

a North American service conference, and that a new World Service Conference be created. As a parallel discussion, the idea was also advanced that the World Service Office be divided into two offices, one to serve the needs of the North American fellowship and the other office to serve truly international needs. Mary's report suggested the International Committee, as it was then structured, was not really of value to the international fellowship. It lacked the funding, specific responsibility and purpose. She suggested a new committee be developed that would replace the existing committee. This was the culmination of three-years of conflict between the committee and the office over what the office should be doing and what an American volunteer committee could effectively contribute. It had taken a long time to get Mary and her key committee members to understand the committee was more of a hindrance than a help to international fellowship matters. They recommended the committee be disbanded.

Suzanne signaled what was probably the death knell for the Steps portion of *It Works* in her Literature Committee report. She wrote there had been so much input received in response to their request, that if properly acted on by the committee, it would substantially alter the approval form as it was published. There were just too many proposed changes to be accommodated. She reported the committee elected to move forward with approval as it was printed rather than try to make a "patch-up" job during the conference. Nearly everyone recognized that few conference delegates would have voted to approve the manuscript without some changes, but neither would they vote for a work that had been substantially changed after the fellowship had their chance to review it and vote on it.

As the conference approached, we readied ourselves for a high-energy conflict. It seemed like this conference was about to turn away from the more positive and spiritual experience of the past three meetings. It was a sad turn of events.

Chapter Seventeen

A Gradual Shift

Perhaps through an accident of fate, most of the world trusted servants I had worked with since 1983 worked well together as a unified team. Yes, there were a few who worked against the majority, but on the whole nearly everyone was working in the same direction. In the coming conference year, there was a gradual shift. A few of the long-time trusted servants went on to other pursuits. Some of their replacements were of a different mind, and gradual adjustments had to be made as new leaders and new ideas emerged.

Leah G. called the 1987 World Service Conference to order on Monday morning, April twenty-seventh, at the Airtel Plaza Hotel. Sixty-nine participants answered the first roll call, including forty-nine regions and twenty others. Since the chairpersons of both the PI and Literature Committees had resigned, their vice-chairs were recognized as acting chairpersons. Shortly thereafter, seven new regions were recognized, including Israel, whose delegate was Etti D. This gave the regions a seventy-nine percent voting block. Efforts at this conference and in later years to remove the voting rights of the trustees could no longer reasonably rest on the claim that the trustee votes controlled the conference or represented an undue influence on group conscience.

The day was spent hearing reports from the various regions, but during the general forum held that evening, the full strength of venom against the *It Works* project was revealed. The same objections were aired about the material having an AA slant, and about our having used an AA member as one of the writers.

Committee meetings were held on Tuesday. Administrative reports were given in the general session that evening, including another lengthy one the staff and I had written for the office. The only memorable items were the fact that we now had thirty-three employees, and that we had sold 215,352 copies of the text during the year. This brought the total number of books sold to 471,263 since it had first been published. The staff were doing a great job, and the success of the conference committees was clear testimony to their skill and ability.

As usual, I reported on the number of meetings registered by state and non-US countries. There were a total of 7,638 in the US and 735 in other countries (the majority of these were in Canada, Australia and England). Although we were already deeply involved with translations of literature into other languages, there were relatively few meetings in most non-English-speaking countries. That number would increase dramatically over the next few years, and our translations problems would expand accordingly.

In another section of my report I sounded the alarm about limitations on WSO income, indicating that this would in turn limit the ability of the office to do everything the conference wanted. I explained we had enough income right now, and we still had income growth potential to meet most current requests, but in the next few years the office would not have as much "available income," and the conference would have to cut back its expectations. During the following years, I used this "reality check" when motions were made or policies proposed that would use up more of the limited office financial resources.

As a change from strict reporting, I included a section that addressed the conflict that was just beginning to surface between some conference officers and the staff. Central to the issue was to what extent should the staff be utilized in achieving the objectives of a committee. In several cases, the staff had done most of the work produced by committees. If they had not been so diligent, the work would not have been completed. Several volunteers were unhappy with this, claiming the staff were actually taking over the role of the committee officers and members. Not deterred in the slightest, I was proud of the success our staff had with keeping the committees working and productive.

When it came to motions proposed by the office, each was adopted. The first, written by Ron H., expanded the content of the magazine to include an editorial comments section and a section for newsworthy events around NA. Another motion authorized the production of a phonenumber directory. This was the final move in terminating our unproductive struggle to produce a *World Directory* of meetings. The conference "recommended WSO produce a softcover Text at the same price as the hardcover Text," which we took as a directive. We were not thrilled with this motion, but knew it was inevitable, so after the conference we made preparations to accomplish it.

Several motions from the standing minority were directed at altering the Board of Directors, but these were not adopted. Ruben F., the RSR from San Diego, proposed "That the WSO office manager, Bob Stone, be heartily commended for his service to our fellowship and be urged to continue with the blessing of the conference." Al-

though the motion was not necessary, the unanimous affirmative vote was reassuring. We were also asked to "prepare a report for the fellowship as a whole on the possibility and impact of reducing the price of our Basic Text and pamphlets by twenty-five percent" and its impact on world services. Steve B. and I opposed the motion during debate.

On Wednesday morning, Randy J. began with H&I matters. Their motions were all adopted, including removal of the "H&I cans" from NA meetings. The elimination of the H&I can as a funding source for H&I Committees was a hard thing for many to accept. The cans had been successful in helping a large number of members into the fellowship. The fear that addicts in institutions would be forgotten and left on their own was hard to overcome. I believe the change did not materially harm the opportunities for addicts in hospitals or institutions to find NA, but it brought the H&I Committee's funding pattern into line with other committees throughout the service structure.

Ed D. came next with Policy Committee motions. They had developed a reasonably clear statement of structure and purpose for their committee. This was finally adopted after a lengthy debate during which several changes were made. A second proposal was overwhelmingly adopted. This one outlined two separate procedures: one for developing material to be used within a conference committee, and another for creating new PI materials.

Acting PI chairperson Biff K. then gave the year-end PI Committee report. But before he delivered his report, he asked Billy Z., who had been chairperson of one of their sub-committees, to make a report. The sub-committee's focus was on making NA more accessible to those with physical, visual or hearing handicaps. During Billy's report, he proposed that an ad hoc committee, separate from PI, be created by the conference to continue this work. The new committee, he suggested, should address how the conference, and the fellowship as a whole, could help addicts with special needs succeed in the fellowship. There were an unknown number of addicts with disabilities (those in wheel chairs, or without vision or hearing or similar disabilities), and there was a concern that these members were inadvertently discriminated against because the fellowship was not aware of their special needs. Billy further suggested that there needed to be programs geared toward helping them succeed in recovery and participate in service. After relatively little discussion, and without any clear understanding of its purpose, an ad hoc committee was created.

This was an example of the conference getting emotional over the plight of addicts in need, and attempting to help by throwing money at the problem, but not developing any clear purpose or plan of action.

The committee was called the "Additional Needs Committee." They held meetings and workshops for the next two years. Cost to the conference and the office for this committee — its meetings, including transportation, lodging, meals, phone calls and administrative support — was in the range of \$45,000. Although the committee did raise the consciousness about those with special needs for a while, it produced no lasting results.

The committee was intended "to investigate and disperse the current information on accessibility of NA meetings to those individuals from whom the message of recovery is limited, impaired or inaccessible due to physical, audiological or linguistic difficulties or handicaps." I cringed as the motion carried. The idea behind its formation was positive and laudable, but I knew it wasn't going to work out quite like its originators said it would.

Biff then proceeded to advance PI Committee motions. Their proposal for a world-level PI contingency plan was adopted, formalizing the process we were already using. Setting the stage for the next few years' PI efforts, the conference approved a new "Learning Days and Workshops" section of the *PI Handbook*. Considerable portions of the PI budgets that followed this conference went to fund participation learning days and non-fellowship PI events.

In essence, the committee had decided that the tools created while Kim J. was the chairperson were still adequate. Their focus was now shifting toward helping regional and area committees use the new PI tools. It was an important developmental shift for the committee: beyond tool development, toward actual implementation. A lot of staff work had gone into the development of those tools, and a lot more staff work and money would be invested in the next phase. I'm glad to say that it was a sound, well-managed plan. In the following years, considerable benefit was derived from these PI expenditures and hard work.

Mark D., who had been serving on the Select Committee as an RSR, was pressed into service to give a report for the committee. His report was brief, but included distribution of the newest draft of the *Guide To Service*. It was a mark of progress, and as usual, when the conference was handed massive documents, they commended the committee and extended their charter for another year. With ease and charm, Mark responded to questions about the work and gave everyone reason to believe another year might get the job done.

Michael L., acting Literature Committee chairperson, presented his report next. Michael had been the vice-chairperson when Suzanne resigned, so he had taken over leadership of the committee only six weeks before the conference. We had worked closely with

Michael during those weeks to help him prepare for the conference and plan for the next year.

Frankly I had not trusted Michael much in prior years. I hadn't felt he had the maturity and strength to manage the Literature Committee, unquestionably the most volatile — and perhaps the most important — of the conference committees. However, in those six weeks he had erased any doubts I had. Quietly over the year he had changed and matured, so when thrust into the fire, he proved more than capable of handling the job. It may not have been easy for him at that conference or over the following year, but he certainly earned my admiration.

After giving his report, he guided the conference through the maze of literature motions and issues. He did a masterful job. For hours he fended off bad motions and attacks and led the way to resolve conflicting views of literature matters. He proposed a motion to change the Text to bring it into line with the changes adopted in the White Booklet in 1986. Despite attempted alterations, all the committee's recommendations were adopted but one. When it came to the *It Works* issue, considerable discussion ensued before a vote was taken. A roll call vote showed only twenty votes in favor of approval; fifty were opposed. With this defeat was washed away thousands of hours of effort and money invested in the project.

Although the standing minority had succeeded in defeating this draft of *It Works*, there was still a desire to have a book on the Steps and Traditions, so discussion turned to constructive alternatives. After some time, an ad hoc committee was appointed with instructions to find a solution and report back later in the conference. The committee was weighted with members identified with the standing minority. I was more than apprehensive when the committee met the next day.

Among the literature motions from regions was one from the Southern California RSR. He proposed that the pre-1986 White Booklet be declared a historical document and printed for those who elected to use it. There was a determined struggle over this. He was speaking for a group of members in his region who strongly criticized adoption of the changes to the White Booklet at the previous conference. They felt that insufficient time had been given for this significant a change. Members not involved in reviewing the *Conference Agenda Report*, for example, were caught off guard when they heard the main readings at meetings suddenly change. They wanted the old language to be made available again as a special historical document. However when it was all over, the vote was fifty-two to four in favor of using the new version. The conference asked those who were

bootlegging the older edition to cease, and to respect last year's group conscience decision.

On Thursday morning Mary B. began the day by proposing the dissolution of the International Committee. Her motion was adopted with seventy votes in favor and none opposed. Her next motion, to suggest that the WSO board create an ad hoc international advisory committee, was adopted.

Mary and I had worked together before the International Committee dissolved on a report about translations. At issue was what we had learned about how the name, Narcotics Anonymous translates into different languages. The International Committee had devoted a lot of time during the year to this discussion. Actually, the English name "Narcotics Anonymous" has a few problems of its own. The members are not "narcotics," and the fellowship described itself as appropriate for all drug addicts, regardless of the drugs they used. But the English-speaking fellowship was long-since accustomed to this.

In other languages, however, these problems were presenting real translation challenges. In Spanish, for example, many members were using the name "Drogadictos Anonymous." However the conference insisted on always using "narcotics" and didn't consent to the Spanish fellowship's preference. In Portuguese the word "narcotico," which has the appearance of a close translation, is understood throughout the Portuguese speaking world to mean "sleeping." So if they used the name "Narcoticos Anonymous" it would be perceived as "sleepers anonymous" and not really convey the correct sense the name implies in English. There was a serious fight over this in Brazil. Some flexibility in translations had to exist rather than forcing use of the word "narcotics" in our name and in other situations where literal translation confused rather than clarified our philosophy, but it took another year to achieve this.

Jack B. then followed with the trustee report. They had held a meeting the night before the conference began to finalize the articles they had spent the previous year working on. Unfortunately, several articles had been adopted by a simple majority of the board, and the conference was not altogether pleased with that. After some fumbling around for the right words for a motion, the conference voted "that unless the trustees can agree by at least a two-thirds majority, articles [will] be brought to WSC before publication."

When Steve B. took to the podium that afternoon to present the convention motions, they were all adopted. They were a complicated batch of motions, but Steve did another great job at leading the conference through, and no one seemed to get lost. The last convention matter was the selection of the 1988 convention location. The con-

vention was scheduled to be on the West Coast and only two bids had been received: Northern and Southern California regions. After a fairly short presentation, the vote was conducted and the Northern California bid was adopted.

On the coattails of the convention motions, Jamie S-H (London) proposed a motion that was quickly adopted: "That the Joint Administrative Committee be assigned responsibility to develop and present to WSC 1988 a proposal that outlines a cost equalization plan for participation at the WSC by conference participants." I believed Jamie was prompted to make the report by his personal knowledge of the economic hardship most non-US regions faced concerning their participation in the conference. However, the dissolution of the International Committee had lent urgency to the issue. Now there was no one to officially champion this concern, and Jamie saw to it that the matter was assigned to someone. This was the first time a motion had been given to the Joint Administrative Committee. And the motion was worded in a manner that pre-supposed that the conference had already approved of the concept. Some of the Joint Administrative Committee members were quite angry about this and showed their hostility. The motion and the idea behind it were to cause a lot of disharmony in the coming years.

Elections then followed, and each of the principal officers was returned to existing posts: Leah G., chairperson; Chuck L., vice-chairperson; Bob H., treasurer; Randy J., H&I; Ed D., Policy; Biff K., PI; Michael L., Literature. Elected to the WSO board were Martin C., Bob McD., and Jamie S-H. New trustees were Greg P. (returning after three-years off the board), Jack B. (re-elected), and Mario T. (Australia), the only new member.

On the final day, the Select Committee got another work schedule, assigning them a July 1, 1988 deadline for completion of their work. This was followed by a report from the *It Works* ad hoc committee. Their complicated report was adopted. It provided for a twenty-four member ad hoc committee to hold input workshops around the fellowship. It called for the publication of both the old review form of the book (containing both Steps and Traditions sections), and the newer approval form (containing only Steps material), as a single document. This document would, taken as a whole, become a review form publication. The motion was adopted with fifty-two in favor and twelve opposed. We published it after the conference with a blue and white cover.

To complicate matters further, Vince D. was assigned to head the *It Works* ad hoc committee. Vince was the new vice-chairperson of the Literature Committee, and his appointment was reluctantly made by Michael, who recognized that he could not effectively do both jobs

himself. Vince had been on the Literature Committee for several years, but not in a leadership position. He was not methodical in his approach to committee work, and he was headstrong and quick to reach conclusions. He seemed to be easily influenced by the last person he spoke with. In a high profile task about which lots of people held strongly felt opinions, he was not the right leader.

As usual, the final minutes of the conference were devoted to the budget. Although a budget had been sent out in advance of the conference, it was now encumbered by a commitment to hold workshops on *It Works* and the Additional Needs Committee. A budget was adopted, but adhering to it would prove to be difficult.

As soon as the conference was over, the staff got right to work to put into print all of the approved literature and make changes in the handbooks or other items where changes were approved. Key to this was production of the Fourth Edition of the Text. Since the conference did not make any changes to our instructions about printing the edited version, we had the green light to print the Text as it was edited and approved by the Literature Review Committee.

On the Tuesday following the conference, I began making calls to Northern California to finalize the bid they had submitted and get contracts signed for the 1988 World Convention. That was when I learned the bid had been submitted without having first priority reservation of the principal location. As it turned out, their bid was based on having it in Santa Clara at a facility where NA was given "a second option right." This is a common practice in the convention industry whereby a facility gives options to rent the space to more than one organization for the same time periods. The first organization to press ahead forces those with higher priority to sign contracts or lose their priority hold. We sent the letter that forced the procedure into effect. However I was told by the facility managers that the other organization had been using the facility for about ten years on the date we needed it, and they would likely move forward to exercise their option. They did. So within two weeks of the conference closing date, we had a convention scheduled for a city where we had no facilities.

The telephone wires began to heat up as we called various alternative places in the Northern California Region and worked with their committee, their regional officers and the Convention Corporation Board. One alternative turned up. It turned out that the San Francisco convention center would be available for us on Labor Day weekend starting at 1:00 AM on Friday morning, and there were a number of hotels that were interested in working with us. We felt we needed the space starting on Wednesday, but I went to San Francisco to investigate anyway. After visiting the facilities and examining the

space to determine if we could make it work, I felt we could, but it was not a particularly good alternative. The hotels were not very close to the convention center, and our members would be spread out in four different hotels. Overall, it was also more expensive to the members attending than the Southern California bid.

Near the end of the month, I presented all the facts to the convention board. The Southern California Convention Committee still had rights to the facilities they had held in preparing their bid, and all of the events and hotels would be within a hundred yards of each other. The board voted to award the bid to Southern California. We learned some valuable lessons from this exercise, and the errors that caused it did not happen again.

While this was going on, we began research on what became known as the "Georgia Study." This was the report we were directed to prepare on the impact of a possible twenty-five percent reduction in the price of the book and other literature. It took two months to complete, during which the staff collected information on actual sales income for every item so we could compare it to projected income if we did lower the prices.

We faced an even tougher problem with the Joint Administrative Committee who met at the office on the first weekend in June. There we wrestled for two days over how to accomplish all the work set out before us without enough money to pay for all of it. Among the proposals was the suggestion that the office come up with the shortage. To have the shortfall come from WSO funds would have required us to lay off about five employees and reduce our service to the committees and the fellowship at large. We would also have had to scuttle plans to open an office in New York, and since that was preparatory to our opening an office in Europe, both offices would be scuttled for the present. The Board of Directors and I were unwilling to do that. The other alternatives were to reduce some committee expenditures to leave money for others, or to make an across-the-board reduction.

In order to accommodate what was to be called "Vince's traveling road show" on *It Works*, and some level of activity in each of the other conference committees and trustees, it was decided each of them had to accept a reduction in their budgets. Bob R., speaking for the trustees, felt they needed all the money requested in their budget, but agreed to make a reduction. The agreement was tempered by an understanding that if funds did materialize, the trustees would claim the right to use the funds originally authorized. Randy J., H&I chairperson, willingly cut his budget to the bone, as did Biff K. for the PI Committee and Ed D. from Policy. Others, too, made concessions, including Vince, who reduced the number of meetings his project would conduct and the number of people traveling to each meeting. A

budget compromise of sorts was eventually achieved, subject to review at the first conference workshop in Newark, New Jersey.

As the June board meeting drew near, we prepared reports on several vital issues. The board had long discussed the idea of having the Basic Text available for purchase in regular bookstores across the country. I attended a meeting of the American Booksellers Association and gathered information on how it could be done. The other issue was a comprehensive review of worldwide fellowship needs, concentrating on duties for which the office was responsible.

When the office directors met in June, they elected Jim W. as the chairperson and Donna M. as the vice-chair. Most of the meeting was devoted to routine business, but they also acted on the conference budget crisis and several other matters. After hearing my report on selling books through bookstores, the board elected to wait on this, but requested more information. I also presented a preliminary report on a possible move of the WSO when the leases on the current buildings expired at the end of the year. The board directed me to gather one or more detailed bids to buy or lease a single building of twenty thousand feet or more. Considering these and other financial matters, the board was not very supportive of taking on the burden of more direct cash support for the conference. They encouraged me to continue to hold the line against covering the growing conferences expenses.

While the board and I were discussing renewal of my contract, I was asked what I felt was appropriate in terms of a salary increase for the coming year. Since 1985, the board had raised my salary when my contract was renewed. I requested they not increase my salary but instead set aside a month's salary to be part of my severance pay, whenever it came to pass that I left the WSO. They agreed and the matter was settled.

In my report on worldwide responsibilities, I clearly admitted we were not effectively doing our job in serving the fellowships needs in Europe. We did have a staff person assigned to international matters, but they also had other duties. The day-to-day press of work often left European matters undone. It was my recommendation that we open an office in Europe with two people. If this were done, I told the board, we would be able to truly dedicate the staff members' time to European matters. Being in closer proximity to the people they were to work with would produce better results, better relations and better information to the board about the real needs in Europe.

The board was concerned about finances, in light of the concurrent problem with conference budgets. However it was their conclusion that the needs of addicts in the streets of Europe were a higher priority than supporting committee meetings in the US. They

adopted a motion to "open an office of the WSO in Europe, contingent upon acceptance of a proposal approved at the next board meeting." It was their intent that we open the office within six months. We published an invitation in the *Newsline* to submit applications for the position, and over the next year received eighteen applications.

To move this along, they decided to send me and someone else to the European Service Conference to "sell" the Europeans on the idea. In the days following the board meeting, I was approached separately by Ginni and Steve B., who both inquired about the idea of becoming the employee I would send to Europe to open and run the office. Both knew I had told the board I wanted to avoid hiring a European member as the first employee there. After discussing this with the Executive Committee it was decided to have both accompany me on the trip to Europe.

I felt it was important to hire an American to run the European office rather than hiring a member from there. I felt we needed to have a member with eight to ten years clean time, someone with working experience at world services, and a person not easily influenced by others. Finally, I didn't want to hire a European, just in case we later had to fire them. If we hired a senior European and then had to fire the person (as it turned out we did with the person we sent), I felt it might seriously undermine the unity that then existed. I was also concerned about the long-term recovery of any person we hired for this position. To have taken a member from Europe and promote them to this key role and then fire them (if it didn't work out), I felt would be harder on their recovery than if the same turn of events happened to an American who could come back to a large support group of people with more time in recovery and less vested interest as a group.

Another decision by the office board was to support the ad hoc International Committee created as successor to the International Committee. Jim W., the new chairperson of the WSO board, wrote about the need to allocate staff time to prepare for the initial ad hoc meeting in his first *Fellowship Report*. Despite his positive words, the office board was less than enthusiastic about the new committee. As it came to pass, we had only one meeting, and after that we seldom found time to involve the new committee even in telephone discussions of international matters. After a period of time it was all but forgotten. Occasionally the members would ask about it but eventually that ceased too.

Those who were observant knew I had not been in support of the International Committee when it was created in 1984. Further, I hardly concealed my frustration over what I considered intervention into one of the primary duties of the office during the years the com-

mittee existed. I was more than pleased when the committee was eliminated. I felt its substitute, the WSO ad hoc committee, could be reasonably effective and not get in the way of the office doing its job. Although I didn't intentionally set out to destroy this new ad hoc committee, I didn't give it the effort and support that could have made it successful. For my detractors who were quick to criticize my decisions, this was one time when the criticism may have been valid. But I wasn't openly challenged when the ad hoc committee wasn't convened again, or when it faded into oblivion.

About the time of the board meeting, I made several staff reassignments. Ginni had been working with literature development for almost five straight years and needed a break. We modified her duties to have more to do with the production side of literature activities and translations. We moved Danette over to take on the job of Literature Committee Coordinator. Cindy S., an assistant to George, was promoted as Danette's replacement to be the PI coordinator and worked with Willie, who was still in the Los Angeles office but getting prepared to move to New York.

As a carryover from the Joint Administrative Committee meeting on the budget, the July *Fellowship Report* carried three important articles about fellowship finances. Chuck L. explained that he had authored a motion, which the conference adopted, requiring the office to cover conference expenses when they came up short. He also decried the last minute conference decisions that included a high level of expenditures without adequate consideration of the financial impact.

The second report from the Joint Administrative Committee showed the office had, as of the date of the report (July), advanced \$51,715 to the conference, whose revenue at the same time totaled \$5,400! Alternatives advanced in this "budget crisis report" were to reduce conference activities, get the fellowship to contribute more money, or to get money from the WSO without expectation that it would be reimbursed. I believe this period of time was a turning point in the relationship between myself and Chuck and several others in world services. Leah was an assertive chairperson, and her leadership led to a reduction in expense of the committees, so that it was nearly within the boundaries of what could be expected as contributions to the conference. After Leah was out of the picture, Chuck didn't want to abide by that practice. He wanted the office to cover conference expenses that exceeded their revenue.

The third push for money came from Michael L., as chairperson of the Literature Committee. He was clearly in trouble. He had to manage his committee's regular work, which was extensive, but he also had to contend with the expense of the *It Works* traveling show.

His appeal for money was to the point — if the fellowship truly wants the projects it assigned to the committee (and projects in other committees too) then the money must be sent in.

Vince D. reluctantly reduced the *It works* meeting schedule, settling on workshops in ten cities; Seattle, Baltimore, Sydney, Montreal, Chicago, Frankfurt, Dallas, Kansas City, Miami and San Francisco. It was an ambitious program, and certain to be expensive. He began right after the conference to arrange for each workshop. It took a lot of effort to keep up with him. He had the same tendency as Bo displayed years earlier, to work at literature responsibilities all the time, despite any personal obligations he may have had to support himself.

A fortunate change had been taking place within the H&I and PI Committees. They had been shifting their efforts from developing tools to conducting workshops at areas and regions on how to better conduct H&I or PI work. This produced a lighter strain on the conference budget for their committees.

On the other hand there was the new committee on Additional Needs. Just how expensive this committee would be depended on how adventurous they decided to be. It became my mission, and that of a few others at world services, to keep the new committee from being grandiose in deciding what it should be doing.

As the summer rolled on, one of my important tasks was working with the Select Committee. During the following four months I spent a considerable amount of time with Bob R. writing and discussing like we had in earlier years. As the new trustee chairperson, Bob had put himself back onto the committee. For about a year, I had found myself unable to spend much time with him, and our relationship had cooled. At first we renewed our old relationship and patterns of working, but in time our relationship cooled again.

At the first meeting of the Select Committee, we resurrected the earlier idea of having the *Service Manual* describe the trustees and directors as a single board with all the authority and power of the WSO Board and the Board of Trustees combined. We worked on this idea for a number of months, and we both supported it. However, by the fall I had changed my mind and was opposed to the centralization of power in the hands of one board. I felt that a balance of power was required. As difficult as it was at times to contend with differing goals between the trustees and the directors, I found those complications preferable to having no balance between the focus on the business needs of the office — the province of the directors — and the more philosophical or spiritual matters which occupied the hearts and minds of the trustees.

For a while, I believe Bob also supported the single board concept. Later I thought he changed his mind about it, but I was never sure. By the time fall arrived, I recognized I was "burnt out" concerning the Select Committee, and took myself out of their work. I left George with the task of handling their meetings and getting the work done.

As mid-summer approached, we published several studies we had been requested by the conference to produce. The first addressed the collective financial situations of the office and the conference. Boiled down to its essentials, the report suggested that the unrestricted spending spree the conference had embarked on, if contributions did not match expenses, would drain the office of funds sufficiently to substantially diminish the services we could provide. A choice had to be made: rein in the conference's "spend-fest" or expect fewer services from the office.

This produced a conflict that remained until long after I left the WSO in 1990, and it may still exist. One group felt that spending should be under the control of the trustees. Another group felt the Conference (principally its chairperson) should control spending. The third group, the one I counted myself in, felt the decision-making system should remain as it was. But most of us agreed the amount of money spent on committee meetings and their activities was already excessive for the amount work they produced. Although there was a concerted effort to ask the fellowship for more money, the first two groups had no qualms about simply forcing the office to hand over its money and reduce its service to the fellowship.

This led to confrontations with Chuck L., who was taking a more assertive role in conference activities. Leah, although still the chairperson, was ill for much of that summer, and less available for our phone calls and meetings. The first big conflict was at the conference workshop held in July in Newark. We had learned from the Charlotte meeting to put the summer meeting in proximity to the standing minority, and put the fall meeting further west. So off to Newark we went. It was hot and humid, and the hotel was run down and infested with cockroaches. It was certainly the worst we ever used.

A new monster arose while we were preparing for the PI meeting in Newark. It was a complicated issue. Until earlier in that year, the Federal Communications Commission required radio and TV stations to give free PSA time to non-profit organizations. However, since the regulations changed, we learned that some stations, in order to make it lucrative to continue to air non-profit organization PSAs, were getting some advertisers to "sponsor" the PSA announcements. A few stations had thought they had a way to get a tax deduction for their advertisers who sponsored the free PSA spots.

How it appeared on the air was an announcer would say "the following public service announcement is being brought to you by the Big Pig markets" (or something like that) and then a PSA from a non-profit organization followed. We were even able to get copies of a letter from a station to an advertiser that indicated a contribution had been received on behalf of NA for airing the PSA! Unfortunately this same concept could also be applied to other situations where NA benefited from being a non-profit organization. All of this all had to be sorted out.

Clearly we were concerned about the possible violation of Traditions, and even the appearance of an outside endorsement or contribution. Some members felt all PSAs should be withdrawn, or that committees should pay for the PSA air time they wanted to use. I attended the PI Committee meeting when they discussed this issue. After explaining everything we knew about the FCC regulations, we volunteered to do some research and write a report about it later.

In general, the committees did well and were productive in Newark. There were really only two problems. First, the new Additional Needs Committee leadership wanted to build an empire. Rather than deciding to study what could be done in practical ways to help reach addicts with special needs, they decided to promote the creation of Additional Needs committees in areas and regions across the fellowship. Having seen the success other committees had because they had a constituency of committees to support their existence and activities, their first priority was to help form area and regional Additional Needs committees. I thought the whole thing was crazy. The committee didn't have guidelines, they had no clear understanding of their basic mission or composition, and they were trying to create a constituency of connected committees. I did everything I could to keep them focused on the fundamental organizational and investigative tasks rather than building an army.

The other problem was over budgeting. The Joint Administrative Committee meeting in June had come up with a reduced spending plan. We were to meet again in Newark to review spending. We would then decide whether to allocate more money if necessary, or perhaps even reduce spending more. Leah was unable to attend for medical reasons, and Chuck L. was in charge. As I recall, we had a head-on confrontation. If a turning point had not already been reached in his attitude toward me, this was probably it. After this meeting, I believe Chuck considered me his primary enemy. For the rest of the year, and while he served as conference chairperson afterward, we were at odds most of the time, especially over budgeting, priorities for spending, and staff allocations. When we left the Newark meeting, the budgeting questions were not resolved.

From Newark, Ginni, Steve and I went to London as the first leg of our journey to the European Service Conference in Germany. In London we met with the attorney we were using in the Expotel/Cardillo matter. Expotel was determined that the Convention Corporation should pay for the loss, and we didn't want to pay for something that was not our responsibility.

We all knew their claim would rightfully be against the individual members whose money was not passed on to Expotel by Cardillo. Cardillo was the agent for the individual member, as they were the ones who had put up the money and used the rooms in the hotels. But Expotel knew it was impractical to try and sue a hundred and thirty individual Americans for three or four hundred dollars each. They correctly concluded that we probably had enough money, and our tradition of avoiding public controversy augured against us letting the matter go to trial. They also correctly concluded we would not be very inclined to have our individual members end up in court in lieu of the Convention Corporation. They were pretty sure that we would eventually agree to pay them something.

Soon after our visit they filed suit against us in the English court seeking payment of the nearly \$15,000 plus interest and their legal fees. While we were with our attorney on this trip, we set the parameters they should use for finding a negotiated settlement.

The board had been supportive of my recommendation that the European office should be in London. There were four sizable fellowships existing in Europe at the time: Ireland, Germany, France and England. England was the largest. I felt we would have an easier time getting an office to function if the society in which the office operated also spoke English. Later, after a few years of operation, and when we had worked out a routine for managing a branch office so far away, the office could move if that were desirable.

Steve, Ginni and I spent some time looking for potential office space in one of the communities along the transit line between Heathrow airport and London proper. We investigated costs for the basics; food, clothing, furniture, equipment, office rental, housing, transportation and a variety of other things. We needed to get a feel for this so we could develop a budget and determine what a proper wage scale should be. One day, one of their office board members took me out to the printer they were using so we could talk about possibly expanding the quantity of printing done there. It was expensive, I thought, but over all less expensive than printing in the US and then shipping to England.

After a quick trip to Dublin to meet the fellowship there, the three of us met with Jamie and traveled to the Conference in Frank-

furt. This was the most enjoyable visit to Germany of those I have taken. Relationships between the German leadership and myself had improved, but not quite to the point where the sense of hostility had evaporated. We were starting to work together, and with a more common view of what needed to be done. Nevertheless, I was more than a little apprehensive. I had mapped out a plan to meet separately with representatives of each country and establish an approach to addressing their specific needs. It was hopefully to be a "let's make a deal" working session with separate deals for each country. It may sound quite cold, but I felt the worst thing was to become confronted with a unified list of complaints and demands. The thing I feared the most was a demand that the WSO simply provide the money as a block grant and let them set their own priorities and strategy, and run an office themselves.

I had sold the board on the need to keep the European fellowship's literature and services under the management of the WSO. It was my task to propose and garner European support for the idea to open a branch office there during the coming spring. Jamie was not terribly keen on the idea, believing instead that the Europeans should make those kinds of decision themselves rather than the Americans making decisions for them. Despite his own reservations, I believe Jamie supported the proposal publicly so as not to be thought of as disloyal to the majority decision of the Board. But in his own quiet way, I believe he encouraged others with opposing views. During the conference, the idea was discussed and at one meeting that centered on the WSO, I was questioned directly by various participants. The idea received a mixed but mostly positive response. Yes, there were many questions and a lot of doubt, but there wasn't the direct opposition that I feared. On this somewhat positive note, I returned to California more determined to open the office.

The directors voted at their August board meeting to take the first step. They adopted a motion "to authorize placement of an employee in New York to handle research for possibly opening an office in Europe and other PI matters that may be appropriate." Soon afterward, Willie and I set a schedule for his move to New York.

By early August, the blue and white review form of the *It Works* material was back from the printer, and copies were mailed out to those who had ordered them. It took a few weeks, but we were stunned to discover we had made an error in what was printed. Somehow, through neglect, the version of the approval form (white covered) was not the same one that had been published earlier. Apparently we had several versions in our computer files and no one checked to make sure the one we sent to the printer was identical to

the one we had previously published. The mistake cost us about five thousand dollars; we had to print the book over again.

One positive result of this error was that we created a separate computer file for "final form" publications that only two people had access to. This minimized the recurrence of this problem, but the biggest instance of this type of error had been made much earlier, and was just getting ready to explode in our faces.

The trustees had a meeting in August, the first with Bob R. as chairperson. Most of the time was spent on review, revision and voting on the position papers the trustees had worked on and published over the years. The conference had directed they be reconsidered. Two were approved by the required two-thirds vote. The first, entitled "Relationship of NA to Nar-Anon and Family Anonymous" set forth a philosophy about non-affiliation and the second, entitled "Open and Closed Meetings" provided guidance on this sometimes confusing issue. One article was tabled (Methadone Use and Medication in NA) while four did not receive the required two-thirds vote and were rejected.

Bob also presided over a lengthy discussion of how the trustees should fit in the service structure, a discussion that could serve as input to that section of the *Guide to Service*. Since there was considerable confusion about this among the trustees, he asked that each trustee write their ideas and send them in so they could be distributed and discussed at the next meetings. Bob was truly seeking to establish a clear and relatively permanent understanding of what the trustees should be doing. He had been dismayed that this important issue had not been resolved years earlier. Unfortunately, the discussion went on for the next three-years, and no conclusion was reached.

A few weeks before the World Convention we shipped all the supplies and merchandise we would need to New Orleans. However, we felt the tape duplicators, computers and some other items were too fragile to ship by commercial trucking companies. We decided to load those things into our blue van and have two employees drive across country to deliver it. Electing to exercise executive authority, I decided I would be one of the drivers. After some discussion, Trinka C. was selected as the other.

On the morning we were scheduled to leave, I experienced some back trouble. As I was bending over to wet my face for shaving, I felt a sudden excruciating pain and collapsed to the floor. My legs wouldn't work. I couldn't move them, and laid on the floor. The pain in my back was the most awful feeling I've ever known. I called the office, and Freddy A. came over to help me get an ambulance to take me to the hospital.

After some quick negotiation, Carlos, our principal shipper, arranged to take my place. Carlos has always been a favorite friend since he came to work for us, although our personal experiences were vastly different. Deep inside of us there was a lot more commonality than the surface revealed. He had never been out of the State of California on his own, except to go to Las Vegas, so this would be a new experience for him. Besides doing their job of getting the equipment to the convention, they had a wonderful time seeing the southwest as they drove. Carlos still remembers that trip fondly.

I spent four days in traction in the hospital, and as the pain subsided, I was anxious to get out. Cat scans disclosed I had a herniated disk that was pinching on the spinal chord. But I wasn't going to let that get in the way of doing my job at the convention. It took a lot of convincing, but the doctors let me out, and after a few days I caught a plane to New Orleans. The bad disk caused numbness in my left leg and foot, and for several years I was in constant pain.

The Seventeenth World Convention assembled in New Orleans over Labor Day weekend at the Sheraton Hotel. The Marriott and La Maridian were over-flow hotels, and a lot of people were using them. Most of the workshops and smaller speaker meetings were in the hotels, but the main speaker meetings each day were at the Rivergate Convention facility, a few blocks away.

Thursday evening a speaker meeting was held featuring Brother Ric G. (DC) and Leah G. (FL). On Friday, Becky M. (NV) and Dudley S. (London) shared the podium. The Saturday night speaker was Dutch H. (NJ) and on Sunday morning it was Judy G. (CA).

A Mardi Gras parade brought convention-goers to the Rivergate Center for the Saturday evening banquet and speaker meeting. Dutch H. (New Jersey) spoke to a crowd of over 4,000, followed by a Mardi Gras ball. Sydney R. (Los Angeles) was the Sunday morning spirituality speaker before several thousand members at the closing meeting.

Over 3,820 people registered, and it was estimated another six hundred attended without registering. Bill W., who had chaired the convention, did a magnificent job. Bill was among the most outstanding and memorable individuals I was to meet in my life. His approach to the principles of NA was to live them in every way, every day. He was an excellent administrator, full of good humor and infectious joy for life on the one hand, and at the same time he was stern with foolishness and dishonesty. It was an honor to work with him for the next few years while he remained on the Convention Corporation board.

Overall, the event was excellent. Although there were long lines at times for registration and the store, there were no serious prob-

lems. And the convention made a profit too, a little over \$43,000 which the Convention Corporation needed to operate on for the next year. We also needed money to pay Expotel. The corporation board met briefly at the convention and discussed a compromise our attorneys had discussed with Expotel attorneys. The board voted to pay Expotel for half of the loss they suffered, but no interest. The deal was finalized over the next few weeks, and the payment was made in November.

The convention was a resounding success. This was important to us, since this was the first one we had completely managed. We were concerned that if this convention had major problems, a movement might have begun to return the convention to a temporary committee run by the host city. Although I spent nearly all my time in the convention office counting money and helping to manage the convention, I had a great number of visitors. Unfortunately I didn't make it to the convention center to see any of the speakers or even attend the banquet, but I know they were terrific.

On my desk upon my return from the convention, was the "blue line" of the Fourth Edition of the Basic Text. The "blue line" is a copy of the manuscript made by the printer and sent to us for final review. After we review the blue line and return it, the book is then printed. I took this opportunity to send a letter to Michael L., chairperson of the Literature Committee. For some time I had been expressing to him and the directors that we should probably delay this edition and submit it to the conference for approval. Having been through the problem that came from changing the original printing of the Text in 1983, and the controversy that erupted over the White Booklet changes in 1986, I had misgivings about printing an edition of the book that the conference had not reviewed and approved. Despite the fact that the conference had voted in 1985 to have it done without further conference approval, I was reluctant to print the book without first putting my feelings on paper for the record.

I wrote that the manuscript was ready for printing. However, I continued, "I am reluctant to authorize printing, as this edition will not have had the same conference review and approval all prior editions had." I suggested that if he was of like mind, we could continue printing the Third Edition (Revised) and ask the conference for approval of the Fourth Edition. His response was to suggest that everyone had followed conference instructions, and there was no reason to delay. I gave the printer the signal to go ahead, and the books were printed.

During September we made a staff change that became important for several years. About eighteen months earlier I had hired a non-addict to handle our computer needs for training, purchasing and

installation. As it came to pass, this person also took over our accounting and later the shipping department too. As I mentioned earlier, she had decided not to return after a maternity leave. At first I announced to the board that I wanted to hire an accountant, and the board was generally in support of that decision.

But as the month went on, I decided not to hire an accountant, but rather promote Lois G., who had been the primary accounting clerk, to have full responsibility for financial matters. I would use an outside accountant for a monthly review and reconciliation of the accounts. This saved us about forty thousand dollars over the following year, and Lois truly performed up to the level of confidence we placed in her. Over a year later, we reorganized and placed Lois under another supervisor, but the office continued to depend on Lois to record, control and disburse all WSO funds for years after I left.

At the end of September, we mailed the quarterly *Fellowship Report*. We reported that the plea for money made in the previous report had paid off, as a considerable amount of money had been received since the conference meeting, but everyone stressed that more money was needed. Chuck wrote about things he learned while attending the European Service Conference in Frankfurt. Perhaps his most telling comment was, "it became evident that our recovery literature and service tools were in many ways not as usable or relevant to non-US recovery needs. Most literature contains American colloquialisms and is reflective of US experience. The service tools in many cases cannot be used outside the US. Laws and customs in many non-US countries dictate a course of action which is, at times, contrary to the direction of the [approved] service guides and handbooks."

In his conclusion, he wrote, "The solution doesn't lie in changing the handbooks and altering the service guides. Those changes might adversely affect some other group. The solution may lie in the WSC's ability to grant NA communities outside the US the ability to create their own service guides, tools and recovery materials. While those items would have to be consistent with NA philosophy, they would naturally be culturally relevant and consistent with the accepted local customs, rules and regulations." I considered his comments evidence that at least one important NA leader could finally see the problems we truly faced as a worldwide fellowship.

On the first of October we mailed a report with a cover letter from Leah as conference chairperson, on the impact of the possible reduction of WSO prices by twenty-five percent. While I had initially objected to having to make this report, I came to believe it was a valuable task and was glad we had to do it. It was among the best reports produced during my tenure with the office. Whenever some-

one wants (in the future), to suggest a price reduction, oldtimers should dig out their copy of this report and pass it around. While the numbers may have changed, the fundamental issues remain the same.

The amount of money saved by a price reduction would affect the average member very little. An \$8 book would cost only \$6. While \$2 wasn't much — it was not likely to mean starvation even for members with limited incomes — but the 250,000 copies of the book sold at \$8.00 as opposed to \$6.00 means the difference of \$500,000 in WSO operating funds. That \$500,000 goes a long way towards helping addicts find recovery in languages other than English. In some of those places, \$2 is a full day's wage. From time to time over the intervening years, the idea of a price reduction came up, but it was never again pushed like it had been in 1987.

In a related matter, we wrote a letter to the Canadian service committees in early October suggesting we make changes in how we handled literature sales in Canada. Our cost to supply literature to the Canadian members was simply too high. If a member purchased a book and sent us a check for eight dollars and eighty cents for shipping, here is what happened: It cost us \$10 (US) to cash the check (a fee charged by our bank for a foreign check), it cost us \$2.35 (US) for shipping, and the book had cost us about \$1.90 (US). Our actual expenses to fulfill that order were \$14.25 (US). The check, because of the exchange rate, was only worth \$7.04 (US) so we lost \$7.21 (US) on that order.

We proposed that we print the pamphlets and White Booklets in Canada and have each printing distributed, by the printer directly to the regional committees. To avoid individual transaction fees, the committees would hold the proceeds from each sale until we asked for the money. The shipping costs could also be reduced this way. The Basic Text was still going to be a problem, as were other inventory items such as key tags and medallions. We offered a discount to the service committees so they could better afford the expense in handling a larger role in the literature distribution system. Although there was a positive response, the program we suggested didn't work. We continued to lose money to get literature to Canadians. It took another two years to achieve a practical solution.

We were having similar problems with other non-U.S. fellowships. The license agreements we were then finalizing with the fellowships in Ireland, England, Germany and Australia would put an end to losing so much money on sales to them. By October, we had generally acceptable drafts for the service committees in each of these countries, or so I thought. Regardless of the agreement (or lack of one), we were getting literature to the members through their service

committees. As it turned out, we never reached a written agreement with the Irish service committee, and the agreements we signed with the other three were never effectively implemented in the way described in the agreements themselves. But we kept negotiating and working on the assumption that a retroactive provision of the agreement would clean up whatever had transpired during the negotiations.

In a separate international matter we had been working with Bob H., the conference treasurer, Leah and Chuck L. on the cost equalization motion the conference directed to be prepared. We spent a lot of hours on research, calculating the costs for each participant to come to the next conference from whatever large airport was nearest to the RSR of record. After lots of discussion, it seemed best to simply add the costs and suggest that each region would be assessed an equal share of the total cost for transportation, lodging and meals.

In many ways it made sense, as the RSR from Germany might have to pay \$1,800 just for airfare while the RSR from Oregon or Arizona might only have to pay \$225 to get to the conference. Our analysis showed the cost for fifty-six regions to share equally in the expense of all delegates would be \$923. However, the conference might not respond well to the idea of assessments. The draft of the plan was discussed at the International Committee meeting held at the conference workshop in Denver in October. There was general support for the plan, although some felt it would be better to spend the money on more direct efforts to carry the message to addicts rather than spending so much on business meeting participation.

Other committees also achieved considerable success at the Denver meeting. Vince and his *It Works* road show had already conducted several of the workshops and were accumulating a lot of input. He expected to have his committee work done within a few months. Michael worked as closely as Vince would allow, but Vince was in a strange frame of mind. He knew he had to work with Michael and get along with him, yet he was so caught up in the thrill of being chairperson of this particular project, it was hard for him to let others have any part of the authority and responsibility. Michael, who suffered through this episode, put on a positive face and did his best to get along with Vince. It was indeed a strange event for the chairperson of a conference committee to have a subcommittee with a larger budget than the full committee, and to have responsibility but no authority over their main project.

Both the Policy and Administrative Committees discussed the idea of having me step aside as parliamentarian at the 1988 WSC. I had served in that role for nine conferences, and increasingly there had been objection from the standing minority about my possible in-

fluence on issues while acting as parliamentarian. I didn't really object, and agreed to search for a replacement, although I explained it might be expensive to the conference to pay for that service. Early in the new year we found Don Cameron, an Assistant Dean at nearby California State University Northridge, who had the skills and was interested in serving in this capacity. After a meeting with Don and Leah we decided to hire him for the task.

Don proved to be a provident selection. He responded well to the rough and tumble at the conference, and gave strictly professional help. He was friendly, unobtrusive, helpful, and always on the mark. He remained as parliamentarian while I served at the WSO and for a number of years after I left.

In late October, Willie packed up the files, equipment (including a computer and printer) and his personal belongings and drove east, heading for New York City. He was going to use some vacation time, but we expected him to begin operating from an office in the New York area by the first of the year. He arrived there in November and set about to find an office.

In the October *Newsline* we printed the article written by the Board of Trustees on the relationship of NA to Nar-Anon and Families Anonymous. I remember the discussions in the trustee meetings that lead up to its approval, and I remember losing on every point. The trustees chose to decide that any relationship with Nar-Anon or Families Anonymous was in fact a violation of the Sixth Tradition, so other than perhaps saying no relationship could exist, NA should pretend that Families Anonymous and Nar-Anon didn't exist.

It was one of the low points in my tenure as a trusted servant and friend of Narcotics Anonymous. I've always felt it was wrong and harmful to be so antagonistic to family members who are not addict, and to an organization based on the same Steps and Traditions. This is one of those differences of interpretation of the Traditions between NA and AA. On the issue of a companion organization, AA believes a relationship with Al-Anon does not violate their Sixth Tradition while the NA trustees chose to pronounce that any relationship with a companion organization was a spiritual sin.

Frankly it was hard at times to understand what Nar-Anon believed and how it was different, if indeed it was, from Al-Anon. And admittedly Nar-Anon was not run particularly well as a Twelve Step fellowship. But on the individual level, for the "significant other" of the average NA member that was a moot point. To deny that a special relationship should or could exist with a fellowship for immediate family members was hard for me to swallow.

Nearly every place I went in my extensive travels around the fellowship, area committees and groups welcomed a relationship with

Nar-Anon. But the world-level trusted servants did not share that perspective. There was a general animosity towards Nar-Anon. Families Anonymous was so unknown that there was much less spite toward that organization.

The thrust of the antagonism toward these organizations seemed to be that a very rigid interpretation of the Sixth Tradition must prevail, even if that philosophy aided and abetted the destruction of a large number of families of NA members. I argued against this attitude every time I had the chance. Of course I knew that not every family relationship of NA members could or should have been saved. I simply felt that in the name of "spiritual" separateness, one of the few threads that *could* exist to help families of recovering addicts pull back together was irrevocably cut. I always considered this a great tragedy. But, since that was the party line, I kept my official mouth shut.

In an inconspicuous little note in the *Newsline* we announced that the Fourth Edition of the Basic Text had arrived, back orders had been mailed off, and we now had plenty in stock. It took probably ten days before we got our first phone call from a member who asked why some portions of the text had been edited out rather than simply improved for grammar and punctuation. Danette took the calls, and assured the callers they were mistaken, but she promised to check anyway. She mentioned the calls to me when they came in and suggested it was probably no big deal. Over the following several weeks more calls came in suggesting other changes had also been made.

In late October at a convention in West Virginia, a group of friends held a meeting to compare the Fourth Edition to the Third Edition (Revised). Bo S., Mac M., Dave M. and an unspecified number of others read through both editions. They concluded that there was more than just clean-up editing done to the book, and that in fact there were philosophical changes made. These members decided to launch a campaign to have the Fourth Edition recalled, and replaced with the Third Edition. They immediately began to lobby others individually and through area and regional committees by letters and phone calls. They mailed their packet of information about changes to regions and many area committees. It seemed to be clear from their charges they had found intentional changes in philosophical emphasis. A phone call to Michael L. was reassurance enough to me that no philosophical changes had been made by the committee. Based on our strong faith in Michael and the Literature Review Committee, I and many others concluded the charges were simply a political maneuver to bash world services. It would not be the first from the standing minority.

Once this organized campaign got underway, the nature of the complaining phone calls changed. We were now faced with a strong movement to terminate use of the Fourth Edition. As the campaign began to widen, many people called to ask us if in fact the Text had been altered without conference knowledge or authority. In the course of some of these calls, it became apparent that the caller had not even seen a copy of the Fourth Edition and was calling because someone else had told them to call and complain.

We began a series of phone calls to Michael, Vince and Sydney R. of the trustees to determine what had taken place. Among those phone calls, it was concluded that there might be some small error, but that it could be corrected. No one suggested there was any grave problem or that we should drop everything and pursue this.

However, there was a problem. We had already printed 30,000 copies and another 30,000 were scheduled for printing during November. This was to be followed by another 50,000 copies in February. Unless we made a decision, I explained in my conversations, we would have over 100,000 copies of the disputed Fourth Edition in circulation. Despite my concerns, no one seemed unduly upset.

Few of the phone calls and letters we received cited specific places where wording had been altered that changed the philosophical concepts. After a while, we began to receive more complaints about the propriety of publishing the Fourth Edition because the conference hadn't voted on it. As a result of being barraged by calls and letters, many of which were truly attacking and irrational, I became blinded, as did most of the leadership of the Literature Committee, trustees and the conference, to the possibility there were indeed changes that none of us realized were there. Consequently, we didn't pursue that as early as we should have.

In defense of the propriety of publishing the Fourth Edition, we quickly gathered from the minutes of the conference, *Fellowship Reports* and the *Newslines*, all of the quotes that related to the work that had been done to edit the book and publish it as the original motion intended. We distributed this report on November 23, 1987. The report was sent to the full conference mailing list and to everyone who had written or called and left their name, phone number or address.

The report didn't have much impact on the struggle, as it soon became clear that the standing minority was pushing this as the "cause celeb." It seemed obvious that their tactic was to ignore what had taken place, including their own complicity in the procedure since the original motion had been adopted in 1985. I don't believe that at the conference in 1986 or 1987 the standing minority could have, of its own voting strength, forced the edited version to be sent out for approval. However, they didn't even try. We had included in the re-

port quotes from the conference minutes of both 1986 and 1987 when work on the editing was reported.

When the original motion was being crafted during the 1985 conference, I got the attention of the chair and said, "Mr. Chairperson, I would like to suggest that there might be something that you might really like to add to this motion. That is whatever work is produced under this instruction [to hire an editor], be returned to the Literature Review Committee for their review, consent and approval. We could not, I think, from the office, print that [the edited book] on our own without the fellowship somehow telling us after we've done the work, that this is still our book, and what you want us to print. So, you've got to make some provision for that to occur. Otherwise, I do not believe the Board of Directors would be willing to stick their necks out to do it."

This was followed by a brief exchange between Greg P., who was then the RSR from Georgia, and George as to what was being edited. Maggie O., the Literature Committee Chairperson, responded that the entire Text was being edited. Greg spoke up: "Mr. Chairperson, I'd like to suggest that this be referred to the fellowship."

George: "Are you *suggesting*? ... [or making a *motion* was George's implication.]" But before Greg attempted a response, Maggie spoke up again.

Maggie O.: "Could we add to the motion? After 'and other grammatical errors,' ... 'and that the edited Text be returned to the Literature Review Committee for acceptance and approval prior to printing and distribution.'" (clapping)

George: "Do we want to send this out to the fellowship?" (No's heard loudly, some yesses, but basically No's heard over and over.)

Ginni S.: "We'd like to point out that this was included in one of our previous *Fellowship Reports* that we have been discussing this year."

Maggie: "This is not an attempt, in any way, to change the content of the book. It's merely grammatical errors."

Bo S. (trustee): "I'd just like to pro this motion as far as it goes, and I'm sure that a good plan will be worked out — procedure — but this is definitely something that would have been done years ago, if it hadn't gotten so out-of-hand and sticky. That was how part of our plan of action to do this, but towards the end of the effort of the Basic Text it just wasn't possible to do this. ... I just think it also needs to be mentioned and underlined in red, main changes beyond this would trigger very different reactions. ... But I do want you to remember that I said something about the ranges of the acceleration" (clapping).

John F. (trustee) then spoke to encourage passage of the motion and the matter was voted on. By a standing vote count, forty-seven

voted in favor, only one voted against, and three abstained. If Bo and the rest of the standing minority felt that an editing and review by the Literature Review Committee was not adequate, this was the time to speak up, but they didn't.

During the thirty months between that discussion and the actual printing of the Fourth Edition, eighteen notices or references to this effort were published in reports from the Literature Committee or the office in the *Newslines* and *Fellowship Reports*. Two World Service Conferences followed that were held before we went to print, and no effort was raised to have the book reviewed by the fellowship at large. Even when the fight had erupted in 1986 over changing the White Booklet, and it was discussed on the floor of the 1987 conference, no one came forward to challenge the propriety of the WSO publishing the edited version after approval was given by the Literature Review Committee.

From the beginning, I was among the most reluctant to publish the edited Text based only on Literature Review Committee authority. And of all the actions I regret from those years as the Executive Director, backing down on this issue was among the most troubling. I knew in 1985 I should have forced the board to take it to the conference to seek fellowship approval of the edits. Even though I didn't, when we were faced in November 1987 with the angry voices to cease publication, my opinion was, "it's too late to go back now." We had done what we were supposed to do, and had continually made it public over the course of thirty months.

One problem in all of this was that we were all concentrating on intentional editing performed by a professional and reviewed by the Literature Review Committee. We were not thinking of errors made by the office in the production cycle of the book after the LRC signed off on the edits. If it was shown to me that we really did omit parts inappropriately, I was willing to take the heat for that. During the following months, the argument shifted from the issue of the propriety of the editing process to charges that there were inappropriate changes. I believe that the report and staunch support from the directors, trustees and conference leadership had put to rest much of the controversy about the process. It was not until February that enough evidence was actually put before all of us that we finally took action to compare the work, word for word. It was my mistake to have delayed so long to do that.

The line-by-line comparison of the two editions of the book turned up a horror story of mistakes and omissions. And as if that were not enough, we found a very costly production error as well. The alignment of the type on the pages was all messed up. On some pages, the text was too far to the left, on others it was too far to the

right. On some pages it was up too high, and on others it was simply crooked. The page numbers, which should have been lined up perfectly with one another from page to page, were moving all over the place. When the hardcover books were assembled, the pages didn't look that bad. But in the paperback books it was awful. The books were so bad we simply could not charge money for them. We had to throw them away.

The printer blamed us for not checking this more closely when they sent us the blue lines, and we blamed them for being so sloppy. The truth is we were both at fault. Neither I nor our staff had been careful enough to catch the error. Actually, we had become so accustomed to the printer doing an excellent job that we didn't look very carefully when we had the proof sheets. And their quality control must have been asleep when this particular job was approved for printing.

We demanded they print them over without cost to us. They refused. At issue were the 10,000 paperback books which cost about \$19,200 for printing and paper. We had paid for the paper separately and also paid them in advance for the printing and assembly work. Well, they really didn't want to lose us as a customer over \$15,700 they had charged to print and assemble the books. They offered to settle by splitting the difference for an entire reprinting. We agreed, and the books were printed. That meant the first paperback books really cost us about \$2.79 per copy instead of \$1.86. We still generated revenue from each one but, less than normal. To add to the pain, this caused serious delays. But more about the book fiasco later.

At their November meeting, the board adopted a staff suggestion that we print the forms from the Treasurers Handbook and sell them in packets with thirteen sets. It was common knowledge that there was poor to almost no accurate recording of group financial data on a monthly basis. We decided to recommend this packet be made available so as to begin to help the groups keep better track of their money. We also felt this would begin to prepare the fellowship for what might come in the future concerning IRS interest in NA financial activities.

Also in November, we were delighted to finally establish reliable contact with the fellowship in Brazil. There had been intermittent contact with some Brazilian members, but lack of consistency in communications left us without a clear picture of what was going on there. This new contact was with one of their members who was obviously in a leadership role, and who spoke English. We were thrilled to learn that there were about sixteen meetings, but we were also

saddened to find out that they refused to use the literature we had in stock that was in Portuguese.

In mid-November I drafted a letter on the Public Service Announcement (PSA) "free air time issue" for the combined signatures of Bob R. as chairperson of the trustees and Biff K. as chairperson of the PI Committee. They both reviewed it, and after a few changes, we distributed it. It addressed the issue of whether TV PSA's were really free, or were in fact a violation of the Seventh Tradition. We explained there were two ways to look at the duty implied by our primary purpose stated in the Fifth Tradition — "to carry the message to the addict who still suffers" — and the Eleventh Tradition's statement about "our public relations policy," all of which must exist within the parameters of non-affiliation and self-support spelled out in the Sixth and Seventh Traditions. In the strict sense only one addict sharing with another in person, could safely avoid any conflict with the Sixth and Seventh Traditions. However that was not realistic, so some prudent judgment needed to apply to how far from personal one-on-one sharing was permissible.

The bulk of the letter was a lot of tap dancing to get to the point that when, or if, it is the case that someone else pays for the cost of NA PSAs to be broadcast on radio or TV, it was not NA who was getting the direct benefit. The general public was the beneficiary, not NA. We were giving the tapes to the stations free, and if they credited someone else for paying to have them aired, it should cast no reflection on NA. The advertiser was giving a subsidy to the public not NA. Hence there was no violation of the Sixth and Seventh Tradition. It was a carefully written essay that seemed to quiet the waters, and the issue did not come up again. And at last look, the PSA's were still being shown on TV.

On a Wednesday afternoon in early December, I boarded a plane and flew to Tokyo, Japan. The fellowship there had invited someone from world services to attend a PI workshop they were putting on for professionals who worked with addicts in Tokyo. They expected a good turnout from the social work, legal and other professions. It had been decided that I should go so I could also work on translation, printing and general literature sales issues with the membership there.

The members treated me with affection and respect and a special appreciation for coming to their meeting. During my short stay I met with most of the Tokyo membership and attended three recovery meetings. The PI workshop was a great success! Fortunately they provided translators, both Roy A., who had been to the conference to translate for the RSR and Sister Turico, a Nun working with the only

drug treatment effort known to exist in Japan. Both did an excellent job. On my return flight I wrote a seven-page report about the trip for the trustees, directors and conference leadership.

This trip was further confirmation of our worries about translations. The Japanese society is mostly of the Shinto or Buddhist religions. These religions do not have the "heaven or hell" and "one true God" concepts that the Judeo-Christian religions are based on, and there happens to be no directly translatable word for "higher power," a term used extensively in NA. Consequently when they read the Steps, they insert the English words, "higher power" in the appropriate place while otherwise reading in Japanese. It also means they have to embark with every newcomer on an explanation about what this English term means. It is a difficult situation, and they lost many newcomers because they often assumed NA was a religious organization. During the following years I was to explain this situation over and over again when talking about translations.

I sent another report at the end of the month to the board, complete with about sixty-five pages of attachments. Included were a list of motions that had been received from regions for inclusion in the *Agenda Report*. As I explained, several of the motions were thinly veiled attacks on the WSO and should receive some response from the office. The office budget for 1988 was also sent about this same time, and so was a preliminary report on the 1987 fiscal year. We had operated on a budget that had income of \$2,668,389 and expenses of \$2,526,946.

The final *Newsline* for the year contained the usual communications, but also included a summary report on the status of fellowships outside the US. Thirty-eight nations were mentioned. Of particular importance were Brazil, India and Japan. The Brazilians were using the name Toxicomanos Anonimos, and wanted NA consent to do so rather than changing to NA. From India we continued to get correspondence and requests for literature. Letters had been coming from India as far back as the late 1970's when meetings first started there. However, until about 1984 communications were infrequent and inconsistent. Then we began to receive regular letters from two people who kept meetings going in different cities. We also outlined the major difficulties the fellowship in Japan was facing.

January began with the great news that Willie had reached an agreement on an office in the New York City area. We had discussed it at length, and although it was in New Jersey rather than in New York, I was happy with his decision. I had been discussing this with Jim, the Chairperson of the Board of Directors, Kim J. (who was living in New York City and still had considerable influence in PI matters), and Leah. Although we all felt that having the office in the City

itself would have been better, I showed them that the expense of having the office in New York City would be a lot more than we could afford. As a cheaper alternative, they were amenable to New Jersey, but not happy about it. Willie sent me the contract; I suggested a few changes by phone with the owners, and then signed the agreement for a twelve month lease. Willie moved in immediately and began work. Although we talked every few days, Willie proved to be good at getting things done on his own and I trusted his judgment.

When the Joint Administrative Committee met in January to compile the *Agenda Report*, the conference budget was once again a major item of discussion. We seemed no closer to consensus on how to devise a practical spending plan or even how to establish a priority system to help in the development of budgets. The JAC proposed several motions. One would allow the WSO to update information contained in adopted publications as that information changed (for example, statistics such as how many meetings we had, etc.). A proposal to create the position of second vice-chairperson of the conference was adopted. They also decided to publish the draft cost equalization policy, but not to offer it as a motion. There was still substantial disagreement over it, and many were concerned that by delaying the proposing of a motion, the idea might fade away. Even though the plan was workable, most of us felt it was not likely to be adopted.

The Policy Committee had prepared revisions to several paragraphs in the *Temporary Working Guide*. However their most controversial motion was one that again would have stripped the voting rights at the conference from everyone but RSR's. That the motion actually came out of the committee was a testament to the energy and work the standing minority had put into the Policy Committee.

Michael's Literature Committee submitted three pamphlets for approval and two revised pamphlets. Additionally, they proposed a comprehensive revision to their guidelines, and their handbook was to be changed to reflect the guideline revision. The *It Works* ad hoc committee had even decided to propose their committee be dissolved. They felt (thankfully) that they had gathered enough input for the publication to be written.

Conversely, the Additional Needs Committee asked to be continued another year and outlined a six point program for their activities. Although I did my best to lobby for termination of the committee, I lost. Their six point program was essentially to become a permanent fixture of conference bureaucracy. I felt it was, in essence, trying to serve the same dual role for those with special needs as the International Committee had proven it could not do for those outside the US. There was a striking parallel between these two efforts.

The WSO proposed a revision of the language in the *Temporary Working Guide* that described the WSO, its organization and purpose. We had refrained from making this change for several years since we were trying to save such changes for the *Guide to Service*. But as it finally seemed to us that the *Guide* might never get done, we decided to go ahead. It was simply to delete an incorrect and misleading description of the office and how it was organized and insert into the *Temporary Working Guide* an accurate description of what the WSO does. It was a well-devised description.

As usual, the Convention Corporation proposed revisions to the convention guidelines. All but one of these were minor: a small change to the map, minor word changes, and some language preparing the conference to vote on the site for WCNA-19 to be held in 1989. But there was a clarification of the statement about special interest meetings at conventions. When the guidelines had first been written, a divisive argument arose over special interest meetings. Some felt that special interest meetings, such as recovery meetings for women or gays or blacks or bikers or teen-age addicts, should be permitted. Across the fellowship there were such events at many conventions. However, the majority of the committee was opposed to such meetings, and there was conflict over their desire to include a statement in the guidelines that recommended against them.

The issue was eventually taken to the trustees, who worked on it from time to time for two years. For some time John F. (trustee) was the primary advocate for including words to the effect that special interest meetings should be permitted. Stu T., who had been on the convention board since its inception, was strongly opposed. It had taken four years, but a revision to the language was finally written. It took the middle ground, suggesting conventions were the place for people to celebrate recovery of all addicts rather than spotlight differences by giving labels to meetings.

Another issue that I had brought up in discussions, mostly with the trustees, was about segregation within the fellowship. There wasn't an intentional practice of racial segregation, but there were very few minority members in meetings. There were a few minority meetings in large cities, but overall, they were under-represented. It was my opinion that world services had an obligation to establish programs to bring more people of color into the fellowship. Furthermore, an effort should be made to integrate the meetings rather than just letting them develop into segregated meetings. Waiting until it just happened, I argued, was going to be divisive. The discussion was always shoved aside as an outside issue, so nothing got done.

And as the years passed, addicts of differing racial minorities began to come to meetings in growing numbers. Yes, some did feel com-

fortable in integrated meetings, but many did not. In time, inter-city meetings took on the general pattern of racial segregation across the country. There were black or Hispanic meetings in some areas, a few addicts who attended any meeting, but most minority meetings and minority members were concentrated and separate. In time, even service committees formed that were predominantly one racial group or another, and the prejudice that should not exist in NA took root.

At the office board meeting in January, the major topics were the Fourth Edition and the budget and motions for the *Agenda Report*. We reported to the board that 113,945 Texts had been produced as of the first of January, and that 50,000 more were expected to be printed in mid-February. To replace these with another edition of the book would not be financially possible. The board instructed us to continue our investigation and keep them informed.

The January *Fellowship Report* was a bit more subdued than might have been expected, and reflected a lull in the battle over the Fourth Edition. Michael reported his committee had considered complaints about it at their December meeting and had voted six in favor and eight opposed (so the motion failed) on a proposal to request that the WSO cease distribution of the Fourth Edition and distribute the Third Edition (Revised). It seems that many callers were less emotional about the revision since the lengthy special report had been published. There were still complaints, but they now seemed directed more to the content than the procedure that brought us the Fourth Edition.

Vince reported the last *It Works* workshops (Miami, Chicago and San Francisco) were being held in January, and after that all the formal input would be in. Individuals were still encouraged to offer their own written input, so more of that nature might follow. Billy Z., chairperson of the Additional Needs Committee, presented a lengthy report outlining everything the committee had accomplished or discussed during the year. His report ends with the recommendation that the committee be continued so more work could be done.

Jim W. addressed a number of items in his office report, but his major emphasis was on explaining the delays in distribution of the Text, and on the board's investigations into making the Text available through commercial bookstores. In that regard, we had reserved a booth at the American Booksellers Association Convention in May, at which time we expected to take orders from book buyers for copies of the Text. Unfortunately we later withdrew our booth reservation and never offered our books for sale through commercial book sellers. The problematic issue continued to be that we would have to offer book-

store buyers a forty-five percent discount and a full return credit policy if the book didn't sell.

Perhaps the most important part of the *Fellowship Report* was the draft of the Policy Committee's "Procedures Used When the Conference is Meeting." The committee had worked on these procedures for almost two years, and had produced a practical tool. The matter was then to get it adopted (without spending a day or two at the conference amending it) and then to follow it properly.

While producing the January printing of the Text, Arcata Graphics had several problems. First, they didn't reserve time for our book in their monthly print schedule, and second, the subcontractor supplying the dust cover sent a whole shipment of inferior work. They sent us samples of the cover material, as usual, and upon inspection we decided the covers were unacceptable. These problems caused a three-week delay in shipment of that printing. To make matters even worse, a dispute arose over the quantity of paper we had in stock and how many books that would make. They gave us one figure when the printing was complete, but several weeks later when they conducted their inventory, they gave us a number that was about 4,000 less than that earlier number.

And, as if we didn't have enough problems with the Fourth Edition, when the January printing was done they had let two paragraphs simply "fall on the floor" from the paste-up material, leaving a blank at the bottom of page 187. We didn't discover this until after the books had been printed and distributed. Someone who had received a copy and was familiar with the book called and alerted us to the problem. We immediately printed gummed patches to fill in the blank space and pasted them in the books we had on hand. In the last week of March we sent these patches to all purchasers of the defective books.

We were very upset about each of these problems, especially the possibility that 4,000 books had been printed and then stolen from their warehouse or that they had lost some of the paper we owned. They assured me that such things were impossible and there was simply a minor confusion within their staff on the "paper to book" calculation process. We were never truly satisfied with their resolution of this matter, and we began to discuss looking for a different printer.

I was on a trip to Australia and New Zealand in February when we finally received the paperback editions of the Basic Text. They had been a long time in getting done, but they were great. At last we could put aside the conflict with the H&I Committee and they could take the Text into prisons where hardcover books are not permitted. We published notice of their arrival in the *Newsline*. In the same

Newsline we also reproduced Issue Two of the recently published *European Newsline*. For some time we had encouraged them to begin working on their own newsletter. Although we were not then prepared to take on the task of publishing (gathering input, editing and publishing) a European version of our *Newsline*, we wanted them to start. We intended, however, to begin publishing a European version of the *Newsline* after we opened an office there.

In late January, Anthony E. and his family arrived from Washington DC, and Anthony took up his post as H&I coordinator. In a short time he not only acclimated himself to an aggressive work routine, but he changed the atmosphere in the whole office. His friendly and dynamic personality seemed to rekindle everyone's enthusiasm about their own work. Although it was not in his job description, and he had resigned from the Convention Corporation Board, he and I decided he would become involved in convention management as a staff member. Since Southern California had been selected as the 1988 convention site, Stu and I had alternated going to the host committee meetings. We added Anthony to the team, and I quickly became confident we would have few if any problems with conventions in the future. Throughout the year I worked closely with Anthony on convention matters, but it was hard to conceal my glee at having such a dynamic and talented convention manager on the staff.

The visit to New Zealand and Australia was a pleasant trip for several reasons. The membership in both places went out of their way to be helpful and considerate as we discussed the business I went there to accomplish. Settling literature matters, primarily through a license agreement, and getting some help for their service office were the primary objectives. Both discussions went well, but quite honestly, the agreement never really got finished or worked as we agreed it would. I also met with Australian convention host committee and Sydney convention officials to review their plan to host the 1991 World Convention. Since the Pacific zone was scheduled to host the event, and only New Zealand and Australia had service committees, it was clearly going to be held in one country or the other.

They had already decided to offer Sydney as the site. The facility they wanted to use, a new municipal convention center, was still in an early stage of construction. Our convention would be one of the first to be held in the facility. I was not encouraged by this as Sydney was recognized as a "union city," and a few labor stoppages might endanger completion of the center in time for our event. I had the host committee work out alternative sites in the event construction halted along the way. While in Australia I took five days vacation and relaxed a little. I had discussed this with the board and obtained their consent before scheduling this into the trip. It was one of only two

times I asked the board for vacation time while on a trip for the fellowship.

Upon my return from Australia, Danette came to my office one day and, after a friendly and mundane conversation, announced that she had decided to quit. She expressed her satisfaction with the things she had accomplished over the years, but felt it was time to move on to other pursuits. I expressed my regret at her decision, but we set a date for her departure. Despite any problems that had existed between us — and there had been some — Danette had been a productive worker. She had accomplished every task I assigned her and was loyal to the fellowship in every respect. Her departure was to be several months after the conference was over but we began an immediate search for her replacement.

When the board met in March, among other reports, I gave them as much information as we knew about the omissions of text in the Fourth Edition. At that time, we had confirmed only two places where omissions had been alleged. The board discussed and adopted a policy that would probably prevent such errors again.

On a separate publications matter, the board elected to support a decision I had made concerning an offer made by Bo S. to sell us a collection of works he had been developing on the history of NA. I had suggested that for the office to purchase such materials from a member, we would need to confer with the Literature Committee. On the recommendation of the Literature Committee, we declined to purchase the material.

The work initiated in the summer of 1987, to use someone to help compose the Traditions portion of *It Works*, was finally winding up. The contractor had conducted a number of interviews with trusted servants about Traditions. The trustees had also contributed some material. The writer's contract required him to complete one rewrite of his drafts. By January all of his drafts had been reviewed by the trustees, and their comments returned to the contractor. In early March his final rewrites were received and his part was over. But it had finally been concluded that the work could not be published without extensive work by a committee, so the material was simply put on the shelf to be completed later.

During February and March, the usual meetings were held across parts of the fellowship to review the *Conference Agenda Report*. The hottest issue was the Policy Committee motion to remove voting rights for anyone but the RSR's. The trustees were particularly disturbed about this, and sent to the fellowship a special letter encouraging a rejection of the proposal. While this was an unusual event — the trustees lobbying the fellowship through a wide mailing — I believed it was the right thing to do. They were much criticized for this,

but Bob R., who took a leadership role in the matter, was truly reflecting the majority opinion of the fellowship and most of those involved in world services.

As March began, and the New Jersey office had been in operation for two months, I endeavored to provide the board with a detailed report on Willie's activities. I reported on the success he had been having making contacts within the United Nations (UN) and the World Health Organization (WHO). Despite our preconceptions about how easy it was going to be to benefit from UN access, he had discovered it was a complex and diverse bureaucracy. The UN was a conglomerate of independent agencies, and getting access to one agency was only of mild importance when it came to approaching another UN agency. Although Willie spent considerable time with various UN agencies, he learned it was going to take several years to make significant inroads.

At first, it seemed to be different with the WHO. The administrators and members of WHO committees interested in addiction recovery were quick to respond to Willie's initiative. After making contact with the right person in WHO, he was invited to come to Geneva, Switzerland, where their headquarters were, and meet with their key administrators. This was arranged for later in the year, and both Willie and Jim W. went. We were to learn later that the WHO also had a fragmented structure, and that a comprehensive worldwide approach from NA was going to take years and considerable sophisticated effort to produce anything of value.

Willie soon discovered that a separate organization known as the Non-Governmental Organizations (association) or NGO, was of particular importance to us and the future of NA around the world. The NGO and the WHO quickly became the center of Willie's attention. The NGO sponsored conferences and similar regional or worldwide efforts that were of particular interest. After making ourselves known to the NGO committee on addiction, an invitation was extended to NA to send representatives to their world conferences and to submit papers (reports on our organization and its effectiveness, structure and activities) at their future meetings. This we readily decided to pursue.

Since we had invited applications for manager of the European branch office six months earlier, I had been at a loss about what to do. Each of the applicants, although bringing some talents and experience to the job, was not exactly what I felt we needed. I had eventually decided to reject all the applications, even close friends I had worked with, such as Ginni, Jamie S-H, Steve B., Mary B., and David T. It was a hard decision, but essential. While I had been searching for an alternative, Jim announced he intended to serve only

one term as chairperson. This actually opened the door, in my thinking, to the possibility of hiring him as the European Service Office (ESO) manager.

After a few weeks, I broached the subject with him during a phone call. I suggested he had all the skills and abilities I felt we needed. Especially since he had been the chairperson of the board during the time the project had come towards fruition. No one, I told him, knew as much about what we needed and how important it was that the person we sent needed to succeed. He agreed to consider it. After several weeks and more discussion, he agreed to take the position. I explained I wanted to wait until after the conference to make the announcement. We began salary discussions, and I confided in Donna about my decision. She was positive about the choice, and continued to be supportive when other candidates began to complain.

Another important change was made about this time in the ranks of world-level trusted servants. Leah, who had been conference chairperson for twenty-two months, in separate phone conversations to Chuck, Bob H., Bob R., George, myself and others, announced she was resigning as chairperson. She had held on as long as possible, but other things in her life had to take precedence. It was a great loss. Leah had been a rock-solid team member when the going was easy — not to mention when it was rough and filled with confrontation. Her understanding of the principles by which NA should operate was clear, and she expressed them vibrantly. Leah was one of the few I've met who always said exactly what she thought, and always meant what she said.

Chuck took over immediately, and for a while we got along — at least on the surface. Only after the conference was over did we begin to have open conflicts — not terrible ones, mostly about little things. For the first time in five years, I had to actively court the opinion and support of the conference chairperson rather than be confident that support was always there.

The controversy that continued to rage over the publication of the Fourth Edition received a lot of my personal attention, as it did of the staff and Michael. In the last *Fellowship Report* before the conference, Michael wrote an extensive report on the process the editing of the Fourth Edition had been through. It was another logical, well-organized and detailed report. I believed it had a lot of influence on average members who might have been concerned. He pointed out that considerable care had been exercised in the process to make sure that the intent of the original motion was fully followed. He also gave insight into the extensive effort that had been exerted to review the editing before it was approved for publication. Unfortunately, his report was written before the full extent of the omissions was known.

The detailed word-for-word reading was begun about the time the *Fellowship Report* was actually mailed.

During March, George headed a team that visited Campinas, a city near Sao Paulo, Brazil. He was accompanied by Bill W. from the Convention Corporation (who traveled to Brazil regularly on business) and Chris C. from Florida. They worked with the NA fellowship there and tried to help resolve their conflict with the Toxicomanos Anonimos organization that had also started. The TA folks were also using our literature, but without permission.

In late March, I assigned a team of staff to work under Ginni to make a detailed comparison of the Third Edition (Revised), the material given to the editor for her to work from, and the final language printed in the Fourth Edition. It was soon clear there was some truth to the accusations about omissions. For more than a week these teams carefully compared the material, word for word. Periodically Ginni would report to me what they found and revealed the extent and details of the omissions. I was horrified.

We had been doing relatively well with our overall publishing responsibilities for years, but the extent of this calamity was staggering. It was really hard to comprehend how this had happened. As each day brought word of more omissions, my heart sank deeper and deeper. I kept asking myself, "How could I have let this happen? What am I going to say to the fellowship?"

What we discovered, and what I later reported to the Board of Directors and the conference, was that the omissions had occurred when the Text was typed into our computer following the 1985 conference. Unfortunately, we didn't immediately proofread the typing when it was done. We didn't make a conscious decision not to proofread it, rather it happened by a lack of follow through. When the typing was finally completed, we were still searching for an editor. When the editor was finally selected, and materials prepared to be sent to her, it apparently did not dawn on me or anyone else that the typing had not been proofread. The manuscript was printed out and sent to the editor and the Literature Review Committee so they could check and concur on the editing. Since I was the chief executive of the office staff, ultimately it was my responsibility for not having done the proofreading when the typing was completed. Consequently I take full responsibility for the omissions.

It would have been nice if the Literature Review Committee had found the omissions, but their review of the editing was done by comparing the unedited manuscripts we provided them against the edited manuscripts we received back from the writer. Had we thought ahead and used a published copy of the book instead of our transcript,

we would have effectively been reviewing our work and the editor's at one time. The fact that our typist had inadvertently omitted small portions of the text in twenty-five places was not discovered by the editor or the Literature Review Committee. When those omissions were later found by members performing the review against the actual book, they assumed, quite reasonably, that these omissions were made by the writer and approved by the LRC.

On the weekend of Saturday, April 9, Michael and Vince were visiting the office to prepare for the conference. Only a few of the omissions had been discovered by that time. On the following day, Michael and Danette informed me that more omissions had been found. I decided at that time not to communicate the details to the board until the proofreading was complete. The following Saturday the last comparisons were finished. I prepared a letter for the board that included photocopies of each page from the Third Edition (revised) where the omissions came from and the corresponding pages from the Fourth Edition. The missing language was highlighted. This letter was the basis for my report on this to the conference. On Sunday I called Bob R. and Leah to tell them the bad news, and on Monday I visited with Jim and Michael in San Francisco.

While we were preparing for the conference, the number of discussions about fixing blame for the Fourth Edition fiasco escalated and centered on only a few people. While the standing opposition had a pretty good idea who in the staff had been involved, and wanted to see heads roll, they mostly wanted mine. Some wanted to blame Ginni, who had been the literature coordinator at the time, but that would not have been appropriate. Ginni was our most competent employee, and had I not changed the work assignments of her staff, she would have undoubtedly had the proofreading done as soon as the typing was complete. That the proofreading had been set aside when the typing was first done was unfortunate. But there was no doubt that the mistake and responsibility for it was ultimately mine and mine alone. Subordinate staff can and should be given authority and responsibility for many things, but the Executive Director retains ultimate *accountability for everything*.

I was the one who was going to stand before the conference and explain the mistake, and I was going to take the blame for it, even if others had done it and I had no knowledge of it. If the conference or the fellowship wanted someone's head, then it was to be mine. Ginni, however was not altogether insensitive to me taking all the heat. I believe she felt that her way to atone for the mistake having taken place within her staff, was to submit her resignation. I was not pleased with her offer to resign and didn't want her to leave, so I rejected her offer. During the month before the conference, we talked

about it at length and I finally acquiesced and accepted her resignation. We set a date of May fifteenth, and decided I would announce it to the board at an appropriate time. However, announcing it before the conference was not my preference, as it would certainly look like she was being forced out as a discipline over the omissions mistake.

In the days leading up to the conference, Jim, Donna and I discussed the Fourth Edition matter at considerable length. I had no doubt that Jim was particularly anxious to avoid being the sole target, but was uncomfortable in trying to shift the blame on to me. I believe he felt the conference would exonerate me, but punish him.

This led to one of the most distressing events during my service to NA. As we discussed the matter on Wednesday before the conference began, they broached the idea of having me fire Ginni, because she had been the staff person working on the project. As politely as I could, I expressed my refusal to fire her over the matter, and especially so close to the conference. I explained that Ginni had submitted her resignation, giving me thirty days notice, and I had reluctantly accepted. I saw no need to embarrass her or make her out to be the scapegoat. The discussion took several hours.

We met again at length on Thursday, and once more they pressed the matter. Again I refused. But overnight they had apparently discussed this even more, and when we reached the impasse again, Jim resorted to his only trump card. He ordered that I fire her. I was angry at them both but the order was not truly unexpected. I told them I would do it, but it was wrong and I would not do it until the next day.

On Friday, Ginni and I met and went over the whole scenario. She was very hurt. She felt she had given the fellowship more than three years of diligent service as an employee, had worked hard and sacrificed too much to be treated in this manner. And she was right. This was unfair and unreasonable. It was hard for me to forgive Jim and Donna for this needless act of vengeance. My anger and frustration notwithstanding, we continued to work together throughout the conference and thereafter. I didn't even let this get in the way of subsequently working with Donna as my boss (she succeeded Jim as WSO chairperson) or with going ahead and hiring Jim as the employee to run the ESO.

As for Ginni, I continue to regret the indignity she suffered and my inability to have prevented it. She was an excellent worker, dedicated to NA and to making it more successful, so that every addict who came through the doors to a meeting had a chance to make it. She was responsible for many of the substantial improvements in the content of literature during her three years as an employee and two years as a volunteer with the Literature Committee. Under her guid-

ance, the appearance of our literature took on a more professional look and the content was always correct. Ginni was a perfectionist in many ways, and carried the burden of getting literature conferences, workshops and meetings completed in a way that produced good literature rather than junk.