

Foundations In Security

An Overview of Foundation Visions,
Programs, and Grantees

PROJECT ON WORLD SECURITY
ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND

Amir Pasic



PLEASE READ

This PDF document has been enhanced to work with your World Wide Web browser.

Any text within this document that appears in blue is a hyperlink to a World Wide Web site. Clicking on that text will launch your Web browser application, which will display that Web site automatically.

If you have never used Adobe Acrobat Reader in this manner, Acrobat Reader will ask you to choose a browser. Upon clicking a hyperlink, a navigation window will appear. Find the desired web browser on your computer and select it. The browser will launch, your machine will connect to the Internet and you will be automatically connected to the selected Web site.

You must have Web browser software present on your computer, as well as a connection to the Internet.

AMIR PASIC served as Deputy Director of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund Project on World Security and is currently a Visiting Scholar at the Thomas J. Watson Jr. Institute for International Studies, Brown University.

The author thanks Kennette Benedict for her guidance and commentary, and Gwyneth Borden for her research assistance.

ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND, INC.
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022-7001
Telephone: 212.812.4200
Facsimile: 212.812.4299
E-mail: rock@rbf.org
World Wide Web: www.rbf.org

Copyright © 1999, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc.

Design: H Plus Incorporated

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	4
PART I : ANALYSIS AND OVERVIEW	5
PART II: FOUNDATION TEMPLATES	18
THE W. ALTON JONES FOUNDATION	19
THE LYNDE AND HARRY BRADLEY FOUNDATION	21
CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK	22
FORD FOUNDATION	24
THE HARRY FRANK GUGGENHEIM FOUNDATION	26
THE WILLIAM AND FLORA HEWLETT FOUNDATION	28
THE JAPAN FOUNDATION CENTER FOR GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP	29
THE HENRY LUCE FOUNDATION	30
THE JOHN D. AND CATHERINE T. MACARTHUR FOUNDATION	31
THE MCKNIGHT FOUNDATION	34
THE ANDREW W. MELLON FOUNDATION	35
THE JOYCE MERTZ-GILMORE FOUNDATION	36
CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION	37
JOHN M. OLIN FOUNDATION, INC.	39
THE SMITH RICHARDSON FOUNDATION	40
THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION	42
THE SARAH SCAIFE FOUNDATION	43
SOROS FOUNDATIONS NETWORK	44
THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE (USIP)	46
THE UNITED STATES-JAPAN FOUNDATION	48
THE WINSTON FOUNDATION FOR WORLD PEACE	49

PREFACE

A chief goal of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund's Project on World Security was to explore the question of how a foundation desiring to contribute to global peace and stability might approach its grantmaking at a time when many of the threats to peace are not of a traditional, military nature. In early 1998, as a part of this exploration, the Fund asked Amir Pasic, the project's deputy director, to prepare a review of the major security-related programs of other foundations.

To the extent possible, the descriptions included in his report are presented in each foundation's own words and are based on annual reports, program statements, and Website pages. Nonetheless, readers interested in pursuing the possibility of support from any of these foundations are strongly urged to contact the foundation directly for additional program details and instructions on applying for a grant. Foundation programs change focus periodically, and the "snapshots" provided in this report are necessarily time-bound.

In addition to program descriptions, the report includes a valuable overview and analysis of patterns and trends in security grantmaking.

We hope this review provides a useful picture of how foundations are conceptualizing and addressing a complex, challenging issue.

Colin G. Campbell
President, Rockefeller Brothers Fund

PART I: ANALYSIS AND OVERVIEW

International security provides foundations with a marvelously fecund field, full of new approaches to furthering peace and new definitions of security. It nonetheless remains difficult to capture the essence of security in a pithy phrase that reflects widespread consensus. Many people remain unaware of or resistant to innovations in security thinking, believing that reconsiderations of definitions and fundamentals divert policy and philanthropic communities from action on pressing problems in the traditional security arena. However, for better or worse, scholars and practitioners are debating the notion of what constitutes security, and this discussion seems poised to enter the arena of public deliberation.

This overview of the current state of grantmaking in the security field construes the topic broadly to include a full range of perspectives. At the same time, the synthesis focuses chiefly on the largest foundations with stated or implicit security interests, because they account for most of the grant dollars and for much of the philanthropic vision devoted both to security issues and international issues more broadly.

There are two primary obstacles to getting a handle on current foundation activity in the field. First, global transformations since the end of the Cold War have led foundations to pursue novel issues and activities in newly accessible regions that are not readily captured by existing methods for tracking grants. Related to this is the lag in compiling grantmaking data. For example, two recent, (1997–98) comprehensive studies of international grantmaking end with 1994 data.¹ Since then, several leading foundations have restructured their international and security programs, and the overview presented here strives to provide a picture of the current state of the field. The second obstacle arises from the changing definition of security, which some have expanded to cover emerging issues that challenge the state's capacity to provide security, while others have generated radically different ways of thinking about security in which the state is no longer the center of analysis. Expanding definitions and conceptions of security, in turn, encompass an ever larger range of foundation-supported activities. For example, responsible environmental stewardship, attention to human rights, sustained economic development, and promotion of an active civil society can all be seen as contributing to the preservation of social order and peace, the traditional concerns of security.

¹ The two studies are Loren Renz et al., eds., *International Grantmaking: A Report on U.S. Foundations* (New York: The Foundation Center, 1997); and Mary Lord and Mary Soley, *Trends in Peace and Security Grants: A Study of Funders Response to the Post-Cold War Era* (Washington, DC: ACCESS, forthcoming 1998).

After some brief background on the broader context of international grantmaking, this overview will describe how foundations approach security and then will review the major conceptions of it that have inspired foundations and that foundations have nurtured through their grantmaking. Some provisional observations about opportunities for grantmaking precede the foundation profiles, which are generated using a common template.

BACKGROUND

Funding for security is part of the larger category of international grantmaking, which constitutes grants made abroad and those made within the United States for international purposes. Grantmaking related to international issues constituted about 10 percent of U.S. private giving in the mid-1990s, including the funding of domestic organizations involved in international affairs. The overall level of international giving has leveled off at this magnitude, representing more than double the level of international giving in the early 1980s.² The top ten international funders accounted for three-quarters of the \$684 million in international affairs grants in 1995 as well as the \$800 million granted in 1996. In 1996 the Foundation Center reports that 4.9 percent of the dollar value of international affairs giving went to overseas recipients, which was a decrease from 1995, when it was 6.3 percent. This represents a return to 1994 levels.

Private philanthropy has played an important role in furthering international affairs research and engagement. Past milestones in international philanthropy include significant support for major multilateral organizations devoted to peace and international cooperation. The Palace of Peace at the Hague (home to the International Court of Justice), the Pan American Union Building (Washington, D.C.), and the Central American Court of Justice (San José, Costa Rica) were built with funds donated by Andrew Carnegie. After World War II, the United Nations building in New York was built on a site donated by the Rockefeller family. More recently, grassroots peace movements in the 1980s received substantial foundation support. Through programs and initiatives specifically directed toward promoting international peace, foundations have also helped facilitate scholarly and cultural exchanges, economic development projects, and the work of various non-state institutions related to international affairs. Private philanthropy has also been a crucial engine for the non-governmental sector both domestically and abroad.

Foundations have helped facilitate a more stable transition into the post-Cold War era. They have supported efforts to help Russia transform its military-industrial complex, and they have also nurtured education and civil society, especially in the former Soviet bloc and in post-apartheid South Africa. Furthermore, they have promoted unofficial diplomatic efforts when direct government contacts were difficult, occasionally engaging directly in efforts to prevent crises and resolve animosities. Finally, foundations have continued their long-standing tradition of funding scholarship and policy analyses.

Some commentators and activists are concerned that the level of funding for traditional security activities has decreased since the end of the Cold War. For example, Mary Lord, a long-time analyst of international grantmaking trends, found that funding in 1994 for "Peace, Security and International Affairs" decreased to \$117 million from \$127 million in 1991.³ During roughly the same period, from 1990 to 1994, overall foundation giving rose from \$8.7 billion to \$11.3 billion.⁴ Though there has been a decrease in attention paid to security issues as they were defined during the Cold War, it is not easy to find a way to understand whether and how this decline has been compensated for by the funding of new issues and new understandings of security. After all, determining the adequacy of funding depends on an evaluation of the most important funding needs, which will depend on one's definition and approach to security. Regardless of persistent differences in analyzing the global

² *The Foundation Grants Index 1996* (Washington, DC: The Foundation Center, 1997) and on the Internet at <http://fdncenter.org/trends/fgia.html#part1c>. A comprehensive and pragmatic guide to philanthropy can be found on the Foundation Center's website; <http://fdncenter.org>. The study of philanthropy and the non-profit sector is attracting increasing attention in academe. Yale University has had a Program on Non-Profit Organizations since 1977 (see <http://www.yale.edu/isps/ponpo>), while more recently, the CUNY Graduate Center's Center for the Study of Philanthropy initiated a five-year project in multicultural philanthropy and voluntarism (see <http://www.philanthropy.org>).

³ Mary E. Lord, "Post-Cold War Trends in Peace and Security Funding," in *International Grantmaking*, p. 134. This was based on a survey of 59 foundations with Peace, Security, and International Relations programs of over \$100,000.

⁴ <http://fdncenter.org/trends/ighigh2.htm>

context and disagreements on philanthropic priorities, foundation officers themselves have recognized the need for a system that will be able to code and track grants with greater reliability and precision.

However, it may well be that clarity in gathering and interpreting grantmaking data is unlikely to precede clarity in the conceptual and normative conundrums that continue to accompany security debates with annoying regularity. Actually, perhaps one of the more exciting developments in the 1990s has been the integration, or perhaps reintegration, of security concerns with other areas of human activity. This is evident both in the consolidation of foundation programs and in more integrative conceptions of security. It may well be that one of the present challenges is not only how to integrate security into other disciplines and activities but also how to prepare those not normally accustomed to dealing with security to adopt security as one of their legitimate concerns.

Of course, by themselves foundations cannot remake the world. By devising well-orchestrated grantmaking endeavors, however, they can serve as catalysts in forging new policy directions, furnishing incubators for innovative ideas, and establishing and sustaining networks of scholars, activists, and public officials. Private philanthropy — especially the major foundations that constitute its leadership — has a special capacity for nurturing innovation and proposals for responsible action in the realm of security where the survival of humanity is at stake. Furthermore, extremely rapid global change is becoming the norm, leading to increased uncertainty and confusion which buffet both policy-makers and the public. In this context, foundations provide a more stable environment for setting a course and for providing a steady beacon to guide efforts at improving the human condition.

FOUNDATIONS

A breakdown of current security approaches into three categories can help illuminate the post-Cold War role of foundations. First, there has been an expansion in basic conceptual issues and theories. The questioning of basic concepts has led to a debate over whose security should really matter: should it be individuals, states, nations, civil society, or perhaps civilizations? And who should make decisions and take responsibility for security? Second, although states still prepare to thwart military aggression by other states, developments are under way to improve the understanding and identification of a variety of dangers and threats. These include both different kinds of actors (such as terrorists, irregular ethnic bands, biological pathogens, and transnational criminal syndicates) and threatening trends, for which it is difficult to hold any one type of actor responsible (such as environmental degradation, forced migration, and the risks of collapse in human-made infrastructures and networks). Third are the strategic and operational responses to security problems, ranging from methods for dealing with crises to long-term efforts at preventing conflict and building healthier societies.

Foundations have contributed to these developments in security through two basic methods. First, they have cultivated insight by supporting basic research and education and by establishing concepts to guide foundation grantmaking programs.⁵

⁵ On the importance for philanthropies of providing accounts of their purposes and roles in society, thus fostering their accountability, see Colin G. Campbell, *Telling Our Story: Accountability for Family Foundations* (Washington, DC: Council on Foundations, 1996).

Second, foundations fund policy development and support the operations of non-governmental organizations involved in this field.

These three categories of security and the two basic methods of grantmaking provide the framework for the ensuing overview of contemporary trends in foundation security grantmaking, as well as the subsequent, descriptive templates of the major foundations involved in security grantmaking.⁶ The following section presents the major concepts and issues as currently identified and supported by leading American foundations. Foundations are singled out in the development of these concepts for illustrative purposes; their selection does not mean that they were the primary or sole grantmaker. The aim here is not to analyze precedence, leadership, or effectiveness in philanthropic endeavors but to provide the reader with representative examples of the more salient foundation activities that receive the bulk of foundation resources and a great deal of scholarly and activist attention.

Global Security

Globalization is perhaps one of the most widely used among the terms that refer to evolving interdependencies among all types of actors around the world. For some scholars and foundations, security itself has become a global issue, so that the security of any one nation is seen to be indivisibly implicated in the security of all. The potential for nuclear holocaust during the Cold War certainly helped create the conviction that planetary survival was at stake, and an interest in international peace was part of the mission of the great philanthropies established earlier in the twentieth century. There has, however, been an increase in attention paid to the global dimension of security, reflecting the perception of growing interdependencies and interconnections among various actors and issues around the world. For example, with funding from the Pew Charitable Trusts, Cambridge University established a Global Security Programme. Its director explained:

Global Security is about survival. It is the next step beyond national and international security studies. It grapples with the transition from a world where decisive power was incontrovertibly interpreted as military force wielded by states to one where, increasingly individuals and communities face threats without enemies; where many of the familiar forces and political ideas of the last two centuries cannot safeguard security.⁷

This idea has already exerted some influence in academe. The notion of “threats without enemies” was the theme for the 1996 convention of the International Studies Association — the major interdisciplinary scholarly association in North America devoted to the study of international affairs.

Pew also thought globally in funding the Pew Global Stewardship Initiative at the Aspen Institute: “a Program to address problems associated with the worldwide interaction of population growth, unsustainable consumption of resources and deterioration of the natural environment, including their international security consequences.”⁸

The global aspect of security also informs other foundations that have been leaders in security grantmaking. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund has a One World program, divided into world security and sustainable resource use components. The MacArthur Foundation has also just consolidated its six program areas into two, one of which is

⁶ Selection criteria: Any U.S.-based grantmaking foundation that makes at least \$1 million in grants annually with a program related to international peace and stability or a publicly articulated intention to affect international security issues through its grantmaking. Whether or not the word “security” is used is not an important consideration. It is more important that the foundation or one of its programs establish a concern for, or interest in, human conflict that is violent or otherwise destructive of important values.

⁷ Gwyn Prins, as quoted by Stephen Del Rosso, “The Insecure State: Reflections on the State and Security in a Changing World,” *Daedalus* 124, no. 2 (Spring 1995), p. 188.

⁸ Pew Charitable Trusts, 1996 grants, on the Internet at <http://www.pewtrusts.com>. The Pew Charitable Trusts are not included in the profiles because they have reoriented their focus toward public affairs within the United States. However, their program on religion in public life does have an interest in global Christianity and the global interactions of world religions.

called The Program on Global Security and Sustainability.⁹ And the W. Alton Jones Foundation has an implicitly global focus in its Secure World program.

On the other hand, other foundations are moving away from a general, global concern with peace and security to focus on a region or country. For example, the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation has modified its general program on peace and security in order to focus on the Palestinian-Israeli peace process. This trend appears to indicate a desire to concentrate resources rather than a philosophical turn away from global concerns.

A global focus indicates a recognition that the trends affecting the security of individuals, communities, and states are global in scope, not easily confined to states or even regions. It also implies that the concern is for security on a global scale, whether the emphasis is on the survival of humanity, the natural environment, or on the products of their interactions. And global security also appears to be increasingly tied to sustainability, so that the pursuit of security is becoming increasingly associated with the promotion of practices and trends in the use of global resources that can be sustained over the long run.

The philanthropic interest in global security stems from a commitment to caring for the human condition regardless of national boundaries. This provides a significant counterweight to the more exclusive, national focus of governmental policy-makers and security analysts who work for the state. It is, of course, a time-honored tradition for philanthropies to focus on promoting world peace, in contrast to states that tend to focus more on immediate threats to their survival or status. The current wave of interest in global security can thus be seen as an attempt to exploit the opportunities for peace and stability that have emerged after the end of the Cold War.

Cooperative Security

An implicit global concern is also manifested in the vision of cooperative security. However, cooperative security is a less diffuse vision and less all-encompassing than the aforementioned global security approach. A more pragmatic orientation, cooperative security is firmly grounded in a policy perspective. Foundations that espouse it seek to craft cooperative approaches to managing military relations among states. For example, the Cooperative Security Consortium, funded by the Carnegie Corporation, brought together scholars and policy analysts who proposed military policies that would promote “collaborative rather than confrontational relationships among national military establishments.”¹⁰ This initiative also led to a longer-term perspective regarding the need for cooperative measures that would minimize conflict.

Cooperative security differs from the traditional idea of collective security much as preventive medicine differs from acute care. Cooperative security is designed to ensure that organized aggression cannot start or be prosecuted on any large scale. By contrast, collective security is an arrangement for deterring aggression through military preparation and defeating it if it occurs.¹¹

Cooperative security is not about fuzzy-minded idealism that seeks to imagine away conflicts and animosities. Rather, it proposes that the moment for cooperative engagement occurs long before conflicts mature and escalate into armed

⁹ Even before this change, MacArthur had a strong, self-conscious global orientation through its previous Program on Peace and International Cooperation.

¹⁰ Janne E. Nolan, “The Concept of Cooperative Security,” in *Global Engagement: Cooperation and Security in the 21st Century*, ed., Jane E. Nolan (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1994), p. 4.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

confrontations. This conviction is justified by pointing to the changing nature of the global economic environment, the diffusion of military technologies, and the increased likelihood of intrastate violence. In this environment, concerted efforts are needed to manage transnational interactions that both benefit and endanger national societies. Dealing with these transnational interdependencies and their potential pathologies cannot be successful if countries, especially the advanced industrial countries, attempt to go it alone.¹²

The Carnegie Corporation changed the name of its Cooperative Security Program to “Preventing Deadly Conflict” in 1994, further homing in on the search for practical ways of preventing and resolving conflicts. However, cooperative security continues as one of its subprograms:

Cooperative security and nonproliferation seeks to support policy research and the interactions of scholars and policy makers toward developing a new international security strategy. Such a strategy is based on principles of cooperation rather than competition, integration rather than isolation, and transparency rather than secrecy. A primary emphasis is placed on the exploration of prospects for more robust efforts by the United States, Russia, and other nations to curb the proliferation of advanced weaponry and weapons technology—proliferation that threatens to raise the stakes dangerously in regional or intrastate conflicts.¹³

Closely allied with cooperative security is the notion of “common security.” Espoused by the W. Alton Jones Foundation as part of its Secure World Program, “the central premise of common security is that states can minimize insecurity by undertaking diplomatic and other efforts to clarify their intentions and reduce their capabilities to commit aggression.” This search for clarity of intentions and capabilities should be conducted “through the creation of treaties and other international regimes that establish norms, rules, and procedures for managing trade, finance, and particularly, military affairs and arms control.”¹⁴ Like cooperative security, common security maintains that states and other actors are mutually engaged in a variety of ways that make it self-defeating to formulate purely self-serving security policies that flout networks of international cooperation.

Environmental Security

Spurred on by several foundations, environmental security has emerged as a major conceptual modification, and one that has even received the attention of defense bureaucracies.¹⁵ Environmental security concerns the sustainability and viability of the natural systems which human societies need to survive and thrive. This concern encompasses both the desire to protect nature for its inherent value and the concern that competition over resources, through demographic pressures and environmental degradation, will lead to violent conflict.

The Pew Charitable Trusts have played an important role in furthering this research through the Global Stewardship Initiative, as has the MacArthur Foundation, through its support for scholarship and the more policy-oriented 2050 Project, which has sought to understand and extrapolate, through the year 2050, the implications of a diminishing resource base under pressure from population growth.

¹² Janne E. Nolan et al., “The Imperatives of Cooperation,” in *Global Engagement*.

¹³ Carnegie Corporation, 1996 Annual Report, p. 75.

¹⁴ W. Alton Jones Foundation, 1996 Annual Report, p. 67.

¹⁵ For a review of George D. Dabelko and P. J. Simmons, “Environment and Security: Core Ideas and US Government Initiatives,” *S AIS Review* 17, no. 1 (1997), pp. 127-46.

Environmental security is perhaps most fully integrated into the visions of the W. Alton Jones Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. W. Alton Jones's environmental and security programs intersect at its particular interest in energy, which also guides the foundation's general grantmaking vision.¹⁶ In its Secure World program, the foundation ties together the long-term security worry of spreading nuclear technology (proliferation, cost of waste) with the short-term need to solve the problems of energy-hungry markets (where scarcities could lead to conflict) by supplying them with the most benign fuels and technologies through regional cooperation.¹⁷ The Rockefeller Brothers Fund, prior to the current reevaluation of its security interests, also explored analytic links between the security and sustainable resource use portions of its One World program out of concern that an inequitable distribution of resources could lead to conflict.¹⁸

Human Security

Though also global in its concerns, a human security perspective has a definite focus regarding whose security matters: it is the individual's. Amidst the rapid changes accompanying globalization, it declares that individuals should be free from deprivation in all the contexts of their lives. Consequently, in this view security is not confined to political-military issues; it extends to the social and economic spheres as well as to the environment. Furthermore, security in its myriad dimensions is seen as the responsibility of a diverse range of actors, transnational and subnational, state-based and non-state-based, military and non-military.¹⁹

Inspired by such diverse views as those of Vaclav Havel, the Commission of Global Governance, and the UN Development Program, human security has led to the pluralization of perspectives on security. Important sustained support for the inclusion of diverse voices and disciplines has been provided by The MacArthur Foundation through its research and writing grants as well as its funding since 1984 of the Social Science Research Council-MacArthur Foundation Program on International Peace and Security. Under its newly consolidated program on Global Security and Sustainability, MacArthur has made better understanding of human security, and how it is affected by global dynamics, a focus of its research and writing grants.²⁰ The SSRC initiative funded two-year scholarships at the doctoral and postdoctoral levels in addition to scholarly research meetings. It has contributed to expanding the range of security issues, the range of theoretical and analytic tools, and it has sought to diversify the population that studies security issues, traditionally dominated by white male political scientists.²¹

The Mellon Foundation has also engaged in a similar long-standing program to increase the number of minority students studying international affairs in universities. Furthermore, its recent program on refugees and migration, focused on increasing the capacity of developing countries to accommodate refugees, can be seen as a human security concern.²²

Human Rights, Civil Society, and Democracy

Since the end of the Cold War, a broad range of foundations has become even more deeply involved in efforts to facilitate popular participation and increase protection for individual involvement in the public sphere. The three themes of human rights, civil society, and democracy are usually seen as reinforcing each other, so that improvements in any one area have positive consequences for the others.

¹⁶ W. Alton Jones's 1996 Annual Report establishes energy as integral to the foundation's interests in the environment, arms control, and citizen activism. "No part of the human endeavor on today's Earth proceeds without energy inputs, but along with the many benefits of our ability to harness energy have come significant costs" (p. 7). Energy is used to tie together issues of equity, distribution, and access to energy in local, societal, and global contexts. "The W. Alton Jones Foundation is convinced that immensely positive opportunities exist to alter the future of energy use. New technologies, new policies, and new economic incentives can all move us away from a path of development that had no sustainable future, decreases global security, and increases international tension, and instead toward a more sustainable and secure world" (pp. 13 and 15).

¹⁷ W. Alton Jones Foundation, 1996 Annual Report, p. 53.

¹⁸ Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 1994 Annual Report, p. 37.

¹⁹ See Emma Rothschild, "What Is Security?" *Daedalus* 124, no. 3 (1995), pp. 53-98.

²⁰ As explained on its Website: "To cope with unprecedented transnational flows of capital, people, goods, environmental resources, ideas, and images, today's society must invent and adapt political structures, social norms, and institutional arrangements. To do so requires the best possible understanding of the concepts of security and sustainability" (on the Internet: <http://www.macfdn.org/programs/gss.htm>).

²¹ See Robert Latham, "Moments of Transformation: The SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Program on the eve of its 10th Anniversary," *SSRC Items* 48, no. 1 (March 1994), pp. 1-8. See also Robert Latham, "Thinking About Security after the Cold War," *International Studies Notes* 20, no. 3, (Fall 1995), pp. 9-16. The Program is also actively involved in sustaining a scholarly network based on the cohort it has supported over the years.

²² However, Mellon does not wish to have its concerns described in terms of security, as it is concerned that such a depiction would elicit inquiries that would not be of interest (Letter from the Secretary, February 23, 1998).

Though activities in this area rarely involve an explicit security justification, there is generally an implicit assumption that the vigorous promotion of human rights, a bustling civil society, and a democratic form of government are key ingredients for assuring long-term peace and stability. This security rationale may be tacit rather than explicit, because efforts to promote participation are often pursued for their own sake, leaving greater peace and stability as implicit secondary consequences. Nonetheless, this diffuse participatory vision borrows from and enriches other foundation visions and allied theoretical approaches. There are echoes of the human security theme in the promotion of human dignity through human rights. There is a commitment to international cooperation, buoyed by the proposition that democratic countries do not fight each other and that civil society organizations can either transmit or cushion globalizing trends.²³

There has been a veritable rush of activity in this area, with the Soros Foundations Network leading the way in terms of the amount of funding, an emphasis on recruiting local leaders, and the establishment of a vision of the open society based on the philosophy of Karl Popper.²⁴ Among the more established leaders in this field, the Ford Foundation has provided substantial grant funding, and MacArthur has had a long-standing program in Latin America. Also prominent in this area is the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, whose Civil Society grantmaking program has a conflict prevention subcategory that helps build understanding among ethnic and social groups in transitional and conflict-ridden countries. The Ford Foundation has also emphasized the broader dimension of its democracy-building programs in its 1996 reorganization: “Peace is a precondition for development with democracy, but so are justice and human rights. Pluralism and inclusion serve the common good of each society and the international community.” These goals reflect Ford’s commitment to “support creative, dynamic institutions and individuals capable of adapting their work to changing realities in a time of great political, economic, and social change.”²⁵

National Security

“National security” based on the “national interest” continues to inform much of the scholarship of The Bradley Foundation, the Olin Foundation, and the Smith Richardson Foundation. This perspective continues to place greatest emphasis on security threats posed by and to inevitably distrustful collectives, be they states, units bigger than the state, or substate groups. In contrast to the other visions of security, this one claims that U.S. national security may be compromised by excessive involvement in multilateral institutions. It also maintains that U.S. interests are bound to be incompatible with the interests of others, making cooperative endeavors potentially dangerous gambles.

Some novel developments have arisen in this line of scholarship, most prominently with Samuel Huntington’s vision of a “clash of civilizations.”²⁶ Huntington maintains that the major conflicts of the future will take place along the fault lines of major world cultures or civilizations. He transfers the traditional notion of state-based national security to the supranational, cultural realm in which it is civilizations that square off against one another, irrespective of political or ideological boundaries.

Though the national security perspective does accommodate the consideration of new issues such as terrorism, intrastate conflict, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, it differs from the other conceptual trends in its representation of the

²³ See, for instance, Kevin F. Quigley, *For Democracy’s Sake: Foundation and Democracy Assistance in Central Europe* (Washington, DC: The Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1997).

²⁴ See George Soros, “The Capitalist Threat,” *Atlantic Monthly* 279, no. 2, pp. 45-58.

²⁵ Ford Foundation, 1996 Annual Report, p. 43.

²⁶ Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996); and Samuel P. Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations?” *Foreign Affairs* 72, no. 3 (Summer 1993), pp. 22-49.

traditional political-military core of the field as the most important security wisdom. Most of the other conceptions of security seek to expand this traditional core.

Security as Public Health

Dissatisfied that responses to conflict are usually orchestrated only after the onset of a crisis, the Carnegie Corporation, among others, sought new ways of thinking about conflict prevention. A prominent project in this vein has been The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict. It was inspired by the public health approach to disease, in which long-term prevention is the main mission.²⁷ The public health paradigm allows one to consider economic development, civil society building, environmental stewardship, and transnational communication as the building blocks of a single preventative puzzle. Furthermore, such an approach brings to the fore issues of responsibility for security, which may in certain cases be distributed more widely among the public than was the case with conventional military attacks. The public health paradigm is proving to be more than a simple analogy. Public health professionals themselves appear to be increasingly concerned with their potential roles in responding to biological and chemical dangers.²⁸ And in humanitarian emergencies, health professionals have led the way in systematically measuring and documenting the humanitarian impact of conflict.

Global Grantmaking

It is commonplace to hear complaints regarding the small proportion of foundation grants that are devoted to international affairs, especially at a time when globalization is an issue that profoundly affects even the United States. Some foundations have envisioned a kind of “third way” that is neither domestic nor international. Its vision goes beyond security, but if it takes hold, it may have significant repercussions for security grantmaking.

For example, this global orientation can be seen in the vision of the Ford Foundation, which maintains that “boundaries between domestic and international spheres have been largely erased.”²⁹ Amplifying this perspective, Emmett Carson, a former Ford program officer and now president of The Minneapolis Foundation, describes the vision of globally inspired grantmaking:

Rather than subscribe to the old paradigm defining a foundation’s grantmaking and convening activities as either domestic or international, globally inspired grantmaking recognizes that the interplay between international and local events requires that foundations actively identify, monitor and respond to international events and trends affecting their local interests.³⁰

Examples include the grantmaking activities of foundations in U.S.-Mexico border areas, the search for “global best practices” so that communities and governments can learn from the policy successes and failures of other communities and governments, and the global ties among once distant communities that are being built by immigrant and refugee populations. Carson also believes that global grantmaking can improve public education by putting community issues such as the HIV/AIDS pandemic into global perspective.

This philanthropic response to globalization—the effort to transcend the compartmentalization of grantmaking into “domestic” and “international”—may

²⁷ Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, *Preventing Deadly Conflict: Final Report* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, 1997), p. 8. The CCPDC was established in 1994 by the Carnegie Corporation “to address the looming threats to world peace of intergroup violence and to advance new ideas for the prevention and resolution of deadly conflict.”

²⁸ For a perspective that uses the public health paradigm to discuss the similarity of response to biological terror and infectious disease see Christopher F. Chyba, *Biological Terrorism, Emerging Diseases, and National Security* (New York: Rockefeller Brothers Fund, forthcoming). See also Graham Pearson, “The Complementary Role of Environmental and Security Biological Control Regimes in the 21st Century,” *JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association* 278, no. 5 (August 6, 1997), pp. 369-72, quoted in Jack F. Matlock Jr., “Russia’s Leaking Nukes,” *The New York Review of Books* (5 February 1998), p. 17.

²⁹ Ford Foundation, 1996 Annual Report, p. 39.

³⁰ Emmett Carson, *Grantmaking for the Global Village* (Washington, DC: Council on Foundations, 1997), p. 1.

contribute to a growing sense of mutual involvement among communities as well as a growing concern for each others' security. In effect, this amounts to a programmatic implementation of the global security concern discussed above, but on a local level. Global grantmaking is thus a pragmatic means of supporting specific communities dealing with concrete issues and activities that span state frontiers. As communities become instilled with and reflective of international engagement, this may create a potential for grassroots interest in global security, in contrast with the lofty analyses of some scholars who employ a single broad perspective in an attempt to grasp the abstract whole of the global condition.

Keeping in mind the pitfalls of ruminations detached from specific facts and concrete experience, it is useful to suggest a few themes that characterize the current state of the field of security grantmaking, as well as the challenges that unite and divide this philanthropic community.

OBSERVATIONS

This interpretation of current themes in philanthropy involved in security points to three levels of concern. The first considers the cleavage among foundations regarding their basic approach to both the possibility and desirability of greater international engagement. The second concerns the more concrete debate regarding the appropriate role of the United States and its citizens in the world. And the third and final theme reflects the concern about what kind of basic intellectual and analytic resources are needed to prepare for the accelerating speed of change and complexity that appear to be in store for the global future.

Realism versus Globalism

Except for the leading funders of security studies scholarship and security policy development, few foundations have a security program or an explicitly articulated vision of security. This does not mean that they do not have security interests: most programs devoted to improving the human condition are undertaken with the hope that they will contribute to social stability and more harmonious and just societies. Consequently, efforts devoted to alleviating poverty, assuring sustainable development, increasing women's participation, and fostering basic education are at least implicitly conducted to improve the security of their beneficiary populations.

Nonetheless, there are important differences among foundations in the ways they participate in furthering the newly contested concept of security. In terms of theory and conceptual development, the two poles of the mainstream are anchored by MacArthur and Ford on the "global security" side and the Olin and Smith Richardson Foundations on the "national security" side. This is an overly simple dichotomy, as these foundations fund many of the same policy development institutes (think tanks), and many scholars have received support from both ends of the spectrum. However, as a first approximation, the conceptual field can be seen as a continuum, with the globalists on one side and the realists on the other. What influence this difference in basic vision has, or should have, for either foreign policy or philanthropic grantmaking is a difficult question. The issue would certainly benefit from wider study and more open, sustained dialogue.

At minimum, the realist belief that mistrust and belligerence among states, nations, or civilizations are undeniable and inescapable, merits close examination for its impact on policy trends.³¹ Some have suggested that this belief in the inevitability of deadly conflict, especially among high-level policy-makers, amounts to a self-fulfilling prophecy. On the other hand, realists provide prudent counsel when they warn against over-enthusiastic globalism and the dangers of trusting potential aggressors. They typically point to the dashed hopes of Wilsonianism in the years between the World Wars, when, some maintain, an overzealous urge to cooperate with all players allowed aggressors to exploit such good intentions, plunging the world into the abyss of the World War II. Of course, the globalists respond by emphasizing how World War II was preceded by the collapse of the world economy spurred on by nationalist, protectionist policies while states turned their backs on international cooperation.³²

The Role of the United States

One avenue that might be explored to deal with the conceptual impasse is to establish a dialogue between globalism and realism at the level of policy development. At least some of the grantmaking interests of foundations representing these diverse visions have established common ground at this level. For example, both the MacArthur Foundation and the Smith Richardson Foundation have funded the Cold War History Project, part of which also seeks to identify and learn from “missed opportunities” that might have led to earlier cooperation among the superpowers. The hope is that lessons drawn from this and similar projects will improve the productivity of international negotiations and will enrich the tool kit for international cooperation. Furthermore, both the globalists and realists share a concern with the U.S. role in the new era and have funded studies to help clarify U.S. responsibilities and concerns. This focus on U.S. interests and values may provide the common ground needed to build a fruitful dialogue.

Such a dialogue among basic theoretical and ideological commitments is worth pursuing for the sake of the United States and the rest of the world. The price of continuing to avoid contentious conversations about basic commitments is the risk of allowing unexamined and unchallenged commitments, including the poorly understood differences among us, to steer us into future dangers that may still be avoidable.

Furthermore, since the role of the United States is not simply what the federal government does, the range of relevant actors whose roles require reconsideration, extends into the very make-up of local communities. Thus a question for further consideration is whether individuals are prepared not only to understand and manage the impact of globalization on their communities, but also to take responsibility for the impact of their actions on others around the globe. This issue is of key importance for those who are beginning to ask what kinds of duties and responsibilities correspond to the individual rights that are being universally asserted. Who bears the responsibility for ensuring and promoting rights? And, perhaps more important, what role is there for individual duties?

Several commentators have pointed to the dearth of programs that engage the public. For example, Mary Lord was struck by “the near disappearance of grants directed to U.S. citizen involvement, U.S. nuclear age concerns related to public

³¹ On the dangers of relying on a realist model for U.S. foreign policy see Joseph S. Nye, “China and the Future of the Asia Pacific Region,” plenary address, IISS Annual Conference, Singapore, 14 September 1997.

³² This often told lesson of idealistic multilateralism leading to World War II stands in stark contrast to the contrary lesson of how unilateral trade and economic policies in the thirties plunged the world into a depression, creating the conditions that made war more likely. For a discussion of these competing legacies, see John G. Ruggie, *Winning the Peace* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

education, or U.S. political debate about national security.”³³ Matters do not appear to have changed with 1996 grantmaking information, though there are several projects under way designed to meet the need of engaging the public, most notably Student Pugwash, which is funded by MacArthur and others.

Finally, the issue of citizenship is another area where the interests of the globalist and realist strands of grantmaking might coincide. The need for improving and sustaining the quality of public deliberation on the interests and values related to security may be a theme that could spur more dialogue within the rich but often disjointed pluralism of security grantmaking.

Understanding Complex Interactions

The pluralization of security concepts and the debates that surround them have led to even more fundamental questions. How adequate are the basic theoretical and policy tools that are used to understand and respond to social problems?³⁴ Some inspiring but controversial work has been seeking to recast the ways in which we conceptualize and analyze social problems. The “sciences of complexity” seek to connect disciplines and provide an integrative view of the interplay of social and natural dynamics. Though “complexity” applauds the spectacular advances achieved by specialized fields, it identifies the need to reintegrate increasingly segregated bodies of knowledge. This mission seems especially appropriate in light of the need to understand interactions among global trends through which people are changing their lives with unprecedented speed. Though the gulf between the social and natural sciences is being bridged in many separate locales, there are inadequate institutional support and career incentives to encourage sustained traffic across disciplinary boundaries. And in addition to these barriers, the walls that created neat divides among private, public, and academic sectors are also crumbling. A response to this challenge is likely to require a full engagement with our deep normative traditions, which is not easily accommodated within the tradition of value-free social analysis that has been at the core of the modern philanthropic tradition in the United States.³⁵

Along with the need to revitalize the social and policy sciences to ensure that they keep up with the dramatic changes in the world, there is also a puzzle regarding the kinds of knowledge policy-makers and citizens use in understanding their place in the global context.

Analysts have pointed to Congresspersons’ skewed images of their constituents’ views of international issues. This reveals the larger gap in our knowledge regarding the actual ways and means by which leaders and the broader citizenry come to understand complex social issues or how they can be affected by public policy or private initiative. The dearth of perspective on this issue is apparent in the contrast between how much influence is attributed to think tanks and yet how little research there is on their effect on policy-makers and the public debate. This is all the more surprising, given the amount of rhetoric devoted to praising the influence of innovative ideas at a time when ideas have returned to social science as a factor used to explain the course of events and policy decisions.³⁶ However, the meager level of systematic knowledge on the influence of ideas is illustrated by the fact that there is not even a reliable count of how many think tanks there are in the United States.³⁷ The amount of commentary that emphasizes the importance of think tanks as incubators of ideas and of government personnel belies the absence of systematic

³³ Mary Lord, “Post-Cold War Trends in Peace and Security Funding,” p. 137.

³⁴ On some of the challenges faced by the efforts to internationalize the social sciences and humanities in the global age, see Arjun Appadurai, “The Research Ethics and the Spirit of Internationalism,” *SSRC Items* 51, no. 4 (December 1997), pp. 1-10.

³⁵ Bruce Sievers argues that foundations need to engage public values and nurture debates on values, in spite of the inertia of the value-free tradition. See his *Can Philanthropy Solve the Problems of Civil Society? Essays on Philanthropy*, No. 16, (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, 1995).

³⁶ For an accessible analysis of the power of the free market idea, see Daniel Yergin and Joseph Stanislaw, *The Commanding Heights: The Battle Between Government and the Marketplace that is Remaking the Modern World* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998). For a review of the scholarly literature, see Albert Yee, “The Causal Effect of Ideas on Foreign Policy,” *International Organization* 50, no. 1 (Winter 1996), pp. 69-108.

³⁷ One of the few studies of the topic, James Smith, *The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of the New Policy Elite* (New York: The Free Press, 1991), contains two numbers that differ by 20 percent. See also Kenneth Prewitt, *Social Sciences and Private Philanthropy: The Quest for Social Relevance*, Essays on Philanthropy, No. 15 (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy, 1995).

studies about how these institutes generate and filter the knowledge that is used to craft policy.

Even in action-oriented philanthropy, whose endeavors often outpace systematic research, the role of ideas is also important. There is even the kernel of a movement to make policy and systematic scholarship more relevant to each other.³⁸ Scholars have begun to propose ways of making the knowledge they generate more timely and useful for policy-makers. Foundations also have found it most rewarding when they use their convening abilities to reach out directly and engage legislators and other government officials in more relaxed circumstances. What is perhaps yet to come is a more complete and broadly accessible appreciation for the way in which the intended consumers of more timely and pragmatic scholarly products construct and implement policy. In sum, it seems that the supply side of the security-related knowledge sector has begun to stir. What is needed is more input from the demand side, which is also changing in ways that are less obvious to those on the outside. The questions then may lead again to the realm of values once the purposes of governance come under scrutiny.

As our age seems to be one of permanent transition, there is a general acknowledgment of the importance of communicating and manipulating knowledge. The public sphere will need to have better and more accessible indicators of the origins and quality of the knowledge used to make public policy, ranging from the local community to the global level. In this context, foundations still seem to have a unique freedom from the immediate crises of transition. They can invest in experiments that connect and reconnect fields of study and spheres of endeavor whose boundaries and activities may need to be reconsidered and recombined, in order to understand and shape the challenges that await.

³⁸ See Alexander L. George, *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1993); and Joseph Leggold, "Is Anyone Listening? International Relations Theory and the Problem of Policy Relevance," *Political Science Quarterly* 113, no. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 43-63.

PART II: FOUNDATION TEMPLATES

The entry for each foundation intends to provide a faithful synopsis of the story each foundation tells about itself and its role in the promotion and preservation of international peace and security. As foundations vary widely in how thoroughly they describe and explain their activities to the public, the length of the entries varies as does the degree to which interpretation is necessary. To the extent possible, while keeping the entries concise and informative, each foundation has been presented in its own words.

The entries that follow this introduction are divided into five sections. The first provides a brief summary of the foundation's vision of its mission and the context within which it operates. This is followed by a description of its program(s) that is explicitly or closely related to international security and then an indication of the kinds of grantees it supports. The resources the foundation devotes to such endeavors comprise the fourth section, which is followed by the foundations' Website address on the Internet, thus completing each entry. Most foundations list their full grants lists on their Websites.

The criteria for inclusion require that the foundation grant at least \$1 million annually for efforts directed at international security issues. Certainly the sheer magnitude of resources does not by itself guarantee successful, innovative, or remarkable grantmaking. It is, however, reasonable to presume that most of the time, ventures initiated by smaller foundations or even people outside the foundation community will, as they prove their worth, receive the attention of the larger foundations. Of course, there may be worthy projects and initiatives that undeservedly escape the notice of the larger foundations. As a result, these selection criteria cannot claim to be able to generate an exhaustive list of grantmakers; however, they do hopefully shed light on most of the philanthropic landscape that is concerned with the broad field of security.

Even when security is not explicitly used as a justification, it suffices that the foundation demonstrate an interest in affecting the likelihood of violent conflict through its international grantmaking. In addition to private foundations, the United States Institute of Peace is included, as it has played a prominent role in independent grantmaking in the security field, even though it is financed by the United States government.

THE W. ALTON JONES FOUNDATION

VISION

The 1996 Annual Report establishes energy as a clear concept for integrating the foundation's interests in the environment, arms control, and citizen activism. "No part of the human endeavor on today's Earth proceeds without energy inputs, but along with the many benefits of our ability to harness energy have come significant costs."³⁹ Energy is used to tie together issues of equity, distribution, and access to energy in local, societal, and global contexts.

"Considerable costs stem from the immense security issues posed by the unequal distribution of energy among countries around the globe."⁴⁰ Though it identifies many problems in the technological use and abuse of energy, it also sees hope in terms of new (or renewed commitment to existing) technologies. "The W. Alton Jones Foundation is convinced that immensely positive opportunities exist to alter the future of energy use. New technologies, new policies, and new economic incentives can all move us away from a path of development that has no sustainable future, decreases global security, and increases international tension, and instead toward a more sustainable and secure world."⁴¹ The concerns of the foundation are captured in two programs, Sustainable World and Secure World.

PROGRAM

In the Secure World program, the primary goal is the elimination of nuclear weapons. To this end the concern with energy is used to tie the long-term security worry of spreading nuclear technology (proliferation, cost of waste) with the short-term need to solve the problems of "energy-hungry markets" (whose scarcities could lead to conflict) by supplying them with the "most benign" fuels and technologies through regional cooperation.⁴² Linking the Sustainable World and Secure World Programs is the Sustainable Energy for Peace Initiative. It focuses on South Asia, Iran, and North Korea, where nuclear energy programs run the risk of being used for weapons purposes.⁴³ The basic belief is that regional cooperation on solving regional energy problems through collaborative mechanisms can be easier as the mutual interests are clearer and the issues amenable to technical, less politicized analysis. As this process leads to habits of collaboration, cooperation on security issue has a foundation to build on and becomes more likely. The program also focuses on nuclear issues by bringing in "common security" as a means through which states can clarify their intentions to avoid self-reinforcing cycles of hostility that could eventually lead to nuclear war. The foundation maintains that this clarification process takes place through treaties and less formal regimes, without which states would be hard pressed to avoid the security dilemma.⁴⁴ The program again connects to the Sustainable World Program through its concern for the long-term environmental problem presented by weapons and nuclear waste already amassed. The Secure World Program melds both an emphasis on the importance of managing perceptions, working for the devaluation of damaging forms of energy production (e.g. nuclear) with the practice and language of science and technology. Their explicitly embraced activism is conducted in the neutral language of science and technology. The Secure World Program is organized according to four objectives: Eliminate Nuclear Weapons, Common Security, Prevent Massive Release of Radioactive Material, and Assess the Full Costs of Being a Nuclear State.

THE W. ALTON JONES FOUNDATION

(continued)

GRANTEES	They tend to be scientific associations, non-governmental organizations, and think tanks directly involved in policy debate. In 1996 the largest grants under the Secure World Program went to the Natural Resource Defense Council (\$225,000) for research analysis, advocacy of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and other nuclear issues; and to the Stimson Center (\$225,000) for the Nuclear Roundtable Project to strengthen nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation.
RESOURCES	Total grants and contributions awarded in 1996: \$20.46 million. Secure World grants awarded in 1996: \$7.84 million. 1996 Assets: \$323.25 million.
WEBSITE	http://www.wajones.com

³⁹ 1996 Annual Report, p. 7.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 13 and 15.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 53.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 67. The security dilemma occurs when efforts intended to increase our own security threaten potential adversaries who then undertake measures for their security, which end up threatening our security.

THE LYNDE AND HARRY BRADLEY FOUNDATION

VISION	The Bradley Foundation stresses the importance of ideas over political and economic factors. To this end the foundation focuses on citizenship and encourages the “decentralization of power” to reempower “traditional, local institutions.” In particular, the foundation is interested in the interaction of human endeavors: cultural, educational, philosophical, and economic. The foundation’s basic premise is that free representative government and free enterprise allow individuals to “hone their skills and intellects,” to “contribute to the improvement of the human condition.” The foundation’s program interests are in “cultivating a renewed, healthier, and more vigorous sense of citizenship” both in the United States and abroad. The foundation seeks to offer support for programs that address problems of public life — economics, politics, culture, or civil society— to help create better citizens. ⁴⁵
PROGRAM	There is no prescribed program for grantmaking. The overarching themes of citizenship, representative government, decentralization, and free enterprise are the basis for providing grant assistance.
GRANTEES	The grantees are usually think tanks, educational organizations, community organizations, and scholars. The three largest grantees in security studies for 1996 were: the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, to support the Foreign and Defense Policy Studies, Bradley Lecture Series and Murray Fellowship (\$810,000); the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies for three different programs (\$563,550); and the Institute for International Studies (\$135,000).
RESOURCES	Total grants and contributions awarded in 1996: \$23 million. Assets in 1996: \$491 million.
WEBSITE	http://www.townhall.com/bradley/

⁴⁵ 1996 Annual Report.

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK

VISION

Carnegie changed the name of its international security program in 1994 to “Preventing Deadly Conflict.” The corporation’s priorities evolved from the early 1980s when it identified crisis management as a key issue for avoiding nuclear war. This led to an examination of ways to prevent crises from arising. Finally, Carnegie went on to search for better alternatives to a range of conditions that lead to crisis and conflict.⁴⁶ This is now the guiding vision of the program, which is closely associated with the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict.⁴⁷

PROGRAM

The Preventing Deadly Conflict Program is officially presented as follows. “In the post-cold war world, ethnic, nationalistic, religious, and territorial enmities within and between states present new and formidable challenges to nations and multilateral organizations often charged with resolving these conflicts. The dangers are heightened in situations where hatreds and fears of groups are exploited in violent ways by political opportunists or where the possession of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons has the potential for menacing the lives of millions.” The program is used to support “independent research and discussion among scholars, policy makers, and informed members of the public to examine interstate and intrastate conflicts and to advance ideas for their prevention and more rapid and enduring resolution in the future.” This takes place under the subprogram titled “preventing mass intergroup violence.” The subprogram also examines conflict origins, conditions that “deter or encourage their deadly outbreak, conflicts that are most likely to escalate into violence, and the functional requirements for an effective system of conflict prevention.” Funding has included research on the tension between the rights of groups and individuals, analysis of media reporting on conflicts, and efforts to educate people in conflict-prone areas about conflict resolution.⁴⁸ The second subprogram, “strengthening democratic institutions,” focuses on the countries of the former Soviet Bloc and the threat of ethnic or nationalist conflict. The subprogram supports creating and understanding democratic institutions, civil society building, and bolstering the Western response to “threats of disintegration and destabilization in the new democracies.” The third and final subprogram, “cooperative security and non-proliferation,” seeks “to support policy research and the interactions of scholars and policy makers toward developing a new international security strategy. Such a strategy is based on principles of cooperation rather than competition, integration rather than isolation, and transparency rather than secrecy. A primary emphasis is placed on the exploration of prospects for more robust efforts by the United States, Russia, and other nations to curb the proliferation of advanced weaponry and weapons technology — proliferation that threatens to raise the stakes dangerously in regional or intrastate conflicts.”⁴⁹ Another program of the corporation, Strengthening Human Resources in Developing Countries, has long-term security implications and is largely focused on Commonwealth sub-Saharan Africa, with more limited attention to the Commonwealth Caribbean and Mexico, “when there is substantial benefit to the people of the United States.” As of 1996, grantmaking under this program is organized under three initiatives: science and technology for development, women’s health and development, and transitions to democracy in Africa.⁵⁰ It also makes grants for capacity-building and the study of conflict resolution and U.S. foreign policy in the region. Finally, special project grants in 1996 supported UN studies as well as studies of diasporas and conflict resolution in Africa.

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK

(continued)

GRANTEES	The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict received a \$2.7 million one-year appropriation in 1996. Its final report was published at the end of 1997. ⁵¹ Other grantees include prominent university research centers; think tanks; organizations devoted to public education on security issues; UN institutes; and nongovernmental organizations involved in arms control, conflict resolution, and reconciliation. The former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are areas that receive much of the regional attention of the Program for Preventing Deadly Conflict.
RESOURCES	1996 Program Approvals for Preventing Deadly Conflict: \$15.4 million, of which almost 18 percent was for the Commission. Also, in excess of \$1 million under the Program on Strengthening Human Resources in Developing Countries was approved for conflict resolution, peacekeeping, and foreign policy issues. 1996 Assets: \$1.3 billion.
WEBSITE	http://www.carnegie.org

⁴⁶ 1996 Annual Report, Report of the President, p. 25.

⁴⁷ The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, founded in 1994, "has worked to deepen understanding of human conflict and conflict prevention... The Commission has contributed to a new interest in conflict prevention among scholars and policy-makers at the highest level throughout the world" (David Hamburg and Cyrus Vance, "The Commission's Mandate," in Jane Holl, *Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict*, Report of July 1996, p. vi).

⁴⁸ 1996 Annual Report, p. 75.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 103.

⁵¹ The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, *Preventing Deadly Conflict: Final Report* (Washington, DC: The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, 1997).

VISION

“We need the talent that abounds in every community to meet three challenges of the twenty-first century: Enabling the poor to build assets that expand opportunity and reduce hardship; Promoting peace and the rule of law, human rights and freedom; strengthening education and the arts, identity and community.”⁵² These three challenges correspond to Ford’s three new program areas: Asset Building and Community Development; Peace and Social Justice; and, Education, Media, Arts, and Culture. Reflecting its belief that “boundaries between domestic and international spheres have been largely erased,”⁵³ Ford’s reorganization has placed its previous “international affairs” grantmaking program under one of these three new overall programs—Peace and Social Justice. The vice-president in charge of the Peace and Social Justice Program writes: “Innovations in technology and communications have revolutionized the way we think about work and leisure. Globalization and the integration of the world’s economies have become facts of daily life. As questions arise about the ability of governments to respond to these changes, many look to civil society—community groups and other citizen’s organizations—for answers.”⁵⁴ Ford finds that progress in the worldwide application of innovative ideas to peace, human rights, social justice, and democratic governance is threatened by the rise of extremism. It believes that the rise of democracy has not ended widespread human rights violations. And as it observes armed conflicts raging around the world, it sees a threat of “nuclear weapons loosely controlled by weak governments.”⁵⁵ The purposes of the three programs (Rights and Social Justice, Governance and Public Policy, and International Affairs) now combined into the Peace and Social Justice Program are (1) to “support regional and international cooperation toward a more peaceful and equitable international order based on tolerance among diverse peoples,” (2) to “promote access to justice and protection for the full range of human rights for all members of society,” (3) to “foster effective, open, accountable, and responsive governmental institutions to secure the rule of law and the narrowing of inequality,” and (4) “strengthen civil society through broad participation of individuals and civic organizations in charting the future.”⁵⁶ “These four goals are interdependent and mutually reinforcing.”⁵⁷ Peace is a precondition for development with democracy but so are justice and human rights. Pluralism and inclusion serve the common good of each society and the international community. These goals reflect Ford’s commitment to “support creative, dynamic institutions and individuals capable of adapting their work to changing realities in a time of great political, economic, and social change.”⁵⁸

PROGRAM

The Peace and Social Justice program is administered by two units. The Governance and Civil Society unit “strives to improve governmental performance and accountability, stimulate new approaches to designing and implementing public policies, and enhance the role of civic organizations, particularly philanthropies, in promoting democratic values. With Foundation support, grantee organizations are developing new social and economic indicators for more accurate measures of national well-being; finding ways to keep people involved in public affairs; and sponsoring national awards programs to recognize government innovation and excellence in the U.S., Brazil, and the Philippines.”⁵⁹ The second unit, Human Rights and International Cooperation “promotes the full range of internationally recognized human rights while supporting the efforts of countries and peoples to secure justice and peace. Grantee organizations throughout the world are promoting and protecting women’s rights and civil rights, exploring human rights concepts and how they might be meaningfully applied in different cultures, seeking new ways to control the weapons trade that fuels international and domestic conflicts, and

FORD FOUNDATION

(continued)

bringing new voices to foreign-policy making.”⁶⁰ Ford’s senior director of the Peace and Social Justice program supervises links between the two units, while also distilling lessons for the foundation to be learned from the grantmaking experience. “Four special initiatives illustrate this approach. The first will explore ways to help organizations build stronger public support for issues related to the rights of women, minorities, refugees and migrants. To combat growing dissatisfaction with international social and economic development programs, a second initiative will explore new ways to improve their effectiveness while pursuing more equitable relations between aid- giving and aid-receiving nations. Third, as nations increasingly shift responsibility for welfare and other social programs to local governments, the foundation will support research on how such changes affect taxpayers and beneficiaries and on alternatives that might offer more equitable treatment for all. Lastly, the foundation will devote special efforts to advancing understanding of the growing complexity of relations between civic organizations and governments throughout the world.”⁶¹

GRANTEES

They range widely from universities to research institutes, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, associations, and individuals in the United States and abroad. The largest International Affairs grant in 1996 went to the Overseas Development Council (\$1.5 million), while the largest grant in the Peace and Security subcategory went to the United Nations (\$544,000).

RESOURCES

1996 Program Approvals: \$44 million (49 percent through field offices) under the old International Affairs program heading (\$142.9 million under the new Peace and Social Justice consolidated program). 1996 Assets: \$8 billion.

WEBSITE

<http://www.fordfound.org>

⁵² 1996 Annual Report, cover Photo Essay.

⁵³ 1996 Annual Report, p. 39.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

THE HARRY FRANK GUGGENHEIM FOUNDATION

VISION

The Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation supports “Research for understanding and reducing violence, aggression, and dominance.” “Mr. Guggenheim wished the program of his foundation to be a continuous effort over a *long period* devoted to *research* into *broad areas of human aggressive behavior* seeking *fundamental answers to basic questions* about such behavior and that the operation of the program should be characterized by *continuing interaction, intellectual criticism, cross-disciplinary stimulation, and exchange of ideas* between *empirical scientists, theorists, and informed laymen.*”⁶² Harry Guggenheim established this foundation to support research on violence, aggression, and dominance because he was convinced that solid, thoughtful, scholarly and scientific research, experimentation and analysis would in the end accomplish more than the usual solution impelled by urgency rather than understanding... The foundation places a priority on the study of urgent problems of violence and aggression in the modern world and also encourages related research projects in neuroscience, genetics, animal behavior, the social sciences, history, criminology, and the humanities which illuminate modern human problems.”⁶³

PROGRAM

The foundation divides its research concerns into eight priorities. The first five (Youth, Family, Media, Crime, and Biology) are primarily focused on domestic issues or basic research. The “War and Peace” priority eschews explanations of war that look to “human nature,” and instead claims: “Nobody, however remote, is isolated from the global system, and modern warfare must be analyzed at that level, particularly because one can predict that future wars will be fought by guerilla movements against the state from within, and with transnational populations challenging the authority of the state. Peace must be constructed within a complex web of interdependency and other relationships: Peace is something more substantial than merely the absence of war.”⁶⁴ The “Terrorism” priority seeks out studies that focus on the underlying reasons for terrorism, believing that addressing these reasons “is likely to be more effective than a violent or repressive response to political violence.”⁶⁵ The final priority, “Religion, Ethnicity, Nationalism” seeks to move away from notions of primordial hatreds toward studies that “address the large questions of how and why people can be persuaded to fight over group difference, and in what political contexts, as well as the conditions for the resolution of these conflicts. The interests of governments and rulers must be made a part of how we understand popular warfare.”⁶⁶

GRANTEES

Grants are made for scholarly research, dissertation support, and academic conferences. For example, HFG funded Ed Mansfield and Jack Snyder’s research on democratization and political violence,⁶⁷ as well as other well-received research on violence of both contemporary and historical interest.

RESOURCES

1995 Grants and Contributions: \$1.86 million.
1995 Assets: \$66.1 million.

After conducting a five-year review in 1995, during which it received positive evaluations for the quality and relevance of the scholarship it supported, HFG foresees decreasing the number of grants it makes. This is largely due to previous, high levels of spending and a

THE HARRY FRANK GUGGENHEIM FOUNDATION

(continued)

decision to limit spending to seven percent of assets. HFG appears to make an impact on knowledge and its circulation that is disproportionate to its size. This may be due to the clarity of research priorities and the hands-on involvement of its program staff.

WEBSITE

<http://www.hfg.org>

⁶² President's (James. M. Hester's) Statement in the 1995 Bi-annual Report, p. 5. Italics in original.

⁶³ 1995 Report, p. 13.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 15.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 16.

⁶⁷ Published in *International Security and Foreign Affairs*.

THE WILLIAM AND FLORA HEWLETT FOUNDATION

VISION

Hewlett has a strong commitment to the private voluntary sector. It seeks to assist the financial base and operating efficiency of organizations and associations outside of industry and government. Because it believes that private philanthropy is of great value to society, it seeks to support this sector, which it finds to be less vibrant than it could be. The foundation's explicit international focus is found in its program on conflict resolution, but it also has a longstanding program in U.S.-Mexico affairs, expanded in 1996 to cover U.S.-Latin American affairs. The program definition for the U.S.-Latin American program is under development during 1997. The foundation also used to fund the Five College Program on World Security but didn't do so in 1996 and also stopped funding international studies programs at liberal arts institutions. The other program areas through which the foundation channels its resources are education, performing arts, population, environment, family and community development, interprogram activities, and special projects which include a "public policy" component with a strong international tendency.

PROGRAM

The Conflict Resolution Program is concerned with a full range of issues, from theory development at university centers to practitioners who apply conflict resolution techniques in the field, including international applications. Grants are made in six categories: theory development (largely at university centers); strengthening practitioner organizations (especially work with underserved communities); promoting the field of conflict resolution; consensus building, public participation, and policymaking; international conflict resolution; and emerging issues.

GRANTEES

Under the international applications component of the Conflict Resolution Program, grantees include Harvard's Center for International Studies (\$200,000 for a program on international conflict analysis and resolution), the Carter Center (\$150,000), the Institute for Multitrack Diplomacy in Washington, D.C. (\$150,000), the Kettering Foundation in Washington, D.C. (\$200,000), and the World Conference on Religion and Peace (\$150,000). Other programs have significant international components, especially population and education. It is within the latter that the U.S.-Mexico program was located, and it emphasized research and training, as well as policy studies.

RESOURCES

1996 Program Approvals: Conflict Resolution: \$5.855 million (\$1.025 million under international category). U.S.-Mexico program in 1995: \$2.2 million. Total grants authorized in 1996: \$46.5 million. 1996 assets: \$4.5 billion.

WEBSITE

<http://www.hewlett.org>

THE JAPAN FOUNDATION CENTER FOR GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP

VISION

The Center for Global Partnership was founded in 1992 as a separate endowment within the Japan Foundation. The Center was founded with the recognition that the need for international cooperation has increased with the end of the Cold War, and that Japan and the United States as the world's leading economies should take the lead in fostering such cooperation. The purpose of the Center is to facilitate international exchange in trying to solve global issues through the collaborative efforts of individuals around the world. It is guided by the belief that "solutions to common and transnational issues require the collaborative effort and combined intellect of all citizens of the world."⁶⁸ The primary objectives of the Center are to promote collaboration between Japan and the United States with the goals of fulfilling shared global responsibilities and contributing to improvements in the world's welfare; and to enhance dialogue and interchange between Japanese and American citizens on a wide range of issues, thereby improving bilateral relations. To meet these objectives the CGP focuses on two areas. The first promotes intellectual exchange to encourage global partnership between Japan, the United States, and other nations of the world; and the second encourages mutual understanding at the regional and grass-roots levels.⁶⁹

PROGRAM

There are three programs of the CGP: the Intellectual Exchange Program, the Regional/Grass Roots Program, and the Fellowship Program. The Intellectual Exchange Program is broken down into three subsets: Policy-Oriented Research, Dialogues, and Access to Current Information. The Regional/Grass Roots Program includes an Educational/Public Outreach component and one for Exchange. And the Fellowship Program is funded through two separate fellowship interests: the Abe Fellowship (international multi-disciplinary research of global concerns) and the CGP Science Fellowship (promotes further U.S.-Japanese exchange in the area of science and engineering to provide opportunities for bilateral collaboration).

GRANTEES

The three largest security grantees in 1995-96 were the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Non-Proliferation and Arms Control After the Cold War (\$160,066 in 1995); Research Institute for Peace and Security, Fellowship Program for Peace and Security (\$187,594 in 1996); and the Aspen Institute, Partners in a Changing International Community: Steps Towards a Stronger US-Japanese Relationship (\$210,000 in 1995).

RESOURCES

Declining from \$19 million in 1995, the 1996 budget of approximately \$14 million was used for grant expenditures in the three programs. Intellectual Exchange received \$4.6 million, Regional/Grass Roots Exchange received \$6 million, and Fellowships received \$2.7 million. The remaining \$700,000 went toward seminars and cultural programming.

WEBSITE

<http://www.cgp.org/cgplink/>

⁶⁸ Annual Report, Japan Fiscal Year 1995, p. 6.

⁶⁹ Program Guidelines for U.S. Applicants, p. 2.

THE HENRY LUCE FOUNDATION

VISION	The work of the Luce Foundation reflects the interests of four generations of the Luce family, centered around the theme of higher education. The interests include the interdisciplinary exploration of higher education, increased understanding between Asia and the United States, the study of religion and theology, scholarship in American art, opportunities for women in science and engineering, and contributions to youth and public policy programs.
PROGRAM	The foundation has several program areas: Public Affairs, American Art, Clare Boothe Luce Program, Henry R. Luce Professorships, Asia, Theology, and Higher Education. Many of these programs include grantmaking in international affairs. The Asia Program currently has three parts : Luce Scholars Program, Asia Project Grants, U.S.-China Cooperative Research Program. The Luce Scholars Program provides stipends and internships for eighteen young Americans to live and work in Asia each year. The program's purpose is to increase awareness of Asia among future leaders in American society. The Higher Education program responds to issues of broad concern for American higher education. These might include foreign language training, international education, library development, or the use of technology. The foundation occasionally makes grants for important initiatives in higher education that either complement or fall outside established categories of support. "For instance, the National Foreign Language Center at the Johns Hopkins University and the Association of American Colleges and Universities are studying the goals and practice of language teaching and learning in the United States. Through another current project, Long Island University has organized an innovative international study program in comparative religion and culture in Israel, India, and Japan." ⁷⁰
GRANTEES	The vast majority of the grants are made in the area of scholarship. The three largest grants in 1997 include a five-year grant of over \$1.6 million for the Asia Foundation (to renew a contract for placement of Luce Scholars Program in Asia); \$1 million for the Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary in Seoul, Korea (for the construction of a new Center for International Cooperation in South Korea); and \$1 million to Brown University (for a faculty position in international studies in honor of Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr.).
RESOURCES	Total grants and contributions in 1994-1995: \$30.3 million. Total assets: \$527.2 million.
WEBSITE	http://www.hluce.org

⁷⁰ <http://www.hluce.org>

THE JOHN D. AND CATHERINE T. MACARTHUR FOUNDATION

VISION

The MacArthur foundation has just finished a wide-ranging review of its strategic mission. The Foundation will continue its present mission, which focuses on “the development of healthy individuals and effective communities, peace within and among nations, responsible choices about human reproduction, and a global ecosystem capable of supporting healthy human societies.... Most of the Foundation’s grantmaking will be carried out through two programs. *The Program on Human and Community Development* will support work in community development, the arts, economic opportunity, youth development, education, mental health, research and other areas. *The Program on Global Security and Sustainability* focuses upon issues of peace, population, and the environment. Grantmaking will continue in three areas of special interest: arms control and non-proliferation, protection of selected ecosystems, and women’s reproductive health in selected communities. The MacArthur Fellows Program and a number of special initiatives—including media—will continue.”⁷¹ With its restructured approach, the strategic review brought a new appreciation for the changing context within which it conducts its activities: “Between countries and within them (including the United States), severe inequalities persist. Worldwide, human development has improved in recent decades, but for fully 1.5 billion people in 100 countries, more than a quarter of the earth’s population, incomes in the 1990s have declined from previous decades.... While the Cold War has ended, reducing certain catastrophic threats, the number of deadly conflicts and the conditions for new ones have only increased. The rate at which the world’s population is growing has declined, yet the majority of the world’s women lack the knowledge, freedom, health, and other resources that they need to make responsible reproductive choices. And despite growing recognition of the need to protect species from extinction and despite historic advances in the knowledge of how to do so, the destruction of critical biological resources continues. Aggravating each individual problem is the strong and complex interplay among problems. The growing globalization of the economy, for example, brings with it certain specific challenges, such as the need for transparency. But economic globalization also has powerful effects on other problems and is affected by them. Job training in Chicago must be undertaken with good knowledge of global economic patterns. To protect forests in Brazil or Indonesia while allowing local people to gain a living from them requires working with transnational corporations and a host of others in the chain of production and marketing. And where economic globalization widens the gap between rich and poor, it lays the groundwork for armed conflict and the breakdown of the rule of law.”⁷²

PROGRAM

Prior to its ongoing restructuring, the Program on Peace and International Cooperation found that “threats to peace and international security have grown more unpredictable since the end of the Cold War. In addition to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the unregulated sale of conventional weapons, other forces and trends are contributing to a growing sense of uncertainty about prospects for peace in the world. Among these are increasing resource scarcity and ecological damage, emerging global economic adjustments that may lead to new patterns of poverty, and population migration within and across national boundaries. To reduce the chances of armed conflict, the world community and national governments need to take into account both the root causes of such trends and the interplay among them as they design new policy frameworks.”⁷³ Grants in 1995 intended to “further the understanding of the causes of conflict in the

THE JOHN D. AND CATHERINE T.
MACARTHUR FOUNDATION

(continued)

world after the Cold War.”⁷⁴ The new Program on Global Security and Sustainability aims “to promote peace within and among countries, healthy ecosystems worldwide, and responsible reproductive choices. The Foundation encourages work that recognizes the interactions among peace, sustainable development, reproductive health and the protection of human rights. It supports innovative research and training, the development of new institutions for cooperative action, and new strategies for engaging U.S. audiences in efforts to advance global security and sustainability.... New challenges arise from globalization, including, for example, whether and how to intervene in civil conflicts, how to manage transboundary resources, and how to protect human rights where standards differ between countries and cultures. Sustaining cooperative action to address these problems requires new partnerships and institutional arrangements. The Foundation recognizes the critical importance of three specific global issues—arms control, ecosystem conservation, and population—and continues to address these as the core areas of the Program on Global Security and Sustainability. At the same time, the Foundation emphasizes the importance of the changing global context, and the new challenges it raises for achieving security and sustainability. To cope with unprecedented transnational flows of capital, people, goods, environmental resources, ideas and images, today’s society must invent and adapt political structures, social norms, and institutional arrangements. To do so requires the best possible understanding of the concepts of security and sustainability. This is one of the three cross-cutting, integrative areas in which the program provides support. The concept of security is now understood more broadly than in the recent past, extending beyond the security of states to the security of groups and individuals in society, to international systems, and to the shared global environment. Security is not only a matter of military defense, but also a search for the conditions for peace—including sustainable development, equity, and protection of human rights, both globally and locally. Likewise, the meaning of sustainability has evolved. Current formulations focus on the constantly changing nature of the interactions between humans and the environment. Sustainability requires not just responsible management of specific environmental resources with consideration of the needs of future generations, but also an understanding of the interplay of human and natural systems under conditions of uncertainty. And to advance sustainability involves strengthening the interface between science and policy.

The requirements for achieving security and sustainability can be met in part through action by governments and existing local organizations. But many new partnerships and institutions are also needed, and this is the second integrative area in which the program provides support. Among those promoting international, regional, and local cooperation, innovation is already taking place. Civil society groups, business enterprises, and local governments are developing new and promising approaches to deal with conflict, environmental problems, and population growth. Many involve the development of new forms of cooperation between state and non-state actors. Building on this beginning, further study, experimentation, and concerted action are needed. Because of its economic and military impact in the world, the United States will be especially influential in efforts to manage global problems—and particularly in creating and sustaining new institutions and partnerships. If this country is to play the most constructive role possible, its leadership and citizens must understand the United States’ interests and responsibilities in the new global context. This is the third integrative area in which the program provides support.”⁷⁵

THE JOHN D. AND CATHERINE T.
MACARTHUR FOUNDATION

(continued)

GRANTEES

Prior to the recent restructuring, grants were made in four categories. In addition to supporting fellowship and training in which the Social Science Research Council figured prominently, as did other efforts at colleges and universities to foster interdisciplinary and inter-mural cooperation, the Foundation's four interrelated areas of interest were (1) *US Foreign Policy and National Priorities* which sought to enhance public access to defense-related information and analysis through grants to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the Center for Defense Information, and the Brookings Institution's Foreign Policy Studies Program; (2) *Arms Control, Disarmament, and Demobilization* which prides itself on facilitating the negotiations on the extension of the Nonproliferation Treaty and other arms control and proliferation issues, including the British American Information Council that monitors the arms trade through an international network of researchers and practitioners; (3) *International Governance and Civil Society* which seeks to improve UN peacekeeping missions through grants to UN Association of America and UNIDIR in addition to supporting an Internet node at Columbia University to facilitate discussion and information exchange on these issues; and (4) *Sustainable Democracy* which seeks to strengthen civil society institutions in transition societies.

RESOURCES

Program on Peace and International Cooperation grants authorized in 1995: \$22.975 million. The breakdown: U.S. Foreign Policy (\$4.75 million); Arms Control (\$3.17 million); International Governance (\$1.58 million); Sustainable Democracy (\$2.38 million), Individual Research and Writing (\$1.78 million); Special Initiatives including a \$6.48 million five-year grant to the Social Science Research Council for training and research on peace and security in a changing world and other research and training related grants; and finally a smaller, special Focus on Cuba program. To what extent these priorities will be altered under the new program remains to be seen. 1995 Assets: \$3.29 billion.

WEBSITE

<http://www.macfdn.org>

⁷¹ <http://www.macfdn.org/>

⁷² <http://www.macfdn.org/aboutfdn/presmessage.htm>. (September 29, 1997)

⁷³ Report on Activities 1995, p. 94.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ <http://www.macfdn.org/programs/gss.htm>

THE MCKNIGHT FOUNDATION

VISION

The McKnight Foundation focuses on human services and community needs. It has a particular interest in alleviating poverty and providing opportunities for self-sufficiency. To these ends the foundation works on building neighborhoods and communities and encouraging long-term, comprehensive approaches to human development and change. The mission is “to improve the quality of life for present and future generations to seek paths to a more humane and secure world.”⁷⁶ This involves supporting efforts to strengthen communities, families, and individuals, especially those in need; and to contribute to the arts, encourage preservation of the natural environment, and promote research in selected fields. The foundation works in partnership with other organizations and those they serve. The foundation has five programs: People and Communities (with four categories: Human Services, Communities, Housing, and Public Affairs), Arts, Environment, International, and Research and Applied Science.

PROGRAM

The International Program “seeks to empower those who have been limited in the past by a lack of opportunities for self-sufficiency and to help organizations develop skills and techniques to prevent conflicts or resolve them peacefully.”⁷⁷ Two-thirds of the funding under the program goes to six countries—three in Africa and three in Southeast Asia. In the African countries (Tanzania, Uganda, and Zimbabwe), the program seeks to enhance women’s economic opportunity and the well-being of their families. In the three Southeast Asian countries (Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia), the program develops local leadership capacity to deliver health services and human development. The final third of the international program is devoted to conflict resolution. Grants for conflict resolution are made anywhere in the world, emphasizing preventive diplomacy and human rights issues.

GRANTEES

Grantees are mostly think tanks and U.S. grassroots organizations. The three largest grantees in 1996 were Case Western Reserve University \$175,000 (to improve the child and community health system in Laos); Maine Medical Center \$150,000 (physician training and family practice in collaboration with Hanoi Medical College); and Partners for Democratic Change, \$150,000 (for conflict management centers in the Ukraine and Romania).

RESOURCES

Total grants and contributions awarded in 1996: \$68.3 million, of which \$1.6 million went to international giving. 1996 Assets: \$1.5 billion.

WEBSITE

<http://www.mcknight.org>

⁷⁶ The McKnight Foundation Annual Report 1996, p. i

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

THE ANDREW W. MELLON FOUNDATION

VISION

The purpose is to “aid and promote such religious, charitable, scientific, and educational purposes as may be in the furtherance of the public welfare or tend to promote the well-doing or well-being of mankind. Under this broad charter, the Foundation currently makes grants on a selective basis to institutions in higher education; in cultural affairs and the performing arts; in population; in conservation and the environment; and in public affairs.”⁷⁸ The foundation is devoted to the humanities and related social sciences. It considers the work it is finishing up in East Europe—linking libraries, institutions of higher learning, and teaching business practices—a success. While remaining committed to funding scholarships for East European humanists for research in the West, it is now increasing its efforts in South Africa, where it is seeking to bolster the universities, which are a resource not only for the Republic of South Africa, but for the entire continent. Applauding the efforts of others to extend basic and secondary education, Mellon has taken it upon itself to sustain excellent institutions of higher learning.

PROGRAM

It is beginning a new initiative in the refugee field, where the emphasis will be on forced migration and providing assistance to developing countries that are accommodating refugees. In addition, there are several think tanks, policy institutes, and universities that receive grants “in support of activities designed to increase minority participation in international affairs.” Under the Public Affairs Program, universities, think tanks, and service-providing nonprofits received grants “in support of activities designed to increase minority participation in international affairs,” “in support of research and training in the refugee field,” in immigration studies and immigrant education, for linking and automating libraries in East Europe with the emphasis moving toward South Africa, fostering entrepreneurship in East Europe, and supporting the scholarly study of philanthropy and the nonprofit sector.

GRANTEES

1996 grantees in the minorities in international affairs category include Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C. (\$130,000), Clark Atlanta University (\$283,000), Global Center, N.Y. (\$200,000), Immigration and Refugee Services of America, Washington, D.C. (\$390,000), and the University of Denver (\$260,000). In addition, support was given to refugee studies programs at the University of Oxford (\$500,000) and a refugee research and training program at the International Famine Center at Tufts University (\$600,000). The Foundation routinely declines inquiries for projects that are “directly on the subject of international security.”⁷⁹

RESOURCES

Total grants appropriated in 1996: \$112 million. Of this Conservation and the Environment received \$11.4 million; Higher Education and Scholarship, \$54.6 million; Population, \$10.8 million; and Public Affairs, \$17 million; with the Cultural Program and the Literacy Program accounting for the remaining \$18.2 million. 1996 Assets: \$2.7 billion.

WEBSITE

<http://www.mellon.org>

⁷⁸ Report of The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, 1996, p. 5.

⁷⁹ Letter from the Secretary, Richard Ekman, February 23, 1998.

THE JOYCE MERTZ-GILMORE FOUNDATION

VISION	The Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation was established to work for peace and civil rights, making quality of life a central theme to grantmaking. The foundation has five grantmaking programs: Environment/Energy, Human Rights, Peace and Security, New York City Human and Built Environment, and Arts in New York City Program. The two programs that are security related are Human Rights and Peace and Security.
PROGRAM	The Human Rights Program includes a broad range of subcategories that include Protection and Support of Human Rights Worldwide, Protection and Support of Refugees Rights Worldwide, Protection of Human Rights in the U.S., and Democratic Development. Under the subcategory Democratic Development, the foundation supported voluntary sector capacity- and infrastructure-building in Central Europe and the Former Soviet republics. ⁸⁰ The Peace and Security Program was the Security in a Changing World Program before 1996. The Security in a Changing World Program was small and supported efforts to promote peaceful inter and intrastate relations, with a particular interest in the linkage between peace and stability, and issues such as environmental and resource protection, human rights, democratization, refugee and immigrant flows, trade or foreign aid. ⁸¹ Guidelines have changed dramatically with the new program, which is now focused on implementing the Oslo Agreement. The revised program focuses on bringing together Palestinian, Israeli, and U.S. non-governmental organizations to facilitate the peace process.
GRANTEES	They are mainly non-governmental organizations and a few university projects. The largest grant in 1996, through the Security in a Changing World Program, went to the New York University Center for War, Peace, and the News Media (\$209,000) for capacity-building. In 1997 the three largest grantees were Pacific Forum/CSIS (Honolulu) and the Okazaki Institute (Tokyo) for a two-year study of Korean unification scenarios and preparation of the U.S.-Japan policy-making community (\$240,000); the Ralph Bunche Institute at CUNY for its explorations with Japan's National Defense Academy of ways to strengthen the U.S.-Japanese security relationship (\$175,000); and the Nautilus Institute in Berkeley for the analysis of energy security in Northeast Asia and related tension reduction studies for the area (\$152,460).
RESOURCES	Total grants and contributions awarded in 1996: \$10.18 million. Total 1996 assets: \$60.28 million. In 1997 total grants awarded totaled \$12.7 million, while assets grew to \$90.7 million.
WEBSITE	http://www.jmgf.org

⁸⁰ 1995-1996 Annual Report, p. 22.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION

VISION

“As a foundation, we believe that learning how people can live together most effectively is one of the fundamental needs of humanity. In so doing, people create a sense of ‘community,’ or belonging, whether at the local neighborhood level or as a global society. Building strong communities through collaboration provides a basis for positive change. As we have found, the most effective solutions often are those devised locally, where people have the greatest stake in the outcome. For that reason, strong, self-reliant individuals are essential to a well-functioning society. Moreover, individuals have a critical role to play in shaping their surroundings. There is a fundamental need to promote the social, economic and political empowerment of all individuals. All individuals should have the right to work and pay their own way, the right to an education, the right to better themselves, and the right to a clean and healthy environment. Therein, society must respect individual, human and civil rights, and those rights should be protected by law. At the same time, such rights carry with them responsibilities, and it is incumbent upon us to encourage citizen participation. All individuals have an obligation not only to seek out but also to seize opportunities that make them a vital part of solving problems, to work toward self-sufficiency and to help foster social cohesion. Also fundamental to any grantmaking is leadership. Clearly, leadership springs from the needs and values of people; likewise, leadership can inspire the aspirations and potential of others. It is our practice to seek out and support leadership in all the projects and programs we support. Finally, respect for the diversity of life is integral to our work in all areas. The ultimate quality of life is tied inextricably to maintaining a sustainable human and physical environment. Through our programming, we endeavor to enhance the capacity of individuals, families or institutions at the local level and beyond. We hope that our collective work in any program area could lead toward systemic change. In the final analysis, the mission of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation is: to support efforts that promote a just, equitable and sustainable society.... I have to say that throughout the Mott Foundation’s many years of providing support for the nonprofit sector, we have come to a new appreciation of it. We have watched as it has taken on renewed vigor and fundamental importance to the very fabric of our democracy as a balance between the public and private sectors, government and business. That appreciation has been further magnified in the past few years as our grantmaking has moved into South Africa, the countries of the former Soviet Union, and other Central and Eastern European countries, where, until recently the term ‘not-for-profit sector’ was meaningless.”⁸²

PROGRAM

“The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation’s grantmaking is organized in four programs: Civil Society, Environment, Flint (Michigan), and Poverty. In addition, we maintain the flexibility to investigate new opportunities through an Exploratory and Special Projects program.”⁸³ It is through the Civil Society Program, and, in particular, the Conflict Resolution area, where the Mott Foundation makes most of its international grants that are also related to issues of violence, conflict, and reconciliation.

GRANTEES

Under the Conflict Resolution interest of the Civil Society Program, grantees included American, European, and indigenous non-governmental organizations working on conflict management and reconciliation. For example, large grants were awarded to Partners for Democratic Change in San Francisco (\$300,000 in 1996) to build conflict resolution centers in East Europe and Russia. In South Africa, Mott funds the Central Methodist Deaconess Society Peace and Development Initiative (\$100,000 in 1995) for programs to decrease violence in migrant worker hostels.

CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION

(continued)

RESOURCES

According to its own calculation, the foundation makes about 20 percent of its grants internationally. The Civil Society Program awarded \$15.7 million in grants in 1996, with \$7.7 million of this going to CEE/Russia and \$2.4 million to South Africa. During 1995, the number 381 grants totalled \$59,873,501. In 1996, the Mott Foundation made 464 grants totalling \$63,967,049. 1996 Assets: \$1.67 billion.

WEBSITE

<http://www.mott.org>

⁸² <http://mott.org/about/annualmessage.htm>

⁸³ <http://mott.org>

JOHN M. OLIN FOUNDATION, INC.

VISION

“Mr. Olin was committed to the preservation of the principles of political and economic liberty as they have been expressed in American thought, institutions, and practice. Accordingly, the general purpose of the John M. Olin Foundation is to provide support for projects that reflect or are intended to strengthen the economic, political and cultural institutions upon which the American heritage of constitutional government and private enterprise is based. The foundation also seeks to promote a general understanding of these institutions by encouraging the thoughtful study of the connection between economic and political freedoms, and the cultural heritage that sustains them.”⁸⁴

PROGRAM

The foundation makes grants in the following four areas: public policy research; American institutions; law and the legal system; and strategic and international studies. Under the strategic and international studies area, “The Foundation makes limited grants in this field supporting projects that address the relationship between American institutions and the international context in which they operate. Such projects include studies of national security, strategic issues, American foreign policy and the international economy.”⁸⁵

GRANTEES

The foundation makes grants for “research, institutional support, fellowships, professorships, lectures and lecture series, books, scholarly journals, journals of opinion, conferences and seminars, and, on occasion, television and radio programs.”⁸⁶ In 1995 the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies (Samuel P. Huntington, Director) at Harvard’s Center for International Affairs received a \$1.6 million three-year grant. In addition, the military academies received grants for Olin Programs in National Security Affairs (\$500,000 million). Other security-related research was supported at Council on Foreign Relations under the directorship of Richard Haass (\$300,000 over three years), at the Hoover Institution at Stanford, at the Center for Strategic and International Studies for the Global Organized Crime Project (\$100,000), at the School of Advanced International Studies for a strategic studies fellowship program directed by Eliot Cohen (\$200,000), and a three-year grant was made for Olin Doctoral and Postdoctoral Scholars in Military and Strategic History under the direction of Paul Kennedy at Yale (\$490,000). The Foundation is also a large funder of law and economics programs and the rational choice approach to social problems throughout universities in North America.

RESOURCES

Total grants made in 1995: \$36.4 million. 1995 Assets: \$117.5 million.

WEBSITE

<http://www.jmof.org>

⁸⁴ 1995 Annual Report, p. 4.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

THE SMITH RICHARDSON FOUNDATION

VISION

H. Smith Richardson wrote: “I believe the need for the time and thought of able men is that they be applied to the increasingly weighty problems of government and the serious social questions which now confront us and will continue to press for solution in the future...the greater the material wealth of the citizen the greater are his obligation to the State and Nation...the obligation to give his time and thought to these public and social problems.”⁸⁷ The current president, Peter Richardson, writes that the mission of the foundation is to “help inform important public policy debates through the support of pragmatic, policy-relevant research and analysis. Grant making is directed largely through two programs, the Children and Families at Risk Program and the International Security and Foreign Policy Program.”⁸⁸ “The Smith Richardson Foundation Trustees continue to believe that equal attention must be paid to the domestic and international challenges that face our country. Although our national debate focuses more heavily on domestic issues, the Foundation remains committed to the support of accessible policy research in both domestic and international policy in order to advance the interests of the nation as a whole.”⁸⁹

PROGRAM

“The Foundation’s International Security and Foreign Policy Program supports research and policy projects on security and foreign policy issues central to the strategic interests of the United States. The foundation takes the view that, although today’s international problems differ significantly from those of the Cold War era, the United States continues to face the fundamental challenges of enhancing international order and advancing American interests and values. In fact, the end of the Cold War requires scholars, analysts, and policy makers to think anew about the nature of our interests and the design of our security and foreign policies.” Under this “broad mandate,” the Program pursues the following priorities. “The Foundation seeks to help define and analyze the important new challenges in the post-cold war security environment, such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or the disintegration of multinational states. It supports projects that examine potential reform or reorganization of the principal instruments of U.S. security and foreign policy, such as the military force structure, the intelligence community, and foreign assistance programs. It seeks to illuminate critical political and economic developments that affect U.S. interests in Europe, the former Soviet Union, East Asia, and the Middle East. Finally within the academic community, it supports policy-relevant security studies research and underwrites historical research with clear implications or lessons for current policy.”⁹⁰

GRANTEES

The International Security and Foreign Policy Program’s three largest grants went to the Washington, D.C.,-based Center on Budget and Policy Priorities for research on “Strategic Planning for a New Era: Forging a New Defense Budget for the Twenty-first Century” (\$300,000); Freedom House in New York for their “Survey of Economic Freedom” (\$254,900); and Harvard University in support of a project on “Coping with the Unfamiliar: American National Security Policy After the Cold War” (\$210,660). In addition, the Domestic Public Policy Program included grants with an explicit international dimension. For example, \$100,000 was granted for a study of U.S. immigration policy; and \$50,000 for an analysis of domestic social regulations in the global economy went to the Brookings Institution. Also, the University of California at Berkeley received a \$17,500 grant toward the study of international perspectives on responses to child abuse.

THE SMITH RICHARDSON FOUNDATION

(continued)

RESOURCES

1995 Grant Payments: \$9.9 million, of which \$4-5 million was paid through the International Security and Foreign Policy Program to twenty-one grantee institutions. Assets in 1995: \$390 million.

WEBSITE

<http://www.srf.org>

⁸⁷ Annual Report for 1995, p. 1.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

VISION

“From its beginning, the Foundation has sought to identify, and address at their source, the causes of human suffering and need. The Foundation’s work is divided among the following program areas: the arts and humanities, equal opportunity and school reform, agricultural sciences, health sciences, population sciences, global environment, and African initiatives including female education. While concentrating its efforts in these areas, the Foundation adjusts its course to reflect needs as they arise. The balance of the Foundation’s grant and fellowship programs supports work in international security, international philanthropy, and smaller, one-time ‘special’ initiatives.”

PROGRAM

Though international security is not featured as one of the permanent nine core areas of concern to the foundation, it is a special initiative that is currently receiving substantial attention. “This year’s (1996) emphasis has been on broadening the accepted parameters of the arms control and nonproliferation debate to encompass abolition of weapons of mass destruction as a realistic medium-term goal. The program also explored ways to facilitate specific cooperative solutions to the security problems that stimulate proliferation in North Korea, South Asia and Iran.”

GRANTEES

“The International Security program’s main Korea initiatives — the NAPSNet electronic communication network, Nautilus Institute, and the Seton Hall Project on Korea — are focused on improving communication about and with North Korea, both on security issues and broader issues related to cooperation in the area of agriculture and energy. The program also has provided grants intended to expand sources of information on North Korea and facilitate the country’s involvement in international security-related conferences. In the Middle East, the program provides grants to analyze Track II diplomacy in relation to the regional peace process and to draw Iran back into the international community. In South Asia the Foundation seeks to facilitate nongovernmental U.S.-Indian discussions regarding global abolition of weapons of mass destruction. Initiatives in the United States included an evaluation by the Social Science Research Council of the views of American opinion leaders regarding the long-term future of nuclear weapons; an assessment by the Center for War, Peace and the News Media on influential journalists’ perceptions on nuclear abolition; and the drafting, circulation and release by the State of the World Forum and the Atlantic Council of statements by leading retired military officers from the United States and abroad on the desirability and feasibility of the abolition of weapons of mass destruction. The Foundation continues to support efforts by the Federation of American Scientists to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention, and the Arms Project of Human Rights Watch.”⁹¹

RESOURCES

Grants and fellowships appropriated in 1996: \$107.4 million, of which \$1.8 million was for the international security initiative. 1996 Assets: \$2.7 billion.

WEBSITE

<http://www.rockfound.org>

⁹¹ <http://www.rockfound.org>

THE SARAH SCAIFE FOUNDATION

VISION	“The Sarah Scaife Foundation directs its resources primarily to the support of publications, research organizations, and education concerning major domestic and international public policy issues. The goal of the foundation is to provide decision makers and the general public with informed source material in a timely manner.” ⁹²
PROGRAM	The foundation does not have any specified grantmaking programs. The foundation states that its grants are directed primarily toward public policy programs that address major domestic and international issues. ⁹³
GRANTEES	The three largest grantees in the area of security studies in 1995 were the Stanford University, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace (\$520,000); the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (support for multiple security projects, \$390,000); and the Center for Strategic and International Studies (\$485,000).
RESOURCES	Total grants and contributions awarded in 1995: \$11.4 million. 1995 assets: \$234.8 million.
WEBSITE	www.scaife.com/sarah01.html

⁹² 1995 Annual Report, p. 5.

⁹³ Ibid., p. 38.

SOROS FOUNDATIONS NETWORK

VISION

“The numerous nonprofit foundations and organizations created and funded by the philanthropist George Soros are linked together in an informal network called the Soros foundations network. At the heart of this network is a group of autonomous organizations known as ‘national foundations,’ operating in over 30 countries throughout Central and Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, and Central Eurasia, as well as in South Africa, Haiti, Guatemala, and the United States. Plans are being developed to establish nine new foundations in the southern African countries of Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Malawi, Namibia, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. All of the foundations share the common mission of supporting the development of open society. To this end, they operate and support an array of initiatives in education, civil society, independent media, Internet and e-mail communications, publishing, human rights, arts and culture, and social, legal, and economic reform. The Open Society Institute-New York and the Open Society Institute-Budapest assist these foundations and organizations by providing administrative, financial, and technical support, as well as by establishing ‘network programs’ that link different foundations within the network. Other entities created by George Soros include the Central European University and the International Science Foundation.”⁹⁴ George Soros’s philanthropic vision is based on Karl Popper’s idea of an open society — one that is continuously adapting and improving by maintaining its openness to new and alternative modes of knowledge. On security Soros writes: “As regards security and peace, the liberal democracies of the world ought to take the lead and forge a global network of alliances that could work with or without the United Nations. NATO is a case in point. The primary purpose of these alliances would be to preserve peace; but crisis prevention cannot start early enough. What goes on inside states is of consequence to their neighbors and to the world at large. The promotion of freedom and democracy in and around these alliances ought to become an important policy objective. For instance, a democratic and prosperous Russia would make a greater contribution to peace in the region than would any amount of military spending by NATO. Interfering in other countries’ internal affairs is fraught with difficulties — but not interfering can be even more dangerous.”⁹⁵

PROGRAM

In 1997 the Open Society Institute launched The Landmines Project “to support efforts toward a comprehensive, worldwide ban on landmines.... It seeks proposals from organizations for public awareness and public education programs regarding landmines and for initiatives that focus on a comprehensive ban of these weapons.”⁹⁶

GRANTEES

“The Landmines Project tends to divide its grantmaking among longstanding NGO actors in the landmines field, startup landmines NGOs, and special projects. The special projects include programs promoting dialogue between NGOs, governments and defense communities, and programs involving non-states actors and non-states military forces...in or with projects in Angola, Mozambique, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Senegal, Yemen, India, Pakistan, Nepal, Japan, Australia, Afghanistan, United Kingdom, Sweden, Latvia, Serbia, Slovakia, France, Belgium, Norway, United States and Canada....For example, the Landmines Project provided funds to a media workshop in Senegal to introduce West African journalists to the issue and to develop their technical skills in this field of reporting. The Landmines Project also funded an initiative by NGOs in South Africa, Colombia and the Philippines to investigate support for a ban on anti-personnel landmines among non-state actors and non-government military forces and to educate these sectors on international law regarding the weapons.”⁹⁷

SOROS FOUNDATIONS NETWORK

(continued)

RESOURCES

In 1997 the Landmines Project provided nearly \$1.2 million to non-governmental organizations. In 1996, the organizations of the Soros Foundations Network expended a total of \$362 million on philanthropic activities. Projected spending by the network for 1997 is in the same range.

WEBSITE

<http://www.soros.org>

⁹⁴ <http://www.soros.org/faq.htm>

⁹⁵ Toward a Global Open Society, *The Atlantic Monthly* Vol. 281, no. 1 (January 1998), pp. 20-32.

⁹⁶ Statement from The Landmines Project, Open Society Institute (Washington DC: February 1998).

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

VISION

“The mission of the United States Institute of Peace is to strengthen the nation’s capabilities to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflicts.”⁹⁸ “The United States Institute of Peace is an independent, nonpartisan federal institution created and funded by Congress to strengthen the nation’s capacity to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict. Established in 1984, the Institute meets its congressional mandate through an array of programs, including grants, fellowships, conferences and workshops, library services, publications, and other educational activities. The Institute’s Board of Directors is appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.”⁹⁹ The Objectives of the Institute are to: Mobilize the best national and international talent from research organizations, academia, and government to support policy makers by providing independent and creative assessments of how to deal with international conflict situations by political means. Facilitate resolution of international disputes through ‘Track II’ encounters among parties to conflicts and by preparing U.S. negotiators for mediation work. Train international affairs professionals in conflict management and resolution techniques, mediation, and negotiating skills. Strengthen curricula and instruction, from high school through graduate education, about the changing character of international conflict and non-violent approaches to managing international disputes. Raise the level of student and public awareness about international conflicts and peacemaking efforts through grants, scholarships, publications, electronic outreach, and conferences.”¹⁰⁰

PROGRAM

The Research and Studies Program (R&S)

It designs, directs and supervises the implementation of research projects on a broad range of current issues affecting international peace. The program’s mission is to bridge the all-too-frequent gap between academia and government by convening meetings of academics and former officials with current policy-makers. R&S works closely with both the Institute’s Grants Program and the Fellowship Program in order to maximize the synergy from the Institute’s various activities. Building on the success of two previous Working Groups on North Korea and the South China Sea, Research and Studies Program concentrates a major part of its activities around a small number of highly focused working groups that meet regularly on key issues.¹⁰¹

Education and Training

Education: The Institute coordinates projects that enrich learning at high schools, colleges, and universities through curriculum enhancement, teacher training, scholarships, and resource development. Examples include: The National Peace Essay Contest, a contest at the state and national levels for high school students competing for college scholarships (The essay topic for 1997 was: What steps can be taken to support the successful implementation of a peace); The Summer Teacher Institute, a week-long seminar for thirty high school social studies teachers on how to teach international peace, security, and conflict management; and grant support for various high school and university curriculum development and teacher training programs.

Training: The Institute is developing conflict resolution training programs for civic leaders and diplomats and has supported such training through its grant program. Examples: An international conflict resolution skills training seminar for foreign government and international organization officials, coordinated by the Institute; training in multi-party mediation skills for local and regional civic leaders in South Africa; and seminars to train the trainers of military officers and diplomats serving as United Nations peacekeepers.¹⁰²

THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

(continued)

GRANTEES

“Through its two principal grantmaking components — unsolicited grants and solicited grants — the United States Institute of Peace offers financial support for research, education and training, and the dissemination of information on international peace and conflict resolution. Unsolicited grants are provided for any topics that fall within the Institute’s broad mandate. Solicited grants are awarded for special priority topics identified in advance by the Institute.

Types of Grants: The Institute invites proposals for projects that will:

- (1) carry out basic and applied research on the causes of war and other international conflicts;...
- (2) develop curricula and texts for high school through post-graduate study and to conduct teacher-training institutes;...
- (3) conduct training, symposia, and continuing education programs for practitioners, policymakers, policy implementers, and the public that will develop their skills in international conflict management and war avoidance; and
- (4) undertake public information efforts...
- (5) increase information on international peace and conflict resolution and to enhance access to this information through the strengthening of library resources, the development of bibliographic databases and indexes, and the expansion of cooperative efforts in resource sharing. Grants are generally not given for institutional support or development.

Tenure and Terms of Grants: Most Institute grants are one to two years in duration. Most awards fall in the range of \$25,000 to \$45,000, although somewhat larger grants are also awarded.”¹⁰³

RESOURCES

Institute’s fiscal year 1997 budget request: \$11,160,000

WEBSITE

<http://www.usip.org>

⁹⁸ <http://www.usip.org/aboutusip.htm>

⁹⁹ <http://www.usip.org/aboutusip/basicfacts.html>

¹⁰⁰ <http://www.usip.org/aboutusip/objectives.html>

¹⁰¹ <http://www.usip.org/research/rs.html>

¹⁰² <http://www.usip.org/et.html>

¹⁰³ <http://www.usip.org/grants.html>

THE UNITED STATES-JAPAN FOUNDATION

VISION

“The United States-Japan Foundation is dedicated to the promotion of greater mutual knowledge between the U.S. and Japan. The foundation funds programs that strengthen mutual understanding between the two countries, increase awareness of important public policy issues of interest to both countries, and address common concerns in the Asia Pacific region from the U.S.-Japan perspective.”¹⁰⁴

PROGRAM

The foundation’s program interests lie in three principal areas: communication and public opinion, education, and public policy. Under the rubric of communication and public opinion the foundation seeks projects that raise awareness about the two countries among each other’s publics, especially with regard to issues that affect the bilateral relationship. The program’s goal is to increase creative, in-depth, quality, balanced, but diversified coverage of international news to inform both Japanese and American publics of issues central to U.S.-Japan relations. The precollege education program supports language instruction as well as the improvement and enhancement of instruction in both U.S. and Japanese schools about the other country. This program funds training, professional development, intensive study tours, and curriculum design, along with many other development components. The public policy program creates non-governmental channels for ongoing discussions among prominent experts in academia, business, government, and media who work on issues that influence the evolving U.S.- Japan relationship.¹⁰⁵ Policy studies are supported for regional security, trade relations, environmental protection, energy, science and technology, as well as multilateral and trilateral projects (provided the U.S.-Japan relationship is the central focus). The purpose is to raise awareness of key policy issues in each country, improve policy, build a consensus, and contribute to institution-building in the policy arena.

GRANTEES

The three largest grantees in the area of security studies in 1995 were George Washington University for a policy study group on U.S.-Japan cooperation on Asian regional security issues (\$236,410); Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York (\$179,093); and the Rand Corporation for a U.S.-Japan-South Korea study group on issues concerning Korean unification (\$134,020).

RESOURCES

Total grants and contributions awarded in 1995: \$4.3 million. 1995 assets: \$87 million.

WEBSITE

<http://www.japanese.com/nonprofit/foundation.html>

¹⁰⁴ Information bulletin to grantees, p.1

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

THE WINSTON FOUNDATION FOR WORLD PEACE

VISION

The foundation's mission is to contribute to world peace. The initial focus was prevention of nuclear war through promoting arms reduction. The end of the Cold War, however, led the foundation to refocus its efforts on the militarized world of growing conflicts over territory, ethnicity, religion, race, and tribalism.¹⁰⁶ In 1992 the foundation decided that conflict prevention, cooperative security, and non-governmental organization capacity-building were its most promising goals for philanthropy. At that time, Winston decided to spend out the foundation's remaining assets, about \$12 million at that time, over an eight-year period to end in 1999. This decision was made for two reasons: (1) the view was that the foundation's financial base was too small to maintain the quality staff needed to promote world peace; and (2) the end of the Cold War created a new world of uncertain risks, and committing the foundation's resources at this critical stage would allow the foundation to foster "patterns of dispute resolution early in this time of unfamiliar risk and stability."¹⁰⁷

PROGRAM

The three areas of support are conflict prevention, nuclear disarmament, and the arms trade. The goal of the conflict prevention program is to improve methods in the field and build indigenous capacity for conflict prevention. The foundation emphasizes the need for reporting and sharing information to disseminate the progress that non-governmental organizations make, supporting innovative projects to resolve conflict, and placing confidence in local practitioners or capacity-building. The areas of work are in the former Yugoslavia, the Caucasus, the Islamic world (mainly the Turkish-Kurdish conflict), several venues of conflict in Africa (mainly the Great Lakes of East Africa), and Central America and Mexico. The nuclear disarmament program focuses on examining NATO expansion, grassroots efforts to reduce Russian nuclear arms, and strengthening non-government organization capacity in Russia. The arms trade program supports (1) supplier restraint, mainly through the Code of Conduct campaign; (2) dampening demand in the Third World, mainly through work with the World Bank and other multilateral institutions; and (3) combining work on conflict prevention with efforts to stem the flow of arms into areas of conflict.

GRANTEES

In 1997, roughly 70 percent of the grants were dedicated to conflict prevention. In 1996, the largest grant went to Search for Common Ground (\$143,480) for three projects: an assessment of opportunities in Bosnia for conflict resolution activities (\$22,500), an on-going dialogue between Turks and Turkish Kurds (\$60,980), and a media and conflict prevention project in Angola (\$60,000).

RESOURCES

Total spending on grants was \$1.6 million in 1997, and will be \$1.8 million in 1998.

WEBSITE

<http://www.wf.org/winstonhome.htm>

¹⁰⁶ Tenth Anniversary Report 1996, p. 1.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.