

**Main Menu**

- [Home Page](#)
- [Trustee Guidelines](#)
- [GA Reference Material](#)
- [Keyword Search](#)
- [Download Center](#)
- [Contact Administrator](#)

**Orlando, FL - Fall 2013  
Information Section**

[Orlando Conference Info](#)

**Rolling Agenda**

- [Orlando Proxies](#)
- [Agenda Information](#)
- [Conference Bids](#)

**Submit an Agenda Item**

**BOT Committees**

- [Anonymity](#)
- [BOR Procedural Review](#)
- [Blue Book Revision](#)
- [Conference Oversight](#)
- [Digital Media](#)
- [Hotline Implementation](#)
- [Hotline Files](#)
- [Intergroup](#)
- [International Relations](#)
- [Liability Insurance](#)
- [Literature](#)
- [Member Retention](#)
- [Online GA Meeting](#)
- [Pressure Relief](#)
- [Prison - Canada](#)
- [Prison - US](#)
- [Public Relations](#)
- [Rules and Procedures](#)
- [Telephone Conference Call](#)
- [Trustee Area Demarcation](#)
- [Trustee Removal Merit Panel](#)
- [Trustee Website](#)
- [Website Revisions](#)

**Trustee Line & Other Features**

- [Trustee Line Home Page](#)
- [Login For The Trustee Poll](#)
- [Trustee Poll](#)
- [>>Trustee Information Update<<](#)
- [Trustee Website Tutorial](#)
- [Area Event Flyers](#)
- [Local Area Website Guidelines](#)
- [New Area/Trustee Accommodation Fund](#)
- [Local Area Help Flyer](#)
- [Board of Regents News Page](#)
- [Trustee Memorial Honor Roll](#)

**Future Conferences**

[Upcoming Conferences](#)

Select Language ▼

**Trustee Line for April 2013**

A PDF version of this issue to distribute to your rooms, or to print out for easier reading, will be available after 4/30/13.

**Thoughts From The Trustees - Current and Past**

The subjects listed below are themes that have been submitted by other Trustees. You may respond to any of them, or start an entirely new subject

Item	Subject	Last Entry	Entries
1.	<a href="#">Yes, That Pedal Is For The Brakes</a>	4/1/13 12:01 AM	1
2.	<a href="#">Fellowship and Recovery - Continued</a>	4/1/13 12:01 AM	1
3.	<a href="#">Recovery Step 4 Experiences - Revisited</a>	4/2/13 8:28 PM	1
4.	<a href="#">Retention</a>	4/9/13 2:25 PM	4
5.	<a href="#">Item 84</a>	4/10/13 3:20 PM	1
6.	<a href="#">Term Limits</a>	4/11/13 5:42 PM	3
7.	<a href="#">Appropriate Literature</a>	4/12/13 9:51 AM	1
8.	<a href="#">Overseas Chair</a>	4/12/13 7:18 PM	1

**Yes, That Pedal Is For The Brakes**

4/1/13 - 12:01 AM

Well folks, I suppose the Trustee Line is at a crossroad. There was certainly a lot of energy being parceled for various subjects from last month. Maybe it's time to talk about the process.

Gary's reply to George's posting on 'How Sick Is Sick' was an example of why we all belong in this program. We are terrible handicappers. If you had asked me late last month if the tone of the Trustee Line would return to reasonability, I would have said no. But Gary apparently started the high-pitched drama last month and Gary apparently ended it, quite handily.

His reply to my posting regarding the changes that I felt needed to be done at the BOR, took the Trustee Line to a very ugly place. You could have driven an ocean liner through the clear division of opinion that was then released. Yes, it appeared that both sides were moving apart at a rapid pace. We had more people write to the Trustee Line than we have had in a while.

Through this divide, what others would call disunity, the Trustee Line forced everyone to find themselves and in the process, repair itself. The tone changed, the substance of the postings changed, the temperament changed, and the realization that not everything is in black and white, but shades of gray, was realized once again. That is the beauty of the Trustee Line. The Trustees set the tone of each issue, with guidelines that were clearly being bumped into during March. That's fine...now we all are a bit stronger for the experience, and maybe a bit less sensitive.

For those who read the ISO Bulletin, I suppose no one comes away from such a reading with ideas or comments that rub you the wrong way, or better yet,

make you stop and think about things that need to be addressed in the Fellowship. Karen is the editor for the ISO Bulletin and she is very careful to only allow positive entries into the Bulletin. That's fine - for the Bulletin. The Trustee Line has no editor and we function in an open environment.

We have many members who preach that we should always look the positives. I get that concept as it relates to our recoveries, so we don't fall back into the pity pot and wallow in our misery, which could bring us right back to the bet. I want others to understand that the Trustee Line is a valuable tool for turning the negatives into positives. The Trustee Line is the staging area for this process. We are all Trustees, either current or past. As a result, we understand this Fellowship from a very different perspective, coordinated cooperation. Hopefully, the current Trustees have taken their current position to make the Fellowship better. The first and most important way to do that is to identify the many problems and inefficiencies within our Fellowship and the Corporation of GA. Yes George, it's not all about spirituality. We have a corporation and that's what the BOR takes care of. I don't want to take the posture of working from problems to solutions as the only way we operate, because many Trustees have brought inspired ideas to the BOT have have gained overwhelming support. However, highlighting problems on the Trustee Line is the first step toward a possible solution. That is when the feedback is so valuable. Dissenting opinions are a delight, even arguing those different views. This process is also about H.O.W. If we deal with the issue, we are then in the process of working toward a positive result. The problem we face is that many stop at the first notification of a problem surfacing and then get consumed and hardened in those views to where they feel they have to forcibly defend their stance.

Let me just quote Socrates: 'When the debate is lost, slander becomes the tool of the loser.' We can't see under every rock for all the problems we have in so many areas of the Fellowship, nor should we focus our efforts in only trying to find them, which is a cynical view of recovery. We also can't ignore them and hide behind the protective wall of 'Just think about the positives.' If you want to be an optimist, fine, but you also must be a realist. Maybe such people just don't want to admit or deal with the problems and the potential solutions. That is also fine, but they should then yield to those who want to try and find an answer or happy medium of some sort. However, when we run across them, it is completely possible that those who don't agree with the view point, already realize that their position on the subject is wrong. Should the next response be a posting focused on how to grind up the person that presented the issue? I'm sure there is a heavy majority in the 'No' column on this one.

Here is what I would like everyone to think about, as of this posting until whenever. I have heard through my life that we need to think twice and act once. People in the construction and manufacturing business should measure twice and cut once. Whatever has been said like that - give it some credence. Let's all think in that period just before we hit the send button on our email about a mental checklist of things that just don't belong in a Trustee Line posting, such as...

- Attacks on anyone, named or otherwise
- Character assassination
- Personalities before principles (that even feels bad typing it out)
- Distortion of the facts to make an argument
- Misstatements of our literature to bolster positions
- Creation of false premises to promote a point
- Snippets from prior postings without direct reference to the entire posting for others to confirm and evaluate for themselves

No doubt there is much more, but this is a starting list to think about. It's nothing more than a 'take a deep breath' and think things over before you actually submit your items.

I do have one point of disagreement with Gary's response to George's 'How Sick Is Sick' posting. He said that I control the tempo of Trustee Line. That's not true. I am only one person who is constantly trying to light a fire under the Trustees with edgy commentary on numerous topics. The Trustee Line is not mine. I enjoy the banter on the Trustee Line. Everyone in this Fellowship owns a piece of the Trustee Line. Everyone has a life outside of GA and probably many forget to read it, which leads to fewer postings. Being the Trustee Website Admin, I am in this site numerous time of the day with work that has to be done throughout the site for various people who need to update the information designed for the website use. It is my choice to remain active with the Trustee Line.

It should also be said that a large quantity of changes have occurred in this Fellowship because of postings that started out as edgy commentary about various issues. I don't know how to get more people involved, but I encourage everyone to take another therapeutic step in their recovery. Submit something to the Trustee Line on a regular basis. Let's have 50 topics a month. Some of them might make you say to yourself...'hmm - let me think about that for a minute.' When someone opposes your view, greet it and don't take it personally. The ensuing debate may just drag in others with different ideas on the same subject.

Hopefully, we are back to the world of points of view expressed passionately. Go ahead, read the postings line by line and send in a response to show everyone why that person's posting is not how you see things. Make it an arm wrestling contest of beliefs, not pistols at 20 paces.

I'll close with a quote from Robert Kennedy: 'Progress is a nice word. But change is its motivator. And change has its enemies.' So let us all take the high moral ground and remind ourselves that if we don't change, we don't grow. If we don't grow, we aren't really living.

David M. - Area 12, New Jersey

PS - If none of what I wrote resonates with you and you still really need to get ugly about something and feel that you can't hold back with your issue, try a different website. Craigslist.org has a section called 'Rants and Raves'. It won't make the rounds in GA, but it might make you feel better that you were able to post it somewhere. Hopefully, that will leave the Trustee Line open to its original intent - the exchange of ideas about the Fellowship in all its capacities to pool resources that will improve Gamblers Anonymous, as a whole.

---

### **Fellowship And Recovery - Continued**

4/1/13 - 12:01 AM

Great title. I see a great message last month. It's not about being cured or perfect, so come join us. The BOT is both a decision making and deliberative body and entries last month show at least two benefits to democratic bodies and processes. The opportunity for democratic input and an opportunity for character enhancement. I see clear positives from many angles, the input of the telephone advances and significant savings enhancing resources to better reach out the hand of the fellowship, positive moves towards telephone / conference call meetings to possibly reach those previously marginalized. I see also positive items as a result of communication and co- operation between committees and bodies on all our behalf. As we start the new month, it is less important that my words are seen than I make the effort. Sometimes it is the people who maintain a dignified silence who speak the true language of recovery. Looking forward to all April has to offer if I make that effort.

Odie B. - Area 36, S/East Ireland

---

### **Recovery Step 4 - Revisited**

4/1/13 - 8:28 PM

Hi Joe,

First off I want to apologize for not replying sooner but your post and the single response received are at the core of something I have been posting about on here for the last 7 or 8 months. You raise a great question about the steps (which are "the basis of the entire Gamblers Anonymous program" ) and I wanted to wait to see if you would get many (or any) replies before I responded. Clearly, some of the other issues raised last month (which undoubtedly do have significant merit) dominated the postings. But is it possible for us to at least keep our focus on issues at the heart of recovery while still recognizing the need to handle the ministerial and procedural issues that often take up so much of our time?

Now on to your question....I felt the Step 4 workbook was extremely thorough but almost too in depth. I am not adverse to working recovery but for me, my sponsor and I supplemented the Step 4 workbook with The Working the Steps Pamphlet, The Step 1 Pamphlet, The Writing the Steps Pamphlet, and the Daily Inventory of My Behavior Worksheet. These were used while I also attended a

weekly meeting that was devoted to working on the steps (in addition to any other therapy meetings I attended). I found this extremely helpful in dealing with the feelings and emotions I had while gambling and recovering and also as they compared to that of others.

Hope this helps and if you're a current Trustee, I look forward to meeting you in Vancouver.

Steve T. - Area 14, Long Island, NY

---

<b>Retention</b>
------------------

---

4/3/13 - 2:51 AM

I sometimes wonder why so many people come and go in GA. Any attempts at trying to answer that would just be speculation. Truth of the matter is I have no idea why so many people in GA exposed to the same literature and message I am do not come back yet I do. All I can do is share why I keep coming back...that I can answer more factually. If I don't keep coming back I'll eventually start gambling again and then I'll probably get into financial shambles again and fall into a deep depression again and then I'll want to kill myself. I think that is when GA is most effective when one is facing prison, insanity, or death and perhaps want what some people in GA have and are willing to go to any lengths to get it and are willing to perhaps do what they did to recover. Who the hell wants to go to meetings, get a sponsor, work the steps unless they are absolutely desperate to recover. When I came into GA nobody had to sell me anything when my alternative is prison insanity or death. I had many relapses my first 2 years in GA. I could have had a sponsor with 40 years clean time and a working knowledge of the steps and it would not have made a damn difference. I eventually got clean not because the message in GA got better but because my life was getting worse...it is my opinion that the number one recruitment of GA is GAMBLING...absolute despair caused by gambling...I don't have the answers. If it was up to me everyone who walked through a GA door would stay but that's not up to me. I'm not GOD. Anyone want to speculate on how we can retain more members? Joe T. - Area 2, Northern California

---

4/7/13 - 9:28 PM

Great topic Joe, I ask this question all the time. Here are a few of my thoughts.

I wish we had more meetings in Connecticut for GA members to attend. My experience in another fellowship was that they strongly encouraged 90 meetings in 90 days and there are over 300 meetings a week for that fellowship in Connecticut, there are just 26 meetings in Connecticut for GA each week. I would have to travel 30-50 miles round trip on three days a week to get to a GA meeting. Getting to a meeting every day is important for people who were daily gamblers; they need to break the old patterns they have lived for a long time. Perhaps the telephone meetings will give them other options for talking recovery every day.

When we have a new person show up, we try to give out their number to other members to call during the week. This has been the best retention tool at our group. I see those people I have called during the week return more than those who I do not call. Letting the new person know how to use the phone is vital to getting them to come back.

Most meetings in Connecticut ask new people the 20 questions during the therapy part of the meeting in front of the whole room and I am not sure I like this technique. Our literature says the only requirement for membership is a desire to stop gambling, but I have seen rooms that ask a person to leave if they do not state they think they are a compulsive gambler after answering the 20 questions. Or they are allowed to stay for that meeting and are told after the meeting that the meeting is a closed meeting and only self admitted compulsive gamblers can attend the meeting. I think this puts too much peer pressure on a new person and may drive them away if they are unwilling at that first meeting to admit to their gambling problem. How do other groups handle the 20 questions?

I am slowly developing a disagreement to the term "therapy meeting" or a member giving "therapy". It has too much inference to professional counseling. Our literature says we share our experience, strength and hope with each other and nothing about giving therapy. This is about one compulsive gambler talking to another about how he/she stays away from a bet, one day at a time.

It is not group therapy and I think that sometimes scares people away. Another reason I don't like this term is that I have had members with many years say "I will not give therapy in front of someone who is not a self admitted compulsive gambler". For me, this is wrong on so many levels, I want to share my experience to the person who is not sure. I want to relate the thoughts I have as a compulsive gambler to them and maybe they will identify with my story. I want them to feel comfortable and welcome in any GA room if they have a desire to stop gambling but just aren't ready to say they are a compulsive gambler.

To me, we need to look for tools and policies that make the new person feel safe and welcome at our meetings; to encourage them to come back and learn about their illness and not overwhelm them with probing questions or labels that they may not be ready to look at during their first meeting. This topic will give me something to think about on my long flight to Vancouver, thanks for bringing it up.

In recovery,  
Paul S. - Area 17 Trustee, Connecticut

---

4/7/13 - 3:49 PM

How do we keep retention in our rooms full of compulsive gamblers.....I'm not sure that there is an easy answer to this question. We always have to remember that our addiction, although similar to others, is also very unique. We have an addiction that our brain has given to us. There is no substance that we can stop taking, have it out of our body, then move into recovery. We have to try to reconnect the circuits through recovery.

I think we all need to remember what it was like coming into our first meeting. Long before that, we knew we had a problem. We felt we were the only ones who thought the way we did, who felt as hopeless as we felt, who had no idea why this was happening to us. We come into our first meeting convinced that no one there could possibly be as bad as we were. There was no one who possibly could have done the things that we had or suffered the things that we had suffered. We were terrified, embarrassed, and for most of us, we were at rock bottom.

To respond to Paul's question about the 20 questions, this is how we do this in Area 8A (Minnesota). Most of our meetings read all or a portion of the yellow combo book at the beginning of our meeting. When we reach the 20 questions, we go around the room, each person taking a question, reading it, then answering yes or no. For us, this works. I have heard other areas saying that they put the new member on the spot by having them answer all 20 questions in front of the room. I think that had that been done to me at my first meeting, I would never have returned. After all, how many of us actually answered all of the 20 questions honestly at our first meeting? How many answered them honestly at our 2nd, 3rd or 4th meeting even? At my first meeting, I answered yes to 8 of them. I had to answer yes to seven or more to justify my presence there after all! Today, I answer yes to all 20. I can do that because I learned the value of H.O.W. Members of my home group taught me those values through kindness, love, patience, and their own honesty of what gambling had done to their lives.

As far as not allowing someone to come back to a meeting because they would not admit at their first meeting that they were a compulsive gambler, this really happens at a meeting in this fellowship? Really? Of course they have a gambling problem! They balked up every last bit of courage that they could muster and walked through the door! Our primary purpose is to carry the message to the compulsive gambler WHO STILL SUFFERS! To me, that would be so humiliating to be that new member who couldn't quite yet admit to a roomful of STRANGERS that I am a compulsive gambler that I would be back at the casino within an hour of leaving! Would I have the courage to darken the door of that meeting again....probably not. Why would I? I was not welcome there the first time I tried to get help, why would I put myself through that humiliation again? I'm sorry, but I just cannot wrap my head around this! We have had many newcomers come into our rooms that have said, "I'm here because my wife/husband/children said I have to be here." It may take them several meetings before they openly admit to us (who by this time have become friends, NOT STRANGERS) that they are a compulsive gambler. These members are just as welcome as the one who admits at their first meeting that gambling has destroyed them. How do these 'long time' members who won't give therapy to a non-admitted compulsive gambler new in the program treat the member who has relapsed? I would hate to even think about that!

I have ranted enough. Can't wait to see you all in Vancouver and Paul, can't wait for your response!

Your Sister in Recovery,  
Karen E. - Area 8A, Minnesota

---

4/9/13 - 2:25 PM

First, I think retention should be the most important part of our program and what we spend most of our time focusing on. Our primary purpose is to help the compulsive gambler who still suffers. Sometimes when I think about our Trustee Agendas in the years past, and all of our discussion on Rules and Procedures and the Guidance Code, I wonder if our focus has gone in another direction.

In our area, most of our meetings read the Twenty Questions in the middle of the meeting to the new member and have them answer out loud. I have been to other meetings where they don't read the questions at all, and still others where they have the new member stand in front of a podium and read and answer the questions by themselves. Whatever is working in your area, is the way it should be done. But also, if it's not working, what can we do to change the retention of new members? I can tell you that when I attended my first meeting, I was asked the Twenty Questions, and I answered yes to 18 of them. I lied on questions 16 and 20, because I didn't want to be judged. I now can answer yes to all of them, because for me it's not only a program of honesty, but also essential to my recovery. I know I will not be judged, but instead loved unconditionally. To admit to something is not a weakness, but a strength in disguise.

It's interesting when we talk about the word "therapy" as opposed to "sharing". I also am not a huge fan of that word, though, it is in our literature, specifically in the GA Red Book. I also think it might be in the Group Handbook. That said, each group is autonomous, so you can change your format to say "sharing" if it truly bothers you. I know that I'm there to recover in any way possible. My feelings are that those that want to look for differences, will always find a "loop-hole" or "short cut" or "excuse" for some reason to not stay. It could be a word, something someone said, but usually they're just not ready to stop gambling, which is okay. We all have different bottoms. My head sometimes says that maybe if I say something profound or be a temporary sponsor that the new member might stay, but ultimately, it's not anything that I'm going to do, they have to want to be there. Our program is based on attraction not promotion, so it's not what we can do to change everything to accommodate the new member, but hopefully, we have something that they want and that will bring them back to another meeting. As a GA member, I can share my experience, strength and hope with the room and hope that the new member will identify and know they're not alone.

Today, my willingness to not place a bet far out weighs my desire to leave because of some format or some person. I know we say Principals before Personalities, and following that can be difficult at times. But, I also know the program works, I just have to be willing to work it and make it work in my life.

Grateful to be a compulsive gambler.

Steve F. - Past Trustee, Area 1, Los Angeles, CA

---

<b>Item *4</b>
----------------

4/10/13 - 3:20 PM

Dear Brothers and Sisters,

I have an item up asking what is the purpose of not allowing the "AA Big Book" and the "AA 12 & 12" ( Steps of Recovery and Traditions – our Unity Program) at GA Meetings. I would suggest reading these materials before the item comes up for discussion. Our Program and Steps were based on these two books and they are interesting literature. Especially the 12 & 12 book which I believe is the original instruction manual for the Steps. I believe if we had access to these books, we would be able to create more consistent literature (relevant to Gamblers Anonymous) to the original intent for which they were created. At this time I'm not asking that they be approved as Gamblers Anonymous literature. I'm just asking for an informed discussion.

### Term Limits

4/10/13 - 11:06 PM

It seems during the election time for the BOT and BOR elections the subject of Election Term Limits comes up. There are many examples I will cite and I am hoping for a positive discussion on several levels of our fellowship.

I have had many different conversions on all levels of positions throughout our fellowship. They have ranged from the secretary of a GA room up to the Chairs and the executive levels of BOT, BOR and the International Secretary.

Almost everyone agrees on the rotation system in theory, but very few actually practice it. Many argue with 100's of excuses and reasons why they do not practice it.

Some rationalize it with excuses that sound more like egos and self-righteousness, than the best interest of GA. They proclaim they do it for their room, area, BOT for if not GA would not exist.

Granted the experience that one receives from being in one position for years or even decades is invaluable for that person and perhaps for that area and GA as a whole.

However, there is an agenda item for the silencing of ex trustees not being able to share their experience on the BOT floor. I will tie this statement in later on. Cause we cannot have it both ways.

First - Lets look at some of the excuses:

1. If I don't take the position it will hurt my room or area?

As one may feel it is very important for the area to have a position filled, it is not that person's right or obligation to fill it themselves. I believe this fellowship comes from the bottom up. Meaning from the member up to the Chairs of the BOT/BOR. This point of view/direction keeps everyone humble and prevents egos growing in all areas of the fellowship. The "TOP" down view creates a corporation approach and therefore we would have a procedure manual instead of the combo book.

I ask what if a position is not immediately filled? Would it create such a problem to that area? And if so, for what period of time? I have seen many of times empty office position in my area's intergroup. Our intergroup has never closed down, even without a chairperson. We simply put out the word to the rooms, that we need someone to fill that position and most of the time a member that never went to intergroup steps up and does a great job. Therefore growing intergroup to be stronger, as well as that person in our fellowship.

The exact same thing happens with our trustees. NJIG has 6 trustee positions with just 4 filled. There are many positive things that are coming out of this. The area is now asking many of questions about this. Is it a struggle? Is it hurting our area, the BOT or GA as a whole? Of course not.

I would suggest that even if NJIG did not have any trustee that it would not hurt our area, the BOT or GA as a whole. I would never like to see that for our area. But if it did, there would be reasons and our area would have to do a hard Step 4 to face the issues. Therefore, making it better and stronger. Our area's membership and group conciseness would be controlling its outcome and not an individual.

2. No one has the time and dedication in my area. If I don't do it no one else will?

Unless you are a brand new area, this excuse hurts an area more than anything else. It stops growth on every level of an area and rooms. It encourages ego and breaks down unity.

The only time I heard someone defending this excuse is the person that is in the position for way too long and creates the fear to his or her area.

3. I love the position and only live for this.

This maybe true for the first or maybe second time to be elected. After the second term it is not healthy for either the area or GA as a whole.

I have heard this many times on all levels and most people fall for it. They hear their false passion and not the ego for the position and believe that they are doing right by voting for that person.

It is a touchy statement and I am not singling out anyone so let's examine this some more.

#### THE ROOM LEVEL:

A secretary in a room is elected for the third term in a row. What do you think about this – is it good or healthy for that room's growth? Whose room it? Who controls the group conscience? What kind of unity is the group learning?

#### THE TRUSTEE LEVEL:

A trustee that has more than 4 years straight is not sharing their experiences with other area members that may want to grow. I love to talk to trustees that have 10+ years being a trustee. Their experience and history of the years of change is invaluable to my growth and to GA as a whole. However, I can learn this by members, ex trustees that continue to come to the BOT conferences and by me attending them as well. I have attended 24 BOT meetings in my 16 years of recovery, with only 6 years as a trustee.

I find that my knowledge of fellowship along with many other ex trustees that have 30, 40 and 50 years of recovery and knowledge of its history of many agendas, would hurt GA as a whole. Being able to share this wealth of recovery is the core of our Combo book and structure of our fellowship.

The theory that the so-called new trustees has GA best interest and therefore that the ex trustees should not be able to share this information on the BOT floor is insane and screams ego to me. The entire BOT needs to be able to hear this experience and not just from one or two new trustees of that area, that may decide to share it or not.

Some of the best speakers I have heard are ex trustees. Their maturity, wisdom and years of experience on how to explain the benefits or lack of an agenda item benefits GA.

#### THE EXECUTIVE BOARD:

Any board member or chair on either BOT or BOR should be limited to two consecutive terms. We have over 110 current trustees and ten times that of ex trustees, which offer many different points of view. Not just their own but their area and or country. Any more than 4 consecutive years becomes a political powerhouse and creates ego and disunity throughout GA. Six years of reign is way too much. Not even the president of the USA can do this.

This is another reason why I believe that we should not stop ex trustees from speaking on the BOT conferences. The wisdom of the Bob W's and Tom M's would be silent. Collectively, they have over a 20 years of being involved in both the executive boards of the BOT and BOR. To silent them would be cutting off GAs right hand.

I dream of the day when the BOT welcomes the idea of having a BOT Chair from another country other than North America. But that is another topic.

I am sure that many of you have additional, different opinions or viewpoints. I hope that this topic takes a positive discussion and not get into pointing fingers or bashing. Please share your thoughts.

Thank you and I hope everyone thinks about this the next time they run or votes for someone.

Gary S. - Area 12, New Jersey

---

4/11/13 - 1:24 PM

Gary,

Since I am the trustee who, as you state, has "an agenda item for the silencing of ex trustees not being able to share their experience on the BOT floor", I felt that I should respond to your post. Somehow you have managed to tie in the rotation theory to this, however; since that is not what these agenda items are about, I'm not even going to address those issues. I am going to stay on the topic of PAST trustees and the current special status that they hold as such.



I am going to skip down to THE TRUSTEE LEVEL. I agree with the statement that PAST trustees have a wealth of knowledge to share. There are many avenues for them to do just that. They can post on the trustee line, speak in their areas, do workshops for the International conference, offer their stories for the new Blue Book that we are currently revising. Guide the trustees for their areas. I don't feel that by taking away their special privileges on the floor of the BOT meetings is detrimental to either the BOT or GA as a whole. There are many, many members of this fellowship who have never served on the BOT who have great insight and wisdom about this program and the way that it works. They choose to give back to their areas and work with the people in those areas. Does that make them 'less than' a PAST trustee who served on the BOT for 10+ years? No, it doesn't. Yet these members, if they wish to be heard, must be heard through their trustee. They cannot come to the microphone to speak for or against any item on the agenda.

Next, "The theory that the SO-CALLED new trustees has GA best interest and therefore that the ex trustees should not be able to share this information on the BOT floor is insane and screams ego to me." I am trying to hear something positive in this statement but quite frankly, all I hear you saying is that because a lot of the current are newer at this, myself included, we are not able to take care of the business for which our areas elected us for, and to think that we can, we are still living in the world of insanity that our recovery has saved us from. That because the "Bob W.'s and Tom M's would be silent", should the currently elected BOT vote for this item, we will be harming GA beyond repair. We would be "cutting off the right hand" of GA I believe is how you stated this.

It seems to me that most of the ego being threatened here is that of the PAST trustee. I may not have been in this program as long as many of my brothers and sisters, but no one can say that I do not have a great passion and respect for this program that has literally saved my life. I believe that many of my fellow current trustees feel the same way. These items are not on the agenda because I devalue any member who has served on the BOT. It is on there because our areas have elected those that they wish to represent them at the BOT meetings. When I speak, I speak FOR MY AREA. When a PAST trustee speaks, they represent no one but themselves. If you have noticed, there is also an item that gives the Chair of the BOT the authority to call ANY MEMBER of GA to the microphone if the Chair feels they have something pertinent to say to the BOT.

To make my point clear, I am NOT wishing to 'silence' the PAST trustees. I am simply trying to make sure that all decisions made by the BOT for GA as a whole is done by the current sitting BOT.

I too would like to hear from others on this.

Your Sister in Recovery,  
Karen E. - Area 8A, Minnesota

---

4/11/13 - 5:42 PM  
Gary,

You asked that this be a positive discussion on your thread. This will be difficult regarding your comments about the Executive Board, as they were so heavily weighted in negativity.

You stated that serving more than two terms on the Executive Board creates 'A political powerhouse and ego and disunity within GA'. If I assume you mean serving more than 2 terms in the same position on the Executive Board I am astonished by this reckless charge.

However, in keeping with the positive, I will simply ask specific questions about those people. Bill B (Area 15-NY) Served 4 consecutive terms as Chairman of the BOT. Tell us please how his service created a political powerhouse and ego and disunity within GA?

Eddie L. (Area 12-NJ) Served 3 consecutive terms as Chairman of the BOT. Tell us please how his service created a political powerhouse and ego and disunity within GA?

Tom M. (Area 2-Northern CA) the right hand of GA, served 3 consecutive terms as Chairman of the BOT. Tell us please how his service created a political powerhouse and ego and disunity within GA?

Bill M. (Area I-Los Angeles) a founding father of our Fellowship served 5 consecutive years as chairman of the BOR. Tell us please how his service created a political power house And ego and disunity within GA?

Karen H. (Area I-Los Angeles) has been reelected and served more than 20 years as our IES. Tell us please help her service created a political powerhouse and ego and disunity within GA?

There may be others, but these are the ones that come to mind. How can you possibly justify the statements you made about these people, while not mentioned individually by name, but rather denounced as a group.

Certainly you are free to have your opinions and to state them as you see fit, but both the BOT and the BOR are entitled to an explanation of your character assassination on the Trusted Servants that fit your criteria.

On another matter, not expressing an opinion pro or con on the subject itself, I am confused by the inconsistent logic of someone who supports term limits but also supports special lifetime privileges for past Trustees.

Lastly, and mainly for those outside the United States, the President of United States is permitted to serve 8 consecutive years not 6.

David M. - Area 12, New Jersey

---

### Appropriate Literature

4/12/13 - 9:51 AM

Greetings, Brothers and Sisters,

What are your feelings about using handouts from past mini-conferences as topics or talking points at meetings?

We have all gathered many very good handouts from various local and national conferences that I believe would be valuable assets to have available in the rooms. Although not specifically named in our Guidance Code, many of these original (usually) writings have merit and are thought-provoking.

In order to be used in a room, would each of these items need to be submitted as a separate agenda item at a Trustees meeting? Or are they already considered to be 'appropriate'?

See you in Vancouver!

Your friend in recovery,

John B. - Area 13, Philadelphia

---

### Overseas Chair

4/12/13 - 7:18 PM

How would it ever be possible for an overseas trustee to garner enough support to become chair of the board. Excuse my innocence and newness but I'm under the impression that a certain, significant even, level of application, dedication, demonstrable commitment and indeed ability and aptitude is necessary. It seems clear that a sufficient number must witness or be aware of such qualities to vote in favour of electing such member to the chair. Surely nobody is going to try and organise the overseas community into a band to elect one of their own, or anybody else for that matter. This couldn't happen could it? Surely we don't have to concern ourselves with that carry on?

Odie B. - Area 36, S/E Ireland