

Membership Policy Working Group Report

Findings: View of Membership, History of Membership Development and Current Shambhala Buddhist Membership Practices

Summary of Objectives:

#1. FACILITATE A MANDALA-WIDE DISCUSSION OF VIEW OF MEMBERSHIP. Key questions related to the nature of commitment and the definition of membership have been summarized in Part One of this paper. These questions are inextricably linked to larger issues regarding who we are as a Mandala and our vision for the future.

#2. EDUCATE OUR MANDALA REGARDING THE HISTORY OF MEMBERSHIP DEVELOPMENT. Part Two of this paper is an historical account of membership development over the past 30+ years. This section offers core contextual material necessary for understanding our Mandala's current lack of unified view regarding membership.

#3. DESCRIBE CURRENT MEMBERSHIP PRACTICES AT A REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE OF CENTERS AND GROUPS. Data has been gathered from seventy-three Groups and Centers from five continents through a combination of limited sampling structured interviews and a survey distributed via Center-talk. Part Three of this document describes areas of convergence and divergence in current membership practices across our Mandala.

Membership Policy Working Group Findings

Membership Policy Working Group:

Chairperson: Mary Whetsell of Birmingham, Alabama

Members: Susan Wagner of Media, Pennsylvania
Wendy Layton of Halifax, Nova Scotia
Fernando Allyon of Valencia, Spain
Chris Tamdjidi of Cologne, Germany
Candia Ludy of Memphis, Tennessee
Corey Simpson of Boulder, Colorado
Jane Ward of London, England
Francesca Nilo of Santiago, Chile

Special thanks to our “unofficial member”, Acharya Simon Luna, for his generous input regarding membership and community development in South America.

Please note: Responsibility for various parts of this report was divided across working group members. To facilitate further discussion and feedback, please see Appendix D for a list of who did what, and how to contact them if you would like to engage in dialogue regarding the particular areas they addressed in this report.

INTRODUCTION

The over-arching goal of the Membership Policy working group is to address the following question: As Shambhala Buddhists how do we define our mandala’s boundaries, proclaim to others “Here’s who we are!” and warmly welcome them to join us? Over the past thirty-five years, our approach to membership issues has been a dynamic and continually evolving process, with many changes in both the view and practice of membership. Are we comfortable with the ways in which our mandala, and its natural borders, are evolving? Are these changes congruent with our shared vision for Great Eastern Sun society?

PART ONE: KEY QUESTIONS REGARDING MEMBERSHIP VIEW

Membership Working Group and Review Group discussions have attempted to isolate some of the core questions regarding membership. What is it, exactly, that one might choose to join or to commit to? What would the criteria be for joining? In approaching these questions, this section will employ a familiar framework: 1) how we relate to the teacher, 2) how we relate to the teachings, and 3) how we relate to one another.

A. The Teacher: Commitment to Whom?

At one point in our development as a Mandala, membership was based on commitment to the Vidyadhara as one's Teacher. Today, things are less clear, with questions such as the following arising:

- Many practitioners who consider themselves to be within our mandala do not relate to the Sakyong as their teacher. How does this affect our culture in general, and their sense of belonging as members in particular?
- For members who primarily relate to Shambhala or Nalanda approaches, what is the nature of their relationship to the teacher principle?
- Can one be a member if they do not relate to the teacher principle at all?

B. The Teachings: Commitment to What?

Thirty years ago we were clearly a Vajrayana Buddhist sangha. Our Mandala has broadened exponentially with the addition of the Shambhala Path, the Nalanda disciplines, and the notion of Shambhala Society as open to everyone, but has our essential identity changed? Some questions which have emerged include:

- What are the fundamental teachings which bind us as a Mandala? Is there an integrating view that connects the Buddhist, Shambhala, and Nalanda approaches? Can there be a unified membership policy which would encompass the broadness of a society open to all and the precision of the Buddhadharma?
- What are the essential practices which bind us as a Mandala? Is the sitting meditation practice of shamatha-vipashyana the tie that binds us as one? Or can shamatha-vipassana be understood in a broader sense to include other practices that develop stability-awareness such as martial arts, performing arts, etc.?
- If Shambhala Society is open to all, but membership is not, then what exactly are people joining? Are they joining the "organization" as referred to by the Sakyong in his Treatise on Organization and Society?

C. The Community: Cultural Dynamics of Membership

A healthy community, some would argue, is a self-aware community. This self-awareness would extend to open exploration of cultural dynamics, including implicit and explicit status variables, how we judge who is "committed enough" to be a member, and how we present ourselves to newcomers. Questions regarding cultural dynamics include:

- Is commitment to membership also a commitment to one another? Acharya Luna writes “ *What do we mean to each other as fellow sangha members? Are we simply fellow church-goers, or “family” in some deeper sense? Trungpa Rinpoche said creating the kingdom of Shambhala has to begin in the home, with our families. In our Shambhala Centers, how do we create more and more a sense that this too is our home and our family?*” Are there ways in which membership policies can help create (or hinder) this deeper sense of spiritual “home”?
- Cultural status in our Mandala (just as in most Buddhist groups and monasteries) has historically been linked to two types of currency: 1) how advanced a level of practice one has achieved, and 2) degree of access to the Teacher. It is arguable that if these remain our status variables, the Vajrayana path with its many intensive practices and its samaya connection to the guru will continue to be seen as the path for the most advanced or serious students. To what extent do these dynamics continue to determine cultural status today? Are persons who are Hinayana/Mahayana/Shambhala/Nalanda practitioners discouraged from wanting to become members by implied cultural messages that the Vajrayana is the “real deal”? If they do become members, are there subtle levels of status hierarchy in which they feel “less than”? Are they equally considered for leadership roles? Teaching training?
- Are there ways of approaching membership and community development which cut through the spiritual materialism of “credentialing” according to practice level and practice type?
- There seems to be general agreement that membership must involve commitment of some type. The most common theoretical formulation is that a member be committed to sitting meditation, volunteering at their Center, and giving regular financial support. In practice, however, this seemingly straightforward approach raises quite a few questions:
 - a. Who decides if one is “committed”? Is this a personal decision made by each potential member, so that becoming a member is a matter of self-selection? Alternately, some Centers employ a “gate-keeper” approach, where one must be recommended for membership, for example by an M.I., or subjected to membership approval by a Council or Board of Trustees. What are the cultural implications of each of these approaches?
 - b. Approximately 50% of our Centers use a tiered membership structure, where one is assigned to a particular tier based on “level of commitment”. Typically, the functional definition of “level of commitment” actually means level of financial giving.

What happens culturally when commitment is equated with levels of financial giving? Does this create unnecessary hierarchy and another structure for cultural status, or is it simply skillful means for fund-raising?

- There is surprising little correlation in our Mandala between the age of a Center and its number of members. Quite a few Centers seem to plateau at a fixed number of members, sometimes for years and years, while other Centers' membership ranks grow steadily. What factors influence each of these situations? What variables make people feel like they would like to join a community; that they are invited in and cared for? And what variables are off-putting to potential new members? How can we integrate a sense of welcoming with a sense that this path requires commitment?
- Some Centers describe the skillful use of M.I.s as the best way to encourage new members. Others feel that the M.I. system needs to be re-evaluated, particularly for those students entering the Mandala via the Shambhala and Nalanda gates. The skills levels, training, and time availability of M.I.s to their students vary widely across Centers. In many Centers, the M.I.s are also the volunteer administrators, the Shambhala Directors, the Buddhist teachers, and the light-bulb changers, leaving little time and energy for working with individual students. Is there a better system than this for welcoming and developing new students/members?
- What is the relationship between local membership and membership in Shambhala International? Can there be a unified membership policy which would link membership between these two levels, yet still accommodate the existing differences across Centers/Groups?
- Given the above questions, how accurately does the existing Shambhala Membership Oath (see appendix A) reflect our views and practices about membership?

PART TWO: HISTORY OF MEMBERSHIP IN OUR MANDALA

The history of membership in the Vajradhatu/Shambhala Buddhist community is divided into two distinct periods. From the early 1970s until 1990, a consistent view of membership based on level of practice (see below) prevailed among the Dharmadhatus and major practice centers throughout the mandala. This lasted up until the time of Trungpa Rinpoche's death and a little bit beyond. The second period of membership began to evolve in the early 1990s and continues to this day. Growing diversity, organizational fragmentation, and the impact of new technology began to challenge our

original notions of community and society, of Buddhism and Shambhala, and of what it meant to be a member altogether.

First Period - During Trungpa Rinpoche's Lifetime

Not long after Trungpa Rinpoche began to teach in North America, a hierarchical structure for membership was established. People joined through their local center or group, which followed or closely adapted guidelines from Vajradhatu. One would first apply for membership, becoming a provisional member for a period of time. After fulfilling established practice requirements, one was accepted (or not) as a full member of their local community. It was generally understood that membership meant that one "officially" became a student of Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche, and this relationship formed a common identity and bond for all community members. All centers and groups, as well as individuals who did not live near a center or group, were bound to the center of the mandala where the guru resided.

Conditions for membership during the 70s and 80s included:

- 1) Demonstrating a commitment to a clearly defined path of practice and study that was designed by Trungpa Rinpoche and the leadership of Vajradhatu. Practice requirements were established, and guidelines for study were recommended for centers as well as for individuals who did not live near a center but wished to attend the three yana Seminary. In Boulder, members and provisional members were required to sit at least one nyinthun a month as well as one hour per day. All members were encouraged to have relationships with trained Meditation Instructors and these were instructed to track their students' progress through meeting regularly with their students.
- 2) Financial commitment through membership dues;
- 3) Volunteer work was strongly encouraged;
- 4) Tantra dues were required in addition to membership dues for those who were accepted as vajrayana students. Funds were used to support the 3 Yanas office of Practice and Study of Vajradhatu.

Second Period

Beginning in the early 1990s our organization became more diverse and more fragmented. Computers and the Internet helped attract new interest in our organization from people all over the globe. At the same time, we began to rely more heavily on the Internet for intra-mandala communications. This was helpful to those with Internet access, but tended to leave out the tech-impaired among us as the use of snail mail communications decreased. Our current membership policy, at least in North America, did not include a category of membership for those who do not live close to a local center or group, nor were resources dedicated to take account of the growing numbers of people who fell into this category.

Changes affecting membership during the second period included:

- 1) Shambhala Training was established in most Dharmadhatus and had a separate path for its participants. Students of Shambhala Training were not initially encouraged to become members of their local center. Resources at the local level had to nourish both the Buddhist and Shambhala Training communities, which sometimes caused stress among the separate constituencies of these two paths.
- 2) Although many centers experienced greater numbers of people participating in center activities, significant proportions of these newcomers were not and did not become dues paying members. In some cases even members of the centers' governing councils were not dues paying members.
- 3) The "second wave" of participants in our community included many children of existing community members, particularly in the largest Centers. Many of these individuals came of age during the 90s. Although these second generation Shambhalians seemed de facto "members" of our centers, in many cases this did not translate in their actually formally joining. Thus a second-generation person might participate at a very high level in our organization without becoming a member.
- 4) After the death of Rinpoche and the Vajra Regent, other teachers such as Ponlop Rinpoche, Khandro Rinpoche, Khenpo Tsultrim Gyamtso Rinpoche, etc. began to serve as principal teachers to members of (what we now call) the Shambhala community. This again called into question what membership really meant when a member's root guru was no longer the head of our organization..
- 5) The various contemplative paths offered through the Nalanda gate began to attract people not necessarily interested in becoming members based on current requirements, yet nonetheless connected to many of the core teachings of our mandala.
- 6) Through the internet many people have a relationship with the Shambhala and Buddhist teachings but are not part of local centers and groups. How is the idea of membership to take account of the connection of these people to our mandala?
- 7) Finally the redefinition of our community in 2000 as a Shambhala Buddhist community brought with it a need for a new view and clarification of many issues including membership.

Two distinct approaches towards membership have been articulated during discussions at Shambhala International and Shambhala Europe over the past few years. The approaches are based on differing views of what membership should be. The basic difference in approach seems to be connected to whether one sees our mandala as a "society" or as a practice-based "community".

Because of all the usual problems with semantics, we will define how we are using these terms: Society is by nature very large, diverse, and chaotic, containing many activities, religions, etc. Community, on the other hand, is a smaller group of people who are bound through more specific common interests. There are many communities in any given society.

1. Membership in Shambhala Buddhist Society.

In this view, membership represents an expression of support and commitment to the over-arching principles of creating a good, sane society. Membership is open to anyone who wishes to be a member; thus members are self-selected. Practice and study, financial support, and volunteer activities are **encouraged but not necessarily required** to be a member. This model is more similar to modern forms of membership in non-profit organizations. Membership is thus seen as an expression of interest and support, which may or may not transform into a deeper personal commitment to following a particular Path. It is also a way to empower people wishing to be associated with Shambhala, some of whom report feeling put off or patronized by the hierarchal approach of the “Friend” category of membership (see below).

2) Membership in Shambhala Buddhist Practice Community.

In this view, membership is open only to those who have developed a commitment to practice and to support the Mandala. When it has been determined that a student has made such a commitment, the student is recommended for membership by a meditation instructor, local council, etc. Thus membership is a category granted to one by those already within the mandala. Practice commitment and financial support are **required, not just encouraged**, and volunteering is also expected unless one is prevented by one’s life circumstances.

The “Practice Community” view of membership is articulated by the Shambhala Europe membership policy. It is followed to varying degrees by most European Centers, with each Center free to modify the policy as fits their local situations. It is closely tied to the traditional view of membership that prevailed during the first period reviewed above.

Many Centers who follow this model offer individuals the choice to become associate members or “friends” of Shambhala. This is seen as a way of including those who have some connection with our organization but do not wish, or are not yet able, to fulfill the practice-based requirements. This category exists in Europe as well as some centers in the United States. In many cases, friends may progress to becoming full members.

PART THREE: CURRENT MEMBERSHIP PRACTICES

I. Method

Information about current membership approaches across the Mandala was gathered in two ways: (1) The following thirty-two Centers & Groups were queried by members of the Working Group, using a structured interview format (see Appendix B):

- 4 large European Centers (Centers large enough for paid administrative staff)
- 7 small to medium sized European Centers (all volunteer staff)
- 8 European Meditation Groups
- 4 large North American Centers (Paid administrative staff)
- 4 small to medium sized North American Centers (all volunteer staff)
- 4 North American Meditation Groups
- 1 South American Center (all volunteer staff)
-

(2) A brief survey was sent out on Center-talk (see Appendix C). A total of forty-two Centers and Groups responded to this survey, as follows:

- 18 North American Centers
- 15 North American Groups
- 3 European Centers
- 4 European Groups
- 1 Japanese Group
- 1 New Zealand Center

II. Findings

This section attempts to integrate all of the data described above without being too wordy. For the reader who may want further detail, individual interview findings and spreadsheets with Survey findings are available by contacting the Working Group Chairperson (See Appendix D). They may also be posted on the Shambhala Congress website at some point.

A. Size Range: Who Knows? Apropos to the questions raised above by this Working Group, many Centers and Groups found it very hard to say how many members they have. There was no standardized approach across Centers/Groups for defining how they counted members. Even among groups with written policies defining membership, records are not always able to be kept. For example, for Centers using the modal definition of membership (money, volunteering, practice), the only easily tracked criteria is financial support, and some all-volunteer Centers have had difficulty tracking even the finances. In Europe, Centers must keep Shambhala Europe informed about how many local members pay dues since they must pay a proportion of the membership dues received. Estimated Group sizes ranged from 4 to twenty-one members. Estimated Center sizes ranged from thirty to six hundred-twenty members.

B. How many of us use tiered membership or participation levels? These types of levels would include “Friends of Shambhala” status, for example, or a level of financial giving, such as Golden Key member. The use of tiered membership levels vary widely across Centers with no discernible pattern of variation. For example, one might expect larger Centers to use a tiered system. In Europe, however, two of the four larger Centers

interviewed use a tiered approach, and in North America only one of the four larger Centers interviewed use different membership categories. Paris has three participation categories primarily tied to level of practice involvement: exploring member, friends, and full member. New York was unique among North American larger Centers interviewed with six distinct membership categories tied only to levels of financial giving; discounts and benefits increase with each level of financial giving.

Small to medium sized Centers interviewed also varied regarding use of participation categories. In North America, three of four Centers interviewed have a “Friends” category: the definition of who is assigned to the Friends category, however, is not consistent across these Centers. The European Mid-size Centers also vary in whether they have tiered participation levels, with three of the six interviewed using this category. Shambhala Europe provides a very clear definition of the Friends category, which these Centers seem to have adopted. In Santiago, a three-tiered membership approach is being tested as a simplification of the “confusing” 5-tiered old system.

Of the eleven Meditation Groups interviewed, only one employed a tiered participation system.

C. What are the benefits of membership?

At some Centers, members’ benefits and responsibilities are defined via written policies. For many others, however, there are no clear-cut policies about either the benefits or the responsibilities of membership. Most Meditation Groups do not have written membership policies, about half of the small to medium size Centers have written policies, and all eight of the larger Centers interviewed have written policies. Centers/groups vary widely regarding how membership is introduced, and when, with some of the options including:

- brochures
- through Meditation Instructors
- word of mouth
- at GES level

In Europe, local membership automatically entails membership of the wider mandala - Shambhala Europe and Shambhala International. There is direct communication between SE and the member - the member gets an annual letter from the Director of Shambhala Europe and the monthly Shambhala Europe newsletter. Centers contribute a proportion of their membership dues to Shambhala Europe (as well as a proportion of the income

from Shambhala Training programs). These monies fund Shambhala Europe staff posts servicing the membership.

Throughout the mandala, membership means that members can get a user name and password and have access to the “members only” section of the website. Members should also receive electronic communications from the Shambhala News Service. Current practice seems to suggest that many members are not taking advantage of these possibilities.

There may be other unwritten benefits of membership. The following apply in some Centers: reduction in purchases from the shop, possibility to borrow books and tapes from the center library including transcripts, possibility to have a key to the center.

It is important to remember that when people become members, they do not automatically have access to all parts of the mandala, in particular dharma texts and materials. There are still areas restricted according to level of practice.

D. What are the Responsibilities of Membership?

1. Financial Responsibility: Every group and Center contacted considers financial support as part of membership. There is wide variation, however, on the valence given to this support. Some Centers/Groups see it as the defining characteristic of membership, since it can be measured. Others see it as secondary to commitment to practice. All Centers/Groups have mechanisms for inclusion of those who have limited income. This seems to be a universally shared value, but not a universally communicated practice.

Survey responses from 21 Centers world-wide revealed that about 65% of people who attend their programs are members, and about the same percent pay dues. Some Centers have a suggested dues amount, others leave it open. European Centers have been given suggested dues amounts by Shambhala Europe – some appear to follow this suggestion while others do not. Average dues range for members appears to be around \$35US to \$100US per month.

Financial support for Meditation groups is more relaxed, often because they have little or no overhead expenses. Survey responses from 21 Groups indicate about half of people who come to their programs are members, and about 41% pay dues regularly. Of the groups interviewed, all four North American groups operated on the “collection bowl” system, while 60% of the European Groups interviewed are collecting dues via automatic withdrawal!

2. Volunteering. Volunteering at the Center/Group is a part of most membership policies, whether written or implied. However, there is wide variation in how often this requirement is followed up on by members. Among the 21 Centers who responded to the survey, the percent of program attendees who volunteer regularly ranges from 10% to 60%. There appears to be an interesting correlation between

size of Center and percentage of volunteers: the larger the Center, the smaller the percent of total members who volunteer. One Center with 600 members has an 18% volunteer rate: their volunteer director emailed to say this is NOT because they don't need the help! Many Centers and Groups regardless of size note that volunteers need to be invited to help, even if they are already members. To a non-volunteer, the appearance of an "in-crowd" who does everything and needs no help seems to be a frequently appearing phenomena. No one mentioned any mechanism, formal or informal, for tracking whether members fulfill volunteer obligations.

3. Meditation Practice. All groups and Centers report this as the mainstay of their requirement for membership. The main differences across Centers/Groups seem to be related to how a potential member's commitment to meditation is assessed. In general, most Centers/Groups in North and South America approach one's level of commitment as an individual's personal decision. They would advise consultation with an M.I. regarding membership, but most do not require such a consultation. The Europeans, on the whole, tend to be somewhat more structured about ensuring one has a committed meditation practice – the Shambhala Europe membership policy states one must be recommended for membership by an M.I.. The three tiers of membership in Paris are presented as linked to the level of individual practice. It should be noted, however, that there are also broad differences in approach across European Centers. For example, at the Marburg Shambhala Center the practice commitment may be to Nalanda or Maitri activities rather than to the Buddhist or Shambhala paths.

D. **Active Non-Members.** Survey results from 21 Centers in Europe and North America indicate that on average, about 35% of people who participate in Center activities are not members. This statistic is subject to various interpretations; the Working Group has discussed the importance of learning more about the 1/3 of folks who attend our Centers but who do not join.

E. **What sorts of programs our students attend.** The Center-talk survey was interested in learning about how many students currently move back and forth with some ease between Buddhist and Shambhala programming. This question is closely related to cultural shifts in status and hierarchy, and also how well we are beginning to integration the notions of Shambhala Society and spiritual path of practice and study.

Survey results for both Centers and Groups reveal that the majority of students attend Buddhist programs/practices and Shambhala Training programs/activities just about equally. A bell-curve pattern was described, where the least numbers of students attended only Buddhist or only Shambhala events. Below are the central tendency results in terms of mean and median for both Centers and Groups:

MEDITATION CENTERS: N = 21

A. Attend Buddhist programs/practices exclusively, with no participation in Shambhala Training activities.
Mean = 13.47, Median = 10

B. Attend mostly Buddhist programs/practices, with some participation in Shambhala Training activities.
Mean = 19.76, Median = 15

C. Attend Buddhist programs/practices and Shambhala Training programs/activities just about equally.
Mean = 39.42, Median = 40

D. Attend mostly Shambhala Training activities, with some participation in Buddhist programs/practices.
Mean = 16.85, Median = 13

E. Attend Shambhala Training activities exclusively, with some no participation in Buddhist programs/practices. Mean = 11.09, Median = 10

MEDITATION GROUPS: N = 21

A. Attend Buddhist programs/practices exclusively, with no participation in Shambhala Training activities.
Mean = 14.33, Median = 0

B. Attend mostly Buddhist programs/practices, with some participation in Shambhala Training activities.
Mean = 15.76, Median = 0

C. Attend Buddhist programs/practices and Shambhala Training programs/activities just about equally.
Mean = 37.81, Median = 30

D. Attend mostly Shambhala Training activities, with some participation in Buddhist programs/practices.
Mean = 21.76, Median = 10

E. Attend Shambhala Training activities exclusively, with some no participation in Buddhist programs/practices. Mean = 10.33, Median = 0

SUMMARY

In general, it seems the challenges of defining membership and building community are the same across cultures and Centers. At the same time that students worldwide are eager for and responding to the Shambhala Buddhist teachings, everyone seems to have the same questions regarding who is a member and what commitment membership entails. Europeans may be somewhat more comfortable with structure and a hierarchal approach to membership than are North Americans. South Americans, in particular, seem to be resistant to “rules”, especially those rules which might be imposed from outside of their own very tight-knit communities.

Simon Luna describes the high value placed on close family ties in South and Central America, and suggests that how we relate to one another as fellow Shambhalians and citizens of this planet is the central point. We conclude with a quote from Acharya Luna:

“ My intuition is that the Latin cultures have much to offer in this conversation now happening in our international community. To our surprise, we perhaps will discover that our deepest family ties include Shambhalian aunts and uncles and cousins who are South Americans, North Americans, Europeans, Asians ... The Shambhala vision includes all, and penetrates into the deepest ties of home and family in our hearts.”

APPENDIX A: SHAMBHALA MEMBERSHIP OATH

Inspired by the vision of Shambhala,
I hereby affirm my commitment
to the path of meditation as presented
by the Vidyadhara, Chögyam Trungpa, Rinpoche
and the Sakyong, Jamgön Mipham, Rinpoche.

I pledge to practice, uphold, and propagate
the disciplines of sitting meditation
and meditation in action;
continually working with myself and others
with gentleness, fearlessness,
a sense of humor, and exertion.

Whether following the path of the Buddha,
basking in the glory of the Great Eastern Sun,
or enjoying the precision and elegance of the Shambhala arts,
being in the moment, living in the world now,
is the binding wisdom of Shambhala.

Committing my support to carry out this vision,
I hereby take this Shambhala oath.

APPENDIX B: STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- a. choose a representative sample of 3 or 4 Centers/Groups from your category
- b. describe the range in size of membership across these groups. Do they have membership levels? Friends of the Center status, for example? What are the benefits and responsibilities of membership?
- c. describe the range in dues amounts across these groups
- d. describe the range in size of non-members who are active in group activities across these group.
- e. do they have a written membership policy? How is membership defined? How do new people learn about the possibility of membership?
- e. describe the major points of agreement across their membership policies
- f. describe major points of disagreement.

APPENDIX C: SURVEY DISTRIBUTED ON CENTER-TALK

1. How many years has your Center/Group been in existence?
2. About how many members do you have?
3. Which of the following categories best describes your Center/Group? Please either put an asterisk by the correct answer or underline it.
 - A. North American Shambhala Center large enough to have paid administrative staff positions.
 - B. North American Shambhala Center, all volunteer staff positions.
 - C. North American Shambhala Meditation Group.
 - D. European Shambhala Center large enough to have paid administrative staff positions.
 - E. European Shambhala Center, all volunteer staff positions.
 - F. European Shambhala Meditation Group.
 - G. South American Center or Group
 - H. Other Center or Group (please describe):
4. Please **estimate the percentage** of your students who fall in the categories below.
 - A. Attend Buddhist programs/practices exclusively, with no participation in Shambhala Training activities.
 - B. Attend mostly Buddhist programs/practices, with some participation in Shambhala Training activities.
 - C. Attend Buddhist programs/practices and Shambhala Training programs/activities just about equally.
 - D. Attend mostly Shambhala Training activities, with some participation in Buddhist programs/practices.
 - E. Attend Shambhala Training activities exclusively, with some no participation in Buddhist programs/practices.

(NOTE: the total of the percentages you have entered should add up to 100)
5. Of the persons who attend programs at your Center/Group, what percentage of them are members (according to your local definition)?
6. Of the persons who attend programs at your Center/Group, what percentage of them pay regular dues?

7. Of the persons who attend programs at your Center/Group, what percentage of them regularly volunteer to help with the various needs of your Center?

APPENDIX D: WHO DID WHAT AND HOW TO CONTACT THEM

All working group members helped to create this document via phone conferencing, emails, and reading and commenting on one another's work. This document is really the combined effort of all of us. However, each of us also had our "jobs" to do, as described below. If readers would like to dialogue with any of us about our findings or ideas we have presented, we may be contacted at the addresses below.

Mary Whetsell, Chairperson. Summarized working group and review group discussions to write the "Key Questions" section of this document. Integrated structured interview and sample survey findings to write the "Current Practices" part of this document. She may be reached at mwhetsell@mindspring.com

Wendy Layton. Wrote section two of this paper, "History of Membership". Email her at wlayton@shambhala.org

Fernando Allyon. Conducted structured interviews with eight Shambhala Meditation Groups in Europe – Bristol and Brighton in England; Corsica and LaDrome in France; Heidelberg, Germany; Valencia, Spain; Zurich, Switzerland; and Krakow, Poland. His address is feray77@yahoo.es

Candia Ludy. Conducted structured interviews with four Shambhala Meditation Groups in North America. (Although Candia turned in the data from her interviews, she did not supply us with the names of those groups interviewed.) Contact her at candialudy@yahoo.com

Chris Tamdjidi (with the assistance of Maizza Waser). Conducted structured interviews with six small to medium sized Shambhala Meditation Centers in Europe – Bern, Koln, Madrid, Munchen, Rotterdam, and Ticino. He may be reached at chris_tamdjidi@shambhala-europe.org

Susan Wagner. Conducted structured interviews with four small to medium sized Shambhala Meditation Centers in North America – Vancouver, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and Durham. Her address is susan.wagner12@verizon.net .

Jane Ward. Conducted structured interviews with four large Shambhala Meditation Centers in Europe – Amsterdam, Paris, London, and Marburg. To contact her email janeward@gm.apc.org

Corey Simpson. Conducted structured interviews with four large Shambhala Meditation Centers in North America – Boulder, New York, Atlanta and Halifax. He may be emailed at Csshome@aol.com

Francesca Nilo. Answered structured interview questions regarding her Shambhala Center in Santiago, Chile. She can be reached at f_nilo@hotmail.com

