

EXHIBIT "G"

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, Compcare, 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 benefiting 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 overburdened. 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 roll 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 fellowship. 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)