

Chapter Sixteen

New Challenges

During the first three-years I worked at the World Service Office, I was engaged mostly in the details of getting a business to function properly. From getting an accounting system established to finding reliable suppliers, to hiring and organizing an staff, much of what I spent my time on was internal to the office. Yes, much of what we did was connected to committee and the fellowship activity, but office operation was a first priority. After the 1986 conference, more of my time shifted to new challenges in the fellowship at large, and I left much of the office operation to the crew we had hired and trained. They were a hard-working group, up to the many challenges they faced.

George called the 1986 World Service Conference to order in April at the Airtel Plaza Hotel in Van Nuys. Representatives had arrived from places as distant as Australia, Japan and Germany, and reports were received from service committees in Brazil, Spain, Italy, India, Colombia and Israel. At the first roll call, forty-one representatives gave reports, after which eight new regions were accepted and they gave reports too. Among the new regions was Virginia who had been refused recognition the previous year. The motion to seat them was proposed by the Chesapeake/Potomac region, whose representative the previous year had opposed seating them. Other new regions included Japan, Australasian (also representing New Zealand), and England.

Daniel S., the representative from Germany, gave a report with intermittent help from a translator, but came across better in his halting English. He reported on the strength of their meetings, told of an active Translations Committee and described the need for literature in German. He complained that the office and the US fellowship were not doing enough to get literature translated. The Americans, he felt, spent too much time and energy fighting with each other and left addicts in other countries to die in the streets.

Mario T., whose Australian accent won endearment from everyone, spoke for a growing fellowship "down under." He told about their desire to help start NA in other countries in the Southwest Pacific.

Jamie S.H. spoke for his homeland in England and was welcomed by a rousing standing ovation. Kiyoshi O., the representative from Japan, stood up and delivered his entire report in Japanese, translated by Roy A., another member who came from Japan specifically to do the translating. While Kiyoshi gave his report, those present were either so thrilled they could hardly contain their joyous shouts or quietly choking back. I was among the latter.

The RSR from Montreal, Canada, Andrea L., delivered her report in French, with a Quebec accent, and then did her own translation. She also stressed the need for literature in her native language and decried the high cost of literature for those in Canada. Andrea supported Daniel's concerns over the slowness of translations with some strong comments of her own. She was a very expressive individual to begin with, and her French/Canadian flair, directness and wit made her very effective. I thought her comments were a veiled attack on me personally, and an attack on the office, and I felt hurt. For some months afterward, our relations were strained, but by the end of 1986 we had become friends and worked closely to get French translations done. With her help and similar aid from members in other countries, our translation efforts became more effective. The value of their criticism, despite my initial feelings of being unfairly criticized, was shown by the fact subsequent translations were done more quickly.

Reports were also given by representatives from Ireland as well as British Columbia and Ontario, Canada. These regions had been recognized at previous conferences. The conference was greatly moved by this exhibition of international growth, and awed by the realization that NA was truly becoming a worldwide fellowship. Other exciting international news was given later by Mary B. when she gave the International Affairs Committee report. Compared to all that international energy, the regional reports from the US, despite being peppered with all that American street slang, sounded almost dull and monotonous. Another open forum was held in the evening.

After the open forum I gave another of my lengthy reports — over four hours with my talking and all the questions. I began by revealing that the number of groups registered at the office had grown during the year from approximately 4,000 to over 6,000. Startling as that figure was, less than three months later we reported the number had grown to over 7,000! The growth during that time was staggering.

It always seemed important to disclose figures that could be compared with earlier years. In this way, members around the world, as well as NA leadership, could chart our growth. We showed financial information, sales data and figures about meetings and events. Wherever I traveled, members asked about these things and

marveled at the phenomenal growth these indicators showed. We made sure that our staff who gave tours to visitors during those years had some of these statistics fresh in their minds as well. The sheer pace of growth was a real inspiration to anyone exposed to it.

Our financial report showed gross sales of \$1,436,108 although we spent \$121,691 more than we received. This shortfall came from the reserve, and was used mostly for the public service announcements, Texts and additional services. Of the 6,000 copies of the committee-written draft of *It Works: How and Why*, we sold the entire printing. For the first time we showed sales totals from non-US countries. Canada purchased the most, followed by England. Together they bought over \$33,000 worth of literature in the previous twelve months.

White Booklet sales, in my opinion, were a good indicator of the number of members. Most dedicated members had their own copy and kept it handy most of the time, ready to give to an addict in need. In the previous twelve months we had sold 309,750 copies of the White Booklet! The number of Texts sold since the last conference was 133,527, a growth of more than 47,862 over the previous year. This brought the total number of copies sold to 255,911. Since many treatment centers were purchasing the books for distribution to every patient, and some of them returned to using drugs, it was not realistic to equate Text sales to the number of members.

The magazine continued to improve in quality, but the number of subscribers had not grown as much as we wanted. We tried a number of things during the year to promote readership, but subscription growth was slow. Discounts were offered for multi-year subscribers as well as bulk purchases, but the magazine still lost money. We showed only 2,835 subscribers and a loss of about \$9,000. I told the conference the number of subscribers needed to break even was approximately 3,500. But Ron was then engaged in a good promotional program and we held out great hopes for substantially increased readership.

I spent a lot of time discussing speaker tapes. Since we had withdrawn all tapes several years earlier in order to review their message and recording quality, we had been working on finding replacements. Unfortunately, I did not devote much time or energy to this project, and it sort of limped along with limited success for several years. We tried a number of approaches to getting tapes reviewed and approved, but it was a slow, expensive process with many delays along the way. Each year I promised we would improve it, and for several years, brought proposals to the conference with that intent. Eventually we devised a workable system and then devoted

enough staff time to get the job done. In 1986 we began to see the results, as "approved" tapes were finally available.

An important part of my report was about translations and our efforts to facilitate delivery of literature to other countries. We showed an impressive list of works in progress in various languages. However, our success was less impressive than the report stated. We had completed a number of draft translations, but we had arguments with the members who were going to use them over the final wording.

I also reported on the production of literature by non-US fellowships, such as England, Germany, Australia and Ireland. My report acknowledged that these printings were being done and discussed the need to find a solution to this unauthorized printing. The solution I favored was to enter agreements that sanctioned their printing in return for three things: acknowledgment of the office's authority and responsibility for the copyrights, the members' assistance in maintaining those rights, and the payment of a nominal fee or royalty. An eight or ten percent royalty was first suggested, based on the retail price they charged for literature.

Included in my report was the first of several comments about embezzlement of fellowship funds. Fortunately the office had a dedicated staff and good procedures which served to prohibit embezzlement at the office, so we were in good shape. But the rest of the fellowship was not in the same situation. We were contacted constantly about members who embezzled thousands and tens of thousands of dollars. Some committees wanted to prosecute the individuals, while others wanted to hush it up. In the years ahead I would frequently speak and write about this. I told the conference that we had received reports from areas and regions about embezzlements that added up to more than \$100,000. The amount lost from group treasuries was probably equal to that figure as well.

Among my concluding remarks was information about the support we had provided in finding and paying for a professional to help with the Steps and Traditions book. I explained the board's support for the process and satisfaction with the ultimate product developed by the Literature Review Committee. The meeting adjourned late in the night. Again my report was enthusiastically approved!

Tuesday morning had been set aside for committee reports, but the order of business was changed so that another attempt to redefine the two-thirds vote problem could be addressed. Fortunately, the Policy Committee had actually accomplished something during the year — they developed a proposal to resolve this matter. Their motion was to require on "matters of policy, literature approval or matters that affect the service structure" a two thirds majority of all registered participants of the conference. This was adopted with sixty-

eight votes in favor, none voting against or abstaining, although several amendments were also adopted. At last the matter seemed to be settled! The rest of the day was spent on committee reports and more open forum time.

On Wednesday morning, motions from the *Agenda Report* were taken up. The first were those offered by the office. Steve B. stood at the microphone to present the motions and answer questions. He did a marvelous job, and all of them were adopted, most with no opposition. With so much support for office proposals, it was hard to imagine that five years earlier anything the office proposed was loudly defeated; but then again, it was a different team of people.

Jack B. then proposed the motions from the trustees, starting with the changes to the Little White Booklet. One by one the motions were offered and approved by unanimous votes. After the trustee changes had been adopted, a number of modifications were offered by a few RSR's, most of which were soundly defeated. A couple were approved, but they were mostly minor word changes. Roll call votes were then taken to approve the modified White Booklet in two sections. The first part was adopted unanimously, but the second half (containing the stories) failed to get a two-thirds majority. George appointed an ad hoc committee to study the issues in conflict and report later in the conference, hopefully with a solution.

The changes they approved to the White Booklet presented us with a problem, and I explained this to the conference. The changes also applied to the Basic Text, since the italicized parts at the beginning of many of the chapters were directly quoted from the White Booklet. We had thousands of the Text in stock, and therefore tens of thousands of dollars tied up in inventory that was now incorrect. We could not consider throwing away the books, nor could we modify the books on hand, but we could change the affected pages in the next Basic Text printing. In response, a motion was adopted to allow the existing books to be sold as they were, and to make the changes in the next printing.

Motions proposed by the Administrative Committee came next, and received mixed response. Their proposal to delete the elected positions of conference secretary and assistant secretary was adopted (finally I could stop worrying about having my secretary become a voting participant). Their proposal to have the World Convention every other year was defeated. On the last day of the conference, a motion was adopted appointing the office as secretary for the conference. This was an important recognition that a service body of this size and significance required full-time staff to provide its administrative support. Besides, we had been doing all the work since Carol K. had ended her term as secretary in 1984.

When Maggie O. presented the Literature Committee motions, the pamphlet *A Physicians Viewpoint* was not approved, but the revised pamphlet *Self Acceptance* was. Her report went quickly, which seemed odd, considering the strong feelings about several literature matters. Maggie had decided to serve only one term as committee chairperson. She was a good organizer and very sensitive to the interests of every member. She had a soft personality and a tremendous sense of humor. There was just something about her that attracted the affection of others; I often thought it was her feeling of joy about life and recovery. I cherished every opportunity to work with her, and I remember them all. We were going to miss having her to work with. I took every opportunity for several years to try and get her involved in special projects that came up later on.

Since Kim had resigned a few months before the conference as chairperson of Public Information, Leah presented the motions to adopt the two handbooks the PI Committee had written. Both motions passed with nearly unanimous votes. This was a great testament to Kim's perseverance and leadership as committee chairperson while the work had been done. Kim had moved to another city several months before the conference, and that was the primary reason for her resignation. A motion establishing an administrative policy on participation in non-NA events was adopted after some modification. This policy was used quite extensively during the following years and added greatly to the image of NA in the eyes of the general public.

Motions proposed by the Convention Committee were handled by Bobby B., the chairperson. The conference selected New Orleans as the site of the 1987 convention, the first time the World Service Conference made a World Convention site selection. All the committee motions were adopted: the committee's decision to transfer control of conventions to the corporation known as WCNA-15 was ratified, revisions to the convention handbook and their last proposal were accepted, the committee was dissolved. This was the first time a standing committee of the conference had been created, accomplished its duty and then asked to be dissolved.

As chairperson of the committee, Bobby had been strongly supported by Stu, Mary B. Chuck L. and myself. Together we had written the *Convention Handbook* and obtained conference approval for it. The following year we modified it, and the conference adopted them as well. We had taken over the Chicago Convention Corporation along the way and began to transform it into the World Convention Corporation. This was probably the best example of how the fellowship can work through conference committees since the conference began in 1976.

As the conference was about to adjourn, the Finance Committee was also abolished. It had been limping along since it was first created. When *The NA Tree* was written, it was thought that a Finance Committee would be an important working group to assist in budgeting for the conference and auditing the expenditures of the treasurer. However, the treasurer was never audited and the conference acted as its own advisor when developing its budget — usually doing a very poor job of it at that.

When elections were held on Thursday, Leah G. (Florida) was elected as new conference chairperson and Chuck L. (Arizona) the vice-chairperson, while Bob H. (Ohio) became the treasurer. Ed D. (Massachusetts) was elected to lead the Policy Committee, while Bruce A. (So. Cal.) was elected to head PI. Randy J. (Maryland) was chosen to chair the H&I Committee, and Suzanne S. (New Jersey) became chairperson of the Literature Committee. Mary B. (Texas) was returned as chairperson of the International Committee. Surprisingly, no one was elected to the Board of Trustees.

Leah took over the reins of conference leadership with a lot of enthusiasm and confidence. She was a strong and forceful personality, yet beneath the gruff exterior was a warm and sensitive woman. During her upbringing, and then through her using days, she had developed a toughness and "street smarts" that allowed her to "mix it up with the hardest of cases." She was, however in the midst of monumental personal change. In her personal growth through the Steps, she was about to break free of the old baggage she carried and emerge with a less aggressive personality, one that allowed her to express greater affection for those she loved. She served as chairperson for about twenty-two months. Both of her terms were very successful and crucial to the fellowship.

Friday morning, the conference quickly approved the recommendations from the ad hoc committee appointed to work out a solution to the changes in the White Booklet that had been tabled earlier. The roll call vote showed fifty-three favored approval, ten were opposed, and four abstained. Changing the White Booklet had been a major accomplishment. Although most of the changes proposed by the trustees had been compiled by Ron H., editor of the *NA Way*, the weight of public pressure had been on Sydney R., as the trustee in charge of the project. She did a marvelous job. She was able to articulate the reasons for every change, and did so with confidence and sincerity. Sydney was a key leader in literature development during the years I worked for the office. The White Booklet was only one of several important projects upon which she left the imprint of her character and her recovery.

Later that day, a reconstituted Select Committee was appointed. This time a working group was actually chosen. This committee began to have meetings, and slowly started to write a legitimate alternative to the *Temporary Working Guide*. Unfortunately the work dragged on so long that a new body of appointees was made in subsequent years and they started all over in a different direction. When I left the office in 1990, the work was far from complete.

Remaining true to form, at the last minute the conference adopted a budget that envisioned spending more money than it could reasonably expect to receive in contributions. The details for its implementation were again left to the Administrative Committee.

There was a substantial difference in this conference compared to the last one. This one showed real maturity in its decision-making process. Yes, the standing opposition was as organized as ever and quite vocal at times. When they were right on an issue, the conference sided with them. But when they were wrong, the conference benevolently ignored them or strongly defeated their proposals.

The standing opposition, was led by several strong willed and determined individuals. Their opposition to the people and things they could not control or intimidate became the objects of vicious attacks. Even as the 1986 conference ended with a lot of brotherhood and affection, the storm clouds were gathering around the *It Works* project and the editing of the Basic Text.

It is fair to point out, however, that on several issues during the coming years, the standing minority were right on target, and forced some needed changes. Sadly, the targets of their anger were often the office, me personally, and some of the things we did. It was from the experiences in 1986 that I was first exposed to members who, seemingly with clear conscience and intent, would declare to me and others that the things they did were indeed at the direction of God and not their own choosing. It had been some time since I had met people who communicated directly with God. I knew these were going to be interesting times.

Saturday morning the World Convention Corporation held a lengthy meeting. Since the conference had endorsed all the actions the committee/corporation had taken during the year, and then disbanded the Convention Committee, the corporation was now responsible to conduct world conventions. The meeting began with settling membership, electing a vice-chairperson (Tony D.), and formally transforming the Chicago corporation into the World Convention Corporation. It was a productive and positive meeting.

Vivian D., the chairperson of the London host committee, presented a number of requests from her committee and described a problem with the Cardillo travel agency. She claimed that Cardillo had not transferred all the funds that were required for the hotel reservations they had made. Cardillo had denied this, and we had no way to prove the truth of the matter. Modifications were made to the London budget, and Stu and Chuck were authorized to return to London to make final convention decisions.

The office directors met after the Convention Corporation meeting adjourned. The board accepted Chuck L.'s resignation, since he had been elected conference vice-chairperson. Jamie S-H was added to the board, even though he lacked the required five years clean time. The board authorized me to draft license agreements with Australia, England and Germany to allow them to print literature on a limited basis. The board also authorized funds for Chuck and Stu, while on the London trip, to visit Germany and attempt to repair some of the damage resulting from my earlier visit. They also authorized funds for a workshop in Detroit to help regions who were forming office corporations.

In the week following the conference, I began drafting a report for the board. I had been considering the general organization of the office and its relationship to the work of the trustees and conference committees. I suggested that the board consider dividing the staff into two distinct organizations. One, related to the production and sale of literature, would continue to be controlled by the WSO board. The other could become directed by a new body, possibly composed of trustees, conference officers and committee chairs, and maybe some directors. This second group would control activities of the staff who worked with the conference and trustees. In this way, I thought, the staff needs of the trustees and conference would be more closely controlled by those who needed that staff support. I asked the board to consider the idea at the next meeting.

The month following the conference was a very busy time. We had a long list of publications to revise or get printed in approved form. We used everyone who was not engaged in some important task to help get all these publications into print. To complicate things, we also had to prepare for the office workshop at the end of June in Detroit. I had been working on the material for the workshop, but it required a lot more time. I gave it as much as I could and eventually prepared a pretty hefty package of information.

About the time the conference was over, we finalized an agreement with a member to edit the Basic Text based on the 1985 conference instructions. The double-spaced manuscript, which included changes made in the White Booklet portions, was soon sent to the edi-

tor. It did not dawn on us at the time that in the ten months since the book had been typed into our computer file, it had not been proof-read. Copies of the manuscript were also sent to the Literature Review Committee for their use in comparing the edits that would be made.

In late May, trustee Tom McC. flew to Japan. Hawaii was a contact point for members in Japan reaching out for support, and Tom had been helping the Japanese membership for years. Several Japanese had come to the last two Hawaii conventions, and Tom met one of their members while the member was traveling through Philadelphia the previous fall. From these discussions came an invitation from the Japanese members for Tom to go there and share his experience, strength and hope. Fortunately he had amassed enough frequent flyer miles on NA trips to make this visit without cost, and the Board of Trustees authorized the trip. He later wrote a wonderful article that we published in the *Newsline*.

It was an important milestone in our relationship with non-English-speaking fellowships. Tom helped open my eyes and the eyes of other world-level trusted servants to many of the problems they faced. His trip and those being taken by other world-level servants helped us make a more rational international service policy. We began to work with greater unity towards addressing international needs.

The Convention Corporation met again on the morning of June fourteenth, and elected Steve B. as chairperson and Stu T. as vice-chairperson. Most of their work was confined to agreements and budgets for the London convention and associated matters. One of those matters was a report from Cardillo travel agency that one of their employees had departed and left with some of the records. We later came to believe this was a ploy by their owners to gain time while they embezzled the money from their own company and clients (such as our members who made hotel reservations through them) before disappearing.

This was the first meeting which Anthony E., the representative from Washington DC, had attended. The chairperson of the Washington DC convention was expected to have been their representative, but she elected to decline and Anthony became the replacement. Anthony was well versed in all aspects of conventions and quickly made his mark in discussions and decisions of the board. He volunteered to write several policy statements for the board, and when they were reviewed months later, they demonstrated his writing and organizational skills. We were all glad he would be serving on the board.

In the afternoon, when the office board met, Steve B. was re-elected as chairperson for another year. Jim W. from San Francisco

was elected as the vice-chairperson. George H., just completing his term as WSC Chairperson, was elected as a member of the board. Later in the meeting, the board approved a new contract to keep me another year, and then took action on the recommendations of the Personnel Committee to hire an assistant administrator. The committee had recommended we hire George H., and the board unanimously agreed. George accepted the appointment and resigned from the Board of Directors. I believe it was the shortest time anyone had ever served on the office board — a total of about seven hours, during which he never proposed a motion.

George had been conference vice-chair for two years while Bob R. had been chairperson. He then served two years as chairperson, and did an excellent job. During those four years, he matured in every respect and learned more about the fellowship than anyone I knew. A tremendous investment had been made in furthering his knowledge and ability. We had conducted an open and unbiased selection process, and there was no doubt among the committee or the directors, once all candidates had been considered. The Personnel Committee and I felt it would be an awful waste for us to miss the opportunity to have him become the assistant administrator. Over the years he proved again and again it was the right decision.

Actions on publications dominated the meeting. Among the most important were those concerning the Traditions portion of *It Works*.

Since receiving the Steps portion from the professionals the previous September, the *It Works* committee had continued to work on that draft and revised or re-wrote most of it. Just after the contract with the writers was terminated, the Literature Committee, the office and the trustees had formed a working group to attempt to salvage the work. Ginni S. and Ron H. were assigned to the project from the office. A group of trusted servants made up of trustees and Literature Committee members served as an editorial team, while Ginni and Ron divided up the chapters and began to rework the material. Their charge had been to take the original committee material and the manuscript that the writers produced, find the best material from both, and produce a final draft. They were to retain the voice of the writers, because it was very distinctive and would have been nearly impossible to remove from that material. They each took alternating chapters and went to work, meeting regularly with the editorial team to review their progress and get direction for future work. They were now almost finished.

While they worked on the Steps, the Literature Committee had set aside the Traditions portion, expecting to work on it later. About the time of the conference, they asked the office to allocate money to hire another professional to work on the Traditions portion before

they began to work on it themselves. They wanted the professional to take all the input available and organize a first draft, after which the Literature Review Committee would then revise and complete it.

Although the Literature Committee chairpersons had written from time to time in their reports about using a professional, none of the work that a professional had produced had yet been published, so no controversy had developed. In retrospect, we probably should not have hired the second professional until we had released the work of the first one, even though the work produced by the first professional had been substantially modified.

When the discussion turned to the Basic Text, I reported that the editing had just been completed, but that the Literature Review Committee had not started on their review of the work. The board voted to have the next printing of the Text incorporate the changes made to the White Booklet by the conference but not otherwise delay production. This meant we would have a Third Edition (Revised) and then a Fourth Edition later in the year, after the editing and review was done by the LRC. I thought it was crazy, but could see no other options.

When it came to discussion of my proposal to consider division of the staff between two decision-making bodies, the board declared they were not interested in having the idea pursued. Since my board reports were also sent to the trustee chairperson, I felt if Jack was interested in the matter, he would bring it up at the next trustee meeting. It didn't make it to the trustee agenda, and the matter was not raised again for a year, when it was resurrected in my discussions with the directors and the Select Committee.

About a week after the board meeting, we began converting our manual order and shipping process to a computerized system. It had taken two years, but we finally found a computer program that could be adapted to our needs. Slowly over the next few months we made the change. It wasn't perfect, but it worked. Vida, who had been responsible for processing the orders every day by hand, didn't want to convert to a computer system. She, like so many of us, was intimidated by computer programs and was afraid she might not adequately learn the system. She considered quitting, and on several occasions we had private talks about the transition. We went slow, Vida did learn the system, and in time became expert at it.

It was almost a fully automated system. It included inventory control and a full range of accounting. But there were limitations, and the program was not quite sophisticated as we needed. Nevertheless we used it for several years, and we even had the software company modify the program to better suit our needs.

The Literature Review Committee had continued to make progress in composing the Steps. And despite occasional problems within the committee, it was a pretty well-balanced group and got a lot accomplished. They eventually developed their own style and confidence, and at the end of June the work was finished. As our staff had been making changes in the computer files of the manuscript, transforming it into a book was much easier than earlier productions of this magnitude. After proofreading by the committee, the manuscript was sent to the printer. In July they began to review the suggestions from the professional editor hired to propose edits in the Basic Text.

While this had been going on, a search for someone to compile the Traditions portion of *It Works* had proceeded. Several interviews were conducted, again using a team with a trustee, conference officer, chair of the Literature Committee, myself and an office director. Once the person was selected, a contract was negotiated and the work began. This was briefly explained by Suzanne in a later report to the fellowship.

On the last weekend of June, Steve S. and I held the long-planned-for office workshop in Detroit. Steve had taken a keen interest in these offices, since they interfaced with the general Group Services duties for which he was responsible. Thirty-one participants arrived, representing eleven existing or new offices and some committees interested in starting an office. It was a good way to work with the people who were going to be the largest fellowship literature customers. At this meeting, and all the subsequent office workshops, we gave information they could all use and worked on individual problems. During the sessions and in between, there was constant sharing of ideas and suggestions. The workshop was a very valuable experience for everyone.

In early July, George and Mary B. went to London to attend the third European Service Conference (ESC). They were inundated with questions about how to resolve some of the problems we were then having with literature shipments to Europe. Another important issue on the minds of the Europeans was just how they were going to be active participants in the World Service Conference. It was a productive meeting. When it was over, George flew on to the conference workshop.

When mid-July arrived, we were off to Minneapolis, Minnesota for the conference committee workshop. I also arranged for a group of us to visit the Hazelden facility north of the city. Our group included conference officers, trustees, office directors and staff. We were given a tour of their treatment facilities and the literature development center, sales offices and warehouse.

We met with their senior staff and shared our views openly. Hazelden got the chance to hear first-hand the complaints members across the fellowship had about their sales and advertising practices. We discussed our literature development plans and projects we intended to pursue. We also shared ideas about literature needs that NA was never likely to satisfy. It was a productive meeting in every respect.

The Minneapolis workshop itself was also an excellent meeting. Each committee spent long hours discussing and working on their various projects. Because we had coordinators assisting three committees (Literature, H&I and PI), George and I were able to spend more time with the Policy, Select and International Committees. I went to different committees, when asked, to respond to questions or proposals that affected the office. I spent a lot of time with the Select Committee who held their first real input meeting. They decided to restrict their work during the first year to the member, group and area committee levels of service. Regions and world services would come later.

The Policy Committee, under its new chairperson Ed D., established an impressive list of projects. Although Ed acknowledged the independence of the Select Committee and its responsibility for the big issues of the service structure, his committee began to encroach into the Select Committee's work anyway. For the next few years, the standing minority would keep a lot of its followers on the Policy Committee and attempt to use it to push forward their ideas on service structure matters, since they were mostly excluded from Select Committee membership.

We were having some headaches with the PI and International Committees as well. The new PI chairperson set out to establish his "turf," and in so doing moved us into a series of minor conflicts. We were trying to keep national PI matters in the hands of a working group composed of a trustee, conference officer, office staff and the PI chairperson. This didn't work so well with the new chairperson, as he seemed to want more direct authority for himself.

About the International Committee, I didn't always hide my frustration with its very existence. Mary B., the chairperson, was truly interested in working together and trying to serve the needs of the international fellowship. I still felt the committee was simply a lobby group and an extra finger in the pie that we had to deal with.

In the July *Newsline*, we announced that the total number of registered meetings had reached seven thousand, including H&I meetings or panels. It was about this time that I began to use the *Newsline* to condition the fellowship to the idea of discontinuing pub-

lication of the *World Directory* as it was then published. Our alternative was to publish the directory in three parts; western, eastern and international. We thought that by spreading out the deadlines for receipt of information and working with a small number of meetings, we could keep up an accurate list of meetings. With a unified directory it was substantially incorrect by the time it was offered for sale. The directory was also an expensive project that didn't produce enough income to cover its cost because so few people actually bought them.

One of my biggest concerns during the summer of 1986 was the national obsession about the war on drugs. I didn't fear that its success would pack NA meetings with addicts seeking recovery — that was my dream. I feared the misconceptions being propagated by misinformed media moguls. They were making lots of money selling news time about the "war," yet having no positive impact on addicts suffering with the disease. They exposed using addicts, often making celebrities of them and thereby making it harder for them to find recovery. For recovering addicts with only a few years clean time (or less), the notoriety made it hard to stay clean. This exposure did lead some back to using. Most were simply being exploited. I privately recognized that the war on drugs was a political game on one hand and a money-maker for the media businesses on the other. Of course, the office kept to the tradition of expressing no public opinion on what was really an "outside issue."

I would have favored a war on drug *addiction* rather than a war on the addicts. I felt that it was important to understand addiction as a disease and to confront those with the disease and offer a solution rather than spend millions on interdiction of drug trafficking. But those in power were more interested in "law enforcement" than in getting addicts clean. I felt that the "war" was another election charade intended to pressure Congress for more money for law enforcement budgets and to garner re-election votes for those supporting the "get tough policy on illegal drugs."

The war was a boon to the news media, as it provided a great opportunity to parade drug busts, hard working cops and helpless addicts before the nation on the evening news. There was a mad rush by the media to scour the streets for sympathy stories about addicts. When their searches didn't involve the fellowship, we kept out of their way. But when they contacted NA, we often became involved. Individuals, area committees and regional committees were calling every day with requests for advice, help and clarification of what they could do. We were concerned that every effort be made to remain within the bounds of the Traditions so as to protect our members and NA.

We had a particular concern about stories carried by the national media. A large number of these stories were generated in or around New York City, and we felt that an area PI committee in those situations might not have enough perseverance to adequately protect themselves, other recovering addicts and the fellowship. We began to evolve a practical response system to these national media stories. With Kim, who was then living in New York City, as the principal liaison, we put our national media response team into effect in a few situations. This involved telephone consultations with the team before and after national media contacts. The team was composed of a trustee, conference officer, the chairperson or vice-chairperson of the PI Committee and one of our office staff members versed in PI matters.

The media folks wanted full faces on camera, and we went out of our way to discourage that, refusing to participate if that was the plan. Some members on their own elected to allow their full face identities to be shown, much to our dismay. Typical of the situations we participated in was one of the hour-long news magazine programs. Kim helped locate an acceptable volunteer who was to appear on camera in an interview without having her identity revealed. Kim was off camera when the filming was done and acted as advisor on how to accomplish the interview, with taste, and still avoid showing our member's face. Conference calls preceded and followed the taping.

In mid-summer, Chuck and Stu flew to London to make final arrangements for the convention. Because it was so far away and difficult to truly make decisions in concert with the rest of the board, Chuck and Stu took over control of the convention, for all practical purposes. When they returned, Steve B. and I were briefed about what they had decided and a report was sent to the full board. They also went to Germany, and after their meetings, reported our relationship with them was much improved.

In August we finalized the basics of an agreement with the United Kingdom service office that permitted them to print pamphlets and the White Booklet in England. The printing part of the agreement worked quite well. They got the literature easily and at a fairly reasonable cost. However, the other aspects of the agreement never worked as they were supposed to. We had agreed a year earlier that they would hold the money due to the WSO on literature sales until we negotiated an agreement, and then we would ask for the money. They bought literature from us, and for more than two years we did not ask for the money.

The funds they kept were actually used on a variety of other things such as their office operation and PI. This was done with my general knowledge and consent. We expected the agreement to be reached relatively quickly, and that the requirement for payment would be quite small. But as it turned out, it took about three-years to reach agreement. Although they were required to pay less than ten percent of what everyone else paid, they didn't have the money when we asked for it. Negotiations about the payment had still not been completed when I left the WSO in 1990. I believe the office eventually forgave the United Kingdom service office the entire amount of its debt, some 17,000 dollars (US). In practical terms, it turned out to be an additional subsidy from the US fellowship to the UK fellowship. Their failure to pay the office was a mistake for which I share considerable blame.

In August we notified the fellowship in the *Newsline* about the status of the editing and printing of the Text. We didn't want to incur criticism for keeping the fellowship in the dark. We reported that the revisions of the White Booklet portions of the Text were made, and would be reflected in the next printing (it would be the Third Edition (Revised)). The editing, in accordance with the conference instructions from 1985, was behind schedule, but the editor's work had been completed, and was then in the hands of the Literature Review Committee. The edited version would become the Fourth Edition and would come later. The Literature Review Committee concurred with this report, and there were few, if any complaints from the fellowship.

Although our transition to a computerized accounting and order entry system was taking place, we were having problems both in that area and within the shipping department. In the final weeks of August, I made some staff reassignments in the hope of improving things. The shipping activity was then managed by a woman named Linda M., a non-addict, who I felt had not been getting the job done properly. There was employee dissension, poor performance, and several problems with inventory control and purchasing. And to complicate things, she was on maternity leave, so for a while I used a temporary supervisor. I finally decided to make a permanent change. After talking it over with the chairperson of the board, I offered the job to Bob S., our H&I Coordinator. Fortunately, Linda decided to quit.

Bob was reluctant at first to take the job, but with a little encouragement he agreed. During the remaining years I was with the office, he did just about everything I wanted him to do. His soft management approach helped infuse a positive attitude among the shipping department staff. But we then had to find a replacement H&I coordinator. I immediately asked Randy, the H&I chairperson, to

search through the army of H&I people and help find a good coordinator for us.

Beginning on August twenty-eighth, NA held its first World Convention outside of the US with the theme of "Live from London." This, the sixteenth World Convention, was held in the Wembley conference center. Our members were spread out among numerous hotels. Americans mostly stayed in the hotels, while many Europeans stayed with members of the London fellowship.

Vivian R. had been the chairperson of the convention, a difficult position to be in, since Chuck and Stu took over operational control of the convention when they arrived a few days before it started. But Vivian had the grace and wit to handle the situation and still get her committee to work hard. Vivian was a talented administrator who exemplified the English propensity to be organized and have well-established plans. She was assisted by David T., as dignified, dashing and refined as the English can be. Both Vivian and David possessed a dry wit and a considerable propensity for having fun. Together they had managed a complex but successful event. It didn't make much money, but through their leadership it didn't lose money either. Fortunately, there had been enough money left over from the Washington DC convention to carry us through this one and on to the convention in New Orleans.

Most reports claim that over a thousand people attended the convention. Although smaller than the previous World Conventions, a thousand addicts in London was quite a crowd. It was good for the Americans who went, as it exposed them to the needs of European members. It probably encouraged and frightened the Europeans as they could easily see they were part of an enormous American fellowship. It did create a lot of enthusiasm among their members.

While the conventioners were having a good time, the Traditions part of *It Works*, was heading for a behind-the-scenes crisis. At long last a sizable quantity of input on the Traditions had been organized and compiled in readable fashion by the contractor. However, some of it was contradictory, while other ideas were not fully developed, and there were some ideas that seemed to be missing. He had discussed this at length with the Literature Review Committee, who finally asked the trustees for help. An ad hoc committee was created to help sort through the problems. The contractor even wrote a list of questions to help the committee fill in the blanks and clear up the contradictions. A series of meetings and phone calls followed, and the trustees began to filling in these gaps. In time, over sixty pages of information were created.

I prepared the usual report for the Board of Directors in advance of their October meeting. One of the problems I decided to address was how to present the best long-term resolution of the problem of fulfilling our responsibility to the European fellowship. There was no doubt that the right solution was to open a branch office there rather than continue trying to do everything from California. This idea had been discussed from time to time, but nothing concrete had been done.

In my board report I explained I was greatly in favor of this, but also reluctant to attempt a European branch office without first getting experience at managing a branch office in the US. Taking recognition of some of our other problems, I wrote the board suggesting that we open a branch office in the New York City area as a first start. This would give us experience in managing a branch office, yet at the same time prepare groundwork for some of the tasks a European office would handle. Additionally, the person there could also be an immediate resource to the PI problems coming from the nightly news "drug war."

I suggested the total staff be one coordinator (primarily a PI kind of person) and a clerical assistant. Like most such ventures, I thought it would take months of discussions to reach consensus, so this was just the first step. I was surprised when the board quickly approved the idea and authorized money for the coordinator position. We announced the position was open and began to search through the candidates.

Three other important issues were being discussed with the board at and between meetings during the early fall: moving the office so as to consolidate our operations in one large building (and possibly buying the building), making the Basic Text available for sale through regular bookstores across the country, and purchasing the equipment to do much of our own printing (not including the books). During the following year, much about these issues was discussed by the boards, and within the conference. When there was opportunity, I would squeeze in a little time to gather information on these issues and share it in board meetings.

Considerable support grew for having the office buy a building. We were looking for opportunities, and might have done so, but other priorities got in the way. The idea of selling the Text through bookstores was never resolved. For several years we investigated different approaches to getting it done, but none proved easily acceptable. The main problem was that in order to get the book into regular bookstores, we would have to offer a large discount to the bookstores and have on hand a large number of books with which to supply their needs. After a while, the board was willing to print enough books but

the discount was just too high for the board to accept. About buying the printing equipment and doing our own printing, we eventually decided not to pursue the matter. The equipment was dangerous enough that it would substantially increase our insurance costs, and the expense for separating the noise and vapors connected with printing from the other staff areas made the whole idea impractical.

Translation projects were starting to produce usable material. The committee in Germany sent us several pamphlets they had worked on. We had them checked by the Berlitz translation service, and they reported that the translations were excellent. This gave us the confidence to depend more on the German committee. The French translations were another matter.

It seems "French" written and spoken in France is slightly different than in Quebec, Canada. There were many discussions between them, and we encouraged them to work out their differences. We even agreed to pay for some phone calls and two members to travel to the other committee to work on final translations. Andrea, the Canadian spearheading the French translations, was always on my tail to keep the process flowing. She wanted me to concede on every point of disagreement. There were some tense moments between us, but we kept working.

During October, our staff and the conference committees were preparing for the Charlotte, North Carolina workshops. The Literature, Policy and PI Committees were each ready to propose works for conference approval in the spring. So the Charlotte meeting was expected to be productive and exhausting. H&I, we thought, was also about to propose their "H&I can" be taken away and rely upon the generosity of the area and regional committees for funding like other committees.

About a month before the Charlotte meeting, the Steps portion of *It Works* arrived from the printer. It looked great! As word had been going out for some time about their pending arrival, we had lots of advance orders, and they were sent out as quickly as possible. The Literature Review Committee was quite pleased with their work and expected a good response. However, almost as soon as they hit the mail, we began to get negative phone calls, some quite angry and strongly worded. Over the first month we got a lot of phone calls and letters complaining about various passages, about the fact it was an approval form rather than a new review form, and about the fact that a non-member professional had been used to help write it.

For the week before the Charlotte committee workshop, I was in Washington DC at a conference put on by the Partnership for a Drug Free America. This was one of about a half dozen events targeted by the PI Committee to have a booth at and hand out our literature. Biff

K., the committee vice-chair, Marty E. from the local fellowship, and I spent most of our time in the booth giving out literature and answering questions. When it was over I drove on to Charlotte, and into a firestorm!

One of the factors we had considered when deciding where and when to have the conference committee workshops was whether to avoid having it in the back yard of the standing minority. Well the last three conferences had been quite tame, so we were lulled into complacency when we chose Charlotte. Rather than being a peaceful and productive event like Minneapolis had been, this was four days of constant conflict.

The standing minority came out there in force, having recruited and brought to the meeting a large number of people to protest about the Steps portion of *It Works*. The complaints we had already received were mild compared to what took place in Charlotte. In Charlotte, we faced a well orchestrated opposition, and the tactics used against Ginni and Kim years earlier came back to life. The leaders of the opposition had a game plan, and they worked it well. Their objectives were to throw out the Steps publication, return to the earlier draft of the work, and banish everyone associated with the project.

They charged there were too many passages where AA influence was obvious. It was tainted, it seems, by the fact that one of the professionals who had been a part of the work was an AA member. From those intimately familiar with AA literature, we were told there were passages that sounded like they came right from AA publications. Although I was not familiar with AA literature, I was certain the Literature Review Committee had thoroughly revised and re-written the work before it was finalized. There had been about twenty-five long-term NA members who had worked on the project over the past two years, and I just couldn't accept that they would have allowed an undue amount of AA jargon to have been incorporated into it.

In the halls and in the Literature Committee there were vigorous arguments. Despite having six trustees, four directors and all of the conference leadership there as resources, the standing minority carried the day. They so strongly pressed their attack that several trustees switched sides from supporting the draft to calling for its demise. I was greatly disappointed by this "change of heart" under pressure.

Suzanne was assaulted so much it was hard to see how she could take the punishment they handed out. I got my share too, for having been part of the plan to pay someone (and an AA person at that!) to work on NA literature. There was such controversy that a Friday night "open forum" meeting was held in order to allow people to vent their feelings. There were a number of separate issues discussed: What was the proper procedure to take this work from a review form

(subject to revision) to an approval form (submitted for approval as-is)? Why was there such a difference in content between the review form and the approval form? Where did the authority come from to use a professional? Why did the content sound like AA? Why did we use a closed committee rather than the old style "everybody's welcome" format? It was hard to determine the relative value of each person's complaint.

Looking back at the draft years later, it is obvious that it contained good material. Unfortunately, its content may have been of more help to addicts with some clean time rather than to newcomers. This was part of the objection, and also part of the reason it sounded a little like AA lingo.

Chuck explained in his vice-chairperson's letter in the *Fellowship Report* after the meeting about the approval form dilemma. "In some case, review-form drafts and final approval-form literature are similar, but on occasion approval-form literature bears little resemblance to earlier review drafts." A few sentences later he continued, "Two things are certain. First *"It Works: How and Why"* is out in approval form and scheduled for action at WSC 87. Second, no service board or committee has the actual authority to stop the approval process."

He was right on target, and although the standing minority knew this, they didn't care. It was not enough to simply campaign to defeat approval in the spring, they intended to disrupt the process and spread fear among the fellowship. It was simply a power struggle. For several years, members of the standing minority had been left out of key committee assignments, and they didn't really have much legitimate power. This campaign would be a test of their strength. Unfortunately, dishonesty became a key tool they used in order to win. They spread many untruths about the work that had been done, the people involved, and the costs associated with it.

Despite the eruption in the Literature Committee, they made progress on revising three pamphlets and finishing another. They also raised concern about six places in the Text that included language that they felt was inconsistent with a current understanding of NA philosophy. But since they couldn't simply make the changes, they proceeded to send them out for consideration at the conference. When the next *Newsline* was prepared, they included a two-and-a-half-page report giving all the details they could cram into it.

Over in the H&I Committee, a renewed call for a paperback edition of the Text — with or without the personal stories — was raised again. Dutch H., the trustee, was the principal proponent, and I felt a little awkward having a confrontation with him over the issue before the committee. They eventually proposed removing the "H&I can"

but wanted a thirty percent discount on their literature purchases as quid pro quo. They talked openly about helping find a replacement for Bob S. as the H&I coordinator, but they couldn't find one. Several weeks later I called Randy again and gave him one last chance to come up with a name. He offered no suggestion, so I struck out on my own.

The Policy Committee had really begun to roll. They had written membership requirements for their committee and devised draft policies for the approval of various types of material. The most valuable of their completed projects was writing a policy that would simplify the creation of materials the committees would use internally. They hadn't been successful in writing the rules of order for the conference, although that had been their first priority.

When the Convention Corporation met in November, we were presented with the tragic news that Cardillo had written a check to Expotel for the money due at the time of the convention, but the check was refused by the bank, and Cardillo had gone out of business. Also a few NA members who had paid Cardillo and didn't go to the convention, wanted refunds. We were soon contacted by Expotel who wanted us to make good on the bad check. The board authorized us to make refunds to the members, but said no to Expotel.

Progress was reported on the planning for the New Orleans convention, and decisions were made on prices for registration and the banquet. A program committee was set up to provide for broad participation in the selection of speakers. The two bids for the 1988 convention were reviewed (Anaheim and Santa Clara) and a board member was assigned to meet with each bid committee.

In mid-November the trustees had their fall meeting. They completed a full agenda, receiving reports on nine issues their members had written about. They addressed such issues as illness in recovery, NA language, open and closed meetings, medication, and special interest meetings. It was one of the most productive meetings in years. The support Steve S. provided to them was paying off.

When the fall *Fellowship Report* was prepared, we included in the WSO section a proposal that we had been hinting at earlier. We suggested discontinuing the *World Directory* and publishing a phone-line directory instead. We were hopeful the idea would catch on, but if pressed, we would have kept on making the directory.

In my quest for an H&I coordinator, I called Anthony E. in DC and asked if he would consider taking the position. It took him completely by surprise. We had not discussed anything about him working for the office, and I doubt he had even considered it. He had a good job in Washington DC, and he was in the community where he

grew up. The idea of coming to LA was a new concept. We had a few conversations about it, as he wanted to discuss it with his wife Bea, and give the offer some thought. It took a few weeks, but after a visit to California for an interview, he said yes and prepared for the move of his life.

Another issue that I finally had time to get finished was a draft of the long-awaited report on financial and legal matters. In this twelve-page report, I provided guidance on matters like what non-profit and tax exempt status did and didn't do for corporations, how to obtain tax exemption, and on banking regulations.

For a long time I had been issuing warning notes and talking with office directors and trustees about issues that needed to be faced with regard to the Internal Revenue Service. In order for a non-profit organization to properly comply with its tax-exempt status, it had to register with the IRS and file annual reports with them. The office was in compliance, and we were including the income and expense of the World Service Conference in our annual report, so they were in compliance too. But the rest of the fellowship, in my opinion, was in violation of IRS regulations. It was my contention that every dollar every group received as a contribution from its members needed to be reported to the IRS.

I was often told that NA didn't need to do that, since AA didn't report money from its groups and committees. I would respond that this really didn't constitute legal precedent, because it was not clear that AA was in compliance with the law either. Unfortunately, almost no one outside the branch of the IRS responsible for tax exempt organizations knows the requirements of the law. Even if AA didn't know the law, and the IRS tax exemption division hadn't gone after them, we still had a duty to comply with the law.

It was my estimate that in 1986, NA collected at meetings and events over five million dollars. The IRS regulations were (and still are) written so that every organization, even NA and its groups, can and should report its income and expenses to the IRS. For all of the years I was with NA, I endeavored to get this point across and get the fellowship to begin to find a solution. It was not until my last year with NA that we finally found an attorney who knew IRS tax law well enough to discuss these matters intelligently. So until then, as in 1986, nothing but talk took place.

As the year was coming to an end, we were still being barraged over the *It Works* issue. A lengthy and coordinated report from all world services branches addressing the issue was prepared and distributed. The report focused on the reality of the situation. Rather than force a yes or no vote, or a yes vote with motions to modify page

after page during conference debate, alternatives were offered. We suggested that input be sent in for changes that could be made in the approval form, and those changes would be compiled and considered at the conference.

As 1986 came to a close, most of world service attention was focused on the *It Works* issue, but other things got done too. The trustees met and continued work on their projects, efforts to revise the convention guidelines were completed, and the Administrative Committee got ready for the *Agenda Report*. We had been unsuccessful in finding a candidate within the ranks of the PI Committee for the coordinator position in a New York branch office. So in December I began to have discussions with Willie L., an office board member from North Dakota, about the possibility of hiring him.

When the WSO Board of Directors met in early January, I asked them for authorization to hire Willie to fill the position, subject to his resignation from the board. Their agreement was without dissent. On other matters, they adopted motions for the second time to be included in the *Agenda Report* and approved the budget I proposed, which was based on anticipated income of \$3,500,000.

The Joint Administrative Committee met in early January to prepare the *Agenda Report*. They were confronted with a bevy of motions from regions, several of which were disruptive to the work being done by conference committees. The JAC added several motions of their own, including options explained in the special report about *It Works* that had been mailed in December. In the *Fellowship Report*, Chuck L. addressed the regional motions, pointing out that they would be included in the *Agenda Report* but stressing the need to use the conference committees to evolve fellowship policies rather than just submitting motions developed within one region.

From the Literature Committee, Suzanne's committee put forward approval recommendations for *Working Step Four in Narcotics Anonymous*, *Am I an Addict* (revised), *Staying Clean on the Outside*, *The Group* (revised) and *Hey! What's the Basket for?* In her *Fellowship Report* she explained about the editing of the Basic Text. She wrote, "The editor did an exceptional job of light editing, which consisted of spelling, punctuation, capitalization and grammatical corrections. The Literature Review Committee was given the task of reviewing the edit to ensure that the content and meaning of the book had not been altered. The Literature Review Committee has completed their review and is satisfied with the editing job." She then went on to discuss the conceptual problems they discovered in reviewing the Text that they wanted guidance on.

The *Agenda Report* was mailed on schedule, and was then subjected to the usual series of meetings and workshops to discuss it. We

were more concerned about the standing minority meetings this time than before, as we knew they were mounting a maximum effort to defeat the *It Works* book. The only thing we could do, and did, was to be available as a resource for facts. Several world-level trusted servants traveled to regional agenda workshops to present the truth and offer the voice of reason.

In late January, Willie came to work as the new PI coordinator. Willie was an ideal candidate for this assignment considering his education, service experience and objectives. He soon proved to be a valuable addition to the staff. He was reserved in manner, but clear in his understanding of the principles of NA recovery. Willie was good at making oral reports or presentations but even better at writing reports and correspondence. He was also dependable and tenacious when given assignments. Though he would eventually be moved to run the New York office, he started out with an office in Los Angeles.

At the February office board meeting, we had a lengthy report from and discussion with our attorney on the Cardillo Travel company problem. His research had clearly shown the company was "a bloodless turnip," and the Expotel lawyers were about to file a lawsuit against us in an effort to recover their loss. Unfortunately the cost of the legal battle (i.e., to prove that we were not liable for the loss), would eventually cost more than finding a settlement out of court and paying all or part of what Expotel wanted. Additionally, we would be drawn into public controversy, and that we wanted to avoid. This issue was discussed again and again during the next seven months as more information surfaced and we moved toward resolution.

Early in the year I wrote another essay on the *World Directory*. Printed in the *Newsline* the essay was a second request for input on the alternatives to a *World Directory* that I had written about earlier. Although I tried to present an objective view, most readers could tell I wanted to end collecting meeting details and printing the directory. Simply put, a vast quantity of our information was inaccurate at the time of publication. Typically a new meeting would register with us soon after it started. However, few groups provided updates about their meetings when they moved, changed times or meeting days, or when they folded. The most accurate information was available at the area level. Unfortunately, we couldn't even get area committees to give us their updates on a timely basis. It was clear to us that the office should not continue to make a directory of this type, and the duty to provide meeting information should be in the hands of area and regional committees.

In the last report to the fellowship before the conference, a number of important matters were addressed. Leah wrote about the dilemma we faced concerning regional representatives from countries without enough money to send their RSR to the conference. She also noted the difficulty faced by non-English-speaking RSR's when they arrived at the conference. She explained an effort would be made to provide translators (although there might be limitations), but she felt the conference did not have enough money to pay for transportation and lodging for their RSR's.

She also addressed concerns about a few dedicated members who had not accepted the decision of the conference in 1986 to change the White Booklet. Some of them had tried to rent a room at the conference hotel for a "hospitality suite," where they intended to lobby members to reverse the earlier conference decision. Leah put the hotel on notice that they could not permit this, and the hotel canceled the reservation. It was not even a regional service committee, but an ad hoc group of individual members. Leah was determined not to allow the conference to be turned into a political caucus where delegates would be "hammered" by proponents of one issue or another who set up shop and tried to alter the group conscience process.

In another *Fellowship Report* section, Mary B. included a lengthy analysis of the International Committee. Her report reflected the extensive discussions going on within her committee, the trustees, conference leadership, the WSO board and the Select Committee. A large portion of her report concerned itself with the question of whether the conference was truly a world conference or a North American conference. She explained that most issues the conference addressed concerned the needs of the US fellowship, and only to a lesser degree did it address concerns from other countries. The committees, for example, were composed of American members and addressed American needs. It was not possible for the American committee members or conference participants to be fully informed about the needs of non-US fellowship.

"First, there is something basically wrong," she wrote, "with the notion that one or two representatives would come from each country representing an entire nation. Where, here on this continent where only two nations are present, we have over fifty regions [voting at the conference]. If each country were to form as many regions [as over time they will] we would have some serious problems. Administratively it would be nearly impossible to coordinate the issues and motions each region in each country might bring to the conference. The issues in literature, PI and H&I would be quite different."

Among the ideas advanced in the report were suggestions that the current World Service Conference should in fact be changed to be