

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, WSCLC, regional literature committees

FROM: BOT Traditions Ad Hoc Committee

DATE: March 18, 1991

RE: March meeting of the Traditions Ad Hoc Committee

The committee met during the weekend of March 1-3, 1991. Present were Danette B., Steve B., Donna M., Nancy S., Mitchell S., Ceven McG., and Bob McK., committee members, and Lee Manchester and Steve Lantos, WSO staff.

Friday, March 1, 1991

The meeting opened at 9:00 a.m. with a review of this weekend's agenda. It was decided that the committee would focus on drafts of Traditions Seven and Eight on Friday, review the input received from the fellowship on Traditions One and Two Saturday morning, and proceed to review second drafts of Traditions Five and Six that afternoon. Sunday morning would be set aside to have some general discussions about the panel presentation at WSC '91, plans for the next conference year in terms of membership and meeting schedule, and a brief discussion about the upcoming combined meeting in April with the full Board of Trustees to review drafts of Traditions One through Six.

Danette informed the committee of her intention to not continue as the chairperson of this committee after the conference. She cited other commitments, and her wish to have a balance in her life, as the primary reasons. She feels that she will not be able to attend each and every meeting of this committee as well as the Board of Trustees' meetings next year. She still, however, wants to continue being actively involved in the project, but in a reduced role.

The committee then started to review the first draft of Tradition Seven by reading it aloud. General comments afterwards showed the committee's general impression that, while there were parts of the draft that were acceptable, a considerable portion of it will need to be refocused and given more substance. After general comments, the committee started to do a specific, paragraph-by-paragraph, review of the draft. The group's discussions included: whether or not this tradition spoke to N.A. groups only, or N.A. as a whole; that this tradition did

not only refer to financial self-support, but support through time and energy as well; whether or not one group or community should support another, and if so, in what ways; balance in our support as individual members and groups; concerns about the service structure being supported primarily by activities and literature sales; how this tradition supports our unity and common welfare; and a strong desire/need to educate the fellowship about the principles of this tradition. The committee broke for lunch at 12:15 p.m.

The ad hoc group reconvened at 1:45 p.m., and continued to provide specific direction to the staff team to help them in their revision of this draft. It was pointed out that, with the focus of the committee during the next meeting on the first six traditions, they will not see the revisions resulting from their input until after the conference. In light of this and time constraints, after completing their work on Tradition Seven, the committee decided to table the review of Tradition Eight until the first meeting after the conference, and instead discuss some of the general items on the agenda.

A proposed meeting schedule was presented. If the committee is to accomplish its goals for next year, it would probably need to meet eight times next year, and have one or two additional meetings with the Board of Trustees. In reviewing the proposed schedule, various members expressed some concerns about the frequency of the meetings, considering that it would mean twelve meetings during the next year for the trustee members of the committee. As a solution to this problem, a proposal was forwarded for revolving attendance, incorporating a membership expanded to six trustees and six non-trustees, with only seven to eight members participating in each meeting. With such a committee, the trustees assigned to the project would each be expected to attend only half of the committee meetings, and each non-trustee would only have to attend five or six meetings, instead of all eight. All twelve members would be kept fully informed of the proceedings by phone and mail. The proposal and the meeting schedule for next year was then accepted in principle. The group also decided to propose inviting various regional literature chairpersons to attend some meetings, in keeping with the committee's desire of maintaining close communication with the fellowship. Both proposals will be discussed during the combined meeting next month.

The final item discussed during this portion of the meeting was the manner in which the review-form of the traditions would be released to the fellowship. The committee decided to recommend to the BOT to release the review-form of the traditions in a simple manner--loose leaf pages instead of having them bound. Other discussions arose about sales price and marketing, but were tabled to a later date for WSB and WSO BOD consideration. Additionally, the ad hoc group reiterated its desire for conceptual, rather than line-by-line input. A questionnaire, similar in nature to the one utilized for the pre-review on Traditions One and Two, will be developed for that purpose. The committee adjourned for the day at 5:45 p.m.

Saturday, March 2, 1991

The committee started at 9:15 a.m. by reviewing the input received on the pre-review drafts of Traditions One and Two. The members were gratified by the size of the response received from the fellowship. (Please see Attachment One for specific information on the responses received.) The draft of Tradition One was read aloud prior to reviewing the master-list of input on that tradition. The group noted three areas for discussion from the input received: the concept of acceptance; the common welfare portion of the draft; a question about whether or not to include discussion about the service structure being included in this tradition; and a request to include the concept of "home-groups" in the material.

The consensus reached, after discussion on the concept of acceptance, was that it can be relatively easily worked into the material in conjunction with surrender. Next, the committee discussed the few comments received requesting that "common welfare" be developed further. Specific direction was given to the staff team to highlight this concept in relation to unity in the draft. The committee felt that the issue of the service structure was covered adequately in the draft. In their consideration of the home-group concept, which had been discussed a number of times in the past, some different perspectives came to light. There was some reticence on the committee's part to include certain specific practices that are generally associated with "home groups," such as the specific ways that they conduct their business meetings, and the types of services they may offer, when those practices are not necessarily the experience of the fellowship as a whole. It was recognized that the way the material was drafted reflected the strengths and benefits of a home group, without specifically calling it by that name. After further discussion, the group decided to mention home groups in the context of the personal commitments members may make in the "Unity in action" section. The committee broke for lunch at 12:15 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 1:45 p.m. The review of Tradition Two input was begun by reading the draft aloud. There were five ideas the committee discussed in reviewing the input on the pre-review draft of Tradition Two. They were: group conscience vs. group opinion; whether or not the word "group" in this tradition referred only to N.A. groups, or any groups and committees, etc.; rotation; the concept of authority; and the value of describing conflict as either beneficial or detrimental.

After considerable discussion, the committee agreed that group conscience in the context of this tradition meant a spiritual practice and not a political tool, and that the draft did not need to be altered, as it clearly represented the differences between "group conscience" and "group opinion," without specifically utilizing that exact wording. The committee, while cognizant of the controversy surrounding the word "group" in this tradition, did not see that specific distinctions needed to be made between N.A. groups and committees in the draft. The committee felt that the spiritual practice of group conscience could be exercised by any group of individuals, in any setting. After some discussion on the concept of rotation, the group agreed that rotation in and of itself is a practice, and while it involves various spiritual principles such as humility, selflessness, integrity, and anonymity,

among others, it is not a spiritual principle. In referring to the concept of authority, the group felt that the following statements in the draft answered the concern raised adequately: "Who has the final say in our discussions? Our answer is that a loving God, the source of our unity, has the final say--the same Higher Power that guides our personal recovery." The final point raised was that of the benefits of "conflict" being mentioned in the material. After careful review of the written material in the draft and the input received, the committee felt that there was a considerable amount of discussion in the material about differing points of view and opinions in the development of group conscience, and that they did not feel that they specifically needed to mention that conflicts are inherently good or bad.

The committee then read aloud the second draft of Tradition Five, and gave general comments. There was some dissatisfaction noted with the material. While there were good portions of it, generally it was bland and tried to say too much. The group proceeded into specific review of the material, and ended up restructuring it so that the ideas presented were simple and straightforward. It was noted that, at times, there was too much of an effort to try and include much more than needed to be in the material. There was some discussion about primary and secondary purposes in the context of this tradition. The "Spiritual Principles" section was also revised to reflect the motivation and heart of this chapter. The meeting adjourned for the day at 6:05 p.m.

Sunday, March 3, 1991

The committee started its meeting at 8:00 a.m., in order to complete its task while all the members were present. The second draft of Tradition Six was read aloud and general comments were given. Once again, it was noted that this draft needed a fairly large amount of additional work before it would be considered ready. The material was restructured, and major amounts of input were given to the staff team to help in their revision of this draft.

The final item on the committee's agenda was some preliminary discussion about the upcoming combined meeting with the Board of Trustees. The committee will meet with the board on April 6th and 7th, to review drafts of Traditions One through Six. It is their mutual hope that drafts of those traditions will be released for fellowship review, by the end of April. The committee, however, is also aware that, depending upon the amount of needed revisions on the material, the drafts may not be ready for fellowship review and input by that date. A proposal for next year's meeting and attendance schedule will also be prepared in time for the combined meeting.

ATTACHMENT ONE
RESULTS OF MASTERLIST OF INPUT ON
TRADITION ONE

February 27, 1991

Number of Packages Mailed - Approximately 230*

Number of Responses - 169

Responses to Questions

- 1. Does the draft reflect the concepts contained in this tradition accurately?**

Yes: 155 No: 14

- 2. Are there any concepts missing? If yes, what?**

Yes: 47 No: 119 ?: 3

The majority of the yes responses pointed to the concept of "common welfare" not being developed fully enough. Additional comments centered around "unity" being expressed in other ways, and acceptance. There were some mentions about wanting to see the concept of "home group" be developed.

- 3. How would you rate this draft?**

Good: 130 Fair: 39 Poor: 0

- 4. Is this draft acceptable in its present form for general fellowship review and input?**

Yes: 146 No: 19 No Comment: 4

* While there were 230 packages mailed out to conference participants, members of the WSCLC, and regional literature committees, the packages were in some cases duplicated locally and sent to areas and groups for their comment. As a result, the number of responses received should not be considered as a percentage of the packages mailed out by the office.

5. **General comments:** This section was generally encouraging the committee's direction regarding the presentation of the material on this tradition. The comments that reflected a dissatisfaction with the material were few.

RESULTS OF MASTERLIST OF INPUT ON TRADITION TWO

February 27, 1991

Number of Packages Mailed - Approximately 230*

Number of Responses - 160

Responses to Questions

- 1. Does the draft reflect the concepts contained in this tradition accurately?**

Yes: 144 No: 11 ? : 5

- 2. Are there any concepts missing? If yes, what?**

Yes: 42 No: 112 ? : 6

While there seemed to be no majority in the yes comments, the concepts of "authority" and "responsibility" seemed to come up a few times. Additional comments (a few) centered around the desire for some discussion about the difference between group "conscience" and "opinion".

- 3. How would you rate this draft?**

Good: 109 Fair: 41 Poor: 11

- 4. Is this draft acceptable in its present form for general fellowship review and input?**

Yes: 124 No: 35 Close: 1

* While there were 230 packages mailed out to conference participants, members of the WSCLC, and regional literature committees, the packages were in some cases duplicated locally and sent to areas and groups for their comment. As a result, the number of responses received should not be considered as a percentage of the packages mailed out by the office.

5. **General comments:** The comments were overwhelmingly positive, with a few concerns about grammar, tone, and content. Obviously, there were many comments about the "group conscience" portion. A number of respondents felt that it should go out to the fellowship as soon as possible. There were a few comments about using "unanimity" in the draft--some respondents had a difficulty understanding the word.

**BOT TRADITIONS AD HOC QUESTIONNAIRE
MASTER LIST OF INPUT
TRADITION ONE
ORIGIN OF RESPONSES**

ALABAMA

Millbrook3

ALASKA

Fairbanks.....1

ARIZONA

Tucson1

ARKANSAS

Little Rock.....1

AUSTRALIA

N.S.W.....1

CALIFORNIA

Fremont.....2

Modesto.....1

San Francisco1

CANADA

British Columbia.....1

Quebec2

CONNECTICUT

Poquonock1

Washington1

Waterford.....1

FLORIDA

Boca Ratan4

Miami.....1

HAWAII

Kamuela1

ILLINOIS

Cicero1

Pana1

Quincy1

Salem.....3

Wildwood.....1

INDIANA

Chestertown1

IOWA

Waterloo1

LOUISIANA

Baton Rouge1

MICHIGAN

Central Lake1

Flint1

MINNESOTA

Minneapolis.....13

MISSOURI

Springfield2

NEBRASKA

Lincoln1

Omaha.....1

NEVADA

Reno1

NEW JERSEY

Ashbury	1
Burlington County	1
Cinnaminson.....	1
Cranford	1
Elizabeth	2
Newark	2
Rehway	4
Roselle Park	2
Staten Island	1
Ventnor	2

NEW YORK

Brooklyn.....	1
Forest Hills	1

NORTH CAROLINA

Charlotte	2
China Grove	5
Winston-Salem	10

OHIO

Athens.....	1
Columbus	3
Kent.....	1
Marion	1

OKLAHOMA

Norman.....	1
-------------	---

OREGON

Portland.....	1
---------------	---

PENNSYLVANIA

Allentown.....	1
Clifton Heights.....	1
Downingtown.....	1
Leechburgh	1
Wyomissing.....	1

RHODE ISLAND

Providence	1
------------------	---

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville	1
Myrtle Beach.....	1
West Columbia	8

TENNESSEE

Nashville	2
-----------------	---

TEXAS

Austin	1
Dallas.....	2
Houston.....	1
Lubbock	1

UTAH

Jefferson City	1
Salt Lake City.....	1

VIRGINIA

Newbern.....	1
Virginia Beach	1

WASHINGTON

Kelso.....	8
Kennewick	
Kent	1
Marysville	1
Spokane.....	1
Walla Walla.....	8

WYOMING

Casper	7
Sheridan.....	2

<u>UNKNOWN</u>	18
----------------------	----

TOTAL	169
--------------------	------------

**BOT TRADITIONS AD HOC QUESTIONNAIRE
MASTER LIST OF INPUT
TRADITION TWO
ORIGIN OF RESPONSES**

ALABAMA

Millbrook3

ALASKA

Fairbanks.....1

ARIZONA

Tucson1

ARKANSAS

Little Rock.....1

AUSTRALIA

N.S.W.....1

CALIFORNIA

Fremont.....1

Modesto.....1

San Francisco1

San Jose.....1

CANADA

British Columbia.....1

Quebec2

CONNECTICUT

Washington1

Waterford.....1

FLORIDA

Boca Ratan3

Miami.....1

ILLINOIS

Cicero1

Pana.....1

Quincy1

Salem.....3

Wildwood.....1

INDIANA

Chestertown1

IOWA

Waterloo1

LOUISIANA

Baton Rouge1

MICHIGAN

Central Lake1

Flint1

MINNESOTA

Minneapolis.....12

MISSOURI

Springfield2

NEBRASKA

Lincoln1

Omaha.....1

NEVADA

Reno1

NEW JERSEY

Ashbury	1
Cinnaminson.....	1
Cranford	1
Elizabeth	1
Newark	2
Rehway	4
Roselle Park	2
Staten Island	2
Trenton.....	1
Ventnor	2
West Hampton	1

NEW YORK

Brooklyn.....	1
Forest Hills	1
Staten Island	2

NORTH CAROLINA

Charlotte	2
China Grove	5
Winston-Salem	8

OHIO

Athens.....	1
Columbus	3
Kent.....	1
Marion	1

OKLAHOMA

Norman.....	1
-------------	---

OREGON

Portland.....	1
---------------	---

PENNSYLVANIA

Allentown.....	1
Clifton Heights.....	1
Downingtown.....	1
Leechburgh	1
Wyomissing	1

RHODE ISLAND

Providence	1
------------------	---

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville	1
Myrtle Beach.....	1
West Columbia	8

TENNESSEE

Nashville	1
-----------------	---

TEXAS

Austin	1
Dallas.....	2
Houston.....	1
Lubbock	1

UTAH

Jefferson City	1
Salt Lake City.....	1

VIRGINIA

Newbern.....	1
Virginia Beach	1

WASHINGTON

Kelso	7
Kennewick	1
Kent	1
Marysville	1
Spokane.....	1
Walla Walla.....	7

WYOMING

Casper	6
Sheridan	1

UNKNOWN..... 15**TOTAL 160**