Leadership and Foresight in a Changing and Challenging World

A Call for Servant-Leadership

—David Whitfield

Intercultural Leadership, Inc.—Washington, U.S.

> The greatest leader forgets himself and attends to the development of others.
>
> —Lao Tzu (600 BCE)

This paper addresses four global leadership challenges that demand different leadership theories, models, and philosophies because of how these challenges affect and will continue to affect what the future portends for a changing world. They are persistent, potentially destructive, life-changing, and have been for many decades; they are also opportunities for corporate leaders to use their power to create possibilities throughout the world to minimize poverty, facilitate the acquisition of clean drinking water, decrease illiteracy, and diminish greed. What is the role of corporations regarding these global challenges?

Corporations are less likely to create such possibilities, since they are legal entities. Meaning, their leaders are bound by law (Bakan, 2004) to maximize shareholders' investments, desires, and whims. So when it comes to developing countries where many corporations make their money, chances are conditions for the poor in those countries will remain: living without clean drinking water, struggling through life not knowing what they don't know or experiencing illiteracy, enduring the consequences of greed, and lingering in poverty. Given the laws governing corporations, foresight—the central ethic of leadership (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 37) might be an approach for them to gain a different perspective on how their decisions affect citizens of developing nations.

"Over the last 150 years the corporation has risen from relative obscurity to become the world's dominant institution" (Bakan, 2004, p. 5). Bakan adds that corporations rule our lives by first determining "what we eat, what we watch, what we wear, where we work, and what we do. We are inescapably surrounded by their culture, iconography, and ideology" (p. 5). One may conclude that corporations are more powerful than governments and thus have become vulnerable, which could lead to their demise. As Bakan states, "Corporations now *govern* society, perhaps more than governments themselves do; yet ironically, it is their very power, much of which they have gained through economic globalization, that makes them vulnerable" (Bakan, 2004, p. 25).

According to Bakan (2004), politicians and businessmen were suspicious of the corporation from the time it first emerged in the late sixteenth century.

> The corporation was unlike the prevailing partnership form with small groups of men who bonded together by personal loyalty and mutual trust, pooled their resources to set up businesses they ran as well as owned, the corporation separated ownership from management—one group of people, directors and managers, ran the firm, while another group, shareholders, owned it. (p. 6)

Based on this unique design, many believed it was a perfect "recipe for corruption and scandal" (p. 6). Adam Smith warned of this (as cited in Bakan, 2004) in his *The Wealth of Nations*, that managers could not be trusted to steward "other people's money," "negligence and profusion" would be the outcome as when "businesses organized as corporations" (p. 6). The behavior of corporations was such that England banned them for more than fifty years (Bakan, 2004). The South Sea Company in England was such a case in point, according to Bakan. The South Sea Company was established as a trading company, "trading slaves with the Spanish in South America" (pp. 6–7). It was fraught with scams from the very beginning and it collapsed. It was so corrupt that it was brought before Parliament; some were fined and others were jailed (p. 7). "As for the corporation itself, in 1720 Parliament passed the Bubble Act which made it a criminal offense to create a company "presuming to be a corporate body" and to issue "transferable stocks without legal authority" (p. 7).

Bakan adds,

[O]ver the last three hundred years, corporations have amassed such great power as to weaken the government's ability to control them. A fledgling institution that could be banned with the stroke of a pen in 1720, the corporation now dominates society and government. (p. 8)

Corporations are pervasive, powerful, and privileged. Despite what they do for, or do to developing countries, specifically, corporations go in and take developing countries' natural resources (oil, water, diamonds, etc.) with little or no regard for the welfare of the citizens of those countries. And that's because "Corporations are created by law and imbued with purpose by law. Law dictates the roles corporate leaders and managers must play" (Bakan, 2004, p. 35). According to Bakan, in the United States and other industrialized countries, "the corporation, as created by law…compels executives to prioritize the interests of their companies and shareholders above all others and forbids them from being socially responsible—at least genuinely so" (p. 35). As cited in Bakan (2004, p. 34), Milton Friedman asserted,

A corporation is the property of its stockholders. Its interests are the interests of its stockholders. Now, beyond that should it spend the stockholders' money for purposes which it regards as socially responsible but which it cannot connect to its bottom line?…There is but one "social responsibility" for corporate executives…they must make as much money as possible for their shareholders. This is a moral imperative. (p. 34)

Friedman firmly believes that executives are immoral if they "choose social and environmental goals over profits—or those who try to act morally—are, in fact, immoral" (p. 34). Again, stockholders own the corporation. And who owns the resources corporations take from the land of the developing countries? It may be lawful for them to maximize stockholders' investments; it is not lawful for them to take property that doesn't belong to them. Men created laws and men can change them, especially when it comes to the welfare of those who sit atop the resources that make corporations rich while others go without and suffer. A bit of foresight could change the conditions: world poverty, illiteracy, hunger, lack of potable water for billions of people, and greed would be minimized.

Namely, foresight is a servant-leadership characteristic that enables servant-leaders to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequences of their decisions in the future (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 18).

Embracing foresight, corporate leaders might anticipate the likely outcome of a situation (Greenleaf, 1977) by considering the history (civil war, genocide, etc.) of countries with oil, diamonds, and other potentially lucrative commodities; they might consider the degree to which countries are experiencing poverty, hunger, or lack of clean water, before they extract oil and other resources. For example, before deciding how to maximize profit from oil, corporate leaders may reflect on what might happen to the future of those living where the oil is located. Will there be civil war, protracted poverty, and more genocide as a result of their decisions and actions? Will the human rights of poor citizens of oil-rich developing countries be violated? Yes, the law stipulates corporate rules about maximizing shareholders' investment (Bakan, 2004). And I believe both conditions can exist concurrently: maximizing shareholders' investments and accommodating the needs of the citizens of the countries in which they operate. After all, who owns the oil, the diamonds, the water? To whom do these commodities belong? There is no law that says avoid a "win-win" for all relevant parties. With foresight in mind, corporate leaders might create possibilities to realize the well-being of poor citizens of oil-rich, developing countries. Otherwise, corporate leaders become complicit in violation of human rights and setting the stage for death and destruction, despite what the law says. And when it comes to corporations being complicit in violating human rights, Pinaud holds:

> The operation of oil companies in countries that are well known for repeated human rights violations begs the questions of complicity. Are these companies entitled, because of free trade policies, to pursue activities that increase tensions inside the local community? Since the sole purpose of oil companies is to increase their profits, they often do so at the heavy cost of human lives. Because of their complicity regarding human rights violations, they have often been targeted in places such as Angola, Nigeria, and Malaysia. The heavy involvement of oil companies in Sudan, whose money acts to exacerbate the conflict, further warrants the question of responsibility. (Pinaud, n.d., p. 1)

She further asserts that no matter who writes the reports regarding oil companies' endeavors, be they by U.N. or local NGO, all reports have the same conclusion:

> [T]he revenues created out of oil exploitation and the greed that these revenues create have only acted to further inflame the conflict. On the one hand, fighting intensifies because of government policies around oil

exploration and on the other hand governmental forces continue to use more and more sophisticated weapons obtained by oil profits. Although oil is not the only cause of the conflict, it seems to have become a critical contributor to its intensification. (Pinaud, n. d.,p. 1)

As Bakan posits, "Corporations are not democratic institutions—their directors and managers owe no accountability to anyone but the shareholders that employ them" (p. 151), as Bakan adds,

> Initially, corporations were established to serve the public institution whose purpose was to serve national interests and advance the public good….The modern for-profit corporation, programmed solely to advance the *private* interest of its owners, differs profoundly from these earlier versions of the institution. Yet in one crucial respect it remains the same: it is, as it has always been, a product of public policy, a *creation* of the state. (p. 153)

ARE CORPORATIONS TRANSFORMABLE?

What keeps corporate leaders from considering a different point of view? There are alternatives to the corporate posture, as White suggests. White (2006) and his colleagues established the GTI—Great Transition Initiative; it consists of "a network of engaged thinkers and thoughtful activists who are committed to rigorously assessing and creatively imagining a *great transition* to a future of enriched lives, human solidarity, and a healthy planet. And their key question is, 'What is the purpose of the corporation?'" (p. 6).

White believes there is a chance to transform corporations, though it requires a change in what they value. In his "Transforming the Corporation," he believes there is hope through the "*Great Transition*" (p.1) for corporations.

> A *Great Transition* envisions a sea of change not only in individual values and behaviors, but also in the values and behaviors of institutions, including economic entities to which societies grant the license to operate. A shift from consumerism, individualism and domination of nature to human solidarity, ecological sensibility and enhanced quality of life ultimately means changes in values. But such individual transformation ultimately must be expressed through, and reinforced by, the institutions around which society organizes itself. To achieve both individual and institutional change, organizations must be transformed and, through a virtuous circle, reinforce the values that trigger such transformation in the first place. (p. 7)

To aid in transformation, corporations may consider the servant-leadership philosophy, specifically foresight (Greenleaf, 1977). Foresight "is a characteristic that enables the servant-leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of a decision for the future" (Spears, 2005, p.4). Though the law dictates that corporations must maximize shareholders' interests, it does not mandate that while doing so, they exacerbate the conditions of citizens from developing nations.

When it comes to leadership, Greenleaf posits that servant-first and not leader-first thinking should be at the fore. "The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 27). An example is, people living in developing countries where their natural resources (oil, water, diamonds, etc.) are extracted with little or no regard for their priority needs are prime for servant-first thinking (Greenleaf, 1977). Testing servant-first thinking, per Greenleaf, is very challenging. "The best test is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they *while being served*, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?" (p. 27). When the priority needs of people are ignored, they are left worse off, especially when it comes to oil and water. "*And*, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will they benefit or at least not be further deprived?" (p.27). Leaders who consider the servant-first principle while crafting corporate vision statements may prevent violating human rights and lessen the chances of war.

I believe the roles leaders play in shaping visions and bringing those visions to fruition should differ from roles heretofore. "A well crafted vision statement," according to Schaetti, Ramsey, and Watanabe (2008, p. 108), "can serve as a compass for how we want to be in the world, and can help us determine how best to respond to a particular situation or person." According to Zander and Zander (2000) vision statements provide the framework for creating possibilities. Creating vision statements may help leaders lead from the head and heart; simultaneously, it may help them embrace foresight and include all relevant parties, resulting in a more fruitful outcome for all. Greenleaf's (2002) servant-first thinking would facilitate leading from the heart, especially if leaders desire to accommodate the priority needs of those affected by their visions and decisions. White (2006) supports the relevance of vision.

> The Great Transition vision compels us to reconsider the design of corporations to make their behavior harmonious with a form of global development that is equitable, sustainable, and places the quality of human well-being at the center of economic activity. (p. 8)

As White asserts, leading the corporation as usual is not sustainable despite what the law says about its purpose. Global leaders in general and leaders of oil companies in particular are in an excellent position to make it sustainable, to embrace servant-leadership's characteristics, such as listening. Listening is the foundation of servant-leadership (Greenleaf, 1977). At a minimum, listen to the villagers, for example, of Ecuador, Nigeria, or Burma, where citizens were left worse off than they were prior to Texaco's extracting oil from their land (McMillan, 2003).

Empathy is another servant-leadership characteristic available to leaders. "We need to go beyond listening: we need to be empathic with others" (Spears & Lawrence, 2004, p. 137). Neither globalization nor nation-states will be sustainable if these challenges are *not* addressed by leaders who respect people, their priority needs, their cultures, their natural resources, and their conditions (Greenleaf, 1977). Cultural arrogance and corporate greed are not necessary for accommodating shareholders or maximizing profits. That means leaders have opportunities to create communities of possibilities; they can become contributors to improve the human condition. Such contributions may take the form of visionary statements, namely: food without boundaries; or, clean drinking water for the world; or, survivability for the world. Becoming servants first (Greenleaf, 1977), leaders are more likely to lead from the heart and perhaps become better contributors by putting people before profits. This leads to the first global challenge, poverty.

GLOBAL POVERTY

Poverty is the worst form of violence.

—Gandhi

I believe that the first global challenge needing immediate leadership attention is global poverty. Shah (2007) avers that parts of the world—nearly three billion people—live on less than two dollars a day. One may wonder what that foreshadows for world leaders. Musa (2008) cites how a hungry man is an angry man, and that leaders keep that in mind as their impoverished populations struggle with food costs driven ever higher by record oil prices. With the practice of the servant-leadership (Greenleaf, 1977), leaders have the potential to decrease chances of conflict, avert the risk of war over natural resources, reduce greed, and minimize poverty.

Consider the meager two dollars per day three billion people spend to live on (Shah, 2007) with the gross domestic product of the poorest forty-eight nations; that is less than the total wealth of the world's three

richest people. So what keeps corporate leaders and heads of nation-states from creating policies that address the primary needs of the poor? When leaders lead while embracing foresight, their policies and decisions are more advantageous to creating possibilities, to meeting citizens' priority needs, helping to alleviate poverty, hunger, and illnesses. There are endless reiterations to do more (Blank, 2007); very little progress has been made and global poverty is becoming more bothersome.

There are potential corporate solutions to global poverty (Blank, 2007). Three examples may demonstrate how corporations can help the poor and at the same time paint a different, more positive corporate picture.

First, Lodge and Wilson (2006) (as cited in Blank) suggest that "corporations have gained legitimacy by maximizing shareholder value and meeting consumer desires in the marketplace" (p. 1); that a "growing international consensus has begun to expect companies to adhere to the greater calling of addressing community needs, giving rise to a 'legitimacy gap,' where corporations' stated aims and purposes are at odds with those of the larger community" (p. 1). They suggest that the legitimacy gap be closed, which may be done by "encouraging profitable pursuits that open up the enormous markets of developing countries, creating mutually beneficial relationships among governments, corporations, and developing populations" (p. 1). This is consistent with Greenleaf's idea of foresight, meaning that corporate leaders consider the potential consequences of their decisions.

Second, Joseph (2010) posits the idea of poverty reduction strategies; this approach would involve international financial institutions, local governments, and civil society organizations. The aim is to:

Create participatory processes within government to include central ministries, parliament, and sub-national government;

Involve other stakeholders, namely, civil-society groups, women's groups, ethnic minorities, policy-research institutes and academics, the private sector, trade unions, representatives from the country's regions;

Include bilateral and multilateral external-development partners' involvement, including collaborative analytical work to support poverty development; and,

Establish mechanisms to consult the poor and their representatives. (Joseph, 2010, p. 1)

According to Joseph (2010), it would be necessary to establish a framework for mutual accountability and processes for monitoring performance metrics. This calls for a partnership among corporations, civil society, NGOs,

and other relevant entities. This will involve monitoring states' behavior (Joseph, 2010, p. 1); meaning, governments would be required to publish annual progress reports, meet various objectives relevant to government performance in poverty reduction, plus government accountability to citizens.

The third example demonstrates how an individual (not a corporation) is able to take steps to reduce poverty. Mohammad Yunus has dedicated the past three decades to lifting the human spirit and eliminating poverty (Ivanova, 2007). He has said, "Poverty is perhaps the most serious threat to world peace, even more dangerous than terrorism, religious fundamentalism, ethnic hatred, political rivalries" (Yunus, 2007, p. 105). Yunus is a paragon to follow because he personifies servant-first thinking (Greenleaf, 1977) in considering the priority of people's needs. An American-educated economics professor, he witnessed the devastating impact famine had in 1974 in Bangladesh. He decided to loan twenty-seven dollars each to forty-two individual villagers in Grameen, Bangladesh; this was so successful that the Grameen Bank was born (Ivanova, 2007, p. 1). By 2007, the Grameen Bank had loaned the equivalent of $6 billion (U.S.) to more than seven million poor people who otherwise would not qualify for a loan, and 97 percent of them were women. This is also an example of not doing business as usual; it is a stellar example of servant-first thinking and foresight (Greenleaf, 1977), leaving those served better off than they were.

I believe corporations have an opportunity to create a different future when it comes to famine and poverty, especially by embracing White's concept of transition.

> A *Great Transition* envisions a different kind of future, one in which the values of equity, ecological sustainability, and quality of life undergird societal behavior, choices and institutions. A world of corporate power amidst social marginalization, and organizational wealth amidst the impoverishment of billions, is incompatible with this portrait of the future. (p. 7)

SHORTAGE OF CLEAN DRINKING WATER

> Water, water, everywhere,
> And all the boards did shrink.
> Water, water everywhere,
> Nor any drop to drink.
> —Samuel Taylor Coleridge, "The Rime of
> the Ancient Mariner" (1798)

The second challenge is the shortage of potable water throughout the developing world. According to Srivastava (2007) a lack of access to clean drinking water is a reality for more than 1.2 billion people, which is about 20 percent of the world's population. For children under age five, water-related diseases are the leading cause of death.

According to Srivastava (2007), providing access to potable water remains one of the greatest challenges for the global community today; it is essential to life and the lifeblood of our planet. This challenge is partly caused by consumption abuse. An example is the Coca-Cola Company (Srivastava, 2007). As a champion of unsustainable use of water globally, Coca-Cola is the largest beverage company in the world, and according to its own admission (Srivastava, 2007) the company used 283 billion liters of water in 2004; 283 billion liters of water is a lot of water—particularly in a world where more than one billion people cannot meet their basic water needs. That's more than seventy-three trillion gallons of water. It is enough water to meet the entire world's drinking needs for ten days! If we used the water that Coca-Cola extracts in one year, we could meet the entire drinking needs of people who don't currently have access to clean drinking water for forty-seven days (Srivastava, 2007). Coca-Cola, too, can think differently by embracing the servant-first philosophy. "Servant-leaders strive to understand and empathize with others" (Spears & Lawrence, 2004, p. 137).

To add insult to injury, according to Srivastava, Coca-Cola doesn't just stop at extracting 283 billion liters of water; it proudly boasts that it has a water use ratio of 2.7 to 1. That is, for every 2.7 liters of water (fresh water) it takes from the earth, it produces 1 liter of product. What happens to the remaining 1.7 liters (or 63%) of the water? It is used to clean bottles and machinery, and is discarded as wastewater (Srivastava, 2007). Perhaps if Coca-Cola embraced *empathy*, the second characteristic of servant-leaders (Spears & Lawrence, 2004), one of Indian citizens' primary needs, that of water, would be addressed with different results. Spears and Lawrence (2004) speak about recognizing the moment of truth, meaning, visualizing how to improve the lives of those who are poor, hungry, and thirsty (p. 139). I agree with Greenleaf when he says, "Caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is the rock upon which a good society is built" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 49).

In a world where 20 percent of people do not have access to potable water, it is indeed preposterous that any company could extract such large quantities of life-sustaining water, and convert the vast majority of the fresh

water into wastewater. Especially given that fresh water is scarce—only 2.5 percent of all the water in the world is fresh water, the rest being salt water, according to Srivastava. Srivastava further states that Coca-Cola's water use ratio in India is four to one—that is, 75 percent of the fresh water it extracts is turned into wastewater (Srivastava, 2007). Srivastava adds that Coca-Cola has indiscriminately discharged its wastewater into the surrounding fields, severely polluting the scarce remaining groundwater as well as soil, all in the name of stockholder interests.

The impact, according to Srivastava, is felt by the communities (of India) who live around Coca-Cola's bottling plants. In India where more than 70 percent of the population still makes a living related to agriculture, taking away the water and poisoning the remaining water and the soil have had dramatic consequences.

Coca-Cola too can be transformed per White's Transition Initiative (2006, p. 6). "This initiative compels us to reconsider the design of corporations to make their behavior harmonious with a form of global development that is equitable, sustainable, and places the quality of human well-being at the center of economic activity." White's idea of shifting "from consumerism, individualism and domination of nature to human solidarity, ecological sensibility and enhanced quality of life ultimately means changes in values" (p. 7). Despite what corporate laws say, Coca-Cola can change its worldview.

According to Kostigen and Rogers (2007) another source of tremendous waste of water is the world's golf courses. Golf courses consume 2.5 billion gallons of water each day to keep their grounds irrigated and green, which is the same amount of water required to support around 4.7 billion people per day (Kostigen & Rogers, 2007). Vision statement regarding clean drinking water might read: a world of potable water; or, clean drinking water in every village. Not only are billions of people thirsty, they suffer also from illiteracy.

GLOBAL ILLITERACY

Literacy is not a luxury; it is a right and a responsibility. If our world is to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century we must harness the energy and creativity of all our citizens.

—Bill Clinton

Illiteracy is my third global challenge for corporate leaders. There are more than 860 million illiterate adults in the world, two-thirds of whom are

women (Annan, 2003). That means some 567 million women suffer and will suffer until servant-first leaders surface to meet their needs. Helping achieve literacy is vital in its own right. Literacy unlocks the door to learning throughout life; it is essential to development and health, and opens the way for democratic participation and active citizenship in every village, town, and city (Annan, 2003). Why are there so many illiterate citizens in the world? Perhaps a more poignant question would be: Why is there not more awareness of the magnitude of this major challenge?

Awareness, which is another servant-leadership characteristic, means not only keeping in touch with one's self but also keeping in touch with others (Spears & Lawrence, 2004, p.142). While this challenge is greatest in developing countries, no society in the world can claim that illiteracy has been fully eradicated. Many developed countries are experiencing modest but worrying levels of illiteracy. In all countries, illiteracy is connected to patterns of poverty, social exclusion, and inequalities (Sharma, 2003).

However, even poor countries have shown that where there is the political will, much can be achieved. Cuba was able to mobilize nearly 270,000 adults to reduce illiteracy from 23 percent to 3 percent within a few years of Fidel Castro's 1959 revolution (Sharma, 2003). More recently, Haiti, with a 52 percent illiteracy rate, has opened thousands of centers to teach Creole and reduce illiteracy to 25 percent (Sharma, 2003).

According to Monten (2007) no country is immune from illiteracy. In many of the world's richest countries where free universal primary and secondary education are widely seen as having wiped out illiteracy, nearly a quarter of the adult population is incapable of understanding and using information contained in brochures, or instruction leaflets for household appliances or medicines (Monten, 2007).

Great Britain and other developed countries are experiencing similar global challenges (Monten, 2007). In Great Britain, the rate of functional illiteracy is 21 percent; that's more than seven million people. A survey conducted by the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) compared its twelve member countries, stating that, depending on the country, between 25 and 75 percent of the respondents aged sixteen to sixty-five did not have a literacy level for coping with the demands of modern life and work. Sweden, according to Monten, had the highest functional literacy level, Poland the lowest. There was no statistically significant difference among Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Switzerland, UK, and the United States;

however, the United States came in fifth out of six countries: Bermuda, Canada, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, and the United States; only Italy had a worse rate of literacy/numeracy (Monten, 2007).

To help leaders create a world of possibilities (Zander & Zander, 2000), I believe a vision statement toward diminishing illiteracy might read as follows: educational possibilities for every man, woman, and child, or a literate world. The ideas of Joseph (2010) regarding strategies for poverty reduction may be applied to illiteracy reduction, to help "create participatory processes within government to include central ministries, parliament, and sub-national government" (p. 7) to help minimize illiteracy. Additionally, corporations, in conjunction with civil society groups, women's groups, ethnic minorities, academic institutions, and other relevant stakeholders, are in a position to help alleviate or minimize illiteracy (p. 1).

GREED

> There is no calamity greater than lavish desires. There is no greater guilt than discontentment. And there is not greater disaster than greed.
>
> —Lao-Tzu

Greed is the fourth global challenge necessitating different leadership strategies. Guharoy (2008) defines greed as an excessive desire to acquire or possess more (especially more material wealth) than one needs or deserves.

Gandhi (as cited in Klein, 2007) says it best about greed:

An economic war is prolonged torture. And its ravages are no less terrible than those depicted in the literature on war properly called. We think nothing of the other because we are used to its deadly Effects….The movement against war is sound. I pray for its success. But I cannot help the gnawing fear that the movement will fail if it does not touch the root of all evil—human greed. (p. 129)

Do the wealthy really need so much while there are millions suffering? This is directly relevant to many living in developing nations: homeless, illiterate, hungry, and thirsty, where oil and other resources are extracted. Greed rolls over the interests of people in villages or communities (Donnelly, 2004). Ecuador is a prime example. After forty years of extracting oil from the Ecuadorian rain forest (Smith & Gullo, 2008), Texaco left eighteen billion gallons of toxic oil waste, sludge in some 356 wells covering an area as large as Rhode Island, polluting all the sources of water villagers used

for fishing, drinking, swimming, etc. According to Smith and Gullo, this is considered one of the world's largest oil-related environmental catastrophes. Without money, people are in dire straits; they cannot survive; they need to buy food, find accommodations, and educate their children. Without money, some resort to stealing (and possibly killing innocent others) to put food on the table or a roof over their heads. This is consistent with Greenleaf's (1977) notion about caring for those in need, which is the rock upon which a good society is built.

Northouse (2001) relates servant-leadership to those who have less. "In addition to serving, the servant-leader has a social responsibility to be concerned with the 'have-nots' and to recognize them as equal stakeholders in the life of the organization" (Northouse, 2010, p. 385). Perhaps greed would be less frightening if corporations valued everyone in the community, especially those communities where citizens are left worse off than before the corporation took their natural resources and ignored their primary needs.

Greed, according to Guharoy (2008), leads to corporate arrogance, contributes for the most part to the nearly three billion people living on less than two dollars daily. There is, unfortunately, an oversupply of greed along with the need to distort the truth (Guharoy, 2008). Guharoy believes that greed has taken over, and has become a global corporate culture spreading like a cancer, unchecked. A suggested vision here might be: a world of contribution, or, a world of equitable sharing. I believe captains of industry, CEOs, CIOs, stockholders, etc., are able to create a framework for sharing, contribution, and possibilities, despite the laws of corporations.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, despite the current leadership theories, models, and philosophical orientations, corporate leaders who practice foresight—the central ethic of leadership—and lead from the head as well as the heart are more able to create communities of possibilities for all: for those living in poverty, unable to access clean drinking water, suffering from illiteracy, and suffocating under greed. Corporate leaders are also more able to create and implement visions that are all-encompassing, visions that respect the culture, conditions, and natural resources of every woman, man, and child especially in developing nations. I believe corporations are transformable and are able to change their worldview, opening the possibility of becoming more responsible world citizens by practicing foresight. They are in better positions to be

viewed as paragons to follow by creating paradigms to minimize greed, cease taking poverty-stricken countries' natural resources—e.g., oil, diamonds, water, etc.—and leave developing countries in better condition. If corporations are not willing to transform, I believe people will continue to retaliate through terrorism and other acts of violence.

So, my call to corporate leaders is to interrogate their thinking about: (1) the processes of leadership; (2) how they make their profits; (3) how their decisions affect the civil rights and human rights of citizens of developing nations; (4) the violence that often ensues due to their corporate presence in oil-rich, diamond-rich, etc., countries; and finally, (5) hiding behind corporate law. This is not leadership, but, rather, a form of cowardice.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

David Whitfield, is a senior consultant for Intercultural Leadership, Inc. He studied organizational leadership at the University of San Francisco where he wrote his dissertation on computer literacy of four-year college professors and graduating high school seniors. David Whitfield established Integral Leadership, Inc., a training, consulting, and career coaching company in Frankfurt, Germany, in 1987 and led it for some twenty years. He has worked with seven of the NATO partners: Germany, Belgium, Greece, The Netherlands, England, Iceland, and Italy, where he provided training and consulting. He teaches Intercultural Leadership, Leadership and Social Justice, Leadership and Economics, Leadership and Diversity, and Statistics. David Whitfield stresses personal and professional development of individuals, groups, and nations, focusing on awakening the minds of leaders and challenging the status quo by inviting us to lead from the heart.

REFERENCES

Annan, K. (2003). Literacy prerequisite for reaching global anti-poverty goals. Speech presented at the United Nations. Retrieved April 25, 2008, from http:// www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2003/sgsm8849.doc.htm.
Bakan, J. (2004). *The corporation: The pathological pursuit of profit and power*. New York: Free Press.

Blank, S. (2007). A corporate solution to global poverty: How multinationals can help the poor and invigorate their own legitimacy. *Journal of Economic Issues, 41*, 1186–1192.

Donnelly, M. (2004). The people v. corporate greed. Counterpunch Newsletter. Retrieved April 25, 2008, from http://www.counterpunch.org/donnelly05142004.html.

Gilbert, K. (2006). Malaria, poverty kill children in Angola. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from http://www.nothingbutnets.net/node/32.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power & greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.

Guharoy, D. (2008). Global hunger, corporate greed: When will enough be enough? Retrieved April 27, 2008, from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2008/04/15/global-hunger-corporate-greed-when-will-enough-be-enough.html.

Pinaud, C. (n. d.). Sudan, between oil and civil war. [Review of the book *Sudan, between oil and civil war*, by J. Hery (2003)].

Ivanova, M. (2007, Summer). Inequality and government policies in central and Eastern Europe. *East European Quarterly, 41*(2), 167–204. Retrieved April 20, 2008, from Academic Search Premier Database.

Joseph, J. (2010). Poverty reduction and the new global governmentality. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, 35*, 29–51.

Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Kostigen, T., & Rogers, E. (2007). *The green book*. New York: Crown.

McMillan, J. (2003). *Angola's mislaid billions*. Stanford: Stanford Graduate School of Business.

Monten, M. (2007). More than one-third of Washington D.C. Residents Are Functionally Illiterate. Retrieved April 26, 2008, from http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/183792/more_than_onethird_of_washington_dc.html.

Musa, T. (2008). Hungry crowds spell trouble for world leaders. Retrieved April 26, 2008 from http://www.reuters.com/article/latestCrisis/idUSL23502580.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schaetti, B. F., Ramsey, S. J., & Watanabe, G. C. (2008). *Personal leadership: A methodology of two principles and six practices*. Seattle: FlyingKite Publications.

Shah, A. (2008). Causes of poverty. *Trade, Economic Issues*. Retrieved April, 27, 2008, from http://www.globalissues.org/TradeRelated/Poverty.asp.

Sharma, Y. (2003). Literacy a global problem. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-url_id=10513&url_do=do_topic url_section=201.html. New Change Courier No. 2 April 2003.

Smith, M., & Gullo, K. (2008). Texaco Toxic Past Haunts Chevron as Judgment Looms. Retrieved March 25, 2009, from http://chevrontoxico.com/news-and-multimedia/.

138

Spears, L. C., & Lawrence, M. (2004). *Practicing servant-leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Srivastava, A. (2007). *Coca-Cola and water: An unsustainable relationship* Retrieved April 25, 2008 from http://www.commondreams.org/views06/0307-30.htm.

YourDictionary.com. Retrieved April 28, 2008, from http://www.yourdictionary.com/greed.

Yunus, M. (2007). *Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism*. Philadelphia: Perseus Books.

Zander, R. S., & Zander, B. (2000). *The art of possibility*. New York: Penguin.