

QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND CONCERNS about sections of our February, 1985  
FELLOWSHIP ULTIMATUM (F.U) docs! I mean REPORT

Page 1 ¶12 and following -- many, many references to something called the WSC ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE. In reviewing our service structure documents (The N.A. Tree thru our current T.W.G.S.S. - twigs) I find no reference to this committee. There is, of course, an ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE which, if I remember correctly was composed of both incoming and outgoing officers as well as a Trustee and whos purpose was to FACILITATE the Conference. I can only assume that:

1. the same typographical error was made numerous times,
2. our W.S.C. Officers are unknowledgable about W.S.C. terminology, or
3. this was a DELIBERATE change

Any of these three possibilities have disturbing implications.

Page 1 ¶11 and following -- numerous references to W.S.C. SUBCOMMITTEES This isn't a new error just made more frequently. There is no reference to W.S.C. SubCommittees in our service structure documents; our W.S.C. has COMMITTEES. The same three possibilities exist here as with the previous item of concern, however the implications are far more serious. The term Subcommittee implies a Committee which the Subcommittee is subservient to. This would change our W.S.C. structure to:

WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE  
\*  
\*  
W.S.C. ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE  
\*  
\*  
W.S.C. SOB-COMMITTEES

instead of:

WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE  
\*  
\*  
W.S.C. COMMITTEES

(with our W.S.C. Committees responsible to the representatives of our Fellowship rather than to a committee) It's obvious to me that we're inadvertantly (?) building power, control and prestige into our Service Structure. WHAT ABOUT DIRECT RESPONSIBILITY???

Page 1 ¶13 designated 1. proposes a new way to replace committee chairs I thought we already had a procedure for this called Vice-Chair and a back-up system in the form of a Trustee member of each committee. This existing procedure has worked well in the past, when it has been used. In the case of our Foreign Affairs Committee it does not seem that we followed our procedures. Actually what bothers me the most about this proposal is that it exists at all. I don't think that it is appropriate for our W.S.C. Chair to propose motions directly to the Fellowship! He should submit them through the appropriate committee or our representative system just like anyone else. This proposal places our W.S.C. Administrative Committee in an unfortunate position (as does much of this F.R.) ; it forces them to manage and control under certain circumstances. The explanation for this proposal sais that this "has been an accepted practice" which, of course, just isn't true in N.A. service! It probably is an accepted practice in many businesses but it doesn't feel right for a spiritual fellowship guided by the 12 Traditions.

Page 2 ¶2 -- item 2 -- Budgets -- Again, "POWER TO ADMINISTRATION" what our Finance Committee, doesn't budget seem more appropriate for them? (P.s. - my experience is that multiple part (overlapping) motions are a perfect way to slip POLITICS in along with good ideas.)

Page 4 line 1 -- LOOK!!! They got the name right here.

Page 4 -- input -- I am astonished that there were only 7 items of input this year; in fact, I can't believe it since I've seen more than 7 in copies of letters that were sent to W.S.C. this year. What happened to the rest of them? What Regions submitted these?

Page 4 -- Item 1 -- Voting Participants -- I would like to suggest two related motions (or amendments if that's the only way to get them to the floor).

1. That other "W.S.C. PARTICIPANTS" fully participate in all other aspects of the Conference
2. That our W.S.B. be empowered to "Return to the Fellowship" for reconsideration" any item voted on at W.S.C.; and that this process be limited to one reconsideration of any given item.

Page 4 -- item 4 -- Why should we throw away a good idea which hasn't been tried yet?

Page 4 -- item 6 -- You're kidding, I hope!

Page 10 - 17 -- Treasurers Report -- Why two reports? Why are W.S.C. 83 - 84 Expenses the only section not itemized? I don't object to \$4900 I'm sure that the cost of staging the Conference was close to that, but it would be nice to know.

Page 18 -- Title -- I'm glad that the Literature Committee knows they're a Committee rather than a Subcommittee.

Page 18 - 19 -- IT WORKS -- I like the work that has been done so far, but has the Fellowship decided if this should be a separate book or put into our Basic Text in place of the existing Dtes and Tradition material?

Page 20 ¶ 3 -- Implies that our Basic Text is currently being Professionally Edited. Is this true, and if so who authorized it?

Page 22 item 4 -- Much has been said about this elsewhere -- talk about a few members ramming something down the Fellowship's throat! Why has ~~the xxxxxxxxxx~~ this pamphlet been in such demand and photocopied so extensively throughout the Fellowship, if our conscience was to remove it from our Literature?

Page 23 Reminder 1 -- Probably one of the most outrageous and dangerous statements in the whole 153 pages!

Page 29 -- The Ad Hoc Committee knows they're a Committee.

Page 31 - 36 -- My only statement is that the ONLY really functioning W.S.C. Committees we've ever had were based on the participation of as many N.A. Members as possible.

Page 37 -- Police Committee doesn't know that they're a Committee

Page 41 -- H & I is confused, sometimes they're a Subcommittee and then sometimes they're a Committee. (oops! look at the bottom of page 41 "ASC H & I Committee - wrong again!")

Page 43 - 59 -- H & I "Approval Literature" -- Does the fact that this is H & I Literature exempt it from the literature review process. - I know that we've been trying to get this passed for years, but it keeps changing; where's the part about a "Statement of Non-Affiliation" to be read at every H & I Meeting?

Page 60 - 61 -- H & I & You -- Is this new? Shouldn't it be included in the regular Literature Approval process? Why doesn't our Literature Committee have this and why isn't it on the Addendum Order Form?

Page 62 -- Public Information doesn't know their a Committee.

Page 62-63 -- The "Sub-Committee System" has never really been tried except maybe once or twice. According to our Service Manual (s), the PURPOSE of these service bodies is to FACILITATE, MOTIVATE AND COORDINATE a service task and not to actually do the work (TWGSS - 1984 - page 38) why don't we try the system the way it's designed before we eliminate or change it. IT WOULD BE SO MUCH SIMPLER IF WE JUST FOLLOWED THE DIRECTIONS!!!!!!!!!!!!

Page 66 -- Convention knows that their a Committee, but obviously WSC-84 was confused at times

Page 128 -- Select knows their a Committee

Page 129 - 133 -- W.S.B. Report -- Our Trustees seem to be more aware of Conference nomenclature than most, this is a hopeful sign.

Page 131 - top -- Closing prayer -- what about the opening prayer?

Page 131-16 -- W.S.B. - licence to modify literature (except that the proposed motion doesnt say anything about literature) -- I think I understand the motivation behind this proposal; it sure would be convenient if someone could do a little "fine-tuning" without having to worry about the reaction of the Fellowship. There's no question that there are a lot of items in our published material that a little "minor rewording" for "clarification sake" would "fix"; and I'd just love to have the power to do it. I also know that virtually anything can be either attacked or defended by an "inturpretation" of our Traditions. Justification is a symptom of our disease. This proposed motion is so vague, so wordy, and so sweeping that it, in fact, gives our W.S.B. licence to make whatever changes they can justify without having to consult our Fellowship. I don't think we should write blank checks for any select group within our Service Structure.

Page 132 - Actors or Pseudo-Addicts to do P.I. work -- Have things changed? Are we now able to give away something we haven't got, or doesn't this apply to non-addicts? Also, I don't see anything in the proposal about mandatory Urine Drug Screens. Wouldn't it be great for one of our non-addicts to be seen chatting about what a great job he did for us over a few drinks or a ligh of coke at his next casting party. It seems to me

that our 11th Tradition would be better served by utilizing members whose lives depend on staying clean and who are conscious about protecting their anonymity for P.I. projects. What is the purpose of the 11th Tradition?

Page 152 - 153 -- Recognizing Southern Nevada as a Region -- Is this a personality problem or just another example of long standing competition between the cities of Las Vegas and Reno (or Reno and Las Vegas if you prefer)? I would like to propose a motion: "That the World Service Conference of Narcotics Anonymous NOT RECOGNIZE any (new) Region applying for recognition which represents a geographic area smaller than a single telephone area code."

In closing I would like to make one more suggestion:

That the format for W.S.C. - 1985 either be as specified in our Guidelines or that our Guidelines be amended to conform to the new agenda and that the following motions be made at the beginning of the Conference:

1. "That all items for consideration at W.S.C. - 1985 be tabled until 1986"
2. "That all current Fellowship Projects be brought to the floor, individually, without comment, for a vote to CONTINUE or STOP ACTION."
3. "That the W.S.C. Administrative Committee be directed to:
  1. prepare a listing (without comment) of ALL unresolved Conference motions and items for consideration (including all tabled or returned to fellowship from this and previous Conferences as well as all pending input to Conference Committees) and mail a copy of this list to all W.S.C. - 1985 participants and each Regional Service Committee on or before August 1st, 1985.
  2. accept input on this list (including amendments, related motions and statements pro and con) and written nominations (including nominee statements of service experience and willingness) for World Service Conference elective positions until November 1st, 1985.
  3. compile and mail (as in item 1 above) a Fellowship Report containing the above material (including the best pro and con statement for each motion) on or before January 1st, 1986."