

WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE OF NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS

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

To: The Fellowship
From: Bryce Sullivan, Chairperson
WSC Literature Committee
Date: July 20, 1989
Re: *It Works: How and Why* Development 1982-1989

INTRODUCTION

The WSC Literature Committee has as part of its responsibility an obligation of accountability to the fellowship through the World Service Conference. The committee's accountability is maintained, in part, by consistent reports from the chairperson on the progress of our work and the decisions that we may make. In keeping with these responsibilities this comprehensive report has been developed.

The following report provides an overview on Narcotics Anonymous literature development starting with the Basic Text, through our ongoing development of a book on the Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions of Narcotics Anonymous -- *It Works: How and Why*. This information is important in understanding how we have arrived at the current status of our work today. Hundreds of thousands of hours and hundreds of thousands of dollars have been contributed to the project by N.A. members, yet we still lack an effective description of the fundamental principles of Narcotics Anonymous for use by our membership or interested non-addicts. The premier priority of the WSC Literature Committee, in fact the chief project of all world services since the approval of the *Basic Text*, remains an unrealized goal.

Work by an ad hoc committee of the WSC Literature Committee during the 1988-89 conference year was encouraging. Our hopes had been raised by the initiation of a new committee writing process which showed promise of bringing the project to a successful end in the foreseeable future. Those recent hopes were frustrated by problems in last years ad hoc process as well as more fundamental problems in our system of literature development.

It is clear that our processes need some reevaluation and restructuring. Solutions need to be found to allow us to produce major works like a book on our Steps and Traditions, along with the rest of the workload: assessing the fellowship's literature needs and utilization, revising existing literature

items, and developing new, high quality recovery and service materials worthy of bearing the Narcotics Anonymous name. The following discussion of various projects gives some background. The WSC Literature Committee trial step development plan in a later section addresses our proposed solution to the problems we have encountered. The historical experiences described give us hope and confidence that what we are proposing can work without repeating the mistakes of the past.

The consequences of doing nothing and continuing in either the present process or some variation of the past seems so serious to us that we have been compelled to exercise leadership in crafting this report and setting the record straight about the many literature issues which have in part made the explosive growth of Narcotics Anonymous possible in the 1980's. At this critical time there is an overwhelming need to examine how the fellowship is going to develop written recovery and service materials in the future. Only an honest appraisal of the assets and defects of our literature development process will enable us to improve our ability to serve the fellowship in the creation of recovery literature for Narcotics Anonymous.

Throughout this report every effort has been made to assure its clarity and accuracy. It would be impossible to give an indepth accounting of every event, so I have concentrated on what I believe to be the most enlightening information. Fairness and balance has been sought throughout and although certainly there have been individuals who have played very important roles in the history of our literature, we rely on the Twelfth Tradition to help ensure that personalities are kept to a minimum. The WSC Literature Committee has reviewed this report as well as trusted servants who were involved in some of the events described.

In presenting this report, I would like to express my gratitude to the previous chairpersons of the WSC Literature Committee whose vision, leadership, and support have in many ways made this presentation possible.

LITERATURE'S EARLY DAYS -- THE BASIC TEXT

We existed for many years without a comprehensive book on recovery in Narcotics Anonymous. From the beginning of our fellowship in 1953, until 1982, we had little in the way of recovery literature: a *Little White Booklet* and a few informational pamphlets was all. The effects of not having a recovery text can more clearly be seen in hindsight than could ever have been dreamed of when members began work on our book in 1979. We went from a fellowship with groups numbering in the hundreds in 1982 when the *Basic Text* was approved, to a fellowship with groups numbering in the many thousands and our membership in the hundreds of thousands today. We can only speculate what the impact of having a recovery text sooner would have been, or what the impact of not having a text at all would be today, but we can safely assume that the impact on our fellowship would have been great in either case. Those of us who were not there when the *Basic Text* was approved can only wonder what it must have felt like. All that is recorded in the 1982 WSC minutes are these four words: "*We Have a Book.*"

As significant and noteworthy as the approval of the *Basic Text* certainly was, there was a considerable portion of our fellowship who were displeased with the simple, often ungrammatical style of our first edition text. In spite of substantial reservations the *Basic Text* was approved because of the overwhelming need at that time. The attitude of the Conference was that our book would not be set in stone. We would be able to change and improve on it as we grew. No one imagined the course these changes would take. Certainly no one imagined five editions in six years. Through considerable editing and piecemeal revision we now have our fifth edition, a text which most would agree is of superior quality to that of our first edition text. However, even with improvements, the committee style of writing is still evident: choppy, abrupt, and often overly simplistic explanations of recovery in Narcotics Anonymous pervade our cornerstone publication.

On the West Coast of the United States particularly, our membership was less than completely pleased with our first text. Part of the inducement that led to the approval of our text was the idea (presented at the 1982 conference) of giving Northern and Southern California the job of developing a companion book on our Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions. The decision to assign the task of developing initial drafts to the two existing California regions acknowledged the limited participation California N.A. had enjoyed in writing the *Basic Text*. This limited participation occurred despite the facts that the fellowship had its origins in California and that the largest concentration of members with long-term clean time remained there. It was hoped that this more mature portion of our fellowship would be able to develop this book in fairly short order. The thought of having a book which would remedy the problems of brevity in Chapter Four (on the steps) and Chapter Six (on the traditions) in the *Basic Text* was hopeful to all. With the text approved, a book to provide us all with comprehensive information on our principles of recovery and unity was our next literature priority.

BASIC (TEXT) CONFLICT

The fragile unity which had been forged by the Board of Trustees in the period between 1975 and 1982 culminated in the adoption of our *Basic Text*. This unity was shaken vigorously in the controversies which sprung out of attempts to publish the approved *Basic Text* in the 1982-83 Conference year. The joint action by members of the World Service Board of Trustees, WSC Administrative Committee and the World Service Office Board to delete certain sentences in Chapter Six (Traditions Four and Nine) resulted in an enormous uproar. It was in a confrontational atmosphere that the WSC Literature Committee threatened to sue the World Service Office in the months leading up to the 1983 WSC. The trustworthiness of the WSO holding the copyrights to N.A. literature was being challenged. There were many dramatic moments at the 83'WSC such as when the WSC Literature Committee chairperson ripped the *Basic Text* in half during the World Service Office report to the Conference. The significant conflicts over WSC voting, the service manual, the *N.A. Way* magazine, the world

convention and the WSO's role in N.A. world services were all played out against this backdrop.

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

IT WORKS: HOW AND WHY -- THE BEGINNING

After the 1982 WSC, work began in Northern California on the Twelve Steps, and in Southern California on the Twelve Traditions. Regional and area literature committees had to be formed in both places, as none had existed prior to that time. The members who chose to get involved in those fledgling literature committees were not those with long-term recovery experience, but predominantly newcomers and others in the first few years of recovery.

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

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

JAMISON LITERATURE CONFERENCE

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

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

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

Later that year, in November 1984, a literature conference was held in San Diego, California. For the first time, the WSO executive director attended with office clerical staff and computer equipment available on site. Although several members of the World Service Board of Trustees and other world-level trusted servants were in attendance, overall attendance was moderate. The bulk of the work focused again on the steps portion of the book. The conference resulted in the finalization of the blue review-form draft, which was then distributed in January 1985.

1986 APPROVAL-FORM STEP BOOK/PROFESSIONAL WRITER

The chairpersons of the Board of Trustees, the World Service Conference and the WSC Literature Committee had informally discussed the option of hiring a professional writer over a period of several months in late 1984. They approached the full Board of Directors for their support

and sought the agreement of others in World Services. All boards were given the opportunity to discuss the matter and there was a general consensus to move forward in hiring a professional writer to develop *It Works: How and Why*. The WSO Board of Directors, at a January 1985 meeting, agreed to enter into a contract with a professional writer for this task. By March 1985, prior to the 1985 World Service Conference, an ad hoc committee process utilizing the professional writer was underway. The decision was presented to the 1985 WSC as an accomplished fact for the conference's concurrence. The process and procedure used in making this decision, and particularly the secrecy surrounding it, were all clearly mistakes.

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

There were major problems with the employed professional writer. The writer was not a member of Narcotics Anonymous. Interaction between the ad hoc committee and the writer was almost non-existent. The writer attempted to exercise creative control in ways that were inappropriate. The writer, quite simply, was not working out as had been hoped. The writer's "finished" drafts were considered unacceptable and were significantly rewritten by the ad hoc committee in conjunction with World Service Office staff. When the final step draft went before the WSC Literature Committee in December 1985 there were only two registered members in attendance. The other participants were all members of the Literature Review Committee who had participated in the ad hoc committee process as well. Therefore, no objective review took place. The need for this review was not recognized at the time, and there was substantial fear that such an objective review would destroy this book in which \$100,000 (which was later negotiated and reduced) had been invested. Negative input and comments were handled in a very defensive way, and were generally rejected.

Decisions were reached at this same meeting to hire another professional writer to produce the traditions portion of *It Works*. Unfortunately, because this process was initiated before the approval-form step book was published in April 1986, and was already well underway before any reaction to the white approval-form had developed, the same mistakes were made. No one was willing--or perhaps able--to inventory the

process, so the traditions process repeated all the mistakes of the steps process, along with some new variations.

There was a considerable outcry from portions of the fellowship concerning problems with the white approval draft. The outcry began in October at the workshop for WSC committees in Charlotte, North Carolina. The atmosphere of the conference workshop became highly politicized. Open input sessions were held, with the proceedings taped for the input for the literature committee. Mass mailings were soon instituted by members and service committees, similar to those occurring during late 1987 around problems associated with the edit of the 4th Edition *Basic Text*. Prior to the release of the 1987 *Conference Agenda Report*, a special report was developed by the chairpersons and vice chairpersons of the World Service Conference, the World Service Board of Trustees, the WSO Board of Directors, and the WSC Literature Committee. The report presented three options to the fellowship which were hoped would be insurance against the possible defeat of the approval-form book at the conference. A variety of options were offered for gathering input and integrating the input into an approval draft. The possible adoption dates of the book ranged from WSC'87 to WSC'89. All options retained the white book as the base draft, and all fell somewhere short of what the conference evidently desired.

1987 WORLD SERVICE CONFERENCE

The feeling of the fellowship was strong enough regarding the problems surrounding the white approval-form version of the book that the 1987 conference rejected it by a vote of 20 yes, 50 no, and 5 abstentions. This resulted not only from objections to the book's contents, but also from resentment over the process involved and the employment of a professional writer. Some argued that the conference was simply saying that N.A. could produce a better book. But objections to the closed process which had been utilized, in contrast to the manner in which the *Basic Text* and the blue review-form draft had been created, were undeniably root issues. In a spirit of compromise, and under pressure, WSC participants devised a proposal to create an ad hoc committee drawing from all service branches to continue work on the Twelve Steps book. This committee was technically separate from the WSC Literature Committee, but was chaired by the WSC Literature Committee vice chairperson. A series of eight international open participation workshops was planned. The guiding premise was to gather input on both the 1985 blue review-form draft and the white approval-form book, and to use what was acceptable from both to produce a new review-form draft which would include additional fellowship input.

1987-88 CONFERENCE AD HOC COMMITTEE

This compromise proposal did more to heal wounds than it did to produce a new book. The creation of the WSC *It Works* Ad Hoc Committee was a case where the conference was not fully honest with itself, and failed

to accept full responsibility for the consequences of the decision to reject the approval-form book. Sober reflection immediately following the conference indicated concern that the workshops which had been planned were not in fact a practical solution to the problem.

It can be said on the success side of the 1987-88 WSC *It Works* Ad Hoc Committee that the fellowship's confidence and trust in the literature process were in some ways restored. In addition, a massive amount of fellowship input was gathered on both the blue and white books, as well as some new material. By the 1988 WSC meeting, the WSO was able to compile a "master list" of the input that had been received, which summarized the additions, deletions, and changes that the fellowship wanted to make in both the blue and white books. Substantial unanimity emerged on the vast majority of changes desired, although minority opinion on some points indicated the diversity of fellowship views on the Twelve Steps, as well as geographical differences. Overall, the input which exists on the "master list" of input still gives us a general sense of what the fellowship wanted and expected at that time in the step book; what was acceptable, and what was controversial or unacceptable.

CHICAGO LITERATURE CONFERENCE

Following the completion of the "master list" presented to the April 1988 WSC, the WSC *It Works* Ad Hoc Committee was dissolved, and the step book was turned back over to the WSC Literature Committee. A World Literature Conference was scheduled to be held in Chicago in July 1988. The purpose of this conference was to factor all of the additions, deletions, and changes into both the blue and white versions of the book, and then combine whatever was left into a single new draft. This draft, which became known as the "Chicago draft", was then to be turned over to a small ad hoc committee appointed by the WSC Literature Committee chairperson. Alternatives to the process used in Chicago were considered, but it was decided that the task was essentially a mechanical one at that stage. The amount of input, the number of people needed to process the input, and the amount of time it would take to accomplish the same task by a single committee resulted in a consensus that the best option for the task was a World Literature Conference.

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

much material was judged to be unacceptable according to fellowship input that some Chicago draft chapters were extremely short.

In hindsight, although the members who gathered in Chicago did the best they could in completing the monumental task asked of them, mistakes were made.

In fact, it seems that some of the other available options for integrating this input into the draft would have been more effective. These alternatives included either a small ad hoc committee, or the WSC Literature Committee itself, factoring in the input. One of the factors which made this evident was the lack of experience with which many members came to the workshop. The differences in the way the working groups were able to accomplish their jobs, both in terms of quality and integrity to the fellowship input, made this obvious. Working groups with a preponderance of experienced members needed only administrative support and some other minor assistance when they ran into problems. Groups without experienced members needed almost constant support, support which was lacking. A new literature committee had recently been elected at the World Service Conference, and a number of the committee members were absent from the workshop partly due to a lack of funding.

On the success side of the Chicago literature conference, a draft made up of all the additions, deletions, and changes from fellowship input was put together. The shortcomings of the conference can be seen to have come from essentially three points. One, members through the WSC *It Works* ad hoc process of the previous year made substantial deletions to the material, yet provided very little in the way of new original writing. Because of this, there was little hope or realistic expectation that the Chicago experience would create a cohesive draft; the material simply was not there. Two, we were not able to give the appropriate support to the volunteer members who participated in the workshop. And three, the kind of group interaction, understanding, and mutual support necessary to write a whole book does not occur over a mere weekend. Even had these members brought more experience with them, the end result would not have been significantly different, due to the very nature of the writing task and the fact that the participants had financial and time constraints limiting the scheduled length of the workshop. Our experience indicates that large participatory workshops are not only difficult to manage, but additionally may no longer be a viable or responsible option to accomplish the task of writing Narcotics Anonymous literature.

1988-89 WSC LITERATURE -- STEPS AD HOC COMMITTEE

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

One of the N.A. members appointed to the ad hoc committee had what many felt to be exceptional writing skills. Following substantial discussion of the Chicago draft and the development of additional written input from other ad hoc committee members during the first two meetings on Step One, this writer was assigned the task of constructing a new draft. What became immediately apparent to all was that both the Chicago draft material and the submitted input were unrecognizable in the newly produced draft. This draft, known as the L.A. draft, was considered by most to be an improvement. Although some objections and concerns were raised within the ad hoc committee, both about the material and about how the volunteer writer was being used, the overwhelming response by the ad hoc committee was positive. It became clear that guidance and direction from the fellowship would be needed while work proceeded along this new direction which had emerged. After producing a second draft of the Step One and Step Two material, a special report was prepared by the WSC Literature Committee chairperson, and copies of the drafts were submitted to all conference participants and regional literature committees for comment and input. Almost no specific written input was received, perhaps in part because the mailing of material in this form caused some confusion. Nonetheless, the initial response was considered positive.

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

REVIEW OF THE 1988-89 COMMITTEE AD HOC PROCESS

This report would have never been developed had last years ad hoc process worked. We were able to learn a lot, and are able to use what was learned in our work today, yet the process was flawed. With the interruption of the ad hoc committee's work from March until June, partly due to the 1989 WSC meeting, there was an opportunity to inventory the drafts and the process which created them. In doing so, problems became increasingly apparent. It is clear now that problems existed in three specific areas. The underlying and root problem was with the management and administration of the literature committee and ad hoc process. A secondary problem was with the style, tone and content of the L.A. draft material. The third problem was in the literature committee retaining creative control over the draft material. . The underlying and root problem was with the management and administration of the literature committee and ad hoc process. A secondary problem was with the style, tone and content of the L.A. draft material. The third problem was in the literature committee retaining creative control over the draft material.

The L.A. Drafts. Consensus had begun developing over the last few months prior to the conference that there were significant problems with the L.A. drafts, these became most evident *after* the 1989 World Service Conference. Some concerns had been raised by the WSC Literature Committee, and increasingly by various members of the steps ad hoc committee, as well as others who had studied the material critically in depth over a considerable period of time, rather than just reading it once or twice. The material does have a depth and complexity to it. Although there is a consistency that is a welcome change from the disjointed and ungrammatical character of some N.A. literature, there is the problem and concern that funnelling all the input and material through one member's voice is causing problems.

Because the membership of the steps ad hoc committee was drawn from outside the membership of the WSC Literature Committee, the WSC Literature Committee's review in March brought a fresh, more objective perspective than had been present in the ad hoc committee's discussions. Problems and concerns emerged regarding the use of language, the style, and the perceived negative tone of the material. Although the WSC Literature Committee generally liked the L.A. drafts, their input had the affect of reinforcing the increasingly critical look that the ad hoc committee was beginning to apply to the material.

Considering the input from all sources, the second draft versions of the first three steps are not considered satisfactory in their present form and, though workable, would need significant additional work prior to distribution as a review-form piece.

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

The volunteer professional writer. The biggest problem the ad hoc committee had in using a volunteer writer was in retaining creative control. Working as just another volunteer committee member, rather than as a paid professional or special worker, the individual was unfortunately allowed to be in a controlling role. There was a resistance to making changes to the draft material. Specifically, changes discussed by the committee between the first and second drafts were not made to the satisfaction of ad hoc committee members. Unable to dedicate additional time outside of committee meetings to do the work of writing and rewriting the drafts, writing was only done during the meetings, and then in a room separate from the rest of the ad hoc group. Because of this, the writer missed out on significant portions of the discussions, having access mainly to transcripts. This was a handicap for all concerned, and negatively impacted

the content of the material. This also helps explain why only three chapters have been drafted to date.

The writer's lack of experience in the service structure, particularly in a committee process, led to some misunderstanding and conflict. Furthermore, faulty and incomplete information regarding the role in the ongoing development of the step book was given to the writer by the committee chairperson. Information which only contributed to a lack of understanding and future conflict. Throughout last year, the need for writer control to be relinquished, which was clear to most ad hoc participants, was never squarely confronted. When our need to be open to the very real possibility of bringing in additional writer(s) for assistance in writing and rewriting draft material was firmly and clearly expressed to the volunteer writer, the proposal was rejected as being an unacceptable condition of their ongoing involvement. Ultimately, this resistance to allow other writers to modify the work caused the loss of the writer as a member of the ad hoc committee.

Management and administration of the ad hoc process. The root cause of the problems from last years ad hoc process came not from particular problems with the writer or the drafts, but more correctly from our inability to correctly manage and administer the process. Had we been able to accurately address problems which were occurring in the Summer and Fall of 1988 prior to the Summer of 1989, well, at the very least we could have provided this report for the 1989 WSC, while at the same time having the Conference involved in the solutions we are proposing in a more timely fashion.

The core of this administrative snafu was in the separation of the ad hoc committee from the body of the WSC Literature Committee. It was thought that by keeping the ad hoc separate from the literature committee, the literature committee would be able to provide a more objective review of the ad hoc's work. This was true, but at a cost of only the leadership of the committee having complete knowledge about the work and related process. This information was actually the purview of the entire WSC Literature Committee. With our current arrangement, the WSC Literature Committee is an administrative body, more designed for broad review and guidance than for actually writing. The kind of information which was not shared with the committee was the very information which would have allowed the committee to make the broad management decisions they were responsible for. Had members of the literature committee been involved in the ad hoc in a substantial way then the problems which were in many ways skirted would have had more opportunity to find the light of day. The problems which were not acknowledged within the ad hoc committee would have had a better likelihood of being confronted by literature committee members, who most probably would have been less project oriented. This will always be a danger in the administration of any task, the tunnel vision which distorts our thinking to the point where things which we would normally find unacceptable become okay if they bring us significantly closer to project completion.

SEVENTH AND EIGHTH TRADITIONS ISSUES

Although there were significant problems associated with the use of the volunteer professional writer, this discussion will attempt to show that a more-fundamental conflict existed between the process that has evolved and the Twelve Traditions of Narcotics Anonymous. Problems are evident particularly in regards to Tradition Seven, "Every N.A. group ought to be fully self-supporting, declining outside contribution," and Tradition Eight, "Narcotics Anonymous should remain forever non-professional, but our service centers may employ special workers."

Our deficiency of approved literature on our Traditions makes it difficult to speak with much authority on such issues, yet to avoid the discussions because of this lack would not prove very helpful. Our attempt during last year to use a volunteer professional writer may be able to teach us some new lessons about the application and meaning of our Seventh and Eighth Traditions. This discussion is offered for your consideration. It certainly can't be considered authoritative, rather, consider it food for thought, hopefully stimulating more discussion on these important principles.

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

When we (the ad hoc committee) asked a volunteer N.A. member to take on the task of writing and rewriting the drafts of a book-length project, we crossed over the boundary of the Seventh Tradition. We did this because we had a need for quality writing, for the cohesiveness and organization that seems impossible to produce when writing by committee. We tried to circumvent the self imposed restrictions of our guidelines by using an N.A. member with professional skills. The fact that the demands of the project required an amount of time and effort, inside and outside of committee meetings, beyond what the individual was able to contribute, highlights the conflict with the Seventh Tradition. This is the principal reason why our Eighth Tradition exists: to give us the opportunity to employ members and non-members alike to perform services which require skills or commitments beyond what can be reasonably expected or asked of individual volunteer members. (If this argument is sound, it has applications toward the way in which other world service positions and responsibilities are structured. Clearly, there are other cases where members have been thrust into responsibilities so enormous that they have made sacrifices that were damaging to their lives and their recovery.)

When we employ special workers, we specifically place such individuals under a different kind of structure of supervision and accountability than that which applies to volunteers. This gives us more direction over the work they perform for the committee. The problems we encountered with a volunteer in this role--such as resistance to direction that changes be made

in the material, a refusal to let others on the committee make those changes, and objections to additional writer(s)--can be directly attributed to a conflict with the Eighth Tradition. Tradition Eight supports the Ninth Tradition (direct responsibility of our service boards and committees). When it is our investment--our collective self-support--we maintain our freedom to resist the demands of individuals whose personal investment of time, money, or energy, gives them the impression that the work belongs to them, rather than to all of us. A group's adherence to Tradition Seven protects it from outside control or influence. That in turn protects the autonomy promised by Tradition Four, and also maintains the unity of the group, upon which Tradition One indicates our personal recovery depends. In the same way as these Tradition relate to Narcotics Anonymous groups, the principles of Traditions One, Four, Seven, Eight, and Nine apply to our literature process and the relationships within it.

With our experience, we can reach a number of important conclusions about the process of developing literature using primary writers. Using non-addicts or non-members hasn't worked. Having a single writer involved who is responsible to rewrite his own material has been problematic. Sticking to a neutral, non-opinionated, non-personal style is helpful. Major editing or rewriting that stays faithful to the source material, yet reorganizes, clarifies, and improves the material, is helpful. And in the development of literature using primary writers, using World Service Office staff who are recovering addicts themselves has been more successful than any other method involving primary writers to date.

SPECIAL WORKERS AND THE LITERATURE PROCESS

Although we have a history of two separate, unsuccessful attempts to enter into employment contracts with non-addict writers outside of Narcotics Anonymous in the work on both the step and tradition portions of *It Works: How and Why*, we also have a successful history of using special workers who are regular WSO employees as well as members of Narcotics Anonymous. These successes include work on the *Little White Booklet* (revisions adopted at the 1986 WSC), *Working Step Four in Narcotics Anonymous*, *The N.A. Way Magazine*, editing services used in the development of numerous recovery pamphlets and service handbooks, and most recently, the draft materials on the *A Guide to Service in Narcotics Anonymous* and the Twelve Principles of Service. The professional editor contracted to edit the *Basic Text* can also be stated as a successful example. The Fourth Edition was a horrendous problem due to publishing errors; however, the edits accomplished by the professional editor are a significant improvement over the Third Edition, Revised, and should really be considered separately from the unfortunate publishing errors which occurred.

The White Booklet. One of the thirteen pamphlets which the WSC Literature Committee worked on during the 1982-83 Conference year was a revision of the *Little White Booklet*. Although only a simple majority was required to approve literature at that time, the proposed revision failed to

gain approval after divisive debate at the 1983 World Service Conference. At the 1984 Conference division continued and no clear direction was provided on possible revisions to the White Book.

During the 1985 World Service Conference the WSC Literature Committee met and recommended (due to lack of resources and lack of consensus) that the conference turn the White Book project over to the Trustees. After work began on this project the Trustee ad hoc committee responsible for this task asked WSO staff to review their work and add comments or suggestions. Upon reviewing the recommendations, the staff was asked that these comments be presented directly to the full Board during the ad hoc committee's report. Throughout this process, the trustees used staff extensively to point out specific problem areas and to recommend language that would serve as a better alternative. WSO staff was also asked to prepare a report on all of the input received by the WSC Literature Committee back in the spring of 1983.

A report was prepared for the trustees, informing the Board of each consideration raised in that body of written input and making specific recommendations for incorporating the suggestions into the draft. One by one each point was considered by the full Board and incorporated into the draft as appropriate.

Once the full Board had settled on every language change in the work, they asked for a complete edit by office staff for clarity, grammar, punctuation, etc. The entire Board reviewed the edited draft and appointed one trustee member with the necessary skills to engage in a closer evaluation. When satisfied with the edits, the Board of Trustees approved the draft for presentation to the fellowship in the 1986 *Conference Agenda Report*.

The 1986 Conference approved the *Little White Booklet*, Newly Revised after vigorous debate. The successful revision of the White Book demonstrates the positive role WSO staff support can play in the literature process. However, it also emphasizes that using special workers is not a cure-all. To achieve the highest possible quality we must take our time and work together.

Working Step Four in Narcotics Anonymous. The 1983 World Service Conference approved *A Guide to the Fourth Step Inventory* by a vote of 19 yes, 10 no, 13 abstentions. A simple majority, but less than fifty percent of Conference participants, let alone the two thirds of Conference participants now required. The 1984 WSC removed the Guide from the category of Conference-approved literature under even more divided circumstances, with a significant and vocal minority objecting not only to the fact that the issue had not been presented to the fellowship in the 1984 Conference Agenda Report, but also lack of any literature to replace the guide. In certain geographic locations the old guide continued to circulate, causing ongoing debate and controversy.

Following the 1984 Conference, the fourth step guide was placed on the "priority list", but work on the step and tradition book took precedence. Only after the publication of the blue review-form of *It Works* and the 1985 Conference did the WSC Literature Committee begin to develop a review-form version of a new fourth step guide for Narcotics Anonymous. Although

some consideration was given to the rejected version of the guide, the bulk of the review-form draft was developed from the material on Step Four in the blue review-form of *It Works*. *Working Step Four in Narcotics Anonymous* was distributed in review-form for what was then the customary nine month review period, from January 1, 1986 through October 1, 1986.

During this period the Literature Review Committee was a part of the WSC Literature Committee and, in fact, more involved in decisions of substance than was the WSC Literature Committee itself. All fellowship input went directly to the Literature Review Committee; the registered members of the WSC Literature Committee never saw the line-by-line input from the hundreds of area and regional literature committees, only a completed draft from the literature review committee which incorporated that fellowship input. Based on fellowship input from the review-form piece, the literature review committee realized the need for extensive reorganization and rewriting to create the approval-form. The literature review committee decided that help from a WSO staff member who had the necessary time and skills to construct a new draft was essential. The Literature Review Committee clearly established the outline and the entire conceptual framework for the proposed approval-form draft, discussed all of the fellowship input, and taped an extended discussion for use by the office staff of what members felt was lacking in the piece. The WSC Literature Committee guidelines at that time specifically authorized the Literature Review Committee to work in this manner, as well as this use of special workers. Nonetheless, the WSC Literature Committee body was not informed that an office staff member had organized and drafted the fourth step guide. The Literature Review Committee maintained firm editorial control and provided very specific direction. The staff member did an excellent job in constructing a draft which was faithful to fellowship input and the instructions of the Literature Review Committee. This staff draft provided an essential jumping off point which was then modified by the Literature Review Committee and the WSC Literature Committee. The WSC Literature Committee approved the release of the approval-form in April, 1987. The draft was met by wide acceptance from the fellowship and subsequently approved by the 1988 World Service Conference.

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

The volunteer efforts of the members of the WSC N.A. Way ad hoc committee were heroic and admirable in many respects, but the demands

placed on a handful of members to solicit fellowship input and produce a magazine each month on schedule were severely strained. The fellowship was not only slow to provide written input, but also to support the magazine through subscriptions in sufficiently large numbers to allow the magazine to financially break even. Faced with losing money on a publication which few members were even reading, the WSO seriously considered encouraging the Conference to eliminate the magazine.

However, the 1984 Conference adopted a proposal from the World Service Office which abolished the ad hoc committee, but preserved the magazine under the WSO staff editor in charge and a Conference elected editorial board and review panel, both of which included Board of Trustee representation. These steps addressed the Ninth Tradition issues of accountability and direct responsibility which had been concerns, and unified the fellowship behind the magazine.

The history of the *N.A. Way* shows that the fears which once existed that the WSO was going to destroy the magazine or take over the writing of the magazine from the fellowship were unfounded and unwarranted. The WSO accomplishes nothing of lasting value without the support of the fellowship. Members of the fellowship still write the articles about recovery. Equally important, it is clear that the WSO did not write the *Little White Booklet*, *Newly Revised*, or *Working Step Four in Narcotics Anonymous*. In all cases, the WSO has contributed services, sometimes involving significant editing, other times involving staff writing assistance which resulted in various drafts for specific committee review and approval.

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

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

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

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

The staff began by working on material for the Twelve Principles and the N.A. Service Charter. In both cases, the committee had already discussed rough drafts which had been developed by the staff coordinator prior to initiation of the staff team approach. The staff team met first to review those drafts, discuss them, and ask additional questions. From there, the team's skilled members went to work individually, one working on the principles of service, the other on the charter, bringing successive drafts back for line-by-line review by the complete team. Prior to the final team review of each document, each member completed a thorough edit of the document written by the other. The final team drafts were sent to the members of the WSC Ad Hoc Committee on N.A. Service ten days before their meeting at the end of March. All concerned clearly understood that the committee had the complete right to accept, reject, alter, or reorganize all or any part of the draft. The full committee exhaustively reviewed each document, both in concept and in detail. In the end, minor changes were suggested throughout both documents by the committee, but no substantial changes were found to be necessary.

The staff team approach appears to be working well. The committee establishes the initial direction, and engages in a substantial review of final compositions prior to release. The composition itself is accomplished by WSO staff, who are N.A. members with professional-level writing skills, and is edited by staff with similar skills; as a result, work completed is consistently of acceptable quality. None of the actual writing process is performed by a single individual; the primary writer, while responsible for the composition process itself, always works within the context of the team. The team is small enough so that it can accomplish a substantial amount of work in a relatively short period of time, but is sufficiently varied in composition to provide broad perspective to the task. While control of the project remains in the hands of the committee both at conception and conclusion, the project is administered by employees who can devote a significant number of hours each week to the work, and who have the ability to easily consult with one another at whatever length is necessary for the particular stage the project is in. Those who have been directly involved in the process, and others who are familiar with it, feel confident that the staff team approach will serve well for whatever particular writing project it may be applied to.

WSC LITERATURE COMMITTEE STEP DEVELOPMENT 1989-90

Due to all of the previously mentioned problems with not only the L.A. drafts themselves, but more importantly with the process we have been using to develop them, the steps ad hoc committee has not met this

conference year. As chairperson of the WSC Literature Committee I included some ad hoc participants from last year, as well as World Service Office staff, to participate in a consultation session with myself and the vice chair in early June to discuss the problems which had been encountered and possible solutions.

The meeting in June covered topics which were broad and comprehensive, as were numerous discussions with other WSC trusted servants both before and after this June consultation meeting. These discussions covered not only the historical information in this report, but also recommendations which were subsequently offered to the WSC Literature Committee. These recommendations were modified and accepted in principle by the committee at our June 24th meeting.

The literature committee decided to move ahead on a trial basis, using an ad hoc process along with a WSO staff team to produce new step drafts. A thorough evaluation and discussion of this plan took place within the WSC Literature Committee. Being committed to the principle of direct responsibility the committee chose to move forward, but to do so cautiously. The committee will closely manage the development of these future drafts, and a full report of their work to date will be given at the 1990 World Service Conference, along with any recommendations the committee may have. The Conference will have the opportunity to have a thorough discussion of the committee's decisions and recommendations at WSC'90.

The process which the committee adopted to develop the steps portion of *It Works: How and Why* is essentially the same as the process the WSC Ad Hoc Committee on N.A. Service has used in their development of *A Guide to Service in Narcotics Anonymous* and the Twelve Principles. The following section outlines the process and its various components:

- 1) The WSC Literature Committee will provide broad direction, review, consultation, and decision-making for the book's development, as well as being involved as rotating members of the ad hoc committee.
- 2) An ad hoc committee will provide additional guidance and specific direction for the book.
- 3) A World Service Office staff team will provide primary writer(s), along with staff editing and review of the work.

The WSC Literature Committee. The committee will establish the initial direction of the work and engage in substantial review of the ad hoc and staff team's drafts prior to completion. Individual members of the literature committee will also be involved in the project as rotating members of the ad hoc committee. The WSC Literature Committee's primary role will be that of providing broad direction, review, consultation, and decision-making for the book's development. These are extremely important functions, functions which will be enhanced in a number of ways. Involvement by literature committee members in the ad hoc committee will help. Having ad hoc committee and staff team members participating in WSC Literature Committee discussions will help. Regular, thorough reports from the chairperson to the full WSC Literature Committee will also help the literature committee in these duties. These reports will be the primary vehicle of communication between the ad hoc committee and the full literature committee, detailing the discussions and work of the ad hoc

committee each time it meets. Most importantly, these reports will offer information and recommendations for the full committee to consider in the decision-making process. It is of utmost importance that the literature committee be informed on a level commensurate with its responsibility for this book.

The ad hoc committee. An ad hoc committee of the WSC Literature Committee will have the role of providing the basic principles and specific direction for the book. The ad hoc committee will be counted on to have discussions of great depth and breadth about our recovery principles using source material for guidance. The source material for developing the newly created drafts will be the Chicago draft, the three L.A. step drafts, as well as the blue review-form draft, and the white approval-form draft. Through discussions guided by broad direction from the WSC Literature Committee the ad hoc group will guide the staff team. The ad hoc will make specific decisions on what each step chapter will contain, which underlying principles and general concepts to include.

The ad hoc will consist of both literature committee members and additional members appointed by the chairperson. Some members of the ad hoc committee will be attending WSC Literature Committee meetings, in the same way as members of the literature committee will be attending ad hoc committee meetings. Although the anonymity of last year's steps ad hoc committee will remain protected (as last year's chairperson assured those members would be the case), knowledge of the membership of the 1989-90 steps ad hoc committee will be open.

The literature committee will make broad decisions; the ad hoc committee's role will be to implement these broad decisions, giving specific guidance and direction to the WSO staff team. When the staff team accomplishes the task of producing a step chapter the ad hoc will review the draft, providing specific input to the staff team for modifications to the draft.

The WSO staff team. The use of WSO staff in the process will be as primary writer(s), along with staff editing and review of the work. The staff team will be made up of as many members as are necessary to accomplish the task assigned.

Members of the staff will participate in the literature committee and ad hoc committee discussions on each of the step chapters. Following meetings of the ad hoc committee the primary writer will use an outline of the topics and principles provided by the ad hoc to develop first drafts. The writer will work within the context of the team. The staff team will go over the drafts which are developed, and further clarify and fill out those drafts with guidance from their notes from the ad hoc committee and literature committee discussions. A skilled staff member will edit the material prior to the drafts being returned to the ad hoc committee.

The ad hoc committee, as well as the literature committee, will of course have the authority to accept, reject, or modify the drafts in any way that is deemed necessary. The final decision to accept draft material will be in the hands of the literature committee. At each of the remaining literature committee meetings this year the work of the ad hoc group and staff team will be reviewed. With this constant supervision the WSC

Literature Committee will retain the final authority for this process as well as the ultimate creative control.

The full literature committee and the ad hoc committee will both need to be able to quickly address any concern of writer control over the work. It is felt that the staff team approach will be found superior in giving us the ability to address this concern, maintaining the necessary checks and balances. Regular meetings of the WSC Literature Committee to review the work will give us the opportunity to do so quickly. Using this kind of development plan--and perhaps most importantly, being open and aboveboard throughout--will allow us to make appropriate use of writers, and at the same time safeguard their attachment and personal creative control over the work.

Fellowship involvement. Fellowship interaction with this development process will be in essentially three ways. First, the WSC Literature Committee will be open to any input from the fellowship regarding this process and possible modifications to our procedural guidelines. Second, following the development of step chapters, some vehicle will be used to gain fellowship assessment of the work. And third, following the completion of a review-form draft of the Twelve Steps the fellowship will have their customary opportunity to provide specific input on the completed draft.

LITERATURE'S "A-LIST" PRIORITIES

The WSC Literature Committee has decided to modify our other work for the remainder of this year in order to have the kind of involvement that will be necessary in our step development process. The steps portion of *It Works* is our preeminent priority, adjusting our work schedule to allow for more full meetings of the WSC Literature Committee and fewer meetings of our informational pamphlet ad hoc committees is in keeping with the concept and intent of having an ordered list of priorities. This will have the effect of turning the development of approval-form pieces of *For Those In Treatment and In Times of Illness* into two-year projects, and making the development of revisions in the N.A. Group Starter Kit a similarly long-term project. The WSC Literature Committee has decided to reapportion our work schedule to fully embrace its responsibility to guide the development of the steps portion of *It Works: How and Why*.

GUIDELINES AND NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS LITERATURE

In the nine months following the approval of the *Basic Text* (WSC'82), the WSC Literature Committee developed eleven pamphlets, one booklet (the original Fourth Step guide), and a revision of the *Little White Booklet*. All thirteen items were presented to the fellowship in the 1983 *Conference Agenda Report*, and all except the *Little White Booklet* were adopted at the 1983 conference. However, no requirement for two-thirds majority of Conference participants existed for the approval of literature at that time.

Only two of the thirteen items received this two-thirds margin. On the heels of this "success", few saw the need to inventory the literature development process.

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

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

By November 1983 at the Jamison Literature Conference, where extensive work was done on the steps, a set of guidelines had been produced. These were accepted by the WSC Literature Committee Jamison for inclusion in the 1984 *Conference Agenda Report* and were subsequently approved by WSC'84 becoming the first literature guidelines. The 1984 guidelines were relatively simple, providing for a defined review and approval process and a definition of a body of registered active members of the WSC Literature Committee.

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

The intent behind the creation of the Literature Review Committee was to produce better quality literature through the involvement of a small committee which included members having significant literary and recovery experience. Those involved hoped the Literature Review Committee would restore integrity and balance to the literature process, providing an alternative both to the sometimes destructive "cut-and-paste" process, and to the literature conferences--long on newcomer participation, but short on experienced members--which had been counted on previously to develop N.A. literature. The Literature Review Committee plan was implemented by the WSC Literature Committee between the 1984 and 1985 meetings of

the World Service Conference. The plan was not officially endorsed by the conference until the 1985 WSC annual meeting, thus becoming the second set of Conference-approved literature guidelines in two years.

Primarily as a result of the perceived problems with the development of the white approval-form draft, and particularly the problems with the professional writer used in the process, the 1987-88 WSC Literature Committee had as its chief goal the development of new guidelines. The closed nature of the literature process and the shortcomings of the Literature Review Committee structure were also an issue. Input was sought from throughout the fellowship. At that time, the 1985 guidelines were still in effect and virtually unchanged from their original form. Many thought that the new guidelines were the appropriate solution to the problems we were continuing to encounter in literature development. They set up some practical processes for prioritizing the literature work load. They also opened up the committee in a big way, especially by comparison with the previous guidelines. The guidelines allow Regional literature subcommittee chairpersons, as well as RSR's and alternate RSR's, to become general members of the WSC Literature Committee. With the adoption of these guidelines at the 1988 WSC, they became the third, and current, literature committee guidelines.

The overriding problem with the current guidelines is that they don't do is allow the literature committee the freedom to use all the resources at hand. Primarily in reaction to our previous experience with the *It Works* professional writing contracts, their use is strictly forbidden in the 1988 approved guidelines. Further, the section on special workers is so convoluted that it is at best, confusing. The guidelines have an overemphasis on "control", and as such lack flexibility.

The very fact that these committee guidelines are Conference-approved creates problems. Part of the future solution may lie in allowing WSC committees the flexibility to modify their own guidelines according to general parameters.

Two separate but related actions of the 1989 World Service Conference illustrate how the literature process problems continue to be addressed in the usual way: randomly and non-systematically. The first is the decision of the conference to assign the future development of the traditions portion of *It Works* to the World Service Board of Trustees. Although the trustees certainly have the experience necessary to accomplish this task, the very fact that the conference removed the traditions from the literature committee work list indicates a desire to work around the current guidelines and committee structure. This is a symptom of deeper problems with the policies, procedures and resources which we have been using to develop recovery and service literature - all of our written materials.

The second decision of the conference worthy of note is the motion which created a new process for the development of "literature for use by N.A. service committees with addicts and non-addicts." The motion outlines a process by which the originating committee "may use resources including, but not necessarily limited to, the BOT, area and regional subcommittees, other WSC committees, appointed ad hoc committees (not necessarily limited to committee members), and World Service Office staff." Other

conference committees, namely Hospitals and Institutions and Public Information, have clearly been exasperated at our inability to provide them with any real help in developing their needed literature. Two clear examples, H & I's *For Those in Treatment*, and P.I.'s *Questions and Answers About N.A.*, are both indications of our inability to effectively accomplish the tasks given us. The adoption of this motion for service committee materials can be seen as both an attempted solution to this literature committee log-jam and a clear indication that the conference is willing to free up the use of the resources which are available to us in order to develop literature for Narcotics Anonymous.

1990 WSC ANNUAL MEETING

The WSC Literature Committee discussed our procedural guidelines and the development of the steps portion of *It Works* using the assistance of WSO staff as writers. Although an argument could easily be made that this plan is not a departure from the explicit authority given the committee in the guidelines, one could also be made that using office staff in the writing of recovery literature is, in fact a departure from our guidelines. Rather than build a "case" for our adopted plan, it is felt that by accepting that it may be contrary to the intent of the guidelines is the most honest approach to take. The literature committee feels that this action is warranted. Even members who feel that using office staff to draft recovery material goes beyond the explicit direction of our guidelines agree, along with the rest of the committee, that our development plan is the most responsible course to take based on our experience.

The report and recommendations which we present the Conference in April of next year will be based on ongoing evaluation and review of the staff team approach. The Conference will be able to decide at that time if we have acted responsibly in the trust given us.

It is clear that to be able to effectively serve the fellowship in the creation of literature that the literature committee needs to have the ability to make decisions that are balanced with the responsibilities that the Conference has given the committee. Perhaps allowing the literature committee guidelines to become committee approved, rather than Conference-approved is part of the solution to this dilemma. The fellowship entrusted the World Service Conference with the responsibility for the development of *It Works: How and Why*, and the World Service Conference will have the opportunity to make decisions which impact that responsibility.

All affected world service branches, conference participants and literature committees will need to discuss the issues this report presents. Hopefully this report will help to bring all conference participants up to date in a comprehensive way so that an informed decision can be made regarding the literature committee trial step development plan at the 1990 World Service Conference. We must come together in unity and participate in this reexamination of our literature development process.

THE WORLD SERVICE COMMUNITY

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

During the joint July meeting of these world service boards and committees to review portions of *A Guide to Service* and discuss the priorities of world services I was given the opportunity to present a report to those gathered. The report summarized the decisions by the literature committee to move forward with a trial step development plan to develop *It Works: How and Why*. The discussion was very helpful in that it presented the opportunity to clarify our plan and the reasons for it, as well as to answer the questions of the Trustees, Board members, and Conference Committee chairs and vice chairs present. My primary goal in this presentation was in assuring that our world service leadership be fully informed on the work on one of our highest priorities. Their support, as well as commitment to ongoing review of our process and the drafts which we develop was also hoped for. The session of the meeting covering our trial step development process was successful in that much discussion occurred and many questions were answered. Although the forum was not one where motions were made and votes taken, the mood of the participants could certainly be said to be supportive toward the decisions and aims of WSC Literature Committee.

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

CONCLUSION

Many conclusions could be drawn from the information that this report has presented. Clearly, the problems we have had and are having in the literature process warrant a reexamination of the entire literature development process. This reexamination should be comprehensive, from the process we currently utilize in determining the initiation of work on a particular recovery subject, to the fellowship involvement in the early stages of its development, on to the resources used to develop draft material, to the widespread fellowship involvement encouraged by our current review and input system, to our approval process itself. Our literature development system affects Narcotics Anonymous as a whole, not merely those of us who

choose active involvement in this process. Whatever development process we eventually use, it must meet the needs of addicts everywhere who desire and deserve high quality written material for use in their groups and in their personal recovery.

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

We need to closely and thoroughly examine our past actions and see for ourselves how we have restricted our literature development process from meeting our needs. We need to discuss at length the basic purpose and premiss of why we have literature in the first place, and then thoroughly evaluate our needs and responsibilities as a fellowship. Literature cannot possibly serve to take the place of the spiritual value of our meetings. Our writing should reflect Narcotics Anonymous by drawing out the diversity of recovery found in the application of our Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions. These principles are our saving grace, not what we write.

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

Regardless of the development plan we use there will be more delays and mistakes before we are finished with this work. As human beings, there is no limit to the number of mistakes we can make. The desire to rush and to hurry has been a constant thought these last seven years. There are no shortcuts. The effort to rush and hurry the process has been our greatest mistake. We will make new mistakes, but we don't have to make this one over again. The quality of our work on our Twelve Step book should not be sacrificed for a timetable.

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