

# WORLD SERVICE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS

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



TO: Board of Trustees, Board of Directors, JAC, RSRs and RSR  
alternates, regional literature committees

FROM: Danette Banyai, Chairperson, BOT Literature Review  
Subcommittee/Traditions Ad Hoc Committee

Date: August 13, 1990

RE: June and July meetings of Traditions Ad Hoc Committee

---

Because of time constraints and the fact that our meetings fell so close together, this package contains a combined report of the two Traditions Ad Hoc Committee meetings from June and July, 1990.

## **June 29, 1990 - July 1, 1990 Meeting**

The meeting began on Friday morning, June 29, at 9:00 a.m. Members present included Danette B., Steve B., Nancy S., and Bob McK. Ann Rider (WSO staff) was also present. Ceven M, Donna M., and Jack B. joined the meeting later in the day.

Since the last meeting, two members (Mitchell S. and Craig W.) have resigned from the committee. We discussed committee membership, and agreed to add one more regular member, to bring our total group number back to eight. As soon as we begin discussions about individual traditions, probably in two more meetings, we will want to start rotating in additional members to offer specific experience. We agreed on a list of suggested new members to offer to the BOT for a final decision at the next full board meeting during the Virginia workshop, July 13th. We also discussed a desire to rotate in (or at least use as resources) bilingual members. So... anyone reading this with knowledge of such members, PLEASE let us know immediately. Additional criteria for committee participation include a minimum of five years clean, service experience, a firm foundation in N.A. and some knowledge of N.A. literature. Any such members meeting the criteria with the ability and willingness to participate need to write a brief resume and forward it to WSO, attn: Tradition Ad Hoc Committee.

We then reviewed our progress in reviewing input since our last meeting and assessed our needs for this weekend. Realizing we had at least three full traditions worth of input still to be done, we assigned two-person teams, utilizing WSO staff to work with committee members. The rest of the morning was spent on that task.

After a lunch recess between noon and 1:00 p.m., we reconvened as a committee of the whole. At this time Jack joined us and asked that, before continuing on with input review, we review and comment on the final draft of the letter from the BOT regarding the illegal printing of the Basic Text. That took until about 3:00 P.M., at which time we went back into two-person teams and continued reviewing and coding input.

We recessed for the day at 5:15 p.m.

We reconvened Saturday at 8:30 a.m., and began discussion on the work-plan, specifically the use of a WSO staff team. George H. was present during this portion of the meeting, to advise on staff availability and also provide some needed guidance on how staff might best be utilized. He specifically requested that we try to get a consensus on how much, and of what nature, writing we would be doing and how much we would require assistance for. This is something we've been discussing and going back and forth with throughout our work. Although we still are not crystal clear about exactly how far the committee members are able and/or willing to go in actual writing, we did definitely agree that we will need the services of a staff team at some point not too far in the future, and requested that such a team be available beginning with our next meeting (which we ultimately set for July 27-29). That team will consist of a writer, an editor, and a project manager/coordinator.

There was a question raised regarding the propriety of spending money to hire a writer-type person just for this project and we were assured that this isn't the case.

We feel that, because the book is not written in the style we agreed to, a considerable amount of the input we've reviewed will not be usable, except for the concepts, ideas and principles presented. So... a lot of new writing will be required. Various thoughts about how that will occur were shared including: Committee could develop at least one content/prose outline as example for writer; have committee or staff develop all input to the stage of our Tradition Three example (which was developed by one of our two person teams) and give that to a writer/staff team for upgrade. In any event, we will most likely have drafts go back and forth between Committee and staff several times. Upon getting first drafts back, we will decide who does what and how much. The Committee must be responsible for maintaining conceptual control. Drafts from any writers/staff need always be viewed as only recommendations.

Some members felt that the simple use of the word "writer" creates problems. We, in N.A., seem to have attached an onus of ownership to the word.

Regarding a time-line, not much was decided. However, a request was made of WSO to help develop something to that effect. (Note: since the meeting, a possible production schedule has been presented and will be discussed during the next several weeks.)

Our next agenda item was RSR contact. The committee members have not been able to contact all the RSRs, and not all the RSRs contacted returned messages from committee members. Due to the change in committee membership, a new list will be compiled and sent to members who have taken others' place, so that they will know which regions they are the contact for.

The next item was regional requests. One request has been received, from the Ohio region, for a September Literature Awareness Day. Bob McKendrick will attend.

The above discussions lasted till about 10:15 a.m., at which time we went back to two-person teams (without benefit of WSO staff help this time) and worked until 4:30 p.m., with a lunch break from 12:30 to 2:00.

At 4:30, we were done with all the input and reconvened as a committee to compare notes and thoughts on the process and our progress.

We looked over the coded input that had been typed and realized that it was not in the order we had hoped. There was some discussion about how to proceed so that the input will resemble a first rough draft. Specific instructions were given to staff.

After some discussion about various ways to proceed, we decided to begin reviewing the "C" items from Tradition Two and worked on that, finishing at 7:30 p.m. We recessed for the day at that time.

We reconvened at 9:00 a.m. Sunday. We took a little time to discuss all comments received so far about the process and our reports. We also talked a bit about communication between the Steps and Traditions groups, focusing on the feeling of increased importance as we actually begin developing text for the documents. We agreed that since both projects will be using staff teams, we would like the staff members to liaison with each other and the groups. Also, it turns out that our newest member, Ceven, lives close to and talks often with a Steps Ad Hoc Committee member. So... he offered to liaison and promote consistent communications in that manner.

We next discussed our meeting schedule for the next several months and decided on the following: July 27-29, to begin Friday evening at 6:00 p.m.; August 24-26, to begin at 9:00 a.m. (tentative); September 21-23 (tentative).

After the above discussions, we began review of "C" items on Tradition Five and worked on that until 11:30 a.m., at which time we adjourned for the weekend.

**July 27, 1990 - July 29, 1990 Meeting**

The meeting began Friday evening, July 27, at 6:00 p.m. Members present included Danette B., Steve B., Bob McK., Ceven McG. and Nancy S. Becky M. and Greg P. of the BOT were also present, as were Ann Rider and Steve Lantos (WSO Staff).

The first item was reviewing the agenda for the weekend. We added the topic of regional workshop requests.

Next, we discussed committee membership. Mitchell S. is able to rejoin the group, so no additional member is required to complete our complement for the time being. We do definitely want to continue our identification of bilingual members to bring into the process as soon as possible. Their participation will most likely not involve regular participation in the meetings, but will involve their review of drafts through the mail at as early a date as possible.

We next looked at a proposed production schedule. At the Board of Trustees meeting, which occurred two weeks later, it was realized that there was still a lack of clarity regarding the BOT's involvement in reviewing the committee's drafts, as well as the release of the material chapter by chapter. The Board needs to spend some more time discussing the production schedule, in order to ensure their ability to respond to the project as a full Board. As a result, the production schedule is not attached to this report as was originally planned. This item will be on the agenda for the October meeting of the BOT, as a priority.

Regardless of that, I would encourage any regions, who are able, to begin arrangements for review groups NOW. We are hopeful that some of you will be able to give us your response to the material in a much shorter time than the four month review and input period proposed. As a result, we would be able to hear from the Fellowship if we're way off track as soon as possible, and won't spend additional time and money working in an unacceptable direction. Any help you can give in this respect will be greatly appreciated.

Our next agenda item was the staff team, which actually was discussed in conjunction with the production schedule, as they seemed to go hand in hand. We have a three member writing team working with us now at every meeting, recording all discussions, and asking questions to help ensure clear understanding of what we want communicated on paper. As internal drafts are developed, the chairperson and one or two other members will review them to further ensure that what we want is what's being done. In addition, the WSCLC and BOT will be used as a type of pre-review body, prior to the review draft going out to the Fellowship.

It's continually amazing to find out how differently every person in the same room, listening to the same discussion, perceives any particular thought or concept, so it's been great to have questions of clarification repeatedly asked of us. We are looking forward to seeing how this whole thing works out in the first committee drafts at our August meeting.

We recessed for the day at 9:15 p.m.

The committee reconvened Saturday morning at 9 a.m. and started to review the "C" input on Tradition One. During the review, a considerable amount of direction was given to the staff team regarding the material we wanted to see in the drafts. Reviewing the "C" input for Tradition One took all morning, and we recessed for lunch at 12:15 p.m.

We reconvened Saturday afternoon at 1:45 p.m. We continued on with reviewing "C" items from Traditions Two and Four. Once again, in doing this review, the staff was given a lot of information regarding material to be included in the draft material.

We recessed for the day at 6:30 p.m.

We reconvened at 8 a.m. on Sunday. We spent the remaining meeting time reviewing the compiled input draft of Traditions One and Two, and spent considerable time giving staff team input on conceptual questions about group conscience, meeting/group terminology, and autonomy applying to the group versus the service structure.

We acknowledged a phone request received by one of the committee members for attendance at a Traditions workshop in the Alsask Region. We asked the committee member to contact the Alsask region and ask that they put their request in writing so that we may respond. During our discussions on regional communication, it became apparent that we will have to revise the contact lists.

As the final item on our agenda, Ceven gave an update on his communication with the Steps Ad Hoc Committee member he has been in contact with. He reported that they will be meeting August 18 and 19, and asked for further clarification about his role as liaison.

We adjourned at 12:30 p.m. on Sunday. Our next meeting will be August 24 - 26. Once again, thank you for allowing us to be of service to the fellowship.

