

Discussion of BLUU at the October-14-2016 UUA Board Meeting (text from audio recording v2)

JIM KEY: I'm going to defer to our secretary, who wants the privilege of making a motion, but before that, any clarifying questions just on what you've heard? Tim and then Greg.

TIM ATKINS: I just want to make sure I know, the \$300,000 short-term ask, that's \$300,000 in new funding, correct? OK. Just wanted to make sure.

LESLIE MAC: That is correct. That would be new funding.

JIM KEY: Greg.

GREGORY BOYD: I don't have a question. I have many different points of procedure that I think are directly related to this situation. And so I want to remind us who we are and how we are as a board. We are a mission and vision board, we are not a funding panel.

So what we're being asked to do is to affirm a prioritization of how the administration of our association spends money on racial justice work. That's what we're being asked to do right now, that's what we can do. We decided our budget back in April and it was affirmed in June at our General Assembly. So that that's one part of that.

In the long-term ask, we are similarly asking our administration, so our current president and our presidential candidates, to interpret our ends around racial justice in a way that prioritizes black racial justice work, in particular, in a way that does intersectional work in a very specific way that we have been very general about in the past. In our leadership work, because of the way we use policy governance, we are going to be working with congregations through linkage work to get them to affirm of vision of the beloved community that centers blackness, at least for this period of time so that the vision that we're crafting together emerges from our congregations. We are not setting a vision and taking it to them, we're helping them to understand the vision of racial justice work that centers blackness. And we're also doing some internal auditing work that talks about how we are currently and inadequately supporting the needs of people who are raised Unitarian Universalist because that's part of the structure that we have to do as well. So I want us to be very clear on how we can respond to these asks.

JIM KEY: Thank you Greg. Mr. Secretary.

ROB ELLER-ISAACS: Acknowledging that there are some disagreements between how Greg has framed the situation and this motion, I move-- and Stephanie you have a copy of this if you want to put it up on the-- I move that the UUA board approve in principle

the funding of Black Lives UU and that the staff be directed to bring to the board meeting of January 2017 a plan that will fund the immediate operating costs of the collective's plan while providing a schedule for the transfer of \$5 million from existing common endowment funds into the direct control of the Black Lives Matter collective.

JIM KEY: OK. So we have it up there. Andy?

ANDY BURNETTE: Just a second.

JIM KEY: So we're ready to discuss this. Now let me just say, procedurally, this is a big deal. You know that. We don't have to make this decision today. We've got two days if you need to think on it but this a good time to discuss what's on the table and get a sense of where the trustees are on this. So, are there comments about this motion that you would like to discuss? Denise, and then Lucia.

DENISE RIMES: Just a question, a point of clarification. The \$5 million would cover what time period? Until it runs out or is there a--

LESLIE MAC: So we would hope it would be set up endowment style so that we would be continually doing this work. It wouldn't stop, there's no expiration date on liberation work. And so that's what our hope would be. Yeah we want to fund the work itself and have that be something that's always in existence within our faith.

DENISE RIMES: So it would be a separate endowment, if you will, the proceeds from which would help continue to work. OK.

CARLTON ELLIOT SMITH: Right, and that would not be the end of our fundraising endeavors. It would also other things that we would be doing to generate income as well.

JIM KEY: Lucia? Thank you Denise.

LUCIA SANTINI FIELD: So that was one of my questions. So I do think that's a really helpful clarification. But I just want to echo something that Carlton said early on, which I believe very passionately, and that, is that it's not a zero sum game and that is that this is an opportunity for this board to engage in stewardship writ large in a variety of ways. And so my only concern about the wording that the secretary has proposed is that it's a transfer of \$5 million from the existing common endowment funds, which to an extent, I think, removes both some urgency and an enormous opportunity for the board to use this to exert its leadership in support of this movement by raising those funds itself specifically for this purpose, and articulating the mission and goals of the movement in the process. And that by taking it from existing funds, we cut ourselves off from that enormous and urgent opportunity. And I would regret that.

JIM KEY: Dorothy and then Rob.

DOROTHY HOLMES: I think Lucia's point is connected very vitally to what I want to say, which is I think money, in a way, is the easiest thing to promote. If we have an easy way to raise the money, I think, it makes it more than just possible that, in a more profound way, we're going to disconnect from this. As a black person of age now, there was a time when I used to be the youngest person on boards and so on, no more. But age has its benefits.

As is one who's in academia, been at the forefront of many movements for inclusion, it's very easy to set up things in such a way that it looks like we're being generous and involved when we're not. And my greatest fear, I can't connect all the dots, but it's based on my experience, is that we would end up one day with the equivalent in Unitarianism of the AME in Methodism. In other words, that you'll end up with a vitalized group of black folks who, more or less, are tied to Unitarian principles and beliefs but through bitter, bitter, bitter experience, end up separating out.

I think we have to have a very profound set of guidelines for inclusion all along the way. And so we need to discuss that in addition to discussing funding. You know, Jesus had 12 disciples. As far as I can tell, this movement has five, when I think about the collective.

And everything you've said to me Carlton and Leslie, convinces me of your clarity, your strength, your absolute commitment, your devotion, your high energy, but it won't be enough. And you know, burnout is a real thing. And I hear you dashing around here and there. I will push back to you and challenge you to create more of you.

It can't be just five. I don't care how brilliant you are, it's not going to last. And so that is my only misgiving, not about your qualities or strength or wonderfulness. And I will say, we will let you do it. We will let you do it to the point that you are extinguished. I mean, you may not feel that way now because you're so inspired and you're so wonderful

CHRISTINA RIVERA: I'm already tired.

DOROTHY HOLMES: Tired and exhausted are different. I'll hold my piece there.

JIM KEY: Yeah. Did you want to go Rob?

No, let me-- I've got Rob--

DOROTHY HOLMES: I spoke to several things.

JIM KEY: You want to come back?

DOROTHY HOLMES: No. I just want them heeded.

JIM KEY: Rob and then Jeanne Pupke and then Andrea, and then Greg. And then let's see where we are, and we may want to--

CHRISTINA RIVERA: I'm going through a process observation in here. So Dorothy had some specific comments. And I felt like you all wanted to address those, and I'm not sure that you want to wait until--

JIM KEY: Oh, I'm sorry, I misread that Dorothy. I thought she was deferring until she wanted to come back around to it.

CHRISTINA RIVERA: I'm not talking about Dorothy, I'm talking about the group behind you because you can't see them.

JIM KEY: I can't see them.

CHRISTINA RIVERA: So I just want make sure that we're having a conversation here and not doing the queue in line that we talked about yesterday.

JIM KEY: Thank you, because I can't see behind you.

CARLTON ELLIOT SMITH: Ralph's going to go.

JIM KEY: Hold on a minute. But I do want to check in with Dorothy. Do you--

DOROTHY HOLMES: I'm fine what--

JIM KEY: OK. Very good.

CHRISTINA RIVERA: Jim, can you move over a little bit and then [INAUDIBLE]

JIM KEY: You just need to be on the microphone.

CHRISTINA RIVERA: But Rob's going to talk [INAUDIBLE]

ROB ELLER-ISAACS: I've got a mic. So I actually agree with you Christina, and this is a point of personal privilege because I have to walk out the door in what is no doubt, the most important conversation that I've been in as a member of this board. So just let me make two fairly simple points. With the agreement of the seconder of the motion, I'm perfectly comfortable with having the existing endowment funds guarantee the raising of the funds and that we--

?????: I wasn't the seconder but that--

ROB ELLER-ISAACS: No, but he's the seconder. Are you comfortable with that? So will you work on perfecting language after I go? The other issue here is a little more

complicated, and that is, that we are slowly learning to defer to young black leadership. We're learning it in our settings, congregational settings, we're learning it right now in this room. The risk that they're taking around burnout, the risk that they're taking if they control this money themselves, which is certainly the intention of the motion, that we're starting a new ministry, a new organization here, that will not be under the supervision of the administration or of the UUA.

This motion is framed in the spirit of that kind of affirmation, the affirmation that we will be led now, and that our concerns either about tactics or about organizational development will take a second position, at best, to our radical affirmation of what we're being asked to support. Thank you. Forgive me for leaving I but I have to.

ELANDRIA WILLIAMS: So I just want to say one thing to Miss Dorothy. So some of us are highly southern in this room, and so there are things that we shall never do, which is not ignore things. So one, I've been at UU for, let's see, I started in the third grade, I'm now 37. So we'll figure out what that means. And I've known people much longer than me that are UUs and with me. So this thing got started out of one thing that happened. There are new members on out of what's happened.

And the hope to have a gathering that's inviting black ministers, black DREs, black lay people, to come join and say, let's figure this out. Like who's going to be helping the staff, who's going to be on whatever board? This is not the beginning nor at the end.

I think I just needed to say it because even talking about this, I talked to six people who've been working with us forever, who were in DRUUM and [INAUDIBLE]. So I just want to put that on the table so it doesn't sound like this is a five-person thing that will be in perpetuity. The hope is to change it very quickly.

LESLIE MAC: Super quickly. Very, very quickly. Yeah, that just goes back to the point of us not being consultative. Our goal is, in the gathering, is to allow as many entry points and as much participation as possible so that this is not on our shoulders. And truthfully, it hasn't been. We've been, up until this point, a very project-focused, organizing collective. So we haven't had the opportunity to do this larger work that we need to do because we just don't have capacity.

What we've been able to do is respond to crisis and have very specific projects that we've been able to work on. And what we're looking to do now is to expand this work into a much broader sense and bring more people into the fold so that we can have a larger vision and a larger impact, not just in our faith but also in the world.

CARLTON ELLIOT SMITH: All of that is true. And just for example, looking to see how we can create a national pastoral care network for black Unitarian Universalists. As wonderful as our white and other ministers are inside of our congregations, there's ways in which, when a killing happens of an unarmed black person, that impacts those of us who are black differently.

I mean, I'm just thinking, when I saw the tape of Eric Garner's killing in Staten Island, I was out of commission for two days behind that. I mean, like, literally just in the bed because I'd been in that situation, where my life has been threatened but you know because of the police. So that's just like an example of something we're working on.

JIM KEY: Thank you. Jeanne and then Andrea.

LESLIE MAC: Just to respond. And also, your point about the is AME is super important and super real. When I made that analogy that Carlton mentioned about popping the bubbles within, our hope is, again, to fulfill that dream I mentioned, which is that all of our congregations would be affirming the lives of all people, and that by focusing on-- by us collectively as black people-- being able to focus on ourselves, that that expands into the rest of the faith.

DOROTHY HOLMES: May I just have a response, quickly?

JIM KEY: Sure, Dorothy.

DOROTHY HOLMES: Again, I want to make everyone understands, my comments had really nothing to do with the quality or purposes or vision of your work. My concern is letting the rest of us off the hook. I'm just not prepared to do that.

?????: It won't work.

DOROTHY HOLMES: So, it won't work. We will end up a separate organization. So that's my concern. I don't like this vision but white UUism going to take these issues on in parallel or--

LUCIA SANTINI FIELD: In concert, ideally.

DOROTHY HOLMES: You know, so that we're not ships passing in the night, and if so, guilt isn't relieved through \$5,300,000, however it is raised. It's a real danger, in my view.

JIM KEY: Thanks Dorothy. Jeanne.

JEANNE PUPKE: Thank you for permission to speak. I've said publicly that I'm in support of this amount of money. And I just want to hold up a religious thread that I don't want us to forget, that I think, in part, deals with Dorothy's issue, and the challenge that would lie in leadership trying to make this discernment. This is money we didn't pay. This is the present value, coincidentally, this is the present value, roughly, conservatively, of how we didn't work out our differences, how we could not hold ourselves in accountable relationship with respect and love sufficient to continue the conversation not because of all that we didn't do or did. All that true. There was a lot

going on at the time, as Mark Morrison Reed has taken great pains to remind us.

This is a religious question that I do not want us to forget. In creating these funds, whatever the amount and the amount ongoing, demands of us an unusual thing in our faith, which is a long-term commitment to a vision. And we cannot give the funds and fail to create the vision that is holy supported, and going to go through the process, willing to fail, and find difficulty, and stay at the damn table.

We're picking up, as [INAUDIBLE] said, we haven't had an agenda in so long. We haven't had an analysis in so long that we've been out wandering in an unaccountable way. How do we bring ourselves, as religious people, into this event as an accountable people? I know this process is going to teach me and I'm going to come up short. And I think we all ought to know that and say that up front and do it anyway.

JIM KEY: Thank you Jeanne. Andrea and then Greg. then Tim, then Peter.

ANDREA BRISCOE: So I've heard you talk about having ministers, and DREs, and laypeople go to these events but I also wanted to make sure that-- I'm sure you are doing this, but include youth in this because I'm looking at this thread of comments from a post that I made just a couple of days ago, that is over 50 comments long, of what youth want to have happen in this movement, many from youth of color. And they're ready to get involved. And I want to make sure that some of this money to help people go to these events will go to youth because I know specifically, a lot of youth, especially, the ones that authored the response of resolution this past year, would be so excited to be able to have their voice heard in this movement.

And I just wanted to lift up that we need to make sure to have youth at the table because-- I also have a specific comment from one that I was really inspired by, that is speaking to the entire UUA saying, why do y'all think the youth of color aren't the future of our movement?

LESLIE MAC: So one, youth is awesome. I take all of my direction from people way, way younger than me. It's my goal in life, generally speaking. I actually don't decide anything in my work. I just say, what do you need? And I say, OK, I'll go do that. So that's really critical for me, just personally speaking, in how I do the work that I do.

But also, one of the things that's been great about the collective is we couldn't be more different than each other if we tried, literally, both in our connection to this faith and also what we do generally in our lives. So you know, Kenny Wylie is part of the collective, and he is really involved with youth and young adults as a DRE and then also just as himself, as a UU. And being born a UU and raised a UU, it's really critical for him. And so we spent a lot of time ensuring that.

But one of the things that we also know is that without youth at the table we don't get to decide how they want to be involved and how they get to be involved. And so, the convening is exactly where the youth would be there to say, this is what we need, this is what we want. And we'd be there to say, sweet, here you go. Let's do it. So. for sure. Love all of that.

JIM KEY: Thanks for all those comments. Greg.

GREGORY BOYD: In that vein, I don't want us to make this decision this way. This is not beautiful. This is not beautiful. I don't want us voting to fund justice. I want us to find a different way to encourage the same outcome that is not in motion form. I want us to find a way to make this decision, where ultimately, the elected trustees are not the only ones who get to affirm it because that powerfully leaves out the youth voices that we do have at the table. Let's make this decision differently so that it can be beautiful so that the decision that we make is in line with the vision of beloved community we have in mind.

JIM KEY: Thanks Greg. Tim.

TIM ATKINS: So I've got three, I don't want to say small points, but three minor points I want to ask about. The first is, if we approve something like this, because I think this presentation you all gave us is one of the best I've heard as a board member, and I want to know if we could keep that going, like a once a year check in with the board? Not like a report to the board but a check in with the board about how the work's been going. Is that amenable?

LESLIE MAC: Yeah. And I think that the report would come back to us. So, what you guys have done as well. So I'm all about all of that, for sure.

TIM ATKINS: My next question is just a quick question to Tim, Fellow Tim. Could you just give us a quick heads up of how much is actually in our endowment because it's \$5 million and 20 cents, that's a different question than if it's more than that? I just want to-- I don't really know the off the top of my head. So I just want to double-check.

JIM KEY: Tim (Brennan)?

TIM ATKINS: It can be a rough estimate. I don't need it down to the--

TIM BRENNAN: The answer is more complicated than--

TIM ATKINS: Of course.

TIM BRENNAN: --I can actually give you this exact second, although, I can probably tell you in about five minutes. But I think the way to think about this is not so much the amount as what it means to the payout. So it would have to come out of unrestricted

endowment. And what this would mean in rough numbers, if you take away \$5 million, the payout is around 5%, a little less actually, but around 5%. So call it \$250,000 a year.

So that would be the budget challenge is figuring out, without a fundraising effort, that would be the challenge, is where does that \$250,000 come from? And probably it would be the flip of it too, to say, if there was \$5 million dedicated to the clearing, then that would produce revenue, annual perpetual revenue, of about \$250,000, and it would increase with inflation, too. That would be the long-term goal. So that's really what we're talking about. And I'd hate to give you a number offhand, but I would say that unrestricted endowment is \$25 million, something like that.

TIM ATKINS: That answers my question.

JIM KEY: Thanks Tim.

TIM ATKINS: Oh, and my third point, there's one more, is with the actual motion itself, to me, the plan to fund the immediate operating costs, the immediate operating cost is a little vague and I appreciate that specificity you had in your report, saying it would be probably around \$300,000. I'm just wondering Andy, since you're in charge of perfecting the motion now, if we could put something like that in there? You know, immediate operating cost around \$300 or up to a certain amount, something like that.

ANDY BURNETTE: Say again?

TIM ATKINS: Were you not paying attention to me Andy? Something like a to fund the immediate operating costs, parentheses, around \$300,000, parentheses.

JIM KEY: Let me interject here. Before we get to wordsmithing a proposal, I want to come back to Greg's comment. But I want to hear from Peter before we come back to that, if we can hold off on what it might look like and say. Peter.

PETER MORALES: OK. So several things. The overall idea and the presentation of the work is fabulous stuff. And the administration has, I hope, been supportive of this all the way along. And I have to put that in context because I have some cautionary concerns. One, we're talking about asking-- and also part of the context is, I realize, that the implementation of this will not fall to me, it would be to my successor. So this is kind of a legacy thing.

But as I understand this, this is asking for something that's not part of the UUA. That's my understanding. It's creating a separate organization that is not part of the administration. And that goes to Dorothy's point. I think that's something that the board should not do without thinking that through very carefully. So that's a piece of it.

One of the things I've seen in our association is a tendency, and if I'm not chief among sinners I'm one of the chief among sinners in this, is to fall in love with an idea and a

proposal, and then you get yourself in the position of having a position that you're defending, advocating and defending, any criticisms of. I have a concern that we haven't looked thoroughly and carefully enough at other organizational alternatives to this that are more agile. I worry about five years, 10 years, 20 years out, are we creating a separate, essentially, nonprofit organization in response to a need that we feel now? What's it going to look like in 10 years.

A lot more thought, I think, needs to go into that. I mean, part of what we've been doing for some time in the administration, little catchphrases, we have been trying to move from program to ethos, which means that we try to spread, for example, the anti-racism, anti-oppression stuff, not essentially ghettoize it and one little organizational unit, but make it part of the attitude and the functioning of the entire organization. I would want to look for a way of supporting this effort, which is a fabulous effort, which is not going from ethos to program, which is not undoing that. So I would be an advocate for much more thoughtful reflection and discussion and work with the administration on that.

JIM KEY: Thanks Peter. I'm going to go to Christine.

LESLIE MAC: Jim, can I just respond real quick to that? Is that OK? Sorry. The first part about the creating of something outside of the UUA. I think that we run the danger of assuming how things are going to be because that's how they have been. And what we're asking for is a different vision for what can happen within our association. We're not looking to be separate from it but we're also not looking to be under the currently defined criteria for being a part of the UUA.

We're looking for a way to have self-determination but still being a part of this movement in a real fundamental way. And we need to talk about what that looks like. But I don't think it's a binary question. It's not an either/or. I want to be clear that we don't need to do that with this particular, that piece of the conversation.

PETER MORALES: Can I respond very quickly because I realize I'm making a mistake I criticize others for doing? Sometimes we talk about the UUA as a movement, and sometimes we talk about the UUA as the administrative structure of the UUA. I was talking about the administrative structure.

ELANDRIA WILLIAMS: So was I.

PETER MORALES: But it's easy to talk past one another on that.

ELANDRIA WILLIAMS: So I need to say something. I'm sorry. Can I not say it?

JIM KEY: Please.

ELANDRIA WILLIAMS: So I'm going to say this in love, respect, and honor, and complete disagreement, in every way disagreement. We had a strategy that was

moving. So there are two things that have happened since I've been in UU that broke my heart. We want to talk about heartbreak moments? One, I was born and raised a UU. That's why it's tattooed on my wrist.

We sat there and talked about, how do we get young people to be more on the board? How do they get this, how do they get that? And we're like, oh my god, most of the ways we did it are gone, gone, gone.

It was so easy at one point to go, yes, this is how you get on the board. This is how you can become DREs. Jim called when he ran as city leader, why are so many members from your church that were youth DREs, ministers, on boards, and major leadership positions? Because our church helped train them up and then sent them to national gatherings for them to meet other young people.

Do you know how hard the responsive resolution fight was? People grabbed me and said, we don't know who else to talk to. Bart said you worked with him when he was a youth, can you please help us? People didn't know where to go to. So the hardest thing ever was having-- at this point, I was doing work with the denom--

The administration had a plan. Some people decided they didn't like the plan because that was not in their vision, destroyed the plan, and now there is hardly no way to do youth leadership development on a national way that is helpful for young people. It happened twice as a youth. So when we talk about why youth is important, that is how I got into this work.

Second, DRUUM used to get money from the UUA. So I had to explained to folks why we don't have multiracial family retreats anymore, why we don't go to Murray Grove anymore, why there is no ability for youth of color, young adults of color, youth of color to meet adults of color. So there is this disconnect between adults and youth. So unless you have kids, the two shall not meet.

So while I understand what you were saying, it was not DRUUMS decision to define DRUUM. It was white leadership, along with leadership of color, who decided they couldn't do that anymore. If it was up to DRUUM, we would have still had multiracial family retreats, we would have still done all of these things. We didn't get to make that decision.

So I want to just hold where we sit, and [INAUDIBLE] I'm very passionate about it because it impacted a lot of people I know, and me, which is the only reason why, part of way, I'm on this board is because someone had to call me and say, please. People have had to call lots of times because I was out. I work a job that we do [INAUDIBLE] to people.

So what I'm saying is, if the people that need it are not in some ways in control of what it looks like, it doesn't have to be one person in control, there can be 20 of us in this room

with different ideas of what it means to have happen, but if those 20 people can't ever come together and say, here's what we should do, then they will never be support of them. Other people will always be making the decisions for them. That is the history of this country. People come in and decide we're going to colonize and decide to tell you what to do. So at some point you have to have a both/and.

We do not have an administration right now, and will not have for the next probably, 100 years, that can actually say, here is what people of color, youth of color, pick a-- poor people, whatever, need because they are the ones leading and deciding. So I'm not saying things have to be completely outside or completely inside but there has to be some sort of collectively determined purpose that helps you move forward. Otherwise, it's always other people making decisions for you. And that is, to me, been the history of this faith.

So I may be completely wrong, and you all can be like, no, she's completely wrong, and that's fine. I just know what I've lived through, and what people who have been hurt by the most by this faith tell me all the time, which is why they won't come back. So what we have been trying to do is create space for people to say, I can come home again. I can be free in this space. That might help me come back to being a Unitarian Universalist.

That is our goal, is to help people feel like they can be within this faith. And that means that sometimes cannot be determined by the administration because the administration may not know. The other thing I want to say is to tells us what it means to say, you haven't done enough research, you haven't done enough this, it needs to be more agile. Don't assume that we are like, we are not going to be agile. That's an assumption.

And so I would just say, there's a thing that it just felt odd. It felt odd. We can hold that things can feel odd, and to hold a both/and around what it means to have another institution tell a group of self-determined people what to do is a little weird. It is not going so well for some people in our faith.

JIM KEY: Thank you. Christina and Lucia, and then I'm going to take a time break and see where we are and how we want to proceed after lunch.

CHRISTINA RIVERA: So I think it's really important to-- what you lifted up Peter is really important, that we're sending the money outside the UUA, that we're a fiscal responsible board. That's something we need to own as a board that we're doing. So I appreciate you lifting that particular point up in our board responsibility hat. And I would submit, it's a good thing to send it outside of the UUA. I would submit that if we had the ability to do this we would have already done it.

That if this institution was able to be an institution that didn't perpetuate systems of power and oppression and white supremacy, we would already be that. That while we work at that and we hold that as our highest aspiration and our ideal of what we want to

center, we are not that yet. And we have the ability-- I don't want to monitor what they're doing. I don't want to have to do what we have to do for the association, the administration, the monitoring reports that we get and we have to decide whether or not they're appropriate measures of what we're trying to move towards the ends. I don't want to do that for you all. I love you guys. I don't want to do that.

I don't think that's appropriate. And we would have to do that if that was inside the UUA. We would be saying, OK, we got to get a new monitoring way of doing this. If we could've done it we would have already done it. I really, deeply respect the work that the UUA does. That's why I'm on the board.

It's not to denigrate anything that we have already done and where we have come. It's not what I'm saying. I'm saying what they are wanting to do is wholly in line with our values, and our mission, and the way we want to see beloved community occur within our faith. And I have no problem sending that money outside of our fiscal control, absolutely none.

That's what we sign on for, is allyship, right? To say, this is what you need. We asked you to tell you what do you need. No, maybe that's not really what you need, let me tell you what you need. No. That's bullshit. Sorry. This is what they need. We asked them to tell us. Here it is. It's a big ask. What are we going to do?

JIM KEY: Thanks Christina. Lucia.

LUCIA SANTINI FIELD: I just wanted to say that I also thought that Peter's concern was a very good and appropriate one, and lines up very strongly with Dorothy's. And yet, I don't think that needs to mean that the answer is no. I think it should mean that we consider thoughtfully and together the most appropriate models for the best success long term.

And I completely agree that the autonomy is so important to the self-determination and the continued creativity and constructive energy, and yet we don't want it to become two separate and really only loosely connected things going forward. So I encourage us to explore various models. And having had the privilege of serving on the board of the Church of the Larger Fellowship for a number of years, I know that there are models of separation and integration at the same time, that preserve the strong link (recording ends and continues moments later).

LUCIA SANTINI FIELD: [INAUDIBLE] (recording continues)...and community between Church of the Larger Fellowship and the UUA, because it is indeed the largest congregation, but it has a separate board. It has a separate endowment. It has independent functioning. And so that might not be the ideal structure for this. But I think it's one way to think about how we might proceed differently.

And the only other thing I want to throw in, other than the things I said earlier about wanting us to speak to the mission and vision and raise the money and the awareness simultaneously with our commitment, is that I would like the Board to consider one additional tweak to the proposal, in that we respect and include their intention that it serve as an endowment for the long-term support and future growth of BLUU, because that's their goal. And I think that is what is powerfully speaking to me and that I would feel best having that reflected in the language that, however we approve it, whether it's by vote or by acclamation or consensus or any other way, that it's an agreement and a collaboration and a shared vision.

JAMES KEY: Thank you Lucia. Dorothy, I'll give you the final word here.

DOROTHY HOLMES: Yeah, a couple of attributions were made to me that I want to try to clarify.

[LAUGHTER]

DOROTHY HOLMES: Oh, I don't know. It's so much. I think maybe we need two resolutions. If it goes the way it's being proposed-- and I'm not against that-- it is an implicit statement that, in some ways, we failed. And I think we have to take up that matter and decide what we're going to do about it as an organization and as a Board. If we affirm this consistent with what Christina said and, I think, what Jeanne was saying also, it implies we have stumbled badly. We have failed.

We're trying to remedy that in part by passing this resolution. But that's not the end of our job. We would have to take up something else and resolve to do it. So that's what I also.

JAMES KEY: Thank you all for this-- rich discussion seems to understate it all. But I want to come back, before we break for lunch, to Greg's notion. I'm rather intrigued, particularly building on our workshop of yesterday, and approach where we can affirm something without voting and recording the yeses and nos and the abstentions and whatever.

First of all, we have a motion on the table that's been seconded. Somebody is going to have to table that if we don't want to vote on that soon. We could certainly table that till tomorrow so it doesn't die, that we can finish that discussion. But we have some time scheduled in the morning for generative discussion. It seems to me this fits.

Would someone like to work with Greg to bring forward-- I'll just call it a proposal-- something that captures the mood of the Board that moves this forward. I get the sense that the trustees are in favor of responding fairly enthusiastically in some way. Am I reading the trustees correctly?

And I really like the notion of including the youth trustees in this vote, or whatever this affirmation that we do. Is that amenable to the trustees to table this until we get some language that we think is more consistent? Dorothy?

DOROTHY HOLMES: I don't [INAUDIBLE].

JAMES KEY: OK.

DOROTHY HOLMES: That's my only thing. Because I think we've just built such intensity. I think our presenters won't be here tomorrow, is that right? OK, they're leaving.

JAMES KEY: What time are you leaving?

DOROTHY HOLMES: Their presence is not-- their energy is so wonderful.

JAMES KEY: No, no, I hear you.

DOROTHY HOLMES: I just think taking till tomorrow might be all of our obsessionism, our fears, maybe a few too many sidebar conversations. I think we should try to conclude it by today.

JAMES KEY: Is there a consensus on that, Richard?

RICHARD JACKE: [INAUDIBLE]. I thought that the intention was to address this as the January meeting.

JAMES KEY: We're going to approve whatever the funding is at the January meeting. This is approving something to move forward, to direct the administration to respond to this in a concrete way that we can approve in January. What I see happening, logistically, is the Board's going to have to have a couple of conversations on the phone as this thing evolves in terms of the logistics of it. What I would like for us to achieve, whether it's today or whether it's tomorrow, is this a consensus that we're moving forward, either naming our concerns or anxieties or whatever? Christina?

CHRISTINA RIVERA: So to Greg's point of wanting it to be beautiful, right? I think that's where we started, right? I don't think it's an either or. So I think we could-- right here we've got many religious professionals in the room-- craft something that does our due diligence of taking a vote, but frankly, also has some spiritual component to it. And I mean, if it was me and they were willing, I would love a laying on of hands and a prayer for the work that's going forward, but something that roots us in our selves as a religion and a faith movement that says that this is really different from business as usual.

JAMES KEY: Andy.

ANDY BURNETTE: That's fantastic, I think. And to do that without real financial support would seem to me empty. And so I think they need to go together somehow. I have language that I've sent to Stephanie as a proposal. I guess that's what will be tabled?

JAMES KEY: Well, I'm not suggesting we table. I'm just trying to see where we want to go as a group. I'm not advocating for tabling. Patrick?

PATRICK MCLAUGHLIN: At the risk of wordsmithing, what I'm hearing is this concern about approving. And maybe what we want is for the Board to commit in principle. We are making a commitment about where we're going. Approval is where we're expecting to be in January.

JAMES KEY: I'm going to turn to you, Andy, in terms of where do you think you want to go with the language? I'm getting now a sense that the Board would like to approve something and then do a ritual after lunch perhaps.

ANDY BURNETTE: The language that I've suggested is up on the screen. And the amounts are all in there. And I think Rob's intent is still honored.

JAMES KEY: I don't know who was up first, Lucia and then Tim.

LUCIA SANTINI FIELD: So the one thing that it doesn't include is my more recent suggest and request that it include language which respects the intentionality that the funding be used as an endowment to ensure the perpetuity of this effort so that the \$5 million is not 10 years of \$500,000 of funding. It is indeed the beginning of an endowment for the future of BLUU.

ANDY BURNETTE: And I wasn't certain that that was a consensus, so sorry I didn't get it in. And also, I'm not sure that we want that level of this direction when it comes to the money. I think that the intent, the original intent of this proposal, was that we are very clear that \$5 million is under the authority of Black Lives UU, and that even that has to be used in typical endowment fashion, was more control than I--

DOROTHY HOLMES: I thought they didn't want that. Did you--

ANDY BURNETTE: Was that [INAUDIBLE]?

LUCIA SANTINI FIELD: They did affirm it.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

LUCIA SANTINI FIELD: They do--

ANDY BURNETTE: Do you affirm putting it in the proposal so that five years from now that is still binding on the way that those resources--

CARLTON ELLIOT SMITH: That the money would be set aside as an endowment. I'm thinking we--

LUCIA SANTINI FIELD: We can't.

JAMES KEY: I'm getting the sense that we're going in a lot of different directions here, Tim, and that we probably need to do some convening over lunch and bring something back after lunch to be followed. And I like the notion. Tim is next and then Greg, and then we'll be back to Lucia.

TIM ATKINS: So one of the things I heard was that we don't want this to maybe just be a vote about voting in January on something. That might have more meaning now if we attach some kind of dollar amount. I for one would be in favor of us approving the \$300,000 of immediate funding and then coming back in January with a plan for this greater discussion about \$5 million, but that's just me. I'm not saying we have to do it that way. I'm just offering that as a possibility for [INAUDIBLE].

JAMES KEY: Well, I think we have the realistic-- \$300,000 not budgeted. And that's got to be resolved. And I'm not comfortable as Chief Governance Officer of resolving that today until-- that's a means discussion and we need to have a collegial discussion of what that might look like. That's why I was looking forward to something that we could-- we could approve the logistics and the programming of it in January, if you will, but it's something that we can agree with today.

And I'm going back to Greg's notion that affirms the direction we're in. This is a big, significant, and important event, ministry, direction. And let me just add-- we were talking about the both/and and how it would be organized and who would control it. I don't think that's something we need to be terribly concerned about with today.

Remember, we've got this parallel piece of work going on of renewing covenant. And that group is out looking, a network of networks. And this sort of activity fits into that, what might be a nice first network, if you will-- for lack of a better name-- a first entry into covenant with something we've never done before in this particular way. So I think there's a great opportunity here on a number of different levels.

But we've got a motion. We've got a second. Do you want to vote now or do you want to wait until after lunch? I don't mind recessing and calling the vote when we reconvene. But I'm hearing any preponderance of ideas on it.

So what I think I'm going to do, until somebody changes my mind on this, is to let's move into recess, let's enjoy our lunch and thank our hosts when they come in after lunch, and then resume this and either vote on it or table it until we have something that the Board is more comfortable with, or both. Are we good with that?

DOROTHY HOLMES: When you say motion, you mean Rob's motion or this one?

JAMES KEY: I can't hear.

DOROTHY HOLMES: Rob's motion or this motion? Which motion?

JAMES KEY: Well, we only have one more. This is an amended motion that I'm offering up recessing. It's still active. And we concluded after lunch. And after lunch we voted up or down or we table it or we have another approach to it. I just think people need more time with this.

CHRISTINA RIVERA: Board, do we need more time with this? I'm not getting that same sense. So I'm just--

JAMES KEY: Are you ready to-- Lucia?

LUCIA SANTINI FIELD: So I just want to say, my enthusiasm is so different as the Financial Advisor and the fiduciary. If this proposal committed us to raising the funds in a more powerful way, I appreciate that the language has been tweaked. But as it stands now, I'm just terribly concerned that we'll do the easy money thing, which may be easy for us and horrible for those outside the room years from now. Because if \$5 million is 25% or 20% of the unrestricted endowment of the association and we remove it without a commitment on our parts to replace it and we give it to an organization without even a loose requirement or expectation that it be serving as an endowment, I view that as not consistent with my fiduciary duty, because it's an enormous responsibility and resource. And I just feel as though, as enthusiastic as I am about this, I have a fundamental fiduciary duty to express those concerns and ask us to reflect those concerns in a meaningful way.

JAMES KEY: Andy.

ANDY BURNETTE: OK. First, I want to expand fiduciary to include the soundness and wholeness of the movement, even outside finances. So my sense of our being in an historic moment is pretty strong right now. And I think that the finances of the issue need to be held together with the fact that we as a movement have talked about this for a long time. I think most of us expected this to be a big financial ask. And so to me, I think that it is within my fiduciary duty-- fiduciary seen as a whole, a holistic term-- not to place conditions on the money that--

?????: I want them on us. I want the conditions on us.

ANDY BURNETTE: The other thing I wanted to say was, I'm not sure how to put in here that the Board is committed to-- I think we need to commit to that. But I'm not sure that it needs to be in this motion. I think we do need to commit to raising money, but I'm not sure that we need to put that in this motion. However, I'm open to an amendment if that's what we need to do.

JAMES KEY: Well, let me comment. This reads to me like we are approving a principle that we have yet to see the details on. So again, speaking as the Chief Governance Officer, I don't see a problem or significant risk of approving something that we need to do some refining on. So are you ready for me to call a vote?

ANDY BURNETTE: No, you can call the question.

JAMES KEY: Thank you. So let's--

GREGORY BOYD: So we're not going to do that, all right? No, no, I've had my card up for about 15 minutes. So we're not going to call that question. We are not approving something of this magnitude in this way. I'm not going to see it happen, I'm really not.

I requested that we make this beautiful. We are not required to have perfect language. We are only required to make a decision. Can we make a decision about the bare minimum of the facts that it's funding in this amount at this point, funding at this amount at this point, and we can make it beautiful later?

I want to invite us to go back and read the original 1968 resolution to make sure that what we're committing to is in line with what we're already on the hook for and make it beautiful later. So right now, I don't care what this says. I don't think we need that level of precision in the language. I think all we need to know is that we want the administration to immediately fund \$300,000, that they're going to look at how to make \$5 million happen from unrestricted endowment. And we'll do some more stuff later. I think those are the only two things we actually need to decide right now.

JAMES KEY: Denise?

DENISE RIMES: This is an act of faith. And if there's a legal element to this act of faith, so be it. But an act of faith-- I mean, I'm with Greg. I mean, I see myself-- or as I-- I wish I could see myself in a fundamentalist setting where people give up their vacation earning or plans, their vacation funds, or their new home funds for the good of the church. That's what I want this to feel like.

And I just implore us to do this as an act of faith and, to your point Greg, leave the rest aside for right now. We'll figure it out. I have faith that we will.

JAMES KEY: So we ready to do this leap of faith?

DOROTHY HOLMES: Yes.

JAMES KEY: So be it. Do you want to call the question? Or how do you want to proceed, Greg?

GREGORY BOYD: I think we just decided.

JAMES KEY: Thank you. We are in recess until probably 1:30. I think we've got to have 45 minutes for lunch and meeting our hosts. And are we going to do that now or after lunch?

[INAUDIBLE]

JAMES KEY: Thank you.

[APPLAUSE]

JAMES KEY: Thank you all.

[APPLAUSE]