most appropriately presented? (cf Presenting the Future: an alternative to dependence on human sacrifice through global pyramid selling schemes, 2001).
This is especially challenging when the credibility of solutions has to be determined by those impatient for immediate solutions within mindsets that may be inappropriate to their comprehension -- as suggested by the maxims:

- If one does not understand how one is part of the problem, one cannot understand the nature of the solution required
- What we need to understand may only be expressible in a language that we do not yet know
- What we now know to be true may later prove to be less meaningful than understanding why we believed this to be so before it was reframed by a larger truth

The challenge is one of distinguishing, in a timely manner, a credible leader from a manipulative con-artist and purveyor of snake-oil. However the distinction may in fact be primarily in the eyes of the beholders, and how they are affected by the interaction, and may have little to do with the actual intent of the catalyst of that transformation. The situation is further complicated by the extent to which the (mis)leader embodies the risks and uncertainties of the situation in order to successfully navigate its challenges -- effectively abandoning the mindset which inhibits an imaginative "out-of-the-box" response to contrary forces. Successful (mis)leaders may be inherently risky to encounter -- as attested by disciples of many gurus regarding their unpredictability (whether appropriate or inappropriate), notably those of the "crazy wisdom" persuasion.

The current global disarray is in danger of invoking new forms of "Hitler" offering immediately credible solutions -- where I understand your "Hitler" as my "Saviour", and you understand my "Saviour" as your "Hitler". A foretaste of this dilemma was to be seen in the manner in which families were divided regarding the appropriateness of the intervention of the Coalition of the Willing. The misleading ways in which any such dilemma can be framed is evident from the pair of interlinked presentations cited above (Strategic Briefing for Satan -- based on professional insights from preemptive news and image management, 1999; Strategic Briefing for the Messiah -- based on professional insights from preemptive news and image management, 1999).

In the longer term, and in a larger scheme of things, the interplay of polarized judgements of appropriateness and inappropriateness may need to be understood as a necessary feature of the dynamic of a complex dissipative system. Hence the value of the Mandelbrot set as a framework for such reflection. This overcomes the tendency to value the constructive conditions (judged "positive") from a short term perspective over the conditions of collapse (judged "negative") from a short term perspective -- typically without recognizing the validity of the decay portions of any cycle, so notably emphasized in recycling (and gardening). Curiously the need (noted above) for a leader effectively to "dance" across the quadrants of the Mandlebrot set might be usefully understood in terms of the quadratic polynomial equation on which it is based.

Appropriate celebration of "misleadership" -- and "misfollowership"?

As argued elsewhere, there is a strong case for acknowledging the various forms of "misleadership" and "misfollowership" with a lighter or more provocative touch to benefit from the insights they may bring (Humour and Play-Fullness: essential integrative processes in governance, religion and transdisciplinarity, 2005; Liberating Provocations: use of negative and paradoxical strategies, 2005; Humour and International Challenges: augmenting problem and strategy comprehension through psycho-cultural catalysts, 1998).

In that spirit, the following possibilities merit consideration:

- **Awards**: There is a case for awards (or magazine-cover treatment) in response to the following:
  - Refusal to obey inappropriate orders, notably as reflected in efforts to honour whistleblowers (eg award ceremonies at the Whistleblower Week in Washington, 2007)
  - Blind obedience to inappropriate orders, following inappropriate instructions, or responding to misleading advertising
  - Misleading people most inappropriately, as with the Misleader of the Year award, or perhaps the Darwin Awards recognizing the most stupid way in which people can accidentally kill themselves
  - Misleading people in ways of greatest benefit to them, as suggested by deliberating introducing them unawares to experiences that are of greatest educational benefit -- or even by the Ig Noble Prize awarded annually for initiatives that "make people laugh, and then make them think."

- **Creating events and organizations**:
  - **Convening of events** to celebrate misleadership, such as traditional carnival and festive events, dating from medieval times and pagan Saturnalia, celebrating the Lord of Misrule (cf 'Lord of Misrule' kicks off Brazil's Rio carnival, 2007) and rulership over the Feast of Fools
  - **Creation of experimental organizations** for the promotion of various forms of misleadership (eg Wanted: Enemies of the Earth and Greenwar International, 1992)

- **Maintaining misleaders in positions of authority** as a means of benefiting from the lessons they continue offer. This might be understood to be the procedure unconsciously pursued by many communities and nations to maximize collective learning.

- **Promotion of research** on the role of misleadership in relation to:
  - Unforeseen social and technical innovation
  - Vulnerability to risk through ignoring the precautionary principle
  - Necessary period of abeyance of disciplined controls; the political function of the court jester or the trickster archetype in many cultures as a god, goddess, spirit, human, or anthropomorphic animal who plays pranks or otherwise disobeys normal rules and norms of behaviour (cf Allan J. Ryan, The Trickster Shift: humour and irony in contemporary native art, 2000; Klaus-Peter Koepping, Absurdity and Hidden Truth: cunning intelligence and grotesque body images as manifestations of the Trickster, History of Religions, 24, 3, 1985, pp. 191-214 )
  - Appointment of misleaders of some form to elicit valued alternative responses
  - Liberation movements as political exercises in misleadership, whether appropriate or inappropriate
  - Reframing challenging institutional situations by the appointment of misleaders, partly inspired by the Peter Principle, the
Emergence of a Global Misleadership Council?

Given the essential ambiguity between leadership and misleadership emphasized above, the question is the extent to which the emergence of some form of Global Misleadership Council can be detected.

Conspiracy theorists have for many decades been highly creative in presenting evidence for the threatening influence of secret elites on society -- and the web is a natural medium for the development and proliferation of such rumours. These elite networks have variously included and combined bodies noted in Figure 12 (for a more comprehensive list see Global Elite Wiki). Some variants focus on emergence of a New World Order, New Age conspiracies, Illuminati, extraterrestrials, and esoteric secret societies.

Many of these preoccupations have been dismissed as unfounded speculation. They do however offer an interesting institutional complement -- the possibility of a singular manipulative global body -- to the contemporary strategic tendency to promote a singular global threat as a necessary focus for future strategy and attention (cf Promoting a Singular Global Threat -- Terrorism Strategy of choice for world governance, 2002).

Like "front organizations", false flag operations are prime examples of misleadership in practice -- whether to be understood as strategically justified or totally questionable in any "just war". Given the historical possibility of false flag operations -- covert operations conducted by governments and others to appear as if they are being carried out by other entities -- it is curious that no official media discuss such a possibility on the occasion of "terrorist incidents" (cf Cui Bono: Grouptink vs Thinking the Unthinkable? Reframing the suffocating consensus in response to 7/7, 2005). Failure to mention such lines of inquiry seriously undermines the credibility of the knee-jerk security responses triggered by such incidents and of the predictable explanations so quickly offered.

These are an exemplification of groupthink -- unworthy of any intelligent community. A case of mobilizing national resources to "bolt the door after the horse has fled" -- a desperate token demonstration of "post facto efficacy" (cf Max Hastings, This gesture security is inevitable: but it has barely any practical value, Guardian, 2 July 2007). Such a socially destabilizing and restrictive response is precisely how terrorists seek to achieve their objectives with comparatively trivial allocation of resources (cf Simon Jenkins, We are offering the terrorist a megaphone for his cause, Guardian, 4 July 2007).

| Figure 12: Framing the challenge of detecting any Global Misleadership Council |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Indicative cited sources of global (mis)leadership by elite groups | "Appropriate" what valuable (mis)leadership has been provided? | "Inappropriate" what regrettable (mis)leadership has been provided? |
| Leadership what has been effectively enabled? | Misleadership what imaginative reframing has been used to enable new action? | Leadership what incompetence has been demonstrated? | Misleadership how have supporters and others been dangerously misled? |
| Alfalfa Club | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Asymmetric Threats Contingency Alliance | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Bilderberg Group | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Bohemian Club / Bohemian Grove | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Club of Budapest | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Club of Rome | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Coalition of the Willing | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Freemasonry | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Global Governance Group | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Illuminati | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| InterAction Council | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Opus Dei | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Society of the Elect (The Round Table) | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Tällberg Forum | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| The Elders | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Tri lateral Commission | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| World Economic Forum | ? | ? | ? | ? |

In addition to such specific examples (however mistakenly cited), religions, sects and cults, whether esoteric, New Age or otherwise, explicitly operate with multiple levels of secrecy accessible only through some initiatory experience, paradigm shift -- or by some understanding of the "grace of God". It is curious how such concentric levels of knowing are echoed in the neolithic architecture of places such as Stonehenge.

Through such levels of misleadership, the leadership within such inner circles must then necessarily mislead -- both those in outer circles and outsiders -- as to its nature and the transformation it seeks to bring about (cf Strategic Opportunities of the Twice Born: reflections
on systemic camouflage of mass deception, 2004; Global Strategic Implications of the "Unsaid": from myth-making towards a "wisdom society", 2003).

Given the characteristic self-righteousness, it may be believed by such leadership (and strongly asserted) that this is being done "in the best interests" of others (and despite their reservations). Even their democratically elected "representatives" avoid seeking their consent -- as with the EU constitutional treaty process. The subsequently proposed Reform Treaty, avoiding any previous commitment to a referendum, is a prime example of "hardcore misleadership" -- with many leaders indicating that its content was at least 90% of that which had previously been rejected (cf EU Referendum, 25 July 2007; Steve Watson, EU Federal Superstate Becoming A Reality: European globalists no longer even pretend the people will have a say, 18 April 2007). This highlights "misrepresentation" in a democracy as a problem of similar nature to "misleadership". As noted earlier, followers evoke from leaders, to some degree, the degree of misleadership that best responds to their collective circumstances. Unconsciously followers may not wish to be conscious of the challenges and decisions the (mis)leader feels to be appropriate.

One unfortunate dimension of misleadership is especially problematic in the case of initiatives with which every hope may be legitimately associated. Examples of such are Synthesis Dialogues, World Future Council, World Wisdom Alliance, and The Elders (Evaluating Synthesis Initiatives and their Sustaining Dialogues, 2000; Future World Council Creation, 2004). The challenge however lies in what such initiatives typically avoid in launching out anew. Especially striking is the extent to which they take a "green-field" approach, avoiding the "brown-field" issue of why their predecessors "failed" -- even though they may continue to exist and attract resources and support. Curiously a key to the relationship between (mis)leadership and (mis)followership is in the nature of education (Latin: educare) -- itself derived from an understanding of leading (out of a condition of ignorance). (Mis)leadership may then be understood as a process of education -- recalling the comparison between education as "lies to children" and politics as "lies to adults" (see Terry Pratchett, Ian Stewart, Jack Cohen. The Science of Discworld, 1999).

This ambiguity is especially evident in relation to leadership in the advancement of knowledge where it might be claimed that scientific leadership is necessarily about truth and avoidance of misleading statements. Misleadership is however indeed evident, as with any communication from the wise, in the extent to which an expert is obliged by the nature of the subject matter (at the limits of current understanding) to knowingly mislead when communicating with the modestly informed, unskilled in the language of the relevant discipline. The challenge is evident over time when an earlier (simpler) theory is still used "because it works", even though this thereby misleadingly obscures a subtler truth of greater validity. Chris Lucas (personal communication) makes the point as follows:

A later theory may well be an improvement, but the earlier one still works better than guesswork or a disproved one! Note that 'replacement' theories are usually rather wider reaching. What quantum mechanics did, compared to Newton's mechanics, was to expand the scope, but Newton's is still usable today, it just doesn't take into account some wider issues. In the same way complexity theory doesn't disprove Newton or quantum mechanics, just widens further the scope - we take account of what we neglected previously (nonlinearity) - so can achieve a 'better guess'.

The current global condition is such that no authority with the power to mislead is able to prove with any credibility that it is not in the process of misleading (cf Marilyn Ferguson, The Aquarian Conspiracy, 1980). This is especially the case when those involved are persuaded of their power and insight

Especially challenging to discernment of appropriateness is the tendency to convene admirable gatherings, even to institutionalize them, as a basis for admirable initiatives where questions of "misleadership" may then be associated with:

- deliberate discrepancies ("double standards", "contradictions") between the admirable declared intentions and those it is intended to pursue in practice (possibly primarily in the interest of the leaders and their immediate followers)
- inadvertent discrepancies, arising from negligence or incompetence, between the support they continue to evoke and the effective implementation of the declared intentions in practice.

In presenting the results of the survey of the Pew Global Attitudes Project (Global Unease With Major World Powers, 2007), the co-chairman, former US Secretary of State Madeline Albright commented that the results showed that The international system as we know it has broken down, according to these numbers". She spoke of a growth of "nihilism" and the "disarray" of international governance. Others have recalled Albright's response on 60 Minutes (1996) when asked about the deaths of Iraqis under US sponsored sanctions: "We have heard that a half million children have died. I mean, that's more children than died in Hiroshima. And, you know, is the price worth it?". She responded "I think this is a very hard choice, but the price -- we think the price is worth it." Some have remarked that her understanding of nihilism may differ from that of others.

Equally strong points about the disarray of Western-dominated international governance, in selecting Tony Blair to be its envoy to Palestine, are made by the Middle East political commentator Robert Fisk (How Could Blair Possibly Get This Job? The Bumbling Envoy, CounterPunch.org, 23/24 June 2007).

For those potentially affected by such misleadership, whether appropriate or not, the challenge is caricatured by the recognition that "if it walks like a duck, talks like a duck, then it probably is a duck". In the light of the initiatives of the Coalition of the Willing -- and tacit support for its action, notably by some represented in Figure 12 -- it would appear that there is some form of emergent Global Mischleadership Council. Like al-Quida, it may be primarily an idea inspiring strategic action of various forms by various less-shadowy bodies (Jason Burke, Al-Qaida is now an idea not an organisation, Guardian, 5 August 2005). But the challenge of whether it is understood to be acting appropriately or inappropriately is what will continue to divide people -- dangerously.

The fundamental challenge in a global society may be that of understanding what forms "appropriate misleadership" may take and under
what conditions. How to be engaged by strategic options whose nature is beyond our immediate comprehension -- given the credibility challenge of those undertaking such initiatives, supposedly in our "best interests"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges and insights of other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given the central role of &quot;leadership&quot;, why do many languages choose to use the English term untranslated? Why is &quot;leadership&quot; (or &quot;followership&quot;), let alone &quot;misleadership&quot; (or &quot;misfollowership&quot;), so challenging to translate into other languages, even other European languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the other hand, are there some languages that have richer articulations of styles of leadership and followership that take better account of the distinctions highlighted above? Such possibilities are indicated by several compilations (Howard Rheingold, <em>They Have a Word for It: a lighthearted lexicon of untranslatable words and phrases</em>, 1988; Adam Jacot de Boinod, <em>The Meaning of Tingo: and other extraordinary words from around the world</em>, 2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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