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ABSTRACT

The present modern Western Development model is in chaos, and many fear it is in fact broken. This paper examines the roots of this breakdown and proposes an “Alternative Approach” to follow. Based on the wisdom of visionaries, both past and present, such as Einstein, Gandhi, Laszlo, Harman, and McGilchrist amongst others, this paper offers an alternative approach to our present development situation. This alternative approach involves the institution of a careful BALANCE between our present objective, quantitative approach to development, and a human, subjective, qualitative approach. This rebalancing of our development approach appears to affect every human behaviour and action, and thus forms an essential new foundational step in coming to grips with the present one sided objective, quantitative approach to all development.
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INTRODUCTION
We are all aware that the present Western Development model is in crisis. This paper examines the roots of this crisis, and how we can approach the whole field of a genuine sustainable future in an alternative new way than our present attempts towards sustainability.

This alternative approach is based on firstly studying the insights of a number of highly respected international visionaries, and learning that much of our problem at its root appears to have already been identified as “close to home”.

Some visionaries have already indicated where we need to begin. They point to a common thread that our present system has somehow missed, and has created a societal breakdown. As well, it has been indicated by these visionaries that we need to refocus on the “total spectrum” of our human capabilities (genuinely looking inward) instead of only one part of these capacities (that is the exterior objective part), if we hope to gain insight into the roots of a viable solution.

These visionaries include highly respected international names such as Einstein, Gandhi, Laszlo, Harman, and McGilchrist, amongst others. All of these visionaries point to a common thread that has created the present breakdown, as well as the need for us to refocus on the “total spectrum” of our human capabilities for a solution. This will require rethinking a number of personal root values and principles that we have only partially understood, or assured as being “untouchable,” and true forever. This includes BOTH our qualitative as well as our present day quantitative thinking. Both now appear to be essential when considering a deeply rooted genuine meaning of Sustainable Development.

This paper is directed mainly towards university education but can be equally applied across all disciplines as well as personal rethinking and everyday attitudes and behaviours at home, in the community or at work. It searches into the way we have been accustomed to thinking about issues, and compares that with a new deeper understanding of the problems it has perpetuated. In other words, we are searching personally “inward” for the deep solutions to sustainability. In so doing this paper offers a new alternative approach to the whole area of transformation in thinking in order to attain genuinely sustainable long term behaviour, no matter where we are.
PRESENT BREAKDOWN

There has been presently, a broad based acceptance of the fact that human activity is for the most part creating a worrisome situation related to ecological use, as well as related societal eruptions. The number of strong deniers are becoming fewer every day and there appears to be suspicion (and for some confirmation) that humanity and Nature in its full sense are really interdependent.

The way we have been trying to deal with these challenges have been mainly related to studying and acting on the SYMPTOMS rather than the root causes. This is evident in “useful but not sufficient” actions related to resource use and ecological breakdown. We are still frustrated by seemingly so much time and effort made, but with limited results. The question is: WHY?

The present efforts have been successful only to a point and for often relatively short time periods. However, they do not appear to be sufficient to withstand the increasing challenges related to natural resources, pollution problems, and population disruptions. The question often posed is what more can we do or do we need some different or additional measures?

WHERE CAN WE BEGIN? TOWARDS AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH

To begin this alternative approach firstly let us examine the wisdom of a few key visionaries, (amongst many), both past and present. They appear to have some deep insight into what has created our present breakdown, plus some indications of where we need to begin the process of transformation, based on the personal values that form the roots of our society, and the principles that are built upon these values overall.

ALBERT EINSTEIN (Einstein 1979; Calapice 1996; 2000)

--- We cannot solve our problems by using the same kind of thinking that created them.

--- Not everything that counts can be counted and not everything that can be counted counts.

These are well known statements by Einstein, but each contains a special message that can help us in our search for an Alternative Approach.

The first quote indicates clearly that the “thinking” we are accustomed to using (that is, 20th Century thinking) will not be capable of dealing with the 21st Century challenges we see
presently. Therefore, according to Einstein, we need to reexamine what we presently believe are solid principles and values.

The second quote by Einstein leads us directly to the belief that objective, scientific, quantitative measurements alone will not be able to deal with our challenges. We need to search more deeply into our thinking in search of deeper and more profound human capabilities to come to grips with what “counts” in life and work. Based on Einstein’s strong spiritual (in the broad sense) evolvement, it certainly appears that we need to take our deeply felt values and principles into account, and reexamine them to discover what we have missed over many years of believing that only science based, objective and measureable thinking is valid and can solve all our problems.

WILLIS HARMAN (Harman 1984; 1994; 1998)

--- The industrialized world, having lost any consensus on ultimate meanings and values, steers itself mainly on economic and financial signals serving pseudo-values (..). The key step in our bringing about change is eschewing the negative vision (or purely objective, positivistic thinking) to which we have unwittingly been contributing, and choosing a vision that benefits our inner purpose and that of those around us.

The first question usually refers to the “pseudo-values” we have been following. What are these pseudo-values and principles that we are at present viewing as almost untouchable? Where do we need to search as human beings in order to find a deeper meaning that we somehow have missed? It appears that Harman is certainly referring to something deep in our thinking that provides us with values that we are not respecting presently, and this has created, over time, the problems and dilemmas that we now face in all industrialized countries. Are we really convinced we can outsmart Nature, on which we depend for our existence?

ERVIN LASZLO (Laszlo 2001; 2009)

--- We are attempting to cope with the conditions of the 21st Century with the thinking of the 20th Century (…) Ultimately, such as “shift” (in human thinking) lies in the changes in hearts and minds, in the values and conduct of all.
Laszlo clearly indicates the need for a new way of thinking if we hope to solve the problems of this century. This thinking will need to obviously expand our thinking beyond the singular scientific, quantitative track we have been accustomed to using for problem solving for about 300 years. This thinking separates humanity from Nature, and indications that we feel superior to Nature, and will eventually be able to “conquer it”. Such thinking brings the real problem clearly into focusing on ourselves and our deeply held beliefs, as a significant part of the problem.

DAVID KORTEN (Korten 1999; 2006)

---That which cannot be observed or measured, such as spirit and consciousness, came to be excluded from consideration by science – and therefore from the scientific perspective does not exist.

---Just as the cultural messages of science would leave us spiritually dead, the ideological doctrines of corporate libertarianism would leave us politically inert.

There is a clear warning from Korten that we as human beings have made a mistake in placing our efforts on a purely quantitative, scientific and corporate business foundation. Humans, based on Korten’s insight, need more than that. There is something else that human capabilities can contribute in order to somehow balance these quantitative efforts, and we have somehow missed out on that “something” that appears vital for us to deal with in our present day challenges through only scientific means.

In summarizing the views of visionaries, it appears that, to date, we have been concentrating on the “exterior” symptoms of our problems, especially in the ecological areas-----as if Nature is totally separate from any human aspects. We have viewed the problems as challenges to be solved by technological and scientific means. This approach has been highly developed at present. However it appears there is an area we have not realized, or do not want to accept. Does the problem have its origin in how we humans think (especially about our interdependence with Nature) and the values we have had so deeply engrained over about 300 years? That means being able to solve all problems through purely scientific, objective means, and keep deep human values outside as not credible as we cannot measure them scientifically. These assumptions appear evident every day as we see decision makers treat “symptoms” of problems in place of first treating the roots of the problems.
A common thread seems to run through all of these examples of insights from visionaries, both past and present. Are they referring to “something” we seem to have not seen or realized?

There seems to be an inability to accept, in our present system of thinking, even at a very personal level, that we need to reexamine deeply held personal values. We know from experience that these are the ones that affect all our behaviours and attitudes ---both at the personal level, and all the way up to the highest level of decision making.. However it now appears that this “missing link” so to speak may provide us with a clue towards understanding what has been left out in our efforts to solve our present challenges.

This common thread of a need to look “inward” toward our personal values and the overall importance of our “inner self” and its incredible importance and wisdom still appears to be discounted and certainly uncomfortable for individuals to take seriously. After all we have been brought up and educated to think that the solutions to whatever problems lie “out there” in the exterior and science will finally find ways of solving them. That thinking no longer seems to work, except slowly show some short term temporary improvements. But it has shown not to be enough. One can see our present approach to looking at issues to be solved in basically two different ways:

I. Present conventional approach:
   a) identify problem to be solved  
   b) Take action directly to solve that problem  
   c) people and their values involved do not enter into the process.

II. Alternative Sustainable approach :
   a) Identify the values and principles involved in the problem. 
   b) Reexamine these values and principles to find which ones are creating the problem, and rethink these values and principles, so they can solve the problem for the long term ----thus involving genuinely sustainable values and principles.
   c) apply these new principles and values to all the problems at hand.

In example I, the values and principles that created the problem initially are not questioned. Therefore the actions taken are based on conventional values/principles and create a conflictive situation. Outcomes are obviously not positive for many reasons, as we are not looking at the genuine root of the issue. We are in fact treating symptoms.
In example II, we firstly identify the values and principles that have CAUSED the problem, and then go through the complex task of accepting that these must be rethought first if we hope to have a long term sustainable result. Hence, when these root values and principles have been rethought and become “sustainable”, then following that we can be assured that the resulting actions will also be sustainable, and all actions following that, in many different areas will also be sustainable, both at a personal and organizational level. Notice we have treated the ROOT first.

Putting this in a context of the relationship between person and task, or between exterior thinking and interior thinking, we see our conventional way of thinking is “task oriented” (or exterior), and the sustainable way is “values oriented” (or interior) as an important root beginning to realistically transform our activities, thinking and attitudes to sustainability. In the genuine long term sense, this includes our genuine linkage between Nature and humanity.

These visionaries show us that we have in fact been limiting our overall knowledge and problem solving abilities to only one source ---our objective, scientific, positivistic thinking. However, these visionaries recognize that we also have capacities that many of us are unaware, and when we access these, we have incredible sustainable wisdom and deep values that can combine well with our everyday outcomes of activities.

WHAT IS BEHIND THIS NEW THINKING or ALTERNATIVE APPROACH?
Firstly we begin with new, highly respected research by Iain McGilchrist, in his new book, “THE MASTER AND HIS EMISSARY: The Divided Mind Brain and the Making of the Modern World.” This book provides new insights into the capacities of the human brain and the special functions performed by our Right and Left brain. McGilchrist has achieved outstanding results in identifying the functions of our brain. This whole area of work has been controversial, related to how we think, and the distinct functions of our Right and Left brains, and the confirmation of our need for both.

In his book, McGilchrist shows that basically the Right brain is our Master, where our overall “big picture of reality” and thinking is rooted, and takes into account all the different interrelated influences we need to consider in decision making, as well as being the foundation or home for our deeply rooted wisdom and core values.

The Left brain, on the other hand, is considered essential for “putting into practice” the thinking or wisdom of the right brain (which apparently the Right brain does not have the
capacity to do) and it provides the basis for essential objective, scientific thinking. So McGilchrist sees the absolute need for both, as each performs a key but different function for a long term sustainable development model. He views our present model as purely Left brain thinking and thus we have lost our way in terms of the needs for deep thinking connected with overall sustainability. We have apparently allowed the Left brain to become our Master. Now we are trying to REBALANCE our thinking to allow an important place for both Right and Left brain thinking in order to achieve genuine Sustainable Thinking.

**DIVERSITY AND SUSTAINABILITY**

What is Diversity? We meet diversity every day. At the local level we see diversity in how communities develop, diversity in cultures of people who live there, diversity in thinking and working in different sectors of society, and these diversities can be extended to whole regions or countries. In our world today, with global trade in products, ways of doing business, movement of people, and interconnected global organizations, we are seeing conflicts in many areas, as some of the most powerful groups are often viewed as attempting to dominate smaller and weaker groups or cultures, in terms of what should be accepted and what needs to be adjusted. Ecological realities as well as genuine sustainable needs of local populations are often not taken seriously. The present worrisome power of the whole financial world is an important example.

All of these efforts in global interconnections appear to have mostly pure Left brain considerations, as societies appear to be reacting mainly to the power of economic aspects, at the expense of ecological and human considerations. Powerful organizations appear to have developed a societal acceptance that money is the key to their future success and happiness. Thus we have a situation where purely Left brain values and principles have prevailed at the expense of long term genuine sustainability.

Diversity as such is considered natural in Nature, and before we began to put into effect serious globalization values and principles, most regions or countries had more control over the way they could develop. Recognizing that some countries absolutely need or needed some products or copy some concepts from other regions or countries, but these could mostly be adjusted to the host country without damaging the diversity of a particular country. Today we are seeing the concept of globalization extended in some areas to believing that “one size fits all” in many products, or governance areas, as well as the new found needs for non renewable
natural resources, as a singular source of income, especially in poorer countries. What can be done?

We need to firstly recognize that deep universal core values form a common foundation for ALL humanity, and these apparently come from Right brain thinking. Therefore, at all levels of society we need to accept that the first step begins with the individual, and how our personal values affect everything we do and think every day ----all our behaviours. This applies to every person at all levels of society. Many researchers such as Korten (2006; 1999) have indicated that we need to start with our local communities, in order to develop a stable region or country. In other words, if local communities are stable and work well together, stability in regions and countries will follow, as long as we have a common foundation of values.

Diversities are accepted as positive and real, and stability comes through common root values, while at the same time, working with communities that are different or diverse, be it type of work, culture, or circumstances. This also places us in agreement with Nature which encourages Diversity in its full spectrum of the biological world. We are totally interlinked with Nature in every way, and at all levels from the community level all the way up to large corporations and country governments, as well as common international organizations. Consequently Diversity is essential for our survival and the survival of Earth and its systems. Researchers have been studying the concept of Diversity for many years, and it is now accepted that there are many different ways to develop sustainably, and we need to respect the different ways as valid, even though they all seem to need a common set of root values.

What is Commonality in Values? Diversity leads to questions of the need for commonality, as researchers, such as Korten has shown. When working with diversity, we also need to find, at some deeper level, a commonality of values that we all agree with, even though the way these values are put into practice is different. In that regard, apparently our deep human values are based on some commonly held values that every human being possesses deep within our thinking. After that we have diverse ways of actually putting these concepts into sustainable practice. At present we are apparently only drawing from Left brain objective based values, and not accessing the deeper Right brain values that are needed. Therefore even our principles are affected by left brain thinking, and our Left brain, as Walsh (2003) indicated has been “overdeveloped” and our Right brain (the home of our deep human values)
has basically been left to languish. Now we need to REBALANCE this situation. We need to draw out our Right brain values (that we apparently all have in common) as our foundation, and then accept a group of diverse ways of putting these values into practice. In this way we are making use of the important aspects of both Right and Left brain capabilities, resulting in both subjective and objective thinking and values. In business these concepts are sometimes referred to as “human scale” considerations.

THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATON

Even though this paper can be helpful for all members of society in search of sustainability, the youth in our countries and communities are in special need. They are our future and will be faced directly with the consequences of our actions. This will influence their daily behaviours as well as the organizations where they work, and their societal mindsets in general.

Within the education sector, we would like to especially encourage the participants in universities, that is, professors and students. These students will soon become our new societal leaders and deserve an education that prepares them for the realities that they will be confronting after university. This means professors have the responsibility of being aware of the roots of the challenges in new thinking related to overall sustainability.

Following are some examples of different views and attitudes that appear prevalent in many universities related to embracing root changes in values and principles related to a new approach to Sustainable Development.

1) University Professors: Some of these differences in views can be summarized as:
   View a) : The transformation in thinking needed will mean a complete change in the basic principles on which all our educational preparation has been based. This also means that our curriculum could be affected, and the basic positivistic philosophy is in question. We need to take this situation seriously and to search out the different steps needed. This will often mean some major changes in the university experience.
   As Stephen Sterling (Sterling 2001, 21) stated: “The crisis in education is its limited ability to assert humanistic and democratic values in the face of quasi-market and managerial forces”.
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Our question now is: Where is the time to think about these issues, to reflect and use critical thinking and discussion of these new challenges?

View b) The education leaders in our institutions will never agree to such a major transformation. This changes the root beliefs in the positivistic based principles on which our institution has been based for many years. These positivistic based principles are now being questioned by some highly respected educators like David Orr (Orr 2001, 14) who stated: “Education presently taking place in the U.S. (and other countries) is long on performance standards and testing and short on how to encourage critical thinking, creativity, and ecological awareness.”

View c) Our present philosophy in teaching has served us and society well during many decades. Why should it be changed?

2) Students: At present there also exist a number of different views related to attitudes of students, and how they perceive their university learning process:

View a) New ideas are welcome, come with a meaningful university experience, and are considered positive. We live in fast changing times, and have serious challenges in front of us that could mean major changes ecologically and socially, and our very survival seems threatened. We look to universities to help us find new ways to think and work that can solve these problems that seem to have built up over many years.

View b) These new ideas behind Sustainable Development seem to make some sense and hopefully we will learn some useful tools to counteract what is happening, especially in ecological areas. I am hopeful that what I learn will help me find a good job.

View c) The basic idea of university seems to be to think like the university professor wants. The main thing for us is to finally earn that degree so we have something useful in our hand in the market place when looking for a job afterwards.

Summarizing these outlooks, we have indeed much work and new thinking ahead, if we hope to deal adequately with the new challenges in society in general. This means searching more
deeply into the sacred ground of educational principles – a new world that has not been touched for many decades. However we have new threats, for example in ecological areas, that we have never experienced before in our history, and threaten the very existence of our children, grandchildren and generations yet to come.

We have, in our experience been involved in only superficial changes, but never, for over 300 years (according to researchers) questioned the basic positivistic principles and values that underpin our educational systems. Now there appears little choice if we wish to provide the basic fundamental changes needed for genuine sustainability. Teaching our youth is our responsibility and hope for a sustainable future is their right.

SUSTAINABLE CORE VALUES
Core values involve deeply held human values that basically form the foundation for sustainability. These values apparently most all of us possess, but our own upbringing and early education has a significant influence on how active they become in our lives and work. In modern industrial countries, these values have mostly become “hidden” as many can conflict with our modern industrial world thinking. This thinking depends on our scientific mindset and values that can be counted or measured, and thus the deep core values do not gain credibility, as they are a foundation based on Right brain rather than objective Left brain thinking.

Many visionaries have viewed the re-examination of these values as vital for us to gain genuine sustainability thinking in our personal as well as organizational lives.

For simplicity these core values are grouped into 3 main areas. The values shown in this study are drawn from a wide research base, but principally drawn from the United Nations Earth Charter (1997), and thus is based on an international scope.

a. Values related to Self: (Kras 2007)
   - LOVE: This includes respect for all humans, including oneself. The concept of Love includes some key values such as: COMPASSION, KINDNESS, GENEROSITY, FORGIVENESS, JOY.
   - Respect: This includes respect for oneself, as well as respect for others.
   - Honesty and Trust: To have honesty needs trust; to have trust needs honesty. Out of that evolves cooperation and sharing.
• Non-violence: This refers to non-violence in thoughts, attitudes and behaviours, as it applies to all organizational and personal interactions and utilizes dialogue to handle differences (Gandhi 2006).

• Humility: This is usually considered a weakness in Western society. Humility is considered a positive value that often requires “quality” education as a basis for understanding the true strength of humility. The opposite of humility is usually referred to as conceit, and it appears often that conceit results in learning to stop while humility promotes learning.

• Service: We all need to feel the need to give of ourselves to help others, without expecting anything in return. That is difficult in a very individualistic society.

b. Values related to Family, Community, work: (Kras 2007)

These values are directly related to and depend on the Values related to the Self. These values basically cover relationships with others, and are strongly associated with the attitudes and behaviours found in the workplace and community. Schumacher (1997) indicated clearly the importance of work for a balanced individual in all regions of the world. He indicated that the average person, in relation to work, wants: “to be creatively productive, to render service, act in accordance with our moral impulses”. This clearly indicates the human need for creativity in work, the need to do something for others without expecting anything in return, and the importance of some deeply felt values that can be respected in our daily work. All of these values depend on a solid family upbringing related to deep personal values, as well as cooperation with ones colleagues no matter what work we do. It also means the importance of a strong community where the same values are present, and these are then present in the work situation.

c. Values related to Nature (ecological areas) and Outer Space or Cosmos (Kras 2007).

Nature makes human life on earth possible, and therefore we are inextricably linked. Simply to live we need Water, Soil and Air. The damage of one of these renders life impossible. Therefore, within us as humans, we possess some deep seated capabilities to experience deep wisdom in our human consciousness, and awe of the many things in Nature and the Cosmos we do not understand.
SUSTAINABLE PRINCIPLES

Many of the principles that follow will appear familiar, but they often carry a very different meaning when they are seated on Right brain sustainable values discussed above. This is the major difference we see in work and life when we “change the interpretations of values”, our whole “reality changes”, and thus our interpretation of everything happening around us. This is usually a dramatic development for many people who have been interpreting the following principles based on conventional values, and thus have a totally different interpretation, and resulting conclusions. As is obvious, the following principles can only be interpreted “sustainably” if we firstly gain insight into the Values shown above, and re-examine our own values. For simplicity, these principles have been divided into what is commonly known as 3 major groups in society: Ecological, Social and Economic.

Ecological Principles (Kras 2007)

- Harmony and Balance: We need to have harmony and balance amongst the ecological, social and economic aspects of work and personal life. This is especially difficult in the present situation where the economic area predominates all others.
- Long term planning: We need to begin to think beyond the usual short term of today, and plan for the longer term (25-50 years), so we go beyond any personal benefits, and are more in consideration of Nature’s rhythm, that is long term.
- Earth is a living system: This questions our present system of many “specializations”. All of Nature on Earth is interconnected, and we are discovering that humanity is also dependent on or related to our natural environment in almost everything we do. This controls how we treat Nature, from everyday activities to how we treat our natural resources, renewable or non-renewable.
- Commitment: to protect, conserve and restore damage done to Nature by humanity.
- Precautionary Principle: Nature shows us that we are subject to its limitations, and there is much we do not understand. Therefore we must be mindful to use precaution in our actions related to Nature and our natural resources.
- Integrated thinking: This involves a sustainable understanding of how human activity affects all of our key functions—such as the linkage between ecological, social and economic aspects.
• Polluter pays: When we make mistakes or knowingly negatively affect our ecological base, we are also prepared that such actions come with a price, and accept this principle.

**Social Principles** (Kras 2007)

• We believe humans are inherently good: All humans possess deep universal human values, as indicated above. This is based on the Right brain thinking researched by Iain McGilchrist, described previously. This social value questions many of the present governance principles that are commonly used today. Combined with this principle also comes responsibility for ones actions in the broad sense.

• Right to equitable use of natural resources, and equality in treatment in general: This applies to all sectors, regardless of economic position.

• Respect for Diversity: This includes different cultures, disciplines, countries, businesses, and economic positions in society.

• Equality of opportunity: This principle needs to be respected, in spite of ecological, social or economic differences.

• Tolerance and non-violence: This applies to our thoughts, attitudes, behaviours and actions.

• Social and economic justice for all.

• Work has intrinsic values.

• Education in its full sense is life long.

**Economic Principles** (Kras 2007)

• Main objective: Quality of life, meaning overall human well being for all sectors.

• Long term planning: Key to sustainable development overall.

• Institutions, decision makers responsibility: democratic, accountable, transparent.

• Integration: Balanced carefully between ecological, social and economic needs.

• Distinct groups in society needed: Society has different interrelated groups who have distinct responsibilities in a balanced society, and can all work together in harmony without any one becoming the dominant one. These include government, business, education, health etc.
• Progress measured in Quality of life: This is a total change from the predominance of the present situation where economic considerations are a key measure in Quality of life.

• Trade: A balance between local and international, with most importance given to local trade, involving smaller companies, and generally local and regional trade areas.

• Money: Money is considered a tool for exchange, not a commodity for trade.

• Economic sector: considered a subsystem of and dependent upon the whole Earth Ecological System.

• Development: Balance of ecological, social and economic sustainability for each region and country.

• Wealth: Based on the natural resources of a region or country.

• Cooperation: Differences are settled based on sustainable cooperation values.

### SUMMARY COMPARISON CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONVENTIONAL THINKING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABLE THINKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Individualism</td>
<td>Whole system collective concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Personal Ego</td>
<td>Personal Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win/Lose Outlook</td>
<td>Win/Win Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision: Short Term</td>
<td>Vision: Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Thinking</td>
<td>Integrated Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic priority</td>
<td>Balanced priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all others externalities)</td>
<td>(all others internalities)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kras 2011.
CONCLUSIONS

1. Present situation: It is considered a broken system, that is, a breakdown in both the concept of sustainable values as well as the principles of operation that depend on these sustainable values. A few key compared principles of operation include: strong individualism is present instead of whole system collective concerns; short term planning is present instead of long term; short term vision is present instead of long term; linear thinking is present instead of integrative thinking. These are examples of needs for change for genuine sustainability.

1. Alternative Approach: In place of treating the present issues as an “end of pipe” issue, the Alternative system looks firstly at the values and principles on which the present systems are seated, re-examine these values and principles, to locate the areas of conflict, and develop a new foundation of values and principles on which to place actions for genuine sustainability. This Alternative approach affects all societal processes and activities, including buildings, design of products, forestry cutting, fishing, etc. as well as all businesses, governments, educational and health related institutions, and of course society in general.

2. Various visionaries have pointed the way towards an entirely new dimension or treating 21st Century problems with 21st Century thinking, housed in a deep human values foundation. These deep human values include love (in its broad sense), compassion, forgiveness, respect for oneself and others, honesty, trust, non-violence in thought, word, or deed, humility and service, in the sense of giving to others without expecting anything in return.

3. Diversity has been confirmed as a sustainable concept and totally in harmony with the new foundation of 21st Century thinking in human sustainable values and principles. Diversity as such copies the Rules of Nature, that is naturally diverse. Diversity is considered essential for sustainability to be present.
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