

Date: Sun, 18 Feb 2007

Subject: Requests Reported by Outreach Committee for Side-by-Side Presentation of the 12 steps of Third Edition 1996 and Fourth Edition draft 2006

Hi Steve & Gerrie:

Please see the following info from the combined Holland, MI and Grand Haven, MI meetings, for your review. I thanked Kathy for their group's valuable input.

Hugs & Peace,

Michele S.

Note: forwarded message attached. Date: Sat, 17 Feb 2007

Subject: Requests Reported by Outreach Committee for Side-by-Side Presentation of the 12 steps of Third Edition 1996 and Fourth Edition draft 2006

Hi Michelle,

Thanks for forwarding the side-by-side comparison to us. We weren't sure if we should send them to you or not, so I have saved a copy if we need to send it directly to WSO. . Just let us know.

The following are our comments:

Overall, we are very confused by the continued use of "coupleships" throughout the document--- does that mean all of the coupleships in the group or all of our previous coupleships? If we are working on our current coupleship do we need to be continuously reminded of all of past coupleships? (if that is what this refers to) Changing "Higher Power" and "Sponsor Couple" to the plural throughout the document makes this version very confusing.

When there is not a comparable part in the new version, does that mean they are deleting it from the previous version? We would object to deleting those items.

We definitely prefer the previous edition that includes the "Promises", "How it Works", etc, providing they meet the AA guidelines, or AA is properly cited. If we had not has those sections for guidelines when we first started our meeting, our meetings would not have been successful. We would not have been able to use the newer Blue Book as a resource or guideline for our meetings. In fact, after those things were eliminated, those of us who had the original Blue Book, printed our own "Meeting Guide" that included those sections and continued to use them.

This document seems to be a rough draft in need of revision. Neither of us is a copy editor, but there seem to be a number of grammatical inconsistencies throughout the new version of the

document--primarily verb tense disagreements brought about by the use of the plurals of coupleship and Higher Power. These errors make the reading very hard to understand. Also, we think the tense changes from present tense to past tense within the Step sections make the document less powerful. Below are some specific examples {*references are to the Side-by-Side*}:

1. pg 6 & 7--we prefer "relationship" where they have replaced it with "coupleships", & why have "Higher Powers"--we thought we had "a Higher Power" or "a power greater than us"--not multiple Higher Powers. It implies we need more than one higher power.
3. Ditto with page 9 and the plural of Higher Power---anywhere in the document,
4. pg 10, part 5, the first line is not grammatically correct--Higher Powers, images, feelings are plural, so we think "was" should be "are"--but again, we object to the term "Higher Powers" in the plural sense.
5. pg 16, we prefer the previous version--the new version implies that we have power to make our partners feel a certain way, we can affect them, but cannot make them "stressed" unless they choose to be.
6. pg 17, part 2, #10, we think the "shared issues" part is unnecessary --sometimes we also blame partners for our own issues, that are not shared---the new version doesn't take that into account, the old version is inclusive of all issues of shame and blame.
7. page 20, part 1, the plural "sponsoring couples" or "other couples" implies that the 5th Step needs to be with more than 1 couple---the previous version is more precise. This is also a problem on pg 31, part 4--why "sponsoring couples"?
8. page 22, part 1, why change the tense to "had"---Step 6 has in the old version is more precise.
9. pg 24, part 6--the new version make absolutely no sense--the old version describes taking our issues to new relationships very powerfully.
10. pg 37 & 38, the elipsis after each phrase of the Serenity Prayer (...) should still be there, the elipsis implies the rest of the prayer is coming--it provides anticipation for the reader to keep reading.
11. pg 39 part 1--more tense problems--present tense and past in the same paragraph and within a single sentence.

Yours in Recovery,
Kathy and Dave C.
Lakeshore Recovering Couples Anonymous
Spring Lake/Grand Haven, Michigan