

Minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting in Santa Monica, California.

Meeting stated at 9:00 p.m. Present were: Chuck S., Chairman; Sally E.; Jack B.; Chuck G.; Cliff K.; James D., Canada; Bob B.; Jim N., Nebraska; Hank M.; Capt. Michael Bohan, W. Virg.; Pro-Temp Sec. Dianna P. Absent were: Carl B.; Greg P., Oregon.

The meeting was called for all new members and all old members to get acquainted and for any business that should be brought up at the Conference.

Chuck S.: It appears we are off to a good start and all delegates who have come can get N.A. back on N.A. business. There is a strong feeling among the membership that individual voting should be taken away from the Board of Trustees at the World Service Conference level which would place us back into the business of "Guardian's of the Traditions." Also, there is an Affirmation possibility of the Board of Trustees on a yearly basis.

Sally E.: The issue was brought up in the study about the voting by the Board of Trustees. Most Fellowship persons wanted direct elections to the Board of Trustees rather than from within. The biggest complaint seems to be that the Board of Trustees are not directly responsible to the Fellowship.

Jack B.-Ca: Trustees would only have one (1) vote. Possibly we could choose persons for our Board at the Conference rather than wait until later. Possibly we need a new format for the Board of Trustees. Perhaps we need a Committee to review another structure that may help solve many of our problems.

Bob B.: Board of Trustees study could be done by persons who may have longevity to do this, but before doing so a committee would confer with the "old timers" for past history. In order to protect the Traditions of N.A. any organization needs firm guidance.

Hank M.: This has been brought up before and the comment is "Yes, but we are different!"

Chuck S.: N.A. appears to be here to get it mandated now, to get it changed. Mention was made of the difficult "heads of Boards that are broken down".

James B.-Can.: We addressed two issues. One was discussed that the input we received, they felt that the Board of Trustees should be kept at a guiding level. The second was separate votes, perhaps. We should present a united front no matter what. Credibility is very important to and for us. If we are going to go on and become something valuable to the Fellowship so that they can turn to us.

Cliff K.: Does the Fellowship doubt the integrity and credibility of the Board of Trustees. Most complaints come before the Board of Trustees in the form of a written inquiry and a response has been given back in writing. Taking away the vote from each of the Board of Trustees members, and it becoming just one vote, may not be serving the Fellowship as a whole.

(continued)

Chuck G.: "Trustees losing their vote" - A.A.'s Trustees vote. And, after much thought, may be we are making a mistake doing it as one.

Chuck S.: "Collectively as a body" for us to agree and vote the same way, it would mean the issue is very, very important and meaningful.

Jim N.-Neb.: "I'm just listening and learning".

Chuck S.: We are advisers and still have a vote at the Conference. The newcomers are looking to us for guidance and wisdom. Persons will come to us as individuals.

Cliff K.: I express concern over the classification of "Input". Input has come from the individuals. Perhaps the Input should be brought in at the Area level and then on a Regional level. Have it clear the hurdles before coming to the Board of Trustees. Suggest the Board of Trustees vote in favor of the Green Manual since the Fellowship appears to be so in favor of the book that has been drawn up.

Jack B.: So, it is decided that the Board of Trustees will leave it up to the Fellowship and let it go.

Chuck S.: The issue of Affirmation of Trustees each year.

Jack B.: Brought up point that newer persons look for "time" from persons on the Board of Trustees.

Sally E.: Movement is for direct election by the Fellowship. Movement appears to be really strong.

Cliff K.: Based on who and what criteria World Service Conference could vote by ?????

Chuck G.: A.A. votes on person's by their own body, but at the Conference they can be shot down.

Jack B.: Nominations are made at the Conference - Challenges could be made at the time of the Conference.

Discussion: Board of Trustees in A.A. hire the persons who work in the World Service Office. Membership does not understand the structure of the N.A. Service Manual and it is felt they are not being properly represented by a person from their part of the country. It is felt that they are being run by California.

Capt. Mike B.: There is a provision that we have a non-addict member on the Board of Trustees. National representation could be possible if each voted the persons who need to be in attendance. If the Fellowship knew the amount of collectable Input that the Board of Trustees did actually do then perhaps they would not be so fearful.

Chuck S.: Fear and lack of understanding is one of our big problems.

(continued)