

Conference Committee Report Corner

Conference Literature Committee

Mission Statement:

The Conference Literature Committee (CLC) creates quality literature in support of S.L.A.A. recovery; guides the planning, writing, and editing of literature from writers, writing groups or service bodies within S.L.A.A.; and approves draft literature prior to submission for full Conference approval.

Our Code of Ethics:

To keep each of our meetings safe and productive, we:

- **Communicate our views honestly and respectfully** on issues raised, especially controversial ones. We do not raise our voices, stoop to sarcasm, cuss, or try to bully others into our way of thinking.
- **Are tolerant** when we differ. We share our meeting time fairly so that each of us has an equal opportunity to comment.
- **Are willing to put our egos aside** when our opinions do not win favor with others. We are able to let go, trust our group conscience, and strive for the “unity and harmony that our Fellowship requires for the successful accomplishment of its primary purpose. Our service structure exists to support us” (per Concept Six, from our draft ‘Framework for Living’) and works for the greater good.
- **Encourage one another** by doing our part to maintain a safe and supportive atmosphere.

This has proved to be our blueprint for success. We ask your cooperation in continuing these traditions as we work together in the coming months. Thank you for helping the CLC by contributing your time and talents. Your Twelfth Step work is deeply appreciated!

Active Members: Susan G., Lee W., Ray H., Susan G., Mark M., Kelly C., Sam, Dave G., Gill, Fabiana, Jeff C. Jeff-UK, Stephen S., Suanne, Sarah B., Anthony C., Troy, Vivian D., Timothy P., Ari, David B., Anthony, Eddie, Austin, Beth, Peggy S.

Volunteer Positions:

Facilitator/Chair: Susan G. New Chair
Vice Chair: Ray H. New Vice Chair
BOT Liaison: Jay G.

Minutes Recorder:
Spiritual Reminder: All
Timekeeper:

1. **Very Important:** The Literature Creation Editing and Publishing (LCEP) Workgroup (of the Board Publishing and Distribution Committee (BPDC) with appointed CLC members) is as follows: BPDC structure: BPDC membership is BOT: Suzanne (Chair), Christina, Jay. Non-BOT: Anthony, Lee, Tavia. LCEP membership is BOT: Suzanne (Chair), Christina, Jay (interim). CLC: Jeff, Lee. CCC: Anthony, Open. Former BOT: Deb, Stephen). The LCEP is hammering out a new draft process for how literature is created and Published: [LCEP Proposed](#)

[Workflow VERSION 3 r2 20220309](#) This item is **on the ABM Agenda 2022 as an IFD. Please familiarize yourself with this important document.** It will ultimately change the process of creating and publishing new literature. Next year it is likely to be a motion, and if approved will introduce sweeping changes for all writing groups and Conference Committees who create literature. Currently the CLC is piloting this effort by beginning to align with it. The LCEP committee which is a joint CLC and BPDC, is informed by this piloting effort as glitches that become apparent are being worked out along the way. We strongly urge you to ask questions and make comments. We look forward to hearing your ideas on it.

The CLC has had an exciting year with many working groups which have produced quality literature. Several of them were on the ABM Agenda for discussion last year and some have become CLC approved Motions for approval at this year's ABM. They are as follows:

Here is a list of the items we have sent to the ARS to be **Motions** for the 2022 ABM:

- **12 Steps in Plain Language: Accepted by the ARS for 2022 ABM. Now on Second Agenda**
- **A Framework for Living: Accepted by the ARS for the 2022 ABM. Now on Second Agenda**
- **The Importance of Making Outreach Calls: Accepted by the ARS for the 2022 ABM, Now on Second Agenda**
- **Anorexia 8, 9: Accepted by the ARS for 2022 ABM. Now on Second Agenda**
- **Super Service Star: Accepted by ARS onto the 2022 ABM Agenda. Now on Second Agenda**

Writing projects to be IFDs at 2022 ABM:

- **Sex and Love Addiction on the Internet: Accepted by ARS for 2022 ABM. Now on Second Agenda**
- **Making the most of Meetings: Accepted by the ARS for 2022 ABM; Now on Second Agenda**
- **50th Anniversary Basic Text*: Accepted by the ARS for 2022 ABM. Now on Second Agenda**

- **Anorexia 10,11,12: Approved by CLC to be submitted as an IFD.**

IFD literature discussed at the ABM Conference last year received many favorable and constructive comments. The feedback was recorded as well as captured by a note taker (you may request these minutes from the F.W.S. website). It has been wonderful to work with the various Conference Service Committees and writing groups who are working tirelessly to get quality literature to you. If you are interested in being a part of this exciting work, please contact us on our Committee Corner, at the bottom of the F.W.S. home page: slaafws.org (where all the Committees are listed; near the bottom of the page) look for more info there.

***Of note: the 50th Anniversary Edition of the Basic Text is looking for stories. Please submit your story here: <https://www.slaafws.org/committee/clc/> - Thank you for your service to the CLC!**

Join us!

Here's a list of our active projects. <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1rNjJ9PNSIk6feES1t9mSkv0sL6LWMjEcz7DARTSuveA/edit?usp=sharing>

Any one of these writing groups would be happy to have you join them in the writing of the piece of literature, or in your feedback on the piece.

Our one-and-a-half hour meetings are held on the **4th Saturday** of the month at 11:00 Central, eleven months out of the year.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6518051209?pwd=Q1ZNckFPd2dlQVU4T2dCSG9tSXJxZz09>

Meeting ID: 651 805 1209

Passcode: 957399

One tap mobile

+16699006833,,6518051209# US (San Jose)

+13462487799,,6518051209# US (Houston)

Dial by your location

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 929 436 2866 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 651 805 1209

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/kzKPqADhp>

Thank you all for your service!

Susan G.
CLC Chair

Conference Service Committee (CSC)

Mission Statement:

The Conference Service Committee (CSC) is responsible for educating and increasing members' commitment to service.

Announcement:

CSC is seeking additional members. Any S.L.A.A. member may become a member of the CSC. Volunteers are essential to the continuation of our many active projects!

Meeting Info:

Monthly, second Friday, one hour Zoom meeting, 892 0060 0554, passcode: 121976
4:00 p.m. Eastern, 3:00 p.m. Central, 2:00 p.m. Mountain, 1:00 p.m. Pacific

Established/Active Projects:

Super Service Star: Motion on 2022 ABM agenda.

Committee Info ("Conference Committees; What they do and when they meet!"):

This project maintains the "PDF Schedule of Conference Committee Meeting Times" found at <https://www.slaafws.org/conference-committees/>

Creative Service Media:

Needs a project leader. Seeks to produce visual/multimedia content to educate and inspire service. Some content is available to help carry on this project.

S.L.A.A. Service Manual:

Seeks to produce a manual for providing information about service. A draft is pending.

Sticking to Service:

How to adhere to service goals in the face of opposition: Needs a project leader. Seeks to produce written content for describing common challenges faced in being of service and solutions for maintaining a commitment to be of service in light of challenges that arise. Concept has been discussed and background information for content was collected but not organized into written form before the departure of the former project lead.

Committee Meeting Consolidated Schedule (Google Calendar):

This project maintains the Google Calendar data about Conference Committee meetings. The data has been published as a *.ics file that is downloadable from <https://www.slaafws.org/conference-committees/>. This resource is also available via <https://bit.ly/SLAACConfCmteCal>

Conference Steps, Traditions, and Concepts Committee (CSTCC): Questions from the Fellowship

The CSTCC welcomes Questions from the Fellowship concerning the Twelve Steps, Twelve Traditions and Twelve Concepts. Our responses are individual, and neither binding nor authoritative. We do not speak for the whole of S.L.A.A.

Question from the Fellowship (Committee Reference #2022-1):

We started an S.L.A.A. virtual meeting in another part of the world – and it is the only one meeting in S.L.A.A. to that uses the language of that region. The group is fairly new (about eight months) and the maximum number of attendees is 15 on good days. A group conscience was taken (I wasn't there), and it was decided that only members who worked their Seventh Step are entitled to vote.

This means that the group decisions will be made by two or three (who worked their Seventh step). I feel this is in violation of the Twelve Traditions. I would very much appreciate your feedback on this.

Response #1:

Was this vote to restrict the vote to the people who have worked their Seventh Step a vote of all the members of the meeting present or only members who had worked their Seventh Step? (If only the 2-3 who have worked their Seventh Step, I have concerns that it was not a group conscience).

What is the logic of the Seventh Step? Why not the Third or the Ninth, or a six months of sobriety requirement? (The Seventh Step: "Humbly asked God to remove our shortcomings." doesn't seem magical).

I have seen some groups restrict the vote to people who regularly attend the meeting, to stop someone from recruiting "ringers" support of a particular motion they favor.

The thing is the Fourth Tradition says each group should be responsible to its group conscience. (In other words, each group is free to make its own mistakes).

If the majority of the group doesn't like the restrictions on the group conscience, they are free to start a new group and the original group would only have the few members who support the Seventh Tradition rule.

Remember the Traditions are only guidelines, they are not rules, so I wouldn't call what this meeting has done a "violation," but I do think that restricting the definition of the

voting members of the group for a group conscience is inconsistent with the spirit of the Traditions.

When I was first asked to be a delegate to the ABM and chaired a conference service committee, I was still working my Fourth Step. So while I was trusted by my intergroup and members of the ABM to vote on items affecting the fellowship as a whole, I would not have been allowed to partake in a group conscience vote at the meeting you asked about.

Response #2:

I agree, voting shouldn't be limited to members who worked certain steps, unless there is an election of service positions that requires working up to Step Seven in this case, and the requirements are in the meeting format. It is a violation of Traditions.

Response #3:

Tradition Four guides us to acknowledge that each group is autonomous. That means that a group has the right to be wrong, to make mistakes, to do things that are irrational. A group can do things that are contrary to the spirit of our Steps, Traditions, and Concepts.

We do not govern. Personally, I find a rule to limit voting to be unprincipled, but the group can do as they wish.

I highly encourage a study of the Twelve Concepts. Concept Twelve in part says that we "will always remain democratic in thought and action." In my opinion limiting voting based on recovery progress (or anything else for that matter) is undemocratic.

Response #4:

Tradition Four states that each group is autonomous unless it would affect another group or S.L.A.A. as a whole. Since this decision would not seem to affect any other groups, it is in keeping with this Tradition to make that decision.

However, Tradition Two indicates that our that our leaders are but trusted servants, and should not govern. By limiting decision making to only certain members who have worked through Step Seven, it would seem that those few members would be governing the ones who had not worked them yet. That would appear to be in conflict with this Tradition.

Concept Twelve provides sound guidance as well. Warranty C specifies that no member be placed in unqualified authority over others. Warranty D indicates that important decisions be made, whenever possible, by substantial unanimity. And, Warranty F states that we should remain democratic in thought and action. This decision to exclude certain members from having a vote does not seem to align with the Warranties.

Question from the Fellowship (Committee Reference #2022-2):

There are three questions that I would like input on:

1. Can the Twelve Traditions be abrogated by Intergroup via the bylaws?
2. Is specifying majority rule in a bylaw contrary to the Second Tradition?
3. My local S.L.A.A. Intergroup has taken the position that they will list groups that are not registered with Fellowship Wide Services. This includes meetings that are limited to people of a specific gender or race. That also includes my meeting that is just nervous about being listed on the F.W.S. website. Is this okay?

It will be interesting to me to hear different interpretations of the Traditions.

Response #1:

My responses to the three questions are:

1. Absolutely not. The Traditions cannot be abrogated. They may not be abolished, annulled, or treated as nonexistent. They are always a part of our program.

The Traditions are guidelines. In *The Framework for Living* they are called "points of light that guide us out of the darkness." But they are not laws, or rules, or commandments. They are guidelines.

Bylaws are laws. They are used to govern. Our intergroups — all of our service organizations — exist to serve the fellowship, not govern the fellowship.

The Concepts may be more relevant to this discussion. Concept Seven in particular addresses bylaws which are "empowering the trustees [or by extension, intergroups] to **manage and conduct** world service affairs." And, "also relies on tradition." The Traditions are spiritual in nature. They always supersede man made laws. However, we live in a practical world and must use the tools (including bylaws) we have to navigate through that world.

2. Not at all. However, we are guided both in the Traditions and in the Concepts to strive for substantial unanimity. Each group must decide for itself how best to do that.
3. Absolutely OK. Maintaining a complete meeting list at the intergroup level is excellent service to the addict who needs to find a meeting. Registration with F.W.S. is not what determines membership in our fellowship (see Tradition Three.) Note, however, that the F.W.S. website's meeting list links to each intergroup's website. So, if the intent is to not be visible on slaafws.org, that will not be possible.

I highly suggest reading a draft copy of *A Framework for Living* which will be available to your intergroup's ABM delegate shortly. It includes essays on the Concepts and the Traditions that are worth studying.

Response #2:

Very interesting Questions, responses as follows:

- 1) Remember the Traditions are only guidelines, they are not rules any intergroup or group may choose by group conscience to follow or not follow the Traditions. I would suspect that an intergroup that differs widely from the traditions would not be successful in the long run.
- 2) I believe that each group or intergroup may interpret "group conscience" in their own way. For some it may be 50% +1, for others they may strive for substantial unanimity (however you might define it). If any member of the group feels that substantial unanimity has not been met they should be able to call for a group conscience vote. At the ABM unless there is a unanimous vote, there is the opportunity for the minority opinion to advocate for their position and have a second vote.
- 3) If they call themselves and S.L.A.A. group and have no other affiliation, they are an S.L.A.A. group as defined in Tradition Two (*Any two or more persons gathered together for mutual aid in recovering from sex and love addiction may call themselves an S.L.A.A. group, provided that as a group they have no other affiliation.*) It doesn't matter if they have chosen to register with F.W.S. or be listed on the F.W.S. website. Your intergroup is free to decide if they want to list them on the website.

I worry that meetings that are restrictive by gender or race are violating the spirit of the Fifth Tradition (*to carry its message to the sex and love addict who still suffers*) if an addict needing support shows up at one of these meetings will they the meeting offer the support they need?

If the meeting has multiple affiliations (i.e., double winners A.A. and S.L.A.A.) then it is up to the intergroup to decide how to list them, but my opinion is that they should be clearly labeled showing the multiple affiliations.

Response #3:

Abrogate" in the Merriam Webster's definition means to treat as non-existent, to fail to do what is required by (something, such as responsibility).

Traditions cannot be treated as non-existent and bylaws cannot ignore or override traditions.

Traditions are guarding our safety, anonymity, singleness of purpose, and above all, "there is but one ultimate authority - a loving God as is expressed in our group conscience".

Bylaws are good to have, but they must respect all Twelve Traditions.

Response #4:

My personal responses to the three questions:

- 1) An intergroup using bylaws to abrogate Traditions would seem to be in conflict with Tradition Four. Tradition Four allows groups to be autonomous, unless the decision could affect other groups or S.L.A.A. as a whole. This decision would potentially affect many groups (at least all in the Intergroup area), and depending upon area size, could affect S.L.A.A. as a whole. The ramifications of overriding the Traditions could be far reaching and consequential.
- 2) There is nothing in Tradition Two that directly, or indirectly, dictates how to conduct a group conscience. In my program experience, use of majority rule is quite common. I do not see any potential conflict with Tradition Two or any other Traditions.
- 3) Neither the Traditions or Concepts have any requirement or suggestion concerning specific meeting listings with F.W.S. Tradition Four allows each group, including Intergroups, to be autonomous unless it would affect other groups or S.L.A.A. as a whole. This decision would not seem to have a negative impact on any group. In fact, it seems like it would positively impact them by helping more people find the meetings. There would also seem to be no impact on S.L.A.A. as a whole, so it appears to be in keeping with the Tradition.