

Samples of Input to Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust Document and other pertinent data/comments

This is the first time in the history of NA service that the fellowship has been asked to vote on a legal document defining our rights to own, use, and control our property. We, the members, Groups, and service committees of NA, now have the opportunity to help write this document. We can each send input to the WSB/RSR working group C/O WSO inc. We've been told this input will be factored-into the document where appropriate. The deadline for input is Oct. 1 1992. Many workshops have been scheduled accross the fellowship to develop input. We hope that the following is of some use to you. We make no comment as to the content or flavor of the input samples offered here except to state that each represents a different style or approach. We encourage you to make your own judgments and state your own feelings clearly as regards our property and it's use, development, and control. We have only one request - please send us a copy of your input.

*Each block of sample input has a name & phone # you can call for more information about what's included in that sample...

*Copies of transcripts of the federal court proceedings including the hearing during 1992 WSC are availible from Carl D. POB 206 Central Lake, MI. 49622 616-544-5165

*Copies of transcripts of May/June '91 conference calls re Trust Document are availible from Jim M. 43437 Crestview Rd. Columbiana, OH. 44408 216-482-4932

HOLDING AN INPUT WORKSHOP KEEP IT SIMPLE-JUST DO IT

Input workshops can be as easy to do as book study NA meetings. Just get together with another or several other members who want to help; read the document (focusing on the Instrument part, which is the 'real' legal part); discuss what you think it means/how it makes you feel - remember this is about giving away-trusting someone else to care for, something you own ; write down your ideas, short or long, simple or complex, and send them to WSO inc. attention-Hollie Arnold, Fellowship Services Team. POB 9999 Van Nuys, Ca. 91409

You can also make input as an individual. Or you can form an ad-hoc committee of your Group, ASC, or RSC.

*For more information on structural service ad-hoc committee formation re. Trust Doc. input contact John W. 34 Maplehurst Ln. Piscataway, NJ. 08854 908-563-1464

*Be sure to invite the WSB/RSR working group to your workshop

*You may want to ask a local lawyer to explain some of the legal language and concepts to you - maybe there's even someone in your local fellowship with experience in legal contracts.

PLEASE SEND A COPY OF YOUR COMPLETED INPUT TO US TOO SO WE MAY ALL
LEARN & GROW C/O Jim M. 43437 Crestview rd. Columbiana, OH 44408

THE FOLLOWING ARE COMMENTS MADE TO ORIGINAL
TRUST DOCUMENT WORKING GROUP

5-16-91

Members aware of the facts will no longer tolerate the existing situation. More "Illicit" texts and other literature will appear. More members will be hurt. We could lose our non-profit status. Most important: fewer addicts could find recovery.

A Literature trust document that reinforces the solution rather than compounding the problem could be an honest initial effort.

SOME POINTS AND CONSIDERATIONS RE: LITERATURE TRUST

1) for our common welfare: A document should be written which accurately describes and formally defines the unwritten "trust" and de-facto contractual agreement that already exists. The different entities that are party to this trust and contract need to be accurately defined and characterized. The roles of these parties and their relationship should be realistically specified. This document should surpass current or past written or perceived limitations, definitions, guidelines, policy or procedure.

2) (simply stated) NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS TRUSTS IT'S SERVICE BOARDS, COMMITTEES, TRUSTED SERVANTS AND (EMPLOYEES) SPECIAL WORKERS TO RESPONSIBLY PRODUCE(PUBLISH) DISTRIBUTE, CONSERVE AND DEVELOP IT'S PROPERTY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE "ADDICT WHO STILL SUFFERS" ACCORDING TO THE SPECIFIC OPERATIVE GUIDELINE/CONTRACT IN THE 2ND, 7TH, 8TH, AND 9TH TRADITIONS

...6)[reiterated] the fellowship Narcotics Anonymous creates the property and wishes it to be given to those who need it. Service boards and committees (ASC's, RSC's, WSC & WSB) and their agent WSOinc. package the property and offer it for use according to the direction of the fellowship. Addicts who still suffer acquire the property from the agent and use it to their benefit.

7) A (real) "trust" already exists: the preceding is accurate description of that trust. --- Document is only formalization.

8) Whether this trust is formalized or not, whenever the spirit of the trust is broken the owner/trustor will assign different "trustees" to achieve goal of gifting "property" to beneficiary.

(Proposed) Lit.Trust Background Statement - Introduction
6/20-21/'91

During the years between 1978 and 1982 Narcotics Anonymous began the process of self-definition and maturity that would allow our Fellowship to become a significant worldwide force for recovery from addiction. A relatively small group of people, ordinary recovering addicts, developed our fellowship's first significant item of property - our Basic Text - the book entitled Narcotics Anonymous. This collection of NA members worked as part of the literature sub-committee of the world service conference. The Four major writing/editing literature conferences were located both centrally and at geographical extremes across the fellowship so that the maximum number of NA members could attend and participate.

Every NA member who wanted to help write our book had the opportunity. The committee eventually numbered in the hundreds of active participating members. Each had a role and a voice in the content of our basic text. During this time these members and the fellowship of which they were representative developed a trust bond with the service structure that the results of their work would be used in the same spirit and manner it was developed. This is the basis and foundation of the Literature Trust Document.

- excerpts -

(LETTERS FROM NA GROUPS TO THE CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL)

We are a "group" a local chapter of the spiritual fellowship Narcotics Anonymous. As a discreet unit, an autonomous but integral part of this fellowship we wish to clearly state that we are part-owners in each and every item of "Intellectual Property" that belongs to Narcotics Anonymous, and we do not assign or give ownership of any item of this "Intellectual Property" to any service board or committee of Narcotics Anonymous.

All service boards and service committees of Narcotics Anonymous are defined by one principle; the Ninth Tradition of Narcotics Anonymous..."N.A. as such ought never to be organized, but we may create service boards and committees, directly responsible to those they serve." All Narcotics Anonymous service boards and committees are theoretically composed of these trusted servants who do not govern.

"THE FELLOWSHIP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TRUST" is a legal document proposed to the World Service Conference of N.A. by the World Service Board of Trustees. In this legal document the "Parties" of the trust are: Trustor (owner) - WSC, Trustee - WSO, and Beneficiary - Fellowship (Groups) of N.A. This is **wrong**; the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous-the groups of NA own all of the property of NA, Therefore, this

document, as proposed, is invalid. There are many other misrepresentations in the document but this one major flaw is the basis of our severe objection to the document...

We, The Recovery First Group of Narcotics Anonymous are writing in protest of decisions made by the World Service Conference. The WSC has chosen to violate the spiritual principles of Narcotics Anonymous, therefore WSC decisions are "null and void". We will not be bound by WSC decisions, Narcotics Anonymous is not bound by WSC decisions.

The World Service Conference has gone along with the World Service Office, World Service Board of directors, and the board of trustees in seeking power and control of the spiritual fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous that created them. They participated in the theft by deception of stealing the copyrights of The Basic Text of Narcotics Anonymous. These copyrights belong to the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous as a whole, not to any service board or committee.

Our Basic Text was written by recovering addicts for addicts seeking recovery without support of the W.S.O., Inc. it was written by the NA members who participated in our literature movement during the late 70's and early 80's. Our book was not written as a "work for hire" but rather, We wrote our book as a labor of love. We entrusted the publishing of our book to the W.S.O.inc. withall intent that the fellowship would continue to "own" its ownbook with all the rights and responsibilities of that ownership. What has happened instead is that the W.S.O., Inc., with support of it's board of directors and the World Service Board of Trustees have manipulated changes in our text without seeking direction of the NA Fellowship. Theses World "service" entities haveused the World Service conference as a vehicle to endorse theirbehavior while compromising the Twelve Traditions of Narcotics Anonymous.

World Services including most of it's boards, committees and officers, participate in persecution of NA members who speak out against their policies. They even prosecuted one member by taking him into Federal Court for copyright infringements. They deliberately selected this member, only one of many involved, who is dying from the AIDS virus and did not have the financial backing to defend himself.

World Services in general and the WSO inc. specifically have used a large portion of the funds generated by sales of our book to provide "services" that were not requested by those they serve. A great deal of money has been spent to further their own singular perceptions through political style propaganda via their exclusive access to effective Fellowship-wide communication. This violation of our spiritual principles is expanded through world service travel worldwide, to personally manipulate the Fellowship, interfering with the group conscience process and influencing groups, area and regional committees and service offices to agree with their power and control political beliefs. NA world services regularly violate the principles of the ninth tradition including... "the ninth tradition goes on to define the nature of

the things that we can do to help N.A. It says we may create service boards or committees to serve the needs of the fellowship. None of them has the power to rule, censor, decide, or dictate. They exist solely to serve the fellowship... Narcotics Anonymous."

PERSONAL OBSERVATION/EXPERIENCE

I participated in discussions held at MRLCNA in Harrisburg, Pa. in February, 1991.

The purpose of these discussions was to "heal" the division in the Narcotics Anonymous fellowship which resulted in case #907631 before the Eastern District Federal Court. We were to be part of a working group that was drafting an Intellectual Property Trust document which would accurately describe the origin, ownership, and purpose of Narcotics Anonymous literature and the bond of trust between the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous and it's service boards, committees, and service office.

The participants in these discussions were: George H Stu T, Bo S, David M, Oma J, Jim M, and Kathleen M.

Stu T clearly stated during these discussions that WSO Inc. would not suggest any definitive action regarding the copyrights on NA literature during WSC '91. Stu re-affirmed his promise during a conference call April 19, 1991, "...we'll keep things status quo until we get finished..."

Stu T broke his promise when, during the WSO Inc. report to WSC '91, he called upon attorney Terry Middlebrook to address the conference regarding copyrights. Subsequently, Mr. Tooredman initiated the motion that the conference re-affirm WSO inc.'s "exclusive rights" to copyright and publish NA literature.

Jim M
216-482-4932

ONE OF THE REASONS TO DRAFT THIS DOCUMENT IN THE FIRST PLACE WAS THE QUESTION OVER THE EXCESSIVE COST OF OUR LITERATURE. THIS DOCUMENT NOT ONLY DISALLOWS THE FELLOWSHIP THE ABILITY TO HELP DETERMINE THE PRICE OF ITS LITERATURE, BUT PLACES COMPLETE CONTROL OF PRICING IN THE HANDS OF WSO, Inc.

ALL N.A. LITERATURE BELONGS TO (IS OWNED BY) NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS - THAT IS, N.A. GROUPS, AND MAY BE USED BY THOSE GROUPS -(NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS) AS THEY SEE FIT. The copyrights on our Basic Text have been registered not only improperly, but FRAUDULENTLY: The book was not written as a work "made for hire," but written by N.A. members as part of "we can only keep what we have by giving it away" and "we tried to carry this message to others." The copyrights cannot, and never will be "owned" by any other entity than Narcotics Anonymous. The copyrights were entrusted to WSO, Inc. as a fiduciary. WSO, Inc. has flagrantly ignored and superceded its fiduciary responsibilities. The

"trust" has been broken. WSC & WSB have condoned and reinforced this activity. If WSC & WSB cannot do something corrective about this situation, we can, and we will.

WHY ARE YOU DOING THESE THINGS? A BRIEF (BUT ACCURATE) HISTORY OF NA LITERATURE AND INCIDENTS IN WORLD SERVICE NOT GENERALLY KNOWN

DATES ARE APPROXIMATE (FROM MEMORY) ACTIONS ARE EXPLICIT

Following WSC '79

•Work on "Our Book" begins as a project of the Fellowship...by the World Literature Committee (members were members just by being willing to help). This was not the WSC Literature Subcommittee, that we know today but something called the World Literature Committee. Any NA member could be a part-of.

•First World Literature Conference; World lit. held first conference, wrote first literature handbook.

Following WSC '80 Work on Basic Text continues...WLC-2 decides to frame chapters from little White Book...

Memphis Feb.'81- WLC-3 THE CONCEPT: POWERLESS OVER THE DISEASE - IDENTITY-very simply AN ADDICT...AND...THE 1ST DRAFT OF OUR Basic Text - THE GREY BOOK ...are developed by World Literature Committee

Memphis Mar.'81- Grey Book distributed to every known NA Group (free) for review and input.

Santa Monica April '81

•WLC-4 Fellowship responds with lots of input. Edit by committee, factoring-in all input begins. WLC membership swells into the hundreds - no NA member is ever denied membership. Book is becoming outgrowth of fellowship.

WSC '81

•Obvious battle between WSO & WSB. 1st real WSC - most of the fellowship is represented.

Warren June '81, Miami Sept. '81

•Basic Text finalized by committee despite irresponsible, political new chairperson who eventually resigns. Strong, directly- responsible, open committee survives to serve in spite of inadequate trusted servant.

Memphis Nov. '81

•WLC elects its own new chairperson, distributes Approval Form of Basic Text to the Fellowship. Every known NA group receives a copy. Policy committee (WSC) enlists help of World Lit members to help draft a new service manual reflective of current fellowship practices- including reformation of WSO, Inc.

WSC '82

•Book is approved by the fellowship through the WSC. WSO instructed to produce hardcover by September. Price of book established at \$8.00 until office "gets on its feet," then will be lowered - perhaps to \$4.50 or less...

Mid-winter '82/'83

•No book published by WSO. Most of fellowship copies approval form for use by members till hardcover is out.

WSC '83

•"1st Edition" is altered from form approved by fellowship. Justification used was that some few members feel changes are appropriate. Fellowship demands book returned to approved state by a reformed WSO, Inc.-->2nd Edition

•Motion passed WSC by 2/3 of voting participants that RSR'S ONLY VOTE AT WSC. CHAIRPERSON CALLED MOTION DEFEATED BECAUSE NOT 2/3 OF TOTAL REGISTERED VOTING PARTICIPANTS.

•WSB MAKES EMOTIONAL APPEAL BASED ON (PROBABLY SOLICITED OR FRAUDULENT) LETTER FROM GROUP IN NEVADA TO 'POLL' FELLOWSHIP DURING A 90 DAY-PERIOD REGARDING CHANGES TO THE CONCEPTS OF 4TH, AND 9TH TRADITIONS REPRESENTED BY DELETIONS IN 1ST EDITION. FELLOWSHIP REPORTEDLY RESPONDS IN AFFIRMATIVE, THOUGH DOCUMENTATION NOT AVAILABLE TILL 1991. --->3rd Edition

•"Original 13" pamphlets approved.

'83-'84

•Fellowship Report, originated as open fellowship-wide communication, becomes increasingly (and unnecessarily) detailed and exclusive in tone. WSO, Inc. initiates "Newsline," presenting Office's views to every NA group world-wide, free.

•Price of Basic Text is still \$8.00 (printing cost reported to be \$1.45).

WSC '84

•NA WAY magazine taken from the fellowship and given to WSO, Inc.

•World convention incorporated as a profit making venture

administered by WSO, Inc.

- WSC Finance committee disbanded.

- World service communication persuades fellowship to accept concept of "vote of confidence" for RSR's.

WSC '84 con't....

- WSC committee membership begins to close, eventually becomes small controllable groups of like-thinking members.

WSC '85

- Little White Book revisions passed... Lit. sub-com. will factor into basic text --->3rd Edition Revised

- Motion passed to allow WLC to do "minor editing of Basic Text for tense, verb agreement, etc." Office hires professional editor to do lit committee's work resulting in many changed concepts -->4th edition.

WSC '86

- Fellowship tells world services "no more professional writers." However, WSC takes it upon themselves without fellowship direction to re-edit Basic Text as committee of the whole -->5th edition [allowing no fellowship review/input and ignoring established fellowship Approval process]

THESE ARE SOME OF THE REASONS WHY MANY OF US MAINTAIN THAT THE 2ND EDITION WITH THE REVISED LITTLE WHITE BOOK SECTION ARE THE LAST AND ONLY "FELLOWSHIP APPROVED" BASIC TEXT

Literature Trust Document - Working Group (Input)

Roy D - 216-637-3145

The definition of parties relevant to the L.T.D. seems to be of question. I will attempt to proliferate the definition and application of these parties.

OWNER:TRUSTOR

The fellowship or members of the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. The owner or owners maintain and empower the Trustee (World Service Conference) to make decisions, with the approval of the owners, relevant to the intellectual properties of the owner. This is not Power of Attorney. A spiritual trust is mutually exchanged that the trustee will act in the best interest of the collective owners and the owners will support the action of the trustee.

TRUSTEE

The World Service Conference of Narcotics Anonymous. The body given authority by the owners to act upon decisions and deliver services effecting Narcotics Anonymous as a whole. The trustee may create committees to develop and define, with owners approval, what tangible or intellectual properties are. The trustee may elect or appoint an agent (World Service Office) or entity responsible for the acquisition of legal requirements concerning protection of the owners property, as well as fiduciary responsibility on behalf of the trustee.

AGENT

The World Service Office of Narcotics Anonymous. In the capacity of obtaining and maintaining all legal requirements and fiduciary responsibility, the agent may also receive an amount of remuneration as determined by the trustee.

BENEFICIARY

The future members of Narcotics Anonymous. Through the efforts of the agent, the 'newcomer' becomes the beneficiary of the Trust. The paradox of this instrument is that the beneficiary, in time, becomes the owner and continues the process by which this Trust is based. As the new owners of the Trust determine the identity of new or additional property to be placed in this Trust, they have the sole responsibility and power to direct the Trustor (RSRs) in the application of the Trust.

All of the above definitions are centered in the belief that the spiritual direction set for this trust will be obtained and maintained through the ultimate authority of our fellowship as described in our 12 traditions.

I fear that the definition, as written in the present form of the trust, leaves room for control of the property of Narcotics Anonymous to a system that does not abide by our spiritual principles.

This document has the ability, once approved by the fellowship, to invert the service structure and place the direction of our literature under the auspice of the agency the fellowship created to implement the fellowship's direction.

I don't know if any of the intent of the creation of this document is designed to circumvent the necessity to seek direction from the fellowship of NA, but it feels like it does.

During an attempt to involve the fellowship in the creation of this document I, as well as other members, expressed a concern as to the wording used by the creators. With the

amount of time given to peruse the contents as well as the impact this document may possess, I strongly recommend that we postpone approval of the Trust until such time that we can understand it's existence.

Roy D 216 637 3145

EXCERPTS

January 28, 1992

WSB Van Nuys, CA

Dear fellow members,

...Another matter concerns me now: the copyrights to our literature. Along with many others, I helped work on literature directly in my capacity as a member of the World Service Office Literature Committee, Board of Trustees Literature Committee, and as Chairperson of the World Service Conference Literature Committee. In that time, there was a fundamental understanding: Addicts were writing for addicts, passing on what was known of recovery in N.A., and that none of us sought, nor would receive, any personal gain. It felt like a giant Twelfth Step. I think time has verified this. The main discovery was that there was a verbal literature trust. It went like this: "We're doing this work with no thought of self, out of love and gratitude. We seek no byline, no royalties..."

If you had been involved in talking with the few thousand members who contributed time, travel, and material sufficient to see the Basic Text from dream to reality, you would probably feel some loyalty to those whose trust you had to earn. This trust is still upon me as well as others who were fortunate enough to be directly involved.

I realize now that we were in error to not have documented this statement formally. Our trust in the leadership during that time was perhaps overzealous. Our encouragement to the old WSO to inspect their accounting and copyright procedures, was perceived as personal criticism of Jimmy Kinnon, and was one example of how things started to go wrong. I pray that we can show some good sense and goodwill to formulate a suitable trust document. In my opinion, the document currently out for approval would not stand up to Fellowship scrutiny, or be an effective service document even if it were approved. The misconception remains, and perhaps is even fostered, that WSC approval equals Fellowship approval.

...It's sad when some of our most loving, dedicated, and selfless members are betrayed and leave the Fellowship when they see that processes have been abused and ignored, or see individuals taking advantage of their servant positions.

We need plain and simple documents defining the role of our world service branches in carrying out the will of the Fellowship. Any member should be able to read, understand, and feel a degree of respect to the material maintaining the Fellowship's legal right to copy the material it has created. As written, the current "Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust Agreement" is harsh and intimidating.

... I was asked to participate in developing what was then called the "literature trust document." While I put in over 70 hours working on this, I cannot see where any of my input, nor that of the other members who also submitted input, was utilized. Foreseeing a need to review what was said in the conference calls, and not wanting any viewpoint to be lost, a taped transcript has been made of both

calls. These are available upon request. It is somehow prophetic that the need for this documentation is being manifested.

Regardless of what Stu and George may have stated at the June 15 (1991) combined meeting, **that document was in no way ready for fellowship review or approval.** In fact, Stu said only a few weeks earlier that "We had better take time to work on it a little bit. I think if we expanded our thinking a little bit, we could come up with some viable options."⁽¹⁾ It was clear to everyone at the time that no consensus existed in the "small working group."

As time went on in May and June, and "we" continued to work on solutions to the extreme conflict of tone and approach, I was told that the work was discontinued due to lack of funds. At the time, I was only disappointed and chagrined. However, looking at the report on the seventh and eighth pages of the approved minutes, combined BOD/BOT meeting in June, Stu said "The small working group feels that the document is basically ready for fellowship review." **THIS IS A LIE.**

It was evident to everyone involved that conceptual problems existed and that the document was advanced prior to resolution of these issues without the knowledge or consent of the majority of the working group. Frankly, I was sad, albeit not surprised, to see documented evidence contradicting the excuse of a low budget. If this were a factor, surely the work could have proceeded in a less costly manner.

Is this matter going to go to the Conference? If so, as one member of the small working group, I would like to report now that some time and money is getting wasted. It won't pass at WSC, and if it does, the Fellowship will abandon it at the first strong wind. Hopefully, we will be able to grow together to the point where we don't play politics with one another. Apparently, we have not yet reached that point. I'm not too dismayed, though. I trust that some of you will have the wit and humor to scrutinize these classes of concern with more vigor.

Bo. S. 412-375-3377

(1) Page 37, May "lit trust" tape transcript

Rachel H.
To Whom It May Concern:

My input to the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust document is based on the premise that all literature and other properties belongs to, properly, the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous.

In cases of literature written by an N.A. group, that group reserves the right to print, copy, and use that literature for its group purpose, as determined by group conscience. This may include, but is not limited to, pamphlets, meeting lists, newcomers packets, flyers, physical merchandise, etc. The group may or may not choose to release that literature to N.A. as a whole. Unless or until it is released to the World Service Conference Literature Committee (or other board or committee), that literature belongs to the N.A. group who produced it. Other groups may utilize and/or reproduce this literature, so long as it is not sold, produced for profit, or used for reasons other than fulfilling the group's primary purpose.

In cases of literature written by a Literature Committee of an Area or Regional Service Committee, that committee reserves the right to print, copy, and use that literature to fulfill the primary purpose of the group: to carry the message to the addict who still suffers. The ASC or RSC may or may not choose to release that literature to N.A. as a whole. Unless or until it is released to the World Service Conference Literature Committee (or other board or committee), that literature belongs to the ASC or RSC who produced it. N.A. groups, or other ASCs or RSCs may utilize and/or reproduce this literature, so long as it is not sold, produced for profit, or used for reasons other than fulfilling the groups' primary purpose.

In cases of literature written by the World Service Conference Literature Committee, other WSC boards or committees, or in cases of literature that has been released to the WSC by individuals, groups, areas, regions, or other committees, the WSC reserves the right to print, copy, and use that literature to fulfill the primary purpose of the group: to carry the message to the addict who still suffers. N.A. groups, ASCs or RSCs may utilize and/or reproduce this literature, so long as it is not sold, produced for profit, or used for reasons other than fulfilling the groups' primary purpose.

World Service Conference approved literature belongs to the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous as a whole. Any changes to the concept or wording of WSC-approved literature must be made with the consent and 2/3 majority vote of all registered N.A. groups in this manner:

- 1) Proposed changes to literature will be compiled yearly by the WSCLC at the World Service Conference. All proposed changes, including the old language and the section or paragraph in

which it is found, will be mailed to the groups the first week of July, with a return date of September 1. All registered groups shall be allowed and encouraged to participate in the voting procedure, and ballots will be sent individually, according to the group number assigned by the World Service Office, Inc.

- 2) The ballots shall consist of a self-addressed, stamped postcard which has the group's registration number on it, and numbers assigned to each proposed change in the literature. Each number shall have "yes," "no," and "abstain" space in which to record the group's vote, along with a blank for brief comments.
- 3) Proposed changes to N.A.'s "12 Steps," "12 Traditions" or "Basic Text" shall be made and approved by a 3/4 majority of all registered groups.

Final approval of new N.A. literature, which has been through the thorough input and review periods, will be made by 2/3 of registered groups in this manner:

- 1) Proposed literature will be compiled yearly by the WSCLC. All pamphlets and small books will be sent to each registered N.A. group. Large books will be sent to each registered Area Service Committees. This literature will be available for all groups to read and review.
- 2) Ballots shall be mailed along with proposed literature to each registered N.A. group. Ballots shall consist of self-addressed, stamped postcard which has the group's registration number on it, and numbers assigned to each piece of proposed literature. Ballots shall include, if necessary, corresponding numbers for large books that were sent to the ASC. Each number shall have "yes," "no," "abstain," and a space for brief comments.
- 3) Ballots and literature shall be mailed the first week of July, with a return date of November 1.

Use of logos and trademarks:

All physical property developed and produced by the WSO, Inc. belongs to the WSO, Inc. This shall include, but not limited to: calendars, mugs, book covers, etc., including only non-recovery related saleable items.

The N.A. logo, trademark, and hybrids belong to the fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. Any group, ASC, RSC, or board or committee may make use of the logo, provided it is not used for reasons other than fulfilling the group's primary purpose. An N.A. group may, as it sees fit, reproduce, modify, and/or

utilize conference-approved literature at its own discretion, provided that it is for the use of the group and its members only. Other groups may choose to utilize this literature, so long as it is not sold, produced for profit, or used for reasons other than fulfilling the group's primary purpose.

Trustee for all literature and intellectual property is the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous, as outlined in this document, and expressed by direct group tally votes on a yearly basis.

Trustor shall be the World Service Conference, as outlined in this document, and expressed by the yearly votes at the conference.

Beneficiary shall be the addicts who suffer, for indeed, they are truly the ones who should benefit most from the effort of our service.

In decisions that must be made throughout the year, decisions shall be made by direct polling of ASCs. Assuming that not many things happen "all of a sudden," most N.A. members should be aware of the issues that face the world service structure. It follows then, that if a matter arises during the year, that questionnaires, ballots, or other methods determining the course of action desired by the Trustee, shall be employed.

The World Service Office, Inc., is the service center for the N.A. fellowship. Its rights and responsibilities include: printing, producing, copying, distributing conference-approved literature. Its rights and responsibilities DO NOT INCLUDE: managing, making profitable, mortgaging, pledging, loaning, lending, or otherwise controlling the content, price, development or "profitability" of N.A. literature.

The WSO, Inc. has the right to control quality and quantity of printing, methods of distribution, and other "non-decision-making" aspects regarding the content of N.A. literature.

More will be sent as time permits.

If the WSO, Inc. spent \$20,000 in 1990 on developing the lit trust, we can assume that the vast majority of that was on legal fees. More than likely, Wagner & Middlebrook, the law firm retained by WSO Inc., developed the Trust from a standard document, and "tailored" it for N.A. use.

It must be made clear that the WSO, Inc. is the "Trustee" in this document. In the document, and in fact, it is a separate entity from the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous ("beneficiary"). The Fellowship must be informed that the law firm represents the interests of the WSO, Inc. (Trustee), and not of the Fellowship (Beneficiary). The Beneficiary must be entitled to legal counsel

of its own to represent the interests of the N.A. Fellowship.

616-544-5165

Carl D

Being privy to the ongoing efforts to make this Trust a reality I have taken the liberty to include my input on this material. In discussion with other members involved, several items are needed to make this workable:

- 1) Fellowship shall hold copyrights and decide actions. Beneficiary to be the addict who still suffers.
- 2) Trustees of literature shall represent the fellowship as a whole by some means of polls, numbers of groups or meetings, or areas.
- 3) That Trustee shall not be WSO, Inc., but the Literature Trust members. This document will then replacees the WSO BOD by-laws affected.
- 4) Avoid legal terminology. The fellowship must understand.

This is in effect a fiduciary statement. Better written by the Fellowship than the WSO and its attorneys. In effect, it's like the employees telling the employers how things will be run. This obviously is entirely the wrong approach. This Trust, or better yet, "foundation," has the chance to be more far reaching than is seen on the surface. A "foundation" can allow us some freedom beyond what the BOD currently does.

I pray for an open dialogue that can be heard by all and allow for an open understanding beyond what the FIPT has developed into. The document with its "legalese" is controlled by the instrument to be filed. To that end, I limit this input to that section.

Our difficulties with the FIPT are many. The Explanatory Notes are vague and misleading. The term "essentially the same" (#1) begins the portrayal of a new fiduciary capacity as being the same as the way things have always been. It leads the reader to believe that it has been widely discussed (#2) over a year's time. But this is untrue. It was kept quiet until June of 1991. A term like "practically speaking" (#3) implies previous use of these practices, yet that hasn't been approved for use. "Consistent with" also denotes adherence to principles or course:

This does not hold true for this document. It changes procedures and does not state clearly the operating structure in current use in N.A., but one the WSO would like to see in place.

Very blatant is the statement about clear definitive terms (#4) regarding our literature process. This implies finality of fixing of how things are to be. This is not a representation that lends itself to "trust." Even though the process of writing this was moved from the WSO BOD chairperson to the Internal Committee of the WSB Chairperson, he is one and the same person, Stu Tooredman. A comment like this written from a previously approved procedure? (#5).

In the document itself, there are numerous occasions of new procedure. Conference-approved literature was previously the only material the WSO held in trust. Now the statement is "all," yet there is no description of what this means (#6). There is even a statement about literature added by the WSO (#7). This has never been practice in N.A.

Since the beginning of its development, this Trust's main input and consideration have come from the WSO and its Boards and lawyers. It seems very inappropriate for the fiduciary to write the fiduciary statement. The statement that the WSC and WSO shall mutually generate and agree on Trust Operational Rules (#8) is a very clear statement of a plan to continue to tell the Trustor what it will and will not do. I find this to be spiritually incorrect.

The Trustee's duties far outstep what has been standard practice in N.A. Administration, according to the statutes of California, has been bent by what is contained in this document (#9). The document does not allow for an immediate change to anything (#10). But the WSO does put in its place a long elaborate process to change what the Trustee is doing that the Trustor or Beneficiary may not want to be happening. A statement to deal with the Beneficiary impartially is followed by the description of what they have the rights to do regardless of its bias or fairness on the individual member (#11). This implies their ability to decide what might be adverse (#12) to the Fellowship. Yet we will see it can take a long time to correct their misjudgment.

The next several duties described in the Trust Instrument are again quite different from currently described processes and approved means of literature use development and production. Literature has been approved by a vote of the Fellowship at the WSC, then given to the WSO for production in its approved form. The duty to take Trust Property is outside the bounds of this procedure. Then it is followed by the Trustee's duty to make the property productive (#13). This can easily be used to modify the approved literature, something that is intolerable in a spiritual Fellowship grounded in group conscience. Then comes a statement that this can even be delegated to anyone they choose (#14). Once again, this is unacceptable; far outside of current development

for procedure, and contrary to fellowship-expressed wishes when used as a policy in the past. But it's been repeated again and again, and here it's presented as policy.

The Instrument talks of encumbering the trust property (#15), change the form of the business, take part in any other business it sees as necessary (#16), lease, and obtain loans with trust property to be mortgageable (#17). All well beyond current policy.

Perhaps most blatant is the statement on jurisdiction (#18). I could be wrong, but I don't think you can order copyright disputes into a particular state court system. But this may only be alluded to, and not legally enforceable, and the code section referenced may only apply to internal affairs of the Trust.

The trust rules can be easily side-stepped by Article IV by the determination that a rules application is in conflict with the terms of the Trust Instrument. Thus, they are not binding. Yet statements abound. Owner of all Trust property is not true. The Chicagoland Service Office held the copyright on our N.A. symbol and circle design, would not or did not release/sell it to the WSO, and now we have a new service symbol for our medallions, etc.

It sends notification to the conference participants and not the Fellowship. What better ways are there to get around direct responsibility than these? I feel this is a direct violation of Tradition 9, and violates Article I, Section 4 of this document titled, "In keeping with the 12 Traditions." Enough said?

#1	page 1	second paragraph
#2	2	first paragraph
#3	4	third paragraph
#4	5	first paragraph
\$5	4	second paragraph
#6	8	Section 2, Article I
#7	9	Article III
#8	9	Article III
#9	9	Article V, Sec. 1, Sub 1
#10	9	Article V, Sec. 1, Sub 2
#11	10	Article V, Sec. 1, Sub 6
#12	10	Article V, Sec. 1, Sub 5
#13	10	Article V, Sec. 1, Sub 6
#14	10	Article V, Sec. 2
#15	11	Article V, Sec. 4, Sub 5
#16	11	Article V, Sec. 4, Sub 3
#17	11	Article V, Sec. 4, Sub 5
#18	13	Article VIII

Linda R.

Hello family,

I would like to see WSC not allow the WSO to take over in subtle ways our freedom of expression, freedom of feelings, ideas, and the message of recovery that is our primary purpose.

I feel if you take from us what was so freely given, we will pay!

What else will the WSO ask for next without asking?

As members of groups, we as addicts in the process of recovery should take a stand or fall.

Chuck H.

Page 1, last sentence on Paragraph 2, sentence beginning "The document" and ending "exists today.": This paragraph states it is the purpose of this document to eliminate confusion as to the authority of the Fellowship, the WSC, and the WSO. The term "essentially, the same authority that exists today" neither clarifies any clear authority or authoritative boundaries imposed on each service branch, or defines any authority (or lack of) in the future.

The 9th Tradition says our service boards or committees are directly responsible to those they serve. Organized means to have control and to have management. Our service boards and committees are supposed to guide and offer help. This doesn't give anyone, any service board, or any committee the "right" or "power" to rule, control, or dictate control over the Fellowship as a whole. Many of the rules and wording in the Fellowship Intellectual Property Trust document, inconcise, guises to make it seem as though it is in the best interest of the Fellowship as a whole. Are individual or group freedoms to grow or have spiritual input stifled? Will addicts feel a part of or apart from due to restricting their voices, as a fellowship as a whole, from being heard?

I'm a bit apprehensive to let few speak for the many...already here and those to come. May our Higher Power guide us and show us the mature way to cope with this trying time.

Billy Z.

THE PASSAGE AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FELLOWSHIP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TRUST AS IT NOW READS WOULD BE HARMFUL TO THE FOUNDATION AND TO SPIRITUAL HEALTH OF NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS AS A WHOLE!

I. **The Trust is built totally on a defective premise.** This trust was, from its creation, predicated on a foundation of no less than three major lies:

- 1) The opening paragraph of the introduction to this document states in part, "Most of us assume that the World Service Conference has the authority to approve new or revised N.A. literature, and that the World Service Office has the responsibility to copyright, print, and distribute that literature.
- 2) A little further along on that same page, they also state that: "N.A.'s fellowship-wide service and decision-making body, the World Service Conference, has both the responsibility to create or revise N.A. literature and the authority to approve it."
- 3) Also on that same page, they tell us that they have done this "in part, because of U.S. law and international treaty regulate the way intellectual property - copyrights, trade-marks, and other creations of the mind or spirit - should be administered."

As it stands at this moment, right now at least in spirit as well as writing, the WSC is not (in itself) N.A.'s fellowship-wide service and decision-making body. In keeping with that same spirit, the WSC has neither the authority nor the right to create, revise, or approve any new or existing N.A. literature without the advice and consent of the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. The WSC again is not the decision-making body of our worldwide fellowship. It is those members within all our Narcotics Anonymous groups that send their groups' conscience to, and speaks through, the WSC.

Since its creation in 1953, N.A. has been basically operating within the same by-laws. Established as a non-profit organization, the fellowship has had very few, if any, problems meeting its legal obligations with regard to by-laws, structure, or operation. To my knowledge (and I have done checking), it is a fact that insofar as the law and external matters are concerned, N.A. has a clean record.

Externally, they are clean with the US government, state of

California, and any international tribunal. I see no legal reason, therefore, to adopt this trust in its current form. The problem, however, lies within. More will be revealed in my summation.

II. Definition of terms (taken from an independent legal source)

- 1) A legal trust is a right of property, real or personal, held by one party for the benefit of another.
- 2) The Trustor is one who settles, creates, or administers the general policies of a trust; the grantor.
- 3) The Grantor is one who makes a grant.
- 4) The Trustee is one in whom property is vested for others; one appointed to execute a trust.
- 5) The Beneficiary is one entitled to profit, benefit, or advantage from a contract or estate.
- 6) The Trust Instrument is the relationship of all parties involved formally placed in writing.
- 7) The Trust Operational Rules are those rules which actually control the administration of the trust and all parties with respect therein.

IV. Summation

In this, my summation, I give to you a Trust. I further submit to you that this trust is not what it appears to be. This Trust is not held solely for the benefit of the Fellowship of Narcotics Anonymous. In reviewing this document, I offer you, the Fellowship, the following points of information for your consideration. It is my hope that this will be of some help when the time comes to vote in your home group:

1. This trust was also formulated, created, established, and would if implemented, be of financial benefit to the Trustee. Such an action, if accomplished in the administration of a trust, is illegal.
2. N.A.'s fellowship-wide service and decision-making body is not the WSC. The Fellowship as a whole, through its groups and the members through the WSC, has both the responsibility to create or revise N.A. literature and the authority to approve it.
3. For the benefit of the Fellowship, the Trust in its present form should not be approved at this year's conference, re-structured to reflect the following changes, and re-submitted in yet another year's time for approval at WSC '94.

- A. The WSO, Inc., shall remain as the administrator of the Trust, as trustee, with all the rights, duties, and powers with respect thereof.
 - B. The worldwide fellowship shall assume the role of the Trustor, with all the rights, duties, and powers with respect thereof.
 - C. **THE ADDICT WHO HAS YET TO FIND THE ROOMS OF NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS** shall hereby be known as the Beneficiary, with all the rights, duties, and powers with respect thereof.
-
- 4. A document which holds such importance to the fellowship of N.A. should be available for review for one year.
 - 5. This document, if passed, would effectively eliminate a member's right to participate directly in the creation of N.A. literature.
 - 6. This document also grants the right and authority of the WSO, Inc., to create, revise, approve, sell, and distribute all N.A. literature within the office itself.

Literature Trust Proposal

Bo Sewell
490 Franklin Avenue
Aliquippa, PA 15001

412/375-3759

May 14, 1991

Dear Fellow Members:

Here are my ideas of the Literature Trust.

First: that a viewpoint has grown up within World Services that it owns our literature. I can see the natural assumption by people in positions of trust that their service board or committee would be in place at any point in time and therefore the natural and legally correct choice to hold the copyrights. I can feel for these members because I can say with great certainty that I have shared their experience though with more intimacy than has yet been discussed.

In reality, our structure is not a stable thing in terms of personnel, policies and orientation. The last few years, there has been such a preoccupation with money that many members make jokes about getting involved with service and make money for N.A. Huh?

Perhaps many in world service cannot conceive of the Fellowship as a potent body capable of action without recourse to the formal service structure. Where the pathways of group conscience become blocked, members find other ways to communicate their ideas and concerns to one another. This effort towards a literature trust agreement would be a waste of time if it were only to formalize or further entrench either of these problems. Open communication is the only way out.

The original trust bonds were made by myself and others to get members of N.A. to come forth and help write the Basic Text, Narcotics Anonymous. We assured them that there would be no by line, credit for the work would go to the Fellowship and that proceeds from the sale of the literature would shower down on the Fellowship forever in the form of services. To us, that is what and how world services is non-profit. Not so that N.A. can qualify for government funding or any other reason. We had been given such assurances at the time by the WSO manager and the Board of Trustees Chair. The WSC was not yet in existence. Understanding of the trust was universal: do the work, get your book, help the newcomer, keep the faith. The Basic Text is evidence of the attractiveness of this trust bond.

Looking through the preface and introduction sections of the Gray Form,

Literature Trust Proposal

the Approval Form and the Basic Text might lay out some ideas on the trust. Also, the Handbooks for N.A. Literature Committees might have source materials. I have only thought of this because I was asked to participate in the work towards a solution capable of reuniting the Fellowship. I feel that we are dealing with some issues that will continue to divide us until we deal with them. I am also including a print out of a book have written, The Story of the Basic Text. A letter on page 37 and a sentence on page 78 seem to be useful. Also, included is a copy of my affidavit to Judge Pollack.

Creators of a work have the deepest bonding, that is what makes work owned. The creators have the savvy to protect the work and be responsible. We are concerned about the survival and welfare of N.A. If the Fellowship today is not able to write its own literature, has there been so massive a change that we have deteriorated rather than grown more adept? We believe protecting and enhancing the Spirit of N.A. to be ever bit as important as the legal issues of copyrights. Trust is more than law. Evaluation of doubtful benefits to addicts over these issues, we want these surface disputes ended. We want to care enough to be effective. The Fellowship actually exerts a trust towards certain world service bodies that is contingent on performance and revocable. This is so important that our service representatives and officers are called 'trusted servants.'

Origins of the book are in the members of the 1979 to 1982 literature committee. We worked for the common welfare. We prayed to be able to work with no thought of self. We believed and trusted our leadership. Trust was on a human, spiritual basis, not authoritative.

So, coming from a loving, open trust we as servants had the task of looking out for them. We don't like a few people making unauthorized changes, then making out like others are being egoistical to complain of the disorder. Such misdirection is evidence that trust was poorly placed. It is true that human nature is such that wrongdoers can get away with this for a while. It is to be hoped that some perceptive individuals may allow that something more deep and important is going on here now.

It is illogical to construct the basic elements of a trust document from the WSO towards the originating literature committee. WSO is a temporal structure made up for our convenience and replaceable. The first thing the Fellowship did when the Book was done was completely reorganize the WSO. In truth it was the Literature Committee and the Fellowship trusting that WSO would carry out their job of printing and distributing the literature without meddling with the material or the lit process.

It has been WSO who has repeatedly broken trust and needs to be restrained from further disorder. Making WSO responsible to the Fellowship through the WSC is meaningless if the Office controls what the Fellowship

Literature Trust Proposal

reads, what materials can be accessed and what workshop and presentations are scheduled.

Where basic conflicts exist, the Fellowship is forced to extraordinary measures. World Services will utilize Fellowship Report, the WSO Newslines, correspondence and formal presentations to get support for their positions. In every case, members who create non-structural newsletters, workshops or other efforts to deal with issues are at a disadvantage. Even the most urbane and conservative may seem radical. To be heard necessitates some ability to make yourself heard in view of these obstacles. When a matter grows in size and complexity the way the literature trust has done, it is enough to warrant a serious evaluation. For the WSO to be nonresponsive to Fellowship concerns is not directly responsible. A response is required.

There are many members who are concerned that a better job could have been done in maintaining the integrity of the form of the literature and the profile of our World Service Office. There have been irritating changes in the Basic Text without the benefit of a Fellowship wide group conscience and the process that created the Text has been shut down. Many believe the literature process as defined in the Handbook for N.A. Literature Committees has been rendered defunct by the shift of emphasis away from enhancing members of the Fellowship and engaging forces capable of replying to our needs for literature within our service structure.

The situation comes to a head where WSO, Inc. takes legal action. I am not exerting an opinion on the court case here. Legalities reduce to human dimensions and this is an unfortunate case in the courtroom and to the Judge. Had this action been directed towards a non-member trying to encroach on our literature, it would make a little more sense. That the action was taken against a member under the notion that all other efforts towards a remedy had been exhausted is not believable. It presumes that an observer cannot discern the basic conceptual issue from the copyright issue. The validity of the version of the Basic Text now in print and the current cost are more important issues than can WSO win an expensive legal battle against an impecunious aid victim who has been printing inexpensive copies and either selling them at cost or giving them away.

That a sizable sum of money was expended to pay for this lawsuit undermines my faith in a world service system that says it must sell a special edition Basic Text to raise monies to pay for translation of our written message into other languages. Without nit picking, this approach relating to copyrights is abrasive and lacks faith in an Ultimate Authority to take care of the business of N.A.

I hope all this gives the other participants something of use and look forward to seeing the results of their efforts. We can solve all this, if we

Literature Trust Proposal

are all willing.

In my experience, you have to be careful to follow a path of love. Others may not be setting such careful standards for themselves. Deep abiding love - kind of love that exists in some families and cultures, the love that does not feel the need to retaliate, even this kind of love can be perceived as only a force, thereby worthy of opposition.

Some place for the originators needs to be made in the council, board or whatever to administrate the trust documents, intellectual properties and logos. Also, some excellent trusted servants exist like Bob Barrett and Chuck Skinner who might be willing to serve. Some members involved now should be included to complete the array. One way to look at today's problems is as results from uneven information availability and impact from short term committee systems that lack sufficient overview to be competent at tasks beyond their experience or training.

Other constructs diminish Fellowship and lessen spiritual charge on NA as whole - We all know Fellowship can rise or fall to almost any level of expectation. So we set it high. Since we care enough to be effective, we should do our best to set these important matters far from the periodic winds that blow through N.A. yet not so far that the Fellowship as a whole has no say.

I have looked at the documents sent to me and tried to review them as I was working up this input. Though brief, it has taken much time and has been difficult for me to work out exactly what my belief and experience is on this area of trust. After I realized the deadline was approaching, I broke off further scrutiny to write this document.

As I await my comprehensive package, I will go back to reviewing the document prepared by the WSO and its attorneys.

In Loving Service,

Bo Sewell

Article One - Origins of the Literature

The spoken tradition of N.A. recovery was located, collected, reviewed and

Literature Trust Proposal

edited utilizing a technique that maximized Fellowship participation. Located means that there were many coming to our meetings and claiming membership yet carrying a message that had little to do with N.A. On the other hand, there were members and parts of the emerging Fellowship who had no knowledge or experience with other Fellowships and naturally approached all thing from a purely N.A. viewpoint. These members had a lot to offer. They were also capable of a vast commitment to our principles and message.

Article Two - Parties

Originators from the service periods when the literature was developed with an equal number of non-lit workers and a third equal number of members currently involved and informed on the issues at hand. This would stabilize.

Article Three - Properties

Basic Text, Ip's, logo,

Article Four - Rules

Intent - All own, none sell, like Indian lands.

WSO not to compete with Fellowship literature process. Management of the Fellowship will be left to group conscience processes. No attempts to change or control the literature to take advantages of the marketplace and shift area of concern and concentration off serving the primary needs of the N.A. Fellowship. Items of concerns can be routed to the appropriate service arm or branch, repeatedly if item not being dealt with. WSO should not seek to take over ownership of the copyrights but only hold in trust as was intended. Many witness will support this as it is the original intent and thought. Attempts to reword, rewrite, abridge or otherwise change the Basic Text should stop.

In what ways can WSO be trusted and what remedies are in place if future errors or deliberate acts against the will of the N.A. Fellowship occur. This is an area that needs to be defined, agreed upon and formalized in the Trust document. Specific areas of concern are the disbursement of funds for unapproved projects with consent and approval of Fellowship, signing of contracts which impact on the approved Fellowship processes. We need to follow guidelines or stop working on them! Especially, world servants should

Literature Trust Proposal

support and appear to support approved processes so that members can resume trusting what appears in print!

More is being revealed.

Bo S.
490 Franklin Avenue
Aliquippa, PA 15001
412/375-3759

December 26, 1990

Dear Sirs:

The Basic Text, Narcotics Anonymous was written as a gift from those addicts clean in N.A. in the late seventies and early eighties to addicts seeking recovery in N.A.

In a very real sense, God wrote our Book. The energy, ideas and personal experiences assimilated in the material all spring from a spiritual source and lead to spiritual objectives. Our personal experience in working on the book was of the God of our understanding using us as instruments.

Tremendous outlays of personal time, money and perseverance were required on our part to overcome the obstacles of finance, logistics, travel, mailings, literary competence and the where- with all to hold seven conferences each lasting three to nine days over a three year period. Minutes of these conferences were taken and still exist. Our faith and dedication has resulted in a document that has helped hundreds of thousands of addicts get clean and stay clean in N.A. Ownership was intended to reside with the Fellowship. Our World Service Office was reformed to administer the printing and distribution of this, our major work. The book was written by addicts, for addicts. WSO was to copy- right the material on our behalf because we would be in violation of our Twelve Traditions to copyright the work in our names, thereby breaking our anonymity.

Literature Trust Proposal

I will break my anonymity if subpoenaed yet would hope to retain my right not to do so. I feel intrusion to have to do so. In the matter before the court, case number 97631, I feel our Traditions are being violated by bringing an internal matter into a public court inappropriately.

At the request of a friend, I am submitting this statement relating to the book, Narcotics Anonymous. I was witness to the writing from conception to completion.

I served as chair of the World Service Conference Literature Committee from spring of 1979 to spring of 1981. After my terms as chair were completed, I continued to be an active participant in the WSC Literature Committee until the work was done and approved by the worldwide Fellowship of N.A. in 1982.

We deliberately set out to do the work in such a way as to have no 'by line' and no payment of royalties of any kind. Many individuals worked long and hard that the dream of a book for our people would come true. Working voluntarily offset internal rivalries and made the statement that what we were doing was beyond what money could buy. This is a big factor in the success of the work: that the book was written by addicts for addicts. Recovering addicts have a definite need to know that what they are trusting to work for them has worked for others. We instinctively distrust those who have other goals having nothing to do with our lives and well being. Our Traditions warn us of the destructive powers of money, property and prestige when it comes to recovery and carrying our message of hope.

This intrinsic value of our book being a work done in love and gratitude is deeply embedded in the material. Understanding this may help explain why there is no claim of authorship by individuals who certainly played major roles. At least a thousand clean addicts in N.A. participated in the writing, editing and reviewing of the material. Approval by the entire Fellowship came after a six month approval period with universal reading and discussion within the N.A. Fellowship.

We entrusted the results of our work to the World Service Conference of N.A. By the Twelve Traditions of Narcotics Anonymous, and general policies implemented through the years, the World Service Conference is disallowed to possess or own any permanent property. Under direction of the World Service Conference, our World Service Office prints and distributes our Basic Text, Narcotics Anonymous. Proceeds from the sale of our Basic Text are to fund services to the N.A. Fellowship forever.

The Fellowship of N.A. on its own and without direction, funding or any outside support, collected, compiled and reviewed the material contained in Narcotics Anonymous. The funds involved with the work were accounted for

Literature Trust Proposal

within the World Service Conference of N.A., our representative body. WSO was reformed in 1983 to hold in trust this material: it is not a work done for hire. The N.A. Fellowship will resolve the matters before the court.

I have written a letter to our WSO suggesting that court action expands the problem by including those who may not be familiar with our Traditions and the way we do things in N.A. Violation of anonymity is abhorrent to us.

If this will serve as the affidavit in case number 97631, let it be known that I swear that the statements contained are true under penalty of perjury.

Sincerely,

Bo S.

Additional Notes

May 23, 1991

One thing that seems helpful is to attempt to define what we mean when we use certain words. Literature, trust, common welfare, revocable, services, royalty

May 2, 1991

Trust - Understanding what is held in common is dependent on participants keeping faith with one another. Violations of this trust injures all and helps none.

Literature - Our written message accurately encoding our responses and strategies in various recovery situations that allow us to stay clean. Writing for other purposes such as selling books or flattering non-addicts would be a terrible violation of trust. Literal statements about our thoughts and feelings in Twelve Step recovery. A way of showing loving concern towards others and gratitude for those who have helped us. We write down what we have learned from others, discovered for ourselves and what we would say to others if we had a chance.

Common welfare - All that is held in trust by addicts seeking recovery in

Literature Trust Proposal

Narcotics Anonymous. All the good things done in our name. All our courage in the face of addiction. All that we have accumulated to help us receive and pass on the N.A. message that recovery for addicts is possible. All that we can do if we keep the faith.

Revocable - The fact that none of our service structure is permanent or unchangeable. This is a necessary item where our disease would make moves to take over sectors where it was unable to take over the whole thing. The ability to revoke power, control or prestige is the only way the Fellowship has to keep its service elements directly dependent.

Services - Extensions of group conscience combining our resources into some effort to help addicts seeking recovery in N.A. Without a basis in group conscience, an act can be good or potentially service yet lack spiritual substance. The strength of service comes from support based on individual commitment to faith and action where the individual can freely say no. These matters need to be made clear to head off those who would insult us with paternalistic roles, prevent the flow of accurate information through our structure and manipulate people and events for their fantasy of what is best for us. In the past, these sorts of abuses have been easy to see yet hard to reconcile.

Literature Trust Proposal II

page *1*

Bo Sewell
490 Franklin Avenue
Aliquippa, PA 15001

412/375-3759

June 20, 1991

Dear Fellow Members,

This computer broke down last week and came alive again Tuesday as if by miracle. So some more input seemed like it might be in order.

I find myself going back in time to the actual writing of the Basic and then moving forward in time to now. I comb through all this to discern the nature of our conflict and how it came to be. For one thing, do any of you know that there are tapes of the Basic Text being written? They are in storage somewhere in the Office? The tapes were recorded at Wichita, Lincoln and Memphis. While there are only a few from the first two conference sites,

Literature Trust Proposal

there are around twenty five from Memphis.

I firmly requested that Bob Stone copy mine for the archives and he finally had someone do so. I didn't want there to be just one copy. It still confuses me that there is no interest in the facts. It is almost like the rumors are more interesting. The fact is that abundant evidence that the Fellowship wrote the Basic Text exists and somehow this has become an embarrassment in certain circles.

I have two questions. There were additional members on the last conference call. How were these people added to the calls? It seems hard enough to say all that is needed and I am not yet sure I am being heard or am hearing all you say. Do we need more voices? In this case, I like the members involved. I just think we need to reach some accord among ourselves before we start moving outward to involve others. It diverts my attention from trying to communicate with you.

Second, by what process is our input to be factored into the existing lit trust document. It is a difficult piece and seems to have little heart in it now. It seems to appropriate something from the Fellowship. Whoever is working on it should be taken off. The tone is completely unacceptable.

Let me clarify. The writing, the whole spirit of N.A., has been built on the idea of caring. Feelings matter here. The styling of the Literature Trust document tells me the writer doesn't like me much, thinks he or she is smarter, more educated and probably is only being nice to me because it is part of their job. If others involved in this work feel this way, he or she should be fired for being so presumptuous. It is hard enough to go forward as it is, there seems to be a grain to the existing document that would have to be overcome to make it suitable.

The extra legalese in the document is intimidating and this intimidation goes against the healing that Jim talks about. I would not like to see the effect of the current form on trusted servants. It is like the classic dope deal gone wrong. As trusted servants, and as human beings, I feel like I was chummed along and allowed and encouraged to do this work and produce the Basic Text from scratch with no outside help or advisement and that part is like me giving you the money. The desired result is the dopey idea that you really like me and care about my well being. You disappear into the house and no matter how hard I knock, you won't open the door.

Well, guess what? You were given magic and it has its own power. If you break the TRUST, you undo yourselves. We are free, clean and grateful to be clear of these unfortunate occurrences. When we learned and taught how to serve at the world level, we stressed sincerity, truth and admission of fault. We communicated abundantly to prevent feelings of animosity and suspicion from building up. People are funny and our members are especially people.

I mentioned two questions and now another occurs. Why did Grateful Dave not have a copy of the input I sent in last time? I sent him a copy after he said he hadn't gotten his the other week.

In our first conference call, I mentioned it might be easier to write

Literature Trust Proposal

another book than to go through the interminable conflicts of viewpoint. I'm enclosing some very rough, unedited materials. Please notice in the preface, where it says no service board of committee ought ever regard this material as their property or use it to harm any addict seeking recovery.

It might help reframe this situation to look at this material from the eyes of a member who only wants to stay clean and grow spiritually. Members don't like to be asked to help and sign release forms on general input. Stories are more particular and should be released. I have never seen how general input could be subject of a copyright action, especially where the criteria for inclusion has to do with currency or general application or usage in our meetings. The other members utilizing that portion of our message would testify to the general nature of our recovery process that is our true common welfare. I have always thought the release forms killed the lit movement in N.A. The distrust implied by the form undercut the trust and made the friendliness superficial. Since the general release forms have come into use, there has been no new approved material excepting some small marginal items.

N.A. still supplies me with people who genuinely care about me personally and if I do better, they are glad and happy to be a part of my success. They know how dependent I am on them and that I am glad to be there for them on any occasion at all.

Except for the recent phone calls and personal visits at Harrisburg, the last thing I heard from world service was to seek another publisher after I asked for help and direction while the Story of the Basic Text was being written.

Oh. Are copies of the Story being sent to everyone on the conference calls? I suppose I can do it if necessary but I'll need their addresses. It seems like the WSO that could spring for the lawyers in Philadelphia could make a few copies. How much of our money went out for that? Was it really fifty or sixty thousand? Did the attorneys cut us a deal when they found out more about the case? Or... are they still on the case. Please answer these questions. It may seem unfriendly to ask them, however, actions taken in the past nine months raise then questions and it is not fair that we should be required to ignore valid concerns.

The time it takes to do this work right now diverts my attention from my other work and while I am willing to do it if it will help addicts, I am not willing to waste my time.

Recapping this input, I find these items:

1. Why is material like the cassette tapes of the Basic Text being written ignored and the Literature Trust document written as if by 'owners' or 'appropriators.'

2. Why is the constitution of the group engaged in these discussions being expanded without consultation? Should we then make suggestions as to members who might ought to be on the calls?

3. How is our input to be used? Should we develop copies of portions of

Literature Trust Proposal

the Literature Trust document on our own?

4. How can we get rid of the tone of legal antagonism in the current document? Can whoever has been working on it be dis- charged or at least gotten away from the work?

5. The literature already under a spiritual bond.

6. Why didn't Dave get his input?

7. Why wasn't all the input sent out? This regards the Story of the Basic Text yet there may be other input sent in that I didn't receive if others didn't get what I sent.

8. What are we going to do about the new literature being formulated now?

9. What is the status of the court case presently? What are the costs of the case to date? What position does the WSO Board take for the future on the court case?

10. Why does this work seem slightly fantastic? What I mean is, why are we having to work without clerical support and time for quality communication? It seems disjointed and takes much energy to resume the work on input.

I am sorry if parts of the material submitted here may seem aggressive. It feels like if we don't get real about some simple things, we are going to blow apart and it will become too much trouble to try to communicate. I care about each one of you and delight in your progress as much as I hurt in your difficulty. I hope you feel the same about me.

In Loving Service,

Bo Sewell

Literature Trust Proposal II

Bo Sewell
490 Franklin Avenue
Aliquippa, PA 15001

412/375-3759

June 20, 1991

Dear Fellow Members,

This computer broke down last week and came alive again Tuesday as if by miracle. So some more input seemed like it might be in order.

I find myself going back in time to the actual writing of the Basic and then moving forward in time to now. I comb through all this to discern the nature of our conflict and how it came to be. For one thing, do any of you know that there are tapes of the Basic Text being written? They are in storage somewhere in the Office? The tapes were recorded at Wichita, Lincoln and Memphis. While there are only a few from the first two conference sites, there are around twenty five from Memphis.

I firmly requested that Bob Stone copy mine for the archives and he finally had someone do so. I didn't want there to be just one copy. It still confuses me that there is no interest in the facts. It is almost like the rumors are more interesting. The fact is that abundant evidence that the Fellowship wrote the Basic Text exists and somehow this has become an embarrassment in certain circles.

I have two questions. There were additional members on the last conference call. How were these people added to the calls? It seems hard enough to say all that is needed and I am not yet sure I am being heard or am hearing all you say. Do we need more voices? In this case, I like the members involved. I just think we need to reach some accord among ourselves before we start moving outward to involve others. It diverts my attention from trying to communicate with you.

Second, by what process is our input to be factored into the existing lit trust document. It is a difficult piece and seems to have little heart in it now. It seems to appropriate something from the Fellowship. Whoever is working on it should be taken off. The tone is completely unacceptable.

Let me clarify. The writing, the whole spirit of N.A., has been built on the idea of caring. Feelings matter here. The styling of the Literature Trust document tells me the writer doesn't like me much, thinks he or she is smarter, more educated and probably is only being nice to me because it is part of their job. If others involved in this work feel this way, he or she should be fired for being so presumptuous. It is hard enough to go forward as it is, there seems to be a grain to the existing document that would have to be overcome to make it suitable.

The extra legalese in the document is intimidating and this intimidation goes against the healing that Jim talks about. I would not like to see the effect of the current form on trusted servants. It is like the classic dope deal gone wrong. As trusted servants, and as human beings, I feel like I was

Literature Trust Proposal II

chummed along and allowed and encouraged to do this work and produce the Basic Text from scratch with no outside help or advisement and that part is like me giving you the money. The desired result is the dopey idea that you really like me and care about my well being. You disappear into the house and no matter how hard I knock, you won't open the door.

Well, guess what? You were given magic and it has its own power. If you break the TRUST, you undo yourselves. We are free, clean and grateful to be clear of these unfortunate occurrences. When we learned and taught how to serve at the world level, we stressed sincerity, truth and admission of fault. We communicated abundantly to prevent feelings of animosity and suspicion from building up. People are funny and our members are especially people.

I mentioned two questions and now another occurs. Why did Grateful Dave not have a copy of the input I sent in last time? I sent him a copy after he said he hadn't gotten his the other week.

In our first conference call, I mentioned it might be easier to write another book than to go through the interminable conflicts of viewpoint. I'm enclosing some very rough, unedited materials. Please notice in the preface, where it says no service board of committee ought ever regard this material as their property or use it to harm any addict seeking recovery.

It might help reframe this situation to look at this material from the eyes of a member who only wants to stay clean and grow spiritually. Members don't like to be asked to help and sign release forms on general input. Stories are more particular and should be released. I have never seen how general input could be subject of a copyright action, especially where the criteria for inclusion has to do with currency or general application or usage in our meetings. The other members utilizing that portion of our message would testify to the general nature of our recovery process that is our true common welfare. I have always thought the release forms killed the lit movement in N.A. The distrust implied by the form undercut the trust and made the friendliness superficial. Since the general release forms have come into use, there has been no new approved material excepting some small marginal items.

N.A. still supplies me with people who genuinely care about me personally and if I do better, they are glad and happy to be a part of my success. They know how dependent I am on them and that I am glad to be there for them on any occasion at all.

Except for the recent phone calls and personal visits at Harrisburg, the last thing I heard from world service was to seek another publisher after I asked for help and direction while the Story of the Basic Text was being written.

Oh. Are copies of the Story being sent to everyone on the conference calls? I suppose I can do it if necessary but I'll need their addresses. It seems like the WSO that could spring for the lawyers in Philadelphia could make a few copies. How much of our money went out for that? Was it really fifty or sixty thousand? Did the attorneys cut us a deal when they found

Literature Trust Proposal II

out more about the case? Or... are they still on the case. Please answer these questions. It may seem unfriendly to ask them, however, actions taken in the past nine months raise then questions and it is not fair that we should be required to ignore valid concerns. The time it takes to do this work right now diverts my attention from my other work and while I am willing to do it if it will help addicts, I am not willing to waste my time.

Recapping this input, I find these items:

1. Why is material like the cassette tapes of the Basic Text being written ignored and the Literature Trust document written as if by 'owners' or 'appropriators.'
2. Why is the constitution of the group engaged in these discussions being expanded without consultation? Should we then make suggestions as to members who might ought to be on the calls?
3. How is our input to be used? Should we develop copies of portions of the Literature Trust document on our own?
4. How can we get rid of the tone of legal antagonism in the current document? Can whoever has been working on it be dis- charged or at least gotten away from the work?
5. The literature already under a spiritual bond.
6. Why didn't Dave get his input?
7. Why wasn't all the input sent out? This regards the Story of the Basic Text yet there may be other input sent in that I didn't receive if others didn't get what I sent.
8. What are we going to do about the new literature being formulated now?
9. What is the status of the court case presently? What are the costs of the case to date? What position does the WSO Board take for the future on the court case?
10. Why does this work seem slightly fantastic? What I mean is, why are we having to work without clerical support and time for quality communication? It seems disjointed and takes much energy to resume the work on input.

I am sorry if parts of the material submitted here may seem aggressive. It feels like if we don't get real about some simple things, we are going to blow apart and it will become too much trouble to try to communicate. I care about each one of you and delight in your progress as much as I hurt in your difficulty. I hope you feel to same about me.

In Loving Service,

Bo Sewell

August 10, 1992

Thoughts on how we might proceed to construct a comprehensive, and comprehensible, literature trust document.

Solicit input from the members of the littrust working group. Give the comm a address, telephone, Propose a writing to go with the packet saying welcome to this working group. Explain what that position of owning copyright gives the member and the fellow collectively. Now, you don't have have to worry about arbitrary changes to reflect popular treatment philosophies. Explain what work held in trust means to us as opposed to work done for hire. Then intro the original disagreement Dave had over the improper form and the cost of the literature that led to the creation of the baby blue book. They dialogue that led up to the BB. How WSO Failed to make an agreeable settlement of the issues and finally initiated court action.

We have transcripts of tapes from October 1990. Tim BANNER SAID I'll sue him for free.

Statements leading to the intel prop trust. tom mack has found copy of the original document that the trust is copied from. from Dave's archives. Much of the offensive language comes from the

Court would have thrown out if they had a case.

This year last minute order from Judge Pollack to stop conference action. Represent that information with back up docs inserted and may do the dialogue in bold print or italics. Packet could be bound and be more effective.

Jim can also ask for ten dollars for making up financial problems.

Beneath surface structure is a deeper level composed of human knowings of one another. These trust bonds formed from the time when we first got clean, interlock fellowship wide. It is this network of bonds that holds us together.

N>.A. is not about fear but about faith. We have greater recourse with God than with legalities. Law can't keep us clean!

Tuesday

Lit is not 'work done for hire'. It is the result of gratitude and giving on the part of our members. To say it is something else does violence to the spiritual nature of our Fellowship and the truth of our love and caring.