

# PSEFG

Peace and Security Funders Group



**PEACE AND SECURITY GRANTMAKING  
BY U.S. FOUNDATIONS, 2008-2009**



The Peace and Security Funders Group (PSFG) is an association of foundations and philanthropists dedicated to supporting civil society efforts to promote peace and prevent violent conflict. Our mission is to enhance the effectiveness of philanthropic activity in the broad area of peace and security. To this end, PSFG facilitates the exchange of information and ideas, fosters collaboration, and provides educational opportunities for funders. We also encourage new funders to join the field. Learn more at our website at [www.peaceandsecurity.org](http://www.peaceandsecurity.org).

# INTRODUCTION

This report aims to present a comprehensive picture of U.S. foundation grantgiving in the area of peace and security over the past two years. We calculate the total amount of new funding authorized by foundations in 2008 and 2009 for civil society initiatives. We track the flow of these resources to the major sub-fields or issues within the larger field of peace and security, and determine the level of support directed at different types of work or strategies. We identify the donors and the recipients. From this data emerges key findings and an overall picture that we hope will help funders think more strategically about the impact of their philanthropic efforts and inform their decisions.

Our database includes over 2000 individual grants from 91 foundations. The list of foundations extends far beyond the PSFG community to include a more diverse and comprehensive set of donors, including ones discovered through research. We did not exclude foundations on the basis of their political perspectives. While most espouse typically progressive positions on national security issues, this is not true of all. The data does not include funding from individuals or from governments; nor does it include programmatic expenditures by operating foundations, as these expenditures fall outside of the scope of this report. Despite our efforts to be comprehensive, many foundations unknown to us undoubtedly are missing from this study. If and when additional data on grants is received, it will be added to our database and the analysis will be refined, as necessary.

We faced several methodological challenges, the most trying of which was the need to develop and consistently apply a definition of “peace and security” grants and a classification system. Grantmakers in this area regard their work in diverse ways and each uses different terms and definitions that are internally coherent and that advance individual missions. There is no need to arrive at a consensus. However, in order to draw meaningful and valid conclusions about the field as a whole, it is necessary to impose uniform definitions and a system of classifying grants by issue area and strategic approach. Thus, some foundations’ grants were excluded from the database because their primary objective(s) lay elsewhere, such as to promote human rights

or democracy or to encourage economic development, and some grants may be categorized in ways unfamiliar to the grantmaker. We took great care to develop clear, intellectually rigorous categories and to consistently apply them. For a discussion of the classification system, and the steps taken to ensure reliability and validity of the data, please read the Methodology section.

This report provides a snapshot of the picture at a specific moment in time. It contains data only on grants authorized (not necessarily paid-out) in the calendar years 2008 and 2009. Given normal yearly fluctuations in foundation expenditures due to multi-year budgeting and changing priorities, such a snapshot view may contain distortions. We combined two years of data in an effort to mitigate those distortions. Direct comparisons between 2008 and 2009, of course, must take account of idiosyncratic fluctuations.

To our knowledge, this report represents the only available effort to present a comprehensive picture of U.S. funding in the field. The report is posted on our website along with supplemental data. We hope and trust that this study is the first of an annual series. Reports in subsequent years will provide important longitudinal data that will allow us to identify trends over time. We would be pleased to answer questions about the data and our analysis, as well as receive suggestions on how to improve the report. 🍷

Katherine Magraw, Executive Director


Carah Ong, Consultant

*December, 2010*

# MAJOR FINDINGS

- 1 Foundation funding for work to promote peace and security totaled over \$257 million in 2008 and 2009 combined.
- 2 Two large foundations provided over one-third of all peace and security dollars. Twenty-two foundations awarded over one million dollars, on average, over the two years.
- 3 Controlling and Eliminating Weaponry — mainly focused on nuclear weapons — is the primary concern (as measured in dollars) of funders in the field, followed closely by Prevention and Resolution of Violent Conflict, and Promoting International Security and Stability.
- 4 Funding in the area of Advancing Education and Public Understanding attracted the largest number of funders, yet only nine percent of all funds; was not dominated by large foundations; and had the smallest average grant size.
- 5 Foundation-run operations are assuming an increasing role in civil society efforts to promote peace.
- 6 Foundations supported a variety of strategies, but Policy Analysis and Research received nearly half of all funds.

- 7 Three strategies — Field Work in Conflict Areas, Advocacy, and Public Mobilization — each garnered a little over ten percent of the dollars in the field.
- 8 Thirty-nine grantees were awarded over one million dollars in grants during 2008 and 2009.
- 9 The three largest single grants were for \$3.5 million, \$3 million and \$2.5 million.
- 10 University-based centers and scholars were awarded 21 percent of all grant dollars. Stanford University received the largest share.
- 11 Less than one-quarter of funds were awarded to non-U.S. organizations.
- 12 Conservative and progressively-oriented foundations share many grantees and issues of concern.



# CONTENTS

Introduction • 1

Major Findings • 2

In-depth View • 5

Methodology • 29

Master List of Foundations • 33

## **TABLES**

1. Ranking of Foundations by Total Funding for Peace and Security Grants • 7

2. Funding by Issue Area • 11

Funding for:

3. Controlling and Eliminating Weaponry • 12

4. Preventing and Resolving Violent Conflict • 13

5. Promoting International Security and Stability • 14

6. Supporting Diplomacy and International Institutions • 15

7. Addressing Transnational Threats • 15

8. Domestic Preparedness and Priorities • 16

9. Advancing Education and Public Understanding • 17

10. Funding by Strategy • 21

11. Top Grant Recipients (over \$1 million) • 22

12. Ten Largest Grants in 2008 • 24

13. Ten Largest Grants in 2009 • 24

14. University Funding by Foundation (over \$1 million) • 25

15. Top University Grant Recipients (over \$1 million) • 26

16. International Grantmaking by Foundation (over \$1 million) • 27

17. Top International Recipients (over \$1 million) • 27



## **Foundation funding for work to promote peace and security totaled more than \$257 million in 2008 and 2009 combined.**

---

Ninety-one American foundations made commitments to invest a total of \$257,221,598 in civil society efforts to promote peace and security over the two year period of 2008 and 2009. The total in 2008 was \$136,403,719 and the total in 2009 was \$120,817,878.

Lack of comparable data from past years makes detailed comparisons difficult, but it is clear that overall giving in the field has grown over the last decade, despite fears of a decline as foundations reacted to the economic recession or shifted their priorities. However, the growth in the peace and security field has lagged behind growth in other areas with an international focus, such as global health and development, and humanitarian responses.

Although multiple surveys showed that the typical foundation endowment lost nearly 30 percent of its value over the course of 2008, most foundations in this field, especially the larger ones, maintained their commitment to peace and security. Indeed this appears to be part of a larger trend as other studies by the Foundation Center and the Council on Foundations have found that funding for international issues and concerns has climbed steadily over the decade, significantly out-pacing overall giving.

Both the MacArthur Foundation and Carnegie Corporation of New York, for example, reaffirmed their strong commitment to funding in the peace and security field in response to the recession. Several other foundations joined the field or increased funding. For example, the Hewlett Foundation launched in 2008 a special multi-million dollar initiative to advance nuclear security. Jeff Skoll launched the Skoll Global Threats Fund in California in 2009 and began making grants in 2010 to five priority global issues, including nuclear proliferation and the Middle East conflict. (These grants are outside of this report's time frame.) Catalyst for Peace, a grantmaking and operating foundation based in Maine, was started in 2003; Humanity United was launched in 2005 to address mass atrocities and modern-day slavery; it has quickly become a major funder in the field. Both Catalyst for Peace and Humanity United also conduct their own operations, pointing to another clear trend; namely, the rise of foundations that are purely or partly operating foundations. See finding five for further discussion of operating foundations.

On the negative side of the ledger, the Ford Foundation announced in spring of 2009 that it was ending its international security program, which for years had been one of the most important philanthropic programs in the field. Ford provided substantial closing grants in 2009; thus, the loss of the Ford Foundation dollars will be reflected in the 2010 totals. The Scherman Foundation ceased peace and security grantmaking in 2009 and the Public Welfare Foundation ended its Human Rights and Global Security program in

2008, although it made final grants in 2008 and 2009. The Peter G. Peterson Foundation made one large grant of \$3 million in the nuclear security field in 2008 to the Nuclear Threat Initiative, but has not indicated an interest in further funding. Moreover, it is possible that the effects of the recession may yet be felt in 2010 and later.

The caveat to the good news on growth in the field is that giving to peace and security is just a sliver of all international giving. According to the Foundation Center's most recent calculations, funding for "peace and security" in 2008 was less than two percent of all giving for international work. And although "international giving" has steadily climbed over the past decade, by 2008 it was less than a quarter of overall giving. (The Foundation Center's classification system follows the tax code rather than categories commonly used in the philanthropic community; however, its findings convey how miniscule peace and security funding is relative to overall funding.) Peace and Security funding also lags far behind funding for other urgent threats to society. For example, the Foundation Center calculated that U.S. foundations in 2008 awarded \$897 million in grants relating to climate change. (However, it is worth noting that \$500 million of that came from one foundation, the Hewlett Foundation.)

Thus, we are faced with the paradox that although national security concerns are at the top of the American political agenda and our nation remains mired in on-going wars, philanthropic involvement in these issues lags considerably behind many other areas of international attention. Efforts to promote global health, development aid, resources to address poor governance and environmental catastrophes — are all critical. And yet, violent conflicts, global militarism, and widespread civil strife undermine efforts to tackle these and related problems and they prevent enduring progress.

Grantgiving declined from 2008 to 2009 by more than \$16 million. However, we do not believe this indicates that foundations contracted in light of the recession or that the numbers necessarily forecast a trend. It appears to be an artifact of idiosyncratic yearly variations in individual foundations. In particular, much of the decline is attributable to the fact that the largest grantgiver, the MacArthur Foundation, made large, multi-year investments in 2008 in its Asia Security Initiative (of over \$12 million) and in its Science and Security Technology Policy program. These were all counted in 2008. Moreover, we were unable to gather data on 2009 grantmaking for several foundations, which would have added an additional two to three million dollars. Most foundations did not show significant decline from 2008 to 2009 and some grew. 📄





**Two large foundations provided over one-third of all peace and security dollars. Twenty-two foundations awarded over one million dollars, on average, over the two years.**

The MacArthur Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York provided \$88,437,427 or just over one-third of all the dollars in the field over the two-year period. Looking just at 2008, the MacArthur Foundation alone accounted for one-quarter of grant dollars in that year.

And the five largest foundation programs collectively —Smith Richardson Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and Humanity United, in addition to the two above — awarded well over half (56 percent) of grant dollars. (As noted earlier, the Ford Foundation has since ceased funding in the field.)

Although the large givers skew the distribution of dollars across the 91 foundations included here, there are a total of twenty-two foundations that awarded over one million dollars, on average, over the two years. These foundations provided 1,242 grants totaling \$233,791,961, accounting for over 90 percent of the dollar total.

Among these 22 foundations, four of them were started in the last decade, Humanity United, Skoll Foundation, Catalyst for Peace and Peter G. Peterson Foundation. The first two, both based in California, are the fifth and sixth largest peace and security grant-makers respectively.

The remaining pool of 69 foundations provided 767 grants totaling \$23,408,990. The average size of these grants was nearly \$30,000. This compares to an average size grant given by the top 22 foundations of nearly \$185,000, or more than six times larger. Thirty percent of all grants were \$20,000 or less.

**Table 1** Ranking of Foundations by Total Funding for Peace and Security Grants, 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL	NUMBER OF GRANTS	% OF TOTAL FUNDING
MacArthur Foundation	\$34,224,476	\$15,481,151	\$49,705,627	119	19.32%
Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$17,706,300	\$21,025,500	\$38,731,800	135	15.06%
Smith Richardson Foundation	\$10,974,049	\$10,115,315	\$21,089,364	144	8.20%
Ford Foundation	\$8,548,316	\$8,695,400	\$17,243,716	80	6.70%
Humanity United	\$5,333,849	\$11,732,599	\$17,066,448	78	6.63%
Skoll Foundation	\$4,920,000	\$5,810,000	\$10,730,000	12	4.17%
Ploughshares Fund	\$4,971,498	\$5,621,856	\$10,593,354	191	4.12%
Hewlett Foundation	\$3,065,000	\$4,925,000	\$7,990,000	39	3.11%
The Atlantic Philanthropies	\$2,601,016	\$4,629,056	\$7,230,072	14	2.81%

*Ranking of Foundations Continued*

FOUNDATION	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL	NUMBER OF GRANTS	% OF TOTAL FUNDING
United States Institute of Peace	\$3,330,211	\$3,337,724	\$6,667,935	90	2.59%
The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation	\$2,801,000	\$3,696,000	\$6,497,000	50	2.53%
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation	\$4,221,695	\$1,523,256	\$5,744,951	14	2.23%
Rockefeller Brothers Fund	\$2,587,000	\$2,412,500	\$4,999,500	70	1.94%
Sarah Scaife Foundation	\$2,627,000	\$2,177,500	\$4,804,500	21	1.87%
Rotary Foundation	\$3,452,559	\$1,321,215	\$4,773,774	2	1.86%
OSI International Women's Program	\$1,162,092	\$2,262,590	\$3,424,682	36	1.33%
Catalyst for Peace	\$1,435,875	\$1,845,887	\$3,281,762	11	1.28%
Peter G. Peterson Foundation	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$3,000,000	1	1.17%
Colombe Foundation	\$1,579,000	\$1,241,000	\$2,820,000	74	1.10%
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation	\$1,055,000	\$1,635,000	\$2,690,000	23	1.05%
The Simons Foundation	\$724,601	\$1,838,521	\$2,563,122	27	1.00%
Henry Luce Foundation	\$1,290,000	\$875,000	\$2,165,000	11	0.84%
Compton Foundation	\$833,200	\$850,210	\$1,683,410	42	0.65%
Connect US Fund	\$804,800	\$779,000	\$1,583,800	38	0.62%
Better World Fund	\$825,210	\$645,000	\$1,470,210	15	0.57%
Alan B. Slifka Foundation	\$1,327,346	Not Available	\$1,327,346	21	0.52%
Richard Lounsbery Foundation	\$744,650	\$304,401	\$1,049,051	23	0.41%
Fred J. Hansen Foundation	\$602,990	\$433,125	\$1,036,115	5	0.40%
Nduna Foundation	\$1,025,000	Not Available	\$1,025,000	2	0.40%
The Stanton Foundation	\$0	\$675,000	\$675,000	3	0.26%
Hertog Foundation	\$0	\$630,000	\$630,000	5	0.24%
United Nations Foundation	\$423,071	\$191,000	\$614,071	13	0.24%
Prospect Hill Foundation	\$320,000	\$290,000	\$610,000	16	0.24%
Education Foundation of America	\$160,000	\$440,000	\$600,000	4	0.23%
H.K.H. Foundation	\$375,000	\$225,000	\$600,000	6	0.23%
Arca Foundation	\$235,000	\$345,015	\$580,015	13	0.23%
Samuel Rubin Foundation	\$312,250	\$262,071	\$574,321	44	0.22%
Carthage Foundation	\$545,000	Not Available	\$545,000	4	0.21%
Kathryn W. Davis Foundation	\$545,000	Not Available	\$545,000	12	0.21%
Towncreek Foundation	\$375,000	\$150,000	\$525,000	11	0.20%
Hunt Alternatives Fund	\$291,742	\$187,600	\$479,342	32	0.19%
Flora Family Foundation	\$371,000	\$85,000	\$456,000	11	0.18%
Stewart R. Mott Foundation	\$186,000	\$220,000	\$406,000	51	0.16%
Shelby Cullom Davis Foundation	\$400,000	Not Available	\$400,000	1	0.16%
Annenberg Foundation	\$400,000	\$0	\$400,000	4	0.16%
Planethood Foundation	\$191,536	\$190,802	\$382,338	40	0.15%
Foundation for Middle East Peace	\$163,972	\$180,900	\$344,872	26	0.13%
Schooner Foundation	\$333,672	Not Available	\$333,672	10	0.13%
David and Katherine Moore Family Foundation	\$240,000	Not Available	\$240,000	7	0.09%
Firedoll Foundation	\$112,500	\$122,772	\$235,272	21	0.09%
Public Welfare Foundation	\$135,000	\$100,000	\$235,000	3	0.09%
Lee and Gund Foundation	\$122,000	\$105,000	\$227,000	13	0.09%

*Ranking of Foundations Continued*

FOUNDATION	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL	NUMBER OF GRANTS	% OF TOTAL FUNDING
Shinnyo-En Foundation	\$222,000	Not Available	\$222,000	3	0.09%
Scherman Foundation	\$215,000	\$0	\$215,000	6	0.08%
Peace Development Fund	\$148,233	\$66,327	\$214,560	28	0.08%
Chino Cienega Foundation	\$90,000	\$118,000	\$208,000	5	0.08%
Moriah Fund	\$94,235	\$110,000	\$204,235	7	0.08%
Unitarian Universalist Congregation at Shelter Rock	\$40,000	\$160,000	\$200,000	4	0.08%
HF Guggenheim Foundation	\$139,855	\$59,268	\$199,123	7	0.08%
A.J. Muste Memorial Institute	\$101,800	\$81,979	\$183,779	44	0.07%
Agape Foundation	\$72,906	\$87,087	\$159,992	39	0.06%
McKnight Foundation	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$150,000	2	0.06%
Harold and Esther Edgerton Family Foundation	\$42,900	\$100,000	\$142,900	3	0.06%
Park Foundation	\$130,000	Not Available	\$130,000	7	0.05%
Bridgeway Foundation	\$120,000	\$0	\$120,000	2	0.05%
Saga Foundation	\$110,000	\$0	\$110,000	3	0.04%
Channel Foundation	\$65,000	\$45,000	\$110,000	5	0.04%
Earhart Foundation	\$97,500	Not Available	\$97,500	4	0.04%
El-Hibri Charitable Foundation	\$60,000	\$30,000	\$90,000	4	0.03%
Global Greengrants Fund	\$60,218	\$22,550	\$82,768	18	0.03%
Kenbe Foundation	\$6,000	\$75,000	\$81,000	3	0.03%
Janelia Foundation	\$50,000	\$30,000	\$80,000	7	0.03%
1185 Park Foundation Inc	\$37,500	\$32,000	\$69,500	5	0.03%
Ben and Jerry's Foundation	\$30,000	\$30,930	\$60,930	7	0.02%
Edgerton Foundation	\$50,000	Not Available	\$50,000	1	0.02%
Crosscurrents Foundation	\$25,250	\$20,250	\$45,500	6	0.02%
Daniels Fund	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000	1	0.02%
MCJ Amelior Foundation	\$35,700	Not Available	\$35,700	6	0.01%
Rosenkranz Foundation	\$34,000	Not Available	\$34,000	4	0.01%
Unitarian Universalist Association Funding Program	\$13,784	\$19,310	\$33,094	5	0.01%
The Pluralism Fund	\$32,624	\$0	\$32,624	2	0.01%
F.M. Kirby Foundation	\$15,000	\$17,500	\$32,500	2	0.01%
Gilder Foundation	\$28,500	Not Available	\$28,500	3	0.01%
Ettinger Foundation	\$27,000	Not Available	\$27,000	4	0.01%
Lydia B. Stokes Foundation	\$0	\$26,000	\$26,000	2	0.01%
Fetzer Institute	\$25,000	\$0	\$25,000	3	0.01%
Steiner-King Foundation	\$19,000	\$0	\$19,000	3	0.01%
Threshold Foundation	\$6,489	\$6,711	\$13,200	3	0.01%
Cypress Fund for Peace and Security	\$0	\$13,000	\$13,000	3	0.01%
Leighty Foundation	\$5,750	\$2,000	\$7,750	7	0.00%
Diamondston Foundation	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$2,000	3	0.00%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$136,403,720</b>	<b>\$120,817,878</b>	<b>\$257,221,598</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>100.00%</b>


### 3

**Controlling and Eliminating Weaponry — mainly focused on nuclear weapons — is the primary concern (as measured in dollars) of funders in the field, followed closely by Prevention and Resolution of Violent Conflict and Promoting International Security and Stability.**

Over the two year period of 2008 and 2009, funding in three issue areas — Controlling and Eliminating Weaponry, Preventing and Resolving Violent Conflict, and Promoting International Security and Stability — accounted for the bulk (79 percent) of all funding recorded in the database.

- Controlling and Eliminating Weaponry accounted for the largest share of foundation dollars in the field, receiving \$75,648,441 or 29 percent of all funding.
- Preventing and Resolving Violent Conflict received the next largest share of dollars at \$67,628,377 or 26 percent; and
- Promoting International Security and Stability received \$60,328,342 or nearly 24 percent.

**Chart 1** Funding by Issue Area (2008–2009 combined)



**Table 2** Funding by Issue Area, 2008–2009

FUNDING SUBFIELD	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL	NUMBER OF GRANTS	AVERAGE GRANT SIZE
Controlling & Eliminating Weaponry	\$40,111,662	\$35,536,779	\$75,648,441	558	\$135,571
Preventing & Resolving Violent Conflict	\$30,281,625	\$37,346,752	\$67,628,377	413	\$163,749
Promoting International Security & Stability	\$36,774,253	\$23,554,089	\$60,328,342	375	\$160,876
Advancing Education & Public Understanding	\$12,921,297	\$9,083,719	\$22,005,016	393	\$44,157
Supporting Diplomacy & International Institutions	\$8,878,403	\$9,844,239	\$18,722,642	134	\$139,721
Addressing Transnational Threats	\$5,074,202	\$3,667,841	\$8,742,043	82	\$106,610
Domestic Preparedness & Priorities	\$2,362,278	\$1,784,459	\$4,146,737	54	\$76,791
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$136,403,720</b>	<b>\$120,817,878</b>	<b>\$257,221,598</b>	<b>2009</b>	

As reflected by its large funding share, concern about nuclear weapons arms control and nonproliferation has been a mainstay of the field — and of the Peace and Security Funders Group — for the past two decades. Although the danger of a nuclear war engulfing the planet receded dramatically with the end of the Cold War, the possibility of limited nuclear exchanges or accidents still jeopardizes large populations. Moreover, funding during the time period of this study may have been slightly boosted in anticipation of perceived historic opportunities with the change of administration in 2008.

However, funding for nuclear weapons work has declined significantly relative to other issue areas over time in response to the end of the Cold War and the increased appreciation of the perils posed by persistent, deadly intrastate and regional conflicts. Indeed, we can expect a further leveling of the field — to include other issue areas beside the top three — as “security” becomes increasingly re-defined to reflect the range of global threats that link the fates of people around the globe from New York to New Delhi. The “growth” area of this field is clearly in the area of Preventing and Resolving Violent Conflict, as evidenced by the fact that many of the largest funders in this area are new foundations, and the array of non-governmental actors is growing in strength and numbers proportionately.

Four other substantive areas of work share the remaining 21 percent of funds, with work on Domestic Preparedness and Priorities garnering the smallest share at just over four million dollars or 1.6 percent. For a discussion of how each sub-field is defined, please see the Methodology section. 

**Table 3** Funding for Controlling and Eliminating Weaponry, 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008 TOTAL	2009 TOTAL	2008-2009 TOTAL
MacArthur Foundation	\$11,545,151	\$4,420,151	\$15,965,302
Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$5,675,400	\$10,250,600	\$15,926,000
Ploughshares Fund	\$4,530,998	\$5,337,247	\$9,868,245
Ford Foundation	\$3,080,000	\$3,760,000	\$6,840,000
Hewlett Foundation	\$2,915,000	\$3,005,000	\$5,920,000
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation	\$4,221,695	\$1,523,256	\$5,744,951
Peter G. Peterson Foundation	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$3,000,000
The Simons Foundation	\$567,480	\$1,811,821	\$2,379,301
Smith Richardson Foundation	\$969,788	\$1,095,953	\$2,065,741
Colombe Foundation	\$1,075,000	\$750,000	\$1,825,000
Skoll Foundation	\$25,000	\$1,265,000	\$1,290,000
Connect US Fund	\$375,000	\$420,000	\$795,000
The Stanton Foundation	\$0	\$675,000	\$675,000
Prospect Hill Foundation	\$320,000	\$290,000	\$610,000
Towncreek Foundation	\$200,000	\$50,000	\$250,000
Flora Family Foundation	\$200,000	\$40,000	\$240,000
Public Welfare Foundation	\$135,000	\$100,000	\$235,000
Richard Lounsbery Foundation	\$147,000	\$57,000	\$204,000
Arca Foundation	\$100,000	\$75,000	\$175,000
McKnight Foundation	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$150,000
Education Foundation of America	\$0	\$150,000	\$150,000
Rockefeller Brothers Fund	\$25,000	\$115,000	\$140,000
Stewart R. Mott Foundation	\$75,000	\$64,500	\$139,500
Scherman Foundation	\$135,000	\$0	\$135,000
Samuel Rubin Foundation	\$65,000	\$64,071	\$129,071
Schooner Foundation	\$125,000	Not Available	\$125,000
David and Katherine Moore Family Foundation	\$125,000	Not Available	\$125,000
Saga Foundation	\$110,000	\$0	\$110,000
Better World Fund	\$80,000	\$0	\$80,000
United Nations Foundation	\$0	\$65,000	\$65,000
Lee and Gund Foundation	\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
H.K.H. Foundation	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$50,000
Park Foundation	\$45,000	Not Available	\$45,000
Ben and Jerry's Foundation	\$15,000	\$25,430	\$40,430
Peace Development Fund	\$150	\$21,000	\$21,150
Crosscurrents Foundation	\$10,250	\$10,250	\$20,500
Compton Foundation	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000
Planethood Foundation	\$1,000	\$10,000	\$11,000
Leighty Foundation	\$5,750	\$2,000	\$7,750
Ettinger Foundation	\$7,000	Not Available	\$7,000
Cypress Fund for Peace and Security	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000
Firedoll Foundation	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500
Agape Foundation	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$40,111,662</b>	<b>\$35,536,779</b>	<b>\$75,648,441</b>

**Table 4** Funding for Preventing and Resolving Violent Conflict, 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008	2009	2008–2009 TOTAL
Humanity United	\$4,423,819	\$10,780,084	\$15,203,903
Skoll Foundation	\$4,515,000	\$3,530,000	\$8,045,000
Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$4,413,800	\$3,517,000	\$7,930,800
MacArthur Foundation	\$2,770,100	\$4,160,000	\$6,930,100
Ford Foundation	\$3,463,281	\$3,298,000	\$6,761,281
The Atlantic Philanthropies	\$1,851,016	\$4,429,056	\$6,280,072
United States Institute of Peace	\$2,149,606	\$1,920,388	\$4,069,994
OSI International Women's Program	\$1,162,092	\$1,624,287	\$2,786,379
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation	\$905,000	\$1,040,000	\$1,945,000
Catalyst for Peace	\$499,875	\$945,887	\$1,445,762
Smith Richardson Foundation	\$660,000	\$600,000	\$1,260,000
Compton Foundation	\$684,500	\$572,000	\$1,256,500
Nduna Foundation	\$1,000,000	Not Available	\$1,000,000
Hunt Alternatives Fund	\$291,742	\$177,600	\$469,342
Ploughshares Fund	\$185,000	\$174,500	\$359,500
United Nations Foundation	\$256,604	\$0	\$256,604
Connect US Fund	\$50,000	\$129,000	\$179,000
Flora Family Foundation	\$141,000	\$25,000	\$166,000
Hewlett Foundation	\$150,000	\$0	\$150,000
Richard Lounsbery Foundation	\$150,000	\$0	\$150,000
Bridgeway Foundation	\$120,000	\$0	\$120,000
Channel Foundation	\$65,000	\$45,000	\$110,000
Firedoll Foundation	\$23,000	\$77,500	\$100,500
Harold and Esther Edgerton Family Foundation	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000
Rockefeller Brothers Fund	\$0	\$75,000	\$75,000
Annenberg Foundation	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000
Better World Fund	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000
Towncreek Foundation	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000
Colombe Foundation	\$20,000	\$26,000	\$46,000
Foundation for Middle East Peace	\$21,000	\$22,000	\$43,000
Kathryn W. Davis Foundation	\$40,000	Not Available	\$40,000
Global Greengrants Fund	\$31,718	\$0	\$31,718
Peace Development Fund	\$6,500	\$24,700	\$31,200
Moriah Fund	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000
Planethood Foundation	\$17,500	\$5,000	\$22,500
Schooner Foundation	\$20,972	Not Available	\$20,972
Stewart R. Mott Foundation	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$20,000
Steiner-King Foundation	\$12,000	\$0	\$12,000
Fetzer Institute	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
Cypress Fund for Peace and Security	\$0	\$8,000	\$8,000
David and Katherine Moore Family Foundation	\$5,000	Not Available	\$5,000
MCJ Amelior Foundation	\$3,000	Not Available	\$3,000
Samuel Rubin Foundation	\$2,500	\$0	\$2,500
Gilder Foundation	\$1,000	Not Available	\$1,000
Diamondston Foundation	\$0	\$500	\$500
Agape Foundation	\$0	\$250	\$250
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$30,281,625</b>	<b>\$37,346,752</b>	<b>\$67,628,377</b>

**Table 5** Funding for Promoting International Security and Stability, 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL
MacArthur Foundation	\$15,285,000	\$2,820,000	\$18,105,000
Smith Richardson Foundation	\$5,617,559	\$4,583,840	\$10,201,399
Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$4,051,300	\$4,873,000	\$8,924,300
Sarah Scaife Foundation	\$2,627,000	\$2,132,500	\$4,759,500
The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation	\$2,116,000	\$2,031,000	\$4,147,000
Ford Foundation	\$1,250,035	\$1,487,400	\$2,737,435
Rockefeller Brothers Fund	\$1,293,000	\$1,090,000	\$2,383,000
Hewlett Foundation	\$0	\$1,700,000	\$1,700,000
Henry Luce Foundation	\$1,290,000	\$335,000	\$1,625,000
United States Institute of Peace	\$533,810	\$509,550	\$1,043,360
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation	\$150,000	\$595,000	\$745,000
Hertog Foundation	\$0	\$630,000	\$630,000
Kathryn W. Davis Foundation	\$425,000	Not Available	\$425,000
H.K.H. Foundation	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$400,000
Shelby Cullom Davis Foundation	\$400,000	Not Available	\$400,000
Richard Lounsbery Foundation	\$225,975	\$118,190	\$344,165
Carthage Foundation	\$295,000	\$0	\$295,000
Ploughshares Fund	\$215,000	\$50,109	\$265,109
Colombe Foundation	\$79,000	\$100,000	\$179,000
Lee and Gund Foundation	\$47,000	\$105,000	\$152,000
Schooner Foundation	\$106,700	Not Available	\$106,700
Earhart Foundation	\$82,500	Not Available	\$82,500
David and Katherine Moore Family Foundation	\$75,000	Not Available	\$75,000
Janelia Foundation	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$70,000
1185 Park Foundation Inc	\$37,500	\$32,000	\$69,500
Kenbe Foundation	\$6,000	\$50,000	\$56,000
The Simons Foundation	\$52,061	\$0	\$52,061
Edgerton Foundation	\$50,000	Not Available	\$50,000
Connect US Fund	\$24,800	\$25,000	\$49,800
The Pluralism Fund	\$32,624	\$0	\$32,624
F.M. Kirby Foundation	\$15,000	\$17,500	\$32,500
Rosenkranz Foundation	\$29,000	Not Available	\$29,000
Gilder Foundation	\$25,000	Not Available	\$25,000
Moriah Fund	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000
Nduna Foundation	\$25,000	Not Available	\$25,000
Stewart R. Mott Foundation	\$10,000	\$13,000	\$23,000
Flora Family Foundation	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000
Park Foundation	\$20,000	Not Available	\$20,000
Samuel Rubin Foundation	\$10,000	\$1,000	\$11,000
Ettinger Foundation	\$10,000	Not Available	\$10,000
Threshold Foundation	\$2,389	\$0	\$2,389
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$36,774,253</b>	<b>\$23,554,089</b>	<b>\$60,328,342</b>



**Table 6** Funding for Supporting Diplomacy and International Institutions, 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL
MacArthur Foundation	\$4,049,225	\$4,064,000	\$8,113,225
Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$2,215,800	\$1,969,900	\$4,185,700
Better World Fund	\$655,210	\$645,000	\$1,300,210
Smith Richardson Foundation	\$590,000	\$600,000	\$1,190,000
The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Rockefeller Brothers Fund	\$450,000	\$455,000	\$905,000
Humanity United	\$75,000	\$375,805	\$450,805
Planethood Foundation	\$166,273	\$174,802	\$341,075
Ford Foundation	\$300,000	\$0	\$300,000
United States Institute of Peace	\$149,637	\$73,429	\$223,066
Connect US Fund	\$125,000	\$85,000	\$210,000
OSI International Women's Program	\$0	\$153,803	\$153,803
Colombe Foundation	\$35,000	\$80,000	\$115,000
Hewlett Foundation	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000
United Nations Foundation	\$45,558	\$40,000	\$85,558
Stewart R. Mott Foundation	\$7,500	\$17,500	\$25,000
Hunt Alternatives Fund	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000
MCJ Amelior Foundation	\$9,200	Not Available	\$9,200
Lee and Gund Foundation	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$8,880,411</b>	<b>\$9,846,248</b>	<b>\$18,722,642</b>

**Table 7** Funding for Addressing Transnational Threats, 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL
Smith Richardson Foundation	\$412,500	\$361,681	\$774,181
Skoll Foundation	\$0	\$765,000	\$765,000
Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000
The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation	\$300,000	\$135,000	\$435,000
MacArthur Foundation	\$400,000	\$0	\$400,000
United States Institute of Peace	\$118,375	\$210,017	\$328,392
Carthage Foundation	\$250,000	\$0	\$250,000
Richard Lounsbery Foundation	\$99,330	\$109,711	\$209,041
Rockefeller Brothers Fund	\$0	\$135,000	\$135,000
Ford Foundation	\$105,000	\$0	\$105,000
Connect US Fund	\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Humanity United	\$57,573	\$0	\$57,573
Global Greengrants Fund	\$28,500	\$22,550	\$51,050
Flora Family Foundation	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000
Compton Foundation	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000
Earhart Foundation	\$15,000	Not Available	\$15,000
Rosenkranz Foundation	\$5,000	Not Available	\$5,000
Diamondston Foundation	\$1,000	\$500	\$1,500
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$2,362,278</b>	<b>\$1,784,459</b>	<b>\$4,146,737</b>

**Table 8** Funding for Domestic Preparedness and Priorities, 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL
Smith Richardson Foundation	\$2,674,202	\$2,328,841	\$5,003,043
The Atlantic Philanthropies	\$750,000	\$200,000	\$950,000
Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$550,000	\$0	\$550,000
Education Foundation of America	\$160,000	\$290,000	\$450,000
Connect US Fund	\$170,000	\$120,000	\$290,000
Colombe Foundation	\$130,000	\$150,000	\$280,000
Samuel Rubin Foundation	\$132,500	\$125,000	\$257,500
MacArthur Foundation	\$175,000	\$0	\$175,000
The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation	\$0	\$130,000	\$130,000
Stewart R. Mott Foundation	\$45,000	\$80,000	\$125,000
Hewlett Foundation	\$0	\$120,000	\$120,000
Ploughshares Fund	\$40,000	\$60,000	\$100,000
Scherman Foundation	\$80,000	\$0	\$80,000
Towncreek Foundation	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000
Compton Foundation	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000
Better World Fund	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000
Kathryn W. Davis Foundation	\$20,000	Not Available	\$20,000
MCJ Amelior Foundation	\$20,000	Not Available	\$20,000
The Simons Foundation	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000
Richard Lounsbery Foundation	\$0	\$12,000	\$12,000
Park Foundation	\$10,000	Not Available	\$10,000
Peace Development Fund	\$7,500	\$2,000	\$9,500
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$5,076,210</b>	<b>\$3,669,850</b>	<b>\$8,742,043</b>



**Funding in the area of Advancing Education and Public Understanding attracted the largest number of funders, yet only nine percent of all funds; was not dominated by large foundations; and had the smallest average grant size.**

Funding for Advancing Education and Public Understanding accounted for only nine percent of funding in the field. However, more funders support work in this area than in any other — 59 out of 91.

This area of work is also distinguished by the fact that it alone among the substantive areas is not dominated by the large funders. Not surprisingly, it also has the lowest average grant size of \$44,000. (The average grant size for this area was calculated without grants from the Rotary Foundation because we do not have data on its individual grants for fellowships and its university centers, but only the total dollar amount of its peace and security grants.) This average grant size is roughly one-fourth of the average size of grants in the field of Prevention and Resolution of Violent Conflict. 📄

**Table 9** Funding for Advancing Education and Public Understanding, 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL
Rotary Foundation	\$3,452,559	\$1,321,215	\$4,773,774
Catalyst for Peace	\$936,000	\$900,000	\$1,836,000
Rockefeller Brothers Fund	\$819,000	\$542,500	\$1,361,500
Humanity United	\$777,457	\$576,710	\$1,354,167
Alan B. Slifka Foundation	\$1,327,346	Not Available	\$1,327,346
Fred J. Hansen Foundation	\$602,990	\$433,125	\$1,036,115
United States Institute of Peace	\$378,783	\$624,340	\$1,003,123
The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation	\$385,000	\$400,000	\$785,000
Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$300,000	\$415,000	\$715,000
Skoll Foundation	\$380,000	\$250,000	\$630,000
Smith Richardson Foundation	\$50,000	\$545,000	\$595,000
Henry Luce Foundation	\$0	\$540,000	\$540,000
Ford Foundation	\$350,000	\$150,000	\$500,000
OSI International Women’s Program	\$0	\$484,500	\$484,500
Arca Foundation	\$135,000	\$270,015	\$405,015
Colombe Foundation	\$240,000	\$135,000	\$375,000
Annenberg Foundation	\$350,000	\$0	\$350,000
Compton Foundation	\$128,700	\$203,210	\$331,910
Foundation for Middle East Peace	\$142,972	\$158,900	\$301,872
Shinnyo-En Foundation	\$222,000	Not Available	\$222,000
Chino Cienega Foundation	\$90,000	\$118,000	\$208,000
United Nations Foundation	\$120,909	\$86,000	\$206,909

*Advancing Education and Public Understanding Continued*

FOUNDATION	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL
Unitarian Universalist Congregation at Shelter Rock	\$40,000	\$160,000	\$200,000
HF Guggenheim Foundation	\$139,855	\$59,268	\$199,123
A.J. Muste Memorial Institute	\$101,800	\$81,979	\$183,779
Towncreek Foundation	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$175,000
Samuel Rubin Foundation	\$102,250	\$72,000	\$174,250
Agape Foundation	\$72,906	\$85,837	\$158,742
Peace Development Fund	\$134,083	\$18,627	\$152,710
H.K.H. Foundation	\$150,000	\$0	\$150,000
Moriah Fund	\$94,235	\$55,000	\$149,235
Firedoll Foundation	\$89,500	\$42,772	\$132,272
Richard Lounsbery Foundation	\$122,345	\$7,500	\$129,845
The Simons Foundation	\$85,060	\$26,700	\$111,760
El-Hibri Charitable Foundation	\$60,000	\$30,000	\$90,000
Schooner Foundation	\$81,000	Not Available	\$81,000
Stewart R. Mott Foundation	\$38,500	\$35,000	\$73,500
Kathryn W. Davis Foundation	\$60,000	Not Available	\$60,000
Park Foundation	\$55,000	Not Available	\$55,000
Sarah Scaife Foundation	\$0	\$45,000	\$45,000
Harold and Esther Edgerton Family Foundation	\$42,900	\$0	\$42,900
Daniels Fund	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000
David and Katherine Moore Family Foundation	\$35,000	Not Available	\$35,000
Unitarian Universalist Association Funding Program	\$13,784	\$19,310	\$33,094
Lydia B. Stokes Foundation	\$0	\$26,000	\$26,000
Crosscurrents Foundation	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$25,000
Kenbe Foundation	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000
Ben and Jerry's Foundation	\$15,000	\$5,500	\$20,500
MacArthur Foundation	\$0	\$17,000	\$17,000
Fetzer Institute	\$15,000	\$0	\$15,000
Threshold Foundation	\$4,100	\$6,711	\$10,811
Ettinger Foundation	\$10,000	Not Available	\$10,000
Janelia Foundation	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
Lee and Gund Foundation	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
Planethood Foundation	\$6,763	\$1,000	\$7,763
Steiner-King Foundation	\$7,000	\$0	\$7,000
MCJ Amelior Foundation	\$3,500	Not Available	\$3,500
Gilder Foundation	\$2,500	Not Available	\$2,500
Ploughshares Fund	\$500	\$0	\$500
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$12,921,297</b>	<b>\$9,083,719</b>	<b>\$22,005,015</b>



## **Foundation-run operations are assuming an increasing role in civil society efforts to promote peace.**

---

Several of the foundations established during the past decade combine grantmaking with a significant operational component. For example, Humanity United, established in the last several years, awarded over \$17 million in grants in 2009 to address mass atrocities and conflict prevention, but also has staff directly engaged in advocacy, research and convening influential actors. Catalyst for Peace, founded in 2003, provides over a million dollars in grants on peacebuilding and post-conflict reconciliation, but also has produced a documentary and runs its own program in Sierra Leone. An older foundation, The Hunt Alternatives Fund, dating back to 1981, combines an operational foundation and a private grantgiving foundation.

Other new foundations such as the Secure World Foundation, are wholly operational. The Secure World Foundation makes no grants at this point, but devotes about one million dollars per year on projects in collaboration with “partners” in the area of space security and sustainability. Both the U.N. Foundation and its sister The Better World Fund, are focused increasingly on their own programming, often working with partners. They join the Stanley Foundation, which has always conducted programs on global affairs rather than provide grants to others, and the German Marshall Fund, which has both extensive internal programs and a grantmaking program in the peace and security field based in Europe. The Open Society Institute, the largest member of the family of Open Society Foundations with headquarters in New York, provides some grants in the peace and security field, but devotes a significant share of its resources to carrying out its own programs.


Yet another example of this emerging trend comes from the Ploughshares Fund, a leading source of grants for organizations and individuals addressing the risks posed by nuclear weapons. In early 2008, Ploughshares established a Washington, D.C. office and hired staff to be more directly involved in policy making and to interact with the grantee community as fellow activists.

This study did not collect data on the programmatic expenditures made by the above foundations or the many other operating foundations. However, it is clear that across the field, foundations are devoting increasing resources to carrying out their own programs and that these programs have assumed a larger role in the overall activities of civil society. 🍃




## Foundations supported a variety of strategies, but Policy Analysis and Research received nearly half of all funds.

About 47 percent of the funds — or over \$120 million — recorded in the database supported work that was intended for Policy Analysis and Research. If one adds to this the funds for Technical Analysis, the total reaches nearly \$125 million or half of all funds.

There were 683 individual grants for work on Policy Analysis and Research, representing just over one-third of all grants. In particular, the three largest funders in the peace and security field, MacArthur Foundation, Carnegie Corporation and Smith Richardson Foundation, devoted the bulk of their funds to Policy Analysis and Research — or 69 percent of their collective grant dollars. In terms of total dollars devoted to Policy Analysis and Research these three foundations accounted for 63 percent. Foundations on the conservative side of the spectrum were also more likely to give priority to this strategy in their grantmaking. 

**Chart 2** Funding by Strategy (2008 and 2009 combined)





### Three strategies — Field Work in Conflict Areas, Advocacy, and Public Mobilization — each garnered a little over ten percent of the dollars in the field.

A significantly smaller, but still sizable share of funding was directed at three other strategies: Field Work in Conflict Areas, Advocacy, and Public Mobilization. Each attracted over \$30 million in grants over the two-year period, for a combined funding share of 37 percent.

The following five strategies (in descending order of “priority”) — Youth Leadership Development; Media and Communications; Technical Analysis; Track II Diplomacy; and Lobbying — shared among them 15 percent of funding.

Although the share of grant dollars devoted to Youth Leadership Development and to Media and Communications was small, they both attracted a good number of funders; 42 and 29 foundations respectively.

The Ploughshares Fund was the only foundation to fund Lobbying. It provided nine grants worth \$510,000.

**Table 10** Funding by Strategy, 2008–2009

FUNDING STRATEGY	2008	2009	2008-2009 TOTAL	NUMBER OF GRANTS
Policy Analysis and Research	\$66,924,306	\$53,620,135	\$120,544,441	683
Field Work in Conflict Areas	\$14,909,562	\$18,460,872	\$33,370,434	244
Advocacy	\$18,005,433	\$14,513,317	\$32,503,750	311
Public Mobilization	\$14,236,643	\$15,918,616	\$30,145,259	429
Youth Leadership Development	\$9,005,744	\$5,527,966	\$14,533,710	132
Media and Communications	\$7,409,931	\$6,231,570	\$13,641,501	129
Technical Analysis and Research	\$4,023,151	\$3,792,932	\$7,816,083	28
Track II Diplomacy	\$1,628,950	\$2,502,470	\$4,131,420	44
Lobbying	\$260,000	\$250,000	\$510,000	9
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$136,403,720</b>	<b>\$120,817,878</b>	<b>\$257,196,598</b>	<b>2009</b>



## Thirty-nine grantees were awarded over one million dollars in grants during 2008 and 2009.

Thirty-nine organizations were each awarded over one million dollars in grants during 2008 and 2009 combined for peace and security work. There are more than 900 grantees in the database.

In nearly all cases, these organizations were the beneficiaries of large grants, many times the average grant size of \$128,000. The top recipient, the Nuclear Threat Initiative, was awarded \$6.5 million in just three separate grants during 2008 and 2009 from the pool of 91 foundations. Nearly three-quarters of them received ten or fewer individual grants. The median size grant in the database — that is, one half of grants were larger, one half was smaller — was approximately \$50,000.

The combined value of the grants to the top 40 recipients was over \$100 million, or 40 percent of the total funds.

**Table 11** Top Grant Recipients (over \$1 million), 2008–2009

ORGANIZATION	2008-2009 TOTAL FUNDING	NUMBER OF GRANTS
Nuclear Threat Initiative	\$6,500,000	3
Carter Center	\$6,000,000	3
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	\$5,957,561	22
Center for Strategic and International Studies	\$5,863,141	30
Stanford University	\$4,299,962	17
International Center for Transitional Justice	\$4,138,411	8
Brookings Institution	\$3,666,400	21
World Security Institute	\$3,307,000	16
Aspen Institute	\$3,120,000	7
American Association for the Advancement of Science	\$3,001,690	8
Council on Foreign Relations	\$2,911,989	20
Henry L. Stimson Center	\$2,641,730	32
National Security Archive	\$2,555,000	10
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies at Nanyang Technological University	\$2,535,000	2
The Elders	\$2,500,000	3
New York University	\$2,404,300	12
Center for American Progress	\$2,339,612	4
Harvard University	\$2,339,490	10
National Bureau of Asian Research	\$2,230,000	6
International Institute for Strategic Studies	\$2,205,000	8



*Top Grant Recipients Continued*

ORGANIZATION	2008-2009 TOTAL FUNDING	NUMBER OF GRANTS
American Academy of Arts and Sciences	\$2,167,009	7
Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis	\$2,028,164	6
East Asia Institute	\$2,000,000	1
Arms Control Association	\$1,907,500	13
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	\$1,885,575	10
Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation	\$1,869,158	3
ICPO-INTERPOL	\$1,850,000	1
Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainable Development	\$1,845,000	6
George Mason University	\$1,844,000	5
World Federalist Movement/Institute for Global Policy	\$1,833,000	5
International Crisis Group	\$1,820,000	8
School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University	\$1,788,355	17
RAND Corporation	\$1,700,834	9
America Abroad Media	\$1,625,000	5
Suffolk Lenadoon Interface Group	\$1,559,912	1
Center for International and Strategic Studies at Peking University	\$1,400,000	1
New America Foundation	\$1,442,466	13
Institute for State Effectiveness	\$1,375,000	4
Institute for Science and International Security	\$1,290,000	11
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$103,747,259</b>	<b>368</b>



**The three largest single grants were for \$3.5 million, \$3 million and \$2.5 million.**

A number of organizations were the beneficiaries of large multi-million dollar grants. Most were multi-year grants. 

**Table 12** Ten Largest Grants in 2008

TEN LARGEST GRANTS IN 2008	AMOUNT
Skoll Foundation to the Carter Center	\$3,500,000 (1 yr)
Peterson Foundation to Nuclear Threat Initiative	\$3,000,000 (1 yr)
MacArthur Foundation to School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University	\$2,500,000 (3 yr)
MacArthur Foundation to American Association for the Advancement of Science	\$2,250,000 (3 yr)
MacArthur Foundation to East Asia Institute	\$2,000,000 (3 yr)
The Sloan Foundation to ICPO-INTERPOL	\$1,850,000 (3 yr)
MacArthur Foundation to Nuclear Threat Initiative	\$1,500,000 (1.5 yr)
MacArthur Foundation to the Center for International and Strategic Studies at Peking University	\$1,400,000 (3 yr)
MacArthur Foundation to International Institute for Strategic Studies	\$1,350,000 (3 yr)
MacArthur Foundation to International Institute for Strategic Studies	\$1,200,000 (3 yr)

**Table 13** Ten Largest Grants in 2009

TEN LARGEST GRANTS IN 2008	AMOUNT
Humanity United to Center for American Progress	\$2,250,000 (1 yr)
MacArthur Foundation to International Center for Transitional Justice	\$2,000,000 (3 yr)
Carnegie Corporation to Nuclear Threat Initiative	\$2,000,000 (1.25 yr)
The Simons Foundation to World Security Institute	\$1,600,000 (1 yr)
The Atlantic Philanthropies to Suffolk Lenadoon Interface Group	\$1,559,912 (3 yr)
Skoll Foundation to Carter Center	\$1,500,000 (1 yr)
The Atlantic Philanthropies to Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation	\$1,224,158 (3 yr)
The Hewlett Foundation to National Security Archive	\$1,200,000 (2 yr)
The Hewlett Foundation to Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	\$1,100,000 (2 yr)
Skoll Foundation to Apopo	\$1,015,000 (3 yr)

**University-based centers and scholars were awarded 21 percent of all grant dollars. Stanford University received the largest share.**

The sizable share of funding (21 percent or \$55,092,695) going to university-based centers and scholars is consistent with the finding that funders directed nearly half their funds to Policy Research and Analysis. Grants to support pre-doctoral students — that is, dissertation fellowships and doctoral stipends — were not included in the database.

Although the MacArthur Foundation and Carnegie Corporation between them accounted for half of the funding, it is striking that an additional 35 foundations also provided grants to universities. Twelve foundations each awarded over one million dollars to universities; these grants accounted for 90 percent of the total dollars.

A total of 120 universities received funding. The top ten recipients of University grants received 40 percent of all university funding.

Notable among the top recipients of university funding is Stanford University, which received 17 grants; including ten given to the Center for International Security and Cooperation (\$2,761,000) and another seven to the Hoover Institution (\$1,538,962). Princeton University’s eleven grants were awarded primarily to a few centers within the Woodrow Wilson School. The S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore received a \$2,250,000 three-year grant from the MacArthur Foundation in 2008 as part of its Asia Security Initiative. 📖

**Table 14** University Funding by Foundation (over \$1 million), 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008-2009 TOTAL	NUMBER OF GRANTS
MacArthur Foundation	\$15,786,302	37
Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$11,938,100	39
Rotary Foundation	\$4,773,774	2
Smith Richardson Foundation	\$4,103,145	37
Ford Foundation	\$3,642,435	18
Catalyst for Peace	\$1,836,000	2
United States Institute of Peace	\$1,641,027	27
Hewlett Foundation	\$1,410,000	11
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation	\$1,171,695	3
Humanity United	\$1,117,477	6
The Atlantic Philanthropies	\$1,081,620	3
Fred J. Hansen Foundation	\$1,036,115	5

**Table 15** Top University Grant Recipients (over \$1 million), 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008-2009 TOTAL	NUMBER OF GRANTS
Stanford University	\$4,299,962	17
Princeton University	\$2,706,414	11
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies at Nanyang Technological University	\$2,535,000	2
New York University	\$2,404,300	12
Harvard University	\$2,339,490	10
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	\$1,885,575	10
George Mason University	\$1,844,000	5
School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University	\$1,788,355	17
Center for International and Strategic Studies at Peking University	\$1,400,000	1
King's College London	\$1,066,000	2

**Less than one-quarter of funds were awarded to non-U.S. organizations.**

Twenty-two percent of all grant dollars in 2008 and 2009 (\$57,239,165) in the field of peace and security were awarded to international organizations. A total of 35 foundations made 364 grants to international recipients. Twelve foundations each awarded over one million dollars; these grants accounted for 95 percent of the total dollars.

Grant recipients are based mostly in Asia, Africa, and Central and South America. However, six of the top twelve recipients are from Europe. The International Institute for Strategic Studies and the International Crisis Group each received eight grants, the most of any organization. The Singapore-based Nanyang Technological University received the most dollars, \$2,535,000.

**Table 16** International Grantmaking by Foundation (over \$1 million), 2008–2009

FOUNDATION	2008-2009 TOTAL	NUMBER OF GRANTS
MacArthur Foundation	\$20,082,225	52
Ford Foundation	\$7,576,316	33
The Atlantic Philanthropies	\$5,383,269	9
Humanity United	\$3,611,934	21
Carnegie Corporation of New York	\$3,048,800	10
Skoll Foundation	\$3,045,000	4
United States Institute of Peace	\$2,954,427	42
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation	\$2,071,695	2
OSI International Women’s Program	\$2,067,213	27
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation	\$1,920,000	16
Catalyst for Peace	\$1,242,562	4
Ploughshares Fund	\$1,234,095	22

**Table 17** Top International Recipients (over \$1 million), 2008–2009

ORGANIZATION	2008-2009 TOTAL	NUMBER OF GRANTS
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies at Nanyang Technological University	\$2,535,000	2
International Institute for Strategic Studies	\$2,205,000	8
Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation	\$1,869,158	3
ICPO-INTERPOL	\$1,850,000	1
International Crisis Group	\$1,820,000	8
Suffolk Lenadoon Interface Group	\$1,559,912	1
Crisis Action	\$1,168,133	6
King’s College London	\$1,066,000	2
Center for Policy Studies in Russia	\$1,040,000	3
Peaceworks Foundation	\$1,040,000	2
Apopo	\$1,015,000	1
Fund for War-Affected Children and Youth	\$1,000,000	2


## **Conservative and progressively-oriented foundations share many grantees and issues of concern.**

---

The database includes many foundations considered to have a generally conservative orientation. These include the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Henry Luce Foundation, Sarah Scaife Foundation, Smith Richardson Foundation, and others. We found significant overlap among grantees of those foundations considered “conservative” and the larger pool of foundations.

Grantees that received support from foundations across the political spectrum, to the extent that this could be ascertained, included: America Abroad Media, Brookings Institution, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Columbia University, Council on Foreign Relations, Henry L. Stimson Center, Harvard University, Hudson Institute, Institute for State Effectiveness, National Bureau of Asian Research, New America Foundation, Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, Stanford University, School of Advanced and International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, and Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars.

Of course, despite some grantees in common there are fundamental differences in political perspectives, assumptions and objectives between the foundations with a “progressive” orientation and those with a “conservative” orientation. It is also true that profound differences exist between foundations within these two grouping. A political analysis of the differences among the grantees and work supported is outside this study, however the database could be used for such an analysis at a later time.

Foundations with a conservative political orientation appeared to invest primarily in efforts to Promote International Security and Stability and their primary strategic approach is to fund Policy Analysis. Also notable is the fact that the Smith Richardson Foundation was the dominant investor in the area of Domestic Preparedness and Priorities, providing more than five million dollars — or nearly 60% of total funding — in the area over the two-year period. 

# METHODOLOGY

We constructed a database composed of 2,009 individual grants from 90 U.S. Foundations and one Canadian foundation — the Simons Foundation. (We made an exception for the Simons Foundation as it mostly funds U.S.-based groups and works closely with U.S. foundations to promote nuclear disarmament.) Our data came from foundation program staff, IRS 990 forms, foundation websites and annual reports. We typically sought help from foundation staff to collect and review our data, although we did not always receive the benefit of assistance and ultimately, we decided what grants to include and how to classify them.

## Scope of the Database

We included grants from foundations whose primary objective relates to preventing, managing, resolving and/or mitigating the consequences of violent conflicts; strengthening conflict management capacity, institutions, and intellectual capital worldwide; and building a culture of peace and human security. As stated earlier, we eschewed use of a political or ideological filter. In order to promote clarity of what we are counting, we excluded grants whose primary purpose relates to other goals such as encouraging development, democracy building, or promoting human rights. For example, we did not usually include grants dealing with gender violence or sex trafficking. However, if the grant addressed the issue of gender violence in the context of an on-going conflict, such as in Congo, we did include this and classified it as a conflict resolution grant. To cite another example, we did not include grants that promote refugee rights, but we did include grants dealing with refugees if the initiative's purpose was to prevent a fresh outbreak of war. This meant that we did not necessarily include all grants from a given program. Thus, for example, selective grants were included from the C.S. Mott Foundation's Civil Society Initiative, or MacArthur Foundation's Human Rights and International Justice Program, or the Open Society Institute's International Women's Program.

Our classification, of course, reflects no judgment about the value of grants or any one foundation's approach to

organizing and describing its giving. Undoubtedly, we were hampered in some instances by a lack of information or understanding of particular grants; if we made errors, we hope they will be brought to our attention for review.

The database does not include grants from individuals or from governments. Programmatic expenditures by operating foundations were not included, as these expenditures fall outside of our scope. Nor does the database include dissertation fellowships or grants to the United States Institute of Peace for its new headquarters. Grants to affinity groups, such as PSFG, or to promote philanthropy in the field likewise were excluded from the data.

In addition, it is worth noting that in 2006 the Nuclear Threat Initiative pledged \$50 million, financially backed by Warren Buffett, for an international nuclear fuel bank. This pledge is not counted in our database, as the initiative's future is uncertain. (The pledge was contingent upon additional contributions from governments, most of which have been pledged, and actions to establish the reserve by the International Atomic Energy Agency.)

Multiple grants to one organization were not combined so as to retain maximum data. An exception to this rule was provided for the Rotary Foundation as our data was limited to the total dollar amount given to fellowships and academic centers.

As of this printing, we were unable to collect complete data on 2009 grants for the following foundations: Alan B. Slifka Foundation; David and Katherine Moore Foundation; Earhart Foundation; Edgerton Foundation; Gilder Foundation; MCJ Amelior Foundation; Nduna Foundation; Park Foundation; Rosenkranz Foundation; Rotary Foundation; Schooner Foundation; and the Shinnyo-En Foundation. Subsequent analyses will include missing 2009 data where possible and report any additional grant information from foundations not included in this analysis. However, we do not believe that the missing data would significantly alter our conclusions, given the expected relative size of these foundations.

## Classification System

We coded grants according to the substantive area of work and by the type of work or strategic approach of the proposed work. To do so, we developed a classification system that identifies, to the best of our ability, the field's most salient, important issue areas and strategies. Any given system of categorizing the grants of funders with widely varying philosophies and approaches may appear somewhat arbitrary. At times, we needed to choose one "label" where an argument could be made for a different one. Where subjective judgments were required, we researched the grants as much as was practical. If a project description was unavailable, grants were categorized by the primary field of work of the grantee. In addition, some grants focus on multiple issues or employ multiple strategies. Because it was impossible for us to know how the grantmakers intended to divide the award, we categorized such grants by the major issue area and by the primary strategic approach.

The classification system we devised aimed at presenting a nuanced, valid picture of the field, without becoming so detailed as to lose the capacity to say something meaningful about the whole field. Once again, if readers believe we made errors in judgment, we hope they will be brought to our attention so we can reconsider our classifications.

### Substantive Areas of Work

---

*Grants were coded by the substantive area of work addressed. We identified seven major issues areas, as described below, that comprise the broad field of peace and security.*

#### ► PREVENTING AND RESOLVING VIOLENT CONFLICT

Initiatives aimed at preventing or resolving civil conflict including peacekeeping and peace operations, mediation, disarming and reintegrating of combatants, and addressing causes of conflict. This area also addresses post-conflict issues of justice, reconciliation and development to prevent a relapse into conflict.

#### ► SUPPORTING DIPLOMACY AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Work focused on strengthening the capacity of international institutions, agreements and norms that promote peace and security, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency, the International Criminal Court, and the "responsibility to protect" obligation. Initiatives to promote constructive U.S. diplomatic engagement would also fall into this area.

#### ► CONTROLLING AND ELIMINATING WEAPONRY

Efforts to control, eliminate, or mitigate the effects of weaponry. The vast majority of the grants in this category relate to nuclear weapons, but some relate to biological, chemical and space weapons, some to the global arms trade, and some to indiscriminatory classes of weapons such as landmines and cluster munitions.

#### ► DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS AND PRIORITIES

Initiatives related to the U.S. military and military budget, and the U.S. ability to respond to terrorism or other hostile actions on U.S. soil.

#### ► ADDRESSING TRANSNATIONAL THREATS

Work related to understanding, measuring and recommending policies for addressing such transnational threats to international security as terrorism, epidemics, refugees, migration, and resource scarcity.



► **ADVANCING EDUCATION AND PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING**

Initiatives focused on encouraging public education and a culture of peace, including peace education in universities, work to understand the prerequisites for peace, citizen exchanges, public outreach, and development of curriculum.

► **PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND STABILITY**

Initiatives that focus on understanding and mitigating the conflict between states and threatening developments in the international security system; and efforts to improve U.S. bilateral relations with adversaries.

**Type of Work or Strategic Approach**  
.....

*Grants were also coded by the type of work or strategy adopted by the grantee. We identified nine strategies, as listed below, that are most often pursued by those in the field of peace and security.*

► **ADVOCACY**

Promotion of general and specific public policies and education of policy makers on specific policies and issues.

► **PUBLIC MOBILIZATION**

Includes public education and work with targeted constituencies, “grasstops” as well as “grassroots.”

► **LOBBYING**

Work specifically aimed at development and passage of legislation; work designated at 501 (c) 4 by the Internal Revenue Code.

► **MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Includes work with the media, public opinion research and messaging work.

► **POLICY ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH**

Expert work to better understand specific issue areas, the publication of studies and reports, and development of policy recommendations.

► **TECHNICAL ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH**

Studies that include technical or scientific analysis.

► **YOUTH LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT**

Includes training and recruitment of new leaders and, in particular, work to encourage involvement by the next generation.

► **TRACK II DIPLOMACY**

Work to encourage interaction among civil society leaders, politicians, and officials as a supplement or alternative to official “Track I” diplomacy.

► **FIELD WORK IN CONFLICT AREAS**

Work with parties directly involved in conflict, including mediation, enhancing women’s participation, and empowering victims of conflict.

## Timeframe

All grants were counted in the calendar year in which they were authorized. For example, grants authorized by a Foundation board at the end of 2008 were listed as 2008 grants even if they were multiyear grants that were not paid out or used until 2009 or beyond, and even if these grants fell in the given foundation's 2009 fiscal year. By attributing all grant funds to the authorizing calendar year rather than tracking yearly payments, we better reflect a foundation's priorities in any given time period. Moreover, we ensure greater accuracy and consistency of the data as it is very often impossible to know payout schedules of multi-year grants or even to know about grants authorized in years previous to the ones under consideration. (Annual reports, 990 Forms, websites, typically do not record grants authorized in previous years.) Lastly, this method standardizes differing fiscal years and irregular grant periods.

This methodology may suggest false dips and spikes for particular recipients and issues. Periodic reports will help correct distortions of a single-year view of the data.

Because this is the first year of this study, we made two exceptions to this rule dealing with large multi-year grants made before our time period. These exceptions were:


- A five-year 2006 Ford Foundation general support grant to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, for \$2,500,000. We counted \$500,000 in both 2008 and 2009 to demonstrate Ford's (then) ongoing commitment to CEIP's international security work.
- A four-year 2006 MacArthur Foundation grant to Princeton University, Woodrow Wilson School for an independent International Panel on Fissile Materials, for \$2,120,604. We counted \$530,151 in both 2008 and 2009 to demonstrate MacArthur's ongoing commitment to Princeton's work in this area.

It should be noted that we did not include four large, multi-year grants from the MacArthur Foundation, which had payouts of several million dollars in 2008 and 2009, but were authorized in earlier years. These grants were part of a seven-year, \$50 million initiative launched in 2003 called

the Science, Technology and Security Policy Initiative. Five final grants in this initiative worth five million dollars were authorized in 2008 and thus were included in the database.

## Regranting

To avoid double-counting dollars, this analysis allocates regranting monies solely to the foundations doing the regranting. This method provides the most information about where and for what purposes the monies are going, thus capturing the intent of the primary funder and the regranting institution. For example, grants from foundations to the Ploughshares Fund and Connect U.S. Fund were eliminated from the database; all the peace and security grants made by these foundations were counted. Note, however, one grant (from the MacArthur Foundation) to the Connect U.S. Fund does appear in the database as it was not for the grant making program, but rather for the Fissile Materials Working Group. The total funds provided to foundations for regranting purposes amounted to \$759,000 in 2008 and \$2,822,550 in 2009.

One large organization — the Nuclear Threat Initiative — has evolved mostly into an operating foundation, rather than a grantmaking foundation. Thus, grants from foundations to NTI were included in the database and grants or consulting contracts from NTI to other organizations were not. 

# MASTER LIST OF FOUNDATIONS

1185 Park Foundation Inc.  
Agape Foundation  
Annenberg Foundation  
Arca Foundation  
Atlantic Philanthropies, The  
Ben and Jerry's Foundation  
Better World Fund  
Bradley Foundation, The Lynde and Harry  
Bridgeway Foundation  
Carnegie Corporation of New York  
Carthage Foundation  
Catalyst for Peace  
Channel Foundation  
Chino Cienega Foundation  
Colombe Foundation  
Compton Foundation  
Connect U.S. Fund  
Crosscurrents Foundation  
Cypress Fund for Peace and Security  
Daniels Fund  
Davis Foundation, Kathryn W.  
Davis Foundation, Shelby Cullom  
Diamondston Foundation  
Earhart Foundation  
Edgerton Family Foundation, Harold and Esther  
Edgerton Foundation  
Education Foundation of America  
El-Hibri Charitable Foundation  
Ettinger Foundation  
Fetzer Institute  
Firedoll Foundation  
Flora Family Foundation  
Ford Foundation  
Foundation for Middle East Peace  
Gilder Foundation  
Global Greengrants Fund  
Guggenheim Foundation, Harry Frank  
Hansen Foundation, Fred J.  
Hertog Foundation  
Hewlett Foundation, William and Flora  
H.K.H. Foundation  
Humanity United  
Hunt Alternatives Fund  
Janelia Foundation  
Kenbe Foundation  
Kirby Foundation, F.M.  
Lee and Gund Foundation  
Leighty Foundation  
Lounsbery Foundation, Richard  
Luce Foundation, Henry  
MCJ Amelior Foundation  
MacArthur Foundation, John D. and Catherine T.  
McKnight Foundation  
Moore Family Foundation, David and Katherine  
Moriah Fund  
Mott Foundation, Charles Stewart  
Mott Foundation, Stewart R.  
Muste Memorial Institute, A. J.  
Nduna Foundation  
Open Society Institute, International Women's Program  
Park Foundation  
Peace Development Fund  
Peterson Foundation, Peter G.  
Planethood Foundation  
Ploughshares Fund  
Pluralism Fund, The  
Prospect Hill Foundation  
Public Welfare Foundation  
Rockefeller Brothers Fund  
Rosenkranz Foundation  
Rotary Foundation  
Rubin Foundation, Samuel  
Saga Foundation  
Scaife Foundation, Sarah  
Scherman Foundation  
Schooner Foundation  
Shinnyo-En Foundation  
Simons Foundation, The  
Skoll Foundation  
Slifka Foundation, Alan B.  
Sloan Foundation, Alfred P.  
Smith Richardson Foundation  
Stanton Foundation  
Steiner-King Foundation  
Stokes Foundation, Lydia B.  
Threshold Foundation  
Towncreek Foundation  
Unitarian Universalist Association Funding Program  
Unitarian Universalist Congregation at Shelter Rock  
United Nations Foundation  
United States Institute of Peace



Peace and Security Funders Group

**PEACEANDSECURITY.ORG**

7 Elliewood Avenue  
Third Floor  
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Katherine Magraw, Director  
Tel: +1 (434) 989-1514  
kmagraw@peaceandsecurity.org

Carah Ong, Consultant  
Tel: +1 (434) 535-2664  
cong@peaceandsecurity.org