

## **IEMT Identity interventions and the role of position between the pronouns**

During the latest dutch historia meeting (april 2020, meeting by the use of 'whereby'. This is the time of videochat as we're in lockdown fellow historians..) we discussed an insight of Soror H. regarding the positions that the 'pronounparts' take towards each other in many expressions spoken by her clients. That got me thinking on the principles of active and passive, part of the first grade historia work.

This piece is an attempt at getting feedback and also writing it down to help me clarify it for my self.

(note how there is no active 'I' in the previous sentence, as it's implied. There is a referential index 'it' and the role of 'me' is to become somewhat active so that the 'self' can remain passive, owned by 'me'.

## **Onderwerp, meewerkend voorwerp en lijdend voorwerp in het Nederlands.**

Subject, indirect object and direct object in Dutch.

In Dutch the subject in a sentence mostly has an active role. The other phrases occupy less active roles, hence the reference to 'object'. The subject in a sentence is often referred to as 'agens', the active part in an expression.

The indirect object and direct object are not obligatory in sentences, but there must be a subject. It can be implied instead of explicit, for example “Er gebeurt iets.” (“Something happens.”). In sentences where all roles are more explicitly encoded in the grammar the active / passive takes shape more clearly:

Ik geef soror H. een boek. (I give a book to soror H.)

'I' is the active part in the sentence, it does the giving. 'Soror H.' is the indirect object in the sentence, it is the receiving end of whatever 'I' is giving. Then 'a book' is the direct object, it is the most passive as it plays no role in the transaction except being the transacted object. Without the book, there would be no giving and there would be no difference between active 'I' and mildly passive 'soror H.'.

So for there to be an active and passive element, something has to be transferred between the two phrases. That something is the direct object.

Some examples where pronouns of identity are used as subject, indirect object and direct object in a fashion that could lead to an identity related IEMT intervention:

Ik geef niet om mezelf.

Zelf geef ik niet veel om mijn gedoe.

Ik word gek van mezelf.

Ik gun mezelf vaak geen tijd.

Ik heb geen goed woord voor mezelf over.

Mijn hart wordt vertrapt.

Ik weet niet wat ik met mezelf aan moet.

Ik heb zelf geen behoefte om me te vergeven.  
Ik heb er zelf geen tijd voor.  
Je moet bij mij niet aankomen met zelfmedelijden.  
Mijn gedachten hebben een leven van zichzelf.  
Ik kan me niet herinneren dat ik om mezelf kon lachen.  
Ik kan me niet voorstellen dat ik van mezelf zou houden.

Well, if you've done IEMT, you know the drill. Figure it out in yer own bloody language. I'll take an example and analyze it in terms of active/passive.

Ik kan me niet voorstellen dat ik van mezelf zou houden. (I can't picture – for me – that I would love my self)

The 'I' is the active pronoun, 'for me' is kind of indirect object, more or less passive, receiving whatever the 'I' is trying to picture 'that I would love my self'. In that subclause the 'I' is again the active part, 'my' is the pronoun of possession. What is possessed is the 'self'. I'm not sure, but I think it's a direct object in this context. By whom is the 'self' possessed? It is probably the 'I'. Which is weird, because the I is often just the active part of 'self'. How can 'Self' be owned by a part of it, 'I'?

Hmm. That's where it starts getting freaky. We associate with 'I' and 'We', while remaining dissociated from 'my self' and 'our selves'. However when I think about 'I' versus 'Self' and ask which is 'more me', I actively think that 'Self' is more 'me' than 'I'.

Maybe it's because there's nothing to associate with a passive part, or better, with the inactive part of an action. Any verb implies an action/transaction/activity. And any activity must have an agent, something doing the activity. Maybe it's not the agent that we associate with so much, as we do associate with the 'active side of the action'. Maybe it's just a side-effect that we associate with I.

I don't think of I. I think of my self. And therefore I am. I cannot be without my self. Sorry for the playing with words. What is 'I' then in relation to 'Self'? I'll hallucinate for a bit.

I is the split-off part of self in that specific context that represents the active part in an action. As soon as the action is performed, I is taken up again in the whole 'self'.  $2=0$ . Without 'I' there would be no meaning in an action, but the 'I' is not permanent. We associate with 'I' because it is active and we've cast meaning upon it, but not because it has any permanence like 'Self' does.

The 'I' is instantiated anytime the 'self' is engaged in an action as the vessel of that action. Wow! Thinking about that my brain goes whoop whoop because of the word 'vessel' that is associated with Binah.

The self is the vessel that is before the I is. Then when action occurs (the divine energy), instantly from the vessel (Binah) the active pronoun comes into temporary existence. 'I' has its influx upon the vessel of 'self' and then it dissolves again into quantum.

Or maybe the 'Self' is Kether. Then it's not the vessel, but potential. Then from the potential there is an influx of energy, that temporarily creates 'I', also known as Chokmah. Because 'I' is instantiated it naturally follows that there must be a vessel. That could be the indirect object. 'Me' and 'My' even sound round and all eternal mother like.

I don't have much experience with 'me and my' in these expressions as I'm very unexperienced with IEMT work, but I think I remember people saying that 'my' and 'me' are often functioning in a similar fashion to internal containers. Now if that isn't your perfect vessel..

So: 'Self' as kether. 'I' as chokmah. 'Me/my' as Binah.

'I' only last as long as the influx of energy lasts from 'Self'. We can only stick meaning to what we've defined and Kether / self remains undefined. But we can attach meaning to 'I'. We've just defined it by the process of creating a process/activity. And 'I' only lasts as long as the activity takes place. And the pronoun 'Me/my' functions on the throne of Binah, as the recipient of 'I'. Bloody hell, that seems about right when thinking about Subject versus Indirect object. And the direct object is what's handed down across the bridge between Chokmah and Binah.

Alright. Enough. Get back to bloody earth frater M. Down boy. Down. Seriously.

## On to positions in identity related work

Soror H. spoke about these expressions. An example:

I don't cover my back.  
I don't support my self.  
I stand in my own way.  
I can't back myself up.  
I don't stand for my self.  
I run away from my self.  
If it was up to me, I'd give myself up.  
I'm not pushing (myself) forward.  
I should take a step back (from myself)  
I never watch myself. (Ik let nooit op mezelf) (in the sense of disregarding oneself)  
I trip over my own feet.  
I want to slap myself.

Now obviously not every identity statement has a positional aspect in the level 1 & 2 sense of the Metaphors of Movement work, but there are plenty of statements that have a positional aspect.

How could we use a Metaphors of Movement kind of intervention to work with these positional aspects of pronouns? Take the example of 'I don't support my self'. The 'I' is not below the 'Self'. There is an aspect of status that plays a role. Maybe 'I' is projected as being above 'Self' during the need for supporting. A possible intervention could be:

- Where is 'I' in relation to 'self'?
- How could 'I' (it is the active part after all) change its position so that it may support 'my self'?
- What happens?
- How does that change things?

Onto 'I want to slap myself'.

- Where is 'I' looking and where is 'myself' looking?
- How could 'I' (active part) change its position so that it may not want to slap 'my self'?
  - Maybe turn around, I don't know
- What happens?
- How does that change things?

Alright. That wraps it up for now. We'd like feedback! Should we explore making 'Self' active and change it's position? Are we onto something?

Greetz from frater M, Soror M, Frater R and Soror H.