

WSC LITERATURE COMMITTEE APPROVED MINUTES

April 26, 27, & May 1, 1992

Sunday, April 26, 1992

The meeting opened in the usual manner at 7:15pm. Introductions were made and Mary Jensen then began with the open forum. The discussion began with questions about the review and input on the steps drafts. Points covered were: different ways that regions and areas were conducting their review and input, who could input, and time constraints for the input. WSCLC members shared their experiences about working on a regional level with literature review and various options available for that process.

The general members also talked about the daily meditation book with points made about: the language--drugs and alcohol, references to the word God, and whether or not the book could be amended on the conference floor. WSCLC members gave information about the revision process used for the daily book and noted that amendments on the conference floor were usually not made on an approval item. One member noted that the approval form of items always seemed to turn into a review and input process--that no one seemed to focus on the projects until that time. Mary J. noted that any grammatical or mechanical errors in the daily book certainly could be corrected. The open forum ended after the daily book discussion.

The WSCLC then approved the March minutes with the proviso that in the future, motions would be listed in their specific form as an addenda to the summary style minutes.

Consideration was then given to committed motions. The first motion discussed was the NJ motion to include IP# 6 *Recovery and Relapse* in the *Introductory Guide to NA*. It was noted that this motion had long discussion in Tulsa, and the information was contained in the White Booklet. However, Anthony Edmonson, WSO administrator, had told one WSCLC member that it would not increase the cost and the next printing had been delayed pending the outcome of this motion. After this discussion, **the committee decided to recommend the NJ motion.**

The motion to develop a new piece of literature "What is a GSR?" was next evaluated. There was some question whether or not this was actually a literature project and whether this information was described elsewhere. **It was then decided that the request in this motion would better be served after the Guide to Service was completed and approved. The next motion regarding an official Basic Text was rejected.**

Motion #56 to develop an IP for additional needs was discussed. Some of the issues involved seemed to be additional needs, references to those needs, and prejudice. **It was decided that the WSB would be the appropriate vehicle for this**

proposal since they are responsible for additional needs, (M/S/C Jorge/Gretchen to reject based on the language of the motion, and to refer to the WSB).

The next item considered was a motion to change the word "meditation" in the subtitle of the daily book "Daily Meditations for Recovering Addicts" to either the word "reflections" or "thoughts." A lively discussion followed with a variety of pros and cons presented for the proposed wording change. The conversation centered around the definition of the word meditation and whether this book reflects a meditative perspective. **The committee decided to stay with the original wording.**

The motion for a continued moratorium on the Basic Text was agreed upon by the committee.

The next item of discussion was about the resolution motion regarding the coordination of services between the WSB and the WSC boards and committees. Another lively discussion took place with concerns expressed about the intent, legitimacy and effect of this motion. The committee could not reach consensus and several motions regarding this resolution were inconclusive. **It was left to Mary J. and Alden to use all the input from the committee in making a decision when this motion was presented on the floor.**

The committee then revisited their decision regarding the proposed IP "Seniors in Recovery." Several members wished to reconsider their vote and felt the proposal had some merit and should be evaluated again. Mike C. asked to go on record as having changed his mind and now stands in support of this motion. Mary J. pointed out that this was an interesting way for a region to get an item onto the WSCLC's worklist, and perhaps this could be discussed in the B panel in order to get a sense of direction from the participants. This brought up discussion about how and why we develop literature, and whether or not there should be some point at which they say no to any further literature development. The meeting recessed at 11:40pm.

Monday, April 27, 1992

The meeting was opened in the usual manner at 10:00 am. The discussion continued from Sunday night regarding the proposed IP "Seniors in Recovery." **After some additional discussion the committee came to consensus regarding their previously made decision about this motion.** Nominations were then considered with India Weber and Daniel Keirns receiving the committee's recommendations for WSCLC registered members.

Alden I. then asked for input, suggestions or comments on the topics for the B Panel. There was discussion regarding the review and input process, the approval

process, and the overlap discussion between the A and B panels. There was a question regarding whether or not it was appropriate for the WSCLC to review others' work if it is recovery-oriented literature like the traditions. The conversation then turned to the concerns of non-English speaking regions and their ability or lack thereof to effectively participate in the review and input process. It was noted that although the committee's request to have review batches of the daily book translated were denied, it clearly showed the WSCLC's concern and opinion on this matter. Perhaps, in the future more participation could be utilized during the creation of original material.

WSO staff informed the committee that they would be unable to accommodate the insertion of a dedication page in the daily book due to a lack of folio space.

Alden asked Jane if she could give them some information on the status of the *Step Writing Guides* project. She noted that she was researching the Connecticut region's archives and would be able to inform them at a later date; however, she felt that there wouldn't be a problem with using the material.

Alden updated the committee on the *History of NA* and the apparent appearance of a private edition of this item. He noted that he had informed the WSO and that WSO staff indicated that they would be researching copyright information about this matter. Alden also said that he would respond to questions about this project as they had previously--that the committee declines to release any of the material to a non-conference body, the material at the office is incomplete and would require the services of a professional.

There was a brief discussion about the joint work on *It Works* with the WSB and plans would be made for an August meeting in which to finalize work on the introduction, presentation of a motion for the '93 WSC and any other related matters. The meeting recessed at 11:00am.

Friday, May 1, 1992

The meeting opened in the usual manner at 11:30am. The order of the agenda was changed to allow the committee to review the additional motions that had been committed to the WSCLC. Motion #116 "That the WSC confirms the use of contract writers who are NA members and who work within our literature development process to draft and edit NA literature" was discussed. It appeared that most of the concern expressed by participants about the use of such a writer was that they not be allowed to draft new original material. As long as a contract writer used source material, outlines and concepts developed by the managing body, then there didn't seem to be much opposition. **The committee agreed to support the motion.**

Attention was then given to the development of literature and projects by other committees such as the PI video working group and their use of a consultant. It was noted that they were told that they would have to produce their own script. The committee reviewed the work that was done on section 3G and the problems involved when definitions of special workers, editors, etc. were attempted. A suggestion was made to offer additional wording describing the literature as "recovery related." Although the narrowed focus seemed agreeable, the committee didn't feel that additional wording clarified the motion any further. **The committee did voice consensus about not producing literature unless it had its conception within Narcotics Anonymous.**

The next motion (128) dealt with concerned the proposal of a position paper on the history of NA. Since the motion specified that this paper be prepared by the WSB, the committee felt that they could refer any source material to the WSB for their use. They also looked at the appropriateness of this project's development within the WSCLC. It was noted that one region had already indicated that they intended to bring a motion removing this project from the WSCLC at next year's annual session. **By unanimous voice vote the committee recommended that this motion be committed to the WSB.**

WSO staff then explained the request from the WS Translation Committee for the outline used to develop personal stories for the BT. Several non-English speaking regions had indicated that they were interested in drafting personal stories, and the Translation Committee wanted to give local translation committees the outline. The committee reviewed the outline, made minor revisions and asked staff to give it to the Translation Committee.

Mary J. then reviewed the committee's agreement from September regarding the use of publication standards by the WSO for all NA literature. **Although their agreement had been expressed to the WSO BOD, the BOD had asked for a formal notice of the committee's decision; the committee directed Mary J. to do so.** There was also a brief mention of the use of the wording "newly revised" and the reasons for discontinuing or limiting its use.

The committee then looked at a request received by the WSO to communicate with dictionary publishers about including the definition of the word "clean" as being abstinent from using drugs. Points were made about: the inability of our fellowship to agree on such a definition, the appropriateness of the WSCLC involving itself in such a venture, how words are added to the lexicon, and whether or not such a definition already exists. **Ceven M. said that he would research the matter for the committee's information.**

The purpose statement for the *Step Writing Guides* was reviewed. Some suggestions were made regarding the wording, but **the committee retained their**

consensus to accept it as written. A long discussion took place regarding the format style of this project and whether or not they could effectively review and integrate input without knowing the format style. Three (or four) styles were examined: workbook, booklet like the 4th Step booklet, a loose leaf notebook style, and simple sheets much like the source material. **A multitude of pros and cons were given for each of the styles without any agreement on one style by the committee.** Mary J. then ended the discussion stating that after the committee members receive their assignments they will be sent some guidelines to assist them in their work on the source material for this project. Each working group will have 4 steps, but will only review 2 at a time.

Alden then updated the committee about the revision of IP #20 *H&I and the NA member*. The H&I Committee wants to completely refocus and revise it. They would like to a joint working group with the WSCLC for this project. Mary J. said that they will make plans to work on that as well as the proposed *Seniors in Recovery* and *Youth in Recovery*. A suggestion was made that perhaps the two pieces dealing with age could be combined. Since the conference assigned the committed motion on the proposed IP, Mary said that the committee could report at the conference workshop about their idea.

The second open forum was held and several topics were brought up. Mary J. responded to an inquiry about future participation by general members and noted they would be able to work on the *Step Writing Guides*. When asked about the possibility of working on *Living Clean*, Mary said that they would have to investigate how productive it would be and that perhaps new material would be a better choice. Several regional literature chairpersons present wanted to know how to involve more members in the literature process. Both general members and WSCLC members shared their various experiences and techniques for attracting more participation in regional literature committees.

The meeting adjourned in the usual manner at 5:00pm.

Addendum

WSCLC's Motions List

- M/S/C Ceven/Jorge to approve the minutes with the addition of a motion list (7/0/1).
- M/S/C Ceven/Mike C. to recommend adoption of the NJ motion (7/1/0).
- M/S/C Jorge/Alden to postpone the motion to develop a new piece of literature "What is a GSR?" to a definite time when the Guide To Service is completed (6/2/0).
- M/S/C Ceven/Mike C. to reject the motion regarding an official Basic Text based on previous conference decision (unanimous).
- M/S/C Jorge/Gretchen to reject motion #56 (That the literature committee develop an IP addressing the addict seeking recovery with additional needs "physical impairments, language barriers, etc." including recovery material and networking information) based on the language of the motion, and to refer to the WSB.
- M/S/C Jorge/Alden to reject this motion because it has been known with this wording since before 1988, it is an accepted standard within the industry, and because approval form literature should not be changed on the conference floor 5/2/1).
- M/S/C Ceven/Mike C. to support the motion to extend the moratorium on the BT for 5 more years). (unanimous)
- M/S/C Jorge/Mike McD to support the motion (116) regarding the use of a contract writer). (unanimous)

Conference Action

1. Motion #13 re: ITOI along with the amendment for the supplemental reading material passed 2/3 majority.
2. Motion #14 re: JFT along with an amendment to add wording to the Feb. 10th entry passed 2/3 majority 0 nays 1 abstention.
3. Motion #15 re: A-list passed 2/3 majority voice vote.
4. Motion #29 re: the addition of Recovery and Relapse to the Introductory Guide passed by a 2/3 majority voice vote.
5. Motion #51 re: "What is a GSR?" was postponed to a definite time when the GTS has been finished and approved.
6. Motion #56 re: an IP for additional needs was referred to the WSB.
7. Motion #33 re: "Seniors in Recovery" was committed to the WSCLC.
8. Motion #31 re: the addition of wording to the Group Booklet was postponed to a definite time when the GTS was finished and approved, or when the Group Booklet was up for revision passed.
9. Motion #25 That no changes be made in Narcotics Anonymous literature without the approval of the NA Fellowship as voiced through the normal NA literature approval process. Substitute motion with #111
10. Motion #111 re: Substitute motion for motion #25: the conference shall not vote on any proposals to change existing conference-approved NA literature unless such changes have appeared in the *Conference Agenda Report* passed.
11. Motion #44 re: the removal of wording from *For Those in Treatment* failed.
12. Motion #70 re: the extension of the moratorium on the Basic Text was committed to the WSCLC with instructions to submit their recommendation in the 1993 Conference Agenda Report.