

RUNNING HEAD: BMOA KMP Mid-term

Joe Castellano

BMOA II: KMP Mid-term

Brie Anderson-Feldman

March 11th, 2015

BMOA KMP Mid-term

In this paper I will define the major features of the Kestenberg Movement Profile (KMP) System I. As well I will compare tendencies and aversions in movement characteristics between the two videos I've shot for this class, the first being of indoor rock climbing, and the second a dinner with a friend. Lastly I will incorporate how this relates to my knowledge of Object Relations and Attachment Theory.

KMP System I is split into 10 Tension-Flow Rhythms “which reflect an individual's predominate needs as well as the influence of developmental phase and external environment”(Amighi, pg. 24). The 10 Tension-slow Rhythms are separated into five Indulging Rhythms: Sucking, Twisting, Running/Drifting, Swaying, and Jumping; and five Fighting Rhythms including Snapping/Biting, Strain/Release, Starting/Stopping, Surging Birthing, and Spurting/Ramming. (Amighi, pg. 14). KMP also includes six Tension-Flow Attributes, which are indicative of emotional states and an individual's core temperament. Tension-Flow Attributes include: Bound Flow, Free Flow (Animated Flow, Neutral Flow), Even Flow, Flow Adjustment, High and Low Intensity, and Abruptness/Graduality.

Looking for common tendencies and aversions between overhung indoor rock climbing (shot full body) and of the back of my body with “dinner with a friend” felt like a stretch for me. Climbing on this angle involves a mix of Animated Free Flow throughout the body, with intermittent Starting/Stopping with moments of Bound Flow, lots of Flow Adjustment, and it's primarily High Intensity. There is lots of Twisting of the hips, torso, and shoulders. The shifts between Free and Bound Flow take place within the context of Strain/Release patterns as I move from hold to hold, position to position.

The “dinner with a friend” video has a vastly different feel for me. She and I had only recently started seeing each other when this video was shot. I noticed a Starting and Stopping

of gestures as we took turns speaking and an Abruptness to how we honored each other's turns to speak, both indicating an Attachment that neither of us felt very secure in. Also I saw that my eye contact had Flow Adjustment between Bound Flow and Free Flow; more Bound when she was speaking as I made direct eye contact, and more Drifting and Free Flow when I was speaking. In the climbing video this is hardly visible, but it manifests as Bound (Narrow) vision of the next hold for the next move, followed by Drifting (Broad) vision to scan for the options of how to position the body for the next movement sequence. I also noticed that my hand gestures over dinner were Free Flowing within Bound Parameters, which is consistent with the movement signature in climbing.

I noticed that I often subtly weave a hand gesture into conversation that is the motion used to clip a rope through a carabineer when lead climbing, which sequences flexion of the middle finger, supination of the hand, with lateral rotation of the wrist and thumb. In both cases this is done primarily with Even Flow and Twisting of the hand, though it can have an Abruptness and/or High Intensity to it in climbing if the climber is near the point of falling.

Bridging these vastly different videos of movement in the context of Object Relations and Attachment Theory felt like leap to me; but the more I thought about and rewatched the videos the more patterns emerged. The more safe and comfortable I am in either setting the more Free Flowing my movements and gestures are, the more uncomfortable be it around uncertainty in the conversation or in the movements on the wall the more Bound Flow I saw presenting, as well an Abruptness in Flow Adjustment around Strain/Release; be it of the utensils to eat with or freeing my hands to use gestures as I speak. Stated differently the more secure the attachment the more at ease (Free Flow) the movement signatures are.

Object Relations and Attachment Theory support and add a layer my understanding of KMP from multiple perspectives. First, that we form multiple characters, perspectives, and conceptualizations of ourselves as our own primary objects. How comfortable or uncomfortable we are with ourselves in a given situation informs how we navigate and move through the world around us. How we have come through the developmental stages of life to arrive at being who we are now has created movement patterns that speak to how our developmental needs were and/or were not met earlier in life. How integrated these facets of our beings are also serves to help us feel secure as we navigate the world around us.

There are several theorists of Object Relations that we have studied in BMOA that help draw connections with how KMP supports understanding and recording individual and interpersonal body movements. As well how they can relay and inform the connection between movement patterns and psychological states from both current and developmental perspectives. While I am not a big fan of Freud it feels important to credit his work for setting the stage for other theorists. His belief that “object relations are a function of instinctual drives.”(St. Clair pg. 23) while incomplete was important for its time. Freud’s notion that the Self-Object contains the Id, Ego, and Super ego is not directly credited in our texts (thus far) as setting the stage for some of the Character/Archetype work that other theorists developed later. This represents an important milestone and connection to draw. This concept is developed further by Kohut as “Self-Objects as those persons or objects that are experienced as part of the self or that are used in the service of the self to provide a function for the self”(St Clair, pg. 149). Much of the Object Relations theories we’ve read felt rigid, fragmented, and compartmentalized for me; which I don’t want to make good or bad, it just felt incomplete. Mitchell’s work on an Integrated Relational Model resonated

though, as he looked at the lineage of this work and concluded that much of the psychoanalytical work in Object Relations that preceded him was “fragmented, diffuse, and developed by psychoanalytic school that regards themselves as competing with, rather than complementing, one another [specifically the relational model, and] has never been developed into a coherent, comprehensive theoretical framework,” (St Clair, pg. 169). While he is referring to the political landscape of this work as much as the work itself; the notion of integrating parts of the self as well as parts of the systems that create the theories felt salient for me on both levels and in the broader context of this course.

On various levels we need to be aware enough of our patterns, our movements, our characters in order to be our most effective in relationship with ourselves, a climbing wall, or dinner with a new friend. As well developing the skills to accurately record and interpret movements, gestures, and patterns is a critical skill for a therapist especially in the context of Somatic Psychotherapy.