


The Essentials of Theory U

Core Principles and
Applications



C. Otto Scharmer

If you enjoy this excerpt...

consider becoming a member of the reader
community on our website!

[Click here for sign-up form.](#) Members automatically get 10% off
print, 30% off digital books.

The Essentials of Theory U

Other books by the Author include

Theory U: Leading from the Future as it Emerges 1st Edition

*Leading from the Emerging Future: From Ego-system to
Eco-system Economies*

Prescence: Human Purpose and the Field of the Future

The Essentials of Theory U

Core Principles and
Applications

C. Otto Scharmer



Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
a BK Business book

The Essentials of Theory U

Copyright © 2018 by C. Otto Scharmer

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law. For permission requests, write to the publisher, addressed "Attention: Permissions Coordinator," at the address below.



Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

1333 Broadway, Suite 1000

Oakland, CA 94612-1921

BK

Tel: (510) 817-2277, Fax: (510) 817-2278

www.bkconnection.com

Ordering information for print editions

Quantity sales. Special discounts are available on quantity purchases by corporations, associations, and others. For details, contact the "Special Sales Department" at the Berrett-Koehler address above.

Individual sales. Berrett-Koehler publications are available through most bookstores. They can also be ordered directly from Berrett-Koehler: Tel: (800) 929-2929; Fax: (802) 864-7626; www.bkconnection.com

Orders for college textbook/course adoption use. Please contact Berrett-Koehler: Tel: (800) 929-2929; Fax: (802) 864-7626.

Distributed to the U.S. trade and internationally by Penguin Random House Publisher Services.

Berrett-Koehler and the BK logo are registered trademarks of Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

First Edition

Paperback print edition ISBN 978-1-5230-9440-0

PDF e-book ISBN 978-1-5230-9441-7

IDPF e-book ISBN 978-1-5230-9442-4

2018-1

Book producer: Westchester Publishing Services

Text designer: Lynn L'Heureux

Cover designer: Richard Adelson

Interior illustration: Kelvy Bird

To

*the emerging movement of people who
bridge the three major divides of our time:
the ecological, the social, and the spiritual divide.*

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Preface	ix
Part I: A Framework for Seeing the Field	1
1. The Blind Spot	3
Three Divides	4
The Blind Spot	6
In Front of the Blank Canvas	8
Arriving at MIT	9
Learning from the Future as It Emerges	9
Building the Container	13
Social Fields	14
2. Theory U—Form Follows Consciousness	16
Making the System See Itself	16
A Moment of Seeing	19
The Process: Three Movements	20
Mapping the Deeper Territory	22
Three Instruments of Inner Knowing	25
Three Enemies on the Journey Down the Left Side of the U	28
Two Barriers to Moving Up the U	29
Presencing and Absencing	29
3. The Matrix of Social Evolution	33
The Grammar of Social Fields	33
Attending	40
Conversing	42
Organizing	47
Coordinating and Governing	51
Field 1 to Field 4: A Journey of Inversion	55
Making the System Sense and See Itself	58

4. The Eye of the Needle	59
“I Expect a Lot from You”	60
Reintegration of Matter and Mind	61
The Essence of Systems Thinking	62
Through the Eye of the Needle	64
Inverting the System-Self Relationship	64
From Reacting to Regenerating	72
 Part II: A Method for Consciousness-Based Systems Change	 75
5. One Process, Five Movements: Innovating from the Future	77
Co-initiating: Uncovering Shared Intention	78
Co-sensing: Seeing Reality from the Edges of the System	84
Presencing: Connecting to the Highest Future Potential	98
Co-creating: Crystallizing and Prototyping the New	114
Co-shaping: Grow Innovation Eco-systems	123
 Part III: A Narrative of Evolutionary Societal Change	 131
6. Upgrading Society’s Operating System	133
Economy 4.0	134
Democracy 4.0	141
Cross-Sector 4.0	142
4.0 Lab	148
 7. Returning to the Roots	150
With Compliments to the East German KGB	150
Staying on Course	151
“I Can’t Not Do It”	152
u.lab	153
Get Involved	157
 About the Author	159
About the Presencing Institute	160
Index	161

Preface

Ten years after the original publication of Theory U in 2006, my publisher approached me about writing this book. Somewhat more politely than this, he said: “Okay, *Theory U* has been selling well. But frankly, we have no idea why. It is almost impossible to read. Five hundred pages, dozens of tables, hundreds of footnotes—it embodies everything that a publisher would tell you *not* to do.” Then he suggested, “Why don’t you, for a change, now write a book that is readable—shorter, more accessible, and updated?”

I probably seemed a bit offended. When he saw that, he quickly pointed out how a couple of other authors, whom I happen to admire, had done what he was suggesting: First, write comprehensively about what you have invented, and then in the next book explain it in a more accessible way. The book you are now holding is the result.

I hope it will serve you well. By providing this introduction to Theory U—an awareness-based method for changing systems—I try to answer the question: How do we learn in the face of disruption? How do we learn from the future as it emerges?

Theory U blends systems thinking, innovation, and leading change—from the viewpoint of an evolving human consciousness. Drawing on the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) tradition of action research and learning by doing, Theory U has evolved over two decades of experimentation and refinement

by a vibrant global community of practitioners. At its core, Theory U comprises three main elements:

1. A framework for seeing the blind spot of leadership and systems change
2. A method for implementing awareness-based change: process, principles, practices
3. A new narrative for evolutionary societal change: updating our mental and institutional operating systems (OS) in all of society's sectors

Part I explores the framework and main ideas of Theory U (chapters 1–4). It illuminates the most important blind spot in leadership today: the “interior condition” from which we operate.

Part II describes the process, principles, and practices of Theory U (chapter 5). It showcases practical methods and tools for change makers. The focus is on building the collective capacity to *shift the inner place* from which we operate.

Part III introduces a new narrative for profound evolutionary change in society (chapters 6–7). What does it take to redesign societies in ways that address the pressing challenges of our time? What does it take to apply the power of mindfulness to the transformation of the collective system? This part of the book outlines a framework for updating the “operating systems” of our educational institutions, our economies, and our democracies. This framework applies the core concepts of Theory U to the transformation of capitalism.

Theory U integrates these methods and lineages for effecting change:

- Action research and organizational learning in the tradition of Peter Senge, Ed Schein, Donald Schön, Chris Argyris, and Kurt Lewin

- Design thinking in the tradition of Tim Brown and Dave Kelly
- Mindfulness, cognition science, and phenomenology in the tradition of Francisco Varela, Jon Kabat-Zinn, Tanja Singer, Arthur Zajonc, and David Bohm
- Civil society movements in the tradition of Martin Luther King Jr., Nelson Mandela, Mahatma Gandhi, and millions of others who are mobilizing change in their local contexts

Theory U Leadership: Cultivate the Social Field

At its core, Theory U makes a distinction between the different ways that action and attention come into the world. ***I pay attention this way, therefore it emerges that way.*** Or, as the late CEO of Hanover Insurance, Bill O'Brien, put it: "The success of an intervention depends on the interior condition of the intervener."

Theory U draws our attention to the *blind spot* in leadership today: the "interior conditions," the sources from which we operate both individually and collectively.

Since I grew up on a farm, I like to compare our interior condition to a field. Each field has two dimensions: one that is visible, what's growing above the surface; and one that is invisible, what's beneath the surface—that is, the quality of the soil.

The same distinction applies to social fields. We can see what people do, the practical outcomes that they accomplish in the visible realm. But we rarely pay attention to the deeper root condition: the *source* and interior condition *from* which we operate. Theory U draws our attention to that blind spot—to the invisible source dimension of the social field, to the quality of relationships that we have to each other, to the system, and to ourselves.

Theory U identifies four different ways (or sources from) that action and attention come into the world. They arise from a quality

of awareness that is (1) habitual, (2) ego-systemic, (3) empathic-relational, or (4) generative eco-systemic.

The essence of leadership is to become aware of our blind spot (these interior conditions or sources) and then **to shift the inner place from which we operate** as required by the situations we face. This means that our job as leaders and change makers is **to cultivate the soil of the social field**. The *social field* consists of the relationships among individuals, groups, and systems that give rise to patterns of thinking, conversing, and organizing, which in turn produce practical results.

Social fields are like social systems—but they are seen *from within*, from their interior condition. To shift from a social *system* perspective to a social *field* perspective, we have to become aware of our blind spot, the source level from which our attention and our actions originate. That source level fundamentally affects the quality of leading, learning, and listening.

The problem with leadership today is that most people think of it as being made up of individuals, with one person at the top. But if we see leadership as the capacity of a system to co-sense and co-shape the future, then we realize that all leadership is distributed—it needs to include everyone. To develop collective capacity, everyone must act as a steward for the larger eco-system. To do that in a more reliable, distributed, and intentional way, we need:

- A social grammar: a language
- A social technology: methods and tools
- And a new narrative of social change

The grammar of the social field is spelled out in Part I. The method, an awareness-based social technology, is spelled out in Part II. In Part III, they are incorporated into a narrative of societal and civilizational renewal.

Theory U revolves around a core process of co-sensing and co-shaping emerging future possibilities. But it is much more than that. The grammar and the method outlined in this book work as a matrix, not as a linear process. Some of the leadership capacities that are at the heart of the U method include:

- **Suspension and wonder:** Only in the suspension of judgment can we open ourselves up to wonder. Wonder is about noticing that there is a world beyond our patterns of downloading.
- **Co-sensing:** You must go to places of most potential yourself because it is in these connections that the seeds of the future come into the world. Connect with these places with your mind and heart wide open.
- **The power of intention:** The power of “intention” is key. In all presencing work, the deeper intention is the opposite of corporate indoctrination. It is about increasing, not decreasing, your range of possibilities. It is about strengthening your sources of self in a world that otherwise tends to tear us apart. It is about making you aware of your own sources of curiosity, compassion, and courage.
- **Co-creating:** Explore the future by doing, by building small landing strips for the future that wants to emerge.
- **Container building:** Create new holding spaces that activate the generative social field.

The problem with our current societal eco-systems is the broken feedback loop between the parts and the whole. Theory U offers a method for **relinking the parts and the whole** by making it possible for the **system to sense and see itself**. When that happens, the collective consciousness begins to shift from **ego-system awareness** to **eco-system awareness**—from a **silo view** to a **systems view**.

The Theory U methods and tools enable groups to do this on the level of the collective. For example, Social Presencing Theater makes it possible for a group of stakeholders in a system to sense and see themselves—both individually and collectively—by **bending the beam of observation back** onto the observer.

This matters because **energy follows attention**. Wherever we put our attention as leader, educator, parent, etc.—that is where the energy of the team will go. The moment we see the quality of attention shifting from ego to eco, from *me* to *we*, that is when the deeper conditions of the field open up, when the ***generative social field*** is being activated.

My work with these and other methods of change over the past two-plus decades boils down to this: The quality of results achieved by any system is a function of the quality of awareness that people in these systems operate from. In three words: **Form follows consciousness**.

Acknowledgments

While a new methodology for leading awareness-based systems change is at the heart of this book, it is also about the journey of the self—in this case, *myself*, a kid who grew up on a farm, became an activist in social movements, and then started rethinking economics and building learning infrastructures in teams, in organizations, and on the societal level. This journey has of course been embedded in a whole web of relationships that co-created the work described in this book.

My heartfelt thanks goes out to the global network of partners and collaborators who helped (1) to articulate this framework, (2) to refine the methodology, and (3) to co-create a narrative and movement that, given today's challenges, has never been more timely.

A deep bow to the co-creators of the Presencing Institute (PI):

The co-founders

- Katrin Kaufer, for pioneering new capacity-building environments in values-based banks by blending the intentional use of capital with presencing practices
- Arawana Hayashi, for creating *Social Presencing Theater*, a new method and art form for embodied knowing in social systems
- Kelvy Bird, for creating the method of *generative scribing* that embodies presencing practices through visual practice
- Marian Goodman, for growing a global eco-system of building capacity around presencing practices
- Dayna Cunningham, for teaching us how to bring presencing practices to complex environments of systemic racism, and structural violence
- Ursula Versteegen, for bringing presencing practices into mindful agriculture
- Beth Jandernoa and the Circle of Seven for holding the space for all the above

The u.lab core team

- Adam Yukelson, for co-creating the u.lab platform and leading the content creation of u.lab 1X (“From Personal Change to Prototype”) and 2X (“Seven Acupuncture Points of Transforming Capitalism”)
- Julie Arts, for facilitating the global u.lab Hub Host community and for leading the content creation of u.lab 3X (“How to create Your Innovation Lab: Pathway to Practice”)

- Angela Baldini and Simoon Fransen, for facilitating and supporting the multi-local Hub Host and u.lab community
- Lili Xu and Jayce Lee, for inspiring and co-creating u.lab China and activating an amazing country-wide innovation eco-system around it
- Martin and Aggie Kalungu-Banda, for co-creating and prototyping u.lab Africa and working with numerous multi-stakeholder initiatives across the continent

Our core team partners in various parts of the world

- Frans Sugiarta, Dr. Ben Chan, and Shobi Lawalata, for co-facilitating and co-leading the u.lab and IDEAS programs in Indonesia in collaboration with United In Diversity
- Julia Kim and Ha Vinh Tho, for blending Gross National Happiness (GNH) with presencing practices in Bhutan, Vietnam, and Thailand
- Kenneth Hogg and Keira Oliver, for implementing u.lab in the Scottish government to activate ABCD (asset-based community development)
- Denise Chaer for pioneering the Food and Nutrition Lab in Brazil
- Katie Stublely, for building collective presencing capacity in Australia
- Manish Srivastava, for blending presencing practice and Gandhi inspired grassroots change in India
- Gene Toland, for creating a Latin American community of practice
- Reola Phelps and Wibo Koole, for the Sustainable Food Lab in Ethiopia

- Beth Mount, for blending inclusion work with Social Presencing Theater
- Liz Solms and Marie McCormick, for leading our L.A. Education Lab
- Dieter van den Broeck for applying the U process in ecosystem restoration
- Susan Skjei and Kathryn Schuyler for advancing awareness-based action research
- John Heller and our Synergos institute colleagues in lab initiatives around the world
- Cherie Nursalim and our United in Diversity colleagues from Indonesia and China
- Claudia Madrazo and our La Vaca Independiente colleagues in Mexico
- Wiebke König and Katharina Lobeck from GIZ Global Leadership Academy

Our circle of advisers and board members

- Peter Senge, Ed Schein, Arthur Zajonc, Diana Chapman Walsh, Eileen Fisher, Isabel Guerrero, Becky Buell, Antoinette Klatzky, Christian von Plessen, for co-inspiring PI from idea to global impact

And

- Janice Spadafore, for her magical skills in applying some structure to the dynamic chaos of all the above!

Much appreciation to my colleagues at MIT including Deborah Ancona and Phil Thompson, and to President Rafael Reif and Sanjay Sarma, MIT's VP for Digital Learning, for their leadership in creating MITx, edX, and spaces that allow platforms like u.lab to thrive.

Also a big thank you to Joseph Jaworski, Brian Arthur, John Milton, Eleanor Rosch, Ikujiro Nonaka, Francisco Varela, Nan Huai-Chin, Henri Bortoft, Betty Sue Flowers, Michael Jung, and Adam Kahane, who were critical contributors to the first articulation of Theory U through the book *Theory U* and the book *Presence* (co-authored with Senge, Jaworski, and Flowers).


Finally, I would like to thank Katrin for her significant input on the manuscript; Barbara Mackay, Jan Byars, and Rob Ricigliano for commenting on (parts of) the draft; Janet Mowery for applying her great editorial craft to the text; Kely for contributing the wonderful figures; Jeevan Sivasubramaniam for suggesting I write this book; and the entire Berrett-Koehler team for turning the manuscript into a book that I hope will be meaningful to you. Thank you all.

Enjoy the read!

Otto Scharmer
Cambridge, MA
September 1, 2017

PART I

A Framework for Seeing the Field



Some people say that, for all the talk about change, very little actually happens. But in my experience that is not true. I have seen tectonic shifts several times in my life. I saw it when the Berlin Wall collapsed in 1989—and with it the Cold War system. I saw it when the apartheid system ended in South Africa. I saw it when a youth movement swept the first African American president of the United States of America into office. I saw it when the center of the global economy shifted from the West to East Asia over the past two or three decades. And I see it now in the recent rise of autocrats, nationalists, and far-right movements as a counter-reaction to a single sided globalization and as an overlay to something of even higher significance: the awakening of a new awareness across the planet.

Even though not every one of these changes amounted to a tectonic shift, this much I know: today, *anything can happen*. I believe that the most important tectonic shift of our lifetime is not behind but right in front of us. That shift has to do with **the transformation of capitalism, democracy, education, and self.**

This page intentionally left blank

1

The Blind Spot

We live in a moment of profound possibility and disruption. A moment that is marked by the dying of an old mindset and logic of organizing. And one that is marked by the rise of a new awareness and way of activating generative social fields. What is dying and disintegrating is a world of Me First, bigger is better, and special interest group-driven decision making that has led us into a state of organized irresponsibility.

What is being born is less clear. It has to do with shifting our consciousness from **ego**-system to **eco**-system awareness—an awareness that attends to the well-being of all. In many places around the world we can actually witness the awakening of this awareness and its underlying force: an activation of the *intelligence of the heart*. Groups that begin to act from such an awareness can, in the words of UC Berkeley cognitive psychologist Eleanor Rosch, “be shockingly effective.”

The beginnings of this shift may seem small and insignificant in comparison with the vast challenges that we face worldwide. And in many ways they are. Yet I believe that they hold the seeds for a profound *civilizational renewal* that is called for in order to protect and further activate the essence of our humanity.




FIGURE 1: The Challenge of Disruption

My friend and Presencing Institute co-founder Kelvy Bird captures this felt sense in the image of an abyss (figure 1).

If we picture ourselves on the left-hand side of the image, we can see a world that is disintegrating and dying (the structures of the past); on the right-hand side we see the new mental and social structures that are emerging now. The challenge is to figure out how to cross the abyss that divides the two: how to move from “here” to “there.”

This picture, in a nutshell, depicts the journey of this book: the journey across the abyss, from a current reality that is driven by the past to an emerging future that is inspired by our highest future potential.

Three Divides

Today this journey matters more than ever. If we look into the abyss, we see three major divides. They are:

- The *ecological divide*: unprecedented environmental destruction—resulting in the loss of nature.

- The *social divide*: obscene levels of inequity and fragmentation—resulting in the loss of society—the social whole.
- The *spiritual divide*: increasing levels of burnout and depression—resulting in the loss of meaning and the loss of Self. With the capital ‘S’ Self I mean not the current ego self but the highest future potential.

The ecological divide can be summed up by a single number: 1.5. Currently our economy consumes the resources of 1.5 planets. We use 1.5 times the regeneration capacity of planet earth. And that is just the average. In the United States, for example, the current consumption rate has surpassed five planets.

The social divide can be summed up by another number: 8. Eight billionaires own as much as half of mankind combined. Yes, it is true. A small group of people that you can fit into a minivan owns more than the “bottom half” of the world’s population: 3.8 billion people.

The spiritual divide can be summed up by the number 800,000. More than 800K people per year commit suicide—a number that is greater than the sum of people who are killed by war, murder, and natural disasters combined. Every forty seconds there is one suicide.

In essence, we are collectively creating results that (almost) nobody wants. These results include the loss of nature, the loss of society, and the loss of Self.

In the nineteenth century many countries saw the rise of the social divide as a major issue, and it has shaped our public awareness ever since. In the twentieth century we saw the rise of the ecological divide, particularly during the last third of the century. It too has shaped our public awareness.

And at the beginning of the twenty-first century we are seeing the rise of the spiritual divide. Fueled by the massive technological disruptions that we have experienced since the birth of the World Wide Web in the 1990s, advances in technology will replace about half of our jobs by 2050. We are now facing a future that “no longer needs us,” to borrow the words of computer scientist and co-founder of Sun Microsystems Bill Joy, and that in turn forces us to redefine who we are as human beings and to decide what kind of future society we want to live in and create. After the various types of tyrannies that we saw throughout the twentieth century, are we now moving into a tyranny of technology? This is one of the questions we face when we look into the abyss.

In other words, we live in a time when our planet, our societal whole, and the essence of our humanity are under attack. That may sound a bit dramatic. Still, I believe it understates the significance of our current moment.

So where is the hope? The biggest source of hope in our time is that more and more people, particularly the younger population, realize that the three divides are not three separate problems. They are essentially three different faces of **one and the same** root issue. What issue is that? The blind spot.

The Blind Spot

There is a blind spot in leadership, management, and social change. It is a blind spot that also applies to our everyday social experience. The blind spot concerns the inner place—the source—from which we operate when we act, communicate, perceive, or think. We can see *what* we do (results). We can see *how* we do it (process). But we usually are not aware of the *who*: the inner place or *source* from which we operate (figure 2).

Let me explain. I first stumbled onto this blind spot when talking to Bill O'Brien, the longtime CEO of Hanover Insur-




FIGURE 2: The Blind Spot of Leadership

ance. From his many years of leading transformational change, Bill summed up his greatest insight like this: “*The success of an intervention depends on the interior condition of the intervener.*”

Bill’s statement opened my mind: What counts is not only what leaders do and how they do it but also their “interior condition”—that is, their inner *source*.

It dawned on me that Bill was pointing at a deeper dimension (the source) from which our actions, communication, and perceptions arise, and which allows us to sense and connect with a whole new set of future possibilities.

The quality of how we pay attention is a largely hidden dimension of our everyday social experience—whether it is in organizations, institutions, or even our personal lives. As we conduct our daily business, we usually are well aware of *what* we do and *how* we

do it—that is, the processes we use. But if we were asked *where* our actions come from, most of us would be unable to provide a clear response. In my research I began to call this origin of our actions and perceptions the *source*.

In Front of the Blank Canvas

Reflecting on my conversation with Bill O'Brien made me realize that, every day, we interact on both visible and invisible levels. To better understand this point, consider the work of an artist.

We can look at art from at least three perspectives:

- We can focus on the *thing* that results from the creative process—say, a painting.
- We can focus on the artist's *process* in creating the painting.
- Or we can observe the artist at the moment when she is standing in front of a *blank canvas*.

In other words, we can look at the work of art *after* it has been created, *during* its creation, or *before* creation begins.

If we apply this analogy to leading change, we can look at the change maker's work from three similar angles. First, we can look at *what* leaders and change makers do. Many books have been written from that point of view. Second, we can look at the *how*, the processes leaders use. We have used that perspective in management and leadership research for more than two decades.

Yet we have never systematically looked at the leader's work from the blank-canvas perspective. The question we have left unasked is: What *sources* are leaders and change makers actually operating from? For example: What quality of listening, what quality of attention, do I bring to a situation—and how does that quality change the course of action moment to moment?

To sum up the discussion of the three divides: While the ecological divide arises from a disconnect between *self* and *nature*, and

the social divide arises from a disconnect between *self* and *other*, the spiritual divide arises from a disconnect between *self* and *Self*—that is, between who I am *today* and who I might be *tomorrow*, my highest future possibility.

Arriving at MIT

When I arrived at MIT from Germany some twenty-four years ago, my goal was to learn how I could help change makers in society deal with the big challenges of disruption that keep coming our way. The then newly created MIT Organizational Learning Center (OLC), directed by Peter Senge, author of *The Fifth Discipline*, brought together a unique constellation of leading action researchers from MIT and Harvard, including Ed Schein, Chris Argyris, Don Schön, Bill Isaacs, and many others. This book is heavily shaped and inspired by the opportunity to work in this network and circle of wonderful colleagues and friends, along with many other valued collaborators from other institutions and places.

Looking back at my own journey today, I see three major insights and learnings that have shaped my journey of exploring the blind spot.

Learning from the Future as It Emerges

My first insight is quite elemental. There are two different sources of learning: (1) learning by reflecting on the *past* and (2) learning by sensing and actualizing *emerging future* possibilities.

All traditional organizational learning methods operate with the same learning model: learning by reflecting on past experiences. But then I saw time and again that in real organizations most leaders face challenges that cannot be responded to just by reflecting on the past. Sometimes past experiences are not particularly helpful. Sometimes they are the very obstacles that keep a team from looking at a situation with fresh eyes.

In other words, learning from the past is necessary but not sufficient. All disruptive challenges require us to go further. They require us to slow down, stop, sense the bigger driving forces of change, let go of the past and let come the future that wants to emerge.

But what does it take to learn from the emerging future? When I started to ask this question, many people looked at me with a blank stare: “Learning from the future? What are you talking about?” Many told me it was a wrongheaded question.

Yet it was that very question that has organized my research journey for more than two decades. What sets us apart as human beings is that we can connect to the emerging future. That is who we are. We can break the patterns of the past and create new patterns at scale. No other species on earth can do this. Bees, for example, may be organized by a much higher collective intelligence. Yet they have no option to change their pattern of organizing. But we as humans do.

Let me say this in different words. We have the gift to engage with two very different qualities and streams of time. One of them is a quality of the present moment that is basically an extension of the past. The present moment is shaped by what has been. The second is a quality of the present moment that functions as a gateway to a field of future possibilities. The present moment is shaped by what is wanting to emerge. That quality of time, if connected to, operates from *presencing* the highest future potential. The word presencing blends “sensing” with “presence.” It means to sense and actualize one’s highest future potential. Whenever we deal with disruption, it is this second stream of time that matters most. Because without that connection we tend to end up as victims rather than co-shapers of disruption.

How can we connect to this second stream of time as individuals, as organizations, and as eco-systems? That exploration has guided my research journey over the past two decades. It has

led me to describe a *deep learning cycle* that uses a different kind of process—one that moves us to the edges of the system, connects us to our deepest sources of knowing, and prompts us to explore the future by doing. This deep learning cycle applies both to our professional and our personal lives. For example, as a sixteen-year-old, I had an experience that gave me a real taste of what it looks and feels like to be pulled by the field of emerging future potential.

Facing the Fire

When I left our farmhouse that morning for school, I had no idea it was the last time I would see my home, a large, 350-year-old farmhouse. It was just another ordinary day at school until about one o'clock, when the teacher called me out of class and said I should go home. I had no idea what might have happened, but felt it wasn't good news. After the usual one-hour train ride I ran to the entrance of the station and jumped into a cab. Long before the cab arrived, I saw huge gray and black clouds of smoke billowing into the air. My heart was pounding as the cab approached our long driveway. I recognized neighbors, area firefighters, and policemen. I jumped from the cab and ran through the crowd that had gathered, down the last half-mile of our chestnut-lined driveway. When I reached the courtyard, I could not believe my eyes. The world I had lived in all my life was gone. Up in smoke.

As the reality of the fire in front of me began to sink in, I felt as if somebody had ripped the ground from under my feet. The place of my birth, childhood, and youth was gone. As I stood there, taking in the heat of the fire and feeling time slow down, I realized how attached I had been to all the things destroyed by the fire. Everything I thought I was had dissolved. Everything? No, perhaps not everything, for I felt that a tiny element of myself still existed. *Somebody* was still there, watching all this. Who?

At that moment I realized there was another dimension of myself that I hadn't previously been aware of, a dimension that related to my future possibilities. At that moment, I felt drawn upward, above my physical body, and began watching the scene from that elevated place. I felt my mind quieting and expanding in a moment of unparalleled clarity. I was not the person I had thought I was. My real self was not attached to all the material possessions smoldering inside the ruins. I suddenly knew that I, my true Self, was still alive! It was this "I" that was the Seer. And this Seer was more alive, more awake, more acutely present than the "I" that I had known before. No longer weighed down by the material possessions the fire had just consumed, with everything gone, I was lighter and free, released to encounter the other part of myself, the part that drew me into the future—into *my* future—into a world waiting for me to bring it into reality.

The next day my eighty-seven-year-old grandfather arrived for what would be his last visit to the farm. He had lived in that house all his life, beginning in 1890. Because of medical treatments, he had been away the week before the fire, and when he arrived at the courtyard the day after the fire, he summoned his last energy, got out of the car, and went straight to where my father was working on the cleanup. Without seeming to notice the small fires still burning around the property, he went up to my father, took his hand, and said, "Kopf hoch, mein Junge, blick nach vorn!" ("Keep your head up, my boy, look forward!") Then, after a few more words, he turned, walked back to the waiting car, and left. A few days later he died quietly.

That my grandfather, in the last week of his life, with much of what he had been cultivating all his life gone up in flames, was able to focus on the emerging future rather than reacting to the loss, made a big impression on me.

Only many years later, when I had started to work on learning from the emerging future rather than from the past, did I start doing my best work. But I realize now that it was seeded in that early experience.

Building the Container

“I hate when people say ‘there are two types of people . . . ,’” my MIT mentor Ed Schein said to me one day. Then, with the hint of a smile, he continued: “But there really are two types of people: those who understand process and those who don’t.”

Ed is right. Understanding **process** means to understand the making of our social relationships. If you want to change a stakeholder relationship from, say, dysfunctional to helpful, you cannot just order people to do it. You have to intervene further upstream in the process of social reality creation. You have to change the *making* of that relationship from one mode to another—for example, from reactive to co-creative.

Similarly, with respect to the “source” level of creativity, we can say that there are two types of people: those who understand containers and those who do not. Container building is facilitator-language for forming a good holding space. Often in organizations you see CEOs and executives who fail to get that. They think they can create behavioral change just by making speeches and pushing tools onto the organization. Tools are important. But they are also overrated because they are so visible. But what is usually underrated is all the stuff that is invisible to the eye—for example, the less visible elements of a good holding space: intention, attention, and the subtle qualities of deep listening. Building a good container means to build a good holding space for a *generative social process*.

Much of the conventional language and toolkits around managing change turn out to be partially useful at best. For example,

consider the term “driving change.” When have you asked your family how much they like you to “drive” their web of relationships from one state to another? Good luck with that. The reality of leading profound change has little to do with one person “driving” the change of another. It is the wrong metaphor, the wrong approach. What I feel may be more useful is the metaphor of the farmer.

Which brings me to my third learning, and also back to my roots. . . .

Social Fields

I grew up on an 800-year-old farm near Hamburg. Sixty years ago, my parents decided to abandon conventional industrial farming techniques (using pesticides, herbicides, and chemical fertilizers) and replace them with organic methods (focusing instead on cultivating the living eco-system of the farm). Every Sunday my parents took me, my sister, and my two brothers on a *Feldgang*—a field walk—across the fields on our farm. Once in a while my father would stop, bend over, and pick up a clump of soil from a furrow so that we could learn to recognize its different types and structures. The quality of the soil, he explained, depended on a whole host of living entities—millions of organisms living in every cubic centimeter of the soil—whose work is necessary for the earth to breathe and to evolve as a living organism.

Just as we did on those field walks of my youth, this book will take you on a similar journey where every now and then we stop and examine a case story or a piece of data that helps us understand the deeper structures of the “social field.” And just as the organic farmer depends completely on the living quality of the soil, social pioneers depend on the living quality of the social field. I define *social field* as the quality of relationships that give rise to patterns of thinking, conversing, and organizing, which in turn produce practical results.

And just as the farmer cannot “drive” a plant to grow faster, a leader or change maker in an organization or a community cannot force practical results. Instead, attention must be focused on improving the quality of the soil. What is the quality of the social soil? It is the quality of relationships among individuals, teams, and institutions that give rise to collective behavior and practical results.

Looking back, I realize that my journey over the past four decades has been one of cultivating social fields. My parents cultivated the fields on the farm. My colleagues and I cultivate social fields. And if you happen to be a manager, educator, entrepreneur, social entrepreneur, performing artist, health professional, parent, or movement builder, that is probably your work, too.

The deeper experiences and levels of the social field, described here, are familiar to everyone who is engaged in creating movements, startups or profound change. In my own case, I first got involved with the environmental, green, antinuclear, and peace movements of the late 1970s and 1980s, and later in launching the Presencing Institute as a new type of global social enterprise. Later in the book I will share some of those experiences in more detail. At this point I just want to draw your attention to the fact that none of these experiences are unique or extraordinary.

On the contrary, they are actually quite ordinary. Many people have them. And yes, they do take you “out of the box,” like the fire experience took me out of my physical body for a moment or two. And yet many of us have these experiences a lot more often than we realize at first sight.



2

Theory U—Form Follows Consciousness

Theory U focuses on how individuals, groups, and organizations can sense and actualize their highest future potential.

You are probably familiar with the philosopher René Descartes's famous statement, "I think, therefore I am." That's not where we start from the Theory U vantage point. From a U perspective we would say, *I attend* (this way); *therefore it emerges* (that way). For example: the quality of my listening co-shapes how the conversation unfolds. Or, speaking more generally, the quality of results in any social system is a function of the *consciousness* from which the people in that system operate. Boiled down to three words, the idea can be expressed as **form follows consciousness**.

Making the System See Itself

Over the past couple of decades I must have seen this happen hundreds of times: groups, sometimes large, sometimes small, going through a subtle shift in awareness in how they see, sense, and relate to each other, to their system, and to themselves.

Figure 3 depicts the mindset shift at issue here: switching from seeing the system as something "out there" (figure 3a) to

seeing the system from a perspective that includes one's own self (figure 3b).

When that shift happens on an individual level, we call it *mindfulness*. Mindfulness is the capacity to attend to the experience of the present moment while *paying attention to your attention*.

When the same shift happens in a group, we call it *dialogue*. Dialogue is not people talking to each other. Dialogue is *the capacity of a system to see itself*. To see its own patterns. To see its own assumptions.

That capacity is, of course, also the essence of systems *thinking*: making the system see itself. Or, as we would say in the context of Theory U-based systems change: **making a system sense and see itself**.

When you deal with managing change then you know that the bulk of the job is moving people from a “silo view” to a systems view—or, as we would say, from an *ego*-system awareness to an *eco*-system awareness.

In fact, what surprises me most is how reliably we can create conditions that allow for that kind of shift in awareness to happen. You can't manufacture it. You can't mold it like a piece of metal by hammering on it from the outside. But you can create a set of inner and outer conditions that allows a group, an organization, or a system to make that move, to sense and see themselves from the emerging whole.

Many people have asked me: How actually did you come up with the U framework? What are its origins? In this chapter, I will share mini-stories and ideas that illuminate the origins of Theory U. All interviews quoted can be found on the Presencing Institute website in the section Dialogue on Leadership (www.presencing.org).



FIGURE 3a: Seeing the System Out There (Adapted from Andreas Gradert)



FIGURE 3b: Bending the Beam of Observation to Seeing System and Self (Adapted from Andreas Gradert)

A Moment of Seeing

Shortly after I arrived at MIT in 1994, I watched a live broadcast on organizational learning facilitated by Peter Senge and Rick Ross, co-authors of the *Fifth Discipline Fieldbook*. In response to a question from the audience, Rick Ross went to the whiteboard and mapped the systems thinking “iceberg model” with the following words:

Structure
Process
Mental Models

Seeing these words made me aware of two things. One is that organizational change happens on different levels. And two, probably there needed to be a fourth level beneath the three depicted on the whiteboard. When I wrote the three words down, I spontaneously added a fourth level that represented the *source*. Later I began to refer to the fourth level as “presencing.”

Shortly thereafter I connected these four levels with the image of a U: One traveled down the left-hand side of the U from surface to source, differentiating levels of perception (projecting, perceiving, perceiving perception, intuition), and then up the right-hand side of the U, passing through different levels of action (envisioning, enacting, embodying).

Why did I use the U-shape? First, I was interested in depicting a *process* that showed the unearthing of the different system levels of the iceberg. Second, I had seen a different version of the U in two other places years before. One was in the work of the Austrian organizational development and conflict resolution expert Friedrich Glasl. In his model he used the U to differentiate the levels of identity, people, and politics, and the techno-physical realm of organizations. The other place where I saw the U described as an evolutionary principle was in the work

of the early twentieth-century educator and social innovator Rudolf Steiner. Reading Steiner was the key source of inspiration not only for me but also for Glasl. So, if any one person should be credited with originating the U process of evolutionary thinking, it should be Rudolf Steiner. A radical social innovator, Steiner has had a lasting impact; his institutional innovations include Waldorf schools, biodynamic farming, integrative medicine, phenomenological science, and a meditative path to self-development.

The Process: Three Movements

Fast-forward four and a half years. Now we are in early 1999 and I am traveling with my good friend and colleague Joseph Jaworski, author of *Synchronicity: The Inner Path of Leadership*, to Xerox PARC in Palo Alto, California, a research site in the heart of Silicon Valley. It is a place that once housed what many even today consider the most creative team ever. That team created, among other things, laser printing, Ethernet, the modern personal computer, the graphical user interface, and other key features of what later became a multitrillion-dollar industry. Yet, ironically, its parent company, Xerox, never took full advantage of these inventions. But someone else did: Steve Jobs. The rise of Apple was basically a function of putting together all the key ideas that he saw at Xerox PARC. But back to our meeting.

We met with W. Brian Arthur, the founding head of the economics program at the Santa Fe Institute, who also had an office at PARC. Brian started by talking about the changing economic foundations of today's business world. "You know," he said, "the real power comes from recognizing patterns that are forming and fitting with them."

He went on to discuss two different levels of cognition. "Most tend to be the standard cognitive kind that you can work

If you enjoy this excerpt...

consider becoming a member of the reader
community on our website!

[Click here for sign-up form.](#) Members automatically get 10% off
print, 30% off digital books.