

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Ellie Beckett asked Evelyn about her reference, as a Yoga teacher, to Jung's four functions, compared with the Yoga chakra system. Evelyn said that, according to Jung, there are four functions: intuition, thinking, feeling and sensation, but there is no hierarchy or order of priority. The Yoga chakras proceed up the body, from lower to higher. The three lower chakras (muladhara, svadisthana and manipuraka) can be likened to sensation or sensing, next, anahata, the heart chakra, to feeling, of course, then visuddhi, where speech comes from, related to thinking, and finally sahasraha, the chakra of the head, related to intuition, the highest faculty.

Evelyn went on to compare this with Dorothy Glaister's reference to Jung's four functions, in her book on progressive education, "Cheiron's Cave". Dorothy begins the book, surprisingly, with Jung's functions, saying that sensation develops first, in early childhood, followed by feeling, then intuition, as the child grows, and last, in the teens, thinking. Children should be encouraged to develop all aspects of the personality, in progression. Dorothy published "Cheiron's Cave" in 1928, before she married Norman, who did not follow Jung's ideas, and seems to have suppressed her interest from that point.

Jean Robertson said it had been a very great privilege to work with John. She and John were very different, and at first they were always falling out. They came to realise that this was because their minds worked in very different ways. She remembers sitting in the summerhouse for about two hours with him, talking about what was different about each of them. After that they got along well together. This is

an example of integration, but also of John's great generosity. The talk was his initiative, to find out why they didn't get along. Jean said that John was a man of enormous enthusiasms. She remembers sitting in the inner hall, hearing his voice in the outer hall as he came in, and having the feeling of comfort: "John's here".

John Murrell remembered John's help when he was leaving the RAF and about to take up a scholarship at London University, and also, of course, in the starting of the community at No.66 Hornsey Rise, after Haslemere Road had, very wisely, sent him, his wife and their three children, away. He remembered, too, co-convening a course with John and Glynn Faithfull. Braziers' courses, in those days, had a full session on the Friday evening, and he had driven all the way from Felixstowe with his family, to take part. He began his contribution as a convenor, then came Glynn, then John Woodcock. After that long drive, he found himself falling asleep. John, at the end, turned to him and said, heartlessly, "What do you think, John?" He managed to reply somehow.

Nuresh Giangrande said he remembered John as a marvellous man, his generosity and enthusiasm, and his help when Nuresh first came to Braziers. He remembered John's courses, with the Rounds, and how John just had to comment on each person's contribution. It was his natural enthusiasm.

Maurice Roth said that there were different types of Round, and there was a "John Woodcock Round". He himself found the Myers-Briggs personality indicator very interesting. He was less interested in dreams, but would go along to support John's courses. In the morning they had to read out any dreams they'd had the night before,

and listen to John's explanations of them. However, on one occasion one person read out a full four pages and then said he'd give a brief interpretation – and read out another four pages! The dream was about that man coming downstairs in the middle of the night and being given half a glass of beer by Glynn. This was all examined in great detail, why a glass and not a cup, why Glynn, etc. etc. By the time he'd finished John's course was ruined and Maurice felt very sorry for him.

Evelyn said that John's interest in dreams and dreamgroups came from his association with P.W.Martin, author of the book "Experiment in Depth", who ran dreamgroups himself. Martin had met Jung in Switzerland while working for the League of Nations between the wars, but was not a trained analyst. He believed that lay people could share their dreams, as a means of self-understanding. You have to have a lot of trust, though. It is easier if you meet casually, on a course, perhaps, when everyone goes away at the end, or, on the other hand, if you know people very well indeed, and trust them. Dreams are not easy to interpret, and they often deal with difficult things. She remembered a woman who came to one of John's dreamgroups for the first time, to see if she would like it. She brought a dream in which she was standing in her kitchen when suddenly a large plant broke through the tiles and came up through the floor. This really bugged her; she said she didn't want to go on and join the dreamgroup. It disturbed her universe too much, we supposed. Dreams do disturb the universe. Also if you record your dreams and study them, you remember more dreams. You have to write them down straight away, the next morning. If you don't attend to them, you don't remember – we have dreams every night, but we don't remember them. Some people never remember their dreams, or only a very few outstanding ones.

Alan Clark said he felt that John's hope for the future had been so intense that he undervalued the present. Appreciation of the present is "all our lot" as the poet says, and the tension between present and future is one of the human tensions we have to hold. Jean's story of John and herself going to the summerhouse has startlingly obvious implications for the present moment here. He can testify how difficult it is. At one time he felt that he should have gone, with Jean, to the summerhouse to do this exercise, but he faked it – it is not an easy thing. One perhaps needs to say on such an occasion as the present, to at least three or four people: "Look, we love you all, we value you all, we want to keep you all - will you kindly go to the summerhouse and sort out this difference *please*. [Applause] Face the fear of doing it. If you don't do this now, I can guarantee this isn't the only person you are going to find so loathsome you can't speak to them".

Hilda Salter recalled an incident that took place in the very room they were in, the drawing room. John was a great one for minds in community, but also for bodies in community. At one summer school he used out bodies. First we split up in twos, sitting on the floor back to back. This isn't easy, but if you introduce a third person the bodies can remain upright. John, still standing, left over as it were, explained what we had to do next: spread the legs wide and adjust them to meet someone in the next group. Arms were then left over – could they reach to another group? Finally everyone collapsed in laughter.

Evelyn said she didn't remember this exercise. She wondered if the reason John didn't join in was, because he couldn't get down on the floor. He was someone who tended

to neglect his body, and should have had hip replacements some years before he did.

It's no use nagging someone like that!

Tom Glaister asked Evelyn about the anti-intellectualism she mentioned as being in society. Did she think it was at Braziers too?

Evelyn said that tides come and go, and what happens in society is reflected at Braziers. One of the old quarrels at Braziers was about art, some people wanting Braziers to become an art college. People have wanted to do different things with Braziers. She felt that, for some years, we have lost the intellectual side of our work, but it may come back. She had mentioned the young people wanting to study philosophy now. Here at Braziers we have to see ourselves as one part of the wider picture, while following the role give to us as pioneers and explorers.