

Dear J [redacted] C [redacted],

Thank you for your letter with its calm and optimistic tone.

There are certainly no general conclusions to this course. During the course W [redacted] decided to leave language teaching and to go into business training. I have since written her a testimonial. I suspect, through her major storm on the Wednesday after you left (she attacked me fiercely for lack of plan and wooliness), she may have learnt a lot about herself and her need for restrictive control over her own thought and that of others. Her storm was very useful to her own learning and to that of others.

Maybe for H [redacted] this was just another course, a bit odd and different, but just another course. I believe I failed her.

T [redacted] made a huge irruption into the world of humanistic teaching- she came to realise that a good heart, human energy and love of language are important, yes, for a teacher, but that a good teacher needs more than that in terms of person skills. She will probably be back next year and in 5 years time I see her as maybe a member of the Pilgrims trainer team.

She did vital work on the second Wednesday afternoon, trying to bring more parts of herself into the teaching business, including her hidden, tender parts.

I could go trying to guess what the "grandes lignes" of these two weeks were for different participants. The reality is that I don't know, unless the individual tells me.

J [redacted] C [redacted], my job is to open windows and to offer options. I cannot predict what the person will see thru a given window and I don't want to decide which options he chooses. I offer a menu- you organise your meal.

In the last two days we looked at parts of Neuro-linguistic programming that are useful to Teacher-training, especially the sensory preferences and the meta-programs. I think I sent you some papers around that.

Bonne Annee,

Mario