



# Letters to the Editor

Dear David Jones

I read your article in *Self & Society*. It was nice that you got together a spread of opinions on Bhagwan, though in a way I don't feel our mag. was represented which isn't the Bhagwan line or the Guy Gladstone line, though I feel that we fall into the 'positive' camp. Many "official" sannyasins such as Devageet for example, feel that we are 'beyond the pale'.

I happened to be a teacher at Medina, and also an LSE graduate but I trust that my response to the questions I guess you put to Sajon (who incidentally has since dropped sannyas) would have been a little different - and considerably more cerebral.

My feeling is that your conclusion about those who lived within the commune is decidedly wrong. Some, and maybe more than you could gather as an outsider, were very tongue in cheek about any organization - let alone the one we were living in. . . but we also knew that without an organization Bhagwan would never have reached many of us. And even amongst many ex-sannyas there is a multifold gratefulness that he touched their lives.

Secondly, please bear in mind in your cogitations that Bhagwan like the Buddha spent 3 days (a fact early Indian sannyasins who I know verify) deciding on whether to accept Laxim's proposal for some sort of formal organization. In fact those early devotees were made to wait while Bhagwan considered the matter in isolation.

No organisation might well have meant that you would have not spent 'enjoyable frequent visits to Medina' or ever heard of Bhagwan in the same class as a whole range of so-called enlightened beings, whose ways 'are not our ways'. At least, as an academic, to have an open mind on the subject might be circumspect.

Anand Samartha  
Editor Here & Now.

Dear David,

Just a short note to say how very much I appreciated your work on the *Self and Society* on Rajneesh. I didn't approve of the cover photograph, which seemed to me inappropriate for a magazine which goes out to many people outside AHP who don't know Vivian, but all the rest was excellent. These things needed to be published. Thankyou.

Shirley Wade  
Matlock.

Dear Editor,

The arguments regarding 'old' or 'progressive' styles of teaching, whether it be maths or history, leave me profoundly disturbed - and the idea of a fudge between the two - positively alarmed.

It is surely not beyond the wit of our educational experts to realise that both have their benefits and should therefore be available. Education is as much about social conditioning, for better or worse, as it is about skills and knowledge.

We all know we are better at things we enjoy, or is it vice versa? There is ample research evidence on how children who are given encouragement, improve performance. Equally, there are few of us who would claim that there is not some way our own talent was stunted or undeveloped. That the emphasis be on learning rather than teaching is self evident,

On the other hand, the need for discipline and rote learning are also clear.

I cannot see why a curriculum cannot be devised which incorporates both. Not together, but as distinct facets of the educational process. While I hold clear views as to the eventual outcome, the starting balance could be 50/50.

Could there be any better inducement to learn basic principles than the idea that by doing so one achieved the ability to learn creatively and with fun?

Mark Matthews  
London NW1

Dear Editor,

I would like to supplement David Jones' comments in the January newsletter on the AHPP November training weekend.

Patrick Casement's very presence at such a weekend was something to be appreciated: and both the quality of his paper and the qualities of the man whose experience and integrity, had made the formulation of those words possible deserve much more than a snide mention.

Also commenting on some workshops while ignoring other highly successful ones seems ungracious.

The weekend was good in many ways, not the least being the beauty and serenity of the surroundings and the variety of experience of those present. It seemed a shame, however, that this very variety, expressed in the variety of approach and content of the workshops offered, detracted from the possibility of thorough exploration of the announced topic - the humanistic/analytic interface? /overlap? - /complementariness? /contradiction? Some workshops did address it, and Richard Steven's mind tackled it, but the opportunity for focussed striving meeting between people from the two backgrounds in order to enrich each other seemed to be hindered rather than facilitated. It would be good if more opportunities could be made

Yours Sincerely  
Mavis Kemp-Leighton  
Cambridge