

JACK SHAKELY
President, California Community Foundation
Interviewed by the late Kay Bixby
at the Foundation Office
on May 30, 1980

BIXBY: Our subject today is Jack Shakely, President of the California Community Foundation. Jack, you just said that you had not been recorded before for research or anything.

SHAKELY: This is the first time.

BIXBY: What led you into working in a social work atmosphere in the beginning?

SHAKELY: It started out as an adventure. I was in law school back in the early 60s and very much moved by John Kennedy. I joined the Peace Corps in 1963 and got out in 1965. Those two years turned my head about social change and community development. I then went into the Army, and interestingly enough, had pretty much the same job in the Army. I was doing community development kind of work and what they called in those days, "winning the hearts and mind." I worked on things that were pretty much of a social work nature. By the time I got out of the Peace Corps and the Army, I was almost 30 years old. The dye was already cast. I saw an opportunity to go into community development. I was actually working at the University of Oklahoma and got into fundraising and grantsmanship, and that sucked me into the non-profit world. I've been there ever since, and I enjoy it.

BIXBY: You went through one of the - when was it that you went to the mental health hospital?

SHAKELY: Resthaven? I went on the staff of Resthaven in 1970. I had just been out in California for a couple of years. I came out of the Army and moved out here in 1969. I was working at Martin Luther Hospital in Orange County.

BIXBY: Oh, that's interesting. What did you do there, Jack?

SHAKELY: I was Director of Public Relations and Communications. They were doing a big consolidation effort of Anaheim General and Martin Luther and there was some pretty strong feeling about that - against that. They brought me in to work with the press and do some publicity and public relations work and speaking engagements all over Orange County. One of the people I met there was a guy named Ken Stein, who became a very close friend and was the head of the Community Outreach Department at Resthaven. As luck would have it, Resthaven had a position that opened up in Communications. I moved up there in February or March of 1970.

BIXBY: When did all of the altercations start?

SHAKELY: They just about greeted me at the door. I remember not more than a month after I got there, there was a protest by the predominantly Asian community, led by a community activist named Morrie Noshita, that accused Resthaven of being in Chinatown, but not being of Chinatown. There were no Asian therapists on staff - all those accusations, by the way, were correct. There was no Asian therapist, there was no Asian of any kind on staff at that time. It was a very exciting period from the word go.

BIXBY: Well it fit in with the turmoil of the times.

SHAKELY: Very much so. There was a tremendous part of the community wanting to express itself and also a tremendous distrust of institutions, whether the institution was government or military. Resthaven was an institution. It was also seen as an institution that was White and elitist; that was the perception. So it was a natural target: a very natural target.

BIXBY: It was the only target, though, that the Asians went for, wasn't it?

SHAKELY: It was, it really was.

BIXBY: That was what was so strange to me.

SHAKELY: I'm going to look back - hindsight is 20/20, but I believe one of the reasons why the demonstrations were so effective was that there was a posture on the part of the Board and key staff to accept what the community was saying. There was a very quick admission that the staff was not ethnically balanced and a tremendous move to get that done. The Board was expanded to bring in the community. I think that the mistake that was made was that the same community activists who had raised much of the problem were invited to join the Board. Very often, community activists serve in an activist role; they're destroyers, not builders, and I think that proved to be the case later on, because the organization imploded and destroyed itself.

BIXBY: Didn't it come under pressure, at that time, to change the services that were traditionally done?

SHAKELY: Yes. It had been a traditional, psychiatric inpatient setting. Because it had recently received community mental health center monies from the Federal Government, it was required to, and wanted to, go into the whole spectrum of mental health services such as outpatient and community outreach. We had a child and family program under Thor Nelson that was off site. Resthaven had always been innovative, as you know. It had work therapy and dance therapy. Twila Tharp had actually started her career as a dancer at Resthaven. There was a very successful inpatient setting. It was run at the top by men and women who were very familiar with a medical-model institution, but unfamiliar with a community-based model institution. Therein lay a lot of the conflict. Some of the people, like Ken Stein, who were the community outreach people, felt like outsiders in their own group. They would come

swaggering in from the outlands like grizzled veterans in a war movie, looking at people who stayed in the hospital as if they were somehow not on the cutting edge. There was a great deal of tension, internally, as to whether we were a psychiatric hospital, devoted to patient care, or a community mental health center, devoted to social change. Both those feelings were held very strongly by members of the staff, and they were simply dichotomous. They couldn't work together.

BIXBY: What do you think that the turmoil of that period - what were the gains and the losses?

SHAKELY: There were very few gains, in my opinion. The gains that were made were in the area of programs. Resthaven did respond quickly to the call of the community and created, for example, a couple of Hispanic family programs and group programs in the Spanish language. That was one of the first Spanish-language inpatient groups. There was a theory at the time that Hispanics did not respond well to basic European traditional psychotherapy, which was a bunch of hooey. They just couldn't find any therapists that spoke Spanish. Then they did find one. When Resthaven did it, that gave a lot of other hospitals and other psychiatric centers the impetus to do it, too. There was real trail blazing there. That was very effective.

The other thing that Resthaven was able to prove, unfortunately, was that community mental health centers are financially stepchildren, can't possibly make it on their own and must depend for a huge amount of their support on government money. Resthaven moved from a strictly private sector psychiatric hospital that was receiving only modest amounts of government support and huge amounts of private support - very large volunteer effort.....

BIXBY: They were good fundraisers.

SHAKELY: They were very good fundraisers, they had support groups for young women, for more mature women, for young men. It looked like the Music Center. They had four or five dinners a year. They had all kinds of things. When the huge infusion of government money came in, a lot of the support groups, especially the women's groups, were saying to themselves, "What does our \$15,000 a year mean when it's compared to \$4,000,000 from the State?" The ardor started to disappear. What we learned was, in fact, that the private sector could not sustain that hospital. If you look now at community mental health centers here in Southern California, Resthaven was the first to go under, but not the last. There have been at least six others that have gone under. The ones who have not gone under, such as Thaliens, which is really a mental health center in name only. There's not an institution there, they just do work and call it "Thaliens." Kedren is gone, Central City Community Health Center is gone, San Fernando Child Guidance Center has now changed its name and changed its direction, Gateways is gone, I think.

BIXBY: Pretty well gone.

SHAKELY: If not gone, it's merged. I think the community mental health experiment has proved itself to be both successful and horribly expensive. The government is not wanting to pay for it.

BIXBY: Just as they aren't in a lot of mental health problems, too.

SHAKELY: I think so too. As you well know, the whole mental health picture is one where a person can look perfectly sane for years, and yet be in real bad trouble. You can look at ten years in retrospect: look at all the jobs he lost, all the fights he got into, the divorces. We should have seen the pattern, but we didn't see it. Persons in the middle of that pattern are really in

desperate need, but there's really no place for them to go. They may still be holding a job, although not quite the job they wanted; they may still be getting some support, though not as much support as they need. It's a devilish, devilish situation in a series of diseases.

BIXBY: In the mental health changes - that was the 60s and 70s, too - when they didn't want them in institutions anymore, but now we're reaping the rewards of that.

SHAKELY: That's right, too. Things have changed so much. I can remember that one of the - Resthaven wasn't just attached by the Asian Community: it was attached right, left and forward.

The gay community made a concerted attack on it, too, stating that they wanted to have specific services for gays. Resthaven responded by saying, "Yes," but in a curious early 1970s way, they made homosexuality a disease. That infuriated the entire gay community, so they lost twice in that battle. I don't think they ever really recovered from that. I think the Gay and Lesbian Community Service Center started its own mental health program shortly thereafter.

BIXBY: Where did you go after Resthaven?

SHAKELY: (Laughing) On a long vacation. I left in 1974, and I'd been, for about a year, I'd been working part time at Resthaven and part time in some consulting with the local television station here. I was doing odd jobs, basically, in grantsmanship and proposal writing and things like that. Through that, a group of us formed the Grantsmanship Center.

BIXBY: That was what I thought.

SHAKELY: That was actually started in 1973, and I went full time in 1974 and stayed with them for six years till I came here.

BIXBY: All right. Now, what happened to the Grantsmanship Center?

SHAKELY: It's actually still around, although in a vastly different system. I'm becoming

fearful: virtually every agency I worked for, seems to go away. Maybe I'm the kiss of death.

The Grantsmanship Center started in 1973, and as you remember, there were so many community-based organizations. During the War of Poverty, under the Johnson Administration, tons of money came into communities. Community-based organizations were started, but it took a while for the community-based organizations to understand they had to be administratively far better than they were. They didn't know anything about corporate funding or foundation funding or how to get support from the general public. They were totally at the behest of the Federal Government, and if they lost their federal funding, the agency was gone. A lot of community activists decided that wasn't right and that community-based organizations should be able to play on the same level field as the big boys who were getting money from foundation. We knew corporations and foundations. Church groups and quasi-governmental units like the National Endowment for the Arts were giving away hundreds of millions of dollars. We just didn't know how you got it. About a half dozen of us, probably so green and not knowing what we were doing - that was the only reason we could have started it - created this organization called the Grantsmanship Center. I traveled to - the first three or four years, I would travel to 35 cities every year, teaching these four-day seminars. Every time I was in one, I would make it a point to stop and interview foundations and corporations. The other five would do the same thing. By the time we got back, in a couple of years, we had the largest collection of information about foundations and corporations that anybody ever had.

We started a magazine called the Grantsmanship Center News, which was very irreverent. It didn't like foundations, by and large; said they were non-responsive. No one had ever said that in print before, and it got us two things: it got a lot of recognition and a lot of subscribers,

but it also got us a lot of vilification on the part of the establishment at that time. Interestingly enough, at that same time, the Farber-Filer Commission was looking at philanthropy in America.

This was 1976. We issued a minority report at the Farber Commission that the New York Times picked up and printed side-by-side. The Farber Commission had spent \$20 million in about a year and a half, and we spent about \$37 in all of our travel. The Farber Commission, to their credit, then asked one of our staff members, Jim Abarnathy, to spend a year with them and give the community-based side. He did, and from that was created a group called the National Committee for Response and Philanthropy, who now pokes sticks at me. I feel like Dr. Frankenstein. There does need to be a realist or somebody who sees that the Emperor has no clothes. That was the task that we took to ourselves, the Grantsmanship Center in the 70s.

There was an awful lot of money from the Federal Government in those days, and State governments, too, for training and technical assistance. From the period 1974 to 1980, the Grantsmanship Center grew and grew and grew almost exponentially. We had a tremendous amount of money. We were doing a tremendous amount of training programs, and we were doing senior programs for advanced people in the field, a lot of writing and publishing books, pamphlets and materials.

Then in 1980, with the Reagan Administration, it all ended. It ended with the blunt severity of a lead pipe. Almost all training and technical assistance money was the first go: it was the softest money, anywhere. United Way cut back on training, community development organizations cut back on training, economic development groups cut back on training, and the Grantsmanship Center went from about a budget of about \$3,000,000 in 1980 to a budget of about \$1,000,000 by 1982. We couldn't contract as quickly as we spent, and by 1983, the

Grantsmanship Center had debts of well over \$500,000 and no prospects. So in 1984, we decided to close it. But Norton Koortz, who was the actual founder of it, the fellow who had been the driving force behind it and put a lot of his own money into it, asked if he could buy it. In California, you can sell a non-profit corporation and make it into a private corporation, if the person who's buying it, will give the corresponding money of the worth of that corporation to charity. So we worked out a deal with the Attorney General that Norton would take over the half million dollar debt and personally accept that and continue the Center as a profit-making corporation, which it is today. The magazine ceased to function in 1985, and the Grantsmanship Center, now, is pretty much where it was in 1972 or '73 when it started; two or three going around the country, teaching these courses. I hear good thing things about them.

BIXBY: That's interesting.

SHAKELY: I don't want to make this out to be too political, but I think we're just beginning to see the abject harm that the Reagan Administration's budget cuts placed upon this country. A lot of people were pretty smug with the fact that they couldn't see anything bad after the cuts were made. Well, that was because it takes awhile for the infrastructure to destroy itself, but it's destroyed. Non-profit organizations today are probably no better prepared for seeking funding than they were twenty years ago. Boards of Directors of non-profit organizations are by and large no better trained than they used to be. Some of the volunteer organizations that have for years been doing a lot of training, find it difficult to find funding. The Center for Non-Profit Management here in Los Angeles struggles. It's something we're really paying for. We find, suddenly, that the small, non-profit organizations really can't manage. We find ourselves, here at the Community Foundation, providing technical assistance to our grant teams. We give them

some money, but we're also telling them how to set up their books and how to go about recruiting. It's pretty raw out there.

BIXBY: Well, I'd agree with that. Do you see any other differences? From my own experience since retirement, I see differences in the way agencies operate. In other words, motivations aren't the same, it seems to me. Do you notice that?

SHAKELY: I do notice that. I think that the same thing is starting to happen in the non-profit sector that we're noticing in other sectors. It's a more "bottom line" feeling.

There's a good and a bad part of that. Our private sector has been, for years, accused of poor management. I believe that was a false accusation, frankly. I think that the non-profit sector has gotten along far better than people imagine. A case in point is that for years, where a non-profit hospital was accused of poor management, and, you remember in the early 1980s, a couple of nation-wide health chains were proprietary - AMI being the biggest one - made a lot of bally hoo about taking over these non-profit hospitals and saying, "We're gonna make 'em pay. We're gonna make 'em work." Well, AMI didn't make them pay and didn't make them work, and they went belly-up, too. The fact of the matter is that AMI probably ran those hospitals far worse as a proprietary hospital than as a non-profit, but the newspapers only picked up the quotes from the Chairman of AMI. He said, "We're going to turn these around and make them work." They never really got around to reporting the fact they were probably being run better as non-profits than they were being run as proprietary. At least, that was the accusation. Nowadays - I just saw a Business Week article that did have a list of some of the best entrepreneurial and best managers in the non-profit sector: Fay Wallenstein at Planned Parenthood, and Jim Joseph at Council of Foundations. I thought that was quite fascinating.

Maybe it has enhanced, a little bit, this bottom line thing, as with all administration. In some cases it has taken a little bit out of the soul of some of the organizations. Do you agree with that?

BIXBY: Yes. In fact, that worries me.

SHAKELY: Me too.

BIXBY: I'm finding the staffs of agencies less centered on client services than on their own salaries.

SHAKELY: That's unfortunately true, and I don't know where the curve goes on that. In many cases, even here in the Foundation, we're having to compete with private centers. Schools are having to compete with computer centers for math and science teachers, volunteering has changed. You know better than anyone I can think of how much that's changed. Most women these days, work, so the daytime volunteer business has declined. There still is a large cadre of people doing volunteering in traditional areas like hospitals, and so forth. I'll wager that the number of daytime volunteers is way down, and I think that the evening time work is up. We're going to see a new type of volunteering. Volunteers seem to band together and do things on their own. They do it entrepreneurially. They don't go under any other organizations. If they want to do scholarships, they don't think about going to UCLA and saying, "Can we help you raise scholarships?" They simply create a new organization and call it Los Angeles for Youth for instance. This proprietary volunteerism is brand new to me. I never saw it before. I see it all the time now.

BIXBY: Also they're short-term, very visibly volunteering and then dropping out.

SHAKELY: Yes, yes. I don't want to discredit any type of organization, but I sometimes feel

that the organizations that provide a day at a baseball game or Disneyland for a terminally ill child is really 19th Century-type charity. It is not 20th Century-type philanthropy at all. It doesn't improve the condition of the youngster. In fact, many social scientists would argue that provides a divisive wedge in the community and provides for sibling rivalry and guilt.

BIXBY: It's an ego trip to the giver.

SHAKELY: That's exactly what it seems to be, and that worries me a bit. I think that means that maybe those of us who are in the non-profit sector, and those of us who've been in it for a while, aren't reaching out and reaching over enough and grabbing a hold of these people and saying, "Look, there are better ways to do it better." We're looking for ways to pull the people in, but we're missing it. These are people who are on the outside, and they're going to stay on the outside.

BIXBY: Jack, turning things around a little bit, let me ask you about another area that worries me. Is the public sector, the government sector, now setting up its own non-profit entities?

SHAKELY: I gave a speech two years ago that said if all the governments and the schools didn't stop creating foundations, foundations would create government just in retaliation. That worries me as well. I can't tell you the number of failures in this area. It's just legendary. In Los Angeles, Project Restore is a good example, where they tried to create a foundation to restore City Hall, and they found that most people gave a huge yawn. They felt City Hall should be restored by City Hall. It's a government building, and they expected that the government would take care of it. There was a whole rash, as you know, of public school foundations being started, and just as we predicted, the only ones who thrived were San Marino, Beverly Hills, Pacific Palisades, and Pales Verdes. The ones in South Central LA or East LA where the need is

greatest, have all failed. Money begets money. I don't really understand the proliferation of the government foundations. I think it's a way of getting private sector money and still control it by the bureaucrats. It's totally oppositional.

BIXBY: They blame it all on Proposition 13.

SHAKELY: Yes, well, Prop 13 did have some problems alright, and caused some real problems. The government looked at it the only way government, perhaps, could look at it, and that is, "We don't have enough money from the government: we've gotta get some money from someone else." What they should have looked at, they should have said, "If we don't have enough money to do this, why don't we let somebody else do this?"

The Parks and Recreation Departments should have been privatized long ago. We have a park here - the Community Foundation owns a park - we maintain it. Our cost of maintenance is about one third of what the cost to the City of Los Angeles is, and we maintain it beautifully. We have not experienced the same kinds of problems the city parks have.

I'm not anti-government. I believe government should be a way for people to get things done, but not necessarily do things for us. Public housing is a good example. We've learned in the 70s and 80s that government cannot build housing. It can fund other people to build housing, but it can't build housing. It can't run parks either. It can't run zoos. It shouldn't run mental health centers, and it shouldn't run psychiatric hospitals. It ought to collect taxes and give it the non-profit sectors to run almost everything. By the way, that opinion is probably not shared by a lot of my friends, but I really think that the government with all these foundations in kind of fits and starts has expended a great deal of public money, giving almost nothing in return.

The average American is not going to sit down and write a check to his city. He writes plenty,

anyway, and gives it in taxes and so forth, but I think he would be far more willing to give money to a private, non-profit organization, doing the same thing. He feels a little closer in line with people who are on the board or staff, and he feels he could be in somewhat more control if they don't have success with these foundations.

BIXBY: I don't quite trust government saying they have no money, because every time they had a cause that was politically nice to have, the money was always there.

SHAKELY: One of the things that we do learn, and learn very, very distinctly is that government has a very, very important role in this country. That is the role of taking care of national security. National security isn't just watching our borders for invaders from foreign shores. It's taking care of the national security of people who put their money in savings and loans, who fly on airplanes. If I fly on an airplane and there hasn't been an inspection of that airplane for a couple of months because the government can't pay enough money to put inspectors in the FAA, and the top blows of the airplane like it did in Hawaii, my security has been threatened as much as if a Russian had come in to my back yard. If I put money in a savings and loan association, and Charles Keating steals it because there's nobody there to watch him do it, my security has been threatened. What we have really seen over the last decade is that the role of the United States Government and the State and County Government has become very clear: it must protect the commonwealth. It should get out of building homes and get into monitoring all these skid row hotels that are being poorly run and making sure that they're well run. The ability of certain tiny, tiny minority of this world to do desperate acts for money, is spell-binding. When you look at all the money the S & L's are going to cost this government, it amounts to more than all the savings that were inactive in the eight years of the Reagan

Administration times about ten. I'm getting off on something other than what we had just been talking about. One of the reasons why, right now, we're having an infrastructure problem is that we don't have strong monitoring. If government needs that kind of money to do it, I don't think that anyone in America would say no. And they should leave the non-profit sector to do all the social work and all the human service work and all the art work, for that matter. This National Endowment for the Arts thing is tearing the art world asunder, right now.

BIXBY: That's an interesting phenomena, too. By the way, whatever happened - remember when we were trying to get the arts to have a management center? Did you ever manage to get anything done on that?

SHAKELY: I never pulled that together. We must have had meetings for two years. I never was able to pull that together. The (name on tape is indistinct) Players were very, very seriously involved in it for a while, but then Los Angeles Theater Center got the place downtown, and they split off. Bella Lewinsky got a promise of all that money from Rob McGuire, and then they split off. Here it is, seven years later, and they still haven't built that dance gallery. It was just very difficult to get a group in place that could feel strong enough to compete with the Music Center. So we never got it done.

BIXBY: I got such a kick out of one of the people that we were talking to. He said, "I'm not interested in any of this. All I want to do is get on stage." (Laughter) That wasn't helpful at all to management, was it?

SHAKELY: That's right.

BIXBY: Jack, did you find your vast experience helpful when you went into this Foundation?

SHAKELY: Very helpful. Because I'd been so involved in non-profits, I knew what

non-profit organizations were looking for. I knew the kind of foundation they were looking for.

We tried to create that for them. The California Community Foundation had been very quiet, had been more of a function of a trust office at Security Pacific Bank for years.

BIXBY: And really only funded capital.

SHAKELY: Only funded capital. The Board came to me and said they were tired of being called the “Typewriter Foundation,” or whatever we were being called at that time. We wanted to feel like we could make a difference, so working with the Board for about three months, we did come up with a complete new agenda and a new set of guidelines and criteria for funding. I had a meeting in one of the downtown auditoriums, and we must have had five to six hundred non-profit organizations in attendance. I walked out on the stage and said, “Guess what? We’re not funding equipment anymore at all.” There was a rush of intake of breath all over the place. One person said to me later, ‘Now you don’t do general support. You don’t do capital, and you don’t do equipment. What’s left?’ But we really started being a program-oriented foundation at that time. I was able to bring on board other people who had worked with me, not necessarily at the Grantsmanship Center, although it turns out Jennifer Leonard and Harvey Chess did and a few others, the people who knew not just grantmaking, but who knew what it took to run a non-profit organization. The Community Foundation pretty quickly became seen as a partner, rather than adversary in the whole funding area. And that’s what we wanted. We didn’t have that much money. When I came on board, we had \$19,000,000 in assets, and only about \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 of that was unrestricted. So at best, we could give away \$500,000 a year. We’re giving away now, in unrestricted funds, about \$4,000,000 a year, and total grants of about \$9,000,000 a year. We’ve really grown. At that time, and even now, we

really had to posture ourselves as being sort of an advocate for non-profits. We have our library, we do our training programs. I really didn't want to have the Community Foundation seen as standing apart.

I think my background gave me that opportunity because I had worked with so many of these organizations, if not by name, by type, at the Grantsmanship Center. I knew what the expectations were. I also knew, after working for ten years at other foundations, how frustrating it can become to have people not have their mail answered and things like that. So I think it was a tremendous help.

BIXBY: At what point did you separate from the bank?

SHAKELY: Just about six months after I got there. I had come in to the Foundation with the pledge to the Board that that would happen. Security Bank, frankly, was acting in a very heroic fashion, because you don't see corporations giving up territory very often. This was territory. Although they didn't make any money on the Community Foundation, they saw it as their Foundation. We got the bank convinced to spin us off. They gave us about a \$200,000 grant to buy new letterhead, stationary, new brochures, and all those things when we moved, and got us into new quarters. It really took off after that. 'Eighty-one was really the launch year for us, and interestingly enough - and this didn't have any application to anyone else except the Community Foundation - by doing that, we grew so swiftly that Security Pacific's assets actually grew faster than they had been before when they were the exclusive grantor. A lot of the people had been fearful that if they gave the money to Community Foundation, it would just go into Security Pacific, somehow, and get lost. So by our breaking off entirely, it really changed that philosophy.

BIXBY: Then there's a decided definition which people can make -- very specific kinds of definition about the use of their money.

SHAKELY: Very true. I think that even - I had a lot of hope for Community Foundation. I really wanted to come here. I had been studying community foundations for years and wrote a big article, and when I say big, it was about a 50,000 word article on community foundations back in 1977. I really wanted to run a community foundation. The fact that there was one right here in my back yard that, at the time, wasn't being run very well, was just irresistible to me. I can tell you I used everything I could think of to get recognized so that I could get this job. I really tried to get it, and it's been extraordinarily rewarding. I think community foundations, by and large, are a good thing for the community. They're flexible, they can change direction. One of the problem I can raise here is that you get a group of agencies, and that group of agencies depends on funding, the last thing they want to see is 200 new agencies come along and share in that wealth. There's a recent study by the Asian Pacific group that said there are only seven Asian-specific organizations in the United Way out of some 320 agencies. That's just not enough. Yet, getting other agencies was difficult. Communitize, you can change overnight. They can give all the grants in 1989 to Hispanics; or all its grants to United Asians, if they feel like it.

Community foundations throughout the country have been able to move very swiftly. I like being in that sort of thing. I like being able to be in the hunt, from a non-profit perspective.

We were one of the first organizations to fund AIDS back in '84, and were able to get into the amnesty program very, very quickly when that law was passed in '86. We're looking now at affordable housing, so there is a lot of flexibility in the movement. I love being in the

community foundation scene.

BIXBY: It gives you, as director, a lot of freedom that you wouldn't have in a lot of other settings, either.

SHAKELY: That's exactly right. We have over 300 funds here. Not a single one of the funds represents more than two percent of our total assets. We're not beholden to any particular person or corporation. Most of our donors leave us money through wills and bequests, so much of the money is pretty much unfettered.. So we do have a great deal of flexibility to move where the community wants us. We can go into loans, we can go into arts, we can go into mental health, just wherever the need is the greatest. I like that, because I can look at the community from a perspective that says, "I don't have to look at it as an educator or a mental health professional. I can look at it as, I hope, a fairly objective community organizer who has some bucks." There's nothing better for a community organizer to not only have the ideas, but to have the money to get it done. It's a dream come true.

BIXBY: Ann Shaw is on your Board, and her comment was that it was so nice to be on that side of the street. (Laughter)

SHAKELY: I know. The difficult part is that there's never enough money. We have to turn down people and agencies that have top notch wonderful ideas. Ann and I have talked about this. To get the combination of the right idea and the right people to do it, to be able to actually put money into it and see it work, is a rare thing. We've had that more than once, and it really feels good.

BIXBY: Okay, Jack, do you want to say anything else on this tape that you can think of?

SHAKELY: Oh, I don't know. I know one of the things that I hope - the United Way is going

through a renaissance now, a rebirth, and the Community Foundation is still just reaching its rebirth: we'll have a hundred million dollars sometime this year. But a hundred million looks like an awful lot when it used to be only twenty million. For a community this size, the California Community Foundation really should be five hundred million. The United Way should be raising two hundred million dollars a year instead of eighty-five million a year. So we have a long way to go, but I feel something good happening here. I am the eternal optimist, of course, but I wasn't terribly optimistic in the early '80s and mid-80s. I'm far more so, now, in the 90s. I think LA is going to take some giant strides toward helping it's neighbors, and I'm glad I'm part of it.

BIXBY: I think Los Angeles is so unique in its diversity and its inter-cultural kinds of things. It's an exciting place to be.

SHAKELY: It really is. I'd rather be here than anywhere. Thanks, Kay.

BIXBY: Thank you. I appreciate your time. This will be very helpful to have in the Archives.

