



WORKING WITH THE FIELD¹

Abstract: Gestalt is a holistic epistemology, based on field theory. What does this mean in practice? How can we move to a more experiential notion of the field rather than intellectually engage with a conceptual model? This article focuses on how organisational consultants can consciously develop more field-sensitive professional practices. It also explores intuition as a natural field phenomenon. Implications and applications for a different approach to management and organisational development are considered.

Key words: field, field theory, felt sense, holism, systems, intuition, presence, embodiment, organisations.

Part One: Experiencing the Field

Putting the Field First

As an organisational consultant, my Gestalt orientation helps me to support more holistic management practices that involve creative links between parts and wholes - what business people refer to as 'joined up thinking'. I have found the related notions of figure and ground can provide leaders and teams with a way of navigating between competing business priorities, while holding a 'big picture' view that can be harmonising and integrative. Approaches to dialogue help bring teams together. The focus on phenomenology enables process observations that help managers gain insights which can lead to significant personal and professional shifts.

And then there is field theory.... Though Lewin (1952) described it as a methodology and practice and not just a conceptual model, and hoped it would support large systems change, I have found it less than straightforward over the years to translate field theory into field practice. This is despite a strong belief that field theory is potentially transformational of my practice, and offers real benefits to my work with organisational clients.

Working with field theory in practical ways demands that we understand more about how an appreciation of the field contributes to our lived experience of being whole. This involves us moving towards a more experiential and embodied understanding of the field.

It is important to recognise that there are different levels of discourse going on about fields within and across different disciplines. Even within the pages of this journal recently, contemporary Gestaltists have referred to the field of

experience (Kepner, 2003), the field of soul (Beaumont, 1998), the erotic field (O'Shea, 2003), the phenomenal (Kennedy, 2003) and phenomenological field (Jacobs, 2003), and even the pre-phenomenological field (Robine, 2003).

Such vigorous and ranging debate might be confusing, but is understandable - field theory is nothing if not radically inclusive, for at its core the notion of a field implies that everything relationally has its place in the greater whole. One of the challenges of describing field-orientated approaches is that the term 'field' simultaneously applies to the all-encompassing *physical fields*, of which we are a part, *and also* to multiple, overlapping, contingent, *experiential fields* which seem to be structured and organised in subtly different ways. For example, what influences the field of soul is arguably different in part to what influences the erotic field. One view of our work as Gestaltists is about acknowledging, including, and attending to possibilities for *co-creative* adjustment between different aspects of the fields we and our clients are embedded within.

Another challenge in codifying field approaches lies in the apparent contradictions of fields being described as entities that are generally encompassing and specifically personal. Yontef (1993) describes a field as 'a totality of mutually influencing forces that together form a unified interactive whole' and later (Yontef, 2001) clarified that a field can only be usefully described in relationship to one's present purpose. Kepner (2003) states that "there is no 'the field' outside of one's subjective perceptual field (p8)." McConville (2001) too, has noted that 'Fields cannot be spoken of properly as existing in themselves, in nature, apart from a co-constitutive human subjectivity (p200).' These are complex ideas that contain paradoxes - and indeed these very ideas are at the cutting edge of Gestalt thinking today, and exercise other writers including Jacobs, Parlett, Robine, and Wheeler.

A critical question emerges. Beyond the 'energised subjectivity' McConville speaks of, is there any 'objective' validity to the field, outside of the metaphoric fields of perception and experience that we intersubjectively co-create?

Since Faraday first introduced the notion of 'field' in the 1840s, science has acknowledged different kinds of *physical fields* - electromagnetism, gravity, and strong and weak nuclear forces being the four classical fields of physics. Other notions of fields, such as Sheldrake's (1989) morphogenetic fields, are generally afforded only metaphoric status. Even the field we speak of in Gestalt has

been described by Parlett (1997) as 'generally metaphorical' (p19) although he quietly suggests that recent developments in consciousness studies could suggest otherwise.

Recent Speculative Developments

There is no shortage of emerging ideas about The Field. Influential pioneers in the life sciences and physical sciences including Laszlo (1996) and Puthoff (1989), have described a shift in scientific thinking over the last hundred years that suggest the field is more than metaphoric. Sheldrake (2003) describes the increasingly accepted scientific position:

Matter is no longer the fundamental reality, as it was for old-style materialism. Fields and energy are now more fundamental than matter. The ultimate particles of matter have become vibrations of energy within fields (p4).

For quantum physicists, energy exchange is the basic dynamic of life. The give and take of energy occurs ceaselessly between quantum particles. However, energy cannot be created or destroyed, just transformed. 'The Field' is a feedback loop of energy exchange that takes different forms at the physical level, but is fundamentally boundless across space and time, flows through all things and interconnects all things. Physicist Hal Puthoff (1989) remarked that this kind of quantum exchange implies 'a kind of self-regenerating, grand ground-state of the universe' that is constantly revitalising itself. Ervin Laszlo (1996) provides a poetic image of the field as 'a memory-filled, interconnected and self-creating cosmos - a fathomless and timeless whispering pond' (p xxii) and hints at its profound vitality. This quantum explanation might also illuminate ancient metaphysical notions, such as the Chinese concept of chi, the fundamental life force, or Prana, the universal breath of Hinduism.

The dynamic equilibrium of energy exchange forms the underlying 'field of fields' and is, as Robine (2003) notes, genuinely pre-phenomenological. Roberts (1999) remarks,

The field referred to, when we say 'the field', existed prior to our thinking and talking about it. Indeed, we emerged from it, and our thinking and talking are part of it. It is important to understand that the field has an order of its own... (p35)

This order has been described by Bohm (1981) as an 'implicate order' that is innate in the 'unbroken wholeness of the totality of existence as an undivided flowing movement without borders' (p172). For quantum physicists, if not yet for most Gestaltists, this holistic field is not an intellectual construct but a living reality - what Laszlo describes as an 'organic totality' (p xx). This raises a startling question- to what extent, if at all, is the field like an 'organism'?

While we have to be careful not to anthropomorphise, I believe there are certainly ways in which the field seems to exhibit some of the characteristics of a living entity. For example, Puthoff's (1989) notion of quantum exchange describes the sort of interplay between emergence and entropy that is characteristic of biological systems. In

addition, Nobel chemist Ilya Prigogine's (1984) work on dissipative structures² suggests a fundamentally creative aspect of the field, where order emerges out of chaos, and where uniqueness and variety are produced from constant flux.

Just as the field could be regarded as creative in this particular way, it might also be seen to be 'conscious'³ - in the sense of having a patterned, apparently purposeful drive to realise its inner potential. This teleological impulse - where nature is not only responsive, but also organises itself towards underlying ends (what systems thinkers describe as *autopoiesis*) - is seen in the way an acorn strives to become an oak tree, or in the ordered progression of the seasons. Hellinger (1999), for example, not only notes that the field is ordered - that it has primal, intricate, nuanced levels of self-organisation and self-regulation that have their own principles - he also shows that the field holds awareness of systemic events across time. In this sense, it is seen to be a 'knowing field' - one that both forms and informs us.

The Authority of the Body

While the above ideas are exciting, we need to come back to our senses (to paraphrase Perls). Above all, we need to recognise that whatever the exact nature of a field (or the field), our 'knowing' of it is critically important. Moreover, we do not access the field through intellectual abstraction, but more closely and familiarly. The body is our only ultimately reliable source of field information. As Merleau-Ponty (1945) notes, 'the field is incarnate in the bodies of the people' (p198). Body and field are not split, in any Cartesian dualist sense, but are directly co-implicated and inter-involved in the experiencing of life. It is through our bodies that we naturally and spontaneously sense field-shifts - atmospheres, forebodings, ripenesses, loaded moments, switchpoints, dangers, precognitions... It is knowing in a biblical sense, of being intimate, felt, quickening, flushed, fecund.

This kind of knowing, involving an intensely visceral *feeling of knowing*, has been widely utilised by Gestalt practitioners. Gendlin (1981), influenced by Laura Perls, describes this as a 'felt sense' that is not confined to the head:

A felt sense is not a mental experience but a physical one. Physical. A bodily awareness of a situation or person or event. An internal aura that encompasses everything you feel and know about the given subject at a given time - encompasses it and communicates it to you all at once rather than detail by detail (p32).

If, then, we are to develop practical ways of working with the field, attending to our embodied experience appears to be fundamental.

As Gestaltists, we have long nurtured a notion of awareness that encompasses our energies, sensations, emotions, mental processes and their expression in the body. At its fullest and most profound, this has been described by Merleau-Ponty (1945) as 'primordial contact' (p ix). Kennedy (2003) notes:



It is through primordial experience that we explain how the body has been given a knowledge of the world that is not ordinarily accessible to my thinking, and it is upon this body-knowledge that my thinking is founded (p82).

Yet how do our bodies 'know' - how do we receive and perceive field-shifts? Recent work by physician and psychotherapist Daniel Cappon (1994) has suggested that there are in fact nine senses. Cappon delineates these senses from outside to inside the body: the five physical senses of sight, hearing, smell, touch and taste that enable us to attend to 'outer' experience; as well as four more subtle senses that enable us to attend to our 'inner' experience. He defines these subtle senses as kinaesthesia (a sense of one's movement in space), proprioception (a sense of one's position in space), visceral (the body's awareness of its inner tensions), and introspection (which is akin to witness consciousness - an awareness of our inner states). Building on Cappon's observations, I suggest that it may be the visceral and introspective senses that are primarily engaged when we experience the field through the felt sense.

Intuition as a Field Phenomenon

A well developed embodied sensitivity to the field may underlie the phenomenon of 'intuition'. Talking with a close colleague recently, we noted how often the most fruitful turning points in our projects with organisational clients were based upon a *feeling of knowing* on a hunch or intuition rather than a more rational, objective, analysis. Furthermore, we realised that when we attend more to these impressions, and act upon them, work seems to flow more easily; there is a sense of less friction and resistance; and - oddly - coincidences happen.

I am suggesting that intuition, defined here as a form of direct knowing without recourse to cognitive ability or logical processing, might be a field-sensitive form of awareness that is less unusual than is sometimes thought. Epiphanies happen everyday. Coincidences are commonplace. Hunches, dreams, flashes, glimpses, gut-stirrings, and feelings in our bones arise as part of daily experience. Colleagues in clinical and consulting settings have many such stories of intuition and coincidence. If nothing else, such stories show that intuition is not unusual or indeed exceptional, at least in conditions of heightened, embodied field awareness.

Frequently occurring though they may be, there is something extraordinary and wonderful, in the truest sense, about intuitive and synchronous phenomena. They raise many unanswered questions: for example, how do insights form, and where do ideas originate? It is difficult to explain rationally how we make the creative leaps that characterise intuitive understanding, but if we pause and consider the evidence of our own bodies, it is clear that moments of intuitive insight have a powerful legitimacy often equal to or greater than apparently more 'objective data' and can be potentially transformational, both individually and collectively.

Ordinarily, we have been accustomed to regard intuition from the prevailing individualist paradigm (Wheeler, 2000) of contemporary Western culture as something that is both

anomalous and intrapersonal. However, field theory enables us to regard intuition from a holistic paradigm as an aspect of a unified, more-than-human consciousness. Intuition might thus be a form of knowing that is *registered* in our bones and guts but does not necessarily *originate* there. So conceived, intuition is not a disconnected 'inner' flash, but a natural and aware reciprocity with the 'outer', underlying reality of the field - an example of embodied, non-local awareness that can be summoned and mediated as part of our profoundly interconnected nature that is inseparable from the field.

Part Two: Changing Practice

Emerging Ideas in Management Practice

'Engaging in experiencing the field through the felt sense' and 'developing our capacity for intuition' are, of course, far removed from the world of globalised, goal-oriented, task-driven, evidence-based business cultures. However, as we shall see, there is a business case for considering what it means for organisational leaders and consultants to foster the intuitive, felt sense and to practice field-agency-in-emergence.

Views that are compatible with a new outlook are beginning to infiltrate and transform pockets of management practice. What is realised more and more is that in large organisations, effort and resource are often wastefully channelled into projects that go nowhere long-term; that people are increasingly over-stretched to meet targets; and that increasing levels of stress and complexity at work force decisions 'on the run' that affect the lives of others. There is a strong sense of the need for a fundamentally different approach.

The futurist Willis Harman (1988) acknowledges the need for new forms of practice. He once stated from a conference platform that if we don't learn how to engage the intuitive faculty in our fast-moving, data-intensive, knowledge-driven economy we'll just have to 'sit back and watch the road-kill.' He points to the need to work skilfully with the field, with intuition contributing to problem-solving, enhancing performance management, supporting business start-ups, improving leadership, and linking values with vision to help develop strategy.

While there is much bandying of slogans about purpose, vision and strategy in organisations, something else is obviously called for by way of a practice: something corresponding to 'holding a vision with integrative intent' or 'co-creating results from emergence when there is contextual readiness' - in other words, a practice that derives from an embodied sensitivity to the field as a whole. In particular, intuition, as a significant part of field consciousness, can open up new approaches to problem-solving, decision-making, and innovation. It can also be part of new thinking regarding leadership.

Jaworski (1993), for instance, describes leadership as the art of working with emerging fields to sense and bring forth new realities. Senge (2004) notes that in order to do well in hi-tech, fast-paced, globally driven environments, leaders and managers will have to develop a new cognitive capacity that involves paying attention to the intangible sources of



knowledge and knowing. And Senge's collaborator at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology⁴, Otto Scharmer (2000), states,

As we move into high-velocity business environments, knowledge-creation and innovation will depend more and more on the capacity of a system to operate from its primary source. Would-be leaders who are unable to access and operate from the deeper levels of emergence will depend on imitating others and hence will be less likely to succeed in highly competitive environments (p9).

Scharmer suggests that leaders can become more effective at harnessing the potential of their businesses firstly by reconnecting with the deeper social purpose of their organisations, and secondly by attending more personally to their own intuitive and creative being, effectively learning the skills of 'sensing, tuning in to, and bringing into presence that which wants to emerge (p14).' He quotes with approval the words of William O'Brien, former Chief Executive of Hanover Insurance Company: 'The success of an intervention depends on the interior condition of the intervenor' (p14).

Personal Experience with a More Intuitive and Field-based Approach to Consulting

In a first piece of work I undertook recently with a major corporation, a newly-appointed director complained that he was unable to be effective as the team he inherited continually challenged him. His and others' energy was going in to sorting out the interpersonal issues of the team, rather than forwarding the strategic agenda of the business. Initially, he asked for a team-building exercise.

My starting point in this instance, however, was not to recommend a team-based intervention, but to begin from an altogether different place: an inquiry into what this particular piece of work as a *field event* was trying to call forth from me and what it was offering to my own development, as something *interdependently co-arising* with the needs of my client?

In trying to sense the emerging pattern in the field, of which I was now part, I was not excluding my own development, along with that of my individual client and of the client system in relationship. I was trying to hold an openness of us together as a learning, jointly responding 'virtual system' within the emerging field. Thus, I was asking why the issues encoded in this assignment had arisen for us both now, and what were the invisible, connective threads between us? How could the organisation that had differently engaged us be best served - perhaps in terms of what needed to be manifested through the director and his team in its next period of existence? Holding a perception that 'we seek out what we need to be influenced by' helps me orient to what is trying to emerge in the field of which I am part, in a way that might have less transactional and more transformational meaning for us all within that field.

I recognise that this is a very different starting point from getting on with the job of sorting out the client's presenting problem (*which* does need attention - it has to stay in the

frame and be resolved). However, rather than striving to artificially produce results 'against the flow' - which might not be sustainable even if they had been possible - the work here was first of all to 'read the field' and determine what might be emergent, or even striving for expression.

In this instance, over the course of the following two weeks, multiple, overlapping, coincidental themes showed themselves in the corporate culture as well as in the space between me and my client. These included pertinent issues of how to make strategic shifts in the nature of our work; how best to exercise leadership authority without bullying or giving away power; how best to begin something new in ways that gathered strength; and how to experience a greater sense of belonging. These were all themes in my own development at that time, but were also themes that were striving for expression in the client system that had engaged me.

Surfacing and tuning in to these joint themes for me is an important aspect of 'holding the space' - preparing the ground for mutual shifts to occur and relationally configuring circumstances in a way to support these shifts. One of the ways I work is to proactively explore my own manifestations of such issues in therapy, supervision, and in small experiments in day-to-day life. I believe that shifting my own sense of my relationship to these issues is important to the success of the client work.

Working With Vision

As well as looking at what the field was articulating about the relatedness of the business and myself, I also encouraged the client (the board director in this instance) to explore past and present systemic patterns, and also to develop a vision for the future of his function in the business. The vision was not developed (as is customary) through intellectual analysis in a series of corporate workshops. Instead of an analytical process, the client was encouraged to draw on his intuition in a structured way, through holding a question and remaining open to discovery - a process known as 'scrapbooking'⁵. The material generated was then engaged with creatively not in an office but on a facilitated walk up a mountainside⁶. The deliberate shift in the environmental field played a significant part in enabling the client to achieve a different quality of insight: as is widely known, one of the most immediately powerful ways of supporting change is to change the physical field.

Bearing in mind that a vision is both 'visual' and 'visionary', this way of working enabled the client to have an embodied experience of *seeing* things of significance - both in the scrapbook and in nature - which could then be related to his organisational circumstances. The *experience* of scrapbooking and of walking in nature enables clients to have an *embodied* sense of vision (regarded as an essential precursor to strategy formulation). Vision is something they have to work *from*, rather than something they work *towards*. Vision in this sense is received and perceived as a gift of the field, rather than as an intellectual abstraction or glib wish about the future.

Making this fundamental shift, from relating to vision as a future abstraction to experiencing vision as a different way



of being present, involves opening to a more future-receptive state. It places different demands on organisational and project leaders as well as consultants.

After only two weeks into the assignment, my client rang to note that for the first time, the team had had a productive and enjoyable meeting together, and a board member had asked how he could help do more to co-create the conditions for the success of the function. These gains are modest but significant, given that no work had directly focused on team or board relationships. The work is about sensing into what the field is trying to manifest, and seeing if it is possible to accelerate the development of possibilities by taking small steps where there is 'ripeness' and 'yield' in the system.

In working with vision in this unaccustomed way, we are not fixed on resolving a current problem, but rather are supporting a potential new future. In the process, the presenting issue gets resolved - but so much more is organically achieved. Senge *et al* (2004) summarises some of the skills of doing this work as *sensing* (learning to see freshly and perceive ourselves differently), *presencing* (becoming open to what is seeking to emerge) and *realising* (acting in service of what is emerging). Such ways of being and doing are congruent with the kind of holistic epistemology that has long been recognised by Gestaltists as having the potential to transform a systemic process.

The stance required of the consultant is one of respectful attending, attuning, opening - of using the whole self, harmonising both rational intelligence and intuitive knowing. When we understand that effects are not the result of causes but of multiple, overlapping field conditions we 'sense into' situations so that we can make differently-informed interventions. Intervention at this level - where we 'read' the field - needs representing as an art, not a science.

The work is about being sensitive to the inherent possibilities for change and development, tracking and directing the energy of a group or a whole system, and edging the emerging process towards the next possible step. The consultant's stance - one of creative non-differentiation - allows for unfolding relationships to be perceived, explored, and unfolded, by - and with - the client. The paradox is that the grace and ease of the consultant's more 'holding' energy can often promote a powerful sense of agency that feels different from prosecuting a line of action with wilful expert intent. It also takes less resource and generates less client resistance.

I think this confirms the essence of Gestalt practice - where the task is not so much to change anything, but to support a transformational awareness that penetrates and perceives 'what is'. To characterise extremes (somewhat artificially, but for the sake of making the point), the difference is between creating the conditions for field-shifts to occur naturally, and being overly goal-oriented and driven. The consultant's work is to lend an energetic coherence that enables the collective wisdom of the client system to mobilise itself, and to flow with less hindrance. In practice, it is never as clear-cut as this, and we have to ride the tension of acting quickly while supporting an unfolding systemic *gestalt*.



Conclusion

In the task-driven corporate contexts in which I work as a Gestalt consultant, I am often called upon to be directive and to help leaders and teams achieve specific results. The pressures on a consultant to work towards defined, timed, quantifiable objectives and outcomes are acute. Field-sensitivity in these large systems settings requires an often moment-by-moment discrimination of which specific field and systemic forces support greatest flow.

In business decision-making, the convention (although not always the reality) is that we explicitly preference 'hard data' over 'soft skills,' and favour logical, practical, controllable approaches over the contextual, contingent and relational. There are benefits of course, but there are also personal, social and environmental costs. Techno-rational decision-making processes that are predicated upon individualist, reductionist, analytical principles alone seem to improve parts while compounding problems for the greater wholes upon which those parts depend. The outcomes are never sustainable and invariably damaging in the longer term.

By way of contrast, developing practical approaches to 'working with the field' involves focusing attention on the client, the situation and the consultant as a virtual system in relationship. It means becoming more aware of what the field offers and of how to capitalise on the emergent qualities of fields. It means fostering the conditions under which field phenomena such as intuition and coincidence can arise, so that we are not just field-informed but can also be field-forming - becoming much more receptive to what is trying to emerge naturally, *but also* artfully co-creating from emergence.

This form of consulting is more akin to being a creative catalyst than an expert. It requires a particular form of awareness - a balancing of *intuitive attention* to the field with *creative intention* regarding the client's need. The focus is on what is happening in the relationship between the consultant, the client and the system, so that clients can expand their sense of possibility in terms of what the field

can naturally support at any one time within their organisation.

Working with the field in this way is a reframing of Beisser's (1972) Paradoxical Theory of Change, in that the consultant and client are not attempting to mechanistically engineer results so much as to align with and perhaps accelerate the naturally unfolding, generative and implicate order of the system. This is not dissimilar to how Buber (1958) describes people who are in touch with 'Grand Will':

Then he intervenes no more, but at the same time he does not let things merely happen. He listens to what is emerging from himself, to the course of being in the world; not in order to be supported by it, but in order to bring it to reality *as it desires* (p59, italics added).

Notes

1. Writing about the field in ways that do not perpetuate the split between self and field is inherently problematic. While I believe that we are profoundly a *part of*, rather than *apart from* the field, there is no holistic, non-dualistic field language that adequately communicates this in English.

While it might be more precise to talk about 'working within the field', or 'as the field', I have chosen to talk about working 'with the field' to draw attention to the conscious choices we need to make to become more sensitive to shifts in and of the field, as well as to the possibilities of mindfully influencing the field. I am not meaning to imply that we can work with the field from an 'outside' position.

2. Dissipative structures are chemical systems capable of regenerating to higher levels of self-organisation in response to changing environmental circumstances. In doing so, a new entity with completely new properties emerges. This process has since been observed in genetic networks, neural networks, immune systems, eco-systems and social systems.

3. Groundbreaking but highly controversial work undertaken by an international collaboration of physicists and consciousness researchers at the Institute of Noetic Sciences (www.noetic.org) since 1998 is also raising important questions about the possibility of an innate field consciousness attendant on major world events. Roger Nelson (2005) describes a project whereby electronic random number generators have been insulated from all known forms of environmental disturbance (such as physical tampering, telecoms signals and electromagnetic disturbance) and placed in an unconnected network around the world. The random numbers generated by these machines are regularly checked. Over the past six years, major global events have had an unexpected and unaccountable effect. Singly and collectively, the machines have recorded massive deviations from expected correlates at particular times. Such times have included the bombing of Buddhist temples in Banyan, the death of Princess Diana, the beginning of the Kosovo conflict, the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and other such events. Things that seem to register most acutely are events that tear the social fabric. Intriguingly, the machines register deviations in output hours and sometimes even days before the events occur. Researchers estimate the probability of such anomalies as being less than one in a thousand. Nelson and his colleagues note: 'We are obliged to confront the possibility that the measured correlations may be directly associated with some (as yet poorly understood) aspect of consciousness attendant to global events.' (Nelson, R. et al (2005). *Correlations of Continuous Random Data with Major World Events*. <http://noosphere.princeton.edu>, p10). Such work is pioneering and highly contentious. It pushes strongly at the boundaries of what we understand about our existence. It is important that these experiments are repeated, reviewed, and challenged by peers with no vested interests in the results.

4. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in Cambridge USA is a global centre of excellence for management studies. Organisational systems specialists based at MIT include Peter Senge, Otto Scharmer, Betty Sue Flowers and Joseph Jaworski. They are now openly discussing concepts well-known to Gestaltists such as presence, phenomenology, dialogue and fields. Leadership provides the nexus of interest of these concepts. In his eponymous book, Jaworski describes synchronicity as 'the inner path of leadership'.

5. In 'scrapbooking' the client is asked to hold a question a week before a facilitated walk in a natural environment. Analysis and answering of the question is discouraged. Instead, the client is invited to remain open and curious about the question over the course of the week, and to include in the scrapbook any images or objects, snippets of poetry or song, or other material that has an intuitively sensed connection to the question. The scrapbook is brought along to a facilitator for exploration through storytelling about the objects that have found themselves in the scrapbook, and the circumstances of their inclusion when and how they were found over the course of the week. The client is supported to make meaning through identifying 'hidden connections' that reveal themselves through the storytelling. These objects and the connections between them then become key aspects of the client's vision of the future.

6. This is a truncated form of a shamanic Vision Quest. In shamanic societies, Vision Questing was undertaken in solitude, in wilderness environments, at turning points in the life of the person undertaking the quest, or of the tribe. The individual who cried for a vision did so for themselves, but significantly also on behalf of the community.

References

- Beaumont, H. (1998). The Field of Soul. *British Gestalt Journal*, 7:2, 77-87.
- Beisser, A. (1972). The Paradoxical Theory of Change, in Fagan, J. & Shepherd, I. (eds) *Gestalt Therapy Now*. Penguin, London.
- Bohm, D. (1981). *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. Routledge, London.
- Buber, M. (1958) *I and Thou*. (trans Smith, R.G.). Scribner. New York.
- Cappon, D. (1994) *Intuition & Management* Quorum, London.
- Gendlin, E. (1981) *Focusing*, Bantam, New York.
- Harman, W. (1988) *Intuition as the Code Word for Global Transformation*, IMI Conference on Intuition in Business, 19.2., Institute of Noetic Sciences, Geneva.
- Hellinger, B. (1999). *Acknowledging What Is*. Zeig, Tucker & Co., Phoenix.
- Jacobs, L. (2003). Practices of Care and Inclusion. *British Gestalt Journal*, 12:2, 88-96.
- Jaworski, J. (1996) *Synchronicity*. Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco.
- Kennedy, D. (2003). The Phenomenal Field. *British Gestalt Journal*, 12:2, 76-87.
- Kepner, J. (2003). The Embodied Field. *British Gestalt Journal*, 12:1, 6-14.
- Laszlo, E. (1996). *The Whispering Pond*. Element, Shaftesbury Dorset.
- Lewin, K. (1952). *Field Theory in Social Science*. Tavistock, London.
- McConville, M. (2001). Lewinian field theory, adolescent development and psychotherapy. *The Heart of Development, Volume 2*, Adolescence (eds Wheeler G. & McConville, M.). The Analytic Press. Hillsdale, NJ.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945). *Phenomenology of Perception* (trans. Smith, C.). Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- O'Shea, L. (2003). Erotic Field. *British Gestalt Journal*, 12:2, 105-110).
- Parlett, M. (1997). The Unified Field in Practice. *Gestalt*



Review, 1:1, 16-33.

Progogine, I. & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue With Nature*. Bantam Books, New York.

Puthoff, H. (1989). Where Does the Zero Point Energy Come From? *New Scientist*. 2 December: 36.

Roberts, A. (1999). The Field Talks Back. *British Gestalt Journal*, 8:1, 35-46.

Robine, J-M. (2003). I Am Me And My Circumstance. *British Gestalt Journal*, 12:1, 49-55.

Scharmer, O. (2000) *Illuminating the Blindspot: Leadership in the Context of Emerging Worlds* McKinsey SoL Leadership Project.

Senge, P. et al (2004) *Presence: Human Purpose & the Field of the Future*, SoL, Cambridge MA.

Sheldrake, R. (1989). *The Presence of the Past*. Fontana, Bodmin.

Sheldrake, R. (2003). *The Sense of Being Stared At*. Hutchinson, London.

Wheeler, G. (2000) *Beyond Individualism*. GIC Press, Cambridge MA.

Yontef, G. (1993). *Awareness, Dialogue & Process*. The Gestalt Journal Press. New York.

Yontef, G. (2001). Relational Gestalt therapy: what it is and what it is not, why the adjective 'relational'? *Contact and Relationship in a Field Perspective* (ed Robine, J.M.) L'Exprimerie. Bordeaux.

Ty Francis works as a consultant with global commercial corporations and UK Government Departments on a range of change management, management development and corporate communications issues. Ty has trained as a Gestalt consultant and systemic constellator. He is a graduate member of the Chartered Institute of Marketing, holds a Master's Degree in Human Relations and is presently completing his PhD on Intuition and the Field.

Address for Correspondence: 12 Shavington Avenue,
Chester, Cheshire CH2 3RD
Email: ty@tyfrancis.org

© Ty Francis 2005, published in *British Gestalt Journal* 14:1, 26-33

