

WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE OF NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS

P.O. Box 9999
Van Nuys, CA 91409
(818) 780-3951



To: The Fellowship
From: Bryce Sullivan, Chairperson
WSC Literature Committee
Date: October 13, 1989
Re: *It Works: How and Why*, 1982 - 1989

INTRODUCTION

The WSC Literature Committee is accountable to the fellowship through the World Service Conference (WSC). The committee's accountability is maintained, in part, by reports from the chairperson on the progress of our work and the decisions we make. This is one such report. It provides an overview of N.A.'s literature development process. This starts with the *Basic Text*, through to our development of *It Works: How and Why*, a book on the Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions of Narcotics Anonymous.

N.A. members have contributed hundreds of thousands of hours and hundreds of thousands of dollars to this project. Even so, we still lack a comprehensive description of the fundamental principles of Narcotics Anonymous. This overview attempts to provide the perspective necessary to understand how we have arrived at this state.

During the 1988-89 conference year, work by the steps ad hoc committee of the WSC Literature Committee was encouraging. The initiation of a new committee writing process raised our hopes. The process had shown promise of bringing the project to a successful end in the near future. But those hopes were frustrated by flaws in last year's process, and by more fundamental problems in our system of literature development.

The problems encountered in our development of *It Works* point out that our processes must be reevaluated and restructured. Solutions must be found which will allow us to produce major works, as well as providing for the fellowship's other literature needs. Effective means must be discovered for assessing the need for various pieces of literature, for revising existing items, and for developing new, quality materials worthy of bearing the Narcotics Anonymous name. The following review of various past projects gives some background to the restructuring I believe necessary. The frank historical overview is a first step toward avoiding the mistakes of the past. The staff team approach described in a later section, addresses one possible solution to the problems we have encountered. More

traditional literature development processes are also being considered by the WSC Literature Committee as options for developing pieces such as *It Works*.

The consequences of doing nothing, and continuing in either the present process or some variation of the past, seemed so serious to the committee that I have been compelled to present this report to the fellowship. At this critical time there is a need to examine how the fellowship is going to develop written recovery and service materials. Only a thorough and honest appraisal of the assets and defects of our literature development process will be satisfactory. We must improve our ability to serve the fellowship in the creation of literature for Narcotics Anonymous.

Throughout this report, every effort has been made to assure its clarity and accuracy. It would be impossible to give an in-depth account of every event, so concentration has been focused on what is believed to be the most relevant information. Fairness and balance has been sought throughout. The WSC Literature Committee, as well as other trusted servants who were involved in some of the events described, have reviewed this report. It is the committee's sincerest hope that in the interests of our common welfare we keep the principles of our First and Twelfth Traditions in mind. At the same time we hope for vigorous discussion and debate on the included ideas and the options we have for developing N.A. literature in the future.

I would like to express my gratitude to the previous chairpersons of the WSC Literature Committee. Their vision, leadership, and support have in many ways made this presentation possible. The efforts which have gone toward developing literature for Narcotics Anonymous over the years have been heroic. It is with gratitude toward all who have participated in our literature's development, and faith in a loving God that this report is presented.

LITERATURE'S EARLY DAYS -- THE BASIC TEXT

For many years, N.A. was without a comprehensive book on recovery. From the beginning of our fellowship in 1953, until 1982, we had little in the way of recovery literature: a few informational pamphlets and the *Little White Booklet* (1962). The effects of not having a recovery text can be seen more clearly in hindsight than members could have imagined when work began on our book in 1979. Since the book's approval in 1982, N.A. has grown from a fellowship with groups numbering in the hundreds to a society whose groups today number in the many thousands and whose membership runs in the hundreds of thousands. We can only speculate what the impact of having a recovery text sooner would have been, or what the impact of not having a text at all would be today. We can safely assume that the impact on our fellowship would have been great in either case.

There was a considerable portion of our fellowship who were displeased with the simplistic tone and often ungrammatical style of our first edition text. But in spite of substantial reservations, the *Basic Text* was approved because of the overwhelming need for a recovery book at that time. The attitude of the conference was that our book would not be set in stone. The conference would be able to change and improve on it as the fellowship grew. No one foresaw the course those changes would take; certainly no one imagined five editions in six years. Through considerable editing and piecemeal revision we now have our fifth edition, a book which most would agree is of superior quality to our first edition text. However, even with improvements, the committee style of writing is still evident. Choppy, abrupt, and often overly simplistic explanations of recovery in Narcotics Anonymous extend throughout our cornerstone publication.

In particular, the membership on the West Coast of the United States was less than completely pleased with our first text. Part of the inducement that led to the approval of the book was the idea of giving Northern and Southern California the job of developing a companion book on our Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions. The decision to assign the task of developing initial drafts to the two existing California regions acknowledged the limited participation California N.A. had in writing the *Basic Text*. This limited participation occurred despite the fact that the fellowship had its origins in California. The largest concentration of members with long-term clean time remained there also. It was hoped that this more mature portion of our fellowship would be able to develop this book in fairly short order. The thought of having a book which would remedy the problems of brevity in the *Basic Text*, Chapter Four (on the steps) and Chapter Six (on the traditions), was encouraging to all. With the text approved, a book to provide us all with comprehensive information on our principles of recovery and unity was our next literature priority.

IT WORKS: HOW AND WHY -- THE BEGINNING

After the 1982 WSC, work began in Northern California on the Twelve Steps, and in Southern California on the Twelve Traditions. Regional and area literature committees were formed in both places, since none had existed before that time. The members who chose to become involved in those fledgling literature committees for the most part were not those with long-term recovery experience. Mainly these members were newcomers and others in the first few years of recovery.

From its first meeting in July 1982 until March 1983, the Northern California Regional Literature Committee accomplished very little. The Southern California committee was able to accomplish more. It had stronger leadership, more experience, and closer ties with the WSC Literature Committee. A joint Northern/Southern California literature conference was planned for March 1983 in conjunction with the 5th Northern California Convention in Fresno. In a five day conference, the drafts of essays on the Twelve Traditions which the Southern California committee had produced were revised into the first draft of the traditions portion of the book. When Northern California members were asked where their drafts on the steps portion were, they said they had left them at home. In truth they had constructed only the barest skeletons of essays on the first three steps.

A Northern California literature conference was held early the following month, April 1983, in San Francisco. The very small group which showed up was cohesive in its point of view. They were determined to produce draft essays on all twelve steps, no matter what, in time for the April 1983 WSC meeting. Consequently, the quality of their draft was significantly inferior to the Fresno final form of the traditions. In fact, the draft later caused considerable developmental problems, because it contained very little original material of any value. It was full of material borrowed from the approved *Basic Text*, previously rejected or rewritten material from the grey review-form *Basic Text*, and passages liberally adapted from Alcoholics Anonymous literature.

PUBLICATION OF THE BASIC TEXT

During 1982 as the WSO prepared to publish the *Basic Text*, it experienced major difficulties. There were continual and unexplained delays in the publication. The printer hired by the WSO kept advance payments and failed to complete the work. There was no vehicle such as the *Newsline* to inform the fellowship about these delays. Controversies

which sprung out of attempts to publish the approved *Basic Text* in the 1982-83 conference year shook the fellowship. The decision was made jointly by members of world services to delete certain sentences in Chapter Six (Traditions Four and Nine) which resulted in an enormous uproar. It was in a confrontational atmosphere that the WSC Literature Committee threatened to sue the World Service Office (WSO) in the months leading up to the 1983 WSC meeting. The trustworthiness of the WSO holding the copyrights to N.A. literature was challenged. There were many dramatic moments at the WSC '83 such as when the WSC Literature Committee chairperson ripped the *Basic Text* in half during the World Service Office report to the conference. Significant conflicts over WSC voting, the service manual, *The N.A. Way Magazine*, the world convention and the WSO's role in N.A. world services were all played out against this backdrop.

These occurrences were not the beginning, but the continuation of resentment and prejudices toward the WSO and world services. Clearly the atmosphere and feeling of most of the fellowship towards the WSO and world services is different today. The importance of these events is in gaining an understanding conceptually and historically of some of the roots in the mistrust of world services; mistrust of world services in general and the World Service Office and WSO staff in particular. Reporting these basic conflicts bring into focus the subsequent events in a more balanced perspective.

JAMISON LITERATURE CONFERENCE

Following the 1983 WSC, the first draft step and tradition book was distributed to several regions for further work. The Greater Philadelphia Regional Literature Subcommittee was assigned the task of planning the WSC Literature Committee's annual meeting. The meeting was held November 4-11, 1983, in Jamison, Pennsylvania. Participants relied on the traditional cut-and-paste workshop method which had produced the bulk of the *Basic Text*. The Jamison conference was able to complete a second draft of the Twelve Steps portion of the book. The title, *It Works: How and Why*, was adopted.

The Jamison literature conference, coming five months after the tumultuous 1983 World Service Conference, was mired in conflict. The participants at the conference challenged both the authority and the agenda of the WSC Literature Committee chairperson at several points. Nonetheless, there was an attempt made to discuss the step book as a whole and its relationship to the step and tradition material in the *Basic Text*. A minority was opposed to having a separate step and tradition book because it was seen as imitating Alcoholics Anonymous. They felt instead that the work should be directed toward revising Chapters Four and Six of the *Basic Text*. As a result of this discussion, a compromise was worked out. The compromise put material from the *Basic Text* preceding each chapter in the new book, just as the material from the *Little White Booklet* precedes each chapter in the *Basic Text*. This decision stemmed from a concern that the new step material be consistent with the text but not redundant. There was also a desire for a similar style and tone. Months later the idea was dropped. It stands out as one of the few times at that stage when there was significant discussion about the content or form of the book as a whole.

Following the 1984 WSC meeting, a literature conference was planned for June in Knoxville, Tennessee. This conference worked on the Twelve Traditions material from Fresno and additional input which had been generated. The resulting Knoxville draft was substantially the same as what later appeared in the blue review-form draft of *It Works*.

Later that year, in November 1984, a literature conference was held in San Diego, California. For the first time, the WSO executive director attended, with office clerical

staff and computer equipment available on site. Several members of the World Service Board of Trustees and other world-level trusted servants participated, although attendance was moderate. The bulk of the work focused on the steps portion of the book. The conference resulted in the finalization of the blue review-form draft of *It Works: How and Why*, distributed in January 1985.

1986 APPROVAL-FORM STEP BOOK

The chairpersons of the World Service Board of Trustees, the World Service Conference, and the WSC Literature Committee had informally discussed the option of hiring a professional writer over several months in late 1984. They approached the full WSO Board of Directors for their support, and sought the agreement of others in world services. The WSO Board of Directors, at a January 1985 meeting, agreed to enter into a contract with a professional writer for the task of developing *It Works: How and Why*. By March 1985 an ad hoc committee had been formed to work with the professional writer. The decision was presented to the 1985 WSC as an accomplished fact for the conference's concurrence. The process and procedure used in making this decision, and particularly the secrecy surrounding it, were all clearly mistakes.

During the summer of 1985, while the fellowship was providing input on the blue review-form draft of *It Works*, the ad hoc committee met in an atmosphere of secrecy. The committee drew its members from all world service branches, but registered members of the WSC Literature Committee were excluded. Those who were directly involved saw themselves as exercising an important leadership responsibility. A tiny minority of members with a great deal of experience recognized a need to use special workers in the literature development process at a time when this was inconceivable to most. It was hoped that taking this action would produce material of a significantly higher quality than that of the *Basic Text* or the blue review-form draft. The prevailing attitudes about literature and group conscience, and the general immaturity and exploding growth of the fellowship, led to the methods which were adopted.

There were significant problems with the professional writer who had been hired. The writer was not a member of Narcotics Anonymous. Interaction between the ad hoc committee and the writer was almost non-existent. The writer attempted to exercise creative control in ways that were inappropriate. The committee failed to establish a relationship with the writer that would have assured committee control over the work. The writer, quite simply, was not working out as had been hoped. The writer's finished drafts were considered unacceptable. These drafts were rewritten by the ad hoc committee in conjunction with World Service Office staff. When the final draft on the Twelve Steps went before the WSC Literature Committee in December 1985, there were only two registered members of the committee in attendance. The other participants at the December meeting were all members of the Literature Review Committee who had participated in the ad hoc committee process as well. Negative input and comments were handled in a defensive manner and generally rejected. Therefore, no objective review took place. The need for this review was not recognized at the time, and there was concern that such an objective review would destroy the step project.

Decisions were reached at this same meeting to hire a different professional writer to produce the traditions portion of *It Works*. Unfortunately, the same mistakes were made. This was because this process was started before the approval-form step book was published in April 1986, and before any reaction to the white approval-form had developed. No one was willing or perhaps able to inventory the process. The traditions process repeated all the mistakes of the steps process, along with some new variations.

There was a strong protest from portions of the fellowship concerning problems with the white approval draft. The outcry began in October 1986, at the WSC workshop in Charlotte, North Carolina. The atmosphere of the conference workshop became highly politicized. Open input sessions were held, with the proceedings taped as input for the WSC Literature Committee. Mass mailings were soon posted by various members and service committees. Before the release of the 1987 *Conference Agenda Report*, a special report was developed by the chairpersons and vice chairpersons of the World Service Conference, the World Service Board of Trustees, the WSO Board of Directors, and the WSC Literature Committee. The report presented three options to the fellowship which were hoped would be insurance against the possible defeat of the approval-form book at the conference. A variety of options were offered for gathering input, and for integrating the input into an approval draft. The possible adoption dates of the book ranged from WSC '87 to WSC '89. All options retained the white book as the base draft, and all fell somewhere short of what the conference evidently desired.

1987 WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE

The feeling of the fellowship was strong enough regarding the problems surrounding the white approval-form version of the book that the 1987 World Service Conference rejected it. The vote was 20 in favor of approval, 50 against, and 5 abstentions. This resulted not only from objections to the book's contents, but also from resentment over the process involved and the employment of a professional writer. Some argued that the conference was simply saying that N.A. could produce a better book. But objections to the process which had been used, in contrast to the manner in which the *Basic Text* and the blue review-form draft had been created, were undeniably root issues. In a spirit of compromise, and under pressure, WSC participants devised a proposal to create an ad hoc committee drawing from all service branches to continue work on the Twelve Step book. This committee was technically separate from the WSC Literature Committee, but was chaired by the WSC Literature Committee vice chairperson. A series of eight open participation workshops was planned. The idea was to gather input on both the 1985 blue review-form draft and the 1986 white approval-form book. What was acceptable from both would then be used to produce a new review-form draft which would include additional fellowship input.

1987-88 CONFERENCE IT WORKS AD HOC COMMITTEE

This compromise proposal did more to heal wounds than it did to produce a new book. The creation of the WSC *It Works* Ad Hoc Committee was a case where the conference was not fully honest with itself. It failed to accept full responsibility for the consequences of the decision to reject the approval-form book. Sober reflection immediately following the conference suggested concern that the workshops which had been planned were not a practical solution to the problem.

It can be said on the success side of the 1987-88 WSC *It Works* Ad Hoc Committee that the fellowship's confidence and trust in the literature process were in some ways restored. In addition, a large amount of fellowship input was gathered on both the blue and white books. By the 1988 WSC meeting, the WSO was able to compile a master list of the input that had been received. The master list contained the additions, deletions, and changes that the fellowship wanted to make in both the blue and white books. Substantial unanimity emerged on the majority of changes desired. Minority opinion on some points showed the diversity of fellowship views on the Twelve Steps, as well as geographical

differences. The master list of input still gives a general sense of what the fellowship wanted and expected at that time in the step book. It also indicates what was acceptable to the fellowship, and what was controversial or unacceptable.

CHICAGO LITERATURE CONFERENCE

At the April 1988 World Service Conference, the WSC *It Works* Ad Hoc Committee was dissolved. The step book and master list of input was turned over to the WSC Literature Committee. A World Literature Conference was scheduled to be held in Chicago in July 1988. The purpose of this conference was to factor all of the additions, deletions, and changes from both the blue review-form and white approval-form versions of the book into a single new draft. This draft, which became known as the Chicago draft, was then to be turned over to a small ad hoc committee of the WSC Literature Committee. Alternatives to the process used in Chicago were considered, but it was decided that the task was essentially a mechanical one at that stage. The amount of input, the number of people needed to process the input, the time it would take to accomplish the same task by a single committee and most importantly financial constraints resulted in a consensus that the best option was a World Literature Conference. The literature committee simply didn't have a budget large enough to bring together the full literature committee to integrate the input into a single draft. To have done so would have limited the funds needed for the planned ad hoc process.

The members in Chicago divided up into small working groups, with each group working on a single step. Although experienced members were present, there was an unevenness and inconsistency in the way in which individual working groups approached their task. It is clear that material was retained in the Chicago draft from both the blue and white books despite input from the fellowship indicating that the material should be deleted. Similarly, material considered acceptable according to the master list of input was sometimes deleted. Written under pressure by enthusiastic members laboring in 95-degree heat without air conditioning, much of the new material was of poor quality. Additions, changes, and deletions were not incorporated into the text in the best possible way. Moreover, so much material was judged to be unacceptable according to fellowship input that some Chicago draft chapters ended up being extremely short.

On the success side of the Chicago literature conference, a draft made up of all the additions, deletions, and changes suggested by fellowship input was put together. The shortcomings of the conference can be seen to have come from essentially three points. One, members through the WSC *It Works* Ad Hoc Committee of the previous year had made substantial deletions to the material, yet had provided very little in the way of new original writing. Because of this, there was little realistic expectation that the Chicago experience would create a cohesive draft; the material simply was not there. Two, we were not able to give the appropriate support to the volunteer members who participated in the workshop. And three, the kind of group interaction, understanding, and mutual support necessary to develop an entire draft does not occur over a weekend. Even had these members been more experienced, the end result would not have been significantly different. This is due to the very nature of the writing task and the fact that the participants had financial and time constraints limiting the scheduled length of the workshop. Our experience indicates that large participatory workshops may no longer be either a viable or responsible means for creating book length pieces of Narcotics Anonymous literature.

1988-89 WSC LITERATURE STEPS AD HOC COMMITTEE

The WSC Literature Committee steps ad hoc committee, newly appointed by the WSC Literature Committee chairperson, held its first meeting in August 1988. The general weakness of the Chicago draft was immediately evident. To some extent this was expected, because the original purpose of the WSC Literature Committee ad hoc group was to add quality material to the Chicago draft, refining and polishing the draft in the process.

One of the N.A. members appointed to the ad hoc committee had what many felt to be exceptional writing skills. The ad hoc group had substantial discussions on the Chicago draft and developed additional written input during the first two meetings on Step One. Following this, the writer was assigned the task of constructing a new draft. What became immediately apparent to all was that both the Chicago draft material and the submitted input were unrecognizable in the newly produced draft. This draft, known as the L.A. draft, was considered by most to be an improvement. Although some objections and concerns were raised within the ad hoc committee, both about the material and about how the volunteer writer was being used, the overwhelming response by the ad hoc committee itself was positive.

It became clear that guidance and direction from the fellowship would be needed while work proceeded along this new direction which had emerged. After producing a second draft of the Step One and Step Two material, a special report was prepared by the WSC Literature Committee chairperson. The report and copies of the drafts were mailed to all conference participants and regional literature committee chairpersons for comment and input. Although very little written input was received, it was generally positive. Based on the lack of negative comments in this limited response, the chairperson assessed the overall fellowship's response as positive support of the work.

Between August 1988 and March 1989, the steps ad hoc committee met eight times and produced drafts of Steps One, Two, and Three. Each of these chapters were second drafts. The ad hoc committee in each case had received a first draft, discussed additions, deletions, and changes, and then, through the writer, received back a second edited draft. Because the committee was able to discuss and review material faster than the writer was able to write, significant discussions on Steps Four, Five, and Six, as well as the introductory chapter, also took place before the process was halted.

REVIEW OF THE 1988-89 COMMITTEE AD HOC PROCESS

Following the ad hoc committee's work in March 1989 there was an opportunity to inventory the drafts and the process which created them. In doing so, problems became increasingly apparent. It is clear now that problems existed in three specific areas. The underlying and root problem was with the management and administration of both the literature committee and the ad hoc process. A secondary problem was with the style, tone, and content of the L.A. draft material. The third problem was in the literature committee's failure to retain creative control over the draft material and process.

Management and administration of the ad hoc process. The leadership of the committee as well as the literature committee's inability to effectively manage and administer the process was the fundamental cause of the problems that later became evident in the ad hoc process. Had the committee been able to address problems earlier we could have provided this report for the 1989 WSC meeting. This would have allowed more timely conference involvement in the discussions we are now encouraging.

The core of this administrative predicament was in the separation of the ad hoc committee from the body of the WSC Literature Committee. The membership of the steps ad hoc committee was drawn from outside the membership of the literature committee. The chairperson thought that separating the ad hoc committee from the literature committee would enable the literature committee to provide a more objective review of the ad hoc committee's work. This was partially true, but at the cost of only the ad hoc committee members having complete knowledge about the work and the related ad hoc process. This information and management of the project was actually the responsibility of the entire WSC Literature Committee. With our current arrangement, the WSC Literature Committee is an administrative body, more designed for broad review and guidance than for actual writing. Ad hoc committees and working groups, generally made up of literature committee members, actually do the writing. The information which was not shared with the literature committee would have allowed them to make the broad management decisions they were responsible for. Had members of the literature committee been involved in the ad hoc committee in a substantial way, it is more likely that the problems which were skirted would have been exposed. There always exists the chance that our overzealousness to complete a project will lead us to adopt something we might normally find unacceptable in order to finish the task.

The L.A. Drafts. Concerns regarding problems with the L.A. drafts began developing a few months before the 1989 conference meeting. These became most evident after the 1989 World Service Conference. However, concerns had been raised by members of the WSC Literature Committee at their March meeting. Later increasing concerns were voiced by various members of the steps ad hoc committee, as well as others. Typically these were members who had critically studied the material in depth over a considerable period of time, rather than just reading it once or twice. On the positive side, it was observed that the material had a depth and complexity to it. And although a consistency in the drafts was noted that was a welcome change from the disjointed and ungrammatical character of some N.A. literature, there was also concern that funnelling all the input and material through one member's voice had caused problems.

The WSC Literature Committee's review in March brought a fresh, more objective perspective than had been present in the ad hoc committee's discussions. Problems and concerns emerged regarding the language, style, and perceived negative tone of the material. Although the WSC Literature Committee generally liked the L.A. drafts, their input had the affect of reinforcing the increasingly critical look that the ad hoc committee was beginning to apply to the material. Nonetheless, a division of opinion existed even within the ad hoc committee.

Although some might argue that the conference gave substantial support for the three step drafts, as well as for the process which developed them, there is reason to question this. For one thing, the way in which the step drafts were distributed is not an accurate way to gauge fellowship opinion. We have seen, as was the case with the white approval-form step book, our membership holding back, or not realizing their concern over proposed literature until late in the approval process. The white step book was literature in the approval-form, far from the case of the draft step material which was distributed.

The volunteer professional writer. The biggest problem the ad hoc committee had in using a volunteer writer was in retaining creative control. Working as just another volunteer committee member, rather than as a paid professional or special worker, this individual unfortunately was allowed to be in a controlling role. There was some resistance to make changes in the draft material. Specifically, changes discussed by the committee between the first and second drafts were not made to the satisfaction of ad hoc committee members. Unable to dedicate additional time outside of committee meetings for the work

of writing and rewriting the drafts, writing was done only during the meetings, separate from the rest of the ad hoc group. Because of this, the writer missed out on significant portions of the discussions, with access limited mainly to transcripts. This was a handicap for all concerned, and negatively impacted the content of the material. This also helps explain why only three chapters were completed from the eight ad hoc meetings held last year.

The writer's lack of experience in the service structure, particularly in a committee process, led to some misunderstanding and conflict. Furthermore, faulty and incomplete information regarding the writer's role in the development of the step book was given to the writer. A mutual understanding was reached between the writer and the literature chairperson regarding the role of the writer in the development of the step book. This understanding excluded any additional writer(s) and allowed the writer to be the only person drafting material for the steps project. This only contributed to future problems. Throughout last year, the need for the writer to relinquish control of the process was never squarely confronted. When the committee's need to consider additional writer(s) for assistance in rewriting or writing draft material was clearly and firmly expressed to the volunteer writer, the proposal was rejected as an unacceptable condition by the writer. I felt this position was unacceptable, given the nature of our literature development process. Any individual writer involved in the development of Narcotics Anonymous literature must be willing to release their work unconditionally. Although we should be mindful of the feelings and needs of individuals who volunteer their talents and energy toward Narcotics Anonymous services, we must not forget the responsibility we have to N.A. as a whole. Because of the writer's staunch position, I felt there was no alternative but to thank the writer for contributions to date, and seek other ways to continue the development of *It Works: How and Why*. Although regrettable, I believe this matter was handled in the best, most diplomatic way possible. We are grateful for the contributions of the writer and all of the members of the 1988-89 ad hoc committee.

IT WORKS: HOW AND WHY FINANCIAL REPORT

There is another important point to be discussed before we go further with this report and that concerns the actual costs of the *It Works* project since 1985. The year 1985 was the first year that the fellowship began to invest a considerable amount of funds to develop the project. The figures used in the following paragraphs reflect the best estimates of the actual costs attributed to *It Works*. General administrative costs as noted below may include travel, lodging, facilities rental, equipment costs, mailing and copying costs, telephone expenses, and some clerical staff time when it could be clearly discerned (mostly in 1987). Some costs cannot be calculated since they were either lumped together in a general category expense or were actually contributed by members and or service committees of the fellowship and therefore are not available.

In the 1984-85 conference year, the total expenses of the *It Works* project came to approximately \$50,000. Of these expenses, \$15,000 was for general administrative expenses and \$35,000 was for the professional writer's contract for work on the steps.

During the 1985-86 conference year, the total expenses came to approximately \$55,000. This included WSO expenses of \$43,000 for another professional writer's contract for work on the traditions, general administrative expenses of \$6,000, with \$5,000 spent by the WSC. The production costs of the white version of *It Works* was recouped, along with other associated expenses, through the sale of the book. The minimal expenses incurred during the 1986-87 Conference are also included in this total.

In 1987 the WSC created the Ad Hoc It Works Committee which had workshops in eight different locations, seven around North America and one in Australia. The total expenses for this year came to approximately \$115,000. The costs of the workshops can be broken down this way: WSO costs of \$43,000 in general administrative expense, WSC general administrative expense of \$12,000, and individual members' costs of \$66,000 for attendance at the workshops. This last figure was an approximate cost calculation of \$100 for each of the total 660 registered participants from all the workshops. The production costs of the blue and white and later the black and white step draft versions came to approximately \$4,000 after the sales were calculated against the production costs.

During the 1988-89 conference year, the WSC Literature Committee used a smaller ad hoc group to develop and enhance all the input and work done previously. This included a workshop in Chicago and ad hoc group meetings that began in August, 1988. The total costs expended for this year came to approximately \$42,000. The breakdown of expenditures was: WSO costs of approximately \$8,000 in general administrative expenses, \$4,000 in production expenses, and WSC costs of approximately \$25,000 in general administrative expenses.

The current year already reflects a cost of about \$15,000 in administrative expenses associated with this project bringing the entire approximate total to date to a conservative figure of \$272,000.

TRADITIONS ISSUES AND THE LITERATURE PROCESS

This discussion will attempt to show that a fundamental conflict existed between the 1988-89 ad hoc process that evolved and the Twelve Traditions of Narcotics Anonymous. Problems are evident particularly in regards to Tradition Seven ("Every N.A. group ought to be fully self-supporting, declining outside contributions.") and Tradition Eight ("Narcotics Anonymous should remain forever non-professional, but our service centers may employ special workers.").

The lack of approved literature on our traditions makes it difficult to speak with authority on such issues, yet to avoid the discussions because of this deficiency would not prove helpful. Last year's attempt to use a volunteer professional writer may teach us some lessons about our Seventh and Eighth Traditions. This discussion is offered for your consideration and hopefully this will stimulate more discussion on these important principles.

The Seventh Tradition, like all our traditions, expresses a collective principle which we each individually share responsibility for upholding. As a fellowship, we are self-supporting, declining outside contributions. A corollary principle is that we allow no single individual to give or sacrifice more than his or her fair share in time or money. In our groups we don't allow one member to pay our rent or do all the work; nor should we allow one member of a committee to carry the entire load.

When we asked a volunteer N.A. member to take on the task of writing and rewriting the drafts of a book-length project, we crossed over the boundary of the Seventh Tradition. We did this because we had a need for quality writing, for the cohesiveness and organization that seems impossible to produce when writing by committee. The demands of the project required time and effort, inside and outside of committee meetings, beyond what the individual was able to contribute. These demands highlight the conflict with the Seventh Tradition. This is an important reason why our Eighth Tradition exists: to give us the opportunity to employ members and non-members alike to perform services which

require skills or commitments beyond what can be reasonably expected or asked of individual volunteer members. If this argument is sound, it has applications toward the way in which other world service positions and responsibilities are structured. There are other cases where members are thrust into responsibilities so enormous that they may make sacrifices that are damaging to their lives and their recovery.

When we employ special workers, we specifically place such individuals under a different kind of supervision and accountability than that which applies to volunteers. This gives us more direction over the work they perform for the committee. The problems we met with a volunteer in this role such as resistance to direction that changes be made in the material, a refusal to let others on the committee make those changes, and objections to the idea of including additional writer(s) in the project illustrates the value of the Eighth Tradition. Tradition Eight supports the responsibility of our Ninth Tradition ("N.A., as such, ought never be organized, but we may create service boards and committees directly responsible to those they serve"). When it is *our* investment, our collective self-support, we maintain our freedom to resist the demands of individuals, individuals whose personal investment of time, money, or energy gives them the impression that the work belongs to them, rather than to all of us. Adherence to Tradition Seven protects us from undue control or influence. In the same way, as these traditions relate to Narcotics Anonymous groups, the principles of Traditions One, Four, Seven, Eight, and Nine apply to our literature development process and the relationships within it.

Tradition Eight states, "Narcotics Anonymous should remain forever non-professional, but our service centers may employ special workers." The central question for the fellowship to discuss and resolve is: Does the employment of N.A. members to write recovery or service literature for Narcotics Anonymous compromise the non-professional foundation of N.A.?

I believe that hiring members for their writing skills will not professionalize N.A. literature, nor N.A. as a whole. We pay special workers for specific skills to perform specific jobs, not for their recovery. Our fears about money, property, prestige and professionalism need not cripple our efforts to carry the message and grow. We need not fear the service centers, special workers, service boards and service committees that Tradition Eight and Nine give us the freedom to utilize. Our fellowship is based on the therapeutic value of one addict helping another. We freely (without charge) carry the message of N.A.'s Twelve Steps to each other and are able to stay clean and recover through this process. We know this works for us in ways no professional service ever has. We describe this free exchange of our common experience, strength and hope and this identification among fellow addicts of equal status as being "without parallel." The source of literature's content will continue to be from the membership of Narcotics Anonymous as it has always been. The fellowship and a loving God through which we experience a spiritual awakening as a result of our Twelve Steps will remain the source of Narcotics Anonymous literature.

The history of our entire recovery and service literature development process, including the early *Basic Text* days, demonstrates our need for professional help. Our need for professional writing and editing services to better express our message and our experience in written form seems clear at this time. Our fellowship's message is the content. We need the ability to use assistance with the written form, not the message.

SPECIAL WORKERS AND THE LITERATURE PROCESS

We have a history of two separate, unsuccessful attempts to use professional writers outside of Narcotics Anonymous in the work on both the step and tradition portions of *It Works: How and Why*. We also have a successful history of using special workers in the literature process who are regular WSO employees as well as members of Narcotics Anonymous. These successes include work on the *Little White Booklet* (revisions adopted at the 1986 WSC), *Working Step Four in Narcotics Anonymous*, *The N.A. Way Magazine*, and editing services used in the development of many recovery pamphlets and service handbooks. Most recently special workers have assisted in drafting materials on the yet to be published draft version of *A Guide to Service in Narcotics Anonymous*. Special workers also assisted in drafting the Twelve Principles of Service, released to the fellowship in April, 1989 and released again as the Twelve Concepts for N.A. Service in September, 1989. Use of the professional editor contracted to edit the *Basic Text* can also be cited as a successful example. The Fourth Edition was a horrendous problem, riddled with publishing errors; however, the edits accomplished by the professional editor are a significant improvement over the Third Edition, Revised, and are separate from the unfortunate publishing errors which occurred.

The White Booklet. One of the thirteen pamphlets which the WSC Literature Committee worked on during the 1982-83 conference year was a revision of the *Little White Booklet*. Although only a simple majority was required to approve literature at that time, the proposed revision didn't gain approval after the divisive debate at the 1983 World Service Conference meeting. At the 1984 conference meeting, this division continued, and no clear direction was provided on possible revisions to the *White Booklet*.

During the 1985 World Service Conference meeting, the WSC Literature Committee met and recommended (due to resources and lack of consensus) that the conference turn the *White Booklet* project over to the trustees. After work began on this project, the trustee ad hoc committee responsible for this task asked WSO staff to review their work and add comments or suggestions. After reviewing their recommendations, the staff was asked that these comments be presented directly to the full board during the ad hoc committee's report. Throughout this process, the trustees used staff extensively to point out specific problem areas and to recommend language that would serve as a better alternative.

WSO staff was also asked to prepare a report on all of the input that had been received by the WSC Literature Committee during the spring of 1983. One by one each point was considered by the full board and if appropriate was incorporated into the draft.

Once the full board had settled on every language change in the work, they asked for a complete edit by office staff for clarity, grammar, punctuation, et cetera. The entire board reviewed the edited draft, and appointed one trustee member with the necessary skills to engage in a closer evaluation. When satisfied with the edits, the World Service Board of Trustees approved the draft for presentation to the fellowship in the 1986 *Conference Agenda Report*. The 1986 meeting of the World Service Conference approved the *Little White Booklet, Newly Revised*, after vigorous debate. This debate was concerned with sentimental attachment to the old *Little White Booklet* and not with the process used for revision.

Working Step Four in Narcotics Anonymous. The 1983 World Service Conference approved *A Guide to the Fourth Step Inventory* by a vote of 19 yes, 10 no, 13 abstentions. This was a simple majority, but less than fifty percent of conference participants, far from the two-thirds of conference participants now required. The 1984 WSC removed the guide from circulation under even more divided circumstances. There was a significant and vocal

minority objecting to the fact that the issue had not been presented to the fellowship in the 1984 *Conference Agenda Report*, as well as the lack of any literature to replace the booklet. In certain geographic locations the old guide continued to circulate, which caused recurrent debate and controversy.

Following the 1984 conference meeting, the Fourth Step guide was placed on the WSC Literature Committee's priority list, but work on the step and tradition book took precedence. Only after the publication of the blue review-form of *It Works* and the 1985 conference meeting did the WSC Literature Committee begin to develop a review-form version of a new Fourth Step guide for Narcotics Anonymous. Although some consideration was given to the rejected version of the guide, the bulk of the review-form draft was developed from the material on Step Four in the blue review-form of *It Works*. *Working Step Four in Narcotics Anonymous* was distributed in review-form from January 1, 1986 through October 1, 1986.

During this period the Literature Review Committee was still a part of the WSC Literature Committee and, in fact, was more involved in decisions of substance than was the WSC Literature Committee itself. All fellowship input went directly to the Literature Review Committee. The registered members of the WSC Literature Committee never saw the line-by-line input from the hundreds of area and regional literature committees. Only a completed draft from the Literature Review Committee which incorporated fellowship input was reviewed by the full literature committee. Based on fellowship input from the review-form piece, the Literature Review Committee realized the need for extensive reorganization and rewriting to create an approval-form guide to the fourth step. The Literature Review Committee decided to request help from a WSO staff member who had the necessary time and skills to construct a new draft.

The Literature Review Committee clearly established the outline and the entire conceptual framework for the proposed approval-form draft. They discussed all of the fellowship input, and taped an extended discussion for use by the office staff of what review committee members felt was lacking in the piece. The WSC Literature Committee guidelines at that time specifically authorized the Literature Review Committee to work in this manner. Regardless, the WSC Literature Committee was not informed that an office staff member had drafted the Fourth Step guide.

The Literature Review Committee maintained firm editorial control and provided very specific direction. The staff member did an excellent job in constructing a draft which was faithful to fellowship input and the instructions of the Literature Review Committee. This staff draft provided a jumping off point, which was then modified by the Literature Review Committee and the WSC Literature Committee. The WSC Literature Committee approved the release of the approval-form in April 1987. The draft was met by wide acceptance from the fellowship, and was later approved by the 1988 World Service Conference.

The N.A. Way Magazine. Our fellowship magazine, first produced by a World Service Conference committee in 1982, experienced life-threatening problems during its first two years. The 1983 conference vigorously debated whether the magazine should even continue as a fellowship project. Some were concerned about whether the magazine was representative, both geographically and philosophically, of the entire fellowship in its editorial content. Others were either doubtful that a need existed for the publication or believed that it was too imitative of the Alcoholics Anonymous magazine. The 1983 conference worked out a compromise where the magazine was continued as a fellowship project, but physical production and publication was carried out by the WSO in coordination with the WSC N.A. Way Committee.

The volunteer efforts of the members of the WSC N.A. Way Committee were admirable in many respects. However, the capacity of a handful of members to ask for fellowship input and produce a magazine each month on schedule was severely strained. The fellowship was not only slow to provide written input, but also to support the magazine through subscriptions in sufficiently large numbers to allow the magazine to break even financially. Faced with losing money on a publication which few members were even reading, the WSO seriously considered encouraging the conference to eliminate the magazine.

However, the 1984 conference adopted a proposal from the World Service Office which abolished the N.A. Way Committee. The proposal preserved the magazine under the WSO, with a staff editor in charge and a conference-elected editorial board and review panel. The editorial board included representation from the World Service Board of Trustees. These steps addressed the Ninth Tradition issues of accountability and direct responsibility which had been concerns, and unified the fellowship behind the magazine. The history of *The N.A. Way* shows that the fears which once existed that the WSO was going to take over the writing from the fellowship were unfounded and unwarranted. Members of the fellowship still write the articles about recovery. While it is clear that the WSO did not write the *Little White Booklet, Newly Revised*, or *Working Step Four in Narcotics Anonymous*, in all cases, it has contributed services, sometimes involving significant editing, other times involving staff writing assistance which resulted in various drafts for specific committee review and approval.

A Guide to Service in Narcotics Anonymous. The first draft of the *Guide to Service* was published in 1985. The committee had spent almost a full year discussing concepts and modifications to the existing service structure. They later spent some time writing by committee but due to their difficulty realized that the organization of the material and major composition would benefit from the assistance of WSO staff. Since this was the first attempt to use staff extensively in drafting material for a WSC committee, they went about it very carefully. Unfortunately, the staff member who was used did not have enough writing skills for polishing the work. The published draft was acceptable, but the writing style itself was often rambling, unclear, and grammatically incorrect.

The second draft, published in 1987, used a slightly different approach. Individual chapters were assigned to members of the committee as well as to their WSO staff coordinator. The main problem with this process was that the committee was never satisfied with the results. Members had neither the time nor the skills to adequately put into writing the committee's thoughts and concepts. The committee members were unable to accomplish their writing tasks. Deadlines came and went before committee members admitted they were unable to write the drafts.

Once the committee recognized that neither they nor their coordinator were writers, they were able to spend more time discussing concepts and ideas. When they were able to nail down the basics of these concepts and ideas, it became easier to assign the writing to office staff. Here is how the process has worked.

In January of this year, the WSC Ad Hoc Committee on N.A. Service began using a staff team to assist in the drafting of *A Guide to Service in Narcotics Anonymous*. The committee itself had discussed and agreed upon general concepts to be addressed in the *Guide*. However, because of their problems with putting these concepts into written form they decided to use the additional resources of a WSO staff team in actually creating the text.

The staff began by working on material for the Twelve Concepts and the N.A. Service Charter. In both cases, the committee had already discussed rough drafts which had been developed by the staff coordinator before initiation of the staff team approach. The staff team met first to review those drafts, discuss them, and ask additional questions. The team's members then went to work individually, one working on the concepts, the other on the charter, bringing successive drafts back for line-by-line review by the complete team. Before the final team review of each document, each member completed a thorough edit of the document written by the other. The team drafts were sent to the members of the WSC Ad Hoc Committee on N.A. Service before their meeting at the end of March. All concerned clearly understood that the committee had the complete responsibility to accept, reject, alter, or reorganize all or any part of the draft. The full committee exhaustively reviewed each document, both in concept and in detail. Minor changes were made throughout both documents until the committee was satisfied.

The staff team approach appears to be working well. The committee establishes the initial direction, and engages in a substantial review of final compositions before release. The composition itself is accomplished by WSO staff members who are N.A. members with good writing skills, and is edited by staff with similar skills. None of the actual writing process is performed by a single individual; the team writer, while responsible for the composition process itself, always works within the context of the team. The team is small enough so it can accomplish a sizable amount of work in a relatively short period of time. The control of the project remains in the hands of the committee at conception, during development, and at conclusion. The project is administered by employees who can devote a significant number of hours each week to the work, and who have the ability to easily consult with one another at whatever length is necessary. Those who have been directly involved in the process feel confident that the staff team approach could serve well for whatever particular writing project it may be applied to.

STAFF TEAM APPROACH

The volunteer writer played a central role in last year's ad hoc process. Without the writer's services, our development of step drafts was halted. As chairperson of the WSC Literature Committee I scheduled a consultation meeting with the vice chairperson of the committee in early June. Also included in this meeting were some ad hoc committee participants from last year, as well as World Service Office staff. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the problems which had been encountered in the ad hoc process and to look toward possible solutions.

The meeting in June covered topics which were broad and comprehensive, as were numerous discussions with other WSC trusted servants both before and after this June consultation meeting. These discussions covered not only the historical information in this report, but also recommendations which were later offered to the WSC Literature Committee.

In June, I recommended that the committee adopt on a trial basis a process using the assistance of WSO staff to develop the steps portion of *It Works: How and Why*. The process recommended was essentially the same process that the WSC Ad Hoc Committee on N.A. Service has used in their development of *A Guide to Service in Narcotics Anonymous* and *The Twelve Concepts*. This recommendation was included in a comprehensive report covering the development of *It Works: How and Why* from 1982 to date. The report also covered pertinent historical information on other facets of our literature development process. The report you are now reading is a modification of the

report which was originally presented to the committee. The following section outlines the process I recommended and its various components:

- 1) The WSC Literature Committee would provide broad direction, review, consultation, and decision-making for the book's development.
- 2) A WSC Literature ad hoc committee would provide additional guidance and specific direction for the book.
- 3) A World Service Office staff team would have drafting responsibilities, along with staff editing and review of the work.

The WSC Literature Committee. The WSC Literature Committee's primary role would be that of providing broad direction, review, consultation, and decision-making for the book's development. The committee would establish the initial direction of the work and engage in considerable review of the ad hoc committee and staff team's drafts before completion. Regular, thorough reports from the chairperson to the full WSC Literature Committee would be an important vehicle of communication between the ad hoc committee and the full literature committee, detailing the discussions and work of the ad hoc committee each time it meets. These reports would offer information and recommendations for the full committee to consider in the decision-making process. It is of utmost importance that the literature committee be informed on a level commensurate with its responsibility for this book.

The ad hoc committee. An ad hoc committee of the WSC Literature Committee would have the role of providing the basic principles and specific direction for the book. The ad hoc committee would have in-depth discussions about our recovery principles, using source material for guidance. The source material would include the draft developed at the 1988 Chicago Literature Conference, the three L.A. step drafts, and the blue review-form draft and white approval-form draft. Through discussions guided by broad direction from the WSC Literature Committee, the ad hoc group would help steer the staff team. The ad hoc committee would make specific decisions on what each step chapter would contain, and which underlying principles and general concepts to focus on.

The ad hoc group would consist of both literature committee members and additional members appointed by the literature committee chairperson. Although the anonymity of last year's steps ad hoc committee will remain protected (as last year's chairperson assured those members would be the case), the identities of any future steps ad hoc committee members will be open.

The full literature committee would make broad decisions; the ad hoc committee's role would be to carry out these broad decisions, giving specific guidance and direction to the WSO staff team. When the staff team accomplishes the task of producing a step chapter, the ad hoc would review the draft, providing specific input to the staff team for modifications to the draft. Some members of the ad hoc committee would also attend WSC Literature Committee meetings. This would help each group stay abreast of the work, allowing for ample feedback between the ad hoc group and the literature committee.

The WSO staff team. A WSO staff team would have drafting responsibilities, along with providing editing and review of the work. The staff team would be made up of as many members as are necessary to accomplish the assigned task.

Members of the staff team would participate in the literature committee and ad hoc committee discussions on each of the step chapters. Following meetings of the ad hoc

committee, the staff team would meet to provide the team writer with direction, using an outline (provided by the ad hoc group) of the topics and principles to develop first drafts. The staff team would go over the drafts which are developed, and further clarify and fill out those drafts with guidance from their notes from the ad hoc committee and literature committee discussions. A skilled staff member would edit the material prior to the drafts being returned to the ad hoc committee.

The ad hoc committee, as well as the literature committee, would of course have the authority to accept, reject, or modify the drafts in any way that they deemed necessary. The final decision to accept draft material would be in the hands of the full literature committee. At each literature committee meeting the work of the ad hoc group and the staff team would be reviewed. With this constant supervision, the WSC Literature Committee would retain the final authority for this process, as well as the ultimate creative control.

The full literature committee and the ad hoc committee would both need to be able to quickly address any concern of writer control over the work. It is felt that the staff team approach would be a superior way to give us the ability to address this concern about maintaining the necessary checks and balances. Regular meetings of the WSC Literature Committee to review the work would give us the opportunity to do so quickly. Using this kind of development plan would allow us to make appropriate use of writers. At the same time the literature committee's constant review would safeguard against any attachment and personal creative control over the work.

Fellowship involvement. Fellowship interaction with this development process would be in three ways. First, the WSC Literature Committee will be open to any input from the fellowship regarding this process and modifications to our procedural guidelines. Second, following the development of the step chapters, some vehicle will be used to gain fellowship assessment of the work. And third, following the completion of a review-form draft of the Twelve Steps, the fellowship will have their customary opportunity to provide specific input on the completed draft. Regular and thorough reports to both conference participants and literature committees will allow the fellowship to remain apprised of all of our committee work on this important project.

CONFERENCE 1989-90 LITERATURE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The literature committee met in late June to discuss the report and recommendations which I had presented to them. Each member of the committee, as well as members from last year's ad hoc committee, had the opportunity to evaluate in detail all aspects of the report along with the staff team approach. The committee agreed in principle to my recommendation to use a staff team approach on a trial basis to develop the steps portion of *It Works*.

The June meeting closed with the understanding that the trial plan would be modified with committee input. Work was to begin once the committee had consented to a modified trial plan. The report that I presented to the committee was also to be revised and distributed to the fellowship.

In June, the committee felt the staff team approach was the most responsible course of action based on our experience. The committee had discussed the implications of our procedural guidelines on a trial development plan using the assistance of WSO staff as writers. The committee felt in June that this action was warranted. Even members who felt that using office staff to draft recovery material goes beyond the explicit direction of

our guidelines agreed. The committee did have some disagreement over whether using staff to assist in writing is contrary to our guidelines. Nevertheless, the committee agreed in principle to the proposal by a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions. Rather than build a case to defend our proposed plan, the committee felt that acknowledging the possible conflict with the intent of the guidelines was the most honest approach to take.

At the August literature committee meeting the entire issue of the appropriateness of using a staff team approach was again considered. The committee, along with additional ad hoc committee members from last year, discussed the staff team approach and last year's ad hoc process. The committee decided at the August meeting not to move forward with the staff team approach. Perceived conflicts with the guidelines was one of the reasons for the change in decision by the committee; another was strong disagreement surrounding last year's step development process. There were particularly strong disagreements about the ad hoc committee process of last year.

The August meeting ended with the committee left in a virtual deadlock. The committee had rejected moving forward with the trial basis staff team approach without approving an alternative proposal. Various proposals were discussed and assigned to an ad hoc working group for development in late August. The ad hoc group was also directed to develop recommendations for needed changes in our procedural guidelines.

The full committee met in late September to evaluate and formalize the recommendations from the ad hoc group formed in August. One item the committee considered was our work on developing the steps portion of *It Works* for the remainder of this year. The other primary task of our September meeting was to consider changes to our procedural guidelines.

The WSC Literature Committee decided in September to proceed with an ad hoc committee process for developing the step book this year. The ad hoc committee will be responsible to the full literature committee and a report from the ad hoc group will be presented to the committee after each meeting. The fellowship will also be kept informed of our progress by regular reports from the chairperson. The ad hoc committee will focus on the preliminary groundwork necessary to develop the book, short of actually writing any step drafts. The committee will be using office staff as an appropriate resource, short of draft development assistance. The issues this committee will address will be items such as: purpose, style, format, reading level, content of chapters, review of all fellowship input as well as the various step drafts. The composition of the ad hoc committee was also agreed upon. The ad hoc committee will be comprised of the WSC Literature Committee chairperson and vice-chairperson, two members appointed from the WSC Literature Committee, four members from outside the literature committee and two open positions to be used to rotate members from the literature committee and members from outside the literature committee.

A thorough evaluation of our procedural guidelines has pointed out our need to have more freedom in the resources we have at our disposal. Section 6 of our guidelines describes the resources we may use. These resources range from working groups or ad hoc committees made up of literature committee and appointed members, to literature conferences, area and regional committees and special workers. Section 6-G pertains to special workers and describes the kinds of tasks special workers may assist the committee in accomplishing. The current approved section is confusing at best. It clearly limits the use of professional writers, yet leaves much to the interpretation of the reader. The committee voted to recommend a new section 6-G for the WSC to consider for approval. This proposed section 6-G is detailed later in this report in the section on the 1990 WSC annual meeting.

The WSC Literature Committee has struggled this year to resolve these difficult issues. My June recommendation to begin with the staff team approach was agreed to in principle, only to be followed by rejection of this plan at the following August meeting. Disagreements on development plans in August lead to the proposal of an ad hoc committee more acceptable to the committee. The ad hoc committee will continue the development of *It Works* without the assistance of any volunteer writer at this time. Neither will the ad hoc be able to use the WSO staff for drafting assistance. The committee has agreed on a very conservative plan which allows us to study in detail the underlying components of our book on the Twelve Steps in a way we have not studied these components to date. Deciding on the issues of purpose, style, tone, audience and content are so important that accomplishing these tasks will be a more significant accomplishment than most realize. In hindsight, it is clear that the 1985-86 steps ad hoc committee's failure to comprehensively examine these underlying issues was ultimately one factor which lead to the rejection of the book in 1987. Your support and guidance now, and most importantly at WSC 1990, is earnestly sought.

GUIDELINES AND NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS LITERATURE

In the nine months following the approval of the *Basic Text* (WSC '82), the WSC Literature Committee developed eleven pamphlets, one booklet, and a revision of the *Little White Booklet*. All thirteen items were presented to the fellowship in the 1983 *Conference Agenda Report*, and all except the *Little White Booklet* were adopted at the 1983 conference. However, no requirement for two-thirds majority of conference participants existed for the approval of literature at that time. Only two of the thirteen items received this two-thirds margin. On the heels of this, few saw the need to inventory the literature development process.

The WSC Literature Committee had no guidelines, and there were no requirements for committee membership. At the time the *Basic Text* was written, you were a member of the WSC Literature Committee when you said you were. As such, it was a very free-floating entity that was only loosely connected to the conference. Decisions were made according to the group conscience of those members who had the willingness to sacrifice whatever was necessary to attend the next World Literature Conference. Committee vice-chairpersons were elected by the committee rather than by the conference, and there was no succession procedure for the replacement of chairpersons who relapsed or otherwise failed to perform their duties.

In the aftermath of WSC '83, some members recognized the need to examine the literature process with an eye toward increasing accountability and direct responsibility. With these concerns in mind, development of the first WSC Literature Committee guidelines was begun. These guidelines were developed partly to define WSC Literature Committee membership, partly to add stability and continuity, and partly out of dissatisfaction with the *Basic Text* and the 1983-approved pamphlets.

By November 1983 at the WSC Literature Committee's annual meeting in Jamison, Pennsylvania a set of guidelines had been produced. These were accepted by the WSC Literature Committee at Jamison for inclusion in the 1984 *Conference Agenda Report*. They were later approved by WSC '84, becoming the first literature guidelines. The 1984 guidelines were relatively simple, providing for a defined review and approval process, and a defined body of registered active members of the WSC Literature Committee.

The general character of the "out of control" literature process, as well as several divisive events at Jamison, added fuel to arguments for a better controlled, more centralized literature process than even the 1984 guidelines proposed. An alternative set of guidelines had been proposed by a member of the World Service Board of Trustees, and was included in the 1984 *Conference Agenda Report* alongside the WSC Literature Committee proposal. The trustee proposal called for a more closed and hierarchical committee structure, with direct election of registered members by the World Service Conference and the creation of a Literature Review Committee within the larger committee. These guidelines restricted the distribution of review-form literature to area and regional literature committees only, rather than the whole fellowship, and also included the option of using professional writing and editing services.

The intent behind the creation of the Literature Review Committee was to produce better quality literature through the involvement of a small committee which included members having significant literary and recovery experience. Those involved hoped the Literature Review Committee would restore integrity and balance to the literature process, providing an option to the methods which previously had been counted on to develop N.A. literature. These methods included both the sometimes destructive cut-and-paste process, and the literature conferences, long on newcomer participation, but short on experienced members. The Literature Review Committee plan was implemented by the WSC Literature Committee between the 1984 and 1985 meetings of the World Service Conference. The plan was not officially endorsed by the conference until the 1985 WSC annual meeting, thus becoming the second set of conference-approved literature guidelines in two years.

The 1987-88 WSC Literature Committee had as its chief goal the development of yet another set of guidelines. Primarily this was a result of the perceived problems with the development of the white approval-form draft of *It Works*, and particularly the problems with the professional writer used in the process. The closed nature of the literature process, and the shortcomings of the Literature Review Committee structure, were also at issue. Input was sought from throughout the fellowship. At that time, the 1985 guidelines were still in effect, virtually unchanged from their original form. Many thought that the new guidelines were the appropriate solution to the problems we were continuing to encounter in literature development. They set up some practical processes for prioritizing the literature work load. They also opened up the committee in a big way, especially when compared to the previous guidelines. The guidelines allowed regional literature subcommittee chairpersons, as well as RSRs and alternate RSRs, to become general members of the WSC Literature Committee. With the adoption of these guidelines at the 1988 WSC, they became the third, and current, set of literature committee guidelines. These 1988 approved guidelines resulted in the elimination of the option of employing professional writers in the literature process, yet the deeper underlying issues and problems of our literature development process were not addressed successfully.

The overriding problem with the current guidelines is that they don't allow the literature committee the freedom to use all the resources at hand. Undoubtedly, in reaction to the previous experience with the professional writer of *It Works*, their use is strictly forbidden in the 1988 approved guidelines. The guidelines have an overemphasis on control, and as such lack flexibility. The very fact that these committee guidelines are conference-approved creates problems. Part of the future solution may lie in allowing WSC committees the flexibility to modify their own guidelines according to some general parameters.

Two separate but related actions of the 1989 World Service Conference illustrate how problems with the literature development process continue to be addressed in the usual

way: randomly and non-systematically. The first is the decision of the conference to assign the future development of the traditions portion of *It Works* to the World Service Board of Trustees. The very fact that the conference removed the traditions from the literature committee work list shows a desire to work around the current guidelines and committee structure. This is a symptom of deeper problems with the policies, procedures, and resources which we have been using to develop recovery and service literature, all of our written materials. It may also signify the fellowship's pressing desire for recovery literature produced in a more timely fashion.

The second decision of the conference addressing literature development problems is the motion which created a new process for the development of a certain type of literature. This is *"literature for use by N.A. service committees intended for addicts or non-addicts."* The motion outlines a process by which the originating committee *"may use resources including, but not necessarily limited to, the BOT, area and regional subcommittees, other WSC committees, appointed ad hoc committees (not necessarily limited to committee members), and World Service Office staff."* Other conference committees, namely the Hospitals and Institutions and the Public Information Committees, have clearly been exasperated with the literature committee's inability to provide them with any real help in developing literature. Two clear examples are H&I's *For Those in Treatment*, and P.I.'s *Questions and Answers About N.A.* with their ongoing developmental delays. These delays are a sign of our inability to effectively accomplish the tasks given us. This conference action can be seen as an attempted solution to this literature committee logjam, and a clear indication that the conference is willing to free up the use of available resources in order to develop literature for Narcotics Anonymous.

1990 WSC ANNUAL MEETING

To more effectively serve the fellowship in the creation of literature, the literature committee needs the ability to make decisions that are balanced with the responsibilities given to them by the Conference. The fellowship entrusted the World Service Conference with the responsibility for the development of *It Works: How and Why*. The World Service Conference will have the opportunity to make decisions which impact that responsibility in April, 1990.

A revised section 6-G was approved by the committee in September and will be presented to the conference for consideration. This revised section states:

"6-G. Special Workers: Special workers are often used to perform tasks which require time and effort beyond what can reasonably be expected of volunteers. There are a variety of tasks that special workers may accomplish for the committee. These duties range from clerical tasks to editing and drafting responsibilities. Special workers used by the WSC Literature Committee for drafting and editing must be N.A. members. Editing and draft recommendations as well as any suggestions are submitted to the WSC Literature Committee for their consideration. When using the services of special workers, the WSC Literature Committee maintains strict creative control of all its projects. The development of each project draws solely from input contributed by members of the fellowship. We recognize that Narcotics Anonymous literature, in all stages, including composition and editing, can only be developed by N.A. members."

If adopted, this new section will allow the committee the responsibility to determine the best development plan for each piece of literature. The revised section will allow the committee to choose between ad hoc groups, literature conferences, area and regional literature committees, volunteer writers, WSO staff writing assistance, or contractual

arrangements with members of the fellowship in developing literature. The WSC Literature Committee will retain responsibility for the process and finalization of any developmental and final production material. The extreme difficulty the literature committee has had in deciding the issues we are faced with points out a need for the World Service Conference to give us specific direction.

The choices we have are controversial issues which have been vigorously and vocally discussed. On the one hand there are members who feel that the writing done by volunteers in area, regional, and world literature committees is of a good enough quality to adequately meet the needs of our fellowship. Implicit in this belief is the idea which generally follows that the use of any paid employee or contracted writer is contrary to our fundamental principles. On the other hand we have members who feel that at this time it is essential that we have the ability to use N.A. members to write as either paid staff or contracted writers to assist the committee in draft development. This belief is generally accompanied by a feeling that the use of these resources will lead to more stable and better quality literature process, but is also in keeping with our guiding principles.

The World Service Conference must make the decision to resolve this conflict. The WSC must guide the WSC Literature Committee in the direction it wishes us to take. The pros and cons of this volatile issue must be openly debated. All affected world service branches, conference participants, and literature committees will need to discuss these issues. Hopefully, this comprehensive report will help to bring all conference participants up to date so that an informed decision can be made at the 1990 World Service Conference. We must come together in unity, and participate in this reexamination of our literature development process.

THE WORLD SERVICE COMMUNITY

As this report clearly suggests, the work on the Twelve Steps has not been sailing along these last seven years without incident. We are once again at a turning point, and we need help. The assistance of the World Service Board of Trustees, the WSO Board of Directors, the WSC Joint Administrative Committee and Regional Service Representatives in the work on the Twelve Step review-form book is essential. World services needs to focus its attention on the steps and traditions portions of *It Works* and *A Guide to Service* in a balanced manner so that the step book we all desire has the support it needs.

There is no substitute for the involvement and discussion of these boards, committees, and representatives. Their written input, advice, and guidance are essential to the success of this project, even if their input is short and general. This project will be difficult to complete without the attention and support of the most able and experienced service leadership in Narcotics Anonymous.

A REALISTIC TIMETABLE

A realistic, flexible timetable is essential. Regardless of the development plan we use, there will be more delays and mistakes before we are finished with this work. There is no limit to the number of mistakes we can make, therefore, we must plan accordingly.

When work on the Step and Tradition book started in April 1982, there was a big rush. A goal was set to complete a review-form draft in one year, by the 1983 World Service Conference. By March of 1983 a draft of the Twelve Traditions had been completed but there was almost nothing on the Steps. A service conference was held in

Northern California in April of 1983 to complete in one weekend a first draft of the Step book. Even though it was completed the draft was flawed by any standard. The step draft's quality was vastly inferior to the traditions draft, a draft which had been worked on steadily over the course of the year. The quality of the product was sacrificed for the timetable.

The desire to rush and hurry has been a constant these last seven years. There are no shortcuts, and the effort to rush and hurry the process has been perhaps our biggest mistake. We will probably make new mistakes, but we don't have to make this one over again. The quality of our work on our Twelve Step book should not be sacrificed for a timetable.

CONCLUSION

Many conclusions could be drawn from the information presented by this report. Clearly, the problems we have had and are having warrant a reexamination of the entire literature development process. This reexamination should be all encompassing in its perspective. The process that we currently use to initiate the drafting of a particular recovery or service piece must be examined. The resources used by the WSC Literature Committee in draft development needs evaluation. The effectiveness of a widespread fellowship review and input system, and improvements in this system, needs exploration. The need for fellowship review of both review material and approval material should also be examined. Our literature development system affects Narcotics Anonymous as a whole, not merely those of us who choose to be actively involved in this process. Whatever development process we eventually use, it must meet the needs of addicts everywhere who desire and deserve quality written material for use in their groups and for their personal recovery.

This question must be answered by the WSC. Does the use of writers who are N.A. members working as special workers or contracted to assist the committee in draft development conflict with our principle of non-professionalism? Does it conflict with any of our guiding principles? The use of special workers in drafting recovery material is one area which needs immediate attention.

With our experience, we can reach a number of important conclusions about the process of using primary writers in developing literature. Using non-addicts or non-members hasn't worked. Having single writers involved who are responsible for rewriting their own material has been problematic. When using primary writers in the development of literature, using World Service Office staff who are recovering addicts themselves has been more successful than any other method to date.

Special workers should not necessarily be used on any specific project, but rather we should reconsider our need to have the option available along with all the others. We have learned a good deal in the past few years about how and when it might be appropriate to use special workers in drafting material for committee and fellowship review and approval. Experience with the special workers involved in developing our literature from *The N.A. Way Magazine* to the Fourth Step guide show that fellowship participation is not excluded by the involvement of addict special workers; rather, it is enhanced.

We need to closely and thoroughly examine our past actions to see whether we have restricted our literature development process from meeting our needs. We need to discuss at length the question of the purpose of our literature, and then thoroughly evaluate our needs and responsibilities as a fellowship. Literature cannot possibly serve to take the place of the spiritual value of our meetings. Our writings should reflect Narcotics

Anonymous by drawing from the diversity of recovery found in the application of our Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions.

We have more experience as a fellowship with the Twelve Steps and the Twelve Traditions of Narcotics Anonymous than we did when we started the process to develop *It Works* in 1982. We have had seven years to grow. The mistakes we have made are lessons that will help us build a workable literature development process and write a book that will help us continue to grow. We are building the future of Narcotics Anonymous. We are trying to create a tool that will help the hundreds of thousands of members who have come to N.A. in the last few years *stay*. And we are trying to give the groups a book which will attract millions more addicts to our way of life in the future.

In looking toward WSC '90, please reflect on our responsibilities to the fellowship as a whole. In studying this report, and in contemplating solutions to the problems which we have encountered in the development of a book on our Twelve Steps, please remember the needs of our entire fellowship.