

JUN 25 1991

Literature Trust Proposal II

Bo Sewell
490 Franklin Avenue
Aliquippa, PA 15001

412/375-3759

June 20, 1991

Dear Fellow Members.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The extra legalese in the document is intimidating and this intimidation goes against the healing that Jim talks about. I would not like to see the effect of the current form on trusted servants. It is like the classic dope deal gone wrong. As trusted servants, and as human beings, I feel like I was chummed along and allowed and encouraged to do this work and produce the Basic Text from scratch with no outside help or advisement and that

Literature Trust Proposal II

part is like me giving you the money. The desired result is the dopey idea that you really like me and care about my well being. You disappear into the house and no matter how hard I knock. you won't open the door.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Literature Trust Proposal II

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

Recapping this input. I find these items:

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

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

In Loving Service.


Bo Sewell