

History of the Transfer of SA Literature From SA Inc. to SA Publications and Related Copyright Issues

by Roy K.

Since there has never been a public disclosure of the history of events surrounding the transfer of literature which took place in October of 2001, and since this has been the occasion of considerable misunderstanding, I feel the following timeline may help reveal what was transpiring from my side of the process. I also hope this will encourage others who were involved in that process to review these data, provide documentation of any inaccuracies or relevant omissions herein, and fill out the other side of the process, especially since this constitutes an important element of recent SA history.

LITERATURE DEVELOPMENT

SA literature evolved through a long process. From the first draft of the *Twenty Questions* in January of 1978, *The Problem* in October of 1981, and the SA brochure in November of 1982, I wrote a continuing succession of pieces offered to the fellowship to meet our growing needs, resulting in the SA Publications we have today.

BACKGROUND OF THE TRANSFER

Disunity Around the Sobriety Definition. The history of SA's experience with the sobriety issue played an important background role in the eventual literature transfer.

1. 1990-1991— The NYC Split. NYC changes the sobriety definition to “no sex with oneself and no sex with another person outside a committed relationship” [ref. NYC's published brochure], asking, “Is our program in New York something other than SA?” In 1990 every SA group worldwide is asked by SA's leadership to indicate how it feels about the following statement: “*Regarding SA's definition of sexual sobriety, 'married' means traditional, legal, heterosexual marriage, and 'spouse' does not include 'committed relationships' with either the same or opposite sex.*”

75.3 percent of responding groups affirm this statement, validating SA's interpretation. NYC splits off from SA and allies with Sexual Recovery Anonymous (SRA).

2. On 3 July 1990 the chairperson of SA's International Group Conscience Committee (IGC) declares [ref. letter] that the IGC, SA's newly formed leadership body, cannot function per its charter and “is radically divided on SA's most basic tenet—the definition of sexual sobriety.” This disunity centered around the NYC sobriety definition issue. Those IGC members holding to SA's definition resigned in protest, and the IGC dissolved.

3. In the Chicago conference, July 1991, I formally stepped away from SA

leadership and offered my best suggestions for how I felt the organization should be structured in “Invitation to Service—A Suggested Approach to SA Self-Responsibility.” It turns out that the organizational structure would follow more conventional lines.

4. In the early and mid-1990s SA’s new organizational structure starts to fall into place with the Delegate Assembly and Board of Trustees constituting the General Service Conference (GSC). I personally hear some of these SA leaders begin waffling on SA sobriety as cultural issues come to the fore, such as Hawaii’s then-imminent vote on the gay marriage issue. For example, these comments from two leaders: “Times, they are a changin’,” and, “Looks like we may have to change.” There’s uneasiness and division in the leadership on this issue, which now includes non-sexaholic professionals on the Board of Trustees, one of whom goes on record with a view of sobriety differing from SA’s. This breaks into the open with the Internet controversy. In the late 1990s certain influential SA members promote “spouse as you understand spouse” on the SA Net, igniting intense controversy. This begins turning into a replay of the old 1990 NYC issue, with polarization becoming more pronounced.

5. Copyright matters. On February 19, 1998 I write a frank letter to the Chairs of both the Trustees and the Delegate Assembly expressing great concern over what has transpired without my knowledge or permission. I learned by happenstance that the Central Office (SA Incorporated) had reprinted the Spanish edition of the White Book, changing the copyright notice from “SA Literature” (my copyright designation, which had appeared on the books from the beginning) to “Sexaholics Anonymous,” thereby appearing to claim ownership of the copyright for SA Incorporated.

Also, the Central Office, in a letter to the copyright attorney February 10, 1998, wrote, “No timetable has been established for the transfer process [transfer of Roy’s copyrights to SA], but Roy and the fellowship have deemed it prudent to begin the process now.” This was a shock. I couldn’t believe it. It was completely untrue. I was remiss in not asking the leadership to document the circumstances of such an aggressive tactic.

Also, by happenstance, I was told that the Trustees had spent large sums on legal fees to see if SA Inc. could claim copyright ownership. Needless to say, all of this put me on guard; I didn’t know what was going on. (This whole affair should be honestly examined on all sides and brought into the light so all the facts are known.)

In my February 19 letter of response to all of this I wrote, “I have never said or implied that the copyright transfer process should begin now or at any other time. Everyone knows that just the opposite is true, that Roy is resisting assignment of his copyrights [to SA Inc.] due to the kind of issues brought up in this very letter.”

In my letter I first summarized the whole history of my granting SA permission to print and distribute my writings, concluding, “Thus I have printed

and allowed my writings to continue to be printed by SA without ever taking compensation or royalties. You need to realize that this arrangement has been and continues to be revocable at any time, as would be true with any other author. . . . This right has always existed, granted by International Copyright Convention, whether SA members were aware of it or not, and regardless of how that right was exercised in the past.”

I believe this was the first time I indicated that the long-standing literature distribution arrangement between me and Central Office was being threatened by leadership actions.

6. Cleveland Statement of Principle. Finally, on July 7, 1999 at the Cleveland Conference, as the sobriety definition controversy came to a head, the General Delegate Assembly and Board of Trustees unanimously approved the Cleveland Statement of Principle: *“In SA’s sobriety definition, the term ‘spouse’ refers to one’s partner in a marriage between a man and a woman.”*

That leadership was joyously relieved that the clarification cut through the years of controversy and SA could unite around our primary purpose (see the SA History for details). I felt that was a proper expression of the leadership’s Right of Decision inherent in Concept III. I hopefully looked “ahead to leadership actions that might finally put this stressful, draining, wearisome, and destructive matter to rest.” (ref. e-mails to [psh] 2-28-01, [dbs] 7-16-01, and others under the heading “Background and Rationale for Roy K.’s Recent Decisions”) However, my hopes would again prove to be unfounded.

7. 1 March 2001— My letter to the Delegate Assembly and Trustees. Some in the new leadership (one of whom was involved in the old IGC conflict of 1990, see item 2, above) were challenging the prior leadership’s vote for the sobriety Clarification. Since SA’s sobriety definition is the bedrock foundation upon which SA’s whole program and future rest, and since the integrity of the literature was being threatened, I wrote saying, “. . . [W]e have again become embroiled in the same old tiresome debate. Some . . . are seeking to undo the very decision that was so gratefully and joyously achieved.” I went on record, declaring that the Cleveland Statement of Principle faithfully represents the original intent of the sobriety definition in all my writings and hence should be included in the literature. I first summarized the past history of SA’s experience with the “spouse” and “marriage” issue and then stated:

I hereby declare that the following Cleveland Statement of principle faithfully represents the original intent of the interpretation of “spouse” and “marriage” as it appears in any and all SA literature of which I am the author: namely, “In SA’s sobriety definition, the term ‘spouse’ refers to one’s partner in a marriage between a man and a woman;” and I request that this declaration be communicated to the fellowship by means of this letter. [It was not released.]

I added that interpretation of “spouse” and “marriage” in SA literature does not

depend on any opinion poll or vote, either by the members or the leadership. That interpretation derives from SA's reason for being, origins, and literature, and is confirmed by the historic chain of events described above in my letter. "This decision to assert my prerogative can help prevent a worse break in that foundation and bring closure, which the fellowship desperately needs." This assertion served as another hint that I might have to take action to protect the literature.

A motion was made to ask me to add the Cleveland clarification to the White Book. It did not carry, one stated reason being that "such prerogatives belong to the author or copyright holder." The fact that some in leadership had made that motion and that it apparently threatened others spoke powerfully to me. I felt the weight and responsibility of that prerogative, but again chose not to take the action unilaterally, hoping the leadership would become unified around the issue, take the initiative, and ask that the Clarification be added.

8. 18 April 2001— Central Office was running out of books. I received a Requisition for 5,000 more White Books from Central Office. (This was standard procedure when reprints of my writings were needed.)

9. 22 April 2001— I initiated a two-hour conference call with Delegates and Trustees at my own expense, hoping for unanimity on inserting the Clarification. The new leadership had had no history of working with me on issues, such as the old Advisory Committee had. In those days, our mutual relationship had been blessed and was effective, and I was hoping that such rapprochement could be regained with this new group.

During the call, the leadership admitted they were divided on sobriety. I said SA's definition of sobriety is not votable; it's a given, just like AA's. I made a plea: 1) Let's together implement the Cleveland Clarification [put it in the book], and 2) Solve the problem of divided leadership—formalize the requirement that leaders support this interpretation. I felt a good degree of support and that they were close to passing these, but one Trustee prevailed in not allowing any vote.

10. 24 April 2001— Encouraged by that degree of support from the conference call, I signed the Requisition for 5,000 books—with the stipulation that it include the Cleveland Statement of Principle. I was, in effect, forcing the issue, based on the principle of the July 1999 Cleveland Clarification vote. I did not come to that conclusion hastily, but eventually it was made confidently, following much discussion and guidance from many sources, including the So. California Area Intergroup.

11. 27 April 2001— I was advised that the "Trustee Executive Committee" (an undisclosed entity) put a hold on the printing. I was never apprised of the makeup of this committee, what their motives were for not allowing the printing, or the

grounds for their action.

12. 15 June 2001— With some in the leadership aggressively opposing the clarification, I wondered about the extent of such sentiment within the leadership. Could I continue to entrust the literature to a leadership that was perennially divided on this most basic issue? Thus, I decided to ask where they stood on the issue. My stated reason in this 15 June letter was, “since the fellowship has the right to know where its leaders personally stand on this very point.”

By e-mail sent through the Delegate liaison person, I asked each Delegate and Trustee, to respond to the following:

“In SA’s sobriety definition, the term ‘spouse’ refers to one’s partner in a marriage between a man and a woman. I personally uphold this interpretation of ‘spouse’ for the fellowship of SA YES ___ NO ___.”

Two Delegates gave ambivalent answers, and four Trustees refused to disclose their position.

This response and the recent goings on forced me to conclude that the leadership was not only divided on SA’s most basic principle but divided in spirit among themselves. The literature I had provided was in the middle of all this disunity; its integrity was being tacitly questioned.

13. 18 June 2001— The Trustee chair wrote me, asking that I allow the printing of the White Book without the Cleveland clarification.

14. 22 June 2001— In a letter to the Trustees titled, “My Response to Trustee Request,” I took a firm clear stand:

“1. I will not authorize further printings of the White Book without the Cleveland clarification. . .

2. I will not financially support a divided SA leadership with proceeds from the sale of my writings.

3. I will, if necessary, arrange that printing, distribution, and sale of the White Book be done via some entity other than SA Inc. In that event, SA Inc. (and/or groups) would have to purchase books from that entity.

4. I would rather that SA Inc. print it now, as I have stipulated. . . .

I urge that we do this together immediately since we are out of books.”

15. 23 June 2001. This important e-mail to the Trustees was titled “Roy’s Rationale for Response to Trustees.” I explained my position taken in the 22 June letter, including the following points:

- The Cleveland clarification (CC) is more “conference approved” and “due process” than any SA literature to date. (Confirming history available). . . .
- Interpretation of “spouse” is a given and is not votable (just as AA’s definition of not drinking is not votable); therefore it must not be put to a vote. This would set a treacherous precedent: SA’s foundational principle could be up

- for grabs again, and there could never be lasting unity.
- I cannot allow the intent and basic principle underlying my writings to be subject either to polling or leadership response to polling.
 - Recent Trustee actions indicate they may be preempting Delegate authority and responsibility in this matter. Delegates must proactively assume the responsibility that is rightfully theirs instead of reacting to Trustee decisions.
 - The long drawn-out process of polling the Fellowship has no promise of resolution under a divided leadership which has become self-perpetuating.
 - Printing the White Book now, with the CC [the Cleveland clarification], will be less traumatic to the Fellowship than such a process. We can even turn the new printing into a plus if it is handled right and has majority Delegate support.
 - If Delegates don't support implementing the CC, I will arrange that printing, distribution, and sale of the White Book be done via some entity other than SA Inc., and SA Inc. (and/or groups) will have to purchase books from that entity.
 - Printing White Books now, with CC included, will actually serve real Fellowship unity. The leadership is divided, and to a lesser extent the Fellowship is divided on this issue. The printing will draw the line clearly so groups and individuals can have a choice. And prospective leaders will have to come clean on whether they commit to supporting the CC for the fellowship of SA. There is no prospect of a divided leadership achieving unity without the clarification in the book [emphasis added].
 - By not explicitly defining "spouse," White Book wording has allowed people to use that loophole (only a loophole in today's culture, not in 1981, when it was written) to preach "spouse as you understand spouse" and allows the situation today where groups and Intergroups practice a different "sobriety." This gap can only widen if not clarified now. There's already too much water under the bridge. Decisive action is necessary, or SA's unique message will be permanently compromised, just as the Washingtonian's was (the failed alcoholism recovery movement before AA). It's either unity on this issue now, or never.

"This we owe to SA's future; to place our common welfare first; to keep our Fellowship united. For on SA unity depend our lives, and the lives of those to come. . . . Things have now reached crisis proportions, and the big question hitting us in the face is *What will serve SA unity?* SA must go one way or the other; we cannot survive divided. . . . Now the Delegates have an opportunity for courageous action whereby they can initiate and catalyze the unity process."

Thus, I made it very clear that unless the leadership was united on the Clarification, I would have to take it upon myself to see that the literature was printed and distributed by some other entity. My plea was honest and clear: "Join the author-originating-servant in implementing the Cleveland clarification by a

vote of support so CO can continue printing and selling books.” This was my final plea that the literature remain with the Central Office. But it was not to be.

16. 1 July 2001— The delegates voted on the following four points. I don’t know how this vote came about or why:

- Do you support the trustees in their recent decisions? 7 yes; 2 guarded yes; 7 no. [Only 56% delegate support, at best.]
- Do you support Roy in his recent decisions [his 4-point response to the Trustees (see item 15, above)]? 12 yes, 4 no. [75% delegate support.]
- Do you want the delegates to direct the trustees to allow Central Office to print the white Book with clarification added? 10 yes; 6 no. [62.5% delegate support.]
- Do you want the delegates to advise Roy to independently print the White Book with clarification added? 10 yes; 4 no; 2 abstain. [71% delegate support]

Summary: Delegate support is 75% for my decisions, yet Trustees do not release their hold on White Book printing. And the six No votes on the clarification issue confirm SA leadership disunity on our most basic principle.

The continuing threat was obvious. This disunity on our most basic principle confirmed the danger of possible present or future leadership’s decisions on the integrity of the SA literature. Thus, *I as author would have to take steps to safeguard the literature myself.*

17. 2 July 2001—I wrote another letter to the GSC urging action: “Will the Trustees continue their announced schedule of deliberations, meeting in August and September, then spending six or more months trying to survey the fellowship with a fundamentally divided GSC offering no promise of resolution? How can you proceed on your old course, now that you know there is 75% delegate [Fellowship] support for Roy’s decisions [including the clarification in the White Book]?” I then urged the Trustees to release their hold on printing the books so they would once again be available.

18. 10 July 2001—I heard that there might be some hope of the leadership resolving this issue by the September General Service Conference. In this hope, I compromised by authorizing the printing of enough White Books, *without* the clarification, on a qualified and limited basis, to supply the need for a month beyond that date. This would give the Delegates another chance to consult their regions and resolve the issue of incorporating the clarification Statement into the White Book by the September General Service Conference. My four-point decisions (see item 15) remained unchanged, and I was still waiting for Trustee response to them.

Thus, I had pleaded repeatedly with the leadership to incorporate the Clarification into the literature, preferring that over having to revoke license from SA Incorporated and publish and distribute the literature myself, which would

place a tremendous burden and responsibility onto me.

19. Trustees on their own retain legal counsel to determine the possible liability of including the Clarification in the White Book. This resulted in the Weber legal opinion.

20. August 31, 2001. The rebuttal of the Weber Opinion (by attorney Bob K., offered freely as a personal contribution) clearly indicated that SA was exempt from anti-discrimination laws.

TRANSFER OF LITERATURE DISTRIBUTION FROM SA INC. TO SA PUBLICATIONS

21. October 9, 2001. It was now 26 long months since the Cleveland Statement of Principle had passed unanimously by leadership vote, yet the new leadership was still divided on what to do about it. After waiting all that time, and with no hope of leadership unity on the horizon, I did what I had been saying I might be forced to do. I revoked SA Incorporated's long-standing permission to print and distribute the literature I had written and for which I had always held the copyrights. This was one of the very few times in SA history when I unilaterally asserted my prerogative. I would insert the Clarification into the White Book per the July 7, 1999 leadership vote; I would print the literature; and it would thenceforth be available from a non-SA business entity.

The other result was that SA would finally become self-supporting from its own contributions per Tradition Seven, instead of dependence on profits from literature granted by Roy K. Otherwise, my continued giving SA Inc. the right to print and distribute the literature would have meant that SA would continue to depend on income from the sale of that literature (mostly from newcomers), instead of 7th Tradition support from SA members. Those profits from literature sales represented my personal continuing contribution because I never took any royalties or compensation for any of my SA writings, allowing SA Inc. to keep all profits. *The basic principle here is that SA should be self-supporting, not supported by Roy K.*

The question remains, why did I wait so long to help SA become self-supporting? Perhaps I should have made that change long before, irrespective of whatever was going on in the leadership or the sobriety controversy. Hindsight!

22. On 14 October I announced by letter to the leadership that, "I will make all of my literature available to those who want it and have taken immediate steps to have the White Book printed, with the Cleveland Statement of Principle included." [ref. my letter and email to Dorene S., Chair GSC.]

23. October 15, 2001. I have the White Book reprinted with the Clarification added as a footnote on the bottom of p. 192, at my own expense.

24. November 2001. In discussions with SoCal Intergroup on how to keep literature flowing to SA, I offered to publish and distribute my SA literature and asked for Intergroup guidance and help. The SA Publications Advisory Oversight Committee was thus established and comprised five volunteer members of SoCal Intergroup. Its purpose was to ensure that SA literature would always be made available to the fellowship and to oversee the new literature distribution entity. Bob B. volunteered to be the distributor, and it was voted unanimously by the committee that the name of the entity would be “SA Publications.”

25. January 10, 2002, Atlanta Conference. The Delegate Assembly approved “inclusion and publication in SA fellowship approved literature the wording, ‘In SA’s sobriety definition the word “spouse” refers to one’s partner in a marriage between a man and a woman”” and reaffirmed “that the White Book is approved literature and should be made available” As a result of these actions two Trustees resigned, “when it became apparent that the delegate assembly was prepared to give formal approval to the new editions of the White Book with the footnote on page 192.” On January 12th the Delegate Assembly approved “the arrangement to include access to SA Publications through our web site.”

26. February 1, 2002. SA Publications thus became the new entity for the sale and distribution of literature. For oversight, the Agreement was witnessed and executed by a non-sexaholic CPA. Thus, the White Book, together with the rest of my SA literature, was published and distributed at my personal expense and was available from SA Publications, Riverside, CA, run as an SA service by member Bob B.

27. ESSAY 2003, Issue One. The new literature ordering procedure does not appear until this issue of ESSAY, a year later. It was also unfortunate that no history of this crucial and involved transition has been supplied to the fellowship. From several different sources I learned that misunderstanding and bad feelings resulted and have persisted.

ROY OFFERS THE LITERATAURE BACK TO THE CENTRAL OFFICE

28. September 9, 2004. Roy’s Gesture of Unity. Two and one-half years had passed since the new literature distribution system with SA Publications had become operational (in February 2002). I took a long, hopeful look at things. In this memo to the Delegates and Trustees I wrote: “The existing split between the two SA literature sources [Central Office and SA Publications] leaves the wrong message—that there’s a split in SA, and in some minds, a split between Roy K. and SA. It shouldn’t have to be that way. As a personal gesture of unity, and also seeking God’s will for my relations with the SA Fellowship, I would like to make

a move toward understanding and healing. Thus I am offering to SA [again] the distributorship of all my SA literature.”

I would print and supply the literature to SA. The Central Office would store, distribute, and sell. And SA would retain profits “in such an amount that would ensure there would be no loss, yet so as not to jeopardize Seventh Tradition self-support by having what amounts to an inordinate contribution from one member, namely Roy K. I wanted to be sure that the old system of violating the 7th Tradition did not happen again, that SA would still be self-supporting. I was advised by the Trustee Chair (telecon) that I should go ahead getting such a legal Agreement drafted, the assumption being that it would be drawn up by an attorney.

29. September 23, 2004. I submitted the License Agreement, drafted by my attorney at my expense, via e-mail to the Trustees for distribution prior to the leadership’s Sunday teleconference. Reactions to that Agreement were very puzzling and unanticipated. The understanding was that it would be reviewed by SA Incorporated’s attorneys, but this was not forthcoming; at least I was never apprised of it. Instead, there was a torrent of negative reaction, some of which may have come from the “legaleze” in the Agreement.

So then I offered on my own to do away with the formal legal document that had been requested and boil it down into a simple written agreement; but that offer never got anywhere either. As delays in responding to the gesture of unity and offer mounted, my repeated follow-ups began to reveal that there was more going on; the confusion lay deeper. I began to have serious doubts. Had I been premature in making this offer? Since “God is not the author of confusion,” it became apparent that I should find out where this leadership stood before letting SA Inc. control the literature again.

30. January 27, 2005. Prompted by the negative and confused feedback I was getting from my literature offer, and learning there was still misunderstanding and disunity in the leadership, I wrote an e-mail to the Delegate who was leadership liaison on this issue to convey my request. The Delegate’s e-mail to the leadership reads:

“Tell them Roy’s priority interest is in the unity aspects of this issue (broached in his September 9 letter). Thus, he would like to know (anonymously) from all Delegates and Trustees:

1. What our full and honest feelings are on the definition of ‘spouse’ (Cleveland Statement of Principle, footnote p. 192),
2. What our full and honest feelings about his [Roy’s] work, actions, and beliefs, and
3. What our full and honest feelings about his possible future relations or connections with SA and its leadership.”

31. January 31 2005. This e-mail from the Delegate liaison conveyed responses to my three questions from the Delegates and Trustees:

“Some are upset. . . . Some argue. . . .Some fear. . . . [T]here is a vocal segment against Roy. . . .” The report from one region: “The NW region is still very much divided about this question [the clarification of the sobriety definition] and so am I. . . .”

The situation was getting clarified for me. It wasn’t pretty. How naïve I had been!

Months go by as I continue to wait for the Trustees to respond to my offer to give literature distribution back to SA. One sexaholic Trustee writes: “I am aware of other members, even those in my own group, who deem themselves sober but are having sex with their live-in partners.” I had to hang my head in remorse and sadness for SA.

By this time, I was having more than second thoughts about my offer. How can there be such confusion and division over this gesture of unity, over sobriety? What am I doing offering up the literature again? I was astonished at the delays, distrust, and misunderstanding that were in the air. Something was obviously wrong, but I really didn’t know what was going on. This whole affair was revealing a condition that was personally very disheartening.

Thus, any idea of sale and distribution of literature going back to SA Inc., with the requirement that full 7th Tradition self-support not be jeopardized, became less and less tenable. There was no response to my offer, and I was left without knowing what the problem really was. I still don’t know.

32. February 22, 2005. By this letter—to Delegates and Alternates, Trustees, and Kay at Central Office—I rescinded my September 9, 2004 literature offer. I advised that I was unable to wait any longer for the leadership to respond to my offer, since we had run out of books and cutoff of the SA Publications operation at Riverside, CA was scheduled for March 1st, only a week away. I had to know whether to ship books to Central Office (if SA Inc. were to accept the offer) or to another distributor. I thus ordered the printing of 8000 White Books at my expense and began an intensive search for another distributor.

In this letter, rescinding the September 9, 2004 offer, I gave the following reasons, saying, “I see now that I made a mistake in offering distribution back to the Central Office as I did.”

1. The offer was made without knowing the leadership was still divided on SA’s most basic principle [see January 31 2005].
2. My offer would have greatly compromised SA’s self-support tradition. The percentage of profits offered to SA was far too high and would have constituted inordinate contribution from one member [me] in accordance with Tradition 7.
3. “. . . [T]he connection with the fellowship of SA that I offered from SA’s very beginning, namely my writings, has been disrupted.”

The letter continues:

“. . . [Y]our liaison in this matter, wrote 2/17/05, in response to my withdrawal of the offer, that, ‘I and many (perhaps almost all) in the fellowship want the organization and you to be at peace and to have a good working relationship.’ I agree whole heartedly; that was the intent behind my September 9 [2004] gesture of unity. I wrote . . . [him] back that same day saying, ‘There should be no reason why the organization and I cannot “be at peace and have a good working relationship,” regardless of what the literature distribution source might be.’ Truly, there should be no reason why my relation with the fellowship cannot again be one of making available the truth of my own experience to help any who would be interested. The past is past. Let us press forward together, fulfilling the high calling that is ours in putting ‘first things first’ by using what God puts into our hands today to serve the growing and diverse needs of desperate people seeking help. Sincerely, Roy R. Kuljian”

(There was no response to this Feb. 22 letter.)

33. March 1, 2005 letter from The SA Board of Trustees to Roy Kuljian. This letter included an apology “for any confusion and mistrust that has transpired.” No mention was made of any response to the literature offer. I was advised informally through a Delegate that the offer was being rejected.

TRANSFER TO COMMERCIAL DISTRIBUTION

34. March 7, 2005. All SA publications in Riverside are transferred to a full-service commercial distribution service in Culver City, CA., and are now available on the sa.org website under the heading SA Publications. For the three-year interim period from February 12, 2002 to March 1, 2005, Bob B. stood responsibly in the gap, ensuring that the flow of SA literature to any and all was uninterrupted. That flow will continue.

35. March 9, 2005. I advised Kay of my shipment to the Central Office, free of charge, for new groups and prison work: 500 White Books, 500 20 Question brochures, and 100 each of *Recovery Continues*, *Discovering the Principles*, *Notes on the Origins and Early Growth of SA*, and the Male Abstinence and First Step Inventory brochures.

This hopefully put closure on the whole literature issue. The end of the matter was that I would never again be party to violating SA’s 7th Tradition by contributing more than the \$1000 per year allowed by any one member. At the same time, SA would *always* be ensured a continuing supply of literature, the integrity of which would be safeguarded.

. . .

Note on the Copyrights. One former Delegate had asked me why copyrights are not turned over to the leadership of SA (ref. e-mails of 8-24-99 and subsequent hearsay). But considering the above history, that would be most irresponsible at this time, when in so doing, that literature could then be changed to suit current or future expediency. That had been threatened as early as January 1976, then in December of 1983, then in 1990-91, when the literature was actually changed and published in the Tri-State NYC SA brochures, and most recently, before and after the July 1999 Cleveland Statement of Principle issue. Time will tell, and I plan to “make haste slowly” in this matter, as has been advised by wiser heads. I want to make sure that the principles underlying our literature are safe and not subject to transitory trends and that the literature will always be available to those who want it.

History of Literature Transfer 6-23-06
Copyright © Roy R. Kuljian 2006
All rights reserved
Copies may be distributed for use in the fellowship