

OPEN FORUM AT THE DFW MARRIOTT
SEPTEMBER 7, 1985

(K. H.) There are a couple of things I'd like to pass on to you prior to the time that we get into the actual open forum. Ray King came up to me a few minutes ago and handed me a note showing the election results based on the new directors that we changed this morning, and you had heard Ray say that he declined to run for President of C.A.S.I. beginning immediately. Therefore, he has effectively resigned. Vann York will be the new President of C.A.S.I., Mike Gallagher will be Vice President, Pat Irvine is Secretary/Treasurer. Richard Knight has resigned as Tallymaster. 1986 Tallymaster will be a newly elected director, Rex Jones. I think these are major points of interest, both for chili cooks and for what we have represented as opposing groups. I hope this will prove to everyone that the people that are out here, from both sides, that we're absolutely delighted to have, to have the opportunity to hear what they've got to say to us, and I think that this also proves that both groups are deadly serious about the fact that they would like to have this brought down into a single group, whatever format that might take. I'd like to welcome all of you here today. I appreciate you being here. It shows an interest on your part. All of this discussion will be geared to the Great Peppers. Spectators are strongly discouraged from getting involved in this conversation. There are two gentlemen that I have specifically asked to be the chili security for today. The gentleman in the back on the right, in the red shirt, Duke Walton; the gentleman in back with the yellow shirt, white hat, Waldo Strein. Waldo and Duke have both volunteered to be security. We are asking you to keep your comments to yourself. If you've got anything you'd like to address to the directors that are here, please do so through your Great Pepper. The first time that you become a nuisance in the crowd, you'll be asked to quiet down. The second time you'll be asked to quiet down and told one more time, you'll be asked to leave. The third time you will be asked to leave. If you choose not to, we'll help you out the door. That's awfully tough, that's awfully hard-nosed. I'm sorry it has to be that way, but the invitations were sent to the directors and to the Great Peppers and we would like to make sure that it stays that way. Some question has been going on about who our moderator will be. I'd like to now tell you that our moderator today is Joe Holstead. Joe is news director for WBAP. He's been at WBAP for six years as news director. The prior six years he spent at WFAA as news director. Some of his chili background includes the fact that he was the first ever human Great Pepper of Frank's Dallas pod, human because they didn't do that at the Dallas pod, and some weren't sure that he was. Joe was an original spectator, as a media representative, of the original 1967 Terlingua cook-off. Joe also claims to be a personal friend, I'm not sure that anyone could be a personal friend, of Wick, H. Allen and Frank. I cannot imagine anybody that's got less at stake. He is basically about out of the chili world because of all the stuff that's happened. I cannot imagine a more neutral or impartial person to have as a mediator. There is one other thing that I'd like to cover that came up only this

morning, and for that I'd like to turn this podium over to Gerald Terry.

(G. T.) I went to lunch with three or four of the guys and fortunately I just had three beers, or I wouldn't be able to function here today. I've been asked by Bob Belfantz to read a letter, a note that he has written, and this is strictly from Bob. I am simply a spokesman, but you'll understand the intent after I read it, and to show you that Bob is sincere, I've got \$1,000.00 here that he has put on the line. "To the assembled Great Peppers and representatives of both sides in the Terlingua Cook-off, my name is Bob Belfantz. I try to keep a low profile, so many of you folks don't know me. I regret that I can't be here today, but to all concerned parties, whether you know me or not, let me say this: For nearly three years now, you two groups have been at odds with each other. Many times, adherents to each side have attempted to explain to me the ills of the other side. I've only listened enough to know that none of the so-called "dirty laundry" has anything remotely to do with the actual cooking of chili. Personally, I don't care who did what to whom or why. This has gone on quite long enough. All of us involved are over 21. We should be able to converse, act, and compromise like adults, hopefully, to positively impress our parents and our children alike. It would make me very happy to see all get together and work out a unified Terlingua in 1986. And, furthermore, thereof, I ask you, the powers that be on each side collectively, this pledge and challenge: Work it out, get it together, arrange and announce a unified cook-off for 1986, not later than the close of your business this weekend, such that it can be immediately reported to the Goat Gap Gazette, and I will donate \$1,000.00 in cash, displayed here, to Leukemia Society of America, Inc., non-profit charity. I don't care how you do it. My spokesman, Gerald, will donate the money if you all work out a compromise. If you cannot, he will return the money to me. The best of luck and Godspeed to you and your deliberations. May you all leave here today a little bit closer friends than you are now. I represent no group in making this pledge and I invite no debate or discussion on it. You're either going to do it or you're not."

(J. H.) I have a few opening remarks, basically it boils down to this. Back during the Chisolm Trail Round-Up in Fort Worth, I was approached by several different people asking, "If there should be an effort and a gathering for the purpose of trying to completely re-unify the chili world, would I be interested in being the moderator?" I said, "Yes, of course I would." I was told at that time, "Well, your name has been used several places and you may as well know there's a lot of people that don't want you to do it." and that's fine. Let me tell you what I perceive my role to be. If about half of all of you in this room think I am a direct disciple of Satan, and the other half think the Lord, God Almighty sent me, I will have done my job. I intend to nudge and nurse and inquire and ask all for the one single purpose of delivering to all of you the best information possible of the issues before the chili world. All of you here, and by way of discussions I've had with people over the past several years, I have but one

conclusion: That all parties and all interest and all principles and all sides should have one goal, one objective, one Terlingua. You'll notice on the table of couple of microphones, Bill Brown has covered his with a napkin. The reason for the microphone is pure and simply this: We want a record. We want the information to be as true and correct as is humanly possible for this meeting today. We do not want to hear any more of the "he said, she said, he was there when she walked by and he was told by a guy who was there with a friend of his." We want that cut to an absolute minimum, so that there is a record of what everybody said, and a record of exactly what everybody said. Now for the purposes of going forward this afternoon, the parties you will be hearing, for purposes of identification, will be known as the Tolbert group and the C.A.S.I. group. And at this time, to let you know how deadly serious we are about what we are going to be going through during this afternoon, I would like to hear an expression from the tables of both sides. Are both of you groups present here today prepared to enter into good faith negotiations for the sake of obtaining one Terlingua?

(TOLBERT GROUP) Yes.

(C.A.S.I.) Sure.

(J.H.) I hear from the Tolbert group a yea, from C.A.S.I., a yea from the C.A.S.I. and a positive from Richard on the end. I'm going to impose very few rules. It's kind of a modification of Robert's Rules of Order. It's called Joe's rules. Now, I want to reiterate one thing before we get started here, and that is something that Ken touched on. The information is here for the Great Peppers. All of you who are present in the room, thank you for coming. We appreciate your interest. We need your reaction, we need your thoughts relative to this process. We will not have any outbursts. They just can't be tolerated. One of the things I will impose is that these talks and discussions in forum will go forward on a business-like basis with attention to the issues, with no extraneous matter, be it outbursts or digressing from the subject at hand. For our purposes of going into the talks themselves this afternoon, the Tolbert group is represented by Larry Boyd, Bill Brown, Dick Wright and Ray Shockley. The C.A.S.I. group, Ray King, Larry Burriss, Vann York and Richard Knight. I would, at this time, tell you we are going to extend to each person from each group, a five minute period for the purpose of detailing to all of us, and to all of you, what they perceive to be the key issues that separate these organizations, issues to be resolved to become one organization and one Terlingua. Now to do that, I have one other short announcement. Bob, could you come up here and do something for me? Take that two bits. You want another one, Bob? I want you to flip that when I tell you to, but I will ask Ray, Ray call sides. Heads? Tails for the C.A.S.I. group. Flip it Bob.

(R.B.) Tails

4

(J.H.) Tails it is. By virtue of that, the C.A.S.I. group is going to start. The C.A.S.I. group is going to begin. Five minutes per speaker, just take the issues. I also want to tell you that we ask again, to give you an idea of how very serious we are about concluding successfully, the effort to have one Terlingua, we've asked the directors of C.A.S.I. and the Tolbert representatives to put in their minds right now, five major issues. Not the B.S. issues everybody, that everybody who goes to a cook-off hears about, but five substantive issues that confront this organization, both groups. And we're going to ask later on for those to be presented, maybe you'll be hearing them, but we're going to ask that they be presented in writing for the purpose of identifying the issues, addressing the issues and resolving the issues. Ces tu fini, to settle it with equity and fairness for all, for the purpose of one Terlingua. And to that I will ask for beginning purposes, I will recognize for five minutes, Ray King. You can just speak to the group, the mike will just pick it up.

(R. K.) You know, I wasn't real sure what we were going to talk about today until I came into this room. I didn't prepare. I didn't really know what to prepare for, I really wasn't sure. I was told that the idea of the whole meeting was, what would it take to get a fix in '86, to get both groups together? Well, I don't think it should ever have drifted apart as far as it has. In the beginning we had alot of animosity, bickering, problems, petty things that escalated and festered in groups till they got to be big problems. I don't think we really had big problems in the beginning. There are a lot of misunderstandings. As far as C.A.S.I. is concerned, C.A.S.I., as we went through in our meeting earlier today, C.A.S.I. is you, the chili cooks, the chili cooks, the people who elected Great Peppers, Great Peppers who elect the Board of Directors, that's C.A.S.I. The only thing that is important, as far as I'm concerned, and I'm speaking here as an individual, is that the cook-off out there has to be in the hands of the chili cook, and they have to run it, and we, as directors, are kind of tied to that, because we can't make rules for them, for the Great Peppers. We can only interpret what they do.

(J.H.) Okay. Let me make a note to you at this time. When the gentlemen proceeded at the tables prior to the start of our meeting, we advised both groups of what the discussion would be about, and each director, and each Tolbert representative would have five minutes to state their case. At that time, we were advised by the Tolbert group that one representative would take up the entire time, and that was agreeable to the chair. So at this time, I want to continue on with the C.A.S.I. group and have Larry Burriss address the conference. Larry.

(L.BURRISS) Okay, Ray, I'm going to give you about four minutes back because Ray stole my speech. We had just gotten through going through the process that I think needs to continue and I'm not sure that I even know what the issues are now. There is one thing, the chili cooks have to continue to run the cook-offs. We have a vehicle right now. I think we pretty well showed that earlier this morning. There is a working process for any

difficulties with changing rules for doing a little bit of everything. I could not be involved with anything that did not continue this. I'm not saying it's perfect, but I think it's the best thing we have right now. If there are any other issues, that will be aired. As to some of the minor difficulties we might have, if it sounds like this group here is more or less crawfishing or not taking a stand, it is because we cannot take a stand. We're only four of nine Board of Directors that represent the Great Peppers, who in turn represent the chili cooks. We have no right, nor can we make a decision on our own, so therefore, if we make a statement that we will take back to the Great Peppers or something along these lines, that's exactly what we mean.

(J.H.) Thank you, Larry. Vann

(V.Y.) Well, number one, I would like to reiterate from what Ray and Larry have had to say, from what I understand you're supposed to say. Maybe what we believe in is that is strong enough that we would vote for that and not make a compromise. As far as I'm concerned, it's basically C.A.S.I. as it is today, as it will perpetuate itself. The people are elected, there is no permanent office. I would not vote for anyone to be a permanent office holder. The office may be permanent, but the holder will not be. Certainly, they can be re-elected. But to keep the instrument in place, so that anyone from the chili world can go through any part of this if he so chooses, that he could run as a Great Pepper organization.

(J.H.) Thank you Vann. Richard

(R. Knight) I think the ah, I myself, am a representative of the body of the Great Peppers, and I think we can make any concessions that have already been voted on by the Great Peppers, and because those are the rules that I live by as a director and rules that I live by as a chili cook. And, #1, I am a chili cook. I'm out there fighting for points just like every other chili cook. I believe in what's happened in the last two years, the direction that the Great Peppers have taken, the direction that the Board of Directors is only responsible for following out the rules and the responsibilities that the Great Peppers placed upon me. I firmly believe and will always believe in the C.A.S.I. I have served as tallymaster and I've seen all the names that have come in and you know, I think the growth is there that can really spread chili throughout, not only Texas, but throughout the United States and the world. I think that what happens here is a continuation of the two giant steps made in the last two years. And I firmly believe that we can have one cook-off, and I'll welcome anybody to come back to the C.A.S.I. cook-off.

(J.H.) Thank you Richard. That concludes comments on issues from the C.A.S.I. group. I would like to at this time now recognize that speaking for a period of not to exceed twenty minutes for the Tolbert organization, the Tolbert group, Ray Shockley. Ray

(R.S.) Thank you, sir. First of all, I want to take this opportunity to thank you very much for inviting us. I think this visit is long overdue. I'm really concerned about a great number of things. Next year is a sesquicentennial in Texas. Chili is the state food of Texas. Dottie Griffith recently wrote a book called "Chili Madness" and for some reason I think that's appropriate as to what has been going on. I think the issues are rather simple. But somehow they've gotten confused. And what I want to say to you is that our objective, very simply stated, is one Terlingua. Why have we proceeded where we have? My objective certainly is not to drag out the past. But to say to you by our presence here is that we are committed to a one Terlingua. And what I would like to do is address to you some of the issues that I think really need touching upon. And the reason that I'm your spokesman today, very simply, I'm President of Wolf Brand Products, a very successful company. My only objective whatsoever, whatsoever, with respect to this whole situation has been impartiality. My objective from a business standpoint is to promote chili. To be honest with you, I've gone to great expense not to advertise Wolf Brand. And I'm not here doing a commercial for Wolf Brand. I'm here as a sincere promoter of chili. I think that we have done a great job in improving the quality of chili in Texas. I just talked to you about my sales. Since 1966/67 when we had the first Terlingua, the chili business has been magnificent. The Mexican food business has taken off. I see restaurants like Chili's, and chili has become gospel. They even know about it in New York. These are accomplishments that have been due to all these cook-offs. I mean a great job, you people should be absolutely patting yourself on the back for the great job that you've done. And here we have this great legacy, the great legacy of H. Allen Smith, the great chili confrontation that started it all. Frank Tolbert, his tremendous support represented here by by son and daughter. They want to see chili go, I want to see it go, and I want to see it go together. Now simply, what are the issues? Here they are as I see them. We started off originally in Terlingua. It was a media event and we saw crowds out there build to 10,000. Our crowds are declining. We are split. Sponsors are saying, "You need us, we don't need you. You are a non-media event. You're so busy with whatever the politics." I don't want to use that word, but you know, the devisiveness that we're not promoting chili the way we should. What we need is the fun, the great charisma, the development of chili. That's all we want to do. We want to have fun, the cooks want to have fun. We want to get together. And I'm trying, with the allotted time that will run over, and if I'm not offending anybody, I would like to delineate these issues that I think need addressing. We started out in Terlingua at the mercury mine site. It was dangerous and small. We moved off to Villa de la Mena, which was great. It has certain shortcomings that as our success grew, that became gravid. Now, there's nothing wrong with that. And it so happened with the split, why we went over, the Tolbert group, went over to another area. Now, I'm going to tell you about the possibility of an alternate site and just what you're facing. We know that there is not much of a population out there, and there's only one or two bulldozers that I'm aware of,

and one backhoe. You're going to have great trouble getting equipment out there to cut roads or do whatever you want at a new site. You need somebody out there that is close, that's going to supervise what is being done. I'm going to tell you what we've done in the past two or three years. We took a beautiful site that has 12,000 acres. We took bulldozers and cut through there, and we have roads and we have campsites, and currently, believe it or not, we are erecting a huge tank. What do you think the object of that dumb huge tank is? It's so that if somebody wants to take a quick shower, especially the women, it will be there. We're putting in comodes, now I say comodes, that might be two. We are putting running water in there with urinals. We do have a fine stage. I'm going to tell you that Arturo White has done some great things down there. He lives there. He happens to have people that come over from the border who know how to make adobe, and he's gone out there and he's built and we've built, a stage. We have press facilities, a fine facility. I can tell you, yes, we want to get together. And isn't, I'm talking as a businessman, sure we can abandon this site and go off and pick a third site. But who's going to do the work? Who's going to be out there supervising it, and who's coming up with the money to replicate what we put in out there? My guess would be 25 to 40 thousand dollars, because you're going to bring people from Alpine and all those kind of places. I again point out to you, who's going to do it? So a site is an issue, sure. We can go to an alternate site, but I want you to know what you're running up against. What we do suggest is, as we want to get together, to come over and look at our site, to visit us. We're not going to have everything, but I think we can provide everything. We've got a great start on it. Now, that's the one issue - site. The second issue is going to be the name of the event. You know all the history. We started off as the World's Championship. We lost that. We lost that while we were busy doing other things and that's terrible. Each of us say the 19th annual. I love the word international, I think it's great. But somewhere along the line we did want to recognize a guy like Wick Fowler. He's a competitor of mine. And I think it's great, I think it's great that we can recognize Wick Fowler for the marvelous job he did. And certainly, I wanted to recognize the fantastic contribution of a guy like Frank Tolbert. Frank Tolbert was a historian. As he wrote, he became in love with chili, our whole culture. And all we wanted to do was say the FRANK X. TOLBERT/WICK FOWLER MEMORIAL. And I think that's a great legacy. And I think we should be proud of it whether, you know, you got mad at Frank, or whoever, but I think that is the legacy. You know it's marvelous that these guys have the charisma, the ability to develop the concept to bring chili on, to have the time to do all that. So, personally, the Tolbert group doesn't want to drop and lose their legacy and just be another event. The other thing I would like to talk about is this thing that is C.A.S.I., INC., and CHILI APPRECIATION SOCIETY. I don't understand all this. All I can tell you is that Frank Tolbert has the trademark to CHILI APPRECIATION SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL. It belongs to Frank Tolbert Jr., and Cathlene. It's a federal trademark. We would love to see an organization, a neutral organization, where we can take this trademark and give it to you,

provided, that at any time the organization totally disintegrated, it would not go to one individual, but would revert back to Frank Tolbert and his sister. I'm confused about C.A.S.I., INC., Chili Appreciation Society, but here is the trademark from the Tolbert group that we want to give you if we can ever get this thing ironed out. Some other things that I'm not coped to talk about are the rules. I think the Great Peppers do a magnificent job in setting the rules, setting the tone. One of the suggestions that was advanced to me, and I'm going to pass it on to you, is that maybe you need a group that handles the rules for the five Southwestern states and to consider another group that handles the rules for the rest of the world. I say rest of the world. There are so many people that call, but I'm going to tell you, just as a businessman, about the rest of the world. And I'm going to do it in a salesman language. I sell Wolf Brand Chili, so I know exactly what I'm talking about. In the whole state of New York, a huge state with lots of people, 25 million people, the total amount of chili sold there is 100,000 cases. I have six customers in the Dallas area that I sell a hundred thousand cases to. Chili is not the world in New York. If you go into New England, there is one can on the shelf. And what their chili tastes like is very different. It's very hard for these people to get sanctioned events and all that. Chili is not in out there. But they want to know about it. It takes an awful lot of explaining. It's a whole job in itself. So I ask you to think about that. The other thing I'd like to say to you is alot of the adversity has to deal with people. And I understand that Ray, who has made a magnificent contribution, is stepping down. I have known Vann York for twenty years. He's made a magnificent contribution. And I've known these other fellows. I've been meeting with Larry Burriss trying to get us together at every opportunity. Your tallymaster has been fantastic. These guys have done a hell of a job, have left you a legacy too, just like Frank. And why in the hell we can't put it all together and do it next year I don't know. What I don't want to see us do is try to choose up sides. You know, you guys trying to get your little point, we trying to get our little point. I don't want any of that, at all. I want some good cooks that are willing to think about what we're trying to do and do it. Let us get together and work on it. I think I have addressed the five issues. And I would add, and I hope you don't none of you fellows, take an exception to what I'm going to say, but Ray, I think by you stepping down, and maybe Jim Redd not being involved, with some of these personalities, it might come together easier. I don't mean that to hurt you or anything, but I think sometimes we're so close that we get our personalities hung up in our underwear. And we don't need that. But we do need you, and you need me, I mean, as an example. And you need these guys. Now why in the hell can't we do that? Thank you.

(J.H.) The expression that I hear from both sides in this meeting today, I believe we can come to common conclusion at least with the chair, that the sum is more important than the parts. And the sum being more important than the parts, I think is a major step, and the first one that has been made in several years. I would like at this time to ask Ray Shockley if he would present,

for the use of the group, the five issues that he has just placed before the Great Peppers and all of you in the room today and the directors present here from C.A.S.I. C.A.S.I. directors, I would like very much to have from you in writing, for the purpose of discussion and resolution, some specifics as relate to the cooks and C.A.S.I. and the perpetuity of the organization and for the good of one Terlingua. And I would like for you all to resolve that and get us some specifics that everybody can have some word for word in writing issues to address. I think that's very important now. We have the group Ray Shockley represented, if it is just the direction and the articles as put forth by C.A.S.I. directors, that's okay by me as long as we can get a copy of it for the purposes of addressing the issues. Now then, I compliment all of you on your conduct in the course of this meeting. I think all of you in this room can understand the importance of one Terlingua. I think now all of you in this room understand some of the issues that are before the group for the purpose of achieving one Terlingua. Some of the heritage and tradition that both sides have expressed a very vital interest in maintaining and, indeed promoting now and in the future, and with that, I would like to hope that without going much further at all, that there could be an agreement in principle without dotting i's or crossing any t's. That coming from this group today, let us have a short session for the purpose of saying when will the next meeting be, when we'll begin to resolve the issues and put it down on paper and set a calendar of events for the purpose of saying we will address the issues, we will resolve the issues with one purpose in mind, and that is for the purpose of meeting in October, the day after the cook-offs, for the purpose of making a final agreement and final formal resolution to have the fix in '86 for one Terlingua. And with that I'm going to turn it back to Ken and then at this point feel like that I have pushed the burden of responsibility off on a lot of other people, but feeling very good in the knowledge that one Terlingua is very much in the very near future. Thank you.

(K.H.) The purpose in this group addressing the Great Peppers and the advertisement that was run in the Goat Gap, which everybody has had an opportunity to see, was for open discussion. We, the Great Peppers, have had the opportunity to listen to what you have had to say, and now I think it is our turn.

(J.H.) Please have at it.

(K.H.) I think we should have the opportunity to address specific questions that we might have either to Ray, as a group, or to you individually, is somebody would like to answer those. I do not want to get into the history, I don't care, it doesn't matter, that doesn't have anything to do with zip. What we want to do is pursue the idea that we can find a fix, and the only way we can find a fix is if all of you get involved with us. In light of that, really, the first question that I'd like to ask, and I'd like to ask this of Ray Shockley, he indicated that you would be willing to turn the name C.A.S.I., without the Inc., that now belongs to Cathlene and Frank, Jr., which is trademarked, as I understand.

(R.S.) Correct, Federal trademark.

(B.B.) No, incorrect. Chili Appreciation Society International.

(K.H.) I'm sorry, that was a misnomer. To use Chili Appreciation Society International and this has been part of the discussion that you and I have had privately, that this was possible. And you have indicated that you would like to turn that to the organization of the Great Peppers and what I'd like to ask you is, from us, what signs do you want, what do you need, what guidelines, what's it going to require for you to do this?

(R.S.) The only thing that I can say to this point is that you have an attorney, Pat Irvine, whom I don't know, Pat Irvine, alright. Frank Tolbert and Cathlene are represented by Haynes, Boone, Attorneys, Dallas. It's, I believe, the largest law firm in the City of Dallas. Don Templin is the managing partner, and I would suggest that you contact him on that subject.

(J.H.) And if I understood what you are saying, Ray, that would be an assignment with the dedication, so that it would not end up with any one individual at any future date.

(R.S.) There would be a caveat that at such point the organization would, let's say, become defunct, the trademark would revert to the Tolbert family.

(J.H.) Okay. I think that's very self-explanatory. Let's start with other Great Peppers here in the first two rows, issues and questions for either group seated here today.

(J.G.) Jim Graves, Space City Pod, Houston. Discussing site, I've been at both sites, both, as Chuck (?) says, seem to have their good points and bad points. Over at the store, Arturo's store, there has been quite a bit of work. During the first year, it was kind of rocky and it was rough, but not nearly so rocky and rough as it is over in the canyon. I personally feel, my pod members feel, whom I represent, and I think the cooks have spoken in the last two years as to what site they actually prefer, by going to the site that they felt would be more convenient. One, they feel that they would like to cook in the way that they have cooked all year long, by their campers, in their own immediate areas. Other people may have, but this is a reflection of my pod people. The site itself is more accessible from the road, it is easier for RV equipment to be taken in and out of, and it has all kinds of advantages. And with the addition, and I think we'll agree that baths are a scarce commodity in that part of the country, with the addition of convenience items, such as water and bath facilities for, not only the ladies, which men have a little more convenience in that area than they do, but I think this will be an added plus for the site. If it were taken for a vote by my pod, I feel at this time, and you said that you want the cooks to run this thing and you want the Great Peppers to reflect what the cooks say, and I, being a cook, that's what my pod is saying and

:

that's what I'm saying for my pod. I've heard all kinds of pros and cons and we would elect, as far as a site is a hang-up, the best one of it. And if you want the Great Peppers to get together on that, I've just voiced my opinion. I think that if everything is weighed on a scale and in balance, Behind the Store is by far the more accessible to crowds and we've had good security from both sides and I think the security from sides could probably get together and work something out there and delineate all that discussion that has been brought up too. So, as a Great Pepper, from my pod, if the site is a hang-up, then the Great Peppers can get together on that and that's the way I feel. Oh, incidently, I do want to thank both factions for having the Great Peppers at this meeting. Heretofore, not only have I and my pod and the rest of the Great Peppers, we felt kind of left out. You all have been getting together, together in little private meeting and discussing these things and we felt a little bit left out and I really want to thank you for inviting us here and having us get this thing out in the open.

(D.W.) Jim, we're glad to be here too.

(.H.) Okay, thank you, Jim for the expression. Alright, how about anybody over here on this side? Any one of the great Peppers here. Yes sir.

(?) How much do you pay Arturo for usage of the land?

(J.H.) Do you gentlemen have that information?

(D.W.) We pay him 50 cents a head and that's strictly just for clean-up. Now he does have the beer concessions and he cleans out his store so he makes that. Other than that, that's all he gets.

(J.H.) Okay. Did you all hear Dick? The question was "What was Arturo White paid?" and the answer was 50 cents a head for clean-up, to get the place cleaned up. Then, of course, he has the beer concessions and the store, is that correct?

(D.W.) Well, he has a store, he does very good business. He has all the ice.

(J.H.) All that goes with having a store right there. Alright, another pepper please.

(R.I.) I'm Richard Inman with the Houston Pod. On the matter of C.A.S.I. Incorporated and Chili Appreciation Society International. I'm confused that if we do go together, as one group, we do have two distinct organization in C.A.S.I. Incorporated, which I believe is a registered trademark, Ray? it is an incorporation.

(R.K.) Yes. The logo is incorporated under C.A.S.I. Chili Appreciation Society International.

(R.I.) Alright, then we have the Chili Appreciation Society International which was the first one. Okay, what would we be, I mean, what would this do to our organization? What would we be known as? Would we still have C.A.S.I., INC., or would we use Chili Appreciation Society International? That's always been a little confusing to me on which was which.

(J.H.) Alright, I will call on anybody here if he wants to explain that. As the chair understood it, C.A.S.I. is called C.A.S.I. and Ray Shockly was saying the Chili Appreciation Society International would be negotiated out to be given as ancillary title so it would be C.A.S.I., Chili Appreciation Society International or any other combination of names you think would best reflect one organization. Ray.

(R.S.) Pat may check me on this, but it would seem to me that the federal trademark would carry precedence. That had we legally challenged the other group, which we did not do, perhaps, you know, we would have come out. I think that and Pat nods to that.

(R.I.) Because what my reason for this question is during the last three years, yea, we've made some boo-boos to start with, we all know that. Personalities got in the way. It hurt the cooks, it hurt all of us and it was strictly, in my opinion, personalities, but that's in the past and that's what we're here to resolve. We have made alot of progress and turning the cook-off over to the Great Peppers and the chili cooks to run and I would not like to see us start from square one by, you know, in what name do we use. I mean C.A.S.I. is referred to as Chili Appreciation Society International, but it's not.

(R.S.) I think you would use Chili Appreciation Society International, is what you really want to use, that's what you are, that's what it started a .

(R.K.) That's what we do use.

(R.I.) Okay, that answers my question.

(R.S.) But then, you have the trademark, and then you have the strength.

(J.H.) There is concensus, both tables, that it would be Chili Appreciation Society International and the d/b/a can be C.A.S.I logo or whatever. Ray, Bill?

(B.B.) Whatever.

(J.H.) Does that answer your question? Alright, very good. Great Pepper, yes ma'am, go ahead.

(C.G.) I have a question for the Tolbert group. If we could get it resolved and have one cook-off, are you willing to let the Great Peppers and the chili cooks run the cook-off?

(D.W.) I don't think the first year that could happen. I don't think anyone knows in this room how much time is being spent on Terlingua. Ray and I worked ten months on it, getting it together, getting the trophies, getting the invitations mailed out, just getting the site improved. It's a constant thing that just continues to go on. Now, to turn this over to the Great Peppers . . .

(J.H.) What year are you referring to, '86?

(D.W.) Yes, yes.

(B.B.) Yes, yes.

(J.H.) You're referring to '86.

(D.W.) And to turn it over to the Great Peppers that first year, I think they'd have an awful lot to learn. And I think Ray King and Vann York, don't you agree, sir?

(R.K.) We're operating the cook-off. . .

(D.W.) Well, we're operating it, too, but we're going to let them run it. We're going to get out of it.

(L. BURRISS) Well, . . .

(D.W.) We're going to let the Great Pepper and cooks run it. We're not going to have anything to do with it Larry.

(L. BURRISS) What I'm saying is that the process that we went through this morning is the cooks themselves, and we're also holding the cook-off on the same day.

(D.W.) Right. The cooks have gotten, they are the ones that have gotten hurt. The Geat Peppers haven't gotten hurt. But we're losing cooks. Someone has to teach and train these people how to run a cook-off at Terlingua, because it's remote 600 miles away.

(R.S.) Could I offer a suggestion? I just see this as a detail that we sit down and work out. We want to get y'all in it sure. You know, everybody in it.

(L. BURRISS) May I respond to that? I think, if I understand the question, possibly, is who will be in charges of the cook-offs and at this time one of the cook-offs is run by the cooks through their Great Peppers, through the Board of Directors. If it came back to one, I think they wanted to know who would run it at that time.

(J.H.) Yes, that was question.

(L. BURRISS) Personally, I would like to see one cook-off continue, basically as we have continued the cook-off that some of us have been going to, the one at Villa de la Mena.

14

(J.H.) In other words, the cooks and the peppers, Great Peppers running the cook-off. Is that an issue that could be settled in some in-house meetings following this session? Is that something that is open for discussion or is that an arbitrary decision that can't be discussed?

(V.Y.) We will discuss anything, now. Everything now.

(J.H.) Right now.

(V.Y.) Now.

(R.K.) Let's get it out.

(J.H.) Well, time is going to bind us gentlemen.

(K.H.) Could I just give some ideas as to what time constraints we're working under today. Unfortunately due to the hotel time constraints, we ring the bell at 5:00. Now, that doesn't mean that we stop in the middle of a sentence, or if something is being close to being laid out so that it would be presented to the Great Peppers and these are all things that are going to have to go back to the pods. The next meeting that the Great Peppers have, I would anticipate that a lot of these answers will come back from the pods and have some distinct direction of what direction the cooks want to go. So I don't think we're going to have an isolated agreement, crossed "t's" and dotted "i's". I do think that by the time we get back to this we can go through these in itemized format. We do need to be headed toward the door by not later than 5:30. That means basically, we have an hour and a half. I don't think we're time constrained.

(J.H.) Alright, fine. Another question.

(R.B.) Ray Shockley, I'm a little bit, I won't say confused, but maybe I just don't understand. You said the issues and I take that to mean that this is what it would take for y'all to come over, for us to come over, for us to get together. Is that true and correct? In other words, we'll have to go Behind the Store and we'll have to be a Wick Fowler/Frank Tobert cook-off.

(R.S.) No. Let me be clear. I think that we're willing to concede, but I'm telling you that there's some points.

(R.B.) Yea, I agree with that.

(R.S.) These are negotiable, you know, I'm, all I've done is listen to chili heads until my ears have been beaten to death. And I'm just telling you, as I see it, these are the issues that have to be addressed. I don't know how to address them. I'm telling you, you are the Great Peppers, that these are the issues.

(R.B.) Well, let me put it to you this way. If the Great Peppers, who represent the chili cooks, or the majority of the chili cooks, chose not to go to Villa de la mena, chose not to go

to Behind the Store, realizing that this site situation, I mean, I understand what you're saying about the expense of preparing the site, and Lord knows, it's not everybody who'll put up with chili cooks. I mean, I'll concede to that. But what I'm saying, is that being the case, if we chose not to go either place, would y'all be willing to compromise.

(TOLBERT GROUP) Sure, yea.

(R.B.) How about the C.A.S.I. directors?

(C.A.S.I.) Sure

(B.B.) Bob, could I ask you who is "they"? You said you chose not to go to either one, who is they? I mean, you know.

(R.B.) Well, the Great Peppers as a whole.

(B.B.) Oh, okay, alright, I didn't, I wasn't quite following you.

(R.B.) There's another thing I'm confused about because the cooks and Great Peppers are not seeing eye to eye somewhere down the line.

(B.B.) Well, that's well aware, I'm aware of that.

(R.B.) I'm just saying if we're going to turn this back over to the Great Pepper organization, you know, and we chose not to go there, we chose an alternate site, would both sides be agreeable to that?

(R.S.) Sure, if you can find the money and all that.

(R.B.) I'm not saying, I'm just . . .

(K.H.) There's a lot of ifs.

(J.H.) Everybody in the room hear that? Everybody hear that okay? Waldo, could you hear Bob when he was talking? Oaky, good. Alright, now then, more questions please. Let's air it all out.

(R.S.) Let me tell you that I'm very impartial. I don't cook. I don't know anything about the rules.

(J.G.) Are we talking about the cooking rules? The rules under which we cook under?

(R.S.) Yes sir.

(?) At a sanctioned cook-off?

(R.S.) I'll let these other fellows . . .

(J.G.) Is that what we're referring to?

(B.E.) Right Jim.

(J.G.) Okay, if it's possible to resolve any one of these issues today, would y'all be willing to resolve it? And then we would have one or two more to deal with. I don't think that there would be any argument about the rules that we're now working under. We met this morning representing our pods and whatever rules we're working under now as far as the cooking and judging of showmanship and cooking chili, I think most people are fairly well satisfied with the normal bickering. So I think we can drop that down to four issues that we have to deal with.

(R.S.) Well, my reference was to rules was just to the out-of-state type situation.

(J.H.) The chair understood at the time that Ray Shockley's reference was rules for Texas and four Southwestern states versus the rest of the world.

(J.G.) I think that's a decision that the Great Peppers should deal with and not this panel.

(J.H.) Alright, Bill Brown had a comment regarding that. Bill.

(B.B.) Yes, back to Jim, to your address of the rules. As you well know, I don't know whether you do or not, but back in the early years when C.A.S.I. first got together and the Great Peppers started making, you know, sprucing up the rules, getting them to where they apply to present day needs of that time, Bob Yates, or Bob Taylor rather, from the Great State of Arkansas came down in 1981 and pleaded before the Great Peppers that they had problems getting enough people together in one group to call it a chili cook-off. And, so therefore, could we make a less selection or have a lesser number for chili cooks in that particular area so they could qualify these cooks or qualify as a cook-off to get points. And we did change it at that time to 20 and I think in the State of Texas it was 30 or 35, or 20, no, I think it was 35. There was about 15 difference because we were successful in getting our cook-offs together. Maybe it was 30, 10 difference. That was fine. As the years progressed there were more and more cook-offs in the State of Arkansas, which they got more and more points put together and they got more people interested. Chili was then introduced and it became a good dish to play around with and have fun and all this. So I understand, I talked to Bob earlier, and he said they rescinded that. They are now operating under the present C.A.S.I. rules. Now, that's fine, because I do understand why it's rescinded. There are quite a number of cook-offs in the area. Oklahoma's the same way. Louisiana is gaining on that particular area. Texas has always been that way. New Mexico is gaining in that area. But when you get beyond that 5 state area, friends, it's far and few between to have chili cook-offs and to get the rest of the world to participate in this thing, the Great Peppers are going to have to take in acknowledgment there is going to have to be somewhat a different

set of rules. Not total, they have to abide by almost everything except for the points. Now, understand by the point system or even reduce the number of cooks and put it in special order and then as their cook-offs increase, they get to a certain number, that the new tally master, Rex Jones, will know what is going in that state, then they are put on notice, next year, you will be in the 12 point system. And I think that this is something that the Great Peppers are going to have to address to make sure that you get a worldwide collection of chili cooks to participate if we are going to try to turn this "International World" or whatever we want to call it.

(M.G.) Mike Gallagher. I am one of the new directors of C.A.S.I. I think I can speak with some knowledge of this since I helped run the State cook-off in Texas, run the one in Arkansas, run the one in Louisiana and run the one in Mississippi. When I went to Arkansas, correct me Bob if I'm wrong, there were the state cook-off and three other cook-offs in the state. Now, there's a bunch. We did it with rules we've got. When I went to Meridan, Mississippi, ran the state cook-off there, we did it with the rules we've got. That one hasn't been real successful. But candidly, I don't think it has anything to do with the rules, it has to do with the beer distributor trying to toot their own horn. Correct me Darrell if I'm not correct there. I frankly don't see a problem. I think that if we modify the rules for anyone outside the State of Texas, then in effect, without a careful consideration, as to what specifically they are. I agree in concept with what you're saying, but it just has not yet been a problem, at least with the experience I've had and we've been able to work within it. So, I guess what I'm basically saying is that until it becomes a problem, I don't think that we have to really deal with it. Once it becomes a problem, then I think that's something the Great Peppers again need to deal with. They are the ones who are most familiar with chili. They're the ones who are most familiar with exactly what kinds of problems are presented by a specific rule or elimination of a rule. We have a committee, in fact, I serve on that committee that met last night and talked about the other states and at this point, we see no reason to give any special compensation for that group. However, at some future date, that committee may decide to. The basic point is it's not a problem as I see it right now.

(D.W.) It is a problem now.

(J.H.) Bill

(B.B.) Mike, I would like to ask you maybe one question, we won't go too much further than this. What year was it that you did the Mississippi, the Louisiana and the Arkansas in perspective?

(M.G.) Uh, help me Darrell. Let's see, when did y'all start? It was 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984.

(B.B.) Alright, 1981 the rules were written for 20 cooks for the State of Arkansas, because I was there as Great Pepper of Top of Texas and that rule was put into effect that year. Now, when it was rescinded Mike, I don't know. Bob Taylor might be able to tell us this.

(B.T.) '82 I believe.

(M.G.) I was also Regional Referee in Arkansas at that time and I know that every cook-off there had at least 25 cooks.

(J.H.) Hang on just a second, Mike. State your name please.

(R.J.) Rex Jones

(J.H.) Okay, Rex go ahead and talk.

(R.J.) I don't think this is relevant to getting the chili cooks . . .

(B.B.) Well, alright. Frankly, it's not. But I do want to say one more word. At least let me get my nickel in. I talk to approximately at least 6 to 10 hours a month to out-of-state chili cook-offs; State of Washington, Northern California, Mid-California, Arizona, Nevada and folks, they are so, they're wanting to get into this system and you are keeping them out and that's the end of my conversation. Until you reiterate your rules and look at it a different way, folks, you are going to keep them out. You are going to lock them out.

(D.W.) This is not true, they're to trying to be part of your team.

(J.H.) Alright that's on the record. And this is an issue for the Great Peppers to address for the promotion and good of the organization. And since Bill Brown has presented it, it now is before all of you. Alright, Ken.

(K.H.) Ken Hudspeth, Cowtown. I personally agree with the fact that this has been brought out. I think it's a valid point. I'm not sure I know what the answer is, even though I, it seems like Dusty and I travel an awful lot into the peripheral states being missionaries, if you will. I'd like to take this opportunity, with the approval of the rest of the Great Peppers that are here, I'd like to present the 1985 current rules with the changes that have been accepted by the assembled Great Peppers for what will be 1986 C.A.S.I. rules. I would request and make a specific request, I'm sorry, I've only got one copy, and make the specific request that since there are obviously individual items of disagreement, could we, the assembled Great Peppers request that you, the Tolbert group, being represented here, go through that, line item by line item, give us any changes, any requests for changes, that you would like to see. Maybe even with the wording of what the rules, the way the rules ought to read. Let that come under the advisement of the Great Peppers. Could I ask you to do that?

(TOLBERT GROUP) Yea

(K.H.) And have it back to mer personally, and I'll distribute it. I've got all the mailing lists and all that.

(B.B.) At what time?

(K.H.) Note later than October 1st.

(B.B.) You got it.

(K.H.) Can we do that?

(B.B.) You got it.

(K.H.) Because if we can do that, I can get it out to the Great Peppers. The Great Peppers will have it in their hands and have it available to take to their pods for discussion prior to the Terlingua cook-offs this year. There is a Great Peppers meeting, as there traditionally is, scheduled for Terlingua. These, we could be ready to vote on that at that time if you'll get them back to us. Question?

(B.B.) Thank you Ken.

(K.H.) Could I ask Ray specifically? One of the problems that any cook-off runs into, whether it's Cowtown or whether it's Terlingua, is the problem of sponsorship and their money. No cook-off can be successful without this sponsorship. It does not exist in this day and age. Is Wolf Brand willing to support one cook-off with money, as a sponsor?

(R.S.) It's been our tradition to promote chili. If you can promote chili as one cohesive group, I would see no reason why I would change my policy.

(J.H.) Next question from any of the Great Peppers. Come on, let's get everything out. We've got a good roll going here. If you have a question, get it out.

(L.BURRISS) Somebody ought to bring up the name, you know.

(J.H.) Alright, let's return to that then. It's a good point, the question of a name. Ken.

(K.H.) I didn't really, I was hoping I could do this in absolute closing, after all this is done. If you'd like to go into it, I'm prepared to propose to the Great Peppers, for their voting consideration, a motion, you can't call it a motion in this group. I'd like to suggest the following name that I think would be agreeable for everyone, I would hope this will be, I'd like any input back from the Great Peppers or any of the assembled directors. My suggestion for the name to follow after this coming down to a resolution would be "The, whatever number it is, Annual Wick Fowler/Frank X. Tolbert C.A.S.I. World Championship."

(D.W.) You can't use World

(R.S.) You can't use World. You can't use world.

(K.H.) Well, we can use anything we want to as long as it does not say "World Championship Chili Cook-off." I've had that cleared by lawyers. ICS can do nothing to us.

(D.W.) We were sued . . .

(K.H.) The only trademark they've got is World Championship Chili Cook-off. We can use this format, "The 19th Annual Wick Fowler/Frank X. Tolbert C.A.S.I. World Championship.

(D.W.) We'd love it.

(K.H.) That's legal.

(L.BURRISS) Let's do it.

APPLAUSE

(J.H.) Any more question about the name?

(V.Y.) No

(J.H.) Now then, next question from any of the Great Peppers. Ken, it's the second door to the left, Ken, as you go out.

(D.W.) Turn to the right.

(J.H.) Rex Jones

(R.J.) If an agreement is reached, can we count on your support and would you be willing to step down and let the Great Peppers run it? Did I read it right?

(D.W.) We're going to have to think about that one, Rex. We're going to have to have a meeting on it. I won't . . .

(G.T.) That's not exactly the way it read. Could I read it for my Great Pepper?

(J.H.) Yea, please read it.

(D.W.) Read it again.

(G.T.) If an agreement is reached, can each of you be counted on to support the new C.A.S.I. and relinquish your responsibilities and duties if necessary?

(D.W.) Right, that's much different.

(K.H.) Is that agreeable?

(D.W.) Sure.

(J.H.) The expression is crowded from the Tolbert group that if there is a new agreed to organization, single organization, they will transfer or relinquish their duties and responsibilities as they are now prior to a common group.

(D.W.) Now, there is another alternative to that. What about a third body? Third group to be in charge?

(K.H.) In charge of what?

(L.BURRISS) Don't know exactly what you mean.

(R. KNIGHT) We got two, why a third?

(K. H.) In charge of what?

(D.W.) Well, we're going to do away with this group and this group, so we're going to need a third group. Maybe three Great Peppers, three cooks.

(L. BOYD) You've got to have a neutral body.

(D.W.) You've got to have a neutral body.

(C.G.) How about if we combine the two?

(L. BOYD) That's what we're saying.

(D.W.) That's what we're saying.

(J.H.) In other words, a common group you're saying.

(D.W.) Right, a common group.

(C.G.) Okay.

(J.H.) Okay, does that . . . go right ahead and ask a question if you've got a question.

(C.G.) What would be required of the Tolbert Group to leave the governing bodies, the Great Peppers. You know, do you want three seats on the board, you know, if you can go in and we vote on you just like we would anybody else, we give you three seats on the board, for maybe three year terms, one, two, three, you know.

(K.H.) What are you asking us to do?

(D.W.) I'm not sure what you're asking us to do.

(B.B.) I'm not sure either. It's a . . .

(C.G.) We want to get you involved.

(B.B.) We are involved. It's the thing that we need to know, we've got to pick an avenue into which the two groups can come together as one to efficiently and to effectively put one cook-off in Terlingua. And as you well know, for the past two years neither group can agree on which restroom to use and we're now approaching this point. Now the thing may be that you may have to go and create a third body of whatever, maybe a governing group for Terlingua cook-off and everything else would function under C.A.S.I. rules. Because I have no qualms about C.A.S.I. rules as they are written except my talk with Mr. Gallagher. I think they're fine. But the fact is this particular thing may become a neutral situation where neither side, but the Great Peppers, can maybe talk about this, more than anybody else. They are persons that are going to run that cook-off, but there'll be governing body up there they'll have to answer to. And it won't be nobody on either side saying you can't, you know, you got to do it my way. It's what the third governing body would have to be. Yes Ken.

(K.H.) I guess I really don't understand. If you got, if you're saying to us that you're willing to accept the Great Peppers and the chili cooks running the cook-off and now you're saying you want a supervisory group telling chili cooks what to do.

(L. BOYD.) No.

(K.H.) Is that what you're saying.

(D.W.) Uh uh. No, we're not saying, no you're missing the whole boat. We're not saying that. . .

(K.H.) Pardon

(L. BOYD.) Ken, what we're saying, in order to keep this from ever happening again, in other words, no one group gets control, in other words, a bunch of you Great Peppers can't even get control, cause that can be done to manipulate that cook-off. What we're saying is that we set a neutral body or panel here to see to it that there is no more takeover by anybody. This stays to the cooks and the Great Peppers and the directors and us will pick a certain number of people to oversee that this does not happen. In other words, that we say, let's have two from each side as the governing body to oversee, to watch, to make sure that there's no more power plays from either side. Then you keep this thing neutral.

(K.H.) I guess my, I guess I still don't understand something. If we, the Great Peppers, are elected by the pods and I had to go through a political process to get, to get to be a Great Pepper and I can run a cook-off or our group, any one of these Great Peppers are responsible for some pretty major cook-offs.

(L. BOYD) This is true.

(K.H.) I don't understand, if we, the Great Peppers, elect the directors and we, the Great Peppers are responsible to our voting group and the directors are directly responsible to the Great Peppers, there's always going to be a power consortium in any kind, I don't

care whether they're elected or whatever, whatever you are, there are some people that are going to be more prominent than others. Are you telling, I mean, I don't know exactly how to say this. I don't understand the necessity of a supervisory group. I mean we've got an election process, we proved that this morning. There were three directors that wer just, I'm sorry, they were replaced. And that was done by the Great Peppers appointed by the chili cooks. I don't understand how you're going to prevent a power group from taking over without that group becoming a power group. In other words, you pick 2 and you pick 2. Isn't that what we're resisting? This is a democratic socity. They're not responsible, there's no, it's an appointed thing. We don't get to vote on them, if what I'm understanding, if what I'm hearing is what I understand. And I don't understand how that's democratic. How can, how can the Great Peppers be voted on the they vote on the directors and then we have two guys from here and two guys from here telling us that I can't be Great Pepper because I'm too, I'm too strong.

(B.B.) No, we're not saying that.

(D.W.) No, we're not saying that.

(J.H.) Okay, let's leave that question right there for just a second. Let's let somebody respong. Dick?

(D.W.) Well, the Great Peppers, Ken, can hold an office for one year. So they'd be involved in one Terlingua one yar. I don't think in one year, the new Great Pepper is going to be that versed in what goes on at Terlingua.

(K.H.) But the directors are the people that we vote to run Terlingua. That's there primary function. The directors run Terlingua. That's what we vote on. That's how we vote a director into being, as well as do the day to day of the C.A.S.I. group itself. Where's the problem?

(B.B.) Well, I think Ken, I think we need to roll the time back in to earlier this morning and come forward. I was not here all day to understand how y'all either restructured or how you do your appoinging of governors or whatever it is.

(D.W.) We didn't know that.

(B.B.) It's, we're not sure of your restructuring or who's responsible to who, or what. But I think the point is that we're going to have to look at this and I think that we can get back to the Great Peppers before October 1st. Yes, I understand what you've got here.

(K.H.) What I just gave Bill is a copy of the C.A.S.I. By-Laws by which we operate. And if you would treat those the same way as you treat the rules. Get back to us by October 1st. Let us get this disseminated to the Great Peppers, then we could all have a better picture. Give us what wording you would use and that'll give us a better . . . I guess I'm still fuzzy. I'm slow sometimes. I don't understand.

(B.B.) I understand. There's too much going on too quick.

(L. BOYD) Nobody knew what we were going to get into today anyway.

(K.H.) Including me.

(L. BOYD) You know and we want to be assured that from here on this thing, this cook-off will be as fair as it can be. Now y'all made some changes in your by-laws today that we're not aware of. Now, had we known that information before we got here, then this probably would never have been mentioned.

(K.H.) Okay, but would you agree to look at the by-laws?

(D.W.) Sure

(L. BOYD) Yes

(K.H.) Have them back to us by October 1st.

(L. BOYD) Yes

(L. BURRISS) There were no by-law changes today.

(K. H.) There were no by-law changes today, but this may be the first copy that you've seen. I don't know.

(D.W.) Well, it's true. It is, it's the first copy . . .

(K.H.) But if you'd treat these the same way you're treating the rules, i.e., give us your definition, tell us what you want. Tell us what you want it to say. Let the Great Peppers and the chili cooks decide. The continuing question that I have raised on both sides, that I still am not sure that I got an answer to is "Once you submit those to the Great Peppers, are you willing to, to . . ."

(J.G.) Abide by our decision.

(K.H.) Thank you.

(D.W.) Yes

(K.H.) Abide by the chili cooks and if they say "No guys, I'm sorry, we can't accept this." That's not me, I'm saying they take it to their pods. There are pod votes. They come to the Terlingua cook-off and we have another process similar to this and the guys have had an opportunity to get all this input and they say "No, we cannot accept that. Here's what we'd like to have." Are you guys willing to live with that?

(B.B.) Depends on what the answer is. You know, you're, you're telling me alot of "ifs" Ken. I mean, if we present to you what the changes are, you vote no, obviously, we're still back to point, you know, back . . .

(J.H.) Let me go one step further on that. If the Tolbert group responds regarding rules, the by-laws, whatever else the officers put before you. And if the Great Peppers issue a no, will the Great Peppers then take the responsibility of saying "Our answer is no, if you have a counter proposal, we will entertain that."

(K.H.) Oh, I think everything's negotiable. We just have . . .

(J.H.) I think that's the answer then. I think that's the answer, that it can be, something will be negotiated. Alright, yes sir, give your name please.

(B.R.) Bubba Reinke, Great Pepper, Purgatory Creek Pod. We have C.A.S.I. to represent the cooks. What way does the Tolbert group relate to the cooks? To the cook's wishes and what you feel those rules and regulations are?

(D.W.) If they've qualified, they have their 12 points, they're automatically invited to our cook-off.

(B.R.) How about, uh . . .

(D.W.) C.A.S.I., now if we have a Tolbert cook-off that C.A.S.I. doesn't recognize and someone gets their final point or whatever, they can't cook at C.A.S.I.

(B.R.) That's true.

(D.W.) We're accepting both sides. Okay? Whichever way the cook wants to go, that's his prerogative.

(J.H.) Ken?

(K.H.) Continuing question. I'm not sure that Bubba said, I think I heard what he said, but I'm not sure we were communicating. C.A.S.I. is set up so that the cook can feed me input that I can feed to the Board of Directors, President, Executive Director, other Great Peppers. What structure, what process do you have for me to feed you information about changes I would like to see. How can we do that?

(D.W.) Ken, this is our first meeting we've ever been invited to, a Great Pepper's meeting and we can start right from today on, and if you've got input, you need input, we'll be glad to put it back to you.

(J.H.) I'm not, the chair doesn't really understand your question either Ken.

(D.W.) I don't

(J.H.) I don't know what point you're trying to draw.

(K.H.) Let me give you a for example.

(J.H.) Alright

(K.H.) During the conversation one day in Ray Shockley's office,

26
my point blank question to Ray is "Before I put this to press," and I showed Ray a copy of the ad, proof of the ad that I anticipated running the August issue of the Goat Gap. And my question to Ray Shockley was is "I have not the slightest idea who the Tolbert directors are. Who are they? Who can I go to, as a concerned chili cook and say to you, I've got a concern that I would like to see you address?: And Ray said to me "We don't have any directors."

(D.W.) We don't.

(K.H.) But somebody, I mean, you know, okay, I . . .

(D.W.) We're not structured. You know, we're structured, but we're not structured. You're looking at them right here. We can make the decisions on the spot. We don't have . . .

(R.S.) We call meeting, invite whoever wants to come.

(D.W.) Right. We invite the Great Peppers for their input. I got one letter back from Lynn. I did not get another single letter from the rest of the Great Peppers. Each year I've invited the Great Peppers over to Behind the Store. Last year we had jackets for you. I'm not sure a Great Pepper come over to see us. So, I guess it's been lack of communications, Ken.

(K.H.) Could be.

(L.H.) Lynn Hejtmancik, SOT pod. Looks like there's a little mistrust still between the . . .

(??) Can't hear you good.

(L.H.) In being. . .

(K.H.) Stand up, Lynn.

(L.H.) Looks like a little bit of mistrust still perhaps between the 2 groups. And being as all of the C.A.S.I. directors, at this point, have not been voted on by the Great Peppers, some have been appointed, their term hasn't run out yet. If all of the Great Peppers, excuse me, if all of the C.A.S.I. directors were elected by the Great Peppers, could y'all abide by that decision? That is, by what the Great Peppers would say. Excuse me, wrong, by what the C.A.S.I. directors would say. I guess what it boils down to, if all of the C.A.S.I. directors were elected by the Great Peppers, whom were elected by the chili cooks, would you be satisfied or be happy with that type of situation?

(D.W.) Are you asking us to turn everything over to the C.A.S.I. directors?

(L.H.) If they were elected. . .

(D.W.) Is that what you're asking?

(L.H.) Well, not really. I'm just saying if they were elected by the chili cooks, would you feel more comfortable with that?

(B.B.) The directors?

(L.H.) The directors and as I think it was mentioned earlier today about part being here part there . . .

(D.W.) Do the chili cooks get involved in electing the directors?

(L.H.) They did today.

(D.W.) They did today. That's the first time and I didn't know about it.

(L.H.) What happens if all of the C.A.S.I. directors were elected by the Great Peppers?

(D.W.) That's still not the chili cook.

(L.H.) Okay, the chili cooks are represented by the Great Peppers.

(D.W.) By the Great Peppers.

(L.H.) The C.A.S.I. directors, whoever that may be, are represented, are elected by the Great Peppers. How would this feel? How would you feel towards something like that? Would it help, hinder, make any difference, not make any difference?

(B.B.) I would have to think about it. But I think I know what you're trying to say and um, I rather believe that if you can truly in your own hearts, Great Peppers, say that you're truly, truly, truly representing your chili cooks or your members of your pod in electing the Board of Directors for C.A.S.I. and you're going with the true feelings of your pod and not by your own advancement, then I would feel comfortable with it. But there's always a few people in any kind of organization that is there for self-advancement, be damned who they step on. And when you have that, then it throws the whole thing out of "sync" and it doesn't work the way you really want it to. Like electing a new House of Representatives or a State Senator or whatever. The first year that he is in office at Austin or Washington, he does his damndest to serve his people. The second year there, he is there, he has learned the ropes and he found out you don't go up there to serve the people, you serve that's there around you and what you can get done. So, it really gets back to the point, are y'all, in your own heart, because y'all are the Great Peppers, y'all are doing the voting on electing the Directors, truly representing the cooks. Now, if you want to say, "Let's ballot the cook", then we have another problem. All members of all pods, are they actually members of C.A.S.I., quote, quote? Is this part of the Constitution and By-Laws of each pod? That they are then, you might say, card-carrying C.A.S.I. members. Then that would be the persons that you would have to address this vote to. There are quite a few chili cooks in the

good world, in the State of Texas, that are not members of any pod, but yet, they go to cook-offs and they, to me, they have the same rights of choosing who they desire to govern them at Terlingua or anywhere else and what you're doing, you're taking a private organization, imposing it up on a public domain. And a chili cook-off, as far as I'm concerned, if you got your bucks to pay the entry fee and you've got your meat and your spices, you can cook, regardless of what color, creed or whether you belong to any organization. So folks, it's back down to the Great Peppers, if you're truly representing your pod and your own feeling of your pod is behind you and you're doing what you're doing, I have, I feel good about it and I can sleep with it.

(B.R.) Granted, those are things that you mentioned can certainly happen. I'm maybe disillusioned because I'm going to have to go back to my pod and say exactly what happened and why I voted on what. So I'm responsible to my pod. Maybe y'all aren't. So it could very well be . . .

(V.Y.) Do you have a better suggestion other than election?

(B.B.) I would like to say condolences, your loss.

(J.H) Question is, do you have a recommendation for a better internal control or guidelines regarding that area? Wasn't that it?

(V.Y.) Yes, other than elections.

(B.B.) Varrn, I don't right this minute. You know, I'm not a magic maker of things like this. I would, I think that internally here, some of these gentlemen can help and the Great Peppers can get input and from you and this board over here, can do it, can at least come up with a workable solution. It's gonna have to be that way.

(J.H.) Hang on just a second. Larry?

(L. BURRISS). Okay, I, there's, there's one thing that has not been brought out as an issue and at this point it really is not an issue, but it will have to come up at some time. If we find a vehicle to represent both the cooks and the parties involved in running the cook-off, however we manage to do that, that's satisfactory to everybody, what is, I guess what I'm trying to say is: Is this governing body, what do they do with the income derived therefrom? I realize there's expenses in running a cook-off and us, whoever puts up the front money for whatever site it happens to be is going to have to recoup that. What happens to the income after that? Will it be continued to run a cook-off, or will it be given, donated away, that that is not needed to run the next year's cook-off? What happens to the income from the cook-off itself?

(D.W.) I can answer . . .

24
(J.H.) Dick?

(D.W.) We had the American Legion last year as a sponsor and our second sponsor was the Tolbert's Writer's Fund. Okay, I think we came out with about \$600.00 for the American Legion and about \$400.00 for Cathlene. That was it. That was our profits.

(L. BURRISS) I realize that a cook-off has not been a money making situation. But I mean, this is something that would have to be . . .

(D.W.) It's a break even situation right now. We're just, we're just so glad we can pay the band, whatever, you know. Get out, stay out of debt.

(J.H.) I think the question is "If all great and fruitful things happen to us all and there is income there, what do you recommend or do you have a planned project for disposal of that excess income over and above expenses and the different funds and charities.

(D.W.) Speaking for this group, I feel part of it should go to the Tolbert Writer's Fund. That's how we're set up now. The rest of it can go to the Terlingua Medics or whoever.

(J.H.) Alright.

(D.W.) We need a bus real bad at Terlingua for the children

(J.H.) Larry, does that answer your question?

(L. BURRISS) Right. In other words, we, this would be, we do need to, in all the other agreements, we need to come to, we need to come to an agreement as to how the funds, excess, if there are any, how they would be disbursed.

(J.H.) Sure, favorable reaction. Everybody understand that one? Jim?

(J.G.) I think most of the cooks, getting back to the representation of the Great Peppers of their pods, I think Bill was very close to right. It is impossible for you to represent each and every member of your pod. I didn't vote for Carter, but that's you know, neither here nor there. You can't represent 100% but you can try to carry the majority of those wishes with you.

(L. BOYD) That's what we're asking. That you carry the percentage, the majority of your pods.

(D.W.) And some are going to make up their mind and go to either cook-off they want to, you know.

(L. BOYD) There ain't none of us that can make everybody happy.

(J.G.) No, no way.

(L. BOYD) So you can forget that.

(J.G.) On the issue of what to do with the funds. We cook for charity all year long, and all cooks, we were asked this out on the road last year by the roving reporter, would we be willing to sponsor a charity? Certainly, that's what we do all year long. And I think Dick's group, our group, C.A.S.I. group, that we all want to see some charity benefit from this. I think all we, it may be left up to the sponsoring group or pods as to what their charity may be. And we can follow their rules because usually, when we go to a cookoff, it generally is the promoter or the pod that will pick their particular charity that they want to serve. So, I think there's no question there. It's just a matter of covering your expenses and doing the best you can.

(J.H.) Ray?

(R.S.) Only comment I'd add is that we've all found Terlingua is not a very profitable event. I would like to see it profitable to the extent that you would be able to be self-funding. Because there are alot of things that are rather heavy, up-front charges, you know, in advance of every cook-off. Maybe, as you get bigger, I'd love to see a situation where you know, you could afford a, maybe a paid secretary or something like that. There's alot of correspondence, you know. I'm sure that we could uh, you know, obviously, we take care of the charity, but what I'd like to see is good fiscal management and good audits and you know, good approval of disbursements and real agreement among responsible people, that yes, we're going to sign this and that good audit business procedures are followed and that's all.

(J.G.) I think you will agree with me, Mr. Shockley, as a businessman, that it would be alot more profitable if we only have one cook-off with which to split the gate.

(D.W.) That's true.

(R.S.) I hear you. We would love it.

(J.H.) Go ahead.

V.Y.) You and I are not good businessmen, Ray. They just spent theirs on Larry Boyd. Incidentally, there is a complete 5 year audit available on C.A.S.I. funds up to 1984. It was compiled by a CPA and anyone is most welcome to look at it at any time they choose to do so.

(J.H.) Next question from one of the Great Peppers, please on the next issue. Yes sir.

(K.N.) Ken Novy, Hooch Pod, Oklahoma. I've heard quite a bit in the last 45 minutes. I'd like to have maybe both groups clarify once again the issues. There have been several issues come up since Ray had mentioned the five. Number two is, who is the Tolbert tallymaster or who tallies the points?

(D.W.) Mary Brown is our Tallymaster.

(K.N.) Is there any way we can get a list of who is qualified and how many points they got or something like that?

(B.B.) I believe I can address that since I let here live with me, Ken. How this works, the cook-off that are advertised in the Goat Gap, she sends a list out haveing the cook-off chairman to list the top 10 winners of chili and the top 3 in show. And our response is only as good as that of the chairman of those cook-offs. And where you get a stubborn chairman, you do not get any results. We have been, we have had some access to some of the sheets that were turned into C.A.S:I, where we are, actually what we were doing, we're duplicating 2 systems, or 1 system of tallymasters. Which, I, for one, it's a pain in the rear end. I think a central tallymaster and it'll, I think it'll work, but the thing is, we can get you a list, it'll, by October 1, okay.

(K.N.) If I could have the groups clarify once again the issues of what it's gonna take. There have been, as I said, several come up. Important issues, charity, judging, who's going to run it. Stuff like that. If we could clarify those.

(J.H.) How do you mean clarify? In what regards?

(K.N.) What are they?

(V.Y.) Restate

(J.H.) Restate them?

(K.H.) Rather than to take the time that we've got left to do that, at the beginning of the metting you had specifically requested that each group.

(J.H.) Yes

(K.H.) Individually or collectively, whichever

(J.H.) Whatever

(K.H.) They would prefer, give us as we leave the stage, we have clarified some processes right here, I think. Since we're going to do that anyway, it is going to be in writing format, in written format, can we publish that back to the Great Peppers through a mailing process, that I'm perfectly willing to do, rather than take the time to do that? Is that agreeable Ken?

(K.N.) Yes

(K.H.) As long as we get it back to the Great Peppers, that's what he's saying.

(J.H.) Ray, Varn, Larry, Richard, Dick?

(K.H.) Is that fine? I think that's fine. Excuse me, go ahead.

(B.B.) Can I ask just one question of Ken? How soon do you want this?

(K.H.) Oh, I'd love to have, I'd like to have the list before you guys leave the state.

(B.B.) Well, it's really hard to sit down here and write and listen to comments and make comments back.

(K.H.) Okay.

(B.B.) But we do know what the issues are and we will respond to what has been responded here. Lady down here and there's a tape going over here so if the response is contrary to that, then you can correct us or anyone else on this panel of what our responses are. What I'm saying. . .

(J.H.) Could we, could we . . .

(R.S.) Could I relate back to what Larry Burriss said in his opening address. Larry, I believe you told them there would be no decisions made today. You would have to get back to your Great Peppers.

(L. BURRISS) Oh, I don't think that's a problem.

(R.S.) But you're asking us to make decisions and he's not going to make any decisions.

(J.H.) Would it be appropriate . . .

(L. BURRISS) No, I think, I think what he's asking is that this group sitting up here kind of, at least, specify in writing, what the issues, what we feel the issues are.

(J.H.) Yes

(D.W.) Okay

(L. BURRISS) Isn't that what you're asking?

(K.H.) That's what really we're asking.

(K.N.) Something we can build on, something we can start on, something we can sort of finish on.

(J.H.) Alright, I understand what you're saying Ken. But let me, let me suggest, if that is something that you feel is not something you want to address this afternoon or you'd like a better atmosphere to discuss it and decide whether you'd like, what course you'd follow. Could we entertain some discussion perhaps for a deadline for submission of that information? A week from today, 2 weeks from today, something so we can get it resolved?

(K.H.) Is a week sufficient?

(D.W.) Probably no. It's just not short a time Ken. We all have jobs.

(K.H.) I guess the point is, the sooner we can get it back, the sooner we can get it to the Great Peppers.

(D.W.) You probably wanted it yesterday. We just don't have that much time.

(K.H.) Hell, I wanted it 2 years ago.

(B.B.) Thank you, Ken.

(J.H.) Alright, it's the 7th, then the 22nd, 2 weeks?

(D.W.) Yea, that sounds more reasonable.

(J.H.) 2 weeks guys, Larry?

(D.W.) Let's see. We got to October 1 on these 2 things. Now we're gonna . . .

(J.H.) The reason

(D.W.) Can't we do it all at one time?

(J.H.) My impression is that there's a little bit more priority attached to this respective to the issues to take back to everybody. Is that what I'm hearing from you? Am I correct in drawing that conclusion?

(B.B.) No, I don't agree with it at all. The thing is that what we've said here today is also pending on what's in here also. So, therefore, we need to give a full and complete answers to where there will be no doubts left out there. No hanging.

(K.H.) So the bottom line is that you're feeling that October 1st would be a good date for all this.

(J.H.) Submission of all this?

(D.W.) Yes, right.

(K.H.) That way we can put it out to the Great Peppers all at once.

(B.B.) That's right.

(L. BOYD) You get it at one lick.

(B.B.) And I think don't piecemeal it.

(K.H.) Is there any objection from the Great Peppers? Is that soon enough?

(D.W.) Well, this is the middle of September now.

(J.H.) Alright, then is the concensus of it then, come October 1st, next meeting, that all the information relative to the issues, the rules, constitutional by-laws, officers, directors, umbrell organization, everything else that has been talked about will be submitted for discussion? Bob?

(R.B.) This sounds like it's all directed to them. I'd like to see the same thing out of C.A.S.I.

(J.H.) That's we, that's exactly what we're talking about. Question?

(J.G.) Just a question. Did Bill, do y'all have the addresses and names of all the Great Peppers that you should be sending this stuff to?

(K.H.) That's all, I presume, we started this out with the conversation that you guys would get back with me and I would distribute it.

(B.B.) If you would leave us your name and address, telephone number, measurements, whatsoever, vital statistis.

(K.H.) You'd rather have my wife's. You don't want mine.

(D.W.) And you know, no exceptions Ken.

(K.H.) I'm sorry.

(D.W.) No exceptions.

(K.H.) To?

(D.W.) Well, our meeting was scheduled for the 14th and here it is, we had it the 7th. No changes.

(K.H.) Well, I think anything that you read in here, you're going to have an awful tough time changing.

(J.H.) The whole world knows the next meeting regarding this is going to October 1.

(B.B.) I don't really think so.

(J.H.) For submission of all this material we just made reference to.

(B.B.) Yes, but I want . . .

(J.H.) Chair stands corrected. Thank you.

(R.I.) In order to clarify something for me that I can take back to our pod. I'm Richard Irman, Houston pod. We all know we're here for one reason, is to come to a conclusion to have one cook-off in Terlingua. A peaceful and harmonious and possibly more profitable event. Okay, it can be done, we know we can do it.

It's delayed in coming. Are we —, and I hope the answer will be yse, are we also here to bond ourself, not only as having one Terlingua cook-off, but back together as one group. Or is it always going to be a C.A.S.I group and is it always going to be a Tolbert group. I mean, as you understand now how the C.A.S.I. cook-off is run in Terlingua, the pods elect the Great Peppers, the Great Peppers elect the Board of Directors and such. But the Great Peppers run the cook-off through their directos that we -ave now. Alright, will this eventually, and I'm saying this to both sides, there will be, I hope, directors from Tolbert, directors from C.A.S.I., to where there's not a Tolbert/C.A.SI. or where we have a group all represented? Is this also our goal? To have one chili world in Texas rather than C.A.S.I. and Tolbert?

(L. BURRISS) I cook next to people that go one way, and I go the other or however, throughout the year, as well as everybody does. As far as I know, nobydy's wearing nametags. In the early years they did. There was an awful lot of animosity. I think we've gotten through that state of it. I think the answer to your question: Most definitely, if there's one cook-off, one world championship at Terlingua, there'a also one chili world.

(R.I.) Mr. Shockley? Do you agree with that?

(R.S.) I thought that's why we were here.

(R.I.) So far all we've talked about is having one Terlingua and who's going to run it. And I am, just like I've said, this is why we're here, to have not one Terlingua, but one chili world in the State of Texas.

(J.H.) Well, the chair takes the position that early on in comments coming from both sides of the table, there were expressions that there were areas for common agreement for one single, unified group. I think I heard that unless I'm mistaken. Did I leave the room? Just a second. That was the expression that I hear. Just a second now. Dick?

(D.W.) Ray King's resigning as President, but he still owns the company. He's got to resign his company too. He's not going to do that.

(J.H.) Alright

(K.H.) Is this a new condition?

(D.W.) No.

(AUDIENCE) We didn't hear that.

(R.K.) Speak up Dick, I'd like to hear that one again.

(J.H.) Dick, if you would, just go ahead and make the statement again. Hopefully, we'll get some clarification.

(R.K.) And uncover your mike before you say it Dick.

(J.H.) No, it's open, the mike's not covered.

(B.B.) No, it's not covered at all over here Ray.

(R.K.) I just wanted to hear it again. I thought I heard you, but I wasn't sure.

(D.W.) Well, maybe it's in here Ray, but I haven't read this yet.

(B.B.) I think . . .

(D.W.) But you still own the company, correct?

(R.K.) Own the company?

(D.W.) You're incorporated, you and Judy and who else is on it? No names are on it? Your charter?

(R.K.) Oh our, on our charter? Our charter doesn't have my name on it. I was the original person registered. But that belongs to the new Secretary-Treasurer whenever I gave that position up.

(D.W.) So when you're resigning as President, you are resigning totally.

(R.K.) I didn't resign. I didn't run for President again.

(D.W.) Okay.

(R.K.) They voted for somebody else.

(D.W.) See, this is just, it's new to us today, Ray.

(R.K.) But as of right now, I have no title as an officer.

(D.W.) Okay.

(K.H.) You are a Director.

(R.K.) I am a director.

(B.B.) Of what?

(V.Y.) C.A.S.I.

(B.B.) Okay.

(R.K.) I have another year, 2 years left on the term, then I'm out and I'm gone.

(J.H.) Alright, did that address your question, Dick? Alright.

(C.G.) I don't think alot of people heard the question.

(J.H.) Okay, you want to restate the question. It related to a question by Dick Wright of Ray King having resigned his position. But the additional question was, had he resigned as owner of the Company. Is that correct, Dick?

(D.W.) Right

(J.H.) Correct. And Ray, your answer was?

(R.K.) There is no company. There is an organization called C.A.S.I.

(D.W.) Well, I'm going back when Paul Smith, M. Smith, Judy King and Ray King . . .

(R.K.) That one was done away with in 1983.

(D.W.) I haven't seen the new one then. See, I didn't know that.

(R.K.) It's on record.

(L. BURRISS) Who are the signers of the charter?

(R.K.) Uh, Mickey Roth.

(PAT IRVINE) I've got it in the room upstairs.

(L. BURRISS) To answer your questions, Ray is on the current Board of Directors.

(J.H.) Richard

(R. KNIGHT) I, there's been some passing back and forth here between the C.A.S.I. Charter, C.A.S.I. By-laws, the C.A.S.I. rules. I, as one, would like in return by October 1, to see the charter, By-Laws and rules of the Tolbert group in the packet.

APPLAUSE

(J.H.) Do you gentlemen have a response to that? There had been an earlier statement from Ray that the Tolbert group was an unstructured organization that welcomed any and everybody in essence. Do you have further . . .

(B.B.) I think you'll find that's still true.

(J.H.) Do you have some rules, by-laws, constitution for sufficient purposes/

(B.B.) If you're unstructured you don't have it Joe. I mean, you know, it's quite simple.

(D.W.) We are not that structured.

(R. KNIGHT) Are you incorporated?

(D.W.) No.

(B.B.) We're out to promote chili cooks.

(D.W.) And have fun.

(B.B.) Have fun.

(R.I.) What are your rules when in the advertisement that we see in the Goat Gap and in all fairness to both sides, alot of them are advertised as CASI/TOLBERT rules. Don't you pretty much go with what we have existing as the CASI rules?

(D.W.) 99%!

(B.B.) There's two exceptions.

(D.W.) There's two exceptions of the 1%.

(B.B.) Go ahead Dick, I'm sorry.

(D.W.) Go ahead.

(B.B.) Go ahead, Dick.

(D.W.) I see we went to nineteen to 18 years. There's been some things in the past where a 12 year old boy from Virginia won the State of Virginia cook-off, but he was accompanied by his father, who's a lawyer. I see no reason why he shouldn't cook. Same thing happened to Bill Newsom's son. He won, he qualified for Terlingua and Ray King said he's not 18 or 19 at that time, and he couldn't cook. That's one exception we've made.

(K.H.) Those rules that you currently have a copy of specifically address age limited.

(D.W.) Right

(K.H.) As voted by the Great Peppers.

(D.W.) Cooks must be 18 years and older.

(K.H.) And you are going to respond to that, so that's all.

(D.W.) Right

(K.H.) Okay

(R.I.) Okay.

(B.B.) Let's take a few more steps down the path. Tolbert, if you want to call it Tolbert rules, don't require a remittance of 50¢ per cook. And for these cook-offs that are in outlying areas and states that are not able to muster enough of them in one year, one Terlingua year, to accumulate 12 points, it was

reduced to the 6 point system. And hu, we recognize that throughout. Now, if in the State of Texas, the 12 point system is still intact, now, if Ken Novy comes down and he cooks (switched tapes, lost part of the conversation.) The out of state end of it, because the rules restricted quite a few people that would dearly love to come to Terlingua and try their, put their mark on the world. And, if we're out promoting chili folks, I think we're really doing a damn bad job of it if we restrict the rules of letting people not be able to cook. You have to sometimes mold your rules to accept this, but as the cook-offs are becoming more frequent in their particular state, then you may rescind it and make them work strictly off of what is apropos to the State of Texas. And that's the ned of my conversation.

(J.H.) Ken.

(K.H.) These rules are something that you guys are going to address to the Great Peppers as a result of this meeting.

(B.B.) Yes.

(K.H.) That we will get back to. And I hope you don't mind going on because it is 5 o'clock.

(B.B.) That's fine.

(K.H.) I have one question that I'd really like to have answered before we start trying to wrap up. I've heard the statement there is no charter, there is no group and yet, because of all the hearsay, inmuendos, the rumors, the gossip, the bullshit that's gone on for the last 2 or 3 years, most of the chili cooks understand that there is a group known as OWCAT.

(D.W.) Forget it.

(K.H.) What's happened with that?

(R.S.) It had world in it. We got sued.

(K.H.) Are you saying to me that . . .

(R.S.) That it's no longer in existence.

(K.H.) So that's not an entity that we're going to have to try to deal with somewhere down the road?

(D.W.) No, that's already done.

(L. BOYD) No, that's gone.

(B.B.) Let me maybe clear up a little bit right here. Say that there's no groups out there, but they just want to, for name's sake, call something something, like Chili Appreciation Society International, acronym would be CASI or however you want to pronounce it. Although it isn't really attached to any form

of government or organization, but it's just what everybody wanted to call it. Now, this is exactly how this OWCAT business got started. Someone looked at all of the initials across through there and that sounded great, OWCAT. Well, for some reason or another, some decided to say, "Hey, this is an organization." Well, it wasn't. All it was, was a group that has a title up there that has no structure.

(V.Y.) Was it not incorporated?

(B.B.) No sir, it surely wasn't.

(D.W.) No.

(V.Y.) State has it on file.

(D.W.) It was incorporated, but it's not now.

(B.B.) It's been, I think it was probably for one year, Varn, but or so, it's . . .

(D.W.) 8 or 10 months, whenever we had the lawsuit to drop world, we dropped it.

(B.B.) I don't believe, it's not re-instated.

(V.Y.) You don't pay franchise taxes?

(D.W.) No.

(V.Y.) You don't pay renewal fee?

(B.B.) Pat, correct me, I believe if you don't renew every year with the Secretary of State, then it becomes an inactive company or . . .

(D.W.) Seven years, isn't it?

(P.I.) That is correct, if you don't pay your franchise tax.

(B.B.) Okay, it becomes inactive, okay.

(J.H.) Okay, let's entertain a couple of questions here. We're on our deadline. If you have some questions, please let's get them out right now. Ken.

(K.N.) Ken Novy, Hooch Pod, Oklahoma. I think we've got the ball rolling. It sounds like it. After these letters and issues and everything due to come back to Ken and Ken distributes them to the Great Peppers and to the pods and everything, when can we have another meeting to get down to . . .

(K.H.) Terlingua

(K.N.) Terlingua

(K.H.) There is a Great Peppers meeting scheduled for Terlingua.

(R.S.) That's really a bad time to try to resolve anything because we're all so busy.

(K.N.) Yea, that's true.

(R.S.) You know, it's just not a good time. We tried to do it once before and it just didn't work out. I didn't want Frank Tolbert driving back in the mountains after dark. And for some reason, between Harry Comer and Kasey Kirby, they never got the message and those gentlemen stayed in a cafe for an hour, two hours, whatever. It's just a busy time for everybody.

(K.N.) Don just mentioned, what about the day after?

(D.W.) I don't know about you, but I'm pretty damned tired. I'm driving back like on Monday or Tuesday.

(K.N.) But we're going to have to get together sometime.

(J.H.) Ken, just a second Vann.

(D.W.) Yea, let's pick a weekend somewhere.

(V.Y.) I would suggest that after the Great Peppers meeting, which hopefully, there will be some things put together to bring back to both groups, that the Great Peppers could designate someone to arrange a meeting with the both groups in the very near future, near future being in 1985.

(K.H.) Is it not possible that since we've got the Great Peppers here, we've got this group of directors and this group of representatives, why can we not find a day at this point far enough in advance of everybody's schedule that it would be sceduleable?

(B.B.) Have you got a calendar?

(L. BOYD) Yea, we need to look at something.

(V.Y.) I would like to say on behalf of the board of directors, I would like to thank everyone who helped get this thing together. I salute you. I can assure you if you want one Terlingua, keep the people moving off of dead center, it will be done. Thanks again. Thank you for attending.

(J.H.) Thank you Vann.

(L. BURRISS) I'd like to also make one point. There have been quite a few meetings going on prior to this one. And one reason that the Great Peppers were not notified as to anything that was going on, because at that time, I think we all felt we were negotiating, but we didn't have anything to bring back to the pods. We had nothing to report at that time. And that's basically . . .

(D.W.) Larry, I'll go back to Temple and we could have made a decision at Temple, but you said you couldn't. You had to consult your Great Peppers.

(L.B.) We stated that when we started.

(D.W.) Right, so if you had had the Great Peppers there, we would probably had something more resolved than now.

(L. BURRISS) I just wanted it to be known that Great Peppers were not notified because there was no decisions made.

(D.W.) I think the Great Peppers should be very involved in every meeting.

(J.H.) Let me, I've got a slip of paper and I need some, uh, a little clarification. This is a question regarding the majority of the C.A.S.I. directors, right now, new directors. The majority of CASI directors, what is their election status right now? Have they been elected by the Great Peppers, not elected by the Great Peppers, approved by the Great Peppers? What is exactly the status of the directors and their position right now? Larry?

(L. BURRISS) There are 4 that have been elected. There are 5 that were original members.

(J.H.) Are they on carry-over terms or what?

(L. BURRISS) Serving out their terms. And they were not elected originally.

(J.H.) In other words, the weren't running this time.

(R. KING) Except for the new ones.

(J.H.) Okay, does that answer your question?

(D.W.) Uh uh.

(J.H.) Jim?

(J.G.) Space City Pod would like to invite Tolbert, Dick, Brown, Larry, Shockley, to the Great Peppers meeting where we will discuss y'all's input. The meeting will probably last an hour and you can sit in and listen to what's going on and then you won't have any surprises such as you had today. You will be in on the meeting. Would that be . . . Would the Great Peppers like to have them at Terlingua, just to sit in and see what kind of input and discussion?

(L. BURRISS) If they are available, now we both . .

(R.S.) That's another problem, Jim.

(J.H.) Everybody's going to be jumping through hoops at Terlingua, I think . . .

(J.G.) . . . anything but to just sit in and maybe, like hear what's going on, we want to . . . or a representative.

(J.H.) Yea, representative, that was going to be my next question, representative. Ken.

(K.H.) Continuing with this idea that there will be some answers coming back at the Great Peppers meeting from the pods hopefully, that's out intent. Bill has suggested, or the representatives of Tolbert, have suggested that at the Terlingua meeting of the Great Peppers, which we now have extended an invitation to, at least one of you to attend. At that time, there will be, there will be a date set for which these things will be brought back in front of an open group, after the Tolbert representatives hadve had a reasonable opportunity to pursue the ideas that are being presented at Terlingua. I would hope and I would implore all of you to consider the time constraint of not more than 30 days after that meeting. We cannot go all the way to June of next year and then all of a sudden, say we're going to have one cook-off. We can't do it.

(D.W.) Pick a date between after the cook-off and Thanksgiving. we'll try to be there.

(K.H.) Thanksgiving weekend would be marvelous.

(D.W.) Wouldn't it though. I'll be out of town.

(L. BOYD) No, he said sometime between the time we get back and before Thanksgiving weekend. You got 2 weekends in there before Thanksgiving.

(K.H.) What's the weekend before Thanksgiving?

(B.B.) The 15th.

(D.W.) The 9th, or 16th is a Saturday.

(K.H.) Would you be receptive to the 16th? Understanding that the 6th you're going to hardly be home?

(D.W.) That's right.

(K.H.) Given 2 weeks to digest what's gone on, what's been said, what suggestions . . .

(D.W.) 16th is fine, I think.

(K.H.) So the next meeting that we can anticipate will be November 16th on, that's a Saturday.

(D.W.) And where, you know?

(K.H.) I think probably . . .

(J.H.) Time and date determined later.

(K.H.) We could, we could probably decide that, but since the bulk of the group that's represented here is in the North Texas area, I would suggest somewhere in North Texas, but that can be refined. And I would be delighted to try to work as liason to get that, to make that happen.

(J.H.) Larry?

(L. BURRISS) I hate to bring this up, but there may be a possible conflict with quite a few of us on that particular weekend. That specific weekend.

(??) There is another weekend before Thanksgiving. The 23rd.

(B.B.) Well, that is Thanksgiving, isn't it?

(AUDIENCE) NO

(D.W.) No, the 28th.

(B.B.) The 28th, oh, okay.

(D.W.) The 28th is Thanksgiving.

TOO MUCH CONVERSATION TO UNDERSTAND

(K.H.) Will the 23rd work?

(B.B.) Sure

(J.H.) Gentlemen?

(B.B.) I don't have any problems with it.

(D.W.) The 23rd is fine with us.

(J.H.) Okay, how about you? CASI directors, 23rd okay?

(CASI DIRECTORS) Okay.

(J.H.) Okay, that having been resolved. All of the issues, particularly the submission of information to the Tolbert representatives to the next meeting. The next meeting is going to be Great Peppers. They're going to submit the information by October 1st. During Terlingua weekend, when the Great Peppers meet, they have invited the entire Tolbert representation or a representative to be with them at Terlingua. The next formal meeting at which time all the issues are to be addressed that have been submitted hereto today, will be the date of November 23rd, somewhere in North Texas. Have we resolved any further than that? We'll settle that later. Place to get everybody together. The time has just run away from us. I think there is momentum coming out of this meeting. It is a momentum going in one direction. I certainly hope taht it continues. I thank all of you very much for your contribution. If I don't see anybody formally before Terlingua, I'll see somebody on the chili trail somewhere.

(?) CONVERSATION CANNOT BE HEARD.

(J.H.) You betcha.

(K.H.) I'd like to uh, it takes a lot of guts for these guys to sit up here and take all the heat that this program offered the potential of. I, personally, in trying to do all of this have received nothing but absolute cooperation from everybody. I don't want any misconceptions about, about one group not being receptive to what's happening. But there are some things that these Great Peppers have been charged with. I'd like to clarify that. If there's any misconceptions on any part, let's take care of it right now, before we all go away and all this information is disseminated. Item 1: Great Peppers, you've got to go back to your pods with the suggestion that the name shall be "The (whatever number) Annual Wick Fowler/Frank X. Tolbert CASI World Championship" that needs to be voted on by the pods. We need that information back.

(D.W.) Ken, you're real sure about world?

(K.H.) Yes sir.

(D.W.) I don't want lawsuits.

(K.H.) As long as it does not say "World Championship Chili Cook-off" It can say World Championship, but not say chili cook-off.

(D.W.) Are you going to consult Jim West? I believe I would.

(K.H.) Jim West soon, probably will be in town soon.

(D.W.) Why don't you ask him?

(K.H.) I think that's possible. At the same time, Cowtown is represented by a legal entity and we will go back to him, but that's where my information came from. I don't have the documentation. I did not present it to him. I could only get the input. Item 2: Tolbert representatives are to come back to us, meaning the Great Peppers, by October 1st, regarding rules and by-laws with suggested copies, with suggested changes which they currently have copies of. Item 3: The Great Peppers are to actively solicit a vote from their pod on what site would be acceptable. Are we, as chili cooks, agreeable to going to Villa de la Mena? Is that the wishes of the cooks? Can we go Behind the Store? Is it going to absolutely mandate for a, for a third and neutral site? We have to know that. Item 4: It has been agreed that the next meeting, the next total meeting, between all of these people will be November 23, 1985. The site is to be determined. However, they are invited to have representation at the Great Peppers meeting, which is the point that their chili cooks, the chili cooks will have the voice to say what they've got to say.

(D.W.) Ken, what time are you going to have it?

(K.H.) On November 23rd or at the Great Peppers meeting?

(D.W.) At Terlingua.

(R.K.) 3:00 on Friday is normally . . .

(K.H.) 3:00 on Friday is the normal Great Peppers meeting. Is there a problem with that?

(D.W.) Well, we have our spaghetti-off Friday evening. What time do we normally have it?

(K.H.) 3:00

(D.W.) That might be okay.

(K.H.) I cannot, I cannot express enough appreciation for all the effort that has been exhibited here today. This ain't easy. It's obvious that it hasn't been easy the last 3 years. I think everybody here deserves a hell of a pat on the back.

(R.I.) This vote you want from the pods about the place and so forth and so on, when do you need that or when are we supposed to get this information?

(K.H.) That has to be part of the Great Peppers meeting at Terlingua.

(R.I.) At Terlingua, alright.

(K.H.) We have to have answers. We have to have answers. How can we respond?

(R.I.) That's just what I wanted to know what you're asking. In other words, we're going to have to do it in September or October meetings.

(K.H.) Is that insufficient time?

(R.S.) Can I ask a question? I'm not clear. Will these folks have a chance to look at the site over there? Before, are you voting before you look at it or not? I'm mixed up.

(J.G.) I think if uh, all the Great Peppers we're representing a lot of cooks that have never been to Terlingua. And we're going to have to paint them a very accurate, or as accurate as we possibly can and be unbiased in doing so. The pluses and minuses of Villa de la Mena, the pluses and minuses of Behind the Store and especially the third option of a third cook-off and the expense of putting up the groundwork and stuff. You're going to have to be very fair in doing this to your pod members and try and let them make the decision and not you. A lot of people have already been there. Try to be as uninfluential as you can, but be fair and unbiased in describing both sites. I think that's the only way you could possibly do it. Cause we represent a lot of people that have never been down there and they have no idea of the lay of the land unless maybe, they've been to Big Bend National Park or something like that.

(K.H.) What are you suggesting Jim?

(J.G.) I'm suggesting that you go to the people in your pod and try to describe ?? You might take a poll of how many people. In my pod, it's not too hard, difficult. Most of our people have been there. But we're getting new cooks in the pod all the time, and which, we're, boy we're proud of that. Keep building membership and you know the chili is going in that state. But you're going to have to put it to you people, the topography of the ground or the layout of the ground out there, both at Villa de la Mena and Behind the Store, as you know it. If you've never been Behind the Store, or if you've never been over at Villa de la Mena then you're going to be in a little bit of trouble. Maybe y'all try to be as unbiased as you possibly can.

(K.H.) Are you suggesting we postpone the vote on site?

(J.H.) Well, maybe we vote, might take a poll or something. Say a straw vote maybe, or something like that for the people that have been there.

(D.W.) Can I make a suggestion?

(K.H.) Sure Dick.

(D.W.) Everybody's invited to come Behind the Store at Terlingua to look at our site. We will send our people over to look at your site, alternative site, or whatever. I think that's the time to do it.

(J.G.) Yea, what he's saying though, Dick, is that we go back to our pods after this meeting, you know and ask our pods to vote on a potential site. I don't think that . . .

(D.W.) I don't know how they can do it if they've not even been there.

(K.H.) Could we get a . . .

(R.S.) We don't even have a toilet. We're putting in our equipment and all that right now.

(B.B.) What I'd like to know, is how can they vote on something they ain't never saw? You know, especially, I don't even, I haven't even seen the alternate site, you know.

(K.H.) Ken

(K.N.) Do y'all have a picture or an aerial view or something that can be duplicated in some way?

(B.B.) I can, I've got a hand sketch that I made last year to put the cooks into an order of some sort. I have duplicated it again this year. I can get it into a reproductive form. And it can be mailed out to all the Great Peppers that are here in this forum today.

40
(K.N.) Okay. Last year I visited both areas and I did take some pictures that would help the pods to understand what sites we're talking about.

(K.H.) Can you get those to me by October 1 in duplicate?

(K.N.) I can get, I've got the negatives. In fact, I've got the pictures with me today. If we wanted to sit down and maybe you and I or something and figure out which pictures would be best. I have the negatives and everything that we could get run off and get them, send them out.

(J.H.) Bill

(B.B.) I think I think Ken earlier said that if this thing ran 5:30, we're going to have to be running to the door. You also made mention that you had some suites upstairs. I have with me today, the hand, my eye conception of what we put down there last year and how we laid out and what we propose this year in the car. And the Great Peppers are welcome to look at it. It's an overlay that we show how we can set the cooks in. And of course, there are a lot of cooks that like to cook at their tables and booths and so forth. And we're wanting input from them where they would like to cook. We're flexible in that area, so that's why I have an overlay. We can redesign this thing any way we need to be able to be flexible and please, anybody that wants to cook Behind the Store for 1985. Now, if this can be used to determine what you want to do for 1986, fine and dandy. I can make a permanent reproduceable for anybody here and mail them all out copies that they need to present to their pod. This size, this size, or this size, it don't make any difference. I can get it for you.

(K.H.) I hate to draw this to a close. I'm awfully sorry. We've run out of time. There are a couple of things just in passing. Hospitality suite, the room number is 1926. That's the . . .

(R.B.) (Cannot hear the conversation)

(K.H.) That's the only place we've got.

(R.B.) Where's our cash bar at?

(K.H.) They're setting it up in . . . I'm sorry, look on the agenda. Charlie Brown is saying right over here. It's called the Irving Room? That would be a marvelous place to do it. Two things I'd like to cover real, real quick. Thank you, specators, for being as patient and as marvelous as you have. Thank you, Joe Holstead, I can't believe the job he's done. Meeting is adjourned.

K.H. Ken Hudspeth
G.T. Gerald Terry
J.H. Joe Holstead
R.B. Robert Bell
R.K. Ray King
L. BURRISS Larry Burriss
V.Y. Varn York
R. KNIGHT Richard Knight
R. S. Ray Shockley
B. B. Bill Brown
J. G. Jim Graves
D.W. Dick Wright
R.I. Richard Imman
C.G. Carol Gibbs
M.G. Mike Gallagher
B.T. Bob Taylor
R.J. Rex Jones
L. BOYD Larry Boyd
L.H. Lynn Hejtmancik
B.R. Bubba Reinke
K.N. Ken Novy
P.I. Pat Irvine