

November 1977

## **THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLEX**

(Executive Summary)

The environmental activist movement has enjoyed a significant degree of popular appeal and influence on the policy-making institutions of government. Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin has remarked that it has "institutionalized concern for the environment" and become "an established part of our national decision-making process." Ann Roosevelt, former legislative director for Friends of the Earth, has also been quoted as saying that environmentalists "have a good two-way communication going with Congress. We have friendships with key senators and congressmen and their staffs. We know how to get our viewpoint across to them. And they, in turn, are using us as resources."

It is estimated that there are today better than 3,000 organizations working for preservation of scenic land and wildlife, pollution control, energy resource conservation, and a multiplicity of similar causes. Of these, several hundred are national or regional, with the majority made up of local groups. The most visible are, however, the large national organizations, both membership and nonmembership. Such organizations are generally very well funded; indeed, it has been estimated that twelve of the largest of these groups have a total membership in excess of 4,300,000 people and combined budgets of over \$48,000,000. Their budgets are supported by a combination of individual and corporate contributions and grants from government and from such foundations as the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

Within the environmental movement, there exists a considerable overlapping of interests, as well as extensive cooperation on matters of mutual concern. There is also a pattern of interlocking

relationships through shared board members, officers, and supporters, including supporters among the great foundations. In many cases, the available information indicates clearly that some of the nation's most active and influential environmental groups derive an enormous, perhaps even decisive, benefit from foundation support.

The present study, which is intended as the first in a series on the nation's principal energy and environmental activist organizations, touches on the activities of several groups. Primary attention, however, is given to four organizations: the Natural Resources Defense Council, Friends of the Earth and its affiliated Friends of the Earth Foundation, and the Conservation Foundation. It is hoped that by understanding the operations of these groups, which constitute a representative sampling of the more influential national environmental organizations, the reader may better realize the nature of the movement as a whole.

NRDC is perhaps the nation's leading public interest environmental law firm, while the Conservation Foundation is preeminent among organizations dealing extensively with land-use and related questions. Friends of the Earth, in addition to being one of the foremost environmental activist groups, presents an ideal case study in the operations of a lobbying and legal action organization which is not tax-exempt, but which derives crucial support for its activities from a direct organizational affiliate which does enjoy tax-exempt status within the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

As the study demonstrates, these organizations, like others within the environmental complex, share certain characteristics. There is the interlock with other environmental groups; there is a close working relationship, especially on the part of NRDC and the Conservation Foundation, with agencies of government charged with formulation and implementation of national environmental policy; and there is, again with respect to NRDC and the Conservation Foundation, the tremendous financial benefit derived from foundation support. It will also be noted that several of these groups emphasize current energy issues to a significant extent. The Conservation Foundation stresses what it calls "energy conservation," while NRDC, FOE, and the FOE Foundation place heavy emphasis on campaigns to oppose development of nuclear energy.

## THE ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLEX

### INTRODUCTION

Of the great activist causes that have flourished in the United States in recent years, few have enjoyed the popular appeal, the sustained growth, or the impact on government that have characterized the environmentalist movement. It is a phenomenon which, in a very few years, was able to progress from relatively modest beginnings to a point at which a United States Senator, Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), felt it possible to say, according to the April 7, 1975, issue of Industry Week: "The most important thing that has happened in five years (from 1970 to 1975) is that we've institutionalized concern for the environment. It is now an established part of our national decision-making process."

That Senator Nelson's assessment remains essentially accurate is indicated by an article published in the October 31, 1977, edition of the Washington Post. This article, "Andrus Steers Interior in New Direction," alleges that President Carter's Secretary of the Interior, former Idaho Governor Cecil D. Andrus, is pursuing policies which seem "to have alienated virtually every powerful constituency in the West." According to this account, "Andrus has managed to delight environmentalists, while infuriating miners, Western politicians, timber companies, farmers, cattlemen and oil companies." The article further notes the hiring of prominent environmental activists by the Carter Administration, including Cynthia Wilson of the Audubon Society and Joe Browder of the Environmental Policy Center, both of whom were hired by Andrus, and makes the point that the present emphasis by Andrus on environmental concerns is at variance with the pattern in past administrations.

Such developments, especially when taken in conjunction with the undeniable growth in power and influence of government agencies concerned with energy matters and with the protection of the environment in general, make it imperative that one inquire as to the nature of the movement that has labored so long and so assiduously to bring about the recent radical expansion of government intervention in these areas. One must be cognizant of the organizations involved, of who the leaders are, of the issues they regard as paramount, and of the sources, both public and private, of their all-important financial support.

The environmental movement is probably far more widespread than is generally appreciated. A recent study conducted by the Environmental Agenda Task Force and sponsored by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund (The Unfinished Agenda: The Citizen's Policy Guide to Environmental Issues, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1977) summarizes the current picture as follows:



At the heart of the U.S. environmental movement are about 3,000 organizations engaged in activities ranging from the preservation of scenic lands and wildlife, to pollution abatement, to the future of the human race. Several hundred of these are national or regional in scope, but the majority are local citizen groups working on issues concerning their immediate communities. Most are supported entirely by individual contributions and staffed by volunteers.

The large national organizations, however, are the most visible and familiar components of the environmental movement. These can generally be classified into two broad groups: membership organizations and professional organizations. They represent a large and varied constituency and have access to a large amount of money for use in the public interest. For example, twelve of the largest groups are supported by a total membership of over 4.3 million and have combined budgets in excess of \$48 million. Their budgets are derived from a combination of individual contributions, and foundation and government grants.

As the study observes, professional organizations, as distinct from membership groups, "do not solicit members but are supported by a similar combination of private, foundation, and government donations." Their functions are described as research, litigation, lobbying efforts, public services, and the formation of environmental policy. (It is also noted that the Task Force includes in the environmental movement a third category made up of groups which are "normally classified within the population field" and which are included as environmental groups "in the sense that population size and growth rates are critical to environmental quality." Organizations in this category would be, for example, Zero Population Growth and the Planned Parenthood Federation of America.)

Among the better-known membership organizations are the Environmental Defense Fund, Friends of the Earth, the National Audubon Society, the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, and the Sierra Club, probably the oldest and best-known of all environmental activist groups. Of those environmental groups which emphasize legal action, one of the most effective is the Natural Resources Defense Council, the largest environmental law firm in the United States; others include Friends of the Earth, the Environmental Defense Fund, and, of course, the Sierra Club. Many environmental groups also engage in lobbying activity to a significant extent. The Sierra Club, for example, maintains full-time lobbyists not only in Washington, D.C., but also in several state capitals. One of the more potent lobbying efforts among the environmentalists is an organization known as Environmental Action, perhaps best known as originator of the so-called "Dirty Dozen" campaign against members of Congress rated as unsound on environmental issues.

In line with the national concern over energy questions, various components of the environmental complex also emphasize energy issues in their litigation, lobbying and other programs. Both EDF and FOE, for example, place significant stress on energy-related controversies, while NRDC is actively concerned with nuclear energy matters in particular. Another organization that is less well-known, the Energy Action Committee, engages in extensive lobbying activities on Capitol Hill in a major effort at countering what it regards as the undue influence of the oil and gas industry on national energy policy. Other membership organizations place primary emphasis on conservation of land and wildlife. Such groups as the National and Massachusetts Audubon Societies, the National Wildlife Federation, the National Parks and Conservation Association, and the Wilderness Society are especially prominent in this area; another is the Nature Conservancy.

The professional organizations are similar to the membership groups insofar as areas of emphasis and activity are concerned. The Conservation Foundation, for example, deals with such issues as land use and energy, while the Environmental Policy Center specializes in legislation on energy and water development matters. Other professional groups are the Scientists' Institute for Public Information, which includes public health among its concerns, and Worldwatch Institute, which covers a broad range of issues from population to nuclear power to food and hunger.

On the basis of even so sketchy a recitation as the above, certain facts emerge with some clarity. It is, for example, obvious that there exists a considerable overlapping of interests among the various types of groups which comprise the environmental complex; and the fact is that there has been a significant degree of cooperation among these organizations over the years on matters of mutual interest. There is also the usual interlocking directorate of board members, officers and supporters.

One of the most significant aspects of environmentalist activity, however, is not evident on the face of it; and that is the tendency of a respectable number of groups within the environmental complex to rely upon far more than simple membership fees and contributions for the funding which makes all the litigation and other activity possible. As with other organizations discussed in earlier Heritage Foundation Institution Analysis studies, many of America's most powerful environmental activist groups rely on grants from the nation's tax-exempt foundations for a large -- and, in some cases, a very large -- proportion of their income. In some cases, it appears fair to state that were it not for support derived from these foundations, there would be a serious question as to whether certain groups could continue to function.

With this in mind, it must also be observed that to recount in detail the relevant information on all of the foregoing organizations would clearly be beyond the scope of a study such as this.



It must be sufficient for the purposes of this study to set forth the salient facts with respect to a reasonable selection of these groups so that by understanding the operations of representative members of the environmental complex, we may better grasp the nature of the movement as a whole.

Because of its leadership, the nature of its work, and the extent of its impact, to say nothing of the degree of its dependence upon money from certain of America's major tax-exempt foundations, there is no better organization with which to begin this study than the Natural Resources Defense Council.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

One of the more prominent and effective environmentally-oriented organizations of those currently active in the United States is the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). Incorporated in the state of New York on February 3, 1970, NRDC bills itself in one of its promotional brochures as "a nonprofit legal and scientific organization dedicated to protecting our natural resources and improving the quality of the human environment." The same source further describes the group as having "established a distinguished record" of "winning legal victories in the courts, forcing government agencies to act, and educating the public on environmental issues."

NRDC is the largest environmental law firm in the United States and has offices in New York, New York; Washington, D.C.; and Palo Alto, California. The organization operates with "a professional staff of over twenty lawyers, scientists, and other specialists" whose actions "are directed by a board of trustees which includes men and women from all sectors of our society." A recent list of members of the NRDC Board of Trustees follows:

Stephen P. Duggan, Chairman  
 James Marshall, Vice Chairman  
 Dr. George M. Woodwell, Vice Chairman  
 Dr. Dean E. Abrahamson  
 Mrs. Louis Auchincloss  
 Boris I. Bittker  
 Frederick A. Collins, Jr.  
 Dr. Rene J. Dubos  
 James B. Frankel  
 Robert W. Gilmore  
 Lady Jackson, D.B.E.  
 Hamilton F. Kean  
 Dr. Joshua Lederberg  
 Anthony Mazzocchi  
 Paul N. McCloskey, Jr.  
 Eleanor Holmes Norton  
 Owen Olpin

Franklin E. Parker  
 Dr. Gifford B. Pinchot  
 Charles B. Rangel  
 Robert Redford  
 John R. Robinson  
 Laurance Rockefeller  
 J. Willard Roosevelt  
 Whitney North Seymour, Jr.  
 David Sive  
 Beatrice Abbott Duggan, U.N. Representative  
 John H. Adams, Executive Director

As claimed by NRDC, the members of the board of trustees do indeed constitute a varied group, although it may be a bit overblown to claim that they represent "all sectors of our society." The Chairman, Stephen P. Duggan, is an attorney in New York City who has, among other activities, served as a trustee of the Institute of International Education since 1950. From 1939 through 1958, Duggan served also as a trustee of the New School for Social Research in New York. He has been Chairman of the NRDC Board since the organization's inception in 1970. That the members of the NRDC Board of Trustees are people of prominence within their respective professions may be seen from the following random sampling:

- \* Mrs. Louis Auchincloss is the wife of the eminent author.
- \* Boris I. Bittker has, since 1970, been Sterling Professor of Law at the prestigious Yale Law School.
- \* Dr. Rene J. Dubos of New York City is a renowned bacteriologist who received a Pulitzer Prize in 1969.
- \* Dr. Joshua Lederberg, educator and research scientist, has been a professor of genetics at the Stanford School of Medicine since 1959. He received the Nobel Prize in Physiology and Medicine in 1958 for his researches in the genetics of bacteria.
- \* Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., represents the 17th District of California in the U.S. House of Representatives and also serves as a member of the steering committee of Members of Congress for Peace through Law (MCPL) for the 95th Congress.
- \* Charles B. Rangel, who represents the 18th District of New York in the House of Representatives, is an active member of both MCPL and the Congressional Black Caucus, a left-liberal organization of black members of Congress.
- \* Robert Redford is, in addition to being an actor of some note, a prominent environmental activist, as is his wife Lola Redford.

- \* Laurance Rockefeller is both a business executive and an ardent conservationist who has received numerous awards for his conservation work over the years. His many positions have included the following: Chairman, Rockefeller Brothers Fund; Chairman, Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, 1969-1973; President, American Conservation Association; President, Jackson Hole Preserve; President, Palisades Interstate Park Commission; Chairman, New York Zoological Society; and Chairman, White House Conference on Natural Beauty, 1965.
- \* Whitney North Seymour, Jr., an author and attorney, served from 1970 through 1973 as United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York. He has also served as a member of the New York State Legislature.
- \* David Sive, also an attorney, has been an adjunct associate professor in the graduate division of New York University Law School since 1963 in addition to being active in environmental matters at the state and national levels. His many positions have included the following: member, Legal Advisory Committee, Presidential Council on Environmental Quality; member, Board of Directors and Executive Committee, Friends of the Earth; Secretary and member, Board of Directors, John Muir Institute; Chairman, Environmental Law Institute; Chairman, Committee on Environmental Law, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, 1968-1972; and National Director and Chairman of the Atlantic Chapter, Sierra Club, 1968-1969.

As has been the case with a number of other liberal organizations and institutions, perhaps most notably the Brookings Institution, NRDC has experienced the phenomenon of having several of its people move into the Carter Administration, a development which is obviously indicative of a policy of drawing upon liberal activists for staffing of key administration posts. The January/February 1977 issue of the NRDC Newsletter, for example, carries the following item:

Two NRDC staff attorneys have been appointed to posts in the Carter Administration where they could have an important influence on the nation's environmental policies.

Gus (J. Gustave) Speth, who has been with NRDC since its founding in 1970, is leaving to become one of the three members of the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The CEQ is the President's chief advisory body on environmental matters, and President Carter has indicated that it will play a much greater role in policy-making in his Administration than it has in the past.



Rick (Richard) Cotton, a lawyer with NRDC since 1974, has been appointed as a special assistant to Joseph Califano, Secretary for Health, Education and Welfare. The post will give him an opportunity to play a role in formulating policies on major environmental health issues, because of HEW's jurisdiction over a number of matters relating to environmental and public health.

NRDC's loss is the nation's gain. \* \* \* \*

A similar article appears in the March/April/May/June 1977 issue of the Newsletter. The article, "Four More NRDC Attorneys Captured by Government," reads as follows:

The Carter Administration continues to look to the public interest field for talent and innovation, and it continues to look to NRDC to fill high environmental and legal positions within the government. Our latest losses to the Administration:

JOHN LESHY, an attorney with us since 1973, has been appointed Associate Solicitor for Energy and Resources in the Interior Department. While with NRDC, John specialized in forestry, coal leasing, and public lands issues.

DAVID HAWKINS has closed (we hope only temporarily) a 7-year career with the organization, during which he devoted nearly all of his efforts to the fight for clean air, to become Assistant Administrator for Air and Waste Management in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. It gives us great satisfaction to note that he is now the chief air pollution officer of the United States

RICHARD HALL, who left NRDC two years ago but has continued to work closely with us, has been appointed a special consultant to the Interior Department's Surface Mining Project.

FRANK TUERKHEIMER, who was in charge of NRDC's new Midwest office in Madison, Wisconsin, has been made U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin.

We \* \* \* wish them every success in what will be a time of great excitement and promise for the environmental cause.

It is apparent from the above two items that NRDC has high hopes for the advancement of its primary concerns because of these appointments of its legal activists to Administration positions by President Carter. With this in mind, it becomes appropriate to ask oneself just what these concerns are.

An undated but recent promotional letter makes it clear that one of NRDC's principal areas of activity lies in trying to "apply the brakes to the frightening spread of nuclear technology" which,

in the view of NRDC Executive Director John H. Adams, who signed the letter, "has acquired a powerful momentum of its own." Adams describes NRDC as "the principal organization putting sustained legal pressure on the U.S. Government and on international agencies to bring the proliferation problem under control." The following paragraphs from Adams' letter are illustrative of the main thrust of NRDC's efforts:

NRDC has taken the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to court for failing to scrutinize the consequences of shipping nuclear technology and fuel to India which recently exploded its first atomic weapon, and to Germany, which plans to sell the complete nuclear fuel cycle technology to Brazil.

NRDC's leadership remains central in the effort to lessen our own future dependence on unneeded, expensive, and potentially dangerous nuclear energy. Our thoughtful opposition to the construction of the Clinch River breeder reactor, an enormously costly, government-subsidized demonstration reactor, has forced the decision-makers to reconsider such ill-conceived projects. In addition, we have helped shape a constructive public debate on the desirability of the "plutonium economy of the future" envisioned by nuclear technocrats.

We have kept up a sustained effort which is finally being rewarded, to alter drastically the spending priorities of the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA). In fiscal year 1978, ERDA plans to cut funding for the breeder reactor program by a substantial \$200 million and make energy conservation a first-order priority and by far the best answer to the energy crisis.

It is NRDC's contention "that there is a better path to follow" and that it will lead to what NRDC's John H. Adams calls "a future of slow energy growth, tight conservation measures, and research and development of energy 'income' technologies such as solar, geothermal and wind." Adams concedes that such developments "may not prove to be the complete energy answer" but argues that "they will help reduce our dependence on methods which drain relentlessly our dwindling energy capital of oil and natural gas."

NRDC's overriding concern with nuclear energy is reflected in one of the group's recent promotional brochures which refers to "Safeguarding this and future generations from nuclear contamination and catastrophe" as "one of the most serious problems facing the world today." The same source cites two specific examples of NRDC legal activity aimed at this presumed problem:

- \* In May 1976 NRDC won a court order halting all licensing of the commercial use of plutonium until a nationwide plutonium policy is formulated through public hearings.



- \* NRDC has intervened in two federal export licensing proceedings involving a shipment of nuclear fuel to India and a plan to supply South Africa with reactors and fuel.

NRDC is also vitally interested in public health issues, believing that "Each year we discover more links between pollutants in our environment and disease." Arguing that "effective control of potentially dangerous chemical substances and other toxic agents is essential." for our health, NRDC states that scientists "now estimate that 75% to 90% of human cancers are related to environmental factors." Claiming to base its efforts "on scientific evidence," the organization describes some of its activities in this area as follows:

- \* Our Environmental Carcinogens Project is working to prevent or reduce the presence of cancer-inducing substances in the workplace and in food, air, and water.
- \* We have won a comprehensive court order requiring EPA to develop and enforce strict regulation of discharges of toxic pollutants into the nation's waters.

Two other broad areas of special interest to NRDC are "the protection of wilderness and wildlife" and "the man-made environment" of the cities. In the former area, NRDC has obtained a court order which requires the Forest Service "to consider wilderness values" before it undertakes "to develop several million acres of roadless, primitive areas in our national forests" and has also worked "to reduce predator poisoning," which results in the deaths of many animals "and further threatens rare species such as the eagle." Also, the organization states that its "fight against water pollution" has been responsible for the "extension of federal protection to 75%" of our wetlands. In the latter area, NRDC has been active in trying to effect legal remedies for the problems of "Dangerously polluted air and the erosion of mass transportation" in our cities. NRDC claims that as a result of its lawsuits, federal courts have

- \* Required the federal government to assure that the states develop programs to control automobile-related air pollution in major metropolitan areas.
- \* Ordered New York City and New York State to enforce their own plan to reduce automobile-related air pollution.

NRDC describes its "citizen constituency" as "a key element in our success" and as "the critical ingredient that makes NRDC a powerful force for environmental protection and a vital participant in the democratic process." Current membership is approximately 35,000; there does not appear to be any set membership fee, although the organization does actively solicit contributions of



anywhere from \$15 to \$1,000. All contributions are tax-deductible because NRDC is classified as a public interest law firm and qualifies for tax-exemption under provisions of Sections 501(c)(3) and 509(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

NRDC's financial picture is an interesting one. The initial funding for the organization consisted of a grant of \$100,000 from the Ford Foundation, and foundation support has been of significant magnitude ever since, as will shortly be demonstrated. The current annual budget for NRDC is set at some \$1,900,000, a figure which indicates considerable growth since the initial \$100,000 from Ford in 1970. It also represents a not inconsiderable increase since 1975 when, according to the organization's year-end balance sheet, there were total expenses of some \$1,696,222.

The December 31, 1975, NRDC balance sheet provides a detailed look at the income and expenses of one of the environmental movement's most potent organizations. Public support, derived from foundations and contributions, amounted to \$1,763,558, which was broken down as follows:

General Fund	\$ 646,354
Ford Foundation Fund	400,000
Western Office Fund	104,000
<u>Restricted Funds</u>	<u>613,204</u>
Total public support	\$1,763,558

Of this amount, \$583,031 was derived from contributions and \$1,180,527 consisted of support from foundations. Additional income was listed under the heading of "Revenue" and amounted to a total of \$46,878, broken down as follows:

Interest	\$ 26,855
Court-awarded fees	14,655
<u>Other</u>	<u>5,368</u>
Total revenue	\$ 46,878

The total income for 1975 categorized as public support and revenue -- \$1,763,558 and \$46,878 -- provided the NRDC with funds in the aggregate amount of \$1,810,436.

Expenses listed were of two general types: program services and supporting services. Program services totaled \$1,155,547 and were of the following sorts:

Environmental litigation	\$ 926,204
Scientific support	147,409
Public education	63,584
<u>Intern program</u>	<u>18,350</u>
Total program services	\$1,155,547

Supporting services amounted to far less, totaling \$536,675:

Management and general	\$ 192,630
<u>Fund raising</u>	<u>344,045</u>
Total supporting services	\$ 536,675

Between program services (\$1,155,547) and supporting services (\$536,675), total expenses for NRDC for the year ending December 31, 1975, were in the amount of \$1,692,222, as previously noted. The "Excess (deficiency) of public support and revenue over expenses" was \$118,214.

As indicated above, support from foundations has obviously been crucial to NRDC's operations from the beginning; this is certainly demonstrated in the NRDC balance sheet for December 31, 1975, although available records indicate a pattern of substantial giving by major tax-exempt foundations during each succeeding year.

During 1972, for example, as shown by listings in the 1972 edition of the Foundation Center's authoritative Foundation Grants Index, there were major grants to NRDC in the following amounts: \$450,000 from the Josephine H. McIntosh Foundation, located in Florida, as a three-year grant to establish a branch for environmental legal activities in Palo Alto, California; \$10,000 from the Rockefeller Family Fund of New York for unspecified purposes; and \$765,000 from the Ford Foundation, also of New York, to monitor governmental and private agencies on their compliance with the Environmental Protection Act.

The listings of major grants to NRDC from tax-exempt foundations in the 1973, 1974, 1975, and 1976 editions of the Index are also of some considerable interest, providing, as they do, a valuable indication of NRDC's principal sources of tax-exempt foundation support, as well as a complementary indication of the breadth of NRDC's activities thus supported. These listings appear below and include, where specified, the dates on which the grants were authorized and the purposes for which they were made by the granting institution:

- \* \$15,000 from the Public Welfare Foundation, Washington, D.C., December 9, 1972, for unspecified purposes.
- \* \$12,500 from the Rockefeller Family Fund, New York, New York, December 27, 1972, for general purposes including litigation and negotiation with administrative bodies, training of student interns, monitoring of environmental impacts, and cooperative efforts with conservation and governmental organizations.
- \* \$15,000 from the Public Welfare Foundation, May 11, 1974, "For Clean Air Project."

- \* \$5,000 from the Abelard Foundation, New York, New York, July 30, 1973, toward establishment of a project to defend environmental quality of Catskill Adirondack Mountain regions in New York against unplanned development.
- \* \$800,000 from the Ford Foundation, New York, New York, April 1974, for public representation in environmental issues.
- \* \$25,000 from the Rockefeller Family Fund, October 29, 1973, toward the budget of the Adirondack-Catskill Land Use Monitoring Project "which is engaged in research, monitoring and litigation functions in effort to keep pace with social impacts resulting from development of New York's two great Forest Preserve parks."
- \* \$15,000 from the J. M. Kaplan Fund, New York, New York, 1975, for unspecified purposes.
- \* \$10,000 from the Edward John Noble Foundation, New York, New York, February 10, 1975, for general support.
- \* \$30,000 from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, New York, New York, May 5, 1975, for assistance to foreign environmental groups through provisions of technical information.
- \* \$25,000 from the Rockefeller Family Fund, May 8, 1974, to launch the California Coastal Advocacy Project to engage in legal, research, and consultative activities concerning regional commissions created under provisions of the California Coastal Zone Conservation Act.
- \* \$25,000 from the Rockefeller Family Fund, October 18, 1974, for research and litigation activities in the interest of mitigating the impact of development of New York's two great forest preserve parks.
- \* \$30,000 from the Western New York Foundation, Buffalo, New York, 1974, to support the Stream Channelization program.
- \* \$10,000 from the Clark Foundation, New York, New York, May 13, 1975, for general purposes.
- \* \$15,000 from the Ottinger Foundation, New York, New York, February 28, 1976, for a project on nuclear proliferation.
- \* \$25,000 from the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, 1975, "For project on clean water and project to save our streams."



- \* \$6,000 from the George F. Baker Trust, New York, New York, 1974, for general support.
- \* \$25,000 from the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, New York, New York, 1975, for efforts of attorneys, scientists, and staff to represent the public interest in environmental protection.
- \* \$15,000 from the Clark Foundation, May 11, 1976, for general purposes.
- \* \$5,000 from the Compton Foundation, New York, New York, December 31, 1975, for unspecified purposes.
- \* \$340,000 from the Ford Foundation, May 1976, for public interest litigation in such areas as offshore oil development, national resource management, and land use.
- \* \$15,000 from the Edward John Noble Foundation, December 8, 1975, for general support.
- \* \$10,000 from the Norman Foundation, New York, New York, 1975, for a "campaign to increase income derived from membership of law firm litigating on environmental issues."
- \* \$25,000 from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, January 29, 1976, for a project in management of animal and plant species and rain forests in tropical Africa, Asia, and Latin America.
- \* \$25,000 from the Rockefeller Family Fund, June 27, 1975, for the California Coastal Advocacy Project.

The January 29, 1976, grant of \$25,000 from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund is probably the same as the "generous grant from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund" which was made to NRDC in January 1976 and which, according to the January/February 1977 issue of the NRDC Newsletter, enabled NRDC to hire Dr. Norman Myers, who has served as consultant to the World Wildlife Fund, the World Bank, and the United Nations Environment Program, "to undertake a special Project on Threatened Species and Genetic Resources." According to the same source,

This project is one of several NRDC programs conducted under the auspices of our International Project. Legal and educational efforts to slow nuclear proliferation and a campaign to foster stronger environmental policies within the United Nations are two other important sides of our work at the international level. The International Project is under the direction of staff attorney Thomas B. Stoel, Jr. and project attorneys Ruby Compton and Jacob Scherr.

Beatrice A. Duggan, who has worked extensively with United Nations programs, serves as NRDC's United Nations Representative.

From the foregoing discussion, certain conclusions seem relatively obvious. It is clear that the Natural Resources Defense Council is one of the country's major environmental activist organizations and that it interlocks with others to a significant degree. It is equally clear that the NRDC's growth since its formation in 1970 has been made possible to a notable extent by the considerable largess bestowed upon the organization by a number of America's major tax-exempt foundations. To the extent that NRDC has been able to win major victories in the courts, to affect the formulation and execution of the nation's environmental policies, and even to expand its operations into the international arena, it owes a very real debt of gratitude to some of the most powerful members of the foundation complex.

#### ADDENDUM

The NRDC's Annual Report 1976/77 provides valuable information which serves to supplement the foregoing. The board of trustees list is the same as that cited above, the exceptions being the addition of Michael McIntosh as a third vice chairman and the addition of Alvin M. Josephy, Jr., and Thomas A. Troyer. Lady Jackson is listed under her better-known name, Barbara Ward. The report includes sections on "Clean Air," "Transportation," "Environmental Carcinogens," "Clean Water," "Energy," "The Coastal Zone," "The International Environment," and "Wilderness & Wildlife," all of which demonstrate that NRDC has enjoyed significant success in a large number of its major projects. A general overview is included as "A Message From the Chairman of NRDC's Board of Trustees," and it contains the following passage:

Yet, in many ways, the outlook for the environment is brighter today than it has been in a long time. We have a new Administration in Washington which has demonstrated, early on, a strong interest in conservation in the broadest sense of the word. Awareness of environmental issues is higher than ever before. Tough laws have been passed to clean up our air and water, and, despite substantial delays and some modifications, efforts to render the laws ineffective have repeatedly failed.

The NRDC report is replete with examples of what the organization clearly sees as real impact on government policy. The 1976 NRDC lawsuit in the case of NRDC v. EPA, to cite but one instance, resulted in an EPA commitment "to an extensive research program on arsenic emission control," while in January 1977, after five years

of litigation, "NRDC was rewarded by a court decision requiring New York City to enforce its transportation control plan."

NRDC claims to "have become widely recognized as the chief environmental spokesman on clean air issues" and to have "played a key role" in "supporting federal action to move all sources of pollution into compliance with the mandate to achieve clean water." Related to the latter broad issue are NRDC's efforts in promoting land use planning. According to the report for 1976,

In response to an NRDC law suit (NRDC v. Train), EPA has greatly expanded the scope of its land use planning requirements beyond the regulation of a few urban areas to include virtually every watershed in the U.S. With this powerful new tool for sensible land use policies in hand, members of NRDC's staff have written a guide which explains how citizens can get involved in their community planning. The handbook will be widely distributed by the National Wildlife Federation in 1977.

NRDC's efforts, as previously indicated, have been concentrated especially on nuclear and other energy questions. The 1976 report refers to the Carter Administration's "national energy policy incorporating many of the principles NRDC has fought for since its founding." It also emphasizes, as does so much other NRDC literature, the concept of "an environmentally sound energy policy stressing conservation and increasing efficiency, clean coal, and a number of solar technologies which would keep our dependence on nuclear fission to an absolute minimum." NRDC's activities in this area have included opposition to the Clinch River breeder reactor in Tennessee, among other things, and a lawsuit which resulted in a May 1976 U.S. Court of Appeals decision prohibiting "the use of plutonium as a reactor fuel until a full review of the risks of plutonium 'recycling' is completed." The case has been appealed to the United States Supreme Court.

In the international sphere, according to the report, NRDC's efforts "have been steadily expanding" since 1972. The organization has "taken an active interest in a proposal by Japanese interests to build a giant supertanker port and refinery" on one of the Micronesian islands. It has also "petitioned the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to use its statutory authority to set aside a substantial part" of these waters "as a marine sanctuary" and also "remains active as a non-governmental organization working closely with the United Nations Environment Programme on a broad variety of matters."

The 1976 list of NRDC publications is of special interest because it shows a continuing relationship between NRDC and agencies of the United States government directly concerned with our national environmental policies. One such volume (Who's Minding the Shore? A Citizen's Guide to Coastal Zone Management) was prepared by NRDC for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric



Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce, while a second work (Choosing an Electrical Energy Future for the Pacific Northwest: An Alternate Scenario) was prepared by NRDC, partially funded by the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA), and sponsored jointly by the Sierra Club Foundation, the Oregon Environmental Foundation, and the Northwest Fund for the Environment.

As noted previously, NRDC's total income and expense figures for 1975 were, respectively, \$1,810,436 and \$1,692,222. The figures for 1976 reflect significant growth in both categories. Income, for example, is recorded in the following amounts:

Foundations	\$1,247,856
Contributions	684,874
Special Events	48,310
Interest	22,931
Other	32,826
	<hr/>
Total Income	\$2,036,797

Expenses as of December 31, 1976, on the other hand, were recorded as follows:

Environmental litigation	\$1,090,772
Scientific support	164,823
Public education	103,225
Intern program	20,312
Management and general	272,847
Fund Raising	387,612
	<hr/>
Total Expenses	\$2,039,591

Thus, as of December 31, 1976, the NRDC recorded an excess in expenditures of \$2,794 as opposed to the 1975 surplus in income over expenses of \$118,214.

## FRIENDS OF THE EARTH

One of the most far-flung of all environmental activist organizations is Friends of the Earth (FOE). Founded in 1969, FOE claims a membership of some 25,000 people. Among its principal publications are the Energy Papers, a series on Celebrating the Earth, and another series on The Earth's Wild Places; there is also a twice-monthly newspaper, Not Man Apart, described by the organization's president, David Brower, as "the best source of environmental news and comment available."

According to a listing in the November 1977 issue of Not Man Apart, Friends of the Earth maintains its principal United States offices in New York, New York; San Francisco, California; Seattle, Washington; and Washington, D.C., the last facility serving as FOE's legislative office. Staff people in charge of these offices are, respectively, Lorna Salzman, Lisa Wang, Dale Jones, and Jeffrey Knight. FOE "Field Offices" are maintained in the following cities under the direction of the people listed:

- \* Billings, Montana (Edward Dobson)
- \* Boston, Massachusetts (Ann Roosevelt)
- \* Columbia, Missouri (Don Pierce)
- \* Moab, Utah (Gordon Anderson)
- \* Denver, Colorado (Kevin Markey)
- \* Fairbanks, Alaska (Jim Kowalsky)
- \* Sacramento, California (Michael Storper)
- \* London, England (Amory B. Lovins)
- \* Paris, France (Edwin Matthews, Jr.)

There are also what FOE calls "Sister Organizations" in the following countries: England, France, Sweden, Germany, New Zealand, Canada, Ireland, Yugoslavia, El Salvador, Australia, Thailand, Holland, and Belgium.

FOE's officers include David R. Brower, President and Chief Operating Officer; Jeffrey Foote, Vice President; Alan Gussow, Vice President; and John Clarke, Secretary-Treasurer. These four officers also serve as members of the organization's executive committee, as do six of the group's directors: Anne H. Ehrlich, Roderick Nash, Gayle Nin Rosenkrantz, and Fredric P. Sutherland of California; Dan R. Reece of Oregon; and David Sive of New York.

A complete list of FOE's directors appears below:

George Alderson, District of Columbia  
 Rick Applegate, Montana  
 Mildred Blake, New York  
 Holly Cobb, Colorado  
 Raymond F. Dasmann, California  
 Anne H. Ehrlich, California  
 Daniel Luten, California  
 Edwin S. Matthews, Jr., France  
 Roderick Nash, California  
 Richard W. Nathan, New York  
 Stewart M. Ogilvy, New York  
 Richard L. Ottinger, District of Columbia  
 Dan R. Reece, Oregon  
 Abby Rockefeller, Massachusetts  
 Gayle Nin Rosenkrantz, California  
 Helen Severinghaus, New York  
 David Sive, New York  
 Christine Stevens, District of Columbia  
 Fredric P. Sutherland, California  
 Gordon Wright, Alaska

FOE's staff is a large one. The editor of Not Man Apart is Stephanie Mills, and the managing editor is Jamie Nelson. The others listed as staff for this publication include Anne Bartz, Carol McNally, Rico Mendez, Hugh Nash, John Prestianni, and Eleanor Smith. The staff for FOE itself are as follows:

Jim Adams, Assistant to the President  
 Andrew Baldwin, Legal Director  
 Peggy Berscheid, Membership Director  
 David Chatfield, International Liaison  
 Bruce Colman, Assistant for Publishing  
 Ruth Easton, Book Sales  
 Philip Evans, European Production Consultant  
 Jeff Knight, Legislative Director  
 Pam Lippe, Legislative Assistant  
 Amory Lovins, UK (United Kingdom) Representative  
 Steve Lyons, Roving Editor  
 David Ortman, Research Associate  
 Connie Parrish, California Representative  
 Rafe Pomerance, Associate Legislative Director  
 Mark Reis, Assistant Legislative Director  
 Pam Rich, Alaska Coordinator  
 David Ross, Energy Projects Director  
 Ron Rudolph, Energy Coordinator  
 Patricia Sarr, International Assistant  
 Marion Sherk, Comptroller  
 Tom Turner, Administrative Director  
 Jerome Waldie, Washington Representative  
 Anne Wickham, Conservation Director  
 Ellen Widass, Labor Liaison  
 Chuck Williams, National Parks Representative



As one generally finds with activist organizations, Friends of the Earth boasts an advisory body, the membership of which has obviously been carefully drawn from diverse areas of the nation's professional life, a device commonly used to help foster the impression that a group is truly representative of significant segments of public opinion. Included are eminent writers, men of science, environmentalists, and others, including a number of people from various branches of the entertainment industry. Below will be found a complete list of those currently serving as members of the FOE Advisory Council, as shown by the November 1977 issue of Not Man Apart:

Cleveland Amory	Tom McCall
Ian Ballantine	Karl Menninger
Candice Bergen	Stephanie Mills
Harrison Brown	Noel Mostert
Charles Callison	Paul Newman
Lord Caradon	Basil A. Paterson
Norman Cousins	Linus Pauling
Jacques Cousteau	Aurelio Peccei
Herman Daly	George Plimpton
Raymond F. Dasmann	Eliot Porter
John Denver	Robert Redford
Paul Ehrlich	Pete Seeger
Merlie Evers	Rodney Shaw
James Farmer	Neil Simon
Alfred Forsyth	C. P. Snow
Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen	Gary Snyder
Milton Glaser	Gary Soucie
Hazel Henderson	Maurice Strong
David R. Inglis	Albert Szent-Gyorgyi
Betty Leslie-Melville	Lewis Thomas
Martin Litton	Harriet Van Horne
Konrad Lorenz	George Wald
Jerry Mander	Joanne Woodward

Friends of the Earth, like almost all such groups, reflects the principle of the interlocking directorate, a fact readily demonstrated by reference to a few of the organization's key leaders. FOE President David R. Brower, for example, has also served as the chief paid executive of the Sierra Club and presently is a prominent member of the Steering Committee of the League of Conservation Voters, an environmentally-oriented political action group with headquarters in Washington, D.C. It is further noted that FOE staff member Rafe Pomerance, FOE Board of Directors member George Alderson, and FOE Advisory Council member Gary Soucie also serve on the LCV Steering Committee.

As indicated above, FOE is a decidedly activist organization which uses a variety of means to attack a broad range of environmental issues. A solicitation letter circulated in late 1976 and signed by FOE President David Brower describes the range of FOE's activities in the following language:

- \* lobbying and testifying before Congress and state legislatures
- \* influencing executive decisions by providing information to administrative agencies
- \* publishing -- an excellent newspaper, a regular nuclear information sheet, a series of studies of energy problems, large format photographic books, films, pamphlets -- all to improve the quality of information about the quality of life
- \* speaking out -- widening the conservation constituency by active participation in meetings and conferences
- \* when all else fails, going to court -- suing to ensure that the environmental laws of the land are upheld

The environmental issues to which FOE has devoted these energies are varied. They include stripmining, clean air, clear-cutting, stream channelization, preservation of the Florida Everglades, lobbying against the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, and the protection of such endangered species as the whale. FOE literature reflects claims of leadership in coalitions on strip mining and stream channelization issues, along with a similar claim to having organized and directed the campaign against the supersonic transport (SST). Legislative controversies in which FOE has played a significant part include control of pesticides, so-called "in-plant environmental problems" or industry, water pollution abatement policy, opposition to "superfluous highways," reform of forest management, and the Clean Air Act of 1970.

As noted in the introduction to this study, there exists within the environmental complex a strong community of interest which leads to considerable cooperation on matters of mutual concern. This is as true of Friends of the Earth as it is of other such groups. In mounting litigation to bring about a review of the Alaska Pipeline project, for example, FOE combined with such like-minded organizations as the Wilderness Society and the Environmental Defense Fund; another major lawsuit found FOE working in conjunction with two other powerful groups, the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council, in opposition to offshore leases in the Gulf of Mexico.

More recently, FOE has, in line with the environmental movement in general, become extremely concerned with questions of nuclear energy development, even to the extent of initiating an international coalition to seek a moratorium on the construction and operation of nuclear reactors until greater safety can be achieved in the disposition of nuclear waste material. Actually, however, it appears that FOE's policy on nuclear energy is one of total opposition, as indicated by the following passage from FOE President David Brower's late 1976 solicitation letter:



\* \* \* Right now one of our most important activities is making sure that the light at the end of the energy tunnel is the sun, and not a nuclear reactor melting down.

We've shown leadership in suggesting that we just skip nuclear power altogether, and get on with developing safe, lasting energy sources -- solar and wind power. We've helped make the point that energy conservation will actually create jobs, not cost them. We're convinced that nuclear power just isn't worth it. It entails risks that no one can afford.

Not surprisingly, FOE's anti-nuclear argument is also couched in terms of the danger of war. Claiming that FOE "doesn't want to stop progress," Brower emphasizes such benefits to society as clean air and water, "the chance to enjoy wildness, and most importantly, the possibility of lasting peace. We've already seen how easily the peaceful atom can be turned to purposes of war." What this appears to indicate is a rejection of the traditional arguments for peaceful as opposed to military uses of atomic energy and the adoption instead of a completely anti-nuclear posture by an organization which is certainly among the most important of all groups which make up the environmental complex.

FOE's strong opposition to all nuclear development assumes added significance when one considers the information recounted in an article appearing in the November 14, 1977, issue of Newsweek. According to this source, FOE British representative Amory Lovins "has become one of the Western world's most influential energy thinkers." Population biologist Paul Ehrlich, a member of the FOE Advisory Council, has gone so far as to describe Lovins' Foreign Affairs essay, "Energy Strategy: The Road Not Taken?", which has recently been expanded into a book, as no less than "the most influential single work on energy policy written in the last five years."

The Newsweek account tells of Lovins' returning from a session on St. Simons Island "where he had addressed a group of Federal energy planners. A few days earlier, he had been in Washington, conferring with top Administration officials -- including Jimmy Carter, who invited him to the White House for a chat." He has also lectured, consulted, debated, and testified in numerous cities across the country to campaign against what he calls the "hard path" of our energy development, advocating instead a "soft" one, the distinction being between electric power systems depending on fossil fuels and nuclear energy and those which, coupled with "technical fixes" to cut energy waste by half, rely primarily on non-nuclear power sources such as solar and wind energy.

That the anti-nuclear energy arguments of FOE's Amory Lovins are receiving a sympathetic hearing at the highest levels of the



Carter Administration is clearly indicated by the following concluding passage from the Newsweek piece:

\* \* \* Indeed, the day after he talked with Lovins, President Carter told an international energy conference that the world should consider alternatives to nuclear power. While it would take a capital investment of \$200,000 to \$300,000 to produce a nuclear-energy capacity equivalent to one barrel of oil, Carter noted, "Recent studies I have read show that we can gain the equivalent of a barrel of oil per day by conservation at very little or no cost." The author of those studies: Amory Lovins.

One other element of FOE's current program may be of special interest. As shown by two items appearing in the November 1977 issue of Not Man Apart, the organization has become actively embroiled in the controversy over ratification of treaties affecting United States control of the Panama Canal. The gravamen of FOE's argument appears to be a concern that, in the words of FOE President Brower, "the treaty breathes new life into an almost-dead international environmental threat, the sea-level canal proposal." Brower's statement details a number of arguments against construction of such a new canal, characterized as "a project that has probably had more opposition from the nation's top scientists than any other water resource project." Brower claims FOE "takes no position for or against ratification of the new treaty," the reason being that "the central issues are not environmental ones." However, it would appear that, while opposing the provision in the treaty allowing for development of a new sea-level canal, Brower and the FOE are not unsympathetic to the principal thrust of the treaty. In the final paragraph of his statement, Brower reemphasizes the presumed need for the Senate to "make it very clear that it does not favor the sea-level canal project." He also states, however, that the "Senate should work its will on the Panama Canal Treaty on the basis of its principal purpose -- to resolve Panama's aspirations for control of the present canal and Canal Zone."

Another project reflects both the current interest in the Canal and the ability of environmentalists to coalesce around what they see as significant issues. On September 6, 1977, eleven national environmental groups sent a telegram to President Carter urging that the sea-level canal provision be eliminated from the treaty then being negotiated. Similar opposition had also been expressed to President Ford in 1975. The September 6 telegram relies heavily on the arguments advanced by unnamed "marine scientists" and on a 1970 National Academy of Sciences warning of "grave potential dangers" attendant on such a project. The list of signers of the telegram is indicative of the cooperation that is often found among members of the environmental complex:

- \* John W. Grandy IV, Executive Vice President, Defenders of Wildlife
- \* Peter Harnik, Coordinator, Environmental Action, Inc.
- \* Brent Blackwelder, Washington Representative, Environmental Policy Center
- \* Douglas W. Scott, Northwest Representative, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs
- \* David R. Brower, President, Friends of the Earth
- \* Lewis Regenstein, Executive Vice President, The Fund for Animals, Inc.
- \* Sir John G. Ward, President, International Society for the Protection of Animals
- \* Jack Lorenz, Executive Director, Izaak Walton League of America
- \* T. Destry Jarvis, Administrative Assistant, National Parks and Conservation Association
- \* Godfrey A. Rockefeller, Executive Director, World Wildlife Fund
- \* Celia Hunter, Executive Director, The Wilderness Society

To carry on its ambitious programs, FOE maintains a sizeable annual budget, currently estimated at some \$670,000. As an avowed lobbying group, the organization does not enjoy tax-exempt status; thus, contributions to FOE are not tax-deductible, and the group must rely primarily on membership fees and proceeds from the sale of its many books and other publications for operating revenue. According to the Environmental Agenda Task Force, FOE's current membership is 22,000; it is noted, however, that an employee in FOE's Washington, D.C., legislative office recently placed the figure at "about 25,000." Membership fees cover a fairly wide range: \$25 (Regular), \$35 (Supporting), \$60 (Contributing), \$100 (Sponsor), \$250 (Sustaining), \$1,000 (Life), and \$5,000 (Patron). There are also \$12 memberships for students and for low-income and retired people, while an additional \$5 per year is assessed for one's spouse.

#### FRIENDS OF THE EARTH FOUNDATION

Major support for FOE's efforts also comes, however, from the Friends of the Earth Foundation, FOE's tax-deductible arm established in 1972 for the conduct of research, education, publishing, and "public interest" litigation. Operating from

the same San Francisco headquarters address as does FOE, the foundation, in its December 1976 "Progress Report," describes itself in the following language:

The Foundation is a partner in the environmental alliance of which Friends of the Earth, the activist membership organization, has been a leader since its founding by David Brower in 1969.

Friends of the Earth and the Friends of the Earth Foundation share the same basic philosophies and the same distinguished Advisory Council. Their programs are complementary: Friends of the Earth lobbies aggressively, while the Foundation supports non-legislative projects. Friends of the Earth formed and led the coalition that defeated legislation to authorize an American SST, for example, while the Foundation fought the Anglo-French Concorde in administrative hearings and in court.

The foundation's principal officers are David R. Brower, who serves as president of both the foundation and FOE; Stewart Ogilvy, who serves as vice president of the FOE Foundation and as one of the directors of FOE itself; and Tom Turner, who serves as executive director of the foundation and as administrative director of FOE. Michael Slater and Dan Gabel are listed, respectively, as foundation secretary and treasurer, the two remaining staff people being Charles Bear and Avis Reynick Ogilvy.

A June 1977 fund-raising letter signed by David R. Brower as president states that Friends of the Earth Foundation programs work to

- \* investigate alternate energy sources and promote world-wide conservation so that the dangers of producing nuclear energy and the inordinate dependence on oil might become things of the past.
- \* bring about legal actions to fight measures that threaten our well-being -- measures, for example, that might result in more pollution of our air and water.
- \* protect the California condor, the great whale, the Utah prairie dogs, the red wolf and other endangered species that continue to be threatened with extinction.
- \* provide a foundation of facts to help guide decisions by government and industry in environmental matters.
- \* stem the tide of nuclear proliferation throughout the world so that citizens need not live in constant fear of a nuclear accident.



- \* prevent hunters from gunning down wolves and polar bears from the air.
- \* protect from despoilment one of the last remaining strongholds of wilderness splendor -- Alaska.
- \* train young people in environmental education, laws and research.
- \* make possible expert testimony at government hearings so that our decision-makers might heed environmentalists' views in their legislative decisions.

The FOE Foundation's discussion of issues and activities that form the core of its work frequently includes reference to foundation support for "FOE's non-legislative activities," thereby emphasizing the essentially interchangeable nature of the two organizations, at least insofar as the foundation's tax-exempt status permits. In Alaska, for example, FOE monitored pipeline construction "with Foundation support," while the foundation has also supported research and publicity work by FOE on offshore drilling and "the routing of natural gas pipelines," among other issues.

In addition to its militant opposition to the Concorde SST, the foundation has participated in numerous other activities related to the cities. In San Francisco, for example, the foundation was part of the opposition to doubling the capacity of the San Francisco International Airport. In New York City, it supported litigation to block the reconstruction of the West Side Highway and a lawsuit to bar construction of a huge convention center in Manhattan. The foundation has also, according to its 1976 report, "established a special fund to finance lawsuits to secure strict enforcement of the Clean Air Act; litigation under the fund has been notably successful."

The FOE Foundation has given considerable support to "non-legislative activities" conducted by Friends of the Earth to conserve a variety of endangered species. Priority has been given to protection of such species of the California condor, a bird thought to be almost extinct and whose habitat the foundation claims is seriously endangered by proposals for phosphate mining in the Los Padres National Forest. Special effort has been directed at a campaign to save the world's diminishing numbers of whales. The foundation financed a special issue of FOE's newsletter devoted to the whale controversy (foundation support for FOE publications in general appears to be considerable), while Tom Garrett, an activist from Wyoming who became wildlife director for FOE, "was instrumental in making a moratorium" on killing of whales "the official policy of the United States." According to the foundation's 1976 report, Garrett "has been appointed a US delegate to the International Whaling Commission since 1972 -- at times, the only non-governmental delegate."

The activities of the foundation in the energy field are, of course, extensive. Emphasizing the theme of conservation as the "cheapest source of energy," the foundation has supported "FOE's non-legislative activities" in opposition to oil shale development, synthetic fuels, superports, and supertankers, "all of which would cost more than they're worth environmentally, energetically, and economically." As alternatives to what it calls "exhaustible 'energy capital,'" the foundation urges the use of "solar energy and variations of it such as wind power." This is, it should be noted, precisely the formulation advanced in literature disseminated by FOE. Foundation-supported publishing efforts devoted to energy have included two works by Amory Lovins (World Energy Strategies and Non-Nuclear Futures) and a high school teaching sequence by Mark Terry and Paul Witt (Energy and Order), which "was published and distributed by the Foundation."

Related to its concern over energy issues is the foundation's active involvement in the anti-nuclear energy movement mounted by so many groups within the environmental complex. The foundation contends that nuclear power, because of the waste problem, "threatens all forms of life on earth." Its position, again, is precisely the same as that of its companion organization, Friends of the Earth. Foundation activism against nuclear power has included "support of FOE's liaison with other citizens' groups on the hazards of nuclear power" and the granting of money to FOE to make possible the publication of "a continuing commentary on nuclear affairs in FOE's fortnightly Not Man Apart." Foundation grants finance reprints of articles from the newsletter, and foundation support has gone toward publication of the nuclear power-related books by Lovins and two volumes (ECCS Hearings and The Nuclear Fuel Cycle) written by Henry Kendall and Daniel Ford of the Union of Concerned Scientists. A major portion of the foundation's activity in this area has been involvement in litigation, including serving as co-plaintiff with Ralph Nader in the case of Nader v. Ray.

The foundation claims that it and Friends of the Earth "are unique in the scope of their international interests and activities (emphasis in original)." Foundation money has helped FOE establish "namesake organizations with similar ideals and programs in a dozen countries of Africa, Asia, Australia, and Europe." Further, as shown by the foundation's 1976 report,

FOE International, the umbrella organization of national Friends of the Earth /sic/ groups, established an office in Nairobi with Foundation help. The Foundation also contributed toward the establishment of an Environmental Liaison Centre in Nairobi to serve the various non-governmental organizations working with the United Nations Environment Programme, which is headquartered there.







As these figures demonstrate, the foundation enjoyed an increase in its revenues between 1975 and 1976. There is nothing in the statements to indicate the specific nature or sources of the contributions.

Unlike revenues, expenses declined from 1975 to 1976. The statements reflect a total expense figure of \$325,980 for 1975; this includes \$252,856 for "Environmental Program Services," of which a total of \$115,765 was for grants. Of the \$115,765 listed as grants for 1975, \$61,266 went "to Friends of the Earth, Inc., for various tax-exempt environmental projects." As of June 30, 1976, however, total expenses were \$281,235, a decline of \$44,745 from the 1975 figure. "Environmental Program Services" for 1976 amounted to a total of \$213,001. This amount included \$64,841 in grants, of which \$39,122 was distributed to FOE "for various tax-exempt environmental projects."

It will doubtless occur to the reader that the amounts granted by the foundation specifically to Friends of the Earth during 1975 and 1976 are but a fraction of FOE's estimated annual budget of \$670,000. It should be borne in mind, however, that the foundation's activities, which have merely been selectively recounted in this study, relieve FOE of the necessity of having to defray such costs itself. The complementary programs of the FOE Foundation permit FOE to concentrate its efforts and allocate its expenses only on those areas of endeavor which, because they constitute lobbying activity, cannot be covered by a tax-exempt institution. This means that even though it is not tax-exempt itself, FOE derives a virtually incalculable benefit from being able to draw upon the many support services that can be provided by an organization like the FOE Foundation within the terms of the Internal Revenue Code.

The extent to which this tax-exempt foundation is crucial to the maintenance of FOE's activist program is reflected in the following language in David Brower's June 1977 solicitation mailing:

One more thing: The research you help make possible through your Foundation support is the very lifeblood of Friends of the Earth, the Foundation's activist companion organization that lobbies in Washington and in state legislatures on environmental issues.

A later passage from the same letter reinforces the point even more strongly and is, in addition, vividly indicative of the bias of both Friends of the Earth and its affiliated foundation:

Without the vital resources provided by the Foundation, Friends of the Earth could not lobby effectively...could not influence executive decisions on key environmental matters...could not actively oppose the millions of dollars big business spends in defense of its self-serving interests.

## CONSERVATION FOUNDATION

Of the "professional" organizations within the environmental complex, one of the most significant is certainly the Conservation Foundation, which has its headquarters in Washington, D.C. The Foundation is aptly described in a "Background Statement" prepared by William K. Reilly, foundation president, in connection with a conference held in Colorado Springs, Colorado, in November 1977:

Since its founding in 1948, The Conservation Foundation has encouraged wise use of the earth's resources -- its air, water, land, and energy. Nonprofit and nonmembership, the Foundation emphasizes environmental policy research and communication in several program areas: land use and urban growth, including urban conservation; public lands management; coastal resources management; toxic substances control; energy conservation; and economics and the environment.

Through its Business and the Environment project, the Foundation is promoting greater understanding and clarification between the business and environmental communities, and exploring opportunities for the resolution of complex and polarizing environmental issues. Representatives of environmental groups and chemical manufacturers, for example, have met monthly in the past year in a series of dialogues seeking agreement on testing and other elements of the Toxic Substances Control Act. Other dialogues with the timber industry and home builders and on such specific issues as pollution control strategies are under consideration.

The general perspective of the Conservation Foundation may readily be seen in Reilly's statement, "Consensus Building for Conservation," in the Foundation's annual report for 1976. Noting that our national "commitment to environmental quality is no longer a question of whether, but how," Reilly observes that "Environmental quality is now broadly accepted as a national goal, much like our goals of full employment and decent housing for every family." Reilly states that the "major federal mechanisms for pollution control -- sought by environmental leaders since the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act -- have become law" with the enactment of the Toxic Substances Control Act in 1976; this means, in his view, that "consensus on a goal now is accompanied by the apparatus for attaining it."

However, even while claiming that the principal governmental devices for enforcing environmentalism are in being, Reilly cautions against any diminution of citizen concern:



Enactment of a law, which may seem like the end of a long campaign, is but the first step in a new one. Once a law has been passed, public concern may dwindle on the mistaken impression that the government has disposed of the problem. This tendency is reinforced by the difficulty of tracking actual progress in dealing with problems. Battles over legislation are dramatic, attract press coverage, and can add greatly to the political capital of a congressman. By contrast, the implementation of laws is drab, decentralized, uninteresting to the media, and potentially threatening to both politicians and bureaucrats. Thus, the public is given every reason to accept symbolic solutions as real ones.

Reilly sees the current situation as one which presents considerable opportunity for the environmentalists:

In fact, the establishment of goals and an apparatus for achieving them represents not the end of environmental action outside government, but its entry into a new era. In this new era, while established environmental goals await achievement, conservationists must pay continuing attention to practical questions of specific, incremental measures necessary to implement environmental objectives.

Reilly's conception of the role to be played by environmentalists in helping to bring about realization of the "established environmental goals" to which he refers clearly contemplates maintenance of an intimate relationship with the institutions of government at all levels, national, state, and local:

In thinking about this new era, I see three likely courses of action, all of which will shape the work of The Conservation Foundation. The first action will be to review the administration of federal pollution programs; the second, to search for new federal remedies for environmental problems that so far have evaded resolution; and the third, to strengthen state and local environmental management.

According to the organization's literature, the Conservation Foundation was organized in 1948 by a group of men who shared a recognition of a need for new public policies to deal with ecological problems, which they saw in terms "of the interdependence of all living things in the total environment," a view "that in 1948 was not widely accepted." The founder and first president of the Foundation was Fairfield Osborn, who was at the time president of the New York Zoological Society. The other founders included Samuel Ordway, Jr., an attorney and former member of the U.S. Civil Service Commission; George Brewer, a playwright and educator; David Hunter McAlpin, a financier; and Laurance S. Rockefeller, "a developer and philanthropist." It was felt that "a new and independent enterprise" was needed to effect "the furtherance of



a more sophisticated concept of resource management," the Conservation Foundation being the organizational expression of this belief.

The Conservation Foundation is run by a large professional staff of 41 people who are in turn responsible to a board of trustees. The board of trustees, consisting of 28 people, four of whom serve as chairman, vice chairman, secretary, and treasurer, included the following people as of December 31, 1976:

Ernest Brooks, Jr., Chairman  
 William H. Whyte, Jr., Vice Chairman  
 Anne P. Sidamon-Eristoff, Secretary  
 John A. Bross, Treasurer  
 Louise B. Cullman  
 Dorothy H. Donovan  
 Maitland Edey  
 Charles H. W. Foster  
 David M. Gates  
 Charles Grace  
 D. Robert Graham  
 Nixon Griffis  
 Philip G. Hammer  
 Walter E. Hoadley  
 William T. Lake  
 Richard D. Lamm  
 Lord Llewelyn-Davies  
 Cruz A. Matos  
 David Hunter McAlpin  
 Tom McCall  
 Richard B. Ogilvie  
 William M. Roth  
 James W. Rouse  
 William D. Ruckelshaus  
 James Hopkins Smith  
 Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson)  
 Pete Wilson  
 George M. Woodwell

Of the 28 people who serve as members of the board of trustees, seven also serve as members of the board's executive committee: Brooks, Whyte, Sidamon-Eristoff, Bross, Gates, Hammer, and Ruckelshaus; Hammer serves as chairman. Five serve as members of the board's development committee: Sidamon-Eristoff, Bross, Foster, Hoadley, and McAlpin; Bross serves as chairman of this committee in addition to his position as board treasurer.

As was seen in the case of the Natural Resources Defense Council, the trustees of the Conservation Foundation represent a wide range of the professions and reflect a significant interlock with what might be termed the environmental establishment. Because of the importance of the foundation within the environmental complex, the following background data may prove instructive:

- \* Ernest Brooks, Jr., in addition to being chairman of the board of the Conservation Foundation, is a vice president of the National Audubon Society. He also served (from 1959 through 1969) as president of the Old Dominion Foundation, which merged in 1969 with the Avalon Foundation to form the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.
- \* William H. Whyte, Jr., is the author of such works as The Organization Man and The Last Landscape. His other activities have included serving on the Hudson River Valley Commission, the New York State Environmental Board, and the President's Task Force on Natural Beauty, along with serving as co-director of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty and as chairman of the New York Conference on Natural Beauty.
- \* Anne Phipps Sidamon-Eristoff is a vice president of the American Museum of Natural History and has been, since 1969, chairman of the museum's Exhibition Committee. She is also on the boards of directors of several institutions, among them the Hudson River Environmental Society.
- \* John A. Bross has been retired from government service since 1971. His positions included assistant general counsel to the U.S. High Commissioner to Germany after World War II and, from 1957 through 1959, advisor and coordinator at the American Embassy in Bonn, West Germany. He also held several positions in the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, among them deputy to the director of CIA for programs evaluation.
- \* Louise B. Cullman, in addition to being a member of the Conservation Foundation board, serves on the boards of the Montefiore Hospital and Medical Center in New York City and the Blythedale Children's Hospital in Valhalla, New York.
- \* Dorothy H. Donovan, who serves on the boards of Nassau Community College and the United Board of Christian Higher Education in Asia, located, respectively, in Garden City and New York City, is a member of the Committee on Education and chairman of the Subcommittee on Graduate Training of New York City's Community Service Society.
- \* Maitland Edey, author of several Time-Life volumes, retired as editor-in-chief of Time-Life Books in 1972. Prior to 1972, he had served as an editor of Life magazine.

- \* Charles H. W. Foster, recently named dean of the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Yale University, was, during 1975, professor of environmental policy at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst's Institute for Man and Environment, as well as being on the professional staff of Arthur D. Little, Inc. From 1969 through 1974, Foster served as the first secretary of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Affairs; he has also served as president of the Nature Conservancy.
- \* David M. Gates is a member of the board of the National Audubon Society; he is also on the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation, in addition to serving as president of the American Institute of Biological Sciences and as director of the University of Michigan's Biological Station and professor of botany at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.
- \* Charles Grace is active in the environmental movement in such capacities as secretary-treasurer of the California League of Conservation Voters and member of the boards of the Nature Conservancy and the Sierra Club Foundation.
- \* D. Robert Graham, a developer and state senator from the Dade County district in Florida, was a key force in the development and passage of a comprehensive Florida land-use measure in 1972.
- \* Nixon Griffis, who filled several high-level positions with Brentano's Bookstores, Inc., from 1962 to 1967, is a past president and a member of the advisory board of the American Littoral Society, a director of the American Institute of Nautical Archaeology, and an advisor on business and conservation issues to the New York Zoological Society.
- \* Philip G. Hammer, an urban economist, is chairman of the board of Hammer, Siler, George Associates, Inc., a Washington, D.C., economic consulting firm. A member and former chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, Hammer is also former president of the American Society of Planning Officials. He serves on the boards of such organizations as the Potomac Institute, National Planning Association, National Council for Equal Business Opportunity, AIP Foundation, and Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia.
- \* Walter E. Hoadley is executive vice president, chief economist, and planning coordinator for the Bank of America in San Francisco, California. His earlier positions included the chairmanship of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia and of the Conference of the 12 Federal Reserve Banks, as well as several top-ranking executive positions with the Armstrong Cork Company.



- \* William T. Lake, presently legal counsel for the Conservation Foundation, was once a law clerk to U.S. Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan. An attorney with the Washington, D.C., firm of Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, Lake served as counsel to the Council on Environmental Quality from 1970 to 1973.
- \* Richard D. Lamm, governor of Colorado, served from 1966 through 1974 in the Colorado House of Representatives where he was responsible for several important pieces of environmental legislation, especially a 1974 state land-use bill.
- \* Lord Llewelyn-Davies has been active in planning new towns in Great Britain and elsewhere. He is professor emeritus of the Department of Planning at London University and recently retired as dean of the university's School of Environmental Studies. He is also former chairman of the Center for Environmental Studies, an institution in London which engages in research on urban and environmental issues and which is sponsored jointly by the British government and the Ford Foundation.
- \* Cruz A. Matos serves as United Nations technical advisor on coastal and marine resources to the government of Trinidad and Tobago. In 1973 and 1974, he served as First Secretary of Puerto Rico's Department of Natural Resources, having earlier worked as Executive Director of the Environmental Quality Board in the Office of the Governor.
- \* David Hunter McAlpin, a founding trustee of the Conservation Foundation, was, until his retirement, associated with the stock and bond brokerage firm of Clark, Dodge & Company. He is a director of several corporations and has also served as a trustee of Union Theological Seminary, Princeton University, the Museum of Modern Art, and the New York Zoological Society.
- \* Tom McCall is the former governor of Oregon. During his two terms as governor from 1967 through 1974, he supported a number of environmental protection measures, including the creation of a department of environmental quality at the state level, a law requiring removal of billboards, the first state law in the nation requiring deposits on beer and soft-drink bottles, and land-use-planning legislation.
- \* Richard B. Ogilvie served as governor of Illinois from 1968 through 1973. Presently a partner in Isham, Lincoln, and Beale, a Chicago law firm, he has also served in Chicago as sheriff of Cook County, president of the Cook County Board of Commissioners, and special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General.

- \* William M. Roth is president of California Tomorrow and of Roth Properties. He also served as White House Special Representative for Trade Negotiations under President Lyndon Johnson.
- \* James W. Rouse, developer of the planned community of Columbia, Maryland, is chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the Rouse Company, which is a mortgage and real estate development firm. He has lectured at several major universities on housing, design, and community development.
- \* William D. Ruckelshaus is currently senior vice president of Weyerhaeuser, Inc., in Takoma, Washington. His prior career includes service as first administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency from 1970 through 1973, in addition to a brief period as acting director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- \* James Hopkins Smith is a former vice president of Pan American Airways, Inc., and currently serves as a director of the Aspen Ski Corporation and of Executive Jet Aviation. He is also vice chairman of the Aspen Institute. His earlier government service includes a period as director of the International Cooperation Administration under President Eisenhower, as well as positions as assistant to the Secretary of the Navy and Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.
- \* Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson) has served as president of the International Institute for Environment and Development in London since 1974. She has been a visiting scholar and a Carnegie Fellow at Harvard and is a visiting lecturer at Cambridge University; she was Schweitzer Professor of International Economic Development at Columbia University from 1968 to 1973. Her many books include Only One Earth, written with Rene Dubos, with whom she serves as a trustee of the Natural Resources Defense Council.
- \* Pete Wilson is a member of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, the Federal Coastal Zone Management Advisory Committee, and the Advisory Commission on Housing and Urban Growth of the American Bar Association. He was elected mayor of San Diego, California, in 1971 after serving for five years as a Republican assemblyman in the state legislature. While serving as an assemblyman, Wilson developed major legislation in such areas as the environment, consumer protection, and land-use planning.

- \* George M. Woodwell, formerly a senior ecologist at Brookhaven National Laboratory in Upton, New York, is presently director of the Ecosystems Center at the Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. The author of several books on ecological matters, he has taught at the University of Maine and at the Yale University School of Forestry. He is also a fellow and member of the Council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a founding trustee of the Environmental Defense Fund, and a trustee of the Natural Resources Defense Council.

The staff of the Conservation Foundation, as previously noted, consists of 41 people. Of this number, five serve in the office of the Foundation president, 23 are assigned to the program staff, eight are assigned to communications, and the remaining five are responsible for finance and administration. As of December 31, 1976, the Foundation staff, broken down into its various categories, was as follows:

Office of the President

President

William K. Reilly

Executive Vice President

J. Clarence Davies III

Vice President

John H. Noble

Assistant to the President

Gordon L. Binder

Executive Secretary

Barbara N. Gray

Program Staff

Senior Associates

John S. Banta

John R. Clark

William J. Duddleson

Robert G. Healy

Phyllis Myers

Clem L. Rastatter

William E. Shands

Writers in Residence

Robert Cahn

Elliott J. Weiss



## Associates

John S. Rosenberg  
 Charles R. Terrell  
 Claudia Wilson  
 Cynthia Whitehead (Cologne, Germany)  
 Jeffrey A. Zinn

## Research Assistants

David P. Hackett  
 Bruce H. McLain  
 Marissa Roche  
 Raymond L. Tretheway III

## Support Staff

Gwendolyn Harley  
 Margaret Lewis  
 Lucy McMichael  
 Laura O'Sullivan  
 Celine Seymour

Office of Communications

## Director

Jerry Kline

Editor of the Conservation Foundation Letter

Rice Odell

## Director of Special Events

Janet M. Fesler

## Associates

Susan C. Greenbaum  
 Michael Rawson  
 David Sleeper

## Support Staff

Patricia Ann Hartman  
 Fannie Mae Keller

Office of Finance and Administration

## Director

Paige K. MacDonald

## Accountant

Victoria Brahe-Wiley

## Support Staff

Lawrence J. Amon  
 Maria A. Pisano  
 John Thomas

Once again, as has been noted with respect to other organizations in this study, it is observed that the staff of the Conservation Foundation interlocks with several other organizations, both governmental and nongovernmental, which have been active in the energy and environmental fields. Brahe-Wiley, Harley, and Lewis, for example, have worked with the League of Women Voters, Brahe-Wiley with its Overseas Education Fund and Harley as administrative secretary to the executive director. Davies, Healy, and Pisano have been associated with Resources for the Future, a policy research organization established in 1952 by the Ford Foundation.

Perusal of background information on Foundation staff personnel shows a heavy concentration of people whose specialty is land use, one of the favorite issues of a great many environmentalists. Of these, six -- Binder, Gray, Myers, Noble, Rawson, and Reilly -- are of particular interest because of their prior experience with a major project of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund: the Rockefeller Task Force on Land Use and Urban Growth, which produced one of the most important studies yet written from the pro-land use point of view. This study, The Use of Land (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1973), was funded by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, while the Task Force was created by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality and enjoyed a close advisory relationship to the Council on Environmental Quality. The executive director for the Task Force was William K. Reilly, who was borrowed from the CEQ, and Gray served as business manager.

Reilly is far from being the only Conservation Foundation staff member to have served with the CEQ, however. Banta was coauthor of a report which was written for the Council on the subject of the constitutional limits on land-use controls in the United States, and Myers served at one point as a consultant to the Council. Davies and Reilly were both senior members of the CEQ staff, while Gray and Rawson also served as Council staff employees. Cahn was, from 1970 through 1972, one of the three original members of the Council. Reilly's previous experience is of special interest because he served as editor for the Rockefeller Task Force volume and because he is also credited with being the principal author of the 1971 administration legislative proposal for a national land-use policy.

In addition to the CEQ, several other government agencies have employed CF staff people in the past. Davies, for example, served as an examiner for the former Bureau of the Budget (now the Office of Management and Budget) and as a consultant to the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization, in which capacity he helped draft the reorganization plan which created the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Hackett has also worked for the EPA. Duddleson has worked for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the U.S. Department of the Interior, while Wilson has served with the Office of Coastal Zone Management of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Harley has been employed by the Federal Government

in an unspecified capacity, as has Gray; and Rawson served as a consultant to the Task Force on Environment for the 1971 White House Conference on Youth. Also, four Foundation staff employees have served on the staffs of Members of Congress. Duddleson was a legislative assistant to Congressman Clem Miller of California; Kline worked as press secretary to Congressman H. John Heinz of Pennsylvania; Hackett worked for Congressman Robert Steele of Connecticut; and Shands had otherwise unspecified "congressional staff positions."

Of those who have been associated over the years with the activities of the Conservation Foundation, probably no one has been more prominent than Russell E. Train. The Foundation's 1976 report states that Train "will become associated with The Conservation Foundation in May 1977," and his background is particularly interesting because of the way in which it interlocks with so many environmental causes, both private and governmental. As shown in the Foundation's 1976 report, Train

was administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from 1973 to early 1977. Earlier, he was a judge on the U.S. Tax Court from 1957 to 1965, president of The Conservation Foundation from 1965 to 1969, under secretary of the Interior in 1969, and chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality from 1970 to 1973.

Mr. Train has been associated with a number of leading conservation organizations. He was a founder of the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, and later its president and board chairman; executive board member of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources; director of the American Committee for International Wildlife Protection; director and vice president of the World Wildlife Fund; a trustee of the American Conservation Association, and honorary vice president of the American Forestry Association.

The activities of the Conservation Foundation have been varied and, it is claimed, have met with "some notable achievements." Fairfield Osborn's Limits of the Earth and William Vogt's Road to Survival are credited with examining population problems for the first time "apart from their demographic context" and with analyzing them "in terms of their interactions with the environment." As another example, the Foundation assisted in organizing the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources and "was instrumental in the creation of five regional environmental information centers, including Rocky Mountain Center on Environment, Denver; New England Natural Resources Center, Boston; and Florida Environmental Information Center, Winter Park."

Wild Life in an African Territory, written by Sir Frank Fraser Darling, former Foundation vice president and director of research,



is described as "one of the first serious attempts to relate wild-life conservation to overall land-use planning," while The Careless Technology was published subsequent to a national conference which purportedly "helped bring to public attention the need for regular technology assessment." In this connection, the Foundation asserts that it "was among the first U.S. institutions to identify the double-edged character of technology both to solve and to create environmental problems." It also claims to have been among "the first to encourage environmental law as a separate discipline," to have "held the first national conference on environmental law," and to have been "instrumental in the creation of the Environmental Law Institute."

The Foundation "played a leading role in advancing the methodology for applying scientific ecological principles to land-use planning" in addition to sponsoring "a series of demonstration projects" and providing financial support for Ian McHarg's volume, Design with Nature. The organization's relationship to government is illustrated by its report, National Parks for the Future, prepared at the invitation of the U.S. Department of the Interior for the centennial of the National Park Service in 1972, as well as by its receipt, during Train's presidency, of a reported \$60,000 from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Air Pollution Control Administration to help in organizing citizen groups to participate in public hearings on ambient air standards. More recently, the Foundation has produced a documentary film, "Neighbors: Conservation in a Changing Community," for the National Endowment for the Arts as part of a program dealing with issues of urban conservation.

The Foundation describes its work during the decade of the 1950's as "spreading a message not then widely accepted or familiar" as opposed to the 1960's, when "it turned its attention to the detailed requirements of legislation to protect the environment." During the early 1970's, "it shifted its program to the use of environmental planning as a means for resolving resource conflicts and, more recently, deepened its concern for the human habitat, the interrelated problems of community and nature." Currently, the organization emphasizes generally the need for "a working sensitivity to the humanistic element in conservation" with a concomitant requirement for "competence to deal with those social, economic, and political forces which, in the long run, will determine the effectiveness of all conservation policies." To realize these broader aims, the Foundation is presently engaged in an ambitious program of activity in the following general fields: "Land Use and Urban Growth," "Public Lands," "Coastal Resources Management," "Economics and the Environment," "Energy," "Toxic Substances," and "Student Interns." This program includes considerable publishing, participation in conferences, both national and international, and a significant degree of contact with those agencies of government that are charged with developing and implementing the nation's environmental policies, as well as with the foundation complex.

In the land-use area, which seems to be almost paramount among the Foundation's areas of concentration, Foundation personnel participate actively in the Land-Use Research Conference, which was created because several people, including CF staff members Healy and Myers, saw "a need for more frequent communication among the three dozen or so professionals currently doing research in the rapidly changing field of state land-use policy." The Foundation's concern with land-use is international in scope, however, as shown by the fact that since 1974, it has conducted an International Comparative Land-Use Program (ICLUP), which is financed principally by a grant from the German Marshall Fund of the United States with additional funding supplied by the National Science Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation. Activities conducted within the ICLUP have included visits to nations in North America, Europe, and Asia; production of a report, along with a film based on the report's principal findings and distributed widely in areas "likely to be affected by offshore energy development" activity; writing of numerous articles and essays based on the program's research; and presentation of the program's preliminary research results by William K. Reilly "at several international meetings and seminars during" 1976. These international gatherings included Habitat, the United Nations Conference on Human Settlement, with Reilly serving as a member of the delegation from the United States; an environmental management seminar conducted by the Centre d'etudes industrielles in Geneva, Switzerland; and a seminar on environmental issues in Japan sponsored by the German Marshall Fund in Washington, D.C. Several future reports are scheduled on such diverse subjects as "public participation in the rapid physical changes of cities," "the environmental and planning impacts of tourism," and "problems created by an apparent proliferation of development controls," the last being described as "a five-nation report." A major projected study by Reilly "will present an overview of international land-use practices and discuss their implications for the United States."

In the urban conservation field, the Foundation program stresses research "aimed at understanding the legal, economic, political, and institutional barriers to achieving more livable urban settings, and communicating these findings to public officials and concerned citizens." It feels that "in the two years since the National Neighborhood Conservation Conference, cosponsored by The Conservation Foundation," much evidence has been developed "to demonstrate the strength of urban neighborhood revival." The documentary produced by the Foundation for the National Endowment for the Arts has already been mentioned. Another recent project initiated by the Foundation is intended "to examine the special impacts of urban conservation on older urban residents, often among the principal victims of efforts to upgrade neighborhoods." Myers is scheduled to prepare a report which will outline "issues and policy considerations" and which "will be presented to federal officials, as well as others concerned with problems faced by older Americans." The



project is being supported by a grant awarded in 1976 by the Administration on Aging of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

With respect to public lands, the Foundation has completed a two-year study as a "public policy evaluation of the 24,000,000 acres of national forests in 25 eastern states -- the largest public land system in the eastern United States." This study, which involved "four regional workshops and extensive field interviews," resulted in a number of "legislative and institutional recommendations," including the creation of "a new use category -- protection and enhancement of natural amenity and environmental values," among others. This project was supported by grants from several donors, among them the Nature Conservancy and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Another project currently under way is production of a film about the "history, diversity, objectives, and opportunities" of the national forests, a joint project of the Foundation and the U.S. Forest Service.

The Foundation has numerous projects in the area of coastal resources management, including major efforts on Florida's Sanibel Island and "a program to focus public attention on the barrier islands" off the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts. The latter program has included a 1976 conference in Annapolis, Maryland, which involved approximately "100 environmentalists, coastal zone planners, and government officials" and which resulted in the establishment of the Barrier Island Workshop, described as "a coalition of 25 environmental groups determined to put protection of barrier islands on the public agenda." Both the Office of Coastal Zone Management and the Federal Insurance Administration's floodplain management program have consulted the Workshop with regard to regulations for the 1976 amendments to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. The Foundation's extensive program analyzing the work of the California Coastal Zone Conservation Commissions is supported by donors such as the Packard Foundation and Rockefeller Foundation, while the preparation of the Foundation's Guidebook for Physical Management in the Coastal Floodplains, begun in 1976 and utilizing "advice from federal agencies and from representatives of state and local government," is being supported by the following government agencies: the Federal Insurance Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Coastal Zone Management, Army Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Council on Environmental Quality. Another major project has been preparation of a manual and five supporting reports to aid the government in assessing the impact of developing the oil and gas resources of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS), an effort prepared under contract with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

As part of its program on economics and the environment, the Conservation Foundation has undertaken a three-year project on "Business and the Environment" with Reilly as project director.



This effort is being supported by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and includes a projected series of meetings on such subjects as coordination of government regulatory activities and the requirements for testing chemicals. The Foundation has moved to bring together "business people and environmentalists to explore implications of the recently enacted Toxic Substances Control Act," of which J. C. Davies, executive vice president of the Foundation, was one of the original authors.

The Foundation's activities with respect to energy questions have been widespread and have been geared to what it sees as the need for "public education in energy conservation" both from the standpoint of the development and communication of information and from the standpoint of overcoming public "cynicism and distrust." The staff devised "a program of citizen-training workshops for energy conservation," contacted "potential community leaders in energy policy" with the assistance of a group of ten regional organizations, and conducted a series of ten "regional training institutes in late 1975 and during 1976." These institutes involved "some 1,100 key representatives of businesses, environmental groups, labor unions, civic associations, and civil rights and consumer organizations" and resulted in publication of three major studies.

The toxic substances program has involved planning and holding meetings "for both the general public and technical experts." Sessions have been held in Washington, D.C., and other locations, and efforts are under way to convene "business representatives and environmentalists" around "major issues raised by the Toxic Substances Control Act." In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency awarded the Foundation a three-year grant in 1976 "to advise on early implementation of the Toxic Substances Control Act, and to assist the agency in fulfilling the act's public participation requirements."

The Foundation's student internship program is supported by a grant from the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation and involves "work primarily on projects in land use." Specifically, students have been engaged in work related to such subjects as coastal resource programs, land use, and urban growth.

The Foundation has as its fund raising goal the raising of "at least \$500,000 per year in unrestricted contributions from individuals, corporations, and foundations to supplement about \$1.5 million in project funding." Attempts have been made to establish a network of Friends of the Conservation Foundation groups in several cities around the United States. A major effort has been made to encourage support from corporations through a Corporate Sponsors Program, which resulted in a total of \$37,000 for the Foundation's program during 1976 from the following corporations:

Allegheny Power Service Corporation  
 Amax Foundation, Inc.  
 American Telephone and Telegraph Co.  
 Atlantic Richfield Foundation  
 Bank of America Foundation  
 Bethlehem Steel Corporation  
 The Chase Manhattan Bank  
 CIBA-GEIGY Corporation  
 Crown Zellerbach  
 John Deere Foundation  
 E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.  
 Exxon Company, U.S.A.  
 General Mills Foundation  
 General Motors Corporation  
 International Business Machines Corp.  
 John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company  
 Mobil Foundation, Inc.  
 Natomas Company  
 Oscar Mayer Foundation  
 Pet, Incorporated  
 PPG Industries Foundation  
 Prudential Insurance Co. of America  
 Sears, Roebuck and Company  
 Union Oil Company  
 Wells Fargo Bank

The Conservation Foundation's annual budget is, as already indicated, a large one, currently estimated at some \$1,500,000. The Foundation's financial statement reflects substantial income and expenses as of December 31, 1976, with total "public support and revenues" amounting to \$1,844,373 and total expenses in the amount of \$1,490,530, leaving a surplus of support and revenues over expenses of \$353,843. What the Foundation categorizes as public support for 1976 is broken down as follows:

Friends of CF	\$ 22,200
Corporate sponsors	37,150
CF associates	13,452
Working capital contributions	350,000
<u>Other contributions</u>	<u>178,491</u>
Total public support	\$ 601,293

Revenues are recorded in the following amounts:

Grants and contracts	
U.S. Government	\$ 657,319
Nongovernment	480,945
Sales, royalties and subscription income	55,086
Interest income	16,758
Fees - U.S. Government Contracts	25,452
<u>Miscellaneous</u>	<u>7,520</u>
Total revenues	\$1,243,080

Expenses as of December 31, 1976, are enumerated as follows:

Administration	\$ 212,788
Fund raising	27,702
CF Letter	83,721
Public education and communication	162,977
Bids and proposals	42,419
General programs	88,102
Coastal resource management	250,597
Public lands management	75,032
Land use and urban growth	212,486
Economics and the environment	86,843
Energy conservation	211,159
<u>Special programs</u>	<u>36,704</u>
Total expenses	\$1,490,530

As has also been previously indicated, the Conservation Foundation, which enjoys tax-exempt status under the provisions of Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, has been a recipient of funds from a number of the nation's major foundations. It is reported that the Foundation was established with the aid of funds from the Ford Foundation, which also provided a grant of \$100,000 in 1971 to establish a Florida Environmental Information Center for research and a program of public information. Other such grants for the years 1971 through 1976 are listed below, as are, where known, the dates of their authorization and the purposes for which made by the grantor:

- \* \$10,000 from the Weyerhaeuser Foundation, Minnesota, 1972, for the operating budget.
- \* \$81,000 from the Ford Foundation, New York, 1972, to analyze and solve air pollution problems common to four small industries.
- \* \$225,000 from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, 1972, for general support.



- \* \$100,000 from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, New York, 1972, for budgetary support and development activities.
- \* \$15,000 from the Allegheny Foundation, Pennsylvania, 1972, for preparation of an ecological primer.
- \* \$5,000 from the Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation, Washington, D.C., 1972, for general support of the Central Atlantic Environment Service.
- \* \$25,000 from the Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation, 1971, for general support of the Potomac Basin Center.
- \* \$25,000 from the Charles E. Culpeper Foundation, New York, 1972, for staff time required as follow-up to publication of National Parks for the Future.
- \* \$500,000 from the German Marshall Fund of the United States, Washington, D.C., January 10, 1974, as a two-year grant for an international comparative land-use project.
- \* \$7,500 from the Bush Foundation, Minnesota, January 14, 1974, to complete the Twin Cities Metropolitan Open Space Information Project.
- \* \$180,000 from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, June 18, 1974, to undertake a study of the national forests of the eastern United States.
- \* \$132,000 from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, November 30, 1973, toward three regional conferences of state legislators and other state leaders to discuss recommendations contained in The Use of Land.
- \* \$171,311 from the German Marshall Fund of the United States, October 27, 1975, for an international comparative project to analyze land-use policies, laws, and practices in Australia, England, France, Germany, Israel, Japan, Mexico, and the Netherlands and to publish and disseminate the results and findings of the project.
- \* \$25,000 from the Mary Flagler Cary Charitable Trust, New York, June 30, 1975, for the costs of a proposed study.
- \* \$50,000 from the Ford Foundation, November 1975, for a study of the experience of eight foreign countries in regulating land development.

- \* \$275,000 from the Mellon Foundation, October 7, 1975, as a three-year grant for research, conferences, and publication designed to increase understanding between environmentalists and the business community and to increase the effectiveness of the search for solutions to common problems.
- \* \$15,000 from the Mellon Foundation, November 17, 1975, for costs of barrier island study, Sanibel Island, Florida.
- \* \$50,000 from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, May 20, 1976, for a project, "In Search of a Common Language: Economics and the Environment."
- \* \$20,000 from the Rockefeller Family Fund, New York, November 14, 1975, to complete and publish a book of case studies on ways of making urban neighborhoods more livable.
- \* \$85,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation, New York, 1975, for planning and interim management program of the California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission.
- \* \$5,000 from the Cafritz Foundation, 1974, for general support of the Central Atlantic Environmental Service.
- \* \$24,000 from the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, New York, January 23, 1975, as a two-year grant to provide stipends for qualified interns working on assignments in the area of land-use policy.
- \* \$40,000 from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, October 21, 1974, for general support of an organization engaged in conservation research, information, and education.
- \* \$30,000 from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, May 5, 1975, toward an effort to define standards of ethical behavior for man, using laws of ecology.
- \* \$20,000 from the Rockefeller Family Fund, December 13, 1974, for a conference on the built environment in collaboration with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the City and State of New York.

The conclusions to be drawn with respect to the Conservation Foundation, its activities, and its personnel and funding are in general the same as those for the Natural Resources Defense Council. It is clear that the Conservation Foundation interlocks with many other organizations which make up the nation's environmental complex. It is also fair to state that the Foundation enjoys a close

working relationship with the environmental policy agencies of the United States government and that, like NRDC and other environmental activist organizations, it has benefited enormously from major grants of money for its many projects emanating from the foundation complex.

*(November 1977) The foregoing analysis is one in a series prepared by the Research Staff of The Heritage Foundation. This publication is intended as a background analysis of an important organization which affects public policy. Any comments should be addressed to the Director of Research at The Heritage Foundation, 513 C Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002.*