
ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND

ANNUAL REPORT

1985

10/1

ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND, INC.

1290 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10104

TELEPHONE (212) 373-4200

ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND

ANNUAL REPORT

1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GETTING TO THE HEART OF GIVING

6

THE ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND AND ITS PROGRAM

14

HOW TO APPLY FOR A GRANT

18

GRANTS APPROVED IN 1985

ONE WORLD

20

NEW YORK CITY

33

NONPROFIT SECTOR

35

SPECIAL CONCERNS

37

FUND FOR RAMON MAGSAYSAY AWARD FOUNDATION

37

POCANTICO FUND

38

ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND AWARDS IN ARTS EDUCATION

38

PAYMENTS MADE IN 1985 AND GRANTS OUTSTANDING

39

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

53

TRUSTEES

64

OFFICERS

65

STAFF

65

INDEX

66

I asked the urchin who knocks on my door each year with her order form for Girl Scout cookies what she thinks peoples' reasons are for saying yes to her request. "Sometimes it's because they like the cookies and I think sometimes it's because they like me or they're afraid I'll cry or something if they say no." Sometimes it is all of the above, I thought, as I gave the child, whom I have known since birth, an especially hefty order for my favorite Samoas. Nary a word about the Girl Scouts passed her lips, and she was right not to bother in this case: her rhetorical powers would simply not have been up to convincing me that my order made a whit of difference to the future of that superb organization. But her cookies and her person were motivation aplenty. The little voice inside me that murmured, "It's for a good cause," was a reflex that had nothing to do with the Girl Scouts and everything to do with the twinge of guilt occasioned by the size of my investment in chocolate and coconut.

What is likely to turn us into givers? The young Scout produced a set of reasons that ring true even for those who can claim some expertise on the question. We give because we are asked; we are more likely to give if we are asked in person; we are most likely to give if we are asked by someone we know. We give because we get something we value in return. We give because we are afraid of the consequences if we do not.

If this much insight can be collected from a single query, we might expect to learn considerably more by asking over a thousand people many questions on giving. In 1985 the Rockefeller Brothers Fund underwrote a national survey of charitable behavior carried out by the firm of Yankelovich, Skelly and White, with findings analyzed and published by Independent Sector. The survey provides much new matter on giving, much that invites our speculation, reflection and, ultimately, response.

89% of Americans reported giving an average of \$650 or 2.4% of income to charity in 1984; approximately 70% of all giving went to religious charities

To begin with, the survey included an open-ended question about reasons for giving. The findings here add reasons to the list begun earlier: the belief that one gives to a worthy cause; a desire to help those in need or less fortunate than ourselves; close involvement, loyalty, personal experience with an organization; spiritual reasons. In addition, people report that they give because the gift can be automatically taken out of their salary. Many mention some particular thing about an organization—its programs, the way it is run, its good work—as a reason for giving. From what people say in the survey about why they give to a particular charity, it would appear that what turns us into givers depends on what we are giving to: payroll deduction matters most in United Way giving, the involvement/loyalty/personal experience triad leads our reasons for giving to education. Spiritual reasons are the most frequently mentioned in explaining giving to religious charities; they are very seldom advanced to account for other kinds of giving.

73% of givers said their religious beliefs had no influence on their giving to non-religious charities

The results of the survey's direct questioning about motives leave some broad impressions. People would seem to have a great number of reasons of different sorts for giving. Moreover, they are able to produce different reasons for different gifts and various reasons for a single gift. Clearly, there is nothing so simple as a hierarchy of motives or a model of giving behavior that can be readily wrested from what people are able to tell you about their own giving.

Asking people why they give is a tricky business. A good survey does not trust people to explain why they do what they do; it looks for clues to motivation in actual behavior and in those mysterious intersections of the conscious and subconscious known as attitudes. In the survey researcher's universe people become respondents, known by a set of demographic characteristics, valued for their representation of hundreds of thousands like themselves, indispensable pieces in a statistically valid sample representative of the nation as a whole. The researcher's alchemy makes it possible to scrutinize the connection between who people are—demographically speaking—and how generous they are.

62% of Americans believe that it is better to help people you know in your own community than to help people elsewhere

If we measure generosity only by the dollar amount given, the findings of the RBF survey seem to settle into clear patterns that permit some solid, sensible generalizations about giving. Giving peaks in the middle years of life, increases with income, occupational status, and educational level, is highest among the married, grows with the size of the household. The picture changes if we permit ourselves to ask about generosity as a person's commitment to giving, which the survey does by figuring contributions as a percent of income. Here lines blur, distinctions, especially those based on income, are not so clear. Givers with the lowest incomes give virtually the same percent of income on average as those in the highest income range. Highly committed givers exist in significant numbers in every income range.

On second glance, the rich lode of information that comes from matching giving behavior with demographic characteristics begins to generate more questions than answers. Why are widowed people the most committed givers? Why does giving increase so dramatically as the number of people in the household rises—even if income falls? Finally, why are the young in this survey, those under thirty-five, so spectacularly ungenerous, measured both by dollar amount and percentage of income given? The demographic scan can tell us these things are so, but we are left wondering why they are so.

If neither people nor numbers can be relied upon for an adequate account of the whys of giving, there is still something between the purely subjective and the objective left for a survey to explore. The researcher can anatomize us by our attitudes as well as our demographic characteristics and can look, as well, at other behaviors, like church-going and volunteering, that are likely to go along with giving. The RBF survey finds us solidly in the motherhood and apple pie corner, all for giving as much as we can and volunteering some of our time to help others. We are not quite as unanimous when it comes to acting on these values and many of us express a desire to do better.

The average giving for 35-49 year olds was \$910; it was \$1,940 for those with incomes of \$50,000 and over

Givers with income under \$10,000 gave 3.0% of income on average; those with income of \$50,000 and over gave 2.9%

The average giving for givers 30-34 was \$500 or 1.6% of income; of givers with income of \$30,000 and above, 37% of those under 35 gave less than 1% of income compared to 14% of those 35-64

81% of Americans feel that it is their responsibility to give what they can to charity; 78% believe they should volunteer

38% of Americans said they were not giving enough to charity; 51% of those who supported volunteering did not volunteer themselves in 1984

Things get more interesting when it comes to attitudes not so explicitly tied to giving. The survey offers evidence that for many of us, how we feel about money—our own money—has a bearing on how generous we are. In particular, the survey demonstrates that feeling you have something left over when you have taken care of the necessities and having little or no concern about having enough money in the future go along with strong giving. These subjective measures of wealth turn out to be more strongly linked to how we act as givers than objective measures of actual income.

Those who reported having at least a moderate amount of income left over gave an average of \$1,120 compared to average giving of \$250 from those who reported having no discretionary income

It would seem that feeling one can afford to give without robbing the present or jeopardizing the future may affect the size of our gift but it does not get to the heart of what turns us into givers in the first place. The survey shows too much giving flourishing in the lower income ranges, where very few feel economically secure, and too little among young people with no money worries, to justify adopting some formula related to discretionary income as fundamental to explaining giving.

Perhaps we are closer to penetrating the mystery of giving when the survey verifies what we may already have known: people who attend religious services regularly and people who engage in volunteer work are significantly better givers than indifferent or non-churchgoers and non-volunteers. This pair of findings may encourage us to speculate that people simply give out of the goodness of their hearts. This goodness is cultivated in religious settings and seeks expression in actively helping others as well as in giving. The altruism hypothesis may be more satisfying than any other yet advanced. Its great appeal is that it so unequivocally locates the root motivation for giving inside the giver and presents an optimistic, flattering view of humankind. But our own experience of the world, of particular gifts and givers, even of ourselves as givers may make it impossible to accept altruism as the last word on motivation.

The average giving for those who attend religious services weekly was \$990, compared to \$300 for those who never attend; volunteers gave \$850 on average compared to \$510 for non-volunteers

In an odd way, the survey encourages our skepticism. The best givers of all, it turns out, may be churchgoers, may be volunteers, but they are also *planners*. They may be giving from the heart, but they use their heads: those who plan their giving, have certain amounts or, even better, percentages in mind are the very best givers among us. Altruism does not preclude practical planning for giving, but this last finding of the survey challenges us to find a common denominator in these three correlatives to better giving. The churchgoer, the volunteer, the person who plans for giving share an *awareness* on the subject of giving that is better than average. Planning for giving implies a high degree of consciousness, an integration and acknowledgment of giving as a part of living. The same sort of explicit attention to giving is alive, well and on display in churches, synagogues and volunteer settings. It could be that the more people think about giving, the more they are likely to give.

Those who pledged a certain dollar amount to their church or synagogue gave an average of \$880 to religious charities; those who tried to give a proportion of income gave an average of \$1,210 to religious charities

It could also be that the way to get more people to give is to get more people to think about giving. This hypothesis, teased out of the survey, may help explain the spectacular success of USA for Africa and Live Aid. Presumably many of the millions they raised came from the same younger generation found to be underperforming in the survey. Simple awareness may have played a part in turning them, in large numbers, into givers. The media's intense, and for a time, unrelenting treatment of the tragedy in Ethiopia acted as a sort of massive consciousness-raising campaign, forcing people to think not only about the need, but also about their response. The media began to include information about how to respond: *giving* as well as the famine became an explicit subject in the daily and nightly news.

But none of this really does justice to the phenomena of USA for Africa and Live Aid. Understanding them may be the key to unlocking the mystery of why people give. If failing to capture some ultimate truth about giving in the labyrinths of the survey were not enough to teach us, these two new-wave charities force us to accept that what we are after may exist outside a reality we can test and measure and may be accessible only via the imagination. Perhaps what the survey is measuring, inadvertently, is the murk surrounding the ultimate

motivation for giving, the reason large enough to embrace all others. The murk, too, may be inadvertent, not laid down to order by our subconscious at all, but simply the product of slovenly housekeeping. Remembering the hypothesis that awareness increases giving, we should wonder what might happen if we pulled out whatever is hidden there in the gloom, dusted it off, and gave it some attention: thought about it, talked about it, wrote about it.

To do this we will have to put a name to what is hidden within us and from us. USA for Africa and Live Aid may have made this possible. With music and pictures and a breathtaking marriage of imagination and technology they reached right down through the murk and galvanized whatever instinct lives there unregarded. It was not their organization—impressive but transparent to the giver—not purely their means—spectacular as they were—and not just the life and death need for which they stood. USA for Africa and Live Aid created a sense of global community. The message was not simply that people are starving in Africa; the message was “we are the world, we are the children.” These appeals made the vital connection between living and giving for us and identified giving as an expression of our shared humanity, our belonging to a world community. For millions of people, including the young, this was a reason to give, whether or not they admired Lionel Richie, thought Mick Jagger obscene, loved the song, were not in the habit of giving to international relief efforts, were grateful that they had never gone hungry.

Another of 1985’s giving phenomena, Harvard University, finished raising \$350 million in five years. Those who answered Harvard’s call were also acknowledging a belonging, embracing a connection, establishing membership in a community. The root similarity in two such different cases makes us think we are on to something. A theory is born: a longing for connection underlies giving; giving is the natural consequence of accepting connection. Probing the nature of that longing brings some refinement to the theory: for some, or in some cases, the longing is a need to belong, with all sorts of secondary motives attached; for others, or in some cases, longing is a more single-hearted wish to celebrate the connection implied in the kind of gift.

This proves to be a capacious theory. It accommodates neediness and joy, selfishness and altruism, calculation and spontaneity in a general understanding of the instinct buried in the murk within. Some of the oddities of the survey—the widow’s extraordinary commitment to the church, the steady increase in household giving that parallels the increase in the number of people in the household—lose their mystery in its light. The theory also provides a way to understand the more serious conundrum of the survey’s ungenerous young who nonetheless are swept up by USA for Africa and Live Aid. Does this turnabout mean that they are more at home with a global or even cosmic connection than with the more mundane kinds of belonging that underlie their elders’ generosity? If they are unlike their elders in their giving behavior, they may be presumed to be unlike as well in their longing for connection, their need or desire to acknowledge connection, the sorts of connection they will accept. Are these capacities that will grow and change as they mature or will those now between 18 and 35, as a generation, be forever deficient in the instinct that stimulates generosity? If they are not responding, is it merely because we have not reached them or are they temporarily unreachable? The future of giving may depend on the answers to these questions.

The future of giving is a particular concern of the RBF. Foundations, standard bearers for the nation’s philanthropy, have reason to care about the little guy’s philanthropy. At a time when much is being written and spoken about the roles of the public and private sectors, it is easy to overlook the individual giver, the anonymous, voiceless participant in the struggle to maintain an effective nonprofit sector. While foundations may have become accustomed to thinking in terms of partnerships with a myriad of others—corporations, government agencies, nonprofits, other foundations—partnership with individuals is difficult to conceptualize, difficult to act upon. It is, however, an increasingly logical partnership for many foundations and one that nonprofits are urging upon their foundation supporters as they begin to see new initiatives in fundraising aimed at individuals as a priority.

Concern for strengthening the nonprofit sector, which derives nine times as much of its support from individuals as it does from foundations and corporations, stands behind the Fund's concern for the future of individual giving. Recognizing that the hows and whys of giving is a subject little studied from a broad perspective but increasingly of interest to nonprofits, the Fund undertook the national survey. As fine as it may be simply to have a portrait of American giving in the first part of this decade, the RBF's real interest lies not in pictures but in maps. The goal in commissioning the survey was activist: the Fund wanted to know what might be likely to stimulate increased giving by individuals in this country.

The study encourages us to believe that dramatic change in giving must be linked to changes in how people think about giving. The key to change may be even cruder than that statement might imply: before we see any sizable increase in individual philanthropy in America we have to get people simply to think about giving. Imagine the difference if people paid the same attention to their giving as they do to matters of health, nutrition and physical fitness. Such a revolution in consciousness will not happen overnight, not if it is to last. It is an effort that asks for more than any one organization or interest could do on its own. It is an effort which rightfully belongs to all willing to acknowledge the connections born out of a shared passion for philanthropy.

THE ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND

AND ITS PROGRAM

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund was founded in 1940 as a vehicle through which the five sons and daughter of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., could share a source of advice and research on charitable activities and combine some of their philanthropies to better effect. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., made a substantial gift to the Fund in 1951, and in 1960 the Fund received a major bequest from his estate. Together, these constitute the basic endowment of the Fund.

The assets of the RBF at the end of 1985 were \$209,160,987 and its 155 grant payments and its matching gifts during the year amounted to \$6,899,369. Since 1940, the RBF has disbursed a total of \$341,796,916 in grants.

In June, 1983, the trustees of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund adopted program recommendations presented in a report from the Fund's planning committee. The report, the result of almost two years of work by a committee of the Fund's trustees, recommended that the principal part of the RBF's program be organized around the theme of global interdependence—One World—with two major components: resources and security. The report also recommended that the Fund continue its interests in New York City and in the well-being of the private, nonprofit sector.

PROGRAM GUIDELINES

In November, 1984, building upon the Report of the Planning Committee, the trustees of the Fund adopted the following program guidelines:

The Fund seeks to achieve its major objective of improving the well-being of all people through support of efforts in the United States and abroad that contribute ideas, develop leaders, and encourage institutions in the transition to global interdependence and that counter world trends of resource depletion, militarization, protectionism, and isolation which now threaten to move humankind everywhere further away from cooperation, trade and economic growth, arms restraint, and conservation.

The basic theme of interdependence presupposes a global outlook and, hence, internationally oriented activity. While United States problems and grantees will receive considerable attention, this will be in the context of global concerns and not simply national ones.

The Fund will make grants in four general areas. The first, "One World," is made up of two components, Sustainable Resource Use and World Security, which will receive the major portion of grant funds. The other three areas are New York City, Nonprofit Sector, and Special Concerns.

ONE WORLD

SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE USE

GOAL To encourage more efficient and renewable use of natural, human, and man-made resources, in an approach that blends social, economic, and ecological concerns.

STRATEGIES Defining and advocating the philosophy of sustainable resource use on a global basis through action-research and other projects that employ comprehensive approaches to resources management;

Implementing the philosophy of sustainable resource use through support of clusters of organizations and projects in forestry, agriculture, fisheries, and bioenergy that are creating more renewable resource practices which are less destructive to land, forest, air, water, and human resources;

Focusing effective action on other compelling resource projects of special merit that have been initiated by others and are supportive of the Fund's primary sustainable resource objectives.

WORLD SECURITY

GOAL To strengthen arms control, improve international relations, and encourage development, trade, and finance—recognizing that prospects for world peace are threatened not only by competing political philosophies or differing religions and cultural traditions but also by frustration and aggression bred by inequities in the sharing of food, energy, goods, and services produced by the world economy.

STRATEGIES

Arms Control

Developing new paths to arms control through support of interdisciplinary work analyzing specific nuclear and conventional arms issues, with particular attention to collaborative efforts between U.S. and Soviet groups;

Determining the effects of nuclear weapons use on the world's life support system and the implications of the scientific findings for arms control and security;

Halting the spread of nuclear weapons capability to other countries and groups.

Supporting interrelated activities of public information and education, exchanges, internships and joint work with the Soviet Union and, particularly, Eastern Europe on substantive fields of mutual interest;

Enhancing mutual American and East Asian understanding through public information, education, and exchange; and strengthening international relations and strategic studies institutes in East Asia and helping them construct links with one another and with similar American institutions;

Increasing understanding of common interests among the industrialized nations and helping them deal more effectively with the pressing concerns of the less developed countries.

In connection with the implementation of its “One World” theme, the Fund will support projects related to the not well understood or explored connections between global resource management and global security.

NEW YORK CITY

GOAL	To improve the quality of life in New York City.
STRATEGIES	Encouraging collaborative action between the public sector and various private-sector groups, including business, labor, academic, and nonprofit organizations on projects having City-wide implications, particularly in relation to economic development policies and practices; Strengthening vital institutions of special importance to the City.

NONPROFIT SECTOR

GOAL	To promote the health and vitality of the nonprofit sector, both nationally and internationally.
STRATEGIES	Assisting basic research and public education with respect to nonprofits; Promoting increased individual and corporate giving, the development of new sources of income for and improved management of nonprofits, and greater international grantmaking.

SPECIAL CONCERNS

GOAL To support emergency situations and compelling new opportunities.

ILLUSTRATIONS Providing, initially, support for human rights in Southern Africa and for comparative research and exchange between the People's Republic of China and the United States in the area of general education in the arts.

Four operational "touchstones" will be a key consideration in the development of all grants. These relate to the Fund's approach to its substantive concerns and are *not* specific areas of interest in and of themselves.

EDUCATION of key individuals, special target groups, and the general public.

LEADERSHIP the identification and encouragement of a new generation of leaders, national and international; assisting contact among leaders and the development of leadership networks around specific areas of Fund program interest.

LEVERAGE using combinations of trustees and staff as well as related organizations to work toward common goals in mutually supportive ways.

SYNERGY developing clusters of interrelated projects so as to have an impact beyond the sum of the parts.

THE ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND AWARDS IN ARTS EDUCATION

In 1985, the fourth and final group of Rockefeller Brothers Fund Awards in Arts Education was presented to public elementary and secondary schools with outstanding programs in arts education. Awards have gone to schools whose arts programs are marked by high quality and significant achievement, worthy of national recognition and emulation. Through the awards program, the Fund has sought to enhance the quality and quantity of students' engagement with the arts by encouraging schools to sustain and expand outstanding programs and by making these programs widely known. In 1986, the Fund will make available summary information about the 33 schools that have received awards, and the program will come to a close.

HOW TO APPLY FOR A GRANT

To qualify for a grant from the RBF, as from most other foundations, a prospective grantee must be either a tax-exempt organization or an organization seeking support for a project that would qualify as tax exempt. A grantee must also be engaged in work that fits generally within the Fund's guidelines (see page 14, above).

A preliminary letter of inquiry is recommended for an initial approach to the Fund, although detailed proposals are also accepted. Proposals to the RBF should include a complete description of the purpose of the project or organization, the background and the research that have led to the development of the proposal, the methods by which the project is to be carried out, the qualifications and experience of the project's or organization's principal staff members, a list of those who serve as board members or advisers to the project, and a carefully prepared realistic budget. Attached to each proposal must be a copy of the organization's tax exemption notice and classification from the Internal Revenue Service, dated after 1969, and a copy of its most recent financial statement, preferably audited. Proposals from former grantees of the Fund will be considered only after earlier grants have been evaluated and grantees have submitted necessary reports of expenditures of those grants. Letters of inquiry or proposals should be addressed to:

Benjamin R. Shute, Jr., Secretary
Rockefeller Brothers Fund
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104

Although the RBF has made substantial gifts to organizations and programs in which it has considerable interest, most grants run between \$10,000 and \$75,000, the average between \$25,000 and \$50,000.

It should be noted that the Fund does not make grants to individuals, nor does it, as a general rule, support research, graduate study, or the writing of books or dissertations by individuals.

GRANT PROCEDURE

Each letter of inquiry or proposal to the RBF is reviewed by one or more members of the staff, who try to be prompt in notifying applicants if their plans do not fit the current program guidelines or budgetary restraints. If a project is taken up for grant consideration, staff members may ask for further information and almost certainly for a meeting with the principal organizers of the project. Grants are awarded by the trustees, who meet regularly throughout the year.

Fund grantees are required to submit financial and narrative reports at specified intervals and at the end of each grant period. In addition, RBF staff members are expected to follow projects along throughout the life of the grant and to evaluate the project at the end of the period. The evaluations become part of the Fund's permanent records.

GRANT INFORMATION

In addition to publishing an annual report, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund submits grants information on a regular basis to the Foundation Center for inclusion in its publications, including *The Foundation Grants Index Bimonthly* and *The Foundation Grants Index Annual*. Foundation Center grants data also appear on line in the Foundation Grants Index data base on DIALOG and through a retrieval service available to members of the Telecommunications Cooperative Network through ITT Dialcom. The Foundation Center maintains reference libraries in New York, New York; Washington, D.C.; Cleveland, Ohio; and San Francisco, California; and Cooperating Collections in more than 160 locations nationwide provide a core collection of Foundation Center publications. Information about the location of Cooperating Collections can be obtained from the Foundation Center by calling 1-800-424-9836 (toll-free).

ONE WORLD:
SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE USE

GOAL

To encourage more efficient and renewable use of natural, human, and man-made resources, in an approach that blends social, economic, and ecological concerns.

STRATEGY

Defining and advocating the philosophy of sustainable resource use on a global basis through action-research and other projects that employ comprehensive approaches to resources management.

Bio-Energy Council
Arlington, Virginia

To assist the Council in its merger with Volunteers in Technical Assistance (VITA). Energy from biomass is a principal source of energy in 60 developing countries, but financial support in the U.S. for research and publication of information about biotechnologies has declined. Since VITA is involved in a number of bioenergy projects throughout the developing world, the merger will preserve the accessibility—to the third world and to scientists, research institutions, and government agencies—of the Council's valuable base of reliable information on bioenergy technologies. **\$25,000**

Center for Resources Economics
(formerly Round Valley Agrarian Institute.)
Covelo, California

A contribution toward the start-up costs of the Island Press, a nonprofit publishing service offering effective marketing and distribution services to conservation and resource-management organizations, both abroad and in the U.S. The service will help ensure that information and research data developed by such organizations can reach as broad a segment as possible of the potential readership for materials relating to sustainable resource use. **\$40,000** (over two years)

Global Tomorrow Coalition
Washington, D.C.

For general budgetary support. With a membership of over 100 organizations sharing a concern about U.S. response to long-term global trends in resources, environment, population, and development, the Coalition is promoting information-sharing and networking by means of task forces, publications, and conferences. Relying on the outreach of its member groups at the community level, the Coalition is working to foster a national dialogue and create citizen action on a range of international environmental and economic issues. **\$50,000** (over two years)

Institute for Alternative Agriculture
Greenbelt, Maryland

Toward general budgetary expenses. The Institute serves as a clearinghouse for reliable, practical information on the economically sound and environmentally safe use of interactive, biologically-based agriculture systems. Established in 1983, the Institute represents the alternative, or organic, agriculture constituency in the national agricultural policy process and is fostering the work of younger scientists and farmers in the promotion of more sustainable agricultural practices to build soil productivity, supply nutrients, and control insects, weeds, and other pests. **\$60,000** (over two years)

**International Institute for Environment
and Development**
Washington, D.C.

**International Network of Resource
Information Centers**
Plainfield, New Hampshire

**International Union for Conservation
of Nature and Natural Resources**
Gland, Switzerland

**National Academy of Sciences
Board on Agriculture**
Washington, D.C.

Toward IIED's new agricultural program. In the first year an analysis is being undertaken of agricultural development and advancement that can help policymakers understand better the dynamics and full potential of sustainable agriculture and its concerns for economic advancement in a context of cultural traditions and ecological soundness. **\$30,000**

For general budgetary purposes of this association of experts and managers, located in centers in 20 countries, who are concerned with sustaining long-term productivity of natural resources. Organized in 1982, the Network's operations include assistance to strengthen individual centers and a limited number of projects that pertain to the challenges shared by all of its members. Through the diversity of cultures represented in its membership, much can be learned and shared in addressing resource problems collaboratively, and the Network is achieving a high standard of discussion and cooperation among member scientists and policymakers. Strong involvement in the Network by Eastern European countries provides a channel for fruitful working relations between those countries and the U.S. **\$150,000** (over three years)

A contribution to the director general's fund through which IUCN is implementing the World Conservation Strategy, formulated in cooperation with the United Nations Environment Program to create a global partnership for conservation with emphasis on interdependence and sustainable use of natural resources. Initial activities of the fund were directed toward government policymakers, conservationists, and those involved in development in 116 IUCN member countries. Now, the concentration is on creating better communication tools for use by the 350 nongovernmental agency members of IUCN—who represent 100 million people on all continents—to increase the level of local community involvement in global environmental affairs. **\$100,000** (over two years)

A contribution to its East European program that will join with the IUCN committee of East European and Soviet Union members to address industrial and agricultural environmental challenges common to their countries. The program will involve East and West Europeans and Americans in cooperative research, field testing, pilot projects, training and education, and exchanges to design a long-term plan for air and water pollution control, land-use management, and sustainable agricultural practices. **\$150,000** (over three years)

Toward the first comprehensive scientific appraisal of the role of alternative farming methods in modern production agriculture. Farmer interest in the use of biologically sustainable, cost-effective practices for food production has been increasing in response to economic and environmental concerns, but there has not been an impartial assessment of these methods. The study will summarize and assess scientific knowledge relevant to organic farming systems, examine their potential for accomplishing national environmental, soil conservation, and production adjustment goals, and define an agenda for future research. An objective determination of the role of alternative farming methods in modern agriculture should add scientific legitimacy to them and enhance the credibility of sustainable agricultural systems to policymakers in developing countries. **\$75,000**

National Audubon Society
Washington, D.C.

Toward support of the Society's worldwide leadership activity advocating a broader understanding of the need for sound use of resources in an interdependent world and encouraging actions and policies that will reduce major threats to the global environment. Greatest attention will be given to the threats from nuclear war, human population growth, development and use of energy, and pollution from toxic materials. **\$120,000** (over three years)

Natural Resources Defense Council
New York, New York

Toward the Council's international program which, through informational and educational initiatives, is actively involved in promoting sustainable resource management to resolve global environmental problems. Two areas where the program has played an important role are in the advocating of changes in development and resource-use policies and operations of international and U.S. lending agencies, and assisting environmentally related citizen groups on pest management and the use of pesticides. **\$75,000** (over three years)

Obor
Clinton, Connecticut

A contribution toward the translation of the Worldwatch Institute book, *State of the World*, into the local languages of Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand, which will help to assure the dissemination of information supporting the philosophy of sustainable resource use. **\$44,300** (over two years)

Overseas Development Council
Washington, D.C.

For its core program of policy analysis and education on sustainable development strategies. In line with ODC's long-standing central task of informing and educating Americans about complex relations between the U.S. and the developing world, a current program is exploring what economic, political, and environmental sustainability considerations mean for specific development policy choices and how U.S. government and international organization decision-makers can become better informed about the central importance of sustainability in policy choices. **\$50,000** (over two years)

Regenerative Agriculture Association
Emmaus, Pennsylvania

Continued support to expand the Association's promotion of resource-efficient and less environmentally damaging farming practices in the U.S., Eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa. Working with scientists and farmers who are researching and testing new practices, the Association is producing and distributing reliable technical and cost-related information and providing networking activities to assist farmers in making the transition to practices not requiring intensive applications of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, and fungicides. **\$150,000** (over two years)

WGBH Educational Foundation
Boston, Massachusetts

A contribution to a project to develop a proposal and initiate fund-raising for a public television series on sustainable resource use issues, using materials from the Worldwatch Institute's *State of the World* reports. **\$25,000**

World Resources Institute
Washington, D.C.

Continued support of the Institute's global energy project in collaboration with the Princeton University Center for Energy and Environmental Studies. The project is conducting analyses of the purposes of current energy use—the end-use of energy—in 25 countries to identify alternatives to conventional energy policies that appear to be producing unacceptable long-term environmental consequences. The studies are demonstrating the feasibility of using commercially available technology to satisfy projected worldwide demand for goods and services with a fraction of the energy use indicated in conventional analyses. Project plans call for publicizing the advantages of more efficient technologies for using existing supplies of energy, assisting developing countries to gain information and access to biomass energy technologies, and analyzing in detail the implementation of a global end-use strategy. \$200,000 (over two years)

STRATEGY

Implementing the philosophy of sustainable resource use through support of clusters of organizations and projects in forestry, agriculture, fisheries, and bioenergy that are creating more renewable resource practices which are less destructive to land, forest, air, water, and human resources.

American Farmland Trust
Washington, D.C.

Renewed support for its farmland retention program activities that include public information and education, policy development and technical assistance at local, state, and federal government levels, and demonstration of conservancy techniques. In the five years since its organization, the Trust has built a record of accomplishment in its efforts to reduce the rate of U.S. farmland loss. AFT is also working with the Farm Credit System on a new credit policy to help restructure the debt problems in major segments of the American farming community, and is planning an international program component to help stem the high rate of annual loss of farmland in developing countries. \$600,000 (over three years)

BioEnergy Users Network
Washington, D.C.

For the core budget of an initial two-year program to provide developing countries much needed information and expertise on the use of biomass materials to improve energy efficiency through more sustainable means of energy production and conservation. The BUN Organizing Committee is planning a technology assessment service, a skills transfer bank and training program, and projects involving fast-growing, nitrogen-fixing trees intercropped with agricultural plantings to demonstrate the bioenergy that can be produced from their residues and other biomass materials. The committee is composed of young leaders of groups in several third world countries who are working to create more integrated agricultural and bioenergy production systems. \$150,000 (over two years)

Caribbean Conservation Association
St. Michael, Barbados

Continued core support for the eco-development programs of its Eastern Caribbean Natural Area Management Program and Marine Resources Program for the Eastern Caribbean which encourage economic growth using natural resources in ways consistent with sustained productivity and environmental limitations. Successful efforts in both programs for sustainable use of resources in the management of island ecosystems and fisheries services have helped create an awareness at regional institutions of the importance and appropriateness of the eco-development approach in the Eastern Caribbean, and both programs are preparing for the transfer and institutionalization of many of their functions into ongoing Caribbean institutions. **\$75,000**

Further support of the Eastern Caribbean Natural Area Management Program and the Marine Resources Program for the Eastern Caribbean as these programs assess opportunities for institutional strengthening of their activities through closer affiliation with Caribbean universities and organizations. **\$110,000**

**International Institute for Environment
and Development**
Washington, D.C.

Toward the Institute's work with the United Nations Office for Emergency Operations in Africa in the coordination of the efforts of private voluntary organizations in response to the food and drought crisis in Africa. **\$50,000**

**International Institute of
Rural Reconstruction**
New York, New York

Toward its project to develop cooperative relations with the People's Republic of China. The Institute's chairman, Dr. Y. C. James Yen, was invited to China to observe the areas where over 40 years ago he began pioneering work in rural development, and to familiarize Chinese officials with the more recent techniques and programs developed at IIRR, by which rural reconstruction movements—blending social, economic, and ecological considerations—have been successfully established in several third world countries with large rural populations. **\$25,000**

**Michigan, University of
School of Natural Resources**
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Continued core support for the School's Wildland Management Center, which cooperates with the Eastern Caribbean Natural Area Management Program (ECNAMP) of the Caribbean Conservation Association, Barbados, in promoting economic development in the region in ways that encourage efficient and sustainable use of natural resources. The Center links university research and training with ECNAMP's applied research, project implementation, and program evaluation, and is involved in the process of transferring and integrating these functions into the programs of several regional institutions. **\$55,000**

Nitrogen Fixing Tree Association
Waimanalo, Hawaii

Toward the Association's core program to provide individuals and organizations, largely in tropical regions, with managerial and technical information about fast-growing nitrogen-fixing trees that are a source of fuel, fertilizer, forage, food, and fiber for humans and animals. The Association was established to develop and promote scientific inquiry about these trees as an alternative for reversing the rising worldwide problems of deforestation and soil depletion caused by the pressure of demands for fuelwood and food. **\$60,000** (over two years)

Partners for Livable Places
Washington, D.C.

A contribution to its Caribbean program. Partners is planning a 12-month promotional campaign to attract broader philanthropic support, professional resources, and media attention to small-scale environmental and cultural initiatives in the Caribbean in order to help the efforts of regional organizations, leaders, and individual citizens seeking to bring about economic diversity, self-reliance, and environmental sustainability. **\$25,000**

Quebec-Labrador Foundation
Ipswich, Massachusetts

Toward strengthening and expanding the Inter-Regional Exchange and Policy (IREP) Program of its Atlantic Center for the Environment. Initiated as an informational exchange service on economic and environmental development for isolated rural areas in the Atlantic Region and Appalachia, the IREP Program has expanded to include the Eastern Caribbean, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. The Program encourages the local community development and environmental groups of the regions to exchange ideas and techniques for promoting self-reliance and training young people in economic opportunities that make sound use of natural resources. **\$60,000** (over two years)

Resources Development Foundation
(formerly Agricultural Resources
Development Foundation)
Washington, D.C.

Up to \$50,000 designated for an examination of the feasibility of a new publicly and privately supported, U.S.-based corporation that would finance and conduct joint projects with developing countries in the use of biotechnology in agriculture, bioenergy, health, and environmental cleanup. Complementing this effort, a further \$25,000 was contributed toward the costs of organizing and initiating the first projects of the BioEnergy Users Network, created by young leaders of groups in a number of developing countries working on more integrated agriculture and bioenergy production. Up to **\$75,000**

Further support for the international biotechnology project and the creation of the International Biotechnology Group, which will begin operations in 1986. As a cooperative enterprise involving a for-profit corporation and a nonprofit foundation in leveraging leadership, talent, and money into biotechnology development in the third world, the IBG will be working to increase the level of investment in biotechnology in developing countries for the improvement of resource productivity. **\$175,000**

A contribution for a farmland retention project in New England, a project demonstrating how small acreages—which collectively make up a high percentage of American agricultural land—can be retained as farmland through modern methods of sheep production. **\$25,000**

Society for the International
Public Interest
Arlington, Virginia

Toward general budgetary expenses of the Society, known as the Ashoka Society, which awards annual stipends of approximately \$2,500 for periods averaging three years to public service entrepreneurs in the beginning stages of creating innovative self-help programs for improving living standards of the rural poor. Successful Ashoka associations exist in India and Indonesia; by extending into other populous regions that include Latin America and Northwest Africa, the Society hopes to build a mutual help network of public service leaders working to resolve pressing rural development problems with projects that take account of social, economic, and ecological concerns. **\$70,000** (over two years)

**Winrock International Institute for
Agricultural Development**
Morrlilton, Arkansas

A grant designated for the Institute's planning activities with the U.S. Agency for International Development for the first overseas projects of the U.S. Agricultural Development Corporation. The Corporation was established in late 1984 as a public/private sector intermediary organization to involve more U.S. commercial agriculture and food companies in financial management and other services to agricultural projects in third world countries that encourage the use of sustainable agricultural development practices. **\$35,000**

STRATEGY

Focusing effective action on other compelling resource projects of special merit that have been initiated by others and are supportive of the Fund's primary sustainable resource objectives.

Alaska Humanities Forum
Anchorage, Alaska

A contribution toward the expenses of the Alaska Native Review Commission that analyzed the issues of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971, under which Inuits, Aleuts, and Indians became shareholders in regional and village landholding and management corporations for a 20-year period. The Commission conducted public hearings in all parts of Alaska to ensure that the social, cultural, economic, environmental, and political aspects of the Act are understood by the shareholders and that full consideration is given to the significance of the Act for Alaska's natives and environment when the shares become transferable in 1991. **\$30,000**

Center for Neighborhood Technology
Chicago, Illinois

Continued support of its biodegradable waste conversion project, now in its final phase, as part of the development of an urban industrial park in a depressed neighborhood undergoing economic revitalization. **\$25,000**

**National Association of State Departments
of Agriculture Research Foundation**
Washington, D.C.

Toward the agricultural nonpoint source water pollution control program of the Research Foundation's Farmland Project. Because farming is a major contributor to nonpoint source pollution, which emanates from undetermined points of discharge, the Farmland Project's activities in farmland retention have been expanded to include a clearinghouse service for information about the nature of agricultural pollution of groundwater and surface water, and the various remedial measures being explored. The affiliation with NASDA gives impetus to the Foundation's educational outreach and technical assistance to land owners concerning land use and management techniques for conservation of land and water resources. **\$50,000**

**World Commission on Environment
and Development**
Geneva, Switzerland

A special contribution for an analysis of the major causes and likely impacts of the gradual warming trend of the earth's atmosphere. Issues associated with climate change are a Commission priority, following its worldwide hearings concerning critical environmental and development problems. The project will be undertaken in 1986 and is expected to produce a five-year action agenda for examining policy options. Because the Commission's overall environmental investigations indicate that resolving environmental problems is increasingly complex and prohibitively costly, the analysis will take a "prevention" approach, looking at the potential for moderating the warming trend by reducing gaseous chemical emissions into the atmosphere with conservation and energy-efficient strategies. **\$100,000**

GOAL

To strengthen arms control, improve international relations, and encourage development, trade, and finance—recognizing that prospects for world peace are threatened not only by competing political philosophies or differing religions and cultural traditions but also by frustration and aggression bred by inequities in the sharing of food, energy, goods, and services produced by the world economy.

STRATEGY

Arms Control

Developing new paths to arms control through support of interdisciplinary work analyzing specific nuclear and conventional arms issues, with particular attention to collaborative efforts between U.S. and Soviet groups.

**Business Executives for National
Security Education Fund**
Washington, D.C.

Toward implementation of its national development plan. BENS/ED was formed in 1982 to articulate the business community's concern about defense issues and to conduct public education on the threat of nuclear war and the importance of an effective, affordable national defense. Utilizing active business leaders, leading researchers, and retired senior military officers, BENS/ED has worked particularly to bring proven business practices to bear on defense planning and procurement and military spending, seeking to analyze both the flow of resources into the military and the resulting effects on national security. To continue the momentum of its public education program, BENS/ED is now expanding into a regionally rooted national organization that can involve local civic and business associations in a stronger representation of business views on national security. **\$50,000**

Forum Institute
Washington, D.C.

A contribution toward a survey of over 75 U.S. philanthropic foundations concerned with international security and prevention of nuclear war to ascertain the extent of foundation support to this field, the organizations and kinds of efforts contributed to in the period 1982-1984, and the foundations' program directions for the immediate and longer-term future. The Institute also conducted a supplemental survey on the issue focus and sources of support of organizations seeking grants. Together the surveys should facilitate exchange of information and cooperation within the foundation community and among grant seekers regarding the current initiatives and areas still needing exploration in this relatively new field of foundation interest. **\$15,000**

**International Institute for
Strategic Studies**
London, England

Toward establishing the Institute's Washington, D.C., office. IISS, the preeminent international strategic institution dedicated to informed debate on international security in the nuclear age, provides a foundation of accurate information and analysis of current and future international security problems as well as forums for exchange of views. Policy recommendations printed in its publications are widely read within the field but do not get to the general public, especially in the U.S. IISS has opened a Washington office to increase its visibility in Washington and the U.S. at large and bring a greater international perspective to bear on all arms control and security discussions and debates within the U.S. It will also assist the flow of ideas from IISS to the U.S. through greater publicity, better marketing of its publications in the U.S., and workshops and discussion meetings, and will improve the flow of information to IISS from U.S. research institutes and governmental branches and agencies.
\$100,000 (over two years)

**Johns Hopkins University
School for Advanced International
Studies**
Baltimore, Maryland

Toward the initial activities of the project, Technology and the Limitations of International Conflict, which the Foreign Policy Institute (FPI) of the University's School for Advanced International Studies is undertaking. Designed to serve as a link between the scientific/technical community and the world of politics and policymakers, the project's goal is to foster the development of ideas about how technological advances and innovation can be directed toward limiting arms and lessening the risk of war. Individual briefings and papers will be prepared on specific technological concepts and applications. An executive group of twenty, composed of members of Congress, former high-ranking military, defense, and foreign policy officials, and senior officials with scientific or technical backgrounds, will actively guide the project and give impetus to the implementation of the ideas developed; dissemination of the study's work will be through use of FPI public outreach activities and groups.
\$65,000

WGBH Educational Foundation
Boston, Massachusetts

Toward the production of *The Nuclear Age*, a 13-part public television series exploring the 40-year history of the nuclear age. Each program will have two segments: History, identifying key events, decisions, and policy developments since 1945; and Legacy, amplifying current nuclear issues that have arisen from the historical events. Produced with the collaboration of arms control and security scholars, the programs are to emphasize the changed relationship between war and politics brought about by the advent of nuclear weapons. The aim of the series is to increase the public's knowledge and understanding of our nuclear history and to contribute to thoughtful public dialogue and assessment of strategies for preventing nuclear war.
\$150,000 (over two years)

STRATEGY

**International Council of
Scientific Unions
Scientific Committee on Problems
of the Environment**
Paris, France

Determining the effects of nuclear weapons use on the world's life support system and the implications of the scientific findings for arms control and security.

Toward dissemination of the report and follow-up activities of the project, Environmental Consequences of Nuclear War. The project's report, representing the work of 300 scientists from 30 countries, established a scientific consensus as to the effects of nuclear weapons on the world's life support systems. The report concludes that the climatic effects caused by smoke from burning 100 major cities in a nuclear exchange could so disturb the world's ecosystems that there would be five times more loss of human life from starvation outside combatant countries than from the direct effects of nuclear weapons within them. The report will be translated into the major languages, condensed for paperback publication, and distributed without charge in the less developed countries. **\$50,000**

STRATEGY

Centre for European Policy Studies
Brussels, Belgium

Halting the spread of nuclear weapons capability to other countries and groups.

Toward the initial activities of the Centre's new program on non-proliferation, which grew out of the Centre's participation with eight other European countries and the U.S. in the two-year international project, New Approaches to Non-Proliferation. Encouraged by the project's achievements, the Centre created an ongoing program to foster longer-term cooperation among European countries in regard to halting the spread of nuclear weapons capability by involving distinguished European policymakers, industrialists, and academics, and by increasing European public awareness of and debate on the project's findings and recommendations. The transatlantic dialogue established in the New Approaches to Non-Proliferation project will be maintained in the program and concern for the interests of developing countries will also be included. **\$75,000**

**Roosevelt Center for American
Policy Studies**
Chicago, Illinois

Toward the Center's project to engage the U.S. public in halting the spread of nuclear weapons capability to other countries and groups. To reach and educate people across the country who are largely unaware of the problem of horizontal proliferation and would be unlikely of their own accord to become concerned with these issues, the project will work with local organizations, schools, and various small groups, develop innovative public education materials, and create major events to serve as focal points. Particular effort will be put into discovering how to give the public a sense of the importance of individual and collective involvement in such a complex, challenging, and seemingly distant problem. **\$80,000**

**United Nations Association of the
United States of America**
New York, New York

Toward a project of public education, nationally and internationally, concerning the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. The project will undertake three levels of activities: engaging Soviet and Chinese leaders in serious discussion on the future of nonproliferation through joint statements and through meetings over the next two years in New York, San Francisco, Moscow, and Beijing; conducting a study trip for UNA members and journalists from ten U.S. cities to the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, which operates safeguards worldwide against the diversion of nuclear materials from civilian to military uses; and carrying out national and regional activities, including briefings and seminars in Washington, D.C., for policymakers and regional workshops for media representatives. **\$150,000** (over two years)

Wisconsin, University of
Madison, Wisconsin

Toward the project, *U.S.-Origin Reactor Fuel and the Spread of Nuclear Weapons*, which will explore options for the U.S. to exert leverage on international trade in nuclear materials. Analyses will be undertaken to ascertain how much spent reactor fuel of U.S. origin the U.S. controls worldwide, what rights the U.S. has to approve transfers of the plutonium in this spent reactor fuel now held by foreign countries, and what effect the control could have on the countries' actions. The study aims to present to national decision-makers policy options that would contribute to the international debate over plutonium control and that could bolster significantly the effort to inhibit horizontal proliferation of nuclear arms. **\$47,500**

STRATEGY

International Relations, Development, Trade, and Finance
Supporting interrelated activities of public information and education, exchanges, internships and joint work with the Soviet Union and, particularly, Eastern Europe on substantive fields of mutual interest.

Economic Perspectives, Inc.
McLean, Virginia

Continued support of research and planning assistance for Polish agricultural revitalization, a joint effort with the Rockefeller Foundation and other foundations. Recent involvement has been with the establishment of two organizations: an American non-profit corporation to promote Polish agricultural revitalization in the U.S. and Western Europe; and a foundation in Poland to provide a range of business services to attract foreign investors to Polish agricultural products. Up to **\$50,000**

**Institute for East-West
Securities Studies**
New York, New York

For general budgetary purposes. The Institute is the only permanent center in the U.S. that regularly brings together officials and scholars from governments and institutions in NATO, Warsaw Pact, and neutral European countries. All participants engage in collaborative, interactive initiatives, with opportunities for open dialogue and analysis, to gain fresh perspective on and understanding of the interests and concerns that lie behind East-West security problems. A core activity is the Institute's year-long program for resident fellows from East and West Europe and North America. **\$225,000** (over three years)

Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

Chinese University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong

**Columbia University in the City of
New York, Trustees of
East Asian Institute**
New York, New York

Institute of Southeast Asian Studies
Singapore

Enhancing mutual American and East Asian understanding through public information, education, and exchange; and strengthening international relations and strategic studies institutes in East Asia and helping them construct links with one another and with similar American institutions.

Toward the costs of a joint conference with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences that examined the economic policies of countries in the Asia-Pacific region, their effect on trading patterns, and their implications for U.S.-China economic relations. The conference was the third in a series focusing on issues of international security and international economics, and that has the intent of strengthening the institutes which the Chinese participants are associated with, and of giving the Chinese and American participants a better understanding of each other's perspectives in both a regional and global framework. **\$25,000**

Toward a second international conference on modernization and Chinese culture. At the first conference in 1982, scholars from the People's Republic of China and Taiwan discussed with Chinese counterparts from the U.S., Hong Kong, and Singapore the changes that social structures have undergone in three distinct, but historically linked, Chinese cultures—the People's Republic, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. The second conference in 1985 is to focus on the effects of modernization on the Chinese family in these three cultures, and discussion among participating social scientists will again be in the Mandarin Chinese dialect. The proceedings are to be published, and it is hoped they will be of value to planners involved in the modernization effort in the People's Republic. **\$10,019**

Toward the Institute's Pacific Basin Studies program for advanced training and research on the critical issues arising out of the growing interdependence among nations of the Asia-Pacific region. Scholars from Southeast Asian institutions for strategic and international relations studies will be invited to spend up to one year at the Institute to broaden their perspectives and familiarize themselves with methods of American policy analysis—conducting research with American counterparts and offering seminars on Southeast Asian studies to American graduate students. Such experiences also can help strengthen the Southeast Asian institutions in their capacity for training, research, and policy analysis as they begin to have influence in the process of foreign policy formulation for their respective countries. **\$240,000** (over three years)

Toward a program of training and exchange for post-graduate study in the U.S. for young scholars from Southeast Asian institutes of strategic and international studies, and for American scholars to travel in Southeast Asia for short-term periods of research. The program is designed to enhance the capacity of Asian and American scholars to understand and appreciate the security and economic problems arising out of the growing interdependence of the nations of the Asian-Pacific region and the tie-in of U.S. interests with the development of Southeast Asian nations. **\$210,000** (over three years)

National Committee on United States-China Relations
New York, New York

Continued general support of the Committee's core program to promote sustained, thoughtful interchange between influential Chinese and Americans on matters of mutual concern in international relations, economic management and development, public administration and governance, communications, and education administration. Program activities include periodic dialogues among leaders, ad hoc seminars and meetings, and reciprocal visits of high-level delegations. An integral part of the program is educational outreach to give the American public a better understanding of Chinese political, economic, and cultural affairs and to extend the contacts of visiting Chinese scholars into areas of American society beyond their own specialties and academic environments. **\$60,000** (over two years)

STRATEGY

Increasing understanding of common interests among the industrialized nations and helping them deal more effectively with the pressing concerns of the less developed countries.

Council on Foreign Relations
New York, New York

In 1984 the Council, the oldest private organization in the U.S. devoted exclusively to the study, analysis, and debate of American foreign policy, launched the "Campaign for the Council" to provide permanent support for vital program areas. Part of the overall Campaign is a fund for the David Rockefeller Room, toward which the grant is designated. Mr. Rockefeller is stepping down from the chairmanship of the Council after 15 years and after serving as a board member for 36 years. In recognition of his role as a world leader, the Council is honoring Mr. Rockefeller by naming for him the room where major meetings with American and foreign leaders take place, and where he has frequently presided. **\$100,000**

A contribution to the African project, a collaboration with the Overseas Development Council to review and formulate options for U.S. aid, trade, and finance policies and programs that could help Africans address their development needs. A working group of 50 Africans and Americans examined subjects that bear on problems confronting African nations and the underlying causes. **\$25,000**

Institute for International Economics
Washington, D.C.

A contribution to the Institute's project, Agriculture and the GATT: Issues in a New Trade Round, which will identify and discuss the specific issues to be addressed in a new round of multilateral trade negotiations concerning trade in agricultural commodities scheduled to commence in September, 1986. The project will survey the interests and concerns of key regions—the U.S., the European Community, other industrialized countries, and developing countries—in discussions about reforming the agricultural aspects of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the cornerstone of the free trading system and thus the focal point for the new round of trade negotiations. **\$50,000**

OEF International
Washington, D.C.

A contribution for a study of countertrade practices and policies that encourage paying for imports with goods instead of cash. Countertrade is increasingly a component of strategies being developed by third world countries to improve their economic performance. The study is examining the practical policy considerations that co-exist with the theoretical economic issues; and it will illustrate how industrialized regions need to recognize third world attitudes and perspectives, particularly as they relate to nontraditional concepts, in order to deal more effectively with the pressing concerns of developing countries. An aspect of the study will be to broaden the countertrade discussion to include the large group of people who are not economists but who are involved in influencing the direction of international affairs. **\$15,000**

Trilateral Commission (North America)
New York, New York

A contribution to the general budgetary expenses of the North American branch of the Trilateral Commission. Established in 1973, the Commission offers a private, nongovernmental forum for the examination of important international issues of concern to the trilateral regions of North America, Western Europe, and Japan. Each year the Commission hosts a plenary session for its 320 members and publishes two task force reports on substantive issues of great current relevance to the trilateral regions. **\$240,000** (over three years)

NEW YORK CITY

GOAL

To improve the quality of life in New York City.

STRATEGY

Encouraging collaborative action between the public sector and various private-sector groups, including business, labor, academic, and nonprofit organizations on projects having City-wide implications, particularly in relation to economic development policies and practices.

New York City Partnership
New York, New York

Continued support for core budgetary needs in economic development, housing, and youth employment and education. The Partnership has succeeded in bringing the interest and direct involvement of chief executive officers of member organizations, the skills of on-loan business executives, and its own technical resources to bear on key issues in the City. It has focused attention on the outer boroughs as viable sites for service industries, helped to secure public and private financing for housing, and has successfully placed young people in summer jobs, one-third of which in 1985 were turned into longer-term employment opportunities. Building on its achievements, the Partnership is planning and implementing new projects in all its program areas and seeking to develop new sources of support. **\$750,000** (over three years)

Toward program initiatives in housing, education, and youth employment, a redesignation of the balance of a \$75,000 grant paid in 1983 to the Economic Development Council of New York City for the New York City Partnership's Task Force for Public Safety. **\$43,000**

New York Interface Development Project
New York, New York

Toward its project to assist in the planning of a structure to coordinate and target public and private investment in economic development projects in New York City. The grant was designated for support of Interface's work on specific local economic development and job-creation projects. As shown in previous efforts that demonstrated the importance of industrial manufacturing to the economic viability of the City and that designed policies and programs for creating and retaining manufacturing jobs in the City's outer boroughs, Interface has a capability to translate practical economic development research into locally appropriate, cost-effective action. **\$50,000**

Nonprofit Coordinating Committee of New York
New York, New York

Toward the cost of an inventory of existing data on nonprofit organizations in New York City, the first step in compiling a statistical profile of these organizations and their economic impact on the community, from which a computer data base for the sector will be created. Organized in 1984 to promote better understanding between the nonprofit sector and city and state government and the for-profit sector, the Committee considers this research vital to that purpose. **\$17,000**

South Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation
Bronx, New York

Toward the expenses of the Land Assemblage for Neighborhood Development Unit (LAND) to prepare an inventory of commercial and industrial buildings and land in the South Bronx and match available property with the needs of new firms wishing to relocate in the area and present firms wishing to expand. With demand increasing for industrial space in the outer boroughs of New York City, the LAND unit is an added strategy in the Corporation's activities and technical services for revitalizing the economy of the South Bronx by attracting, retaining, and expanding industry and manufacturing and by providing jobs for local residents. **\$70,000** (over two years)

STRATEGY

Strengthening vital institutions of special importance to the City.

Playing to Win
New York, New York

Continued support of the East Harlem Computer Center, designated for the expenses of establishing a development office. Since 1983, the Center has provided computer access and education to residents, schools, and community groups in the East Harlem neighborhood, making available more opportunities for disadvantaged people to benefit from computer technology. The Center's board recognizes that reorganization and a larger staff are needed to continue the program's effectiveness and growth and to achieve self-sufficiency. **\$25,000**

United Parents Associations of New York City
New York, New York

Continued support to the Educational Priorities Panel, designated for fund-raising expenses. As a coalition of 26 community groups, the Panel has played an important role for ten years in monitoring and developing policy recommendations for the City's schools. Recognizing the need for a broader range of support, the Panel is engaged in exploring and developing plans for a publicity event and in preparing materials describing the decade of accomplishments, and will begin appeals to potential new funders. **\$15,000**

NONPROFIT SECTOR

GOAL To promote the health and vitality of the nonprofit sector, both nationally and internationally.

STRATEGY Assisting basic research and public education with respect to nonprofits.

**Facing History and Ourselves
National Foundation**
Brookline, Massachusetts

Toward the Voluntary Tradition and Nonprofit Sector in America Curriculum Project, which is to develop and disseminate a high school curriculum on the historical role and involvement in contemporary life of the private nonprofit sector in America. Most young people understand little or nothing about the place of voluntary organizations in our society or the extent to which our reliance on the nonprofit sector is not typical of other nations. The curriculum, by raising questions and imparting information through an interdisciplinary approach, should encourage students to become more socially aware, more interested in their communities, and more philanthropic. **\$45,000** (over two years)

Independent Sector
Washington, D.C.

A special grant to the operating needs of the IS's general program, which seeks to increase public and governmental understanding of and interest in the private nonprofit sector; and which seeks, within the sector, to focus attention on effective leadership and management, standards for measurable improvement in volunteering and giving, and research that will provide facts and figures to illustrate what the nonprofit sector is and what it does. **\$25,000**

**National Center for Charitable
Statistics**
Washington, D.C.

A contribution toward the costs of supporting the Statistics of Income samples of tax-exempt organizations and private foundations. Budget cuts prevent the IRS Statistics of Income division from continuing a national sampling of tax-exempt organizations, which is a major data base of reliable information on the nonprofit sector. The Center has negotiated with SOI to carry on the sampling for two years and hopes to develop public support for the continuation of these samples. **\$25,000**

STRATEGY Promoting increased individual and corporate giving, and the development of new sources of income for nonprofits.

Council on Foundations
Washington, D.C.

Toward the fund for the Robert W. Scrivner Award that will be given annually to recognize outstanding creativity by an individual grantmaker relatively new to the philanthropic field. **\$10,000**

Foundation Center
New York, New York

Continued general support in 1986 and 1987 for the Center, which provides information about foundations and foundation grants to the general public through its four reference libraries, its cooperative collections in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Canada, Mexico, and England, and its published directories and indexes. Through functions encouraging accessibility to and accountability of foundation activities, the Center contributes to a greater understanding by governmental agencies and the general public of the entire foundation community and of the possibilities for philanthropy. **\$50,000** (over two years)

**New Business Ventures for
Not-For-Profit Organizations**
New York, New York

Continued general operating support of its consulting service in financial management and planning for not-for-profit organizations and technical assistance for those interested in developing entrepreneurial, profit-making ventures to generate new income for their programs. New Ventures has created the New Ventures Institute to present one-day workshops for nonprofit executives, and is taking on policy research and special analysis projects for clients. **\$25,000**

**New York University
Graduate School of Business
Administration**
New York, New York

Toward the first-year costs of the Institute for Not-for-Profit Entrepreneurship, established as a resource for nonprofit organizations contemplating or involved in income-earning activities. Initially, information and materials are being collected and disseminated, a network developed among those seeking know-how and those who can provide advice and technical assistance, and training activities organized. In succeeding years, the Institute will give emphasis to curriculum and materials development and research and publication. Though regionally based, the Institute will carry on some activities that will be national in scope. **\$35,000**

STRATEGY

Promoting the improved management of nonprofits.

American Public Radio
St. Paul, Minnesota

Toward the costs of a long-range financial and management plan. In three years, APR has created a successful programming operation for public radio stations around the country, obtaining programs from station-based production centers and independent producers in the U.S. and overseas which it markets and distributes to over 300 affiliated stations. To strengthen and stabilize this success, a professional review of its operations is needed to help identify and focus options related to its internal organization, its role as a principal force in public radio, and new business strategies for the next five years. **\$25,000**

**Columbia University in the City of
New York, Trustees of
Graduate School of Business**
New York, New York

Renewed support for the School's program for student internships in nonprofit organizations, with the goal of improving executive-level management in the nonprofit sector by encouraging business school graduates to consider careers with nonprofits and organizations to seek out the talents and skills of professional managers. The grant is a challenge grant for raising funds for the program from within the University. Up to **\$20,000** (over two years)

Volunteer Consulting Group
New York, New York

For its program to encourage corporations to foster the involvement of corporate executives as trustees of nonprofit organizations. The new program will identify four or five major corporations to undertake a pilot program, which will include an educational seminar—tailored to each corporation—for training executives in key aspects of board service, a placement process to match individual preferences, and the development of resource materials. **\$15,000**

**Yale University
School of Organization and Management**
New Haven, Connecticut

Continued support, and a challenge grant, for the School's program for internships in nonprofit organizations, with the goal of improving executive-level management in the nonprofit sector by encouraging business school graduates to consider careers with nonprofits and organizations to seek out the talents and skills of professional managers. Up to **\$12,000**

MEMBERSHIPS:

Council on Foundations

Washington, D.C.

Continued membership support for 1986 of the Council, the national organization representing a broad cross-section of grant-making institutions. Along with its ongoing advisory and informational services for foundations, and representational activities with congressional legislators, the Council is undertaking special projects concerned with the study of the formation, growth, and termination of foundations; the cooperation of grantmakers with counterparts in organized religion; and the encouragement of international grantmaking. Up to \$22,000

Independent Sector

Washington, D.C.

Continued membership in 1986 in this national organization for major charitable and voluntary organizations. \$6,900

New York Regional Association of Grantmakers

New York, New York

Continued membership for 1986 in NYRAG, the regional organization for the grant-making community in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. An active program of meetings, seminars, and workshops is maintained to provide a diverse membership with information to deal with specific funding interests and the technical and administrative concerns of foundations, and to offer members opportunities for cooperation and interchange in shared areas of interest. Up to \$7,000

SPECIAL CONCERNS

GOAL

To support emergency situations and compelling new opportunities.

African-American Institute

New York, New York

A special contribution designated for explorations concerning education and training, dialogue, and other immediate opportunities for foreign foundations to be helpful with respect to the current crisis in South Africa. \$50,000

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Washington, D.C.

Toward the planning of an African program, complementing the Center's other regional activities, to promote fresh analysis and open discussion about the complex problems confronting Africa. Exploratory research and analysis will provide the basis for elaborating specific issues around which a permanent African program could be formed. Attention will be given to the relationship in African countries between strategic concerns for national security and development issues—particularly sustainable resource management—and constructive alternatives for conflict resolution that are appropriate to the African political, social, and cultural context. An aspect of the planning will be a first-hand assessment of the state of advanced research on African issues in African research centers. \$150,000 (over three years)

FUND FOR THE RAMON MAGSAYSAY AWARD FOUNDATION

Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation

Manila, Philippines

To enable the Foundation to increase the 1985 Ramon Magsaysay Awards to \$20,000 each. Up to five awards are presented each year to those persons (or organizations) in Asia "who exemplify the greatness of spirit, integrity, and devotion to freedom of Ramon Magsaysay," former President of the Philippines. Awards are made in five categories: government service, public service, community leadership, international understanding, and journalism and literature. The awards are widely known in Asia, where they are regarded as accolades of high distinction. \$50,000

POCANTICO FUND

**National Trust for Historic Preservation
in the United States**

Washington, D.C.

Toward the expenses of the Pocantico Planning Project to develop a plan, including a management study and architectural plans, for the future of the Kykuit Historic Park Area of the Pocantico Hills Estate. **\$75,000**

Further support for the Pocantico Planning Project. **\$249,178**

ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND AWARDS IN ARTS EDUCATION

The following five schools received Rockefeller Brothers Fund Awards in Arts Education in 1985. The award, a grant of \$10,000 for the school's art program, is given in recognition of excellence in arts curricula and teaching.

Chevy Chase Elementary School

Chevy Chase, Maryland

Gilpin Extended Day School

Denver, Colorado

King Philip Middle School

West Hartford, Connecticut

Mentor High School

Mentor, Ohio

New Traditions School

San Francisco, California

PAYMENTS MADE IN 1985 AND GRANTS OUTSTANDING

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
ONE WORLD: SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE USE (\$2,575,900 Paid)				
Alaska Humanities Forum				
Anchorage, Alaska				
Expenses of the Alaska Native Review Commission	\$ 30,000		\$ 30,000	
American Farmland Trust				
Washington, D.C.				
Core support and revolving loan fund	1,000,000*	\$750,000	250,000	
General program	600,000			\$600,000
Bio-Energy Council				
Arlington, Virginia				
Toward merger with Volunteers in Technical Assistance	25,000		25,000	
BioEnergy Users Network				
Washington, D.C.				
Core budgetary expenses	150,000		150,000	
CAF, Inc.				
New York, New York				
Operating expenses	10,000*	6,000	2,000	2,000
Caribbean Conservation Association				
St. Michael, Barbados				
Eastern Caribbean Natural Area Management Program and Marine Resources Program for the Eastern Caribbean	75,000		75,000	
Eastern Caribbean Natural Area Management Program and Marine Resources Program for the Eastern Caribbean	110,000			110,000
Center for Community Change				
Washington, D.C.				
Core budget and economic development program	250,000*	125,000	125,000	
Center for Neighborhood Technology				
Chicago, Illinois				
Waste conversion project	25,000		25,000	
Center for Resources Economics (formerly Round Valley Agrarian Institute)				
Covelo, California				
Start-up costs of Island Press	40,000			40,000

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
Coolidge, H. J., Center for Environmental Leadership Cambridge, Massachusetts Training program for foreign students and interns studying in the U.S.	\$ 75,000*	\$ 35,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 15,000
Corporation for Public-Private Ventures Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Development Training Institute	300,000*	225,000		75,000
Foundation for P.R.I.D.E. Miami, Florida Renewable energy in the Caribbean	100,000*	70,000		30,000 ¹
Friends of Women's World Banking/USA New York, New York General budget	125,000*	80,000	20,000	25,000
Global Studies Center (formerly Global Research and Training Center) Arlington, Virginia Initial general costs	470,000*	20,000	200,000	250,000
Global Tomorrow Coalition Washington, D.C. General budgetary support	50,000		25,000	25,000
Hong Kong, University of Hong Kong Center for Urban Studies and Urban Planning	40,000*	20,000	20,000	
INFORM, Inc. New York, New York Study of integrated approaches to nonpoint source pollution	21,000*		21,000	
Institute for Alternative Agriculture Greenbelt, Maryland General budgetary expenses	60,000		35,000	25,000
International Federation of Institutes for Advanced Study Stockholm, Sweden General operating expenses over three years	450,000*			450,000
International Institute for Environment and Development Washington, D.C. Coordination of responses to the food and drought crisis in Africa Agriculture program	50,000 30,000		25,000 30,000	25,000

¹ Lapsed

*Appropriation made prior to 1985

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
International Institute of Rural Reconstruction				
New York, New York				
People's Republic of China project	\$ 25,000		\$25,000	
International Network of Resource Information Centers				
Plainfield, New Hampshire				
General budgetary purposes	150,000		50,000	\$100,000
International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources				
Gland, Switzerland				
Director General's fund	100,000		50,000	50,000
East European program	150,000			150,000
Michigan, University of				
Ann Arbor, Michigan				
School of Natural Resources				
Wildland Management Center and Eastern Caribbean Natural Area Management Program	55,000		55,000	
National Academy of Sciences				
Washington, D.C.				
Board on Agriculture				
Alternative methods in modern production agriculture study	75,000		75,000	
National Association of State Departments of Agriculture Research Foundation				
Washington, D.C.				
Agricultural nonpoint source pollution control program of the Farmland Project	50,000		50,000	
National Audubon Society				
New York, New York				
Critical global issues project	120,000		40,000	80,000
Natural Resources Defense Council				
New York, New York				
International program	75,000		25,000	50,000
Neurosciences Research Foundation				
New York, New York				
Neurosciences Institute	85,000*	\$ 55,000	30,000	
New England Governors' Conference				
Boston, Massachusetts				
Farmland retention project and agricultural task force	110,000*	85,000		25,000 ²

² Rescinded and redesignated

*Appropriation made prior to 1985

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
Nitrogen Fixing Tree Association				
Waimanalo, Hawaii				
Core program	\$ 60,000		\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000
Obor				
Clinton, Connecticut				
<i>State of the World</i> translations	44,300		30,400	13,900
Overseas Development Council				
Washington, D.C.				
Core program on sustainable development strategies	50,000		25,000	25,000
Partners for Livable Places				
Washington, D.C.				
Caribbean program	25,000		25,000	
Quebec-Labrador Foundation				
Ipswich, Massachusetts				
Atlantic Center for the Environment				
Caribbean Exchange Project	37,500*	\$ 25,000	12,500	
Inter-Regional Exchange and Policy Program	60,000		30,000	30,000
Regenerative Agriculture Association				
Emmaus, Pennsylvania				
Expansion in the U.S. and to Eastern Europe	80,000*		80,000	
Sustainable agriculture practices program	150,000			150,000
Resources Development Foundation (formerly Agricultural Resources Development Foundation)				
Washington, D.C.				
Biotechnology feasibility project and assistance to the BioEnergy Users Network	75,000		75,000	
International biotechnology project	175,000			175,000
Farmland retention project in New England	25,000		25,000	
Society for the International Public Interest (Ashoka Society)				
Arlington, Virginia				
General budgetary expenses	70,000		50,000	20,000
Leland Stanford Junior University, Trustees of the				
Stanford, California				
Food Research Institute				
Food Pricing in Asia Project	75,000*	45,000	30,000	
Turks and Caicos Development Trust				
Grand Turk, Turks and Caicos, B.W.I.				
General budgetary purposes	30,000*		15,000	15,000

*Appropriation made prior to 1985

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
Volunteers in Technical Assistance				
Arlington, Virginia				
Renewable energy in the Caribbean	\$ 50,000*	\$ 45,000	\$ 5,000	
WGBH Educational Foundation				
Boston, Massachusetts				
Series on sustainable resource use issues	25,000		25,000	
Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development				
Morrilton, Arkansas				
Endowment fund	1,000,000*	250,000	400,000	\$350,000
Private-sector agricultural development project	35,000		35,000	
World Commission on Environment and Development				
Geneva, Switzerland				
Policy project on climatic change	100,000			100,000
World Resources Institute				
Washington, D.C.				
Global energy project	200,000		100,000	100,000
Worldwatch Institute				
Washington D.C.				
<i>State of the World</i>	225,000*	125,000	100,000	
<hr/>				
ONE WORLD: WORLD SECURITY (\$2,122,519 Paid)				
AFS International/Intercultural Programs				
New York, New York				
American Center for International Exchange Leadership	\$ 300,000*		\$125,000	\$175,000
American Association for the International Commission of Jurists				
New York, New York				
Centre for the Independence of Judges and Lawyers	25,000*	\$ 15,000	10,000	
Asia Society				
New York, New York				
China Council and Asian Agenda programs	150,000*	50,000	50,000	50,000
Australian National University				
Canberra, Australia				
Research School of Pacific Studies				
Pacific Trade and Development Conferences	30,000*	10,000	20,000	

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
Brookings Institution				
Washington, D.C.				
Third joint conference with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences	\$ 25,000		\$ 25,000	
Business Executives for National Security Education Fund				
Washington, D.C.				
National development plan	50,000		50,000	
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace				
Washington, D.C.				
<i>Nuclear Proliferation Today</i> publication	75,000*	\$ 25,000	25,000	\$ 25,000
Centre for European Policy Studies				
Brussels, Belgium				
Nonproliferation program	75,000		75,000	
Chinese University of Hong Kong				
Hong Kong				
Second international conference on modernization and Chinese culture	10,019		10,019	
Columbia University in the City of New York, Trustees of				
New York, New York				
Center for United States-China Arts Exchange				
General budget	60,000*	30,000	30,000	
East Asian Institute				
Pacific Basin Studies program	240,000		90,000	150,000
Council on Foreign Relations				
New York, New York				
African project	25,000		25,000	
The David Rockefeller Room	100,000		100,000	
Economic Perspectives, Inc.				
McLean, Virginia				
Polish agricultural revitalization	50,000		25,000	25,000
Forum Institute				
Washington, D.C.				
Survey of philanthropy concerned with international security and prevention of nuclear war	15,000		15,000	
Harvard University				
Cambridge, Massachusetts				
John F. Kennedy School of Government				
Arms control debate project	75,000*	30,000	45,000	

*Appropriation made prior to 1985

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
Institute for East-West Security Studies				
New York, New York				
U.S.-Soviet Relations Program	\$125,000*	\$ 62,500	\$62,500	
Costs of relocating office	50,000*	25,000	25,000	
General budgetary support	225,000		75,000	\$150,000
Institute for International Economics				
Washington, D.C.				
Project on Agriculture and the GATT	50,000		50,000	
Institute of International Education				
New York, New York				
Committee on International Relations Studies with the People's Republic of China	240,000*	75,000	80,000	85,000
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies				
Singapore				
Program of training and scholarly exchange	210,000		70,000	140,000
International Council of Scientific Unions				
Paris, France				
Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment				
Environmental Consequences of Nuclear War project follow-up	50,000		50,000	
International Human Rights Law Group				
Washington, D.C.				
General budgetary purposes	25,000*	15,000	10,000	
International Institute for Strategic Studies				
London, England				
Arms Control Studies	150,000*	100,000	50,000	
Establishing Washington, D.C. office	100,000		50,000	50,000
Japan Center for International Exchange				
Tokyo, Japan				
General budgetary expenses	70,000*	35,000	35,000	
Johns Hopkins University				
School for Advanced International Studies				
Baltimore, Maryland				
Technology and the Limitation of International Conflict project	65,000		65,000	
Korea University				
Seoul, Korea				
Asiatic Research Center				
Pacific Workshops on Regional Affairs	40,000*	20,000	20,000	

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights				
New York, New York				
General budgetary support	\$ 25,000*	\$ 15,000	\$10,000	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology				
Cambridge, Massachusetts				
Project evaluating emerging technologies relevant to defense policy and arms control negotiations	75,000*	37,500	37,500	
National Committee on United States-China Relations				
New York, New York				
General budgetary expenses	60,000		30,000	\$ 30,000
OEF International				
Washington, D.C.				
Countertrade practices and policies of developing countries study	15,000		15,000	
Princeton University, Trustees of				
Princeton, New Jersey				
Program on Nuclear Policy Alternatives	100,000*	50,000	50,000	
Resources for the Future				
Washington, D.C.				
Public education program relating to the International Atomic Energy Agency	75,000*		75,000	
Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies				
Chicago, Illinois				
Horizontal proliferation education project	80,000		40,000	40,000
Scientists' Institute for Public Information				
New York, New York				
Media outreach campaign on nuclear winter	150,000*		75,000	75,000
Trilateral Commission (North America)				
New York, New York				
General budget	240,000*	160,000	80,000	
General budget	240,000		80,000	160,000
United Nations Association of the United States of America				
New York, New York				
Program on The Major Powers in Asia	60,000*	30,000	30,000	
Nuclear nonproliferation project	150,000		75,000	75,000

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
WGBH Educational Foundation				
Boston, Massachusetts				
<i>The Nuclear Age</i> television series	\$150,000		\$75,000	\$75,000
Wisconsin, University of				
Madison, Wisconsin				
Project on U.S.-Origin Reactor Fuel and the Spread of Nuclear Weapons	47,500		47,500	
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars				
Washington, D.C.				
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies				
Endowment fund	125,000*	\$55,000	40,000	30,000
NEW YORK CITY				
(\$949,500 Paid)				
Bryant Park Restoration Corporation				
New York, New York				
Administration expenses for 1985 through 1986	\$ 70,000*		\$ 40,000	\$ 30,000
Harlem Urban Development Corporation				
New York, New York				
Second- and third-year support of development and planning capacities	150,000*	\$ 75,000	75,000	
New York City Partnership				
New York, New York				
Core budgetary needs in housing, youth employment and education, and economic development	950,000*	500,000	450,000	
Core budgetary needs in economic develop- ment, housing, and youth employment and education	750,000		60,000	690,000
New York Community Trust				
New York, New York				
New York Grantmakers Summer Recreation Program	50,000*	25,000	25,000	
Neighborhood Revitalization Program	115,000*	65,000	50,000	
New York Interface Development Project				
New York, New York				
Economic development in New York City projects	50,000		50,000	

*Appropriation made prior to 1985

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1984	Unpaid Balance
New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations				
New York, New York				
Administration and planning	\$135,000*	\$75,000	\$60,000	
Nonprofit Coordinating Committee of New York				
New York, New York				
General operating expenses	25,000*		12,500	\$12,500
Inventory of data on nonprofit organizations in New York City	17,000		17,000	
Playing to Win				
New York, New York				
Development program	25,000		25,000	
Pratt Institute				
New York, New York				
Center for Community and Environmental Development				
New York Economic Development Training Program	75,000*	25,000	25,000	25,000
South Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation				
Bronx, New York				
Land Assemblage for Neighborhood Development Unit	70,000		35,000	35,000
United Parents Associations of New York City				
New York, New York				
Educational Priorities Panel	70,000*	60,000	10,000	
Educational Priorities Panel	15,000		15,000	
<hr/>				
NONPROFIT SECTOR				
(\$369,014 Paid)				
American Public Radio				
St. Paul, Minnesota				
Long-range financial and management plan	\$ 25,000		\$ 25,000	
Columbia University in the City of New York, Trustees of				
New York, New York				
Graduate School of Business				
Student internships in nonprofit organizations	20,000		10,000	\$ 10,000

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1984	Unpaid Balance
Council on Foundations				
Washington, D.C.				
Committee on International Grantmaking	\$75,000*	\$50,000	\$25,000	
Robert W. Scrivner Award	10,000		10,000	
Membership for 1986	22,000		19,100	\$ 2,900 ³
Facing History and Ourselves				
National Foundation				
Brookline, Massachusetts				
Voluntary Tradition and the Nonprofit Sector in America Curriculum Project	45,000		22,500	22,500
Foundation Center				
New York, New York				
General support	50,000		25,000	25,000
Harvard University				
Cambridge, Massachusetts				
Harvard Business School				
Nonprofit Management Fellowship Fund	12,000*		9,814	2,186 ⁴
Independent Sector				
Washington, D.C.				
Operating needs for 1985	25,000		25,000	
Membership for 1986	6,900		6,900	
National Center for Charitable Statistics				
Washington, D.C.				
Statistics of Income samples of tax-exempt organizations and private foundations	25,000		25,000	
New Business Ventures for Not-For-Profit Organizations				
New York, New York				
General operating support	25,000		25,000	
New York Regional Association of Grantmakers				
New York, New York				
Membership for 1986	7,000		4,700	2,300 ⁵
New York University				
Graduate School of Business Administration				
New York, New York				
Institute for Not-for-Profit Entrepreneurship	35,000		35,000	

3 Lapsed

4 Lapsed

5 Lapsed

*Appropriation made prior to 1985

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
Volunteer Consulting Group				
New York, New York				
Corporate executives as trustees program	\$ 15,000		\$ 15,000	
Yale University				
New Haven, Connecticut				
School of Organization and Management				
Student internships in nonprofit organizations	12,000		12,000	
Yale University				
New Haven, Connecticut				
Institution for Social and Policy Studies				
Program on Non-Profit Organizations	150,000*	\$ 50,000	67,000	\$ 33,000
Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc.				
New York, New York				
<i>Charitable Behavior of Americans</i> study	70,000*	62,000	7,000	1,000 ⁶
SPECIAL CONCERNS				
(\$218,327 Paid)				
African-American Institute				
New York, New York				
Explorations re: the current crisis in South Africa	\$ 50,000			\$ 50,000
Columbia University in the City of New York, Trustees of				
New York, New York				
Center for United States-China Arts Exchange				
Arts education exchanges	241,820*	\$ 80,600	\$ 80,600	80,620
Harvard University				
Cambridge, Massachusetts				
Graduate School of Education				
Comparative study of U.S.-China arts education	233,180*	77,725	77,727	77,728
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars				
Washington, D.C.				
African Program planning	150,000		60,000	90,000

6 Lapsed
 *Appropriation made prior to 1985

Recipient and Purpose	Total Appropriation	Paid in Previous Years	Payment in 1985	Unpaid Balance
FUND FOR THE RAMON MAGSAYSAY AWARD FOUNDATION				
(\$50,000 Paid)				
Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation				
Manila, Philippines				
Awards	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000	
POCANTICO FUND				
(\$547,698 Paid)				
National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States				
Washington, D.C.				
Pocantico Planning Project	\$ 335,520*	\$112,000	\$223,520	
Pocantico Planning Project	75,000		75,000	
Pocantico Planning Project	249,178		249,178	
ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND AWARDS IN ARTS EDUCATION				
(\$50,000 Paid)				
Chevy Chase Elementary School				
Chevy Chase, Maryland	\$ 10,000		\$ 10,000	
Gilpin Extended Day School				
Denver, Colorado	10,000		10,000	
King Philip Middle School				
West Hartford, Connecticut	10,000		10,000	
Mentor High School				
Mentor, Ohio	10,000		10,000	
New Traditions School				
San Francisco, California	10,000		10,000	
			<u>\$6,882,958</u>	
Payments matching employee contributions to charitable institutions			16,411	
			<u>\$6,899,369</u>	<u>\$5,597,248⁷</u>

⁷ Total does not include lapsed items

*Appropriation made prior to 1985

RECONCILIATION OF GRANTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS PAID DURING THE YEAR OR APPROVED FOR FUTURE PAYMENT			
Unpaid Appropriations, December 31, 1984:			
Principal Fund	\$5,274,175		
Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation	—0—		
Pocantico Planning Project	223,520		
	5,497,695		
RBF Awards in Arts Education	446,788		
			\$5,944,483
Appropriations authorized in 1985:			
Principal Fund	6,621,719		
Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation	50,000		
Pocantico Planning Project	324,178		
RBF Awards in Arts Education	—0—		
Charitable Matching Gifts	16,411		
	7,012,308		
Less:			
Appropriations lapsed:			
Principal Fund	63,386	6,948,922	
			12,893,405
Appropriations paid in 1985:			
Principal Fund	6,235,260		
Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation	50,000		
Pocantico Planning Project	547,698		
	6,832,958		
RBF Awards in Arts Education*	131,598		
Charitable Matching Gifts	16,411		
			6,980,967
Unpaid Appropriations, December 31, 1985:			
Principal Fund	5,597,248		
Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation	—0—		
Pocantico Planning Project	—0—		
	5,597,248		
RBF Awards in Arts Education	315,190		
			\$ 5,912,438

*includes administration and grants paid

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Following the report of Arthur Andersen & Co.,
Independent Certified Public Accountants, are
financial statements comprising:

Financial Statements

- Balance Sheet, December 31, 1985 with Comparative
1984 Totals
 - Statement of Fund Activity for the year ended
December 31, 1985 with Comparative 1984 Totals
 - Notes to Financial Statements
-

Supplemental Schedule

- Schedule of Functional Expenses, Principal Fund for the
year ended December 31, 1985 with Comparative
1984 Totals
-

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

To the Board of Trustees,
Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc.:

We have examined the balance sheet of ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND, INC. (a New York not-for-profit corporation) as of December 31, 1985 and the related statement of fund activity for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and, accordingly, included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly the financial position of Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. as of December 31, 1985 and the results of its operations for the year then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

ARTHUR ANDERSEN & CO.

New York, N.Y.
March 28, 1986

ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND, INC. BALANCE SHEET
December 31, 1985 With Comparative 1984 Totals

	Principal Fund	Pocantico Planning Project Fund	Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation Fund	Total All Funds	Total 1984 (Note 8)
Assets					
Cash	\$ 130,492	\$ —	\$ 369	\$ 130,861	\$ 1,638
Accounts receivable	—	25,907	—	25,907	—
Investments, at market value (Note 3)	184,011,503	21,985,571	997,772	206,994,846	170,646,224
Program related investments, at net realizable value:					
Program mortgage loans	699,373	—	—	699,373	691,637
Other	800,000	—	—	800,000	1,000,000
Real estate (Note 4)	510,000	—	—	510,000	510,000
	<u>\$186,151,368</u>	<u>\$22,011,478</u>	<u>\$998,141</u>	<u>\$209,160,987</u>	<u>\$172,849,499</u>
Liabilities and Fund Balances					
Bank overdraft	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 1,296,625
Grants payable	5,912,438	—	—	5,912,438	5,944,483
Federal excise tax payable	386,405	65,661	1,914	453,980	557,805
Fund balances	179,852,525	21,945,817	996,227	202,794,569	165,050,586
	<u>\$186,151,368</u>	<u>\$22,011,478</u>	<u>\$998,141</u>	<u>\$209,160,987</u>	<u>\$172,849,499</u>

The accompanying Exhibit I and notes to financial statements are an integral part of this balance sheet.

STATEMENT OF FUND ACTIVITY
for the year ended December 31, 1985 with Comparative 1984 Totals

	Principal Fund	Pocantico Planning Project Fund	Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation Fund	Total All Funds	Total 1984 (Note 8)
Revenues:					
Grant returned from grantee	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 16,703,512
Contributions	89,500	—	—	89,500	1,000
Dividend income	3,630,952	613,682	—	4,244,634	4,351,922
Interest income	4,280,680	384,996	98,473	4,764,149	5,127,757
Other income	9,502	—	—	9,502	5,722
	8,010,634	998,678	98,473	9,107,785	26,189,913
Grants and Expenses:					
Grants awarded	6,574,744	324,178	50,000	6,948,922	8,870,419
Provision for Federal excise tax (Note 1)	386,405	65,661	1,914	453,980	557,804
Functional expenses:					
Direct charitable activities	325,501	—	—	325,501	282,210
Program and grant management	1,256,800	—	77,235	1,334,035	1,128,052
Investment management	1,116,052	92,933	2,764	1,211,749	916,069
General management	510,546	—	—	510,546	423,393
	10,170,048	482,772	131,913	10,784,733	12,177,947
Expense reimbursement received from Rockefeller Family Fund, Inc.	74,372	—	—	74,372	80,775
Excess (deficiency) of revenue over grants and expenses	(2,085,042)	515,906	(33,440)	(1,602,576)	14,092,741
Net Realized Gain From Securities Sales	13,334,767	2,377,315	—	15,712,082	24,374,488
Net Unrealized Gain (Loss) From Changes in Market Prices of Investments	21,499,504	2,006,521	128,452	23,634,477	(27,380,594)
	34,834,271	4,383,836	128,452	39,346,559	(3,006,106)
Excess of income over grants and expenses	32,749,229	4,899,742	95,012	37,743,983	11,086,635
Fund Balance, beginning of year	147,103,296	17,046,075	901,215	165,050,586	153,963,951
Fund Balance, end of year	\$179,852,525	\$21,945,817	\$996,227	\$202,794,569	\$165,050,586

The accompanying Exhibit I and notes to financial statements are an integral part of this statement.

1. Organization and purpose:

Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. (the "Fund") is a non-profit, charitable corporation existing under the New York not-for-profit corporation law and is classified as a private foundation as defined in the Internal Revenue Code. The Fund's principal purpose is to make grants to local, national and international philanthropic organizations.

The Pocantico Planning Project Fund and the Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation Fund represent special purpose funds restricted by the Board of Trustees.

2. Summary of significant accounting policies:

Basis of presentation

The Fund maintains its books on a modified cash basis. However, the accompanying financial statements are not materially different from statements which would result from the use of the accrual basis of accounting.

Certain reclassifications of the 1984 financial statements, presented on a summarized total funds basis, have been made to conform with the 1985 presentation.

Investments

Investments in securities are carried at quoted market prices. Unrealized gains or losses are determined using

quoted market prices at the respective balance sheet dates. Realized gains or losses from sales of securities are determined on a specific identification basis.

Program related investments with limited or no marketability are stated at fair value as determined by management.

Investments in limited partnerships are valued on the basis of the Fund's equity in the net assets of such partnerships.

Grants payable

The Fund estimates that the grants payable balance as of December 31, 1985, will be paid as follows:

	Amount
1986	\$3,682,438
1987	1,680,000
1988	550,000
	<hr/>
	\$5,912,438

Tax status

The Fund is exempt from Federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and has been classified as a "private foundation." Provision has been made for Federal excise tax on net investment income.

3. Investments:

Investments as of December 31, 1985 are as follows:

	Cost (or Market Price at Date of Gift)	Unrealized Appreciation (Depreciation)	Quoted Market or Fair Value
Principal Fund:			
Short-term paper	\$ 17,610,870	\$ —	\$ 17,610,870
Stocks	89,561,795	37,607,831	127,169,626
Bonds	26,920,081	2,033,010	28,953,091
Venture capital partnerships	10,500,000	(222,084)	10,277,916
	<hr/>		
	144,592,746	39,418,757	184,011,503
Pocantico Planning Project Fund:			
Short-term paper	7,075,418	—	7,075,418
Stocks	12,010,768	2,899,385	14,910,153
	<hr/>		
	19,086,186	2,899,385	21,985,571
Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation Fund:			
Short-term paper	6,000	—	6,000
Bonds	767,400	224,372	991,772
	<hr/>		
	773,400	224,372	997,772
	<hr/>		
Total investments	\$164,452,332	\$42,542,514	\$206,994,846

4. Real estate:

The Fund's real estate, which is carried at the cost to the donor, has been leased to a nonprofit organization under the terms of an agreement which expires in 2056.

5. Pension plan:

The Fund participates in the retirement income plan for employees of Rockefeller Brothers Fund et al, a noncontributory plan covering substantially all its employees. The Fund makes annual contributions to the plan equal to the amount accrued for pension expense. However, in 1985 and 1984 no contribution was made since no pension expense was required. Accumulated plan benefits and plan net assets are presented below:

	<i>January 1,</i>	
	<i>1985</i>	<i>1984</i>
Actuarial present value of accumulated plan benefits:		
Vested	\$2,183,822	\$2,092,238
Nonvested	124,021	114,269
	<u>\$2,307,843</u>	<u>\$2,206,507</u>
Net assets available for plan benefits	<u>\$3,782,870</u>	<u>\$3,813,788</u>

The assumed rate of return used in determining the actuarial present value of accumulated plan benefits was 6.5% in 1985 and 1984, compounded annually.

6. Related party transactions:

The Fund engages Rockefeller and Company, a related party, as one of four investment advisors. The Fund also is reimbursed for certain common expenses by Rockefeller Family Fund, Inc. In both instances, financial arrangements are determined on a fair value basis.

7. Commitments:

The Fund occupies office facilities which provide for minimum aggregate annual rental payments as follows:

<i>Fiscal year:</i>	
1986	\$172,800
1987	172,800
1988	172,800
	<u>\$518,400</u>

Rent expense aggregated approximately \$207,000 in 1985.

8. Prior year's financial statements:

The amounts shown for 1984 in the accompanying financial statements are presented to provide a basis for comparison with 1985 and present summarized totals only.

SCHEDULE OF FUNCTIONAL EXPENSES, PRINCIPAL FUND
for the year ended December 31, 1985 with Comparative 1984 Totals

	<i>Direct Charitable Activities</i>	<i>Program and Grant Management</i>	<i>Investment Management</i>	<i>General Management</i>	<i>Total</i>	
					<i>1985</i>	<i>1984 (Note 8)</i>
Salaries and related expenses:						
Salaries	\$168,885	\$ 543,848	\$ 44,788	\$211,598	\$ 969,119	\$ 852,012
Group life insurance	8,640	27,817	2,290	10,820	49,567	39,891
Thrift plan	10,419	33,548	2,762	13,050	59,779	47,494
Other employee benefits	12,806	41,231	3,394	16,039	73,470	58,532
Unemployment and disability insurance	1,711	5,510	454	2,144	9,819	4,323
Social Security tax	9,317	29,997	2,469	11,668	53,451	45,267
	211,778	681,951	56,157	265,319	1,215,205	1,047,519
Other expenses:						
Consultants' fees	992	211,956	—	—	212,948	168,608
Investment services	—	—	1,041,574	—	1,041,574	739,091
Legal and audit fees	—	—	—	86,255	86,255	97,027
Travel	30,556	98,397	—	—	128,953	94,472
Rent and electricity	37,733	121,497	10,002	47,259	216,491	210,211
Telephone	10,534	33,916	2,792	12,241	59,483	51,887
Furniture and equipment	13,051	42,020	—	19,805	74,876	20,721
General office expenses	14,666	47,129	3,886	71,913	137,594	122,829
Publications	6,191	19,934	1,641	7,754	35,520	37,483
	\$325,501	\$1,256,800	\$1,116,052	\$510,546	3,208,899	2,589,848
Less, Reimbursement received for share of expenses: Rockefeller Family Fund, Inc.					74,372	80,775
					\$3,134,527	\$2,509,073

TRUSTEES

Thornton F. Bradshaw

30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112

Laura R. Chasin

2 Appleton Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Mark B. Dayton

980 American Center Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

William M. Dietel

Room 3450, 1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104

Peggy Dulany

Room 5600, 30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112

James H. Evans

375 Park Avenue, Suite 2005
New York, New York 10152

Peter C. Goldmark, Jr.

780 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Henry A. Kissinger

1800 K Street, N.W., Suite #520
Washington, D.C. 20006

Abby M. O'Neill

Sunset Road
Box 200
Oyster Bay, New York 11771

George Putnam

One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

David Rockefeller

Room 5600, 30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112

David Rockefeller, Jr.

Room 5600, 30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112

Laurance Rockefeller

Room 5600, 30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112

Laurance S. Rockefeller¹

Room 5600, 30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112

Rodman C. Rockefeller

Room 316, 610 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10020

S. Frederick Starr

Oberlin College
Oberlin, Ohio 44074

Russell E. Train

1601 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Jeremy P. Waletzky

1700 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

FINANCE COMMITTEE

George Putnam, Chairman

James H. Evans

Henry Upham Harris, Jr.

Claudine Malone

Eli Shapiro

David Rockefeller, Chairman

Room 5600, 30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112

Abby M. O'Neill, Vice Chairman

Sunset Road
Box 200
Oyster Bay, New York 11771

William M. Dietel, President

Room 3450, 1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104

Russell A. Phillips, Jr., Executive Vice President

Room 3450, 1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104

Benjamin R. Shute, Jr., Secretary

Room 3450, 1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104

David G. Fernald, Treasurer

Room 5600, 30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112

Domenica Giacalone, Assistant Treasurer

Room 3450, 1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104

Ebba K. Corcoran, Assistant Treasurer

Room 3450, 1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104

Richard D. Parsons, Counsel

Patterson, Belknap, Webb & Tyler
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112

Program Associates

Lonna B. Jones
William F. McCalpin, Jr.
William S. Moody
Kendra S. O'Donnell*
Hilary K. Palmer

**Rockefeller Brothers Fund
Distinguished Fellow**

Francis Deng

Program Support

Miriam Aneses
Margaret Ameer Cataldo
Josephine Duebler
Bridget M. Fenlon
Winifred Gallagher
Jackquelynn Jones
Wendy Krat
Dorothy Livermore
Bridget Massay
Ellen M. Merrick
Jennifer B. Parker
Barbara Schaubert
Robert Stone
Emily Voorhis
Sandra Ziering

Consultants

Dana S. Creel
Albert R. Ravenholt
Marjorie S. Ravenholt
Thomas W. Wahman

- African-American Institute 37, 50
- AFS International/Intercultural Programs 43
- Alaska Humanities Forum 26, 39
- American Association for the International
Commission of Jurists 43
- American Farmland Trust 23, 39
- American Public Radio 36, 48
- Asia Society 43
- Australian National University 43
- Bio-Energy Council 20, 39
- BioEnergy Users Network 23, 39
- Brookings Institution 31, 44
- Bryant Park Restoration Corporation 47
- Business Executives for National
Security Education Fund 27, 44
- CAF, Inc. 39
- Caribbean Conservation Association 24, 39
- Carnegie Endowment for
International Peace 44
- Center for Community Change 39
- Center for Neighborhood Technology 26, 39
- Center for Resources Economics 20, 39
- Centre for European Policy Studies 29, 44
- Chevy Chase Elementary School 38, 51
- Chinese University of Hong Kong 31, 44
- Columbia University in the City of New York,
Trustees of 31, 36, 44, 48, 50
- Coolidge Center for Environmental
Leadership 40
- Corporation for Public-Private Ventures 40
- Council on Foreign Relations 32, 44
- Council on Foundations 35, 37, 49
- Economic Perspectives, Inc. 30, 44
- Facing History and Ourselves National
Foundation 35, 49
- Forum Institute 27, 44
- Foundation Center 35, 49
- Foundation for P.R.I.D.E. 40
- Friends of Women's World Banking/USA 40
- Gilpin Extended Day School 38, 51
- Global Research and Training Center
(see Global Studies Center)
- Global Studies Center 40
- Global Tomorrow Coalition 20, 40
- Harlem Urban Development Corporation 47
- Harvard University 44, 49, 50
- Hong Kong, University of 40
- Independent Sector 35, 37, 49
- INFORM, Inc. 40
- Institute for Alternative Agriculture 20, 40
- Institute for East-West Security Studies 30, 45
- Institute for International Economics 32, 45
- Institute of International Education 45
- Institute of Southeast Asian Studies 31, 45
- International Council of Scientific Unions 29, 45
- International Federation of Institutes
for Advanced Study 40
- International Human Rights Law Group 45
- International Institute for Environment
and Development 21, 24, 40
- International Institute of Rural Reconstruction 24, 41
- International Institute for Strategic Studies 28, 45
- International Network of Resource Information
Centers 21, 41
- International Union for Conservation of Nature
and Natural Resources 21, 41
- Japan Center for International Exchange 45
- Johns Hopkins University 28, 45
- King Philip Middle School 38, 51
- Korea University 45
- Lawyers Committee for International
Human Rights 46
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology 46
- Mentor High School 38, 51
- Michigan, University of 24, 41
- National Academy of Sciences 21, 41
- National Association of State Departments
of Agriculture Research Foundation 26, 41
- National Audubon Society 22, 41
- National Center for Charitable Statistics 35, 49
- National Committee on United States-
China Relations 32, 46
- National Trust for Historic Preservation
in the United States 38, 51
- Natural Resources Defense Council 22, 41
- Neurosciences Research Foundation 41
- New Business Ventures for
Not-For-Profit Organizations 36, 49
- New England Governors' Conference 41
- New Traditions School 38, 51
- New York City Partnership 33, 47
- New York Community Trust 47
- New York Interface Development Project 34, 47
- New York Public Library, Astor,
Lenox and Tilden Foundations 48

- New York Regional Association
of Grantmakers 37, 49
- New York University 36, 49
- Nitrogen Fixing Tree Association 24, 42
- Nonprofit Coordinating Committee
of New York 34, 48
- Obor 22, 42
- OEF International 33, 46
- Overseas Development Council 22, 42
- Partners for Livable Places 25, 42
- Playing to Win 34, 48
- Pratt Institute 48
- Princeton University, Trustees of 46
- Quebec-Labrador Foundation 25, 42
- Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation 37, 51
- Regenerative Agriculture Association 22, 42
- Resources Development Foundation 25, 42
- Resources for the Future 46
- Roosevelt Center for American
Policy Studies 29, 46
- Round Valley Agrarian Institute
(see Center for Resources Economics)
- Scientists' Institute for Public Information 46
- Society for the International Public Interest
(Ashoka Society) 25, 42
- Leland Stanford Junior University,
Trustees of the 42
- South Bronx Overall Economic
Development Corporation 34, 48
- Trilateral Commission (North America) 33, 46
- Turks and Caicos Development Trust 42
- United Nations Association of the
United States of America 30, 46
- United Parents Associations of
New York City 34, 48
- Volunteer Consulting Group 36, 50
- Volunteers in Technical Assistance 43
- WGBH Educational Foundation 22, 28, 43, 47
- Winrock International Institute for
Agricultural Development 26, 43
- Wisconsin, University of 30, 47
- Woodrow Wilson International Center
for Scholars 37, 47, 50
- World Commission on Environment
and Development 26, 43
- World Resources Institute 23, 43
- Worldwatch Institute 43
- Yale University 36, 50
- Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc. 50