



LEADERSHIP ON THE EDGE

Sir Douglas Mawson

Command, Survival and Adaptation at the Edge of Human Endurance

CASE STUDY NO. 2

CENTRAL LEADERSHIP QUESTION

How does a leader maintain clarity, purpose and the will to continue when the original mission has collapsed, trusted companions have been lost and survival itself has become the priority?

LEADERSHIP THESIS

Leadership under extreme adversity depends on the ability to confront reality, redefine success, conserve the capacity to act and continuously reassess the next achievable objective.

Montane Protective Security

10 September 2026

Executive Summary

On 14 December 1912, more than 500 kilometres from the safety of Cape Denison, Douglas Mawson lost a companion, a team of dogs and a sledge carrying much of the Far Eastern Party's essential supplies to a hidden crevasse.

The moment lasted only seconds. Its consequences transformed the journey.

Until then, Mawson, Belgrave Ninnis and Xavier Mertz had been conducting scientific and geographic exploration east of the Australasian Antarctic Expedition's main base. They had left Cape Denison on 10 November with two sledges, sixteen dogs and provisions for approximately two months. By mid-December, they had crossed major glaciers, gathered observations and moved beyond any immediate rescue effort.

Ninnis's loss was both a personal tragedy and a collapse of capability. Mawson and Mertz also lost the stronger dog team, much of their food, dog rations, essential equipment and transport capacity. Mawson later explained that the strongest dogs and most indispensable supplies had been placed on the rear sledge because the leading sledge was considered more likely to break through a snow bridge. The precaution was rational, but the assumed sequence was reversed when the rear sledge disappeared.

What confronted the two surviving men was not exploration. It was arithmetic:

- How much food remained?
- How much fuel remained?
- How many dogs remained?
- How far away was Cape Denison?
- Could they get back?

The first great leadership decision of the return was not heroic. It was simply the acceptance of reality.

The journey eastwards was over. The journey home had begun.

Mawson and Mertz turned west into a diminishing contest between distance and capability. With most dog rations gone, they progressively killed the weakening animals for food. Each loss extended immediate human survival while reducing transport capacity.

Both men deteriorated physically. Mertz became gravely ill and died in the early hours of 8 January 1913. Mawson initially attributed the death to exposure and lack of food and later considered colitis. A later medical analysis proposed vitamin A toxicity associated with consuming husky liver. The hypothesis remains plausible, but starvation, exhaustion, cold exposure and other physiological stresses may also have contributed. The evidence does not support certainty about one exclusive cause.

Mawson was now entirely alone.

The scientific purpose of the wider expedition remained, but the Far Eastern Party's original mission no longer existed. The three-person travelling party had become a two-person survival effort, and that effort had now been reduced to the survival of one person.

Mawson continued alone for approximately one month. Severely weakened, he reduced the load, modified damaged equipment, managed dwindling food and organised survival around immediate tasks. He reached Aladdin's Cave, approximately nine kilometres from Cape Denison, but severe weather delayed the final movement. Mawson reached the base on 8 February 1913, shortly after Aurora had departed.

Mawson later became closely associated with the closing lines of Robert W. Service's poem *The Quitter*:

*"Just have one more try,
It's dead easy to die,
It's the keeping-on-living that's hard."*

The words belong to Service, not Mawson. Accounts commonly describe Mawson as recalling or reciting them during the solitary journey, although the precise circumstances remain reported tradition rather than an independently established diary event.

Their significance lies not in a simplistic refusal to quit. Mawson had already abandoned the original objective, reversed direction, discarded equipment and reduced expectations. “One more try” represented disciplined continuation after reality had been faced and the mission changed.

Mawson did not survive because Mawson refused to change.

Mawson survived partly because Mawson changed repeatedly.

The case therefore offers a more precise understanding of resilience:

Resilience is not the stubborn continuation of a failing approach.

It is the preservation of purposeful action through honest adaptation.

Part 1. The Scientist and the Expedition

The Scientist-Explorer

Douglas Mawson was a scientist before becoming an expedition leader.

Born in Yorkshire in 1882, Mawson moved to Australia as a child and later studied mining engineering and geology at the University of Sydney. Early professional work included geological exploration in the New Hebrides, now Vanuatu, followed by appointment as a lecturer in mineralogy and petrology at the University of Adelaide in 1905. Mawson investigated ancient rock formations and radioactive minerals and identified and described davidite from specimens associated with the region later known as Radium Hill.

This formation matters because Mawson's interest in Antarctica was rooted principally in scientific inquiry. The continent offered questions about glaciation, geology, magnetic phenomena, weather and the relationship between Antarctica and Australia that could not be answered from a university laboratory.

Science and exploration demanded complementary instincts. The scientist observes, records and resists unsupported conclusions. The explorer enters country where observations are scarce, maps are incomplete and evidence becomes available only after risk has been accepted.

The expedition leader must combine both.

Too much caution and the enterprise never begin; too much ambition and uncertainty become exposure.

Mawson's first Antarctic experience came through Ernest Shackleton's Nimrod Expedition of 1907 to 1909. Mawson participated in the first ascent of Mount Erebus and accompanied Edgeworth David and Alistair Mackay on their journey to the vicinity of the South Magnetic Pole. The party travelled for 122 days and endured hunger, frostbite, severe exhaustion and hidden crevasses.

As David's physical condition deteriorated, David reportedly asked Mawson to assume greater leadership responsibility. David later described Mawson as the real leader of the party and praised Mawson's resourcefulness, physical strength and resistance to the cold.

Experience of this kind develops confidence for good reason. Mawson had already crossed crevassed terrain, endured extreme cold, managed hunger and helped an exhausted party return from the Antarctic interior. Mawson understood that polar exploration demanded more than enthusiasm. It required planning, discipline and the physical ability to continue when ordinary reserves had disappeared.

Experience, however, has two edges. It can improve the leader's ability to recognise danger and devise practical solutions. It can also normalise levels of exposure that others would regard as exceptional. A leader who has repeatedly survived narrow margins may understand those margins better than a novice while becoming more willing to accept them again.

Polar experience increased Mawson's capability.

It may also have increased Mawson's tolerance for risk.

An Australian Expedition

Mawson's Australasian Antarctic Expedition was conceived as a major scientific and geographic undertaking rather than principally as a symbolic race to the South Pole.

The expedition departed Hobart aboard Aurora in December 1911. Five people established a station on Macquarie Island, while Antarctic bases were created at Commonwealth Bay and on the Shackleton Ice Shelf. The scientific program included geology, biology, meteorology, geomagnetism, oceanography and coastal mapping. The expedition eventually travelled thousands of kilometres overland, charted substantial stretches of coastline and pioneered radio communications involving Antarctica through Macquarie Island.

These achievements reveal Mawson as an enterprise leader, not merely as the survivor of one sledging journey.

Mawson developed the purpose, secured political and institutional backing, recruited specialists and organised a distributed enterprise whose members would operate across widely separated locations. Scientists, sailors, wireless operators, dog handlers, photographers and field parties needed to contribute to a common undertaking without performing the same work or facing the same conditions.

Once the sledging parties left their bases, direct supervision largely disappeared. Radio communication was one of the expedition's significant innovations, but it could not provide real-time assistance to people hundreds of kilometres away on the Antarctic plateau. Field leaders had to interpret wider intent while responding to weather, terrain, equipment, supplies and human condition.

The system depended on trust.

It also depended on judgement.

The two were inseparable.

The Home of the Blizzard

Cape Denison became known as the Home of the Blizzard. Katabatic winds descended from the Antarctic plateau and accelerated towards the coast, producing extraordinary and persistent conditions. Blizzards could reduce visibility, halt movement, damage equipment and turn basic outdoor work into a physical contest.

The environment imposed discipline. Clothing had to be maintained, instruments protected and supplies secured. Scientific observations continued regardless of discomfort. Food, shelter and equipment were not background administrative concerns. They were the systems that made scientific work and survival possible.

Life at Cape Denison also created close relationships. Expedition members worked, ate and lived together for months while isolated from the rest of the world. In that environment, companionship became both personal and functional.

Ninnis and Mertz developed a particularly close friendship. Contemporary recollections described them as almost inseparable, with their names frequently spoken together. Mertz later described Ninnis as the closest friend Mertz had within the expedition.

That relationship is important because the later loss cannot be understood through logistics alone.

Ninnis was not simply one-third of the Far Eastern Party.

Ninnis was a companion.

By the spring of 1912, Mawson had organised several sledging parties to investigate the surrounding country. Exploration east of Cape Denison carried particular scientific value because parts of the coastline appeared difficult to approach from the sea. The working season was limited, and Aurora was expected to return during the Antarctic summer.

Scientific opportunity, weather and the ship's schedule created pressure to use the available time decisively.

On 10 November 1912, Mawson, Ninnis and Mertz departed Cape Denison.

East from Cape Denison

The Far Eastern Party travelled with two sledges, sixteen dogs and provisions calculated for a journey expected to last approximately two months. Mawson brought scientific leadership and previous Antarctic experience. Ninnis had military experience and shared significant responsibilities associated with the dog teams. Mertz was an accomplished skier and mountaineer who also brought considerable ability in handling the animals.

The party combined complementary skills. Mawson provided leadership, scientific direction and polar experience. Ninnis and Mertz contributed to the movement, care and management of the dogs on which the journey depended.

The outward journey was demanding but productive. The party crossed major glacial systems and collected observations in country that had not been adequately mapped. With each successful movement, however, the distance from Cape Denison increased.

Distance in Antarctica was not empty space. It consumed food, fuel, animal strength, equipment and time. Every kilometre travelled east would eventually have to be recovered by people and animals carrying fewer provisions and greater fatigue.

The route home might remain geographically similar.

The party attempting it would not.

The sledging loads also contained a hidden concentration risk. Mawson later wrote that the strongest dogs and the most indispensable supplies had been assigned to the rear sledge. The leading sledge was considered more exposed to a snow bridge collapsing, so the arrangement was intended to protect the party's best animals and essential stores.

Part 2. The Journey Home

The Crevasse - The Day the Far Eastern Mission Ended

On 14 December 1912, the Far Eastern Party was more than 500 kilometres from Cape Denison.

For more than a month, Mawson, Ninnis and Mertz had been travelling through some of the most hostile terrain on Earth. The work was difficult, but scientific observations were accumulating and new ground was being explored. The party appeared to be fulfilling the purpose for which it had been created.

The three people had settled into the rhythm familiar to long expeditions. Progress was measured in miles travelled, observations completed and terrain crossed. Their world had narrowed to snow, wind, dogs and sledges. Ahead lay country not yet properly explored. Behind them stretched the long route home.

Then, in a matter of seconds, everything changed.

Ninnis was travelling beside the rear sledge when the snow beneath Ninnis gave way. What appeared to be solid ground was a snow bridge over a hidden crevasse. Ninnis, the sledge, the stronger dog team and much of the party's food and equipment disappeared below.

The loss was immediate and absolute. There was no meaningful opportunity for rescue and no realistic prospect of recovery. Mawson and Mertz called into the crevasse and attempted to determine what could be reached. Mertz recorded that the rear of the sledge could be seen far below and that the sound of a dog was heard for a time, but the ropes were too short and the crevasse too wide to allow descent. The sound eventually stopped.

Ninnis was gone.

For weeks the three people had depended entirely on one another. Every task, meal and mile had been shared. In the Antarctic interior, companionship becomes part of the machinery of survival.

Mertz had lost a particularly close friend. Mawson had lost a companion for whose safety Mawson bore responsibility. The survivors read a prayer from Mawson's prayer book because no other farewell or final honour was available to them.

There was little time to absorb the full meaning of the loss. Mawson later wrote that they strove to forget it in the necessity of work, even while knowing that the truth would return to them in the lonely days ahead.

What disappeared with Ninnis was not simply a companion. It was capability.

The lost sledge carried much of the food, dog rations and indispensable equipment. The strongest dogs had also disappeared. In practical terms, the party had lost far more than one-third of its strength.

It had lost a substantial portion of its future. The scientific objectives that had occupied the preceding weeks now ceased to matter. The maps, measurements and intended route belonged to an operating environment that no longer existed.

The problem had changed. What confronted the two surviving men was not exploration. It was arithmetic:

- How much food remained?
- How much fuel remained?
- How many dogs remained?
- How far away was Cape Denison?
- Could they get back?

The first great leadership decision of the return was not heroic. It was simply the acceptance of reality.

The journey eastwards was over.

The journey home had begun.

The strength of Mawson's response was not stubbornness. It was recognition. Recognition that the world had changed, that the assumptions underpinning the Far Eastern mission no longer existed and that success would now mean something entirely different from what it had meant only moments before.

The wider Australasian Antarctic Expedition had not ended. Scientific work continued at its bases and through its other field parties.

The Far Eastern Party's original mission had ended.

Before the survival journey could begin, someone had to acknowledge that the previous objective was gone.

Mawson did.

Two People Turning West

Mawson and Mertz began the return with six surviving dogs, reduced equipment and severely limited supplies. They had not established a chain of depots along the route already travelled because they planned to return by a different inland circuit. The loss therefore left them without the logistical structure that might have divided the return into more manageable stages.

The homeward journey began under the weight of Ninnis's death. Mawson wrote that work provided temporary refuge from grief, but the practical requirements of survival could not remove the personal reality of what had happened.

The surviving dog team required food, but most of the dog rations had disappeared. As the animals weakened, Mawson and Mertz faced a brutal cycle. Dogs were essential to movement, yet keeping the dogs alive consumed resources that no longer existed in sufficient quantity.

One by one, the weakest animals were killed and eaten. By Christmas Day, the party had recovered almost half the distance to the base, but the system supporting continued movement was collapsing.

Every dog lost solved one problem and created another. The meat extended immediate human survival, but the loss of an animal reduced movement and transport capacity. A diminishing team increased the burden on every dog that remained and eventually on Mawson and Mertz themselves.

The survivors were consuming future capability to remain alive in the present.

The route crossed terrain already encountered during the outward journey, but familiarity did not make it the same problem. The outward party had three people, two dog teams, full provisions and stronger physical reserves. The returning party had two grieving survivors, six dogs, much less food and a rapidly diminishing margin.

Nothing about the route had changed.

Everything about the people attempting it had.

Progress became a contest between distance and deterioration. Each day without adequate food reduced the strength available for movement. Reduced strength slowed progress. Slower progress increased the number of days for which food would be required.

Rest consumed time and food.

Movement consumed strength.

Delay increased exposure.

The problem was no longer how to complete the journey efficiently. It was how to choose among different kinds of risk.

The remaining weeks of December became a struggle against hunger, exhaustion and declining movement. Mertz's condition gradually deteriorated until Mertz could no longer contribute as an equal travelling companion.

On 6 January, the pair had covered more than two-thirds of the return distance. Mertz then became seriously ill and was increasingly unable or unwilling to continue. Mawson tended Mertz and considered hauling Mertz on the sledge, but the effort could not reverse the deterioration. Mertz died at approximately two o'clock on the morning of 8 January 1913.

The precise medical cause remains unresolved. Mawson wrote of exposure and lack of food and later considered colitis. A medical analysis published decades later proposed vitamin A toxicity from eating husky liver, and the hypothesis remains plausible. The combined effects of starvation, severe caloric deficit, cold and exhaustion should not, however, be understated.

For Mawson, the immediate problem was practical and human rather than diagnostic.

Two capable companions had become one relatively functional traveller and one increasingly dependent person. Mawson had to balance the possibility that rest might help Mertz against the food and time the delay would consume. Continued movement offered the possibility of reaching supplies, but it also risked accelerating physical collapse. Reducing the load might improve mobility while removing equipment that could later prove essential.

None of the available options offered safety.

The problem was no longer how to succeed.

It was how to choose between different forms of danger.

Mertz's death ended the second version of the mission. The objective had been to return two people to Cape Denison. Now there was only one.

Mawson was alone.

One More Try

Most leadership literature assumes the presence of followers. The leader communicates, allocates responsibilities, builds confidence and directs collective effort.

Mawson no longer had anyone to lead in that conventional sense.

Yet leadership did not disappear. Its direction changed.

Mawson now had to exercise authority over the only remaining person: Mawson. There was no companion to question a route, identify deteriorating judgement or insist that Mawson eat, rest or continue. Self-command required discipline without supervision, decisions without consultation and purposeful action without reassurance.

The remaining distance was too great to solve psychologically in one decision. If Cape Denison remained the only meaningful measure of progress, each day's modest advance could appear irrelevant. Mawson needed the distant objective for direction, but immediate action required a much shorter horizon.

Could food be prepared? Could the sledge be repaired? Could direction be maintained? Could another section be crossed without spending every remaining physical reserve?

Survival became a succession of immediate decisions.

Mawson later became closely associated with the closing lines of Robert W. Service's *The Quitter*:

"Just have one more try,

It's dead easy to die,

It's the keeping-on-living that's hard."

The words did not promise that Mawson would reach Cape Denison. They did not restore the supplies, improve the weather or undo the deaths of Ninnis and Mertz. They reduced an overwhelming problem to a decision that could be made in the present.

Try once more.

This was not an instruction to repeat yesterday. Mawson had already abandoned the original mission, changed direction, reduced the load and altered every previous measure of progress. What endured was not the method but the purpose.

Persistence without reassessment becomes stubbornness.

Persistence after reassessment becomes disciplined execution.

“One more try” meant deciding what mattered today.

Sometimes that meant movement. At other times it meant preparing food, repairing equipment, reducing the load or waiting for the environment to permit progress. The value did not lie in constant activity. It lay in continuing to behave in ways that kept survival possible.

This was not optimism. Optimism predicts that the future will improve. Mawson had little evidence on which to make such a prediction.

It was disciplined hope.

Mawson could not determine whether survival would ultimately be achieved. Mawson could still choose actions that did not make survival impossible.

The Discipline of Small Progress

Mawson’s solitary return suggests a useful concept: ***minimum viable progress***.

Minimum viable progress is the smallest meaningful action that preserves essential capability, reduces immediate danger or advances the current priority.

Under ordinary conditions, Mawson might have measured progress through miles travelled, observations made or territory explored. During the solitary return, progress could mean repairing damaged equipment, consuming sufficient food to preserve movement, discarding weight or waiting through weather that made travel too dangerous.

The measure changed because reality had changed.

Leaders confronting overwhelming problems often make one of two errors. Some focus so heavily on the final objective that every small action appears inadequate. Others become consumed by immediate activity and lose sight of the purpose the activity is meant to serve.

Mawson needed both levels.

Cape Denison provided direction. The next ration, repair and measured advance created progress.

The distant purpose gave meaning to the immediate task. The immediate task kept the distant purpose alive.

Homeward

During the solitary march, Mawson broke through into a crevasse while attached by harness to the sledge. The sledge remained on the surface and arrested the fall, leaving Mawson suspended below. After considerable effort, Mawson climbed back out.

It preserved a narrow pathway to recovery.

That distinction matters in risk leadership. Not every safeguard prevents the initiating event. Some controls reduce the consequence, slow deterioration or preserve the ability to recover when prevention fails.

The harness created the possibility of survival. Mawson's remaining strength converted that possibility into action.

On 1 February 1913, Mawson reached Aladdin's Cave, a food depot approximately nine kilometres from Cape Denison. After weeks alone, the main base was almost within reach.

Then the weather stopped movement.

A blizzard trapped Mawson at the depot for approximately one week.

Proximity to an objective can weaken discipline. Leaders and teams anticipate relief, reduce vigilance or spend reserves because the task already feels complete.

Antarctica did not recognise Mawson's proximity to Cape Denison.

The environment retained authority.

At Aladdin's Cave, one more try did not necessarily require immediate movement. It meant eating, waiting and refusing to spend the final physical margin merely to satisfy the desire to finish.

Action is not always movement.

Sometimes disciplined progress requires restraint.

Mawson finally reached Cape Denison on 8 February 1913.

The Aurora had left only hours earlier.

Captain Davis's Decision

The ship's departure was not an act of casual abandonment.

Captain John King Davis had responsibility for collecting the expedition's widely separated parties and leaving Antarctic waters before the advancing season made safe navigation impossible. By the middle of January, the Far Eastern Party was overdue. Davis delayed departure while the other sledging groups returned, but Aurora also needed to travel more than 2,000 kilometres west to collect Frank Wild's party from the Shackleton Ice Shelf.

Waiting indefinitely for Mawson risked abandoning the Western Party.

Leaving Cape Denison risked abandoning Mawson.

Davis selected six people to remain at the base in case the missing party returned. When Mawson's arrival was communicated to Aurora, Davis turned back, but fierce winds prevented the ship from reaching the shore. Davis eventually proceeded west and recovered Wild's party later that month.

Davis's dilemma broadens the leadership case. Not every difficult decision belonged to Mawson, and not every leader could assign priority to the same problem.

Davis had obligations in two directions. Every available choice exposed someone to risk.

There was no solution without potential loss.

The Empty Horizon

Mawson had reached Cape Denison.

Mawson was not going home.

Another Antarctic winter remained.

The apparent conclusion of the survival journey became another transition. Movement had ended, but recovery had only begun. Mawson needed to regain health, confront the deaths of two companions and resume responsibilities within a group whose members had remained behind partly because the Far Eastern Party was missing.

The solitary leader had to become part of a team again.

The habits that protect an individual during isolation do not automatically support collective recovery. Narrow focus and self-reliance may need to give way to communication, assistance and renewed interdependence.

Reaching safety is an event.

Recovery is a process.

Mawson remained at Cape Denison until Aurora returned in December 1913. The wider Australasian Antarctic Expedition continued to produce substantial scientific and geographic achievements despite the deaths of Ninnis and Mertz.

Part 3. Leadership at the Edge

The Leadership Beneath the Survival Story

At first glance, Mawson's journey appears to be a study in endurance.

That interpretation is true, but incomplete.

Endurance describes the capacity to continue. It does not establish whether continued effort is correctly directed. A determined person can persist with an obsolete objective as readily as with a valuable one.

Mawson's deeper leadership strength was the capacity to alter the definition of success without abandoning purposeful action.

After Ninnis's death, success was no longer scientific discovery. As Mertz deteriorated, progress could no longer be measured solely by distance. After Mertz's death, the journey had to be reorganised for a single person in declining health. At Aladdin's Cave, progress required waiting. After the departure of Aurora, survival became recovery and renewed responsibility.

Each transition demanded acceptance of changed reality.

This does not remove legitimate questions concerning the planning of the Far Eastern journey. The concentration of vital supplies on the lost sledge created a catastrophic single-point failure. The distance from Cape Denison eliminated realistic rescue options. Dependence on dogs linked food, movement and survival within one fragile system.

The planning vulnerabilities and the quality of Mawson's adaptation can both be true.

Indeed, they must remain together if the case is to teach anything useful.

Mawson's leadership after catastrophe was extraordinary.

The preparation that preceded catastrophe remains open to scrutiny.

Mawson Through VECTOR™

VECTOR gives names to disciplines already visible in the story. It does not replace the narrative or offer a mechanical explanation for Mawson's survival.

REGULATE → CLARITY

Mawson faced shock, grief, hunger, cold, illness, isolation and fear. Regulation did not require denial of those conditions. It required the preservation of sufficient physical and cognitive control to make the next decision.

Routine provided structure. Preparing food, maintaining written records, repairing equipment and estimating distance converted an overwhelming situation into specific work. These actions imposed order where external order had largely disappeared.

Regulation also had a physical dimension. Food, rest and shelter protected judgement as well as life. A leader whose body is deteriorating eventually loses the capacity to assess, choose and act.

Regulation does not remove suffering. It preserves enough clarity to act within it.

VERIFY → UNDERSTANDING

After Ninnis's loss, Mawson and Mertz needed to determine what remained. Food, fuel, equipment, dogs, distance and physical capability formed the immediate operating picture.

Some facts could be counted. Others could only be estimated. Ultimate survival could not be verified or assumed.

The need to act did not transform uncertainty into knowledge.

During the solitary phase, Mawson's focus necessarily became more immediate. Mawson could not know whether Cape Denison would eventually be reached. Mawson could assess whether the weather allowed movement, whether the sledge still functioned and whether sufficient strength remained for another effort.

When strategic certainty is impossible, verify the immediate conditions on which the next action depends.

PRIORITISE → DIRECTION

The priority changed repeatedly:

1. Conduct scientific exploration.
2. Return Mawson and Mertz after Ninnis's loss.
3. Preserve Mertz while maintaining movement.
4. Survive alone.
5. Reach Cape Denison and resume responsibility.

Each priority was valid only while it corresponded with reality.

This is one of the central insights of the case. A priority is not a permanent declaration of ambition. It is the current expression of purpose under current conditions.

Are we solving the most important controllable problem, or merely continuing the last plan?

EXECUTE → PROGRESS

Execution during the solitary return became small and repetitive: prepare, repair, navigate, move, rest and begin again. Service's words captured the discipline of the stage: "Just have one more try."

Within VECTOR, the sequence matters. Mawson first required sufficient clarity to assess reality, determine what mattered and select another useful action. "One more try" was not activity for its own sake. It was effort directed towards the current priority.

Execution is not doing more.

It is doing what the priority requires with the capacity that remains.

CONTINUOUS REASSESSMENT → ADAPTATION

Continuous Reassessment is the defining discipline of the Mawson case.

Reassessment followed Ninnis's death, the disappearance of the supplies, the diminishing dog team, Mertz's illness, Mertz's death, Mawson's physical decline, equipment damage, crevasse encounters, the arrival at Aladdin's Cave and the departure of Aurora.

Each development altered some combination of reality, capability, priority, risk and progress.

Mawson could preserve purpose only by changing the plan as conditions changed.

Regulation created clarity. Verification created understanding. Prioritisation created direction. Execution created progress. Continuous Reassessment created adaptation.

The complete lesson can be stated simply: ***Lead the next problem, not the last plan.***

A Balanced Assessment

Mawson's leadership strengths were considerable. Mawson combined scientific discipline, polar experience and practical resourcefulness with extraordinary physical endurance. After the loss of Ninnis, Mawson accepted that the original objective was no longer viable. As conditions deteriorated, Mawson modified equipment, reduced loads and converted an overwhelming journey into immediate tasks.

Mawson also demonstrated self-command. Purposeful action continued without external supervision, companionship or reassurance. On returning to Cape Denison, Mawson resumed responsibility rather than treating personal survival as the end of the expedition.

The wider AAE demonstrated substantial organisational leadership. Its achievements extended well beyond the Far Eastern Party and contributed significantly to scientific understanding of East Antarctica and the Southern Ocean.

Mawson's strengths nevertheless cast shadows. Previous polar success may have supported a high tolerance for exposure. Scientific ambition encouraged a journey over an immense

distance from support. The distribution of supplies created a severe concentration risk. Dependence on the dogs created a tightly connected system of food, mobility and human survival that possessed little redundancy after the crevasse accident.

The standards and accepted risks of the Heroic Age differed from those governing modern expeditions. Historical context should inform judgement. It should not eliminate scrutiny.

Survival bias must also be resisted. Because Mawson returned, the decisions preceding the crisis may appear wiser than they did in real time.

They were not necessarily vindicated. They were survived.

Mawson's survival demonstrates extraordinary adaptation.

It does not retrospectively make every preceding planning or risk decision correct.

Lessons Beyond Antarctica

For sporting teams, Mawson's case is especially relevant after a season-changing loss. A key player may be injured, a decisive match lost or the original campaign objective placed beyond reach. The leader must acknowledge what has happened without allowing the team's deeper identity and purpose to collapse.

The message is not simply "never quit."

Do not abandon the deeper purpose but be prepared to abandon the plan that no longer works.

For corporate leaders, the case challenges sunk-cost thinking. Previous investment does not give a plan permanent authority. When circumstances change, leaders need to establish what capability has been lost, what remains viable, what must be protected and which action preserves future options.

For security leaders, the Far Eastern Party demonstrates the importance of degraded-mode operations and concentration risk. Plans should account for the loss of key personnel,

communications, supplies or primary systems. Redundancy should focus on those capabilities whose complete loss would remove every practical path to recovery.

For personal leadership, Mawson offers a careful model of resilience. The lesson is not that serious adversity should be faced alone. It is that purposeful action may begin before confidence returns.

One more try may mean making a telephone call, asking for support, attending an appointment or completing one difficult but manageable action.

The scale of the action does not diminish its significance. Disciplined hope does not require certainty that the entire journey will succeed. It requires behaviour that keeps an acceptable future possible.

Enduring Lessons

Five principal lessons emerge from Mawson's journey:

1. ***Reality has authority over the plan.***
2. ***Purpose and method are not the same thing.***
3. ***Persistence is valuable only while aligned with the problem that now exists.***
4. ***Critical capability requires appropriate redundancy.***
5. ***"One more try" should follow reassessment, not replace it.***

Other observations support those central lessons. Grief and purposeful action can coexist. Physical condition affects decision quality. A familiar route becomes a different problem when capability deteriorates. Reaching safety does not complete recovery. Survival validates adaptation, not every decision that preceded the crisis.

Most importantly: ***Good decision-makers act.***

Great decision-makers continuously reassess what action now requires.

Conclusion: Purpose Endured Because the Plan Did Not

At first glance, Douglas Mawson's journey appears to be a story about determination.

One companion was lost. Another died. Supplies disappeared. Dogs were killed for food. Mawson's physical condition deteriorated, and the weather prevented movement even when safety was almost within reach.

Yet Mawson continued.

That interpretation is compelling, but incomplete.

Mawson did not survive because Mawson refused to change. Survival remained possible because Mawson repeatedly adjusted method, expectation and action to the reality that remained.

The Far Eastern Party's scientific mission ended at the crevasse. The two-person struggle ended with Mertz's death. The expectation of immediate evacuation ended when Aurora departed.

Purpose endured because the plan did not.

Robert W. Service's words provide the human expression:

"Just have one more try,

It's dead easy to die,

It's the keeping-on-living that's hard."

The Mawson case adds an essential qualification.

Not necessarily the same try.

Not an unthinking try.

One more deliberate action shaped by what has changed, directed towards what now matters and proportionate to the capability that remains.

Persistence without reassessment becomes stubbornness.

Persistence after reassessment becomes disciplined execution.

Leadership under extreme adversity is not the refusal to change course.

It is the discipline to preserve purpose by changing course whenever reality demands it.

Series Synthesis: Confidence, Persistence and Alignment

Robert Rheault and Douglas Mawson operated in profoundly different worlds.

Rheault faced uncertainty generated by intelligence, secrecy and divided institutional authority. Mawson faced uncertainty generated by isolation, environmental danger, personal loss and physical collapse.

Yet both cases examine the same underlying problem:

How does a leader keep judgement, priority and action aligned when certainty is unavailable?

Rheault teaches that confidence is not certainty.

Mawson teaches that persistence is not alignment.

A leader can be confident and still act on an incomplete understanding. A leader can be extraordinarily determined and still pursue an obsolete objective.

VECTOR provides a quiet structure beneath both stories. It asks the leader to regain clarity, establish what is known, identify what now matters, act with the capability available and continually reassess whether the decision still corresponds with reality.

Mawson gives that cycle its human expression: ***Just have one more try.***

After Ninnis's loss, one more try meant turning west. During Mertz's deterioration, it meant balancing movement, care and dwindling resources. After Mertz's death, it meant reorganising for solitary survival. As Mawson's physical capacity declined, it meant narrowing the horizon to the next meaningful task. At Aladdin's Cave, it meant waiting. After missing Aurora, it meant accepting another winter.

The meaning changed with each new problem.

Mawson could not control the weather, recover Ninnis, save Mertz or restore the supplies. Mawson's remaining leadership power lay in recognising what the mission had become.

Persistence is not alignment.

This offers a demanding but honest conception of resilience. Resilience is not pretending that nothing has changed. It is not endless optimism or loyalty to the first plan. It is the capacity to confront irreversible change and still identify a meaningful next action.

Disciplined hope does not require certainty of success.

It requires behaviour that keeps an acceptable future possible.

At the edge of human endurance, leadership does not begin with certainty or end with survival.

At the edge of human endurance, leadership does not begin with certainty or end with survival. It endures through the discipline to recognise what has changed, redefine what now matters and lead the next problem rather than follow the last plan.

About VECTOR™

VECTOR™ is Montane Protective Security's decision model for operating at the edge of uncertainty.

Informed by military experience, leadership scholarship and real-world application, VECTOR provides a lens through which individuals and organisations can better understand complexity, navigate risk, adapt to change and achieve purposeful outcomes in dynamic environments.

© Montane Protective Security. All rights reserved.

Selected Sources and Reading

- Sir Douglas Mawson, The Home of the Blizzard.
- John King Davis, With the Aurora in the Antarctic.
- Charles Laseron, South with Mawson.
- Australian Antarctic Program historical resources concerning Mawson and the Australasian Antarctic Expedition.
- Mawson's Huts Foundation archival chronology of the Far Eastern Party.
- University of Adelaide archival and biographical material concerning Mawson's scientific career.
- Published diaries and correspondence of Xavier Mertz and Belgrave Ninnis.
- Australasian Antarctic Expedition scientific reports.

Research Note

The Far Eastern Party remains one of the most closely examined episodes of the Heroic Age of Antarctic Exploration. Uncertainty remains regarding the exact cause of Xavier Mertz's death and Mawson's related illness. Hypervitaminosis A associated with consuming dog liver is widely discussed as a possible contributor, although starvation, exhaustion, cold exposure and other physiological stresses may also have played significant roles.

This study distinguishes among recorded events, Mawson's later narrative, subsequent historical interpretation and leadership inference. Mawson's survival is not treated as proof that every preceding decision was sound. Nor are contemporary expedition standards imposed without acknowledging the knowledge, technology and accepted practices of 1912.

The purpose is neither to diminish Mawson's achievement nor to reduce the journey to a motivational story about refusing to quit. It is to examine how an experienced leader responded when the mission, team and remaining capability were progressively transformed by catastrophe.

APPENDIX 1: VECTOR™ Decision Model

