

WSC POLICY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES, DALLAS WORKSHOP  
November 11-13, 1988

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, November 11, 1988. Present were Reuben F., Dave T., Debbie O., Tony D., Bob McK., Steve L., Tim B., Bill R., Alan R., Mitchell S., Linda C., Jack B. and John B.

The minutes of the Detroit workshop were read. A committee member noted that the minutes should reflect on page 9, following "Vote on Amendment," that Linda C., Tony D. and Tim B. were excused to attend a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Special Interest Meetings. The minutes were then approved as amended.

The committee looked once again at two motions which were previously approved for inclusion in the Conference Agenda Report.

"To replace the note at the top of page 6 of the TWGSS with 'Note: Although there are differences in the persons who vote at ASCs and RSCs, all service committee meetings are open to the Fellowship.'" INTENT: The present note does not reflect the experience of our Fellowship, especially those in rural areas. Despite the experience it is a very directive statement (Mark D. Upper Midwest, maker).

Vote to include in Conference Agenda Report as is: 10/0/1.

"To amend TWGSS, page 9, paragraph 3, to replace the first sentence under 'Election of ASC Officers' with 'Committee Officers should be elected from Members of Narcotics Anonymous who have prior service experience such as GSR, group Secretary, group Treasurer and/or subcommittee member' and eliminate the second and third sentences in paragraph one." INTENT: Because the expected release of a new service guide is not in the coming year, this very confusing line needs to be changed to fit our present understanding.

Vote to include in Conference Agenda Report as is: 11/0/0.

The next topic on the agenda was proposed election procedures. The committee discussed first the nominating form and the cover letter to candidates.

STRAW VOTE: In favor of nominating committee being for information gathering only: 8.

In favor of a nominating committee which is for information gathering, verifying and reporting, but also recruiting: 4/6.

STRAW VOTE: Opposed to changing the name to Nominations Committee? 0

The committee is renamed the Nominations Committee.

STRAW VOTE: All in favor of this chair being a voting member? 0

STRAW VOTE: In favor of selecting the chairperson of the nominations committee internally: 9/0/2

Reuben: We plan to be using a written ballot as of 4/89. We will also let the Conference know what we're working on.

M/S/C Tim/Debbie & Tony (12/0): We recommend to Joint Administrative Committee that nominations for trusted servants be oral; each nominee will receive a nomination form to fill out; the form will be turned in to the WSO for reproduction and attached to the ballot form. A ballot with attachments goes to each WSC voting participant for marking. Ballots will be turned back in to the Administrative Committee. The results will be tabulated and announced at a later time. We also recommend that this procedure be discussed either in a pre-Conference mailing or on the Sunday introductory session.

The next topic on the agenda was regional motions in the Conference Agenda Report.

Chuck: The Joint Administrative Committee had some questions about #5 in the original, and I have submitted input with changes to that section. An individual region cannot instruct the chair to include an item in the Conference Agenda Report. That places the region in a position of authority over the chairperson, and only the Conference has that authority. The RSR can address the Conference with a concern, however. We need to keep the responsibility clear here, the region is responsible for bringing it to the floor.

--One of our concerns was the time factor involved. Is there an opportunity for a region to ask the chair to include an item in the Conference Agenda Report, at his/her discretion?

Chuck: If a region proposes a motion and the Conference thinks it's important, it will go on. The Conference has all the power it needs. What I want in #7 is to make the Conference decide what goes into the Conference Agenda Report, rather than giving regions that authority. The inclusion of regional motions historically has been a courtesy. #6 really seeks to have the Conference instruct boards and committees. Also, sometimes motions that are called "regional" are really from RSRs and not regions.

--One reason for this motion is that a lot of regions didn't understand the actions of committees with respect to their motions. Lately committees have gone out of their way to communicate. The difference between the two forms is whether we have individual rights, or the privilege of individuals to participate in the common welfare. Assuming that this is a privilege, we understand and agree that we accept the decision of the whole. The main difference is that the original motion was based on rights, protecting the individual against the whole. If we're based on privilege, then we accept the input from the Administrative Committee. The Conference has never limited access to the floor of the Conference. If something is important to the whole, the Conference will take action.

--To further the discussion of rights vs. privileges, by extension, #5 means an individual can dictate to the fellowship (as an individual can dictate to a group; a group to an area; an area to a region). But regional motions should not be in the Conference Agenda Report for informational purposes only. It's an AGENDA, not a newsletter.



STRAW VOTE: In favor of the original document? 0  
In favor of the Admin. Committee's input? 10/0/2

The committee recessed for lunch at 12:15 and reconvened at 1:45 p.m. Present for the afternoon session were Reuben F., Dave T., Jack B., Debbie O., Bob McK., Steve L., Tim B., Bill R., Alan R., Mitchell S., Linda C., and John B. Tony D. and Keith S. came in later.

STRAW VOTE (reconsidered): Original document: 0  
Administrative Committee's input: 9/0/1

M/S/C Jack/Steve (9/2/2): #7 to read: "Should the Region originally proposing the motion be dissatisfied with the Committee's action, they may move the WSC at its annual meeting, to have the matter placed as an action item for that year's World Service Conference."

STRAW VOTE: In favor of regional motions going on the Conference Agenda Report as action items, regardless of committee action: 5/5/4  
In favor of regional motions sent to committee and rejected, when the region still wants them, appearing as action items on the Conference Agenda Report: 11/0/3

Steve and Jack are to write wording into the document and we will discuss it further after lunch on Saturday.

Next on the agenda was discussion on the Conference Work Schedule as a whole. In paragraph 4, last line, drop "single evening's" and change to "an open forum session." The paragraph in italics on page 2 will stay intact.

M/S/C To adopt Conference Work Schedule through to the portion on Regional Motions: 12/1/0

The committee again looked at two items for the Conference Agenda Report that had been previously approved.

"To add to TWGSS, page 19, I.A.(7.): 'In the absence of a duly elected committee Chair, the Conference will recognize the duly elected Vice Chair of the respective Committee.'"

Vote to include in Conference Agenda Report as it stands: 13/0/0

"To amend TWGSS, page 19, by adding after the first sentence of I.D., 'Only Conference participants are allowed to vote, make motions, or address the Conference. When RSR/WSC Committee chairs are not on the floor of the Conference, duly elected Alternates/Vice Chairs may vote, make motions, or address the Conference. [No member may speak on a motion more than once unless others desiring to speak on the motion have exercised their opportunity. Committee Vice Chairs and RSR Alternates are considered to be the same member as their respective Chair/RSR when acting as a participant.]' To further amend TWGSS, page 19, after H., 'NOTE: Under the Rules of Order of the WSC, no member may speak on a motion more than once unless others desiring to speak on the motion have done so. WSC Committee Vice Chairs and RSR Alternates are considered to be the same member as their respective WSC Committee Chairs/RSR

when acting as a participant (WSC Rules of Order may be obtained from WSO)."

Vote to include in Conference Agenda Report as it currently stands: 13/0/0

M/S Tim/John: Motion to include WCC Chair and Vice Chair on the Joint Administrative Committee. Motion tabled until tomorrow.

The committee recessed for the day at 4:50 p.m. and reconvened on Saturday morning at 9:00. Present for the Saturday morning session were Reuben F., Dave T., Mark D., Jack B., Tony D., Steve L., Keith S., Tim B., Bill R., Alan R., Linda C., and John B. Debbie O., Bob McK. and Mitchell S. joined the meeting later.

The first item of business for Saturday was the formation of new regions.

--Our work group sees this as really two issues: formation, and seating. The WSC has the right to determine how new regions will be seated, but not how or if they will be formed. The purpose of the attached inventories is to help areas/regions make the decision for themselves, at the group, area and regional level. These are not written like a test, they don't get mailed to the Policy Committee. The work we did on seating allows for a voice, but not a vote for the first year. This is to help prevent regions forming for a vote on the hot issue of the day.

--The origin of this motion is in ignorance or discomfort on voting to seat new regions. The deeper issue we should remember is how to best deliver services. Are there alternatives to "growing up" to be a region? We need to redirect the focus everywhere onto how we best deliver services.

STRAW VOTE: In favor of not allowing new regions to vote at their first conference: 2/7/4

STRAW VOTE: In favor of inventory questions as they are, as response to new regions: 13

In favor of cover letter generally (change "I" to "we"): 13

In favor of providing option of new region not voting: 8/3/2

In favor of requesting the Conference to delete our second purpose and transfer the function to the Admin. Committee: 5/1/7

Reuben: Is the committee in favor of adding a discussion of changing our second purpose to next year's agenda? 9/0/3 Do we want to put this on the CAR? I'd like to be able to discuss this at the Conference. I don't want to ask for input through the *Fellowship Report* because we never get anything.

STRAW VOTE: Do we wish to retain our second purpose? 2/3

STRAW VOTE: Do we want to add to our internal action item list an examination of our second purpose? 9/1/4

STRAW VOTE: In favor of work group for language: 1/9/3

In favor of adding the non-voting option concept to next year's internal action item list: 9



The committee chairperson expressed displeasure with the report from the work group on stop action. It did not reflect the Policy Committee consensus in Detroit. It also seemed to be not a product of the work group. The rest of the work group agreed that only one paragraph of the three page report reflected the work of the group.

The committee recessed for lunch at 12:30 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m. Present for the Saturday afternoon session were Reuben F., Dave T., Mark D., Jack B., Debbie O., Tony D., Steve L., Keith S., Alan R., Mitchell S., and John B. Bob McK. and Bill R. came in later, and Linda C. and Tim B. spent part of the afternoon in a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Special Interest Meetings.

The afternoon session was open forum. Concerns expressed included:

1. An impression that we concentrate on extremes and ignore the middle ground. Also a question about whether you are a region when you say you are. We put qualifications on everything else, including groups.
2. Regarding regional motions in the Conference Agenda Report, the fellowship expects documents put out from the world to be accurate and truthful. We may be confusing the groups needlessly and that's irresponsible.
3. Urging the Policy Committee to let others know there are alternatives to forming new regions, such as Detroit's subregion system.
4. A concern that the question on the regional inventory about state boundaries was too restrictive for an international fellowship. This person also mentioned that their region had discussed forming a new region and wanted to hurry and do that before we made it real hard. They were pleased to see we aren't going to do that.
5. A concern that by placing limits on regions we are interfering with the autonomy of groups.
6. A concern that we need to involve the international fellowship more than we do now. Disappointment was expressed at the low level of participation by the local fellowship at quarterly workshops.
7. A comment that the feeling of "us and them" had disappeared since attending workshops. A concern that new regions should know, if they're not well prepared for a split, that the addict who still suffers will pick up the tab. A feeling that the *Fellowship Report* reflects personal opinion only.
8. A strong concern that regions should have access to the Conference Agenda Report for motions so the RSRs can consider them for group conscience.
9. A remark that all motions should go to committee because nothing can be decided in one day.
10. A comment that motions come from members and shouldn't be easily put aside.
11. A question about the motion for a procedure to poll the groups in case of a change in the Steps and Traditions. A further comment heard over the weekend on this subject was that groups in some areas were rushing to register because they believe they will be asked about changing the Steps and Traditions next April.

General forum ended at 3:10 p.m. when all non-members present had asked all the questions they had. The committee then looked at regional motions in the Conference Agenda Report again. A proposal with different language for #6 and #7 was handed out to the committee.

--The differences in the two #7s are: this one can go back to the fellowship in a shorter period of time. It bypasses the Conference. The Conference Agenda Report belongs to the Conference and should contain motions and actions developed by its boards and committees. I'm still concerned that this makes the chair take direction from the regions, instead of the Conference. Also, if we want the fellowship to decide something, we should let them see the committee's work. It's the responsibility of the Conference to tell the chair what to do.

VOTE on items #1-5 as is: 11/0/1  
On item #6 as amended in Dallas: 9/2/1

--I'd like to amend #7, after the word "motion," add ", its intent and Committee recommendations."

--I think the intent addresses the region's concerns. The amendment offered to #7 should cover that concern.

VOTE on amendment: 11/0/1  
On #7 as amended: 11/1/0

VOTE on Regional Motions #1-#7: 10/1/1

Reuben: Regarding including the chair and vice chair of the WCC on the JAC, do we want to suggest that in the Conference Agenda Report? They were left off because of their subsidiary role to the Board of Directors. (no one wants to)

Tim: In the letter to forming regions, change to first person plural instead of singular.

The committee then considered a letter received by the committee regarding the principle of rotation in leadership.

The committee recessed for the day at 4:45 p.m. and reconvened on Sunday, November 13 at 9:00 a.m. Present at the final session were Reuben F., Dave T., Mark D., Jack B., Tony D., Debbie O., Bob McK., Steve L., Keith S., Tim B., Bill R., Alan R., Mitchell S., Linda C., and John B.

Reuben announced that Steve L. will be resigning his position on the Policy Committee to become a special worker, and asked if there was objection to his continuing as a voting member for today. There was no objection.

The committee then further discussed the work on formation of new regions. The cover letter will be changed to read "we" instead of "I".



--Let's strike "Having been at your place several years ago" and begin the sentence with "We understand." (yes) I envision us sending this letter out to people who write to us to notify us that they're working on a new region and asking for information. WSO gets the letter, sends the packet to them and sends the letter to me.

--Let's end the second paragraph after the word "plan" (yes).

VOTE to accept the letter as amended: 9/0/2

In favor of the group inventory: 10/0/1

In favor of the area inventory: 10/0/1

Regarding the regional inventory, make 2(a)-(f) questions (yes).

VOTE in favor of accepting the regional inventory as edited: 9/0/4

VOTE in favor of sending Guide to Service work: 3/7/2

In favor of not sending TWGSS or GTS language: 9/

Question for Conference Agenda Report: "Should the WSC Policy Committee propose requirements on the formation of new regions and the seating of those regions at the WSC?" This will be followed by a request from the chair that if you answer yes, please send specific suggestions to the Conference with your RSR. VOTE in favor of this language: 11/0/0

No specific assignments are made to work groups. Any input will be welcome. The ballot and nomination form are not implemented, but we will request the chairperson to use them. The letter on the principle of rotation will be placed on the committee's internal action item list for 1989. Another item that may be included is setting qualifications, clean time requirements, etc. for WSC officers.

The committee was asked to think of nominations for next year's Policy Committee chairperson and other members. The committee meeting then closed with a prayer at 11:30 a.m.