

LIT TALK TAPES

APRIL, 1991

GD - Grateful Dave BS - Bo Sewell

BA - Billy Allen BM - Becky Meyer

RD - Roy Drum ST - Stu Tooredman

JM - Jim Miller U - Unknown

GH - George Hallohan

ST: I'm putting you all on speaker phone. First, there's George, Danette, Lee, and Joe, the new Executive Director.

GD: Hi, Joe, welcome to Hell.

ST: First of all, I'd like to apologize to you guys. It took a long time to get this done. It's been kind of a mess of late. Has everybody received the draft? Anybody not received the draft? Okay.

GD: Who's got a TV going?

JM: Not us. This is Jim. Is somebody taping this? Do you have a tape recorder going?

U: We've got a secretary, Jim.

JM: Good, that's even better.

GD: Well, I don't know about that?

JM: Would it be possible to tape it while she's writing?

U: Actually, I don't have the equipment for a phone tape.

GD: Yeah you do. You've got a speaker phone, microphone, tape deck and tapes. That's all you need.

D: Are you guys serious?

GD: Absolutely.

D: It'll take a while.

GD: That's all right. We'll chit chat first.

BS: I have one here. I can tape it if you all want me to.

GD: Fine, I don't care who does it.

ST: Does anybody have any opening comments they'd like to make?

GD: Yeah.

ST: Go for it.

GD: You're not going to like it, but I don't have anything positive to say about this or the WSO report or the state of affairs in Narcotics Anonymous today, so prefaced with that, that's my opening comment.

ST: Okay.

BS: I've got a recorder on.

JM: I feel betrayed.

U: Why?

JM: I think that what we talked about in Harrisburg was trying to heal something in the fellowship that's become a rift. This document, particularly the operational rules part of it widens the rift. It doesn't do any healing that I see.

GD: Absolutely. It's completely one-sided.

JM: Essentially, the trustor is in the place where the beneficiary should be consistently.

GD: Absolutely.

JM: I see that if this, from the nature of things that I understand in my region and people that I've visited with, this comes on the floor of the conference, it's going to solidify some people that already want to create an alternative structure.

U: Okay.

JM: That's what I'd really hoped to avoid with this, is getting everybody pulling together instead of pulling separately, and I really feel this shows that somebody who was responsible for the writing this doesn't understand the traditions of Narcotics Anonymous.

U: Okay. How's that?

U: Could you articulate that, Jim?

JM: Sure. Let me look first specifically to one thing that I think is the most indicative of that, and that's page 19 of the operational rules, under **** of inspection. Item #1, referring to this region that might want to inspect the records of the trust. The region's motion to conduct an inspection of the trust must be approved by two thirds or more of regional service committee's voting participants. In this way, the literature trust which is supposed to be part of that scheme of things, which is a service board or committee directly responsible to those it serves, has dictated to those they serve. That's number one.

Number two, which is referent to the ability of this region. Let's refer back to the beginning on page 18, Section 3, "Inspection of Trustee Activities conceptual notes," it says that all records will be available to the inspecting region, except personnel records, and then parenthetically, U.S. federal employment codes require that employers keep these records completely confidential. Somebody doesn't understand that the fellowship is the employer of the employees at the World Service Office.

U: That's correct. But the fellowship elected a board that deals with the personnel aspect. So, in essence, they have a body that inspects personnel records.

GD: Let me interject something here. Is there someone who has background conversations going on that are not related to this conference call, cause I'm having real difficulty separating. I don't know where it is, but it's hard.

BA: Let me go to the other room. That's my house. I'll just go to another phone and hang this one up.

U: To answer your question. How would you have this particular activity take place?

JM: I was really just using this as an illustration. It's not really a major thing, it's just really illustrative.

U: I think the intent was to create an inspection procedure that will allow inspection to take place under a responsible framework.

GD: I've got a comment here at this time. "Responsible framework" is that since the fellowship is the employer of all at the office, really, that the fellowship has been in this inspection procedure, and I'm with Jim all the way on it. It places an unfair burden

financially and otherwise on the region itself. This stuff should be a matter of accounting records that, if proper accounting procedures are used, that should be able to be printed out on a monthly basis, and presented to anyone who asks.

U: Print out what?

GD: Print out the financial status of all the accounts and the other things. If you're using a proper accounting program, which may be a little expensive to institute in the beginning...

U: We do that right now.

GD: Okay, then why are you setting up barriers for the fellowship?

U: We're talking about an inspection that's beyond that particular scope. That's something that we would freely distribute. We're talking about physical inspection.

JM: I'm interrupting, and I apologize for interrupting. I really believe that we're off on one of the smaller issues here and not on some really major things that we might be able to discuss beneficially, and we're really off on one of the minor issues.

BS: I agree.

JM: I apologize for trying to use this as an illustration, but not one of the major things that I have contention with the document. The major thing I have a contention with the document is that I believe in order for this rift to be healed, the fellowship needs to be specified, the fellowship of N.A. as owner or if legally it can only be co-owner, that would be okay, too. There needs to be some direct chain between the fellowship and the administrator of this trust, WSO, and it needs to be somehow defined in here that WSC is going to be included in discussion, but the WSC is the definition of collective conscience of the fellowship. What I have the biggest trouble with is that the WSC is indicated as the approver of literature, primarily, the rift has started because the fellowship to a great extent considers themselves as the approver of literature, and the WSC as an entity that has approved literature (or disapproved literature), changed literature without the consent of the fellowship.

BS: That's the problem.

JM: WSO has acted primarily upon the directives of WSC, which has not defined the group conscience of the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. If we're going to do something functionally healing, we're going to have to correct for those procedural errors that have developed in the last eight years at the world service level. We're going to have to do this in this document. If it's going to be of a healing nature.

U: Unfortunately, Jim, I'm trying to figure out here. There are two things: One is the rules by which WSC would deal with WSO, being that WSC is trustor and has the ability to revoke the trust, control it, dictate to it, and all those factors. The problem is, and some of the stuff that I think you're talking about, deals with the conference itself and it's kind of operational rules that doesn't make it as responsive as it should be to the groups or its conscience in that aspect.

GD: I'd like to interject here and drop a bomb. The bomb is, that all throughout this document and the WSO Report, and several of the public situations that we've all been involved in, you've talked about the mistakes made or the convenience factor of a work made for hire. I will tell you that work made for hire is all through here, and it's prettied up. It's like, "Okay, don't look too close at it, because if you look too close, you're gonna know." Some of the, in fact early, and even a lot of the later stuff shifts some of the criteria for work made for hire. However, upon closer scrutiny and challenge, maybe first time out, but certainly upon appeal, that would never stand up. So your fundamental premise for development of this document as it stands with the work made for hire as its basis, renders this document useless for your purposes. I'm just telling you this for your purposes. The other thing is that you've got, and I shared this with George the other day, you may have 18 months from now and after this conference and people get as disgusted as they are, because I don't see any thing. I looked at the end game three years ago and here we are. It's all unified board, unified this, unified, bring in all the power, bring in all the finance, just reel it all in and put it down. You have 300 people in the fellowship that are manipulating 750,000 that don't have a clue to what's going on.

So you're going to have a few people that have clues that say, "Hey, man, to hell with this." It's going to take them a little while. But what we're going to be, is doing an alternate thing, maybe four regions, maybe five, maybe ten. In 18 months from now, you're going to get a wise idea to take us to court and try to do whatever for work made for hire, and you'll lose. So, Jim is absolutely right in the healing.

I feel really chumped out. I feel that I've been put on a spit and turned over a fire and laughed at, and "Gosh, we got Dave, didn't we? Well, nobody's going to give him a ticket to the conference so he won't be a threat to us." You know what I mean? I told George

this. We had an agreement, it was witnessed in front of officers of the court, and others, and that agreement was that these intellectual properties would be taken care of, and he's nodding his head yes, I'm sure. I don't perceive him to have any reason not to stretch it, and I'm quoting exactly, that "If you don't get these things registered properly and factually, I will be back on you like stink on shit."

I will crawl up 95 and put myself in a rescue mission, and we will be right back to square one, and let me tell you again if you have not figured it out, that if I was doing something that was so radically against the law that a 40-year federal court veteran thought that I was out of line, you would have walked into court, and thirty minutes later you would have had your restraining order, and that would have been that. You had better take a big, hard, long look at what it is that this is all about. As far as I'm concerned, it's the same shit, different day. I have absolutely no hope in this document. There was nothing positive that was said about a reduced price Basic Text, \$3.00 is no bargain. You've failed, in my mind, completely failed.

BS: What is the origin of this document? It's like a first draft or something?

U: It's going to go out for review, and it can be changed dramatically, it can be altered dramatically. But, it is an attempt.

BS: What is its origin, though?

GD: It's origin is just like when you go to a law firm, Bo.

BS: I want to hear that from them, though, Dave, not from you. I want to hear that from them.

ST: The origin of the document is to articulate in writing the nature of the fiduciary trust between the World Service Office and the World Service Conference and the membership. The purpose of it is to define these things so that the membership and the trustors/ trustees, everything, know exactly what the operating rules are and what the parameters of the trust is.

If it's not in the best interest and it lies in these areas, or it needs to change, or the rules need to change, then we need to articulate the way it should be so we don't sit on the

phone and argue back and forth and end up in court while wasting our fellowship's money about who has rights and who doesn't have rights.

GD: Let's go for it. This is a very poor starting point.

ST: That's fine, Dave. You're not really lending a whole lot to this whole God damn thing anyway. Except saying everything sucks. Come on, man.

GD: If you want my whole point by point feedback, I can go point by point. I thought we were just having a general chat to begin with. This is the chat. Yeah, I think it sucks, Stu, I think you're absolutely correct.

BS: Who wrote this document, Stu? Was it written by someone in the office or the law firm?

ST: Parts of it were written by Lee here at the office, parts of it were written by me. Parts of it was written, or taken out of the WSO by-laws. So everything falls in synch with one another. I've tried to define it as best responsibly as possible. I'm hoping that whatever kind of conceptual notes you guys put to this, that you pick a contrary viewpoint of what's written here.

BS: Okay, Stu. I read the WSO report and I'm glad that you have several more years on the board, but we still regard you people that work at the office as temporary. Our longevity and our position, and our trust bond to the people that wrote the Basic Text are still as much in force today as they were in 1983 when it was approved in 1982 when the last work was done. Probably, Jim Miller's concern, and my concern is that we engage those forces, that we get away from this "Let's write a studio screenplay" approach to N.A. literature and get back to the only fellowship process that ever really worked. Effectively produced the major portions of our literature, we have strayed very, very far away from that. The people that wrote the Basic Text know that they wrote it. What the judge perceived is that the people that wrote it, own it, and that the fellowship still owns the Basic Text. They are not beneficiaries, they are owners. Their position has been relegated as if they were small children, taken care of under parental authority. They are not small children. It's like a live steam effect, it's been capped off, there's a lot of energy there, it's very explosive.

In our opinion, for instance, to dramatize this, it's easier for us to write another basic text than it is for us to deal with these interminable conflicts of viewpoint. I know that it's hard for an office worker to see that they're a tiny player in an enormous game, but we're

as committed to recovery and the expansion of our way of life planet-wide in our lifetime as we ever were.

We were doers when everybody else was talking when everybody else was saying addicts can't write. We can still write. We're still clean. We're still alive. We're still in the game. The fellowship owns the literature, and this document would reduce them to the status of beneficiary. I know that they have to work through organizational approaches to have effective ownership and control of their property, but we did it for them. We didn't do it for a current crop of hirelings at the office. You'll only be at the office for a few years.

U: The office only serves the people that it serves.

BS: But it runs a severe danger of thinking that it's the positional center that is the spiritual center, and the best in position to make key positions, and that's often misleading. A person near the center...The president of the United States reacts to forces around him.

U: That's correct.

BS: I've said enough on this, but I wanted to jump in. I hope we hear from Becky and Bill Allen some. I'd like to hear from the new Executive Director, please. I've heard more from George than the others. Let's have a round robin here.

BA: I'm going to listen for awhile. You know my positions already, George. I've been through this. I called you today because I was upset that I hadn't received this thing, it had to be faxed to me. I wasn't given the opportunity to really fine tooth comb it. I'm not interested in moving fast on anything. I'm not in interest of moving fast on anything. I'm a slow paced worker, I fine tooth comb everything, which Danette can probably confirm from being involved on World P.I. with me. I think we've got all the time in the world. What I'm hearing, when I just heard that the office serves basically those who it is responsible to, I have a real conflict with that as everyone knows. I believe they're supposed to serve my home group, and every other home group in the world. The home groups are basically not given the opportunity to participate in the communication network. Until that process starts to be included in this whole structural matter, I don't feel that we're going to get anywhere. I don't see any healing, especially since the court case. I've been attacked physically, I've been slandered, I've been threatened. I get the office report and I see something telling why "we" can't lower the cost of the book, in a pretty general way.

This thing, which I've just scanned over does not include the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. It even creates a Board of Directors as a trustee body, instead. We do have a trustee body and it does not include that whole missing link, the fellowship in the World Service Office. It's like Jim is saying, and Bo confirmed, that the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous, that ownership is to be held in trust for us, and they (WSC) are the link that establishes that for us. That's all I have right now.

D: Billy, would you see that link could or should happen?

BA: What I'm saying, Danette, is that I haven't had the opportunity. I just got that out of a fax machine today, and I didn't get to really go through it yet. I know it has to be in there. I didn't see it because I haven't been able to fine tooth comb it yet. I need time to study.

D: I just thought you might already have some idea of how you would like to see that set up.

BA: I haven't got to go through this to see what this document might have.

D: I'm not talking about what's in the document. I'm talking about that you're saying that link should be there.

BA: Yeah, it should be. I don't know what type of set up you have here. I believe in a whole reorganization of the World Service Conference, the way the conference becomes responsible to the fellowship to start with. If the conference is not responsible, there's no way the World Service Office going to be.

GD: Correct.

BA: So we do have some structural matters that have to be worked toward change for that to happen.

JM: Except, perhaps, if regions could elect a portion of the directors, perhaps a majority, directly.

GD: Directors of what, Jim?

JM: Of the office. Of the Board of Directors of the Office. Directly.

GD: I've got some specific stuff, but there are problems with that specifically. I would like to see the recognized RSC's themselves be the trustors. If that is a compromise situation. However, what we are going to see with the subdivision of the fellowship in the national and international conferences and licensing and printing and all of that different stuff that's going to go on, is we're going to have probably five years from now, ten years from now, when we get some of the literature translated, if that ever happens, we'll have other structural issues pertaining to this trust that we'll have to deal with that haven't been recognized.

Stu, I want to just say right now. I'm interested in seeing that the fellowship's property is enured, and the benefit enured to the benefit of the fellowship. Maybe philosophically, knowing where I'm at with this may help you see into my head a little bit. If you take 330,000 Basic Texts and multiply that by whatever cost you do, and then you subdivide that by 30 cents that you could pay to get them, you're talking about over a million books that could be used to carry the message to addicts who still suffer.

Now, you take the money out of it, you take the personality out of it, you take the control out of it, you take the plane flights away, you take all those things away from it. You have to understand that a person like me, and maybe other addicts are not like me, but I walked in here dead. If something stands in the way of our ability to carry the message to the addict who still suffers, then my whole philosophy is that that's got to go. Whatever barriers there are to saving lives, like mine, has to go. That's why our home group did what we did.

We are basically here today, over the question of the ethic of what it is we are doing to carry the message to the addict that still suffers and the proper use of the money. One faction says we need a dollar Basic Text, it's peppered all over the CAR. Another faction says we need a 30 cent Basic Text that costs \$3.00, which is even more profit that you guys are making now. Are you the same kind of addicts that perhaps the people that worked on the text believing, trying like Joshua in the battle of Jericho, march around and blow the horns. One day it will all fall down.

U: It's been a lot of years since then. I have a question. I understand where you come from, Dave. I don't not believe in a lot of the things that you're talking about. That remains to be seen. I have some questions about something that you said. You mentioned that the RSC's could be the trustor.

GD: Right.

JM: The trustor, instead of specifying the conference, we're saying the RSC's, the fellowship.

ST: Then, if that's the case, are you saying that the RSC's as a whole? Specifically not the conference, which would then exclude all the non-RSC participants, correct? Is that what you're saying?

GD: I got this just so recently that I haven't really had a chance to fine tooth comb it and then turn around and write what it would be that I would like to see in place. First of all, the definition of a trustor, I don't see it. Then, the trustee, I don't see that. But hypothetically, I would see the RSC's acting as the agent of the beneficiary. So, addicts in whatever region that they are in, would have that kind of access to the system. I see a two-fold set up here.

I talked to George about this the other day. The conference is incredibly influenced by the office, and we have got plenty of evidence that for instance, in Florida and the published report from Northern California, it doesn't matter what the areas vote, because their RSR's have stood up and said that they're going to vote exactly what they want to vote and if you don't like it, tough shit.

We have problems with spiritual principles in our fellowship. I see the office and the conference as a symbiosis that needs to be corrected in some fashion. I never supported giving the Trustees the copyrights, because of the move toward the single board concept. But I would see a two-tiered system here where the office would be the office, and the trust would be administered by the RSC's. The beneficiaries would be, this is regardless of the office, the Board of Directors, the WSC, the committee chairs, the trustees, everybody. As far as I can tell, I don't feel...

BS: The beneficiary, properly, would be the newcomer.

GD: Absolutely. And, if we ever get around to writing a step guide, people who have been here a little while. I'd like to see us do something. In 1982, we started writing a step book.

U: Let me ask a question.

GD: Let me tie this up if I can. In 1986, Bob Stone proposed that we license RSO's to print literature. Oops. He went home to California. I was on the committee, me and Charlie Coocher and a bunch of other people. We went home and the committee was canceled. Why? Because if the RSC's or the RSO's could produce their own literature, there would be no need or income for the World Service Office.

That is something that we may need to look at, is that the trust sets up a way for the necessary functions of the office to be continued, which would have to be done in a fellowship wide referendum. It would be a rather complex and protracted process. It says here on the front of this thing that the fellowship will be given a year to review, and we're not going to approve the final version until before the '92 conference. Even for something as simple as, for some people, as simple as this, it's going to take a lot longer to even approve something like this, or even to get input in a way that's going to satisfy all those philosophical concerns that we've discussed previously here and in other places.

I appreciate the work that has gone in on this. But in being less than hostile and a little bit more fair, it seems to be particularly one sided. Even quoting from the WSO annual report, there's a line in here. It's neat, it's slick, but it definitely favors the status quo. No one that I know that's awake yet, is going to be taken in by it.

U: There's two things that I think are important to note at this point. Number one, I believe a lot of discussion that we've heard from you guys is really something that really needs to take place in a document, that for lack of a better explanation, would be a conference charter. That would display the relationship of this thing called the WSC to the regions, to the areas, to the groups, and to the members. We felt as we were writing this, that we were somehow constrained by what currently exists in our fellowship today, what we know as the service structure, right or wrong.

GD: I'm going to interject one small, quick thing. Here is the fundamental thing that maybe it makes it difficult, but I will label the "traditionalists" in this fellowship, assume that all creative and spiritual, quasi legal spiritual documents in Narcotics Anonymous are an expression of the fellowship and group conscience. And that as employees in the office, staff team writers, special workers, lawyers, and that type, that there's a rub in there. We are forever non-professional, aren't we? Doesn't the fellowship do the work and the service bodies assist? I think we've approached this process backwards.

U: We could probably spend a few weeks discussing those things to find some commonalities between us. The current way that the service structure makes decisions, right or wrong, and I think that we all agree that we all have problems with it, that we were somehow confined by that. The issues that you bring up, are the issues that need to be brought to the fellowship. Not necessarily in this type of document, because we are

somewhat constrained about what exists today.

The other thing is, one of the difficult things in trying to put this thing together, is really defining the beneficiary of the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. A fellowship whose only requirement for membership is the desire to stop using. That is not stated in any other way than by the individuals themselves. That presents us with a major difficulty legally. For the fact that by identifying those beneficiaries in a way that they can benefit from the trust, there's also the principle of anonymity. To name all of our members in this type of document may cause us some conflict with that tradition as well. Those are the types of things that as we developed this document, we felt somewhat constrained by. The law does require us to name in a way that can be identified as a beneficiary and a trustor. Unfortunately, the RSC's coming together as a group is not something that we've done in the fellowship. Do you understand some of the confines that we felt constrained by?

JM: Yes.

U: We've basically articulated a document reflective of the current service structure. Who or how a region, or say an area or home group, could pursue a conflict that they have with the administration of the trust.

JM: Please repeat that. I didn't catch that at all.

ST: We tried to articulate something that say a home group or area somewhere has a problem with the way the trust is administered, and they need some way of approaching a question they have to get some reasonable answers. If their questions are answered and it becomes an issue that needs to be addressed. Currently, nothing exists. Currently, you have the World Service Office who has the trust in a fiduciary capacity, and they're connected to the conference somehow. It's not in any writing, or not in anything, but they're connected because we are who we are.

The ideal was to make a formal connection and allow sufficient concern for a problem or issue to surface that could be addressed. This may need to be widened and expanded, but it's going to take **** outside of us. We could only reflect the current system. Maybe the current system needs to change. I kind of think it does, but...

GD: The beneficiaries of the trust ultimately are the addicts that aren't even born yet. Yes, it's a very weighty issue, and I understand anybody's difficulty wrestling with it. But to some degree, we're going to have to find some way to trust somebody, trust the RSC's to

be together and administer this properly, and not...

ST: You know what, Dave? My tying into the WSC is what my way of tying into the region. That's what my conception is. The interpretation of tying into the fellowship through the WSC, because I believe that's the collective conscience of the region, the region are the conscience of the areas, and etc.

GD: I don't think you'll find any agreement on that amongst any of us.

ST: All I'm saying is, if there's a different way to articulate that. That's the intent. Okay?

BA: That's the agreed intent, Stu, but we all know that that's not how the conference operates. We know that. If it worked that way it would be great. We know that what happens there is when the issue of the 3rd Edition Revised and 4th Edition came up, and the RSR only voting participants, we had RSR's marching to the floor and rejecting their regional consciences that they had to carry there. We know that the conference had a world literature conference right in a forum violated our literature guidelines and we know that trustees get to the conference mikes and use their position to manipulate, and others. We know how that operates. We know that it's a political forum there. It is not speaking of the fellowship coming through, and that's where our philosophical differences come in.

BS: Philosophy is one thing, but when the guy from Philadelphia called me and told me about the six guys marching into the home group that used to be Grateful Dave's home group and taking over the group conscience setting, pushing through some votes of their choosing, never having been to the group before, except one of them once. They just walked in like gangsters and pulled this off and called that group conscience. Well, that's not group conscience.

U: I agree.

BS: And I don't think Stu and some of the people realize that those people who did that thought that they were doing a good thing for Narcotics Anonymous. The members of the home group that are left there to carry the message later that night and next week, are just mortified. Who were those guys? They don't belong here. We've never seen them in this meeting. Who were those people coming in here telling us what to do? It was very dispiriting. It hurt the spiritual condition of our primary unit, our group.

BA: But Bo, that was done by a former world level trusted servant, and one who's connected with world service today that manipulated that whole thing.

BS: That's gangsterism, Billy. We can't have it in a spiritual fellowship.

BA: The World Service Conference is the same type of gangsterism that existed there for years so far.

BS: We fail our definition as a spiritual fellowship if we tolerate that.

U: That works across the board, you guys. I watched them in Modesto walk into a group of guys who don't even know anything about what goes on in world services and totally turn around a whole group. It works two ways.

I also was part of the situation in Southern California, where I saw people going into groups, my group in particular, and try to swing their votes because they didn't like the way the 3rd Edition Revised was done. I know all about that. I'm on your side. You know that it works both ways. We're articulating that. That's the way that it happens.

BS: Well, if you're on our side, we'd better get it together soon.

BA: The Chairperson's report from the conference this year and see how it's being done already.

U: Personally, I can't speak for the chairperson.

BA: He's the one who's going to be presiding over the conference this year. He's already taken pot shots and myself and Dave, by bringing up 1985 WSC in this conference report.

U: Oh, was that you?

BA: Look through the minutes and you'll see.

JM: I guess where I come from in looking at all this, is that I think if we, together, want to do something to help solve the problems, that we need to do more homework before we present something to any other group of people than ourselves. It would be really unfortunate if this document were to leave our nurturing until it was a whole lot more acceptable to a wider group of the fellow-ship. I understand what you, Stu and George, about feeling the need to work within the existing structural situation, but I really kind of trusted that you would look back to when it was working, to find some leadership there. I'd like to share with you just a bit on page 9, section 5, regarding where I'm coming from. One thing I do want to commend you on, is that somebody talked to the lawyers and toned down the "legalese" in the first part.

"Operational rules, page 9. Nature of ownership of the trust copyrighted literature. Creation of all new or revised trust literary properties will be initiated by the beneficiary, either directly or subordinate board or committee. The process used to create these properties from commencement to conclusion will be under constant control of the beneficiary, exercised directly, or by a subordinate board or committee, e.g., the trustor. Individuals who take part in the creation of these properties will do so as giftors, and as such, may be called employees of either the trustor or the trustee, whether or not they receive compensation, with full knowledge..."

You see my thrust? Everybody knows that what we're calling beneficiary and trustor, etc., language like that, an alteration philosophically, would make this document more nearly acceptable and more nearly distributable. If we're interested in having a healing, causative impact on the fellowship and the conference. Without that kind of a thrust, we don't even have a place to start.

GD: Absolutely.

U: You want to...What I'd like to do...Do you want to take 30 days to put your stuff in writing? And then, what we'll do is try to include conceptual differences in here so we can have a more thorough review. So you have a variety of sides reflected in the document.

JM: The question's kind of dumb. Of course we do.

U: We're in a position where we've put it out and started a dialogue on it. I'm trying to get to that point. I had a feeling that because we were rushed getting into this thing, that you guys really haven't had the time to really work on this, and I really want to give you the time before this goes out to the fellow... for review.

GD: How about giving us a budget for telephone calls to each other? All of us are busted flat in Baton Rouge.

U: How much of a budget?

GD: I don't know.

BS: I know my phone bill has doubled lately. Meaning \$200 instead of \$100.

GD: I don't have a dime. Everybody knows that.

JM: Tell you what Dave. I just went to the bank and got another \$25,000 grand, the banks are full of money.

BA: That's how I retain my lawyer at \$10,000 a year for when they take me to court. I mean that, Stu. I keep my lawyer on retainer now.

ST: Is that right?

BA: You got it, partner.

GD: It means you're moving up in the world.

ST: You guys want to start with \$500?

BA: Yeah, that sounds reasonable.

U: Take the next 30 days, get your bills together, and we'll take it from there. On the next conference call. Then we'll talk about where we stand.

BS: Let me suggest a little bit of an alternative. We would not even be having this talk if the federal court thing had not, as it were, put us back in the game.

ST: Wait a minute, Bo, this really has nothing to do with the federal court.

BS: No, not exactly, but we are talking about this, and what's important is the experience based on our terms in world services can be brought in as a resource to the N.A. fellowship. We need to meet and have the eye contact, just like any other serious thing that gets done.

GD: We haven't all been part of the world service structure.

BS: I think the avoiding of that eventuality is just going to waste time and head off a solution. I would rather to keep struggling to pay my own phone bill if we could look forward to a get together. That's what it's going to take.

U: I kind of believe that we can have a get-together, but it will be after we release the document.

GD: Here I go again. I look at having attended a few conferences, I know the possibility for anything to happen.

BS: So why push the end game now? It ain't going to happen that quick.

GD: I feel that based on all of us will probably want to review the tapes of the conference, review the actions of the conference, we'll want to see the roll calls, we'll want to have an opportunity to talk to other people about this. I don't understand what this March 28 for distribution thing is, a report on the 3rd Edition Basic Text changes, I thought we were not commenting on anything. I gotta tell you. I really don't want to be a thorn in your side, or somebody that has look at two years ago to see what was happening today. I don't like it.

To me, it's all bullshit. If we can get back to the traditions and do what the fuck we're supposed to do, then we won't have these problems. I can only share with you that we had this guy come back from the Florida Region, who has been one of the most staunch supporters of everything that world services has done, and another person same way. They came back going, "This is completely bullshit. The people that I loved and trusted and emulated and desired to be just finished giving me the fast shuffle." This is not an

uncommon experience. When people start to come back from the conferences and from the regions and tell the story. They are well known, well liked, well respected people who have not been labeled and branded radicals and ostracized like the four of us. You're going to see a snowball effect.

BS: I don't feel ostracized. I don't see why not.

GD: I'm telling you that these people are coming back now. Gosh, things are like Dave and Bill and others have said. That's where you're going to get your problems. And they're going come soon.

BS: They're already enormous. They're so bad that I don't even want to bring them into this discussion.

GD: If we don't get it right soon...

ST: I'll tell you something, guys. Maybe I don't understand what you said. I might be really...I understand a lot of your philosophy and I understand where you're coming from. There's also responsibilities, and responsible ways to approach that. You're trying to get the best of both worlds. I currently don't genuinely know what you expect. Maybe we'll find the time in the months to come, and maybe we can sit down and I can hear what you've guys have said. I don't really know.

BS: When the Basic Text was done, Stu, we envisioned it going to an office that would hold it in trust, print and distribute the literature, and perform other services under the direction of the conference. We didn't expect it to be perfect, but we didn't expect professional writers to be put under contract for \$100,000 two weeks before the conference, when that was an item listed on the agenda to be discussed at the conference.

I did not expect when I served my five-year term on the Board of Trustees to have thousands of tiny changes made to the Basic Text down the hall, and find out only by getting a copy driven in by car several hundred miles that was bought from an institution who bought it from Hazelden, who bought it from the WSO before a member of the Board of Trustees even got to study or look at it. If you follow what I'm saying. Those things really happened. We really don't want those things happening again. That's what makes this serious. That's what we want to get a solution about, and that's the importance of this document, and possibly the conference charter like George was saying. Make the rules of the game clear and posted so everybody can subscribe to them. They confine their actions to a coherent structure.

The structure, as it stands, if the new executive director turns out to be a good and honorable man, then hopefully bring some useful experience to serve our needs, then great. Or he could be out in six months. We really tired of upset. It hurts our people. People come in waves and they leave in waves. Service disorders is our primary problem as a fellowship. We really seriously want a remedy.

GD: We are coming up on 1992, and if you look back ten years ago, there are a lot of ten year cycles in this fellowship. Ten years ago they completely, the fellowship rose up and cleaned house.

ST: You guys can have my job any god damn time.

BS: Had we wanted it, we might.

BA: You might not like it if I had it, Stu.

ST: Hey, you can have it.

BA: I guess that would be decided by group conscience.

GD: ...with integrity, resolve these issues, which created a very strange alliance, one that at this point is the only positive thing I've seen come out of it, is the restoration of George's and my friendship. I would say that it appears that there is something afoot, that it's the same stuff...

BS: Why don't you be a little clearer about that, Dave. In other words, you're saying we're having one reality when we're on the conference call like this, and we have a separate reality going on that's supposed to be out of sight from us.

GD: I'm not going to characterize it as a conspiracy, I'm just going to say I think it was a very poor judgment to have ordered the lawyer to amplify something that is already in such questionable state. That's probably a bad business decision on the part of the office to have done so. The reason I say that is because if it ever comes up and becomes a question, it will look strange.

ST: Wait a minute. The amplification simply explains a work for hire as being the world lit committee is the writer or the author. So I don't know what you mean like this is some big conspiracy...

GD: We don't know what the amplification is or says, or what its legal implications are either, Stu. I'm just bringing this up.

BS: The point is, we're finding out about it now.

ST: Then you want me to mail them to you?

GD: Yeah.

BS: I think that should have happened back when it occurred. We don't know about these things, and I think we're doing pretty good to stay cool in the situation where there's a change. We're supposed to be informed.

GD: Yeah, you guys spent \$96,000 in legal fees this year. I feel very offended that, maybe unrightfully, that the most important thing in the discussions, the agreements, the arrangements, all the conversations that we had was this: I think that this is probably was qualified to be either number 1 or number 2 most serious problem in the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous today, is getting this stuff straight.

BS: And the basic problem is non-communication.

GD: ...five days before the conference, and all the trustees and everybody, I begged you to tell the truth. Hey, we have problems with the registering. If you trust the world service community and you ask us to trust the world service community to resolve problems and act in the behalf of the fellowship and the beneficiary, and you as a business entity does not have enough trust in that same world service community to accurately reflect the problems that we have in the document that has been put out to the people that are going to make the decisions prior to the time that they come together to make the decisions, I see that as really irresponsible. I see that as very poor judgment. You're going to have people coming to the conference with absolutely no more understanding or information

with which to make a decision than they did before. It'll be raw emotion. It'll be committee as a whole. It'll be arguing. It'll be another 5th Edition quick fix.

You may come out of there with the conference going, "Yeah, you guys have it all. By God, you do anything you have to do to whatever." That's what you were initially asking for in your first Board of Directors report. It's hard for me, from afar, being fair, it's very hard for me to see any change or philosophical shift or understanding of the delicacies of the positions of the various factions.

BS: Again, it's easier to write another book than go through all this.

ST: Wait a minute, wait a minute. First of all, Dave, I'm not sure what all particular things that you're talking about. If you don't understand something, the registration is a simple responsibility and basically was in response to you guys. Because it's a responsible way when you deal with something as a work for hire, it needed to be depicted, the truth needed to be depicted.

BS: Dave's not referencing the content, he's referencing the context.

GD: Hold it, hold it. One at a time, cause you're all cutting up.

ST: Second of all, I don't know that what was written that you feel so ripped off about that's so irresponsible.

GD: Nothing was written, that's what I feel ripped off about. You spent nearly \$70,000 taking me to federal court. Is that not a high priority for you to resolve and make me feel good, considering the fact.

ST: You feel good?

GD: All right, fuck the way I feel. Considering the fact that the court case is still wide open.

ST: Whatever. That's fine, Dave.

BA: When do you propose that we get together, Stu? And where?

ST: We're going to have to tie it in with a meeting that takes place back there sometime this year.

BA: How about 4th of July, we've got a history conference going on.

ST: You got a what?

BA: A history conference going on that we're all going to be at. Lehigh University.

GD: July 4th through the 7th.

ST: Let me think about it.

BA: I'm the program chair, so I can arrange the room availability for it.

ST: This document has to be in the review state. We can't waste a whole year.

BA: You're right.

ST: I'd like to take 30 days and have you guys go through it line by line, come up with your ideas and your conceptions, and see if we can articulate different processes in a document to where people can look at the different issues and sides, so we can get it out for review. That way I'll tell the conference that this document is coming, okay? And then, once it's out there, we'll come together in a place like you're talking about and discuss it, thoroughly.

JM: And sit on the conference, Stu. Sit on the conference, because the book is probably better in its current state of "we don't know where the hell it is" than it is in the public domain.

ST: Well, we'll...we'll...we'll just *** the book, we'll...we'll... we'll keep things status quo until we get finished, you know what I mean?

JM: Another suggestion.

ST: What?

JM: If you really want to diffuse everything...Well I don't know, maybe it won't diffuse as much as I think. Sell the book at cost until everything's settled.

ST: Jim, you got...you got...you got an operation that functions...it operates on the revenues from the trust.

BS: We sort of understand that.

ST: ...out of operation, send everybody home. I can't do it. It's just not responsible. And you know, I don't think the fellowship at large would accept that as being a responsible action. I'm sorry.

GD: I have to look at the Board of Directors report. I have to shake my head. There isn't a single positive statement about a reduced price Basic Text. It's just not there.

BS: In other words, it's left out. A sizeable group conscience factor is left out. So it's an incomplete document, so the live steam continues to build.

ST: You're talking about the report on a low cost text that's in the report, right?

GD: Right. All it is I've seen is a synthesis of Stone's report in 1987 with a few little...

ST: You are way off, Dave. I'm sorry, I gotta tell you that. I ain't even going to fucking go for that. It's not even close, man.

GD: All right, don't.

ST: That report has more in it and more information than this fellowship has seen in the last ten God damn years.

GD: I'm talking about that section specifically. You are pushing in that report, a compilation. You have steered everybody in that report, that particular section of the report, you have steered everyone away from a reduced price Basic Text and onto this compilation deal.

ST: I don't think so.

BA: Excuse everyone for a minute, I've got to go to my home group.

GD: Billy, do you have my number where I'm at?

BA: Yeah. I don't want to be left out in this communication. I'm going to hold and respect that Bo, Jim, and Dave will take care of this real well for us. I just want to leave a few words with it. I never reviewed anything in 90 days and got some real good work onto it to be sent out for input/review.

I prefer more than 90 days. I'm going into final exams in the next couple of weeks. I'm taking five courses at school. My time is going to be reviewing the books, so I can get some good grades so I can be out there in the business world. I just hope that we would not rush things, take 90 days would be more like it. We could meet and do some good thorough work and be responsible to the fellowship and not rush things. I think it would be real irresponsible for us to rush things that's not really fully acceptable and causes more of a rift in the fellowship than we have already.

BS: Can I suggest a quick plan while you're still on the line, Billy. Everybody participating in this group write out what their primary concerns are and that a set of documents be compiled and distributed to every member of this group so we can all see what's important to one another, and then we move toward a mutually agreeable solution.

ST: Good idea. How about...

GD: I think that's a good idea too, and I would also like to say that I think Bill's idea is good too, because it will allow us more time to put in input, get together and meet, and the intent is a conscience session...

ST: After we study this report.

GD: And then go back to it. Maybe we can hammer out something between now and 90 days.

ST: Why don't we set up a conference call for three weeks. We'll talk about our status at that point, talk about some of the outcomes of the conference. In the meantime, I suggest you put together the thing that Bo talked about, so you can all see what everybody else feels.

BA: Sounds good to me, partner.

JM: I agree, but instead of three weeks, let's set it one week from the time that you get all this written input. Let's all make a promise that that's going to be at least three weeks.

ST: Okay, then at three weeks we'll be looking for the input.

BA: Okay.

GD: Is there some way to leave me and Jim and Bo on the phone.

BA: I just hope you come up with an agreement cause I've got to get out of here as soon as possible. I hope to see all you people on better grounds. I hope to be able to fellowship with Danette like we used to. God bless.

U: I can hook you guys up and unhook us. I can't unhook you completely, but I can take you off the line. Let me understand what we just agreed to: That by May 15, our comments will be finished. If you want, you can send them here and I'll collect them and send them out to everybody. Then a conference call will be scheduled for the 22nd of May.

BA: Correct. Sounds good to me. And this won't be released at the conference.

U: No.

BA: Okay.

GD: I would make a suggestion that you say there is a document, we're trying to work it up, and we're probably 90 days off from having a draft to go out to people.

BS: I would at least like to hear the Executive Director's comments on some of this, or questions.

JG: Hi, I'm Joe Gossett, I'm the new executive director. I've been here two weeks. I want to make an observation on what I've just heard. I think there are about half a dozen men here that are all very committed to the same goals. We've got some administrative details to work out. We're going to work on them, we're committed to do that. But I think we're all headed in the same direction, and that encourages me.

GD: Sounds good so far.

JM: If you could be encouraged after what you just heard, I guess you're our man.

BA: We're looking forward to meeting you.

U: We'll see you guys later, all right? I'll put you guys on hold from here.

GD: Wait a minute. Are we done? Because we were face to face in all of the things going on surrounding the courtroom and by all these other things that were going on, brought us together in a way that I don't feel we're as together as we were in Harrisburg in our discussion. It seemed to me in Harrisburg that there was...

BS: Well, hellfire. This involves the whole WSC, man. It takes a lot out of you.

GD: Well, shit. It is kind of like taking a bath in shit for eight days. All I go is on feelings, folks, most of the time. My feeling is here that Jim, Bo, Bill and I. George has been stoic. Danette's been silent, and Becky's a sweetheart. We're not together with what the ultimate thing is here. As ridiculous as the whole thing may sound, the only thing I know about is the twelve traditions.

I know that our primary purpose is to carry the message to addicts who still suffer. As I shared with George before, we used to do that by any means possible. If it causes some belt tightening or some minor adjustments, or even major adjustments, I believe that we are missing the boat when we consider these things that we do in any other context. I know that areas that raise money and raise money and raise money and never have enough money to pay their bills. But areas that rely on carrying the message and going out and doing it and volunteering, they seem to have all the money they need to take care of the responsibilities that they have.

There's something fundamental that is being missed. It's very difficult for me to be tactful and diplomatic and articulate. I'm trying to communicate to you that it's kind of a spirit thing that all of us are trying to communicate, and we're trying to interface that with your world, which is a structural world, in dealing with dollars and cents. Joe's comment made me think of this, made me think that perhaps we're headed in the same direction. Our intractability on both sides of our approaches and the unwillingness to interface our philosophies and come up with a compromise which I have really haven't seen the compromise, maybe I'm missing it. I think we all need to take a look at that, all of us.

BS: I'd like to hear something from some of the other persons on this call.

B: This is Becky. The reason I was asking Billy those questions earlier only because I'm trying to understand what it is you're looking for in this document, and I don't know that I'm still clear on this. I have a little bit better idea after this phone call, but I guess I still need to see what you guys are going to come up with in 30 days, because I'm not clear. That's why I've been sitting on this phone call and listening.

JM: I'd like to quickly share with you with what I'm thrusting for. What I think a whole lot of people out here in the world of N.A. are interested in seeing. Number 1, some specification somewhere that the fellowship, who in reality is owner of our intellectual properties, is defined somewhere as owner. The structure, which stands in the stead of or acts as fiduciary for that fellowship is subordinated to its role in reality. That's number 1. Number two, that the fellowship has, as a fellowship, direct controlling powers over these intellectual properties, and that process, exclusive of the process that's now in place, is specified in this document. Number three, referring again to the word "process," that the process that created the usable intellectual properties that we have, which is basically the

2nd Edition Basic Text, is in place for now and ever more. That's my thrust.

Additionally, of course, as an overview to that, that it fits whatever necessary legal things that are required. However, what we need to recognize is that the legal world is there to define itself according to our needs. We're not here to fit our reality to some sort of legal definition, but rather the legal definition needs to be modified, if that is the necessity, to our needs.

BS: The judge, for instance, understood us very quickly and very well. I think he was very impressed by Narcotics Anonymous as a whole. He was very sad and dismayed by our difficulties. He perceived it very rapidly.

JM: That's the whole of my thrust in being involved here.

U: I can certainly understand that. I don't think that our thrust in being involved here is any different. However, I think, Jim, that we don't have an ideal situation in which to deal with. As a fellowship, we cannot even recognize our own groups as exerting their beneficiary rights. These are some real fundamental problems that we've had for a long time. How do you identify a group who's to exhibit direct control over a trust that it has? You don't know that they're even there.

U: Exactly.

GD: Well, I think we made great strides in resolving that thing in our discussions about how we would conduct a group tally. If there are questions of autonomy and the additional question of an invisibility, I think we resolved that.

BS: You send out a piece of paper to every group in the world, and ask them to please respond by a certain date, and you read it, tally it.

GD: I don't see what the resistance is across the board about this. There's a strong personality in every group. Yeah, but with 20,000 strong personalities, you're gonna get a conscience out of it.

GH: It has nothing to do with resistance. It has everything to do with the reality of Narcotics Anonymous as exists today, as un-wholly and as wrong as that can be at times. That's how we are trying to approach this. If I was going to draw up an ideal situation, it

would not be within this document. Do you understand?

JM: No. I guess that's something that I don't understand, George.

GH: Well, to me, the first thing is a member of Narcotics Anonymous is a beneficiary, how are you going to identify him?

JM: Why need you?

GH: Along with being a beneficiary, there is a responsibility you have as a beneficiary, and also certain rights that you can exhibit.

JM: I don't see the necessity of identification, other than through labeling.

GD: What you're saying, basically is the same thing I've heard lots of other people say, is that our groups, a) don't give a shit; b) they're not responsible; c) they can't make a decision.

I don't think you will find some agreement, but with qualifications from us, that I don't know any addict that don't have an opinion on something if they've been given some information. If they were given correct, broad-based information, I would say that a lot of them would welcome the opportunity to participate in that way. We have created an atmosphere, maybe unintentionally, where "let's let the service junkies do it." I think it's more of a matter of education, where we encourage participation, where we coax people along, where we tell them the things that we were told when we got here, like "You matter."

BS: You know what would be a strong structural solution in this tableau, would be to institute the world directory. I'm in the Rotary, and we have a world directory with the mailing address of every club in the world. There's a lot of them. Re-institute the N.A. World Directory, and better than the CAR approach, send a piece of paper to every group in the world and ask them how they feel about the things they've been hearing about all year. It's not like they don't hear about it. That would be functionally much more real, and they could say yes, no, maybe, comments.

GD: We need a media that is responsive to all points of view.

BS: And not biased. It doesn't take sides. They're just so tired of all this game playing and what they perceive is just disorder. It's like noise. The only way they can do it is shut it out and tend to their newcomers, and take care of their home group.

GD: When asked, they say that's all political bullshit and I don't want to get involved.

BS: It needs to be simplified and some positive new directions taken.

GD: I think that attitude has been cultivated. I think that attitude is very well understood.

BS: Which attitude?

GD: You tell somebody that their behavior is unspiritual and they're going to relapse, they're going to stop. They're going to stop quick and look because they don't want to die. We've been playing on fundamental insecurities here.

We've been saying that this one is going to destroy Narcotics Anonymous, that one, and we've been saying a lot of these things. I was in the media business for years, so I understand a little bit about mass psychological things.

JM: And respect a good one when you see it.

GD: Yeah, absolutely. What's gone, in my opinion, forth from world services in the past five years has been a masterful job. I will say that these addicts, because they're insecure, and we all want to know it all, would just say "That don't mean anything. I'll do my H&I."

When really what they're saying is, "I don't have enough information, I feel inadequate, I feel stupid. Every time I go to a service forum and because of my personal recovery, my understanding of the traditions, and I stand up and say, "Well, it seems to me, that because of our 5th, 9th, and 12th traditions, that this is so..." And some service structure sharpie jumps up and goes, "Well, you don't understand. We have this policy and that policy..." and cuts him into fishbait. Everybody goes, "Oh shit, well I'm never going to ask another question."

BS: Well, their feelings get hurt.

GD: Of dealing from a moral or sensitivity position, there's very few people that can stand that kind of shit like I can.

JM: So what do you think, Becky, does that answer your question?

B: I don't know that it answers my question, but it gives me a lot more information.

JM: Is Danette still there?

U: No, she had to leave. Some time ago.

GD: We have an educational process to embark upon, if we are really serious about healing the spiritual sickness in our fellowship. We're now moving onto concepts.

BS: Look, I want to dig away at Becky a little more, cause I hope she's more than just a sweetheart. Becky, has your perception of this issue shifted in the last three months? You must have been exposed to some new information. Hello?

B: I'm trying to think if I can say that my perception has shifted.

BS: I heard you on the tape that was recorded in October of last year, and it seemed like you were pretty adamant about the court case, if I got your voice right. I know that there's a re-evaluation going on, that Stu referenced that we made in Harrisburg.

GD: That was Danette, Bo. And Kim.

BS: Becky wasn't there?

GD: Becky was there, but she was very quiet.

BS: Well, I thought she said something once or twice. At any rate, is there a shift. Lack of information got us into this hole, and maybe a certain class of information can initiate some reproachment.

B: The only thing that's been really encouraging to me is from Harrisburg on, at least, it seems that there's an open dialogue. The fact that all of us are on this phone call together, I don't believe would have happened a year ago.

I don't know that I've had a shift in perception, but I'm at least encouraged by the fact that we're trying to talk to each other and find a solution agreeable to everybody. I don't question anybody's motives. Sometimes I get a little bit defensive, because it sounds like that anybody involved in world services has just lost their membership in any attempt at spirituality.

BS: One thing that hasn't been defined properly or referenced much, probably because it's sort of a tender spot, is the person who is elected in a world service position or employed by WSO, is caught a little bit in a conflict of interest. We heard a lot about that eight or ten years ago, but it seems to have slipped out of usage, because a lot of times it looks to the fellowship like somebody at world level is either jockeying for a job at the office, or they've just gotten a job at the office and there's an immediate shift in their personality. In other words, if you call up an old buddy on the phone, they're a little more high strung and less talkative.

GD: It's like musical chairs, too.

B: Well, hopefully, at least in my case and in the case of most people I know, if there's been any change, it's been in the way people treat me, the way I react to people around me. I don't feel any different because I hold this service than when I did when I held lots of others the whole time I've been clean. I feel like I'm close to a lot more information and I get a lot of advantages of getting exposure to the fellowship all over the world, but I don't feel that I have a conflict of interest.

BS: I'm not personalizing it and saying that you do. I'm referencing some of the terms that I think have led to what Bob Stone used to call, the "us and them phenomenon."

B: I really have appreciated the efforts that have happened in the last 90 days or so to bring all that together. Like I said, I don't believe that this phone call would have happened a year ago.

BS: Yeah, there's been some improvement. I always held out hope. It's hard to give up hope on everybody. If we were going to die, we would have died in the 60s.

GD: Another thing I guess I've got to comment on. I support movement for alternatives, viable alternatives, be they within the context of the current service structure or without. I

see these various approaches and attempts as more of an act of desperation by a whole bunch of people that don't really know what to do. They've been shut out. I would say that if we trust a loving God and if we allow parallel tracks to exist, that maybe we'll all be better off, because we can all learn from these different tracks. We have enforced an approval-seeking. We've indoctrinated our members, "You do this, you talk this way, this is how you do meetings, and this is how you do service. If you don't follow guidelines to the letter, then we have your head."

BS: Or a goon squad walks into your home group.

GD: Absolutely. Our little statement of unity seems to have been lost on those who were most in need. Here you sit here talking to the radicals of the fellowship, and we're really not radicals. We haven't done anything wrong. But your rampant world supporters are still running around ripping books out of people's hands.

B: I don't think there's anybody on this phone call who would behave any differently.

BS: Than what?

B: Stu already said he didn't support that kind of behavior by anybody, and I don't think there's anybody on this phone call who falls into the stereotypes that we kind of toss back and forth.

JM: You're right. We need to model so that sort of thing comes to a conclusion, that era in our history ends as rapidly as possible. We need to model. As trusted servants, we need to start being question askers rather than answer-givers.

B: Well, you're talking to the wrong person, cause I have lots of questions.

JM: I'm not saying that to you, I'm saying that to me. I feel that our modeling needs to change. What's happening is a result of our modeling, whether we choose to accept it or not. I'm accusing me, I'm not accusing you.

GD: Is there anyone here besides me that knows exactly what the last sentence in the 12th tradition says? "Anonymity in action renders personalities and their differences powerless." If that is true, then we all have a ways to go. I'm hopeful, yes there's a dialogue. Yes, this conversation could have, but wouldn't have taken place five months,

six months ago.

BS: The point is, we were willing a year ago.

GD: Years ago.

BS: Lest that's completely unnoticed.

GD: I need to share this because I shared it with George. I struggle to get eight hours a day awake anymore. I have a sense of urgency that may not be falling on anyone else. I would like to go to my rest with a good feeling that there has actually been an observable change, observable by anyone who chose to look. I've dedicated my entire life since walking in the door here to serving and bettering this fellowship. Some of you may not believe that. I sat and read literature to coffee pots. I don't know how long I'll be alive. That's a fact, that's just reality. My disease is running me down quick.

BS: Yeah, you could die wining and dining, whooping it up, instead of dealing with these tedious matters. Wonder why you do it, Dave? You must be nuts. Either that or in love.

GD: AIDS dementia, I guess. No, it's just that it's the same thing. I would like to get a little personal peace and feel good in my gut about what's going on. I had a glimmer of hope a few months ago. I want to continue to have that, even if it's small. It's very, very depressing for me. Whatever my motives may have been, I know there's been a lot of discussion of what they were. It had nothing to do with world service or a vendetta or anything. It was we've got to carry the message to the addict who still suffers. George was in my home group, and he can tell you. He can communicate to you, seeing all those detoxing and toothless wonders on welfare with \$3.00 in the basket, but they all had a blue book and their eyes were bright. That's what counts to me.

Philosophically, I applaud the ideals of the WSO, and I applaud the ideals of the WSC, and I think it's a wonderful experiment that we've become far too rigid about. I think that we have worked to the point where a lot of the things that we do are kind of unnecessary. We need to be able to trust developing fellowships with the literature that we currently have. Let them translate it and then come back to us and work out the little bugs. We'd be saving a hell of a lot of money, and we'd be getting a lot more literature translated.

JM: A hell of a lot more recovery there.

GD: Absolutely. This gift of recovery and our literature, it was given to all of us, and to those to come, freely by a loving God. We are standing in the way of God's gift to humanity. Some people accept barriers and limitations. Jim Miller wrote in my book when I had 45 days clean, "Argue for your limitations and they will be yours forever." I have refused, because there is the power of a loving God, I have refused to accept those limitations in my own personal life, which has set me outside the norm or status quo. What my home group did in group conscience, I am completely okay with on the level of spiritual and what was the right thing to do. It may have interfered with somebody's plans. It may have rocked somebody's boat. It may have pissed somebody off. If there wasn't a WSO or WSC, that's what would be happening today. It's not unrealistic to imagine that those people who might perceive our world structure as being a barrier to carrying the message, might arrive at basically the same moral conclusion.

That's a very powerful motivation to walk into a prison and have a hard back book or two stuck in a counselor's office because they've caused fistfights, or because somebody ripped the pages out. I have watched those blue books going into prison, and they're having step and book study meetings now. They weren't having them before. Yeah, there was a certain amount of it going on, but I've watched this whole thing very carefully. The people who are not involved in the politics of it, love it. The people that we're trying to reach, ostensibly, are benefiting from it.

Maybe we have to look at the whole enchilada. There will be people who will refuse to allow any barriers between them and the thing that keeps them alive. That's what keeps me alive. I have a sponsee with four days clean. That's what keeps me alive. That's what keeps our fellowship alive. God, let's hope that we stop turning them off. Service, yeah, come on, let's go. "Fuck that, I went there once."

BS: You kind of lost me on that last one.

GD: I'm going to take my new sponsee to the area service. Tell him that he counts, that he matters. Service is where we need to be. I'd be talking out the side of my neck, and it didn't used to be that way. It really didn't.

BS: Well, we're still young, there's still hope.

GD: They let me write do's and don't's with 40 days clean, man. It's approved. There's newcomers all in that Basic Text. I think Bo was right earlier in saying that we had a process. Nobody could understand it, but damn it worked, and we tried to fuck around

with it and we've got paid people and this and that. That's a brand new idea. It didn't work before, and I don't think anybody can say that it's working now. Maybe we have to back up a little bit. Maybe all this progress is not what we need to be in. Maybe we need to back up a little. Emotional sap and drivel. That's where I'm at. I have to bare my soul. I guess I have been for a long time. I don't know how long I've got, and I want to see it right. If it comes to me that there's something I have to do, then I have to do it. I don't mean to really leave it dangling there, but...

BS: Don't leave it dangling. You've done your part. You haven't put out anymore Baby Blues, right?

GD: I have honored my agreement to the letter.

BS: Has World Service Office honored their agreement?

GD: Yeah.

U: Yes.

BS: Well, that's wonderful to hear both of you say that. That's something to ponder.

GD: I am a man of honor, whether anybody believes it or not. All I have is my word. That's all I can take to my maker. I've given my word, and I've kept my word.

U: Okay.

BS: What else do we need to deal with in this phone call?

ST: I think you guys wanted to talk some more, right? George knows how to exclude us, I want to say goodbye to you guys, and we'll talk after the conference.

BS: Well, we'll continue the tape and send you a copy of it.

ST: Okay.

JM: Stu, you've got my number.

ST: Okay, we'll talk.

BS: We'll pray for the spirit of the fellowship to come out of this year's annual world service conference. God be with you.

GD: One last closing comment to you guys. I'm not going to be there. I tried every way I could to be there, but I want to ask you Stu, remember when I said please don't send any letters out until we get a chance to talk? I want to ask you to please try to, all of you who have the ability to address the conference, try to prevent the conference from reeling off. We have a problem. That problem cannot be resolved by a vote of the conference. If you can get the conference maybe to even hold off. I think George knows what I'm talking about. I think Stu knows what I'm talking about. Let's downplay all this stuff, in terms of exclusive property and all that stuff, cause I know it's going to be very...I'm almost sorry I'm not going to be there.

BS: Jim and I were going to come, but we just felt like it was going to muddy the waters.

ST: I'm going to do everything I can to have the issue addressed, guarantee that. I'm usually pretty good at that.

BS: To have the issues addressed like...

ST: Well, I'm not...We're going to talk about everything that's in the agenda. We're going to discuss some of the difficulties in the fellowship with the intellectual properties. It's not going to be washed under the rug.

GD: Well, if you create a separate account for Blue Book sales at \$1.50, and limit the distribution, like we talked about before, and dedicate all that money to assisting other fellowships in other parts of the world to translate their literature.

U: There are a lot of things that will be discussed about that, Dave. I really think you're jumping to a conclusion, and really should be patient. Let's see what the conference does.

BS: Also, let's add one thing.

GD: The conference will do what it's told.

BS: The compilation of what we consider to be important be put in one package. There may be some written input in the regional reports this year. If you come across stuff that we may need to be cognizant of, that's important in terms of fellowship respect, that should be included in the overall package.

ST: Okay.

BS: Our chance of doing a good job on this is very dependent on us having a 52 card deck.

ST: Okay.

BS: It's our duty to make sure we put in writing what our concerns and issues are, and trust that you all do the same. I just think there's going to be some discussion. Some of it is going to be written, group conscience type stuff. Sometimes key phrases can be found in that kind of material.

GD: Also, I'm still waiting on the communications registered on the Basic Text and the other things that were supposed to be forth-coming. I know you guys are busy out there, but if you have it, send it. And the amplifications.

ST: Okay, we'll send that out to you then, okay?

JM: Okay, good. (whole round of good-byes)

LIT TRUST TALKS

MAY, 1991

U: I'm not sure about on the list, I just have a rough draft.

GH: The first point that, there appears to be a question regarding the accuracy, or inaccuracy of the background statement, or the style in which it is written. What needs to be stated in this section?

U: I got some of that from Bo's input and some from Jim's input. Maybe they can elaborate on that.

JM: I've gone on from these questions. I thought that was an excellent job, Stu. I appreciate it. I've gone on from these questions, and I have some simple responses. I think that this background statement, very simply needs to be focused on the fellowship rather than services, and most particularly, that portion of the fellowship exemplified by the 1981, before the literature conferences. The composition of the literature committee, the process that was happening then, and the four conferences that occurred then. I believe that it needs a simple description of the bond of trust that does exist between the spiritual fellowship of N.A., and its services, including ASCs, RSCs, WSC, WSB and their agents, primary service center, WSO. To the statement, "our leaders are but trusted servants, they do not govern." That's kind of what the background statement needs to be focused on in my opinion.

The '81 literature committee and those four conferences were something that happened in the fellowship, was a phenomenon that didn't have a precedent and hasn't happened since. The members that worked there, and the fellowship that they were representative of developed a trust bond with the service structure that the results of their work would be used in the same spirit and manner that the work was developed. This must be, in my opinion, the foundation and the basis of this literature trust document.

BS: Roughly, I agree.

GD: I agree. The fellowship and the people who wrote and participated are actually the authors and the owners. I think you've got it switched around. I didn't send any input because I've got some minutes of the conference here, it says to me that the things that we

had discussed in Harrisburg and other times, and the promises that were made to Jim and Kathleen and Bo and myself and others that were present at the time, were ignored. It's like you've got the exclusive rights to do whatever you want to do as far as I'm concerned, it seems like that is "your" trust. The trust that I had that you wouldn't ask for these things and you wouldn't do the things that you have done, you violated that trust.

ST: I never said that we wouldn't ask for it. I put it in the Conference Agenda Report. That's not true, Dave. I told you I was going to ask for it.

JM: What I understand, Stu, what I remember was that in those documents that you gave us your assurance that you would share that something was in process, and that after the process was completed, that you would ask for this, and mention that in any requests for it. I felt you made yourself very clear and agree substantially with Dave.

ST: No. What I agreed to was the fact that I would ask for this in lieu of producing any other document. I agreed that this document was premature to distribute at the conference at that time. It needed some work. I instructed the conference that we would be working on this document and would send it out.***

BS: In the interest of time, can we be send the relevant documents on this. I'm blind to it. I don't have copies of it.

U: What don't you have?

GD: I didn't get anything.

BS: I don't have any WSC minutes from '91.

GD: Did anybody get the amplifications and the other materials that were supposed to be send, because I received nothing.

U: They were just done. They'll be coming in the next package.

BS: Let's clear one thing here. I talked with Dave last night, and he's gained some admirable strength, but he felt very offended and betrayed in whatever he found in the WSC motion in the minutes. Stu, you're saying you don't think you betrayed anything,

that you kept perfect faith and trust. I was never real clear what it was that Dave was asking assurance that you not do. Now he says you've done it. Can I get some paperwork on this, so I don't have to do that addict thing of "make it up and pretend it's so"? It's a little facetious. It takes a marvelous amount of time and attention to participate in something like this, and the idea that some of the participants would be withheld information or events would be very shaky to me. I'm not going to waste my time, whatever happens.

GD: I feel like it's kind of a waste of time. I do so because of my own personal intimate knowledge and understanding of the promises that were made. The last conference call, I said that I had fulfilled my end of the bargain 100%, Stu, you said yes, and everyone was amazed that you had said yes. The fact of the matter is, from what I understood in the court, you were supposed to go from the court to the vote, without any comment.

ST: No, no, no, no, no. The only comment that wasn't supposed to be taken, was I wasn't supposed to put a prelude to the motions that went out to the fellowship. That's what was indicated by the court.

*****REFERENCE PAGE #19 FROM APRIL LIT TALK TAPE**

GD: Was there not a three-hour discussion before the votes were taken at the conference? Was there not papers sent out four or five days before the conference to RSRs about...I have it, it's dated March 28 "For distribution. An essay on the fourth and ninth tradition changes."

ST: The only thing that was sent out that had anything to do with those three motions was the issue of the low cost text, and that was ordered by the court that it was done. That was it. We said nothing, we publicized nothing, we did nothing.

GD: There wasn't three hours were of discussion before the votes were taken at the conference?

ST: At the conference, I gave my report.

GD: And then Terry Middlebrook gave her report, and all that information in which I saw nothing positive, not even in the WSO Report, nothing positive at all...

ST: Dave, those RSRs came there with the vote. There's no votes after the discussion. Those votes were taken by their respective fellowships. Those votes were taken back in their fellowships. They went out in the agenda report. They all came with a vote from their fellowship.

GD: Then why was there a need for three hours of discussion?

ST: Because I give a report every year. There was no cross discussion. There were questions and answers after the report, which they cut short and forced the end of discussion. We went into session, I asked for a committee of the whole, and they refused it and wanted to vote. They voted and then they went into a committee of the whole after the vote. That's what came then.

JM: I'm sorry to interrupt you, Stu, but I believe we need to move on from here. A lot of us weren't there, and we're just really not positive what happened. The reports that we get indicate that you betrayed the trust that we felt we had established. I think that that's something we must deal with. However, for us to deal with it, when I don't have all the details and facts, and Dave seems to have a whole lot of it, but all of us aren't on the same page. I don't think that we're going to make any progress toward dealing with it. Dave and I, and perhaps to a lesser degree, Bo think that this process that we're participating in right now may be of some value. I'm questioning the value from what I've heard of the conference. However, I'd like to go through the motions of it, and see if we can set some positive change. I think if we discuss this any further on this particular conference call, until I have minutes of the conference and Bo has too, and Dave and Bo and I and perhaps others, Billy, have had a chance to visit, we're going to be spinning our wheels. There isn't any sense doing that.

Let's go on to your agenda and deal with it, and any other input that might come up. Deal with these things that come up point by point and see where we're going to go as a working group from here. If you guys, in fact, have snared us into something, deluded us, and Bo can trust, I guess I'm not going to have to make amends for that. If I do this work and it's all for naught, at least it's built character some. Dave doesn't have a lot of time to build character, but I'm going to go ahead and do that.

BA: I have one question before we proceed. I want to know...In Harrisburg, Carl Deal was involved in this, right?

U: No.

BS: No.

BA: He also send input to the office on this?

U: I talked to Carl this morning, and we have not received any input as of this morning. We did not receive any fax from him.

BA: Carl informed me that he'd be mailing it, and I know that I received fax input from him.

U: Billy, I can only tell you what I've received here at the office. I talked to Carl this morning, and he said that he was going to fax the material. I have not received anything across yet.

BS: What the hell has that got to do with anything? What has he sent?

BA: He sent a lot of input to this. That's what it has to do with.

BS: Well, I'm open to that. I think he's an excellent servant. What did he send?

BA: I'll be mailing it to you, Bo.

BS: Okay, but can you give us a rough...

BA: I'll just put it in the mail to you.

BS: Okay, but can you give us a rough picture of it? You don't have to read it. Is it just interesting stuff, Billy?

BA: It has a lot to do with what we're doing, and I just feel...I talked to Carl two days ago, he told me that he mailed it, and I received my packet, and it was not attached. He faxed it to me that same day and I received it. I wanted to see it. I just have a hard time

with things that seem to get lost in the mail over the years. That's what's going on, I'm going to have to have a lot of caution in anything that I do, and I will have distrust with what's happening. I'll be real honest with that.

U: We got everybody else's input.

BS: We can all presume that that's going to be coming in, so we'll just have to wait and see.

GD: I'm sitting here with the minutes of the conference, and I see all the motions. You tell me one thing, and 20 people that were there tell me another. The only way we're ever going to know what's right is if you were to send the tapes of that day to all of us, so we could determine what, in fact, did actually occur at the conference. If you want me to trust you...

BS: Well, just those two or three hours. That's a good bit of listening right there, not the whole damn day, just that section.

GD: There's a lot of stuff here, I'm sure, that spanned over four or five hours. I'm looking at the minutes, making that determination.

U: That section was about eight and a half hours long.

BS: Relating to the copyrights?

U: No, the overall...

GD: The literature, the WSO presentation, the motions, the votes, the committee of the whole.

BS: It's eight hours long?

U: The whole thing was.

GD: If you could get those copies and send them out, then we would have a better idea of what the conference felt like, and what they wanted. If you want me to at least modify my feelings at this trust, then that would go a long way. I don't like to operate from a position where I've got no information. I don't like to make a mistake or get something wrong. From what I'm looking at here, and from what people have told me, and from the publications and things that people have sent me, and looking at the WSO Report, I didn't have much faith to start with, and I put all whatever remaining faith that I had in Narcotics Anonymous and the principles, and the trusting when we went to court, I put whatever I had left there. I don't have any left.

GH: Let me try to put it into perspective for you, Dave, at least what I believe. This trust document will supersede all previous decisions. The decisions that were made by this year's conference were temporary if we find that those decisions are no longer usable in the trust document. That's how I tend to look at that and what we discussed at the conference. I understood Stu to make a commitment that he would not present the trust document, which will be the policy that is established when we get through the review period, hopefully, and the fellowship approves it. The decisions made by the conference are temporary in that light, because the trust document will supersede all of that.

GD: It seems that the perception that the members that were together in Harrisburg and various other communication that you and I have had personally, that you see things one way, and I know I see things another way, and I'm taking a straw poll down the ranks of the people we have on the phone here. You've got people on the phone here who have not been intimate to this stuff, but Oma and myself, Jim and Kathleen, and Bo and his girlfriend that were in Harrisburg, in that room with you, we made, all of us, made agreements together. It sounded like there was something that could come out of all of it that we would all be happy and satisfied with, and there were things discussed at that time. One of those things was that three months after the conference, when we should take and put out the trust document. That was one item. The second item was the idea of exclusivity and ownership of the properties. You would have the exclusive rights to ownership, that was going to be held in abeyance. You promised that you would not ask for those things and/or the right to sue any group, area, or region, or member, until such time as we had developed the document.

ST: I didn't promise that. Anybody else who was on the phone that was there, did I promise that?

JM: Yes, I do believe that approximately what he's saying is what we agreed to as a group. However, I really don't think that we need to spend a lot of time right now going

over that and salving up those wounds. If in fact, our impression of what you said was made in good faith by you, George's word that this trust document will supersede all previous decision, including temporary decisions made at WSC '91, is enough for me to go ahead and not waste the fellowship's money and time, and my time, any further trying to do this, trying to salve this up. It's a waste of time, but I may be wrong. I just need to feel that everyone involved here agrees with George's perception that what we're working on shall supersede anything that's been done previously.

ST: Now, that's what I promised.

JM: Does everyone agree that what we're working on is something that can transcend all previous policy in this area and the areas attached to it?

GD: It seems to me that if it's a legal instrument that's executed, then that will, in fact, supersede even the decisions of the conference. The conference will have to ratify whatever it is that we end up coming up with, because we'll not have any rights to put something like that out, without the fellowship. I may be going even further to say that the fellowship, as a whole, has an opportunity to look at it. The other thing is, that we talked about having a little budget last time so we could communicate with one another. I can't afford to communicate with anybody. If we're going to proceed, I'm willing to proceed. I've given most of my input to Jim, because Jim and I have a relationship where we understand each other, so I gave him most of the input that I had, and he factored most of that into his input.

We've already done some initial work. I just think that our ideas, and I would like to hear from the other people on this particular question, Roy and Billy, and others. Does corporate N.A. own our property, or does the "creator," being the fellowship, own the property? We're looking at the question here of whether...The first literature document that you sent us made the owners the beneficiaries. That's kind of screwy. You guys get the budgets and the travel and the office, you guys are the beneficiary of our work. It's really the other way around. I think we have a chasm between corporate N.A. and spiritual N.A. We have to decide as a fellowship, whether we are a corporate entity, and go on with that, or whether we are a spiritual entity.

ST: We have a corporate entity, because a corporate entity does certain things on behalf of the fellowship. Service. It only exists for the fellowship. They benefit its worth. It has no other purpose.

GD: I'm looking at it, and we may argue over two million dollars, but I'm looking at twenty million dollars over the past five years, and I'm wondering what we got for it.

ST: That's quality judgement. It doesn't exist for anything else other than services to the fellowship. That's what it was intended to do. Now whether the services were good, bad, indifferent, that's something that has to be dealt with from a quality control situation, not from...

GD: Stu, I know what you believe. I think that we're just talking and we could not be further apart, I don't think.

BS: What do you think Stu believes?

GD: I think he believes that it's a business, an agency, this, that, and the other thing. If that's the case, efficient business and successful businesses run on spiritual principles, on good sound principle and practice. It's like it says in the 11th step, "results count in recovery." I haven't seen the results that one would expect for the amount of income that's passed through that office over the years. The controversies and controversial issues that have come perhaps as a result of perhaps me, or the tension created in different philosophies. Do we want to carry the message to the addict who still suffers? Well yeah, we do, but we only want to do that when we can do it with computers and...

BS: Dave, let Stu say what he believes. In view of what you've said, what do you believe, Stu?

ST: I believe that there's a business aspect to Narcotics Anonymous, and that's why you have a corporate arm. I believe that corporate arm operates in that capacity. I don't believe the corporate arm is a beneficiary of the fellowship. I believe actually the reverse. I believe that the corporate arm solely services the spiritual arm. It has no other function other than to protect, and pursue the aims of the fellowship of NA. It has no other...

BS: Don't you understand, though, the reason we're on the phone? There have been some serious breaches of fellowship trust? And like I said on the last phone call, that these are not mysterious, will of the whist, variations on how people who live in different parts of the United States express themselves in English? The severe disorders...

R: Hey everybody, this is Roy. I think what I'm hearing, and I realize that I'm just being brought in on this whole process here, is that we really do have sort of a difference of

opinion. I have to tend to agree with Jim at this point, though. We do have five things that were written down here. If we're going to progress at all, and maybe some day we'll reach perfection, but let's go with progress for now, maybe we ought to try to do what we can with these five issues here for today.

I have one question regarding number one off the bat: What background statement? Either I didn't get that, or it's part of this document, and I just haven't been able to pick it up.

GH: Your copy doesn't have it, Roy, and I apologize. Neither you nor Billy received the background statement.

GD: I don't see anything either.

GH: You should have that, Dave from what was sent before.

GD: I didn't get the question answered, when I asked for the philosophical differences.

ST: The problem that I have, and one of the reason why that motivated me to pursue a trust document, is that the corporate arm can never be the leading arm. What you've had over the years is the corporate arm being the leading arm, and it can't do that. The only way not to do that, is to design an instrument that allows the other arm to orchestrate and direct the corporate arm. It doesn't exist today. That's what you have to do to get the other head in charge of both. Otherwise, the corporate arm is always going to be so efficient, it's going to gobble up. You need to have hoops that the corporate arm goes through to gain its direction and its latitude. Without it, it would just do it based on the personalities. You've got to take all that shit out of there.

GD: Well, Stu's got his trustee hat on now.

ST: Did you really say that Dave?

JM: I think the further we get away from issues and the closer that we get to philosophy, the less difference we're going to find between ourselves. Perhaps there really is something we can do here. Perhaps the experiences that I've had in the past make me more paranoid than I need to be right now. I really believe that we'll demonstrate our

similarities and our differences by attending to our agenda.

ST: Let's get back to the background statement. One of the reasons I pulled that out, I felt that possibly Bo or someone else could possibly take this background statement and articulate another one that describes the background as it stands. So we have a comparable section. I don't know what anybody else thinks, but that's one of the reasons why I wanted the group to see this. If there are parts of this that are workable and others that aren't, then others can be added. We need to get other work done. I wasn't part of any of those literature committees, so someone else will have to do that.

JM: At the risk of monopolizing time, let me offer an introductory paragraph: "During the years between 1978 and 1982, N.A. began the process of self-definition and maturity that would allow our fellowship to become a worldwide force for recovery from addiction. A relatively small group of people, ordinary recovering addicts, developed our fellowship's first significant item of property, our "Basic Text," the book entitled "Narcotics Anonymous." This collection of N.A. members worked as part of the literature subcommittee of the World Service Conference. The four major writing and editing literature conferences were located both centrally and in geographic extremes across the fellowship, so the maximum number of N.A. members could attend and participate. Every member who wanted to help write our book had the opportunity. The committee eventually numbered in the hundreds of active participating members. Each had a role and a voice in the content of our Basic Text. During this time, the members of the fellowship of which they were representative, developed a trust arm with the service structure, that the results of the book would be used in the same spirit and manner it was developed. This is the basis and foundation of our literature trust document."

BS: That's as good as it gets, I think.

ST: You've got that written down?

JM: Yeah, I can't rattle something like that off without writing it down.

ST: You need to send it to us.

JM: I shall.

R: Does it reflect anything similar to what you had originally put down, Stu?

ST: I think the document we have starts from World Convention.

JM: The document you have illustrates the office's relationship with the fellowship. Much of what's in that document, much of what's in the existing background, needs to be factored into a final background statement. I'm just changing the focus with this introductory paragraph to that one special point in time when that one special thing happened that has...

ST: ...everything that's comes in the background statement. I got it. Okay, we need that.

BS: Anyway, I'll be happy to help with that, Stu, although I think was Jim read is terrific. What did you think of my input?

ST: I read it. I liked it. I didn't know how to...I really didn't go beyond looking for differences, but I didn't know how to factor it into the background statement.

BS: The thing that seems to be evolving in some of my talks with Jim and Dave, and just in general as a result of working on that input, was that there was a verbal trust statement that we told people so commonly that we didn't realize what it was. But it went like, "there will be no by-lines, no royalties paid to us for doing this work, and the proceeds will go to the fellowship forever in the form of services." That was basically our operating, verbal trust document agreement. That was delivered to lit workers by the hundreds. Since they liked that, they came and did the work.

GD: That is a quasi contract.

ST: The problem that we have with it is there's a three-tier situation where you have the world service office, and then you have the collection of people of the conference, and then you have the members at large. We're trying to write to capture the whole thing. In some cases, the office is not the voice of the fellowship, it's not an attempt. It's hard. You have the collection of all the regions everywhere that give the direction to the office. The office does work for the whole.

BS: Let me hone in on that, with the support of this working group on the phone. Because I think that's a very primary, that's a really big question. We've always thought of the office as being the primary service center, and every time it's broken out of that role of service center, and became publisher, became governor, minutes or motions or elections or reports seemed to be waived for or again the question in preparation, anytime any of

that came up, it's been the office's disservice, and really injurious to the common welfare and body of Narcotics Anonymous. I sort of feel like you agree with that, that the office is the primary service center, not a publishing agency. If the office is a publishing agent, then it could go into the movie business.

ST: Right, but it's a publishing agency as the fellowship says to publish its work, ITS work, total work. It doesn't do anything without...

GD: I think that's skirting the issue that Bo writes.

BS: I hope we can clear up that. I've listed four things here, there's another agenda, but I really think that the four points that stand out at this point, and maybe if nothing else, it'll clarify something for others: The fellowship owns the Basic Text. And all the names and properties, and all our literature and all our stuff that's going to come. And that needs to be held in trust, however it's held. It can be held by an agent in trust, but it's not done for hire, it's not the kind of product that's subject to the bump and grind of the market place. Our stuff has to be the kind to reach into our people in the middle of the night when they want to use, and the book's there and their sponsor just died. As opposed to the kind of literature that the local hospital may like. We have a different image.

GD: I've spent a lot of time in the music business, and I understand publishing, and I understand royalties and all this stuff. We're still...

BS: Dave, the reason I take time to bring up this, is the key word is "publishing." Publishing has come up a lot in these trust documents in the first few pages, and I hit them with a highlighter everywhere I see the word "publish, publisher, publishing agency." Even line 23 on page one, it says, "The World Lit Committee specifically conveyed the copyright." All I remember is that the office was going to copyright the Basic Text so that they could protect the copyright and distribute it to the fellowship.

ST: Anytime you print, that's publishing.

BS: I know, but the "specifically conveyed" and all that stuff. If that happened, they sure kept it quiet. All we know is we did the work on faith, we turned it in, kept the faith, and there's been some problems, and we want an end to the problems. Those other items, I'm going to recommend that maybe we could just take a quick statement from everybody on questions numbered 1,2,3,4,5. Try to make that our primary focus of what we're trying to do on the phone here. I think the verbal trust statement needs to be emphasized in question number one. What needs to be stated in this section, is that I think this is a long

overdue formalization of a verbal literature trust. That's what I think. What do the other guys think?

GD: I'm flying blind, but I kind of figure the same way. I understand that a company needs to make money. They need to have help, bottom line, they need to have all these things. I'm not so sure what we do about that. I'm not suggesting that we do away with the WSO, I'm suggesting that we do some radical reorganization of it. How many people do you need to do the job? Do you need 42 or do you need 1500?

JM: Let's wait until we get to number 2, Dave, I've got some input about that.

BS: Let's hear from the other people on number one.

JM: Let's hear if there's any more discussion on number one.

BS: What's Billy got to say about number one?

BA: Number one? I agree with Bo's statement, basically. I have real problems with the whole trust, where I believe in the basic of literature statements made between '79 to '81 when I was involved with the fellowship early in my recovery. I believe that the WSO, what it was supposed to be doing, and what transpired afterwards are two different things. It was just supposed to be a basic statement of our eighth tradition, that it was a primary service center. It was not supposed to end up with ownership, but was supposed to have a trust to protect our literature from being printed by outside agencies like Hazelden, Compicare, or any other hospital or institution. Our literature was not supposed to be a profit making venture. Those are the sort of things I'd like to see in our opening statement.

BS: I think there are addicts today who support those viewpoints.

GD: The judge in court steered us away from five counts. He kind of looked at that stuff, and said that yeah, probably a real good case could be made that all of this stuff is public domain. The literature itself could be taken into the public domain. I think that was the intention of the authors. Somehow, we've got to split the difference between if we choose to continue to have the corporate arm being supported from the literature, the creative output of anonymous members throughout the fellowship, then we need to split that difference?

You've got \$25.00 sweats, and jewelry and all this stuff going on, and people making money left and right on Narcotics Anonymous, printing the stuff on you-name-it. Nobody with the exception of "Creative Arts," which was a corporate entity that could be sued by another corporate entity, nobody has bothered to do convention corporations and what have you. So here we go with somebody who wants to produce a Basic Text, at cost, and deliver that to the addict who still suffers, and this is the one who gets sued. To me, that is kind of indefensible. Again, I'm probably off on a tangent again, but I'm not hearing in this conversation, to the degree that would make me comfortable, is this wide gap between the corporate and the creative.

BA: That's number two, David. "Does the fellowship direct the WSO to administrative trust? Does the WSC act as the voice? It's not how, who or what, or does?" That's what Jim was saying earlier, or I would have continued it to there next. Maybe someone needs to read the questions so Dave knows all five questions.

BS: Why don't we hear from Billy Eason, Bob McDonough, and Becky on item one before we move on to number 2.

BE: I'm Billy Eason, and I wasn't privilege to the original statement, but I really liked the paragraph that Jim read. We need to decide whether we are a corporate entity or a spiritual entity. That's my opinion, and I am familiar with the literature process from '79 to '82. Things were a lot different then than they are now. I'm confused about what George said earlier about motions. When I look at motions #112 and #113, he said that they would be null and void if this were adopted, is that correct?

GH: What I was saying, Billy, is that eventually the trust document becomes our permanent document, so if there are differences that exist between past positions, including the most recent, and what the fellowship adopts in the trust document, it will supersede the previous decisions.

BS: Good point.

GD: Next.

BS: Bob or Becky? Did Bob ever come on?

BM: I liked the part that you read as the introduction. My comments from all the discussion that we've had, I guess I see it someplace in the middle. I don't believe that we

can't be a spiritual fellowship and create a corporate service arm to serve us. I don't think we have to decide whether we want to be a corporate fellowship or a spiritual fellowship. I think we are a spiritual fellowship, but I don't think that means we can't have service.

JM: Let's go on to two. I'll read it, that'll give me something to do. I get bored when I can't talk all the time and monopolize the conversation. Don't understand? I'm an addict. "How does the fellowship direct the service office as it administers the trust?" "Does the World Service Conference act as that voice? If not, how, who, or what does?"

My first brief note was new direct method. I'll go into that if anybody would like to hear it. There's been a lot of talk lately about an alternative service structure. It bothers me and it bothers a lot of people. It bothers me positive and negative. We need an alternative channel within the existing service structure so that the responsibility becomes more direct. The very indirect route that's now available should be changed. Much good should not be changed, much good can happen as the fellowship passes direction from member to group to area to region to WSC. However, a more responsive, more specialized, and more direct channel should be opened. Every issue regarding the fellowship's property, every issue, should be finally decided by a group poll, directly between the N.A. groups and the WSO Board of Directors.

GD: Absolutely.

JM: Very general policy decisions should be made through the existing structure, and then parameters for daily operations between the WSC should be made by a) WSO Board of Directors. I think the WSO Board of Directors needs to be established with direct yearly elections and reconfirmations of half that WSO Board by an act of the World Service Conference, the other half of WSO Board elected directly from regions. The election procedure of WSC, supposing 12 Board of Directors, four of them would be elected each year to serve only one three-year term. There would also need to be a provision that the conference to remove any of the remaining nine.

Then the election procedure by regions, supposing 12 Board of Directors, elected directly by 60 regions in a service area, each region would elect a director for a five-year term every five years, four years of that term as an advisory director welcome to attend Board of Director meetings at the expense of the region, able to participate in motions and discussion, but not vote, and one year of active directorship. So of the 60, only 12 would be voting and equal the WSC directors. Active directorship, attending Board of Directors meetings at the expense of WSO, to wit, participate as a voting director. Some lottery situation could be developed so that when the active role came to each region, could be a term. It could be cumbersome to develop that. However, if the WSC, as just a side note, were an effective voice for the fellowship, we wouldn't have the current problems that

we've got fellowship-wide. The statement that WSC anywhere near mirrors group conscience of Narcotics Anonymous, has been an absurdity for some time. Maybe it always was. Maybe it always will be, I don't know. I know that it distresses me and others greatly now.

Additionally, I think that this particular thing like was originally planned, needs a literature trust fellowship panel, which should be formed to consist initially of five folks who were among those who helped to write the book. This panel would be charged with three responsibilities: A) to solicit and act upon mature fellowship input regarding the conservation, maintenance, and development of our literature and property; B) to be a non-voting participant at WSO Board of Director meetings, with veto power on actions affecting the fellowship's literature property. Essentially, let me clarify what I mean by veto power: to postpone changes until a poll of the groups could occur, that's all I mean; and C) to foster open fellowship-wide communication and continuation of the process that effectively developed our literature.

How would this panel be selected? One suggestion is willing nominees could be volunteers from those registered at world literature conferences. All the members that were registered at world literature conferences could be contacted and elect the panel by a mail ballot. I would suggest a 12-year term rather than life, as was previously mentioned. Replacements to this panel could possibly be selected by the panel so that there would be a continuity of service.

GD: We're looking at an administering structure that is equally representative of the varying...Each element of our service structure, including the fellowship has parochial concerns. The trustees have their concerns, the admin has their concerns, the Board of Directors has their concerns, and the fellowship has its concerns. Then you throw the conference in there, and when we're discussing the conference, I tend to echo everything Jim says. I think everything needs to be direct when we're talking about significant decisions that will affect our literature or our properties. It has to be direct.

I'm not upset with the idea of an alternate service structure. I'm not upset with it, because I see the possibility of working along a parallel track and being able to learn from the mistakes that our current structure has made, and to not have the constrictions that have been placed on the current structure. Maybe in developing an alternate structure we learn something. Maybe it will all merge somewhere down the road, that we'll finally get enough information and share enough experience, strength and hope within the context of the two structures.

We're looking at international issues, service structures in different parts of the world, this and that. I noticed something in the minutes: Are we a North American fellowship

with worldwide outreach? If that's the case, then we make the rules and that's the way it is. It doesn't matter what anybody else, anywhere else, wants to do. That will cause even more divisiveness that we currently have. We have to become okay.

So if we must get this multiple-tiered trust organization together that will provide the checks and balances that will create policy, create a structure and will eliminate the necessity for all these parochial concerns and bickering back and forth...

BS: What does "parochial" mean?

GD: It means the way things are in your town.

JM: That means I do shit like a farmer.

GD: Right. And I do shit like who knows? And you do shit like you do, and each one of us because we have control issues, or we think that our way is best, that keeps that tension going. You have that tension between the service arms of Narcotics Anonymous. You have all this infighting in the service structure, and when you take somebody from the fellowship who maybe wants to be involved in area service or something like that, and they look up the tree and they go, "Oh shit, this is nuts" Everything they try to make an entrance into it, the energy that's going on in all of this other stuff, it's like a forcefield on Star Trek. They bump up against it and are repelled.

If we use that kind of a single board made up of representatives to represent all these interests, then I say let's do that. Five years from now, or ten years from now, we could modify that too. It may become unnecessary. There are contractors out there for everything. They say this is the cheapest bid, we can get it to the people for the cheapest bid, and that's what they do. I don't say adopt what they do, but I say that there are lessons they have learned. When bootleg literature was coming up, they sent a letter out that was very nice. If you find that the literature suits your needs, fine. We're looking at a tone and a way of handling. That's got to change too. It's the kind of heavy handed ways that the difference in N.A. today are...

BS: Well, world level positions feel powerful. It takes a trusted servant mentality to not buy into that feeling of power and remain a servant worthy of trust. Can we hear from some of the other people? My answer to #2 is group conscience is the answer to all that. It's strange but group conscience might be at the world service conference on some items or some issues, and if it's not, then those items and issues continue to be a problem. Like the target area we're dealing with. We're functioning as a group conscience right here and

now.

GD: Well, I've got one comment. Looking at the minutes, you've got votes that are 23 to 51, 21 to 55.

BS: You mean this year's minutes.

GD: Yeah, this year's minutes, and I'm sorry that you don't have them. The point I'm making with this is that there are four ways to rule on a vote: Is it a 2/3, or is a majority? I guess that this was considered to be 2/3, but you're looking at 23 to 20 regions that thought that in their conscience, we're talking about a third of the fellowship taking out the trustee and others votes. What I'm trying to say is, you're looking at maybe 40% of the fellowship that thought that this stuff was a good idea, motions 113 - 115. That to me is indicative that maybe on issues such as this, the fellowship needs to be a voice. Group conscience needs to be the voice.

BS: That's sort of my point. If it's dealt with successfully, great. And when it's not, it's still group conscience that has to deal with these matters one way or another. Whether it's through one structural mechanism or another one. It doesn't matter who sweeps the floor, it's got to be done sooner or later. Let's hear from the other people on item #2.

R: Yeah, Roy here. I've been, to be quite frank about it, I've been sitting here sort of in amazement. Again, I need to apologize for a lot of the ignorance that I possess. Whatever happened to "Keep it simple?" I've never lost the faith that this is a spiritual fellowship. I have to believe that the fellowship, group conscience, however you want to describe that, that the fellowship has a responsibility. The fellowship has a responsibility to see to it that its trusted servants are functional. The mechanism that we have today, which is the WSC, and I believe that the WSO is sort of a creation of the WSC as it is now, that in regard to #2, how does the fellowship direct the World Service Office as it administers the trust? It does that already through group conscience. There's been some discussion and some thoughts that maybe the fellowship is ill-informed as to its capability to truly make a decision that affects the WSO through the conference. I don't know if that's true or not. It appears as though the conference, the one that I have been to in the early 80s and this past one, never had an absolute consensus, maybe only on one or two issues of the entire conference that ever comes up anyway. Each issue has an impact different to each particular region. I don't know if there's a better mechanism out there, simpler. There's probably a better one, but maybe not for our purpose.

The WSC, if we're irresponsible in asking the people to represent us, then I don't know who has to pay that price. Maybe this is kind of against what a lot of people are saying, but I have to guess that even with the things that you read, Jim, it seems mighty

complicated to me. To come up with 60 people involved with the WSO. God loves any kind of a decision that could be made from that group, but I have my feeling on the first two sections (If not how, who, what?), I don't know. Again, I'll just make the statement that I'm sort of ignorant, and I'm being a little boggled by what's going on here. If it was kept a little more simple, I might be able to follow in a little better. I'm just going to kind of sit back and listen to what a lot of the other folks have to say.

GD: Well, thank you for sharing that. When somebody reads something like that by us, and we don't have it in front of us to study, all that input is overwhelming. I would like to see as a document, so you could input, I could input. Basically I'm a policy kind of nut. There's a lot of things in there that sounded good, but it was a little too complex, too fast for me to absorb. I'm not scared of complexity so much, as long as what seems to be complex sometimes is really simplicity being manifested. It seemed to me that there was a lot of real good basic ideas in what he was reading. In all fairness to you and to Jim and to myself and all the other people that are on the line, that don't absorb things that fast, we probably need to take a look at those suggestions.

I'm for something like 12, 12, and 12, since 12 seems to be a pretty cool number. Like we have 12 people directly elected from the fellowship, in maybe a zone way, and then 12 people elected from the conference, and then we have the Board of Directors. The trustees, I don't know where they would fit into this, maybe a six director committee, and six trustees.

BS: Before we go wandering down Policy Lane, Roy, one thing that Stu said that was most encouraging, I think to Jim and myself, and Dave too if he hasn't heard it before that point: In Harrisburg, when Stu said there came a day when the WSO Board looked up and somebody said, "Hey, what's all this stuff we're doing? Did we plan this? Was this talked about?" Stu said that the WSO was in process of reevaluating itself. Since then, Stu is no longer acting Executive Director, and he's moved from the WSO Board to the Board of Trustees. But still, that is a very interesting viewpoint, because a lot of people who've been following what's been going on in world in the last five, six or seven years, were concerned. It's good to hear that the WSO Board was into re-evaluation. But damn right, it would be great if "Keep it simple" would work, but it's very hard to get some simple answers to apply to certain complex issues and questions. Maybe what we're working on will become simple later on, but right now, it's still complex.

JM: I'm a little bit like George was when he tackled world services. What I see, observe isn't working to my satisfaction, so I'm trying to learn from him, this is a lot of stuff just like he used to do, and thanks for the inspiration. I'm going to send it off and share for what it's worth, maybe it's nothing, maybe it'll help. My focus on 12, comes from the fact that I had 12 years yesterday.

GD: Who all is on this? Stu and George, are you still there? Megan?

GH: Yeah, I was waiting. I had my hand up.

GD: We need video conferencing.

GH: The thing that everyone seems to be pointing out. I still have a concern that I voiced on the last conference call. A good deal of what we're talking about needs to show the trust of the fellowship with its service boards. This document was never meant to show that in any way. This document would simply show the service structure relationship with its service center, and how the administration of the trust would take place. All the different things that we have brought up are things that to different degrees, I'm sure we all have agreement about that things need to be changed. However, this document, in my belief anyway, is not the appropriate place to bring those changes about.

GD: Why not?

GH: You have a great deal of problem with the service structure, and we need to take care of that. But again, that's the limitations I think we feel in drawing up this document. Those decisions are going to have to be made by the fellowship. I don't know many times in our history in Narcotics Anonymous has made a group by group decision. That is a whole different concept altogether. We thought maybe that point this year that they had adopted motion #15, but it's a completely different concept from what we currently have. There should be two documents. One is something, for lack of a better name, a conference charter that shows the relationship and the trust that the fellowship conveys in the service structure. Then there's a literature trust with service structure in understanding the trust from the fellowship through ways to the appropriate body to take care of it.

GD: Hold on a sec, let me change the tape. I want to get all this wisdom down.

GH: I don't think that we're going to be able to proceed with the idea that we can take care of all of Narcotics Anonymous ills in this document.

GD: Again, I have to go back to something Jim told me a lot of years ago, argue for your limitations and they'll be yours forever. It seems like all of this stuff is either we're developing two documents concurrently, or what we are actually attempting to do here and nobody's comfortable enough to say so, is we're trying to develop a new structure as

we speak.

GH: If that is true, we need to admit that and get that on the table.

BS: Well, I know that in my report on the structure that really got into a couple of other things, but an interesting thing came out that a social movement like ours goes through four separate distinct phases. One, sell it. One is popular. One is formalization. One is institutional. The book was written by a bunch of zealots and in the hurry, the lit trust was not properly written down and defined carefully. Now, there's admission of a popular agreement that there's a need to be addressed here, and now we're formalizing that trust document. That is very central to our entire structure and our philosophy and how Narcotics Anonymous really exists in application instead of theory.

Jim reminded me over this past weekend we went to Cleveland about just how many oldtimers in the late 70s and early 80s were confirmed members of other fellowships and were very surprised to see dedication among the N.A. people. The reason I bring that up is it reminds me of just how deeply I had to walk a razor's edge to stay in service and stay effective while I was upsetting these oldtimers by doing what they regarded as impossible, and possibly improper. In Narcotics Anonymous, where we're enormously much more free today.

JM: Relating back to the question, "How does the fellowship direct the office as it administers the trust?" and following that up with the question, "Does the World Service Conference act as that voice?" My response to that would be, in an ideal world and an ideal situation, yes. In the practicality and reality of today, no one would be on the phone together. "If not, how, who, or what does?" I don't know that I've made a viable proposition, but I really think that this is a significant area we need to work on. However, I think it will clear it up a whole lot, unless someone's got a burning desire, if we just leave this hanging in the air with the discussion that we've had now, and move onto #3. I think #3 might give us some illustration of our real differences and where we need to come together on this document and whether or not we need to use this document to institute a new method of fellowship direction of the World Service Office or not.

GD: Well, would somebody be kind to read it?

JM: Let's see if we can get a consensus, Dave, on if people agree with that statement I just made or not.

GD: I'm going to have to tell my roommate I'm going to be on the phone for a while, so get a consensus.

ST: Yeah, I'm okay.

GD: You were kind of de facto chairperson here, and I wanted to not steal that from you.

ST: I think we should move on.

BM: Just to throw this in, one of the reasons I've been bouncing in and off the phone, and I thought that the call was at 6:00 tonight, and I'm sure that's why we don't have McDonough. The memo just said 6:00 p.m., and since it came from you, I thought that was Pacific Time. I'm sure that's what Bob McDonough thought. I tried to call George earlier and we missed each other.

JM: Well I feel pretty Pacific.

ST: Let's go on and talk a little bit about #3, and I'll read it for you. There is a question as to the assignment of the parties of the trust: "Who is the beneficiary, trustor, and trustee? Who are these specifically?" One of the reasons why I picked this out of Jim's input: He offered two levels, one being the beneficiary being the membership...The beneficiary being the trustor. Do that at two specific levels, one being the addict who still suffers, and one being the member. That's why I basically picked up that difference. The question that I asked at that particular time was the trustor had to be some entity that could in some fashion, direct the trustee, or being that the member at large and the addict that still suffers, don't have any real parameters around, a real entity. It would be hard to identify them as a specific trustor to direction. The original document was organized as the beneficiary being the members.

JM: Let me clarify where I come from in this input: I think what we're talking about here, when we talk about, and I like to call it the tangible property of the fellowship. What we're talking about here, everything that is our tangible property are symbols, indications, the written word, vehicles that we as members of Narcotics Anonymous use to fulfill our individual 12th Step. We carry the message to the addict that still suffers. If these are the vehicles that we use to carry the message to the addict who still suffers, in that, they are so extremely precious to us. There are definitions on property, of what we are and who we are and how we function, and how we function as a group in our 5th Tradition. There are the vehicles of the primary purpose, and therefore the definition. I just see the reality of the situation is that the trustor is the owner, that spiritual fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous who is and can be the only owner, the only entity, however definable or

discernable, that has and holds this property, and therefore the trustor.

I see the trustee as the entire service structure culminating with the agent's service center, WSO, Inc. The beginning of that trustee is the GSR, the ASC, etc., on down through the service structure through the World Service Conference, which makes specific guideline instructions to the agent (the publisher), the legal entity, the copyright defender, etc., WSO, Inc., the corporate arm. That is how we function, that the trustee of our property, of that thing that defines us tangibly in society, culminates, ends with an agent, a corporate arm designed solely to serve us. In that, I see I concur with those who say we need spiritual and corporate.

The beneficiary is obvious. The beneficiary is that "addict who still suffers" in the 12th step and the "addict who still suffers" in the 5th Tradition. Maybe that's you and I, maybe that's somebody out on the street, we can't be specific in definition of that beneficiary. It certainly isn't the trustor. It certainly isn't the owner, because we need to give it away in order to keep it. Except in that, this vehicle is necessary, the integrity of this vehicle needs to be maintained because our recovery depends upon it, (giving it away in order to keep it). I believe that we need to mirror reality in this document and define clearly "trustor" as the spiritual fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous.

U: The way that I approach it is that every member, whether it be the addict who still suffers, is of benefit as a result of whatever the properties or whatever the trusts are. So in my viewpoint in looking at it, they're the ones that gain the benefit of the service structure that they created. The "trustor" is the entity that they place their trust in. The administrator of that trust, the person who carries out the wishes of the trustor. That's the way that I structurally see it.

GD: This is David. I see a two-tiered definition of beneficiary. The varying elements that we've talked about here, there may be overlapping or interconnecting definitions that apply. It may take some creativity to allow our minds to expand a little bit and tell the lawyers that "this isn't a boilerplate kind of arrangement that we're making here, it is a little eclectic," but once we all agree to it and sign it is, it is in fact binding. I see the beneficiary and the owner as the same. In other words, addicts that come in perpetuity and addicts that were here. We own the property. We are also beneficiaries. We benefit in a number of ways.

BS: Because you own your car, you drive your car.

GD: Right. Spiritual ways that as Jim was sharing about with the 12th Step and the 5th Tradition, which to me should be the overriding guiding principle in everything we do. Reality is reality and we have to have some kind of a corporate entity. How we develop that and administer those things, the trustor and the trustee may have some overlapping areas of responsibility. But we need to be a little bit looser and freer in our thinking if we're going to have a document that will stand the legal test of time and the spiritual test of time. I frankly, with my illness, I don't know if I'm going to live to see these things rectified. I know I've mentioned that before, but I'm listening to a number of people here today saying...to the limits of our ability accommodate and know all these potentialities. I am firmly in the camp of that the fellowship owns it, and any document that we were to come up with, if that wasn't the basis of the document, then I don't see how. Maybe you could show me how I could get behind it. I don't see how.

BS: Well, the real rub here seems to be not who owns it so very much per se, because I believe a lot of people agree philosophically, but that ownership not be seen as the same as it has been so that the feeling out in the fellowship is that the office owns it, it belongs to WSO. It's a feeling of loss, whereas the fellowship...

GD: One thing I know for sure is that I don't want the Office to own it, and I don't want the conference to own it.

U: Isn't that the nature of the fiduciary relationship? What you articulate is the fellowship's ability to revoke it.

BS: What I'm trying to do is direct the topic out in the open and put it on the table.

U: If the fellowship has the ability to revoke the trust...

BS: Yeah, through a complicated action. We've had some really rough things happen the last five or six years.

BA: Hold it. Let's get for real here, okay? I get real frustrated when I'm listening. You're all being soft and nice to each other now, okay? But if we were in a conference setting, it would be devastating. People would be having their hearts ripped out like I did before, and the bottom line is real specific. Jim talked about it as the trustee and the trustor, it's real simple. The fellowship itself owns its own literature. That's always been what we've

been brought up to believe. I was brought up to believe that World Service Office was only going to be a fiduciary rights corporation to hold our property for us. That's what we were brought up to believe. This conference...I'm real fucking pissed off because I know there's dishonesty, because World Service Office's Conference lead the fellowship to believe that they are the owners, and reaffirmed that damn thing at the conference. So who the hell are we bullshitting here? You proved that there. This section violated quasi contractual relationships. Always violated those relationships with the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous.

ST: No, it didn't.

BA: It always has.

ST: Look in it, it says the owner...of the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. That's all it says. That's what it says. And when you do that...

BA: Stu, once you get me tapes from the conference, I will continue this conversation. Right now, I want off this phone, because I will not continue without the tapes. I want to listen and know what we're talking about. I want to meet you face to face. Simple facts. My heart's been ripped out this year on a continuous basis. Until we sit down on a face to face basis and iron this stuff out, any meeting, not phone call conversations, where we can sit down and go over the tapes and justifications and rationalizations are put out of the way and the principles are put forward and the personalities are thrown out the fucking door, are we going to get somewhere. I do not trust you, personally.

ST: Well, fine. I don't really trust you either, so we're even.

BA: Simple facts.

JM: Hey, Billy...

BA: No "hey, Billy," I need to get off this phone call right now and call my sponsor.

JM: Before you go Billy, I'm going to suggest down the road here in a minute or two, that if there's any prosecution for infringement that only belongs outside the fellowship and cases of problems inside the fellowship need to be dealt with like other tradition compromises by the Board of Trustees, with soft, gentle letters. I just wanted you to

know that before you go.

BA: Okay. I need to get off this phone now, okay? Do me a favor. I'll pay you for the tapes and the mailings. Let me know what they cost so I can get them from you. Thank you. Bye.

GD: Okay, moving right along.

R: This is Roy. It appears as though the actual definition of trustor, trustee, and beneficiary is in question. Reading the definitions that you sent me, George, in the document. It appears that the only definition that was relatively close without reading any of the input from Jim, was the identification of the trustee. We had some discussion about there being a two-tiered or a multi-faceted trustor or beneficiary... We can't have two up at one end at the trustorship, and two at the beneficiaries, and two as trustee. In reading Jim's input, I think it was on the second page, that fourth paragraph that he had listed there, that really made a lot of sense to me. It really put into perspective the spiritual nature of the whole issue here, on who the owner, the trustee, the beneficiary... it just seemed to make a lot of sense. As we move on into the next thing on your agenda, #4, I had a couple of problems I'll to discuss when we get to that point. I've got to tell everybody that this definition as Jim wrote it is much more sensible to me, much easier to understand and swallow. Maybe it's not quite as...

BS: Roy, would you spell out what you like about Jim's item?

R: Sure. In the "parties of a traditional trust document are trustor, trustee, and beneficiary. We don't have any problem with that. In which case, it indicates here that Narcotics Anonymous owns the property and is the trustor." Being part of the literature committee and part of the effort in creating the book, that's kind of the way that I understood it to be at that given time, was that none of us were to benefit anything other than in continued recovery and spiritual good things, and that really the only people that were going to be beneficiaries of this whole things were us and the new people, which is any member when they say they're a member, etc. There's also another sort of unwritten trustor here who as I recall, Bo, in a lot of the conferences when we talked highly of the Higher Power, and that we were trusted servants of that power. Therefore, we should all be included as trustors and beneficiaries. To kind of close that loop, to be at the beginning and the end, is just that little analogy of owning the car and driving it. It just makes too much sense to say that that's now valid. As Jim's indication of who the trustee is, if the trustee is in fact the WSO, and the WSO is created from the boards and committees directly responsible to the trustor and the beneficiary, then that just completes the whole circle.

BS: Thank you.

ST: Looking at it, I'm trying to think of a way to reorganize it, but it just seems kind of weird to have the service structure serve membership benefitting in being a benefactor. It kind of feels wrong.

R: As far as being the beneficiary, Stu?

ST: Yeah, being a benefit. You're usually doing something to benefit someone else. It just kind of has a weird feeling.

GD: It's certainly a different way of looking at it than we are used to. When we're speaking of the World Service Office and its employees and directors, who are in some way, shape, or form... To me there's kind of like a dichotomy here. I don't mean to put anything more on this than what it is, but it's kind of like an honor and a privilege and what have you to be able to fly out a couple times, three or four times, and eat and things be taken care of as a Director of the Board. The employees certainly are, if we take into literalism the 8th and 9th tradition, and we understand the 12 steps work, and if not, something that we pay for, it would appear to me that each and every employee of the office is directly benefitting through medical, dental, insurance, job security, feeding their families and that kind of stuff from the creative efforts of members of the Fellowship that are not.

ST: But do the trusted servants?

JM: I feel that when I was the greatest recipient of the message of Narcotics Anonymous was during those times that I was of service. I don't think that's a foreign concept at all. As a trusted servant, I've derived my greatest benefit from the message of N.A.

BS: Let's say if a group had a new custom in the new N.A. Fellowship to give a newcomer a credit card for a week, and a plane ticket anywhere, and put them up in a hotel, they would sure be benefitting like crazy. Stu, you've got to face the fact that that's how it looks out in the provinces, pal.

ST: I understand that, but let me throw this one out at you. Thirty weekends a year...

BS: I understand that, baby. You tried to tell me about that one, and I understand.

ST: If I get a trip somewhere, that's wonderful.

BS: I know, you go to New Jersey, but you really enter a hotel and you leave four days later, I know that you have to deal with appearances also.

GD: We're prodding around with some sensitive personal areas. I, for one, was a member of World PI in 1984 and 1985. I came into the service structure in the heyday and the melee, and it was different. Something changed around '86. I began to reevaluate did I want to do this. Today, I wouldn't want to be an RSR. I wouldn't want to be a trustee. I wouldn't want to be an employee of the office. None of those positions are taking away the fact that my region might think that I was a wonderful guy and wanted to send me out there because they trusted me. Taking that and bringing that into the equation, I don't know why we need all the traffic. In my own personal recovery, I had to evaluate what was it about me that made me want to be this or want to be that. I'm just trying to illustrate that we are on sensitive territory, and I'm sure there's different reasons and motivations that everybody has for what they do. I'm just trying to point to the reality.

The reality is that everybody who makes a salary in Narcotics Anonymous as a result of the creative spirit, is benefitting in their own personal lives in their own personal way. That's just real.

ST: There's no doubt about that, Dave, I agree wholeheartedly that an employee benefits from...But the problem I have is the trusted servants. To me, service is giving, and I never look at service as a form of getting something.

GD: Stu, I agree with that. But we're looking now at travel policies and plane tickets are paid for and this and that. Initially, my experience has been in the early days of service, my own personal experience was that you called somebody that lived 100 miles away and they picked you up, or you hitchhiked and you got there. I know that was hard and cumbersome at times, and it cost a great degree of personal resources, and I know why we set up that policy. That policy was so that we could have the people most qualified to serve serving and not have to be financially over-burdened. There has been a subtle shift in, I'd say across the board, but in my perception, there's been a subtle shift across the board in our service structure that has made it one of now it's convenient and attractive and comfortable to serve, for all servants from the RSR, and even some areas, ASRs get overnight expenses. I know they do in Florida. They stay in fine hotels. There's an element that is there that we have to deal with, we have to look at. I'm sure that that's A) a personal recovery issue for the servants, and B) also a recovery and responsibility issue

for the electing body.

JM: On that note, it's kind of unique how each next item seems to lead us out of the tangle of the previous item.

BS: Let me throw in my term from the last tape to this one. The problem there being conflict of interest. That people would want those jobs, want those positions, want those plane tickets, want those hotels, want those dinners and adulation, money, property, and prestige, and that would in some way compromise their service and create conflict against the 5th Tradition, against our primary purpose, against N.A. message in N.A. literature. Against "let's change the book to where we can sell more copies to the hospitals. Then that extra income will justify making the changes regardless of what the fellowship wants or even if they know about it. We can always confuse them at the conference."

GD: 950 changes between the 3rd Edition Revised and the 4th and 5th Editions.

BS: Nobody quite knows how all this happened, but we know it happened.

ST: Come on, guys. They view to travel is self-centered? That's hard for me to believe.

JM: I really think if we move onto the next one, that we can see some of the real problems that we have here. I guess my main concern wasn't with that, but rather with the fact that we decided years ago that we should have an \$8.00 book to get an office started and we never changed the price back, never rolled the price back when it was appropriate. The real beneficiary, I believe, has been what I'll call "pet projects" of world services that have been on consensus thrust upon the fellowship and funded by these profits. Not that they might not have been advantageous to the fellowship, they might be. It was a misrouting of request and information response, requested services responses. This was funded through these profits. I think if we deal with what ability the office has to effect trust property without prior permission, we'll come up with some input on pricing.

BS: You're talking about like "The Guide to Service" project, \$50,000 for five years, right? That's a quarter of a million dollars.

JM: Yeah, etc., etc.

BS: Who asked for it?

GD: It's a joke.

JM: Etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

BS: Well, I just thought I'd throw in a couple of specifics.

GD: We've squandered millions of dollars and we're no closer to anything.

ST: Some people would say, "Hey, this project sucks," or "This project is okay." Somebody's got to make that determination. I'm in line with you on "The Guide to Service," but the idea is that we're going to have projects, they're either going to be successful or not. Somebody has to determine what these projects are. Hopefully, we get the right people proposing the projects, and the right people carrying them out.

GD: Kevin Fahey said that in his report, when in 1984 in March when they sent out "please don't copy, please don't copy. We're going to do this, we're going to do that." The planned price reduction that he talked about... We have been broken faith with year after year after year, and I told you that I was a GSR who'd just gotten clean when that report came out. I made a motion not to copy literature and to quit buying keytags from the Atlanta Lit Committee. But things have changed. We've got just a trail of broken promises. From ideas and things that have been squandered.

ST: You took on a different approach.

GD: You know how many IP's five cents will produce in America?

ST: Yes.

GD: Do you know how many IP's might produce in India? Our priorities...to me it's mismanagement across the board and bush league bullshit.

BS: Let's not get into namecalling here.

GD: I read a letter once from an AA member that was sent to the trustees that said, "I feel like my 50-year old mother is being raped." That was all the addicts running into the AA meetings. My sentiment and my feelings about what has occurred in the course of services, at least in my short time being clean, I have sentiments that run to that degree. I'm looking at a grand lady, a wonderful and beautiful shining light in the darkness that can go out worldwide. Why is our growth diminishing? What's going on here? There are reasons. There are billions of addicts, and we are not doing the job. We're just not doing the job that we should and could be doing. If we didn't have an office to support and 42 employees to support, if we didn't have a conference that spends a half a million dollars a year for nothing. Would we load up 30 cent books and translate the shit and send it to these places around the world? That's what I'm trying to say.

ST: Well, we do that to a degree. We do send books places.

BS: Hey, that's terrific.

GD: But at \$2.07, or do you charge it off to the office for \$8.00. When you send literature, do you send a pamphlet and charge 1.2 cents, or do you charge it at the retail price?

BS: That's real cute, Dave, but don't jam the point. We're all real glad that stuff goes on, but we just want to see more of it.

BE: I'm looking at item #3 and #4, and I keep going back to #2. To get input on this thing, that's the main concern right now that needs to be straightened out.

BS: The big problem with #2, is WSO administrates the trust, because WSO has had trouble administrating the trust, in the six or seven or eight years now that it's been given the opportunity to do that.

BE: Will you let me finish what I'm trying to say? In Stu's report, in last year's CAR, it talked about previous decision. "Actually, we're not accurately documented and recorded in the conference and subsequently distributed to our members." Second, "the fiduciary relationship of the WSO to the N.A. fellowship is not accurately presented to our

members." I know that's what we're working on now. Third, "the initial reasons surrounding the creation of the fiduciary responsibilities of our properties were also currently not understood." At the conference, in motions #112 and #113, at that point in time before it was voted on, it was requested by Greg whether it's conference business or if the matter should be sent to groups. It was determined by a voice vote that it was conference business, and they asked for a role call vote. The results were 67 yes, 9 no, and 3 abstentions, and that's the point I'm trying to get to.

JM: Yeah, it makes a great deal of sense to me. There's abject misunderstanding of the 9th tradition among RSRs. I believe that's an issue that we need to attend to, just like George specified earlier. The structure needs a revamp. Perhaps my discussion of revamping the structure in this vehicle is inappropriate. Perhaps it is appropriate. I think that first we need to have some kind of consensus of who the parties of this trust are. When we have some kind of consensus who it is, owns the literature, who it is, we owners trust to administer the literature, both primarily and then finally, where we intend the benefit of the literature and all other property to go. Then we'll have an inkling of how we should arrive at decision. If we say the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous that organized spiritual entity is the owner of this property, if we specify that every place that it needs to be specified, that the owner of the property is and only can be the spiritual fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous, then obviously we need a vehicle that's satisfactory for the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous to make decisions regarding this property.

What I hear Billy saying is the vehicle we now have isn't satisfactory. I concur with that. It's not satisfactory because of a rampant misunderstanding of the 9th and 2nd Traditions across the fellowship. Just to illustrate that, a friend of mine just became a member of the H&I committee, spoke to the chairperson who talked about the interpretation of traditions. I think if we as a fellowship are so devoid of quality trusted servants that we must elect someone to the chair of a world service subcommittee who considers interpreting traditions, then we're in sorry shape. That's enough of that tone.

GD: What the group conscience put down in that Basic Text in the original traditions is what we are, at least I feel, morally and spiritually bound to operate under. Even if it's not right, if it's not right, then show us through documentation and an education process, that it's not right. The way to keep the trust is to follow those guidelines, but we throw them away.

BS: Well, worse than that, we went there as disorders, and in our zeal to join rejoin and go on together in the bonds of unity, we don't really sit down and do what we're doing now and discuss it. Pick it apart, and say, "Okay ladies and gentlemen, what went wrong? We don't want that to happen again." That's the beauty of what's going on right now. This is the first significant time I can think of when these issues have been under serious

discussion.

ST: That's true.

BS: They're really not so scary once you're talking about them. It's real scary when you can't talk about them.

ST: That's true. What I'd like to do...

GD: We have #4 and #5 to discuss, don't we?

ST: What I'd like to do on #3 is possibly develop some tasks that revolve around what we discussed, see if we can put it in another format and put it side by side. I need to get what we've been talking about on paper.

R: Hey, Stu, this is Roy. Are you kind of expecting to get some more written input over what we're discussing?

ST: I sure hope so.

R: Good, because I think between maybe a number of us and getting back together again, we really can create some adequate descriptions and definition.

ST: Right. What I hope to do is set up another input period so we can go back over it and input this all again, then I'll try to encapsulate it and send it all back out to you again in another mailing.

GD: Why don't you just send us copies of what people send in?

ST: That's what I'm going to do.

GD: Rather than "encapsulate" what people meant and trying to put it into a smaller document.

BS: Use a better photocopier. I couldn't read my input.

JM: I like Bo's thing, because it didn't take him long. It didn't take him a week to do it, it took an afternoon. Thanks, Stu. I like both if you can stick to that kind of time frame.

ST: Let's move onto #4. "What ability does the World Service Office have to effect the trust property without provision of the trustor?" This was raised by Jim, and a couple points of his deletion. My particular feelings on it are that they shouldn't have the ability to affect the trust.

GD: Would you read the question again?

ST: "What ability does the World Service Office have to affect the trust property without provision of the trustor?"

GD: Oh, yeah. Zero.

ST: I felt zero. Jim picked out a few points in there. It appeared that the document gave it some authority. For my sake, I don't believe we have use with that principle.

BS: I made a written comment. I said "None, but may express opinions, etc." I don't think we should have any special workers or trusted servants who can't speak. That would be horrible, but they shouldn't govern or control or manipulate. We can tell when documents are weighted or biased.

GD: But a lot of people can't. Most people can't because they're operating from another place, perhaps spiritually than we do. This man is neither a pessimist nor an optimist. He sees things as they are. Most of us on this telephone call have enough experience to know that basically if it comes out laser printed and well written, even if it's bullshit, most everyone in the fellowship who reads it is going to take it as the gospel. There is a responsibility for accurate communication. All the way around, don't break the circle anywhere. You take the most inflammatory shit and put it in there, and you take the most... it's like mind control. Mass psychology. We can't afford to play those games anymore, because what happens is we find ourselves in a situation such as where we are now, where you have a limited amount of players who have any ability to dissect the results of things.

BS: Did you read my material?

U: Just barely I could.

JM: I could.

ST: I could.

BS: I couldn't read it.

JM: I feel real strongly about #4, that any and all actions affecting the fellowship's property must first be considered by the fellow-ship. The fellowship should decide what products and services should be available from WSO, and the fellowship should decide the price for these. The fellowship should at least provide general parameters. The office from time to time may need to take temporary, specific action until the fellowship has had time to act.

R: I think the office has to have all of the ability to communicate the effect that the trust property may have on the office itself, but none of the affect.

JM: Definitely. In pricing, I think this is maybe one of the real critical things we need to tend to quickly. In pricing, it's contingent upon the office to offer the fellowship now and in its time of question, some sort of analysis. Let's say if the book were to cost \$2.00, what services would be funded, or what services would have to fund...

GD: You mean how many employees would have to be let go for the good of Narcotics Anonymous?

JM: Etcetera, etcetera. What the real effects are. If it cost \$3.00, \$4.00, and \$5.00, in increments. I think dollar increments are not too much of a chore, even though I know the magnitude of the chore I'm asking for.

ST: Well, I hope that things run smoothly again. They have before. That's all everybody knows about. Make a decision one way or another and what the effects would be and what it would take. When we make a clear decision...

R: On #4, did I hear you say that the office should have no affect at all with no prior permission of the fellowship?

ST: The World Service Office really shouldn't have anything to do with the trust property, other than to produce and distribute it, or any of that.

BS: Exactly. That's what we've all been trying to say, Stu.

GD: Absolutely.

ST: Such as changes, revisions, new development, all should be directed to the office. The office should have nothing to do with any of that.

R: And I heard that at this year's conference. I heard George make that statement too, "Hey, just tell us what you want us to do." It was pretty simple. In this #4 then, all we're really doing is defining who the trustor is.

GD: Yeah, and the methodology by which it's administered. How about #5, folks?

ST: See, we all did agree on something.

U: #5 "Does a member have immunity of prosecution for infringing on the trust property?"

JM: Here's something I'd really like to say, that I've really thought about for a long time. I think this matter just requires a little common sense. Members and groups are part owners of the property, so no infringement has occurred. However, if, after a study of all the facts and the impacts concerned by the fellowship, which isn't the current situation, the fellowship then decides the nature of products to be sold and their price. Then, if an individual or group should be approached, they should be approached by the Board of Trustees if they choose to print or distribute on their own. Such action would be approached in the same method that trustees visit gently and kindly with other people

who are violating or compromising our traditions.

GD: Two things here: First of all...

ST: Did you say it is an infringement?

GD: I want to stay away from that, because that's a real ball of wax.

BS: Why don't you let Stu say his piece, Dave. Let Stu finish.

GD: Let me interject something and I will. What I'd like to say is that question, that last phrase you had in there about violating the traditions, I can't support that. I don't see how distributing literature violates traditions.

JM: If, in fact, the fellowship has through true group conscience, made a decision that the World Service Office is going to be the sole distributor of the book at this price, if in fact that happens. Each individual member and group had the opportunity to participate in the decision, at that time, production and distribution of literature outside of that collective decision of the fellowship, would probably a compromise of the 1st and or the 4th tradition. Probably. I'm not standing on that as a firm plank, I'm just saying...

GD: I want to interject that there are problems there.

JM: If, in fact that were the case, then appropriate methods for someone in the fellowship to be approached by that representative of our collective conscience would be through the Board of Trustees. It wouldn't be in some kind of a lawsuit.

GD: Trustee Guidelines, Section 8B, clearly delineates how they're supposed to handle it. If the Trustees are the guardians who protect our traditions, then no other service body, element, or arm has the right to initiate any type of action, legal or otherwise, until our policy that the trustees will place that issue, inform the fellowship and place the issue on the agenda has occurred.

JM: I don't necessarily disagree with that. That would have to take some more. All I'm saying is "infringement" happens outside the fellowship.

GD: That's correct. I'll prove that legally if I need to.

JM: I firmly support the protection of our property from anyone who is infringing on its being held by the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous through whatever agent.

GD: I agree, Jim, I agree. If we had a true group conscience on it, set a price, all those elements that you articulated were present and in place and done, then I agree that we may have a problem. But as I said at the beginning of our conversation today, when that happened with Alcoholics Anonymous, they treated it with more in line with what you're talking about than before. They didn't do anybody, they announced it to the groups and said "If you find that it better suits your needs, fine. We just wanted to inform you that this is not official GSO stuff."

GH: Well, there's two points I'm going to make. Because of the fact that Narcotics Anonymous has only one requirement, the desire to stop using, which is a self-admittance, anyone can make that statement and not be prosecuted because they say they are an N.A. member. Such is the case, and I'm sure Stu would have pointed this out, as the person who had Creative Art, brought to the forefront, and he told Stu he was a member. The same situation would have happened. It's a real difficult situation when you only have one requirement for proof of membership that is so unrecognizable to say whether or not that person is a part of the fellowship.

GD: There's nowhere, any place in our literature, a statement that says "You are a member when you say you are." It says membership in Narcotics Anonymous is not automatic when someone walks in through the door, or when the newcomer decides to stop using. Now?

GH: The point is, Dave, that if I say that I am a member, you have no way of saying that I am not. Alcoholics Anonymous has changed their point of view in how they are handling this situation.

GD: If you have some communication from them on this, or a file that you've gotten, I would appreciate getting it. I want to say that it was the World Service Office that singled Billy and Lou and myself out acting as individuals which could have put us outside and into that definition that you have just articulated. The fact of the matter was that none of us were operating outside the group principle, the group concept. If we're looking at members, suing individuals, you've got permission to sue, individuals, groups, areas, and regions, what's going to happen? There are areas, groups and regions that are going to do what they're going to do no matter what kind of legal threat you put out there. We've got to look at it. What's infringement? The fact of the matter is, what Bo, in Bo's signed

deposition in court and what I'm sure, Roy articulated earlier, that the legal definition that would be applied surrounding these statements that have been made as to the intent of the authors, their financial arrangements and agreements. A case can be made through the fair use doctrine and other points of law having to do with copyright, ownership, and authorship to take this into public domain where anybody can. I'm trying to point up these things, bring them to the forefront. Is Joe Blow's group in San Diego that prints up meeting schedules with "Just For Today" on it? All the underground step guides. Suppose another book is written that uses any of the steps in it or refers to N.A.?

ST: We're talking about exact replication, for sale for profit. Simple.

GH: The proper way to handle it is to apply for permission. You've got situation where you have some delineation for flexibility. Therein lies the point: What actually constitutes infringement? If we set up a trust, and no matter whether or not you are a beneficiary, you have the potential for violating that trust. Just because you are an owner or a beneficiary of that trust, does not remove you, or place you in a position of immunity from infringing that trust.

GD: I think as long as the two legal viewpoints that you're putting out, and the legal point I'm putting out, which are on opposite ends, basically of the spectrum, are unresolved, then we're going to find ourselves in the continuing tenuous situation.

JM: I think what we need to realize here is that we have two potential situations. One as illustrated by the current thing in a state of flux, where a member or a group, because of difference of opinion, what it's given to be, or appears to be, or is used as the group conscience takes action on its own, or his or her own, strictly for the benefit of their personal program or their personal approach to service. Another where an entity removed from the fellowship, whether they claim membership or not, takes action motivated by profit. I think it's two pretty distinct situations that most mature groups of folks could establish the distinction. I'm not saying that there's not going to be difficulty. But I think we need to take an appropriate stance on those two different situations. I don't think that the stance is to treat everything and everyone the same. That needs to be part of this. This is a valid question. I don't want to be a member of a group even if they take AA's 12 and 12 and put the N.A. logo on it and change a few words and start to publish it, I don't want to see them treated as Dave was treated. Because of our failure to learn from our mistakes. I think that what was done was a mistake, and I think everybody will agree that the expenditure was not using money effectively to carry the message to the addict who still suffers. The only good that can come out of it is for us to come up with something that's going to work effectively in the future. The critical point is, how do we treat somebody who's rooted in N.A. and may technically infringe on the trust properties...

GD: It's easy to determine who is a member and who isn't. It's not that difficult of a process.

U: But you still have to have the ability to litigate against them. If they fail to respond in a period of time, then the fellowship ...

BS: Well, my input...

GD: Is that affecting the fellowship detrimentally, or is affecting the corporate bottom line detrimentally?

ST: That's not right, Dave. It ain't the corporate. It's N.A. as a whole. When you lock up the office, nobody can do any kind of service, and you've got people fighting in meetings, you've got people at each other's throats and throwing people out of meetings, yeah, it affects the fellowship at large. It's not necessarily healthy.

GD: Stu, I remember our conversation of July 5. I begged you not to send out those letters. It probably would have died a death. It probably would have gone to about ten groups and nobody would have given a shit about it. It was like you guys handled it all wrong.

JM: Up to this point, every single one of us has handled it wrong. I know that. I don't know how to handle it right, I don't know where to go from here, but we've all handled it wrong.

U: I'd like not to ventilate anymore hostilities. Maybe that's not possible.

R: Stu, you have an indemnification clause in the section under "Trustee." Would it be conceivable to create an indemnification clause under each of the other two sections? In regard to the trustor and the beneficiary?

ST: Yeah, and also articulate in the operational instrument how you handle an individual who's termed "a member" in relation to an infringement. To something like Jim's talking about, instead of a defined process, less rigid is kind of what I had in mind.

R: I think that terminology of indemnification, if we just come together on what that definition is, we can take care of that.

GD: My definition of indemnification, as far as I know legally, if there is no malice aforethought, carelessness, or harm intended by an action, then the insurance carrier, or the corporation in separate cases will take care of the cost. If however, that carelessness, waste, fraud, mismanagement, those types of things are shown, then the corporation is liable and directors and employees are personally liable as well.

ST: Right. If the offer of indemnification in those areas are violated...I've been looking at how to re-work, how to word that section. I remember working on that part of the indemnification. I'll try to reword that.

BS: I don't understand what the problem is there, Stu. Can you explain it to us?

ST: Well, the problem is that you have to have the ability to sue an infringer. So to make a determination to degree of infringement and that somebody is exclusively void of any kind of prosecution for wrongdoing, what is considered wrongdoing or violating trust, violating Narcotics Anonymous. For people to take advantage of it, it leaves us wide open. I believe that N.A. needs the ability to protect itself, but then also take in the concerns that Jim and Dave talked about.

GD: If a service board, committee or group were to print literature that a definition of what constitutes "for profit" needs to be included. Such as 20% over and above for shipping and handling, and administering that. Whereas, somebody that was on the outside that fits the definition of what an infringer would be, would be selling at 100% or 200% or 900% markup. We need to look at what constitutes a "for profit" infringement.

ST: Right. You've have to orchestrate that in the organizational instrument, but the actual trust has to say you'll pursue infringement.

GH: What that allows you to do if you use that as the sole motive for indemnification, Compcare, Hazelden, all those guys can qualify.

GD: I didn't mean them, because they are outside the fellowship.

GH: But if you can prove in the eyes of the law, that they are existing of the same conditions, irregardless of the fact that they are outside of the fellowship, then in the eyes of the law, they will be looked at equally.

GD: I don't know if I support that. What I'm trying to say is that if copious records and notes are kept by the "member infringer..." I mean yeah, we've talked about it here. It's just input, it's feedback. It looks like this may be an alternative, or a way to determine what in fact institutes within the fellowship.

ST: We may be able to write that out. We have tried that.

JM: Well, let's try. Let's try.

ST: Okay. We'll add some of that to the next thing, too. We'll try to write and articulate that. We may be able to just directly write it out.

GD: What are the reasons, spiritual or otherwise, where a group, area or region would do that? On the other hand, we must frown very hard against anyone outside profiteering on N.A. Clear up our own internal profiteering on N.A.

GH: Let me give you a scenario, Dave. If I understand what you're saying, you're creating a system by where an identifiable part of the fellowship can, in fact, infringe through revision and infringe through changing Basic Narcotics Anonymous philosophy, and the fellowship itself has no way to straighten out the situation. You're giving them permission to do so.

GD: No, I'm talking about exactly duplication of conference-approved literature.

JM: I believe, just philosophically, to answer concerns by George. I believe we need to have some language whereby that person, group, or entity who's revising, whereby we can sort of bring them back in the fold, gently. And yet have the legal clout to make them stop if after an appropriate amount of time, I guess maybe I would treat that as two-three years.

GD: I think that revising is out. You can't revise it.

JM: I think we need to retain the legal clout based upon a valid, fellowship-wide decision.

GH: I think what you have to understand, Jim, in that situation is that by waiting that period of time, you have said someone who is protecting your rights and the rights of the fellowship, give up certain legal rights.

JM: Yes, I understand that.

GD: What's the statute of limitation on that?

JM: Perhaps we could put in process, we could develop policies so that wouldn't happen. I guess I'm really kind of sharing an idea rather than a clear cut policy.

ST: I think we had better take time to work on it a little bit. I think if we expanded our thinking a little bit, we could come up with some viable options.

GD: When you take a look at the gross revenues of all the conventions put together, I wouldn't be opposed to say a 5%, or 10% net as an automatic donation for the use of logos on articles. It has nothing to do with recovery. It has to do with money. We need to stop the profiteering within the fellowship, or at least license these conventions to give us money that would go directly to support our volunteer service structure. The World Convention Corporation, when the change was made back in '85, used to have a percentage that went automatically to the WSC, a percentage that went here and there. When the office took it over, that stopped. We need to look at the resources that we have both internal and these conventions, extra-curricular. Convention committees would probably get smart and not put the logo or the tradename on it, and we would kill two birds with one stone. We'd end the profiteering with the logo and the trademark internally, would create an additional profit center for our service structure.

If you're going to apply some kind of policy that has to do with property, trademarks and logos, and all this other stuff, it's got to be fair. It's got to be equitable. It's got to be across the board and address all these areas.

BS: Gosh, you sound like you all agree.

ST: Okay.

R: I have a couple of things I just wanted to state here. A lot of this seems to be going back to something that Billy mentioned back here in #2. Seems to be where a problem is really going to be boiled down to. In one of the last things I heard you say, Dave, was "conference approved literature." We've got "fellowship approved" and then we turned the record over and we mentioned "conference approved."

GD: I don't mean conference approved, I mean fellowship approved. And I mean it in context with what Billy said. We need a direct vote on what is and what isn't, then we need to follow that. Same thing as Jim articulated earlier. We get into this term of convenience that's more laziness than anything else. I meant fellowship approved, what the entire fellowship agrees on.

JM: Well, we've got a lot of input here that George may see fit to package separate from the trust document and conference charter, or perhaps we're visiting about two things, and maybe they both apply to each: I guess what I'm talking about here, is I'm going to say everything I've got written lately into here and let you sort it out. Maybe if some of it just isn't appropriate, doesn't fit, it should be packaged into a conference charter thing. Maybe we ought to start dealing with the second item. Maybe that's wrong. I just thought I'd throw the idea out and perhaps we could go on from there and discuss where we're going from here.

GH: I would certainly encourage that Jim, simply because from where I sit, that key decision about the conveyance of trust from the fellowship to the service structure must come before this other thing.

GD: I've got about six minutes of tape left. I guess everybody else is in about the same shape.

ST: Let me see if we can get a definite agreeable...Can we go for a three-week input period? Then establish another call? Is that acceptable?

JM: Yes.

GD: Sounds all right to me.

ST: Okay.

GD: Are we talking the 21st? Tuesday?

BM: Stu, what happens when both Boards review it on the 14th?

ST: Well, then we'll have that to impact it.

JM: Can what we've done to date be shared with both boards so they can review it?

GH: Sure, that's no problem. You mean the input that we received?

JM: Yeah, and our visits, too. I know you've probably got ten pages of notes, George, from this discussion.

ST: We will do that.

BS: Is it too heavy to mention that since a lot of our discussion seems to involve fellowship issues, and like George is bringing out about the charter, that at least some of the information that we're collecting and generating be tagged and routed to where it can be applied to the discussion later of a conference charter? I think we're going to start turning up that kind of material.

BM: I think we're already talking about it.

ST: We're going to, and I'm going to present to the Board that issue, that there has to be a conference charter that needs to work on some of these problems. I don't know whether they'll take it, but we'll start packaging all that material together.

BS: Excellent. Good.

GH: So let's get the schedule down so I can find out when I have to get all this stuff out to you, and when we've got to have it in here.

GD: I don't have a calendar, but I have to speak in Orlando, which is on a Sunday, and I can be available any other time.

ST: What is the date for end of input?

GH: The 20th of June.

ST: Why don't we call that the end of input and set the conference for mid-week during the following week. No, no, we can't do that, we have to have time to distribute it. It'll be two weeks after that.

R: Are you talking the 4th of July?

JM: Let's try to avoid the cost of overnight shipments, too.

BS: Well, we're going to be in Allentown then.

JM: If we target distribution for the 26th, and the conference call perhaps the 30th, that's just ahead of Allentown.

BS: That may be profitable. That may be worth doing.

GH: Okay, but if you give me the input on the 26th...

JM: Input by the 20th, distribution by the 26th, and conference call by the 30th.

ST: In other words, the 20th is the end of input, the 30th is the conference call.

GH: The 30th is a Sunday.

JM: July 1 would nice.

BS: I have a Rotary, I guess I could cancel it.

JM: I'll cancel it for you.

BS: Wait a minute. I'm taking office as President of the Rotary Club here. Is there anyway to do this Tuesday? I won't ask for this twice.

ST: Is the 3rd too close to the event?

GD: Yeah. Basically we're all going to be wanting to do July the 4th shit. Whatever the hell we're going to be doing, I think we're looking at the 8th.

R: Do we need three weeks to turn in input here?

BS: I don't have any fresh input myself.

ST: Well, let's cut off a week, then.

JM: I think anything beyond that is negative. Let's go for the 28th for the conference call.

GH: Input deadline is still the same, 28th for the conference call?

BM: I thought the input deadline was now moved up to the 14th.

ST: Let's leave it at the three week mark. If you want both Boards to review your input, we need it by the 14th.

GD: Somebody needs to take my address and phone number and make sure I get this stuff. I have personal stuff I want to talk about.

ST: Anything else, gang?

BS: I'm real pleased to hear something like unanimity in progress in the air.

JM: Billy Eason, how do you feel about this conversation?

BS: It went somewhere tonight with the dialogue. We talked about a lot of things we haven't been able to talk about lately in a civil manner. I'm satisfied with that.

GD: Roy, I hope you're going to be in Bethlehem. I'd like to meet you.

R: Yes, I hope to be there, finances permitting.

GD: It's like we wrote the book, you can hitchhike.

R: I didn't hitchhike then, and I sure hope I don't have to now.

JM: You can ride with me.

(whole round of goodbyes)