

DRAFT
STRATEGIC 10-YEAR PLAN
COMPREHENSIVE REPORT —
1999 WORLD SERVICE MEETING
HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA, USA

Table of Contents

Introduction/Summary	1
How the "Motion 21" Project Came About.....	3
"Motion 21" and the 10-Year Plan	4
The 1999 Fellowship Literature Survey	5
Fellowship Input to Revise Existing Literature	6
1. The Little White Book, <i>Narcotics Anonymous</i> (LWB)	6
2. The Basic Text, <i>Narcotics Anonymous</i>	7
3. <i>Youth and Recovery</i> (IP #13)	9
4. <i>Another Look</i> (IP #5)	9
Fellowship Input Proposing New Literature.....	9
Some Key Issues and Additional Background Information	10
Implementation Issues	10
Wants versus Needs and Achieving Consensus	10
Statement Of The Problem	10
History Of The Old A-B-C-D Priority Lists	12
Discussion of Motion 21 and the Other Motions From 1998 and 1999	13
From the 1998 CAR/WSC, Motion 21: Basic Text/Little White Book.....	13
From the 1998 CAR/WSC, Motion 24: WSCLC "A" List.....	14
1998 WSC Motion 77: Sponsorship Booklet	14
From the 1998 CAR/WSC, Motion 49: <i>Am I Too Young To Be An Addict?</i>	14
1999 WSC Motion 30: Traditions Workbook	15
From the 1999 CAR/WSC, Motion 5: Little White Book	15
1999 WSC Motion 34: Internet and Anonymity	15
Overview of the (Strategic) 10-Year Plan	15
1) Identification of Need:	16
2) Development Process:	17
3) Approval:	17
4) Chart Illustrating Potential Tasks in a Normal Conference Cycle:	17
Specific Discussion Issues— For Future Consideration	18
Discussion Issue: Process of Reviewing Fellowship-Approved Literature for Revision	18
Summary of Existing Fellowship-Approved Literature	18
Discussion Issue: Recovery Literature for Specific Needs.....	19
Another Dilemma For Discussion—Service IPs?	21
A Dilemma — Making Literature Development More Equitable.....	21

Introduction/Summary

The 1999 World Service Conference (WSC) approved a project plan to deal with all the literature issues and motions committed from 1998 and 1999. The "Motion 21" project plan directed the World Board "to prepare for the 2000 *Conference Agenda Report* a comprehensive report for the creation and revision of fellowship Approved literature over the course of the next five to ten years." The purpose of this report is to facilitate an informed group conscience about future literature priorities at WSC 2000. This report represents our first effort to develop a vision of what needs to be done in the short-term, as well as how the literature development process might be changed and made to work better in the future.

This draft report has been prepared to stimulate discussion and gather input at the 1999 World Service Meeting (WSM) in Hollywood, Florida, 24-26 September. As a draft, this material is an unfinished, preliminary work-in-progress subject to change. We encourage each of you to provide us with written input. Your input can either be given to us at the WSM, sent by e-mail to worldboard@na.org, sent by mail to the WSO, PO Box 9999, Van Nuys, CA 91409 USA, or by fax at 1-818-700-0700. All input received by 1 November, at the very latest, will be considered at the 11-14 November, 1999 meetings when this draft report will be finalized for the CAR.

Although a comprehensive report will be included in the CAR as directed by the 1999 WSC, the report itself is not meant to be adopted. Rather, we hope it will inform fellowship discussions about the motions committed to the board in 1998 and 1999, and offer tools to help all of us think about fellowship priorities. What would actually need to be adopted in any given year to initiate the plan's goals would be any detailed project plans required to achieve specific plan objectives. We see this report like discussion papers included in the CAR last year. It's designed to provide information that fosters open discussion. Hopefully, through such discussion, NA as a whole can reach the best possible consensus about literature development priorities. And we want to acknowledge certain realities right up front, first about Motion 21/24 from WSC 1998, and then about the 10-Year Plan.

Regarding Motion 21, the board is not offering any detailed project plans to revise the Basic Text or the Little White Book during the next conference cycle (2000-2002). We do support developing more material on sponsorship as a project of the World Board, once necessary groundwork is completed, but we don't see that happening before 2002. The first section of this report explains how we got to that point, and our rationale. The second section of the report describes our position on each of the motions from the 1998 and 1999 WSC meetings, our preliminary work on the 10-Year Plan, and our recommendations for work during the 2000-2002 conference cycle. Our recommendation here is essentially two-fold. First, that we need to take additional time to examine the literature development process and how the board will implement specific literature projects and its Publications Committee. Second, the board is recommending further evaluation of a large number of potential projects (including revisions/additions/changes to the Basic Text, new material on sponsorship, revisions of existing IPs such as *Youth and Recovery* and *Another Look*, and other proposals for new literature). The purpose is to develop fellowship consensus about future literature priorities overall, including an assessment of the need for various specific proposals.

We realize this may not live up to the expectations of some members. But we believe past discussions have in many ways been inconclusive, and that it is not prudent to make the first literature project of the world board a book-length project (particularly if that means changing NA's most important book, the Basic Text). Our report discusses where consensus is

lacking and some of what we think should be addressed before it would be responsible to start work on concrete literature writing projects.

We also believe there may be certain expectations regarding the proposed 10-Year Plan, which we also want to tackle head on. Under a two-year conference cycle, the conference and the fellowship can change its mind at each WSC and alter any previously established priorities, no matter what the circumstances. Given the nature of the WSC, any 10-Year Plan is just a roadmap, and the WSC would have the opportunity every two years to change direction. Another crucial aspect of the WSC's authority is its control over the entire world services budget. Every two years the WSC will be faced under the Unified Budget system with considering all project proposals involving variable discretionary spending—literature and non-literature projects together—and will make the ultimate decision to fund or not fund any project proposal. So while some may object that the 10-Year Plan is presented in the CAR for discussion, not adoption, it is clear that the conference's ultimate authority to approve the proposed goals of any plan is absolute under the Unified Budget system.

Another reality is that the conference gave us the leeway to propose a plan covering the next five to ten years, and we have called this a 10-Year Plan. But, in reality, it is very hard in the middle of a transition today to establish literature priorities beyond five years. In fact, most of the details in this plan only cover work for the next two years. Still, we believe long-range planning is in the best interest of NA as a whole, and that by 2002, if the groundwork we propose for the next conference cycle is supported, NA will then hopefully be in a better position to identify priorities for the next 10 years. We see the 10-Year Plan as a rolling target that is updated every two years. And while we want to acknowledge that this year's 10-Year Plan is short on detail beyond two years, we believe it is a simple reality that there will usually be more detail and clarity about the first two years of any 10-Year Plan. As tasks are projected farther into the future, there'll usually be less detail and more uncertainty about the more distant goals.

If our recommendations are accepted, no new literature will be created, nor will any existing literature be revised, until after 2002. The majority of our recommendations are to conduct further evaluations of potential literature projects, because we just don't know for sure what the fellowship as a whole wants and needs and feels about many of these possible projects. And while it may seem strange to some that so many literature proposals have been in limbo for 10-15+ years, it's always been the reality in NA literature development that the number of projects to choose from exceeds the available financial and human resources. And we acknowledge that the 1998 WSC rejected a proposed four year moratorium on new literature development (from 1998-2002), but the net effect of our proposal now will have the same result.

Finally, it's worth saying that it's been difficult to craft a meaningful 10-Year Plan of priorities for literature development when we haven't yet identified the overall priorities for world services during even the next two years, let alone the next ten years. Our recommendations are conservative because of the ongoing transition, and the need to balance recovery literature projects against other fellowship needs from world services. The board has barely begun to discuss these issues and develop recommendations for project proposals in the next conference cycle. As of August, the board has received 33 ideas from the fellowship, each of which must be considered. While this preliminary report discusses potential literature priorities, the entire fellowship will have to consider possible literature projects alongside all of the other potential non-literature projects. We believe considering what is most needed in literature development is just one aspect of reaching an informed group conscience about what is best for NA as a whole and what will best further the effort to carry the NA message worldwide.

How the "Motion 21" Project Came About

At the 1998 WSC the Board of Trustees proposed Motion 21 to deal with motions relating to the Basic Text and the Little White Book. The trustees felt this was needed because a 10-year moratorium on changing the Basic Text was due to end at the 1998 WSC. The trustees anticipated a large number of motions on this and other aspects of literature development would be coming forward, which turned out to be an accurate assumption. These motions proposed various options: from extending the Basic Text moratorium—to creating a new moratorium on all new literature development—to various competing proposals for new literature—to specific proposals to make different revisions and/or additions to the Basic Text and the Little White Book in various ways.

Prior to WSC 1998, there was also significant uncertainty about the outcome of the Transition Group's proposals to reorganize the world service structure and consolidate the separate boards and standing committees into a single world board (which, as it turned out, regional delegates did approve by an overwhelming vote). The trustees had foreseen that *if* this happened, the transition would have a significant impact on literature development in the short-term. Therefore, the trustees proposed Motion 21, which stated (as adopted by WSC 1998):

"That all motions, amendments and any other input regarding revisions or additions to the Basic Text or the booklet Narcotics Anonymous (The Little White Book), be committed to the World Board who will compile and forward to the conference, in two years, a detailed proposal including options, budgets and timelines for those options. (Note: *Before the vote, the chairperson stated that this will include motion #24.*)" [emphasis added]

If this sounds complicated, it's because it was. The 1998 WSC struggled with how to deal with Motion 21 versus all of the other related motions. The Trustees had intended that Motion 21 be a substitute for conference consideration and debate of all the competing Basic Text motions. Although there was great support for the Motion 21 process, after lengthy discussions and some confusing parliamentary gymnastics, the conference purposefully decided it wanted to postpone voting on Motion 21 until it could first vote for or against certain Basic Text-related motions which had been in the CAR. With no debate on the merits of each of the following individual motions, the conference then proceeded. First came Motion 24, the proposed WSCLC "A" list:

"To approve the following as WSCLC's 'A' work list for the 1998-99 conference year:

1. A new chapter on Sponsorship to be included in the Basic Text
2. A new chapter on Service to be included in the Basic Text
3. The addition/substitution of personal stories compiled from our worldwide fellowship in the Basic Text."

A motion to commit this to the world board initially failed. And in spite of objections that the motion should have been ruled out of order because the WSCLC standing committee had at this point been voted out of existence, the conference deliberately decided to vote up or down on this motion. Without debating its merits, the conference then adopted this motion by voice vote.

Next, the conference rejected without debate CAR Motion 36 (to impose a moratorium until 2004 on changes to the first ten chapters in Book One of the Basic Text only). This proposed moratorium would have allowed changes to Book Two (personal stories) or the addition of new chapters. Then, the conference rejected by voice vote without discussion CAR Motion 14: "That the WSC direct the WSCLC to begin development of a Sixth Edition of the Basic Text as soon as the moratorium expires. The Sixth Edition should include a chapter on Sponsorship, a chapter on Service and new stories of an international fellowship." Finally, CAR Motion 40 died for lack of a second (to add a third book to the Basic Text containing four new chapters titled God, Self, Service and Society).

It was at this point that the conference then again took up consideration of Motion 21, which it had postponed to consider the above motions. Then, without further debate, the WSC adopted Motion 21, while at the same time (as noted above) specifically committing Motion 24 (the "A" list), which it had adopted moments before.

The conference has never in its history adopted a motion, then subsequently committed that motion. At the time, certain conference participants objected to this procedurally, but the conference parliamentarian stated that this could be done. Within moments of this unprecedented action, the conference did this again with a second motion.

By two-thirds majority voice vote, the conference adopted CAR Motion 77:

"To continue with the development of a sponsorship booklet as a new piece of literature. Said booklet should be given to the World Board Publications Committee with a final draft included in the CAR 2000."

Then, after objections and discussion, the conference committed this motion (#77) to the world board and the Motion 21 process. In doing this, the conference also included CAR Motion 49 (to place the proposed IP "Am I Too Young To Be An Addict" on the WSCLC "A" list), which the WSC actually had already committed to the world board without debate moments before.

While these actions to adopt but then commit these two motions are unprecedented and unorthodox, we want to clearly acknowledge that this is what the 1998 WSC did. Not surprisingly, there are conflicting interpretations of these complex actions even among those of us who were there and participated in the decisions. But while we could also argue about the meaning or the way the 1998 WSC made these decisions, *the bottom line is we are making recommendations today which essentially ask the fellowship and the conference to reconsider the priorities which were adopted in principle in 1998.* We are asking that these issues be revisited because we believe there is inadequate consensus to move forward now and that we need more discussion than what occurred in 1998. This position does not stop the fellowship and the conference from reaffirming these priorities, or different ones. Further discussion about our rationale and our position on each of the motions appears below, starting on page 13.

"Motion 21" and the 10-Year Plan

At WSC 1999, the World Board then proposed a more comprehensive approach than the 1998 Motion 21 proposal. The board recommended that the task be expanded—beyond just the Basic Text and Little White Book—to developing a plan for the creation and revision of *all* fellowship-approved literature over the next five to ten years. The expanded scope of this project grew out of the Fellowship Development Plan (FDP) and its 10 long-term strategic goals (first formulated in the mid-1990s). This Motion 21 Project is specifically designed to further

FDP Goal 9: "Identify new recovery material(s) needed by the fellowship and develop a plan for their creation by 1999." The creation of a new single world board has been motivated largely by the desire to make world services more effective and efficient, better using scarce fellowship resources and improving the quality of services delivered through better long-range planning. The development of this 10-Year Plan for recovery literature is an important part of this effort.

At the 1999 WSC the conference accepted the World Board's proposed project plan which expanded the scope of the "Motion 21" project. The scope and funding were adopted as part of the approval of the first Unified Budget, which included 14 projects altogether. All 14 projects approved by the 1999 WSC are intended to further the larger goals of the Fellowship Development Plan. (The World Board also presented an updated version of the FDP to the 1999 WSC showing the relationship between the 14 proposed projects and the FDP.) *The 1999 conference then also committed three more literature motions to the World Board (see p. 15).*

At our first meeting we saw the enormity of our task and how little time we had to accomplish this work. As a result of the proposal adopted by the 1999 WSC, this expanded project now included two (2) major tasks. First, we had to deal with all of the specific literature motions committed to the "Motion 21" process from the 1998 and 1999 World Service Conferences. Second, we had to come up with a "10-Year Plan" which would allow the fellowship to set the initial priorities for the creation and revision of Fellowship-approved literature from 2000 through 2010. The plan also has to take into account the new two-year conference cycle and how the various literature projects will be impacted. As we received the results from the literature survey we saw that the fellowship appeared to be divided about the 1998 proposals to revise the Basic Text, and that other literature proposals seemed to have greater support. This comprehensive report is the result of our efforts and your input.

The 1999 Fellowship Literature Survey

Part of the fellowship input we used to prepare this report came from the March 1999 literature survey. Because of Motion 21 from the 1998 WSC, in February of 1999 the board designed a literature survey to get an initial sense of what the fellowship wanted to see happen with recovery literature. This was done before the Board had developed the proposal for the expanded Motion 21 project plan, and before the 1999 WSC approved the expanded project in April 1999. For this reason, the February survey did not attempt to rank literature development priorities for the next five to ten years, nor was the 1999 survey intended to be a ballot.

As we have reported previously this year, the survey does represent a very preliminary investigation which tentatively suggests certain trends and avenues requiring further evaluation. *We received more than 2,300 responses from members, groups, and various service boards and committees all over the world!* We thank all of you who filled out and returned the literature survey. The summary of the results is still available on request (or online at www.na.org).

Other fellowship input was also of critical value in formulating this plan and our recommendations. We reviewed lengthy and comprehensive summaries of all of the input on file at the WSO which has been received from the fellowship since the 1980's. The next two sections summarize some of this key input relating to revising existing recovery literature, as well as input on proposals for new literature.

Fellowship Input to Revise Existing Literature

1. The Little White Book, *Narcotics Anonymous* (LWB)

As our oldest piece of recovery literature, the Little White Book was approved sometime prior to the creation of the World Service Conference itself (in 1976). A number of revisions also occurred prior to 1976. One proposed revision from the WSCLC was rejected by the 1983 WSC. This led to the WSCLC unsuccessfully attempting to make minor changes to the 1983 proposal before abandoning this approach and turning the project over to the Board of Trustees, who later proposed a revision which was adopted at the 1986 WSC. Conceptual changes were made in the first part of the booklet, and the text was edited, including the personal stories. Punctuation was also changed in the Twelve Steps and the Twelve Traditions themselves. There was some controversy over both the process and content. The 1986 WSC accepted the proposed revision after extensive debate.

From 1986-1988 following the LWB revision of 1986, the relevancy of the personal stories in the LWB continued to be discussed and other changes were considered. In 1986-87 the WSCLC solicited new stories for the LWB. The 1987 conference rejected motions to remove the LWB stories edited in 1986 from all approved literature and to move a certain story from the Basic Text into the LWB. The 1987 conference overwhelmingly also rejected a motion to classify the 1976 version of the LWB as a "historical document" to be kept in print and made available to the fellowship, which if approved would have put the LWB in a "historical category" different from other recovery literature. The 1988 conference rejected a regional motion committed from WSC 1987 to change the phrase "Easy Does It" to "Take It Easy" in all publications and also decided to leave the LWB stories alone. At the 1989 WSC the following motion was ruled out of order because of the Basic Text moratorium: "That in the NA Basic Text and other N.A. literature, the words 'physical challenge' be added to the list at the end of the second paragraph of 'What Is The N.A. Program?'". By WSC action on a 1998 CAR motion, the LWB stories are now subject to the same World Services Translations Committee policy as Book Two of the Basic Text. Also, as discussed below, the 1998 WSC committed to the World Board a motion to change one sentence in the LWB where it states "we . . . are under no surveillance at any time" to "we . . . participate in no surveillance at any time."

The input on file includes the stories received in 1987 (ten are now on file). A small folder of other input relating to the LWB is also on file. Most suggests certain word or sentence changes, sometimes with a conceptual rationale for the proposed change(s). Other specific LWB input is mixed in with the input relating to the Basic Text, described below.

The related items which could be impacted by changes in the LWB include: *Who, What, How and Why* (IP #1), *Recovery and Relapse* (IP #6), *An Introductory Guide to Narcotics Anonymous*, the Basic Text, and *Just For Today, Daily Meditations for Recovering Addicts* (which has some direct LWB quotes which are identified by reference to the page numbers in the Basic Text, Fifth Edition). *It Works: How and Why (It Works)* contains (at least) three quotes from the LWB (each of which is so fundamental that each is unlikely to be revised: see p. 17, p. 181, p. 189). *Behind the Walls* contains an excerpt from the LWB on p. 18. *For the Newcomer* closes with an unattributed LWB quote. Finally, the *Just For Today* statement is part of the LWB and is reprinted in a number of additional publications; if any part of the *Just For Today* statement was revised, all of these additional publications would have to be identified and compared for consistency.

2. The Basic Text, *Narcotics Anonymous*

Although we have had five editions of the Basic Text up to the present, no intentional conceptual revisions have been made since the approval of the Basic Text at WSC 1982, with certain exceptions. The exceptions are: (i) certain changes in the essays on the 4th and 9th Traditions; (ii) the addition and deletion of various personal stories at different times from 1983-1986; (iii) specific conceptual changes relating to the 1986 revision of the Little White Book and (iv) five additional changes in Book One of the Basic Text authorized by the 1987 WSC which were designed to make five sentences consistent with the 1986 LWB conceptual revision. The editing of the Third Edition, Revised, resulted in certain unintentional conceptual changes in the Fourth Edition of the Basic Text, which were corrected by action of the 1988 WSC, resulting in the edited Fifth Edition.

In October of 1987, the WSCLC surveyed the Area and Regional Literature Committees about revising the Basic Text (and several reports to the Fellowship dealt with this subject). The WSCLC invited input about the Basic Text in connection with this survey. This survey was undertaken before any controversy erupted when the Fourth Edition was published in November of 1987, but the controversy then caused confusion which impacted the survey. The WSCLC subsequently decided to include the survey question in the 1988 CAR with additional background information. The 1988 WSC subsequently adopted a plan which corrected editing and production errors in the Fourth Edition in a new Fifth Edition and simultaneously imposed a five year moratorium on further revision of the Basic Text. Because of this, the survey results were never used. However, the record and the survey input on file indicate several things. The overwhelming majority of survey respondents (and, more importantly, the WSC) felt (i) that annual, year-by-year revisions of the Basic Text should stop; (ii) although Book One and Two might need to be revised at some point, that (iii) completion of *It Works: How and Why* was a much higher priority, among others, and (iv) consequently the Basic Text should be left alone for five years (or more). This was the rationale for the initial five year moratorium adopted in 1988.

The WSCLC initially favored lifting the moratorium on Book Two at the 1993 WSC, and floated the idea of changing the existing stories and/or creating a separate book of international stories. However, ultimately the WSCLC unanimously supported the full moratorium for another five years—with the proviso that “during this moratorium the committee would solicit stories worldwide for Book Two.” *The 1993 WSC extended the moratorium another five years for both Book One and Book Two based on a CAR motion.* Following WSC 1994, the WSCLC formed a workgroup to develop a plan for personal stories for Book Two of the Basic Text. In or about September of 1994 the WSCLC agreed to put an issue discussion paper in the 1995 CAR on this subject. (The 1995 WSC was organized as the first issue discussion WSC, and the 1995 CAR contained discussion papers on several subjects, giving the 1995 WSC a discussion-oriented, rather than motion-oriented, agenda.) At the 1996 WSC the following motion was referred to the WSCLC: “It was M/S/R ... RSR-A, South Florida Region/RSR-A, Wisconsin Region ‘That the WSCLC solicit new stories for inclusion in Book 2 of the Basic Text.’”

In the year leading up to the expiration of the moratorium in 1998, the WSC again advanced the idea of changing Book Two, as well as adding two new chapters to Book One—a new chapter on sponsorship and one about service. The WSCLC also took the strong position that no other changes should be made to Book One. This proposal was formalized in Motion 24, the “A” list of priorities, discussed above and below. The 1998 WSC (in its handling of Motions 21/24) first adopted the WSCLC proposal (Motion 24) but then committed it to the World Board, asking that the board report back various options, timelines and budgets for

possible revisions to the Basic Text and LWB in the 2000 CAR. This action thereby delayed further conference consideration until WSC 2000.

The input on file relating to the Basic Text can be summarized as follows:

i) Five (5) stories have been received since the August 1997 WSCLC request for stories; additional story resources include a collection of stories in the French edition of Book Two which were recently approved. A set of stories from addicts in the United Kingdom has been assembled for the proposed U.K. edition of the LWB. Finally, as noted above, there are also ten stories received during 1987-88 which were solicited for the LWB.

ii) Regarding changes to Chapters 1-10 (Book One), three (3) small folders containing input received from 1982 to the present, amounting altogether to a stack of paper less than one (1) inch thick. Most of this suggests certain word or sentence changes, sometimes with a conceptual rationale for the proposed change(s).

iii) Regarding a new chapter on sponsorship, the only source material includes: one 13 page rough draft re-write of the existing IP prepared by an area literature committee; and one five page chapter from the work-in-progress book proposal, *Living Clean*.

iv) Regarding a new chapter on service, there are two very short and rough drafts about service which were submitted in 1991-92 as proposals for an NA service IP. These could become source material for a Basic Text chapter on service, if not used to create an IP (see further description of the service IP proposal below). In both cases, currently available material is extremely limited.

v) Certain input and comments associated with the 26 October, 1987 Basic Text survey is on file (another one inch folder of material of limited relevance).

vi) Various motions relating to the Basic Text have been rejected by the WSC or committed to the WSCLC over the years, and these committed motions were part of the input the WSCLC considered in formulating the 1998 "A" list (Motion 24).¹

The related items which could be impacted by changes in the Basic Text include *Who, What, How and Why* (IP #1), *Recovery and Relapse* (IP #6), the LWB, *An Introductory Guide to Narcotics Anonymous* and *Just For Today, Daily Meditations for Recovering Addicts*. (333 of the 366 daily entries in JFT—over 90%—contain quotes from the Basic Text which are expanded upon in the JFT book.) *It Works: How & Why* contains (at least) one quote from the

¹ At the 1991 WSC, the following motion was committed: "That the next edition of the Basic Text, *Narcotics Anonymous* [sic] reflect the following footnote on the cover page of Book Two, "Personal Stories: [sic] 'The language used in some of these stories is not always consistent with what we understand to be the language and terminology of NA recovery today.'"

At the 1995 WSC the following motion was referred to WSCLC: "That the next edition of our Basic Text include a chapter on sponsorship." (Connecticut/Australia)

At the 1997 WSC the following motion was committed to appear in the 1998 CAR: Motion #102 RSR, Northern California/RSR, Central California, "That the WSC direct the WSCLC to begin development of a Sixth Edition of the Basic Text as soon as the moratorium expires. The Sixth Edition should include a chapter on Sponsorship, a chapter on Service and new stories of an international fellowship." This became Motion 14 in the 1998 CAR, which was defeated by voice vote, as noted above (see p. 4).

Basic Text (p. 51). *H&I Service and the NA Member* contains one fundamental quote from the Basic Text (p. 65). The *NA Step Working Guides* has several quotes from the Basic Text.

3. *Youth and Recovery* (IP #13)

There are four proposals which have become connected with a revision of the existing *Youth and Recovery* IP. These are *Am I Too Young To Be An Addict?*, *Seniors in Recovery*, *So You Think You're Different*, and *Recovery Is For Everyone*. The input and issues relating to these can be found on page 19: "Discussion Issue: Recovery Literature for Specific Needs".

4. *Another Look* (IP #5)

Further evaluation at some point is needed to achieve consensus on the possible revision of *Another Look* (IP #5). There has been reluctance to revise this IP because it was originally authored by one of NA's earliest members, and past minor revisions of this IP created some controversy (it was last revised in 1985). Nonetheless, the WSCLC identified this item as needing revision back in 1992 when it placed this item on its "B" worklist, and it remained there awaiting revision through 1998. The 1999 Literature Survey did not ask about this item. No input has been found in our files suggesting specific changes to this IP, so the scope of any possible future revision needs evaluation.

Fellowship Input Proposing New Literature

Proposals for new literature on various other topics have been on the table as potential future projects since the late 1980's. These include: (1) *What is Spirituality?*; (2) *Relationships*; (3) *Racial and Cultural Diversity*; (4) *Practicing the Principles of the Traditions*; (5) a service and recovery IP; and (6) *Recovery in day to day life*. The source material available for each of these items consists of very short and limited drafts. Each of these proposals was asked about in general terms in the 1999 fellowship literature survey. Further evaluation of the need for each of these proposals will be required if any of these items are to go forward. If need is agreed upon, then how and when any item should be developed would also have to be determined.

Regarding the *service and recovery* IP proposal, because it relates to a new chapter in the Basic Text, further evaluation is especially needed to achieve consensus on the scope of that proposal and related issues (IP, booklet, Basic Text chapter, or nothing). The background is that the WSCLC placed the proposal for an IP on NA service on the "C" worklist (items for regional development) published in the 1993 CAR. It remained there throughout the WSC inventory years, up to and including the "C" list published in the 1998 CAR. However, the WSCLC also added a new "A" list recommendation for a new chapter on service for the Basic Text at that time. The source material for this potential IP consists of two short drafts. The first is a 1-1/2 page draft submitted by a regional literature committee in August of 1991. The second is a four page draft received in September of 1992, originally published in a regional newsletter. Presumably these could be used as source material, depending upon how these two proposals were handled (*i.e.*, a new service IP versus a new chapter in the Basic Text).

Two book-length proposals have been on hold indefinitely. One is a book geared toward members in early recovery titled *Living Clean*, which has been a potential project since 1983. Another is an anthology book of favorite *NA Way* articles (from the magazine's beginning in 1982 up to the present). There is significant source material for both of these potential projects, but the draft material on file for *Living Clean* would require very extensive work because of serious problems with the content, style and tone of the material.

Some Key Issues and Additional Background Information

Implementation Issues

The 10-Year Plan will not and can not implement itself. The Internal Guidelines Project this year is developing internal guidelines for the board as a whole and the protocols between the board, its executive committee, and its other workgroups and committees. The task of developing internal guidelines for each board committee has been left for the board and each committee to develop in the future based upon actual experience of what works and what doesn't. We anticipate this will be a significant task to accomplish from 2000-2002. Thus, we have been conservative in recommending difficult projects, particularly book-length projects, during this transition cycle. The board has not yet had time to discuss and identify other implementation issues, including future tasks needed to implement the plan successfully.

Wants versus Needs and Achieving Consensus

We talked quite a bit as we prepared this report about new ways of determining fellowship "needs" versus "wants" when it comes to future literature development. Telling the difference between wants and needs is a big issue for us as addicts. Our first reaction often is that we need more, and we want it yesterday. Setting priorities, accepting that resources are limited, pacing ourselves—these are issues we tend to struggle with in both recovery and service. Asked to choose, we'll sometimes look for every way possible to avoid making choices and try to have it all now. Reaching agreements we can all live with can also be difficult.

Framing this issue historically, the literature needs of Narcotics Anonymous are certainly different today in the year 2000 than our needs were only 20 years ago in 1980. Back then, we had just five short information pamphlets and the Little White Book. No Basic Text, no other books or booklets. Every new piece of recovery literature was almost certain to fill a genuine unmet need, given the extremely limited expression of the NA message in written form. Today, for our English-speaking members, we have four major books, one workbook, six booklets, and twenty-two information pamphlets. Identifying what is truly needed is much more complex today than in past years, given this abundance of existing recovery literature in English. And the needs of non-English speaking members whose translation efforts are impacted by decisions made about English language literature has been a significant part of our discussions.

Statement Of The Problem

A problem well-defined is a problem half-solved. For this reason, it's worth highlighting exactly what problems we are trying to solve with this 10-Year Plan. *One problem has been a lack of long-range planning.* The introduction to the Fellowship Development Plan states:

"Over the past years, the world services inventory/resolution process has confirmed a number of important things about service provision at the world level that trusted servants have known for a long time. Perhaps one of the most important things that our experience has demonstrated—and that the inventory has borne out—is that world services has lacked long-term strategies and goals. As a consequence, we have for many years often operated in a rather haphazard way in terms of acquiring and allocating resources, as well as developing any long-term strategies regarding fellowship growth and development. . . ."

Another literature development problem has been a difficulty with achieving consensus. We have had great success achieving consensus with some literature projects—while other literature projects have generated some very unpleasant disagreements about the form, content and process by which we carry the message of NA in written form. And we have had troubles setting priorities. Briefly, what have these problems meant for recovery literature development?

Haphazard is a fair word to describe NA literature development in the 1980s. One example of the kind of problem the Fellowship Development Plan describes involves the Basic Text. From the beginning of the World Service Conference in 1976 until the approval of the Basic Text in April 1982, there was only one real priority for the World Literature Committee—the Basic Text. The WSCLC set its own priorities (with fellowship input) during these early years. After the Basic Text was approved in 1982, in one year 12 new IPs were developed and approved by the 1983 WSC. These 12 new pamphlets had been developed in less than nine months and approved by simple majority vote after only a three month approval period. There had been limited time and opportunity for fellowship review and input. And of those 12 information pamphlets approved at the 1983 WSC, three were withdrawn and a total of four were being revised within the next two years. An effort to revise the Little White Book failed in 1983 due to lack of consensus; a second attempt succeeded in 1986, but with significant fellowship conflict and tension. And of course, while all of the above was going on and more, plus the effort to create *It Works—How and Why* (described below), there were five editions of the Basic Text in just five years between 1983 and 1988.

Work started on *It Works* right after the 1982 WSC approved the Basic Text, and *It Works* was to become the number one priority for the next eleven years. It was not until 1985 that the WSC approved the first list of priorities for the WSCLC, a list of 10 items in no particular order (not including *It Works*). This first list in 1985 included six proposed revision items which had been recently approved (within two to five years). This adoption of a single unprioritized list continued until 1988 when the WSCLC proposed new guidelines which included the new process known as the "A-B-C-D Priority Work Lists". This change resulted from a crisis with the *It Works* effort when, in 1987 (just short of the half-way point along what would be a rocky eleven year path), the fellowship rejected the first approval form version of the steps portion of that book. This happened because of disagreements about both the literature process itself and about what the NA fellowship really wanted to say about our most basic principles, the Twelve Steps. *Work had been underway for five (5) years on a book-length project without having achieved fellowship consensus on either the content of the book or the need to change the literature development process.*

These difficulties with *It Works* led to a literature inventory process in the late 1980s, which resulted in new guidelines in 1988 that created the A-B-C-D planning process. Further difficulties led to changes to the guidelines in 1989 which resolved the issue about using addicts who were professional writers in NA's literature process. This led to the approval of *It Works* in 1993, a success evidenced by fellowship acceptance of this book for seven years now without any demands for revision, in contrast to our experience with the Basic Text.

After the reforms of 1988 and 1989, work was able to proceed rapidly and smoothly on the *Just For Today* book. *Just For Today* had also been initiated in the early 1980s. But the work languished over disagreements about the book's content. The literature process was also a problem. Relying on limited human and financial resources in regional workshop settings was not very successful in creating a draft or developing source material. *Once again, fellowship efforts had been underway for years, without agreement on what this book should say or how and when it should be created.* A fellowship-wide survey in 1988 established consensus on the

work list (or return it to the original contributor). Likewise, the guidelines provided for a revision workgroup of the WSCLC who would assess existing literature and then recommend the placement of items in need of revision in the appropriate A-B-C-D work list category. However, this evaluation process was carried out differently from year to year, and essentially stopped once the WSC inventory process began in 1993.

The history of both literature development in NA and the A-B-C-D process supports the conclusion that there has been gradual, incremental progress in how NA has planned and prioritized the creation and revision of Fellowship-approved literature. *But the goal of a ten year plan should be not only to build on what has worked well in the past, but also to solve two recurring problems: (1) effectively prioritizing and executing specific literature projects in the context of a longer range plan and (2) achieving consensus.* Our hope is that this report will facilitate an informed group conscience at WSC 2000 and, through the "strategic plan process", every two years thereafter, so that the fellowship can discuss and reconsider then current needs—whether it's translating or revising existing literature, creating new literature, or devoting resources to other, non-literature projects. *If we learn from the successes and failures in our past, we can further improve both long-range project planning and the effort to gather the entire fellowship's group conscience assessment of the greatest needs and priorities for carrying the NA message in written form.* This ten year strategic plan is intended to be a tool which gives the fellowship a way at WSC 2000 to answer the question: **Where do we go from here?**

Discussion of Motion 21 and the Other Motions From 1998 and 1999

Before proceeding further into a discussion of the 10-Year Plan, this section of the report is a discussion of each of the specific literature motions from the 1998 and 1999 WSCs.

From the 1998 CAR/WSC, Motion 21: Basic Text/Little White Book

The board is not offering any detailed project plans to revise the Basic Text or the Little White Book during the next conference cycle (2000-2002). This is based on a combination of factors. These include: the 1999 literature survey results (in spite of this survey's limitations), the input on file we have reviewed (discussed above), and our own judgement and experience. We are also very much aware that the 1998 WSC adopted Motion 24 and Motion 77 (discussed above), but then subsequently committed these motions to the Motion 21 process, an unprecedented action. Revision of either the Basic Text or the Little White Book would extensively impact numerous other items of Fellowship-approved literature which contain quotes or excerpts from these publications. There is insufficient consensus that either of these are the next, immediate priorities for literature development.

With respect to the Basic Text, we are recommending only that focused follow-up evaluation be done during the 2000-2002 conference cycle. Any changes to the Basic Text need further, measured deliberations. *Given our history and the importance of the Basic Text, substantial unanimity should be our goal before we initiate a project relating to the Basic Text.* At this time we see significant opposition in the fellowship to revising the existing material in Chapters 1-10, and the WSCLC had previously recommended that these be left alone. The fellowship appears divided about adding additional chapters or revising the personal stories section in the immediate future, i.e., the next conference cycle. Evaluating the issue about changing the Book Two stories section in conjunction with a possible project to create a new

specific content and form of the *Just For Today* book. Further consensus was achieved in 1989 about using the WSO staff-team approach in the literature process. This combination of consensus and planning—achieved through fellowship-wide dialogue—smoothed the way for this book to be rapidly completed in 1992 (essentially a three year effort).

A different pattern can be seen in the most recent new recovery book project—the creation of *The Narcotics Anonymous Step Working Guides*. The WSCLC proposed a detailed plan for this work at the 1993 WSC, and in just five years this major work was brought to a successful conclusion with its adoption by the 1998 WSC. The consensus about the content of this book grew out of earlier disagreements about the content of *It Works*, disagreements between those who wanted *It Works* to be a step writing guide and those who didn't. Once consensus was achieved to produce a step writing guide separate from *It Works*, this established a foundation for the subsequent development of the *Step Guides*, built on the fellowship accepted process which had brought *It Works* and *Just For Today* to conclusion.

Now, we recognize members individually may still hold different opinions about the relative quality and value of the different book-length pieces which NA has created. And some care passionately about the method and process through which NA literature is developed, while others are indifferent to how literature is produced and care only about the quality of the final product. *But we believe most all can agree that, given our history, when we have had fellowship consensus and good planning, the fellowship has benefited.* Conversely, the absence of consensus has sometimes been associated with serious conflict and disunity, and poor planning which drains scarce fellowship resources should also be avoided at all costs.

Because the 10-Year Plan is an effort to substantially improve the old A-B-C-D priority planning process, the background about this is discussed further below.

History Of The Old A-B-C-D Priority Lists

Between 1989-1998, the fellowship set literature priorities annually by approving the WSCLC's "A" Work List which was published in the CAR each year. So one of our goals was to create a new long-term planning mechanism for literature development that would replace and improve this process. The objective is to allow the entire fellowship to develop an informed group conscience and reach the best possible consensus about literature priorities. We were confronted with the task of having to balance today's reality with the fact that we are in a transition period. This means balancing the need to build elements of a new literature process while at the same time meeting directives of the fellowship to revise existing recovery literature or to create new literature.

Under conference policy between 1988 and 1998, the A-B-C-D work lists were published each year in the CAR based upon annual evaluations. Each year the WSCLC would make a motion to have the WSC adopt the "A" priority work list only. The B-C-D portion of the list would be published for information only in the annual CAR (and was never voted on). By definition, "C" list items (for regional development) required substantial work to bring these to a stage where work by the WSCLC could be productive. Moreover, "D" list items were in an even earlier stage of development, sometimes consisting of little more than an idea or an outline.

The WSCLC guidelines provided for an evaluation workgroup. This group was to evaluate all proposals for new literature and assess the stage of development a given proposal was in, as well as the *need* for literature on that subject. The evaluations workgroup made annual recommendations internally to the WSCLC to place each proposal on the appropriate

international story book will also help to resolve what the fellowship needs in this area. We acknowledge that the 1998 WSC defeated a motion, without debate, which proposed to create a new book-length anthology of personal stories from recovering addicts throughout the world. But we believe this idea warrants further consideration and should be evaluated in the context of making other changes in the personal stories section of the Basic Text.

Regarding the Little White Book, the board has no immediate plans to give any further consideration to revising it, except for evaluating the separate issue of surveillance (see discussion of Motion 5 below). The general priority setting literature survey (and/or focus groups and/or fellowship workshops, among other things) may also help to clarify which projects (if any) may be recommended first during the 2002-2012 timeframe.

From the 1998 CAR/WSC, Motion 24: WSCLC "A" List

Until there can be further evaluation and fellowship discussion, we are against these Motion 24 "A" list items becoming the next literature priorities. Our rationale is the same as for Motion 21, discussed above.

The general priority setting literature survey (and/or focus groups and/or fellowship workshops, among other things) will also help to clarify which projects (if any) may be recommended first during the 2002-2012 timeframe.

1998 WSC Motion 77: Sponsorship Booklet

Our recommendation here is to support the development of material on sponsorship as a project of the World Board, once necessary groundwork is completed, which we don't see happening before 2002. We believe there is consensus that more material on this topic is needed. The WSCLC first identified the existing IP as needing revision back in 1992, and competing proposals to revise the IP, create a new booklet, or add a chapter to the Basic Text have been discussed ever since. And as noted above, Motion 77 was adopted by the 1998 WSC, but then subsequently committed to the Motion 21 project. The activities in 2000-2002 would be principally further evaluation to achieve consensus on the form and content of this project, clarifying whether the new material should be created in addition to the existing Sponsorship IP, or as a replacement/revision of that IP. The evaluation could also clarify whether a full scale chapter in the Basic Text is needed. The general priority setting literature survey (and/or focus groups and/or fellowship workshops, among other things) will also help to clarify which projects (if any) may be recommended first during the 2002-2012 timeframe.

From the 1998 CAR/WSC, Motion 49: Am I Too Young To Be An Addict?

"To commit Motion #49 ('To recommend that the WSC place Addendum K, 'Am I Too Young To Be An Addict?', on the WSCLC's A-list.') to the World Board."

We are recommending further evaluation of the need for material of this type and fellowship discussion to resolve the philosophical conflicts surrounding this kind of "specialized" literature. If needed, then how and when such material should be developed would also have to be determined. The general priority setting literature survey (and/or focus groups and/or fellowship workshops, among other things) may also help to clarify which projects (if any) may be recommended first during the 2002-2012 timeframe.

Further evaluation is needed to achieve consensus on the scope of the future *Youth and Recovery* project and related issues. (Does the fellowship want to combine *Youth and Recovery* with *Seniors in Recovery* to create a *Recovery is For Everyone/So You Think You're Different* IP, or should we develop individual IPs to carry the message to specific population segments—on one, two or all three of these topics)? There have been philosophical conflicts about whether all recovery literature must be for everyone, or can some literature be tailored to meet particular needs of specific segments of the fellowship. The board has not yet had the opportunity to discuss this issue and make any specific recommendation. This issue is explored at length below in the "Specific Discussion Issues—For Future Consideration" section of this report on page 19 ("Discussion Issue: Recovery Literature for Specific Needs").

1999 WSC Motion 30: Traditions Workbook (Committed Motion)

"To direct the World Board to develop a project plan for a guide book for working our 12 Traditions. (Intent: to create a book-length piece on this subject.)" M/S/C to commit to the World Board.

We recommend future evaluation of the need for material of this type. If needed, then how and when such material should be developed would also have to be determined (and whether an information pamphlet, booklet or a book-length piece would best meet that need).

From the 1999 CAR/WSC, Motion 5: Little White Book (Committed Motion)

"To change in the *Narcotics Anonymous* White Booklet under the section "What is the NA Program?" on page 2, second to last sentence, the language 'and are under no surveillance at any time' to 'and participate in no surveillance at any time'".

We believe there is an important philosophical issue underlying this suggested change. We plan to discuss this motion at our November board meeting. Input is welcome; the board has made no decision so far.

1999 WSC Motion 34: Internet and Anonymity (Committed Motion)

"To provide direction to the World Board for the Motion 21 Project Plan as follows: To include, under the description of the 11th Tradition in the Basic Text and *It Works—How and Why*, language regarding the application of this tradition to television and the Internet."

This motion proposed revising the essays on the 11th Tradition in the Basic Text and *It Works—How and Why*. We are against revising the Basic Text or *It Works* for this purpose at this time. Instead, the full board believes that developing a bulletin on this topic is the best way to begin to address this issue. On topical issues, a bulletin should be the first step. After a bulletin is developed, further evaluation of the need for an information pamphlet could then be considered. Only after these steps and the demonstration of continuing need should the revision of book-length items be considered.

Overview of the (Strategic) 10-Year Plan

This plan is intended to be flexible and modular (having multiple options presented for a given project or choice between projects), including costs and timelines depending on the scope

option selected, as appropriate. In future years, detailed project plans to authorize specific work on specific literature items would have to be approved by the WSC to implement any plan goals.

The process itself is divided into 1) creation of new literature and 2) the revision of existing literature—each with its own aspect of fellowship involvement and its own activities and tasks in each conference cycle.

We see *fellowship involvement* and *communication-reporting* as overarching priorities that transcend all of the plan components described below. Our intention is that fellowship involvement be an integral part of all processes. Fellowship involvement would come through all of the needs assessment tools described below, and by review and input methods. Although we see the continued English language bias potential in this part of the process, we would expect our review and input methods to be better planned and organized, more “user-friendly” and hopefully more effective in gathering useful fellowship input on draft recovery literature. We see fellowship involvement as part of all communication and reporting, and this finally culminates in the ultimate fellowship decision to approve (or disapprove) material. Communication and reporting are equally critical. We noted this happening via *NAWS News*, the CAR, the *NA Way*, special reports, the WSO website and regional/zonal events (workshops, learning days, and the proposed interactive workshop system).

We identified three major components relevant to the future creation and revision of Fellowship-approved literature. These three components were: 1) Identification of need; 2) Development process; and 3) Approval. A brief description of our initial ideas follows:

1) Identification of Need:

The idea behind this plan is to begin to come up with a variety of options and methods that the fellowship could use to identify its needs. We looked at ways in which we could separate “needs” versus “wants” when it comes to literature development for the whole worldwide fellowship. We would like to create open dialogue. What follows are just our preliminary ideas of possible options for improving the needs assessment process. We see surveys as just one part of the needs identification process. We discussed the possibility of having surveys with open-ended questions, not just yes/no questions. The intent of this plan is to use general surveys to gather information to help set priorities, with specific follow-up surveys which would focus on the form or content of a given piece, the scope of a revision, the length and type of material desired about a given topic, etc. Focus groups, small group discussions at fellowship workshops, zonal forums, or the proposed interactive worldwide workshop system, and other new methods would also be part of the needs identification process. *Whatever tools are used, the main idea is to achieve a solid fellowship consensus at the start of the process.*

By using the above tools, priority recommendations could be formulated. To come up with these recommendations, we brainstormed about some specific criteria. These include: fellowship input; estimated costs (financial and human resources); length of piece; stage of development; source material; local need (language/culture); number of literature projects pending; length of time since last revision, etc. We think the bulk of the literature work occurring during the next conference cycle (2000-2002) should consist of these kinds of tasks, plus anything else needed for the World Board to get the new literature process up and running. These tasks rather than actual work on a concrete literature project should come first, particularly before any book-length piece.

equalization, full funding, or a combination of the two. This advantage of a two-year cycle would also make the playing field far more level for international participants, as well all members who might not otherwise have the personal resources to serve at this level.

Reducing overall expenses and activities until the implementation of Resolution A.

Conference participants at the 1997 WSC indicated during the small group meetings that they wished to see an eventual change in representation at the conference resulting in a downsized, more efficient WSC. However, they also indicated that such a transition should be gradual. Moving to a two-year conference cycle would allow world services to reduce its overall expenses and activities pending such changes in the conference as discussed last year. In essence, the two-year conference cycle could be seen as the first stage of the conference-recommended transition process.

Con: Communication Value of the Annual Meeting

The one argument that was raised in our discussion against moving to a two-year conference cycle was the loss of communication value that an annual meeting affords our fellowship. We recognized that the annual face-to-face gathering of regional delegates from around the world is of considerable value to our members in terms of maintaining communications between world services and our membership at large, as well as between the regions themselves. This could be affected by the move to a two-year cycle. We believe that the proposed worldwide workshop system could alleviate this potential "con," but we have nevertheless put it forward for the purpose of further discussion and input in Rhode Island.

2) Development Process:

This is a major task left to be accomplished during the transition of 2000-2002 conference cycle. Issues identified this year include, without limitation, board internal development processes, fellowship review and input processes/review-form literature issues, and the need to improve the process of evaluating potential new literature projects. Three development-related issues are also covered below in the section "Specific Discussion Issues: For Future Consideration". These are: 1) the need to improve or change the process of evaluating existing literature for revision; 2) future development of "service IPs"; and 3) the dilemma of how to make the literature development process more equitable (or more inclusive for all language and cultural groups). The goal here is to consider how the literature development process might be improved to better live up to WSC Vision Statement's ideal: "that every addict in the world has the chance to experience our message in his or her own language and culture and find the opportunity for a new way of life."

3) Approval:

The 1999 WSC passed a motion which lengthened the period of review of the *Conference Agenda Report* to 180 days, including the translation of all CAR material, effective with the implementation of the new two year conference cycle (which would mean the 2002 CAR). Approval form recovery literature in the past has been published in the CAR, which has been distributed a minimum of 90 days prior to each annual WSC meeting (but approval form material has not been translated). *As a result of the two year conference, the World Board is asking the fellowship to reconsider this motion.* We do not believe it is possible to provide translated approval forms (which can take several years of collaborative efforts with local translation committees to accomplish), even with a longer two year work cycle. (See our report regarding the Two Year Conference Project for details about this.)

4) Chart Illustrating Potential Tasks in a Normal Conference Cycle:

Attached as Appendix A is a very rough and preliminary chart illustrating potential tasks in a normal conference cycle. With fellowship input, involvement and communication as overarching priorities as noted above, tasks would include identification of needs through the evaluation of both new literature proposals and any items for revision.

The board would then formulate recommendations and prepare detailed project plans (with timelines, budgets, specific goals and objectives, etc.) for any specific items identified as prospective projects. The result of all of the above could be factored in to an updated version of the 10-Year Plan which would cover the next five conference cycles, from 2002-2012. This process of updating the 10-Year Plan would become a routine task each conference cycle.

In years where detailed project plans had been approved for specific projects, the board would implement those plans. Tasks could possibly include, without limitation, preparing review form literature and/or approval form literature for different projects in different stages of development, as the case might be, with the fellowship ultimately approving or disapproving any approval form literature.

Specific Discussion Issues— For Future Consideration

We welcome fellowship input and discussion of all of the following specific issues.

Discussion Issue: Process of Reviewing Fellowship-Approved Literature for Revision

The chart below shows the revision history of all existing recovery literature. For each item the chart shows the original approval date, the last revision date (if any), the date last evaluated (never, not yet due, or unknown, as the case may be).

Summary of Existing Fellowship-Approved Literature

Title	Approved	Revised	Last Evaluated	Status/Comment
Little White Booklet	Pre-1976	1986	1999	Motion 5 Issue Pending
Who, What, How & Why (IP #1)	Pre-1976	1986	1999	Motion 5 Issue Pending
Another Look (IP#5)	pre-1976	1985	1992	To be revised since 1992
Sponsorship (IP #11)	1983	Never	1997	To be revised since 1997
Youth and Recovery (IP#13)	1983	Never	1992	To be revised since 1992
Just for Today (IP#8)	1983	Never	New title 1986	Evaluation was due 1991
Recovery and Relapse (IP#6)	pre-1976	1986	1986	Evaluation was due 1991
Self-Acceptance (IP #19)	1986	Never	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1991
For the Newcomer (IP #16)	1983	Never	1987	Evaluation was due 1992
The Loner (IP #21)	1987	Never	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1992
Welcome to NA (IP #22)	1987	Never	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1992
Living the Program (IP #9)	1983	Never	1988	Evaluation was due 1993
The Triangle of Self-obsession (IP #12)	1983	Never	1988	Evaluation was due 1993
One Addict's Experience (IP #14)	1983	Never	1988	Evaluation was due 1993
The Group (IP #2)	pre-1976	1988	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1993
Am I an Addict? (IP#7)	1983	1988	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1993
Staying Clean on the Outside (IP #23)	1988	Never	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1993
Working Step Four in NA	1983	1988	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1993
Behind the Walls	1990	Never	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1995
P.I. and the NA Member (IP #15)	1991	Never	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1996
For Those in Treatment (IP #17)	1991	Never	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1996
An Introductory Guide to NA	1991	1992	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1997
In Times of Illness	1992	Never	Unknown	Evaluation was due 1997
H&I Service and the NA Member (IP #20)	1986	1996	Not Yet Due	
Hey! What's the Basket For? (IP #24)	1988	Never	1998	
Self-Support—Principle & Practice (IP #25)	1998	Never	Not Yet Due	
Accessibility/Additional Needs (IP #26)	1998	Never	Not Yet Due	
Basic Text, <i>Narcotics Anonymous</i>	1982	1988	Ongoing	Ongoing evaluation
Just For Today (book)	1992	Never	Never	Evaluation was due 1997
It Works: How & Why (book)	1993	Never	Never	Evaluation was due 1998
NA Step Working Guides (book)	1998	Never	Not Yet Due	

From 1988 through 1998 it was the policy of the WSCLC to evaluate for possible revision each item of Fellowship-approved literature every five (5) years (after each item's approval or last revision). Because of the WSC inventory process from 1993 through 1998, evaluations did not occur. Since WSC 1998, the only evaluations have been informal efforts to construct this plan. Consequently, if we resumed the five (5) year standard at WSC 2000, the overdue backlog scheduled for evaluation in the 2000-2002 conference cycle would be more than *three-quarters of the entire existing inventory* of Fellowship-approved literature, an unmanageable workload evaluating revision items between 2000-2004 (and possibly beyond).

We are drawing attention to this policy because we want to openly acknowledge that it is our intention to ignore it during the next conference cycle. We believe that a change to this policy and process should be considered. One option to consider would be to allow the world board the discretion to select a certain number of items to evaluate for possible revision in each conference cycle (perhaps 3-5 items). The number might depend on other workload, whether a book length piece is included or just IPs and booklets. This option would let the board consider a variety of factors—fellowship input, complaints, objectionable material inconsistent with NA philosophy, length of time since last revision/evaluation, etc—to make a judgement call based on need, rather than just an arbitrary fixed standard.

Another alternative would be to lengthen the time period, perhaps to 12, 15 or even 20 years. (The ideal time period might be longer for books than for booklets or IPs.) A new 15-year standard would stagger the process of evaluating existing literature efficiently over the 2000-2010 timeframe, creating a manageable workload, and better balancing the resources spent revising existing literature versus creating new literature. Nothing about a 15-year standard would preclude an earlier evaluation of any specific item if circumstances warranted. In other words, a longer review standard is not intended to be a moratorium.

A third option would be to evaluate items for revision based on specific need and criteria only. Under this option, there would be no fixed schedule or fixed number of items to evaluate for revision. Rather, the criteria could include, without limitation, a variety of factors—fellowship input, complaints, objectionable material inconsistent with NA philosophy, length of time since last revision/evaluation, etc

A fourth option might be to make no policy change: to resume evaluations based solely on the old five (5) year standard. A dozen years ago, this seemed like a sufficiently long period of time. As the literature process has changed, it now seems there has been significant improvement in the durability of the NA recovery literature that has been created. If this weren't the case, we'd be on our fifth edition of *It Works: How and Why* and our sixth edition of *Just for Today (Daily Meditations for Recovering Addicts)*, but happily we are not. No harm seems to have come from not evaluating all recovery literature for revision every five years.

Discussion Issue: Recovery Literature for Specific Needs

As noted above in the discussion of motion #49, the world board believes further evaluation of *Am I Too Young To Be An Addict?* is needed and that there are unresolved philosophical issues relating to the development of material targeted to specific groups of addicts. For lack of a better term, and without prejudice for or against this type of material, we

discuss such material here under the heading "Recovery Literature for Specific Needs". NA currently has several IPs directed to specific groups of addicts (newcomers, loners, youth, addicts in treatment, institutionalized addicts, etc.). Conflicting proposals have been on the table for many years to revise one of these IPs (*Youth and Recovery*) as well as other proposals to develop new material for particular audiences (*Seniors in Recovery*, for example). The full board has not yet had a complete discussion of this issue and has come to no conclusions yet. But the discussion of some of these issues is presented here to facilitate fellowship discussion and also to illustrate what is meant when we say future evaluation is required—or that there does not yet appear to be fellowship consensus to develop such material one way versus another. We welcome fellowship input on this subject.

The proposals for *Am I Too Young To Be An Addict?*, *Youth and Recovery*, *So You Think You're Different*, *Seniors in Recovery*, and *Recovery Is For Everyone* are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and any combination of these options, or none of them, could conceivably be developed in the future. The 1999 literature survey asked about the fellowship's views about the need for several of these items, but the survey was not designed to evaluate the underlying philosophical issue or prioritize the development of one of these items over another. The background about these related items is presented below to foster further fellowship discussion.

So You Think You're Different was a proposed revision of *Youth and Recovery* (IP No. 13) which was intended to change the "special interest" focus to one of general interest applicable to all members who feel different for any reason. This proposed rewrite was received in June of 1991 from a regional literature committee who reviewed the IP and came up with this direction on their own. It was not until the 1993 Conference Agenda Report that the WSCLC identified *Youth and Recovery* as a revision project, when it was placed on the "B" work list (items awaiting final development). It was not until 1997 that the WSCLC proposed (still as a "B" work list item in the 1997 CAR) that the revision of *Youth and Recovery* be combined with *So You Think You're Different* and two other work-in-progress proposals: *Seniors in Recovery* and *Recovery Is For Everyone*. The WSCLC repeated this plan to combine these four drafts into a new revised IP on the "B" work list in the 1998 CAR.

Seniors in Recovery. At the 1992 WSC the following motion was committed to the WSCLC: "That the WSCLC produce an information pamphlet entitled 'Seniors in Recovery, in large print.' [sic]" The WSCLC subsequently received a two page draft with this title on 14 July, 1992. As noted above, the WSCLC proposed on both its 1997 and 1998 "B" work lists the combination of this proposal with the revision of *Youth and Recovery* (IP No. 13).

The *Recovery Is For Everyone* IP proposal focuses on recognizing our similarities instead of concentrating on our differences. A one-half page draft was received on 1 November, 1992. As noted above, the WSCLC proposed on both its 1997 and 1998 "B" work lists the combination of this proposal with the revision of *Youth and Recovery* (IP No. 13).

As noted above, there was a further development at the 1998 WSC. The proposed draft from the Southern California Region, *Am I Too Young To Be An Addict?*, appeared in the 1998 CAR, and was committed by WSC to the World Board and to the Motion 21/24 process. So, this is a fifth draft which could be combined or developed separately once the fellowship decides whether to keep *Youth and Recovery* with its special focus, or change to a general focus, or create new IPs targeted to specific groups (e.g., seniors), or any combination of these options.

Another Dilemma For Discussion— Service IPs?

Currently, certain information pamphlets have a combined service and recovery focus. These existing “service IPs” include the following IPs and booklets: *The Group* (IP #2), *P.I. and the NA Member* (IP #15), *H&I Service and the NA Member* (IP #20), *Hey! What’s the Basket For?* (IP #24); *Self-Support: Principle and Practice* (IP #25); and *Accessibility for Those with Additional Needs* (IP #26). All of the above items are presently Fellowship-approved recovery literature. This allows them to be sold, read and distributed in NA groups, which makes sense because the primary audience consists of individual members. (By definition, service materials are not generally distributed by NA Groups on literature tables for use by individual NA members, but rather are for use by service committees or in external public information efforts.) What distinguishes these items is the combined service and recovery focus designed to educate individual members about service topics in a way that, arguably, makes them different from other Fellowship-approved recovery literature.

Because we have created and approved these types of items as recently as 1998, we can anticipate that there may be a need to create similar items in the future. Although none are immediately on the horizon, looking forward ten years into the future certainly raises the question about how to best develop this type of material in the future. The “service and recovery” IP proposal discussed above (if ever developed) might possibly fit into this category.

In our comprehensive review of all of the works-in-progress proposals for new literature on file, we also came across another specific proposal for a new IP left over from the 1992 WSC, which might fit into this hybrid “service IP” category too. At the 1992 WSC the following motion was made: “That the WSCLC (or appropriate committee) create an IP called ‘*What is a GSR?*’” The WSC then committed this motion to the WSCLC, which was specifically instructed “to not take any action on it until *A Guide to Service in NA* is dispensed with, or the traditions portion of *It Works* has been dispensed with.” Then, at WSC 1994 this motion was committed to the Trustees: “That the WSCLC create an IP on the group service representative, to be started at the end of the inventory process.” The WSCLC didn’t want to develop an item that appeared to be service material. This item might be developed with content which could result in it being either service or recovery literature. Or, maybe there’s no need for an IP on this topic.

The above proposal is cited just as an example. The full board has not yet had an opportunity to discuss either this specific proposal or the underlying issue of how such items might best be developed in the future. We welcome input on this topic and expect that this would be among the unresolved literature issues to be tackled during the next conference cycle.

A Dilemma — Making Literature Development More Equitable

The workgroup reported preliminary discussions earlier this year in *NAWS News* about possible ways in which the 10-Year Plan and the future literature development process relate to the ideals of the WSC Vision Statement. The full board has committed itself to discuss this important and complex matter in the future, but has not yet had the opportunity to have a full discussion of these issues or reach any conclusions. We welcome fellowship input on this topic—see our June *NAWS News* report on this subject (available at www.na.org or upon request) if interested in more information.

POTENTIAL TASKS IN A NORMAL CONFERENCE CYCLE



