

Perspective

**Civic Service:
Issues, Outlook, Institution Building**

Michael Sherraden

October 2001



**Center for Social Development
Global Service Institute**



Washington

WASHINGTON · UNIVERSITY · IN · ST · LOUIS

George Warren Brown School of Social Work

**Civic Service:
Issues, Outlook, Institution Building**

**Paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the
Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society
October 19-21, 2001, Baltimore**

Michael Sherraden
Washington University in St. Louis

Center for Social Development
Global Service Institute
George Warren Brown School of Social Work
Washington University
One Brookings Drive
Campus Box 1196
St. Louis, MO 63130
tel 314-935-8827
fax 314-935-8661
E-mail: gsi@gwbmail.wustl.edu
<http://gwbweb.wustl.edu/csd/gsi>

Support for writing this paper has been provided by the Ford Foundation.

As I write this paper in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, my hometown paper, has published an editorial raising the possibility of a renewed military draft, reflecting on the merit of the former draft. The editorial recognizes that the technology of war has changed, affecting personnel requirements, and then comes to the key question, and suggests an answer:¹

Whatever the hardships of the draft during World War II, it created a bond among those of what is now famously called “The Greatest Generation.” The lessons learned by universal military service – discipline, sacrifice, teamwork, selflessness – paid huge dividends in building the civil society of the post-war years. There is little sense of civil obligation today. A society that delegates its sacrifice to a professional warrior class cannot ever be so truly democratic.

Yet the fact is that today’s military doesn’t need 6 million men under arms. The era of set-piece land battles are over, obviated by technology and political realities. The US military does quite well with 1.4 million active duty personnel, one in seven of them women. Indeed, in the first few days after Sept. 11, the Army had to admit it had already filled its recruiting quota for the year.

So what is a young person aflame with patriotism to do? How should a nation suddenly face-to-face with real selflessness and heroism capitalize on this opportunity?

In 1910, the American philosopher and pacifist William James wrote, “Great indeed is fear, but is it is not, as our military enthusiasts believe and try to make us believe, the only stimulus known for awakening the higher ranges of men’s spiritual energy.”

Mr. James believed that military service created a kind of brotherhood of dedication, a selflessness of spirit, a devotion to a higher cause. He proposed that the nation impose a two year national service requirement in peaceful causes, an idea that in 91 years has gone almost nowhere.

The participants on this panel would agree that the editor is onto something important. However, was it not for the September 11 attacks, this editorial would likely not have been written. The context (acts of war) and stated motivation (expression of patriotism) are narrow. William James (1910) had a far wider vision than this. Also, the speculation on a universal draft is misplaced. Due to limited personnel requirements, a renewed draft in the United States is a remote possibility. One can only wonder if the editor could conceive of civic service in circumstances other than patriotic fervor and a universal draft.

¹ “National Service: Not Your Father’s War,” editorial, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, October 7, 2001, B2. The next day David Broder’s column was: “National Service: Bringing Our Youth into Homeland Defense,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, October 8, 2001, B9, probably having appeared earlier in the *Washington Post*. Broder discusses a national service bill introduced by Senators John McCain and Evan Bayh that would expand AmeriCorps to enable 250,000 youths per year to serve on projects that would benefit the country. It is important to note that this bill was introduced before September 11, with motivations beyond patriotism and homeland defense.

Nor is it quite accurate that James's idea has gone "almost nowhere." Indeed, one of the noteworthy social achievements of the twentieth century is that service in many countries is no longer restricted to military service. Civic service, while not on a par with military service, is becoming more common. Moreover the idea of *service* has broken out of its origins as service to a kingdom, empire, or nation-state. Today, there are local, national, and international forms of civic service. Most civic service is in the public sector, but service also occurs in the nonprofit and private sectors.

The emphasis on civic service in this paper and on this panel does not downplay the importance of military service, but seeks to broaden the meaning of service and asks if this broader meaning is more suited to the technological, political, and social circumstances of the twenty-first century.

A Definition of Service

It may be helpful to define service in the sense discussed in this paper. Service is *an organized period of substantial engagement and contribution to the local, national, or world community, recognized and valued by society, with minimal monetary compensation to the participant.*² The elements of this definition can be detailed as follows:

- "*an organized period*" means a defined role for serving, much like a job position is defined by the labor market. Service also is also specified for a period of time, say six months or one year; it is not indefinite. Service in this sense is not entirely an individual act. Service is carried out through a program or organization that has created the service position, which an individual "fills." The characteristics of the service role, including nature, conditions, length, and intensity of service, are agreed upon in advance by the organization and the individual who serves.
- "*of substantial engagement*" refers to a greater than trivial level of intensity (e.g., more than a few hours per month) over a greater than trivial period of time (e.g., more than a month). The definition of substantial engagement does not have to be written in stone. The important point is that occasional volunteering is not the same as service, nor is a commitment that is only an hour per week or one week in total duration. This is not to say that occasional volunteering and engagements of limited intensity and duration are not valuable; they are indeed valuable, but not they are not service as defined here.
- "*and contribution*" indicates that service enables participants' energies, talents, and resources to be connected and applied for improvement to the environment, physical infrastructure, organizations, communities, and/or individuals.

² This definition of service was written by the author for the work of the Global Service Institute (GSI) at the Center for Social Development, Washington University in St. Louis. GSI is funded by the Ford Foundation to help develop research and information dissemination on civic service worldwide.

- “*to the local, national, or world community*” indicates service to others beyond self, whether nearby, in another state or province, or on the other side of the planet. No higher value is placed on local service, nor is higher value placed on national service. Cross-national or global service is of equal value.
- “*recognized and valued by society*” means that a particular service role is made known through information and communications and generally presented as a worthwhile endeavor. Formally, service roles may be recognized by logos, insignias, tee shirts, hats, or possibly uniforms, and may be valued by such benefits as stipends, awards for service, and/or educational benefits.
- “*with minimal monetary compensation to the participant*” indicates that little or no money is paid to the server. Service can be distinguished from employment in that the value of service is not well compensated by monetary reward. Of course, there may be other important forms of compensation for service, such as personal satisfaction, experience, skills, and social connections.

My purposes in specifying this definition are to distinguish service from other types of voluntarism; to emphasize the institutional nature of service, with defined roles and expectations; and to extend the concept of service beyond national military service.

National Military Service

Service has historically meant national military service, and the main purpose of national military service has been defense, sometimes offense. To most people, this seems to be necessary. Only a small number of pacifists would suggest that we do not need military service for this purpose. However, military service has also served a number of secondary purposes, both social and instrumental. These secondary purposes should be subject to much wider and deeper debate.

Important social purposes of military service have included fulfillment of citizenship obligations, personal and social development, and integration across social classes and racial/ethnic groups or “nation building.” In some circumstances, social purposes of military service have made extraordinary contributions. For example, in Israel serving in the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) has been a rite of passage, marking the transition from youth to adulthood (Gal et al., 1991). In the United States the military has been perhaps the single greatest opportunity structure for social and economic advancement of African-Americans (Moskos and Butler, 1997).

On the other hand, personal and social development can be harmed. For example, many Russian soldiers who fought in Chechnya or Afghanistan returned physically debilitated and emotionally scarred from the experience. Closer to home, I have a first cousin who has seldom left his room since returning from the Vietnam War. I have not seen him in more than 30 years.

Instrumental purposes of military service have sometimes included internal control and intimidation at the hand of authoritarian regimes. These stories are numerous and familiar. When soldiers stand on street corners with rifles or machine guns, they are seldom there for the

good of the people. It is a stunning fact that far more people have been slaughtered at the hand of their own government, using the military, than through wartime conflict with another nation. The militaries of the Stalinist Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, Maoist China, Pol Pot in Cambodia, Latin American dictators, and African despots have carried out the greatest horrors of the twentieth century *on their own people*.

More positively, armies have often been used for constructive internal purposes such as disaster relief and economic development. Social and economic functions are often carried out successfully by the military. For example, the Red Army in China is involved in a wide range of development projects. During the 1930s in the United States, Army Reserve officers were assigned to administer the camps of the US Civilian Conservation Corps, the greatest tree planting endeavor in the history of the country (Salmond, 1967). At times there have been eloquent calls for “peaceful uses of military forces” (e.g., Glick, 1967; Hanning, 1967). After all, why should a standing army just stand around? Why waste such a valuable resource of organizational capacity, trained personnel, and equipment?

While this swords-into-plowshares theme is hopeful and appealing, there are good reasons *not* to use the military on a regular basis for non-military purposes. The most important of these are compromising the readiness of the military for defense purposes, and the insertion of militarism into civilian life. The latter, although it may be well intentioned, is a slippery slope in a democratic society. All things considered, the military should, with few and rare exceptions, be reserved for military purposes.

Assessment: Two Gaps

However, this leaves two large gaps. The first gap is in opportunities to fulfill citizenship obligations (Moskos, 1988 and this panel). Most national armies do not need all, or even a major proportion, of the young men and women who come of age each year. Moreover, with the increasing technological sophistication of weaponry, demand for soldiers worldwide is likely to continue to decline. Already, in some nations where military service is mandatory for all young people, or all young men, oversupply of military labor is sometimes a problem. This is today true, for example, even in the heavily militarized situation of Israel (Gal, 1995 and this panel). Civic national service can be an alternative to military service in fulfilling citizenship obligations.

The second gap is in important projects that remain undone (Danzig and Szanton, 1986; Eberly, 1968). We live in an age when markets are revered, but markets do not do everything that needs to be done. Where there is no potential for profit, markets do not succeed; and markets function successfully only when nation states and international agreements have established institutions and conditions that enable them to do so.

The fact of the matter is that governments – the public sector – undertake virtually all of the projects that build essential institutions, create social cohesion, and make economic growth possible. The importance of these institutions is only beginning to be realized in the social sciences. For example, in economics, the New Institutional Economics has identified the

institutions that reduce transaction costs, secure property rights, and enforce contracts to be critical to economic growth. Without these, markets do not produce growth (North, 1990).

Many national and international projects would be good long-term investments and/or would be socially valued, but markets are unlikely to respond. A short list includes clean drinking water, basic vaccinations, primary education for all, internet access for all, ending slavery, ending sexual exploitation, care of the elderly, preventing destruction of cultural artifacts, and reducing carbon emissions. Indeed, markets are causing some of these problems because there are profits to be made. The world is in need of reinvigorated public sectors that respond to basic human and environmental challenges and create vital social and economic institutions. Civic national service can be an important tool for re-stating the role of government and re-honoring public life and public affairs.

The Rise of Civic Service³

A civic service can probably accomplish non-military objectives of service better than the army. For example, in Israel the likely alternative to military service is not no service at all, but some form of civic national service. This discussion, while tentative, has already begun in Israel. Other nations are also looking for ways for young adults to work on large projects, serve the country, and get to know one another, even though there is a declining demand for soldiers.

Service is breaking out of its national service origins. Within nations, we see more and more service opportunities at the state and local level, and organized by non-governmental organizations. Indeed, AmeriCorps in the United States is not a national service program at all, but rather a loose affiliation of a tremendous range of service programs sponsored by state governments, local governments, and non-profit organizations. All AmeriCorps participants wear an insignia, but their primary identification is with particular programs.

Civic service seems to be expanding in many countries, primarily for youth, but also for adults and elders. The purposes of service include social and economic development, citizenship, experiential learning, skill development, and nation building. Examples in the United States include AmeriCorps, Peace Corps, Campus Compact, Student Conservation Association, Experience Corps, and the Senior Volunteer Corps. In nations such as Mexico and Nigeria, service is required of university graduates. In some countries with mandatory national service requirements, such as Germany, civic service is an alternative to military service (international examples are in Sherraden and Eberly, 1982; and Eberly and Sherraden, 1990).

Political support for civic service is typically strong. For example, in very partisan times, both Bill Clinton and George W. Bush have championed AmeriCorps in the United States. The civic service option in Germany is so popular, with strong support from the nonprofit sector, that it would be difficult to abolish conscription (Klein, this panel). In Latin America, civic service for university students has roots that are deeply embedded in the social and political culture and unlikely to weaken regardless of who is in power.

³ A portion of this section borrows from an essay by the author, "Service and the Human Enterprise" (2001), which can be found on the GSI Web pages at <http://gwbweb.wustl.edu/csd/gsi/>

The history of civic service is largely positive; for example the US Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s was one of the most popular and successful public programs in the history of the nation. However, examples such as the Hitler Youth in Germany and the Red Guard in China remind us that service can sometimes be turned to evil purposes of the state. Negative examples of service must never be forgotten, but they are historically uncommon.

With increased globalization, we are likely to see increased cross-border awareness and action in all spheres. This is happening more rapidly in economic matters than in social and environmental affairs, but expanded cross-border cooperation in every arena are almost certain. Armies are not well suited for this. Armies, by definition, are designed to defend one group against attack from others. The primary assumption is conflict, not cooperation. Civic service, on the other hand, is very well suited to cooperative, cross-border endeavor. Indeed, civic service could become a vehicle for expression of a new global ethic and global citizenship. Programs like Canada World Youth and the Peace Corps in the United States may become more common. Preliminary planning for a North American Community Service program (among Mexico, the United States, and Canada) is underway. There is a preliminary proposal for an Arab-Israeli Youth Corps to work on regional projects such as a hiking trail that crosses borders in the Middle East between Arab nations and Israel. This proposal is going nowhere in the current hostile environment, but if peace is eventually to come to the region, it will be in part through such efforts.

There is growing realization that service can occur across the life span and should not be confined to a short period in early adulthood. In the United States and other countries there are increasing innovations in service for school age children, college students, young adults, adults, and the elderly. A growing discussion of “productive aging” for older adults and service innovations for elders hold considerable promise (Morrow-Howell, et al., 2001). As these innovations expand they will contribute not only to the availability of service roles, but also to a new mindset about service as a normal part of life at many different ages.

Unlike military service, civic service is a flexible social innovation that can be combined with other forms of voluntarism, with schooling, with paid employment, and with retirement in creative patterns that fit the interests and requirements of many different people and situations.

It seems likely that civic service is an emerging institution, initiated in many places around the planet during the twentieth century, and likely to expand in the twenty-first. Indeed, the global trend appears to be a decline in military service and a rise in civic service. By the end of the twenty-first century, civic service may be commonplace and well accepted, just as education, employment, and military service are today.

Institution Building

In studying social change, sociologists sometimes speak of “social forces” that lead to the emergence of new social institutions, almost as if these were inevitable, beyond human influence. This perspective captures a portion of reality, but not all of it. Actions by individuals and organizations also play a role. Institutions do indeed arise from social conditions when the time is right, but they are also purposefully created.

To illustrate, below is a brief review of some of the major institutions that have been created to engage, care for, and train young people in the United States. The record suggests that new institutions have arisen as a result of visionary individuals and dedicated organizations taking initiative for creating programs and policy:

Perhaps the major example is the *rise in public education* in the nineteenth century. While this development was in part a response to a declining youth labor market, educational leaders and state level policy-makers created legislation and built schools that would both control and educate the US population and lay the groundwork for economic growth and strengthening of democracy in the twentieth century (Dewey, 1916; Bailyn, 1960; Katz, 1968). At the outset, compulsory public education was a radical idea, promoted by advocates and political leaders against huge opposition.

Another nineteenth century example was the *placing out of children in families rather than reformatories*, a program of "diffusion rather than aggregation," making use of natural homes. Led by Charles Loring Brace, by 1870 the New York Children's Aid Society had already "transplanted" 18,000 children to the country. In many respects, the program was a success: ". . . large numbers of these boys and girls have aided the West in its development, and hundreds of lads have served their community in the army. Many are now property-holders, and respectable farmers and mechanics" (New York Children's Aid Society, 1870, p. 10). This new youth institution, halfway between indenture and foster care, was far from perfect, but it was a bold, creative response to perceived social disorder, and an improvement over incarceration (Sherraden and Downs, 1984).

Another example in purposeful institutional change was the policy decision, formulated at the 1909 White House Conference on Children, to *limit orphanage and almshouse care of dependent children* (Thurston, 1930). This decision resulted in the rise in foster care and the creation of Mothers' Aid laws in the states, precursors to Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). While foster care and AFDC today have many problems, they were a huge improvement over the mass institutionalization of dependent children that was occurring in the late nineteenth century. Indeed, this purposeful institutional change was perhaps the greatest single accomplishment of social workers in this century, led by Jane Addams, Julia Lathrop, and others.

Another example was Franklin Roosevelt's creation of the *Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC)*, an innovative, successful, and generative public policy that has led to numerous youth employment efforts since the 1930s. By starts and stops, the experience of the CCC led eventually to the Peace Corps, Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) during the 1960s and AmeriCorps during the 1990s. During the twentieth century, many people helped to lay the

groundwork for civic service as an institution in the United States, including academics such as William James, Margaret Mead, Morris Janowitz, Amitai Etzioni, and Charles Moskos; nonprofit leaders such as Donald Eberly, Franklin Thomas, and Susan Stroud; public servants such as Hubert Humphrey, Willard Wirtz, and Harris Wofford; and US Presidents Franklin Roosevelt, John Kennedy, and Bill Clinton (Salmond, 1967; Sherraden 1979; Janowitz, 1983; Moskos, 1988; Eberly 1988). The time may have been “right,” but change occurred only when key individuals and their organizations took it upon themselves to put something new in place.

These are historical examples of purposeful institutional change. If, as many believe, the United States today requires new social institutions for young people to provide opportunities for participation in society (Coleman, 1972; Janowitz, 1983; Moskos, 1988), then we need not feel overwhelmed by political inertia. In the past, at critical junctures, social thinkers, researchers, and policy-makers have taken in hand the task of altering the institutional landscape, and it is possible to do so again.

Morris Janowitz's sociology focused on society's mechanisms for self-regulation. He believed that social control, in the sense of societal self-regulation (Turner, 1967), did not occur as an abstract "force" or happenstance set of conditions. Rather, he assumed that people as active citizens decided and created political and social systems, and it was in their capacity to transform those systems (Janowitz, 1975, 1976). He also believed that sociology should be relevant not only to social problems, but also to institution building and promoting active citizenship (Janowitz, 1980, 1983). This is the perspective that is required if social thinkers are to be relevant to public life. It is a perspective that requires not only incisive academic studies, but also connecting research with community involvement, program innovation, and policy development.

Toward Institution Building in Civic Service: The Agenda of the Global Service Institute

A great deal of work on civic service has gone before. Many key ideas, studies, and examples are in place. The challenge for the twenty-first century is to assess previous gains, set directions and priorities, and continue building civic service as an institution.

The emergence of civic service as an institution is well underway, but it is poorly understood. The emergence process has qualities of a social movement, with strong advocates and policy and program innovations in many countries, but theory and research have been limited. Many positive impacts of service are recorded as anecdotal information and widely believed to be genuine, but there is little systematic documentation. We do not know very well how to understand service as an institution, nor do we have an adequate theoretical and empirical foundation to guide policy and program development. With rapidly increasing capacity for research and global information, these can play ever-greater roles in institution building.

In an effort to better understand, inform, and innovate in the area of civic service, the Global Service Institute (GSI) has recently been established with support from the Ford Foundation. GSI is initially located at the Center for Social Development (CSD) at Washington University and Innovations in Civic Participation (ICP), directed by Susan Stoud, in Washington DC.

The primary purpose of GSI is to build the knowledge base and understanding of service to inform policy and program development in the years ahead. At the same time, GSI will build a global information network on service, and support program and policy development worldwide. CSD will lead the research and information network. ICP will lead policy and program development. The GSI agenda is summarized in the Appendix.

The long-term aim of GSI is to help put service on stronger footings of a new social institution, with better knowledge, policies, practices, defined roles, widespread recognition, scrutiny, and with hard work and good fortune, gradual improvement over time. This is a large agenda that will require connecting with many people and organizations. Working together, we hope to learn more about the creation of new institutions for civic service within and across countries around the world.

Appendix

Center for Social Development
Washington University in St. Louis

The Agenda of the Global Service Institute: Work Plan for Phase One

An abbreviated work plan below covers research, information, and policy/program agenda of the Global Service Institute for phase one, from March 2001 through February 2003.

Research

CSD will identify, develop, convene, support, and expand an international research network on service. The network will operate primarily via the Internet, in conjunction with the global information network (discussed below). The research network will set a research agenda and begin research projects. Major tasks include the following:

- Cast a global net to identify key scholars who have experience, research skills, and interests in service.
- Form a research network and expand it over two years.
- Convene via the Internet, using Email and Web site.
- Hold a major research conference, in part to set and disseminate a research agenda.

Building on the formation of the network and agenda setting, research and publication will occur in the following areas:

Definition and naming. The meaning of service is not clear. In our view, service is yet to be defined and *named* as a widely understood concept, area of research, and policy direction. For some groups, in some languages, in some cultural traditions, and in some political circumstances the meaning of service is quite different from the meaning in this proposal. There is a rather thick fog in service research and policy that has been muddled though for several decades. We aim to address the definition and naming more directly. This will require both clarification of the concept and establishing a larger vision and reasoning for service. Major tasks include the following:

- Undertake qualitative research (focus group, in-depth interview, or open-ended questionnaire) with different groups, in different cultures, and in different political circumstances to understand better how service is interpreted and what the best terminology might be.
- Write and publish an article that seeks to define service as a concept and emerging institution, taking into account different perspectives of different groups. This publication will draw on historical and comparative data.

State of the field. It would be unwise to begin this major research endeavor without assessments, summaries, and interpretations of the state of the field. Major tasks include the following:

- Undertake a systematic global scan to assess the nature and scope of service worldwide, and write a summary report.
- Assess the quality of research and existing evidence that constitutes the current knowledge base for service. Our goal will not be to find all the research, but rather the higher quality research that exists. We will write and publish a summary article on what is known (and not known) about service.

Theory. Research on service has been characterized primarily by descriptive studies of the nature of service and evaluation studies of impacts. These studies are necessary and valuable, however, the intellectual foundation for service remains weak. In the absence of theoretical foundations, a knowledge base on service cannot fully develop. It will be necessary to identify promising theoretical perspectives from psychology, anthropology, sociology, political science, and economics. Major tasks include the following:

- Identify scholars who have taken theoretical approaches to service and make particular efforts to bring them into the research network.
- Identify the most promising theoretical approaches in different disciplines.
- Within selected theoretical approaches, specify theory as it relates to service; identify research questions that follow from that theory; state major propositions and, where warranted, research hypotheses.
- Write and publish a report on promising theoretical approaches and the key questions and propositions that follow.

Research. The primary emphasis during the first two years will be to lay the foundation for important research projects. Major tasks include the following:

- Commission selected research studies and papers (within budget constraints).
- Hold an international conference, and plan to publish a conference volume.
- Identify promising data sets and develop a plan to take advantage of existing data.
- Write and publish a report on promising directions for research, with specific recommendations.

Place in social science research. Service is not today an established concept in social science research. If a knowledge base is to develop, service must be the focus of large, on-going research efforts. This includes major longitudinal studies and research associated with public policy. Major tasks include the following:

- Discuss the promotion and establishment of research on service at the international conference, and make recommendations.
- Promote the inclusion of service variables in large-scale, longitudinal research projects (this will be a long-term endeavor).
- Promote stronger research agendas attached to public funding for service (e.g., CSD has drafted research sections of federal legislation for individual development accounts).

Information Network

Information technology and use of the World Wide Web will be effective tools for expanding the discussion of service. We seek to build an on-line community and rich, expanding information resource. Using the Web, CSD will coordinate the development of a worldwide information network with multiple nodes. The network will be organic and evolving. Users will encounter a multi-faceted and participatory information source, with seamless links to specialized nodes around the world. The goals of the network are to (1) provide a structured mechanism for service information globally, (2) stimulate growth in the depth and breadth of information on service, (3) promote communication among those interested in service, and (4) promote service as a research, policy, and program agenda. Major tasks include the following:

- Form an international task force to design and develop the network. Create an Email group or Listserv among task force members.
- Make key design decisions such as the location and content of Web pages, standardized format for Web pages, and template for submission of content.
- Identify, solicit, and cultivate partnerships with organizations in the United States and other countries to develop and support particular content areas. A partner is an organization that makes a commitment to develop and maintain a particular set of information on its Web site (e.g., bibliographies, research reports, country profiles, conference reports, and a service newsletter). Depending on the extent of technical resources, partners may house content on their own Web site or may contribute content to a Web site maintained by another organization. Web sites that are part of the network are called nodes.
- Reach beyond the Web's current extension. Solicit service policy, program, and research updates from countries where no Web site is maintained. At the same time, we will seek to develop emerging Web sites into network nodes (one measure of success will be whether new network nodes are developed over time).

Policy and Program Development

Innovations and special projects

- Plan priorities in terms of value that can added in innovation.
- Begin at least one special project focussing on a particular application of service.

Design and publish a newsletter

- Work with Helene Perold in South Africa and CSD staff to design and develop a newsletter.

Build partnerships and collaborations

- Work with international organizations to help shape policy and programs and/or provide technical assistance. These might include the Inter-American Development Bank, World Bank, United Nations (UNESCO, UNDP, UNV), European Union, and Council for Europe. Bring distinctive service strategies into partnerships. These might include service that is transnational (e.g., regional), is based on specific population (e.g., marginalized youth), has a common institutional base (e.g., institutions of higher education), or focuses on a particular issue (e.g., emerging democracies such as Russia, China, and Indonesia; or reconciliation of conflicted groups in areas such as Northern Ireland, South Africa, or the Middle East).

- Contribute to the GSI information network. Contributions might include policy documents and legislation; speeches and transcripts from annual conference and other meetings; and technical assistance materials (e.g., handbooks, programming guides)
- Work with CSD staff and researchers around the world to provide information about policy and program developments in countries around the world to assist with applied nature of the research agenda; and alert practitioners to research findings to assist with program and policy development.

Plan an International Advisory Council

- Identify international figures with an interest in promoting national and community service. The purposes of the Advisory Council include increasing visibility, building links to related areas of intellectual work, and facilitating connections to other organizations, people, and funding.

Regarding the GSI research and information agenda contact:

Amanda Moore, GSI Research Coordinator
 Center for Social Development
 Campus Box 1196
 Washington University
 St. Louis, Missouri 63130
 USA
 Tel 314-935-7433
 Fax 314-935-8661
 Email aam1@gwbmail.wustl.edu

Lissa Johnson, GSI Information Network Manager
 Center for Social Development
 Campus Box 1196
 Washington University
 St. Louis, Missouri 63130
 USA
 Tel 314-935-7433
 Fax 314-935-8661
 Email ejohnson@gwbmail.wustl.edu

Carlos Benitez, GSI Data and Communications Coordinator
 Center for Social Development
 Campus Box 1196
 Washington University
 St. Louis, Missouri 63130
 USA
 Tel 314-935-7433
 Fax 314-935-8661
 Email cab2@gwbmail.wustl.edu

Regarding the GSI program and policy agenda, contact:

Susan Stroud, Director
Innovations in Civic Participation
1776 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036
USA
Tel 202-775-0290
Fax 202-833-8581
Email info@icicp.com

References

- Bailyn, Bernard (1960). *Education in the forming of American society*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Brace, Charles L. (1872). *The dangerous classes of New York and twenty years' work among them*. New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck.
- Coleman, James, and Panel on Youth (1972). *Youth: Transition to adulthood*, report of the Panel on Youth, President's Science Advisory Committee. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Danzig, Richard, and Szanton, Peter (1986). *National service: What would it mean?* Lexington, MA: DC Heath and Company.
- Dewey, John (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Eberly, Donald J., ed. (1968). *National service: Report of a conference*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Eberly, Donald J. (1988). *National service: A promise to keep*. Rochester, NY: John Alden Books.
- Eberly, Donald J., and Sherraden, Michael, eds. (1990). *The moral equivalent of war? A study of non-military service in nine nations*. New York and London: Greenwood Press.
- Gal, Reuven; Manglesdorff, A. David; Manglesdorff, David; and Dolgin, Daniel L. (1991). *Handbook of military psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gal, Reuven (1995). *Community-civic service in Israel*. Zikhron Ya'akov, Israel: Carmel Institute for Social Studies.
- Glick, Edward Bernard (1967). *Peaceful conflict*. Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Books.
- Hanning, Hugh (1967). *Peaceful uses of military forces*. New York: Praeger.
- Janowitz, Morris (1975). Social control and macrosociology, *American Journal of Sociology* 81, 82-109.
- Janowitz, Morris (1976). *Social control of the welfare state*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Janowitz, Morris (1980). Observations on the sociology of citizenship, *Social Forces* 59(1), 1-24.
- Janowitz, Morris (1983). *The reconstruction of patriotism: Education for civic consciousness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- James, William (1910). The moral equivalent of war, *International Conciliation*, no. 27.
- Katz, Michael B. (1968). *The irony of early school reform: Educational innovation in mid-nineteenth century Massachusetts*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Morrow-Howell, Nancy; Hinterlong, James; and Sherraden, Michael, eds. (2001). *Productive aging: Concepts and controversies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Moskos, Charles (1988). *A call to civic service*. New York: Free Press.
- Moskos, Charles, and Butler, John Silbey (1997). *All that we can be: Black leadership and racial integration the army way*. New York: Basic Books.
- North, Douglass (1990). *Institutions, insitutional change, and economic performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- New York Children's Aid Society (1870). *Eighteenth annual report*. New York: New York Children's Aid Society.

- Salmond, John A. (1967). *The Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942: A New Deal case study*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Sherraden, Michael (1979). *The Civilian Conservation Corps: Effectiveness of the camps*, PhD dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Sherraden, Michael, and Downs, Susan W. (1984). Institutions and juvenile delinquency in historical perspective, *Children and Youth Services Review* 6(3), 155-172.
- Sherraden, Michael, and Eberly, Donald, eds. (1982). *National service: Social, economic, and military impacts*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Thurston, Henry W. (1930). *The dependent child*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Turner, Ralph (1967). *On social control and collective behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.