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I. FAMILY HISTORY; CHILDHOOD AND EMIGRATION TO AMERICA; EDUCATION AND EARLY LAW CAREER

Family Emigration from Austria

Larsen: This is October 22nd. I am Bob Larsen. This is an interview with Eva Goodwin at her home in Berkeley. Tell me a little bit about your family background.

Goodwin: Okay. I was born in Vienna, Austria. We lived there until 1938, when Hitler came. Then, we were fortunate enough to leave very quickly and come directly to the US. We first lived in New York, but most of my grown-up years actually were spent in Atlanta, Georgia. One of the reasons we went to Atlanta is that my father didn’t want me to grow up in the Viennese Jewish ghetto in New York. He wanted me to become a real American.

Then, from Atlanta, I went to college at Oberlin College in Oberlin, Ohio. I got active in co-ops there, and then I went to law school at the University of Chicago and then came out West after law school. I think I’m an only child in a family that, as a result of Hitler, lost most of the people on both sides. There are a few people in my mother’s family left in Europe.

Larsen: What was the family occupation in Europe?

Goodwin: My father and my grandfather were both in business, but my father [was] actively involved with the Social Democratic Party in Vienna. So, the whole area of co-operatives and consumer education are somewhat familiar.

Larsen: [Unclear].

Goodwin: Familiar —familiar in terms of an activity.

Larsen: How old were you when you came to this country?

Goodwin: I was eight. So, I’ve lived most of my life in this country, and of course, at this point, I think I’ve been in Berkeley since 1955. So, I’ve spent most of my life in Berkeley.

Larsen: Was there any difficulty in getting out of Europe?

Goodwin: We were very fortunate because my father started very early. Also, my grandfather had just, not too long ago, sold the family business. It was an international silk yard goods business. All the money from that was
sitting in a bank account in Switzerland. So, when we left—we left in, I guess, September of ’38, just shortly before the Munich thing. At that time, the Nazis were beginning to clamp down.

See, their initial approach was: let’s get rid of as many people as we can. So we were fortunate to be part of that and to be able to do so. We also had relatives in this country who were able to sign affidavits for us. When we left, even when we left in September, the restriction was you could only take 25 Austrian shillings with you. As I say, we fortunately had some money sitting in Switzerland because [in] the international business that my grandfather had been in, everything always went through Switzerland. That was the only way you could do business.

**Early Years in America**

Larsen: How long did you stay in New York before you went to Atlanta?

Goodwin: We stayed in New York from about 1938 until the spring—I think it was the spring of 1941.

Larsen: Three years?

Goodwin: Yeah, three years. Of course, when we moved to Atlanta, in contrast to New York, there were very few European refugees. So, I got to be a great celebrity on that account, and it was really fun. We really got there because of my mother’s cooking skills. My mother, like many Viennese, [was] excellent at pastry and things like that. She’d had a catering business in New York, and Mr. Richard Rich, of Rich’s in Atlanta—Rich’s in Atlanta being like Marshall Field’s—Mr. Rich, who was originally from Czechoslovakia, ate some of her cheesecake at somebody’s party and said to her, “What will it cost us to bring you and your family to Atlanta so you can make these wonderful cheesecake[s], like my grandmother’s, and all these other wonderful things, for my restaurant and tea room?”

So, my father thought, the perfect opportunity to get out of New York! Of course, he’d checked out to see who Mr. Rich was, but that still didn’t tell us what figure to give him. We had many discussions about this. I was an only child, so I was always involved in everything. We came up with the marvelous sum of $100 a month, plus moving expenses. That was what my mother was paid when we moved to Atlanta.
Meanwhile, my father had gotten himself involved as a salesperson, travelling for a New York gourmet food company because he really couldn’t find anything in his original line of work, which was silk. There just wasn’t very much silk industry, or merchandising of silk, at that point. So, that’s what he did.

I’ve always appreciated growing up in Atlanta because I was a fringe person and had just a tremendous amount of freedom. [I was] very fortunate, I got to go to a wonderful public high school and had a wonderful teacher there who did everything she could to educate us. I think it wasn’t common, but she used to take us to Spelman and Morehouse, the black colleges, for art exhibits and concerts and things of that kind.

So we immediately got involved with the—I think the Friends Service Committee, for the Friends and the Unitarians. In the ’40s in Atlanta, there were not many organizations that could be or could even have integrated meetings. It was a real problem. Occasionally, the Friends used to meet at our house because there just weren’t any other places. I think the Unitarian Church, in people’s homes, or the black schools and churches were the only places you could do things like that.

**Early Social Activism**

Larsen: It sounds like your family was oriented to social work.

Goodwin: Well, certainly oriented to social and political events and causes. So, I grew up in that kind of a setting. I went off to college with a real intent of wanting to become an artist, but I think my family thought that was too impractical. Then, somewhere along the line in college, I got involved in the very early stages of the Civil Rights Movement.

It was, I think, either the summer of 1948 or 1949, when all the swimming pools in St. Louis had been closed because of a riot. I got to go on an interracial students and industry project that was sponsored by the predecessor of what later became SCLC [Southern Christian Leadership Conference]. I think CORE [Congress on Racial Equality] at that time was one or two years old, and we were demonstrating—trying out certain techniques in the basement cafeteria of Stix Baer & Fuller in St. Louis in the summer.

I guess, in that context, the arts didn’t look sufficiently interesting and exciting, so I was looking for other things, but I didn’t really think very
hard about law school. Then, I got a scholarship to the University of Chicago Law School, so I went there.

University of Chicago Law School in the early ’50s

Larsen: How did you get the scholarship?

Goodwin: I applied at Oberlin, and at that time, Robert Hutchins [then chancellor of the University of Chicago] was building up the [University of Chicago] Law School into a national organization. He allocated, I think, a certain number of scholarships every year to Oberlin, Swarthmore, all of the small colleges all over the country. It seemed like half of my class of ’60 in the Law School were on the scholarship, full tuition scholarship.

Certainly, the University of Chicago Law School, I think, was then in not as monstrously conservative a condition as it is right now. You know, I think Burke went there, but I think Scalia taught there. So did this other guy who’s on the circuit in Illinois, Posner. These are the people that make economic analyses of people’s rights. Cost-benefit analyses of a problem like whether a prisoner is entitled to his mail. In a way, that’s the result of economics taught both at the University and the Law School.

The Law School was, as law schools go, a good experience. [It was] very small. There were 60 people in my class—five women. Again, when I went there —and I was there from what, ’51 until ’54—the Law School then had on its faculty both a woman and a black. The black was Bob Ming of the NAACP, who was probably not as well known as [Thurgood] Marshall, but he was one of that group of people involved [with] a lot of the early school desegregation litigation. I think, actually, when I was in law school, he was trying a number of cases involved in the Cicero [race] riots [of 1951].

The Law School prided itself on being interdisciplinary. So you had courses in economics, and you had a lot of team-teaching going on—not of major first-year courses, but of a lot of the seminar courses. You would have courses team-taught by professors who had opposing points of view. I remember [I] had that wonderful course on the First Amendment where the one professor took a real absolute Alexander Meiklejohn view of the First Amendment. I think [Bob] Ming was the other person, and he had this very pragmatic view of the First
Amendment and how it worked. I think it was, as legal education goes, probably as tolerable an experience as any.

Starting a Legal Career

Larsen: What did you think that you would do with your law degree?

Goodwin: I really set out to be a labor lawyer, I think. That’s what I had had in mind when I went to law school. Of course, all the civil rights stuff also was going on.

Then, my first year out of law school, I worked in Salem, Oregon. I worked for the Legislative Council and got to draft a lot of legislation and learn about the legislative end of things. I learned a lot and enjoyed that, and I think got some differing views. Then, of course, when I came down here, getting employed wasn’t all that easy. I think I was probably looking [for work] just out of school maybe—I think Sandra Day O’Connor was a year ahead of me; I think she graduated from Stanford about a year before I had graduated from Chicago and came out.

Work at California Court of Appeal

Goodwin: So I, funnily, ended up in a very traditional, but interesting job, where I still am, working for the Court of Appeal, which is the intermediate appellate court where about 90 percent of all litigation stops. You get to do all kinds of civil and criminal cases. Whatever is happening, that’s what you get. If there are demonstrators in Berkeley, you get demonstrators. What I particularly like about it is that it’s intellectual and it’s exciting because you’re always on the edge, and at the same time, you can—it’s not like practice. I couldn’t work for a firm and have clients like Standard Oil. I just could not do as good a job in that setting as I can in this one, where I’m a public servant and have the public for a client.

I always get to work on tremendous numbers of interesting issues—whatever the hottest issue of the day is. At the moment, it’s child molestation victims as witnesses and those kinds of cases. There’s always a death penalty [case] intermittently because only when the state does not have a death penalty do those cases go through our court. Whenever we do have a death penalty, they go to the state supreme court.
Then, of course, happily in the recent years, I’ve gotten to see a lot of cases come up under the various consumer legislation that I got to work on. That’s been very interesting.

Larsen: These were issues that you were there [for] at the beginning?

Goodwin: Yeah, and I helped draft the thing and I knew what the legislation was about. Actually […] I was also fortunate that the judge who I was working for in this period, when I was very active in the Co-op, was somebody with four children. So, he had a good understanding of consumer issues and thought what I was doing was just great, as long as it didn’t interfere with my work on the court.

Larsen: What’s his name?

Goodwin: His name’s Wakefield Taylor. He’s now retired. He’s from Martinez. [Pat Brown, then-governor of California] [had] appointed me to the state Advisory Committee, to the first consumer council in the state, [with?] Helen Nelson. So whenever I was going off to a meeting or doing anything, what Wake always said to me [was], “It’s great, give them hell!” I think he was very sympathetic. I think, at other times, as we got consumer problems and saw the consumer dimensions in a legal problem, he was always quite appreciative of the background that I had. I think I probably had a little to do with educating him and some of his colleagues about taking a different view of a case or a problem. Because you could just look at something as an ordinary contract transaction, but if you suddenly see that it has consumer fraud aspects or unequal bargaining power, you get very different kinds of results.

Marriage and First Impressions of Berkeley

Larsen: When you went to Salem, or when you graduated law school, were you married?

Goodwin: So, yes, I was. I was married to my first husband, who, at that time, though, was in the Korean War. Then, when he came back, which was about ‘55, well, by then I was down here. Then we got divorced, and then I got married to my present husband in, well, I think, 1959. He was working at the Court [of Appeal] at the same time that I was, and that’s how we met.

Larsen: What prompted your move from Salem to Berkeley?
Goodwin: I guess I found Salem and Portland too dull and uninteresting and too lily-white. It was such a change from all the communities I had lived in in the past — rather small and provincial. Although I think if I had thought about it more, one probably would have an easy time having a political career there because Maurine Neuberger — she was then in the state Senate — she went to Washington when I didn’t. I came down to visit the parents of a college friend, and I think the moment I saw Berkeley, that was it.

Larsen: What was your initial impression of Berkeley?

Goodwin: Well, I think probably the physical beauty was the most striking part. I think physical beauty, and even then, the tremendous ethnic and cultural diversity, and the color. The saffron-robed — there weren’t then Hare Krishna’s, but I think there were some Tibetans. I just immediately felt at home in Berkeley.

I hadn’t realized why until, I think, [the] early ‘70s, [when] we went back to Vienna, and my son, who at that time was a budding architect, commented [on] the fact that the neighborhood in which we had lived in Vienna looked very much like Berkeley, except that Berkeley is hillier. Not only that, he saw amazing similarities between the house I’d lived in and this house, which I don’t think I had even thought about until David pointed them out to us. I thought that was very, very interesting.

Larsen: Where did you live in Berkeley, when you first got here?

Goodwin: First we lived on Berkeley Way, right behind Ledger’s, that block — is that Acton? Anyway, right behind Ledger’s and the Finnish Hall, very close to University [Avenue]. And then, I think, [we] moved from there to here in 1961 or ’62. So most of the years I was very active in the Co-op [it was] very easy to walk over to the meetings and things.

Larsen: Your first job in Berkeley was what?

Goodwin: Well, before I took the bar, I worked for the Cal-Farm Insurance people, and then once I’d taken the bar, I went to work for the Court.
II. EARLY CO-OP YEARS: WORK ON THE MEMBER RELATIONS COMMITTEE; ARTS AND CRAFTS CO-OP; TWIN PINES SAVINGS AND LOAN CO-OP; CONFLICTS IN THE CO-OP

Early Involvement with the Co-op

Larsen: What was your first contact with the Co-op?

Goodwin: Well, of course, I’d been an active member—I’d lived in the Co-op dorm at Oberlin, and I had shopped in the Co-op there. Then, in Chicago, I didn’t like the looks of the co-op dorms, so I didn’t live in them, but I shopped at the Hyde Park Co-op. So [it was] sort of the first place you go. Then, well, I can’t remember exactly, but immediately, I think, through my husband, whom I met at work, I immediately met [Stan Brown], who died in 1960 but was a tremendously active and important Co-op member for a very long time. I can’t remember whether Stan was on the board at the time or not, but I just immediately met some people who had been involved in the Co-op for a very long time.

Early on, I also met Matt Crawford, who is now in his seventies and has retired. I think, at one time, Matt was one of the first permanent black employees the Co-op ever had. Then, at some point, he left the Co-op and switched to the [Co-op] Credit Union. I think he’s still on the Co-op Credit Union Board.

Certainly the Co-op was a very welcoming, open organization. I think Stan was chairperson of the Member Relations Committee, and he took me to a meeting. So, I just sort of immediately got active.

Larsen: So, you were—if I interpret this correctly—you were interested in the Co-op not as a store so much as [as] a social organization?

Goodwin: Yeah. I knew enough about it—knew that [it] was the place to go. I think the Co-op then had more status than it does [now]. It has, unfortunately, lost a lot of its status in Berkeley these days, but I remember we used to have figures that showed something like, I don’t know, every other family in Berkeley, I think, belonged to the Co-op or something. I don’t think that’s true anymore.

Also, the Co-op was the best place to shop and the only place you could find a lot of things that you wanted, in addition to all of this activity that certainly nobody else had and nobody thought about. I stayed involved with Member Relations for a couple of years, but then
really got involved in the—I think originally it was called the Consumer Information Committee, and then it got called the Consumer Information and Protection Committee. Then we were able to take off. If you’re only involved in information, you don’t have as broad a mandate.

**Chair of the Member Relations Committee**

Larsen: Let’s see, in order to track this. You started off…

Goodwin: In the Member Relations Committee.

Larsen: The Member Relations Committee.

Goodwin: Then, I chaired the Member Relations Committee. I think while I chaired the Member Relations Committee, the Arts & Crafts Co-op got going.

Larsen: As chair of the Member Relations Committee, what kind of a program were you trying to institute?

Goodwin: Well, one of the things I had gotten started, which unfortunately didn’t last very long, was a youth group. You know, trying to do something for the kids of Co-op members. It worked briefly, but it didn’t last. Our focus was mainly on member education. I think the Member Relations Committee had the mandate of working with the editor of the *Co-op News*—and all of the member education programs. I don’t think we used to let people join. Now you can just walk in and join. I think we then required that anybody who wanted to join come to an evening orientation education session. You had to taste some Co-op products and listen to some spiel about the Co-op and co-operative movement before you could join.

Larsen: Who did the orientations?

Goodwin: Some volunteers and some staff people. Usually, I think, volunteers and education staff. Then, we also would have somebody from the warehouse or from the store who would cut cans and let people taste some of the Co-op products and see that the Co-op label was as good as other products, and answer questions, and tell them about all the affiliate organizations, like the Credit Union and the Funeral Society. As I say, the Arts and Crafts Co-op was brand new. I think one of the first things I remember my husband and I did was that we helped write
the by-laws for the Arts and Crafts Co-op, which, I think, was one of the first combination producer-consumer co-ops in the whole country.

**Birth of Arts and Crafts Co-op**

Larsen: What gave you the idea to start that, or who had it?

Goodwin: No, we didn’t start it. There were some people that came to the Member Relations Committee, who had started it, and they had had a couple of sales, but they really wanted a separate organization. It was composed of a lot of artists who were producers. Because it was part of the Berkeley Co-op, I guess, we suggested: “Why don’t you be a combination?” So, they did. It’s really funny because, not too many years later, I think when I was on the Co-op board, the Twin Pines Savings and Loan started—the Co-op Savings and Loan. We worked with the Co-op. The Home Loan Bank Board, I think, wrote some by-laws and stuff for them too.

I think if, at that point, anybody had said to me: “25 years later, the Arts & Crafts Co-op is going to be going great guns and have a building and be a solid functioning co-operative on Shattuck, whereas the Savings and Loan w[ill] have gone out of business,” I think I and everybody else would have thought, “[N]ow, that’s crazy!” In part because some of the people who were initially involved in the Arts & Crafts Co-op were artists, and it just didn’t look as if it was going to survive very long.

Larsen: Who were some of the original artists?

Goodwin: Catherine Webb, who lives in [Albany] and who is still alive. It’s Catherine Webb, and, I think, Erda LaBuhn. I don’t remember. They were the most active and vocal ones, but there was a sizeable group. At the same time, growing out of the Member Relations Committee, there was another group of people mostly chaired by a woman named [Christine Belt], who were very actively working with Jeff Cohelan to set up Strawberry Creek Lodge, which I think was one of the first of the Title 8 senior citizen housing projects to get built.

There was Christine Belt and [Joe Rosen]. I don’t remember some of the others, but they were most active. They got to live there, and then in 1965, after my parents retired, that’s where they went to live. My father is still living there.

Larsen: The artists came to you with the idea. What did they want?
Goodwin: The artists, I think, were a part of the Member Relations Committee and were sort of everything in the Co-op that didn’t directly fit anywhere else. The other committees were management and—I don’t remember how many committees there were—but Member Relations covered all aspects of member relations. So, there were all these groups that were forming and that were involved in different projects and the entire education program with the Co-op.

I think they [the artists] had been running their annual or semi-annual sales as an adjunct of the Committee, but they really wanted to be independent and do more. Actually, they started out importing things made by co-ops in India and elsewhere. There were a lot of people in other parts of the world on Peace Corps projects sending back products. That’s one of the things they did when they started because they thought it was something that they should do, and they hadn’t, I think, sufficiently developed a lot of their own products to sell. I think they eventually foundered on the import regulations and some of those problems.

Also, I think a lot of those Peace Corps projects that got started—I don’t know how long they lasted. After they got going, we ceased to be involved in the Arts & Crafts Co-op except as customers, so I’m not up on all of the things that they have gone through.

I think the Funeral Society also had grown out of the Member Relations Committee. It was a very yeasty kind of place. You came to the Co-op and said, “Well, we have an idea and this is what we want to do.” The Co-op would say, “Yeah, okay, sure. You’re a sub-committee: do it.” Then they would do it for a while and then decide: “Well, it really is bigger than can be handled,” and they would cut off and set up their own organization.

Co-op Meetings and Controversy Over Political Donation Policy

Larsen: I’m having a hard time visualizing how this meeting or meetings took place. Can you describe a meeting—how many [people] came, what sort of format it [was]?

Goodwin: I think we would have anywhere from 15 to 25 people. We always would have the education director, which was Emil Sekerak, and his assistant, Mort Colodny. Either Emil or Mort or both. We always had an agenda. Also, one of the big issues that it seems to me we spent a
lot of time and energy on was the donations: what groups the Co-op would donate money to, and the criteria for those kinds of groups, and the criteria for the people that could stand in the parking lot to raise money because it was always a very good place to raise money.

So, not only [would] groups within the Co-op that wanted to do things come to the Committee and do it, and report on what they were doing, but you also had outside groups wanting to come in. I think we were always concerned that they [might] be people that were politically, well, politically correct is a bad way of saying it.…

Larsen: [Unclear].

Goodwin: …but that’s what it really came down to. I don’t think if there had been a Klan group in Berkeley, we would have let them raise money in the Co-op parking lot. They probably would have gone to the ACLU to — but nobody like that ever came.

Larsen: What were your criteria for donating money?

Goodwin: We spent a lot of time and energy on this, and all those things must be somewhere—[but] I don’t have them and I don’t remember….

Larsen: [Well], we’ll go back to the donations [bit].

Goodwin: Well, as you can see, the donation policy, I think, continued to be a recurringly hot topic in the Co-op for many, many years. I remember constant controversies about it because it is a good place to raise money. Also, how much space people could take up in the parking lot, you know.

**Beginnings of Twin Pines Savings and Loan Co-op**

Larsen: I’d like to talk about the Twin Pine Savings and Loan. Since it wasn’t a success, [but] it started off as a success.

Goodwin: Right, yeah.

Larsen: Or that was your perception of it.

Goodwin: Right. It really grew—I think by that time I was on the board of the Co-op—I think, out of the Management Committee and a lot of support and help from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Actually, they had a lot of problems because the Co-op couldn’t provide the usual kinds of guarantees. So, we had to negotiate all kinds of other things about that.
Larsen: What was the issue there, what guarantees did they want?

Goodwin: Well, I think they finally settled for a guarantee from the board, but I think they would have preferred the more usual thing, which is somebody with a lot of money. That simply was not available in the Co-op context, so I think they accepted the guarantees of the board and the business.

Larsen: Who was pushing for the idea of a savings and loan co-op?

Goodwin: I think George Little, who I think was then president of the board, and Zack Brown, who was then the manager of the Co-op Credit Union and I think had been for a very long time. I think they saw the Savings and Loan as, given the Credit Union and the Funeral Society—and then Co-op then had a [Kaiser] thing—fitting into a package of complete services for families. The idea of a Co-op-oriented savings and loan certainly was a sound one.

Larsen: What could it do that the Credit Union couldn’t do?

Goodwin: Make home loans. It couldn’t write checks, [but] in those days, credit unions couldn’t write checks either, but that was the main thing. That’s [making home loans] a very good thing to do in Berkeley and in the Co-op membership.

**Demise of Twin Pines Savings and Loan Co-op**

Goodwin: Then, I don’t know whether it went down because of short-sighted policy or simply went down when the whole industry got into trouble because we weren’t involved with it.

Larsen: Well, the Federal Home Loan….

Goodwin: Bank. It’s the federal agency that pretty much runs and sets the criteria for savings and loans.

Larsen: Do they provide capital?

Goodwin: No, they don’t, but they provide almost everything else and very strict regulations—how you operate and what you do.

Larsen: So, the capital came from the Co-op.

Goodwin: It came from the Co-op, right. But it was this business of the guarantee for it. [T]hey were used to having somebody with several million dollars there, but as I say, we got them to accept—because the Co-op was in good shape and things looked very good. I doubt if they would
do it today, but then it looked good, and I think they liked the idea. It did well. It did very well until—I think it went down about two, three years ago when a lot of savings and loans went down. Actually, I think it was the Federal Home Loan Bank that had insisted that they merge with these Cal America and things. I think it’s unfortunate that people didn’t fight and say, “We’re very different, let us go do a different thing.” It also may have been too late.

Larsen: Why were they pushing for a merger?
Goodwin: I guess when all the industry was getting into trouble, they were making all the smaller ones join each other.

Larsen: Consolidate.

**Conflicting Business Ideologies**

Goodwin: Yeah, and so, then, it had to be merged with this other one, which, of course, had different principles. Always in the Co-op you have a tension between being a distinct co-operative business with particular principles and good business and management, and there’s just a tremendous amount of tension there. Capitalistic profit motives don’t always fit into….

Larsen: So, the managers of the Co-op had to be skilled in both these [unclear] areas?

Goodwin: Exactly. [There were] [a]lways tremendous conflicts between the managers who were trying to make us more like other businesses — successful ones —and the membership and education people who always want[ed] to make us different, [to] keep the difference and emphasize the principles.

Larsen: Was there a manager, that you can remember, that was particularly skillful at bridging this kind of tension?

Goodwin: Don—well, no, the next education director. The manager for most of the years that I was active was Gene Mannila, who was part of the original Finnish group that founded the Co-op. Gene grew tremendously with the job and things as the Co-op grew, but not enough in terms of vision. I think he was not a person that ever had very much education and [had] just worked his way up in the business. So, [he was] very conservative and very worried about the moves to the suburbs and the other stores.
Co-op Expansion

Goodwin: I was on the board when we made the decision to buy out the Sid’s chain of grocery stores, and that’s how we got the Telegraph Center and the first two suburban stores. Although, we may have opened the Geary Road—I can’t remember. No, I think we may have opened the Geary Road store before that, and then we bought the other one in Castro Valley and the Telegraph.

I think until then, the Co-op—everything was always done for cash. [It was] very conservative, [with] some old-fashioned ways of doing business. I don’t know, you know, maybe in the long run they were right because none of the suburban stores ever caught on and functioned as well as the Shattuck store, [which] made money from the day it opened and, I think, has always carried the whole rest of the operation. That couldn’t go on forever, so…

Larsen: The Geary Road store did not make a profit?

Goodwin: I don’t think so. I don’t remember. People like George Little and other people who were more heavily involved with management can probably… Initially I’m sure they didn’t make a profit. I’m sure they probably broke even, but if they did [make a profit], [it was] not a very big one.

Larsen: Well, how about the social groupings and all that [unclear] Pleasant Hill?

Goodwin: Well, one of the reasons we went out there was that we had an active group of Co-op members who said, “Come out here, we need one, and it’s going to work!” I think both the social and business environments are very different from Berkeley. It never quite worked, although I think they had successful branches of the Credit Unions, and they did a lot of things.

I know as long as we had the stores, in all the time that I was active, the board always made a point of meeting not only in Berkeley, but we would travel. [We] sort of rode the circuit and met in all the locations at least once a year so that all the members there could come to a board meeting and have access. I think the committees did some of that too. So an effort was made, but it didn’t take. I don’t know why. I’m sure distance is a factor there. Everything in Berkeley is so relatively compact and easy. I’m sure once you’re driving miles
to go to a store, it’s much harder, I think, to get people to come and be loyal. I don’t know that the social thing has ever caught the way they did in Berkeley.

III. THE FIGHT FOR CONSUMER PROTECTION LEGISLATION: BREAD ENRICHMENT; TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING, AND LATER ISSUES; CONSUMER FEEDBACK SURVEYS AND LOBBYING

Co-op Becomes Active in Consumer Protection

Larsen: Were you acting as counsel for [unclear]?

Goodwin: No, I wasn’t. I was just a volunteer. In fact, one of the prices of my work at the court is staying out of controversial areas. You certainly cannot do any legal work for anybody other than your family. So, I just stayed away from legal issues and worked mostly on other issues, which was fine with me because I had more than enough legal issues at work. It was, I thought, a much better balance.

Yet I think my training and background gave me a lot of very good skills to use when it came to drafting policies for the Co-op. It took a lot of effort to move the Co-op from just being interested in consumer information to really taking a role—an active role—in consumer protection. Because one of the seven Rochdale principles is that you maintain neutrality in politics—which they always carefully had. Then, we were able to modify that and say that you may be neutral in terms of parties, but you would be certainly crazy not to be able to be active about consumer protection issues. That’s how we reworded and reshaped that aspect of the Co-op principles.

Larsen: Were there people who resisted that notion?

Goodwin: Yes, indeed, because they saw it as being political because of course, at the time, we had the Pat Brown administration, which was pro-consumer-oriented. They saw it more as being political than being consumer protection.

[Also], certainly in California and nationally, consumer protection, like conservation, has always had a lot of people on both sides of that party line. You get it as an issue that cuts across traditional party lines. So, we were able to do that.
Fight for Bread Enrichment

Larsen: What was the first consumer protection issue that you became involved in?

Goodwin: I think the very first one, probably, was the bread enrichment because by this time, I think I was on the board and I was chairperson of the Consumer Information and Protection Committee. We had changed the policy. I was on the statewide Advisory Committee. I think we thought this was an issue that was easy and [that we] could win because all the bread had been enriched during the Second World War.

It was the kind of thing that, of course, all the nutritionists [advocated], and then with the home economists and [Angela Little], and the resources of the university and the public health community — plus the fact it cost very little, I think miniscule cost, so that the industry couldn’t really argue this was going to be very expensive — they had been able to do it. Yet [it was] tremendously important to re-enrich all the bread and cereal products. That was the first thing that we did, and it was successful.

Larsen: Once again, who was the prime pusher on that? Your home economist?

Goodwin: I think it was the home economist, but I’m not sure. At least, I remember it as coming from the home economists. Also, at that time on the Co-op Board we had [Jessie Coles], who was in the Home-Ec[onomics] department at Cal, and she had done a lot of work in this area. So I don’t know whether it started with Jessie or one of the others.

I think also, before we did this, we talked about it with Helen Nelson and there was general thinking: “Let’s get an easy, simple consumer issue that will give us a victory.” Because there were a lot of consumer issues that — well, you had tremendous industry opposition — [like] credit and so much bigger issues where you were up against very powerful industries, and they weren’t going to let you go anywhere. Bread enrichment was a very good beginning — a very good beginning.

Larsen: What was your strategy?

Goodwin: I think we just had a tremendous amount of expertise. Really, who’s going to argue against it? The fact that it had been done — and you see, it had been done for so many years during the War — and then it had
just been dropped. It wasn’t something new. I don’t remember that there was that much opposition from the industry. They’re not crazy.

Supporters in the Legislature and Industry Pushback

Larsen: Did you find a legislator for this?

Goodwin: I’m sure we [did], but I don’t remember who it was—or maybe Helen Nelson did that kind of thing for us. She was always a wonderful source of information, local and national, and would bring together a legislator who was interested with the Co-op. That was one of the tremendous functions that her office performed at that time. Always putting together the people who were interested—people who had the expertise—and a legislator to push it. Certainly, it was an apple pie kind of an issue, which most consumer issues in legislature were not. Most of the time, people were very reluctant to carry consumer issues, but that one was an easy one.

Larsen: Who was your typical legislative support?

Goodwin: At that time, I think Byron Rumford was in the Assembly, from Berkeley. I think he was supportive. One of the other outstanding people was Senator Rattigan—Joseph Rattigan of Santa Rosa, who subsequently became a judge on our court. He was very interested and supportive of consumer issues and credit—credit was always, has, and continues to be [something to which there is] tremendous opposition—John Knox was a tremendous supporter of all of the consumer legislation.

Larsen: Well, who was the opposition?

Goodwin: Most of the industry. [And] of course, you see, one of the things that the Co-op general manager got himself into was that the Co-op would be out there arguing for consumer protection legislation—some of the packaging and other things—and then there were the industry organizations that he was a member of, like United Grocers, who would oppose it.

Tensions Between the Co-op Manager and Board

Goodwin: I think he [the Co-op general manager] occasionally felt a lot of discomfort with his peers. Since it was a member-run organization and the members and the board determined the policy, he just had to live with that.
I don’t remember, though, that we ever—we did not put him in the position of asking him to go to Sacramento and making an appearance. We had plenty of volunteers and experts to do that. But I do know he found this uncomfortable. Of course, he got all the stuff from United Grocers and the packagers and so forth on the other side because after we did the bread enrichment, one of the things we worked on was the state Truth-in-Packaging. Those were some of the things that there was opposition to.

Larsen: Did the manager serve at the pleasure of the board?

Goodwin: Yes, indeed, he did, he served at the pleasure of the board. I must say, he was very—well, he came out of a good Finnish co-op background. Even if he did not always like what he was told to do, he did it. He was not one of these people who would then try to undercut it. Definitely not. That was the nice thing about it. He was a very straightforward kind of person and not one of these slick, sophisticated modern managers who would supposedly go do what the board said but then would undermine it. No, he, I think, really tried to carry everything out to the best of his abilities, even if he was not totally sympathetic.

The Co-op home economists get to decide what products the store will carry. If there’s a product that they don’t think is healthful….  

Larsen: [Make] improvements….

Goodwin: Exactly, they will not carry it. The home economists have heavy voice, and then you don’t get to carry all these things that probably make a lot of money and that a lot of people want. So, I think they’re used to having heavy input. Also, [we] always have [had] a lot of very vocal members who have fought for the Co-op principles.

Larsen: The board was elected by the general members?

Goodwin: The board was elected by the general members, you’re right. That’s right.

Larsen: Okay. So, Truth-in-Packaging was the….  

Goodwin: Was another one, yeah.

Larsen: Was the second to [unclear].

Goodwin: Yeah. As I remember it. There may have been little things in between. Then there were things that happened that we couldn’t do anything about, like, I think, the water in the ham. They put water in the ham. I
think we tried to stop that and we didn’t succeed. Truth-in-Packaging we had some success [with] on both the state and the federal level. Of course, the Truth-in-Lending was more complicated.

Of course, once the Co-op had taken a position on consumer legislation of one kind directly related to its business, well, Truth-in Lending also fit because of the Credit Union. It was very easy. Once the first steps had been taken, it was very easy to get the Co-op to also come along on these others.

**Co-op Leads Fight in Sacramento with Customer Feedback Surveys**

**Goodwin:** I think we just developed a tremendous reputation in Sacramento because you always had a dozen people from the industry, and the industry was always trying to tell you what consumers wanted. Here we were, a consumer organization that could tell them what consumers wanted, which was not what the industry got in its surveys.

Not only that, [but] our home economists got to be wonderful at devising exhibits and member surveys that were pointed towards precise things that the legislation was about. So they would come there not only with a lot of graphic member comments, but also [with] figures. In one week, so many members stopped by and said they would rather have enriched bread than not and that they would buy enriched—they would even pay a penny more a loaf if it was enriched. Things like that. They just developed fantastically good skills at collecting and developing that kind of information, which was, of course, tremendously useful when you went to Sacramento and completely did-in the stuff that the industry had.

**Larsen:** How did you get the membership to respond to a survey?

**Goodwin:** Well, the home economists always had a booth in the store. People came there to ask questions. Then, if you had the material and the survey, Co-op members are very vocal, and given half a chance, they will scream and yell and sign and write. You have a very involved, generally active interest in membership that was just tremendously responsive in these areas.

I think we were in a prosperous, hopeful period. We had both state and national governments that were very supportive of all of these things. I think everybody felt very positive about what they were doing. I think you could get a member to feel that if you stop by and fill out this, or
answer this question, you will have some impact on state and national legislation and policy. They love that—involvement. It was a very good way to involve people in government and empower people. That’s what Reagan has totally undone.

Larsen: Now the Feds are watching what you did.

**California as a National Bellwether and Truth-in-Packaging**

**Goodwin:** California has always been a bellwether because of the market. New products are tested in California. So that’s why the bottle bill has been so hard in California because the view, nationally, is: California gets it, that’s the end. That means you can get it anywhere else in the country and nationally. So, I think, easy to move.

I can’t remember whether the state legislation preceded the federal or whether it went along simultaneously. I somehow think it preceded it. That may only have been because we worked on it in that order. I seem to think it did because then, when we would prepare testimony and results for Washington, we could say, “In California we have…”

[O]ne of the other big battles on the bread was [to] standardize the size of loaves to pound, and pound and a half, and two pound. They used to come in, I don’t know, 10, 11—they used to come in all different sizes, and then you couldn’t even compare prices. I think also—I don’t know whether it was either the bread packaging or the bread enrichment—we got rid of the balloon loaves that had all this air pumped into it. That went down too.

**Larsen:** Did the industry people ever come to one of your board meetings and personally represent themselves?

**Goodwin:** No, they didn’t. I don’t think they would have thought it had done much good. They certainly went to Sacramento. I don’t remember the bread industry so much, but the canning [industry], Del Monte, [was] pretty potent and slick in the way that they would operate in Sacramento—but very obviously so. We were just a bunch of consumers and housewives. I remember I went and testified on the packaging legislation and talked about how it really would be nice if we had uniform sizes for packaging. Of course [in] California, I think for years we’ve had detailed specifications about [olives]. There are pages and pages of legislation about all the different sizes of olives and what sizes they have to be.
Larsen: From gigantic to super [unclear].

Goodwin: Right. That’s been on the books for a very long time, which was helpful. Then, you’d say, “Well, it would be nice if most consumer products could also come in reasonable sized standardized packages.” They asked—well, in those days I always wore a flowery hat when I went to testify. It was more important to look like a housewife than a lawyer, at that point.

Larsen: You did that on purpose?

Goodwin: Yes, I did. I did that on purpose. I don’t know that I necessarily always told them that I was a lawyer. I know I got this question about, “Well, what if all the hats were standardized and you couldn’t wear a hat as pretty as the one you’re wearing?” So I said, “Well, we’re talking about food and essentials, not frivolous items of apparel like hats.”

Of course, in those days, there were not very many people interested in consumer legislation. It didn’t get the play, in fact. You always got the smallest, darkest, furthest-in-the-capital-back hearing room for hearings. It just didn’t get the kind of public interest or attention that it gets these days. Or even the concept of what is a consumer problem, or what is a piece of consumer legislation, just wasn’t out there at all.

Larsen: Did the packaging issue also include what’s in the contents?

Goodwin: The description? No. No, that was a whole different, subsequent thing because those are the standards of identity mostly promulgated by—is it the Department of Agriculture? No, it’s the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We worked on those subsequently.

The whole business about changing some of those [standards] and nutritional labeling, which now everybody takes for granted—standard sizes, the enriched bread, and the nutritional labeling. The nutritional labeling came much later, but we then did a lot of work with the Health, Education and Welfare people on that. Then, I think at a later stage, [we did] a lot of work with this whole business of whether things were organic, naturally grown, and what does “natural” really mean? That was much, much later. So that’s almost a sophisticated refinement of those things.

Larsen: The Truth-in-Packaging was merely to standardize…. 
Goodwin: Right, to standardize sizes and weights so you could compare prices. The whole point of it was to enable consumers to compare prices. Then, the other stuff came after that.

**Following Up on the Success of Truth-in-Packaging: Truth-in-Lending**

Larsen: What was the resolution about the Truth-in-Packaging?

Goodwin: Well, we did pretty well on the state level. I think we did reasonably well on the federal level, and where things really went to pieces was when we got to the Truth-in-Lending because that’s when you really had a big potent industry fighting you. The price of getting that legislation through was some compromises. Even so, at least there was something out there on the books and things for people to work with. There had been absolutely nothing before. Just finding out what interest rates were was insane. Helen Nelson, who was the first consumer counsel, was an economist. That was her background. I trust somebody is interviewing Helen.

That has always been a ghastly area. I think it still is. There’s no legislation or anything, for instance, that right now protects anybody in case somebody goofs on one of these machines. None of the existing rules, I don’t think, would cover or get you there. Just like when the credit cards first came, all the rules about theft wouldn’t work in terms of credit card theft. So I am just waiting for one of those things to go to pieces and not work.

Larsen: We have maybe two minutes left on this tape. I want to pick up on one thing I wasn’t sure I got. You were talking earlier about credit. Was this credit as extended to the customers?

Goodwin: No, no, because the Co-op always did cash. No, no, I’m talking about consumer credit legislation, revealing interest rates. Yeah.

Larsen: That’s this part.

Goodwin: Yeah, no, okay. Because the Co-op always—I think for retail customers, it was always a heavy principle: only cash. I do think for wholesale customers the Co-op always allowed credit—businesses and such.

Larsen: We’ll start with Truth-in-Lending next time….

Goodwin: Okay.

Larsen: …since I think that’s a big topic.
Goodwin: It is a big topic, yeah.

Larsen: The Co-op had a distributor, a warehouse side of the operation?

Goodwin: Yeah, Associated Co-operatives [AC].

Larsen: Who else did they supply?

Goodwin: Palo Alto Co-op. I think as long as there was a co-op in Santa Monica, they supplied. I think they supplied many co-ops in the state but not everything.

Larsen: What was the connection, then, with United Grocers?

Goodwin: The [AC], as a supplier, couldn’t get you everything. So, some things had to come from United Grocers. Still do.

[Start of Interview 2]

Consumer Protection: Truth-in-Packaging; TV and Auto Repair

Goodwin: One of the things I forgot to mention last time is that one of the aspects of the packaging legislation—the state legislation—was to get rid of jars with false bottoms and similar kinds of deceptive packaging. Also, and I’ve left [them] with Therese Pipe, there are some studies that the Co-op did. There’s a copy. When Pat Brown was governor, he sent a message to the legislature on packaging and how important it was. That’s one of the reasons we got the legislation. Just a good demonstration of the kind of support that we had in those days from people in power about these things.

I think John Kennedy came up with his famous speech about consumer rights, which were the right to information, the right to protection. There are two more, which of course I can’t remember now. I’ll remember them. I think one of them has to do with a right to a fair price, and it relates to monopoly situations, like utility rates—that you’re still entitled to a fair price even though it’s a monopoly.

I think those are two dramatic illustrations of the kind of support that there was from the top, which is very helpful in making people realize the importance of it. I think the other area that we did some work on—and it used to be a problem, though I think the problem has since disappeared—[was] TV repair, which used to be as tremendous a problem as auto repair. Then, when solid-state electronics came, it disappeared.
That used to be a terrible consumer problem in the state. The same kind of problems we still have with auto repair: over-pricing and things not being fixed. Then, on top of it, the people who came to pick up the TV sets would kidnap the sets and not return them. That one’s gone by the board. Auto repair, I fear, has not.

Even in auto repair, however, some good legislation has gotten through because now they’re required to give you a written estimate. Also—and I get amused by this every time we get some work done on the car—they’re supposed to give you the old parts they took out so that you know that they replaced them. On its face it seems silly, but it really wasn’t.

Beginnings of the California Consumer Federation

Goodwin: One of the things that I got involved in, [which] the Co-op also got involved in, in part through Helen Nelson, [was that] we formed the statewide Consumer Federation. In that, we were involved with the co-ops and the labor unions and the Credit Union League. So this was the California Consumer Association, which I think is still around as a statewide group. We used to have a lot of interesting interaction with the union people. I think they agreed in principle on these things, but they had different styles.

So their styles were, well, not quite as democratic as the co-ops. Then, of course, when we go to things like the auto repair legislation, I think they couldn’t support that because, at that time, a lot of auto repair was done by service stations with union mechanics. So, occasionally, we parted company. That was one of the more interesting aspects of this whole thing.

Then, on the national level, I think in 1967, the Consumer Federation of America was founded. It, too, is still around and is a sizeable consumer lobby group. I think its funding to this day mainly comes from various labor and consumer and co-operative groups.

Larsen: You were a founder of the Consumer Federation California?

Goodwin: Also, I think I went to the founding meeting of the Consumer Federation of America as a Co-op representative.

Larsen: Is there a story to tell about how the California Federation was founded?
Goodwin: Not one that I can immediately remember. I know we went to Fresno. Nothing particularly amusing or unusual, just a lot of hard work and hammering out areas where all of these groups could work together. All these kinds of things where you stay up all night and write things and so forth. They’re both still around, although I don’t think they have—I don’t know that they ever had a great deal of visibility. I think the credit unions were another one of the founders and heavily involved in both the state and national consumer federations.

What was useful about [the credit union link] was that all of the unions have publications, so you could use the [credit] union newspapers to educate people about legislation and consumer issues, very much the way the Co-op News always has done.

**Lobbying Strategies and the Role of Helen Nelson**

Larsen: Did these organizations go directly to the legislators?

Goodwin: Oh yes, and particularly in the legislature, I think, the union groups had a lot more experience than the co-ops had. So that was very useful and very helpful.

Larsen: So you were using their expertise, how to lobby…?

Goodwin: Using their expertise, how to lobby. In fact, Helen Nelson did a lot of work on teaching people how to lobby, how to write letters. I haven’t finished going through my files, but she produced a lot of material, which is now standard in almost every other organization, about whom do you write to, how do you write a good letter, and other kinds of information about how a bill goes through the Legislature or the Congress and the various steps [and] how the committees function. She did a lot of work of that kind.

Now I think Helen was just an amazing human being. She, I think, was an economist by training. She was the state’s very first consumer counsel when the office was established. It was the first office of consumer counsel in the country that was established by legislation. The only previous one had been established by executive order in New York. Of course, the person who talked Pat Brown into all of this was George Brun. I don’t think that’s a name that’s come up before. George subsequently became a municipal judge in Berkeley. I think he was the first person to ever be appointed to the bench before his
consumer activity. As he often said, it was kind of a long, painful way to get there.

Helen was remarkable in her ability to keep her grace and her cool in circumstances that were pretty horrendous. Also, I think she was probably one of the first women in a position of power and authority at a time when that was very, very unusual. So there are compounded difficulties, both of being a woman and then being in a brand new field, where it wasn’t really quite clear how you were going to represent the consumer interest and define it in the state, plus having to take a tremendous amount of pressure and all kinds of stuff from the industry people, who, I think, always accused her of being dishonest and awful.

She just always had tremendous grace under pressure and, I think, kept our whole Advisory Committee and consumer groups going and provided tremendous amounts of inspiration and education and information. Really, it was a brand-new field then.

Larsen: Where did you meet Helen?

Goodwin: I first met her when I was appointed to the [state] Advisory Committee. I think her background had been as an economist and she had taught—I have forgotten where. She certainly was just a wonderful person to work with and, I think, very inspirational for all of us. Of course, she was in touch with what was going on all over the state and all over the country. She was very good at bringing people and groups together and keeping people working together. That’s a real art. She was able to do that.

The Co-op and the State Advisory Committee

Goodwin: The [state] Advisory Committee had representation—well, I think I was a representative from the Co-op, but we had people there from the Credit Union—Virna Canson was then representing the NAACP Credit Union in Sacramento, I think. She subsequently became executive director of the NAACP in this area. [We had], I think, people there from the League of Women Voters, university women, several of the labor groups, I was saying the credit unions, and, I think, a couple of more lawyers just for good measure.

There really was no precedent anywhere as to what a state consumer agency is supposed to do or how to go about it. But, at the same time,
it was all very exciting and interesting because everything we did was new. You just knew you were—and at the beginning, it was something very big and interesting and exciting. It was a lot of fun to work on and think of how you went about doing it.

Again, see, this is an area where the Co-op had more experience than anybody else. How do you reach people? What are the kinds of issues that people are concerned with? I think that’s where our home economists, again, were very useful and very helpful.

Also, I think by that time, the Co-op had the pharmacy, and we had our pharmacist, our first pharmacist, who was Adolph Kamil, who I think came from the UC San Francisco Medical School, where he had been teaching. Adolph, happily, was interested in doing consumer education in the field of drugs, the generics, and things of that kind. That, too, was a brand-new field when we started it. So it was…

Larsen: You must have got some expertise in innovation [unclear].

Goodwin: [Or so]. It was a very yeasty time somehow, I think. People had a sense that things were possible, and they were. Just as nowadays people have a sense that nothing does any good and everything has gone to pieces. Well, I don’t feel that way. I have no illusions about how long it takes to make progress. I see it as a very positive thing that all of these things have survived. They may not be as active, but very little of the consumer legislation has been repealed. It may not always be enforced as much as it should be by each administration, but I don’t think any of it has been repealed.

Probably the real test of how effective Helen Nelson had been was that, when Reagan came in eight years later, he did not abolish the office. I think he cut its budget, but he appointed somebody else to it, and the office has never been abolished.

**Helen Nelson Pioneers Truth-in-Lending**

Larsen: Was Helen involved in Truth-in-Lending?

Goodwin: Yes. Truth-in-Lending was, I think, probably a bigger area for her than for the Co-op because she was an economist. I think one of the things she spent the most time on, and it was revolutionary at the time, was to get out a little leaflet that showed you the annual interest rate that people paid on loans. That was a most difficult thing because everybody computed it differently. Everybody kept saying, “We can’t
all make the same computations, so you cannot possibly put out any information that people can compare.” She, of course, knew better. I think she had a committee of economists that worked for a year to produce this leaflet. I hope I have some copies in my file somewhere, and I’ll get one to Therese [Pipe].

That was a tremendously revolutionary [thing]: first the idea of doing it and then that it really could be done. Of course, since then, oddly enough, everybody now quotes interest rates in terms of annual rates. Perhaps not totally accurately, and they may not tell you everything, but it’s a lot easier to at least make comparisons than it used to be.

Larsen: How were you involved in the Truth-in-Lending effort?

Goodwin: I’m trying to remember. I think probably in working on both the state and the federal legislation, although not the details because it’s not an area in which I have very much expertise. Simply as an area of tremendous importance to consumers, and that it was needed.

Legislative Support for Truth-in-Lending

Goodwin: I think, at one point, you asked for some of the people who were active, and certainly, I think, one of the leaders on the Truth-in-Lending at that time was Senator Philip Hart of Michigan, who was chairman of the Senate, and I trust he had a very good staff that we worked with.

Of course, in the state legislature one of the strongest supporters, who’s still there, is Nick Petri. He was always on top of everything. As a resident of Contra Costa County, you’ll probably be interested in the fact that at this time John Nejedly was a district attorney. I think he was the first district attorney in the state to set up a consumer frauds division. It was marvelously successful. Not only that—unlike any other part of the district attorney’s office, it made money. So, once John had done the prototype, every DA in the state was very eager to set up a consumer frauds division. They are consistently popular and money-making operations.

I think [Thomas C.] Lynch was then the state attorney general, and he, of course, set up a consumer frauds division in the attorney general’s office. I think most people in law enforcement are not used to having operations that make money. They like it very much. It’s very, very helpful. So it makes it a very popular and easy thing to get going.
The Persistence of Consumer Fraud

Goodwin: Although unfortunately, despite all the activity, we still have a tremendous amount of consumer frauds, and they’re always the same kinds of things. Same old pyramid schemes. One was written up in *The Daily Cal* the other day—it’s especially popular in Berkeley and they tend to deliberately approach professors and other people. It’s just a typical scam about getting money to South Africa. Typical, typical thing. [They say]: “I have this money, I have to get to South Africa and take this package,” and [then they] get your money. It’s just, I don’t know, a different—it’s just the latest version.

I don’t know, I’ve always had the sense that consumer frauds are like weeds. Just like weeds ape the plants and [unclear] them, it seems to me consumer frauds just grow with whatever is happening in the economy. Immediately, there will be some wonderful scheme to defraud people and fool them and have them think that they are getting more than they’re getting or they’re getting something for nothing. It has very little to do with how educated or sophisticated people are. Look at all the people in the stock market who get taken [in] by assorted investment schemes. Things are just that much more complex and sophisticated. So that’s one of the sad aspects of our economy—that it still goes on.

I think one of the big consumer frauds, though, that was gotten rid of by legislation was the health and dance studio business, where people signed up for three years of lessons for enormous amounts of money. There has been a specific legislation to deal with that. Now we have the health clubs and all the things that they promise—similar kinds of problems.

IV. LATER CO-OP YEARS: BAND; STRUGGLES WITH COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND GROWTH; ANTI-NUCLEAR ACTIVISM

Bay Area Neighborhood Development (BAND) and Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO)

Larsen: One of the things in my notes is that you were involved in an organization called BAND [Bay Area Neighborhood Development].

Goodwin: BAND, that’s right. Yeah. I was not as directly involved. My husband was more involved. I guess when Johnson came out with a Great Society program in the ‘60s, the Co-op decided it needed to [do]
something for poor and low-income consumers. In fact, one of the things that has always troubled the Co-op is that it’s been very much a middle-class and upper-middle-class kind of an organization. We’ve had relatively few working-class and relatively few low-income members. This has always troubled everyone, given the history of the Co-op property movement, which was begun by a bunch of poor weavers in England, and also [given] the European co-ops, which are much more heavily worker-dominated and have a much broader scope in the society.

So when the Office of Economic Opportunity [OEO] was set up by the Feds, that was an excellent opportunity to do some consumer education and information and action in low-income communities. Again, there was the problem of how you go about doing it. So they set up a program, and the Co-op had several false starts because, again, middle-class people don’t always know how to go about it. I think they, funnily, ended up with a program in Hunters Point and in the Mission and in East Oakland.

Larsen: How did these programs operate?

Goodwin: Well, the big thing in OEO was to have local people determine what they most needed. It turned out [that] what the people in Hunters Point most needed was a credit union, which is still around. I think the people in the Mission most wanted a neighborhood health center, and that’s still around. They also, interestingly enough, very much wanted a cultural facility. So, one of the offshoots of BAND that nobody had thought about—but the Latin community wanted it very much—was something called [La Casita de las Artes]: a place for poets and writers. I don’t know if that has still survived, but I know the Mission Neighborhood Health Center has. I think in East Oakland there was also a credit union.

As I told Therese, somebody should talk to my husband because he worked for OEO before he became involved with BAND and so had some good experience in community organization, particularly [in] working in low-income areas. Each of the areas that the program was in was completely different from another. I think East Oakland was probably more Chicano and Black. The Mission was more Latino than anything else. Of course, Hunters Point—all Black. So you had very
disparate low-income communities with totally different priorities and needs.

**BAND: Consumer Outreach and Education**

One of the things that BAND concentrated on was producing some consumer information materials to be used in all of these communities. Of course, they were bilingual. Actually, they began to produce these leaflets, and then, pretty soon, OEO consumer education and information programs all over the country used the BAND leaflets. I don’t know that they ever made some money, but they certainly paid for themselves. They went all over the country. Just very simple little fliers that had maybe just two or three or four lines about, “How do you spot a consumer fraud?” Or, “This is what you should do.”

One of the other aspects of all of the programs w[as] that there were not any supermarkets in the low-income neighborhoods. There were little mom and pop stores that gave credit, but there weren’t any supermarkets. So, I think at one point…

[Interruption]

**Goodwin:** One of the big things was taking people on shopping trips to another part of the city, where they then found that the very same items were a lot cheaper at the Safeway in the Marina than they were [in their own neighborhoods]. And I think at one point, the Co-op thought about putting a co-op in Hunters Point, or there was a co-op in Hunters Point and they tried to do something out there, but it didn’t quite take. At that time, they didn’t think about markets anywhere else. A couple of years later, the Co-op [was] at Broadway and MacArthur and tried to open more stores closer to some of those areas. None of those stores ever did well enough to survive, which is very sad.

It was a noble attempt. I think BAND was funded from about something like ‘65 to ‘68 by OEO. Then, after the major activity ceased, all these institutions, however, survived, and I think the leaflets went on for quite a while. The Co-op kept BAND—it stands for Bay Area Neighborhood Development—as a foundation. As far as I know, they still have it and occasionally use it to raise funds for some other purposes.

**Larsen:** By a Co-op foundation, how do you mean that?
Goodwin: I think [as a] separate tax-exempt entity that people could give to for purposes of consumer education and information.

Larsen: But under Co-op sponsorship?

Goodwin: Sponsored by the Co-op, right. As I say, initially, [it was] put together to serve low-income communities, I think.

Co-op Struggles with Community Engagement and Member Education

Goodwin: Somehow, the failure of the Co-op to involve more working class people and low-income has been a major failure, and [it was] a major problem that we were able to work together with the labor people on consumer legislation and other areas of interest but not really ever convert large numbers of people to becoming Co-op members and shoppers. Of course, some of the centers that we opened, like the El Cerrito center, were designed hoping to attract—well, the suburban centers also, but it never quite worked.

Larsen: Maybe this is a good time to talk about why that community activity aspect didn’t work.

Goodwin: How so? Well, my own view is that when things were going well, they didn’t think ahead, and they didn’t think to develop a research and development and long-range education arm. The education program was always kind of a stepchild.

When the Co-op was doing well, you had a good-sized education budget. They never thought way ahead. Never thought of setting up—well, [now there is] the Co-op Institute that is finally being set up by the Co-op [Bill] to study and help promote co-operatives or to set up a co-operative college, which all of the European co-ops have long had, where you send both members and employees and also institutions where you train your future employees and managers.

The Co-op never looked ahead enough to really train people. Everybody sort of got trained on the job, but that’s not the same kind of thing. Then, suddenly, you’re looking for an assistant manager and you don’t have one in-house. So what do you do? You go get one from Safeway. I think they just really [have] a lack and a loss of long-range vision about where to go and what to do.
Lack of Vision and Failure to Expand

One of the other unfortunate things I felt that they turned down [was that], at one time, they had a tremendous opportunity to open a Scandinavian furniture store before there were any others. The Greenbelt Co-ops in Washington, D.C., the other big consumer co-operative in the country, had tremendous arrangements with all the Scandinavian co-op furniture manufacturers, who would have been delighted to ship things here and give us the same good deals. The furniture could have been a wonderful money-making operation because there are higher margins on furniture.

I think in Greenbelt, well, the grocery business has very low margins, no matter what you do. Furniture, of course, has very high ones. I think that if [the Co-op] had had the vision to get into that business, that might have provided some of the capital and money that later was lacking. At the time, I think Gene Mannila and people on the board and everybody said, “Well, the grocery business is really all we know, we can’t spread ourselves too thin, we now have this many grocery stores, we cannot also have a furniture store.” I think [it was] very unfortunate. They did not foresee different economic circumstances in a different time.

Just as I think the Co-op at one point—we tried to have a wilderness store, and it didn’t succeed. Now look at REI—another co-op which has [succeeded]. So, periodically, good ideas would pop up, but either they didn’t know how to do it, or didn’t do it right, or [they] didn’t feel they could do it along with everything else.

One of the other things that I remember: somebody brought something to the Member Relations Committee that sounded very much like what is now the Owner Builder Center. I don’t know that it’s even the same people involved, but they were probably just 25 years ahead of their time—bringing it and saying, “This is a viable thing.”

Anti-Nuclear Activism and Bodega Head

Goodwin: I think one of the positive [unclear] the Co-op got involved in [was] the controversy [which] surrounded PG&E’s plan to put an atomic plant on Bodega Head. We were able to get in touch with our milk suppliers. There was a lot of concern then about strontium-90 in the milk and how the [clouds] went. So, the people who supplied milk to
the Co-op and all the other dairy people in Marin and Sonoma counties were able to rally them in opposition to the Bodega plant. That was, I think, both a consumer and environmental activity that pre-dated Earth Day and all the other things that came along later on.

Larsen: Did you go up to Bodega Head?

Goodwin: Yes, yeah. My husband and I were quite active in that organization and did a lot of work with David Pesonen, who headed it up. It was then called the Northern California Association to Save Bodega Head and Harbor. We did a lot of work on that. We brought a case in the Supreme Court and, meanwhile, also rallied a lot of people in the scientific community, too. I think that was probably the first successful citizen activity against nuclear energy and nuclear power. When, in the early sixties, you talked about nuclear power being too expensive and too dangerous and not working, everybody looked at you as if you were entirely crazy. That was heresy in those days.

Larsen: What was your strategy?

Goodwin: I think the strategy at that point was to get as much information and public outcry out there, to show them how dangerous it was because of the earthquake fault so that, in the end, what was then the Atomic Energy Commission, it’s now the Nuclear Regulatory—it’s changed, it’s split in two and has changed its functions—wouldn’t grant them a license. That’s what ultimately happened.

One of the things that was very helpful was the Alaskan earthquake [of March 27, 1964]. The timing of the Alaskan earthquake was perfect because, when the Alaskan earthquake happened, it changed all kinds of theories about how earthquakes can happen and why. Suddenly [there was] all this new information about an earthquake on the coast, and here all these people had said—well, many people had said, “it’s perfectly safe, because when earthquakes happen they happen this way.” Well, of course, it turned out it happened totally differently. But I think we always just interpreted that as God being on our side.

Larsen: For once.

Goodwin: Because the timing was so perfect. The timing was so perfect on that: just when we most needed some totally different data, it came and of course, I think, frightened everyone also. So ultimately, PG&E was left with a $2 million hole, which they had to fill up. It’s now a park.
Larsen: Were you doing things like they do now, standing in front of the gates?

Goodwin: No. I have not wanted to do that kind of thing since I was in college. Back when I was in college, I did some demonstrating and things. I guess one of the perceptions I’ve had—and it’s a different perception—is that somebody with my background and training can be more useful doing other things. I have just never had this need to go put my body on the line. Many people do, but I have not. I’ve always felt that I can be more useful writing briefs, writing—working on other things that always need to be done also. Or, perhaps, bailing people out when they get arrested doing these things and helping develop arguments as to why they should not be arrested or have to pay fines—[more helpful doing that] than actually doing it [demonstrating].

Providing Bail During the 1964 Free Speech Movement

Larsen: How many people have you bailed out?

Goodwin: Quite a few, I think, on and off. In fact, I think one story I can tell you is that [at] the time of the [Free Speech Movement] demonstrations at Cal in ’64, for some reason—I don’t know whether it was a Co-op meeting—something or other was going on at George and Angela Little’s house. They then lived in Berkeley, and I think George was president of the Co-op. When phone calls came and large amounts of bail money were needed, that’s where they got it. I think probably just from the group of people at the house that night.

Larsen: When the students were breaking windows on Telegraph and Shattuck, did the Co-op go unscathed?

Goodwin: I think so. My recollection is that it did, yeah. Yeah, and I don’t remember that the Shattuck Co-op has ever—or the University Co-op… Yeah, I don’t think the Co-ops have ever gotten it.

Diversity in the Co-op

Larsen: Last time you talked about the first black Co-op member.

Goodwin: Matt Crawford, yeah.

Larsen: Yeah. How was that developed? How was the multi-ethnic workforce of the Co-op started?

Goodwin: It started before my time, so I don’t really know about that. Somebody else would know. I think, as I said, the Co-op had a multi-ethnic
workforce long before there were laws that required it. I think [it was] just the right thing to do.

Also, a number of people involved in the Co-op, like Emil Sekerak, who was the education director for a while, and Larry Collins, who was involved with mutual service insurance—I think both had had backgrounds of working in the Japanese relocation camps. So I think early on there were close ties between some Co-op people and people certainly in the Asian communities. I’m sure that was one piece of it.

Then, I think, Stan Brown, who was active in the Co-op, [and] Margaret Gordon, who was Aaron Gordon’s wife—Aaron Gordon was president of the Co-op before George Little—were both active in helping to found the Berkeley NAACP. So I think [there have been] close community working relationships that probably produced it in the Co-op and that may have….

V. LIFE AFTER THE CO-OP: FOUNDING TOWARD UTILITY RATE NORMALIZATION (TURN); FUTURE OF THE CO-OP; CAREER OF JIM GOODWIN

Larsen: You were the founder of TURN [Toward Utility Rate Normalization]?

Goodwin: One of the founders, that’s right. That’s right, yeah. I think in ’62, I got off the Co-op board. Consumer things seemed to be doing very well. I think I spent some more time working with the Consumer Information and Protection Committee, but also, things were getting a lot more visible.

Then, all of a sudden, there seemed to be too [many] consumer issues and too many directions to stay on top of. So, after Reagan—well, no, before. Before he was elected, I had just decided: the time has come to narrow it down. And as I said, things seemed to be going very well—lots of enthusiastic people involved in other areas. So an area that I had, well, I think, first become acquainted with in the Bodega fight—and really a very interesting one because there was no consumer presence, although it was one of the things that Helen Nelson attempted to do, but [also] a very difficult one—is the whole area of utility regulation and the California Public Utilities Commission. Also, [it] was a good area for me to work in because it’s the one area that the court that I work for has no jurisdiction over.

Larsen: So you’re free to participate.
Goodwin: Free to participate and work on that, whereas everything else is in the legislature, or it eventually may end up in court. Decisions of the California Public Utilities Commission go straight to the State Supreme Court.

Also, it was a new area, and consumer input into public utility regulation was a relatively new concept—something else, I think, that Helen Nelson pioneered. In fact, I think it was Helen Nelson who found Sylvia Siegel, who has now become the head of TURN. Actually, originally, Sylvia was brought on, I think, to be the executive director of the California Consumer Federation.

Larsen: Where did Sylvia come from?

Goodwin: I think Sylvia had worked for the Cancer Society or something like that and then had, I think, taken some time out to have some kids. I think when we started, none of us knew very much about—well, as I say, Helen had made some attempts to participate in utility proceedings, more in the area of household moving because that’s a slightly easier area than utility rates. Sylvia and I and a group of other people decided we would just specialize and put together a consumer entity that really just worked on utility rates and regulation.

[In] that, too, everybody thought we were absolutely crazy and out of our minds. We did have some people who thought we were not crazy. Among others, Senator [Lee] Metcalf from Montana, who was the lone voice in Congress who knew about the utilities and was always interested and knew the history of utilities and their regulation in this country. So we finally put something together. We had a very hard time raising funds until suddenly came the Arab oil embargo [of 1973]. That suddenly brought a lot of these issues home to everybody.

Then we were able, from some of the new-age foundations like [Vanguard] and others, [to] put some money together and put TURN together. I think all of us got educated about utility regulation and what it takes. It’s millions of dollars and two cents of everybody’s electric bill.

Larsen: What’s the modus operandi for TURN?

Goodwin: Well, TURN has finally evolved into an organization that hires attorneys and experts and participates in utility rate cases. For the last few years, of course, once TURN won its first case, it collected
attorney’s fees. You collect attorney’s fees in a multi-million-dollar rate case, and you get enough money to keep an organization going, particularly an organization that is used to running a very small and tight budget, which TURN always has. I’m sure it never got a lot of money for these things.

It’s a major problem because it really takes a tremendous amount of expertise and background. You also need experts. Of course, the utilities have the money and they can usually hire all the experts. There are some consumer experts, but it’s a much more difficult area. It’s a very difficult area to talk to consumers about. People know that their bills are going up all the time, as they have, but it’s much, much harder. Although it’s gotten easier as the bills have gotten up. I think people are much more aware than they used to be—and as [bills] continue to go up.

Still, it’s a much more complex area, but that made it all the more interesting—to try and do it in this field. So I think I spent 10 years with TURN, and then, when it was in very good shape, I left.

**Work Philosophy and Activities**

**Larsen:** What are you working on now?

**Goodwin:** Well, actually, I’ve not really been directly involved in a lot of consumer activity. I think I’ve gotten more involved in some family matters—grandchildren and such. I’ve gone back to an old interest of mine, which is the arts and painting. I guess some more turning inward. I don’t know, I find myself a lot less patient than I used to be and [less] willing to sit through hours and hours of discussions and committee meetings and working out things.

Even then, I used to periodically get tired of it, and then I think it’s a sign that you should get out and move on. When you keep hearing the same arguments, and then you get tired of listening to the same people doing things, obviously the thing has lost its interest and it’s time to move on. I don’t know. I’ve always believed it’s much better to get things started and get them going, and then you move on and do something else. You can’t hold on to things and organizations.

I worry about it when people do. I think that’s one of the other mistakes that the Co-op made, in terms of not thinking about growing and developing and having the same manager for 20 years rather than
moving him onto something else after a couple of years and, meanwhile, educating and bringing up some other managers. I think that’s a tremendous mistake when organizations of any kind put too much in a single person or a small group of people. Then, when that group of people leaves, dies, retires, there’s nothing left.

So, I think [it’s] much healthier and much more fun to work on things while you’re still excited and interested and it’s new. Then, I think, when you get tired of it, you move on. I think I spent as much time with TURN as I did because it took so long to get it off the ground. I didn’t really want to leave it until I felt it was in good shape. So, I worked on redoing its bylaws, and then when I left, I felt, “Well, it’s doing wonderfully well.” Actually, I think that’s a great thing: to see all kinds of things start and go and grow, like kids.

**Reflections on the Future of the Co-op**

**Larsen:** Do you think that the Co-op could be revived?

**Goodwin:** I’m sure it could, but I’m not sure how or [by] what. Maybe if the economic situation gets bad enough, I think it will—because it will be the only thing that works.

**Larsen:** I was thinking more in terms of the social aspects of the Co-op.

**Goodwin:** That’s hard because Berkeley is a very different community than it was. At least in this country, co-ops, historically, have always been able to survive in university communities, so I’m sure it could be. I don’t know.

**Larsen:** Did the Co-op contribute money to the consumer protection aspect? We were talking about lots of people coming in and wanting donations and money.

**Goodwin:** Yeah. I don’t think we did at that time. In fact, one of the sticking points was [that] [the] Co-op [was] always willing to commit money indirectly in terms of staff time, but not directly. Just when I got off the Co-op board, I think there was talk—it never got very far, because I think it was seen as too radical an idea—that one should also make contributions of money. I know often suggestions were made that not very much money to certain legislators and causes could work wonders. That was all always rejected, and so I didn’t pursue it.

**Larsen:** One little titbit here, [and] that’s the Kiddie Korral.
Goodwin: Oh, yes, the Kiddie Korral.
Larsen: Did you have anything to do with that?
Goodwin: No, I didn’t, except that I think our kids were happy there. No, [there were] lots of other people who were more involved with that.

Reflections on Co-op’s Japanese Connection

Larsen: Japanese co-ops. You talked about European co-ops and the model that they had. Did the Japanese have a different model that got incorporated into how Berkeley operates, or should have been…?

Goodwin: I know very little about the Japanese co-ops. I think a lot of the visits and the ties that Berkeley had with the Japanese co-ops [are] relatively recent, except, of course, the philosophical one with, was it [Toyohiko] Kagawa, the great Japanese co-op leader? There’s George Yasukochi, there are all kinds of people who have been to Japan and dealt with them. So I know much less about them. I know they’re much bigger and more successful, but it’s a very different economy. A very different society.

In fact, I’m always struck, every morning—I work in the Civic Center, so I get off at Civic Center BART station. I walk past large numbers of homeless people of all kinds and shapes. Then, I get to that part of the Civic Center Plaza that is always full of tourists taking pictures of the City Hall, and more often than not, [there are] Japanese tourists. I’m always amazed. Every single group, the whole bus full, lines up and takes a picture of everybody. It is such an orderly, well-modulated group. No group of Americans or even Europeans lines up like that.

Jim Goodwin

Larsen: We haven’t touched on your husband very much.

Goodwin: No.

Larsen: What [are] his current activities?

Goodwin: He’s currently marketing prepaid group legal services to credit unions. Actually, [he’s] working with [Rich Lee], who heads up the State Employees’ Credit Union [number 2] in San Francisco, but who, many years ago, worked as a credit union specialist for Jim and BAND. Rich—I think after BAND Rich did Co-op—Rich came out of the Peace Corps [unclear] and then the credit unions there. Then, he came
to work for BAND. Then, I think he did a lot of work for the Credit Union League and credit unions in Africa. He’s just a credit union person, through and through.

At the moment, Jim is more directly—and actually it’s another area, really, [of] consumer education information because I think both of us are convinced that group legal services is the future in legal services for most people. They’re just like HMOs in the medical field. Slowly coming, but clearly—clearly because 70 percent of, I think the [unclear] has figures, 70 percent of people don’t have access to lawyers, only people at the very top and the bottom.

See, when Jim was with OEO, he was involved in helping set up legal services, to begin with, and also, particularly, California rural legal services, which was a whole different kettle of fish and a very revolutionary approach to that. Those were some of the OEO things that he worked on. Then, in between, he spent a number of years with the University of California in the president’s office, in charge of affirmative action.

[He] sort of covered the time when the first executive [order on Affirmative] Action came down through the [Boca?] case and slightly beyond. Then he spent some time in communications—during the Jerry Brown administration he was on the California Public Broadcasting Commission. He did a lot of work in that field and worked with, you know, all of the public stations, funding a lot of programs and things like that.

Larsen: Is there anything else that you’d like to add that we haven’t covered?

Goodwin: Nothing immediately comes to mind. I do have here, I think, the spellings of people’s names and so forth.

Larsen: Okay. We’ll catch that.

Goodwin: Yeah.

Larsen: I’d like to thank you very much for your time on this. I’ll thank you on behalf of the Berkeley Historical Society, under whose sponsorship I’m doing this.

END OF TRANSCRIPT
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In Memory of Eva S. Goodwin

By Leah Goodwin
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Eva Goodwin of Santa Rosa, California passed peacefully after a long battle with a variety of illnesses on April 7, 2011 at the age of 81. She was born in Vienna, Austria, the only child of Erwin and Pat Stasson. They moved to New York in October of 1938, after the invasion of Austria.

Eva graduated Phi Beta Kappa, with a degree in History and Fine Arts from Oberlin College in 1951. She loved Oberlin and supported them throughout her life. She then went to the University of Chicago Law School and received her Juris Doctorate in 1954.

Eva married Jim Goodwin in 1959; they lived in Berkeley until 2007 when they moved to Santa Rosa to reside at Friends House, a Quaker Retirement Community.

She served as a staff attorney for the Oregon Legislative Council, and then moved to Berkeley to take a position as judicial staff attorney for the California Court of Appeal where she worked until her retirement in 1988. She spent the summer of 1979 as a Legal Fellow at Harvard Law School, under the auspices of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Eva wrote the first training manual for Judicial Staff Attorneys. She mastered the technique of legal writing and research and was a mentor to many women who were entering the field of law. She was often asked to serve as a Small Claims Judge on the Berkeley-Albany Municipal Court.

Eva was an active participant and advocate for consumers, affirmative action and women’s affairs. She was one of the principal founders of the Judicial Attorneys of California, a professional organization that represented attorneys at all levels in both State and Federal courts. She served on the Prison Committee of the American Friends Service Committee, and the Board of the Berkeley Co-op. She was president and co-founder of TURN (Toward Utility Rate Normalization), and a member of the Board of Friends of the Marin Fountain and the Northern California Association to Save Bolinas Head and Harbor. Eva was appointed by Governor Edmund G. Brown Sr. to the State Consumer Advisory Committee. In 1977, she filed an amicus brief on behalf of the National Association of Affirmative Action Officers in Bakke v. Regents of the University of California representing minorities and women.

When Eva retired from law she went back to her first love which was painting with watercolors, and became a successful commissioned artist exhibiting and selling works with the Richmond Art Center, the French Laundry Group and others. She always took her sketch books and her paints and brushes on vacations and weekend trips to her beloved cabin in Inverness. She also enjoyed reading, theater, opera, early music concerts, traveling, cooking, gardening and swimming. She loved to put on large dinner parties and cookie bakes for children during the holidays.

Eva is survived by her husband James Goodwin; son, David Goodwin of San Mateo; daughter, Leah Goodwin of San Diego; four grandchildren, Adrianna Farmer of Vista; Azaleah Ashmore of San Diego; Midori Greenwood-Goodwin of Palo Alto; and Amaani Greenwood-Goodwin of San Mateo. Two great-grandsons, Christopher Farmer and Thomas Ashmore, and a great-granddaughter, Leilani Ashmore, also survive her.