

# Beyond BART

## *Analysis at the Level of the Field*

Zachary Gabriel Green and René Molenkamp (2015)<sup>1</sup>  
(in full collaboration)

*Group Relations International*

When we wrote the first BART article - The BART system of organizational analysis. Boundary, Authority, Role and Task – (Green & Molenkamp, 2005), it was for a world that we experienced as far more hierarchical, linear, and static than the one that is emerging. In addition, our own growth and development leads to a different perception of this world. This article offers an analysis of what is emerging at the level of the Field, which consequently redefines our thinking about boundaries, authority, roles and task. The purpose of this work is to help organizations find their way and discover the rapidly evolving roles needed for the times to come. It is not only advancement in science and observations about changing dynamics in organizations and the world that prompts us to rewrite, it is also our own experience and development. We hope that our thinking contributes to shifting individual, organizational and global perspectives in defining tasks, understanding boundaries, exercising authority and taking up roles and responsibility.

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is an unrestricted fair use draft document presented to the public to stimulate dialogue and discussion in as wide an audience as possible. The article may be reproduced in part or in whole for training and educational purposes as long as there is clear attribution to the authors in any such re-issue. Inquiries about other uses of this intellectual property may be directed to René Molenkamp at [rene@grouprelations.org](mailto:rene@grouprelations.org). The article was published on the website of Group Relations International, [www.grouprelations.org](http://www.grouprelations.org).

Beyond BART is an extension of thinking that we believe remains essential for understanding organizations and individual actions at a fundamental level. Our effort here is not to abandon the original model. What we offer in Beyond BART is a way to recognize some of the seemingly paradoxical complexity that life presents in a manner that allows us to notice, just long enough, where we are and how we may engage action. Influenced heavily by theorists that speak of working with the future as it emerges (Scharmer & Kaufer, 2013 and Senge, Smith, Kruschwitz, Laur & Schley, 2010), Beyond BART addresses the process of acting with intention in a larger Field that connects all things (McTaggart, 2008; Laszlo, 2007 and Molenkamp, 2012). This article is a first effort to put the essence of this “knowing” into a form where a larger population can make use of a “more” that is already there.

The presence of global social networks that can mobilize millions in an instant, greater sophistication of social entrepreneurship in supplanting traditional governmental agencies in addressing world issues, and advances in our understanding of human consciousness from our colleagues in neuroscience, quantum physics, and esoteric spiritual studies have each contributed differently to shifting our understanding and application of BART. As the bounds of every individual and all organizations have an international reach through access to the Internet, how we understand boundaries, authority, role and task correspondingly changes.<sup>2</sup> With fewer people in Western contexts working for 25 years for the same company and career paths coming into existence faster than most traditional educational preparation can meet, what we understood about the nature of role also changes. Finally, we are observing that something that is approaching a

---

<sup>2</sup> Shocking facts you did not know a minute ago (YouTube).  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4TKblidbyhk>

critical mass of people is realizing that beyond the task of a group or organization a collective task is emerging: *the preservation of the planet*—or at least humanity's place in it.

Task remains the work of the group. The group is now humanity. Task as described in the previous article may be more accurately be thought of as immediate task. It is the task that is right in front of us and confined to a discrete organizational context or moment of experience. Yet, the *task* is now a collective one. While there is ample debate about the nature of climate change, the prospects for nuclear disarmament, the effects of genetically modified foods, and the impact of economic disparity, there is little disagreement about the complexity of such issues. The task of how to address such challenges concurrently has local and global implications. Our survival socially, politically, and economically as a species may have a great deal to do with how we begin to hold in consciousness the planet as the shared task.

Task is related to what we call the Seed Hypothesis. As in biological systems, seeds are the holders of genetic information that, under the right conditions of fertility, become the next generation of life. Though seeds may possess within them very similar potentials for growth to maturity, the circumstances of nurture of the environment strongly influence how well that life survives and thrives. In this concept, the immediate task is to be responsible stewards of our discrete part of the work. We nurture our seeds as our task, at once similar and differentiated tasks. Proximity of the relationship to the immediate task often makes it difficult to see how each task is related in some way to other tasks in complementary, parallel or

seemingly contrasting ways. Yet, in this Seed Hypothesis the task is to find the fertile ground for the work at hand to be brought to germination. In this way, the task requires creating the necessary conditions for the work to become a living and growing entity with solid roots and the kind of unfolding that can be seen in the light of day. In other words, the pilot project, the prototype of a product, that hypothesis generating exploratory study, the action items from the strategic planning retreat, that first posting of an idea on a blog, the inaugural meeting of a grassroots organization are all examples of seeds related to the collective task of bringing greater consciousness and action towards preserving the generative role of human life on the planet.

Seeds are planted in a field. As ideas grow into action, the flowering becomes visible when that different perspective is accessible at the boundary. On the ground, there is merely one plant to which one attends: our immediate task. At first when we shift our gaze to the surroundings, we can see the multitude that is also in the proximal space. From the horizon and from on high, the abundance of the field becomes increasingly evident. The importance of being able to see the entire field means the vast array of what is available as an expression of the whole is made known. In terms of task, a fuller field yields greater potential for harvesting collective action. In other words, once seeds grow to create the field, the greater task can be seen and wider impact can be brought forth.

In this respect, task becomes more than the work at hand. It begins to be characterized by the conditions that create the opportunity for generative and collective growth. The Seed Hypothesis was proposed as a metaphor external to us. We would like to propose that the Seed Hypothesis also

applies to our internal world. The quality of how well a task is met is directly related to the inner cultivation of practices. When we are able to do our own inner work, we are better able to meet the task. By inner work, we are referring to what Scharmer (2009) has referred to as presence. Practices that involve developing our reflective capacities and bringing us closer to Source, such as meditation, art, journaling, prayer, wellness and the like, help us with the interior conditions needed to be receptive to what the Field may offer. It allows us to see the reciprocal relationship between our organizations and ourselves; giving us a glimpse into what it means to see ourselves from the perspective of what we co-create as organizational life. In short, we are tilling the Field...and the Field is also ourselves.

## **TASK**

When the task is approached as the preservation of the planet, the immediate task of organizations becomes a function of a shared, living, global and interdependent collective entity. In other words, the organizations with which we have the most proximal relationship are also, at the same time, a part of the planet-as-organizational system. When we create organizational practices that run counter to this thinking, in that we take actions that exploit and oppress fellow humans, create situations that evoke violence and limit liberty, and yield products that increase toxicity and reduced wellness to us all, there is an abandonment and abdication of responsibility to the shared task.

The central question in Beyond BART at the level of the task is whether the activity of an organization promotes the preservation of the planet and humanity's place in it. While it may seem arrogant or even presumptuous for

humans to believe that our actions have any true impact on a planet that has had its own history well before us and will well after us, the key difference between our presence on the planet may be the consciousness that we bring to this moment. Irrespective of any particular cosmology, science offers us the premise that we are made of the same “stuff” of this planet and the universe at the most elemental level (Sagan, 1973). It is when organizations act in ways that create an illusion of separation from such knowing that we bring the malignancies of global warming and the scars of endless wars upon ourselves. Similarly, when we fail to see the adaptive nature of cultural practices in different others or the ways we are complicit in perpetuating and participating in economic disparity, our organizations have been seduced by the lure of gratification and immediacy at the expense of an ethic of mutual generativity.

We recognize our pronouncements about the nature of the preservation of the planet-as-task and planet-as-organization run counter to prevailing practices in most Western organizational contexts. Capitalist notions about competition, profit, and market share are all important and valuable drivers of *aspects* of the immediate task. The difficulty is that such focus has become “the finger pointing at the moon rather than the moon itself.” In other words, we have mistaken the immediate task for the collective task; the question we ask in lieu of the question under the questions, “my” life over our collective survival.

What makes placing such thinking into the practice for organizations is the array of “costs” involved. At the most fundamental level, any organization that begins to hold the planet in consciousness runs the risk of losing

immediate competitive advantage over similar organizations that attend to the bottom line. In the Western context, the profits for corporate organizations and the funder patterns in nonprofit fields operate from espoused values of a “Double Bottom Line” but prevailing practices run counter to this thinking. An attitude of economic scarcity rather than the question of “what is enough?” predominates the discourse. When this very real issue is coupled with the lifecycle of most organizations and the people who devote a portion of their lives to the economic promise and viability of such entities, there is little incentive to look beyond one or two decades to the implications of our actions. When we add democratically elected political systems in which these organizations are embedded to this analysis, the cycle is shortened to as few as two years. A planet that has been present for hundreds of millennia and people that are not yet born are difficult to embrace as a part of one’s reality, let alone responsibility.

The preservation of the planet-as-task approach being offered in Beyond BART is, nonetheless, inviting individuals and organizations to begin to do precisely that: place the immediate task of the organization in the context and in subordination to the larger task of us all. We see seeds of this thinking in corporate social responsibility efforts, social entrepreneurships, and “debt relief” by organizations like the World Bank. Social movements that were sparked in the Middle East, push backs on GMO foods, and greater embrace of sustainable energy may all be small examples of how the consciousness of humanity about our role on the planet is growing to be in greater focus for what may be approaching a critical mass of people. Aided by technology that allows us each to have global access in an instant, and photographs and

videos from space that bring the oneness of the planet into view<sup>3</sup>, the exponential potential of holding the planet in mind is becoming available to all of humanity in a manner that makes the inequity, disparity, and brutality no longer the province of the shadows of human life. We are all responsible for what may yet become.

## **BOUNDARY**

The fundamental tenet that Boundary can be understood in terms of time, task, and territory remains essential. What has changed is movement from an organizational open systems way of thinking to one that is far more vast and acknowledges the presence and influence of the Field. When we speak of the Field, we are referencing a larger pool of experience that involves the history of human experience as well as our ability to tap into this Source in the current moment. Such an expansive territory creates a boundless terrain, yet it is our work to move into this realm and create boundaries consistent with the consciousness needed for the current situation and circumstance.

### *Time boundary*

In this way, the nature of time is in itself quite different. While there remain lived consequences when we are on either side of a fixed boundary in linear time, we also know of other kinds of experiences. If we are making an effort to catch a train or a flight, chances are we will miss it if we do not arrive at a designated time. The doors will be closed and our transportation will be gone. We missed the boundary—simple and true, a kind of undeniable lesson on boundaries. Similarly, in an organizational context if we are the

---

<sup>3</sup> OVERVIEW (Vimeo)  
<http://vimeo.com/55073825>



kind of person that tends to allow deadlines to slip, our lack of adherence to these boundaries will no doubt eventually influence our professional reputation and erode the trust of others who rely on us to do our task on time.

We also have experiences where time “seems to stand still” and other moments when “the time flew by.” In either instance, what we call linear time has remained constant. From a Beyond BART perspective, these bends in time, what the Greeks called *kairos* are important. In contrast to *chronos*, linear-sequential time, *kairos* is related to how we understand boundary shifts when we are “in the moment” of something. It is these flow states where everything makes sense and we are fully present to what we are doing as we are doing it. *Kairos* is its own invitation to fuller presence through which we notice and understand the nature of the given moment. When we are in this boundary location/experience/space, it is different *and* as important to notice as the train we are afraid we may miss. It is in these moments where we are connected to the larger Field. While it may appear to be easier and more familiar to focus on linear boundaries of time, the *kairos* time boundaries in the Field are boundless, constant, and ever present in their influence on our actions.

Linear boundaries give us a concrete sense of a beginning and an end. There is agreement about what a clock indicates, as this measure gives us some certainty about when and how to go about our business. The advantage of linear time is that it allows us *not* to confront the illusion of control we may actually have on what happens in the prescribed boundary we create. We all know of those moments when “life takes over” and the clock as reference

point, the calendar as marker, and the years as measures become secondary to the time it takes to deal with certain situations. We each need look no further than to some of the plans we made at some point for our lives and the lives we now live to see the evidence of this distinction.

At the level of the Field, the boundary in which we can work exponentially expands. The boundary opens, sometimes for an instant, like when we catch something out of the corner of our eye and recognize it. In other times, it is more like a slow unfolding, much as when a microscope or telescope brings an object of contemplation into focus. *Kairos* and the Field converge when we can begin to see the patterns of things in our organizations and ourselves in a manner that suddenly make sense. In short, it is that Aha experience. It is that insight that suddenly clicked. It is that instant recognition of something that has always been right before our eyes.

When time bends – *kairos* time - there is still a boundary. The paradox is that it also becomes boundary-less long enough for us to notice and give meaning to a bigger picture. If we made our train, and it happens to be a coastal run, it is the view of the ocean horizon. If we made the plane, it is the perspective we get from above the clouds. In other words, we notice things differently and we see more. And even in missing the train or the plane, it may actually provide an opportunity to enter into a *kairos* experience of time. Once a linear moment is “missed” the void offers us a “now what?” moment to wonder where we are and what is next. Accordingly, what may seem like fixed boundaries from one perspective becomes more permeable and traversable from different vantage points. This broader Field of seeing and noticing expands the boundaries in which we operate and increases the

potential range of effective action. Sports teams learned about this kind of perspective years ago. It is commonplace for there to be a coach that sits above the Field of play to be able to see the whole, recognizing patterns that are not visible on the ground, closer to the action. Similarly, the act of “slowing down time” for a nanosecond is now being understood to be one the key differences between good and great athletes. The great athlete uses this fleeting moment to adjust that shot in tennis to win Wimbledon or swing the bat a bit differently in baseball to hit the winning run or reach a fingernail length further in swimming for the Olympic gold medal. These capacities are available in each of us through the practice of noticing and the presence of Self and organization to the Field.

From a technological perspective, the satellites that orbit our planet allow us to see weather systems as they are forming. Two generations ago, such a perspective was not possible. Who is able to say how many lives have been saved simply by this expanded boundary of view. In a like manner, we can beam our image around the world through the mobile phone in the palm of our hands. Fame and infamy can “go viral” in an instant, bringing our thoughts and actions to the awareness of a global virtual community. As such, we each have the potential to become a part of a larger human consciousness at the press of “send.” As such, these technologies represent extensions of the same process through which our capacity for perception is broadened and deepened. In many respects, cyberspace is a virtual metaphoric expression of the larger Field that exists through and beyond our digital devices.

Such expansions of the boundary are so much a part of our daily routine that we sometimes fail to marvel at the implications for our lives at the personal and organizational level. No wonder it is much easier for us to deal with linear time boundaries than it is to be attuned to experiences of *kairos* time. Paradoxically, our attention to linear time boundaries may actually impede our sense of *kairos* time. The challenge at an organizational level is hold the time boundaries differently, recognizing and working with the discrete boundaries of linear time while becoming increasingly conscious of the larger *kairos* that will express itself, ready or not. It is our premise that holding *chronos* and *kairos* as one that organizations are better able to meet the future as it emerges and take actions that advance purpose.

We suggest that we will continue to need *chronos* time and its duality, marking and dividing experience into discrete elements. The invitation is to also embrace *kairos* time to move beyond duality towards totality and unity.

### *Territory Boundary*

Accordingly, the third element of boundary, territory, also has changed. We each have the potential to be global citizens in any given moment. Tactile reality and virtual reality are co-mingled. As referenced in the previous section, the ground on which we stand and converse with other people may be thousands of miles away, mediated by devices that connect us in a shared virtual space. No longer is information simply passively received through mediums like radio or televisions. Through computers and smart phones, we interact in this new kind of territory instantaneously and often synchronously. The fact that we can do so at all changes the nature and

meaning of boundaries and makes defining the task, as an element of boundaries and its own level of BART analysis, far more fluid and complex. In our earlier thinking about boundaries, we advocated for clarity of boundaries, as if they would provide an easy separation between before and after, here and there, mine and thine, and this task as opposed to that task. In many ways, we provided a linear and dualistic way of understanding boundaries. Through the premise that we are working on the common task of the preservation of the planet at the level of the Field, what we call “boundary” is more accurately the demarcation of contact with a larger whole. If we work from the premise of unity, rather than separation, territory boundaries are regions of connection. Such boundaries are invitations to bridge, rather than remain in a state of duality. Mine and thine becomes: ours. Here and there becomes: the planet. Before and after becomes: this shared moment (*kairos* rather than *chronos*, this moment holds before and after, past and present). This task as opposed to that task becomes: our task.

Capacity to work with boundary at the organizational level is both helpful and limiting. Given that boundaries are often used to determine responsibility, in our expanded way of understanding boundaries, the nature of our understanding of responsibility changes accordingly. We hold responsibility for what is within our boundary and at the same time, we hold responsibility for the larger system. We can see this trend in the growth of employee-owned enterprises where all members of the organization are also the shareholders with a stake in the business. In such instances, when one has direct, bounded responsibility for “my” part the system, one is concurrently responsible for the whole. Though this latter boundary is

largely undefined, flexible, and expansive, it influences our choices, our responsibility, and our involvement.

There may be one major caveat in thinking about boundaries in a way that embraces *kairos*. The issue is one of authority, which will be explored in the next section. The ability of an organization to hold *chronos* and *kairos* considerations of boundaries assumes that the boundaries of authority are managed in such a way that this thinking is a shared ethos. Movement too deeply into the *kairos* space could result in what Alderfer (1980), and Hirschhorn and Gilmore (1992) described as an underbounded system. The boundaries in such situations can lead to an absence of differentiation in roles, a general lack of cohesion, and the potential of the organization to be absorbed by the environment. The optimal balance of *chronos* and *kairos* produces permeable boundaries, clarity of role, and flexibility that helps the organization to learn, grow, and move more deeply into its own potential and purpose.

## **AUTHORITY**

In the classic sense, authority is the right to do work on behalf of a group. It is a sort of power that is conferred onto individuals on the condition that collective aspirations are met without evoking anxiety above a certain threshold that disables or impedes the group's ability to function (Rice, 1965 and Rioch, 1971). In other words, authority is something that a group gives in exchange for desired work getting done. This transactional way of understanding authority fits most situations we encounter each day. For instance, when we recognize the authority of that police officer who stops us for a traffic violation, we are giving the officer the power to levy a ticket. It is

a collective level social contract. Similarly, a failure to recognize the simple transaction of authority confers the power to this same police officer to subject someone to arrest or use deadly force as part of this “right to do work” on our collective behalf.

With the change in boundaries is a corresponding change in the nature and meaning of authority. Ironically, in order to look to what authority is becoming, we must first look back at its etymology.

Authority is believed to come from a French word, *auctorité*, which means “authority, right, permission, dignity, gravity, the Scriptures.” Over time, the word came to mean more directly “the power to enforce obedience.” In English, the - c - was dropped and connotations that had to do with mastery and leadership began to emerge. Looking more deeply, within the word authority is *author*. When we look at its roots, we get a different feeling. We discover that author literally means, “one who causes to grow” as in the originator, creator, instigator, or father.

Flash forward from the 12<sup>th</sup> Century to the 21<sup>st</sup> and we see origination, instigation, and creation all around. Authority is no longer only “out there” in some monarch, government, or the local police officer. We are increasingly the authors of our own reality. Self-authorship is becoming more of a common practice. Rather than wait for power to be conferred to us, we are likely to make our views and desires known by other means and then discover our group, our belonging. Quite literally, those who engage in any form of social media present a virtual image or persona of how we want to be seen. We interact with others through posts, comments, likes, tweets,

pictures and websites. These actions are creating an ongoing image of who we are at our own instigation. This kind of self-authorship is a basic form of doing a kind of work on behalf of a group whether or not we are recognized for it. The quantum physics people would suggest that we are placing energy into the system, and once observed by another person, it alters the system.

In other words, self-authorship creates a quality of connection that may be less visible but still has impact on human systems. If someone returns a smile as we are walking down the street or clicks a “like” for our post, we know that our self-authorship action had some direct impact on another person, however insignificant.

The power of the current moment is that such actions, the small smile or the simple posting of a few words in a social media status, have the potential to connect to the experience of others who are NOT connected to us directly in space and time. A video or posting that goes viral or a tweet that trends are examples of how self-authorship has a self-organizing nature that we are just now beginning to recognize. What we do know is such moments represent a kind of convergence of collective forces. They do not represent formal authority that comes through role, as in our police officer example, nor do they represent informal authority where influence brings about changes in organizational systems. Self-authorship is another way that makes itself available to the system and the interaction with the Field determines whether it is an expression of the work of the group or groups at that time.

If we look to examples of how this works, all we need to recognize is that there were many children abducted before there was an Amber Alert system



put into place. Many young black men were killed with what appeared to be legal authority before Trayvon Martin. There have been other ruthless warlords throughout the world before anyone heard of Kony 2012. In these instances, self-authorship is perhaps a mediator of formal and informal authority to create new realities. We know Amber, Trayvon, and Kony, in part because cumulative acts of self-authorship brought these issues to our collective consciousness. These and other movements like them connect to something fundamental that mobilizes action and broadens the holding and meaning of authority.

Key to self-authorship is what Scharmer<sup>4</sup> calls the movement from the small - s - self of ego and self-interest to the big - S - Self, which is connected to Source and purpose. It is perhaps, when there is a gap between the two that self-authorship is muted and its mediating or catalytic function is limited. Awareness of this gap is key to being able to access and act through self-authorship.

## **ROLE**

Much more than the act of finding, taking, and making one's role, role is connected to purpose. In our original writing, we suggested that role is akin to a job description. Like a uniform, it is something that you put on—or take on—to designate a readiness to perform a particular set of behaviors related to a task. Yet, if role were as static as is being presented, fewer terms of reference for jobs would end with “and other duties as specified.” This phrase is an acknowledgement that each person brings more to a role than

---

<sup>4</sup> Operating from the I-in-Now (youtube)  
<http://youtu.be/7R9ObTXFqP0>

any job description can express, as these elements must be ultimately discovered as we make the role our own.

Our roles are also made more fluid than we would care to believe because of the multiple expressions of our own identity that we bring to them. There was a phrase often used in group relations consultation where you had to be careful to “not confuse the role in the person with the person in the role.” The caveat means to suggest that we are not the roles we occupy. How a person enacts and occupies a role may be a reflection of how they understand their terms of reference, not necessarily an indication of who they view themselves to be. Yet, it is precisely this incongruence between self and role that calls into question one’s fit for a given or taken role. In other words, how I think of myself in terms of race, gender, ethnicity, ability, orientation, nationality and the like may color my perception *and* the perception of others of my role. We then find ourselves not only negotiating what the role is to become as uniquely expressed through us, we also are working to discover how much of our various salient identities to bring to the role. A re-orientation to our understanding of role that takes into consideration the multiplicity of identity allows for more of the potential complexity to be held and understood.

Role at a deeper level is related to the quality of our connection to Source, calling, purpose and essence – spirit. When we take a role that is from Source, there is a greater alignment of gifts, talents, and capacities expressed through it. Though the discovery of this link to Source may not be immediate, signs are present through the quality and depth of the practices we bring to our roles. The discipline is to notice whether we are responding from a place of

judgment, cynicism and fear or from a space of openness where head, heart and hand may be engaged. These voices of judgment, cynicism and fear lead us to absent ourselves from the Source and thwarted openness to presence (Scharmer, 2009). If we find ourselves in such a state, it may well be an indication that we are unwilling or unable to take up the fuller calling and can only function in role at its most rudimentary and technical level. In such instances, role feels like we are but children who are wearing clothes that are several sizes too large. These internal voices breed doubt and fill us with anxiety to such a degree that we question our worthiness for the calling. In the worst instances, we act upon incompetence of our own creation and collude in our own powerlessness (Senge, 1991).

In contrast, the ability to engage reflective practices such as journaling, meditation, prayer, yoga, or even simple walks can reduce the gap between Source and calling to reveal purpose. In this respect, role begins to reveal itself when there is greater congruence and alignment between emotion, intellect, and actions. Attachment to efforts to control what role seeks to become, is gradually reduced so that the emergent state may be experienced and embraced as it crystallizes. As such, role is not made nor is it taken. It does not have a descriptor of duties to be specified. Role simply is.

We know something of this process in those situations where we have a job where we may simply be “going through the motions” and experience the absence from purpose in our actions. When role is characterized by presence and connection to Source, we feel more complete and are able, even in the moment, to see the impact of our actions. In *Beyond BART*, role is a reflection of our capacity to step into this fuller expression of presence and

embrace the mystery of our own becoming in a manner that brings benefit to something beyond ourselves.

## **IMPLICATIONS**

A Beyond BART orientation extends the quality and depth of organizational analysis. Where BART and the classic article by Wells (1990) on the group-as-a-whole ends, is where Beyond BART begins. The fundamental levels of boundary, authority, role, and task remain present but at a different level of complexity and range. Similarly, the analysis extends beyond what Wells described as the group-as-a-whole, intergroup, and inter-organizational levels. Beyond BART operates in the nested and interrelated potential space of the Field. The elements are beyond an open systems orientation to include integral (holonic) hierarchies, fractals, networks, and the realm of collective consciousness.

When we reference an *open systems orientation*, it includes recognition of the concurrent influence of a variety of variables on our actions. There is an acknowledgement of our interrelatedness to one another and the world around us. There is also some effort to account for the continuous quality of how a task changes in any given moment based on the inputs from the internal and external environment. Integral hierarchies are ones that are more holonic. While such hierarchies have elements we name and view as distinct, what makes them integral is that, together, they constitute a whole. These elements may well also be a part of open systems. The chief difference is that any element is a microcosm that contains within it the whole. From an integral perspective, regardless of the size of the piece under observation, all elements are present.

Networks begin with discrete elements of systems but become connected to create a different kind of whole. Anyone who lives in a major metropolitan area has seen this process in play with public transportation. There was a time when one part of a municipality had its own transportation system while the adjacent locality had another. The commuter would need to keep track of the different fares and schedules, working hard to move from one location to another across these regional boundaries. In most cities, these systems are now connected into a single seamless network. The movement across boundaries is more permeable and the task of commuting is greatly facilitated.

Using this same analogy of public transportation, a manifestation of the Field is when this same regional transportation network also connects to the train station and airport. In localities where this is possible, a network becomes part of a global Field. The important element of this perspective is that it illustrates how an individual can literally move into a system, across a network, and into the Field. Energetically, we are the fractals of this Field. When we allow it, we move with what is emerging and become expressions of it. The invitation of Beyond BART is to bring the nature of this process into consciousness and enjoin its essence into our practice. When we work on ourselves and make the critical connections that broaden the web of knowing, we create the conditions to become the authors of new realities and expand the boundaries of action to the universe itself.

Beyond BART is an invitation to notice the Field. In doing so, we are holding more of the whole and working with the vast nature of our

interconnectedness. Though we may not be able to readily see it, we are much more in a boundary-less world where self-authorship is influenced by the complexity of nested roles that reveal our relationship to a shared global task. We are the seeds for this new Field.

## References:

Alderfer, C.P. (1980). Consulting to underbounded systems. *Advances in Experiential Social Processes*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp 267-278.

Green, Z. and Molenkamp, R. (2005). The BART system of group and organizational analysis. Boundary, Authority, Role and Task. Originally published on the Academy of Leadership website (University of Maryland), currently on [www.akrice.org](http://www.akrice.org). Retrieved 2 January 2015

Hirschhorn, L. and Gilmore, T, (1992). The new boundaries of the boundaryless company. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, 1992.

Laszlo, E. (2007). *Science and the akashic field. An integral theory of everything*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions.

McTaggart, Lynne (2008). *The field. The quest for the secret force of the universe. (Updated Edition)*. New York: HarperCollins

Molenkamp, R. (2012). *The field*. Published on [www.grouprelations.org](http://www.grouprelations.org). Retrieved 2 January 2015

Rice, A. (1965). *Learning for leadership*. London: Tavistock.

Rioch, M. J. (1971). "All we like sheep"(Isaiah 53:6): Followers and leaders. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, Vol 34(3), Aug 1971, 258-272.

Sagan, C. (1973). *The cosmic connection: An extraterrestrial perspective*. Produced by Jerome Agel.

Scharmer, C. (2009). *Theory U learning from the future as it emerges : The social technology of presencing*. San Francisco, Calif.: Berrett-Koehler.

Scharmer, C. O. and Kaufer K. (2013). *Leading from the emerging future: From ego-system to eco-system economics*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Senge, P. (1991). *The fifth discipline: The art of the learning organization*. Bristol, VT.: Soundview Executive Book Summaries.

Senge, P., Smith, B., Kruschwitz, N., Laur, J. and Schley, S. (2010) *The necessary revolution. How individuals and organizations are working together to create a sustainable world.* New York, NY: Crown Publishing Group

Wells, L. (1990). *The group as a whole: A systemic socioanalytic perspective on group relations. Groups in context: A new perspective on group dynamics.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.



