New, more complex global problems call out for a new generation of synoptic thinkers who understand power and who dare to act.

**BY JEREMI SURI**

Henry Kissinger never attended a public policy school, he never took an economics course, and he never worked for a law firm, a large corporation, or a traditional government bureaucracy. His career belies the assumptions about professionalization that dominate our twenty-first century discussions of leadership. Kissinger was never really certified as an “expert” of anything. His famous Ph.D. dissertation on the Congress of Vienna, for example, was a work of History written in a Department of Government. The historians considered him a dilettante; the political scientists believed he was too unscientific. Kissinger only found a permanent academic position at Harvard University when the dean of the college, McGeorge Bundy, created a controversial and experimental new home—the Center for International Affairs—to nurture interdisciplinary projects and acquire large grants from foundations, the federal government, and the intelligence agencies.

Kissinger was a cosmopolitan generalist with an eye for pragmatic policy, living in a time of hyper-specialization and growing separation between thinkers and doers. That is what made Kissinger so special. He lived between separated worlds, and he brought those worlds together for concerted action on behalf of clearly defined national purposes. This was not just a form of work for Kissinger; it was his life story. As an Orthodox Jew in Nazi Germany, an immigrant in the U.S. Army, a non-traditional scholar at Harvard, and an unelected White House aide, Kissinger always operated on the edge of respectability. He was always the eccentric, the pusher, and the climber. Among respectable and smug pin-striped specialists, these were the qualities that allowed Kissinger to be more creative and daring in his policy advice. These were the qualities that also made him attractive to powerful figures in search of new initiatives.

Leadership, at its core, is about connections and calculated risk-taking. Kissinger excelled at both. He was a big picture thinker who drew actively on the work of people with diverse areas of expertise. Kissinger might not have done the original research, but he knew how to identify and exploit valuable new knowledge. He brilliantly synthesized the talent around him to address pressing problems in pragmatic ways. In the decades after the Second World War Kissinger guided policy-makers in their responses to the challenges of postwar reconstruction, communist containment, the nuclear arms race, limited warfare, third world revolutions, and détente. He mastered these subjects and he kept a clear focus on the strategic need to expand American foreign influence while limiting direct commitments.

Kissinger understood that leadership in a complex international environment frequently offers a first mover advantage. He had lived through a decade in the 1930s when the powerful democratic states were paralyzed by their hesitation to take action against emerging threats. Kissinger was driven to prevent a recurrence of those conditions. As he put it, the successful statesman must anticipate as well as react; he or she must “rescue an element of choice from the pressure of circumstance.” Leaders, Kissinger recognized, must define their times, rather than let their times define them. He succeeded in those terms as almost no one else has in recent memory.

Kissinger made many mistakes, but he managed to transform major regions of the world in ways that served American interests. The enduring peace agreement between Israel and Egypt and the uninterrupted Western access to Middle East oil were negotiated by Kissinger personally during his famous “shuttle diplomacy.” The U.S. opening to China was also orchestrated by Kissinger through a series of personal overtures that challenged conventional wisdom. Nearly every major international politician of the last two generations—from Richard Nixon and Mao Zedong to George W. Bush and Hu Jintao—has recognized that if you want to initiate international change, Henry Kissinger is a key catalyst. That is why he remains so influential, more than thirty years since he ended his term as Secretary of State under President Gerald Ford.

Whether one approves of Kissinger’s policies or not, the challenges of the twenty-first century require new Henry Kissingers. The problems—from
The new Kissingers of the 21st century do not look or sound like Kissinger. They do, however, share his talent for connection and calculated risk-taking. They are cosmopolitan generalists, not narrow specialists.

failed states and the proliferation of violence, to environmental degradation, fossil fuel depletion, and global disease – require leaders who can synthesize gigabytes of information without getting lost in the details. Leaders will have to connect apparently incompatible ideas and people, and they will have to take calculated risks. The early crises of the twenty-first century – terrorist attacks, North Korean nuclear saber-rattling, the near collapse of the global economy, and the devastating tsunamis in Haiti – have shown that creativity and vision are at a premium. The old language of “determination,” “development,” and “democracy” does not offer much help. The leaders of the twenty-first century will have to invent new intellectual anchors for action.

So far, the required international leadership has been in short supply. The most decorated economists around the world have mobilized to address the global financial crisis, and yet the structure of the international financial system remains largely unchanged. Where are the inspiring reform ideas? The new Kissingers of the twenty-first century do not have fancy titles, large staffs, or new Kissingers of the twenty-first century. Instead, they share his talent for connection and calculated risk-taking. They are cosmopolitan generalists, not narrow specialists, and they congregate in the spaces between established professions, disciplines, and political institutions. Like Kissinger, the new leaders of the twenty-first century are thinkers and doers at the same time, eccentric and indispensable.

They are also young. Active leadership is, in fact, a youthful enterprise. The men and women who are devising and implementing a new vision for international change do not have fancy titles, large incomes, or even big offices. They work long hours, communicating with colleagues around the world and pushing for change within existing business and government institutions. They often disagree on details, but they see themselves as part of a larger, serious, world-historical enterprise.

Who are they? They are the restless academics and journalists who left universities and newspapers because they wanted to be more relevant. In some cases, they achieved professional success because they were so technically capable. Scientists and engineers have proven ingenious in developing machinery and medicine that allow societies to put their health and their human health, and environmental sustenance? The international community has lots of pet projects and ideas, but the individuals who can bring all of them together and implement a coherent strategy? The political machinery and medicine that allow societies to put their health and their human health, and environmental sustenance? The international community has lots of pet projects and ideas, but the individuals who can bring all of them together and implement a coherent strategy? The political machinery is poised to exert ever more influence, especially as global crises mount. They risk, however, becoming too much a part of the governing system. They must make policy, but they also must remain connected to the creative thinkers who do not make policy. In Kissinger’s later life one could argue that he lost this connection and his policies suffered.

The humanities are a incubator for the creativity and imagination that policy needs more than ever before. The humanities are also a natural connector for the arts, business, and policy. The new Kissingers will not be traditional scholars of literature and history, but they will draw on the discussions surrounding that vital work. They will pioneer new humanistic applications of the modern world’s incredible technical capabilities.