

NA Trust

Telephone
Settlement
Conference

1

Rachel
Houseman

p23 JM dsw
2-11 GM

C

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 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 now 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 conferences 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.

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 forthcoming. 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)

GD: Hi, guys.

BS: How's it going?

JM: Hi there, I'm here.

BS: Is it down to the three of us?

GD: Yeah, I guess.

JM: It don't matter.

GD: It don't matter. Well, I think my position with this whole thing is very, very clear. What do you think about my position?

JM: What do I think about **your** position at this point in time?

GD: Yeah, that was contained in my opening statement.

JM: I guess my thing would be that I totally think that you needed to reopen the court case.

GD: I think that too.

JM: I don't see any movement. It's like we're talking two different languages.

GD: Absolutely.

BS: That's the most baffling thing. When we're face to face, or we're on the phone, there's supposed to be this rapport, and then subsequent to the rapport...I've done some writing.

GD: It's like I hand it to Lee Manchester and it gets bastardized, but he hates fucking Narcotics Anonymous, anyway.

BS: What I'm saying is the writing doesn't seem to reflect the rapport we feel when we're together. There's some other force that intrudes and distorts things. What do you mean by that, just beyond the personalities. Are you saying that Lee is a member of some other fellowship?

GD: He just doesn't like the things that we do. There's a lot of people in the office who are on record, on paper, and I've even read some of them when I was there, that don't like what we do, what we've done.

BS: Then why on earth are they there?

JM: Paycheck?

GD: I spent two weeks out there on a daily basis, and I think there's a lot of sickness out there. I would ask that this bit of frank discussion not...

JM: Yeah, well we know. I watched Jimmy go from what he was in 1980 to what he was in 1982, and that was only two years.

BS: Just extend it a little bit. I'm approaching the personality of Lee Manchester under the bold heading of the change that happens when a person gets a conflict of interest going, or the sense of personal power through a position at world services or WSO.

GD: Everyone that I've talked to that has been involved with him on committee projects has been completely dissatisfied with anything that he's written. Lee Manchester, WSO's special project director, obviously. ...the Guide to Service and the Concepts... fucking days to write the statement of unity with Lee, and it was still unacceptable. I told George, "I can't do it anymore. You and I will have to do this." George and I put it down in thirty fucking minutes.

JM: Dave and Bo, I've got to go get showered before our home group meeting. I'm going to leave you with Kathleen. She can refer anything. She's on with us too, by the way, and has been for a long time. We do have a tape of this, by the way. I thought we needed a measure of this, before we taped it. The one thing is, in reopening the court case, I don't know how. I tried to talk to the judge, talk to his clerk. The clerk is an arrogant asshole, and I couldn't talk to anybody.

GD: Only through lawyers, and then you have to...If I went back, Jim,

I will tell you all the "loving support" and all that shit and "I'll help" and this and that. I was sitting in a fucking place with no gas, no heat, no phone, no nothing, sitting there with my dick in my ass going "Fuck Narcotics Anonymous." I'm telling you it was nip and tuck for about a month.

JM: I'm not saying that you need to do that. I'm saying that was probably what you felt.

GD: If I have to do it, Jim, I will do it. I told George that. I said if the conference does something weird or strange, I will. If I have to, I'll crawl up there and stay in a fucking rescue mission. I'll do it, because that's a commitment that I made that precedes any other commitment that I made. I made a commitment years ago to be able to take a sponsee to a service meeting and duplicate the experience of group conscience and anonymity and direct responsibility. I dedicated my entire recovery to that. That's what keeps me alive.

JM: What do you think about the book going into the public domain?

BS: Did Becky hang up when everybody else hung up?

GD: I guess, who knows?

JM: Dave, what do you think about the book going into the public domain?

GD: I think it would be fine. It already is, legally.

JM: That's all I needed to say. I've got to go. I will be in touch.

BS: Is Kathleen here? Hello, Kathleen. (general round of goodbyes and hellos)

GD: If it's a matter of going back to court, I told George that I know the procedure now. I will not go in there and stutter and stammer and be embarrassed and not have the proper copies to do it. I will get people from one end of this country to the other. I'll have every little piece of document I've got. I read in the law books of the attorneys while we were waiting for Stu Tooredman to agree to the settlement, I read exactly what I needed to know about authorship, financial responsibility...duplication, and that the authorship criteria were established. You weren't being hurt financially, that you had written the book for the public benefit, and you had made no attempt as the author, which you were representing there, whether you understood that or not, as the authors, then all of the criteria that was necessary to meet, were met. We moved from that point, establishing and satisfying that criteria into what's called the fair use doctrine, which allows for exact duplication of art, science, or work.

BS: You mean like public domain.

GD: Right.

BS: How could this beneficiary role, who in the hell cooked that up? Do you think that's some kind of oversight?

GD: I don't understand the context of your question. Let me explain my approach as a beneficiary of the trust of world services, which has never been defined, really. I knew that I was a beneficiary of that trust, and so were the members of my home group. I knew...

BS: Do you think we should let that language lay? Ownership sounds a little better than beneficiary. It seems like role reversal.

KM: It sure does. I think the only reason we've fallen into that terminology was because we believe of the legalese, and that's the way they talk about it. You're talking about a trust document, and when you have a trust, you have to have a beneficiary. We are the owners. They are the employees, and I think that should be written down in law.

GD: The problem, and I tried to explain before Stu went into a rage...

KM: Just a little touchy there, huh?

BS: Were you listening a little earlier, Kathleen?

KM: I listened to the whole thing.

GD: What was the question again?

KM: About putting down in law that we are the owners and they are the employees.

GD: Okay, now I'm cued back to where I was. Like boilerplate law. When you go in and your real estate agent or landlord presents a contract to you, it is written favoring that person. Then there are counteroffers, the document gets modified, any special addendums are put in, it's signed, and that becomes law. Period. Their whole thing with this was a) to avoid as many legal expenses as possible so they wrote it very guardedly, and b) it's straight up to protect their interests. This trust intellectual document that they have sent out is toilet paper for our purposes, all the way through.

BS: It's what?

KM: Toilet paper.

GD: Piss paper. It is of absolutely no value to the principles that we have based our life on.

BS: Do you think we should manipulate this document or suggest another document?

KM: We write it, or start over again.

GD: I kind of agree with Kathleen.

BS: It's kind of funny we all had tape recorders. Danette was appalled that we would even think of recording it.

KM: That's really sad, isn't it?

BS: Do you think it was overkill for me to say they were all temporary at the office?

GD: No.

KM: No.

GD: They need to be reminded of that on almost a daily basis.

BS: They didn't respond a lot to it, did they?

KM: So should we write it, or should we keep the one we've got.

GD: If we were to use this as a basis of what **not** to put in it, this would be good.

KM: How are you going to fix it?

GD: This document tells us where they are, where they're coming from, and what they want.

KM: Each one of you can take this and write your own trust document. So maybe that's the direction to go in. Along with what Bo said, everybody write down with what they want, compare them all and see what we end up with.

GD: I think it's abundantly clear what we want. It's the denial on the part of those that don't want what we want. How the fuck could it be more clear? We want the fellowship to own the stuff.

BS: Oh, it could be more clear if more people were saying it in unison, that's how it could be more clear.

KM: Also, you may be doing 12 step work, because I believe the principles that you are talking about are foreign concepts to them.

GD: I would agree with that.

KM: It's always the process that's important anyway, it's never the end result. Maybe that's part of what's going on here. That's just my input.

GD: I think process is vitally important for inclusion. We're cast out addicts, throwing them away. We're telling them that they really don't matter. I've heard you speak five times, and every time you get to that point, I break out in tears. That's where it's at for me. It's written all over me what I'm about. I don't give a fuck what they do, to be 100% honest. Sometimes you have a cancerous limb, you cut it off. The body survives.