**NAWS Claims vs Documented Fact**

The supporting documents cited throughout this essay are listed by their titles as listed at OriginalNA.org. They can be accessed at the web page listed or by going to OriginalNA.org, OriginalNA.com, OldSchoolNA.org or OldSchoolNA.com and clicking the "NA Historical Documents" link.

**NAWS claim:** In 1984 the Fellowship voted to remove language from Traditions 4 & 9.

**FACT:**

In 1982 the language was removed by four people in world service.

In 1983 it was put back in at the Fellowship's demand.

In 1984 the Board of Trustees called for an "emergency vote" because a Group from Nebraska questioned the decision in the form of a letter. The letter from Nebraska was not a motion and the "emergency vote" was out of line with procedure and the Traditions. Some of the RSRs in attendance at WSC protested taking a vote without the Groups deciding.

The Trustee solution was to give the RSRs 60 days to poll the Groups.

However, many regions covered multiple states. In 1984 cell technology was in its infancy and very few people had mobile phones, which were exceedingly expensive. Additionally, not many addicts even carried pagers, especially clean addicts. Answering machines were more of a luxury than the norm. Updated phone lists were hard to come by as they were hard copies - the internet did not exist, let alone easily updated phone lists. Long distance was neither flat rate nor free - To make a long distance call, an RSR had to pay by the minute. The most direct line of communication was from WSC to Regions to Areas to Groups. Most regions met quarterly, so the next regional meeting might be AFTER the 60 day deadline. Best case scenario this "motion" could have gone to Region the next month, to Area the month after, Groups could then have a month to pray and meditate to come to an actual Group Conscience rather than opinion, send it back to area the following month, which could send the decision back to region the next month. The RSRs could then "mail in" the vote. Coincidentally there are exactly three months between quarterly regional meetings. This quarterly process just may have had something to do with the fact that it was a three month process to take a true Conscience of the actual Groups. At a minimum it would take FOUR MONTHS before an RSR could record the vote, put it in an envelope, and mail it in, due to the fact that before the three month Group Conscience process (one that actually involves the Groups) could begin at the regional level it had to be taken from the world level to the regions (and this assumes all regions would be meeting the very next month). In short: There was a 60 day deadline on a process that takes a minimum of 120 days.

Of course, this was all totally outside procedure and a mail in vote leaves all kinds of room for a lack of accountability as to who is voting. Not to mention the fact that the RSR is pretty much left to decide for himself or herself without the proper time to get the conscience of the actual Groups. All new business should have taken a full cycle and come back the next year to be voted on as old business. There is a reason for the procedures, which were to ensure Group Conscience. (Group Conscience still took place in an actual Group back then, before there were Concepts that made service body opinion the working reality albeit in violation of our supposedly non-negotiable Traditions.)

Then again, the best way to subvert Group Conscience and a vote you know will go against you (after all the Fellowship had just demanded the wording be restored) would be to short circuit the process by which actual Home Groups give voice to an Ultimate Authority.
In the face of concerns that RSRs would not be able to feasibly poll every Group the idea of a "vote of confidence" was promoted. Ironically this negates the reason for polling the Groups in the first place. The 60 day polling process merely creates the illusion of true Group Conscience. (Keep in mind, this is all pre-Concepts; all before the processes by which Group Conscience is subverted and moved into the service structure was seemingly legitimized by those Concepts. In fact, at this point the word "Group" was still capitalized in our nonnegotiable Traditions, making clear that we are referring to Groups, proper - actual NA Home Groups - rather than a generic use of the word "group" which could apply to addicts on service boards and committees.)

The Trustees went further in putting out a long memo containing four pages detailing the reasons to remove the wording. This memo included a measly two pages in which the "opposing view" was offered. The problem? The "opposition" to removing the original language to the Traditions was so poorly presented and out of line with the actual reasons for the language in Traditions 4 & 9 that it reinforces the Trustee position by virtue of arguments so weak it appears to be intentional. No one in the Traditionalist Movement (supporters of a literal application of the Traditions including the original wording of 4 & 9) knows who wrote the opinion that supposedly represented our side. No one can be sure, but many suspect the Trustees wrote the entire memo. Had the opposing view been written by the opposition, every question the Nebraska Group asked could have been answered, and every Trustee point countered.

There is, in the Trustee letter, some indication that vaguely indicates that GSRs were being requested to take Group Conscience and forward it to the ASR who was then to forward same to the RSR. However, it is unclear if there was any effort to actually mail ballots to each Group or GSR (something that in itself would have been extremely time consuming and costly given the technology of the day) and the actual ballots allegedly counted were those of RSRs, not GSRs, Groups, ASRs, or Areas. Many Groups claim to have never voted or been consulted, and it is unclear whether these ballots were to be mailed directly to the Groups or were given to RSRs to take to them, assuming there were actually ballots distributed to the Groups at all. (Again, one option is extremely costly and the other would take far longer than 60 days).

The outcome of this "vote" was predictable. The "motion" passed. However, some regions claim to have not voted because this was out of line with established procedure and our Traditions which mandate Group (Home Group) Conscience. Additionally, the actual ballots were "lost". The only thing ever seen by the Fellowship was a letter detailing the claimed results with only raw numbers and no record of how any particular region voted. The letter claims that the mailed in votes were safely locked away. To this day the ballots have not been produced, nor has there been a region-by-region breakdown of the "Yes" and "No" votes produced.

This is hardly an expression of the will of the Fellowship (The actual member-addicts in their Groups). A read of the available documents makes clear the level of manipulation and the strenuous effort to avoid the actual Groups to which our services are supposed to be directly responsible having a voice at all.

The simple fact of the matter is that when those who opposed the original wording of Traditions 4 & 9 changed the Traditions without Fellowship approval, they were called on it and the Traditions were restored. When the established means failed, they simply went outside of procedure and the standing rules to get what they wanted when they wanted it. This was likely less a matter of impatience and more a matter of knowing that, given a full cycle for the opposition to actually express their side, it was
highly unlikely that the Fellowship that wrote the Basic Text and had just demanded that the original wording be restored would reverse its previous decision.

Propaganda works best when there is no time to refute it. There was no emergency, and there was no procedure anyway for an "emergency vote".

The supporting documentation can be found on various places around the internet, including unbiased sites like NArchive.magshare.net and CarryTheMessage.com. OriginalNA.org (The Alive & Free Home Group's site) which does take a strong pro-Baby Blue stance has compiled much of the Baby Blue relevant documentation on one page. For the sake of convenience, source material will be cited according to the OriginalNA.org page. However, we urge all who choose to investigate to verify the validity of these documents by cross-checking them with other sites. In fact, the Home Group that runs OriginalNA.org encourages the same.

http://www.originalna.org/na-historical-documents.html

- **1984 WSC/Trustee Propaganda Piece supporting removal of language from Traditions 4 & 9.**
- **1984 Letter with alleged 1984 mail-in vote results and claim that ballots (never seen) are in a safe.**
- **1984 WSC Minutes - PRE PUBLICATION FIRST DRAFT! (The 1984 minutes have mysteriously disappeared from another site. We thought we'd give them back to the Fellowship!)**

**NAWS Claim:** Grateful Dave and a few others acted of their own volition.

**FACT:** Grateful Dave and *many* others were acting on the direction of their Home Groups. This is established in the testimony offered in the 160 page Court Transcript of the Baby Blue case as well as in a recording of two phone calls between Grateful Dave and Stu T (WSO BOD) in which Dave tells Stu he is acting on the will of his Home Group in reaction to the 4th & 5th Edition Fiasco.

http://www.originalna.org/na-historical-documents.html

- **1991 Court Transcripts (WSO vs Grateful Dave)**
- **1990 Phone Calls Between Grateful Dave & Stu T of The WSO BOD**

**NAWS Claim:** Grateful Dave and others made unauthorized changes to the Basic Text.

**FACT:** The Home Groups responsible did not *change* the Basic Text. They restored the un-italicized body to the last version the Groups approved without shenanigans like the "mail in" vote of 1984. The exception to this is the italicized chapter headings. The reason being that the Fellowship actually did approve the White Book revisions of 1986 that were also applied to the headers (as the Basic Text is based on the White Book). Most people refer to the Baby Blue as The Third Revised with original 4th & 9th Traditions, but the result is the same restoration to the Traditions that the Fellowship approved without administrative structures imposing their wills. WSO Inc changed our book, not Grateful Dave, Billy A, Big Lou, or their Home Groups!

Compare the Baby Blue & The 6th Edition to the Original Approval Draft - Which has more changes?

http://www.originalna.org/na-historical-documents.html

- **Original Approval Draft**
- **Baby Blue**
- **6th Edition**
- **Details Of Changes To Basic Text**
**NAWS Claim:** The Fellowship approved the Fifth Edition after edits to the Fourth Edition went too far.

**FACT:** Neither the Fourth nor Fifth Edition went back to the Fellowship for input, review, or approval. After the Fellowship's outrage at the deep edits and missing lines from the Fourth Edition, it was decided on the floor of the WSC (by RSRs and other "voting members") that they would simply reinsert the missing lines. This ignored the deep edit (not the light edit the Fellowship approved) and still did not send the book back to the Groups for review. Page 20 of the 1988 WSC minutes (Which have been very hard to find since the resurgence of the Baby Blue Movement) shows the motions and votes to suspend the rules and simply reinsert missing lines:

> While in a committee of the whole it was the consensus of the Conference that the 1987-88 WSC Literature Chairperson be charged with the responsibility to select a small committee to verify the correct insertion of the twenty-five typographical omissions and two intentional deletions into the current Fourth Edition and notify the Conference of the membership of the small committee. The Vote:

> Chuck L., (WSC Vice-Chairperson) announced to the Conference that we were now back in regular session.

> It was M/S/C Eric H., RSR (Washington/N. Idaho)/Lori L., RSR (British Columbia) moved to suspend the rules and address the motion just developed by the committee of the whole". The Vote: CARRIED BY 2/3 MAJORITY BY SHOW OF HANDS

This is only a small snapshot and the entire minutes should be read.

Following this up with a five year moratorium to prevent the Groups' voices from being heard at WSC left the Groups with no other option but to restore our book to the one we approved. The initial "Baby Blues" were actually pink and were literally Third Edition Revised books. Eventually the Home Groups involved decided to restore the 4th & 9th Traditions as well because the 1984 "mail in" vote similarly ignored the Groups. (It should be noted that at this time that the ballots were still "lost". There is an unsubstantiated claim that the actual ballots were found in a safe in 1991. Conversely, there are other unsubstantiated claims that some of the votes were recorded via outgoing phone calls to RSRs who had not mailed in ballots. Regardless, the ballots have yet to be seen by the general Fellowship.)

http://www.originalna.org/na-historical-documents.html
- 1998 WSC Minutes in which 5th Edition is arbitrarily created without Fellowship consent

**NAWS Claim:** The 1991 Court Case established WSO Inc. as the sole publisher of NA literature, forbade publication of the Baby Blue, and resulted in the Fellowship affirming this.

**FACT:** The order was actually an agreement between David Moorhead (Grateful Dave) and WSO Inc. It was not binding on any Home Group or member-addict other than Dave. It also required WSO to do several things, which they failed to do. In addition, at WSC '91, WSO misrepresented the spirit of goodwill inherent in the language of the agreement and acted contrary to promises to move in a direction that rescinds the moratorium and allows the Groups to choose their Basic Text.

http://www.originalna.org/na-historical-documents.html
- 1991 Agreement Between Grateful Dave & WSO
By WSC 1992 a motion to enforce or vacate had been filed by with the court alleging that WSO Inc. had failed to comply with the court order. Sadly, Grateful Dave passed before it could be heard in court. This motion is not available but WSO Inc. has acknowledged that it was filed.

**NAWS Claim:** In 1991 The Fellowship affirmed the Fifth Edition and WSO Inc as the sole publisher of NA literature.

**Fact:** After agreeing to pursue letting the Groups decide, WSO Inc. brought an attorney to the floor. They created an atmosphere whereby participants were lead to believe the court affirmed WSO's right to our literature and repeatedly referred to the actions of Dave and his Home Group as illicit and illegal. This is woefully out of line with the spirit of compromise they lead Judge Pollack and Grateful Dave to believe they were embracing.

Here is an excerpt from the agreement:

4. WSO agrees to place, without comment, but with an introduction, the following Motions in the 1991 Conference Agenda Report of the World Service Conference ("WSC"), which shall immediately follow the publication, in their entirety, of the closing remarks of The Honorable Lewis H. Pollak entered at the a Preliminary Hearing held on Wednesday, January 2, 1991, in the United States District Court in Philadelphia, PA., prior to the announcement of any judgment.

**Motion 1**

That the Fellowship reconsider its decision on which Edition (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 3rd Revised, 4th, or 5th) of the Basic Text shall be produced and distributed by the WSO as the official and accepted text of Narcotics Anonymous.

In order for this Motion to be considered, a description of the differences between the respective Editions will be sent to each registered area and region, along with a copy of the complete Basic Text Third Edition, Revised. It is assumed that the WSC will rescind the motions adopted in 1988, which adopted the Fifth Edition as the Basic Text, as well as the motion restricting any change to the Text for five years.
Motion 2

That the WSO produce, at a reduced price, the Edition of the Text ratified by the WSC. The actual price of this text should be determined in view of the following factors: its affordability to the membership at large; the change, if any, in the cost and quality of the materials used in producing the book; whether it includes Book II as well as Book I; and the responsibility of the WSO to provide services from the income generated by sales of the Basic Text.

Motion 3

That the WSC be directed to seek a group by group tally of all the groups registered with the WSO, on Motions 1 and 2 above. This procedure will begin on July 1, 1991 and continue through December 31, 1991. All registered groups shall receive a copy of a paper detailing the differences between the Editions of the Basic Text, and a complete copy of the Basic Text Third Edition Revised. In addition, each group shall receive complete information concerning the issues relevant to a reduction in the price of the ratified Text.

The committee appointed to supervise this tally shall consist of the following: four RSR's, to be nominated by the entire group of RSR's in attendance at the 1991 WSC; two Trustees to be nominated by the members of the World Service Board of Trustees; two WSO Directors, to be nominated by the Directors of the WSO; and the WSC Chairperson. Those nominated by the RSR's, Trustees and Directors, respectively, are to be submitted to the World Service Conference in 1991 for ratification, failing which, those not ratified shall be replaced by others nominated by the RSR's, the Trustees, or the Directors, respectively. Two members of the WSO staff shall also be assigned as non-voting advisory members. The results of the group by group tally shall be published in the Fellowship Report and ratified as official at World Service Conference in 1992.
In Motion 1 the second paragraph begins with the words "In order for this motion to be considered". This was an agreement with regard to the motion, and commentary on the responsibilities of the various parties. In the WSC 1991 minutes when the motion is listed only the first paragraph is in quotations as the motion, itself. WSO is agreeing to send a 3rd Edition Revised and details of all the changes to each Area and Region. There is a list of changes that we have actually referenced as source material in this essay. However, it did not go out to every Area and Region, nor did it go out in the 1991 CAR.

Further, the commentary in Motion 1 indicates that the WSO will move in a direction that supports the motion and assumes the Fifth Edition and moratorium will be repealed.

Interestingly, the WSO agreed to publish the agreement without comment. Yet in the 1991 CAR it appears at the end of Stu T's report. He first begins by stating the BOD has no motions for the Fellowship to vote on (ignoring the fact that the WSO agreed to a Court Order mandating a vote on the aforementioned motions). He then presents three "proposals" or "affirmations". The reason for this is that he had promised the committee working on an FIPT that there would be no "motions" with regard to WSO ownership or control of our literature. Both sides were supposed to be working together. The original FIPT committee was later disbanded by WSO.

In effect, Stu was getting around his promise to make no motions regarding WSO literature control, while at the same time stating the BOD had no motions for the Fellowship, thereby creating the illusion that WSO was not a party to the motions they helped craft and agreed to support.

Worse, Stu puts forth his "proposals" with commentary on why WSO needs to be affirmed as the sole publisher of NA literature. The last such instance in his report is on Page 28 of the CAR. On Page 29 he then publishes the agreement "without commentary". He literally commented extensively on the need to affirm WSO Inc as the sole publisher of NA literature, thereby linking the events of the court case by making such a reference and then moves to the Court Order /Agreement as if moving on to a different item of business equates to publication without comment. This placement was not coincidental, but strategic. You can view the excerpts below, but we encourage you to read the full report in the 1991 CAR.

Excerpts of Stu T's "non-commentary" in the 1991 CAR which illustrate the exact manner in which he violated the letter and spirit of the court order are included on the pages which follow...
The WSO Board of Directors does not have any new motions for you to consider at WSC '91. However, we are asking for your consent to continue our work with the WSC and WSB, on three proposals (included as addendums), and reaffirm some important decisions made by the World Service Conference in years past.

During the 1990 Conference, several important matters were brought to our attention. First, many of the previous decisions and actions of the WSC were not adequately documented in the printed record of the conference, or subsequently distributed to our members. Second, that the fiduciary relationship of the WSO to the N.A. Fellowship is not understood to the satisfaction of our members. Third, that the initial reasons surrounding the creation of a fiduciary responsibility for N.A.'s properties also were not clearly understood.

The initial reasons for creating a fiduciary entity were twofold:

1. To establish, for N.A., the capacity to protect and secure all intellectual properties, trademarks, and copyrights of the N.A. Fellowship.
2. To provide an essential mechanism by which all N.A. literature, books, pamphlets, handbooks, etc., would be uniformly produced, printed, manufactured, sold, and distributed.

***************

Certainly, the activities during this past year concerning the production and distribution of Book One of the Basic Text have caused us to place these issues in front of our members again.

Our choices are not simple, and require a great deal of discussion: To reaffirm our past decisions, modify them, or provide another mechanism to protect and hold the properties of our fellowship. We encourage you to consider the issues carefully, and be prepared to discuss them at length at the Conference.

If the fellowship wishes to continue to have the WSO act in this capacity, then the conference will need to discuss it thoroughly, and choose to act positively on the following statements:

1. To reaffirm that all of N.A.'s intellectual and physical properties are held in a fiduciary capacity by the WSO, Inc., on behalf of the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous.

2. To reaffirm that the World Service Office, Inc., is the exclusive publisher and distributor of all World Service Conference-approved literature, including all books, pamphlets, handbooks, and other intellectual and physical properties, as directed by the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous through the World Service Conference.
The violations of the spirit and letter of the Court Order do not stop there. WSO then brought their attorney to the conference floor, creating an atmosphere and the illusion that Dave and the Baby Blue were out of line and to be defeated, rather than telling the truth: That they made what all involved thought was a good faith agreement; That the motions set forth were mutual.

WSO also strategically placed the vote on the motions agreed to in court directly AFTER motions to affirm WSO as the owner of NA Literature.

http://www.originalna.org/na-historical-documents.html

- 1991 WSC Approved Minutes

From the 1991 WSC minutes (Page references are according to the PDF file as the pages of the minutes are not numbered): PDF Page 17: "Theresa Middlebrook, intellectual property attorney for the WSO, explained that this...is intended to provide clarity, emphasizing the need for the conference to reaffirm and ratify that WSO is the owner of the legal rights to the fellowship literature, which rights are held in a trust on behalf of the fellowship. She pointed out that this has been established 'de facto' ['by the facts'] and a clear, written conference action will be most helpful. "
"Ms. Middlebrook pointed out that the claims of some people that effective written transfer of ownership was never made for the Basic Text, are groundless in her opinion..."

After the vote (which of course ignored all three motions WSO agreed to support) it was obvious that no matter which side one took, no one believed the will of the Groups had been consulted as is evidenced by the following quotes from the 1991 WSC minutes:

"Others expressed the view that the controversy would disappear if the groups could decide the issues." -PDF Page 22

"Several participants suggested reconsidering motions 13 and 15, with the thought that fellowship consultation will help resolve the issues." -PDF Page 22

"Another felt that...the individual involved was now being rewarded by forcing the WSC to spend time on motions 13, 14, and 15. " -PDF Page 23

The last comment is particularly disturbing because it speaks to the fact that WSO presented these motions as something Dave forced on the Fellowship, rather than a mutual expression of unity and a willingness to let the Groups decide the issue. The court documents make clear this was a mutual agreement that both parties had designed. And let us not forget it was WSO who decided to force the issue and sue Grateful Dave. Had WSO elected not to turn the Fellowship against itself and try to sue a member, there would have been no court order mandating that WSO or the WSC do anything. WSO was, in fact, an architect of the agreement and subsequent court order; an agreement that gave WSO what they wanted - Dave stops publishing Basic Texts. It also made it possible for Dave to enter an agreement to stop publishing as it gave the Groups their voice back. In this way he could enter an agreement without violating his obligation to carry out his Home Group's Conscience. Reading the Court Documents makes VERY clear that these motions were a mutual agreement between WSO and David Moorhead. There was no obligation for the Fellowship to vote one way or another, but WSO had a very clear obligation to support the motions and the Agreement they crafted.

Perhaps the most telling of the mentality of some of those involved in "service" is the Following, again from the 1991 minutes: "One participant....expressed his hope that an answer is forthcoming about whether decision making should be done by the membership or a more experienced group of trusted servants."

**NAWS Claim:** They simply don't want to sue Baby Blue supporters.

**FACT:** NAWS would likely lose if it were to sue. Because it would be unwise for NAWS to sue, it has a choice: Accept that they do not control our literature or set the Groups one against the other. The NAWS World Board has seemingly chosen the latter. The truth of the matter is that the Home Groups who were not involved in the case continued to produce Baby Blues in 1991. This has continued to this very day and WSO Inc/NAWS Inc have been aware the entire time. There is absolute proof that they were aware that production of the Baby Blue did not cease when Grateful Dave stopped printing on behalf of his Group because it's in the 1991 WSC minutes!

"...a new version of the illegal book has surfaced." -PDF Page 22
Why would WSO Inc not go back into court with their new "affirmation" from WSC to own and defend the literature? Put simply, it is because they were out of line with the 1991 court order. They would have lost based on the agreement and precedent they created. Moreover, because WSO Inc. and NAWS Inc. have now failed to act against the Baby Blue for a quarter century, having documented in their own 1991 minutes their awareness of continued publication, they would risk losing any claimed copyrights due to their failure to act against Baby Blue publishers. (This is, in fact, the reason WSO gave that same year for allowing outside vendors to sell and profit from the NA logo - They failed to defend when it happened.)

NAWS and the WB are in the position of 1) filing a lawsuit and running a high risk of losing all claims to a copyright, 2) admitting Groups and member addicts have a right to produce the literature (which would at least preserve their ability to litigate against actual outside entities), or 3) trying to maintain power and control by setting Groups against one another. Sadly, their actions indicate they have have opted for the choice that creates unnecessary dissension, carries the illusion of power and control, and denies the newcomer access to literature on the premise that it is better to deny a free Basic Text to newcomers because we need money to produce $12 Basic Texts for newcomers.

In short, allowing a corporate entity to use our name has created problems of money, property, and prestige which are now diverting the Groups from their primary purpose as NAWS stirs dissension rather than allowing autonomous Groups to carry the message free of charge. In their own words from various essays published in 2014 and 2015, "This is fundamentally an issue of economics." Those of us who truly care about carrying the message to the addict who still suffers (including Groups who publish free Basic Texts that include the Fifth/Sixth Edition changes and whom NAWS still opposes) would beg to differ.

This is fundamentally an issue of keeping what we have by giving it away. The well over 130,000 (and counting) Baby Blues (not to mention free Fifth/Sixth Editions) distributed on all six inhabited continents are testament to the fact that there actually are addicts willing to produce a Basic Text without the need of salaried positions or corporate titles with expense accounts in lieu of salaries. We know we can produce a "free or low cost Basic Text" because Groups have been doing it since 1987!

Uniformity is not synonymous with unity. It is the antithesis of unity and a hallmark of tyranny. Baby Blue and Grey Book Groups are not trying force the literature we use on other NA Groups. We respect the autonomy of "Sixth Edition" Groups as much as we value our own. Were addicts and Groups not under fire as a result of NAWS and their World Board encouraging such acts, we would simply ignore NAWS as is our right as autonomous (non-governed) Home Groups. How wonderful would it be if you used your Sixth Edition, we used our Baby Blue, we all peacefully coexisted, and Newcomers got a free Basic Text?

1988 W.S.C. Select Committee On Service Structure

Group autonomy gives each group the right to accept or reject any decision made in its behalf, even if that decision is otherwise supported or rejected by the vast majority of other N.A. groups.

misconceptions. Leading the way is the general perception that the decisions made by the WSC are the expression of a collective ultimate authority. Through our investigation of our Traditions we believe that this is fundamentally incorrect. "The WSC is instead the place where the effective voice of our groups from around our Fellowship, through their chosen representatives, come together with those responsible for our world service operations to establish direction and guidance for our worldwide service efforts." This statement more correctly acknowledges the functional reality of the WSC and does not imply any authority with is out of balance with our principles. If we take a step back and look closely we may conclude that the WSC (or any service body) cannot speak as an ultimate authority. It is only meant to be the collective voice of our Fellowship, determining the mainstream of N.A. experience, which it has properly been delegated to do. The groups, utilizing their group conscience as an ultimate authority, in reality decide the force of any of our service decisions, not the participants of the WSC.