

4-14-84

Dear Sally —

Just one more week to W.S.C. and I'm still uncertain about my ability to attend. It's like an itch I can't scratch. Emotionally I'm excited and geared up for the trip; I have reservations but I still don't see how it will be possible financially. I just can't justify going \$600 further in debt with a family to support. Perhaps someday our fellowship will be able to defray some of ~~at~~ the financial burden of Trusteeship.

I enjoyed our telephone conversation last week and will surely talk to you soon again. I was very excited about your contact with AA. Trustees; the possibility of learning from their experience by attending one of their meetings or maybe having a joint meeting is one of the most exciting things I've ~~heard~~ ~~heard~~ heard lately, the possibilities are fantastic. Please keep me informed about this and let me know how I can get

involved with it. Perhaps I could help develop and foster this type of relationship in this part of the country or even into the north-east. Atlanta to New York is really only a days drive. Again, please let me know how this develops and how I can be involved.

Now, down to business — observations + comments on the fellowship report / items for consideration —

Part one - Policy Committee Report

General

\*

I feel that service structure draft should be returned to policy committee for additional work — 6 mos. input + revision followed by 6 mos. review

Specific

P2  
# 1+2

cover letter — <sup>p2 section 1</sup> as a member of the policy committee the form and "for approval" status ~~rep~~ of the report was a complete surprise to me. I feel that this form is very premature and is either the result of our Chairman's exuberance or a political maneuver — I am very concerned

that we do not rush into policy without adequate planning and forthright. It was my assumption that the service structure we worked on in Miami would be presented as a status report (NOT FOR APPROVAL) and would be completed by the 1984-5 Policy sub-committee or whoever WSC assigned to complete the task.

- P4. (intro 2) 1<sup>st</sup> ¶ is poor delete  
¶ 6 incorrect date + info.
- P13 (intro 11) final ¶ 6 are actually a quote from N.A. Tree 1<sup>st</sup> edition p. 16
- P15 (Group 1) 1.) to limited a purpose for a member - what about becoming a responsible, productive member of society?  
2.) Purpose Group does much more than provide atmosphere of recovery
- P16 Member - from N.A. Tree w/ minor modifications  
Group - from N.A. Tree

P18. #2 — def. of prudent Reserve differs greatly from practice perhaps "1 months expenses" or more

P23 #1 Regional concept needs further clarification this definition + purpose is inadequate. The proliferation of Regions based on politics, personalities, and avoidance of Group conscience is one major problem today.

P24 — Problems, Problems, Problems.

The whole Regional Concept needs work — this proposal sets the region into a roll where it is competing and/or doing the work of its member areas while leaving undone many things it could do more appropriately. We need to clearly define the difference in function and action of Areas and Regions they need to be parts of the same picture not considered separately. This really holds true for the whole service structure all the elements need to be

complimentary parts of an overall vision of service. Perhaps this is what bothers me the most about this Report/Presentation. There is no clear vision of a Service System - it seems as if all the elements were considered separately with minimal thought to their interrelations.

P33

4 WSC Meetings per year - This may be a current need and our structure needs to provide for the possibility, but as ~~time~~ we grow ~~I see~~ and MATURE I see this need decreasing. Let's not write a structure that will continue to need rewriting every couple of years.

P34

WSC committees - this report contradicts itself in terms of committees (P34 vs P38-9) let's look at a system that will cover foreseeable needs w/o getting to complicated + then explain that system clearly.

- P34 #7 Election Procedure -  
PROBLEMS - won't work this way - but I agree that WSC Nominees must be made prior to actual conference and put out to fellowship w/ other items for consideration
- P35 #1 2 year terms for Offices defeats the change/freshness/vigorous concept for WSC
- P37 Voting procedure - problems  
See WSC 1978 voting procedure for some ideas
- P38 Sub-Committees - needs work  
P39 for WSC The concept of Standing Committees is a contradiction  
The sub-committee system needs a lot of work
- P41 WSO <sup>Board Elections</sup> very confusing - I needed to refer to my WSO By-laws in order to figure out what was being said - needs to be reworked + ~~expanded~~, or simplified

¶ 48, 49, 50 - WSO - again needs some work - it doesn't explain and the fellowship is already confused enough about WSO. We need some simplicity and clarification here - what's written is pretty good but why not just include a copy of the by-laws of WSO. They're even more "legalese" and confusing seriously - this section is not bad but lacks a couple of introductory ¶'s about our World Service Office and the Roll it plays in the Service Structure

PS1 Convention - World Service Convention? Is it appropriate? distribution of funds? 25% + 25% = 50% what about other 50%

Literature Committee Report - good Report  
 #1 - yes, #2 - yes, #3 - no, #4 - yes, #5 - yes, #6 - yes, #7 - yes, #8 - no

Finance Report - Very Good

The only problem I have with the whole report is the confusion of "The following diagram, known as the N.A. Tree, ... " Let's call it something else in order to avoid confusion between Fund flow + The org. Service structure document.

N.A. Way Report - I won't comment much on this since I participated in writing it. I do like the format of a proposal (poss. Motion) followed by the reasons for the proposal. Perhaps this format could be used elsewhere. It would sure help understanding what we are considering - In a vote I would approve this report in its entirety.

WSB Report + Guidelines - Approve Sydney's Letter - I'm ~~not~~ Not in favor of this approach - it ~~seems~~ seems unnecessary to establish

-9-

another committee — perhaps  
WSB Lit Review Committee could  
provide this service.

WSO Board of Directors — I'm  
somewhat angered by this  
Report on Magazine and  
against the concept of WSO  
Combining ~~the~~ Report,  
newsline, + N.A. way. They  
~~provide~~ <sup>have</sup> different, distinct  
purposes. — Much of this  
concept was considered by  
WSC Policy committee and  
a decision concerning it was  
made — I resent the "Fuck  
WHAT THE APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE  
DECIDES, WE'LL TAKE IT TO  
THE FELLOWSHIP" implication of  
this report. It would seem to  
me that WSO should utilize  
and abide by our structure  
the same as anyone else — ~~the~~

~~the~~ The whole area of Periodicals,  
tapes, unapproved literature ~~etc.~~  
needs to have a long hard  
fellowship wide ~~committee~~ ~~action~~ ~~etc.~~

The whole area of Unapproved Communications such as Newsletters, tapes, literature, letters, etc. Needs to be seriously looked at. We need to take a long hard look at the potential benefits and problems of this type of communication between Committees, Groups, and Members; And then propose policies to enhance the potential good and minimize the potential problems. I suggest that a special, temporary WSC or WSB committee be established for this specific purpose. Let's stop treating symptoms and get down to the real issues.

Enough for Now — I'll call soon + perhaps even see you next week. Please make my apologies to the Conference if in fact I am unable to attend — You've done a great Job this year — I love you

Greg