

---

# *Box 300*

---

September 1991

Post Office Box 300  
Simi Valley, California 93062

## **IN THIS ISSUE**

- Responses to Roy K's Letter and Papers to Tri-State
- Feedback From Group On Sexual Abuse Issue
- How SA Service Is Done In Germany
- Roy Steps Away From the Central Office
- Roy K's Legacy: A Suggested Approach to SA Self-Responsibility
- Report On Chicago Business Meeting

## RESPONSE TO ROY K.'S LETTER AND PAPERS TO TRI-STATE NY AND JUNE ESSAY

- 24 Supporting letters and calls
- 3 Letters (no calls) against

*A few notes from some of the calls:*

“Your use of the term ‘pseudo-sexual’ is right on the mark! Really grabbed me as describing our condition.”

“I left SA because of the stand on committed relationships. Now I’m back and 100% for the SA position.”

“I’m with what you wrote 100%.”

“Very good! It’s the only response we can have.”

## GROUP FEEDBACK ON SUGGESTED POLICY FOR RESPONDING TO ABUSE DISCLOSED IN SA MEETINGS

**Harrisonburg, VA:** “We can speak for ourselves and our SA meeting. We are recovering sexaholics who desire to stop lusting. We want the Twelve Steps of Recovery practiced in a fellowship and on a foundation of progressive victory over lust, that is, sexual sobriety. We agree that we must take a *stand* for something or else we can *fall* for anything, and our stand reflects our group conscience process, taken seriously, we believe.

“Several of us have admitted having struggles with molestation urges. Nevertheless, we support the policy suggested in *Essay*, October ’90. Anyone who comes to SA while continuing to molest others, though relieving inner ‘pressure’ by speaking about it, effectively turns his or her SA group into an enabler group where the person can persist in the abuse. We wish to accept the person but not the refusal of responsibility for their own actions as well as the impact on those molested. We say this for the well-being of all.

“Had this policy been followed when several of us first came to SA, much needless suffering and harm done to ourselves and others, including substantial time in prison, could have been prevented.

“Sad to say, in our early SA meetings, we consistently chose to distort SA’s qualifier on the 9th Step (‘would injure them or others’). The earlier (pre-89) edition of SA’s Big Book could have been very helpful in its clarity about how the 9th Step’s ‘except’ clause was responsibly explained (found on page 3 of present edition).

“But, you must see, *being addicts* and having impaired and fearful thinking while we were still resorting to our drug, we kept putting ourselves, not others and certainly not our Higher Power, in the center stage.

“We now, as a sadder but wiser SA group, in desiring to abstain from lust in any form, including molestation, support the policy on sex offenders suggested in October ’90’s issue of *Essay*. Strong medicine for a powerful, cunning disease is the bottom line.

“As with AA, SA meetings are not to be run by drunks who are still getting drunk, but by sex drunks in general recovery *and* sobriety. Blinded by lust, the god of this world, we tried to pretend that the persons whom we lusted after and with, were in a committed (and so non-lusting) relationship with us. Only when this lie was confronted and we were no longer *enabled* to keep playing such a hazardous game with others’(and our own) lives, could we *finally* begin living the Program.

“For several years, conferences and even several meetings a week, some of us ‘came,’ yet without sustained SA sobriety. I personally never really ‘came to’ until my molestation was lovingly, gently, and *most* importantly *firmly* confronted in a non-negotiable terms.

“Only following this, I ‘came to,’ I woke up and then with my actions, not just in my head, I could ‘come to believe’ the Program only works when we let it.

“Over three years of hindered, half-measured working brought forth half-measure results on an irregular basis at best. And, of course, this also resulted in being deprived of the joy of recovery for so long.” C.H.



## HOW SA SERVICE IS DONE IN GERMANY

"Ever since our first German semiannual SA Convention in May 1986, we have basically applied the same methods and guidelines in our Service Committee. At the business meeting during the Convention all SA members with more than 30 days sobriety join in electing those who volunteer to be on the Service Committee.

"About two years ago a requirement of a minimum of 6 months sobriety for candidates was introduced, because experience had shown that those with less sobriety tended to have slips and consequently had to leave the committee, which resulted in a much higher workload for the remaining members.

"The S.C. has consisted of anything between 3-11 people who distribute the inquiries, treasurer, newsletter, literature, translations, translations-coordinator, public relations, contact to professionals, contact to SA in US, archives, and formerly tape-copying. This means that the fellowship does not elect candidates for a specific job, but just to serve.

"The S.C. meets 2-3 times in 6 months for 5-6 hours on Sundays at rotating locations to discuss problems arising from ongoing work or inquiries, to take major decisions, e.g. reprinting of German edition of SA Manual, how to deal with media demands for interviews etc. Usually we have, or take, the time to get current with each other and pray beforehand. When major decisions crop up in between S.C. sessions (that can't wait) it is a principle that the member concerned calls two other members and take a joint decision. Apart for that each member does his/her service independently.

"Up to now, the term of office has been half a year, but most do more than one term. It works well, perhaps because Germany isn't too large and we can get together quite easily, the workload is not too big or rather we have found the serenity to live with unfinished business.

"Some of us have known each other for about 5 years and so there is some amount of intimacy and stability, so that it is not difficult to integrate new S.C. members. I, personally get a lot out of doing the service for my recovery and growth. I go home from every S.C. session with renewed spiritual strength and trust." **Ruth P.**



## ROY STEPS AWAY FROM THE SA CENTRAL OFFICE

I have decided to sever all direct administrative connection with the SA Central Office as of this Chicago 1991 convention. My separation from the Central Office at this time may seem to be sudden, but the Advisory Committee and many others have known for a couple of years that I have been moving toward this action. I will henceforth be available to the fellowship on request as needed, but not for Central Office management, supervision, administration, or general duties. Here are some of the factors involved in my decision:

1. In June of 1987 at Bozeman I announced results of my lengthy process of discernment: that I should no longer manage the Central Office (CO). The CO oversight committee I requested never materialized, and I felt I had to continue my relationship with the CO. I feel more than ever the validity and necessity of that original decision.

2. Nan's departure January 27th was the immediate catalyst for this move, forcing me to look at the whole situation again. I had to once again become immersed in the day-to-day operation of the CO. This is a varied responsibility. Just look at the work these women do: Each mail and phone inquiry must be answered personally and promptly. Literature must be printed and mailed. New members must be given contacts. New groups must be given tender loving care and attention. Groups must have their questions answered. There is extensive work with SA members in prison. Members from all quarters who write or call in for various reasons must be responded to. Files and computer work must be attended to. Security and member anonymity must be maintained. There must be accountability of SA moneys and proper allocation of funds. Business matters including quarters, machines, rent, taxes, and personalities must be handled. The volume and complexity of this work slowly increases over time.

Occasionally special problems arise. For example, the CO has experienced a financial crisis dating from the time requests were made by various members that group contributions normally made to the CO be diverted to the stalled IGC. For the first time in SA's history, contributions have sharply and consistently declined. Another special problem has been the involved and ongoing defense of SA's principles, literature, and

trademark, over the entire preceding twelve months, described in the March issue of *Box 300*.

3. The CO should be looking ahead and gearing up for the next decade, especially to fit in with the new SA national service structure that will be required and which I am proposing. That will probably wind up being an added burden to the CO before it can become a help.

By the way, Pat has done a marvelous job since Nan has left. She has not only taken over the whole work load, but has instituted improvements, including improving and maintaining our system of contacts nationwide. She does an excellent job supervising the work of the other two staff. I've heard no complaints about her dealing either with newcomers or members, and she knows how to take a tough but friendly line with media and therapists—not an easy task! You don't find this combination of talents, attitude, and hard work just anywhere!

4. Finally, and most importantly, I feel it is time the fellowship became “fully self-supporting” in all its affairs (Tradition Seven). That's why I am proposing in my paper *A New Beginning* a concept of various Services that will assume and expand on work the CO is now doing and inaugurate total self-support.

In conclusion, I bring to this convention's attention the fact that although the CO continues to function with three part-time non-SA women staffers, my departure leaves the CO without direction, supervision, and without connection and accountability to the fellowship. I thus look to this convention to supply an immediate interim connection with the CO this weekend. My suggestions for the long-term solutions are in my paper *A New Beginning*. I prayerfully urge the fellowship to seriously consider the approach herein suggested and *begin* implementation this weekend. However, the fellowship is at perfect liberty to choose whatever course it will.

Roy K. 3 July 1991



## INVITATION TO SERVICE

### A Suggested Approach to SA Self-Responsibility

by Roy K.

#### Background

There's a program saying that goes, "The road narrows, but the vistas get more beautiful." This is true not only in personal recovery but in the life of our fellowship. There have always been tough roads to travel in SA, but they've led to new and more sublime vistas. We are at another such juncture in the road today. Some hard choices will be made, but we can, in faith of how we've been led from above before, be assured that what lies beyond is not only what we need but leads to greater fulfillment and joy.

I believe that everything that has happened in SA has been leading us to the point we are at today. Sobriety-wise and recovery-wise, we have learned in the school of hard knocks what works and what doesn't work for us. Hundreds of men and women, otherwise trapped in a "seemingly hopeless state of mind and body," are set free one day at a time from the tyranny of lust and sexual obsession. Thousands of others know there is hope and freedom. And, recently forced to stand and be counted on its most basic issue, the fellowship has come through with a clear majority supporting its traditional stand on what sexual sobriety is for us in SA.

Organization-wise, we have learned much and are still learning. I personally believe every bit of experience we've had with the Central Office, the Advisory Committee, and the IGC has been leading us, though we may not have realized it at the time. When I asked for the IGC to be formed in June of 1987, all I thought the fellowship needed was a means of taking an international group conscience. But things have changed, and we know more now. Taking fellowship-wide group consciences is perhaps the *least* of what constitutes our calling and task. There is much much more.

What *is* our calling and task? I don't know about you, but experience has proven to me that our task is not to have greater numbers of members and groups throughout the world. It is not to compete with any other fellowship for the best organizational system, for numbers, recognition, or acclaim. Our calling is to sobriety and true recovery in our own personal lives, issuing in our task of being a channel of God's grace to others still captive in the prison house of lust, sexual obsession, and misconception.



I believe that our collective experience in the last ten years has demonstrated that *our primary purpose is to carry our message to the sexaholic who still suffers*, but that as a fellowship, we have fallen short of that. I thus offer the following suggested approach and plan, which is simply implementing the Twelve Traditions to serve what I hope will become that primary purpose.

Rather than provide an exact blueprint, I offer the following as a concept, which I hope the fellowship will now seek ways of implementing.

## Concepts Underlying this Approach

1. The principle upon which this approach is based is that SA at heart is a *spiritual organism* with God as its source of life and leader. This is my personal conviction, and this is the kind of recovery fellowship I must have for myself. Some would say SA is merely an organization, an association of those seeking relief from sex addiction. It is that, of course, but at heart, it is becoming more and more apparent to me that for us to enjoy true sobriety and recovery from this impossible malady, SA must first be a spiritual, rather than an organizational entity. That is one reason why we must first be one in our concept of what sobriety and recovery are for us. That is also why without such sobriety and recovery, SA is nothing. This is why I believe we need what I will propose as a Spiritual Foundation Service. SA must not be built merely upon an organizational foundation or be driven by an organizational force or agenda. Such a danger is all too present.

2. The plan's basic aim is to implement the Twelve Traditions of SA in our collective experience by having *groups of members* working together in Tradition-related Services. Thus, the various Services should cover the requirements of all twelve of our Traditions, which are the blueprint from which this approach is fashioned.

3. Members, instead of being elected to *office, volunteer and are confirmed for service*, thereby facilitating the humility of anonymity. This has been the approach taken in Germany. (See "How SA Service Is Done in Germany," written by Ruth P.) This plan eliminates the need for Roy's oversight of the CO, the Central Office Advisory Committee, and the IGC and would do more than all these combined. We are grateful for the selfless work of many who served.

4. Instead of SA having any top decision-making body, groups of members serve together in common tasks, yet are also answerable to the fellowship as a whole.

5. Thus, there is no “organization” as such, fulfilling the spirit and intent of our Ninth Tradition. Members who meet the requirements volunteer, are confirmed, serve, and answer to the whole fellowship through delegates.

Today we stand at a crossroads: Looking at our increasing world services opportunities, we can on the one hand create an organizational system, a political apparatus, or, on the other hand, we can band together as a spiritual entity in the joyous upward calling of carrying our own personal message to those still suffering. It is my hope and prayer that members of the rank and file, those unequivocally committed to SA’s revalidated sobriety interpretation, men and women who are living it in their lives, will become this spiritual entity and discover the life-giving joy of service.

As you will see below, however, what I am proposing leaves no room for personalities above principle.

## The Services

Each of the following Services has its own discrete band of SA members. The question of whether any one member would serve on more than one Service is an important one. There may be isolated cases where this might be useful, but caution is urged here due to temptations to power and prestige. The aim would be that overtime, with the principle of rotating service in place, opportunities would thus be given for many members to participate. Of course, the Central Office would still be the communications link between the rest of the world and the fellowship and, as necessary, within the fellowship itself.

**A Spiritual Foundation Service** The idea, taken from the words in our Twelfth Tradition, is for SA *members themselves* to safeguard, perpetuate, and enhance the spiritual principles of our program.

This Service, as SA itself, rests on three imperatives: 1) the newly revalidated interpretation of SA’s sobriety definition—SA’s sobriety imperative, 2) the recovery imperative—this sobriety actually realized in lives, and 3) the Twelfth Step outreach imperative—changed lives reproducing other lives. Here again, I cannot emphasize strongly enough: *Unity in real recovery is the foundation of recovery outreach.*



*another, between one group and the outside world  
when sober*

What is the Twelfth Step imperative? It is the spiritual principle that we receive life by sharing our life with others. "Carrying the message" is a personal, individual transaction between one sexaholic and recovering sexaholics reach out to those who still suffer. The Twelfth seems increasingly to be the "lost Step" in the Twelve-Step movement today. But without it, there is no truly recovering individual or fellowship.

I appeal to the fellowship itself to fulfill this service. It may seem hard to get a handle on what this Service would be about because it deals with abstractions, yet this service is crucially important to SA.

The task of this Service would thus be to help the fellowship implement the above three imperatives—Sobriety, Recovery, and Service (Traditions Three, One, and Five). This Service would help SA implement and maintain its vision and primacy of purpose, safeguarding its unity.

Why not have such a Service assess SA meeting quality and effectiveness to discover what isn't working and what is? The aim would be to tackle problems created by such things as "Supporting the Illness," "The Slipper Syndrome," large influx of newcomers, no influx of newcomers, too much "drunk-talk," not enough sobriety or sponsorship, non-SA approaches that weaken our program and recovery, etc. Perhaps this Service should consider testing the Philadelphia model.\*

\*The Philadelphia slipper syndrome model: When the group feels a member's continued slipping is obviously no longer contributing to his or her recovery, the group confronts the slipping member, letting him or her know how they feel. If the situation continues, the group makes another decision on whether to invite the member to leave. The principle-before-personality issue here is that under certain conditions, we find ourselves supporting the illness in the individual and thus weakening the group's recovery power and spiritual unity. This kind of situation is becoming increasingly felt in SA. There should be a way the problem can be addressed and solutions suggested by one or more of our Services.

An important contribution of such a Service would be finding ways the fellowship can become closer, more intimate at the group level, such as: making connections with rest of the fellowship; inter-group speaker/sharing swaps in adjoining regions; joint Twelfth Step work; looking into home circles, retreats, Step Studies, Step Study families; praying together for the fellowship, groups, slippers, sexaholics who still suffer, and how to reach them; etc.

I hope such a Service would come to depend on working the Eleventh Step *together* on these most important issues.



**Central Office Oversight Service (Traditions Five, Seven, Eight, and Nine)** This need was apparent in 1987 in Bozeman, where I asked for a committee of like name. We need it now more than ever to:

- Serve as liaison or interface between CO and the fellowship. (The Central Office Advisory Committee has been doing some of this.)
- Make day-to-day decisions affecting CO operation that should not be made by the CO staff and need not be fellowship-wide decisions. This includes decisions concerning CO staff.
- Oversee the financial affairs of SA.
- Make sure CO is fully accountable for SA moneys, services, archives, and records.
- Make sure that the CO is maintained in a businesslike manner and that staff is functioning appropriately. Makes sure CO is operating efficiently. Supervise audits and work of CPAs.
- See that work goes out to the appropriate Services.
- Safeguard integrity of SA literature and logo (trademark).
- Make sure the CO represents the “voice and spirit of SA” to the world.
- Make sure every newcomer gets on the *Essay* mailing list.
- The *Essay* newsletter editorship has been held by myself and passed on to various individuals in the past. The last edition was done by Lawrence M. of Virginia, who has agreed to handle it if a direct line of communication with CO, such as FAX, can be set up.

**A New Group Service (Tradition Five)** SA itself should “carry its message to the sexaholic who still suffers.” The Central Office should only be an instrument (and definitely not the only one) through which this is done. The recovering Fellowship—not the CO—should represent and transmit the essence and spirit of our program to new members and groups.

- This Service would be advised by the CO of every new group or potential group that is formed, even if it be but one individual trying to start a group. The Service would provide immediate interim sponsorship, clarify SA’s interpretation of sobriety, give help in meeting structure and format and use of literature, provide ideas for Twelfth Step work, tell of our no-interview-with-the-media policy, get the group involved with conventions and retreats, and be helpful all-around. Historically, this job has been done by the CO, but it belongs to the fellowship. We are not a professional outfit; *we* are

responsible. And this work is part of our recovery program and the source of our joy!

- This Service would also see to it that member correspondence the CO cannot or should not handle is responded to. For example, a member writes or calls in asking for advice on how to stay sober or how to run a meeting or how to work the Steps, special problems, etc. This Service would also take the place of any loner member resource, which is too much for any one individual to handle.
- This Service might want to consider the Pittsburgh principle of expansion for suggested trial: When new groups are formed in an area, the trusted servant leading that new group is an experienced member from the parent group, until such time as sobriety and leadership have sufficiently grown in the new group. This procedure helps the new group avoid many pitfalls and difficulties and provides unity, shared experience, and support. Travel expenses can be shared.

**A Prison Service** The prison work has proven to be too vast for any one individual and too Twelve-Step oriented for the present Central Office. It needs a dedicated group of concerned SA members to handle inquiries and correspondence from the numerous prisons and hundreds of inmates. The magnitude of the prison work amounts to a "Central Office" within the Central Office. The need is for such a group to respond to inquiries from sexaholics in prison or newly released, and serves the same function for them as the New Group Service does for other groups and individuals. (See the Prison Packet Pat has prepared in the CO.) Perhaps this Service would also coordinate work on sexual abuse policies. My personal feeling is that this Service should have members who have had encounters with the law and also those who have not, in judicious proportion. It is conceivable that the Prison Service might well be a subunit of the New Group Service.

**A Conference Service (Ninth Tradition)** We need to develop a set of guidelines that the SA International Conferences (and perhaps other conferences as well) would follow regarding matters relating to the conferences. This Service partially exists in very loose form, but has become cumbersome due to the fact that its membership is continually changing. With the new emphasis on self-responsibility and the delegate structure I am proposing in this plan, such a conference service takes on a whole new meaning and challenge.



**A Tradition Six, Ten, and Eleven Service** We need the Fellowship itself to watch over these very crucial Traditions Six, Ten, and Eleven today—SA misconnections, public controversy, and public relations. As but one example, this Service would help guard and protect SA from the pressure of forces trying to affiliate with and/or speak for SA or for SA itself moving toward other such forces. This is increasingly important, given the forceful and pervasive movement to integrate the Twelve Step Program, including SA, with therapy, other fellowships, and other institutions.

It is not uncommon for therapists, for example, to want to start an SA group, even though they themselves are not members. We've also had problems with groups affiliating with treatment centers or religious organizations. Many related requests and situations arise requiring individual attention and consistent policy. Close liaison of this Service with the CO is required, since the CO usually is first to learn of such situations.

This service could also see how we might be being diverted from our primary purpose through money, property, prestige, and anything else (Tradition Six).

\* \* \*

I hope I have communicated something of the feel I have for this new approach. I believe the above *service* is what SA needs today to become self-supporting according to the spirit of our Seventh Tradition and manage its own affairs. The exact number or form these Services take is unimportant. These could be modified as experience dictates, and other Services can be added as needs become apparent.

## **General Responsibilities of the Services**

The Services should have such a union of spirit and purpose that they pray and work together for the fellowship's needs and concerns and ask for discernment and guidance in their special tasks, per Tradition Two. Let's allow and ask God into the work of our fellowship! Without God we can't...

Services select their own chairperson and other positions, as applicable. Rotating leadership should be implemented.

Every service is responsible to and reports to the conference of delegates (described below) at the annual (or semiannual), conferences.

No one Service has authority over any of the other Services or over the fellowship as a whole.



Service members have one- or two-year tenure (or longer), as appropriate, subject to ratification by the conference of delegates. Service members can be replaced by group-conscience decision of that Service.

Each Service will develop its own outline of policy and procedures, subject to ratification by the conference delegates. This would include specifying Service tasks, means of implementing them, documenting and reporting their activities, etc. These outlines should also be made available to the delegates and to the fellowship.

Services periodically evaluate their own membership and performance. Services are responsible within themselves as well as to the fellowship.

Groups/intergroups help finance sending Service members to conferences.

Groups, intergroups, and possibly the CO, can help defray extraordinary expenses of the work of the Services.

The fellowship can go to the appropriate Service and/or delegates to present issues.

Services solicit SA member input and feedback in the process of doing their work.

It is suggested that each Service be thoroughly conversant with appropriate sections (if not the whole) of AA's Big Book and *Twelve and Twelve* and the long form of the Traditions (back of the AA book).

## **Delegates and the National Conferences**

The above Services are answerable to the national conference of delegates representing SA at large. A scheme for electing delegates—even a temporary one to get things started—should be devised and implemented. For starters, say one delegate for every five or so SA groups, regardless of group size, would serve a specified term. Delegates would ratify or suggest changes to the Service policy and procedures outline of each Service and review the work of each Service at the conferences. Delegates represent their areas to the conference and represent the conference to their areas.

Groups/intergroups help finance sending their delegates to conferences.

Such a delegate structure will take time to implement, but I'm hoping we can get started on a plan and on our Service commitments at Chicago, even if it means a small beginning. New beginnings should probably be small and grow from the inside out, anyway.

Conferences would be held annually or semiannually. How do we make sure our Higher Power runs the conferences? Consider having a standard conference Business Meeting format that would be followed. Consider rotating conference business meeting chairperson, or other alternatives. Each Service gives its report to the delegates at the conference. Matters requiring vote are voted on by the delegates or by delegates and Services, as the fellowship would decide.

All delegates and service members hear all the Service reports and participate in the conference. Thought should be given to possibly having separate Service conferences and SA fellowship get-togethers. The two-conventions-per-year idea might be retained in this way.

### **Matters Requiring Fellowship-wide Group Conscience**

What if an "IGC" type issue comes before the fellowship? We could set up a mechanism to handle that matter at the time; we don't need a top "governing body" just to take a fellowship-wide vote. That's what I've learned from recent IGC experience. There's so much more to SA self-responsibility than just taking fellowship-wide group consciences. It's the day-to-day meat-and-potatoes work the fellowship must become self-responsible for and what we need set into place immediately.

If SA has an issue needing attention that can't be handled by one or more of the Services, or can't wait for the next conference of delegates, the chair of each of the services could be called together on such a decision would be accountable to the next conference of delegates. Each chair would represent the decision of their respective Service members. Such a procedure eliminates the need for any authoritative body at the top.

### **Requirements for Services and Delegates**

*Please read my paper entitled, "Reasons Why I Believe Those in National Service Should Be of One Mind and Heart on SA Sobriety."*

I strongly suggest that the following requirements apply equally to those being considered for delegates as well as those on the Services. Applicants would provide a written response to the following items: (One of the other sex-addiction fellowships requires that the entire fellowship review the "credentials" of those seeking office.) An interim group of qualified



members gathered in Chicago could be a review group for such applications as I hope will be made in Chicago.

1. Your full name, address, phone number, and home SA group.
2. List your length of continuous uninterrupted sexual sobriety as SA defines it, as interpreted in our 12 December 1990 sobriety survey (see March 1991 *Essay*). (Length of sobriety required in any given Service will be as appropriate to each Service, with minimums established at Chicago.)
3. Do you have any reservations concerning SA's interpretation of our sobriety definition (item 2, above)? If so, what are they?
4. Is SA your primary sex addiction fellowship? Are you affiliated with any other fellowship or enterprise that might compromise your work on the Service?
5. In accordance with Tradition Two, would you accept "a loving God as He may express Himself in our group conscience," as working in your Service?
6. Are you able and willing to put principles before personalities, including your own ego, and be part of the spiritual oneness of the Service. (In the past, the Advisory Committee has always set aside time at the beginning of each conference call for those who wish to share and pray together for guidance and help.) Are you willing to render service without desire for power or control? Are you willing to put SA work first and be available to that Service?
7. Give a very brief version (a paragraph or two) of your story, including what you are sober (or not sober) from and how long.
8. Tell why you would like the job and what you feel you can bring to the Service?



## Implementation of the Plan

One problem with this, as with any plan, is that of communication. How do Service members get together, and how does the CO and other work get out to the Services? I feel each Service, once a skeleton crew is in place, can solve the problem. I assume the CO would have a FAX and that the Services would also each have FAX access. Groups, intergroups, and areas could finance conference calls and other expenses. The CO could also help with finances. The fellowship would also thus support sending Service members to the conference.

**What we need immediately are the Services, not the delegate structure.** Chicago could set in motion a procedure for eventually getting a slate of delegates, but *Service work should begin immediately on an interim basis, even with skeleton crews.* As this whole plan is set in motion and announced, applications from the fellowship at large would then add to the Services as required.

3 July 1991 rk

## REASONS WHY I BELIEVE THOSE IN NATIONAL SERVICE SHOULD BE OF ONE MIND AND HEART ON SA SOBRIETY

1. Evidence from individual recovery. Enough time has elapsed now for us to begin to see some history. Take an actual case history: A man comes into SA in the early Eighties and immediately is "hot SA." Becomes a mover and shaker in his SA area. After a while, he decides to start some serious research in "committed relationships," and in his eloquence and fervor (and sexaholic need) actually starts putting doubts in the minds of other members about SA sobriety. After all, he's brilliant, well educated, and top leadership caliber. He leaves SA and continues his research. Years later, we find he's quietly back in SA. He tells us he now fully supports SA sobriety. This person has reinvented the wheel. He has "discovered" all by himself what SA discovered in its early history and continues even now to reaffirm: For him, SA sobriety and the fellowship of that sobriety are what he must have for himself, cost what it may to his ego. There are countless SA stories we know of that fit this pattern, and doubtless many we'll never hear about. Some have left SA to attend or start groups in other sex addiction organizations and have later returned to SA. The solid fact is that *some people must have the real SA.*

2. Evidence from the history of SA groups. Groups divided on SA sobriety usually wind up dividing. What happens to individual recovery when that happens? It is endangered. We've seen this happen time and again. We can list the cities. On the other hand, groups with single-minded leadership, even with some dissenting members in their meetings, function toward sobriety, recovery, and healthy growth.

The fact is that groups often tend to drift along the path of least resistance. New groups, and groups with no solid connection with the spirit of SA and more remote from the center, without committed SA leadership, tend to gravitate toward the prevailing cultural mind-set. Ambiguous leadership leads to ambiguous and divided groups.

3. Evidence from recent SA history. Not specifying requirements for service in accordance with SA principles has produced division, disharmony, and negative results.



4. Evidence from other organizations. As we know, many persons have come to SA from one of the other organizations. One of the current leaders of one of the other fellowships declares SA sobriety is necessary for some people and that SA's sobriety imperative and literature should be left intact.

I'm thinking of a young man, single, in another country, newcomer to SA, and a rip-roaring sex drunk, who has gone farther in his 25 years than many of us older sexaholics have in a lifetime. I'm thinking of an old-timer in SA who has years of SA sobriety, doesn't know if his lust will ever change gender preference or not, but who nevertheless knows he must have SA sobriety. These cases can be multiplied hundreds of times over. The leader in the other fellowship is right: Many persons *must* have SA sobriety for recovery. And it is evident that a great mass of people in SA, as shown in our recent sobriety survey, testify to this.

Here's food for thought. It appears to me that when one of the other fellowships opens up to SA's concept of sobriety, it is strengthened. When SA opens up to the other fellowships, however, SA is weakened. SA cannot try to be all things to all people. *I believe SA must remain a closed fellowship.*

What comes to mind in this connection is the practice in Germany and some groups in the U.S. Before newcomers ever go to a meeting, they are not only told about SA's sobriety, but are asked what they think about it and what it is they really want.

5. Evidence from the fact that recovery is not singular but mutual.

*"Recovery is real because it is a mutual and cooperative effort. The unity of each group is essential."*

A. Philip Parham, *Letting God*

My own recovery is not singular; it is mutual and cooperative. *We are part of the recovery process of one another.* Thus it *does* matter who is leading our group or meeting or speaking at our conventions. It *does* matter what they want and are achieving or not achieving. I can't walk alone. For myself, I must have a fellowship where what I must have for me to recover is the common ground we stand upon. I can't walk on water.

Finally, SA and its sobriety imperative have appeared in history by the grace of God, meeting the need of many who would otherwise remain in a hopeless state of mind and body and for whom nothing else works. Having gone through trial-by-fire, we have emerged united around an incredible proposition, an extraordinary energy; united about a principle that flies in the face of everything about us in today's world, a principle increasingly

lost and alien to the human race—our Sobriety Imperative. This is the great Fact for us.

Not everyone, but many *must* have such a fellowship. And by the grace and love of God, *if the SA leadership is true to its unique calling*, there shall continue to be such a fellowship.

Roy K. 3 July 1991



## CHICAGO CONVENTION BUSINESS MEETING REPORT

*The following is a synopsis of minutes taken at the Chicago Convention Business Meeting, July 13, 1991, by David M., and approved by Jean P., who chaired the meeting:*

On the question of whether the fellowship should have one or two annual conferences, it is the recommendation of Harvey A. of Nashville, who was tasked with studying the issue, that no change be implemented. Harvey reported that since tensions can easily develop between meetings, more frequent conferences are helpful.

Regarding the fate of the International Group Conscience Committee, Jeff R. of New York reported that on July 6, five IGC members met by phone to discuss the issue. They agreed that the IGC was so limited in scope and authority as to make it superfluous as a service body. That meeting in person would have helped the procedure a lot. In addition, several members recommended that SA create a service structure for the fellowship as a whole and that the fellowship create this on its own, in accordance with the 12 Traditions. The five members also recommended that the current IGC Committee be discontinued.

### New Business

In the light of Roy K.'s resignation from the Central Office, Harvey A. proposed the setting up of an interim committee to oversee the C.O. and *Essay*. The committee would be selected on the basis of volunteers from various regions of the country and international areas with at least two years of sobriety as SA understands it. The committee would be composed of not more than nine members and not less than seven. It would be an interim committee only and would cease to exist one month after the international conference in San Diego. A vote was taken and the motion passed overwhelmingly. [This committee was set up before the conference ended. It is chaired by Betsy T., of Washington, D.C., and it has met several times by phone since the convention to complete C.O.-related business.—Ed.]

A motion was made by Armando of New York that a Study Committee be formed to prepare a proposal for an SA General Service Board and to offer the proposal for consideration at the San Diego Conference in January

1992. According to the motion and a friendly amendment, this committee would be comprised of seven or nine volunteer members from various regions of the country and international areas with at least two years of SA sexual sobriety. In an ensuing discussion, it was stressed that this would only start the GSB process for study. Questions arose regarding continuity, how Roy K.'s proposals will be considered, and the need of the fellowship for a GSB. It was stated that we could learn from AA's experience, strength and hope. A vote was taken and this motion also carried overwhelmingly. [This committee also was set up. It is chaired by Jean P. of South Bend.—Ed.]

Bill T. moved that "this conference recommends that address lists not be provided by conferences." This motion also passed.

### **New Editor**

Included in the responsibilities Roy K. handed over to the fellowship is the editorship of the *Essay* newsletter and *Box 300* supplement. I have agreed to serve in this capacity ... My name is Lawrence M. I'm from Northern Virginia, and my SA sobriety date is April 4, 1987. I served on the SA Literature Committee and on the IGC Committee. I also have professional editing experience. I'm very grateful to have this further opportunity to serve the fellowship, and I welcome your suggestions and comments on the newsletters.



**Ordered By:**  
(Please print or type)

## SA ORDER FORM

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State/Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

Phone No. (     ) \_\_\_\_\_

**SA**  
**P.O. Box 300**  
**Simi Valley, CA 93062**  
**(805) 581-3343**

*All payments must be  
made in U.S. funds only*

☐ First Order    ☐ Repeat Order    Method of Payment — ☐ Money Order  
☐ Check

**I'd like to order the following books:**

<i>Qty.</i>	<i>Cost</i>	<i>Book Title</i>	
_____	\$10.00	<i>Sexaholics Anonymous</i>	Title or plain white cover.
_____	\$4.00	<i>SA Meeting Guides</i>	Suggested formats & some crucial SA experience in starting new SA groups.
_____	\$8.00	<i>Recovery Continues</i>	24 articles that deal with various problems & aspects of recovery.
_____	\$6.00	<i>Member Stories—1989</i>	Contains 21 recovery stories.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Total of Merchandise**  
\_\_\_\_\_ **CA Residents**  
\_\_\_\_\_ *Add Sales Tax*  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Shipping & Handling**  
\_\_\_\_\_ *(Chart at right)*  
\_\_\_\_\_ **ORDER TOTAL**

***Not responsible for Cash Remittance***  
***No C.O.D.'s or Stamps, please!***

### Shipping & Handling

0 — \$9.99	\$1.75
\$10.00 — \$19.99	\$2.95
\$20.00 — \$29.99	\$3.40
\$30.00 — \$49.99	\$4.25
\$50.00 — \$99.99	\$5.00
\$100.00 & over	\$6.50

Copyright © 1991 Sexaholics Anonymous  
P.O. Box 300, Simi Valley, CA 93062  
All rights reserved  
(Copies of *Essay* may be reproduced  
for distribution to other members.)