

EXHIBIT "M"

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

Columbiana, Ohio
216-482-4932

JM-0

ATTN: GEORGE / STJ

5-16-91

TO: All those at WSO inc involved in
Literature Trust Document.

Hi,

I'm faxing these notes to you
so you'll receive them by the deadline.

IRREGARDLESS of what happened at the
recent WSC I believe that we must do
the RIGHT thing for the RIGHT reason.

Nothing significant has happened since
we first talked to bring N.A. together.
I believe, at this point, some real healing
actions must occur if N.A. is to remain
intact.

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

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

In Service

Jim E Miller

Some Points & Considerations Re: Literature (Tangible Property) TRUST.

1) FOR OUR COMMON WELFARE: A document should be written which accurately describes AND formally defines the UNWRITTEN "TRUST" AND De-facto CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT that already exists. The different entities that are party to this TRUST AND contract need to be accurately defined AND characterized. The roles of these parties AND their relationship should be realistically specified. This document should surpass current or past written or perceived limitations, definitions, guidelines, policy or procedure.

2) NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS TRUSTS it's service boards, committees, TRUSTED SERVANTS AND special workers to responsibly produce, distribute, CONSERVE AND develop it's tangible property for the benefit of "the addict who still suffers" ACCORDING to the specific operative guideline - contract in the 9th, 2nd, 7th AND 8th Traditions.

3) The "tangible property" of our Fellowship

(3rd) includes (but isn't limited to) the Basic Text AND other Literature, the NAWAY Magazine LOGO's - trademarks & copyrights.

4) The parts of a traditional TRUST document ARE: TRUSTOR, TRUSTEE, AND beneficiary. In this case Narcotics Anonymous (The UNORGANIZED spiritual Fellowship) OWNS the property AND is the TRUSTOR. All of the property is a vehicle to carry the 'MESSAGE' that fulfills AN N.A. Member's program in step 12 AND Defines A Group's primary purpose in traditions. The TRUSTEE is composed of AN AGENT WSOINC which is employed by the service boards AND committees directly responsible to NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS the ASC's, RSC's, WSC AND WSB. The Beneficiary is ANY recipient of the N.A. message contained in the vehicles defined as tangible property.

5) The reality of our situation AND therefore the wording of this Document may be cumbersome for the secular legal system, however, it is the responsibility of the legal system

Jm3

5-cont) to Accomodate us — not
The other way around.

6) The Fellowship Narcotics Anonymous
Creates the property AND wishes
it to be Given to those who need it.
Service Boards AND committees AND
their Agent : ASC's, ISC's, WSC, WSB, WSO.
Package the property AND offer it for
use ACCORDING to the direction of
the fellowship. Addicts who still suffer
Acquire the property from the Agent
AND use it to their benefit.

7) A TRUST ALREADY exists: the
preceding is accurate description
of that trust — Document is only
formalization.

8) Whether this "Trust" is formalized
OR NOT whenever the spirit of
the trust is broken the owner/
trustor will ASSIGN different
Trustees to Achieve goal of GIFTING
property to beneficiary

Lit TRUST: General Input
FROM Jim Miller

6-20/21-91

I'm feeling so frustrated about this input to Lit. Trust document & concept - in many ways it's like trying to convince the flat-earth society that the world is a sphere - explaining the obvious to the uninitiated

First it's important to understand that a very real "Trust" bond already exists AND it's important to recognize the status of that "trust". To share my perception of the nature AND status of this Trust I must give my version of the historical perspective of it's Development.

The following is a combination of facts, observations, & opinions

Early N.A. World Services were not "representative" of the Fellowship they served because ^{most} people with sufficient time to serve at this level were ALSO members of another Fellowship

Real Development of ^{"representative"} N.A. World Services was started when the Fellowship became involved in the "Literature movement" that resulted in our Book. Many N.A. members across the Fellowship had made an exclusive commitment to Narcotics Anonymous. As these members, the true founders of NA as we know it today, came together, shared their recovery and service experience AND wrote our Book our common concepts, shared by ALL of them, became evident;

(2)

- 1) Recovery From Addiction was our Goal AND Narcotics Anonymous was our last hope. Concepts AND programs from other Fellowships, treatment Centers, counselors etc. offered us only incomplete Glimpses of the truth AND could not be trusted because they were based ON fallisities OR misperceptions. We Needed A Basic text written from the basis of Recovery from ADDICTION derived from our collective concept of powerless ness over the Disease ADDICTION.
- 2) We shared the common perception of powerlessness over ADDICTION; the Disease, exclusive of ANY OR ALL of it's symptoms. TO us powerlessness over Alcohol/DRUGS was A life-limiting misperception, AN incomplete concept, OR A Deadly OUTRIGHT Lie. We believed in ONE Disease AND ONE program with out Qualification OR compromise.
- 3) We perceived the traditions literally. We saw them AS clear-cut guideline principles NOT subject to interpretation. We saw traditions AS extending to service beyond the Group setting AS UNCOMPROMISING ^{Direction} DOCTRINE for service committees & BOARDS. We spoke & shared regularly of the strength of the

(3)

Second Tradition in N.A. particularly among those exclusively committed to Narcotics Anonymous as a program of Recovery from Addiction based on powerlessness over the disease. There was (and is) a clear-cut Group Conscience of N.A. as a whole AND we represented that conscience (to the best of our human ability) in our Book-writing service effort by being totally inclusive. Every N.A. member was permitted AND encouraged to work on the book as a full-fledged voting member of the World Literature Committee. We regularly checked ^{and balanced} each other reinforcing the obvious principles of our effort, Group Conscience, Direct Responsibility, and total service inclusiveness. This check & balance system no longer exists:

- a) We participated freely in the service structure. We saw the traditions as literal arbitrary guidelines AND the service structure outlined in the tree AND the Blue Service manual was reality, not theory. We acted at the request of the Group Conscience of N.A. We distributed our work in progress to every group of N.A. for review AND input. We used ALL input equally AND distributed the finalized product of our work to every group for



1
Appar or Disapproval, promising that
early revision would come from any
late input treated according to the same
inclusive participatory process.

These four concepts set us apart from previous
world level trusted servants and mirrored
the fellowship we represented. Without these
concepts the book could not have been written.
The book truly was written by the fellowship
and for the fellowship to carry the message
of recovery from addiction to addicts who
still suffer. The very real informal trust
bond that developed was that these four
concepts would be perpetuated by the
service structure: Trusted Servants of N.A.
would include only those members exclusively
committed to our fellowship and recovery
from addiction based on powerlessness
over the disease. Addiction. Service Boards
and committees would forever dedicate themselves
to literal application of the traditions especially
2 and 11 and remain totally open
to fellowship participation. This basic trust
bond is the foundation of any literature, proper
or service trust that can be developed
to heal the division in N.A. The trust is
between the fellowship and its services.

*that existed
in 1981-1983*

The TRUST is still in the heart of the fellowship, which was last Represented in the majority, at the world level by those people involved in the interactive movement of the early eighties. This Trust has been broken, violated ^{and} ignored ~~and~~ ~~mocked~~ by world services; The most important parts of service discussion in our book were changed by a few people, world level trusted servants.

These same people tried to change the basic concepts of power, over ADDICTION/RECOVERY FROM ADDICTION THROUGH the use of a professional writer hired to edit/write literature. Major service projects come from the ideas of a benificent elite rather than from the needs/desires of the majority of groups/members. Service committees have been closed AND members may no longer participate in primary service projects. The Trust was between fellowship and service structure. The Trust was broken by the service structure primarily world services. The Trust must be re-established in it's entire original form.

(6)

by the service structure - primarily World Services. Most everything that now exists structurally is based on the violation of the Trust. An effective trust document must reestablish the trust 1st by Acting AS Alternative, Antithesis ~~to~~ ^{to} ALL structural ~~organizations~~ ^{ORGANIZATIONS} AND activities based on compromise or violation of the original trust bond.

The necessary ingredients ^{for} ~~of~~ Renewal of the Trust between the ^{NA} Fellowship of N.A. AND it's services ARE obvious:

- 1) A clear statement that the fellowship owns the book (AND additionally all "property")
- 2) Clear subordination of the service structure primarily World Services especially WSOinc to the fellowship
- 3) A fairly simple workable vehicle, Alternative to existing structure, designed to allow fellowship to Direct World Services At WSO-policy level
- 4) An effective re-opening of the participatory service structure primarily the literature writing input Review AND Approval process focusing on inclusiveness rather than exclusivity
- 5) A dedication AND commitment to end all propagandizing, member slandering, character assassination AND prosecution of members.

Re Let Trust cover letter late May '91

Back Ground Statement: Foundation for
Simple Description of the bond of Trust that
exists between N.A. ^{the spiritual Fellowship} AND its SERVANTS: ASSEMBLY
WSC WSB and their ^{Primary} ABOUT (SERVICE CENTER) WSO. ie: OUR
LEADERS ARE NOT TRUSTED SERVANTS they do not
GOVERN:

1) FOCUS on what makes N.A. W.A. BASIC TEXT
13 pamphlets & to lesser degree white booklet & later
pamphlets

2) DURING the years between 1978 and 1982
N.A. began the process of self-definition AND
Maturity that would allow our Fellowship to
become A significant worldwide force for
RECOVERY FROM ADDICTION. A relatively small
Group of people, ordinary RECOVERING ADDICTS
DEVELOPED our Fellowship's first significant
idea of property - OUR BASIC TEXT - the book
entitled NARCOTICS ANONYMOUS. This collection
of N.A. members worked as part of the
Literature Sub-committee of the World Service
Conference. The four major writing/editing
Literature Conferences were located both
centrally and at geographical extremes
ACROSS the Fellowship so that the
maximum number of N.A. members could
attend and participate. Every member who
wanted to help write our book had the
opportunity. The committee eventually
numbered in the hundreds of active

participative members. Each had a role AND A VOICE in the content of our Basic Text. DURING this time these members AND the fellowship of which they were representative developed a TRUST BOND with the service structure that the results of their work would be used in the same spirit AND manner it was developed. This is the basis AND foundation of the literature TRUST Document.

- ② There's been a lot of talk lately of AN Alternative structure - we need AN Alternative channel within the existing structure so that Responsibility becomes more Direct. The very indirect route that is now Available should not be changed - MUCH good can happen AS the fellowship passes direction from member thru Group, Area, Region AND WSC. However A more Responsive MORE Specialized AND Direct channel should be opened - Suggestion #1) Direct yearly elections & re-confirmation of Half of WSO BOD by and At WSC. The other Half of WSO BOD elected from Regions.
- *2) election procedure At WSC: (supposing 12 BOD elected by WSC) 1/3 (4) elected directly each year to serve (only one term) for 3 yrs.
- Also need provision for conference to

#3) Election procedure by REGIONS
 (supposing 12 BOD. elected directly by 60
 REGIONS in service area) each REGION
 would elect A DIRECTOR FOR A 5yr term
 every 5yrs. 4yrs of term as ADVISORY
 DIRECTOR - welcome to attend BOD. mtgs
 at expense of REGION able to participate
 in motions & discussion but not vote & 1yr
 of Active Directorship attending BOD mtgs, at
 expense of WSO AND fully participating
 in mtgs. AS VOTING DIRECTOR.

note if WSO were an effective voice for
 fellowship we wouldn't have current
 problems

*** Additionally A literature TRUST fellowship
 panel should be formed to consist^{initially} of 5 people
 members who were amongst those who help
 write to books - this panel would be
 charged with 3 responsibilities: A/To ~~select~~
 AND act upon mature fellowship input
 regarding the conservation/maintenance/
 development of our Fellowship's literature/
 property, B/To be NON-VOTING participants
 at WSO BOD mtgs. with "Veto" power on issues
 affecting Fellowship's literature/property, C/To foster open ^{fellowship-wide} communication AND continuation
 of the process that effectively developed etc.

1. I think we do for in 1981 WSO Lit. Committee

How would panel be selected? one suggestion
 within nominees would be volunteers from
 those registered at world literature
 conferences. all that could be contacted
 would elect by mail ballot panel members
 suggested term - 12 yrs.
 Replacements selected by panel

RE #3

- beneficiary / trustee / TRUSTOR should
 Material Reality
 "Addict who still suffers / Service Structure guiding WSO / Fellowship"

RE #4

* Any AND ALL ACTIONS Affecting the Fellowship
 property must be considered first by the
 Fellowship - The Fellowship should decide
 what "products" AND "services" should be
 available from WSO AND the Fellowship
 should decide the price for these.
 The Fellowship should at least provide
 General parameters. Office may need
 from time to time to take temporary
 specific action till Fellowship's had time
 to decide.

RE #5

This matter requires common sense.
 Members AND Groups ARE part-owners
 of property so NO "infringement" has
 occurred - However, if after study of
 All facts AND impacts concerned
 (not only the present situation)

JUN 21 '91 15:02 NICE PHARMACY P. 11
(2) ~~Altogether~~ Every issue REGARDING the Fellowship property should be decided finally by A Group poll - Directly between N.A. Groups AND WSO Bd. of Directors. - (B) Very General - overall "policy" decisions should be made thru. existing structure - (C) Parameters for Daily operation between WSC's should be made by (24 member 1/2 WSC 1/2 WSO) WSO BOD.

examples of Different types of Questions that should be decided by different means

The Fellowship Decides the nature of "products" to be sold and their price - then an individual or group etc. should be approached by WORLD SERVICE BOARD of Trustees if they choose to print/distribute on their own - such action would be a violation of 1st &/or 4th Trust - Approach should be gentle & calm

Prosecution for infringement of Trust Paper only applies to people or businesses not connected to Narcotics Anonymous

Literature Trust Proposal

Bo Sewell
490 Franklin Avenue
Aliquippa, PA 15001

412/375-3759

May 14, 1991

Dear Fellow Members:

Here are my ideas of the Literature Trust.

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

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

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

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

Looking through the preface and introduction sections of the Gray Form, the Approval Form and the Basic Text might lay out some ideas on the trust. Also, the Handbooks for N.A. Literature Committees might have source materials. I have only thought of this because I was asked to participate in the work towards a

Literature Trust Proposal

solution capable of reuniting the Fellowship. I feel that we are dealing with some issues that will continue to divide us until we deal with them. I am also including a print out of a book have written, The Story of the Basic Text. A letter on page 37 and a sentence on page 78 seem to be useful. Also, included is a copy of my affidavit to Judge Pollack. ✓

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

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

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

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

It has been WSO who has repeatedly broken trust and needs to be restrained from further disorder. Making WSO responsible to the Fellowship through the WSO is meaningless if the Office controls what the Fellowship reads, what materials can be accessed and what workshop and presentations are scheduled.

Where basic conflicts exist, the Fellowship is forced to extraordinary measures. World Services will utilize Fellowship Report, the WSO Newslines, correspondence and formal presentations

Literature Trust Proposal

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

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

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

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

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

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

Literature Trust Proposal

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

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

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

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

In Loving Service,

Bo Sewell

Article One - Origins of the Literature

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

Article Two - Parties

Literature Trust Proposal

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

Article Three - Properties

Basic Text, Ip's, logo,

Article Four - Rules

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

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

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

More is being revealed.

Literature Trust Proposal

Additional Notes

May 23, 1991

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

May 2, 1991

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

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

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

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

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

Literature Trust Proposal

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

December 26, 1990

Dear Sirs:

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

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

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

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

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

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

We deliberately set out to do the work in such a way as to have no 'by line' and no payment of royalties of any kind. Many individuals worked long and hard that the dream of a book for our people would come true. Working voluntarily offset internal rivalries and made the statement that what we were doing was

Literature Trust Proposal

beyond what money could buy. This is a big factor in the success of the work: that the book was written by addicts for addicts. Recovering addicts have a definite need to know that what they are trusting to work for them has worked for others. We instinctively distrust those who have other goals having nothing to do with our lives and well being. Our Traditions warn us of the destructive powers of money, property and prestige when it comes to recovery and carrying our message of hope.

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

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

The Fellowship of N.A. on its own and without direction, funding or any outside support, collected, compiled and reviewed the material contained in Narcotics Anonymous. The funds involved with the work were accounted for within the World Service Conference of N.A., our representative body. WSO was reformed in 1983 to hold in trust this material: it is not a work done for hire. The N.A. Fellowship will resolve the matters before the court.

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

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

Sincerely,

Bo S.