

**Proposal 2022 – 8** Submitted by: WEB0524, WEB0642, WEB0541, WEB0554 and GBR0017

Issue: That all “only” meetings catering for underrepresented or disadvantaged groups (i.e., LGBTQ+, PoC) as well as single sex spaces (women only, men only) be listed on the WSO meetings web site. In line with Tradition 4, we request that the autonomy of such “only” meetings in determining how they wish to be listed be respected. In keeping with Tradition 9, we also ask that the principle of non-organization in ACA be observed.

Presentation by Submitting Group - None

### Main Discussion Points

- Our group finds it important to have “only” meetings.
- I suggest calling these “special interest” meetings rather than “only” meetings. The purpose of these meetings is not exclusion.
- Other programs that I’m a part of allow for “only” meetings.
- ACA’s literature includes not just self love, but other show of love and the BRB conforms to hetero-normative.
- I disagree with the way this proposal is worded. We should continue to have special interest meetings. However, I believe this proposal violates Tradition 4 by interfering with autonomy of groups. A women groups that excludes transgender would be in violation of Tradition 5.
- My group is in favor, regarding whether other traumas are “outside issues” does ACA seek to resolve intergenerational trauma. I support only meetings that are for people who are not like me. My group supports the autonomy of “only” groups to determine what is right for them.
- Groups in my state want to support this proposal so they have this safe space.
- My intergroup supports this proposal, I personally agree that this could be a “special interest” meeting, rather than “only” meeting.
- I think there can be safe meetings without having to have a gate-keeper and exclude people.
- Having this will be a way for people to heal from social and racial trauma.
- Our group agrees there is an inclusiveness for everyone and a space is available without prejudice.
- The background on this motion is vital and why this came up in this first place.
- Having these safe spaces for newcomers is very important.
- Those in IT need to know what we can post in terms of meetings so it is not appropriate or wrong. Please keep this in mind.
- We guide those who do not identify with our group to those they can join.

- Having these meetings has provided me a safe space to heal from my trauma which I did not experience in working with someone who does not understand my background.
- I am concerned about changing to “special interest” groups instead of “only” since the term “only” protects this safe space.
- The proposal does not create something new. We already have “only” meetings. The only thing that is new is that each group can call themselves whatever they want and how it is listed on the website.
- I would like to be able to go to any meeting and so this is an issue for me.
- WSO in the last year did remove a listing for a meeting that was “heterosexual men” so there has been controversy that I wanted you to know about.
- In the background of the proposal we included that any listing can be made as long as it is not unlawful.
- We support this yet our concern is that restricting attendance to a special population seems to be a violation of the Traditions.
- This is against Tradition 3 and Tradition 5 - I think it would be terrible to turn someone away from a meeting.
- Having gone to only meetings it has opened my eyes to my healing related to racism. I don't think this would come up in a general meeting.

Motion Approved for Online Worldwide voting:

**Motion:** I move that "only" meetings for marginalized or oppressed communities (eg BIPOC, LGBTQ+, women), as well as men's groups, continue to be listed on the WSO website to provide safe spaces in service of carrying the message (Tradition 5); and that \*\*\*the fellowship maintain its Tradition 4 option to delist any "only" group that negatively affects ACA as a whole\*\*\*, for example by using offensive language or by alienating marginalized or oppressed adult children, which would violate Tradition 5.