



# WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE FELLOWSHIP REPORT

March, 1988

**To:** The Fellowship

**From:** Leah Goodrich, Chairperson  
World Service Conference

By now every region should be well on their way to finishing examination of the Agenda Report for the Conference. This report contains some last minute information that may be helpful to some members, areas and regions. There is a lengthy and detailed report from the Literature Chairperson that gives a comprehensive background to the Fourth Edition matter. Exercise some effort to assure that areas that have taken an active interest in this matter receive a copy of his report at the earliest possible moment.

The matter of Conference finances is one that deserves special attention. While there has been disagreement among some world level trusted servants about the procedures for Conference funding, there is no doubt that money is needed to operate the activities of the Conference. There are three important tasks that the Conference needs to address concerning finances.

**Prioritizing the use of available funds:** The Joint Administrative Committee, ACTING as the Conference Finance Committee should be able to sufficiently handle recommending priority spending. After all, the Joint Administrative Committee is composed of the Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of our committees and boards who are responsible for the work and responsible for spending the money. If the job of managing Conference spending cannot be accomplished by this group of people, God help us, because a finance committee that was composed of other people would end up controlling the activities of committees by budget control procedures.

**Improving the fund flow system:** The Fellowship has responded heroically to the need for additional Conference funding. When the alarm was raised last summer, there was doubt that sufficient funds would be available. As detailed in the Treasurers Report the Fellowship has met the need. The major difficulty that arose was in being able to project the availability of funds and match that with the planning necessary for proper committee operation. In several cases Committees were unable to plan sufficiently in advance for some of their meetings. From an examination of the Minutes of area and regional committees, there is ample evidence that the Fellowship still has adequate funds for their work and more than enough funds to continue funding the Conference. The Conference may take action to improve the fund flow system so that scheduling Conference work can improve.

=====  
**MAY BE DUPLICATED AND DISTRIBUTED TO N.A. MEMBERS**  
=====

Evaluating the work the Conference pays to have completed: The allocation of funds to committees should be thought of as an investment in the work of the committee. The Conference needs to evaluate the work committees are doing and be satisfied that all of it is of such priority that it requires funding from the Fellowship. For example it seems we spend an awful lot of money simply to write guidelines that then get changed the next year. While the Convention Corporation folks may not spend a lot of money to get their work done, they keep forwarding large amounts of guidelines to the Fellowship for review each year. The Conference might find it just as real for the Fellowship to have the Convention Corporation folks propose the issues they want in general terms or philosophical statements. If the statements were approved by the Fellowship then the Convention folks would then write the guidelines accordingly. It might save the Fellowship a lot of wasted time and probably some money.

I would like to encourage new Conference participants to attend the orientation session on Sunday afternoon. The new parliamentarian is expected to be there and it will be a good opportunity to learn more about how the work gets done. Additionally I am hopeful that voting participants will take advantage of the Monday General Forum in order to get off their chests what may be in their thoughts and concerns. It will help us be able to get the work done the rest of the week.

I have learned from the WSO that there are some recent developments with business matters that have come up all of a sudden that need to be addressed at this Conference. So bring your patience and understanding.

Finally, I would like to thank the members of the Administrative Committee and the Chairpersons, Vice-Chairpersons and members of all our committees and boards for their hard work for the Fellowship and the assistance they have provided this year.

\* \* \* \* \*

To: The Fellowship

From: Chuck Lehman, Vice-Chairperson  
World Service Conference

As I write this report, the annual meeting of the World Service Conference is just a few short weeks away. I am looking forward to meeting many of our first time RSR's and also seeing old friends.

This report will be brief, by design, as we are including the regional reports in this *Fellowship Report*. I did want to encourage every new RSR/RSR Alt to attend the orientation meeting Sunday, April 24, 1988 at 5:00 pm. We will be going over Conference procedure and attempting to make the process of proposing motions and addressing the Conference at the microphone a little less intimidating.

We have attempted to facilitate all requests for assistance at local/regional presentations of the *Conference Agenda Report*. I attended the Mid-Atlantic Conference in February and other members of our World Service Conference committees and boards have presented the *Conference Agenda Report* at other regional learning days and conferences. Given the ever-increasing volume of requests, we will need to explore a more cost-effective method of presenting the *Agenda Report* throughout the Fellowship. Perhaps WSC-sponsored conferences presented sectionally may have merit. Maybe we could utilize the world

convention zones as a guide. In any event, it will require more study and input from the Fellowship before we could implement such a system of workshops.

Before I close this report, I did wish to comment on a situation which has caused some concern. Even though this specific incident relates to P.I., it could just as easily effect our H&I or literature efforts. Recently, we have learned that some area and regional P.I. subcommittees have taken on the task of writing informational pamphlets for use within the Fellowship to aid in the P.I. effort. The I.P.'s have apparently been developed, reviewed and approved either by the subcommittees themselves or the local ASC or RSC. The pamphlets have apparently been shared with neighboring areas and regions or similar pamphlets have originated in more than one area or region simultaneously. The pamphlets have in some cases been distributed or sold along with Conference-approved literature at our recovery meetings. Almost all of these pamphlets carry a common theme "P.I. and the Individual Member."

Obviously, there is a need for an informational pamphlet dealing with this subject, but we need to maintain the integrity of our current development and approval process for service materials, pamphlets and literature developed for use throughout our Fellowship. We should also be willing to review, and revise if necessary, the mechanism currently used for the development and approval of service tools and related I.P.'s. This has become even more apparent as we have tried to translate our current service tools into various languages. There have also been problems when members from the U.S. Fellowship have tried to develop service tools and, in some cases, recovery literature for use in other countries. While we may agree that the U.S. Fellowship should not continue to develop service tools for use outside the U.S., we may not all share the feeling that areas and regions within the U.S. should independently develop and approve service tools and related I.P.'s for their own use. [Our service tools and related I.P.'s should contain common language and broad experience. This may only be possible by utilizing our WSC Committees to develop service tools and related I.P.'s for use in the U.S.]

The above discussions have been presented for your thoughts and suggestions. Your input is greatly needed and would be appreciated. In closing, may I thank the entire Fellowship for allowing me the privilege to serve as your WSC Vice-Chairperson.

\* \* \* \* \*

To: The Fellowship

From: Bob Hunter, Treasurer  
World Service Conference

Donations received for the third quarter amounted to approximately \$32,000, down from the previous two quarters' average of \$48,000 each. Likewise, expenditures for the third quarter were approximately \$11,000 less than the previous quarter average of \$42,500. There is currently a cash balance of \$18,000, and it appears that expenditures for the fourth quarter could run as high as \$20,000 - \$25,000. In addition, the expenditures for the first quarter of next fiscal year could also run between \$20,000 - \$25,000. In order to meet our budget, which we approved last April, we will need donations of \$45,000 per quarter.

On the positive side, I would personally like to thank all of the regions, areas, groups and members who have donated funds to the WSC. I read all the

letters and notes which you include with your donations and I always feel a deep sense of love and gratitude.

We are in the process of finalizing next year's budget and we hope to mail a "tentative budget" no later than April 1, 1988. If you have any suggestions or questions please send them to the WSO, Attn: WSC Treasurer.

### **WSC FINANCIAL REPORT** **6-1-87 to 2-29-88**

#### **SUMMARY OF CASH RECEIPTS:**

##### **Donations:**

RSC's	\$83,843.11
ASC's	9,857.86
Groups	4,364.21
Members	1,074.00
Conventions/fund- raisers	29,251.87

##### **Other Receipts:**

Credit balance from '86-'87 WSB	137.19
------------------------------------	--------

**TOTAL CASH RECEIPTS \$128,528.24**

#### **CASH EXPENDITURES:**

##### **Admin. Committee:**

Travel	4,344.44
Lodging	2,309.14
Phone	2,745.82
Copying, postage & misc.	1,610.79

##### **WSC Meetings:**

Room Rental	5,747.97
Copying	4,696.68
Coffee & supplies	1,355.84
Publishing projects	983.21
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>23,793.89</b>

##### **H&I Committee:**

Travel	2,708.10
Lodging	1,550.36
Copying, postage & phone	1,226.55
Publishing projects	1,762.23
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>7,247.24</b>

##### **Literature Committee:**

Travel	13,649.12
Lodging	4,374.42
Copying, postage & phone	2,808.50
Com. corres., mail lit., etc.	2,671.71
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>23,503.75</b>

##### **Policy Committee:**

Travel	2,353.80
Lodging	1,311.73
Copying, postage & phone	605.16
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>4,270.69</b>

##### **P.I. Committee:**

Travel	3,510.00
Lodging	909.83
Copying, postage & phone	2,331.02

##### **Non-N.A. Events:**

Registrations	875.00
Literature	0.00

##### **Publishing Projects:**

Production & postage	2,925.51
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>10,551.36</b>

##### **Select Committee:**

Travel	5,010.99
Lodging	1,500.63
Copying, postage & phone	888.10
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>7,399.72</b>

##### **Additional Needs Committee:**

Travel	2,274.07
Lodging	803.25
Copying, postage & phone	488.34
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>3,565.66</b>

##### **It Works Ad-Hoc Committee:**

Travel & lodging	9,786.48
Copying, postage & phone	1,100.70
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>10,887.18</b>

<b>Board of Trustees:</b>		<b>International Ad-Hoc Com.:</b>	
Travel	15,423.07	Travel	188.00
Lodging	6,993.93	Lodging	594.89
Copying, postage & phone	1,457.05	Copying, postage & misc.	9.60
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>23,874.05</b>	<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>792.49</b>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES ..... \$115,886.03**

**RECEIPTS LESS EXPENDITURES ..... 12,642.21**

**BEGINNING CASH BALANCE 6-1-87 ..... 5,430.11**

**ENDING CASH BALANCE ..... 18,072.32**

\* \* \* \* \*

**To:** The Fellowship

**From:** Biff Kramer, Chairperson  
WSC Public Information Committee

Since the last *Fellowship Report* we have received several inquiries from phonline subcommittees. These range from the suggestion that we form a standing phonline conference committee, to the request for more phonline material in the *Fellowship Report* and the *P.I. News*. I've recently had the opportunity to attend a phonline subcommittee meeting at one region, and to attend a phonline workshop held at a regional convention. One thing was consistent in both of these events: the phonline chairs and vice-chairs, for the most part, had not registered with WSC P.I.,--they did not know they needed to,--and as a result were not on the P.I./phonline mailing list, nor were they receiving the *P.I. News*. In the last *Fellowship Report* a paragraph was devoted to asking for input with regard to phonelines. Almost none has been received. The *Guide to Phonline Service* does need to be reviewed and updated. However, our requests for input have gone unanswered. Hopefully, during the P.I. meeting at WSC 1988, we will be able to form a phonline task force within the WSC P.I. Committee. For this task force to have value, we are hoping that regions will submit candidates for membership on WSC P.I. with considerable experience in phonline service. Membership on the WSC P.I. Committee has always been open to phonline chairs and vice-chairs if they have the backing and support of their region.

The World Service Office has received several inquiries with regard to information given at the P.I. workshop on the *Conference Agenda Report* in Allentown, Pennsylvania. It was stated at that workshop that motion #22 in the *Conference Agenda Report* did not belong there. It was asserted that this motion had not been passed by the P.I. Committee for inclusion in the *Conference Agenda Report*. Review of the minutes and tapes from the Denver workshop show this information to be incorrect. The section dealt with in this motion was distributed at the Newark workshop with requests for input and the understanding that action on this item would be taken in Denver. All input received was favorable, and the P.I. Committee voted to request that the Conference add this section to

the *Guide to Public Information*. I hope this clarifies the concerns people have expressed about this motion.

Work continues on compiling input with regard to the Seventh Tradition. The input has been slowly but surely coming in from WSC P.I. members. These members have been selected to provide a geographical distribution of input from around the world. Once we have received all this input, we will collate this information and forward it on to the Board of Trustees. We hope to have some questions and some answers to bring to the Conference soon.

In the area of multi-regional P.I. learning days and workshops, there is a steady ongoing number of these being done. It has been our experience that this is one of the strongest public information tools we have within the Fellowship. More and more members of Narcotics Anonymous are learning how to do public information work and receiving "hands on" experience through these learning days and workshops. It is my hope that these will continue and will increase in number in the future.

We have had numerous requests already this year for participation in national and international non-N.A. events. In adjusting our budget for the upcoming Conference year you will see that we believe an increase in participation on this level is necessary and will help us carry the message of recovery to addicts who would not otherwise receive it. In the upcoming issue of the *P.I. News* there will be an article on a recent non-N.A. event in which we participated in Hong Kong. We have found that at these types of events, we were able to carry out excellent and useful public information work. We are aware of these activities at the area and regional level taking place more and more with positive results. Some areas and regions are moving forward with plans to obtain their own table top exhibit displays for use in public information. This is an excellent idea that areas and regions may want to look at.

This brings me to another subject, the newsletter. The *P.I. News* is another excellent resource for all trusted servants involved with phonelines and public information. The *P.I. News* includes articles, letters, reports, excerpts from guidelines and contingency plans, and excerpts from phonelines and P.I. subcommittees minutes. It serves as sort of a "learning day on paper" and an ongoing sharing of experience in P.I. Every issue gets better as more people read the *P.I. News* and get involved with submitting materials for this publication.

In the WSC Vice-Chairperson's report, he discusses the issue of area/regional subcommittees creating pamphlets. This has come about as the result of a need for new items that address specific subjects where material is not currently available. We understand these efforts and applaud the concerns of these subcommittees. However, the overall impact of this type of work needs to be considered in the interest of unity and consistency. The Vice-Chairperson's report discusses the need for our thought on this subject.

This discussion leads us to a problem the WSC P.I. Committee has encountered during the last Conference year. We discussed this situation at the Joint Administrative Committee meeting, and realized this is not unique to P.I. we believe the Conference needs procedures that more clearly define various types of literature and a process by which this literature may become Conference-approved. It is our opinion there are several classes of literature that are not dealt with in the present literature approval process:

1. Literature that describes the Fellowship to people unfamiliar with N.A. This is literature whose primary purpose is to inform the public of what Narcotics Anonymous is, how it works, and where they can find it. This literature is not recovery-oriented in nature.



2. Informative literature of a non-recovery nature, whose primary purpose is to inform members within the Fellowship of various facts with regard primarily to service work.  
     **EXAMPLE:** The pamphlet entitled "P.I. and the N.A. Member" is primarily to inform the recovering addict what public information is, how it works, and what they can do to contribute.
3. Literature that is a compilation of materials which are already Conference-approved, which have been altered to create a new piece using Conference-approved language.

It is our understanding that at the present time the only method of approval available for these categories is the normal recovery-oriented literature review and approval process. It is my opinion that this creates several problems. The first is adding these items to an already over-burdened Literature Committee and giving them sole responsibility for writing any and all materials for use either in, or by the Fellowship. Secondly, the time it takes to complete these items becomes unrealistic, resulting in areas and regions taking matters into their own hands. The efforts of Conference Committees to generate materials are limited by the approval process. For example, an informational package would greatly enhance P.I.'s ability to carry the message to the public; at the present time there is no mechanism available for Conference-approval of this package.

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the WSC P.I. Committee and the P.I. subcommittees around the world for their help, their input, their support and their enthusiasm. This has been an exciting and fulfilling year for WSC P.I. and N.A.'s public information work as a whole. Thank you for the opportunity you've given me to serve the in the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous.

Hope to see you all in April. In loving service, and God bless.

\* \* \* \* \*

**To:** The Fellowship

**From:** Ed Duquette, Chairperson  
 WSC Policy Committee

I trust we are all diligently reviewing the *Conference Agenda Report* in hopes of prosperity at WSC '88. There are at least the normal number of "hot issues" this year and I urge us all to keep our common welfare tenderly in focus. We have been given a wonderful opportunity to be involved in our future, and this future will be shaped by our decisions and our conduct. Some of us will leave Van Nuys feeling confused and disappointed, and others with confidence. I only hope we can all leave as friends.

I'm feeling a bit nostalgic as the Conference week approaches. This will be my last opportunity to serve you as Chairperson of the dynamic, innovative and relentless WSC Policy Committee. These have been two glorious years, both for the success of the Committee and for myself personally. There are some things I wish we (the Policy Committee) had done differently, but all in all I am pleased with the Committees' achievements. We have a strong base of leadership in the committee who I feel will serve us well in the years to come. Most importantly, I am privileged to have served along side some of the most talented and enthusiastic people I will ever know.

Actually, there is very little for me to report from the Committee. Our work is complete until we meet during the Conference week. I am leaving the

Committee with three unfinished projects. The Committee has agreed to carry these items over into next years' agenda. These items are: the annual work schedule of the WSC, a process for support in the formation and recognition of new regions, and voting procedures used at the WSC.

There is one thing I do need to report to you in hopes of clearing up any confusion that may arise. In regard to ITEM #11 in the *Conference Agenda Report*:

"Be it resolved; that only RSR's (or their equivalent) be voting participants at the WSC. Non-voting participants (WSC Officers, WSC Committee Chairpersons, Trustees and WSO Chairperson) may make motions or address the Conference."

I have been approached by a few members of our Fellowship who were concerned why the Policy Committee didn't take a stand on this issue. One member had told me he believed the committee had failed in its responsibility to show guidance and leadership for the Fellowship as a whole. Another member was concerned that I was a member of the minority voice using the Policy Committee to see this motion pass. A third related that she was confused as to why the motion was included in the *Conference Agenda Report* but the information about the motion was only available through a separate mailing from the WSO.

I am aware that the Trustees have sent a special report to the Conference participants regarding this motion. It is my understanding that this report will explain their concerns about the impact this motion will have on the Conference if passed, will most probably state their recommendations.

In hindsight, I wish we had proceeded with this motion differently. It was my hope that the Policy Committee in taking a different approach, could help resolve the controversy with this reoccurring issue. This question has gone through the WSC Policy Committee several times before and has been presented and addressed on the floor of the Conference more than once. And it still remains controversial, despite our best efforts to settle it.

I presented a plan to the committee during the beginning of last year that would take a different approach. I suggested to the committee that we remain silent and allow the Fellowship to speak through us. We would seek input, both pro and con, and present this input to the entire Fellowship to resolve. I sold this approach to the committee. It was not easy. After all, it was a departure from the standard procedure that Conference committees follow. I believe that it was the committees' confidence in me that made the difference in their consent to the plan.

I still believe that by taking a stand on this issue we would have gained nothing in resolution. Perhaps we may quiet the issue for this Conference, but until we resolve this issue it will continue to come up. I have faith that when the time is right we will finally resolve this and it will probably have little to do with presentation and a great deal to do with maturity. I urge you to get a copy of the Trustees report from your RSR, if for no other reason than to obtain more information. I have always respected the Trustees opinion, they seem to provide balance where it appears little exists.

As you vote on this years' *Conference Agenda Report*, whether in your home group or on the Conference floor, make sure you have the best possible information. Be receptive to all discussions that arise. Feel good about your part in the process of contributing to the future of Narcotics Anonymous, no matter what the outcome may be.



\* \* \* \* \*

To: The Fellowship

From: Randy Jones, Chairperson  
WSC H&I Committee

Well, we are glad to report that our draft of the revised *Hospitals and Institutions Handbook* has been mailed out to all H&I committees registered with the WSC H&I Committee. The draft will be out to the Fellowship until July 1st. By then we would like to receive all input on the handbook. In July, at the WSC workshop, the WSC H&I Committee will review and correlate all input. From July until the October workshop we will assemble a final draft. In October we are planning on approving a final draft that will then be sent to the Fellowship for approval in the 1989 *Conference Agenda Report*. Please go through the handbook and workshop it in your area or region and send your input.

If your area or regional H&I committee is not registered with the WSC H&I Committee, please send in your area or regional mailing address, names of the chair and vice-chair of your committee, a list of your H&I committees and a central contact for meetings. If your committee is registered and you're not receiving communication on what's going on in the WSC H&I Committee, then please contact your updated committee information. Please send it to the WSO, c/o Anthony Edmondson, H&I Coordinator. We have found out through our recent mailing of the handbook that a lot of our mailing addresses are incorrect, so please make sure we have the correct address.

A few members from the WSC H&I Committee and the WSC Literature Committee met in Baltimore in February to continue working on a draft on *For those in Treatment*. The workshop went well, with a lot of good input. We will be meeting one more time in Georgia on March 18, 1988 to finalize a draft for review and input to the Fellowship hopefully to be sent out by the July WSC workshop.

The committee will continue work on a final draft of a pamphlet on transition from correctional facilities to the Fellowship. After our draft is finalized, we will send it to the WLC to be reviewed and sent to the Fellowship for review and input.

In closing we would like to say, please review and submit input on H&I handbook draft and send all input to WSC H&I Committee, c/o the H&I Coordinator at the WSO by July.

\* \* \* \* \*

To: The Fellowship

From: Michael Lee, Chairperson  
WSC Literature Committee

**INTRODUCTION:** The World Literature Committee had a very successful meeting March 18-20 in Atlanta, Georgia. As a result, there is more to report than usual at this time of year. I hope you're out there reading this!, along with all of the Regional Reports which have been included for the first time in this March *Fellowship Report*. This has turned out to be a very long report, parts of which I feel insecure about making, but which I hope will be helpful to the Fellowship and the 1988 World Service Conference participants.

The minutes of the Committee's December meeting in Philadelphia were approved in Atlanta and have been distributed to WSC participants.

**PROGRESS ON PAMPHLETS:** Most of the time in Atlanta was spent working on "For Those in Treatment" and "In Times of Illness." The full WLC will be reviewing the work done in Atlanta between now and the WSC. Pending full committee review, we expect to make the final decision during our meetings at the WSC to send both of these drafts out in review-form for a minimum one year period. This action depends on WSC approval of the proposed WLC guidelines and Committee approval of the "final" draft at our WSC meeting.

It should be noted that both of these drafts are rough and unfinished to a much greater extent than with past review-form drafts released by the WLC. We believe the quality is good, but not complete. Recognizing this, with the "In Times of Illness" draft in particular, we have put notes and directions in the body of the draft suggesting specific areas that need new writing and specific concepts that need development. Rather than the World Literature Committee spending a lot of time and resources writing original material to fill in these gaps and to finish or refine the material, we felt it was better to make a conscious decision to have area and regional literature committees do this work. We hope that everyone will be happy to receive materials which are really in need of work. This will allow the WLC to concentrate its efforts and resources on other priorities, such as the anticipated task of preparing the review-form version of the Twelve Steps portion of *It Works: How and Why*.

**DAILY BOOK SURVEY:** Preliminary results from the ongoing survey about the proposed daily book, tentatively titled "Just for Today", were considered by the Committee in Atlanta. Only a handful of area and regional literature committees have responded so far. Please complete this survey and send it in as soon as possible.

**TRANSLATIONS:** Under existing WSC policy, translation of N.A. literature into non-English languages is the responsibility of the World Service Office. In Atlanta, the WLC adopted a general recommendation to WSO to include one or two members of the World Literature Committee as communication liaisons or representatives to the WSO Ad Hoc International Committee or other advisory committees which the WSO chooses to utilize in discussing general translations issues and problems. The intent is to foster communications between the WSO and the WLC regarding translations issues that have implications for general aspects of the literature creation, development and revision process. As WLC Chairperson, I have been involved in discussions with WSO staff members about some of these issues since February, 1987. A formal communication liaison from WLC would report on significant issues to the full WLC and would also permit dialogue which, we believe, would be helpful and important.

One interesting translations development worth reporting is a recent opportunity which arose to offer Spanish translations of the five approval form literature items up for consideration by the 1988 WSC. Previously, such material has not been translated or made available in any non-English language. Special circumstances made it possible in this specific case. Of course, this raises a variety of issues that are related to the material under consideration by the Select Committee: the development of continental service conferences, and restructuring both the World Service Conference and the entire literature process.

**1988-89 WLC BUDGET:** The 1988-89 World Literature Committee budget was submitted to the Conference Treasurer recently and will be published in a significantly different format in the proposed budget for the World Service Conference as a whole. Many of the differences are cosmetic and/or minor in nature. The real problem is with the whole Conference budgetary process, Fellowship fund flow process, the lack of a functioning "Finance" Committee, and

the whole relationship and structure of the Conference Administrative Committee and Joint Administrative Committee. We have gone around and around in the Joint Administrative Committee discussing some of these issues during this past year, and we are right back where we started from. Many of these discussions have been extremely unpleasant and difficult, because there has been very little agreement among JAC members about the nature of the problem or possible solutions. And in my view, with the Conference budget that is being submitted, we are no better off, and in fact, may be much worse off, than we were last year when the whole financial "crisis" and budget process began to be discussed. By the time of the Conference, I hope to prepare a report which discusses some of the problems I have seen from my experience as a Conference Committee Chairperson trying to spend funds and make plans to accomplish work priorities established by the World Service Conference. I understand that the Conference Treasurer plans to report on this issue also. I am hopeful that the 1988 World Service Conference will be prepared to have a serious discussion about finances and that, working together, we are able to work out long-term solutions to these problems that are not going away.

**PLAN FOR THE STEPS AND TRADITIONS BOOK:** In Atlanta, the World Literature Committee accepted a proposal to advance the work of developing the Twelve Traditions material in the book, *It Works: How and Why*. Briefly, the Committee agreed to re-publish the original blue review form draft version of the Twelve Traditions material, first distributed in January of 1985. Along with this volume of material, the Committee gave general consent to also publishing a variety of input which has been developed or on file over the last couple years. A World Literature Ad Hoc Committee meeting will take place at WSO the second weekend of April to compile this volume of input. The World Literature Committee will then be discussing this work and giving final consideration to this project during its meeting at the 1988 World Service Conference. With the consent of the WSC, publication of this review-form draft of the book would occur in October of 1988. (It would be a manuscript format somewhat similar to the blue and white/black and white version of the Twelve Steps material that has been in circulation this past year.)

The Committee has made this plan for the following reasons. At some point, the steps and traditions will probably have to be put back together in a single approval-form draft and approved by the Fellowship, although it is possible that the Fellowship could approve the two halves of the book at separate times. The assumption, however, is that this would be undesirable, and that the Fellowship wants the How and the Why back together in the *It Works* book. Because the World Literature Committee expects to be working on the task of putting together a review-form draft of the Twelve Steps material during the coming year, and because it is expected that this task (pending WSC direction) will take at least one year and possibly more, the Committee is faced with the choice of getting some work on the traditions done also during the next year, or else letting the traditions sit and gather dust until the WLC has a review-form draft of the steps ready for publication. So, this plan would allow the Fellowship to work on the traditions, while the WLC is working on the steps. The plan envisions a process of switching both halves of the book back and forth, until we reach a stage of development where both parts of the book reach the approval stage. More information about this subject and the whole process and plan for working on the steps and traditions next year will be provided in the World Literature Committee report to the Conference.

**BASIC TEXT - 4TH EDITION:** The Committee discussed the following four subjects related to the basic text in Atlanta: (1) the Basic Text Survey of area and regional literature committees; (2) a Summary of Correspondence received to date

on the Fourth Edition; (3) the three motions from Regions [concerning literature] which appear in the *Conference Agenda Report* and which were referred to the WLC; and (4) a "List of Changes" showing each and every edit that was made in the Third Edition revised basic text, resulting in the Fourth Edition.

(1) **BASIC TEXT SURVEY:** The Committee considered preliminary results of the Basic Text Survey which was distributed to area and regional literature committees a couple of months ago. The decision to develop this survey originated at the June, 1987 meeting of the World Literature Committee, long before any concern about the Fourth Edition of the Basic Text surfaced. Initially, the Committee had considered the idea of proposing that the Fellowship adopt a moratorium on further revision of the basic text. Upon further consideration, the Committee decided to try using a survey to gather Fellowship input on this subject. Since then, it is clear that the publication of the Fourth Edition has changed everything, and the Basic Text survey seems somewhat lost and in confusion. The WLC's last minute December decision to include a modified version of the survey in the *Conference Agenda Report* unfortunately may have created more confusion.

The Committee reviewed the preliminary results of the survey without substantive discussions. Less than 50 of the nearly 300 area and regional literature committees on our mailing list have responded. All are asked to complete the survey as soon as possible, even though a modified version of the survey is going to the groups, ASC's and RSC's in the *Conference Agenda Report*. However, because it is clear from the preliminary results that the way the questions are structured and worded has caused confusion and different interpretations for some, please keep in mind the original purpose. Use the survey as a TOOL, as a basis for discussing how you feel about the basic text and what, if anything, should be done about it, both in the short-term and in the long-term. This was the original intent, even before the Fourth Edition: to provide a neutral, unbiased way of considering the basic text.

(2) **CORRESPONDENCE SUMMARY REPORT:** World Services has received to date approximately sixty-five (65) pieces of input regarding the Fourth Edition of the Basic Text. In addition to the written correspondence we have received some two dozen phone calls on this issue. Each item of correspondence, showing the date and source (member, group, ASC, RSC, or other), has been shared with all members of the World Literature Committee. It also shows the geographic location, and whether the input was positive or negative or mixed. The majority of the input has been fairly general in nature, giving an overall positive or negative opinion on either the CONTENT of the Fourth Edition, the PROCESS which created the Fourth Edition, or both. The breakdown of the source of this correspondence is as follows: 25 pieces from individual members, 16 from groups, 6 from ASC's, 9 from RSC's, and 8 from others.

(3) **REGIONAL MOTIONS:** As reported in the *Conference Agenda Report* (see page 65), the following three motions were referred to the World Literature Committee to study and recommend action:

"That upon depletion of the current supply of the Fourth Edition Basic Texts, as of WSC '88, the printing of the Fourth Edition Basic Text be halted and that the Third Edition revised Basic Text be reprinted for distribution by WSO."

"That the World Service Conference direct the World Service Office to immediately cease the publication and sale of the Fourth Edition of our Basic Text, Narcotics Anonymous, and immediately begin publication and sale of the Third Edition revised of our Basic Text, Narcotics Anonymous."

"That any changes in the book *Narcotics Anonymous* (The Basic Text) be made only by Fellowship-wide group conscience."

The Committee discussed these motions in Atlanta and feels that it is not appropriate to recommend any action at this time. The Committee feels that at this point that it is a matter for the group conscience of the Fellowship as a whole to resolve as it sees fit at the 1988 World Service Conference.

(4) **LIST OF CHANGES:** Since the publication of the Fourth Edition in November, a handful of requests have been received for a "List of Changes" showing each of the edits made in the Third Edition revised which resulted in the Fourth Edition. We have been unable to provide this information in this form. Some members in Pennsylvania produced an unofficial list of changes that has been distributed widely. This did not come from the World Literature Committee, and it is our understanding that this list had some errors and omissions. The WSO is in the process of compiling an accurate, "official" list, at my request, and the Committee in Atlanta was supportive of doing this. This list will be available to the World Service Conference.

To understand the reason why we haven't had a list before now requires a better explanation of the actual, mechanical process of the Literature Review Committee in reviewing and approving the Fourth Edition of the Basic Text prior to publication (in accordance with the 1985 WSC motion).

As I said, the Literature Review Committee (LRC) did not have a "list of changes" when it reviewed the Fourth Edition. The Literature Review Committee did not follow a process of discussing each edit, change by change. The individual Literature Review Committee members, instead, reviewed double spaced manuscript copies of the basic text.

Two manuscripts were available for review (in August 1986 when this took place). One manuscript was of the Third Edition (unrevised) which had been given to the professional editor to edit. The editor was given the Third Edition, and NOT the Third Edition revised with all of the Little White Book changes, because the edit itself happened early in the summer of 1986 before the Third Edition revised had been published. This manuscript contained all of the handwritten edit marks which the editor made. The second available manuscript was a copy of the Fourth Edition with all of the edits incorporated. Both manuscripts contained some typographical errors. Both were made available in August 1986, shortly after the process for reviewing the edit was discussed by the Literature Review Committee at the Quarterly Conference Meeting in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Some members of the Literature Review Committee used both manuscript copies to study the changes. Others used only the Fourth Edition manuscript, comparing that proposed Fourth Edition manuscript to the actual Third Edition book, similar to the way some members have done a line by line comparison of their Third Edition and Fourth Edition books since then.

For the record, I would like to describe my personal involvement in reviewing the edit, and then describe how the LRC discussed and approved the edited book. I stated above that the Literature Review Committee did not discuss each edit, change by change. We did not have, nor did we choose to create, a list of changes that would have lent itself to this kind of process. Even if we had had such a list, because there were hundreds of changes which were viewed as grammatical or technical in nature, we didn't question each change or see a need for discussion. Instead, our general approach was to review the book using one of both of the manuscripts described above, and to bring up for discussion only those edits which any individual felt did involve some conceptual change.

Personally, I used both manuscripts and my Third Edition book to review the edit. I spent about 80 hours in early August, which I once thought was a lot,

but looking back, probably wasn't enough. As a result, I prepared a seventeen (17) page report to the other members of the Literature Review Committee (I was WLC Vice-Chair at the time). In that report, I identified fifty (50) edits that I was concerned about. I wrote:

*"Although it seems like a lot, I went through the manuscript twice and cut out a number of edits which I had marked the first time. I have tried to be critical, but, - I hope - not overly critical, in my work. You will be the judge of that."*

*"For the record, it is worth stating that I had nothing to do with writing any part of the Basic Text, and so, to the extent possible as a member of Narcotics Anonymous, I feel I am not prejudiced about changing Book One of the text. My concerns fall into two major categories: edits which have changed or weakened meanings significantly or awkwardly; and edits which are inconsistent with the White Book, Newly Revised."*

*"I am not objective about editing personal stories. Therefore, I am raising no concerns and am basically not reviewing Book Two..."*

*"Finally, I feel very strongly that the Foreword and Introduction to the book written by the World Literature Committee which gave birth to our text should not be edited or changed. I believe that this material has become part of the history of our fellowship and reflects the non-professional development of N.A. literature by addicts who were extremely dedicated to carrying our message. For these and other reasons, I would hope we leave the Foreword and Introduction in the original form."*

Although I identified a significant number of edits that I was concerned about, I never for one moment thought that the 1985 Conference motion was being "violated" by any of the specific edits or by the edit as a whole. Even with most of the edits I was concerned about, I could see a grammatical reason why the sentence was being changed, I just had a problem with how it was accomplished. Also, even with the large number of edits that I raised for discussion, there were others that I did not notice (such as a couple of the deletions that I did not catch in the manuscript) or other edits which I did not see a problem with at the time.

Other members of the Literature Review Committee would probably tell you stories of their own individual efforts and experience. After the individual review process, a series of telephone conference calls were scheduled in which each members' individual concerns with specific edits were discussed. As a result of this process, many edits which had been made by the professional editor were restored to the original form. There was a group conscience process that went on in the Committee that resulted a decision to accept or reject each edit about which there was concern. I missed all but one of these calls, as I remember, because of my trip to the London World Convention and because I was not notified of the times of certain telephone meetings. However, I also know that the Committee made no additional edits of its own that were not indicated by the professional writer.

The Literature Review Committee also had final discussions about approving the Fourth Edition at the Quarterly Meeting in Charlotte, North Carolina in October 1986. At that time, however, virtually all of the discussion got rapped up in two issues that, at times, were somewhat emotional and controversial, and on which the Committee was divided. The Committee never divided on any specific edits, or the edit as a whole. However, division did occur on the issue of making the edit consistent with the Little White Book Newly Revised, which had just been approved six months earlier at the 1986 World



Service Conference. The Committee also entered into a discussion about future revision of the Basic Text, and the possible need to make various conceptual changes in the book, totally separate from the edit, through the normal review and approval process, at some point in the future. Both of these issues were reported in the November 1986 WLC *Fellowship Report*, and have been re-quoted by me since then in my November 1987 *Fellowship Report*. The White Book issue was resolved by last year's 1987 World Service Conference, and was the reason why publication was delayed until November of 1987.

The reason why I bring up this point about the LRC being divided over these two issues is because, looking back in hindsight, I believe it was significant in the whole decision making process. Our attention was on those issues, and it was somewhat emotional as I say, and not on the basic issues of the edit itself.

However, there were a great many things that I was angry and upset about in World Literature during that year that I was Vice Chairperson. The basic text was not one of them. I felt that I was part of a group that had been given responsibility by the group conscience of the Fellowship as a whole to complete a specific task: approve an edited version of the N.A. Basic Text. I surrendered my will to the will of that group and I felt OK, complete acceptance, about all of the decisions that were made. My feelings about this were constant. Once the LRC accepted and approved the edit, I accepted and approved it also, and became concerned with going ahead with publication as soon as possible, despite any earlier concerns that I had had about individual edits. I made an issue out of a great many things at the 1987 World Service Conference, but felt no reason to do so with the basic text. I felt there was a common, unified understanding.

From April of 1987 on through the summer of 1987 while publication of the Fourth Edition was taking place, as Chairperson of the World Literature Committee I could have forced a re-examination of the whole Fourth Edition issue by the newly elected Literature Review Committee. Or I could have sent the book to the newly elected World Literature Committee and asked them for a second opinion. Or I could have sent the book to each member of the Board of Trustees for their review. Or any of these members or boards could have asked for a copy of the book prior to publication (which no one did).

But we were already very busy as a Committee doing new work and trying to create a new atmosphere, cleaning up past mistakes and addressing problems and issues (such as our guidelines) that had been festering for a long time. Our theme was a new start. If every year, the new committee were to come in and reconsider and re-examine every issue and aspect of the work of the old committee from the previous year, nothing would ever get done. And so I decided that it would be a mistake to reopen the issue with any part of the new committee. And as far as sending the book to the Trustees, in my judgement it seemed to me that the language of the original 1985 motion had been very clear. It had said that the book was to be accepted and approved by the Literature Review Committee. It did not say by the Trustees, or by the LRC and the Trustees. And so I exercised my authority as WLC Chairperson and made the decision NOT to send the book to the Trustees.

In September of 1987, after the WSO made the mistake of publishing the wrong version of the approval form copy of *It Works: How and Why* in the "blue and white" manuscript, another opportunity presented itself to reconsider publication of the Fourth Edition. Bob Stone, who still had reservations about the original 1985 motion and about going ahead with publishing a book that the Fellowship as a whole had not seen and reviewed, suggested to me that the issue be re-opened. I told him "No" in September, and again in October when he formalized his concerns in a letter to me dated 9/28/87 that was also copied to some other Conference participants. I told Bob that at this point we were

obligated to follow the 1985 WSC motion, which the 1986 and 1987 Conferences had all had an opportunity to change, but which the Fellowship did not change. And so publication took place in November of 1987.

Because of the reaction that came with the publication in November - the disunity and the controversy and significant concern - in hindsight I have regretted certain decisions that I made. If a larger group of World Service Conference participants had been involved in re-examining the issues prior to publication, in retrospect the problems probably would have become apparent in world services prior to publication and the whole Fellowship would not be wrestling with this now, at least not in this way. I always knew there would be some who would not like the edit and that there would be a reaction. But I never imagined it would be like this, or that some members would feel that the 1985 Conference motion had been violated.

The thing that troubles me more than anything else about all of this is the fear and mistrust and anger that some members now have toward the World Literature Committee or world services in general. I don't know if any of this will help or not. But I have felt compelled to explain in this great detail more of the specifics of how all of this came about. From what I hear, most are now concerned at this point with the solution, not with the problem, but I feel a responsibility to have more fully explained in this report what happened and why. Because of how things developed in November 1987, it was not appropriate or possible for much of this information to be provided then. I am still coming across members who believe that the Literature Review Committee and/or the WSO and/or others engaged in a deliberate and willful effort to conceptually change our book against the Fellowships group conscience. Out of fear, or mistrust, or lack of understanding, or whatever, it pains me greatly that even one member of Narcotics Anonymous could ever believe such a thing and the danger such fear could do in the future. And so for these and other reasons I have written this report in this way.

Out of all of the input I have seen, an article I came across in a Regional Newsletter a few weeks ago, stimulated me to write an article in response. Although it is not entirely fair because I am not reprinting that article here, I have decided to attach my response to this *Fellowship Report*. I wrote the article in such a way that you can see what some of the articles concerns were. This article contains additional things that I as Chairperson now feel it is necessary to say in anticipation of the resolution of this matter at the 1988 World Service Conference. Response to my November *Fellowship Report* was positive, and I hope that all this that I have written will also be helpful, constructive, and accepted in the spirit of loving service in which it was written.

Thank you very much for the privilege of allowing me to serve you as WLC Chairperson. I've done the best I can and know how, under extraordinary circumstances that have been very difficult for me. After the WSC, I expect this will be the last you will hear from me for quite awhile (yeah!). I am looking forward to having my own life back, and working on myself and my recovery. Thank you for everything.

### **An Open Letter from the WLC Chairperson in response to a regional newsletter article**

Dear Friends and Fellow Members,

I recently was given a copy of the February/March 1988 issue of your **WONDERFUL** regional newsletter, which I very much enjoyed reading. I think it

was great that you published the part of my November *Fellowship Report* dealing with the Fourth Edition of the Basic Text, along with the serious and thoughtful "Discussion of the WSC Literature Committee Report" written by "Anonymous". In the spirit of open dialogue, I would like to respond to a number of issues raised in that article, point by point, and hope you will print my response.

**POINT ONE:** The fact that the original 1985 motion to edit the Basic Text came from the World Literature Committee and "was not brought by an RSR" [Regional Service Representative] is criticized. 'Anonymous' implies that this goes against the "traditional N.A. service structure" and that "somehow the membership was not involved directly" and that the need for the edit should have been addressed first.

The Basic Text was approved by the Fellowship at the 1982 World Service Conference. Even then, it was recognized that the book needed to be edited. It was approved despite weaknesses because of desperate and overwhelming need. Input to change the book conceptually (and grammatically) existed from the time the book was approved. It was kept on file without a clear understanding of what would happen to it (the WLC Procedural Guidelines which provided for literature revision at five year intervals were not approved until 1985). Part of the compromise which was involved in approving the book was an understanding that it would not be "set in stone", that it could "always be changed". After the book was actually published in April of 1983, additional input to change the book in a wide variety of ways began to be received in a continuous stream that is still flowing to this very day.

World Service Conference committees always act on the basis of Fellowship input. Sometimes it is specific and direct, sometimes it is general and contradictory, and sometimes a synthesis of Fellowship input is required. Judgement, experience, accountability and group conscience are always involved when the trusted servants of a Conference Committee carry out the responsibilities and provide the services which the Fellowship delegated by creating the service structure. (Tradition Nine: "N.A., as such, ought never be organized; but we may create service boards and committees directly responsible to those they serve.")

The World Literature Committee was acting on the basis of Fellowship input which had been received between 1982 and 1985 when it proposed the motion to edit the Basic Text to the 1985 World Service Conference. The membership had been involved. Also, historically and traditionally, RSR's have expected Conference Committees to make recommendations and originate motions in this way.

When the specific motion was proposed in 1985 on the floor of the WSC, one RSR did suggest that the motion should be referred to the Fellowship. But the Conference specifically considered, and overwhelmingly rejected, doing this. In hindsight, perhaps this was a mistake. Clearly, the Basic Text and other N.A. literature directly affect the Groups and members in ways that some world services do not. Fellowship review of the specific motion might have uncovered the problems in the proposed process. But in 1985, I believe the feeling of the Conference was: we have waited three (3) years to have the book edited, do we want to wait another whole year to ask the Groups a question we have already heard the answer to? The Conference said, NO! The need for the edit was addressed first.

In the traditional N.A. service structure, the Fellowship has empowered the Conference to make these kinds of judgements routinely. The service manual suggests that RSR's be given a vote of confidence to make decisions on matters that come up during the Conference with the best interests of those they serve always in mind. We elect the best members we can, give them our trust, and then

let go and let God. Does this process conflict with our spiritual principles? No, in my opinion, it does not - the Conference needs to be allowed to continue to exercise discretion. The Fellowship must clarify how group conscience applies to world services, what responsibilities and authority are delegated, and then let go. The Fellowship always retains the Ultimate Authority to change or correct **ANYTHING** that is later revealed to be wrong, mistaken, or contrary to what our membership wants. If we wrongly interpret the direct responsibility of Tradition Nine to mean direct control by the Groups, then the service structure we have created is doomed to failure.

**POINT TWO:** The article by "Anonymous" discussed the specific language of the 1985 WSC motion at length and made the point that it did not lend itself to "casual interpretation by most addicts". First of all, casual interpretation of anything in world services can be difficult: careful study, information, and experience are often required to fully understand complex issues that often cannot be oversimplified, no matter how much the Fellowship might want to "keep it simple". This is one of many communication problems. What are the solutions?

Secondly, the dictionary breakdown of the definitions of the words in the motion illustrate rather clearly how virtually all of the changes in the Fourth Edition were viewed as authorized and legitimate by members who made up the Literature Review Committee - who were acting in good faith, with no ulterior motives whatsoever.

However, in **HINDSIGHT**, it is clear that "Anonymous" was not alone in understanding the motion to mean one thing, while others interpreted it to mean something entirely different. It appears to me that there was a wide difference of opinion in the Fellowship and among Conference participants about (1) what the language of the motion actually meant and about (2) the extent of the "grammatical errors" in the book. This, in itself, amounted to a major miscommunication - a common, human problem. How many times have you seen a Group or service committee vote on something, then have to vote again because of misunderstanding?

Unfortunately, it seems to me now, that the nature of the miscommunication was so complete and total that it helps to explain why the 1986 and 1987 World Service Conferences failed to uncover it, why there was no **UPROAR** or **UPSET** until after the Fourth Edition was published. All members were going along in an attitude of surrender and trust, but, in some cases, with radically different interpretations of what the Conference motion allowed and what a "professional edit" would do. Again, this is where it must be admitted that if the motion had gone out to the Fellowship for review in the Agenda Report, or if the issue had been forced more directly than it was, more widespread debate might have revealed the different perspectives. But attempts were made to raise the issue with no result.

I'd like to say a couple things about the word "grammar", for example. In retrospect, it is clear that many members did not understand the definition that "Anonymous" provided: "The system of word structures and word arrangements of a given language at a given time." The word "syntax" concerns the rules for arranging words - syntax is a part of grammar. A large class of grammatical errors are, in fact, errors involving syntax. To correct a large class of grammatical errors in the Third Edition, it was known from the beginning that the motion meant changes in sentence structure throughout the text. But many members did not recognize this. Furthermore, many members lack sufficient knowledge of grammar in general to recognize grammatical errors in N.A. literature. Quite honestly, many members of the World Literature Committee lack this knowledge.

**POINT THREE:** "Anonymous" makes several errors in fact regarding the role of the World Service Office (WSO) in this matter: "...The **WSO** is the party that

is being directed to revise the book. My understanding of our service structure includes a belief that the WSO is not a part of our service structure. The WSO is a corporation ... I am confused as to why the WSO would be directed to revise our most important piece of literature, bar none."

In the first place, the editing process was not thought of as a "revision" by anyone at anytime. The Fourth Edition is NOT a revision of the basic text. **THE EDIT WAS NOT A PROFESSIONAL REWRITE**, as "Anonymous" also asserts.

Second, the WSO's role in this matter was to enter into a legal contract, hiring a temporary employee (a special worker, in accordance with Tradition Eight) to professionally edit the basic text. This is one of the reasons we have service centers, as opposed to only service committees, to assist us as a Fellowship in providing services where legal issues such as contracts and the management of employees are involved. The process of interviewing and selecting the individual who was hired to do the edit was a cooperative one, involving members of the WSO Board of Directors and staff, the World Literature Committee, and the WSC Administrative Committee.

The approval of the Fourth Edition manuscript was the sole responsibility of the members of the Literature Review Committee, as the motion specified. Disagreeing with this process is one thing.

**IT WAS A BAD PROCESS AND A BAD MOTION:** But these issues were widely publicized in the *Newsline* and the *Fellowship Report*. The World Service Conference had two years and two annual meetings to change that process, and it did not change the process.

In the third place, WSO is most definitely part of the service structure. Confusion about this is not new - this misconception has been causing considerable problems in the Fellowship. The World Service Office Board of Directors have recently found it necessary to propose changing language which has contributed to this confusion in the Temporary Working Guide to Our Service Structure (see the 1988 Agenda Report).

Five years ago, in violent controversy over the sections on Traditions Four and Nine in the Basic Text, some members argued that the service structure itself was NOT part of N.A. Through an exhaustive group conscience process, the Fellowship resolved this issue by removing wrong language from the text which made this untrue statement. The service structure is part of N.A., in accordance with Tradition Nine, because WE - the Fellowship - have created all of the service boards and committees presently in existence, including the World Service Office. How could something we created that is directly responsible to us NOT be a part of us?

The World Service Office is managed by the World Service Office Board of Directors, which are elected and directly responsible to the Fellowship through the World Service Conference. The World Service Office is an Eighth Tradition Service Center ("Narcotics Anonymous should remain forever non-professional, but our Service Centers may employ special workers.") whose relationship to the Fellowship is described by Tradition Nine. The fact that the WSO is a legal corporation has nothing to do with the spiritual principles which are involved. To argue that WSO is not part of N.A. is like arguing that your hand is not part of your arm. There is a connection. If the WSO were not a part of N.A., how could it hold the copyrights and publish Narcotics Anonymous literature? If WSO were not a part of N.A., by its very existence we would be lending the N.A. name and also financing an outside enterprise in violation of Traditions Six and Seven. But spiritual principles are not in conflict. WSO is a part of Narcotics Anonymous, and the Twelve Traditions are a set of consistent, inter-related spiritual principles.

**THE ISSUE OF CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS IN THE BASIC TEXT:** "Anonymous" raised several questions about this issue, writing: "I wonder why the Literature Review Committee, or the professional editor, felt there was any reason for concepts to be addressed at all...It seems...a bit arrogant on the part of someone to assume that they could improve on the concepts that the book already presented, whatever the form ... having decided that the conceptual changes could not be handled without totally rewriting the book, why didn't they simply abandon the project altogether? Why was it that the Fellowship had not felt a need to address these 'conceptual' problems? Is it possible that they were not important?...Regarding one of the specifics...what kind of 'Tradition Problem' was the brevity of Chapter Six? What does that mean? What does the length of any chapter have to do with an edit?" I would like to discuss these questions and clear up some of the confusion I feel is underneath some of these statements and that my previous *Fellowship Reports* may have contributed to.

**LET ME SAY FIRST: EDITING THE BASIC TEXT WAS A TOTALLY SEPARATE ISSUE FROM ANY "CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS."**

In the first place, the Literature Review Committee was ALWAYS 100% CLEAR that the motion did not allow conceptual changes in the Basic Text. This is why the Literature Review Committee did not make conceptual changes in the text to bring it into alignment with the Little White Book, Newly Revised, delaying publication of the "Fourth Edition" for what turned out to be one full year until after the 1987 World Service Conference could resolve the matter.

The reason why the issue of "conceptual problems" even came up in conjunction with the editing process was because of what the Literature Review Committee members found as the professional editor's work was carefully reviewed. To review the edit required many, many hours of individual effort carefully studying and analyzing each change in the text, line by line. We did not have a master list of changes, but instead followed a process of comparing two manuscript copies. It was the first time since the approval of the book that World Literature Committee members had looked so closely at the Basic Text, individually and together. Through this process, in our judgement we found many items in the book which we felt should be brought to the attention of the Fellowship. WE KNEW we had no authority to change anything like this in the text, but we felt we had a responsibility to make the Fellowship aware of statements which we felt might be untrue, inconsistent with N.A. philosophy or our Twelve Traditions.

The length of Chapter Six (The Twelve Traditions Chapter), had nothing to do with the edit, but rather was pointed out as one of several possible reasons to undertake a major revision of the basic text. The issue was whether or not this particular chapter really does provide enough of the "basic" information about each of our Twelve Traditions, whether or not we someday have more information in separate books and/or pamphlets. The length and content of the material on Traditions Ten, Eleven, and Twelve were noted in particular. Perhaps some of these examples were not explained well enough. But the bottom line is that they were separate from the edit. If the Literature Review Committee had wanted to act on arrogance or self-will and consciously disregard the group conscience of the Fellowship, there would have been a number of specific conceptual changes that this group of members could have made. But, of course, as trusted servants, this did not occur. There was considerable reluctance to even open up the issue of possible future revision of the basic text by discussing it and asking for Fellowship input in the November *Fellowship Report* (and later reports). But it is up to the Fellowship to set the priorities of the World Literature Committee, and to tell us



what books and pamphlets we should be working hardest on. We have a responsibility to seek this kind of input and direction from the Fellowship.

**IN CONCLUSION:** "Anonymous" makes the point that there is a problem with too many "issues" and projects going on in Narcotics Anonymous today, that we need to focus our attention as a Fellowship, that there is only so much that we can keep up with as individual members. I wanted to agree entirely with "Anonymous" on these points. But it seems to me that as a Fellowship, we have a tendency to act like individual addicts and "want it all now". If there are too many issues going on, we have to take responsibility for this as a Fellowship. We are responsible. The issues don't come out of thin air, or out of world services, they come out of real problems that have confronted us and out of our common desire to carry our message to more and more addicts. When we hear voices demanding that we "hurry up" a particular project or service, we are all responsible to consider the fact that we may need to "slow down". I am convinced that many of the problems having to do with the basic text had to do with the constant time pressures that we seem to impose upon ourselves. I am equally concerned that we may live out the insanity of repeating this kind of mistake if we are not aware of this problem in how in the future we go about dealing with the Basic Text, the step and tradition book, our other literature, and other major projects like the Guide to Service. Both in Narcotics Anonymous as a whole, and with the problems we create and solve in our service effort, there is no "us and them", and what this really means is that we are all responsible.

(P.S.: I love you, and the privilege to have served you. I care.)

\* \* \* \* \*

**To:** The Fellowship

**From:** Vince Daley, Chairperson  
WSC *It Works* Ad-Hoc Committee

The January workshops in Chicago, San Francisco and Fort Lauderdale were very productive as we finished going through all the input from the Fellowship. A minor loose end came up in March as we received a lot of material from the United Kingdom. Still, it's better late than never, and we are including this material on our single master list of changes. Actually, this was a pleasant surprise as we were not aware the United Kingdom was laboring so hard on our book. We are very grateful for their efforts. The single master list of changes is nearing completion and will be ready to hand over to the World Literature Committee at the Conference.

This recent development brings us to a total of nine world workshops, including: Baltimore, Sidney, Seattle, Dallas, Kansas City, Chicago, San Francisco, Fort Lauderdale and London.

Many regions and area literature committees located throughout the world worked hard at contributing to our book by providing a forum where our members could provide input for it. As a result, approximately eighty new area and regional literature committees have been formed over the last year. This is very exciting, because all of us have gained valuable experience and skills writing and developing our literature. We are approaching three hundred registered area and regional literature committees. If we keep developing and sharing our skills, and we stay united and work together as a Fellowship on our book, the end result is

going to be very special and unique. This has been a tremendous year of growth and of coming together.

This committee feels we have, to the best of our ability, fulfilled the goals and direction given to us by WSC '87. Therefore we will be requesting that this committee be dissolved by the Conference at WSC '88.

We want to express our gratitude and thank all our members who have worked so well and so hard on our book over the years. And we want to thank you for being patient. Perhaps if there is a history or a story of the development of our book *It Works: How and Why* it would be like that of the oak tree. Its strength lay in the fact that it grew so great and strong because it grew so slowly and well.

\* \* \* \* \*

To: The Fellowship

From: Bill Zimmerman, Chairperson  
WSC Additional Needs Ad-Hoc Committee

Because Additional Needs met for the last time this year in Denver, this is going to be a very short report. We have completed our task for this year and we await your direction for next year. The World Service Office and this committee continues to accept group questionnaires. Thank you for letting us be of service.

\* \* \* \* \*

To: The Fellowship

From: Leah Goodrich, Chairperson  
WSC Select Committee on the Service Structure

At our March meeting we examined many of the basic ideas and concepts which may be applicable to our service structure. We looked at those developed by other Twelve Step Fellowships as well as concepts we have developed in our experience. The basis of most of our discussion concerned our experience with the Traditions. What became most apparent was how little information has been recorded over the years regarding our own experience and that which had been written down was not readily available for reference. In our discussions we were able to resolve, to our satisfaction as a committee, some of the many recurring philosophical issues confronting our service structure. Some of our resolutions were the result of our complete agreement but with others we were unable to establish a clear consensus at this time.

The committee has believed for some time now that we had arrived at a point in our work that to go any further without wider consultation and discussion would be inappropriate. The ideas and concepts we have been discussing concern all of us throughout our Fellowship. The subject of our deliberations concerned our basic philosophy of service and the possible development of a foundation of principles that coincide with our Traditions to specifically guide our service efforts. Questions which we addressed included: the purpose, function, and responsibility of our service structure, how our trusted servants are guided in fulfilling their responsibilities, how our Traditions are applicable to service, what is N.A., what is N.A. as such, who is an N.A. member, what is group conscience, how is group

autonomy related to the expression of an ultimate authority, what does direct responsibility imply, and how does self-support relate to the service structure. As a result of our deliberations we have developed some consensus responses as a committee, which will be presented in our report to the WSC in April for further discussion from the participants. It has become clear that a common understanding of the purpose and function of our service structure is needed. The basic responsibilities of our groups and members, as well as those of our trusted servants, service boards and committees needs to be well established, defined, and presented in any guide to service in N.A. During our report at the WSC, we will request the chairperson to allow us to go into a committee of the whole for a comprehensive discussion of these issues and the responses developed by the committee.

There are several other important issues that are more of a structural nature that we request further consideration of. We published in the September, 1987 *Fellowship Report* our thoughts on a plan about our evolving worldwide structure. This plan has received in general, a lot of favorable support and we will continue to work in this direction. However, we would also like to get a consensus from the WSC to continue work in this direction. The detailed development of each continental conference structure will take time and we don't expect the plan to be initiated until the early 1990's. In relationship to each continental conference our committee has been discussing the feasibility of having a single, larger, centralized Board (25-30 members) to have the chief responsibility of administering continental service affairs (in much the same way as our three service arms WSC Admin., WSB, and WSO do now while the Conference is not in session). This is in addition to the conferences themselves. There are several options to this plan and we have not settled ourselves on any one option. Members of this central board could divide their responsibilities into more specific areas of concern, such as: several members (6 or 7) would be responsible for office management, others could be assigned to work with the service departments and/or ongoing WSC Committee responsibilities, but all together would be jointly responsible for all continental service affairs. This particular option resembles somewhat the plan outlined in the N.A. Tree. Please consider these ideas and be prepared to discuss the subject during our report.

Terminology is also a concern of the committee. With all the confusion resulting from some common practices in our Fellowship we are trying to make things more clear and descriptive. One of the solutions we discussed would be to use the term "conference" instead of "committee" when describing ASC's and RSC's. Our other great concern was for the term group conscience. Over the years it has been loosely used to describe and/or justify just about everything we do. We hope to have some more discussions about these things and will report our progress in the future.

We would like at this time to thank all the committees and/or members who have taken the time to input the current draft of the Guide to Service. It is our expectation that the amount of input will begin to increase as we get closer to a completion date. If the WSC decides favorably on our motion to amend our work schedule for the coming year, we will meet at least five times, with two-three day meetings. Upon completion of our work we will publish a draft and present it for whatever approval process the Fellowship desires. Until that time we will need the full support of the Fellowship to successfully complete our work.

There is one other issue in particular that received overwhelming support of all committee members. This concerned changing the name of our committee to reflect a better understanding of our purpose within the Fellowship. We will discuss this further and offer some suggestions for the WSC participants to consider during our report.

\* \* \* \* \*

To: The Fellowship

From: Bob Rehmar, Chairman  
World Service Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees met in Van Nuys on the weekend of February 6 and 7. We spent a large portion of our meeting time discussing the *Conference Agenda Report*. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the WSO Board of Directors were also present and provided us with updated information about WSO activities.

On Friday, before the meeting of the Board, the three ad-hoc committees met independently for the purpose of reviewing their work and formulating reports to the Board. As I reported last time, these committees were formed to make initial evaluations in three areas; a long form of the Twelve Traditions, Tradition Seven and P.I., and the role of trustees. Recommendations on the need for a long form of the Twelve Traditions along with concepts for service will be forwarded to the Select Committee. A draft concerning Tradition Seven should be completed by conference time and will be turned over to the P.I. Committee. Work on the role of trustees has begun with an evaluation of the guidelines for the BOT in the *Temporary Working Guide to our Service Structure* and will continue over the next several months.

In our extended discussion of the *Conference Agenda Report*, several areas of concern were discussed and noted. Motion #11 is the cause of our greatest concern. The Board of Trustees decided unanimously to prepare a special report to the Fellowship regarding our serious concerns with this issue. The nature of the issue and the timing of our report made our decision especially difficult. However, we concluded that this action was necessitated by our guidelines and that our responsibility was to notify the Fellowship of our concerns, along with the broader issue of participation, in relationship to the Twelve Traditions. This report has been mailed to all regions, areas, and conference participants.

Each year as the World Service Conference approaches, some trusted servants and members of Narcotics Anonymous report finding themselves in some confusion regarding some aspects of our world service efforts. While this can be troubling or frustrating, it is also an important opportunity for all of us to reexamine the spiritual principles which guide our lives in recovery and service. It is sometimes easy to get caught up in service issues and lose the focus of our spiritual program. Fortunately for all of us, we have the Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions to help guide us through what sometimes seems to be a hopeless search for unity. Our experience has taught us that each and every one of us is responsible to continue our efforts to further our common welfare so that we can, with God's help, find true solutions to our problems. This is something that is much easier to say than to do. However, we can concentrate on our commitment to live and reflect our spiritual principles in all of our actions, thus dedicating our efforts to current and future members.

\* \* \* \* \*

**To:** The Fellowship

**From:** Bob Stone, Office Manager  
World Service Office

Although there has been controversy enough concerning the publication of the Fourth Edition of the Basic Text, it is necessary for the Office to inform the Fellowship that still another problem has been discovered. The Office was informed on February 25th, by a member that in their copy of the Fourth Edition, second printing, two paragraphs of text were omitted from the bottom of page 87. A check of the second and third printing copies in the office verified the two paragraphs were not there.

An immediate investigation was conducted to discover what had occurred and what could be done to correct the problem. The Fourth Edition was initially typeset in the summer of 1987. From this was produced the Fourth Edition, First Printing. The problem we are now discussing was not present in the First Printing. However the First Printing had another problem. There was too great a variance in the density of the print. While this may have gone unnoticed by most members it is generally undesirable and an effort to correct it was immediately started.

The correction required that the entire Text be re-typeset. This was accomplished in November 1987. We followed the routine procedure for this and the paste-up was proof read before it was sent to the printer. Photographic negatives are made of each typeset page and the "plate" is made from these negatives. It appears likely that the missing paragraphs had glue on both sides and became stuck to the back of the previous page. This went unnoticed by the photographic department of the printer. From these photographic plates an initial print, called a blue line, is made of the text. The blue line was then sent to the WSO for review.

Because the text was proof read, word for word, just prior to having the past-up sent to the printer, it was not again proof-read word for word. Historically, the blue line has been examined only for accuracy of the alignment on the printed page. Since we had not had this problem before, this was the routine we have followed for each of the last twenty times we have printed the book. The blue line was examined for this aspect, as well as other minor marks on the blue line which indicate scratches on the photographic negative. A number of individual marks and realignment requirements were noted and the blue line was returned to the printer.

After the blue lines were returned to the printer, the book was then printed and shipments were made. The Office began distributing copies to purchasers as soon as the books were received on January 20, 1988. Approximately 40,000 copies of the Basic Text were printed with this problem. A subsequent printing with the same problem occurred during early February and was received by the Office on March 2, 1988. By that time, the Office had learned of the problem so none of the books was shipped.

It was decided that the missing paragraphs would be printed on gummed label material and inserted on the appropriate page. The labels were printed and work began on March 7, 1988 to correct all books on hand at the time,--about 16,000 copies. An additional 28,000 copies have subsequently been received and are being corrected as orders for them are processed.

The Office initiated a program to identify all book purchasers whose books are missing these paragraphs. During the last week of March, all of these book purchasers were sent a letter explaining the problem and including the self adhesive labeled paragraphs in question. Instructions were included in the letter

to insert the paragraphs in the appropriate space. It is anticipated that more than 95% of all books with these paragraphs missing will be identified and the paragraphs added. We responded as quickly as possible so as to minimize the impact of the problem.

The Office asks all members who have Fourth Edition Texts to check page 87 to see if there is an unusual blank space at the bottom of the page. If this is the case, contact the Office to request the printed label.

We have kept track of expenses related to the correction of this error and will provide a report in writing to the Conference when it meets in April. The Office is embarrassed that such an error could occurred. Nevertheless we acknowledge that errors do occur and as our Tenth Step to the Fellowship, we apologize for this error. Corrective action has been taken to require a word-for-word proofreading at every stage in future printings.

\* \* \* \* \*

To: The Fellowship

From: Jim Wymore, Chairperson  
World Service Office

As a result of past discussions concerning the use and control of the N.A. name and logo by vendors within and outside the Fellowship we took action in 1985 to obtain trade mark and copyright registration on behalf of N.A. We are pleased to report that we believe we are, at this point, properly protected in areas concerning the use of the N.A. logo and the name Narcotics Anonymous.

This matter was recently discussed at the March workshop for conventions and offices. It was disclosed at that time that there still needs some effort to fully bring some rational order to the commercial use of the N.A. logo and bring these commercial companies into a better relationship to the legal use of N.A. properties. As a result, it was requested that offices and conventions committees who may currently be doing business with individuals or companies who manufacture items for sale to our members or others that contain the N.A. logo or variations of the N.A. logo should send the names and addresses of those individuals to the World Service Office. It is the intention of the Office to communicate to these individuals concerning the rights of the Fellowship and their commercial use of properties owned by Narcotics Anonymous. As this report is copied and distributed throughout the Fellowship, we are hopeful that other members who have knowledge of persons or companies using the N.A. logo in a commercial way will communicate to our Office that names and addresses of those individuals. Fellowship-wide assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

We are not asking for individuals not currently engaged in such business to initiate the production of items containing the N.A. logo or facsimiles thereof. We would prefer to discourage new vendors. We will keep the Fellowship informed of developments as they occur.

The Conference will select members to serve on the N.A. Way review panel for the coming year. This is an important aspect of the publication of the magazine. Regions are reminded to bring names of individuals who are willing and able to serve in this capacity. There has been constant turn-over in the membership of the committee, in part because those who frequently are nominated do not have a strong background in English. Many have been general service volunteers but find the work requires a higher level of skill in the rules of



grammar and punctuation than most of us have. Please seek out members with strong English skill for nomination to the magazine review panel.

In 1983, the WSO withdrew from circulation the speaker tapes that had been included in the inventory of the Office. During the intervening years, the Office evolved with Conference consent a tape review process and has reviewed a vast number of tapes that could be entered into the WSO inventory. This process has been successful. There are currently eighteen tapes in the inventory. More tapes are being reviewed by the committee. The committee as usual, struggles from year to year because the membership is not consistent and the size of the committee fluctuates.

RSR's are reminded to bring nominations of members of their regions who are interested in participating in the tape review process. We have found, during the last two years that we have been able to utilize all of the members who are nominated to this review process, as there is a relatively high turn-over in members. The general requirements are that the individual be willing to listen to several hours of tapes each month, make written evaluations of the tapes, and participate in conference telephone calls to discuss tapes with other members of the review panel. Through this process, we can effectively review the material and bring to the Fellowship tapes of high quality.

Throughout this period of time, there has been a continuing controversy concerning the sale of tape recordings for specific events, usually conventions, by vendors who tape recorded the events at the requests of the sponsoring committee. There has been considerable discussion on this subject over the years in an effort to evolve a clearer understanding of the appropriate relationship to this practice and the spiritual Fellowship. Through these many discussions it has finally become fairly clear that a reasonable course of action can be found to permit the taping of these events, making opportunity for vendors to make a reasonable profit from this service and also provide an opportunity for the Fellowship to protect its ownership rights to these presentations.

During the last eighteen months, a draft recording contract agreement has been evolving from discussions through the Office and in the Fellowship. Copies of this recording agreement draft were made available at the recent workshops for conventions and offices. This agreement generally establishes the rights and relationships of the sponsoring service committee to retain ownership of the tape recordings made at these events. It also makes provision for vendors to record these events as a service to Narcotics Anonymous and make a profit while doing so. The agreements, however, make clear provision for the retention of ownership rights, sale rights and distribution rights of these speaker tapes after the event is over and retention of these rights by the sponsoring committee.

The Office encourages the Fellowship to obtain copies of this agreement prior to further discussion concerning your conventions. We are hopeful that the Fellowship will utilize this method in the future so that the Fellowship maintains appropriate control, ownership and distribution of tapes wherein members share their personal lives, experience, strength and hope.

The transition from open and unrestricted duplication and sale by commercial companies of N.A. recovery tapes to a more spiritually based system will cause some difficulties, especially for those individuals whose primary motive is to make money, rather than serve the spiritual Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. However, we believe that the transition can be accomplished in a reasonable period of time without any substantial disruption to the service that members desire.

In a related matter, the tape review process continues to review tapes submitted by members and committees. Nearly all of these tapes were made of conventions and convention activities. Very few tapes have been received from

members that are recordings of their local groups or special meetings of area or regional events. This is fine, although it has denied the Fellowship the opportunity to review and include tapes generated under non-convention atmospheres. From time to time the Office has been asked about this and we have encouraged area committees or regions to obtain, at their expense, an acceptably high quality tape recorder to make their own individual recordings of some meetings and speakers. These could then be introduced into the tape review process. Most tapes that have been submitted by individuals where recordings were done by themselves, tend to have been accomplished on tape recorders of very poor quality. As a result, most often these tapes have not been found acceptable because of excessive background noise and other poor quality recording characteristics.

The Fellowship would be well served by the opportunity to include more of these local meeting tapes, but it is necessary to improve the quality of the tape recorders in order to make this a viable alternative.