NEW HORIZONS, NEW FUTURES

Our leadership must move us from the Smart City to a place where we can see the future, unconstrained and untethered from used narratives and placed into a new narrative which defines what our cities’ future ought to be: a designed future which, as previously mentioned, pulls the city to its own aspirational image, complements the city’s strengths, and positions the city to seize opportunities for its citizens several decades and centennial years from today. Our leadership must also act with one intent, meaning leadership action should not separate the city from the citizen, unlike the current smart city narrative that, although aspiring and intending to have the citizen as a co-creator within the city, is failing because the citizen and the city are viewed as two different entities. More so, the current narrative makes the city smart and the citizen dumb. This is because an extraordinary emphasis on technology continues to minimize the role of the citizen and alienates a large number of non-tech sector and non-tech savvy citizens (Gupta, Chauhan, & Jaiswal, 2019; Neirotti, De Marco, Cagliano, Mangano, & Scorrano, 2013; Simonofski, Serral Asensio, De Smedt, & Snoeck, 2018). The fact is the future of the city and its citizens are inescapably intertwined as one. The old axiom, “what we do to one, we will do to the other” would be true because the citizen and the city cannot be separated. In short, our leadership must
take us to a new place and unify these two entities (city and citizen). That place is the *Foresight City*.

Foresight City is the metaphor representing the gamut of humanity, the space where the current, emerging, and future generations are able to join hands as coexisting brothers and sisters responsible and accountable to one another. This metaphor forms a powerful image in our minds which, in the present, thrusts us backward in time and then pulls us forward into the future. The thrust backward gives us insight as to how we arrived at where we are today, so we can gain wisdom. The pull forward gives us farsightedness, so we can actively reach for the judgments, consensus, and advice of the future in the decision-making process of today. Foresight City certainly disrupts the order of things. It does challenge our consciousness and sensory to think deeply and be farsighted. In thinking about how the Foresight City challenges us, I am drawn first to the insightful words and leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. A minister and the most prominent leader of the American civil rights movement. King led the civil rights movement from 1955 until his assassination in 1968 (King, 1964). He lived in a polarized and discriminatory world plagued by atrocious acts of violence against a minority. Most shocking when one thinks about King’s time is all the turmoil and appalling acts of violence were happening in a society known as civilized and having become advanced politically, economically, and most certainly technologically unlike any other nation in the world. Many of us could say that, as a nation and in spite of the progress still to be made, the United States has come a long way to accomplish what King spoke about in his well-known “I Have a Dream” speech as making every hill and mountain low and the crooked paths straight (King, 1963). This progress has been an inspiration for many nations and has provided a more fertile ground for American citizens. Still, as I read some of King’s speeches today (51 years later), I cannot help but think about the prophetic sense of his words. For instance, the thought the destiny of one group is tied to another, the freedoms of one group are inextricably bound to the freedoms of another, and we cannot walk alone. And finally, even when we face difficulties today (and will face them tomorrow), it is a dream (a powerful, uncontrollable imagery of the upcoming) the force that is going to pull us through to beautiful beginnings.

King’s words express the sense of the interconnectedness of all things in the universe: the physical, the spiritual (back also to Covey’s point about creation discussed in Chapter 9), the man-made, and the natural.
Moreover, we take these four interactions combined (the physical, spiritual, natural, and man-made) and realize these are minuscule interconnected parts of a myriad of unseen forces within the universe which are not always obvious, as in the laws of physics, chemistry, thermodynamics, equilibrium, gravity, vibration, inertia, and the like each with its own unique systems of feedback loops and time-delay factors which many times surprise us. This second set of interconnections composed of universal laws and systems is the densest part of our world. Unfortunately, since these are not always obvious (although scientists have proven their omnipresence), we usually neglect to think about them or consult with them. More intriguing and incredible is the first set of interconnections, not only interacts with the denser sets of interconnections, but it is absorbed and intertwined in such way that the first and second sets of interconnections become one, creating a new system which is now alive, is goal-oriented, and is also balance-seeking within itself and its environment. The simple sketch (not really simple (protrayed in Figure 10.1)) represents the interconnectedness of our world.

In Foresight City, this idea of interconnectedness is an important conceptual understanding because it forms the context for deeper thinking about the layers of change leaders set in motion when they make decisions. Moreover, we understand, especially in an era where information is ubiquitous and digital human connectedness has reached billions, leaders are not the only ones generating change. Although the leader may make decisions creating change, other actors in society, special groups, and large multinational corporations, aided by economics and advances in technology, tend to have more influence and can achieve more momentum in the change process than titled or elected leaders. Another big actor, and we have seen its undeniable force, is the environment. Its force and equilibrium-seeking phenomena cause tremendous shifts in how change happens, who adapts and does not adapt, and how fast the rate of change adoption will take place (to include the development and adoption of technology). In short, these points are discussed here to illustrate how in Foresight City we think about the future. Since the future is connected and constantly in flux due to the multitude of interconnection of components and forces which we can and cannot see (as noted in the previous paragraph and also seen in Image 10.1), we are nothing less than tested to think differently than past generations; we are required to think, at least, in three dimensions.
Fig. 10.1 Interconnections of four domains (Source Author’s creation; Note A depiction of the interconnection between the man-made, the nature’s creation, the spiritual world, and the physical world. The systems within these domains are constantly interacting. All four of these domains and their interdependencies form one system. The new system is goal-seeking and equilibrium-seeking within other forces which act on this system. See also Image 10.1)

THREE FORMS OF THINKING IN FORESIGHT CITY

Three forms of thinking connect Foresight City. These forms of thinking are thinking encounters. They are intended for the leader to understand and appreciate not what to think but how to think. This sort of thinking promotes the emergence of insight, so we can then act with foresight. The first form of thinking is to think about ourselves. How did we get here? This is an important question usually answered superficially by many without much thought, and that in itself (not giving profound thought to how we got here) is problematic. Whatever our life experience has been, it is easy to look at our circumstances and believe the situation was either caused by our actions (internal locus of control) or entirely by others (external locus of control) for not thinking more exhaustive about the matter we had in front of us. Many times, that thinking leads
Image 10.1  Four domains within universal forces (Source Author’s depiction of universal forces acting on the four domains; Note As the unseen balanced elements that make up Fig. 10.1 exist and are only seen portrayed in this Image, the myriad of unseen forces of the universe are not always obvious, as in the laws of physics, chemistry, thermodynamics, equilibrium, gravity, vibration, inertia, each with their own unique balancing systems of feedback loops, nodes, and time-delay factors act on the four domains. Both the four domains and the universal forces become a system of systems. The interactions depicted and still those unseen create nonlinear responses which cannot always be predicted given the multi-nonlinear relationships, feedback systems, array and natural-forming architecture of nodes, and time delays in the system of systems)

us to reason this present-day we are experiencing has been pre-determined and was, therefore, inevitable. The truth is the present-day’s frustrations we may be experiencing are a combination of countless factors, some of them out of our control (like pushes and pulls from the forces of the universe and interconnected systems as in those presented in Fig. 10.1 and Image 10.1), but others are totally our own doing (implementing quick fixes which were the product of superficial thinking). Sometimes the accumulation of these quick fixes upset the equilibrium of the environment around us and causes the friction and turmoil we get into. The opposite is
also true: The paths of richness and prosperity we enjoy are most likely the fruits of deep thinking, deliberate planning, and careful decision making. Both just-mentioned thinking contrasts have been reflected for thousands of years in human belief, for example, as the more than two-thousand-year-old proverb goes, “Lazy hands make a man poor, but diligent hands bring wealth” (Proverbs 10:4, New International Version). Hence, superficial thinking is not going to get us out of many of the situations we have gotten ourselves into as the result of the quick fixes implemented in the past. Therefore, we all must contend with the law of the harvest in either of two ways in our lifetime’s journey. One way aligns with the popular wisdom stating “we reap what we sow.” The other aligns with a more ancient principle which says, “One sows and another reaps” (John 4:37, NIV). When we think about Foresight City, we can see the latter as fitting because Foresight City reaches, mends, and glues across generations and across time. We sow in this generation, and another reaps later in our generation, the present, the emerging, or the future generation. We also reap in our generation what others (consciously or unconsciously) sowed in the past. The point about thinking and asking of ourselves how we got here is to exercise a form of thinking which transcends the recent in order to inquire and challenge our assumptions about the present era. Moreover, we take the opportunity in this form of thinking to map the motivations and thought-processes which got us where we are, in addition to mapping the core belief systems which were dominant in our journey from past generations to the present. We must examine the type of thinking, motivations, and beliefs, as well as the assumptions and link them to their effects on the present conditions.

The recent worldwide Corona Virus pandemic of 2020 gives context to our discussion about this first form of thinking in Foresight City. Let us recount briefly the situation. From the first confirmed case of the Novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China on 31 December 2019 to 11 April 2020, more than 1,653,204 cases have been confirmed around the world, including 102,088 deaths (European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, 2020; World Health Organization, 2020). In a little over three months, the spread of the pandemic has overwhelmed the capacity of countries’ medical health systems, especially in cities around the world (Allen, 2020; Blasberg, Fahrion, Sarovic, & Schaap, 2020). The pandemic has become a disruptor of major proportions. It has caused massive shutdowns of work centers, small businesses, restaurants, and the closure or forceful movement of traditional classroom education to online
education. As well, it has triggered social distancing rules, unemployment, and the intense competition and rapid depletion of some consumer goods and medical supplies, leading the global economy to see its most brutal equity collapse since the Great Depression of the 1930s (Jones et al., 2020). How can someone not see this coming? And if someone saw it, how could this happen, especially given the advances in technology over the past 100 years? The truth is that several thought leaders saw the advent of a pandemic, at least since 2015, some of them speaking, writing, planning, and conducting physical as well as computer-assisted simulations (Gates, 2015; Habib et al., 2019; Li et al., 2016). Nevertheless, the world is suffering (as of this writing) from the continued spread of this pandemic.

It is clear we are now facing the big question, “How did we get here?” In the first thinking form, we begin to gain insight, as previously mentioned, from the analysis of the type of thinking, motivations, and beliefs, as well as the assumptions that got us here (to the pandemic). Next, we link those motivations, beliefs, and past assumptions to their effects on the present conditions (shortage of consumables, overwhelmed health systems, disruption of social and work life, as well as the economic collapse). What type of thinking got us here? American businessman and billionaire (now turned philanthropist) Bill Gates (Gates, 2015) argues that for decades the world has been preparing for a nuclear war as the most harmful scenario to tens of millions of people worldwide. Therefore, motivation has led to mass investments in nuclear deterrence because of the belief that a strong nuclear deterrence will keep us safe. The assumption of this type of thinking, and subsequent motivations and beliefs, is that no other threat is more dangerous to human existence than a nuclear war. No one can deny that nuclear war is a major threat to our existence, but the point here is to understand how this thinking promotes massive action on one side of the security dimension but ignores other threats that carry the same devastating potential. The second point is that by seeing how this thinking dominates our ways of acting, we activate our understanding of how the lack of action on other existential threats begins to create vulnerabilities. When left unchecked, these vulnerabilities can become our demise. In the example being explored (the pandemic), several warnings and world events like those of Ebola, SARS, and MERS (Habib et al., 2019; Suwantarat & Apisarnthanarak, 2015), allowed us to begin to see the world’s health vulnerabilities caused by the lack of
action. Without investments in health infrastructure, response preparedness, contingency plans (including, logistics, social, and economics), and associated leadership and inter-agency communication collaboration, we could have foreseen the following: quick depletion of reserves, the rapid spread of the virus due to unknown facts about the make-up of the “enemy” nations were fighting, unsuccessful attempts to contain the spread in the early stages to avert massive pandemic spread, shortage of health workers and inability to protect them, misinformation and panic, a surge of death toll followed by a slow stabilization period, rapid depletion of consumables as panic sets in among the populace, and disruption of a country’s economics. All of these took place.

The second form of thinking is to think about others. In Foresight City, we inquire others. We want to know and understand others’ perspectives. What do they know about the past, the present, or the future? This is a good place to verify our assumptions against what other people know and see is been happening over time, so we can join those perspectives and compare them against our own. The purpose is not to validate whether one is right or wrong. The aim is to seek an understanding of the world around us. This understanding leads us to awareness which is crucial for change to occur. One is seeking to reduce blind spots in thinking. Multiple perspectives help us do that. In working with students and clients, I often introduce the concept of the Johari Window to illustrate the notion of blind spots in leadership thinking. This tool is also useful in analyzing our own dimensions of awareness. The Johari Window was initially designed by psychologists Joseph Luft and Harrington Ingham (1955) to be a communication tool to analyze how someone uses and receives information (Ivanovic & Collin, 2006). It is normally depicted as a four-quadrant matrix representing four areas of self-awareness—what you know about yourself and others know about you (open self); what you know about yourself and others do not (hidden self); what you and others do not know about yourself (unknown self); and lastly, what others know about you but you do not know about yourself (blind self) (Glew & Harper, 2018; Harriss & Witwicka, 2012). Not only is this tool useful when we are thinking about leadership processes, it can also be adapted to processes which help us explore the future. This is one of the reasons why we briefly bring it to this discussion of Foresight City.

Recall that in the first form of thinking, we learned about ourselves (how did we get here); in thinking about ourselves we gained insight, but that insight was not enough to tell us about the future. Therefore, it was
paramount we embraced the second form of thinking in Foresight City: thinking and seeking others through inquiry. Using the Johari Window to accomplish the inquiry, we query others with the aim of reducing the sizes of some of those quadrants, for example, creating greater self-awareness to reduce our blind self. The shift here, in the adaptation and use of this tool to gain awareness about the future, is we can use it as a form of inquiry to generate questions and learn about the future. One way is to substitute the wording of the pronouns and shift the aim for the target of inquiry, so we can generate future-focused questions. Table 10.1 portrays the Johari Window adapted to the futures’ function. In short, the adaptation of the Johari Window in a futures’ inquiry tool produces the Futures Awareness Inquiry Tool. Let us discuss this tool as one of the principal vehicles used for futures inquiry within the second form of thinking in Foresight City.

The Futures Awareness Inquiry Tool takes us through four stages of future awareness named the Open Future, the Hidden Future, the Blind

Table 10.1 Johari Window adapted as a Futures Awareness Inquiry Tool

| **Open Future:** | **Blind Future:** |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| What you and others know about the future. | What others know about the future, but you do not know. |
| Future Inquiry: What do we collectively know about the future? What critical uncertainties, issues, and existential hopes do we share in relation to the future? | Future Inquiry: What kinds of perspectives I have not considered? What biases and ways of thinking prevented seeing critical events in our past and our present? Why were we not able to detect the signposts of the critical event? |
| | |
| **Hidden Future:** | **Unknown Future:** |
| What you know about the future, but others do not. | What you and others do not know about the future. |
| Future Inquiry: What do I perceive about the future which others cannot? How did I gain this perspective? What kind of experiences led me to see what others did not see? What experience prevents others from seeing the future I see? | Future Inquiry: When individual and collective perspectives join, what kind of futures we have not seen? What kinds of elements and critical uncertainties we have not discussed? Can these be combined into new forms of plausible futures? |

Source Author’s adaptation of Luft and Ingham’s (1955), Johari Window

Note The Johari Window helps us increase our self-awareness, so we can efficiently, as leaders, communicate with others. That framework is an excellent contextual base to help leaders generate inquiry, awareness, and insight about the future. The Future Awareness Inquiry Tool is designed for that purpose. The questions posited in the tool are some examples of the question-generation method this tool incites. In Foresight City, the aim is to enlarge the view of the open future quadrant and reduce all others.
**Future, and the Unknown Future.** The open future is the future we all can envision. This future is collective given our shared experience, consciousness, known facts, and exercised collective deductions derived from those facts, present trends, and shared assumptions. In the open future, we feel strongly we can understand, anticipate, and shape the future(s). Therefore, there is a future we can create (or several of them). The aim is to enlarge this open future stage as large as possible, so we can see more details of the future, shape the future, and create a powerful, more collective image of that future. Examples of this open future are autonomous vehicles and even space tourism. Given the knowledge we have today and the conditions of the environment around us (political, legal, technological, and social), we know these futures are already in motion, and although these futures may not be immediately plausible as there are things that are still needed to be worked out, i.e., ethical implications, these open futures are well within our reach. From that envisioning, we will give way to the physical manifestation of that open future.

The hidden future is the next stage in the Futures Awareness Inquiry Tool. This stage describes a position in which we can glean insights based on our research, experience, scholarship, as well as mental and spiritual gifts. This experience may be unique to a leader or a small group of leaders but foreign to many others. The purpose of inquiry here is to understand the logic or mental images that led to the discovery of something one can see but others cannot. Remember, the aim is not for futures to be hidden, but for them to be visible, so we can deal with those futures appropriately. The recent COVID-19 pandemic discussed previously is an example of a hidden future. This was a future a selected number of leaders and organizations were able to see (Gates, 2015; Habib et al., 2019; Li et al., 2016; Petersen, 1997). They saw it and warned the world about this undesirable future. They could see this future given their exploration, experience, and scholarship despite this future being hidden to most people.

The next stage in our discussion of the Futures Awareness Inquiry Tool is the blind future. This is the future that remains invisible to us but not to others. This invisibility can be the payoff of biases, ignoring signposts, or simply not paying attention. An example of the painful experience of this future is disruption. The iPhone, is perhaps, for many businesses and product developers a painful (or pleasant) example of this blind future. It may have appeared to have come without warning, rendering obsolete many of the products that were once designed for separate consumer product markets. For example, when I was to travel around the world
across cities, over days, weeks, or months, I remember making sure I had planned (as part of my travel checklist) to take with me my phone, my music player, my GPS, and my small camera. I also planned to take four different sets of power cords, adapters, and batteries just to make sure all of these products would work. I sometimes wondered if these four products could be combined into one, so I would not have to carry them all. Well, it happened. The iPhone became the phone, music player, camera, and GPS—all in one! As the iPhone became main stream, the need to pay for subscriptions to keep maps up-to-date on my GPS (and the device itself) disappeared. As well, the time and preparation to keep up with the needs of the other separate products for the other functions (music and camera for example) also disappeared. Such sudden consumer shift took many companies by surprise, causing several of them to painfully switch to new lines of businesses, adjust to the new market the iPhone had created, or fade, vanish, and disappear. Certainly, this stage (the blind future) requires us to stay in contact and form a dialogue with others who can offer us different perspectives and new knowledge, increasing our awareness so the blinders can be removed.

The fourth (and last) stage in our discussion of the Futures Awareness Inquiry Tool is the unknown future. The unknown future is the future we, as well as others, do not see. The kinds of futures we see in this stage are mostly unanticipated and come as a surprise because the likelihood of some of these futures taking place is very low. Nevertheless, leaders should be concerned with the probability of these futures happening because their appearance (although not as likely) cause dramatic changes in our lives, and in most instances, overwhelm human response systems. Unexpected natural disasters are an example of this kind. The unexpected appearance of a devastating tsunami overwhelms emergency response mechanisms, but also, the tsunami creates a series of chained events that can continue to deepen the crisis, i.e., the collapse of the country infrastructure hampering traffic and logistics movement, in turn creating poor delivery of food and supplies, which in turn creates famine and extreme economic downturn. Although the previous example was environmental, renowned futurists warn us about others: self-aware machine intelligence, perfected human cloning, no-carbon economy, super-fast transports, cessation of EU-US relations, etc. (Hauptman, Hoppe, & Raban, 2015; Petersen, 1997). In foresight, we name these futures “wild cards” (Cornish, 2003; Petersen, 1997). The aim of the leader when
doing an exploration of this stage is to reduce the size of this quadrant by continually exploring the plausibility of future horizons.

The third form of thinking is to think about what we cannot yet see. Here, we raise our sights beyond ourselves and others to come to terms with uncertainty. This is not an easy process, especially when we have been conditioned to dismiss those things which do not fit our senses. As humans, we trust those things we can distinguish through our sensory systems. The five basic senses of sight, hearing, touch, taste, and smell integrate a complex set of interactions which send information to the brain, so we can reason and perceive the world around us. Only a few people venture beyond these five senses. And in regard to the future, as some people like to point out, it cannot quite be distinguished; therefore, it does not exist, so why spend neurons trying to explore something non-existent? For one, we can agree the future cannot be predicted—the complexity of the millions of interactions create unnumbered possibilities, as we have previously discussed, and so predicting with accuracy is not yet possible. But then again, we are not trying to predict the future; we want to explore it. As we have discussed in previous chapters, we can see the future(s) developing. Then, why not explore the great diversity of futures and devise a framework for living so we can shape the future(s), or failing that, be prepared for the range of possibilities? To let the future happen without leadership action is irresponsible. Robert Greenleaf (2002), best known for introducing and pioneering the theories of servant leadership in the 1970s, saw decisively the leader needed to harness two important intelligences. One of them was to “have a sense for the unknowable” and another was to “foresee the unforeseeable” (p. 35). Later, Greenleaf noted the leader who fails to foresee (or refuses to foresee) commits an ethical failure (p. 39). This is a very serious charge! To his point, Greenleaf observed most serious ethical failures and ethical compromises can be traced to a leader’s inability to make an effort to foresee the consequences of decisions when there was freedom to act. Once the unforeseen future is upon us, there is little we can do to shape it. Consequently, our innate intelligences never develop, in turn, leading to undesirable futures, incapable people, and incapable organizations. But the leader, per se, is not the only one needing to make the effort to develop these human intelligences. Leadership today, as it is a collective endeavour, must also be a collective set of intelligences. Therefore, an entire community, city, and country should develop these intelligences—to sense for the unknowable and foresee the unforeseeable.
When we talk about Foresight City, we are not center-staging the lone leader with the great vision which everyone will “surely” follow; instead, one can envision a city where its citizens have developed the two intelligences we have been talking about. Of course, the leaders are critical enablers, and they need to be versed in how to develop these intelligences in themselves and others. But ultimately, we should not think foresight is a competency colonized by one person, an entity, or a thing. These intelligences have always been a human capacity, and in describing that development here, we make explicit an entire society must commit to working as one to grow and develop these intelligences over time and across generations. Developing a sense for the unknowable starts with the understanding that reality goes beyond what our senses can tell us. (This is one reason the lone leader will be ineffective; the capacity for sensing is limited in one person, but it is infinite in the aggregate of the collective.) Our collective senses are a starting point. Additionally, practicing the two previous forms of thinking in Foresight City is a second good step. But here we emphasize other dimensions of reality exist; although not always seen, they cannot be discarded. Most times, these dimensions carry signposts of the future, and what we must do is use the previously-mentioned starting steps (our senses and forms of thinking collectively) through a sort of magnifying glass (see Fig. 10.2) to develop a sense for the unknowable. This action does exactly what the magnifying glass does for the human eye: it brings the future from its far, perhaps microscopic, dimension on the horizon (non-existent to the human consciousness), to the dimension of our reality, so it can be scrutinized and studied. For example, as illustrated in Fig. 10.2, we develop a sense for the unknowable through our senses and forms of thinking. The stimuli this process produces activates our sensory systems. The sensory systems allow us to understand something is present, perhaps without being able to clearly define what it is just yet. As we explore our perceptions of the world we cannot yet see, there will be a need for insight triggered by our own desire to make sense of what we do not quite understand, asking us, “What are these signposts telling me about futures to come?” That activity triggers our consciousness which uses a combination of attention, perception, memory, and awareness to equip us with the power of thought so we can make choices about what to think (Martin & Morich, 2011; Pierson & Trout, 2017). When combined with cognitive processes, we begin to get a sense of the unknowable as a picture of plausible futures that begins to take form. The narrative scenarios of Techno City, Green Spaces, Notek
City, and Ascent City discussed in the earlier chapters are examples of that process. If you recall, we began a literature review followed by several perspectives about the smart city, followed by an examination of signposts, predetermined elements, and critical uncertainties on the horizon. These began to paint a picture of plausible futures depicted as the narrative scenarios. Lastly, the aim of this entire process is action (the last step left to discuss in Fig. 10.2). When we decide to make a choice informed by our senses and forms of thinking collectively and based on seeing and thinking through the magnifying glass, we gain a sense of the unknowable and the ability to foresee the unforeseeable. We are then certain we have acted with ethical forethought; we have exercised foresight. When the leaders and citizens of the city act in this way, they are known as citizens of Foresight City.

Foresight City is the epitome of exercising ethics in leadership. It is the space where the current generation, the emerging generation, and the future generation are able to join hands as coexisting brothers and sisters responsible and accountable to one another. Foresight makes this possible.
in Foresight City. It is called Foresight City because the people give the city its name through the vibrant exercise of sensing the unknowable, seeing the unforeseeable, and acting with foresight (while also practicing the other two forms of thinking discussed in the previous paragraphs). In turn, the citizens change the future deliberately in myriad dimensions. i.e. politically, socially, technologically, and economically. Becoming Foresight City is, therefore, not a badge. It is the deliberate ethical leadership action of the citizens. Anyone visiting the city can see the signs of foresight orientation in its citizens. The citizens of the future are represented in the forms of government; leaders make time to be teachers; cross-generational citizenship co-creates long-term solutions, while scanning the horizons for signposts; nature and humans live in mutual admiration knowing their relationship is symbiotic; and technology serves the aim of the collective, not idolized as a deliverer but as an enabler. Another sharp sign of Foresight City is seeing how little boys and girls rise to be explorers of the future through foresight education and practice. This is nurtured by the preceding generation who carefully injects a sense of curiosity, storytelling, vision-creation, and responsibility for the future. That generation carefully mentors and guides the new generation through those methods, so there will be generation after generation of explorers who know how to think about futures, how to explore the myriad of futures developing on the horizon, and how to act to seize the desired futures and not be captive by undesired ones.

Surely, the skeptic would ask, can this ideal of Foresight City be realized? One can wonder how much different this ideal of Foresight City could be from the ideal of democracy. If democracy was realized, why couldn’t the aspirations of a collective body of smart, foresight-minded, future-oriented people be realized? It takes a different kind of leadership, one armed with foresight.
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