
Group and Member Comments on the Sobriety Survey of 12 December

Written comments accompanying the survey are numerous, including many personal letters. It was felt that the need for the fellowship to know how SA expressed itself on this issue warranted publishing them all. Since it was virtually impossible to get prior permission from all to reprint, it was felt that deleting all group and individual identification safeguarded anonymity. [. . .] indicates deletion. We hope we didn't miss anything. If your comment did not get in, please understand that some may have been missed in the piles of mail of various sorts received since mid-December. Nan's leaving has also complicated matters. Comments are listed in the order in which they were received (date stamped) at the Central Office. The 12 December definition read:

Regarding SA's definition of sobriety, "married" means traditional, legal, heterosexual marriage, and "spouse" does not include "committed relationships" with either the same or opposite sex.

Groups were asked whether they affirmed that statement, whether they did not affirm it, and whether they chose not to respond. In the comments transcribed below, letter prefixes denote the following:

- A The group making that comment affirmed the statement.
- NA The group making that comment did not affirm the statement.
- NR The group making that comment chose not to respond.
- I The comment comes from an individual.

Most groups affirming the statement did not offer comments.

These comments, if looked at as a whole, are telling us something very important about SA that we should all face, regardless of how painful that might be.

NA The organization is committed to serve the needs of the members. With the current rigidity this is not being done. A committed relationship, regardless of sexual orientation, is monogamous and should be enjoyed within the beautiful guidance of SA.

NA The group was not unanimous. However, the majority feels that times and mores have changed, that gay men have a right to express themselves sexually with one "spouse," that a truly "committed relationship" is a marriage with or without benefit of a marriage license.

I Our secretaries have already conducted group conscience meetings which have unanimously endorsed and affirmed the existing sobriety imperative which is based on traditional, legal, heterosexual marriage and which does not include "committed relationships." The purpose of my PRIVATE response is to add an emphatic "Amen!" If other people want to change the definitions, let them go to any of the many other groups with custom-made sobriety definitions and let SA not be bothered with these anarchists.

I I have been in recovery for a little over four years, although the first two years consisted of my playing a lot of games with the program. I got into recovery through SA, and still consider it to be my home group. I STRONGLY support the current SA definition of sobriety, although I haven't always been able to live up to it. For me, any form of sexual activity outside of my marriage is trouble. For me to even look at a girl walking down the street and notice that she is attractive can sometimes be enough to throw me into my addictive behaviors. I, personally, cannot support any change in the SA definition of sobriety.

To those who are wanting to make a change in the definition, I would ask "why?" Why are they wanting to make this change? One of the unique features of SA is the very clearly defined boundaries. If others are not happy with these boundaries, and are wishing to make the changes indicated in your December 12 letter, I would like to know why these folks don't try attending SAA meetings, or SLAA meetings. Leave SA alone. The program works. And as the old saying goes, "If it works, don't fix it."

I would appreciate being kept informed of the results of your responses. If too many people disagree with my position, and apparently yours also, I may need to find another support group that will accept my definition of sobriety, and not expect me to change my values to suit their whims.

As I'm sure you're aware [...], a former member of your I.G.C. group, lives here in [...]. I am not sure where he, personally, stands on any of this. But I do know that he called for a group conscious at one of the SA meetings to decide if they wanted to stay with

you folks. There was some talk about sending moneys intended for SA to some guy who is the treasurer of the I.G.C. If memory serves, this guy lives somewhere out there in California. So, things are already pretty stirred up here.

I guess I'll close for now. Sorry if I took up too much of your time, but this issue is very important to me. Keep up the good work, Roy. I have you, and folks like you, to thank for my sanity. Please know that you are in my thoughts and prayers daily. Take care of yourself, and my very best wishes to you and yours for a happy holiday season.

A We think SA would lose its basic identity if the above definitions were changed. 100% agreement to affirm the above.

I Based on my "if it ain't busted, don't fix it" attitude, I don't believe SA needs to be fixed (or changed).

I think your efforts to expand the sobriety imperative are counterproductive to the SA problem and intent.

I suggest you devote your effort and interest to an existing group in line with your philosophy rather than be a divisive force in this program.

The SA program is the only one that works for me (and apparently many others) and I oppose any effort to dilute the sobriety imperative.

NR Our group wishes to take more time to discuss this important issue.

NR We agree that Married means traditional, legal, heterosexual marriage. We disagree with the singles being totally non-sexual. Think about O.A. Suppose singles could not eat anything whatsoever unless they got married.

P.S. Everyone in our group has a committed personal relationship with Jesus Christ and seek his will in all things to the best of our ability.

A Our vote was 5 to 1 in favor, with one man abstaining because he was new. The person who voted against said that he was in favor of our sexual sobriety but felt that it was inappropriate to ask gays to choose between celibacy for life and sexual sobriety.

A Marriage is for life.

A Our group deplores this controversy — We hope it will resolve itself soon thru lack of fuel.

We are currently 7 committed members here with some rewarding cooperation with [...] members.

Thank you for your leadership.

A Do not need to include "married," "committed relationships," etc...just leave

our sexual sobriety definition as is without the expanded part...and tell others not to expand on the definition. The issue is lust, no matter what or with whom the relationship is with!

A As a whole, we feel that SA's sobriety definition outlines a goal worthy of the struggle necessary to reach it. Thanks for keeping the standard, Roy.

Your friends in sobriety.

A Please do not waver or change the SA definition. My entire sobriety after June 23, 1989 has depended on it. If others wish to change this SA definition let them go to other groups who are available with other definitions. The accusation that one man is the authority of SA is absurd. It is unfounded since group conscience has always reviewed and approved issues of such importance. I personally believe that the author of this other letter is dealing with personal resentment towards authority figures which he projects on the the founding member — This is only my opinion by the way — To conclude, I absolutely affirm, stand behind and agree with the SA definition as it is. If it were ever to change I would no longer consider myself a member of SA. That is how important it is to me.

A Do not compromise.

A Hang in there!

A I have the honor of serving as Chairperson of both SA and SLAA meetings and I find the suggested change creeping into SLAA chapters as well, primarily because of the gay community. I welcome gay persons into SA if they are willing to adhere to the SA rule as it now stands "No sex with self or freedom from sex of any kind." To allow sex in any form is like allowing an alcoholic a mixed drink.

A We believe sexual sobriety can only be defined in terms of the 2000 year old commandment concerning marriage and traditional Judeo-Christian spiritual laws.

"Committed" relationship is a vague and indefinable term which we believe plays right into the insanity of addictive thinking (i.e. changing the rules to justify our behavior).

This group will withdraw from SA if the current definition changes.

A Unanimous, after much discussion. We feel we are hard core sex addicts who need a very strict definition.

A There is some reservation as to if the above resolves the "definition" issue (peeping or porn without masturbation ok?). In other words, there may be people who are

technically sober but might still be "acting out."

A Strongly agree and can not accept otherwise.

I I am a loner, but I agree 100% with your definition. There is no SA group here. Some day, maybe.

I We have had a chance to read and reflect on the packet recently sent by Roy K. in regards to attempts, on the part of several IGC Committee members, to change the Sobriety Definition as stated in our Big Book. Our group is of one mind that the definition is not only correct, but has also been a life saver for many of us in the fellowship. Think of the consequences for recovering alcoholics if a similar situation arose in AA, and was not addressed by affirming the Third Tradition. Is this not comparable for us who are trying to recover from the rampages of lust?

Since we believe that we are dealing with an equally destructive and life threatening disease, our Group Conscience goads us to reaffirm the wisdom and necessity of the current SA Sobriety Definition. Therefore we heartily endorse the efforts of the SA Central Office and all SA groups seeking to put an end to this controversy.

May God bless all of you as you seek to restore peace and unity among all who are called to recover in this fellowship. Be assured of our love and support in this vital matter, and may it be quickly resolved.

NA This is a statement against homosexuals. They can be in as much a committed relationship as a straight married couple. I'm glad you finally had the courage to at least state that your argument is against homosexual relationships, though you state opposite sex also. People do not need a marriage church wedding to be in love. I stand by committed relationship 100%.

A Several of us have attended meetings of SAA which is based out of [...] and it allows a less strict interpretation. Perhaps those in our groups desiring less restricted guidance could find comfort in SAA. Our group conscience does not want to redefine SA's definition as now stated.

A The group conscience was settled without debate.

NA We want the definition of sobriety to stay as it has been and feel no need for further clarification.

A Group conscience (60% members present, all divorced). Unanimous agreement with SA definition as being the only true, real

definition. We also feel that our only course for helping those who do not see the value of SA's definition is thru prayer asking our HP to help others see the light. We feel that for us to write letters isn't going to help Him to fill others with His grace. Let's give Him a chance!

A Our group was ALMOST unanimous. Thank you for hanging in there on your "thankless job." I appreciate your work. Also, I am so grateful for the SA definition. I don't know if I'd be alive or not if it were not for it!

A I read years ago that California is ten years ahead of the rest of the nation in social development. For this reason, I firmly believe that groups, particularly in the East, simply have not had enough experience with "sexual liberation" to realize yet that what California has experienced will be their experience also with the passage of time. Therefore, it might be more profitable for the CA groups to share more of the actual experiences that lead up to the final "sobriety definition" ... "in the crucible of our experience" If the other groups still do not want to listen, all you can do is wait for time to tell the difference. In the meantime, starting a second group with the "old" sobriety definition, as [...] suggested to me ages ago, may be the only alternative, if the "group conscience" of the present SA wants to radically alter that definition.

I A recent letter, widely distributed within SA, raised issues concerning our founder, SA leadership, and the SA sobriety imperative. We, as members of SA in the [...] region, respond to those issues as follows:

1. We affirm SA's Second Tradition: "for our group purpose, there is but one ultimate authority — a loving God as he may express himself in our group conscience. Our leaders are but trusted servants; they do not govern." We also deeply appreciate the years of selfless service provided by SA's founder. His honest sharing of his experiences as a fellow addict enlighten and inspire us. Were it not for his willingness to serve, many of us might not be sober today.

2. We are firmly opposed to any change in SA's sobriety imperative. We believe there is great wisdom in the statement, "... (F)or the sexaholic, any form of sex with one's self or with partners other than the spouse is progressively addictive and destructive," (from *Sexaholics Anonymous*, page 4), and we take the word "spouse" in its traditional heterosexual and legal sense. Other Twelve-Step Fellowships, which define sobriety differently, define "spouse" differently, or permit members to define their own sobriety, are available for those who do not agree with SA's sobriety imperative.

3. We recognize that others may disagree with our opinion concerning the

sobriety imperative, but we believe that, as stated in the First Tradition, "Personal recovery depends on SA unity." We therefore support the efforts of the SA Advisory Committee to obtain an international group conscience on this important issue, and we urge other SA members and groups to abide by the results of this group conscience.

4. We support the efforts of the SA Advisory Committee to educate SA members on the existing structure of and history behind any service boards or committees serving SA as a whole, specifically the Advisory Committee and the Inter-Group Conscience, or IGC, Committee. We believe that a more thorough understanding of the makeup and charters of these committees may be one of the biggest benefits arising from the existing controversy concerning the sobriety imperative.

5. We request that the Advisory Committee consider including this letter in the next issue of the *ESSAY* Newsletter.

NR We feel our emphasis should be on sobriety not politics. Reference the 4th Tradition.

I First of all, I am over 2 years sober. Even before the SA program I had achieved 11 months sexual sobriety through the A.A. program; but I lost that sexual sobriety...and that brought me to SA 2 years ago and I regained the sobriety. I believe in the definition as is, and I used it even before I entered the program itself and before I knew about it explicitly. I am gay and celibate...incapable of a sexual relationship without lust.

I reread the sobriety definition on pp. 191-193 and once again gave my consent to that statement. I believe it is the way I must go in sobriety.

I only have one concern and this is really why I write to you. In our discussion last night at the meeting, some of the members were saying things which were in favor of the definition but which I think were not intended by the definition. To put it in a word, they were moralizing or theologizing the definition. Some of the things said against the definition were *also* moralizing. On a personal level that may be okay, but on an SA level it bothers me.

The words of the program come to me: "SA is not allied with any sect, denomination, politics, organization, or institution; does not wish to engage in any controversy; neither endorses nor opposes any causes. Our primary purpose is to stay..."

"Trad. #10: SA has no opinion on outside issues."

"p. 191: In defining Sobriety, we do not speak for those outside SA We can only speak for ourselves..."

Some of the members were speaking as if the Sobriety definition was some kind of moral stance (either "for" or "against") on

gay relationship *per se*, on gayness *per se*, and on committed relationships *per se*, not differentiating between the addict and the non-addict. As far as I know we, as SA, have nothing to say (pro or con) about the non-addict or about gayness in general. We are just sharing what has worked for us in gaining sobriety from our addiction.

I've always believed that the issue for us is our common addiction, emphasis on "addiction" and not on judging on other issues.

I plan on voting in favor of retaining the sobriety definition as it was intended, but I hope it is not used to judge anyone morally or doctrinally.

I The Monday 1 pm meeting of SA voted to endorse the current sobriety definition as it is now published in all SA literature.

A Two newcomers felt they did not know enough about the group and abstained. One person admitted he was gay but felt the definition as it stood helped him, but he felt attacked. The fourth seemed to agree with the other 3 that abstained. The remaining 5 agreed with the definition as it is. Like the clarity, very clear boundaries.

A Those people who chose not to respond felt there was not enough time to discuss the issue. Others felt that they did not want homosexuals excluded from SA.

A First off, this has the ring of the world's view and *half measures* that avail us nothing. This sobriety statement is the *heart* of our program that our lives depend on and that has been working for me since 83. At first I wanted a softer, easier way and I went to those groups and I got nothing!

A In this matter we speak only for ourselves as recovering sexaholics without intending to pass judgment on others or to say what might be appropriate for those who do not suffer from this disease.

From our experience we know that impaired thinking can lead us to find any number of rationalizations for practicing our addiction. The SA sobriety definition provides clarity that we have not always been able to provide for ourselves or obtain from others. The support of a fellowship which strives for the same sobriety has been very helpful to us in maintaining our sobriety.

There is a danger that allowing each of us to define "spouse" or "married" or "committed relationship" within this program will only result in confusion. In the end we may be saying that each of us shall provide that definition of sobriety which suits us at the moment. Some of us have tried that and it hasn't worked for us. Some of us have come into SA for exactly that reason.

In saying all of this we are not unmindful of the dilemma this creates for our gay and lesbian brothers and sisters. We are aware that many of them have the same need for Sobriety as we and that many of them strive for fidelity in their own relationships and for freedom from the bondage of sexaholism.

Under the present state of the law, homosexual couples cannot enter into legally sanctioned marriages, but would if they could. Their situation does not seem to us to be the same as that of a heterosexual couple that could legally marry but don't. We think this is a significant difference entitled to serious consideration by the fellowship. We think the consideration given it ought to be thoughtful, dispassionate and prayerful.

I I think you will win this vote but I beg you not to use it to change our beloved pamphlet and book. The thought of reading an enlarged form of the sobriety statement that spells out the view you outlined breaks my heart. I don't know if I could bear it. [...] people blew up over this issue. I think a decision could split off part of the fellowship which I love.

I don't know why I feel so strongly about this. I support everything you say in your beautiful letter [on relationships and marriage]. I think we do need to respect authority and the community rules as part of our recovery. I am not a gay rights man. I am very opposed to many things they favor. I'm homophobic and make it clear I'm aware of that part of me to gay guys who ask me to sponsor them. So I don't know why I feel so strong on this but I do. I hate the idea of defining sobriety. I've watched guys come into AA for years and hang on to their pills or their dope. AA lets them do that until they come to see their need for a better sobriety.

I hate to see you take an action that might so hurt the fellowship over a few isolated people. I can't think of ten people outside New York who believe different than you. But New Yorkers are weird. [...] says that the only time they see the New Yorkers at the national GA conventions is when they are in New York or the Catskills. So let those dogs bark. That barking and the letters being mailed to everyone is part of the beginnings of us coming to work out the issues and start taking responsibility for governing ourselves. Most everybody disagrees with what they are reading, but it is part of the process of starting to think about the fellowship wide problems. My guess is that it will be closer to ten more years than five years before we would finally have a large group of SA's with long term sobriety ready to sit down and work out a government for ourselves. Most people who get those letters can't begin to understand what all the fuss is about. They trust you as our founder and inspired leader.

So please don't use a shotgun to kill a fly. The great bulk of the fellowship loves and respects you. Our beloved sobriety definition has brought us this far. It does work. Please don't fix it.

If you feel you must do something, tell the fellowship the vote was not a consensus so the sobriety definition stands as is. And tell them if you need to, what you said in the [above] letter as being your view which you offer to us in the fellowship for our prayerful consideration. To me this is thinking and deliberation time, not voting time, especially on an issue that affects so few and could bring so much trouble to at least a sizable minority that feels so deeply opposed.

When I came in in 1983, you had just come back from a terrible meeting in New York. Maybe they are your cross to bear. They sure aren't picking up any adherents any place else. I know it must be very hard for you, but look at all the groups all over the country who have taken the sobriety definition as it is and look what they have done with it. I don't think anything is broken and I beg you not to fix it this way. If, down the road a ways, the fellowship is all together and there is a tidal wave of sentiment to tighten up the definition because of a lot of people going wrong because they feel differently, I could go along with that.

I Our group changed to SLAA four years ago because of the definition of sexual sobriety. I (and some others in the group) still use that (SA) definition (5 years in Feb.).

I Our group does not exist. A group had been formed but I am the only person as far as I know interested. I'll keep trying.

P.S. Stand up to these people who are trying to destroy SA. You should consider court action. Are there pro-sodomite infiltrators? Don't allow this negative behavior to continue. Maybe they mean well, but they will harm us. You can not let cancer fester in the body. Find it and remove it. I will not support any group which supports sex outside of proper heterosexual marriage.

I As indicated above, our group affirms the traditional understanding of SA sobriety. We have no other options.

We do have some serious reservations, however, as to whether one person orchestrating a national group conscience is in line with the Twelve Traditions of our Fellowship. We refer to the second Tradition, which states, "For our group purpose there is but one ultimate authority — a loving God as He may express Himself in our group conscience. Our leaders are but trusted servants; they do not govern."

After reflection and discussion, therefore, it is our group's suggestion that though we affirm the traditional understanding of sexual sobriety, we ask that the Central Office Advisory Committee, or

some other representative body, be included in a more democratic process of taking a group conscience on this matter of sexual sobriety.

A "Strongly." "It can't be any other way." Sobriety is the base, we must not change the meaning in any way, shape or form.

A SA should not, need not be a democratic phenomena. One reason SA works is that it is based on a Godly premise. To change would undermine the basic principles by which it works. People searching for alternatives should go to SLAA.

NA As a group we (group compromise/consensus) two years ago dropped the above definition. Abstinence and celibacy is and are as *they ARE* in SAA-SLAA strongly advocated for the individual to practice and live until that person comes to his, her place in sexual recovery with God's help to function again using the gift (sex) as a gift gives us and not for abuse and shame. Roy you'd be surprised at the number of people who at God's prompting, not man's came into total recovery and abstinence. Please let go and let God.

NA Our group wants "committed relationships" added to the sobriety imperative.

NA Our group wants "committed relationships" added to the sobriety imperative.

I 1. Obviously this is a topic leading to dissension and distraction (from personal recovery, and thus should not be discussed in regular recovery meetings according to the SA Meeting Format, p. 198). Thus the appropriate times and places to discuss this topic would appear to be during group conscience meetings or fellowship get togethers. At our regular group conscience held December 28, 1990 this group agreed not to affirm the original sobriety definition terms, by a vote of four to one. None of us is in a nontraditional relationship and all follow the current definition of sobriety, having none, one, four and ten months, and almost two years sobriety as this is written.

2. First, we feel that a proper group conscience held at the international level is the only way to solve this ongoing problem. By that we mean an open face-to-face discussion with give and take; not a ballot with only a yes-no-abstain vote on merely one option. Open discussion could lead to a choice between a larger number of hopefully better options. A ballot such as this cannot

reach any useful or even valid resolution to this problem.

3. Second, no rational discussion can actually occur until each person is willing to acknowledge the strong feelings held by all and agrees to proceed with the understandings that these feelings must be accommodated in any proposed change. For example, those who are against change because the current sobriety definition has brought them perhaps the first sanity in their lives, and is their strong rock of recovery that they lean on, must first be assured that no change will be made to degrade or diminish the effectiveness of the sobriety definition. Similarly, those who would like to call themselves sexually sober in a non-traditional relationship, such as a monogamous common-law marriage or gay relationship, need to be assured that every effort will be made in the ensuing discussion of change to remove from the sobriety definition anything which makes them feel victimized or excluded. And for those who wish to avail change for religious reasons in order to avoid "recognizing the gay lifestyle," let's provide a reminder that twelve step groups leave behind the trappings of individual religions in order to be more inclusive. And finally, for those who say, "Let those who are unhappy with the current sobriety definition go down the street to another twelve step group," let us remind them to read about tradition three in the "Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions" to learn about the imperative for inclusiveness. "Separate But Equal" was found unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court for public schools and is clearly contrary to the spirit of twelve step recovery groups. For those addicted to their fears of Gays, we pray that they remember "Perfect love casteth out fear."

4. Our group feels that the current definition has brought recovery to many, but it is ineffective to the extent that it excludes many who also need recovery and who are in or seek to be in nontraditional relationships. The changes proposed in the letter from the individual in New York City as excerpted in Roy K.'s letter of December 12, 1990, suggest a definition preferable to the current one, but which could itself very likely be improved.

5. Some suggestions which have surfaced locally to help solve this problem are to change tradition three to read, "The only requirement for membership is a desire to stop lusting (period)."

That suggestion includes eliminating the sobriety definition everywhere it occurs in the SA literature. A second suggestion is to substitute these two sentences for the first two sentences in the second paragraph of "What is a Sexaholic and What is Sexual Sobriety?" (with similar changes to The solution, etc.):

"Thus for the sexaholic any form of unreal sex is progressively addictive and destructive. We also see that lust is the driving force behind our acting out, and that true sobriety includes progressive surrendering of lust in all its forms."

6. With little dissent our group has a number of very great regrets. We regret that we have witnessed Roy K. suspend the operation of tradition two, imposing his individual will for that of God as expressed in a true group conscience, this ballot procedure being of no real value as a substitute for an actual group conscience. We regret the absence of a group conscience meeting from the proposed agenda of the international conference in Oklahoma City. We regret the refusal of the SA Central Office to continue funding the conference calls of the IGC Committee. We regret Roy K.'s rigid control over the content of the 'Essay' to exclude any points of view contrary to his own. We regret Roy K's rigid control of the SA and 'Essay' mailing lists for the same reason. We pray that Roy K. can let go and let God. We feel that the current sobriety definition violates tradition ten, and that SA is in violation of tradition two on this issue.

NA Use of "NY" definition.

NA This group uses the "New York" definition of sobriety. We are five years old.

NA We use committed relationships and have gay relationships. No problems.

A Roy: Hang in there. I suggest that we encourage and *help* them form another self-help group with their bottom line. The movement can stand a plurality.

A 1) People in "committed relationships" are sometimes more "married" and faithful than those in traditional marriages. I feel the sexual sobriety definition should not be so confining or limited as not to include gays and others not traditionally married. This is important. I believe if we want to keep members, a little more openness to the real world and what's in may be worth investigating.

2) I believe that the appropriate means of resolving this controversy is through either an International Group Conscience or other process which guarantees due process; this request is one member asking our opinion.

3) I believe that it is discrimination for SA to limit the definition of "spouse" to heterosexuals and not gays. I feel that gays should have the same possibility of having a meaningful, committed relationship as straights. The traditional definition of "spouse" sends gays a message that they are inferior, bad, and not wanted!

Roy — the above are comments of dissenters but the group voted 12 to 4 to

affirm the definition of sexual sobriety that you put in your letter.

A I agree with the above definition but feel that definition should not give any group the right to exclude anyone from meetings.

A Group felt that SA definition should be kept as it has been stated. However, individuals should be made known that SAA (Sex Addicts Anonymous) allows one to set their own boundaries so that option is available if they don't like SA philosophy. Also the slogan "take what you like and leave the rest behind" could be used.

A We feel it is unfortunate that we weren't allowed to vote for the preservation of the present definition, but separately on the "heterosexual" part of this. Marriage implies the kind of commitment necessary before sex is not destructive for us, but we aren't sure the homosexuals should be treated differently from other married people in states that allow it. It is a valid Biblical concept that homosexuality is condemned, but not necessarily program.

A We had a group conscience after appropriate discussion. Although it was not unanimous, our group voted overwhelmingly as indicated above.

I I voted to support our local group's definition of sobriety which includes the broader phrase "committed relationships," in order to not exclude gays and singles who attend the meetings. However, I want to declare that although I support the broader definition in terms of relationships — I love all my program pals gay or not, I appreciate gay sharings, and the deeper sense of "we're all dealing with the same problem" — I nonetheless on a philosophical basis (and I consider the philosophical foundation to be of critical importance) would never want the current world-wide definition of sobriety to be tampered with: I entirely believe that heterosexual marriage is the only type of sexual relationship that God blesses.

I The sobriety statement as written in our SA Big Book and in our SA brochure has done wonders in my life. I do not believe this statement is broken and I do not believe it needs to be fixed.

I I do agree with your definition of sobriety as far as it goes. But for me, it must include other things such as not flirting, no pornography, no cruising, etc. I came very close to having an affair and still stayed within the boundaries of your definition of sobriety... I had to add to your boundaries some boundaries of my own. I realize now that I was just "playing the game" but that is what it took for me to get serious about the

program. Also, this is a fellowship of people who want to get well and there are admitted homosexuals within the group. Some are trying to change their lifestyle and some are not. We love them all. I fully believe that the Bible teaches your definition of sobriety but I also believe that this is an opportunity to witness. So I say include them all and let each individual work on his or her spirituality. I think that love and acceptance is the key to survival in this world. I have no intention of watering down the gospel and everyone in our group knows where each other stands. I hope this doesn't muddy the water for you.

I In response to the inquiry regarding the changing of the wording of our definition of sobriety I wholeheartedly support the changing of the words to include "committed relationship."

I have been a member of [...] SA group for over a year and have gained wonderful support from the fellowship and learning that has taken place. I am a sexaholic and daily struggle to grow and overcome my addiction.

I am also a gay person who has been in a committed relationship for the last 10 years. My spouse and I have grown together in love and commitment over that time. We have also endured the stress and strains put on our relationship by my addiction. As I sit and listen in meetings these are the same stresses that a heterosexual relationship endures in the face of this addiction. The wording of our definition of sobriety as it stands would prevent me from ever developing a normal and healthy sexual relationship with the person I have chosen to be my life mate, by virtue that we cannot "legally" marry in the eyes of the state. To adhere to our definition as it stands would force me to do one of four things. It would 1) put me in a position of continuing my relationship with absolutely no sexual contact, 2) put me in a position of choosing between having a life of absolutely no sexual contact or beginning a relationship and marrying a female which for me would be living a lie, 3) put me in a position of deciding whether or not to stay with SA or go to a group where I could be accepted as a whole person, or 4) put me in a position of attending SA as I do now and gleaning out what is right for me and discarding the parts that do not accept me as a whole person.

Given the fact that one of the purposes of SA is to restore us to sanity and provide us an atmosphere to learn to have healthy relationships instead of addicted or unhealthy ones, I feel that any of the above options would be wrong. They could lead myself and people like me into feelings of being thrown out again, less self worth, more non-acceptance, more hiding from society and isolating ourselves.

I can only speak for myself, and as a gay person I am seeking sobriety, and the support I need to obtain and maintain sobriety. I do not feel that my addiction is any different

than that of a heterosexual, even though my objects of desire may be different. My sexuality is not part of my addiction. It is our own individual addictive processes which include our choices of acting out that make up our addiction as opposed to who we are or how we are labeled by society (i.e. white person, black person, gay person, non-gay person).

I I believe that the sobriety definition as it stands should not be changed — the sobriety definition is what makes SA unique.

However, I think perhaps there are two issues involved with the definition which may be causing SA chapters and individual members some difficulty. The broader issue is whether or not SA should retain the sobriety definition at all, or allow each member to define his or her own sobriety. Closely linked to this is how the term "spouse" in the definition is defined — the second issue.

In regard to the first issue — keeping the sobriety definition — I would suggest that those SA chapters who wish to dispense with the definition should join Sex and Love Addicts Anonymous or Sex Addicts Anonymous — neither of these groups has a group-wide definition of sobriety stated as strongly as SA. I do not suggest those SA chapters change allegiance out of spite or ill-will, but simply recognize that the sobriety statement is indeed what makes SA unique. If those chapters are not comfortable with the SA definition, they need to affiliate with a group with whom they are comfortable.

The second, narrower issue which I suspect is causing difficulty is the definition of spouse. No definition is explicitly stated in "Sexaholics Anonymous," but, from my reading of the literature, the implied definition includes the adjectives "heterosexual" and "legal union." This implied definition excludes common-law and homosexual marriages.

There are two approaches to examining the definition of marriage. We could, within the group conscience approach, make the traditional view (heterosexual legal union) of marriage an *explicit* part to the sobriety definition. Unfortunately, we risk alienating our common-law marriage and homosexual marriage constituents who are truly seeking sobriety within their marital constraints.

The second approach is to allow an individual interpretation of marriage. By not explicitly defining marriage we can still include our common-law and homosexual marriage constituents in the SA fellowship. This is the approach I favor. I realize that there are pitfalls to this approach (for example, the individual who justifies his or her monthly exchange of sex partner as "new" common-law marriages). However, I prefer to allow some individuals to hold on to their rationalizations (in the hope that

someday they may surrender their rationalizations) rather than exclude someone from the SA fellowship who truly desires sobriety in the context of his or her common-law or homosexual marriage.

Thank you for taking the time to read these ramblings.

NR Our group feels that the concept of sexual sobriety as stated in *Sexaholics Anonymous* is adequate. (See pp. 191-193, *The Sobriety Definition*.)

NR By unanimous vote, [...] SA group votes not to answer the question regarding the sobriety statement. Also, this response is not to be construed as either a yes or no vote of any kind if any tabulating of the results of this questionnaire is done.

Our reasoning is as follows: We believe the question is being asked by the wrong person, that it originates from the wrong source. A question regarding something so important as the sobriety statement should be taken to the fellowship-wide group conscience as outlined in the approved IGC procedure.

We are aware of the split within the IGC committee. We believe, however, that that body must resolve its differences within itself. We do not believe that Roy K., acting either as an individual or as SA's trusted servant (whether on his own or in consultation with the Advisory Committee), should be taking on the task that has been delegated, again with fellowship-wide approval, to the IGC Committee. Also, we have concerns about how this information will be used. The questionnaire and letter ask for a response but do not say really what purpose the questionnaire's results will be used for. Will the results of this be construed as a fellowship-wide group conscience? Will they be used as a litmus test to separate the "true" or "pure" SA groups from others, perhaps even indicating that some groups may not call themselves SA, etc.?

Our position, again unanimous, is that if Roy K. wants the fellowship's conscience on this matter, he should bring it to the attention of the full IGC committee and let them run it through the approved IGC procedure.

To answer yes or no, it seems, is to return responsibility for the fellowship to Roy K. and take it from the fellowship. This is unfair to Roy K. and to the fellowship in our opinion.

A Complete support for sobriety imperative — 18 members present. 17 voted for sobriety imperative, *no dissensions*, 1 abstaining!

Many indicate that if SA sobriety definition changed, they would personally leave SA. God Bless!

A In thus affirming, we do not mean to judge the lifestyles of persons outside SA,

nor to exclude any person from our fellowship. But speaking for ourselves as sexaholics, we have found that this definition of sobriety is vital to our recovery.

A "Married" means *legally* married. "Heterosexuality vs. homosexuality" is NOT an issue to be considered.

The issue is "committed" relationship vs. legally recognized/legal "marriage."

A Addictions are unmanageable at any level. It's all or nothing. It is really that simple.

A *Unanimous support* on Wednesday for the traditional sobriety imperative. Thank you for your strong stand, Roy. You are doing the right thing!

No dissenting votes!

NR By group conscience on 1/10/91, our meeting decided that in our view this question should be taken up through the IGC Committee.

NA Our group discussed your letter and felt that the main thrust of our meeting is to help people with their addiction. We did not feel that laying the "normal" issue of marriage *per se* is necessary.

NA Our group wishes to have the sobriety definition remain as now stated in *Sexaholics Anonymous*, new and revised edition dated July 1989.

NA Our [...] SA group has taken a group conscience on the above statement regarding the sexual sobriety definition.

—15 out of 16 agree with the definition of sexual sobriety as stated thus in the SA Big Book.

—13 out of 16 disagree with the interpretation *placed* upon the SA definition as so stated in the SA Big Book.

I I believe the unanimous vote from [...] supporting the sobriety imperative is an indication of a new spirit up here. We know that we need unity and we need meetings that support recovery — this is now becoming a consistent reality.

A The groups in [this country] affirm not only the sexual sobriety definition but what marriage means as SA in *Sexaholics Anonymous*.

A There are 3 members of our group. Two voted for retaining the sobriety definition as is. The one dissenter, although she uses the present definition in her own life, believes that the present definition discriminates against homosexuals and so voted for change.

A All groups agree. Those who don't accept the sobriety definition have formed their own groups, SLAA, etc.

A It's the best we have so far. There are other groups for other needs.

A *Complete support for sobriety imperative! No dissension!*

A The above affirmation was enthusiastic and unanimous!

I We know from our own experience that it is our Sobriety Imperative (as originally established by group conscience...) that has saved many of us from our tendency, arising out of our addiction, to rationalize and push at the edges of what we can and cannot do in sobriety. To many of us the acceptance or accommodation of a "committed hetero or homosexual relationship" would push us right back into our addiction. We *need* the SA sobriety imperative in its present rigid, unambiguous form in much the same way that true alcoholics need the "no drinking" imperative in AA. This is *why* we choose SA and not other groups which accept open-ended definition of "sobriety," "committed relationships" and "spouse."

We are not so naive that a traditional marriage license guarantees sex without lust, but we believe it is important that we stop debating about the moral issues around the institution of marriage because it distracts us from our main purpose — sobriety. By agreeing on the accepted legal definition of marriage as a clear objective limit to our behavior we can focus on pursuing sobriety together in unity and harmony. We believe that the subject of sex in marriage is adequately covered in the SA literature.

There have been many examples in our group who have called themselves sober, have been in either homo or heterosexual "committed relationships" and have literally poisoned our meetings....Thankfully most of these people no longer attend our meetings but the memories are still fresh.

NR We feel it is inappropriate for any individual member to take the fellowship's group conscience. The IGC has been given this mandate and therefore it is its duty to undertake such a task. We endorse the IGC Committee in so doing or, if appropriate, informing an additional source structure to conduct such a group conscience, i.e. a GSB.

NR Altho we adhere to the definitions of sobriety and "married" as described in Roy K.'s letter of Dec. 12, 1990, we believe that it is improper for Roy to be handling this and that it has to come from the International Group Conscience Committee, which we all put into operation and which still exists.

I [...] SA group affirms the sobriety imperative as it is already stated in the SA Big Book on p. 191 & 192. We do not affirm a sobriety of "committed relationships" nor do we affirm a further definition of the already stated sobriety imperative. This group conscience was taken on 1-4-91 with 15 regular members present.

A Our group unanimously affirmed SA's definition of sexual sobriety in the SA White Book. It is our understanding that in our culture today, partners in "committed relationships" are NOT "spouses," no matter how strong the "rationalization."

Our group unanimously believes that it was inappropriate for Roy K. to react to the situation in New York with words like "traditional," "heterosexual," and "legal," because these are *not* in the White Book, and are NOT the *opinion/conscience* of SA. A healthy response would have *only* reiterated what SA IS; it doesn't matter what SA is not.

I [...] unanimously supports the Traditional Sobriety Imperative. Any other definition, in our view, is not SA. We also will continue to send our financial and moral support to the Central Office in Simi Valley, California.

I [...] unanimously supports the Traditional Sobriety Imperative for SA, i.e. no sex outside of heterosexual marriage. There was not one dissenting vote from any of our three groups on this topic.

[...] SA will continue to send all its financial and moral support behind the Central Office at Simi Valley, California.

In our view, any other sobriety definition is *not* SA.

I Of 9 members, 4 affirmed and one did not affirm. However, 4 also abstained; explanation: In accordance with our 4th tradition each group is autonomous in its own affairs and we believe should be free to set its own definition of "sobriety," "spouse," etc. and not be dictated to by a higher authority other than our group consciousness and a loving God as He reveals Himself to us. Second, we believe that there should be no leaders in SA, but rather trusted servants.

I 3 members of the 5 who chose not to respond recommend that the definition as outlined in the book remain unchanged.

I After taking a group conscience about our group's response to your letter, we have decided not to vote as you requested. Instead we have decided to express our concerns.

Our group feels that the questionnaire is not the proper forum for gaining clarity about the SA Sobriety Definition. The fellowship has adopted a process by which an

international group conscience might be taken. This issue should be referred to the existing International Group Conscience Committee. There an appropriate decision should be reached as to how the fellowship might gain a clear sense of its group conscience regarding the sobriety definition.

We do not wish our response to your letter to be viewed as participation in the taking of a group conscience. We are concerned about the definition of sobriety, but we are also concerned that the process for taking an international group conscience should be followed, lest the fellowship be weakened by its failure to adhere to its own group conscience.

We have additionally decided to make our views known to our area representative to the IGC Committee, [...].

I The issue presented in the accompanying letter is from an inappropriate source. The group believes the proper forum for such an issue is in the International Group Conscience as approved by the world-wide fellowship. We do not want this response to be considered as a "yes" or "no" vote and there is concern as to the use of this response.

A Our group would be amenable to *considering* "committed relationship," depending upon a strongly worded definition of the term.

We would *not* support a definition that permitted *frequent* changes of "committed relationships" because we know what our minds could do with that situation.

A Roy K. Thanks for your commitment to what sexual sobriety was meant to be.

I I don't know if the analogies of drinking "just beer" in AA or being just a "little bit pregnant" are completely correct, but I do believe that trying to define sobriety as "committed relationships — heterosexual and homosexual" is like this; I believe that that kind of "sobriety" can never be total or lasting, and I have no idea how many years it will take for that to become evident to everyone.

Again, I am not interested in that kind of incomplete sobriety and the concomitant mental denial and want to feel free to have and be a part of a group that is dedicated to the only quality of sobriety that we feel really works. Therefore, I beg of you to let those of us in SA who think this way have our group.

I Regarding our sobriety statement: When I was in the other programs, it seemed to me we needed a basis or goal like SA's. At that time, I did not know SA existed. When I found SA I knew it was for me.

Perhaps SA is or is not for those that want to change the sobriety statement — I

don't know. If SA is not for them with the statement as it is, I believe SA is not for them. The other programs seem to have what they say is right form them.

I need SA as it is. What they want it to be did not work for me.

Thanks to God, through SA I am a sober husband and father in my family. May we keep our sobriety statement — PLEASE. May God continue to help us. I know God will. Our imperative action, I believe is to keep our statement.

I would like, if that's OK, to make the top half of page 2 of Sexaholics Anonymous my words also.

A We have no problems with sobriety themes.

A Some of us do have a hard time with that definition.

A Please Note: We feel that, somehow, homosexuals and those in "committed relationships" should be made welcome to SA. Our fear is that we will have a fallout. The new, clarified position should be explained to understand how persons in "common law" or other relationships can work toward our sobriety imperative.

A If somebody prefers another definition, there exist groups with these other definitions and he or she is free to visit these other groups. We don't exclude anybody from our group but we refer to o.m. definition obligingly.

NA Our group conscience was divided. Of nine members present when the group conscience was taken, after some discussion, five members did not agree with the above, three agreed and one member abstained from voting.

NA We define sobriety as no sex with oneself or with anyone outside of a committed relationship.

NA We feel this question is divisive. We unanimously disagree with the amendment. We feel that this issue needs to be discussed openly and not in back rooms, which would draw the organization into a political controversy. The issue of the definition DOES need to be discussed.

NA Our group has voted to include committed relationships with either the same or opposite sex in the sobriety definition. (Enclosed is a comment from one of the members of our group.)

I I wish to share with you my personal convictions regarding the sobriety imperative. As a Roman Catholic, I certainly have felt very much "at home" in SA as it has

been structured and with the sobriety imperative as it was originally described. It has been an integral part of bringing me to a sobriety that I now have enjoyed for almost two years. I have found similar results in the lives of many others who have found security in the solid base that SA provides for their road to recovery. I find it far better to be challenged to what at first seems impossible than to be able to set my own limited standards. I will continue to strive, with the help of our fellowship, to meet this challenge.

At the same time, however, I have come to have great respect for individuals who are very faithful to the fellowship and the values of SA who find themselves committed to long-term relationships that are not encompassed by the "traditional" definition of a spouse relationship. I have witnessed their humble acknowledgment of and genuine striving against all of the sick and out-of-control attitudes, behaviors and relationships that have enslaved them in the past. I have witnessed them coming to the wisdom of the group to discern the validity and quality of the respective relationships that they are a part of, to make sure that they are not being fooled by their addictive thinking. Having come to appreciate the sincerity of these individuals in their quest for sobriety, I feel that I must give them the benefit of the doubt that they, in their own situations, have made a clear and valid distinction between their addiction and the respective relationships that are already enhancing their lives or for which they long in the future.

Therefore, while personally subscribing to the sobriety imperative as it was originally conceived, I would not want that definition to exclude those individuals who have been attracted to the wisdom and supportive fellowship of SA while not being able to walk away from "non-traditional" relationships. All 12 Step programs are built on trust. I personally feel called to trust that this adjustment of the sobriety imperative to be more inclusive will not be the "beginning of the end" for SA but will be the occasion for all of us to be more honest, within ourselves and within the fellowship, in assessing the real quality of our sobriety.

I We decline to respond to your sobriety definition survey because we believe it is inappropriate that you — as an individual member of SA — pose the questions on this survey, which, presumably, could be used to redefine sexual sobriety within our fellowship.

Because you sent this survey on your own, we believe you have violated Tradition Two of SA, which reads, "For our group purpose there is but one ultimate authority — a loving God as He may express Himself in our group Conscience. Our leaders are but trusted servants; *they do not govern.*"

We believe surveys such as this one should come from the membership-elected International Group Conscience Committee. We will gladly consider responding to a sobriety definition survey, provided its source is the International Group Conscience Committee.

NA We agree with the definition of sobriety as stated in the SA Big Book but feel it is up to the conscience of the individual to decide with their higher power what "marriage" and "spouse" means. We don't want to exclude any group of people who need this program!

I The [...] meeting, after several weeks of discussion, took a group conscience on the issues raised in your letter of December 12, 1990, regarding New York SA apparently unilaterally changing the definition of "spouse" to include the words "committed relationship." Because the issues raised and discussed as a result of your letter exceeded the parameters of your enclosure, the group felt it would be best to write a letter of explanation of their results.

As you know, the [...] meeting was one of the three initial meetings in the greater [...] area. This group has been at the same location since inception in 1984. Group attendance has fluctuated over the years. During the past 12 month period the group has been averaging 25-30 members in attendance at each meeting, and the newcomer's meeting averages about 2 per week, but it is not unusual for 5 or more newcomers to attend at once.

As an initial matter, a question was raised whether NY SA had the authority to unilaterally change the sobriety definition without written permission, and whether it remained as a viable group under the SA umbrella. It was pointed out that the SA definition, as an integral part of SA Literature, copyrighted in 1989, probably could not be changed without the written permission of the holder of the copyright. Neither the earlier letter from the NY SA individual nor yours of 12/12/90 addressed this issue, but it was surmised by the tone of your letter that permission, written or otherwise, was not given.

A second issue raised was whether, in light of current circumstances, and the current make-up of our particular group, considering to change the definition of "spouse" and "marriage" to include "nontraditional" relationships with either sex would be warranted. It was pointed out the definition of "spouse" varies from state to state, with some states including in their definition so called "common law" or live-in relationships. As you many know, the California courts opened the door for committed couples to be entitled to each other's property interest based on a contractual basis or theory of recovery in the

celebrated case *Marvin v. Marvin*. However, the case in *Marvin*, and all other cases after *Marvin*, were quick to point out that this "right" did not rise to the dignity of a marital right, but was based on the implied contract between the two persons. The only appeals court case that granted what amounted to marital rights was a case out of the 4th District (Orange County) entitled *Butcher v. Superior Court*, circa. 1985. The facts in *Butcher* were the couple were living together for a long time, and there was a promise of marriage between them evidenced by their engagement and having set the date. Before then, one of the couple died in an automobile accident. The other party sought to get the proceeds of the settlement of the unlawful death action under California surviving spouse statutes. The family of the deceased challenged it, based on the fact that he did not marry her before he died, so she could not claim to be a surviving spouse under California law, nor did she have any contractual right to the proceeds of the insurance settlement under *Marvin*. The Superior Court agreed with the relatives that she had no interest under the surviving spouse statutes, nor any contractual right to the proceeds under *Marvin*. The Appeals Court, however, agreed with the woman and reversed the lower court's decision. In its discussion, the *Butcher* court pointed out that there was no logic in granting what amounted to marital status in terms of inheriting under California law in one case where the couple has gone through a ceremony and got a piece of paper from the state before the spouse dies, and other cases where there was substantial indicia of reliability, stability and longevity in the relationship as compared to married couples. The Court then proceeded to provide an outline of what factors they would consider a non-married couple would have to have a relationship of equal dignity with a legally recognized marriage, on a "case by case" basis.

Butcher was recently overruled by the California Supreme Court in the case of *Elden v. Shelden*. *Elden* recognized the only standard for a person to be treated as a surviving spouse was a legally recognized marriage under the laws of the state of California. One reason why the *Elden* court overruled *Butcher* was the overwhelming concern of deciding whether a relationship was "substantial" enough to pass for a legally recognized marriage, on a case by case basis, as well as the necessity of further line drawing by deciding in each case what was "substantial" enough.

The issue of further line drawing was a concern raised if the accepted definition of "spouse" or "marriage" were scrapped or modified to incorporate "committed" relationships. Others felt how one defined "spouse" and "marriage" was a personal issue, and it was nobody's business to impose an arbitrary, or for that matter, any other

definition of spouse and marriage on their personal relationship.

To further complicate the issue, it was pointed out that the definition of "spouse" and "marriage" are not only differing among the states, but differences also exist between countries, especially when they have cultures and religious beliefs that differ with the Judeo-Christian notions of spouse and marriage.

The feeling was that taking a group conscience at the local level on an issue with apparently more than one side and with such far flung implications was not appropriate, and exceeded the scope of what a group conscience at the local level was designed to do. It was stated that this appeared to be an issue that affected SA as a whole, and it would be more appropriate for this matter to be handled at the international level, after appropriate input from the locals.

The third issue raised is whether the sobriety definition should be changed at all.

Based on the group discussion, three separate votes were taken:

1. Whether the SA definition of sobriety should be changed or remain the same.

2. Whether the definition of "spouse" should be changed to include "committed relationships," or remain the same.

3. Whether the NY SA, by unilaterally changing the definition of spouse, exceeded their authority and could no longer be considered under the umbrella of SA.

The results were as follows:

1. Keep the definition of sobriety as it is:

5 Yea

2 Nay

1 Abstention

2. Whether the definition of "spouse" should be changed:

4 Yea

3 Nay

1 Abstention

3. Whether N.Y. SA by changing the definition of spouse, should be considered something else besides SA:

4 Yea

1 Nay

1 Abstention

I Our group chooses to leave the definition as is, as stated per pages 191-192 of the White Book.

I After careful consideration, our group conscience affirms the existing sobriety definition as stated on pages 191, 192, and 193 of the "White Book." It has served SA and this group well and should not be altered.

I So many people want large groups of people (I think it's a function of the disease...the old desire to "party"). I think that's how SA's present troubles started — people wanted large groups of people so they

brought persons in who didn't really belong in SA in the first place. I keep hearing people who say, "Well, homosexuals don't bother me" and don't see the sobriety issue at all or take seriously the fact that they *do* cause a problem for some (me, for instance).

A All this fantastic rules of Roy brought us not much more than endless discussions. I only believe in the AA-Program. This is a personal view.

I I agree with the definition of sobriety, but in case of homosexual members, it is fair to have a committed relationship (about 7 years or so), because they never have the chance to get married. (People who don't agree should go to SLAA!)

P.S. Once I was a strong fighter for a new definition of sobriety, that means for a "committed relationship" but now I've changed my mind, *because it didn't work!* I'm not married and I know all the good reasons for "committed relationships" (we are not working together with any institution and so on) because I'm a member of SA since the beginning in 84 in Germany and I led a lot of SA-Information meetings in 3 different clinics and other places. After being in SA 4 years and after having 3-1/2 years of sobriety, I began a relationship with a girl friend who I knew for about 3 years (she is also in the program). I did it very *carefully* — not living together, and of course: no sex! (I wanted to wait until marriage). But after one year of living like brother and sister, I decided suddenly that it would be OK if "it" happened — remembering the (now) 4-1/2 years of total sobriety. The sex was great, no lust at all. I put in my mind my higher power on the edge of the bed, friendly looking at us. I was very happy and told that in the meeting — I've learned in SA to have *real* and enjoying sex while having a true bonding with my partner from heart to heart (without wanting any more). One man wanted to throw me out of the meeting and more than one quarter were very angry. I couldn't explain to them. I began to feel uncomfortable in my own "family" and struggled for understanding. But it was not possible, so it happened that I didn't [go] to the meeting so often as before. And veery sloowly I slipped back to lust. So it didn't work! I was wrong!

A While we affirm this definition, we welcome others who may have other definitions to our meetings. This affirmation and comment are the result of consensus.

NR We'll discuss the problem at our *first* Swiss-intergroup-business-meeting! Happy New Year!

I Original definition pages 191-192 of SA book.

I Our group chooses to leave the definition as is, as stated per pages 191-192 of the White Book.

I We reject the above interpretation and want to have the definition remain as it exists on pages 191-192 of Sexaholics Anonymous.

I As a homosexual sexaholic I applaud and am grateful for the clarification of our sobriety definition. I have always felt warmly accepted and "at home" in SA as have others no matter what form their sexual addiction took. To affirm my homosexual behavior, even with a so-called "spouse," would be to build a false sobriety based on a lie. We don't view masturbation, bestiality, fetishism, molestation, voyeurism or exposing oneself as acceptable behavior, why would we accept homosexuality? They all have the same thing in common: the addiction is to the *wrong object*.

I am very grateful to the fellowship for supporting the truth even if it means taking a hard line which may be very unpopular in our permissive society. This program is a life-giving gift for those who *really* want to turn their lives over to God's care, not society's. We cannot expect to help the homosexual by betraying the truth as God gives us the grace to see it. A conscience that is formed solely on the grounds of "compassion" without regard to the truth will not help the homosexual but only confirm her or him in their illusions. We should recognize that the homosexual has been doubly wounded (as have others): not only is he or she compelled to act out, but they mistakenly chose or were otherwise guided toward, often innocently, the wrong object.

How can I be restored to sanity if SA confirms and supports my mistaken choice? How can we help others whose sexuality is not only addictive but mis-directed? I may never become more heterosexual — I'm not even trying though I am open — but God has given me an awakening to the goodness of my *own* male sexuality. That gift, to not only be male but to really feel male, has been a wonderful surprise! I thank God that the program has supported me in discovering the truth about myself.