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I have walked that long road to freedom. I have tried not to falter; I have made missteps along the way. But I have discovered the secret that after climbing a great hill, one only finds there are many more hills to climb. I have taken a moment here to rest, to steal a view of the glorious vista that surrounds me, to look back on the distance I have come. But I can rest only for a moment, for with freedom comes responsibilities, and I dare not linger, for my long walk is not yet ended. (Mandela, 1994, p. 544)

NELSON MANDELA’S WORDS, of course, refer most clearly to his decades-long experiences as a freedom fighter in apartheid South Africa and his anticipation of the challenges that he would face in the journey to come. We, however, read these words as Mandela’s meditation not only on his activities as a revolutionary leader, but also as a reflection on his processes of growth and discovery into an integrally informed leadership role. In this passage and throughout his autobiography, Mandela demonstrates keen awareness of his own developmental processes, his view from the mountain. And, given the centrality of racism in all aspects of life in South Africa—collective and individual—we maintain that Mandela’s developmental processes provide an excellent illustration of an integral view of diversity dynamics.

We contend that Mandela in confronting racial oppression throughout his life, came to an integrally informed, transformative understanding of the dynamics of diversity. In other words, he was engaged in a process of what we have theorized as Integral Diversity Maturity or IDM (Gregory & Raffanti, 2009). Mandela’s experiences illustrate the transformative learning that occurs as individuals reconceptualize diversity beyond traditional categories and dualities to recognize diversity as unlimited creative possibility. That is, Mandela engaged in “learning that produces a substantial shift in perspective so that problems or situations
are re-envisioned and addressed with creativity and innovation” (Gregory & Raffanti, 2009, p. 46).

The purpose of this paper is to analyze experiences depicted in Mandela’s autobiography through the lens of IDM theory. The analysis is designed to shed light on how individuals in extraordinary situations of racial tension are able to develop transcendent and integral views of diversity. The paper outlines the main components of the IDM process and employs that framework in examining documented life experiences of Mandela that are relevant to his perspectives on diversity.

An Overview of Integral Diversity Maturity

This section provides an overview of the key components of IDM. The theory, which continues to evolve, emerged from the authors’ synthesis of many theorists, most notably R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr. and Ken Wilber. Integral diversity maturity owes much to the groundbreaking scholarship of Thomas (1990, 1991, 1994, 1996, 1999), who introduced the concept of “diversity tension”—the conflict, stress, and strain that arises when combinations of diversity dimensions (e.g., class, gender, education, race, political views, etc.) interact with one another (1996, p. 15). He posited that diversity tension exists wherever one finds diversity (any mixture of similarities and differences). The outcomes from such tension, he argued, can be highly productive but also non-productive, depending in part upon the responses of individuals to the situation. Thomas also contended that becoming versed in productively responding to diversity tension could increase a person’s “diversity maturity,” which “signifies a deep clarity about the fundamental concepts of diversity” (1996, p. 11). Such clarity, he argued, came from formal and informal education and personal reflection and putting these concepts into daily action.

Although Thomas expanded diversity theory and practice beyond race and gender, his work centered on the cultural, physical, and structural dimensions of diversity, and did not fully address the dimension of individual consciousness. Further, his framework lacked the crucial link between diversity maturity and processes of human development.

Integral Theory, specifically Wilber’s (1996, 1997, 2000a, 2000b) All Quadrants, Levels, Lines, Types and States (AQAL) framework, is the linchpin of IDM. Wilber’s model allowed the authors to reconceptualize the dynamics of diversity maturity as a complex developmental process that integrates interior, exterior, individual, and collective dimensions of reality. The authors discovered a profound theoretical synergy between the AQAL model, Thomas’ diversity paradigm, and our expanded view of diversity maturity as a transformative learning phenomenon. Our model is integrally informed. That is, it suggests that every social space has four irreducible dimensions: subjective experience, objective physical characteristics and behavior, inter-subjective culture and inter-objective structures and systems. Additionally, individuals within the social space occupy various states (e.g., insight, confusion) and display an array of additional dimensions such as diverse types (e.g., race, gender, learning style) and diverse levels of development (e.g., pre-conventional, conventional, postconventional) across diverse lines of development (e.g., moral, cognitive). This implies that, even within

\[\text{\footnotesize The authors recognize Wilber’s is not the only approach to Integral Theory. For an excellent overview of various approaches, see Allan Combs’ The Radiance of Being (2002). Wilber’s model is adopted for the comprehensiveness of the AQAL model as well as the soundness of Wilber’s approach to developing theory.}\]
environments that appear to be homogeneous, multiple and complex interactions of diversity dimensions are at play.

Our synthesis of AQAL, Thomas’ diversity paradigm, transformative learning, and other theories coalesced into an integral vision of diversity. We explained:

In the integrated, postconventional diversity paradigm, diversity can be conceptualized as the multidimensional and dynamic interaction between quadrants, levels, lines, types, and states. In this paradigm, the four quadrants represent a co-enacted field of probability waves and potentiality/creativity out of which multiple, complex events emerge in each quadrant and interact with each other within and between quadrants. (2009, p. 45)

One who achieves this perspective on how diversity operates in reality has become an integrally diversity-mature individual.

Becoming integrally diversity-mature is a process of transformative learning, which leading theorist Jack Mezirow (2003) has defined as “learning that transforms problematic frames of reference—sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindsets)—to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change” (p. 58). Other theorists have built on Mezirow’s rational-critical approach to transformative learning. For example, “a psychoanalytic view of transformative learning is seen as a…lifelong journey of coming to understand oneself through reflecting on the psychic structures (ego, shadow, persona, collective unconscious, and so on) that make up an individual’s identity” (Taylor, 2008, p. 7; see e.g. Cranton, 1994, 1996 and Dirkx, 2000).

We maintain that IDM is a transformative learning process that requires a substantial shift in perspective regarding diversity. One transcends conventional approaches that have generally been framed in terms of “duality and oppositionality…[and] the tendency to oversimplify…to binary oppositions as opposed to more complex and multiple perceptions…” (Gentile, 1995, pp. 1-2). Mary Gentile, in her “Ways of Thinking About and Across Difference” taxonomy, addressed many of the conventional approaches to dealing with difference (and hence diversity). We describe some of those perspectives below:

1. **Rights Talk.** This approach is focused on individual rights and preserving one’s own privileges. An “all or nothing” orientation towards rights “promotes unrealistic expectations, heightens social conflict, and inhibits dialog that might lead toward consensus, accommodation, or at least discovery of common ground” (Glendon, 1991, p. 14).

2. **Self-definition through Oppositionality.** This approach is about defining one’s “identity, in opposition to, or as distinct from, others” (p. 4). For instance, constructions of Whiteness and masculinity have been developed in opposition to non-Whiteness and femininity. Such perspectives perpetuate dichotomous us/them thinking in order to preserve a superior sense of identity among dominant groups.

3. **Cultural Generalizations.** Gentile observed that exploring patterns of difference through generalization (e.g. comparing men’s and women’s approaches to leading), while useful, is dangerous. She noted that “the tendency to value one pole of a dichotomy over another can result in prejudices reinforced…we can get lost in generalizations and stereotypes.
that keep is from seeing the distinctiveness of individuals and the commonalities between these same groups…” (p. 5).

4. **Seeing for Innocence.** Based on Shelby Steele’s (1990) essays on racial dynamics in the U.S., Gentile noted a propensity to see oneself or one’s group as innocently victimized by another’s oppression or dominance. As Steele (1990) argued, “Your difference from me makes you bad, and your badness justifies, even demands, my pursuit of power over you…to be entitled [to power] one must first believe in one’s innocence, at least in the area where one wishes to be entitled” (p. 5)

5. **Racial Reasoning.** This perspective was influenced by Cornel West’s *Race Matters* (1994) and is associated with a “closing ranks mentality” for survival in a hostile social environment. Racial reasoning patterns in the African American experience, for example, lead to judgments about whether one is “Black enough” to be an authentic member of the group.

The IDM process is one in which conventional approaches to diversity transcended through a cycle of disorientation/breakdown, deep reflection, re-orientation, integration and, ultimately, transformation. The process is conceptualized in four stages: (a) rewiring (b) clarifying (c) mastering, and (d) transcending.

In the rewiring stage individuals confront the limitations of preconceived, conventional notions about diversity. In this stage, which involves a measure of disorientation and dismantling of deeply held views (e.g. diversity is only about difference or is primarily about race and gender categories). Rewiring these conceptions reveals the omnipresence and multidimensionality of diversity.

While stage one is about coming to awareness, the clarifying stage sees individuals reflect deeply on newfound insights about diversity. They work through and eventually gain congruence between old and new perspectives of diversity, quelling the cognitive dissonance created by encountering new conceptions. The disorientation is heightened as one confronts criticism from those who claim that social justice is achievable by addressing only discrimination and oppression based on race, gender, and such other classifications. To expand the definition of diversity to any combination of differences and similarities is a jolt for those who have become accustomed, perhaps for very laudable reasons, to equate diversity with conventional notions. Yet, through reflection, one makes a perceptual shift so that competing frameworks can be reconciled as compatible variations of the same basic dynamics.

While the first two stages are directed toward reflection and reexamining assumptions about diversity, the third stage is action-oriented. In the mastering stage individuals enhance their diversity maturity by applying new understandings gained in the first two stages. Mastery involves a fuller appreciation of diversity’s creative potential rather than a problem to be confronted. In this stage, individuals begin to have a better sense of diversity tension as a tool for creative problem solving. For example, such an individual will begin to approach situations of conflict with responses that are less reactive and individualistic and more reflective and open to outcomes that are considerate of the complexities of the contextual environment. S/he will act to maximize the potential of conflict to solve the inherent problem. If, for instance, this individual is a member of a particular group whose members are challenged with difficult interpersonal dynamics, s/he will reflect on the situation from the perspective of all the members while simultaneously encouraging a resolution that sets aside
individual/personal objectives and optimizes collective action, most often resulting in outcomes that are innovative and noticeably unique (Kleiner et al., 2000).

Finally, the transcending stage is characterized by creative responses to diversity tension. Integrally diversity-mature individuals who have transcended conventional approaches to diversity demonstrate their capacity to negotiate the complexities of diversity in ways that produce transformative outcomes. The transcending stage sees individuals consistently respond to diversity tension through reengaging in transformative learning, continuing to evolve in their understanding of diversity. They can see beyond conventional conceptualizations, recognizing their own development within systems and cultural milieus. The integral diversity-mature individual will recognize diversity as “an unlimited and creative field of potential” (Gregory, 2006, p. 549). Cook-Greuter’s (2004) reference to climbing a mountain unintentionally pays homage to the reflections of Mandela in regard to his developmental process:

The metaphor of climbing a mountain can serve as an illustration of what it means to gain an increasingly higher vantage point. At each turn of the path up the mountain I can see more of the territory I have already traversed. I can see the multiple turns and reversals in the path. I can see further into and across the valley. The closer I get to the summit, the easier it becomes to see behind to the shadow side and uncover formerly hidden aspects of the territory. Finally at the top, I can see beyond my particular mountain to other ranges and further horizons. The more I can see, the wiser, more timely, more systematic and informed my actions and decisions are likely to be because more of the relevant information, connections and dynamic relationships become visible. (p. 3)

Throughout the process of becoming integrally diversity-mature, a person is developing along various lines. The authors have identified at least three lines of development relevant to IDM: worldview, moral, and cognitive. An individual who has reached the transcending stage will possess postconventional capacities in each of those three areas.

Worldview is an essential line of development for integral diversity-mature individuals. They will have developed the capacity for multiple vantage points, giving them the capacity to perceive the nuances of diversity and diversity tension.

A worldcentric perspective is related to the moral line. This stream of development concerns moral judgment and care, as well as increased inclusiveness of who is deemed morally worthy of consideration. As one moves from egocentrism to ethnocentrism to worldcentrism, his or her moral span becomes wider.

The cognitive line of development also is central to understanding and achieving IDM. Wilber (2006) asserted,
As consciousness further develops and deepens, these concrete categories and operations begin to become more generalized, more abstract... and thus more universal. Formal operational consciousness can therefore begin to support a postconventional orientation to the world, escaping in many ways the ethnocentric/sociocentric world of concrete (and mythic membership) thought. (p. 26).

The process of transformative learning about diversity requires continuous, deliberate, and profound thinking, which can enhance and can be enhanced by cognitive development. This and other elements of IDM are well illustrated in the life experiences of Mandela in pre- and post-apartheid South Africa.

Analysis

Our framework for the analysis is derived, in part, from that proposed by Thierry Pauchant (2005). Pauchant put forth a model for identifying and assessing integrally informed leadership practices. He contended that, “While their actions are not solving all the problems of our world, we can, however, learn much from the ‘leadership pattern’ these leaders encourage, leadership being seen as an ‘architecture’ which facilitates the ‘collective genius’ of people” (p. 217). As Pauchant (2005) acknowledged, there are few individuals who can be classified in the “integral category.” He suggested three criteria for identifying such individuals: They 1) “must have had an important impact on an organization or a community;” 2) “must be judged positively by a diverse population;” and 3) “must have been publicly recognized for his or her post-conventional outlooks and actions, for his or her post-conventional ‘ultimate concerns’ (p. 219).

We chose to begin our study of integrally informed leadership as an example of IDM with an analysis of Mandela because we noticed experiences of early, sustained, and violent exposure to severe racial conflict that appeared to catalyze the development of integrally informed perspectives and IDM. We identified developmental shifts and patterns in Mandela’s story and our discoveries indicate that, although further and more in depth study is warranted, much insight can be gleaned from this initial exploration.

Nelson Mandela

Nelson Mandela emerged as a possibility for exploring IDM not simply for obvious reasons—his leadership in bringing South African apartheid to an end. Rather, the authors were intrigued by his consultations in the mid-1990s with Don Beck, one of the premier theorists and practitioners of the developmental model, Spiral Dynamics (1996). Mandela’s openness to conceive of diversity based on developmental worldview, versus solely focusing on race, was an indication to us of the presence of integral tendencies. Additionally, Pauchant (2005) listed Mandela among a handful of leaders identified as possessing “ethical and spiritual maturity” (p. 211).

Long Walk to Freedom (Mandela, 1995) chronicled Mandela’s inner and outer journeys from his childhood to assuming his nation’s presidency. Mandela’s experiences and reflections serve as excellent illustrations of the transformative IDM process. In this section, we recount incidents and insights from Mandela’s autobiography, analyzing them within the four-stage
Rewiring

In recounting his childhood, Mandela recognized the influence of the collective cultural and social spheres (LL and LR quadrants) on his perspective and behaviors. He observed, “My life, and that of most Xhosas at the time, was shaped by custom, ritual and taboo…without being told, I soon assimilated the elaborate rules that governed the relations between men and women…all these beliefs seemed perfectly natural to me” (p. 10). The early impetus for Mandela’s openness to new perspectives was the death of his father and the resulting relocation to his uncle’s home. This was a disorienting occasion, an early first step in Mandela’s rewiring of diversity perspectives. He recalled, “I felt like a sapling pulled root and branch from the earth and flung into the center of a stream whose strong current I could not resist” (p. 14).

Incidents from Mandela’s adolescence and young adulthood reveal a propensity to engage in deep reflection over issues of difference. He attended western style schools and interacted with students from different ethno-national backgrounds. As was his habit, Mandela took mental note of diverse perspectives, but his youth did not see him move beyond ethnocentrism. He recalled, “I had many new and sometimes conflicting ideas floating in my head… I went back and forth between pride in myself as a Xhosa and a feeling of kinship with other Africans” (p. 33). For the young Mandela, the most important form of difference was ethnic membership, although he also recognized that African ethno-nation members had tremendous similarities, most notably a shared oppression owing to their race. He realized that his internalization of ethnic divisions was the result of the White government’s strategy to divide and conquer.

Given that racial difference was the driving force in South Africa’s apartheid system, it is hardly surprising that Mandela’s autobiography ostensibly focuses on racial issues. Nevertheless, his writings indicate a capacity to analyze race in more complex terms. Thus, as noted in the example of ethnic divisions, he recognized systemic causes (LR quadrant) for the lack of African integration; he saw the dynamics between ethnic, racial, political dimensions of diversity. Mandela came to understand that “we [Black Africans] were not different people with separate languages; we were one people, with different tongues” (p. 73).

Mandela’s education, observations, and continuous reflection led him to political action. He recalled, “The graduation at Fort Hare offered a moment of introspection and reflection. I was struck most forcefully between my old assumptions and my actual experience…I found myself being drawn into the world of politics because I was not content with my old beliefs” (p. 77). Thus, in 1942 he began attending African National Congress (ANC) meetings and eventually became entrenched in activism. At this time communist ideas were also floating around intellectual circles, but Mandela was convinced that South Africa’s problems were rooted in race, not class and therefore rejected the notion of a communist solution. This indicated that while Mandela was open to considering diverse alternatives, he was closely attentive to the significance of context (LL quadrant) and its interplay with transforming political systems (LR quadrant).

While Mandela initially supported the ANC view that Blacks must lead their own radical efforts, he always entertained the notion of inclusion. His experiences in law school (where...
he was the only Black) had shown him that Whites were not monolithic in their beliefs and behaviors; he saw that some could be potential allies in the freedom struggle. He also observed with admiration Indian activists who resisted the government’s 1946 series of discriminatory laws targeting them. Mandela learned from the Indians’ community-based tactics and widespread willingness to sacrifice and suffer for the collective good. This proved to be an opening for Mandela to reflect on the nature of diversity tension. He deepened his learning about diversity as similarity and difference; in this case the existence of racial and ethnic difference as well as the similarities of shared oppression and convergent goals to dismantle the socio-political order. But the level of complexity with which he examined diversity dynamics was a rewiring from his traditional worldview.

**Clarifying**

A second chance came for solidarity with the Indian activists. In 1947 Mandela supported the ANC pact with Indian organizations. He viewed the agreement as a foundation for future cooperation of Africans, Indians, and Coloureds, since it respected the independence of each individual group, but acknowledged the achievements that could be realized from acting in concert…precipitated a series of nonracial, antigovernment campaigns around the country, which sought to bring together Africans and Indians in the freedom struggle. (p. 95)

Mandela’s words demonstrate a mature response to diversity tension. Rather than excluding other oppressed groups from ANC efforts, he realized that building relationships and fostering mutual adaptation (in accord with the most developed responses in Thomas’ diversity paradigm) would bring the most productive outcomes. His choice of the term “nonracial” indicated his willingness to adapt in such ways that racial difference was not the overriding concern. Instead, the Blacks, Indians and Coloureds would go beyond race and collaborate as freedom fighters.

Nonetheless, Mandela insisted that Blacks take the lead in this collaboration, which suggests he was still clarifying his approach to diversity. There remained a pull on his consciousness to consider race (Black versus White) as the defining variable in the political movement. He had not internalized an integral understanding and found himself still blaming behaviors: “I was angry at the White man, not at racism” (p. 98). However, Mandela’s subsequent experiences led him to deep reflection and further maturity.

**Mastering**

Mastering is an action-oriented stage of diversity development, where one tries out new learning, reflects on those actions, and develops further maturity. Mandela’s increasing leadership in the ANC coincided with his deepening understanding of diversity as multidimensional and a field of creative potential. For example, in 1954 he co-organized a Congress of the People, inviting White, Black, Indian, and Coloured organizations. Significantly, the Congress resulted in the Freedom Charter by June 1955, calling for equal rights for all South Africans, majority and minority. Additionally, the Charter contained socialist and capitalist elements, transcending rather than toppling the current economic system.
Mandela subsequently traveled around the country on a fact-finding mission. He met formally and informally with a diverse array of South Africans, both rural and city-dwellers. Mandela’s travels convinced him that the freedom movement would benefit by including diverse viewpoints and backgrounds. He recalled, “My idea was that our movement should be a great tent that included as many people as possible” (p. 165). His aims were a nonracial society so that leadership and participation would not be race-based. His moral span was widening to include all South Africans who supported change.

Mandela displayed increasing levels of cognitive development through meta-awareness of his own development. He explained,

One matures and regards some of the views of one’s youth as undeveloped and callow. While I sympathized with the views of the Africanists and once shared many of them, I believed that the freedom struggle required one to make compromises and accept the kind of discipline that one resisted as a younger, more impulsive man. (p. 199)

His integral thinking brought him to a stance of unity in diversity. In 1960 he gave a speech calling for a national convention to create a constitution that would mirror aspirations of the country as a whole: “I called for unity and said we would be invincible if we spoke with one voice” (p. 225).

Mandela’s vision would be put to the test with his imprisonment by a regime that recognized him as a threat to the social order. Despite deprivation and isolation at the hands of the White authorities, Mandela developed an enhanced level of diversity-maturity during his decades in prison. His strategies for surviving and thriving in prison resemble an Integral Life Practice (Wilber et al., 2008). In the LL quadrant, Mandela and his compatriots developed a culture of learning and cooperation, going so far as to develop syllabi and teach each other courses. In this way they created their own positive social systems and structures within the oppressive prison system (LR quadrant):

Whatever we knew, whatever we learned, we shared, and by sharing we multiplied whatever courage we had individually. That is not to say that we were all alike in our responses to the hardships we suffered. Men have different capacities and react differently to stress. But the stronger ones raised up the weaker ones, and both became stronger in the process. Ultimately, we had to create our own lives in prison (p. 341).

Mandela worked on developing his own body and spirit (UR and UL quadrants). He read as many novels and histories as he could get his hands on in prison. They built a tennis court and used that to stay physically active. He took advantage of permission to cultivate his own garden. The prisoners eventually had access to films, which further helped Mandela to stay connected with the outside world. Mandela remained vigilant about not losing touch with the revolutionary movement; “The danger was that our ideas would become frozen in time” (p. 437).

Ever open to expanding his perspectives, when new prisoners entered who were more radicalized, Mandela listened and learned; “In these young men we saw the angry revolutionary spirit of the times” (p. 421). The Black Consciousness Movement sought to undo the psychological damage and sense of inferiority that apartheid had created. Thus, they opted
to exclude Whites from the movement. They believed that separatism, not integration, was the key to success. Mandela realized the young activists were on a developmental path:

I was confident that these young men would transcend some of the strictures of Black Consciousness. While I was encouraged by their militancy, I thought that their philosophy, in its concentration on Blackness, was exclusionary, and represented an intermediary view that was not fully mature. I saw my role as an elder statesman who might help them move on to the more inclusive ideas of the Congress Movement. (p. 423)

**Transcending**

Mandela’s post-prison experiences as reported in his autobiography (the book’s narrative ends with his Presidential Inauguration) illustrate the transcending stage of Integral Diversity Maturity. He was able to see the complexities of difference and responded to diversity tension in surprising ways. Mandela noted,

I knew that people expected me to harbor anger toward Whites. But I had none. In prison my anger toward Whites decreased, but my hatred for the system grew. I wanted South Africa to see I loved even my enemies while I hated the system which turned us against one another. (p. 495)

To illustrate his willingness to reach out to Whites as allies in dismantling the apartheid system, Mandela told a large Cape Town crowd after his prison release that President de Clerk “had gone further than any Nationalist leader to normalize the situation and [is] a ‘man of integrity’” (p. 493). He had to explain to a wary constituency that his willingness to negotiate did not mean that he had turned his back on African National Congress principles of armed struggle. This is a challenge associated with translating values to individuals whose worldview is non-integral.

At a press conference the day after his release, Mandela stated that “there was a middle ground between White fears and Black hopes…Any man or woman who abandons apartheid will be embraced in our struggle for a democratic, non-racial South Africa” (p. 495). From the time of his release until the end of the apartheid regime, Mandela engaged in diplomacy, negotiations, and leadership, putting into action his integrally informed commitments to inclusivity.

Mandela’s moral span had expanded to include not only Whites who supported the freedom movement, but also those who supported the oppressive regime. His multiple perspective-taking abilities had grown such that he could understand and empathize with his oppressors. Mandela understood that Whites feared democracy because they were in the minority and could become oppressed by a Black majority and he sought to allay those fears.

Mandela’s autobiography displays increasing levels of moral and cognitive development through meta-awareness of his own developmental process. Additionally, he “developed an integral understanding of the ways in which diversity (social) tension contributed to the civic and political dynamics in apartheid South Africa and was able to leverage that understanding for the benefit of his country and the world” (Gregory & Raffanti, 2010, p. 1020)[emphasis in original]. Those understandings and actions took him to the South African presidency.
Becoming President, Mandela gained the power to realize his integrated vision of South Africa, where diversity would be viewed not with fear but with a sense of possibility. He wrote:

I saw my mission as one of preaching reconciliation, of binding the wounds of the country, of engendering trust and confidence. I knew that many people, particularly the minorities, Whites, Coloureds and Indians, would be feeling anxious about the future and I wanted them to feel secure. I reminded the people again and again that the liberation struggle was not a battle against any one group or color, but a fight against a system of repression. (p. 540)

Mandela had cultivated an ability to see beyond individual needs to the needs of the whole. He first sought freedom for himself to pursue his own potential and civil rights. But he came to realize that everyone who looked like him had his or her freedom curtailed as well. These realizations transformed him from “frightened young man into a bold one…that turned a family-loving husband into a man without a home” (p. 544). Ultimately, he came to see that his hunger for freedom the freedom of Blacks “became a hunger for the freedom of all people…that was my mission, to liberate the oppressed and the oppressor both.” (p. 544).

Conclusion

Mandela’s life journey indicates that the development of Integral Diversity Maturity is a lifelong process. Mandela appeared to have exhibited an innate capacity for integral thinking that was nurtured and supported during the pre-conventional stages of his development. However, the full realization of this potential depended on his progressive development into postconventional stages. Because it is a postconventional capacity, IDM is not easily acquired. Our intent in providing these examples of IDM in an individual who exhibited characteristics of integral leadership is not only to provide a glimpse into the process of IDM, but also to illustrate the kinds of experiences that can produce the conditions necessary for the transformative learning that has to occur for IDM to be realized. Certainly, Mandela experienced dilemmas that set the stage for such development (e.g. death of father at an early age; racial oppression; exposure to violence; imprisonment). He also had legal training that strengthened his ability to consider opposing and conflicting positions (although this could just as easily have led him to zealously advocate for only his own positions). These experiences alone, however, were not likely enough to fuel integral development and IDM. Rather, the predisposition for integral capacity may have been what set Mandela apart.

As Pauchant suggested, throughout Mandela’s autobiographies, we found evidence of epiphanies, crisis points, liminal experiences and patterns of “…integration of [his]personal ‘crucibles,’ including mentoring relationships, enforced reflection, insertion to a foreign territory, and disruption and loss” (p. 221). These factors are all essential for transformative learning to occur (Mezirow, 1991; 1995) and transformative learning is necessary for IDM. Although there is still much to be learned from future research, we are convinced that, in the case of Mandela, IDM was the result of a confluence of factors in all four quadrants: an integral capacity nurtured at a young age aligned with social, cultural, and historical events.
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The Diversity Community
This knowledge community is brought together by a shared interest in diversity in one or another of its manifestations, in organizations, communities and nations. The community interacts through an innovative, annual face-to-face conference, as well as year-round virtual relationships in a weblog, peer reviewed journal and book imprint – exploring the affordances of the new digital media. Member of this knowledge community include academics, public administrators, policy makers, private and public sector leaders and research students.

Conference
Members of the Diversity Community meet at the International Conference on Diversity in Organizations, Communities and Nations, held annually in different locations around the world.

The Diversity Conference was first held in Sydney, Australia in 2000; Melbourne, Australia in 2001; University of Hawai‘i, Manoa, Hawai‘i, USA in 2003; University of California, Los Angeles, California, USA in 2004; Institute of Ethnic Administrators, Beijing, China in 2005; Xavier University and Louisiana State University, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA in 2006; OZW-School of Health, Amsterdam, the Netherlands in 2007; HEC Montréal, Montréal, Canada in 2008; Riga International School of Economics and Business Administration (RISEBA), Riga, Latvia in 2009; Queen’s University Belfast, Northern Ireland in 2010; University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa in 2011, and in 2012 the conference will be held in Vancouver, Canada.

Our community members and first time attendees come from all corners of the globe. The Conference is a site of critical reflection, both by leaders in the field and emerging scholars, and examines the concept of diversity as a positive and at times fraught aspect of an interconnected world and globalised society. Those unable to attend the conference may opt for virtual participation in which community members can either submit a video and/or slide presentation with voice-over, or simply submit a paper for peer review and possible publication in the Journal.

Online presentations can be viewed on YouTube.

Publishing
The Diversity Community also enables members to publish through three media. First, by participating in the Diversity Conference, community members can enter a world of journal publication unlike the traditional academic publishing forums – a result of the responsive, non-hierarchical and constructive nature of the peer review process. The International Journal of Diversity in Organizations, Communities and Nations provides a framework for double-blind peer review, enabling authors to publish into an academic journal of the highest standard.

The second publication medium is through the book series On Diversity, publishing cutting edge books in print and electronic formats. Publication proposals and manuscript submissions are welcome.

The third major publishing medium is our news blog, constantly publishing short news updates from Diversity Community, as well as major developments in issues of diversity and community. You can also join this conversation at Facebook and Twitter or subscribe to our email Newsletter.
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