

PREFACE TO BEGINNING HISTORY OF C.N.I.A.

The following is a recall of the beginnings of the Service Structure, and the individuals and events which were a part of that historical origin. This was written at the request of a member of the Committee approximately two years ago, and is not a volunteered action. It has been submitted as such, and is in the files of the Committee since that time.

Recognize that the following comments, as related, do not necessarily follow in chronological order, although an attempt will be made to keep them in sequence. However, the facts and comments are made by the writer as a result of "being present" at the time of such events, problems, etc. when and where they happened. Accept the fact that these events can be enlarged upon, if requested, but the writer will include only those remarks that would seem to be of interest to that small portion of the Service Membership, as they related to our Service picture as of this date.

Necessarily, the writer reserves the prerogative of verification of all statements and comments, as submitted, and also to have the opportunity to review any and all "other" recounts of "The Beginnings of Service", which might be submitted by any other source. Realistically, only comments are put down in this history that are the subject of total recall, and if there are omissions, it is only because of time and length factors involved. Inasmuch as the writer participated in all of these events, we feel they are valid, and not hear-say. Naturally, personal observations, as such, are intermingled with the factual historical events, and can be explained, enlarged upon, and clarified on request.

It should be clarified that full names are used in this narrative, as it is assumed that this will be used by, and is of interest to, only members of AA, and is not to be used for public presentation, or release. *{Note that in this specific transcription, copied from the original typed document, last names have been omitted, seeing as it will be posted on our area's website.}*

Please note that this "history" of the Interior Panel covers the history only through the year 1968. We feel that there are others who will be able to continue from that point forward, but if information is needed after that date, the writer will be happy to contribute, on contact.

Maybe the motivation for this piece is in keeping with a statement made by Carl Sandburg-----
"Any society, civilization, or fellowship that forgets where it came from is doomed to failure!"

The "first" Service Meeting, (Not called Assemblies at that time) was held in conjunction with the NCC, at which time the Coastal Panel elected their first Delegate, Nick N. He was a member of AA Service Panel "1". (At that time, we were assigned to be a member of Panel "2", and, as such, we were not entitled to elect a Delegate in 1951) Contrary to current rumors, Nick was

not our Delegate at that time. Very simply, we operated without a Delegate in the Interior Panel for that first year. For clarification, Northern California had four (4) conferences at that time rather than the current three (3).

It had been pre-determined by the Conference Planning Committee in New York that our state of California was entitled to four (4), Delegates to the Conferences. Two of them would be elected in 1951, and then other two in 1952. This provided the experience rotation that was felt required at that time. It was then decided that the first two Delegates would be elected from the Los Angeles area, and the second from the Coastal area of Northern California. We were fortunate to have been allotted four state Delegates, as most states had only the one. This selection of the allotted Delegates, per state, was based mainly on the AA population and the geographical proximity of the groups within that state. It was not until the late fifties that California was allotted an additional Delegate. The border line originally, for the Northern California Panels was from the Oregon Border down to a line running through Visalia and Coalinga. The division of the Coastal and Interior Panels was determined by the active Service members in both areas. Initially, there was a lengthy discussion involving the N. California dividing line to make it a North and South Panel set-up. Due to the geographical structure of Northern California, and the location of groups in this area, it was finally decided that the most effective division to meet the needs of Service Committees on a more convenient status was to make the dividing line to include the Coastal Groups as against the interior AA population. At that same time, it was accepted that the Coastal Panel would elect the first Delegate because of the size of the AA population in their groups. Remember, also, that the areas at that time were called Panels, both as geographical areas and the sequence of participating in the Conference back in New York.

Needless to say, our Interior Panel was as interested in the election of Nick N. as we also became interested in our anticipated election the next year. All of our Service people were present at that election meeting held at the NCC get together, and watched how it functioned, and naturally learned from any mistakes that they made, --at least in our opinion based on our intelligence and expertise.(?????) And, then when we held our own election the following year, we made the same errors and added quite a few of our own. (Of course, with their expertise as validated by their long time experience (one year), it was then their turn to take our inventory. In spite of this difference of opinions, of which there were many, the two Panels began to cooperate from the beginning and have held to that spirit ever since. (Remember, the principle of having a balance of "experienced" (?) Delegates and "new" Delegates was carried over to the election of Regional Trustees in 1963. As of 1985, that principle was disbanded, somewhat, when it was decided that the Regional Trustees could be elected at any time, when it was necessary due to death, resignation, or appropriate replacement. And, the new election

was for the full four year term, which has, realistically, diluted the balance of experience and newly elected Trustees.)

When Nick returned from the first Service Conference in New York, and gave his first Conference Report, in Oakland at the June NCC, all of our Interior Panel people were in attendance. The Report was given at an afternoon session, and the auditorium was well filled. This was all very new to everyone. As a result, there almost as many "non-Service minded" members in attendance as there were active participants. His Report was very well done, and interesting to all. Basically, Nicks Report was keyed to his feelings that that first Service Conference was mainly keyed to the overall feeling of "Unity and Effective Participation from the Grass Roots". In Nicks words, it was more of an Introductory Session because there was no precedent for the conduct of the Conference. However, there were many discussions re Literature needs, Financial Support, Delegate expenses, etc. All of the subjects were down to earth and basic, because the sessions were longer, and there was more floor participation. Remember, there were not the Presentations and Workshops that are the norm today. As Nick said, time was not important, as such, and each of the discussion sessions could run as long as two or three hours if input from the Delegates was forthcoming. Most of these sessions were chaired by Hank G., who was the part-time office Manager at that time. No further comment on the subjects discussed at this time, other than to say that this writer was not all that sure what it was all about. This feeling was then allayed somewhat when it was evident that no-one else was all that well informed either, including Nick.

Then, in that same year, in the fall of 1951, we had our opportunity to be the focus of attention at the NCC Election meeting. This Conference was held in Sacramento, in Governors Hall at the old Fairground at the corner of Stockton and Broadway. This session was also well attended, and there were almost as many AA members, AND Alanons at that Saturday afternoon Election Session, as there were at the evening meeting the same night when Father P. {Or, as we know him today, Father Doe), and Marian S. from the New York Staff spoke.

Remember, at the time of these elections, there were no real guidelines, --only suggestions. The writer had the chance to read them when they came to us from New York, and they were so general and wide-open that each and every Panel had to resort to their own imagination and ingenuity. Fortunately our Panel was blessed with some very capable members, and we had the one year experience of the Coastal Panel to rely on. We had tentatively divided the Interior Panel into "Four" Districts. The boundary lines were not specifically drawn at that time, but basically, we were divided into four Districts. The four Districts were keyed on the four cities who had the most active Service members, as well location. We basically were set up as the Fresno, Stockton, Sacramento, and Chico. The writer felt then, and believes now, also, that these were the focal points for the four Districts because of the "Founding Fathers" who were active and representative of that particular area. For instance, Doc B. and Jess F. of Fresno,

Wayne P., Bob T., and Gordon (?) from Stockton, Clem W. from Chico, and Vic M. and Muriel P. from Sacramento.

We had no "Committee" at that time, but it was decided that each Group in our Panel was entitled to submit a Nominee for Delegate, if they chose to do so. However, this was not so much of a problem as it might seem to be, because each District normally submitted only one name, and it followed that one person, or two, would stand out in any of the Districts, so that a flood of names were not presented at the time. The election meeting was chaired by an attorney from Roseville, Floyd B. The suggestion of requiring a 2/3 vote to elect a Delegate was followed, as it is today. However, directions for conduct of the election if one of the candidates did not receive the required votes on the first ballot was left to the discretion of the local members. Floyd was assisted by the able abilities of Vic M. and Muriel P. from Sacramento. We should note at this time, that a small pamphlet was sent to each Panel, consisting of three pages, only, giving the local members ample opportunity to handle the election at their own discretion. Compare those directions to the very complicated instructions for conducting our elections today. The writer feels that there are active members in our Panel, or Area, today who could accomplish the same satisfactory results with no more than three pages of directions, and might have to use their own knowledge. In other, words, it is still up to the Areas to formulate their own procedures as they see fit.

When the blackboard was set up in the Hall, a vote was taken, for the names submitted by each District. All "Group Service Representatives" were entitled to one vote each. (That is what GSR's were called at that time, and the change to General Service Representatives did not evolve until some time later.) Six "ballots" were taken, all-together. From the first ballot it was evident that there was to be a "dead-lock" between the two top Nominees. In the initial voting, up to the fourth round of voting, a third name was a small factor in the overall count. However, after the fourth ballot that third person dropped out of the voting choice, but it still left the total vote divided between the two top candidates. Neither had the specified two-thirds vote to be elected. At that time, Vic M., with the concurrence of Muriel P., stopped the voting, came to the microphone and made a motion. The motion was very simply that a dead-lock was very evident, and that a motion be put on the floor to the effect that the "third nominee" in the voting sequence, who had dropped out after the fourth ballot, be voted as the new Delegate. The motion was carried, and, as a formality, another written ballot was taken and the vote was "unanimous" for Floyd B., from Roseville, as our first New York Delegate. He proved to be an extremely top-notch Delegate for our Panel, and was well respected at the Yearly Conference in 1952 and 1953.

Vic M. and Muriel P. continued to be active in Service, and gave their complete support to Floyd, as Delegate. At that time, our Service activity began to blossom all over the Panel. Just a word about the two "top" nominees who were locked up in the voting procedure. Vic M. was a

long time member of Group #1, located at 3146 - N St., known as the Business Men's meeting, or Group. He was very active in Sacramento AA History then, and in the future. Muriel P. was just as active as Vic, but was one of the Co-Founders of Group Three, or 20th and L, as it was known as in those days. Unfortunately, Muriel passed away within the next year, and our Service activity lost a valuable asset.

Floyds yearly reports were magnificent, to the point, and left out the pleasure comments that somehow infiltrated reports in later years. Needless to say, the halls were filled for the Annual Reports, both by Service people and general members of the conference, also including Alanons. It was necessary, although they did not know it at the time, for the Alanons were to have their own yearly Conference in years to come, and took our experience to work with when they become a Service entity in themselves and had to elect a Delegate, and make reports. In the main, the "Main" Conference Reports were given at the June NCC, and it was the obligation of all of the Service people to be in attendance at that meeting in order to hear what the Delegates had to say in order to carry that information back to their groups and districts. Naturally, no expenses were paid to anyone for attendance at the NCC. The reports were given simultaneously by both the Coastal and Interior Delegates. Each Delegate took a different facet of the Conference action, and then a Question and Answer period followed. For many years after that time, all Delegates basically gave only three or four Reports through-out the year, and it was the responsibility of the Committeemen and GSR's to attend the Report Meeting, as it would be the only chance they would have to attain the information to carry back to their groups. It was felt, through-out those years that if the Delegate went "everplace", when asked, that it deprived the Committeeman and the GSR's of their responsibility to carry the message to their Districts and Groups. These three or four Delegate Reports were usually given at a central city, or town, in the Panel within each District. Being that for years it was necessary to operate on a very lean budget (practically nothing), none of the expenses for the Delegate visits were taken care of by the Panel. Normally, the gas and the room for the Delegate were taken care of by the local groups wherever the Report was to be given. None of the expenses of the Committee were ever covered at any time. Somehow, the attendance of the Committeemen and the GSR's was exceptionally good.

Remember again, that all of the work in the beginning was carried on without the convenience of ready money, and we asked each Group to contribute what they could to provide the Delegate and Committee with bare essential mailing needs, such as postage, etc. Our money depended essentially on the collections at the NCC Service meetings, and monies collected at the report meetings, and other special Service meetings. Not too much to work with--but the work got done, never-the-less. We did have some Groups who contributed to the Service Fund, as it was called then, so we had enough to meet expenses, when we knew that it was our obligation to pay the first one hundred dollars of the Delegates expenses to the yearly N.Y.

Conference. The remainder of the Delegates expenses, including meals and plane fare, etc., was to be reimbursed by New York upon arrival. Anything other than plane fare had to be born by the area. The Conference paid only for the plane expenses, over and above our \$100. Naturally, the rooms were paid for by New York, and the meals were furnished. As far as any extra expenses were concerned, it was up to the Delegate to assume that part. (This factor started the rumor, which could have had some merit and truth, in some cases that only those AA members who were financially well-off could afford to be considered for Delegate. However, that concept was nullified in the middle fifties when a Delegate was elected who did not even have a suit to wear to New York. In fact, his Group took up a collection to buy him a suit for the trip.)

As mentioned previously, all elections were held at the NCC at the fall meeting. It was a joint endeavor, as it is today, but they were joined in that activity by most of those in attendance at the NCC. One more comment regarding finances. At one of the NCC meetings, it was self-evident that the Interior Panel was broke, for all intent and purposes. However, the Coastal Panel happened to have "some" money at that time, and they voted to "donate" \$250.00 to our Panel. We operated for almost a year on that amount. Incidentally, we have never re-paid that donation, AND they have never sent us a "dun" for it, either. Paul G. was the Delegate at the time for the Coastal Panel, and the writer was the Interior Delegate. We all were very thankful for that life-saver.

Most of the early Reports centered around needed Literature and financially supporting the New York Office -- not yet called GSO. There was concern at that time that we were accumulating too much Literature output, but at the same time felt concern about needs in additional areas that it was felt were lacking in written explanations. There was a great deal of concern at that time over the possibility of too much literature being published, evolving in repetition of material, needlessly. In addition, there was a great deal of discussion of the need for pamphlets, etc., for "special" groups, or for a particular type of AA member. It was viewed as an alarming "trend", and it evoked a lively discussion at all Service meetings. (Think about that today!)

Although there were a variety of subjects discussed each year in the 50's, probably the most important topic was "Support of the New York Office." We have to remember that the financial picture in N.Y. at that time, and for many years, was "slim and close to none." With the expense of the Conference and the need to carry out the mandates of the Delegates, more money was needed to fulfill the "need". It seemed that the general reaction at that time, from the Trustees and the Office personnel was, "Ok, if you want us to do this for you, YOU are going to have to furnish the money to do it, because we are not in a financial position to take care of it." So, it was up to us out at the grass roots to provide the wherewithal to carry out our requests. So, the question was very simply, "How do we support out our N.Y. Office, and still have money to

carry out the needs of the local Service area?" Many times, in our recollection, it was necessary to have an extra collection at local Service get-togethers, just to pay for the mailing and printing of a newsletter.

At one of the early conferences, it was suggested and voted on, that each Group should count the number of members in their "Group", and send in a dollar a year for every member listed for the group. There was no question about how the "meetings" were to be handled as far as donations, inasmuch as it was not a problem--EVERYONE belonged to a specific group. Just going to meetings was almost unheard of. In fact, if you did not belong to a specific Group, you had no vote or say in what was going on in the area, AND you were bluntly asked "What Group do you belong to?" when you had a complaint or suggestion. A variety of schemes and proposals were suggested each year at the Conferences for obtaining operating expenses. It was then recognized, AT THAT TIME, that it was not only our way of controlling what New York did, or did not, do, but it was up to us to support what we asked them to do. At that time, all publishing of literature was handled by AA Publishing Co., and they were operating on a shoe string budget, and did not produce if we did not furnish the money. Very little profit came from the literature sales, it is certain. We normally donated once a year, and it was suggested, and abided by, that all groups send in their "donations" between Thanksgiving and the first of the year, so that New York could plan their budget for the next year. Some groups did not send in their contribution until January, and it made it difficult to propose a budget for operation that year.

Most of the subjects under discussion during those early years were about the same as they are today, only much more "basic". Much of the time was devoted to discussion, understanding, and deviation from, the Traditions. We have to remember that they were only a few years old at that time, and a meeting could get very lively, simply because they were basic topics of our activities, and had not gotten watered down, and interpreted at that time.

Then, in 1953, Vic M. was elected as our Interior Delegate for the years of 1954 and 1955. Vic was a top motivating force in Sacramento AA, as well as the prime mover of the Service Structure for the Interior Panel. Some will remember Vic as the founder of the very successful Town and Country Group in Carmichael, which has since disbanded. He was also one of the most productive Delegates in the history of Interior Service representatives. To give an idea of how strapped we were for finances, .remember that there was no report sent to us from New York at the end of the Conference. So, Vic took it upon himself to compile and print a Conference Report for us all, at his own expense. The Panel did pay the postage, but all other expense was paid for by Vic in his attempt to have everyone informed. That first Report was four (4) pages long, on one side only, but it was informative, interesting, and motivating. It was the beginning of what we know today as the Area Accents.

It is too bad that so few know of Vic M.'s contribution to the start of our Service activities. He was not only a force in the Interior Panel, but, also had great impact on AA, world-wide in the fifties. This writer had the privilege of working closely with Vic at that time, and I soon found out the value and necessity of a willing Service Sponsor. He was that to many people. Vic was vitally aware of the need for support of the New York office, and it concerned him more than any other facet of our involvement. Then, one day Vic hit upon what he thought was a possible plan to raise more money for extra contributions. He felt that we could tie in his idea with Tradition Month, as proclaimed by Bill W. at that time. (We have all heard the misconceptions re Gratitude Month, or Tradition Week. These are very definitely incorrect. The proper designation is Tradition Month, and Gratitude Week.) At any rate, Vic felt that it would be a valid proposition for each area, regardless of size, whether it be metropolitan city, small town, or a combined area of any size to hold a function of any type, whether it be large speakers meeting, banquet, social event of any type, or simply a Gratitude meeting, and then to donate the proceeds from that event to New York. This took off immediately in our Interior Panel, and "events" were held through-out this Panel during the week of Thanksgiving, all called Gratitude Events. Vic then presented it as a proposal to the next Service Conference, and it was unanimously accepted as an official AA function. From that time on, all over the world, the week of Thanksgiving has been designated as Gratitude Week. To this day, all over the AA World, these functions have become a yearly occasion at that time. Unfortunately, this "Tradition" has more or less been passed by in the Interior Panel, but has flourished in most areas of AA. (The next time you see Gratitude Week mentioned, or hear of a Gratitude Week function, take pride in the fact that it originated right here in Sacramento, and in the Interior Panel of N. California.) We have many firsts in AA's history which originated in our Panel, and should be proud of this area's contributions to the growth of AA, and also the development of Service activities through-out the years since 1951. And, so this "Tradition" took off and is a part of most areas "special events" during a given year.

At that same time, we had an AA visitor from the mid-west, a former Delegate, who also had an idea for extra financial support in Service. His name was Ab A., and he spoke to us at a NCC in San Jose in 1955. He was the originator of the "Birthday Plan", as we knew it then. (With the input of the 60-30-10 Contribution Plan, this has fallen by the wayside, but was a very important step for many years all over AA's world). Basically, the Plan was that each member, on his or her AA Birthday, would donate a Dollar for Each Year of Sobriety, -- (up to a limit of ten dollars per year.)

At this same time, a further yard-stick for suggested Group Contributions was initiated by the writer, in the Interior Panel, and it took off with a great amount of success with Groups in most all AA areas. Very simply, it was a slogan to remember, and could be understood and applied by all members whether they were in Service, or not. That Slogan was simply, "A Penny a Day for

the Heart of AA". Based on a penny a day for each day of yearly sobriety it was acceptable, and many members did not balk at the \$3.65 per year. The groups then accumulated this money until the end of the year in a special fund, and forwarded that money to New York before the first of the year, as requested.

(One participation event by an Interior Panel Delegate was the fact that Vic M. was one of the Delegates seated on the stage at Kiev Auditorium in St. Louis when Bill W. presented us with all Three Legacies. The writer was present at this conference and can affirm that it was a historic moment for Vic, and all of those who he represented.)

Doc B., one of the beloved members and founders of AA in Fresno followed Vic as the third Delegate and represented us well at all levels.

By this time, we began to call Service Work by the name of General Service, in order to separate it from the every day "Service Work", who were carrying the daily work of AA at every group level. It was felt that the designation would clarify the work of the GSR's, Committeeman, Officers, and Delegate who actually are the communication links between the local everyday Service members and our New York Office, both ways. So we started to clarify this group difference by calling them "people in General Service".

Following Doc B., our next Delegate was Jim M., from Grp #3, at that time. He is still active in AA in this area. As mentioned before, his stint as Delegate disproved the concept that only the financially well-to-do would be able to run for, and be elected, as our Delegate. He did not have a suit to wear to the Conference, so Grp #3-Thursday Night Group members took up a collection and gave it to him so he could buy a suit to wear back to New York. Incidentally, Jim is the only living ex-Delegate in the first ten years of Conferences, coming from this Panel. Jim also went on to become the "first" Regional Trustee in AA. During Jim's term as Delegate, he served as Chairman of the Admissions Committee of the Conference which dealt with requests for additional Delegates from the various Panels. The formula as set up at that time, was one of the most lasting of all of the Conference actions, standing up until well into the late 70's, with no revisions.

The Interior Delegate for the next two years, was one of the older members from Modesto, Duane R. And again represented us well. As you can see, the Service participation was being spread around to other areas than Sacramento, and the activity in the Modesto area grew by leaps and bounds during Duane's tenure.

We had a sad situation for all of us after electing our next Delegate, Ray B. Ray had come to Sacramento from Medford, Oregon, in 1952, and became an active member in both general AA activities in this area, but also in Service obligations. Some of the old timers might remember, also, that Ray was the first Central Office Secretary when it opened. Unfortunately, Ray passed

away prior to the April Conference and was unable to go. He would have made one of our finest Delegates had he been able to participate. Bertha W., from Coalinga, who was the Alternate Delegate for Ray, then took over as our Delegate for the years 1960 and 1961. Many members will remember that her husband was Jack W., who worked very closely with her, and was a real addition to an active two-some.

At the end of that term, our Panel became unique in a special way, when Cliff J. was elected as the Delegate for 62 and 63. It would seem that it is important to remember that we, in OUR Panel, had the only situation in AA, up till that time, and since, where-in "Three" Delegates had been elected from ONE Group. All within Group Three of Sacramento. Maybe this is not important, in the long run, other than to say that it is another thing that makes us different and unique, as a Panel. It is in the same sense that we also had in our area, the man who helped get AA started in British Columbia, and western Canada. His name was Roland M., and he is the one they are referring to in the history of AA when they talk about the man involved in "The Canadian Experience". And he was an active Service person from the time of our first Delegate election, and lived in Fair Oaks.

By this time, the Service interest and action had spread to other areas besides Sacramento, as is evident, and it now centered in Redding, with the election of Ricky S. who was the original motivator of Service in that area. Ricky was a factor in many decisions made back in New York, and gave us some very serious and interesting recounts of the conference actions during his tenure of office as Delegate. He was followed by Ken K., from Roseville, who likewise served us well.

This brings us up to the year 1968, and we will stop the input at this stage and let others take over. We still have members around who were sober and active at that time, and we will let them continue. However, if the writer can be of any help to anyone after the year 1968, we are available. All of the aforementioned Delegates and active General Service people from those early days, as covered, have since passed on, with the exception of Cliff J. and Jim M.

In 1963, our Panel had another event which is unique to our Panel, or Area, as we call them now. Up until that time, 1963, the Foundation, or what was changed to the Board of Trustees, was composed of a non-alcoholics and alcoholics. However, there was always more "nons" than "alkies" on the Board, and there was a good reason for that ratio, stemming from the early days of the Foundation. At the same time (in about 1962) they felt that there should be a few more alcoholics on the Board, in order to get a better overall conscience of AA all over the U.S. and Canada. However, it was decided that the ratio of more non-alcoholics should remain intact. Up until this period most of the alcoholics who were on the Board came from around the New York area. Finally, in the middle fifties, it was decided that at least two of the Alcoholic Trustees should come from outside that area, and one from all of Canada. As a result, two Trustees were

selected from areas with the largest AA population and geographical area. The last of these 3 Trustees was Dave B., from Canada, Tom S. from Florida, and a member from the New York area. Prior to that time, the two from the U.S. were Cliff W. from Whittier, CA, and Icky S., Texas.

However, it was decided at that time to divide the AA area of the U.S. into Regions, so that a balance of experience and input would be available. Being that they still wanted to have the balance of experience, and newcomers to the Board, they scheduled the elections so that some Regions did not even hold a Trustee election for several years, and again, those Regions that were largest, etc. in AA population were allowed to submit a Candidate for a Trustee on the Board. Fortunately, the Pacific Region was one of the first three who were chosen. Actually, the Pacific Region and the Mid-Central Region (including Ohio, Illinois, etc.) were the only TWO Regions who were to elect a "full four year" Trustee at that time. The South Central Region elected a Trustee for only Two years, so that a balance could be attained over the years. And this is where the Pacific Region, and more interestingly, the Northern Interior Panel was fortunate again to be a part of the total picture.

What happened was that the very FIRST REGIONAL TRUSTEE ELECTED came from the CNIA. Not just from the Pacific Region, but from AA as a whole. At the election in April of 1963, the elections were held in New York at the Conference. The first election was for the Pacific Region Trustee, and as a result, Jim M., from Carmichael, was elected on the third ballot by more than the two-thirds vote required, thereby becoming the very first Regional elected in AA. And, he was from the N. California Interior Area. Again, a first for our Area. At that same time Howard B., from Cleveland, and Roy S., from Oklahoma City, were selected for the Board from their Regions, but neither of them were elected by a two-thirds vote of the Conference. They both had their names drawn from the hat, per Third Legacy procedures. (Incidentally, Howard passed away shortly after being selected as Trustee, and was eventually replaced by Bruce M. from the Akron area).

So again, the Interior Area was a part of the history of AA with Jim M. serving on the Board of Trustees from 1963 - 1967. He was the Chairman of the Policy Committee for two years, and served on the Literature Committee for the full four years. Incidentally, he was involved in many of the Literature pieces we have today. Our Area was also represented at the Toronto World Convention in 1965. At the big Meeting in the Maple Leaf Gardens, Jim was on the program along with Bill and Lois W., and Marty M. In fact, if we open the front and back cover of "Dr. Bob and the Good Old-Timers", you will see the picture of the Convention, and the person standing at the microphone is Jim M., from CNIA. So it is evident that our Area has been a part of AA's events right from the very beginning.

Again, with Jim's election as Trustee, we acquired another unique status, as we are the only Area that includes a Group from which a total of 3 Delegates, plus a Trustee, has emerged. No other area can make this claim.

In conclusion, we would like to mention a few facts about the Panel, or Area, of the Interior California structure. First of all, that the level of activity has constantly shifted from one area to the other. At the start of Service, it was centered around the Sacramento area, but it was not too long before it shifted to Fresno, on to Stockton and Modesto, and on up to Redding, and it is well to remember that each area of the interior has had its ups and downs in activity and interest as the years went by. The writer hesitates to even begin to mention "names" in this area between 1951 and 1968, but will chance it, in hopes that some of the names will ring a bell for some members, even though they might not have been present during these years. Forgive us if we omit some very important names, but it is purely unintentional, we can assure you.

However, these names are those to whom all of us today owe a great deal because if it had not been for them, we would not have gotten off the ground. We recall from the "Fresno Area"-- Doc B., Jess F., Bertha and Jack W. of Coalinga, from "Modesto", Duane R., Pauline H., from the "Stockton Area"--Wayne P., Bob T., Bill S., Paul and Lillian G. from the Sacramento area -- Vic M., Muriel P., Charlie H., Hal G., Roland M., Warren I., Jim M., Ray B., Cliff J., Floyd B., and Bill M., and from "Chico" -- Clem W. and Jim and Irma C., and lastly from "Redding"--Rickey S. (There are many more, but the name memory fades as the years pass by. However, they were all a part of the early history of Service.)

If a current GSR, Committeeman, or Delegate can benefit from the many experiences, trials, and difficulties that we all encountered in those first 10 or 15 years, this writing will have been worth the while it took to put it all on paper. The writer has been asked so many times, why this has not been documented on paper, that it was felt it should be done. This writer had submitted a similar document about two years ago, but nothing has ever evolved from it. However, we felt that due to the number of AA Service people who seemed to want to read a recount of those early days, and to correct some of the misinformed rumors about the activities of that period, it should be worth putting on paper, for what it might accomplish.

THIS PANEL, OR AREA, HAS MUCH TO BE PROUD OF IN THE AREA OF INVOLVEMENT AND ACTIVITIES SINCE 1951, AND OUR AREA SHOULD BE PROUD OF OUR RECORD.

Completed on Feb. 1, 1986