


A History of Climate Action through Foundations' Archives

by Laura Schwarz

Política e Ambientalismo Research Group

 © 2018 by Laura Schwarz



After two years of intensive negotiations, 156 countries signed a Framework Convention on Climate Change at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), convened in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992. Bert Bolin, chairman of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) from 1988 to 1997, believed that it would not have happened if a “well-organized and scientifically credible assessment had not been available in 1990.” In turn, the IPCC assessment was possible “only because assessments initiated by the US National Academy of Sciences and the international scientific community had begun a decade earlier.” As stated by Bolin, “the emergence of the climate change issue was primarily scientifically driven.”¹ But how did the issue move from the realm of science to the realm of politics? Who were the agents of this process? A series of documents produced by scientists, NGO and foundation officers, preserved in archival collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center, provides previously unexplored information about how the climate change issue broke onto the international policy making agenda in the 1980s.

Connecting Science to Policy

In the late 1970s, the first generation of climate activists brought the global warming issue into the political arena in the United States. At that time, the Carter administration was restricting natural gas use and promoting a program of synthetic fuels to be made from coal, tar sands, and oil shale. Rafe Pomerance, a member at the staff at Friends of the Earth, partnered with Gordon MacDonald, a geophysicist who had been working on climate related issues for much of his career, to draw attention to the problem. They started conducting briefings in Washington, D.C. and approached Gus Speth,² chairman of the U.S Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), who asked for an accessible, scientifically credible report.³ By July 1979, Speth received a report signed by David Keeling, Roger Revelle, George Woodwell and Gordon MacDonald and soon presented it to the president. The Carter administration, according to Speth, never had a chance to tackle these problem and the other global-scale concerns pointed out by the Global 2000 Report.⁴ He, however, following departure from government, was fortunate to find support from the MacArthur Foundation to launch a new organization, the World Resources Institute (WRI), dedicated to these issues.⁵

Over the same period, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund (RBF) chairman appointed an *ad hoc* planning committee “to look into needs and opportunities over the next decade or so” and to suggest ways in which the Fund could “try to respond effectively to these.”⁶ In the planning committee report outlining the Fund’s *One World* program, dated June 7, 1983, the trustees stated that fostering global interdependence was the RBF’s primary objective. In pursuit of this goal, the report recommended supporting “a global outlook, and hence, internationally oriented activity.”⁷ It was also asserted that “one of the most important ways” in which the RBF could pursue such one-world issues was “to seek out and support institutions and processes” which would “connect these ideas and issues with future centers of influence, leadership and enterprise throughout the world.”⁸ In 1983, the Fund began to provide support for organizations that were “drawing international attention to critical resource problems and proposing more coordinated and comprehensive approaches to their global resolution.”⁹ A grant to the WRI energy task force network for analysis of the sources and uses of energy worldwide was considered a “possible building block for the Fund’s new program.”¹⁰

In 1984, the Fund refined the *One World* broad objective, creating guidelines for its sustainable resource use program. During discussions with Thomas Wahman, responsible for drafting those guidelines, Larry Rockefeller¹¹ expressed that he would like to see the RBF do more “institutional strengthening” of organizations that sponsor projects on climate, acid rain, greenhouse effect, biological diversity, population, toxics, water, etc. As reported by Wahman, Larry was “quite positive about the list of issues” that the World Resources Institute was undertaking.¹² In June 1985, Russell Phillips, the executive vice president, informed Wahman that he “should begin immediately to explore the broad general field of the climate change.”¹³

Gus Speth was one of the many people consulted by Wahman in his research. In a letter to Speth, he explained that his assignment was to make a case for one or two grants totaling \$100,000. His inclinations were to recommend a project that could complement other work going on in the field and also emphasize policy aspects in such a way as to “build more concern about the problem on the part of public and private leaders and decision makers.” Additionally, the project should address “the international more than the domestic dimensions from a base outside the U.S.” and attract funding from other foundations sources. Furthermore, Wahman

expected to endorse a proposal that could “receive enthusiastic support from Larry Rockefeller.”¹⁴

At this time, the WRI was cooperating with energy and atmospheric experts at centers studying the impacts of climate change. Under the project, *Energy, CO₂, and Climate Change*, directed by Irving Mintzer, in collaboration with the Beijer Institute,¹⁵ the WRI analyzed how various global energy paths affected CO₂ accumulation. This constituted one phase of the Second International Assessment of CO₂, carried out under the auspices of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), and the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU).¹⁶ The WRI had also organized the meeting *Moving Toward Policy Responses: A Seminar on Greenhouse Warming* to explore “the timeliness of bringing the issue of greenhouse warming onto the policy agenda of governments and to identify particular strategies, actions, and initiatives that would be useful in that regard,” focusing on the question of what the WRI and other NGOs could “contribute to UNEP’s efforts to move the issue beyond purely scientific investigations.”¹⁷

The list of participants at this meeting included George Woodwell, Rafe Pomerance, Mostafa Tolba and Peter Thacher, a distinguished fellow at the WRI, who was also a founder and retired deputy executive director of the UNEP. Pomerance had left Friends of the Earth and would become part of the WRI staff in 1986. Woodwell, who in the late 1960s and early 1970s had become engaged in founding the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) and the National Resources Defense Council (NRDC), was by that time creating his new organization, the Woods Hole Research Center (WHRC). In May 1985, Woodwell sent the prospectus for the new organization to William Moody, RBF program director. It informed that the central topics for the Research Center were “an examination of the issues of biotic diversity and biotic impoverishment combined with continued analysis of the interactions inherent in the global CO₂ problem”, which included “the possibility of climatic change.”¹⁸

The EDF had also started a global warming program, led by atmospheric physicist Michael Oppenheimer, an expert on acid rain, whom the organization had hired in 1981. In June 1985, Oppenheimer informed Thomas Wahman that the EDF considered that the greenhouse effect represented “a threat to the biosphere of such great magnitude” that they had chosen it as a major focus of their work over the following five years. Since the greenhouse problem could not be solved without

international cooperation, it was “imperative that the scientific basis for regulating the problem” evolved from “a joint effort” which elicited “support from all sectors of the climate community.” The organization was convinced that it was possible to “accelerate the development” of the necessary “international scientific consensus.”¹⁹

The overall strategy was “to use the fruits of research to develop a regulatory scheme.” Scientists and local end-use energy experts would be “encouraged to develop pressure at the local level for specific governmental actions,” providing “leverage for an international long-term greenhouse emissions reduction strategy.” It would be important to “establish contacts within the international ecological, climatological and energy communities” and use this international network as a base to “form a consensus around the specific regulatory proposal.” The EDF was also planning “to participate in international activities aimed at creating a long-term, binding agreement on climate change limitations.”²⁰

In September 1985, after reading books, articles, proposals and reports, and interviewing scientists, policy analysts and others, Thomas Wahman submitted an interim report on climatic change to the RBF’s executive officers. Wahman stated that he never had encountered so many variables and uncertainties and that “near or intermediate term international agreement on ways to control CO₂ and other gases” was “not likely.” While “awareness of the problems associated with climatic change” was increasing, policy action and political leadership appeared “to be in the offing.” Wahman observed that what appeared to be needed was the “identification of strategies to move climatic change issues more to the forefront of political decision making,” acknowledging that in the past the RBF have had “considerable experience in identifying political leverage points for resource issues.” Wahman considered that while this would be “much more difficult to accomplish on a global basis, focusing on intermediate-term projects that have identifiable action-oriented goals in selected countries or regions could produce tangible results within a five-year period.” Regarding the initial grant ideas, Wahman outlined the following topics:

- a) Pushing ahead for regulatory approaches in ways similar to those being applied to the “acid rain” problem;
- b) Advancing the agendas of leading biologists and ecologists involved with climatic change;
- c). Developing control strategies in the growth rate of methane;

d) Using the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED)²¹ as an opportunity for constructing a worldwide action agenda; co-funding an informal, “next steps,” one- or two-day workshop for the leaders in climatic change.

The EDF, the WHRC and the Beijer Institute were appointed as possible grant recipients. The Beijer Institute was headed by Gordon Goodman, who was playing a leading role in the WCED. Goodman and James MacNeill, the chief executive of the Commission, were “favorably disposed if not enthusiastic about the idea of using the Commission to issue a climatic change action agenda.”²²

Goodman and MacNeill sent a project entitled *Developing Policies for Managing the Effects of Future Climate Change* to Wahman, explaining that a meeting that would occur in Villach, Austria, in October 1985, sponsored by UNEP, the WMO and the ICSU, would “make the most authoritative and comprehensive statement to date about the man induced climate warming problem.” Following Villach, the time would be “ripe for some serious work on policy development.”²³ Wahman was invited to the Villach meeting but wasn’t able to attend it. He asked to be represented by Oppenheimer, who received the task of providing a report to the RBF and explore with Gordon Goodman the prospects for using the WCED as a “mechanism for producing a 10-year Action Agenda on Climatic Change.”²⁴ The project would include an international scientific symposium in the U.S led by George Woodwell and a policy workshop in the U.S or Europe led by Gordon Goodman.

In October 1985, Wahman sent a progress report to Russell Phillips detailing that idea. The RBF would grant \$100,000 to the WCED: “\$50,000 for Gordon Goodman as the staff person in charge of the climatic change issues for the Commission; \$ 35,000 for Michael Oppenheimer to act as a consultant to the Commission in the US to mobilize key scientists in the US to work on behalf of a strong, scientifically based action agenda; and \$ 15,000 to Woodwell for his symposium in October 1986.” The planned activities would “culminate in a special climatic change report as part of the final report of the WCED in March of 1987.”²⁵ The grant to the WCED was approved in December 1985.²⁶ The Commission, however, was not able to go forward with the project and recommended the transference of sponsorship to the Beijer Institute.²⁷ Gordon Goodman reported to Thomas Wahman that he had been in contact with Michael Baker, the executive secretary of the ICSU, and Tom Potter, responsible for the climate warming issue

within the WMO. They had indicated that the RBF had “identified an extremely important area for further development” and hoped that, despite the difficulties experienced with the WCED, the Fund “would consider keeping the grant in play for its original purpose.” They “would be happy if the Beijer Institute organized the meeting as was originally planned with the output being ultimately referable to the Joint Advisory Group (WMO, ICSU, UNEP)” instead of to the Commission.²⁸

In June 1986, the RBF approved the reallocation of the grant to the Beijer Institute, including expenditures of \$35,000 by the EDF and \$15,000 by the WHRC.²⁹ By that time, Michael Oppenheimer was already working on a “broad set of activities aimed towards the Beijer meeting.” One of them was “starting a U.S. environmental task force on climate” with Rafe Pomeroy of the WRI. Further, the EDF’s new economist, Dan Dudek, had commenced an econometric analysis of the effects of climate change on agricultural productivity that Oppenheimer thought could also be useful for that meeting.³⁰

As planned, the WHRC made use of the grant to organize a symposium on biotic impoverishment, in October 1986, which was co-sponsored by the WRI, the American Institute of Biological Sciences and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.³¹ Woodwell and Oppenheimer were “positively ecstatic” about the success of the symposium when they met with Gordon Goodman, Thomas Wahman and Marianne Ginsberg, from the German Marshall Fund, to review progress and plan next steps regarding the RBF’s climate project.³²

The “Beijer meeting” was organized as a “two-stage workshop.”³³ The first stage, *Management Issues Workshop*, was planned to take place in Villach, Austria, from September 28 to October 2, 1987, with the objective of formulate the specific technical questions that needed to be answered. The second stage, *Policy Development Workshop*, received support from the Rockefeller Foundation to take place at Bellagio, Italy, in November 1987.³⁴ At this meeting, the “new technical agenda” would be presented to a “group of 25-30 ministerial-level policy development professionals from governments and policy research institutions.” The two workshops had been “specially designed to deliver a product” which was “the first step in the policy-oriented process called for at the original Villach Meeting of October 1985.”³⁵ It was expected that this product would “provide input to a major high-level international meeting on Global Climate to be hosted and organized by the Government of Canada in June 1988.” Goodman and Jill Jaeger from the Beijer Institute, along with Michael Oppenheimer were serving on

both a steering committee and the statement-writing committee for the meeting, being well positioned to assure that the “Bellagio message” would be “carried through in the Canadian output.”³⁶

In June 1987, the RBF grant to the Beijer Institute was renewed. Wahman expressed his belief that the series of meetings organized by Goodman and his colleagues would “culminate in a call for an International Convention of Greenhouse Gases”, a goal he considered “desirable and possibly attainable especially in light of recent progress on the ozone front.”³⁷ To continue the program of the “Beijer project” and “strengthen its representation in policy work in Washington, D.C.,” the Environmental and Energy Study Institute (EESI) was included as a participating organization in the effort.³⁸ In October 1987, Thomas Wahman registered his impression that the project had “the promise of having much impact,” observing that “a little money, some perseverance, some strategic thinking and planning coupled with a perception of the probable” could “get some things done on the world stage.”³⁹

In the beginning of 1988, Oppenheimer reported to Wahman that the Villach and Bellagio meetings were completed successfully and that the goal of the activities over the following months would be to “raise awareness of the need for a rapid policy response on climatic change by dissemination of the Bellagio document.”⁴⁰ The report was officially released on June 7, 1988. Coordinated press conferences were held in Washington, Stockholm and Toronto, “attracting considerable attention in the print media and on television.” Subsequently, Senator Tim Wirth held a hearing of the full Senate Energy Committee on the Bellagio report, in which James Hansen of NASA announced that as far as he was concerned, the greenhouse warming had begun. As stated by Oppenheimer in a report to RBF, “the hearing proved to be a watershed in attempts to focus the public attention on this issue.”⁴¹ In February 1989, Goodman observed that the “international attitudes to greenhouse gas issue” were “dramatically different” from those that prevailed in 1986. He considered that the change was “largely due to the very high level of exposure given by the news media to a series of unusual climatic anomalies,” worrying that the “somewhat easy public acceptance of the reality of climatic change could lose momentum” if further steps weren’t taken by scientists and politicians.⁴² This request was taken in consideration by the RBF and in June 1989 another grant was approved to the climate change “cluster.” Discussion of the issue among members of the general public and government officials had “risen to a level not anticipated when the RBF first approved grants in this area.” To ensure that

public concern would be translated “into positive action,” there would be “an important, behind-the-scenes role to be played by thoughtful and well-placed nongovernmental organizations that are free from the political considerations that often constrain government initiative.”⁴³

At this point, the RBF was not the only foundation supporting organizations that were addressing the climate change issue. Evaluating the Fund’s grants, William McCalpin stated that it have had a “kind of multiplier effect” and “sources that had no past association with the global warming issue, e.g. the William Bingham, Ford, Rockefeller, and Charles Stewart Mott foundations” were then providing substantial funding.⁴⁴ The *Policy Panel on Responses to the Greenhouse Effect* created by the WRI “to review and then utilize current scientific knowledge as a basis for formulating effective domestic and international policies” received grants from the RBF⁴⁵ and the Ford Foundation.⁴⁶ WHRC efforts for rising awareness in developing countries and to “provide non-governmental organizations with materials, ideas, and initiatives to assist in their efforts to place the global warming problem in a global policy context”⁴⁷ were supported by the RBF,⁴⁸ Ford⁴⁹ and Rockefeller Foundations.⁵⁰ Ford⁵¹ and Rockefeller⁵² also supported EDF efforts to facilitate participation of NGOs in the process of formulation of an international accord on climate change and stimulate the establishment of regional climate networks in developing countries.

In December 1990, the RBF hosted a meeting for representatives of groups that had received assistance in the related areas of climate change, energy policy, and reforestation to evaluate the impact of the Fund’s five years of grant making to address the climate change issue. The participants agreed that much had been accomplished since 1985 and that NGOs “have been effective catalysts for the much of the positive change,” constructing a “global network to speed the flow of information about developments on the climate change issue.” The following two years were considered “an especially critical period.” A series of activities were planned to monitor the progress of the negotiations toward preparation of a Climate Convention and “hold the process accountable to its mission.”⁵³

A post-UNCED evaluation presented to the RBF Board of Trustees, after the adoption of the Climate Convention, stated that the new challenge was “to begin modeling the practical alternatives” that would “form the basis of climate and biodiversity protocols.” Grant making “should deliberately aim to enhance the prospects for these models by spreading word of their success, by helping NGOs to

think proactively about their possible contributions to international protocol-making, by helping to build the necessary constituencies required to support these ideas, and by, whenever possible, engaging international leaders in the process of understanding and appropriating models that have proven successful.” With “targeted effort, the RBF could have an impact on international legal negotiations by helping to show the way forward.”⁵⁴

1 * Member of the *Policy and Environmentalism Research Group*, Brazil.

Bolin, Bert, *A history of the science and politics of climate change: the role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

2 Speth was a co-founder of the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) in the early 1970s.

3 Yergin, Daniel, *The quest: energy, security and the remaking of the modern world*, New York: Penguin Books, 2012. Speth, James Gustave, *Angels by the river: a memoir*, White River Junction: Chelsea Green, 2015.

4 Prepared at the request of President Carter in the late 1970s to study the probable changes in the world’s population, natural resources and environment through the end of the century”.

5 With Jessica Mathews, a scientist on the staff of the National Security Council in Carter’s White House, who joined the WRI as vice president and research director, Speth assembled a “stellar board of directors”. Led by former Undersecretary of State Matthew Nimetz, the board included Robert MacNamara, Russel Train, Mostafa Tolba and George Woodwell, among others.

6 David Rockefeller, Jr. was chairman of the committee. The other members were: Abby M. O’Neill, Laurance (Larry) Rockefeller, Jeremy Waletzky, Peter Goldmark and Gerald Edelman. Memorandum from David Rockefeller, March 9, 1982. Letter to Henry Kissinger from Russell Phillips, February 24, 1983. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG2 Office of the President, Series 1, William M. Dietel Papers, Box 36, Folder 153, FA774.

7 Document of Record No 14,787, *The RBF’s Sustainable Resource Use Program: A Post-Rio, Post-Election Vision*. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG1 Administrative and Accounting records, Series 1, Board of Trustees, Sub-series 1.2 Documents of Record, Reel 17, Vol 60, FA005.

8 Memo from Thomas W. Wahman to Russell A. Philips, Jr., William M. Dietel and William S. Moody, July 9, 1984, Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG2 Office of the President, Series 1, William M. Dietel Papers, Box 34, Folder 146, FA774.

9 Redraft of the *Resources Discussion Paper*, to be reviewed. From Russell A. Phillips, Jr. to David Rockefeller, Jr. and Laurance Rockefeller, October 25, 1984. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG2 Office of the President, Series 1, William M. Dieter Papers, Box 33, Folder 144, FA774.

10 From Agenda & Docket for RBF Fall meeting – November 18, 1983, Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1477, Folder 9253, FA005.

11 Larry, the son of Laurance S. Rockefeller, was a trustee of the RBF and also an attorney at the NRDC.

12 Note from Thomas W. Wahman to Russell A. Philips, Jr., July 17, 1984, Subject: Meeting with Larry Rockefeller. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG2 Office of the President, Series 1, William M. Dietel Papers, Box 34, Folder 146, FA774.

13 Memorandum from Thomas W. Wahman to Russell A. Philips, Jr., September 19, 1985. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1163, Folder 7175, FA005.

14 Letter from Thomas Wahman to Gus Speth, July 2, 1985. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1163, Folder 7173, FA005

15 The Beijer Institute is an international research institute under the auspices of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, established in 1976. Jack Hollander, the co-founder of the environmental research program at Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and first Director of the University of California Energy Institute, was its chairman from 1976 to 1988.

16 WRI Annual Report 1984/1985, Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1478, Folder 9259, FA005. A first international assessment was initiated jointly by the ICSU, UNEP and WMO in 1980. See BOLIN, *Op. cit.*

17 Letter from Gus Speth to Mostafa Tolba, May 23, 1985, Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1163, Folder 7173, FA005.

18 *The Woods Hole Research Center: A Prospectus on Environmental Research with Emphasis on the Biosphere as a Whole*. May, 1985, Attachment to the letter from George M. Woodwell to

William Moody, May 21, 1985. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1162, Folder 7172, FA005.

¹⁹ Letter from Michael Oppenheimer to Thomas Wahman, June 28, 1985. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1162, Folder 7172, FA005.

²⁰ Memorandum from Michael Oppenheimer to Thomas Wahman, July 24, 1985. Re: EDF Climate Change Project – Proposed Action, 1986. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1163, Folder 7174, FA005.

²¹ Also called the “Brundtland Commission” after its Chairman Gro Harlem Brundtland, Norwegian Prime Minister.

²² Memorandum from Thomas W. Wahman to Russell A. Phillips, Jr., September 19, 1985. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1163, Folder 7175, FA005.

²³ Letter from Jim MacNeill to Thomas Wahman, September 20, 1985. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1163, Folder 7176, FA005, Rockefeller Archive Center. From Gordon Goodman to Thomas Wahman, September 1985. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1163, Folder 7175, FA005.

²⁴ Memorandum from Thomas Wahman to Russell Phillips, September 23, 1985. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1163, Folder 7175, FA005.

²⁵ Memorandum from Thomas Wahman to Russell Phillips, October 25, 1985. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1163, Folder 7176, FA005.

²⁶ From Agenda and Docket for RBF Fall Meeting, December 2, 1985. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1163, Folder 7176, FA005. Also Letter from Thomas W. Wahman to James MacNeill and Gordon Goodman, January 13, 1986. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 546, FA763.

²⁷ Letter from James MacNeill to Thomas Wahman, March 21, 1986. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 546, FA763.

²⁸ Letter from Gordon Goodman to Thomas Wahman, March 21, 1986. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 546, FA763. See also Proposal for an International Workshop to: Analyze the Environmental and Socio-economic implications; initiate a process of global policy development and secure appropriate international institutional follow-up. Attached to the letter from Gordon Goodman to Thomas Wahman, May 16, 1986. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 545, FA763. Gordon Goodman continued working with the Commission and the report *Our Common Future* by the WCED (1987) was “instrumental in bringing the climate change issue to the attention of the UN General Assembly”. Bolin, *Op, cit.*

²⁹ From Agenda and Docket for RBF Annual Meeting, June 27, 1986. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 545, FA763.

³⁰ Letter from Michael Oppenheimer to Thomas Wahman, April 25, 1986. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 546, FA763.

³¹ Press Release: Biotic Impoverishment: Scientists from Around the World Examine Changes in the Biotic Systems that Maintain the Biosphere, October 23, 1986. Attached to the letter from George Woodwell to Thomas Wahman, March 5, 1987. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 544, FA763.

³² Memorandum from Thomas W. Wahman to RBF Files, November 3, 1986. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 544, FA763.

³³ Letter from Gordon Goodman to Thomas Wahman, April 2, 1987. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 544, FA763.

³⁴ Rockefeller Foundation Records, Projects, RG 1, Subgroup 1.16 (A90), Series 120: Bellagio Study and Conference Center, Box R2453, Folder Developing policies for responding to Climate Change – Conference, 1986-1987, FA469.

³⁵ Status Report. Attached to the letter from Gordon Goodman to Thomas W. Wahman, April 2, 1987. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 544, FA763.

³⁶ Memorandum from Michael Oppenheimer to Thomas Wahman, February 29, 1988. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1239, Folder 7679, FA005.

³⁷ Memorandum from Thomas W. Wahman to RBF Files, June 20, 1987. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 544, FA763.

³⁸ From Agenda and Docket for RBF June board meeting, June 26, 1987. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 544, FA763.

³⁹ Note from Thomas Wahman to RAP/WMD/BRS/TWW, October 20, 1987. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 99, Folder 541, FA763.

-
- ⁴⁰ Memorandum from Michael Oppenheimer to Thomas Wahman, February 29, 1988. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1239, Folder 7679 (Environmental Defense Fund), FA005.
- ⁴¹ Report from Michael Oppenheimer to Gordon Goodman, October 5, 1988. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 4, Box 98, Folder 539, FA763.
- ⁴² Responding to Climatic Change: Further Steps in Policy Development – A proposal for the continued development in 1989 and 1990 of work on the possible responses to climatic change. The Beijer Institute, February, 1989. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1445, Folder 9047, FA005.
- ⁴³ From the agenda and docket for RBF Annual Board meeting, June 27, 1989. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1446, Folder 9048, FA005.
- ⁴⁴ Memorandum from William McCalpin to RBF Files, June 1, 1989. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1446, Folder 9048, FA005.
- ⁴⁵ From Agenda and Docket for RBF Board Meeting, June 17, 1988. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1476, Folder 9246, FA005.
- ⁴⁶ Ford Foundation Records, Grants U-Z, PA 08800603, Reel 5957, FA732I.
- ⁴⁷ Interim Report: Global Climatic Change: Steps toward an international protocol to stabilize the composition of the atmosphere. Kilaparti Ramkrishna, received in April 1988. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1476, Folder 9245, FA005.
- ⁴⁸ From Agenda and Docket for RBF Board Meeting, June 17, 1988. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG3 Project Files, Subgroup 2, Box 1476, Folder 9246, FA005.
- ⁴⁹ Ford Foundation Records, Grants Them-Tw, PA 09000874, Reel 6118, FA732H.
- ⁵⁰ Rockefeller Foundation Records, Projects, RG 1, Subgroup 1.19 (A93), Box R2712, Folder 8837 and Box R2717, Folder 8926, FA469.
- ⁵¹ Ford Foundation Records, Grants E-G, PA 09000875, Reel 6524, FA732C.
- ⁵² Rockefeller Foundation Records, Projects, RG 1, Subgroup 1.20 (A94), Box R2839, Folder 9020, FA471.
- ⁵³ Document of Record No 14,585, *Global Climate Change: Evaluation and next steps*, March 28, 1991, Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG1 Administrative and Accounting records, Series 1 Board of Trustees, Subseries 1.2 Documents of Record, Reel 17, Vol 56, FA005.
- ⁵⁴ Document of Record No 14,787, *The RBF's Sustainable Resource Use Program: A Post-Rio, Post-Election Vision*. Rockefeller Brothers Fund Records, RG1 Administrative and Accounting records, Series 1 Board of Trustees, Subseries 1.2 Documents of Record, Reel 17, Vol 60, FA005.