

# Matrixes

By Dr. John Veltheim

The *matrixes*, as we refer to them in [BodyTalk](#), describe distortions of both inborn, inherited personality traits, and the inborn masculine and feminine traits inherent in the psyche or beingness.

The primary matrixes relate most specifically to the anima/animus or feminine/masculine psychic energies. This is because, as distortions, they relate to gender.

At birth, the two psychic energies are drawn upon and expressed to varying degrees. How much you draw on them as a child, and for how long, is dependant upon the health of the body at birth and how nurturing or otherwise your childhood environment is.

Initially, the primary matrixes will form. These matrixes or personality modifications have everything to do with the way in which you are taught verbally, and by example, about your own gender, and your gender opposite.

The stronger the primary matrixes or distortions of the feminine/masculine energies are, the harder it will be to sustain any form of objectivity on self. Another way of saying this is that the stronger the primary personality modifications or matrixes are, the harder it will be to feel comfortable with yourself. This is because these matrixes will keep you out of touch with “what comes naturally” to you in terms of the natural inborn feminine/masculine traits and the inherited personality traits.

The lower self-esteem is, the harder you will try to cope with, or mask, what it is you dislike about yourself. This dislike of self will, first and foremost, relate to gender. It will have to do with the way you have learned to think about yourself in terms of “being” a man or a woman, and it will relate to the way you act out for others.

The anima/animus energies express themselves in intellectual expression and resulting behavior. For example, if anima/intuitive processes are not sufficiently infused with animus rationale, then self-expression, or the personality, will be labeled *irrational*. This is because the anima provides a “felt sense” of the world, and if this “felt sense” cannot be expressed or explained in “rational” terms it is usually labeled *irrational*.

This label will give rise to a whole host of other labels such as “useless,” “stupid,” “weak,” etc. Because these descriptions are given to the body and gender you are identified as, your first defense is to modify your expression of that gender.

For example, if anima/feminine psychic energy predominates in the female body, the woman might try to adopt a more masculine way of expressing herself if these traits are labeled negatively.

Anima expression can also be criticized in a way that is deprecating to the woman yet be seen as beneficial in her relationship to men. How this works is that feminine traits are labeled irrational, but the woman is taught to believe that this gives her a mystique vis-avis the male. What this mystique is, is that seeming “irrationality” complements male logic, and makes the man feel more powerful and superior.

The more the woman falls under the spell of this delusion, the stronger the primary female matrix will probably become. How this matrix will more than likely manifest will be in terms of a female role-play of subservience or simpering, and poor self-expression.

If this primary matrix becomes very strong, the feminine/anima traits that are being parodied in female roles will become increasingly hard to ignore and disown. The way the feminine psychic energies will then express themselves is by projecting themselves onto others. The stronger the matrix, the more volatile the anima energies will become, and this volatility will be mirrored in others, and in the body of the person who is disowning them. This can result in health problems, abusive relationships, and a sense of the world being hostile.

By this point it must also be noted that the animus/masculine energies inherent in her psyche will have also been modified into a male matrix. This is because the woman will have been given to understand that as an "irrational" being she is incapable of animus rationale or logic. The male matrix is probably going to be fairly weak in comparison to the female one, however, if the woman's focus is primarily directed towards her parody of female gender roles or the female matrix. Alternatively, the male matrix might be quite strong if the woman feels she needs to sustain some form of control over her life. The female matrix will have everything to do with the idea of controlling (as all matrixes do), because it is the result of conformism, and the need to please, and thus to feel in control of her emotions. However, the woman will probably rarely experience being in control, especially if she is doing a really good of acting out roles that are in direct conflict with her inborn personality traits. For this reason, the strength of the male matrix will probably grow in direct proportion to the inability of the woman to experience control via the female matrix.

The more uncomfortable and distressing this dynamic becomes, the more likely it is that the woman will start developing secondary matrixes. These secondary matrixes will be colored by the primary matrixes in that they will also relate to issues of control. The secondary matrixes, however, do not specifically have to do with gender roles but have more to do with the idea of embellishing on the personality in any way possible. In one way, the secondary matrixes are embellishments on the primary matrixes. This means that they are actually an extension of them.

In another way, often times, rather than embellishing on the primary matrixes, the secondary matrixes are adopted in order to temper the primary ones. For example, if a woman begins to feel conflict as the result of her primary female matrix, she might try to draw on the anima energies that are more natural to her. Finding herself incapable of this because the female matrix is too strongly suppressing it, she will probably opt for trying to draw on the animus psychic power.

However, the feminine/anima energy predominated in self-expression in childhood, and was related to her gender, and compared to her gender opposite. This resulted in her focusing on modifying the inborn anima traits and parodying them in female role-play. Because this role-play was subservient to the male, it meant that she simultaneously disowned the power of the animus.

Another way of putting this is: Her primary, habitual mode of self-expression and her strongest matrix will probably be the female one. Because its distortions or modifications have come about in relation to the male, she is unlikely to feel herself capable of drawing on anything that relates to male rationale. This means that she will be incapable of drawing on inborn animus traits and, at best, will have to settle for parodying male roles in accordance with what she has learned to believe about men.

In [BodyTalk](#), if innate indicates that the female matrix is a priority, it means that the woman's state of balance at the time of the session is conducive to the onset of the process of becoming conscious of that primary gender modification. In isolating the matrix from the male primary matrix and other secondary matrixes, the primary female matrix is highlighted.

In [BodyTalk](#), practitioners often think in terms of severing the ties with the primary matrix and related matrixes, and of dispelling the primary matrix. However, the primary matrix is nothing more than a learned modification and a distortion of an inborn aspect of the two psychic energies. As a learned distortion, it has no separate existence to the psychic energy it pertains to.

For example, learned female roles are nothing but a parody of inborn feminine traits inherent in the psyche. Although these roles or parodies seem to transform the psychic energies, actually the seeming change that occurs does not change the nature of the anima in any fundamental way. This is because the matrixes are still aspects of the psyche.

When the anima energy is disowned, it is projected into the body and, eventually, manifests in the seeming limitations of disease. It is also projected outward and manifests in behavior in self and others that is seemingly repressive. All that is happening is that the anima's suppression is being reflected in the mirror of the world. But this has not changed the anima energies in any fundamental way at all.

Why the anima energies have changed in no fundamental way is because they relate to the intuitive processes and one's "felt sense" of the world. The un-owned anima is projected into the body and outward onto others and inward in terms of behavior modifications. But this doesn't change the anima in any fundamental way. All that happens is that the anima's power of providing a deep "felt sense" is simply being amplified and reflected in the "outer" world in a way that is more tangible.

Why this is, is because the anima needs to be drawn upon if the human being is to become conscious. Because "coming into consciousness" is natural, and is what innate's healing abilities are all about, the anima persists in trying to be acknowledged. The longer it takes for the person to acknowledge and draw on this psychic power, the more tangible and detrimental these un-owned energies become. This is because they need to get the attention of the person if they are to "wake up" to themselves.

When the anima stirs up sufficient trouble that it becomes impossible not to try and change one's life experience, this is when a person often tries to draw on the animus energy. Unfortunately, this masculine energy will have been related to male roles, and these roles will have triggered the need to embellish in some way on female roles. This will have brought about suppression of the anima, and simultaneously closed the way for the person to draw on the animus. The animus will have been equated to something that is either impossible or dangerous to connect to, because it has been seen to be in direct conflict, or dominant, to the anima. Consequently, in order to "come into consciousness," first of all the woman will have to draw on the power of the anima energies before this fear can be put into context in relation to the animus.

For example, young boys in western societies are usually equated with the animus traits. This is because, in general, men are considered to have superior abilities when it comes to rational thought and the ability to compartmentalize things in such a way that their emotions don't get in the way of their interactions in the world.

Because this type of thinking predominates in the west, young boys are often taught that emotions are "bad" and should not be overtly expressed. They are also often taught that they need to be the caretakers of women who are, by nature, irrational and less capable of interacting in a grounded, "rational" way in the world.

These attitudes describe the superimposition of male roles upon the animus traits. That is, the masculine/animus energy is equated with male dominance and superiority of intellect.

Consequently, many young boys who have a parent, or parents, who subscribe to this type of thinking, are going to learn by example from the parents that they need to act and express themselves in a rational, dogmatic, domineering or “macho” way. This is because the parent, or parents, will probably be acting out male and female roles that are in accordance with this type of misinterpretation of the animus.

Because the parents or primary caregivers of the boy serve as his mirror, and thus his primary identity, the boy is, more than likely, going to begin mimicking what he sees in the “mirror” his parents are providing him.

If the boy’s nature has a predominance of anima energies, he will probably experience tremendous conflict within himself if this happens. This will probably translate into conflict with the parents—his mirror. Subsequently, this conflict will either result in the boy assuming the male role he is being taught, and thus conforming; or the boy may rebel and start parodying the female roles that are his parent’s misinterpretation of the anima traits the boy is expressing. That is, he will probably assume a stronger female than male matrix.

If he starts to parody female roles (develops a female matrix), the conflict with his parents will no doubt escalate. Experiencing inner conflict at not wanting to disappoint the parents, the boy will also have this conflict mirrored back at him in his parent’s attitudes towards him. Because the boy is going against his inborn anima “felt sense” of what comes naturally to him, this will give rise to tremendous confusion—the absence of logical rationale. As a result he will feel incapable of drawing on the inborn animus/male psychic powers and will start to assume a male matrix as a substitute.

When anima energy is disowned and starts being parodied and projected outward, its expression is usually exaggerated. This means that the young boy might find his parody of the anima (female matrix) results in him thinking he has homosexual tendencies—has stronger female tendencies than male.

Conversely, if he tries to conform, and begins parodying the masculine/animus energies in “acceptable” male roles (matrix), he will probably act out in a way that is aggressive or domineering towards women. This is because he is trying to suppress the feminine energies that at first predominated in his nature. This dynamic will serve to strengthen the conflict he faces in suppressing the two inborn psychic energies. It will also set up a personality conflict, or split, between the two matrixes that have formed in order to parody the anima/animus.

Do please note that I am only giving one clear cut example here, as a possible scenario, for how the matrixes are used to “hide” the psychic energies. There are numerous variations on this theme.

Because the matrixes—be they primary or secondary—are learned and assumed distortions of the innate psychic powers, it means that they are not other than them. I know I have talked of these psychic powers being “suppressed” and “dis-owned” but I am not inferring that they have been overridden by something other than themselves.

The word *matrix* denotes a cast or a shape that is formed out of an existing substance. Relatively speaking, the anima/animus energies can be considered entities in that they infuse the psyche or beingness, and seem to divide it into masculine and feminine. This “division” is inherent at birth, and the anima/animus energies have no bearing on inherited familial traits. At birth, therefore, the anima/animus energies are uncolored by personal traits, but serve to complement them.

Because these psychic energies or powers have no bearing on the personal, their expression is not limited or restricted to any culture, society, or environment. What this means is that, to get in touch with, or consciously draw on these energies, is to begin to “transcend” the personal.

Because personalized roles are limiting, and limited to societies and cultures, if “coming into consciousness” is the goal, the anima/animus energies must be owned. That is, you have to become conscious of them and draw healthily on these two powerful “entities.”

In a clinical setting, it will not always be appropriate, or helpful, to talk in these terms to a client. However, as a [BodyTalk practitioner](#), if you have an understanding of the anima/animus energies, it can only benefit you when innate indicates that a matrix is the priority. The way in which you can explain the [BodyTalk](#) dynamics at this point to a client is by talking to them about “getting in touch with what comes naturally to you.”

Basically, when a matrix is indicated as a priority it means that innate is ready to have a personality modification isolated and thereby highlighted. When a matrix in the body is addressed and you “tap out” the client, the “tapping out” is part of the synchronistic dynamic of innate.

What this means is that, because innate is ready to address a matrix, and requires “secondary” input, you the practitioner fall in with this synchronicity of events. To understand this is to realize that the session is both out of your hands and out of the hands of the client.

If, as a practitioner, you consider the concept of addressing the matrixes to mean that you are effecting change in the client, this agenda will be part of that synchronicity. This does not mean that your agenda is inappropriate to the process, because it could not unfold in any other way than it is—with you as part of the synchronicity of events.

If you understand that the client’s “coming into consciousness” can be facilitated by the addressing of the matrixes, this understanding can also give rise to strong agendas on your part. However, if you understand that the matrixes are merely a distortion of the innate energies of the psyche, and that this means that the psyche has undergone no *fundamental* change as a result of the matrixes, your focus is less likely to be concerned with bringing about change.

Instead, you might recognize that the addressing of the matrixes will merely serve to highlight personality distortions (which is what the matrixes are). When this happens, the client usually finds that he or she has increasing difficulty in acting those distortions out. This is because these roles will start to feel limiting and limited and, consequently, there is every possibility that behavioral habits will begin to change.

Because behavior is something that is always changing, no real change can be said to occur. A relative change between one form of behavior and another will be apparent. However, no *fundamental* change will have taken place.

The psyche, or beingness, is nothing more than a mass of undifferentiated consciousness that has assumed the appearance of duality or differentiation because it has been given the name “me.” This “me” is considered to be capable of being *more* or *less* conscious. But because the psyche is by nature undifferentiated consciousness, this idea is faulty. That the psyche, labeled “me,” is nothing more than an undifferentiated mass of consciousness, means that the “me,” or self, is nothing but a thought or a bundle of names.

These names or thoughts are not other than undifferentiated consciousness. Paradoxically, they give this consciousness the appearance of duality. The perception of the undifferentiated, impersonal mass of consciousness is thus divided up into dualistic concepts which are labeled personal and attributed with gender traits. This changes the impersonal undifferentiated consciousness in no *fundamental* way.

Because the word *mind* describes the thinking processes, with a little thought, it isn't too difficult to understand that the mind cannot have caused itself. That is, thinking cannot have given rise to itself because nothing can act upon itself. Neither can the mind have subjective knowledge of itself, because to do so it would have to be apart from itself, and other than itself.

You seem to know about yourself by means of the mind. *To know about something* describes subjective knowledge. The term *subjective knowledge* describes separateness between a knower, and a known. The confusing thing is that you believe you are both the cause of knowledge, and the mind, which gives rise to subjective knowledge. This means that you believe that you are both a cause *and* an effect.

When something is deemed the cause of something else, this dynamic describes cause and effect. The word *cause* denotes "attributing responsibility to." The word *blame* has the exact same meaning. Although *praise* is an expression of approval, the act of praising is actually no different to, or is just a variation on, blaming. This is because both concepts denote the attributing of responsibility to something.

You might argue that praise and blame are different because praise describes a virtuous responsibility whereas blame describes the opposite. In response to such an argument, let us look at the dynamic of love.

When you say you love someone, what you mean is that they make you feel a certain way. In essence, to tell someone you love them is, therefore, to say that they have power over your emotions. This is clearly a heavy trip to lay on someone, but despite this, most people believe that love is something to be sought after, and that it is a desirable thing to offer others. This gives you one definition of the ego or false self—masochist!

Let's say that you are deeply "in love" with someone. You tell them frequently how they *make* you feel, and while you are doing this, you think they will be overjoyed that your words will help them to feel special. As it is, the people we love usually do feel special when we voice loving words to them—such as "you make me feel so good!"

Few people, be they the recipient of such words, or the bearer of them, think that the term "you make me feel" has anything to do with blame, or victim consciousness. However, this is exactly what these words denote, because you are attributing another with being responsible for, and the cause of, your emotions. This makes them "to blame" and, because you are identified as your emotions and the beloved is deemed responsible for them, that makes you a victim.

I know this looks like a cynical view of love, but unfortunately, if you are sincere about "becoming conscious," you have to understand humanness as deeply as possible. Because the concept of *love* is pivotal to most people's "existence," it is one of the aspects of humanness that you are eventually going to have to look at deeply. As you are reading this, this appears to be the time!

Now let's look at the opposite of *love*, which is named *hate*. When the so-called beloved starts acting in ways that displease you, love starts to undergo change, or so it seems. At first you might

blame yourself, or you might begin by blaming them, and then blame yourself. Either way, as soon as something about the beloved displeases you, you are apt to experience overt blame. *Overt*, of course, is the key word here because, until this point, “you make me feel” hasn’t been categorized as blame.

When overt blaming gets underway, suddenly the love experience seems to be permeated by hate. Sometimes, of course, it seems as if love and hate interchange if you are trying desperately to remedy the situation. But because these two contradictory experiences can’t co-exist, this brings about even more confusion.

What is helpful to understand is that both so-called love and hate have one thing in common: they are both underlain and permeated by need. And the need is for the “other” to make you feel a certain way. Clearly, when hate is experienced, neediness is pretty easy to recognize. It isn’t that most people are oblivious to neediness when love is the experience, but usually neediness isn’t the description you give it. And after all, most people believe that telling someone “you make me feel” and “don’t ever leave me” is something the other person will delight in hearing. This is because you like to think, or hope, the other person feels exactly the same way.

In short, whether you are covertly blaming the “other” in terms of love, or overtly blaming them in terms of hate, the dynamic is essentially the same. You experience being the victim, and this experience—be it love-ly or otherwise—perpetuates neediness. It also perpetuates the idea that cause and effect are real.

You say “I AM in love” and identify as the experience of love. What this means is that, when you tell the other that they are responsible for this experience, you are essentially saying that they are the cause of your identity. In other words, you are blaming them for your experience of yourself. Because you like this experience, and like yourself when you are having it—and because you are identified as the experience—it becomes imperative that the other person sustain the experience for you.

What this means is that the other person has to continue acting in ways that please you if you are to maintain the identity you have adopted. This dynamic is called *love*, which is considered a wonderful, desirable experience. Actually, as you can probably tell, it is far from desirable, because the “love” you are offering to the other, and asking them to give you, is full of conditions.

“I will love you as long as you act a certain way” is basically what love is all about. You might argue that in some cases people manage to carry on loving in the face of incredible abuse, and regardless of what the other person is doing. However, perhaps you will now take into account the idea that the love experience is so coveted precisely because it gives you a special identity. Love is considered virtuous and special, so as long as you are loving, you have the possibility of adopting these concepts and adding them to your identity. This means that the so-called “unconditional love” people offer others in the face of abuse or other unpleasant actions is never free of conditions.

The condition that always goes hand in hand with love is that, if you love someone, it should make you feel special, useful, and better than you feel when you are not loving. Clearly, such a demand has to be underlain by fear of the alternative experience. Because love is always conditional and underlain by fear, it is impossible that love is not permeated by blame and neediness. It is also impossible for love not to give you the identity of victim, and equally impossible that the so-called beloved is not deemed “to blame.”

Of course, this line of reasoning is one that very few people will come upon, and it is probably not one you are enjoying pondering. But my point here is to give you a deeper understanding of ego or

the false self. The nature of ego is fear, and the concepts of coping, control, and neediness, are outcroppings of this emotion. This means that the ego is nothing more than this bundle of undesirable concepts.

Because the nature of ego is dualistic, it relates to the idea of separateness, which is undesirable. Because everyone experiences the undesirability of separateness, everyone has a vested interest in masking or coping with this experience. One of the best ways of doing this is to give the ego a positive identity. You can do this by consciously using the power of positive thinking. Another alternative is that you can spend your time looking for, and trying to maintain, the love experience, which pastime is really no different to the power of positive thinking. Either way, you are trying to convince yourself that who you are is worthy, virtuous, and special. This is a description of coping or masking, and *coping* is one more description of the fundamental nature of ego.

The concept of *coping* relates to the idea of cause and effect. You cope with your emotions because you believe they “make you feel” a certain way, *and* that you cause these feelings. At the same time you are identified with the thoughts and emotions that you experience. This means that you believe yourself to be both a cause and an affect.

That you believe that emotions “make you feel,” means you believe you are the victim of your emotions. The word *victim* denotes someone who undergoes harsh or unjust treatment. In this sense, if you are experiencing emotions you like, you might say it is anathema to call yourself a victim of emotions. However, because desirable emotions are always underlain by the need to sustain them, they are also underlain by fear. This means that, however nice the emotion you are feeling might be, it is rooted in fear.

To some degree or another, fear is always experienced by someone who is in victim mode. Because all emotions are rooted in fear, regardless of how much you like an emotion, as long as you believe emotions “make you feel” (i.e. you are identified with them), you are in victim mode. Whether emotions are overt, subtle, or imperceptible, emotions are always being experienced. Because the ego or false self is the sum of all experiences, this means that the ego is synonymous with *victim*.

Consciously or unconsciously, the victim mode or identity is never free of blame. Either the victim blames another for “making” them a victim, or the victim blames him or herself for acting in a way that is unacceptable. When self-blame is present, you are basically crediting yourself with being both the cause and the effect of an experience. Another way of saying this is that you consider yourself to be both blameworthy (the *cause* of an experience), and a victim (the result or *effect* of an experience).

Clearly you cannot be both a cause and an effect. Neither can you be both someone who is a victim, and someone who is to blame. In other words, you cannot possibly be any concept you are identified as. Because victim and blame consciousness describe the nature of ego, it means that the ego is non-existent. This is why another word for ego is the “false” self: because it is NOT YOU.

If you understand this so far and it rings in some way “true” to you, then you will intellectually recognize that the psyche or this beingness – called “self” – is NOT YOU. You will also realize that who you Really are has to be beyond concepts. When we talk of the anima/animus energies and the matrixes, what we are talking about are various facets of the false self. The overtly false facets of this “self” are the learned roles that you act out habitually. These, in BodyTalk, we talk of as being the personality matrixes, which are learned ways of behaving, as opposed to inborn traits.

What is less overt in the psyche, once the matrixes are formed, are the psychic energies. That is, they manifest overtly, in the “mirror” of the world. Until you recognize the dynamics of mirroring, the reflection of these psychic energies is blamed/disowned by being projected onto others, or onto the body. Because these psychic energies are inborn and are not colored by personal traits at birth, they can, relatively speaking, be considered somewhat impersonal. This is because their expression is not unique to anyone.

The only time the anima/animus energies are considered very personal is when they start being drawn on to a slight degree only. This is because they will continue to be somewhat colored by the existing matrixes. The anima/animus energies are the most natural aspect of the psyche or beingness because they are not unique to anyone and because they are innate or inborn. For this reason, if you want to know “what comes naturally,” or if you want to “come into consciousness,” you need to investigate the humanness as deeply as possible.

To do this you need to “become conscious” of the distortions of anima/animus that are called personality matrixes (learned and adopted roles that parody the natural, inborn psychic energies). When, in whatever way, these distortions are highlighted, their unnaturalness and limitations become obvious. This makes it very difficult to continue acting out in habitual ways.

When sufficient of the matrixes have been highlighted, and learned, habitual roles subside, it is possible to start, consciously, drawing on the energies that permeate the psyche—instead of unconsciously parodying them. This brings about a clarity in the thinking processes, because the anima/intuitive power is then able to infuse the animus trait of rational, practical thought and bring about deep insights into learned information. Similarly, the animus trait of rational thought gives the anima added dimension in that one’s “felt sense” of things begins to make rational sense. In other words, relatively speaking, the mind is steadier.

This mental clarity—provided by the interfacing of anima/animus energies—illuminates the mind. The mind, which was once full of thoughts that name “self” real and thoughts “truths,” begins to fill with questions that shed doubt on the thinking processes and their seeming “truths.”

As a result of this mental clarity, and the ability to cut through the darkness of ignorance by means of questions, the mind continues to clarify. Eventually, if this process of questioning continues to unfold, all thoughts are realized to be not only untruths, but nonexistent. Because thoughts are what divide the perception into duality, duality is also realized to be non-existent.

This realization then highlights the dynamics of anima/animus, as well as the colorings that have arisen from inborn, inherited personality traits. The realization that duality is non-existent then does the work of highlighting these dualistic concepts to such a degree that the mind is experienced as being impotent in the face of these conflicting aspects within the thinking processes.

Once the mind’s insanity and impotence are sufficiently highlighted, no thought can be considered a “truth.” Finding no (animus) rationale in any thought whatsoever, and finding the (anima) intuition incapable of touching the Truth, the psychic energies and inherited personality traits that dictate expression of the thinking processes subside. When this happens, the mind empties of all thoughts, and the perception ceases being named. Because the perception is no longer being named, its dualistic nature ceases to be apparent.

When this “happens,” perception of the false self, or “me,” ceases being apparent AS SUCH. Duality ceases being apparent AS SUCH. This changes the Perception in no fundamental way at

all because It has always been an undifferentiated, non-dual mass of consciousness, and You are That.

Although the term “non-dual, undifferentiated mass of consciousness” is used here to describe Self, do remember that no thought, and no name, is capable of naming or explaining the Truth. In order for this Truth to reveal ItSelf, you need to investigate the humanness that masquerades as “truth” and appears to hide Reality from you. To do this, you have to become conscious of the limitations of the personality matrixes.

By means of [BodyTalk](#), and the practice of consulting the innate wisdom inherent in the psyche, you have the potential of undertaking this investigation in a way that is very different to other “pathways.” As a [BodyTalk practitioner](#), you also have the potential of serving as an intermediary between the client’s innate, and your own. This means that your role as a practitioner is potentially that of also helping others to “come into consciousness.”

However, this idea is unhelpful and detrimental to the process of “coming into consciousness.” This is because the role of “helper,” like any role, is nothing but learned habits of behavior which relate to the matrixes. To remain cognizant of this will assuage the problem of becoming goal-oriented in practice. Added to this it is very helpful to remember that “the client” is nothing more than a mirror in which your own psyche is reflected.