

1995

A Policy Study of Youth Service: Synthesizing Analysis of Policy Content and Policy Process Over Time

Jean Shumway Warner
University of Oklahoma Norman Campus

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcedt>

 Part of the [Service Learning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Warner, Jean Shumway, "A Policy Study of Youth Service: Synthesizing Analysis of Policy Content and Policy Process Over Time" (1995). *Dissertation and Thesis*. 3.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcedt/3>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Barbara A. Holland Collection for Service Learning and Community Engagement (SLCE) at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertation and Thesis by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

A POLICY STUDY OF YOUTH SERVICE:

SYNTHESIZING ANALYSIS OF
POLICY CONTENT AND
POLICY PROCESS OVER TIME

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

National Information Center
for Service Learning
1954 Buford Ave, Room R290
St. Paul, MN 55108-6197
1-800-808-SERVE

By

JEAN SHUMWAY WARNER
Norman, Oklahoma
1995

NSLC
c/o ETR Associates
4 Carbonero Way
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

This is a doctoral dissertation submitted to
the Graduate College, University of Oklahoma.
Spacing and pagination have been changed
to facilitate reproduction.

c Copyright by Jean Shumway Warner 1995
All Rights Reserved.

Acknowledgements

Many people contributed in numerous ways to the completion of this dissertation. Gary Copeland chaired my dissertation committee and provided valuable direction and encouragement. The other members of my dissertation committee, Larry Hill, Allen Hertzke, David Ray, and economist Don Murry, also provided helpful suggestions. David Wilsford and Don Kash offered constructive advice in the early stages of the study. Through her teaching, research, and numerous conversations over the years, Anne Schneider contributed in countless way to this dissertation.

The Political Science Department and the Carl Albert Congressional Research and Studies Center at the University of Oklahoma provided me with financial support and a superb environment for scholarly pursuit. My special thanks go to Ron Peters, Don Maletz, and LaDonna Sullivan.

For my year on Capitol Hill, I am grateful to the American Political Science Association's Congressional Fellowship Program. The hard work of Catherine Rudder and Kay Sterling was evident in the remarkable opportunities available to participants throughout the year. Both Congresswoman Mary Rose Oakar and Senator Frank Lautenberg gave me full staff status while permitting time to pursue my dissertation research.

I must acknowledge the many individuals in Washington, D.C. and around the nation who generously consented to be interviewed for this research. A small number of these people are quoted directly in this study; unattributed quotations are from those individuals who preferred to speak off the record. I thank all of those whom I interviewed for their time and wisdom and insight. Special thanks are due to those who gave me complete access to their youth service files including Donald J. Eberly, John Glenn, Bob Graham, Edward Kennedy, Barbara Kennelly, Will Marshall, Dave McCurdy, Barbara Mikulski, Claiborne Pell, and Peg Rosenberry.

Sarah Flanagan, Ron Grimes, Sam Halperin, Eric Jensen, Roger Landrum, Nick Littlefield, Chuck Ludlum, Catherine Milton, Don Mathis, D. Gray Maxwell, Charles Moskos, Julie Abbott Murphy, Gretchen Pagel, Glenn Roberts, Rocky Rosacker, Shirley Sagawa, Alden Schacher, Gene Sofer, Frank Slobig and Tom Wolanin provided me with particularly valuable

Sofer, Frank Slobig and Tom Wolanin provided me with particularly valuable information. Chris Murphy made it possible for me to attend Senator Kennedy's Senate receptions for members of the Points of Light Commission and the Commission on National and Community Service. I especially thank the members of Congress who took time to talk to me; my interview with Congressman Martinez was particularly memorable. Throughout my research, Don Eberly was a constant source of information, insight, and encouragement; this dissertation and the youth service movement are greatly indebted to his vision and tenacity. I absolve all of these individuals of any direct responsibility for what appears in this study. All errors in fact and interpretation are mine alone.

Finally, I owe my greatest debt of gratitude to three academic scholars who have guided and counseled me over the years: my husband, economist Larkin Warner, whose unfailing confidence sustained me; my father, historian Floyd Shumway, whose prodigious example inspired me; and my father-in-law, political scientist Earl E. Warner, whose unwavering faith motivated me and in whose memory this work is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING POLICY DEVELOPMENT	15
3. PROPOSALS FOR NATIONAL SERVICE WRIT LARGE.	27
4. PROPOSALS MODELED ON THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS.	55
5. SERVICE-LEARNING PROPOSALS AND YOUTH SERVICE AMERICA.	75
6. CIVICS, CITIZEN SOLDIERS, AND THE DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP COUNCIL	93
7. YOUTH SERVICE BILLS IN THE 101ST CONGRESS.	113
8. ENACTING YOUTH SERVICE LEGISLATION IN THE 101ST CONGRESS	139
9. CONCLUSIONS.	163
APPENDIX	175
REFERENCES	177

LIST OF TABLES

1. Select Youth Service Bills and Amendments Introduced in the U.S. Congress, 1960-1990.	5-9
2. Participants, First National Service Conference, May 7, 1966	34
3. Original Members, National Service Secretariat Advisory Board	35
4. Conservation and Service Corps Programs in the United States, Total Dollars and Number of Enrollees, By Type of Program, 1986-1989.	71
5. Conservation and Service Corps Programs in the United States, Number of Programs by Type of Program, 1986-1989.	72
6. Summary of Major Characteristics of Select Full-Time National Service Writ Large Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress	128
7. Summary of Major Characteristics of Select Part-Time National Service Writ Large Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress	130
8. Summary of Major Characteristics of Select CCC- Type Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress . . .	131
9. Summary of Major Characteristics of Select Student Aid Related Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress	133
10. Summary of Major Characteristics of Select School- Based Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress. .	134
11. Chronology of Events Leading to Passage of PL 101-610 During the 101st Congress	140
12. Members of the House Committee on Education and Labor Who Chaired a Subcommittee and Also Introduced a Youth Service Bill During the 101st Congress	147
13. Original Members, Commission on National and Community Service	156
14. Youth Service Bills in the U.S. Congress . . .	164-165
15. The Continuum of Youth Service Opportunities. . .	167
16. Target Funding Levels for Select Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress	171

A POLICY STUDY OF YOUTH SERVICE:
SYNTHESIZING ANALYSIS OF
POLICY CONTENT AND POLICY PROCESS OVER TIME

BY: JEAN SHUMWAY WARNER

MAJOR PROFESSOR: GARY COPELAND

This dissertation uses a case study of youth service proposals to examine how policy is formulated. For this study, youth service refers to federal programs that provide America's youth with opportunities to participate in domestic, non-military, full- or part-time community service activities. A theory is proposed that synthesizes two complementary approaches to the study of policy -- process analysis (Kingdon 1984, 1994) and the analysis of policy content (Schneider and Ingram 1990, 1993) -- and advocates analyzing policy over time. Four theoretical categories of data -- actors, ideas, opportunities, and strategies -- guide the study.

Three versions of youth service -- national service writ large, team oriented programs modeled on the New Deal Civilian Conservation Corps, and school-based service-learning -- are identified. Analysis of policy content underscores the importance of the social construction of target populations (Schneider and Ingram 1993). The youth service policy community's efforts to change the public perception of youth illustrate how policy entrepreneurs understand and use this policy tool. In the late 1980's, when the target population, youth, was successfully portrayed as positive (i.e., deserving and potentially powerful) rather than as negative (i.e., deviant and/or politically weak), the U.S. Congress passed PL 101-610, the National and Community Service Act of 1990.

Youth service policy entrepreneurs are assertive and manipulative. They frame policies, use rationales to link their ideas to problems receiving Congressional attention, and create opportunities to advance their proposals. For the youth service case study, Kingdon's description of policy entrepreneurs as mostly reactive underestimates the role of these

individuals. The theory advanced here reveals the process of public policy formulation to be less random than research by Kingdon suggests.

Patterns emerge when policy is studied over time. A review of youth service bills in the U.S. Congress over thirty years identified only marginal change from one Congress to the next. Competing policy ideas seldom converged. Advocates for each version of youth service pursued separate strategies and addressed different audiences. Most innovations were proposed by newcomers to the youth service policy debate.

In 1986, an umbrella organization was formed to unite youth service advocates. Eventually most members of the youth service policy community saw the wisdom of supporting a wide variety of program types. This strategy further enlarged the policy community and made it easier for divergent groups within Congress to support a broad youth service bill. Nevertheless, the dedicated commitment of a skilled and powerful member of Congress, Senator Edward Kennedy, and a 1988 youth service campaign commitment by successful presidential candidate George Bush were required before Congress would enact a comprehensive federal domestic youth service program.

Chapter 1. Introduction

This dissertation uses a case study of federal youth service proposals to explore how public policies are formulated and modified over time. Youth service refers to programs that provide America's youth with opportunities to participate in domestic, non-military, full- or part-time community service activities; youths may or may not be compensated for their service. The dissertation reviews the origins of the idea of a federal youth service program, the search for appropriate program models, objectives and target populations, and efforts to redefine youth service through the proper framing of ideas, the use of rationales, and the most favorable social construction of the target population. This chapter discusses theoretical contributions of the study, presents an overview of youth service, reviews the methodology, data, and definitions used in the research, and describes the topics covered in the remaining chapters.

Theoretical Contributions of This Dissertation

The study's methodological approach yields important insights about public policy formation. It is argued in this dissertation that Kingdon's description of policy entrepreneurs as largely reacting to random, fortuitous events (1984, 1994) undervalues the role of individuals and overstates the degree of happenstance and serendipity in the policy process. The methodological approach supports the argument of Schneider and Ingram (1993) that the social construction of a policy's target population is an important although generally neglected policy characteristic. The case study documents how newcomers to the policy debate tend to be more open to policy innovation than do established policy advocates both on and off Capitol Hill. Finally, this research suggests strategies for legislative success where a policy's constituent support is limited and the target population is considered to be politically weak.

A Policy Theory -- In this dissertation, a theory is advanced that synthesizes two complementary approaches to the study of public policy. Kingdon's process-oriented model of concurrent streams and windows of opportunity (1984, 1994) is modified and augmented by the analysis of policy content (Schneider and Ingram 1990, 1993). The theory is then applied in a historical analysis of the youth service policy field. Four theoretical categories -- actors, ideas, opportunities, and strategies -- guide the analysis. By combining policy process with the analysis of policy content over time, this theory yields insights regarding policy origin, formulation, change, and adoption.

Calculating Actors in a Rational World -- Kingdon's process-oriented theory of agenda setting and alternative formulation features a nonrational model composed of three concurrent but independent streams -- policies, problems, and politics. He describes policy entrepreneurs as mostly reactive participants waiting for windows of opportunity to open. This study of youth service policy reveals policy entrepreneurs to be shrewd and resourceful; they frame issues, use rationales to link their proposals to perceived problems, and create opportunities to promote their ideas. The theory advanced here reasserts the importance of individuals in policy formulation and reveals a policy process that is less random and more purposive than

Kingdon's theory suggests.

The Social Construction of the Target Population -- When first published in 1984, Kingdon's work was notable for acknowledging the role of ideas in the policy process. Yet his theory downplays the actual content of the particular policy under scrutiny. The theory advanced here incorporates the analysis of policy content as developed by Schneider and Ingram (1990, 1993). Youth service proposals are analyzed according to policy components including rules, tools, agents, target populations, and program goals and objectives.

The analysis of policy content provides particularly useful insights regarding the social construction of target populations. Members of the youth service policy community deliberately pursued strategies designed to change the public perception of youth from negative (deviant and/or politically weak) to positive (deserving and potentially powerful). This behavior illustrates how policy entrepreneurs understand and use this policy tool.

Policy Innovation and Change -- Patterns emerge when policy is studied over a considerable period of time. The history of youth service in America reveals three independent versions of youth service. One group of policy entrepreneurs championed a comprehensive domestic, civilian national service program. A second set of individuals advocated team-oriented youth service activities similar to the 1930s Civilian Conservation Corps. A third contingent promoted school-based service-learning programs for students of all ages or programs that linked youth service to student financial aid eligibility. The three versions of youth service attracted different supporters, addressed different problems, served different target populations, and reflected different objectives.

A review of youth service bills in the U.S. Congress over a thirty year period shows little change in policy content from one Congress to the next. Competing policy ideas seldom converged. Advocates for each version of youth service pursued separate strategies and addressed different audiences. Different versions of youth service were rarely present in a single bill. Most youth service policy innovations were offered by newcomers to the youth service debate -- often over the objections of youth service experts.

Implications for Policies Similar to Youth Service -- This case study contains lessons for others with ideas they hope will someday receive congressional support. With financial support and encouragement from a number of large philanthropic foundations including the Ford Foundation, a wide variety of youth service programs were established across the United States during the early 1980s. The successful operation of these programs permitted the idea of youth service to graduate from an abstract concept to a concrete, credible program. As the choice of program designs expanded (for example, by including high school and elementary students), the base of grassroots support for youth service activities also broadened.

In 1986, an umbrella organization, Youth Service America, was formed to unite the various subgroups within the youth service policy community. Members of Youth Service America worked to change the social construction of the target population for service programs from negative to positive. Eventually, most youth service proponents accepted the wisdom of supporting a bill that advanced all three versions of youth service. This strategy -- and the legislation it spawned -- expanded the target population, attracted a wide range of supporters, and allowed formation of a coalition around multiple, interrelated program objectives. Nevertheless, it

still required the dedicated commitment of a skilled and powerful member of Congress, Senator Edward Kennedy, and a 1988 youth service campaign promise by successful presidential candidate George Bush before Congress enacted a comprehensive federal domestic youth service program, Public Law 101-610, the National and Community Service Act of 1990.

A Brief Overview of Youth Service

This section describes the three versions of youth service identified for this dissertation and briefly outlines the legislative history of youth service proposals in the U.S. Congress. Substantive material is presented in much greater detail in Chapters 3 through 8 of the dissertation.

Three Versions of Youth Service -- Youth service policy can be grouped into three categories -- national service, Civilian Conservation Corps-type programs, and education-linked programs. In this study, proposals that call for a comprehensive, universal, sometimes mandatory, federally sponsored, nonmilitary youth service program are labeled "national service writ large." Some national service writ large advocates seek to establish a federal program of service opportunities for all youth. Other writ large proponents merely call for a demonstration program to test the concept or a federal commission to study the idea. National service writ large programs are often suggested as a civilian alternative to military conscription. Chapter 3 traces the early years of the youth service movement and chronicles efforts to enact a federal program of national service writ large.

The second version of youth service involves team-oriented programs modeled on the New Deal's Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). The CCC program operated from 1933 until 1942 when it was terminated because of World War II; youth service advocates consider the CCC to be the first large scale federal youth service program in the United States. In the 1970s, the Congress enacted two youth service programs modeled on the CCC; the Youth Conservation Corps provided 8-week summer service opportunities while the Young Adult Conservation Corps offered a limited number of full-time, year-round service positions. Both programs were phased out in the early 1980s.

Traditional CCC-type youth service proposals depict youth working in small, highly supervised teams or corps on conservation projects in rural areas -- often in national or state parks. More recent CCC-type youth service proposals include work projects located in urban settings or human-service projects such as working in nursing homes, hospitals, day care centers or libraries. Chapter 4 chronicles the history of the Civilian Conservation Corps and other New Deal youth programs and describes CCC-type bills in Congress since the end of World War II.

The third version of youth service involves education-linked youth service policies. Early proposals envisioned university-administered service-learning activities for college students; the service providers may or may not have received college credit for their service efforts. More recent school-based student service proposals have involved high school students and even elementary school students.

Youth service activities have long been proposed in conjunction with student financial aid benefits although no bill on this subject was introduced in Congress until 1987. In these proposals, student financial aid benefits can be for either college or vocational school training. Benefits can be provided either prior to the provision of service or after the service is performed. Some proposals defer or forgive college loan repayment if the individual

participates in a youth service program following graduation. Other proposals promote service activities by students while they are still enrolled in school. Chapter 5 recounts the development of education-linked youth service programs and reviews efforts beginning in 1986 to unite youth service advocates through the establishment of a nonprofit advocacy group, Youth Service America.

Other Service-Related Federal Programs -- Congress has enacted other service programs but these programs have been small in scale and limited in scope. The Peace Corps, for example, was established in the early 1960s but enrolls only a few thousand volunteers at any given time. Only a small percentage of Peace Corps volunteers are young and the Peace Corps does not offer domestic service opportunities. Other service programs enacted in the 1960s include the Teacher Corps, Health Services Corps and Volunteers In Service to America (VISTA). Youth service advocates consider these programs to be too small-scale and narrowly targeted to qualify as federal programs of youth service. Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) youth programs have never been considered youth service programs; rather, they are viewed as youth employment and training initiatives.

Youth Service Proposals in the U.S. Congress -- Since the late 1950s, members of Congress have sponsored many youth service bills but most received little attention. A few bills were the subject of congressional hearings. An even smaller set of bills were actually reported out of committee or voted on by the full House of Representatives or Senate. While advocates regularly sought to advance the idea of youth service, the Congress seriously considered youth service proposals only in the mid-1970s and again in the early 1980s. Rarely were bills proposed that included more than one version of youth service.

In early 1989, Congress embraced youth service with enthusiasm. Over thirty youth service bills were sponsored in 1989 and 1990. In addition to bills providing for each version of youth service, several bills were introduced that included all three versions of youth service. These later bills, S. 1430 (Kennedy), H.R. 3807 (McCurdy) and H.R. 4330 (Hawkins), were labeled "continuum bills" because they proposed a continuum of service opportunities. Table 1 lists the Congressional bills identified for this research. The bills are sorted according to national service writ large, CCC-type, education-linked, and continuum bills. Chapter 6 describes how, in the 1980s, the theme of citizenship brought into the youth service policy community new, influential organizations including the Democratic Leadership Council, the People for the American Way, and the William T. Grant Foundation. Chapter 7 summarizes the youth service bills introduced in the 101st Congress.

Bill Passage and the Clinton Modification -- In November, 1990, the Congress passed and President Bush signed H.R. 4330, the National and Community Service Act of 1990. The new law, PL 101-610, provided for several types of youth service programs including rural conservation corps, youth service corps in urban areas, service programs in schools from kindergarten through college, and full-time or part-time national service demonstration programs. A new federal agency, the Commission on National and Community Service, was created to administer most of the new programs. A budget of \$250 million was authorized for the first three years of the program. Chapter 8 records the events during the 101st Congress that led to passage of the youth service bill.

Table 1.
 Select Youth Service Bills and Amendments
 Introduced in the U.S. Congress, 1960-1990

National Service "Writ Large" Bills:

<u>Years & Congress</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Bill Number</u>	<u>Bill Title or Description</u>
59-60 86th	Humphrey	S. 3657	A bill to establish a Peace Corps
	Reuss	HR 9638	A Point Four Youth Corps
67-68 90th	Brewster	S. 1213	Establish a foundation to do 1-year study
	Kennedy	S. 3025	One section similar to S.1213 (a study)
69-70 91st	Hatfield	S. 1937	Youth Power Act (Eberly wrote; no military link)
	Bingham	HR 1000	National Service Act of 1970
71-72 92nd	Hatfield	S. 1777	National Youth Service bill
77-78 95th	Cranston	S. 20?	[Not known]
79-80 96th	McCloskey	HR 2206	National Service Act (compulsory service)
	Cavanaugh	HR 3606	Public Service System Act (similar to HR 2206)
	Panetta	HConRES 271	Commission to Study National Service (Like S 2159 but gives them only 12 months)
	Tsongas Panetta	S. 2159/ HR 6868	Commission to Study National Service Companion to Tsongas bill S. 2159
	Tsongas Amendment #1675 to S. 1843		The Domestic Violence Prevention and Services (and National Service Commission) Act
	Schroeder, Amendment McCloskey, Panetta		To the Defense Authorization Act; required administration to study national service
81-82 97th	McCloskey	HR 1730	National Service Act (similar to S. 2206)
	Panetta	HR 2500	Select Commission on Voluntary Service Opportunities

Table 1. Continued

National Service "Writ Large" Bills (continued):

Years & Congress	Sponsor	Bill Number	Bill Title or Description
83-84 98th	Panetta	HR 1264	Select Commission on Voluntary Service Opportunities Act of 1983 (like HR 2500)
85-86 99th	Torricelli Hart	HR 1326/ S. 536	Select Commission on National Service Opps Companion to HR 1326 (like S 2159/HR 6868)
	Martinez/ Panetta	Amendment to HR 18	(See list of CCC-Type Program Proposals)
87-88 100th	Torricelli	HR 1468	Select Commission on National Service Opportunities Act of 1985 (like HR 1326)
	Torricelli	HR 2225	Universal National Service Act of 1987
	McCurdy	HR 1479	National Service Act of 1987
	Sikorski	HR 3096	A Commission to Study Opportunities for Youth Service Through the Federal Government
89-90 101st	Nunn McCurdy	S. 3/ HR 660	Citizenship and National Service Act Companion bill to Nunn's S.3
	Mikulski Bonior	S. 408/ HR 1000	National Community Service Act Companion bill to Mikulski's S. 408
	McCain Porter	S. 781/ HR 1951	National Service Act of 1989 Companion bill to McCain's S. 781
	Kennelly	HR 948	National Voluntary Service & Educational Opportunity Act of 1989
	Kennelly	HR 2084	National Service, Education, and Housing Opportunity Act of 1989
	Nunn	Amendment to S. 1352	National Defense Authorization Act (for a study)

Table 1. Continued

Programs Modeled on the Civilian Conservation Corps

Years & Congress	Sponsor	Bill Number	Bill Title or Description
71-72 92nd	Jackson Meeds	Unknown	To expand YCC to 100,000; passed Senate 5/23/72 Companion to Jackson bill in Senate
73-74 93rd	Jackson Meeds	Unknown	Young Adult Conservation Corps bill Companion to Jackson bill in Senate
75-76 94th	Humphrey	S. 3869	Youth Community Employment (Title I)
	Harrington	HR 12795	Youth Employment Act
	Tsongas	HR 13008	Youth Counseling & Emp Act
	Hawkins Humphrey	HR 50 S. 50	Sec. 205 addressed transition to work Companion to Hawkins bill in House
77-78 95th	Jackson Meeds	S. 249 HR 32	Young Adult Conservation Corps Companion to Jackson bill in Senate
	Humphrey/ Javits	S. 170	Comprehensive Youth Employment Act
	Simon	HR 1713	Bill addressed youth employment
	Stafford	S. 360	Youth Community Improvement Program
	Hawkins	HR 6138	CETA (PL95-33) 8/5/77
81-82 97th	Roybal	HR 3686	Civilian Conservation Corps II
	Seiberling Moynihan/ Mathias	HR 4861/ S. 2061	American Conservation Corps Act of 1981 Companion to Seiberling bill in House

Table 1. Continued

Programs Modeled on the Civilian Conservation Corps (continued)

Years & Congress	Sponsor	Bill Number	Bill Title or Description
83-84 98th	Roybal	HR 667	Civilian Conservation Corps II
	Seiberling Moynihan/ Mathias	HR 999/ S. 27	American Conservation Corp Act of 1983 Companion to Seiberling bill in House
	Unknown	S. 724	Youth Employment and Economic Assistance Act (one section similar to Seiberling's HR 999)
	Panetta	HR 6422	Voluntary National Service Act
85-86 99th	Panetta	HR 888	Voluntary National Youth Service Act of 1985 (could also be categorized as writ large)
	Seiberling Moynihan/ Mathias	HR 99/ S. 27	American Conservation Corps Act Companion to Seiberling bill in House
[NOTE: Seiberling and Mathias retired following the 99th Congress.]			
87-88 100th	Udall Moynihan	HR 18/ S. 27	American Conservation Corps Act Companion to Udall bill in House
	Martinez/ Panetta	Amendment to HR 18	Essentially the same as HR 460 (below)
	Panetta	HR 460	Voluntary National Youth Service Act (was HR 888)
89-90 101st	Williams Moynihan	HR 1408/ S. 232	American Conservation Corps Act Companion to Williams bill in House
	Dodd Panetta	S. 322 HR 717	American Conservation & Youth Service Corps Act American Conservation Corps and Youth Service Act
	Gaydos	HR 781	Civilian Conservation Corps II Act
	Roybal	HR 1033	Civilian Conservation Corps II Act
	Martinez	HR 1474	Community Service Corps of 1989

Table 1. Continued

Education Linked Proposals

<u>Years & Congress</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>Bill Number</u>	<u>Bill Title or Description</u>
87-88 100th	Morella	HR 2632	Peace Corps Volunteer Education Demonstration Act
	Bumpers	S. 759, 760	Higher Education Volunteer Services Amendments of 1987 to Require Dissemination of Information ... to Establish Partial Loan Cancellation for Service
	Sikorski	HR 2156,2157	Companion bills to Bumpers bill in Senate
	Pell	S. 762	Voluntary National Service and Education Demonstration Program Act
	Berman	HR 5535	Secondary School Community Service Act
	Chiles	S. 2450	Business & Citizens School Volunteers of America Act
89-90 101st	Morella	HR 985	Peace Corps Volunteer & Education Demonstration Program Act
	Bumpers Sikorski	S. 539-541/ HR 3039-3041	Higher Education Voluntary Services Amendment Act Companion to Bumpers bills in Senate
	Pell	S. 576	Voluntary National Service & Education Demonstration Program Act
	Garcia	HR 1615	Voluntary National Service and Education Demostration Program Act
	Graham	S. 382	Business and Citizen School Volunteers of America Act of 1989
	Atkins	HR 2137	This bill is similar to Graham bill in Senate
	Kennedy Ford	S. 650 HR 2591	Service America, the Service to America Act of 89 Companion to Kennedy bill (S 650) in Senate
	Owens	HR 1947	Similar to Kennedy's S. 650
	Dominici	S. 689	Kids Helping Kids Act of 1989
<u>Compromise Bills in the 101st Congress</u>			
	Kennedy	S. 1430	National and Community Service Act of 1989
	McCurdy	HR 3807	National and Community Service Act of 1989
	Hawkins	HR 4330	National Service Act of 1990

While this dissertation ends in 1990 with passage of the nation's first major youth service legislation, the debate over youth service policy continues. During the 1992 presidential campaign, candidate Bill Clinton adopted youth service as a policy issue. After his inauguration, President Clinton asked the Congress to expand the size and scope of the federal youth service program. Using discretionary monies, he funded a "1993 Summer of Service" program to test his legislative ideas.

In September, 1993, the Congress passed a modified version of the Clinton youth service proposal as the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (PL 103-82). For the first year of the Clinton program (FY 94), \$370 million was appropriated to a newly established Corporation for National and Community Service to administer most of the programs. Another \$204 million for FY 94 was appropriated to another federal agency, ACTION, to administer the balance of the Clinton youth service initiative. Under the new law, ACTION was to be merged into the Corporation in FY 95. Following the Republican party victories at the polls in November, 1994, however, the new House Speaker, Newt Gingrich (R-GA), has vowed to abolish the federal youth service program. In the early summer of 1995, the future of federal youth service programs was uncertain.

Data, Methodology, and Terminology

This dissertation traces the evolution of the idea of a federal program of youth service in the United States. Its conclusions are based on extensive interviews and reviews of youth service bills sponsored in the U.S. Congress. The research also drew upon youth service related books, newspaper articles, journal articles, newsletters and reports published by organizations advocating and opposing youth service legislation, and studies of youth service proposals prepared by the Congressional Research Service and the Congressional Budget Office.

Analysis of Bills in the U.S. Congress -- Youth service bills sponsored in the U.S. Congress from 1960 through 1990 were analyzed for this case study. At the end of each Congressional session, the House and Senate destroy any remaining copies of bills not acted upon during that two year period. Therefore, actual copies of older bills are often difficult to obtain. Some older youth service bills were located in the files of senior members of Congress. Other bills were located in the files of long time youth service advocates. When an actual bill could not be located, a description of that bill could sometimes be found in books, newspaper articles, or advocacy organization newsletters.

Because copies of every identified youth service bill are not available, a complete analysis of the content of all youth service bills is not possible. Nonetheless, most bills can be characterized in a number of important ways. In addition to the analysis of bills over time, this dissertation contains a detailed analysis of all youth service bills introduced during the 101st Congress.

Comprehensive Interviews and Extensive File Review -- As Congress took up and passed the conference report of youth service legislation, I arrived in Washington, D.C. to participate in the American Political Science Association's Congressional Fellowship Program. For the next year, I worked as a legislative assistant for Congresswoman Mary Rose Oaker (D-OH) (December, 1990 through May, 1991) and for Senator Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ) (June, 1991 through November, 1991).

While I was on Capitol Hill, I conducted over 60 lengthy interviews with members of Congress and those individuals on their personal or

committee staffs most directly involved with youth service legislation. Several individuals central to this research consented to one or more follow up interviews as well. I also interviewed individuals with the White House Office of National Service, the Points of Light Initiative Foundation, the Commission on National and Community Service, the National Service Secretariat, the Human Environment Center, the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, People for the American Way, the William T. Grant Foundation, the Democratic Leadership Council, and Youth Service America plus youth service program staff from around the nation.

When interviewing members of Congress and Congressional staff, my questions addressed the member's bill (origin of ideas in the bill, who drafted the bill, "problems" the bill addressed, program models or previous bills the drafters borrowed from, supporters and opponents of the bill), the member's reasons for sponsoring the bill, reasons why youth service legislation passed in 1990, youth service terminology, and personal experiences with volunteering or youth service programs.

These questions were often highly specific and sometimes personal. They often addressed political strategy and tactics. Everyone interviewed provided frank and informative responses. Many were eager to speak on the record. Some asked that they not be quoted. A few requested that they not even be named in my final report. The appendix to this dissertation contains a list of those individuals who were interviewed and who were willing to be named in this study. I also had complete access to many people's youth service files including those of Donald J. Eberly, John Glenn, Bob Graham, Barbara Kennelly, Will Marshall, Dave McCurdy, Barbara Mikulski, Claiborne Pell, Peg Rosenberry and the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

Informal Discussions At Meeting and Receptions -- During my fellowship year, I attended several of the initial organizing meetings of the Commission on National and Community Service. I also attended a reception in October, 1991, for newly appointed members of the Commission on National and Community Service and a reception in June, 1991, for newly appointed board members of the Points of Light Initiative Foundation. These receptions were hosted by Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA) in the Russell Senate Office Building on Capitol Hill and were attended by many of the Senators who sponsored youth service legislation. Both receptions involved an opening session during which all Senators and guests made formal statements; an open discussion session followed these opening remarks. The participants spoke candidly of their personal motivations, past efforts, and ongoing concerns regarding youth service programs. After Senator Kennedy adjourned the formal programs, participants enjoyed refreshments and private conversations. The receptions offered special insights and a remarkable opportunity to visit with key Senators.

Towards the end of my fellowship year, I participated in a strategic planning session on youth service held at the White House. Organized by President Bush's Office of National Service, the session addressed possible ways to operationalize the national service demonstration programs that were mandated in the 1990 law. Present at this meeting were members and staff of the new Commission on National and Community Service, Hill staffers who worked for members of Congress interested in youth service policy, and many major youth service policy entrepreneurs. As participants offered advice on how to best implement the new legislation, these important actors in the youth service saga reflected on their past tactics, strategies, rationales, and motivations and shared their personal dreams for the future

of youth service in America.

Defining Terminology -- Over the years, members of Congress introduced bills to establish programs that were labeled national service or community service or youth service or voluntarism. During my interviews, I asked members and their staffs whether they felt there was a significant difference in meaning between these terms. If the respondent indicated that the choice of terms mattered, I asked her or him to define each term.

For most respondents, national service implies a universal, comprehensive program of service that lasts one or more years and might involve some form of monthly stipend and/or an end-of-service payment. A number of respondents view national service as a nonmilitary alternative to the draft. The term is often linked to mandates of one sort or another. Some feel the term "national service" should not be used if the scope of the program is not nationwide.

Generally, respondents believe that the term "community service" suggests local autonomy and less of a life-changing commitment than does the term national service. Many respondents view community service as part-time rather than full-time work. The community service label is avoided by some who fear it could be confused with the sentence that judges sometimes assign individuals who have broken the law.

A few respondents feel that programs cannot be called "voluntarism" if they include stipends or some other financial benefits. (The counter argument to this line of reasoning is that we call our current military system the "All Volunteer Force" even though the soldiers are paid.) Many respondents see parallels between community service and youth service although some are reluctant to use the term "youth service" if adults and seniors might also be eligible to participate.

The specific terminology is not important to most respondents. A member of Senator Dodd's staff observed

what brought us to the table was the concept of service... there could be definitions that distinguish national service from community service from voluntary service but I have never weighed the terms and gotten hung up in the semantics.

Others said "we used those terms interchangeably," "it's just the same... what I think we keyed in on was civic values and service," and "they are all hybrids of the same stuff." Some respondents, however, clearly saw their bill as "a youth service bill" or "as part of the national service debate." The bill that passed in 1990 represented an amalgam of many bills and the member of Senator Kennedy's staff who worked most closely on the Senate bill admitted to agonizing over terminology when forging the final bill language.

Terminology may have mattered more to off-the-hill advocates than to members of Congress and their staffs. One Hill staffer recounted

It never made any difference to me. I kept talking about voluntarism until one of the Youth Service America people told me "we aren't interested in volunteerism; we do service!"

Several criteria determine which youth service bills are included in this research. First, the principal participants must be youths. Second, whether the service to be rendered is voluntary or mandatory, a significant sacrifice of the individual's time must be required. Third, the focus is on

civilian and domestic service versus international or military service (Aleman and Robinson 1989).

Terminology has become somewhat standardized in recent years. According to a 1993 Congressional Research Service Issue Brief,

The Commission on National and Community Service uses "community service" to refer to the full scope of service activities -- full-time and part-time -- occurring in freestanding organizations such as youth corps as well as those integrated in schools, and persons simply helping others. They define "national service" as a major life commitment -- one year or more of full-time service or its equivalent in part-time service over a longer period. Community service is almost entirely unpaid; national service participants generally receive some type of assistance, often some combination of living allowance, health or similar benefits, and end of service stipend (Robinson 1993, p. 1).

The Case Study Approach -- The focus of this dissertation is policy formulation -- where ideas come from, who generates the ideas, how they are communicated to others, and how the ideas find their way into legislative proposals in the U.S. Congress. This research project began as an application of Kingdon's theory (1984) but it quickly became apparent that a theory was needed that also incorporated the analysis of policy content (Schneider and Ingram 1990, 1993).

Theories are, by nature, so generalized that they miss the specific. Applying a theory to a detailed case study allows the researcher to evaluate how well a theory (or combination of theories) fits with reality. Clearly there are drawbacks to a case study of a single policy but Nelson Polsby has argued persuasively that

so long as our stock of ideas about policy initiation is relatively primitive, and so long as we are still learning and disagreeing about what a policy is and what an initiation is, the strategy of laying out case studies and searching for ideas about the experience they embody seems not only defensible but desirable (1984, p. 6).

Hecló (1974) notes that previous policies shape our view of current policy choices and Skocpol (1992) stresses the importance of understanding the history of a policy topic if we are to understand the final outcome. In this regard, national service proved to be a good issue for a case study of policy development. The history of youth service policy in the United States covers a significant period of time, remains relatively stable over that period, and is surprisingly well documented. We know a great deal about who introduced what sort of bill and (to some degree) why. Many of the pioneer policy entrepreneurs are still active and eager to share their experiences with researchers. The policy field is not overly cluttered -- particularly because there has been surprisingly little involvement by members of the federal bureaucracy. In addition, because there were three versions of youth service policy with three separate groups of policy advocates, youth service actually comprised three distinct case studies until the mid-1980s.

Plan of the Dissertation

Chapter 2 discusses public policy theory as it specifically addresses policy formulation. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 narrate the history of the three versions of youth service -- national service writ large, CCC-type youth service, and education-linked proposals -- and outline the events leading up to the formation of Youth Service America. Chapter 6 describes how the theme of citizenship brought the Democratic Leadership Council, the William T. Grant Foundation, and the public interest group, People for the American Way, into the youth service policy community. Chapters 7 and 8 describe and analyze the contents of the youth service bills introduced in the 101st Congress (1989-1990) and relate the legislative maneuvering that led to passage of a youth service bill in November, 1990. The final chapter assesses the degree to which a theoretical approach that applies both policy process theory and policy content theory over time provides insights into policy formulation, evolution and adoption.

Chapter 2. A Framework for Analyzing Policy Development

This chapter presents a conceptual framework for the study of policy development. A brief history of past theories of the policy process suggests weaknesses in these approaches. Recent research by Kingdon on agenda setting and policy formation (1984, 1994) and by Schneider and Ingram on analysis of policy content (1990, 1993) provide fresh approaches to this field of research. Kingdon suggests a nonrational model of the policy process that is composed of three concurrent streams -- problems, policies, and politics -- as well as windows of opportunity and policy entrepreneurs. Schneider and Ingram propose a taxonomy of policy content including rules, tools, agents, target populations, and goals (1990) and offer theories on policy framing, rationales, and the importance of the social construction of target populations (1993, 1995).

A synthesis of the findings of these two research areas is proposed and four categories of analysis are recommended as a guide to understanding the development of youth service policy in the United States. These categories are actors, ideas, opportunities, and strategies.

A Rational Model of Policy Development

This section reviews an approach to policy study that utilizes sequential stages or phases of the policy process. These policy stages often include agenda setting, alternative specification, policy selection, policy implementation and policy evaluation.

Science, Rationality, and the Stages Model -- Early policy scholars were influenced in their thinking by a respect for the scientific method and rational models of decision making (Somit and Tanenhaus 1967). Colleagues were urged to employ rigorous, scientific research methods, to focus on theory building research, and to view politics as an integrated system (Easton 1957). Out of this philosophy developed a model of the decision making process composed of precise, rational steps; a problem was identified, possible solutions were proposed and evaluated, and the most preferable solution was selected and implemented.

This progressive, incremental, rational decision making model seems to share common features with the public policy making process. Chamberlain (1946) describes the legislative process as a series of stages and Lasswell (1962) enumerates a sequential policy making process that includes the stages of intelligence, recommending, prescribing, involving, applying, appraising, and terminating. Price (1972) identifies six policy development functions in the U.S. Congress that reflect this sequential model of policy making: instigation and publicizing, formulation, information-gathering, interest-aggregation, mobilization, and modification. The sequential stages policy model continues to be a popular way to approach the subject of policy development -- especially in textbooks on the policy process (Anderson 1975, Jones 1984, Ripley 1988).

Agenda Setting and Alternative Formation -- While some scholars look at the complete policy process, others focus on one or another of the stages in the policy process. Some study agenda setting (Hoppe 1969; Cobb and Elder 1972; Cobb, Ross, and Ross 1976; Sharp 1992). Others address policy innovation and the diffusion of policy ideas (Gray 1994, Walker 1969, Gray 1973, Krist et al. 1984, Jacob 1990, Glick and Hays 1991, Hall 1989, Yishai 1993, Nathan 1989, Boeckelman 1992).

Alternative policy formation has received less attention. Policy formation is defined as the development of "a plan, a method, a prescription, in this case for alleviating some need, for acting on a problem" (Jones 1984, p. 77) and as the process of

devising and advocating a specific legislative remedy for a supposed need. The formulation draws boundaries around an issue and establishes a focal point for its further consideration (Price 1972, p. 4).

Schattschneider believes that "the definition of the alternatives is the supreme instrument of power" (1960, p. 68) and Simon writes that scholars

need to understand not only how people reason about alternatives, but where the alternatives come from in the first place. The theory of the generation of alternatives deserves, and requires, a treatment that is just as definitive as the treatment we give to the theory of choice among pre-specified alternatives (1981).

Yet, as late as 1984, Jones observes of policy formation that

by now everyone acknowledges the importance of these early stages of decision making, but relatively little research has been conducted. The task is difficult but is too important to be left undone (1984, p. 69).

The rational model of decision making is not viewed by all political scientists as appropriate for describing activities in the public sector. Rational-deductive decision models such as those used in operations research, statistical decision theory, and systems analysis do not account for the political aspects of the policy process. Some argue that public policy making involves log rolling and a decision style of "successive limited comparisons" (Lindblom 1959) or "disjointed incrementalism" (Braybrooke and Lindblom 1963). Critics argue that the sequential stages model of policy development is not causal, provides no specific testable hypotheses, and is overly simplistic if not descriptively inaccurate (Jenkins-Smith and Sabatier 1993).

A Nonrational Model of Decision Making and Policy Development

In the early 1970s, Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) developed an innovative model of decision making that used the example of an American university. A decade later, several studies applied this nonrational model of decision making to the public policy development field.

The "Garbage Can" Model of Decision Making -- Cohen, March, and Olsen describe the university setting as "an organized anarchy," i.e., an

organization characterized by a loose structure, problematic preferences, unclear technology, and open and changing participation. For decision making in this a setting, they propose a nonrational model of organizational choice composed of four streams: problems, solutions, participants, and choice opportunities. They picture a garbage can containing

a collection of choices looking for problems, issues and feelings looking for decision situations in which they might be aired, solutions looking for issues to which they might be the answer, and decision makers looking for work (Cohen, March, and Olsen 1972, p: 2).

Their model suggests concurrent activities and no set causal direction as well as a degree of chance with respect to who participates, the order in which issues are addressed, and decisions reached.

Applying the Model to the Policy Process -- In his study of the Presidency, Light (1991) considers but rejects the Cohen-March-Olsen model; he finds the executive branch to be more structured than an "organized anarchy." Polsby adapts the nonrational model in his study of policy innovation and proposes a two-stream model composed of invention and search (1984). But it is Kingdon (1984) who best adapts the Cohen-March-Olsen nonrational model to the agenda setting and alternative formation stages of the policy process.

Kingdon proposes a model of agenda setting and alternative formation based on the Cohen-March-Olsen "garbage can" model of organizational choice. His model is composed of three concurrent but independent processes or "streams" -- problem identification, policy formulation, and political events. Occasionally a window of opportunity opens, two (and sometimes all three) streams come together and a new policy is enacted. Kingdon's model also incorporates the concepts of policy entrepreneurs -- individuals who advocate, broker and otherwise work to advance their pet issue or problem -- and policy communities.

In the Kingdon model, problems are identified in the problem stream. At the same time, researchers, academics and other issue specialists discuss policy ideas within an informal set of networks that Kingdon calls policy communities. Political events such as campaigns and elections, personnel turnover (especially with the arrival of a new administration), and jurisdictional turf skirmishes occur independently of problem identification. As Kingdon's three streams flow along, policies come to be joined (or "coupled") with problems and to be adopted at times of "propitious political happenings" (1994, p. 216). When a problem exists and "a proposal is available that can be related to that problem" (1994, p. 216) and "the political conditions are right" (1994, p. 216), a window of opportunity opens. While new policy can occur at any time, Kingdon hypothesizes that dramatic policy change is most likely to occur when all three streams are joined. There is some element of chance involved in when the window of opportunity opens and when two or more of the streams come together but clearly events are helped along by the persistent efforts of policy entrepreneurs.

An Alternative Approach: Analysis of Policy Content

Kingdon's model encompasses both agenda setting and policy formulation but does not address why the policies that rise on the agenda

contain the particular elements that they do. Backing into the study of policy initiation from a focus on policy implementation and evaluation, other policy scholars focus on policy content and suggest theories about the relationships between policy content and policy adoption.

Identifying the Components of Policy -- Beginning in the mid-1980s, policy analysts began to break specific policies into their component parts. These scholars of policy design look for relationships amongst the parts of a policy proposal and develop theories that relate the nature of the component parts to the likelihood of a policy being adopted. Policy design scholars view policies (such as bills, statutes, regulations, and administrative rules) as "the purposive tools available to government to attempt to change economy and society" (Linder and Peters 1990, p. 106) and argue that a "tools" approach to the study of policy offers a useful framework for policy analysis and research (Salamon 1989). Policy design scholars identify and classify policy instruments and suggest theories of how policy makers assess and select from alternative policy instruments (Peters 1983, Hood 1984, Linder and Peters 1989, Bobrow and Dryzek 1987).

The Work of Schneider and Ingram -- Schneider and Ingram (1990b) argue that policies are composed of rules, tools, agents, target populations, and goals. Policy rules identify eligible participants, assign responsibility and authority, and specify the actions and decisions that must be made and the procedures that must be followed. Tools are the incentives used to get targets and agents to respond as desired; examples of tools include grants, stipends, fines, contracts, licenses, vouchers, imprisonment, education programs, and standards (1990b). Ingram and Schneider identify agents as the individuals, organizations, agencies, or firms charged with carrying out the policy and define target populations as

the persons, groups, or firms selected for behavioral change by public policy initiatives such as statutes, agency guidelines, or operational programs (1991, p. 334).

Eligibility criteria define the boundaries of the target population. Goals represent the desired outcomes or impacts expected from the policy. These elements of policy -- rules, tools, agents, target populations, and goals -- are linked together through behavioral and normative assumptions which vary according to policy tools (Schneider and Ingram 1990a).

Bringing the Fields Together: Process Plus Content Over Time

Sabatier (1991) suggests the possibility of a synthesis of policy theories. He sees as particularly promising the policy process theory of Kingdon and the theories of policy content developed by Ingram and Schneider. This dissertation draws from both of these research tracks and highlights the importance of studying a policy in depth and over time.

This case study of youth service policy is a historical analysis of the idea of youth service as it is represented in legislative proposals sponsored in the U. S. Congress over a 30 year period. It draws on Kingdon's research for insights regarding the policy development process and also for hypotheses regarding the role of individuals. The Schneider and Ingram emphasis on policy content including rules, tools, agents, target populations, and goals is adopted in this study to describe and analyze youth service policies.

The youth service policy case study involves considerably more activism and strategic behavior by policy entrepreneurs than Kingdon's

model suggests. Such behavior includes issue framing, use of rationales to link policy proposals to problems under consideration by the Congress, and efforts to manipulate the social construction of the target populations (those who would benefit directly from a youth service program). Not only are these actions less random than Kingdon's work suggests, but Kingdon's research gives only slight attention to the role of strategic action. Therefore, Kingdon's concurrent streams and windows of opportunity are combined in this dissertation with work by Schneider and Ingram on policy content, framing, rationales, and the social construction of target populations. These two sets of theoretical fields complement one another and, together, provide valuable insights regarding how ideas develop, change, and come to be adopted as public policy.

Actors, Ideas, Opportunities, and Strategies

The conceptual framework for gathering and analyzing data for this dissertation is composed of four elements: actors, ideas, opportunities, and strategies. This section discusses each of those four elements.

Actors -- Participants in the policy process can be individuals, informal or formal groups, and what Kingdon calls policy communities. A special subset of actors are those individuals known as policy entrepreneurs.

Kingdon places individuals who advocate and influence policy within his "policy stream." Over time, policy specialists who share a common interest in an issue become acquainted and exchange information within informal policy communities. Policy communities tend to be small and the resulting intimacy enhances the sharing of ideas. By definition, the rate of interaction between members of a policy community is relatively high.

A policy community can be either open or closed. If it is open, a community is likely to experience a greater degree of fragmentation and instability as it attempts to influence the policy agenda. Generally, policy communities operate relatively free from political events or pressures. While the members of the policy community are not entirely unaffected by politics, Kingdon's policy stream generally functions independent of his other streams.

Kingdon defines policy entrepreneurs as individuals who are willing "to invest their resources - time, energy, reputation, and sometimes money" (1984, p. 129) in order to advance a pet policy or concern over a problem. Policy entrepreneurs are found inside and outside of government. In government, they can be elected or appointed. Many are associated with interest groups, research or academic communities, and nonprofit organizations. They also include congressional staff, bureaucrats, budget people, and highly motivated private citizens.

The primary tool of a policy entrepreneur is persuasion. According to Kingdon, they spend much of their time "softening up" other members of their policy community, special subsets of the public who will be affected by the policy, and/or the public at large. On Capitol Hill, policy entrepreneurs push for introduction of bills and for the scheduling of hearings to draw attention to their topic. Off the Hill, they give speeches, conduct studies and issue reports, distribute papers, and undertake other activities meant to keep an idea alive.

We generally think of policy entrepreneurs as activists pushing for adoption of some new, innovative solution to a problem or working to draw attention to an important but unrecognized problem. In fact, policy entrepreneurs can work equally hard to stop others from succeeding. As

Kingdon notes, "each of the actors and processes can operate either as an impetus or as a constraint" (1984, p. 93).

Kingdon found that participants in the agenda setting and policy formation processes can be divided into two groups: a visible cluster and a hidden cluster. The visible cluster tends to receive considerable attention and publicity as it goes about setting the public policy agenda. This cluster includes the President, high-level political appointees, prominent members of Congress (including the leadership and committee chairs) and, to a lesser extent, the media, political parties and campaigns. Kingdon's hidden cluster includes academics and researchers, congressional staff, career bureaucrats and low level political appointees in the administration. The influence of this second group is usually seen in the generation of policy alternatives rather than in setting the agenda. Generally, swings in national mood and personnel turnover resulting from an election will be felt more on setting the policy agenda. While interest groups play a role in both agenda setting and policy formation, the political forces of interest groups are more likely to be seen in the formulation of policy alternatives.

Kingdon's model provides a place for individuals and groups and this dissertation adopts his terminology. Kingdon's research provides testable hypotheses regarding participation in his visible versus hidden clusters and regarding influence on agenda setting versus alternative formation. In Kingdon's model, actors tend to be discussed in the context of policy communities although he does acknowledge some role for actors in what he labels the problem stream and the politics stream.

The work of Schneider and Ingram focuses less on actors than on policies but they do suggest that both politicians and non-politicians fail to appreciate the implications of various behavioral assumptions and other policy elements when drafting policy. They stress the ability of politicians to manipulate policy content as well as external matters including the social construction of target populations.

The youth service case study suggests that Kingdon's portrayal of actors reacting to events undervalues the degree to which policy entrepreneurs purposefully set out to influence events. This point is discussed further under the headings "Opportunities" and "Strategies." This research also recognizes nonpoliticians as manipulators both of policy content and of perceptions regarding policy, national mood, and target populations.

Ideas -- Before public policies are proposed, ideas emerge regarding how the world works and how it might be made to work better and how individuals might be motivated to continue or change their behavior. Federal proposals for youth service programs were preceded by political treatises, novels, speeches, and discussions about the proper role of voluntary action within a democratic society. When members of Congress speak of their youth service bills, for example, they often refer to concepts expressed by Alexis de Tocqueville (1945), Edward Bellamy (1982), and William James (1906). The "idea of youth service" varied across the policy communities and across time with respect to what it was, how to do it, who should do it, the goals of a federal youth service program, and the appropriate role of government. (The idea of a federally funded youth service program also drew opponents, including fiscal conservatives who said it would be too expensive, civil libertarians who saw it as one level above indentured servitude or who feared it would lead to reinstatement of the military draft, and those who advocated part-time, unpaid volunteerism rather than full-time, compensated service.)

An important contribution of Kingdon's work is the role he gives to ideas. He argues that ideas matter and eventually gain good currency through persuasion.

The content of the ideas themselves, far from being mere smokescreens or rationalizations, are integral parts of decision making in and around government (Kingdon 1984).

Kingdon places ideas within his policy stream. He argues that there really are no new ideas and, even if there were, it would be impossible to identify the original source of an idea anyway. Rather, his focus is on how policies mutate and recombine. In this study of youth service, an effort was made to identify when ideas and concepts were first interjected into the policy community discussion.

The Schneider and Ingram structure for characterizing a policy proves very useful in this dissertation. Each youth service legislative proposal is characterized according to the type of youth service specified (conservation or environmental versus human services, rural versus urban or suburban, full-time versus part-time, etc), the length of the proposed service period, and the projected size (number of volunteers estimated to be involved), costs, rules (eligibility criteria and work to be performed), tools of influence (the incentives provided to get participants to volunteer including provision of wages, end-of-service stipend, and in-service training), agents (the federal agency that would administer the program as well as the role of state government and local communities, if any), the target population (youths, seniors, at-risk kids), and program goals. This level of detail is critical when identifying policy themes and philosophies reflected in actual legislative proposals over time and within a single congressional session.

Opportunity -- In Kingdon's model, policy windows "open infrequently and do not stay open long" (1984, p. 175). Policy windows close for many reasons; the problem may have been resolved or a law may have been passed to address the issue. A policy proposal may have been offered but was defeated or people may have shifted their attention to a new area. Perhaps the reason for the window opening (such as a crisis or shift of personnel) has changed or the window may have opened without there being a solution available.

Certain events enhance the likelihood of a window of opportunity opening. A window of opportunity can open as a result of events in the problems stream (such as a crisis or a significant shift in a major indicator) and by events in the political stream (such as a shift in the national mood). At the congressional level, elections result in new individuals serving in the Congress; the new configuration of members can also reflect shifts in the ideological or partisan distributions in the two legislative bodies. New members bring new issues to the Congress. Balances on various issues tip one way or the other. Election outcomes also send messages from the public about problems the public wants addressed. Kingdon describes these events as occurring "according to their own dynamics" (1994, p. 216). The timing for some windows opening (if not the outcome) is predictable; program reauthorizations, the budget cycle, and campaigns and elections all hold forth the strong possibility of a window of opportunity opening. Timing is less predictable for party realignments, interest group pressure campaigns, broad social movements, and swings in public mood.

Kingdon observes that dramatic agenda change usually accompanies

the arrival of a new administration:

At the time of a change in an administration, people all over town hold their breath in anticipation, waiting to see what the new administration's priorities will be, what its policy agendas will look like (1984, p. 161).

The same holds true for each federal agency; as new administrators take charge, departmental priorities shift. Personnel turnover can also enhance or hinder an issue's chance of advancing on the policy agenda. Some previously neglected issues may receive attention while others are dropped from the agenda.

Jurisdictional disputes -- between government agencies, between congressional committees, and between the Congress and the administration -- can either help or hinder an issue.

In the case of the federal government, administrative agencies and congressional committees have their claims to turf. Their positions are affected by their jurisdiction, agenda setting is affected by battles over turf, and some times are ignored because they are "defined away" by the drawing of jurisdictional boundaries (1984, p. 162).

Kingdon calls the degree of uncertainty regarding when a window of opportunity might open "residual randomness" (1984, p. 199). When a window of opportunity opens, it means that there is a chance for policy enactment; at that time, according to Kingdon, policy entrepreneurs step forward to take advantage of the opportunity. While the policy entrepreneur can play an important role in bringing the streams together, Kingdon portrays actors as generally reacting to events in the process.

The window opens because of some factor beyond the realm of the individual entrepreneur, but the individual takes advantage of the opportunity (1984, p. 192).

Policy entrepreneurs are involved in advocacy (pushing their proposal or problem) and in "brokerage... negotiating among people and making the critical couplings" (1984, p. 192). Yet Kingdon attributes most policy entrepreneurs' success to persistence rather than to skill.

They push for their proposals all the time; long before a window opens, they try coupling after coupling that fails; and by dumb luck, they happen to come along when a window is open (Kingdon 1984, p. 192).

The policy process is characterized by Kingdon as unpredictable. He observes that since outcomes depend

on the mix of problems and proposals under consideration, there is bound to be some happenstance, depending on which participants are present, which alternatives are available, and even what catches people's eye (1984, p. 186).

Thus, for Kingdon, the policy process is relatively haphazard and idiosyncratic; the actors, policies, and even the windows of opportunity are subject to random -- or at least uncontrollable -- events and factors.

In the case of youth service policy, policy entrepreneurs both on and off Capitol Hill take a more activist, proactive role than is suggested by Kingdon's model. While they wait for opportunities to arise, policy entrepreneurs also work hard at creating opportunities and influencing the outcome of such predictable events as presidential campaigns.

Strategies -- The strategies employed are important not just for explaining legislative outcomes but for what they tell us about how and why an idea is shaped and modified and how Kingdon's streams come together. Contrary to Kingdon's view, my research suggests that policy entrepreneurs do not succeed by lucky timing but actually devise and carry out strategies intended to force open Kingdon's windows of opportunity.

Kingdon does not ignore the role of strategy completely. He observes that for a problem to rise on the governmental agenda, it helps to be attached to a viable solution. For a problem to rise on the decision agenda, its chances are "dramatically increased if a solution is attached" (1984, p. 150). And a proposal is most likely to rise on the decision agenda if all three of Kingdon's streams are joined. Kingdon does acknowledge that problem streams and policy streams are sometimes intentionally joined by policy advocates.

People in and around government sometimes do not solve problems. Instead they become advocates for solutions and look for current problems to which to attach their pet solutions (Kingdon 1984, p. 129).

Linking a solution to a problem is often accomplished through issue framing and rationales -- strategies that Schneider and Ingram argue can be used to "legitimate policy goals, the choice of target populations and policy tools" (1993, p. 339).

Kingdon proposes some useful hypotheses regarding criteria for policy success. If an issue is perceived to be out of favor with the public, little action is likely on that subject; advocates must wait for policy makers' perceptions of the national mood to shift back in their favor (1984, p. 157). Other criteria for policy success include

technical feasibility, value acceptability within the policy community, tolerable cost, anticipated public acquiescence, and a reasonable chance for receptivity among elected decision makers (Kingdon 1984, p. 138).

For an idea to meet the criterion of value acceptability, Kingdon suggests it should represent "mainstream thinking" within the policy community. It also helps its cause if the proposal is compatible with certain elements of political culture of the United States including the "virtues of limited government," equity, and efficiency (1984, p. 142-145).

The case study of youth service policy reveals numerous instances of policy entrepreneurs framing their policy proposal so that it appears to meet Kingdon's criteria. Kingdon recognizes that this activity occurs. His model, however, significantly undervalues the role individuals play in shaping not just the policy but the way policy proposals are framed by and for different

audiences.

One of the more interesting strategies used by policy entrepreneurs has to do with the social construction of the population affected by a policy. Schneider and Ingram note that a good part of the

political maneuvering in the establishment of policy agendas and in the design of the policy pertains to the specifications of the target populations and the type of image that can be created for them (1993, p. 336).

The social construction of the target population involves

stereotypes about particular groups of people that have been created by politics, culture, socialization, history, the media, literature, religion and the like (1993, p. 335).

Both the target population and the social construction of that population are important elements in agenda setting and policy formation. Schneider and Ingram argue that policy makers often have a choice of target populations when drafting a proposal. When considering a policy that will mete out benefits, elected officials anticipate the degree to which their constituents and others will agree that the target population is deserving and should be the beneficiary of the proposed policy.

Social constructions can also be altered. Stone notes that "different sides in a conflict create different portrayals of the battle -- who is affected, how they are affected, and what is at stake" (1988, p.25). Through development of these "causal stories," political actors attempt to reconstruct reality with respect to who is the victim, who is to blame, and how the policy proposal will rectify a problem or situation (Stone 1989). Given the need to justify the target population, policy entrepreneurs attempt to define the social construction of the target population via these causal stories and other rationales.

Schneider and Ingram measure social construction of the target population along two dimensions: political power and positive versus negative standing in society (i.e., whether they are deserving of benefits (positive construction) or burdens (negative constructions). They divide the possible target populations into four groups -- advantaged (politically powerful/positive standing), contenders (politically powerful/ negative standing), dependents (politically weak/positive standing) and deviants (politically weak/negative standing) and identify a "distinctive pattern in the allocation of benefits and burdens to the [four] different types of target groups" (1993, p. 337).

According to Schneider and Ingram, benefits tend to be over-subscribed to the advantaged group while burdens are over-subscribed to the deviants. Indeed, they argue, advocates have a difficult time passing legislation that provides benefits (such as stipends, vouchers, and employment opportunities) to a target population with a social construction of deviant (such as youths involved in gang activity or school dropouts). They have a better chance of passing such a bill if the target population is viewed as merely dependents (minorities, youths from economically disadvantaged families, or even just "good kids" who face societal challenges in making their transition to adulthood). Schneider and Ingram argue that the same legislation (with its "benefits" of jobs, loan deferments, housing vouchers, etc.) is more likely to pass the Congress if the target group has a

social construction of politically powerful and positive (their "advantaged" category).

Use of strategies for advancing a policy are evident in the history of youth service policy. Issues were framed through causal stories and other means. Advocates proposed rationales that linked solutions to perceived problems and sought to influence the social construction of the target population.

Schneider and Ingram tend to credit (or blame) calculating, manipulative politicians for the shape of and perceptions about public policy. Just as Kingdon's model seems to undervalue the role that individuals play in opening the window of opportunity, the theories of Schneider and Ingram seem to over emphasize the role of the politician while failing to fully acknowledge the ability of other players in the policy stream to frame policy, market persuasive rationales, and shape the social construction of the target population.

Conclusion

The rational, sequential model of policy analysis is essentially a macro-level approach to the study of policy. This study rejects the rational model of sequential stages as unrealistic and nonpredictive.

Kingdon's concurrent streams model derives from a mid-level study of policy development at the federal level over several years. His model offers a more dynamic and detailed approach to policy development but includes a strong element of randomness. (The model is not totally nonrational as Kingdon describes very deliberate behavior on the part of policy entrepreneurs and others.) But the opening of Kingdon's windows of opportunity is unpredictable, which undermines the explanatory value of Kingdon's model.

This dissertation represents a micro-level analysis of policy evolution. It reveals a policy process that is considerably more intentional and proactive than Kingdon's analysis suggests. For youth service policy, at least, windows of opportunity opened due to the conjunction of fortuitous events but also as a result of the calculated behaviors and strategies of policy entrepreneurs.

My approach to the study of policy synthesizes the process-oriented analysis of Kingdon with analysis of policy content as advocated by Schneider and Ingram and considers evidence over a substantial period of time. The theories developed by Schneider and Ingram are both predictive and prescriptive. These scholars classify policy variables -- or elements -- into a taxonomy that allows them to predict when policy is likely to succeed and the relationships that are likely to be found between elements within a successful policy.

Their theories are also prescriptive at the strategic level. If policy entrepreneurs want their ideas to succeed, they should follow certain behavior, including issue framing and the employment of rationales that link issues (i.e., solutions) to problems. They should intentionally promote an appropriate social construction for the target population of their policy. The case of youth service policy over the past half century supports these arguments. While the analysis of policy content alone leaves out important aspects of policy evolution, when combined with process analysis, it yields rich rewards.

The analytical framework of actors, ideas, opportunities, and strategies stresses the importance of people, policy content, and behavior calculated to create opportunities and to advance a policy's chances of being

adopted. The approach renders considerable detail and some opportunity for prediction and emphasizes the important role of politics and politicians in the policy-making process.

Chapter 3. Proposals for National Service Writ Large

The campaign for a federal domestic youth service program began in 1959 when a letter to the editor written by Donald J. Eberly was published in the Christian Science Monitor. Over the next thirty years, Eberly would work tirelessly to advance the idea of national service.

But several factors constrained the policy proposal's chances for success. The policy community was small, elite, and politically weak. There was little consensus on either strategy or program design. Over time, national service was framed as a possible solution to the problems of military draft inequities, youth unemployment, and deficiencies in the All Volunteer Force. The target population was seldom depicted as deserving of public benefits; rather, the social construction of the target population was often negative and/or politically weak (draft dodgers, conscientious objectors, rioting college students, school drop-outs, at-risk youth, or renegade military recruits). As public attention to each problem faded, the national service policy community searched for a new program rationale.

A historical analysis of national service policy content reveals little innovation over time. Nor were national service advocates willing to join forces with proponents of other types of youth service. Finally, while national service policy always enjoyed a few backers in the U.S. Congress, the concept never attracted the attention of a powerful political champion in either the Congress or the White House.

"The Moral Equivalent of War"

The concept of youth performing a period of civilian service for the betterment of their country was not an idea conceived in the mid-twentieth century. American author Edward Bellamy described a program of mandatory youth service in his 1887 novel Looking Backward: 2000 - 1887 (1982). His idea of all citizens contributing a few years of nonmilitary service to their country led to the establishment of debating groups and study societies. But the activities of these "Bellamites" rarely moved into the political realm.

Instead, William James is generally identified as the father of the idea of a federal program of youth service. An American social philosopher, psychologist and pacifist, James lived from 1842 to 1910. He was shocked by the imperialist nature of the Spanish-American War of 1898 yet recognized the positive effect the war had played in building an American sense of nationhood. He wondered whether, in the place of war, a compulsory, universal work program for all young males in America would produce a sense of common purpose and national solidarity -- what James termed "a civic passion."

He presented his ideas about a program of national service in a speech at Stanford University in 1906; the speech was later published as "The Moral Equivalent of War" in 1910. James observed that

What the whole community comes to believe grips the individual as in a vise. The war function has grasped us so far; but constructive interests may someday seem no less imperative,

and impose on the individual a hardly lighter burden.

If now--and this is my idea--there were, instead of military conscription, a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against Nature, the injustice would tend to be evened out, and numerous other goods to the commonwealth would follow... Such a conscription, with the state of public opinion that would have required it, and the many moral fruits it would bear, would preserve in the midst of a pacific civilization the manly virtues which the military party is so afraid of seeing disappear in peace (James 1966. p. i).

James believed that such a program would help young men "get the childishness knocked out of them, and to come back into society with healthier sympathies and soberer ideas" (1966, p. i). They would develop a "toughness without callousness, healthier sympathies and soberer ideas, ideals of hardihood and discipline, and civic temper" (James 1966, p. i).

First Efforts at National Service: Peace Corps But Not VISTA

National service writ large policy entrepreneurs influenced the legislation that led to the Peace Corps and VISTA, but neither of these federal programs met their national service writ large program specifications.

There is considerable debate over what individuals and organizations influenced (or served as prototypes for) the Peace Corps. Besides William James, writer Liberty Hyde Bailey had called for a federal program of universal service (1919). Labor leader Walter O. Reuther (1950) and Heinz Rollman (1954) also offered proposals for international youth service programs. Several successful private foreign service programs also served as models.

Possible Working Models for the Peace Corps -- Several models of service existed that may have influenced Humphrey and, later, John F. Kennedy in conceiving their proposals for a Peace Corps program. The Experiment in International Living (EIL) had promoted cultural exchange since 1932 by bringing together youth from different nations. In the 1930s, Sargent Shriver (who would become the first director of the Peace Corps) was an EIL participant and later an EIL group leader (Polsby 1984). Another possible model for the Peace Corps was the International Volunteer Service, an interdenominational religious program founded in 1953 to teach basic living skills to citizens of underdeveloped nations including Vietnam, Laos, and Egypt.

President Kennedy identified Operations Crossroads Africa as one inspiration for his vision of the Peace Corps (Polsby 1984). Begun in 1957 with a goal of promoting relations between citizens of participating nations, Operation Crossroads Africa placed young Americans in summer public works projects in African nations. And Harris Wofford has identified several individuals who may also have influenced Kennedy.

Milton Shapp claimed that he had put the idea in Kennedy's head, and through Ted Sorenson the then Philadelphia businessman had indeed suggested something like the Peace Corps. Through Robert Kennedy, a talk along the same lines by

General James Gavin also reached the presidential candidate in the fall of 1960. Sorenson listed six additional sources in Kennedy's mind: the Mormon Church's requirement of full-time voluntary service (often overseas) by its young people; other voluntary service efforts; an editorial Kennedy had read years earlier; the suggestions of some academic advisors; the legislation previously introduced in Congress; and, finally, the response to a spontaneous late night challenge he issued to Michigan students three and a half weeks before the election (Wofford 1980).

Kennedy received additional suggestions and encouragement from Mildred Jeffrey and the hundreds of students at the University of Michigan who circulated petitions following Kennedy's October 14 talk (Redmon 1986).

The idea for a Peace Corps was first outlined in a bill in the U.S. Congress that Senator Hubert H. Humphrey sponsored in June of 1960. This bill reflected the ideas of Donald J. Eberly, America's the first youth service policy entrepreneur.

Eberly Contacts Senator Hubert H. Humphrey -- The son of a Methodist minister, Eberly was graduated from high school at the close of World War II. He felt a debt of gratitude to those who had served and died in the war and resolved to make his own contribution. As an undergraduate student at MIT, Eberly worked on a project that brought foreign students to the campus for summer study. Upon graduation from college, his plans for a foreign service career were interrupted by receipt of a draft notice following the outbreak of the Korean War.

While waiting to receive his final orders from the Selective Service Commission, Eberly wrote to President Truman about meeting his draft obligation through non-military service. He had read of a new government program that placed Americans in African nations for 3-year terms of service and asked if he could join the "A-3" program in lieu of military service. He was informed that there was no nonmilitary alternative to military service. When he entered the Army in 1951, Eberly resolved to

Observe the contribution I made as a soldier and then, if I survived, I would serve over seas in a civilian capacity and compare the contribution I made in the two forms of service. Then, if the idea had any validity in this individual test, I would consider its development on a larger scale (1988 p. 16).

After his release from the Army in 1953, Eberly was the first individual placed in Nigeria by the International Development Placement Association, a new, private organization that placed teachers in foreign countries. Over the next few years, he taught at Molusi College and University College in Nigeria and at Robert Academy near Istanbul.

Eberly developed his idea of a federal civilian service program open to all youth while working abroad. He sent a 5,000 word essay setting forth his ideas to the Christian Science Monitor. A shortened version of his "National Service for Peace" essay was published as a letter to the editor on April 8, 1959. In that piece, Eberly stated

I believe America should actively support a National Service which employs the instruments of peace as an alternative to

military service... America's need for a strong standing army is accepted. It is also accepted and strongly advocated that our young men should be of direct service to our country for a period of two years. However, this proposal does assume that a few of the thousands of young men who are drafted annually could be of greater service to America in constructive, peaceful pursuits (Eberly 1959, p. 16).

Later that year, Eberly returned to the United States to enter graduate school and begin promoting his idea of a national service program.

Eberly was encouraged by the fact that Representative Henry Reuss (D-WI) had introduced "A Point Four Youth Corps" bill in the previous Congress. Reuss' wife had participated in the Experiment in International Living program during the 1930s. His bill had not passed but Congress ordered a study of possible youth service programs. "An Analysis of a Proposal for the Establishment of a Point Four Youth Corps" was submitted to Congress December 17, 1959 (Darken 1959). Reuss reintroduced his bill January 14, 1960, as H.R. 9638.

Recognizing that the idea of national service needed to gain currency and good standing with influential policy makers, Eberly sent copies of his full essay to a number of colleagues and public officials. U.S. Congressman Frank T. Bow (R-OH) wrote to Eberly in February, 1959, that he would try to get Eberly's idea incorporated into the Selective Service Act; he dropped the effort when the idea met resistance in the Armed Services Committee. Deciding to "spread the net more broadly in hopes of finding someone who would sponsor national service legislation" (Eberly 1988, p. 33), Eberly then mailed his proposal to close to half the members of the U.S. Senate.

Eberly's idea struck a chord with Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. The Senator had been working on a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. Now, his focus shifted to Eberly's universal youth service proposal. On February 29, 1960, he wrote Eberly

Since writing to you on August 21, I have had the opportunity of studying your proposal for a National Service for Peace more thoroughly... To put it to you squarely, I like your idea. I not only like it, but I have been advocating it in a number of speeches. I now want to get moving and see if we can translate it into public policy (Eberly 1988, p. 34).

Eberly and Humphrey's legislative assistant, Peter Grothe, drafted a bill that called for participants to perform a three-year term of civilian service. Other than in times of war or national emergency, this service would be considered as fulfilling the participant's military requirement except for reserve obligations. Humphrey introduced this bill as S. 3675, "A Peace Corps," on June 15, 1960 (Polsby 1984).

The Presidential Campaign as a Window of Opportunity -- Campaigns and elections offer the opportunity to place an issue on the public agenda. The 1960 Presidential campaign illustrates this point well. In 1960, both Humphrey and John F. Kennedy were involved in the presidential campaign. National service did not become an issue in the presidential primary but it was raised during the general election.

In a 2 a.m. speech to a crowd of college students and townspeople on the University of Michigan campus on October 14, 1960, Kennedy was impressed by the favorable response he received after challenging youth to

contribute a part of their life to their country. In a speech on November 3, 1960, in San Francisco, Kennedy proposed that the meager U.S. effort to help underdeveloped nations to help themselves

be supplemented by a "peace corps" of talented young men willing and able to serve their country ... for three years as an alternative to peace-time selective service... We cannot discontinue training our young men as soldiers of war -- but we also need them as ambassadors of peace (Kennedy 1960).

After the election, Kennedy's advisors urged him to act quickly on his Peace Corps proposal. On March 1, 1961, the newly elected president created a temporary Peace Corps by Executive Order No. 10,924. A Peace Corps Act was passed by the Congress and was signed into law on September 22, 1961.

Would the Peace Corps Be National Service? -- Just getting an idea onto the public agenda and approved by public officials does not guarantee a satisfactory final product. Eberly did not view Kennedy's Peace Corps proposal as the equivalent of his national service writ large idea. It excluded domestic service opportunities and was likely to involve a very limited number of volunteers.

Some ideas for how the Peace Corps might operate came out of a study prepared for Congress. Congressman Reuss had introduced a bill in 1960 to study Humphrey's and Kennedy's Peace Corp proposals. That bill passed and Colorado State University carried out the study and prepared the report -- New Frontiers for American Youth: Perspectives on the Peace Corps (Albertson 1961). The report was released just before President Kennedy established the Peace Corps by Executive Order. By that time, however, the concept of national service had narrowed to Kennedy's Peace Corps model.

Eberly shared his ideas on the need for a domestic service program open to a large number of American youth with Sargent Shriver and Harris Wofford while they worked on the initial design and implementation of the Peace Corps. Eberly knew Wofford through his earlier work; Wofford had served on the board of directors of the International Development Placement Association in 1952 when it placed Eberly in Nigeria. Shriver was not very interested in Eberly's ideas but did offer him a position with the Peace Corps. Eberly believed that he could be more successful in promoting his idea of national service if he worked outside government. He declined the job offer but did serve on the Peace Corps' recruiting team and traveled extensively promoting the new agency.

After a new program is created, advocates tend to back off for a time to see how the effort develops. That was the case with Eberly's promotion of a program of national service. In the fall of 1961, Eberly accepted a three-year appointment as undersecretary in Nigeria's Federal Ministry of Education. Following another brief period in the United States, he worked in Liberia for one year under the auspices of Education and World Affairs. During his time out of the country, the Peace Corps took shape; he realized it would never meet his vision of national service.

VISTA: A Pale Shadow of National Service -- For a while it looked like the Kennedy administration would propose a broad domestic youth service program. A group appointed by President Kennedy and headed by then Attorney General Robert Kennedy met to draft legislation for a national service corps. Meeting between November, 1962 and January, 1963, they envisioned a program involving no more than 5,000 volunteers -- a far cry from Eberly's concept of a program open to all youth. The task force

generated a report entitled "Information on a proposed national service program (S. 1321/H.R. 5625)" (President's Study Group on a National Service Program 1963). Their recommendations eventually led to establishment of the Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) program when Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act in August, 1964.

VISTA has been a small-scale, low-key domestic service program. By 1994, over 100,000 volunteers had served in over 12,000 anti-poverty projects across all fifty states. In 1981 (President Carter's last budget), the program reached a peak of 4,200 volunteers with an appropriation of \$30 million. Under Reagan, however, the budget was slashed and VISTA was scheduled for termination. The 1983 budget of \$11 million supported only 1,700 volunteers (McCarthy 1994). Intervention by previous VISTA volunteers managed to save the program, but it did not increase in size substantially until the 1990s. VISTA volunteers must be 18 years of age but the average age of a VISTA volunteer in 1989 was 36 (Toomepuu 1989). The small number of volunteers, the older age of volunteers, and the narrowly targeted anti-poverty mission makes VISTA a pale shadow of the program envisioned by national service writ large advocates.

A number of other anti-poverty programs were also enacted in the mid-1960s as part of the Johnson administration's "War on Poverty." These included the Job Corps, Head Start, Legal Services, Health Service Corps, the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, Teachers Corps, Foster Grandparents, and Upward Bound. All of these programs fail to meet the standards of a national service writ large program.

Job Corps participants attend a facility away from their home where they receive job training and job placement assistance. The program was never well funded and experienced particularly low levels of funding in the 1970s. The program is targeted to disadvantaged and unemployed youth aged 16 to 24 and is generally viewed as a youth unemployment rather than as a youth service program. The Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Summer Youth Employment Program were also targeted to disadvantaged youth. None of these programs represented the universal, comprehensive, program of national service supported by writ large policy advocates.

Organizing the National Service Policy Community

By the mid-1960s, Eberly had become an active policy entrepreneur working to build a national service writ large policy community. He hosted conferences, founded a private, nonprofit national service association, authored a newsletter to generate continued interest, wrote articles, delivered speeches, and promoted national service to public officials.

The First National Service Conference -- When Eberly returned to the United States in 1965, he read of a conference hosted by the Johnson administration to observe the "International Cooperation Year." He submitted a paper and attended the conference in December of 1965. Eberly's paper was well received and, at the urging of conference participants, he organized and hosted the first conference on national service.

Thirty individuals attended Eberly's conference on May 7, 1966, in New York City. Seven papers were presented that offered definitions of national service and proposed rationales for a federal writ large program including

opportunities for education in its broadest sense; giving to participants a sense of self worth and civic pride; provision of cross-cultural experiences; reduction of draft inequities;

meeting manpower needs in areas of short supply; and fulfillment of the obligations of citizenship (Eberly 1966).

Participants at this conference came primarily from the academic community. Harris Wofford attended from the Peace Corps. Other federal agencies represented were VISTA, the U.S. Army, and the Department of Commerce; the Department of Health, Education and Welfare sent an observer. Nonprofit and philanthropic organizations, a journalist, two Congressional staff aides and a minister rounded out the list of participants (see Table 2).

With a grant from the Alfred P. Sloane Foundation, Eberly published the proceedings of the first national service conference -- A Profile of National Service -- with an annotated bibliography divided into four sections: "Early Days -- The Moral Equivalent," "Middle Days -- The Peace Corps," "Later Days -- The Non-Military Alternative" , and "Today -- National Service" (Eberly 1966).

Establishment of the National Service Secretariat -- Policy entrepreneurs need a platform from which to promote their ideas and Eberly soon founded such an organization. In the summer of 1966, he founded a nonprofit association that he named the National Service Secretariat (NSS). Its purpose was to "provide research, consulting and information services in all areas relating to the concept of national service" and to serve as a "clearinghouse of information on national service" (Eberly 1991, p. 1). NSS began publishing a periodic newsletter, National Service Newsletter (NSN), in August, 1966, to inform interested parties of national service developments. In January, 1967, Eberly announced the establishment of a National Service Advisory Board composed of "a wide range of interests, backgrounds and attitudes" (NSN 1967, p. 3). The original members are listed in Table 3.

In April, 1967, Eberly hosted a second national service conference in Washington, DC, for 160 people. Over thirty papers were presented on panels that addressed manpower implications, participant eligibility criteria, education linkages, possible service activities, organization and administration of a federal program, trial summer programs, and whether service should be compulsory or voluntary. Anthropologist Margaret Mead gave the opening address, and Senator Jacob Javits (R-NY) closed the final session. A Russell Sage Foundation grant funded the publication of a 1967 conference proceedings summary (Eberly 1968). Other funding for the NSS came from the Alfred P. Sloane Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Arthur Vining Davis Foundation as well as from contributions from private individuals.

Eberly was not alone in advocating national service. His colleague, Harris Wofford, published articles and delivered speeches on the merits of a program of youth service during this period. At a 1966 National Student Association convention (NSN 1966b) and in a Saturday Review article (1966) later that fall, Wofford set out a proposal that included volunteer service fellowships, a national volunteer registry, and academic credit for youth service. One reason for the interest in national service was its relationship to a festering problem on the national agenda -- the military draft. On many occasions, including a 1966 Armistice Day speech in Washington, D.C., Wofford argued that so long as there was a mandatory military draft there should also be a program of civilian youth service as an alternative to military service (NSN 1966a, p. 2).

Table 2.
Participants
First National Service Conference
May 7, 1966

Ray Borton, Agricultural Development Council
Leon Bramson, Sociology and Anthropology, Swarthmore College
The Rev. Roy B. Chamberlain, Jr., Gorham, Maine
The Rev. William S. Coffin, Jr., Chaplain, Yale University
Geoffrey Cowan, Legislative Assistant to Congressman Ryan
Terrence Cullinan, Captain, U.S. Army
J. Dudley Dawson, Vice-President and Dean of Students, Antioch College
Donald J. Eberly, Executive Associate, Overseas Educational Service
Robert Edwards, Program Assistant, Ford Foundation (Observer)
Thomas E. Ford, Director of Scholarships, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation
Robert G. Greenway, Research in Education, Franconia College, N.H.
Ted Higgins, VISTA, Office of Economic Opportunity
Ray Lamontagne, Associate of John D. Rockefeller III
Dale MacIver, Administrative Assistant to Congressman Fraser
John Monro, Dean, Harvard College
Frederic A. Mosher, Executive Associate, Carnegie Corporation of NY
Charles N. Myers, Executive Associate, Education and World Affairs
Howard M. Nemerovski, White House Fellow, Health, Education and Welfare
Glenn Olds, International Studies, State University of New York
Robert Oshins, International Investments, U.S. Department of Commerce
Jack J. Preiss, Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Duke University
Roger Rapoport, Student, University of Michigan
Mrs. Marion K. Sanders, Associate Editor, Harper's
Philip Sherburne, President, U.S. National Student Association
Arthur Springer, Associate Editor, Current
John S. Stillman, Chairman, American Veterans Committee
Robert Terry, International Training, Experiment in International Living
Jerome Vogel, Overseas Youth Program, Operation Crossroads Africa
Lawrence M. White, Massachusetts Service Corps
Harris Wofford, Associate Director-at-Large, Peace Corps

Table 3.
Original Members
National Service Secretariat Advisory Board

Leon Bramson, Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology,
Swarthmore College
Rev. William S. Coffin, Jr., Chaplin, Yale University
Kathleen Cullinan, Research Assistant, National Service Secretariat
Terrence Cullinan, Manpower Economist, Stanford Research Institute
Earl W. Eames, Jr. Vice President, Council for International Progress in
Management
Donald J. Eberly, Director, National Service Secretariat
Eugene Groves, President, U.S. National Student Association
Edward Hall, Litchfield, Connecticut
Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, President, University of Notre Dame
William Josephson, Attorney, New York City
Dorothy M. Knoell, State University of New York
Harry Marmion, American Council on Education
Margaret Mead, The American Museum of Natural History
Thomas C. Mendenhall, Northhampton, Massachusetts
Glenn Olds, Exec. Dean, International Studies & World Affairs, State
University of New York
Jack J. Preiss, Department of Sociology, Duke University
Mrs. Marvin Ross, Long Island
William G. Saltonstall, Chairman, Massachusetts Board of Education
Arthur Springer, Associate Editor, Current Magazine
John A. Stevens, Computer Research, Rochester, New York
John S. Stillman, Attorney, Chairman, American Veterans Committee
Harold Taylor, former President, Sarah Lawrence College
H. Donald Wilson, Senior Staff, Arthur D. Little and Company

Source. National Service Newsletter January, 1967. Vol 6:3-4

Proposals to Reform the Selective Service System

Issue advocates work to associate their idea to problems and topics of concern. They link their solution to perceived problems through rationales and issue framing. In the mid-1960s, national service was associated with the debate over the military draft.

In 1960, Republican presidential nominee Richard Nixon had warned that the Senate proposals to establish a Peace Corps program would provide "a haven for draft dodgers" (Eberly 1988, p. 36) and a 1960 Princeton University program asked "Should Peace Corps volunteers be exempt from the military draft?" (Ostrander 1960). Eberly was disappointed when President Kennedy elected not to allow Peace Corps service as a substitute for military service. But by the mid-1960s, the war in Vietnam was underway and conscription was highly controversial.

The military draft law was scheduled to expire in 1967, the House Committee of Armed Services had scheduled hearings for June, 1966, on inequities in the draft. A New York Times reporter who attended Eberly's first conference on national service described the event under the headline "Educators urge options to draft; Peace Corps service asked as military alternative" (New York Times 1966a, p. 49). The New York Times ran an editorial on national service a week later entitled "Testing for the Draft." It read in part,

Nationally sound reform lies in the direction of universal national service, with limited options to serve either in the armed forces, the Peace Corps, the National Teacher Corps or a variety of domestic urban and rural missions. Leading educators have already endorsed such a plan. It is now up to the nation's educational, manpower and military leadership to evolve a blueprint for national debate and Congressional action (New York Times 1966b, p. 30).

The Johnson Administration and Youth Service -- Windows of opportunity often open when there is a change of administration and the personnel turnover such a change usually brings in its wake. When Lyndon Johnson became president, there was speculation that the idea of a national service program might receive consideration (Wofford 1980). In 1965, President Johnson had called upon the nation to seek ways whereby

every young American will have the opportunity -- and feel the obligation -- to give at least a few years of his or her life to the service of others in the nation and in the world (Johnson 1965, p. 16)

On May 11, 1966, President Johnson told an audience

The call for public service therefore cannot be met by professionals alone. We must revive the ancient idea of citizen soldiers who answer their nation's call in time of peril. We need them on battlefronts where no guns are heard but freedom is no less tested (Johnson 1966, p. 14).

Even more encouraging were the words of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. Commenting on the selective service system in a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, McNamara said

It seems to me that we could move towards remedying [the draft] inequity by asking every young person in the United States to give two years of service to his country -- whether in one of the military services, in the Peace Corps, or in some other volunteer developmental work at home or abroad (McNamara 1966, p. 11).

Four months later, President Johnson observed "we must move toward a standard that no man has truly lived who only served himself" (NSN 1966a, p. 1). When asked if McNamara's proposals were administration policy, however, Johnson replied that they were not (Eberly 1988, p. 51).

Conference on the Draft Considers National Service -- Policy entrepreneurs create their own events to draw attention to their ideas. They also take advantage of other events. Eberly and several other national service advocates participated in a conference on the draft hosted by the University of Chicago in December, 1966. Conference participants divided into three camps on the question of how best to reform the Selective Service System. One group favored eliminating the draft entirely. They proposed replacing the existing system with a completely voluntary military. Milton Friedman, among others, promoted this proposal forcefully at the conference. Years later, the Congress chose this option; the salaried, professional military that the United States maintains today is called the "All Volunteer Force."

A second group of conferees proposed reforming the system used to conscript citizens. Educational deferments were seen as unfair and disruptive to college administrators and to youths who stayed in school to avoid being drafted. Senator Edward Kennedy favored going to a lottery system and had already introduced legislation to that effect. This approach was actually adopted by the Congress in the late 1960s.

The remaining conferees advocated replacing the Selective Service System with universal national service that included both military and nonmilitary options. University of Chicago sociologist Morris Janowitz read a paper on the logic of national service. Other national service papers were presented by Don Eberly, Margaret Mead, Terrence Cullinan and Leon Bramson (all members of the National Service Advisory Board) and by John Mitrisin (Tax 1967).

Federal Advisory Commission Offers Further Exposure -- Eberly also took advantage of a federal advisory commission on Selective Service System reform. In July of 1966, President Johnson appointed a 20-member National Advisory Commission on Selective Service; chaired by Burke Marshall, the commission was to report its findings and recommendations to the President in early 1967. After conferring national service colleagues, Eberly sent the commission an 80-page plan for national service.

Eberly called his proposal an option plan because all young men could choose one of three options upon turning age 18. If a youth selected the first option, he could do a limited period of service and then have his name placed at the end of the list of candidates eligible for the military draft. A youth choosing the second option would have his name added to the official draft list for a period of 6 years. Under the third option, a youth could chose the existing Conscientious Objector status. Youths would be advised of their options at age 17 -- thus giving them a full year to make their decision. The civilian service program would be administered by a new government corporation, the National Foundation for Volunteer Service. Eberly proposed that Congress provide GI-bill type post-service education benefits to civilian volunteers.

For awhile, Eberly believed that his idea might receive a hearing. When the Commission's 213 page report, In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve?, was issued in February, 1967, however, it contained only three pages on the subject of nonmilitary national service. Worse yet for the supporters of national service writ large, the report said that the Commission believed the idea of universal youth service needed more research (National Advisory Commission on Selective Service 1967). When President Johnson addressed the Congress on reforming the Selective Service System one month later, he also made only passing reference to nonmilitary alternatives to the draft (Johnson 1967). Eberly was disappointed but not surprised. He recalled that

Sometime in December [1966], my almost daily calls from Neil Boyer, a [National Advisory Commission on Selective Service] staff member, stopped. I called him to ask what was going on and he was vague. Later I learned with virtual certainty that that was the time President Johnson concluded that the United States could no longer afford the war in Vietnam as well as a large War on Poverty; he decided to pursue the former at the expense of the latter and passed the word to [Chairman of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service Burke] Marshall not to come out for national service (Eberly 1988. p. 57).

Congressional Bills Also Link National Service To The Draft -- An important goal of policy entrepreneurs is to get bills introduced in the U.S. Congress. Early national service bills were tied to the issue of military conscription. In the 90th Congress, Senator Daniel Brewster (D-MD) sponsored S. 1213. Introduced on March 7, 1967, this bill would have established a Civilian National Service Foundation plus a seven member commission appointed by the President to study the feasibility of adopting a national service system. Youths who volunteered for two years of civilian service could defer their draft status during the service period.

The following February, Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA) introduced S. 3025. Kennedy's bill replaced the Selective Service System with a system of random selection. One section of Kennedy's bill was similar to Senator Brewster's S. 1213. It called for a one-year feasibility study of a national service corps. Kennedy had chaired a hearing in March of 1967 on the Selective Service System at which Eberly, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, and Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity R. Sargent Shriver had testified on the merits of a comprehensive national service program.

Representative Jonathan Bingham (D-NY) introduced a National Service Act of 1970 (H.R. 1000) in the 91st Congress that would replace the military draft with a comprehensive national service program for all 18 year olds males. Youth could enlist in the military, enroll in a 2-year program of civilian service, or register for a military draft lottery. The proposal had been developed by Bingham's son, Timothy, and several of Timothy's classmates at Yale University.

Not all national service legislation during this period was directly linked to the draft, however. At the invitation of Senator Mark Hatfield (D-OR), Eberly and a member of Hatfield's staff drafted a bill that the Senator introduced in 1969 as the Youth Power Act (S. 1937). This bill provided service-learning opportunities for youth, established a national service foundation and created nonmilitary service programs. Hatfield insisted that

his bill contain no linkage to military service. The proposed foundation's 21-member board included representatives from the Peace Corps, Job Corps, and other existing youth service agencies. The programs provided constructive learning and service opportunities for any youth aged 17 to 27 who volunteered to work in full- or part-time positions. A similar bill, S. 1777, was sponsored by Hatfield in the 92nd Congress; it established a three-year program of service-learning funded at \$1.5 billion (NSN 1971a).

Just as a problem or crisis can place an issue on the agenda, so the resolution of that problem can lead to the closing of a window of opportunity. Nixon had campaigned in 1968 on a platform to end the military draft. Legislation to end draft deferment for graduate school students was enacted in 1968. The last draftees entered military service in December, 1972, and the power to draft officially ended in June, 1973. The military draft was replaced with an all volunteer force (Sage 1979).

As the issue of draft inequities faded and it became apparent that the Johnson administration was not going to support a program of national service, Eberly's ability to raise funds for the National Service Secretariat diminished, too. Eberly closed the NSS offices in New York City due to a lack of funding in August, 1967. He moved to Washington, D.C. and operated the NSS out of his home. He stopped drawing a salary from NSS after 1969 but continued to serve as Executive Director through 1994. Nonetheless, the organization produced an impressive number of articles and reports during this period, including a formal position paper describing and endorsing the concept of national service signed by Senators Birch Bayh and Edward Kennedy, Notre Dame University President The Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, Margaret Mead, W. Willard Wirtz, and others (National Service Secretariat 1969).

Eberly Joins ACTION to Lead Seattle PLS Project

Political appointees in the executive branch of government can also advance policy ideas. While serving as director of the Peace Corps from 1969 to 1971, Joseph H. Blanchford, Jr., would occasionally lunch with Don Eberly and discuss the possibility of a major domestic youth service program in the United States. Blanchard had been intrigued by the concept of national service since reading William James' "Moral Equivalent of War" in college and supported a program of national service in the United States (NSN 1971b). The international mission of the Peace Corps limited his ability to advance a domestic program. As the 1972 presidential campaign approached, it appeared he might get a chance to establish a domestic youth service program. In a speech at the University of Nebraska on January 14, 1971, President Nixon called for a new federal agency to bring together all federal volunteer service programs. He hinted that he might support further youth service programs as well. At a Congressional hearing on April 29, 1971, Blanchford indicated the Nixon administration's interest in establishing a broad program of youth service (NSN 1971b).

Nixon established a new federal agency, ACTION, by executive order in July, 1971, and named Blanchford as ACTION director. Incorporated into ACTION were the Peace Corps and Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) plus a number of small service programs including the National Student Volunteer Program, Retired Senior Volunteer Program, Foster Grandparents, Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE), and Active Corps of Executive (ACE).

Policy windows of opportunity can open during presidential campaigns, and the 1972 presidential campaign cycle looked promising for national service advocates. During the campaign, the Nixon administration proposed to create an Urban Volunteer Corps consisting of one-year, full-time service opportunities for youth (NSN 1972). In a speech at the University of Connecticut in June, 1972, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Elliott Richardson spoke in favor of a GI-bill for community service. Among the other presidential candidates running in 1972, Republican Congressman Paul "Pete" McCloskey of California stressed his support for a national service program and Senator George McGovern noted his cosponsorship of Senator Hatfield's "Youth Power Act."

Washington State's Program for Local Service -- Abstract ideas are hard to sell to elected officials; Eberly needed a successful working model of national service writ large, and ACTION held the best prospects for such an endeavor. As the new Director of ACTION, Blanchford instructed his staff to draw up plans for a national service program; he hired Eberly in August of 1971 to help on the program. In 1972, he submitted a multi-million dollar youth service proposal to the Office of Management and Budget. The massive program was denied but Blanchford did receive permission to undertake a \$1 million test project on the condition he not call it national service (Eberly 1988).

Washington State was selected as the site of ACTION's youth service pilot program. Governor Daniel Evans was a supporter of voluntarism and community service. In 1969, his administration opened a state Office of Voluntarism and, as Chair of the National Governors' Association, Evans had urged his peers to support service programs. In January, 1973, Evans and ACTION Regional Director Marjorie Lynch announced a two-year pilot project of youth community service in Seattle called Program of Local Service (PLS).

ACTION wanted to determine what types and numbers of youths would apply for a service position if a full-scale national service program was in effect. Therefore, all 18 to 25 year old residents of Seattle were eligible to apply for the 350 paid, full-time, one-year volunteer positions. According to a post-project assessment, ten percent of the eligible youth who had heard about the program actually applied. Participants were a relatively representative sample of Seattle's youth population. In the 2-year test period, 372 Seattle youth worked for 137 public and private non-profit agencies (Control Systems Research 1973).

When Blanchford left ACTION in 1973, ACTION support for the Seattle project waned (Eberly 1988). The State of Washington continued the Seattle PLS program through 1976 with funding from ACTION and, when ACTION funding ended, with federal Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) funds and state appropriations (Millard 1983).

Additional ACTION Projects -- In 1974, ACTION expanded the Seattle PLS program statewide and also provided grants for local or regional programs in Arkansas, California, Colorado, Kansas, and Wisconsin. Not all programs were directed towards youth; the Colorado program, for instance, was for Americans 55 years of age or older. The programs were also very limited in size -- ranging between 50 and 300 participants.

Under the Carter Administration, ACTION administered a second youth service pilot project in Syracuse, New York. Beginning in 1978, the Youth Community Service program involved 2,000 volunteers between the ages of 16 and 21. In this program, however, the Labor Department insisted that youths be out-of-school, unemployed and looking for work. Because the

potential participant pool was so narrowly construed, Eberly never considered the Syracuse project a fair measure of the numbers and types of youth who would seek to participate if such a program was open to all. The government spent \$10 million on the Syracuse project before it ended in 1980.

Conferences and Studies Focus Attention on Youth Service

One strategy that policy entrepreneurs employ involves framing their idea as a solution to a problem receiving public attention. By the mid-1970s, national service advocates were linking their issue with youth unemployment. There was a cost associated with this strategy, however; youth unemployment programs narrowed the target population and carried a different -- generally more negative -- social construction of that target population.

In the early 1970s, Congress became increasingly concerned about spiraling youth unemployment rates. While insisting that a national service program be open to all youth, advocates sought to link the idea to the youth unemployment problem. A story in the December, 1974, issue of Eberly's National Service Newsletter (NSN) carried a front page headline: "National Service Linked with Unemployment" and reviewed recent magazine and newspaper stories that "suggested some form of national service as at least a partial solution to the rising problem of unemployment" (NSN 1974, p. 1).

The Eleanor Roosevelt Institute -- Eberly's NSS continued to lead the still small and narrowly defined youth service policy community. The community picked up membership and stature in the mid-1970s when the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute announced that it would sponsor a conference in 1976 focused on the relationship between youth unemployment policy and universal youth service proposals.

The foundation's focus on youth service was in keeping with Eleanor Roosevelt's own interests. She had remarked in May, 1934, that she "would like to see us institute a volunteer service to the country, open to both boys and girls" (Lash 1973, p. 699). Her influence was felt in the Civilian Conservation Corp and the National Youth Administration programs during the 1930s. She also lent her support to a private youth service venture, Camp William James, in the 1940s. When, in 1959, The Christian Science Monitor published Eberly's letter to the editor proposing a national service program, Eleanor Roosevelt had sent Eberly a note that read in part "I have read your proposal and I think your idea is a good one. However, I fear this [Eisenhower] administration will not consider it" (Eberly 1988, p. 30).

In the summer of 1975, Joseph P. Lash, program chairman of the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, asked Eberly to organize a national conference on youth service. According to Eberly, the Institute's

trustees had decided they wanted to do something of a more activist nature that would be relevant to current needs and would be in keeping with Eleanor Roosevelt's philosophy... Youth unemployment was a serious problem and it promised to be an issue in the 1976 Presidential campaign. They figured that a conference on universal youth service might bring to public notice an answer to the problem of youth unemployment (Eberly 1988, p. 133).

The two day invitational conference, "Youth Service Opportunity: An American Answer to Unemployment?", was held in April, 1976, at Hyde Park. Among the 75 participants were Eberly, Bernard Anderson (an economics professor at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School), Congressman Andrew Young, and Willard W. Wirtz.

In a conference summary, Joseph P. Lash said that there was considerable support amongst the conferees for a universal youth service program that would differ markedly

"from the anti-poverty programs of the '60s," Lash noted. "They were all targeted at the poor and disadvantaged," said Lash. "whereas universal youth service recognizes the need for all young people for a set of options that would include education, work and service" (NSN 1976, p. 1)

While this conference helped enlarge the membership in the youth service policy community, the participants expressed a desire to keep their numbers small so as to promote intimacy and cohesion. There was discussion at the conference of broadening the debate by including

such other groups as women, the elderly and minorities. Wirtz said in his summary address that "we're going to lose a good deal of force if we broaden" our efforts to the coalition level. The clear consensus favors concentration on a youth policy, reported Wirtz (NSN 1976, p. 2).

Interest groups typically fear losing control; later events suggest that this strategy probably reduced the group's chances of selling their idea.

The Committee for the Study of National Service -- Around the same time, Harris Wofford and other national service advocates organized a Committee for the Study of National Service to consider prospects for a universal youth service program in the United States. This independent effort was co-chaired by Wofford, then President of Bryn Mawr College, and Jacqueline Wexler, the President of Hunter College. Both Wofford and Wexler had been involved in the early phases of the Peace Corps and were strong youth service advocates. Other committee members were Bernard Anderson, Donald Eberly, Harold Fleming (President of the Potomac Institute, a Washington, D.C., think tank that provided staff and office space for the study), Edythe Gaines, The Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, Mildred Jeffrey, Charles Killingsworth, Christian Kryder, John G. Simon, Eddie Williams, and Willard Wirtz (Committee for the Study of National Service 1980).

Roger Landrum joined the youth service policy community when he was hired to direct the study. Landrum was one of the first 600 volunteers to serve in the Peace Corps. He taught in Nigeria from 1961 to 1963 and later directed Peace Corps training programs. He held a doctorate in Human Development from Harvard University and taught at both Harvard and Yale. He directed the teacher education program at Yale before leaving to found and manage Teachers, Inc., a private, nonprofit organization. At the time he was hired to staff the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute project, Landrum was affiliated with the Potomac Institute.

This project was also noteworthy for the range of charitable foundations that provided support. While the principal funding for the study was provided by the Ford Foundation, other financial support came from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, the

Field Foundation, the New World Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the J.M. Kaplan Fund, and the Charles H. Revson Foundation (Committee for the Study of National Service 1980).

The ideas about national service that were discussed by the Committee did not differ markedly from Eberly's early ideas. In an interim report entitled Outline of a Proposal for a Voluntary National Service System (1977) and in a final report issued eighteen months later, the Committee called for restoring "the spirit of service" by creating a voluntary youth service program with at least one million full-time positions (1979). While not calling for a mandatory, universal system, the Committee recommended moving toward a program large enough that it could absorb all youths who volunteered. It insisted that a national service program be defined in terms of the service provided as opposed to being sold as job training or youth employment. Youth who performed service should be rewarded with education or employment benefits similar to those in the G.I. Bill or offered to Peace Corps volunteers. Again, a public corporation was believed to be the best arrangement for administering a federal youth service program.

What was innovative was the way the Committee chose to disseminate its findings and recommendations. In order to encourage discussion of national service and generate additional grass roots support, the Committee distributed nearly 20,000 copies of its report to leaders in education, government, business, the media, and the nonprofit sector. Copies of the report's executive summary were sent to over 10,000 high school newspapers. The National Governor's Association, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties were asked to urge governors, mayors, and county officials to review the report, solicit input from their constituencies, and carry forward the public discussion of a program of domestic service for America's youth.

In May, 1979, the Committee sponsored a conference in Washington, D.C., to follow up on questions raised by the final report. Eberly had generally endorsed a target population between the ages of 18 and 21 although the Seattle PLS program admitted youths as young as 16. An interesting insight came out of a workshop on "Service Before Age 16" that included a number of youths. That group

concluded that the desire to be involved in community service is strongest among junior high students...and that a national system of service should also focus on creating opportunities for those well below the age of 16 (Committee for the Study of National Service 1980, p. 8).

National Service and The All Volunteer Force

As the public mood shifts from one perceived national problem to another, policy entrepreneurs look for new ways to frame their idea. In the late 1970s, the problem of youth unemployment faded; national service advocates shifted their attention to the topic of Volunteer Force (AVF).

Alarm Over Recruit Numbers and Skill Levels-- Almost from its inception, some military analysts and policy makers worried that the AVF would not work. The chair of the Subcommittee on Manpower of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Sam Nunn, was amongst the first to express concern that the AVF had been a mistake (1977). There was concern that manpower shortages would grow significantly in the coming decade under the AVF (Congressional Budget Office 1978). Nunn asked the Congressional Budget Office to conduct a study of the AVF, military recruitment patterns,

youth unemployment, and the possibility of a national service program with a nonmilitary component. The Congressional Budget Office study considered three national service scenarios: a small, targeted program; a broad-based, voluntary program; and a broad-based, mandatory program (King 1977). Nunn requested another study on national service and the AVF in 1978 (Congressional Budget Office 1978).

If the AVF could not meet the nation's defense needs, the government might find it necessary to reinstate the military draft. The Christian Science Monitor carried a commentary entitled "Let's Go Back to the Draft" (Saikowski 1978). At the start of his term, President Carter opposed reinstatement of the draft but said he would consider a national service nonmilitary component in the event the draft were reinstated (Committee for the Study of National Service 1979). When the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in late 1979, Carter called for a resumption of draft registration.

The possible reinstatement of the draft generated extensive debate, including consideration of national service as a nonmilitary alternative to military service. Congressman Paul "Pete" McCloskey (R-CA) published an article entitled "National Youth Service as an Alternative" (1979). Senator Paul Tsongas (D-MA), a former Peace Corps volunteer in Ethiopia, hosted a conference on the draft in February, 1980. With Eberly as moderator, Tsongas supported a voluntary national service system.

As time passed, concern over the AVF escalated. No branch of the service was meeting its recruiting goals. The quality of the average recruit was unacceptably low. Close to one third of the Army's recruits read at the 5th grade level or below and less than one half of the Army's recruits held a high school diploma (Evans 1980). Morale within the ranks was low. There was a rising incidence of hooliganism; drug use and alcoholism were alarmingly high. Retention was low; more than one third of the service members failed to complete their initial enlistment period. One student of the U.S. military observed that "the All-Volunteer Force is on the ragged edge of survival" (Moskos 1980).

Bills in the 96th Congress Reflect AVF Concerns -- Bills advocating a federal program of national service continued to be introduced in the U.S. Congress during this time. In 1979, McCloskey sponsored H.R. 2206, the National Service Act. The House Armed Services Committee's Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on H.R. 2206 on March 12 and 14, 1979 (U.S. Congress 1979a). The House Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Select Education held a hearing on the bill on April 9 and 10, 1979 (U.S. Congress 1979b). The Congressional Budget Office conducted a study of estimated costs of the proposal (Congressional Budget Office 1980). McCloskey was a strong supporter of national service in its own right, but was also motivated to introduce this bill over concern for the All Volunteer Force. This bill received considerable press attention partly because of his reputation as a Korean War hero and partly because he ran against Nixon for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1972 on an anti-Vietnam War platform.

McCloskey's bill drew heavily from Eberly's 1966 options plan and the Hatfield proposal that Eberly had written in 1969. It established a mandatory service program of compulsory, nonmilitary service for all 18 year olds. At age 17, all citizens (male and female) would register with a National Service System and be informed of their options. Upon turning age 18, each youth could chose to (1) volunteer for 2 years of military service and receive education benefits at the completion of the service period, (2) volunteer for

6 months of active duty followed by 5 1/2 years of reserve duty, (3) volunteer for 1 year of civilian service, or (4) have his or her name placed in a pool for 6 years during which the youth would be subject to a military draft; if drafted, the youth would serve for 2 years on active duty and for another 4 years on reserve and receive a smaller educational benefit.

Representative John J. Cavanaugh (D-NE) also sponsored a youth service bill in the 96th Congress. H.R. 3606, the Public Service System Act, required youths to register between their seventeenth and eighteenth birthdays and select from four options before they reached age 26. The first three options were similar to those in McCloskey's bill -- active military duty for 18 months, 6 months of active duty plus 3 years of reserve duty, or 2 years of civilian service. Option 4 however would place the youth in a lottery pool for 6 months. If selected, youths would be randomly assigned to one of the other 3 options. One innovation in this bill was the condition that all youth service would be performed only in federal agencies. All federal agencies would have been required to reserve five percent of their job slots for civilian youth service volunteers.

In 1980, Senator Tsongas and Representative Leon Panetta (D-CA) sponsored companion bills to establish a 25 member Presidential Commission to study the feasibility of national service. Tsongas introduced his bill, S. 2159, on September 21, 1979. The bill was referred to the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee. An agreement was reached that allowed the Labor and Human Resources Committee to consider his proposal and, on February 28, 1980, Tsongas introduced identical text as Amendment No. 1675 to Senator Cranston's bill, S. 1843, the Domestic Violence Prevention and Services Act. Cranston's subcommittee on Child and Human Development held a hearing March 13, 1980, that included testimony from Tsongas, Panetta, McCloskey, Pell, Wexler, Wofford, Eberly, Hesburgh, and others (U.S. Congress 1980a). The House Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Select Education also held a hearing on this bill on June 4, 1980 (U.S. Congress 1980b).

The Senate Subcommittee amended S. 1843 by appending Amendment No. 1675 as Title II of the bill and favorably reported the bill to the full committee. The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee favorably reported the bill and it was passed by the Senate (46-41) on September 4, 1980. The section on national service, however, was dropped in conference committee. No such language was in the House bill and Panetta's bill, H.R. 6868, was then receiving favorable treatment on the House side. H.R. 6868 did attract 21 cosponsors and was voted out of the Education and Labor Committee (U.S. Congress 1980c), but failed to reach the House floor. The Department of Labor opposed the bill on the grounds that it would compete with CETA.

Panetta had supported youth service since his election to the Congress in 1976. He was familiar with a conservation corps program underway in his home state of California and he also had several individuals on his Congressional staff who were interested in youth service. (In the mid-1980s, Michael Brown would leave Panetta's staff to join with Alan Khazei in founding the City Year program in Boston, MA.)

Representatives McCloskey, Panetta, and Patricia Schroeder (D-CO) did manage to introduce an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act of 1980 that obligated President Carter to study national service. The resulting report opposed a national service program on the grounds that it could compete with the military for personnel.

Patriotism and Citizen Soldiers -- While many were alarmed over

problems of poor recruitment in the AVF, criticisms of University of Chicago sociologist Morris Janowitz and Charles C. Moskos, a Northwestern University military sociologist and protege of Janowitz, struck directly at the basic premise of the AVF. They argued that an army of mercenaries obviated values intrinsic to the idea of the "citizen soldier." A purely professional military corps worked against development within the nation's populace of a sense of civic duty. One way to counter this phenomenon, they argued, was through a program of national service.

Janowitz had long supported a federal program of national service (Janowitz 1967). He questioned the political and moral basis of an AVF that resulted in a disproportionate number of minorities as combat soldiers and proposed national service as a form of civic education (Janowitz 1983a). In The Reconstruction of Patriotism: Education for Civic Consciousness (1983b), he proposed a national service program as a means to achieve a more "representative" military force. Janowitz also believed that the government needed to alter the incentives offered if the AVF was to succeed. He urged Congress to experiment with making military service (or some form of nonmilitary service) a requirement for receiving federal higher education financial aid (Janowitz 1981).

Moskos also argued for a program of national service as a supplement to military service (1980) and called for linking higher education financial aid to a program of voluntary national service (1981). He believed that a new GI bill for the AVF and the establishment of a 2-track military service system would bring new participants into the armed services. One track would be for careerist "professional" soldiers, while an alternative track would permit "citizen soldiers" to volunteer for a shorter period of service involving different military training and responsibilities (Moskos 1981).

Around 1981, the Ford Foundation provided a grant to the Atlantic Council of the United States' Working Group on Military Service for an 18-month study on the future of the military service. The Council hosted a conference in March of 1982 that brought together 60 people to discuss national service and the military. Among those present were Don Eberly, Charles Moskos, "Pete" McCloskey, Peter Szanton, James Lacy, Robert McNamara, and Martin Binkin. The final report recommended a Presidential Commission to implement a program of voluntary national service (Atlantic Council of the United States 1982).

Senator Glenn's Presidential Campaign Platform -- Presidential campaigns offer policy entrepreneurs an opportunity to push their issue onto the public agenda. In the 1984 presidential campaign, the vehicle for national service appeared to be the candidacy of Senator John Glenn. When Glenn began considering a run for the presidency in 1983, his legislative assistant for defense, Phil Upschulte, assembled a defense and foreign affairs advisory group. One member of the group was James Woolsey, a D.C. lawyer active in defense and military disarmament matters. Woolsey suggested that Charles Moskos be included in the group as well. Woolsey and Moskos had become friends after meeting a few years earlier; under a fellowship with the Smithsonian Institution's Woodrow Wilson International Center in the early 1980s, Moskos had presented a paper that was critiqued by a panel including Woolsey and Senator Nunn.

Senator Glenn's legislative director was an ex-Peace Corps volunteer who, like Glenn, believed strongly in citizens giving something back to their country (Connelly Interview 1991). With input from the advisory group, Glenn campaigned on a three part proposal entitled "Volunteers for America" that included a "Student Aid Volunteer Earnings" package, an American

Conservation Corps bill, and a Citizen Soldier GI Bill. Glenn dropped out of the presidential race following his defeat on Super Tuesday. Once again the window of opportunity for national service legislation appeared to have closed.

In addition, the All Volunteer Force was no longer seen as a public problem demanding Congressional attention. A major error in the Army's recruiting examination was discovered around 1980. The recruit aptitude test had been misnormed, leading to inaccurate scores that suggested recruits were considerably smarter than in fact was the case. The events and errors leading to this situation were determined to have been an honest mistake and the test was corrected (Gold 1989). Congress also increased funding for advertising and recruiting, raised wage levels for military enlistees, and passed Glenn's "New GI Bill." By the mid-1980s, recruitment and retention had improved and the AVF appeared to be a success (Knickerbocker 1983). It was time for youth service policy entrepreneurs to identify a new public problem for which a national service program might be the solution.

Writ Large Proposals in the 1980s

Fortunately for the national service writ large supporters, there were still several true believers in the Congress who continued to introduce national service bills. Even though the threat of the AVF collapse had passed, Congressman McCloskey continued to promote a mandatory, universal service program. In 1981, he sponsored H.R. 1730, the National Service Act. This bill would have established a National Youth Foundation to administer a National Youth Service Corps. Under this compulsory program, youths could serve 2 years in the armed forces or one year in a civilian service program.

The same year, Congressman Panetta sponsored H.R. 2500. This bill called for a Select Commission on Voluntary Service Opportunities to study only voluntary service. A Senate version of Panetta's bill never left committee, but H.R. 2500 did receive a hearing August 11, 1982 (U.S. Congress 1982) and was reported out of the House Committee on Education and Labor on December 1, 1982. The bill was defeated on the House floor by almost a 3 to 1 vote. According to some reports, the bill was poorly managed on the floor and was opposed by members of the House Armed Services Committee.

Panetta tried again in the 98th Congress with H.R. 1264, the Select Commission on Voluntary Service Opportunities Act of 1983. Introduced February 3, 1983, this bill picked up 37 cosponsors. It was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Select Education. The bill was marked up and reported from the full committee on May 10, 1983 (U.S. Congress 1983), but was defeated on the House floor on November 16 (179 yeas to 245 nays).

Two new national service writ large advocates sponsored legislation in the 99th Congress. Congressman Robert Torricelli (D-NJ) and Senator Gary Hart (D-CO) introduced companion bills (H.R. 1326 and S. 536), the Select Commission on National Service Opportunities. These bills again proposed to establish a commission to examine the need for and desirability of a program of mandatory national service. The bills were similar to the Panetta/Tsongas bills of 1980. H.R. 1326 and Panetta's bill, H.R. 888, received a hearing before the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities. The Subcommittee was chaired by Congressman Martinez (D-CA) and held in New York City on September 27, 1985. Witnesses included Panetta and Senator Hart, Eberly,

Landrum, Moskos, New York City Mayor Ed Koch, and youths from New York City's CCC-type youth service program. College presidents Donald Kennedy (Stanford University) and Howard Swearer (Brown University) also testified about campus-based programs at their schools (U.S. Congress 1985).

Torricelli reintroduced his bill in the 100th Congress as H.R. 1468. He also sponsored H.R. 2225, the Universal National Service Act of 1987, a bill to require either civilian or military service by all youth. Congressman Jerry Sikorski (D-MN) also sponsored a national service bill in 1987; H.R. 3096 proposed a commission to study a voluntary federal service program.

Congressman Dave McCurdy (D-OK) also joined the national service debate in 1987. McCurdy had long been supportive of national service (McCurdy Interview, 1991). With input from Moskos, whom he knew through his armed services interests, McCurdy sponsored H.R. 1479, the National Service Act, in March 1987. The idea of linking a program of national service with eligibility for federal higher education financial aid had been proposed previously. Wofford had suggested such a policy in the late 1960s, and Moskos had proposed this approach in the late 1970s (Moskos 1978). But McCurdy's bill was the first to call for restructuring of the existing federal student aid program and replacing it with a program of youth service (McCurdy 1987).

These bills never picked up the kind of attention or support that would carry them to victory. And while the bill sponsors were sincere in their support of the concept of national service, no member of Congress was willing to go the extra mile to get a national service bill passed. As one experienced Hill staffer observed, a handful of members of Congress were happy to introduce a bill but none were willing to twist arms, call in chits, trade votes, or use other tactics to get their bill passed.

Searching for the Best Model of Youth Service

One drawback for national service advocates was that the idea of youth service was still quite an abstraction to most Americans. At a conference hosted in 1979 by the Committee for the Study of National Service, Harris Wofford had opened the program with a speech on national service that he titled "An Idea Still To Be Shaped." Proponents of national service inevitably ran up against the argument that there was insufficient proof that a youth service program would work. In Youth and The Needs of the Nation (Committee for the Study of National Service 1979), Landrum had listed numerous theoretical models that had been proposed yet skeptics still demanded hard proof that national service could meet some or all of the objectives claimed by its advocates.

Models From Other Nations -- Some advocates searched for successful models of national service by looking outside the United States. Under a U.S. German Marshall Fund grant, Roger Landrum traveled to West Germany and France in 1980 to study the national service programs of those countries. The West German civilian service program was designed for conscientious objectors and placed over 35,000 young men in a range of social service activities (Landrum 1980).

Eberly and Washington University (St. Louis) professor Michael Sherraden co-edited a book in 1982 that described youth service programs in nations including Kenya, Nigeria, Indonesia, West Germany, and France. A chapter entitled "Alternative Models" reviewed previous efforts at national service in the United States, including the PLS program in Seattle. Other chapters summarized national service bills that had been proposed in

Congress and estimated the effects such programs might have on society, the military, the economy, and participants. Contributing authors included Moskos and Landrum. Morris Janowitz observed in the book's introduction that

with the publication of this volume, we have passed from the phase of broad sketches of national models to organizational and policy analysis in detail (Sherraden and Eberly 1982).

Sherraden and Eberly continued their interest in national service abroad. By mid-1988, they had also looked at programs in Canada, China, Costa Rica, Israel, Mexico, and Great Britain (Eberly and Sherraden 1990).

Danzig and Szanton Conduct Ford Foundation Study -- Other advocates devised hypothetical models of national service for the United States. In 1983, the Ford Foundation awarded a grant of \$259,000 to Richard Danzig and Peter Szanton to study national service. The researchers estimated the costs and benefits of national service on youth, communities served, the labor market, and the military. "The National Service Study Project" had an advisory board comprised of members of Congress (Bill Bradley, Dave Durenberger, Sam Nunn, Les Aspin, Jack Edwards, James Leach, and Leon Panetta) and military personnel including Colin Powell and Maxwell Thurman. Landrum, who at the time was a senior policy advisor for Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA), also served on the Commission (NSN 1983a).

When the Danzig and Szanton book was released on June 5, 1986, the president of the Ford Foundation, Franklin A. Thomas, and the foundation's program manager on national service grants, Gordon Berlin, hosted a dinner for columnists, policy makers, and practitioners of national service. They said their research suggested that demand for full-time national service slots in any year could be as high as 3.5 million youth. The study estimated costs and benefits for four hypothetical models. To the dismay of some youth service proponents, the authors concluded that any job skills acquired would not be readily transferable to the job market (Danzig and Szanton 1986). Eberly would later argue that the authors did not consider the right scenario.

With a long record of support for and contribution towards youth policy development, the Ford Foundation in 1983 was in the midst of a major youth initiative that addressed youth employment and training concerns with special attention to school drop-outs. In a speech to the Economic Club of Detroit in early 1983, Ford Foundation President Franklin A. Thomas concluded that "national service is a compelling concept that merits a place near the top of the national agenda" (NSN 1983b, p. 1). He continued to urge policy makers not to let the concept of national service slip from the national agenda (Thomas 1984). These speeches gave important status and credibility to the idea of national service. But for all their efforts, the content of the policy remained vague.

State and Local Youth Service Programs -- More promising by far was a third source of models of national service -- actual youth service programs across the United States (see Chapters 4 and 5). The Ford Foundation awarded a grant to Public/Private Ventures (P/PV), a private nonprofit organization in Philadelphia, to evaluate a statewide youth conservation corps program begun in California in the 1970s. The P/PV assessment was completed in 1982 (Bailin 1982) and was to become one in a series of reports by P/PV on "activities states can do as federal funding declines." Indeed, following the demise during the Reagan administration of two small

federal youth corps programs, several nonfederal units of government began experimenting with CCC-type youth service programs. In January, 1985, the Ford Foundation awarded another grant to P/PV for \$550,000 to look at youth service programs in the U.S. and Canada and identify critical elements of successful programs. P/PV published two reports in 1987: a critique of the defunct federal YACC program and a review of current state youth service programs in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Texas. Chapter 4 recounts the spread of state and local CCC-type youth service programs in the United States.

Summary and Conclusions

This section recapitulates the story of national service writ large policy in terms of actors, ideas, opportunities, and strategies.

Actors -- Don Eberly is considered the "dean" by most in the youth service field. He conceived a plan and communicated it to others through his Christian Science Monitor piece, speeches, books, journal articles, and other publications. He peddled his idea to members of Congress and found especially favorable receptions with Senators Hubert H. Humphrey and Mark Hatfield. He also worked with presidential appointees including Sargent Shriver and Harris Wofford at the Peace Corps and Joseph Blanchford at ACTION. From 1971 to 1980, Eberly promoted his idea while employed at ACTION.

The preeminent group supporting the idea of a national service writ large program was Eberly's private nonprofit organization, the National Service Secretariat. Other organizations advancing national service writ large were the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute and the Ford Foundation. The Committee for the Study of National Service was an important but short lived group as well. Besides supporting Eberly's efforts with occasional grants, the Ford Foundation supported the Committee for the Study of National Service, brought in Public/Private Ventures to evaluate youth service programs and paid for the Danzig and Szanton study of national service.

Eberly virtually created the national service policy community. He organized and hosted early conferences on national service. Through the National Service Secretariat's newsletter, he kept interested people informed on current events and publications.

Early participants in the policy community included anthropologist Margaret Mead, Harris Wofford, Morris Janowitz, Willard Wirtz, and The Rev. Theodore M. Hesburg. In the 1970s, the policy community included Washington Governor Daniel Evans, Joseph Lash, and others with the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute plus Roger Landrum and the members of the Committee for the Study of National Service. By the early 1980s, Charles Moskos, Michael Sherraden, Richard Danzig, Peter Szanton, and James Woolsey had joined the national service writ large policy community.

Members of Congress and their staffs also participated in the national service policy community. Early members of Congress who supported national service writ large included Congressmen Bows and Reuss and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. Senators Edward Kennedy and Daniel Brewster also participated in the dialogue during the 1960s. By 1980, Jonathan Bingham, Mark Hatfield, John Cavanaugh, Sam Nunn, Paul Tsongas, Pete McCloskey, and Leon Panetta had sponsored bills. In more recent years, supporters of national service writ large proposals have included Senators John Glenn and Gary Hart and Congressmen Robert Torricelli, Jerry Sikorski, and Dave McCurdy.

Yet national service writ large lacked a powerful, energetic policy entrepreneur with substantial resources and influence. In the mid-1960s, Harris Wofford was an active proponent, but he was distracted by other career demands. Don Eberly was reluctant to be aggressive; he felt that the idea of national service should sell itself. Eberly observed

I am not your typical lobbyist. I don't pressure; I give opportunities. I am not a salesman. I don't like that work (Eberly Interview 1991).

Except for a few years in the 1960s, the National Service Secretariat was a one-person operation run out of Eberly's home. Membership was somewhat by invitation and the tone was decidedly low key. The group believed it would "lose a good deal of force if we broaden" the focus (NSN 1976).

The national service writ large policy community also lacked grass roots support. It did not include on-the-ground program administrators. The activities tended toward the abstract and academic -- journal articles, testimony at Congressional hearings, speeches. The participants were rich in expertise but poor in political clout or local representation. And, most critical of all, they could not agree on the specifics of their idea.

Ideas: Origins, Bill Content and Change Over Time -- The idea of national service writ large traces its origins to William James, the World War II shared military experience, conscientious objector programs, and private service organizations prior to the Peace Corps. After the 1960s, proponents could point to the Peace Corps, VISTA, the PLS program in Seattle, and programs in other nations -- particularly the German program. Writ large proponents rejected the New Deal Civilian Conservation Corps as a program model as too limited in size and scope.

Support was divided between several legislative proposals. Some favored a feasibility study; others were ready to jump directly into running a program. Bills to study the idea of a national service program were introduced by Brewster and Kennedy, Panetta and Tsongas, Torricelli and Hart, and Sikorski. Bills to actually implement a national service program were introduced by Bingham, Cranston, McCloskey (twice), Cavanaugh, Torricelli, and McCurdy. Hatfield's 1969 bill differed from other proposals in that his program would have provided part-time service-learning opportunities for students (see Chapter 5).

There was also disagreement regarding the actual content of a national service program. Most of the national service writ large bills that called for the establishment of a program (versus a study) linked the proposed program in some way to military service -- usually participants could choose between a military and a civilian service option. Generally, the Selective Service System would be replaced by a federal nonprofit corporation -- a "National Service System" or a "Public Service System." The target population for national service writ large proposals was universal; almost by definition, all youths should participate or at least have the opportunity to participate. Most writ large program advocates supported making participation mandatory.

The national service writ large bills usually included numerous civilian activities that a volunteer could perform; usually it was left to the volunteer to determine an activity. (By comparison, CCC-type bills almost always involved supervised work to be performed in teams or "corps;" see Chapter 4.) Only minimal job training was provided at the start of the service period. Subsistence wages and health coverage were usually provided. McCloskey's

bill also provided a post-service education or training benefit. In Cavanaugh's bill, youths who failed to complete their period of service would not be eligible for federal jobs or loans and loan guarantees including a home mortgage or SBA loan. His bill also required all federal agencies to set aside 5 percent of their job slots for volunteers.

The essential characteristics of the national service writ large proposals did not change much over time. When the AVF appeared to be a success and it became obvious that there was no longer a chance that a military draft would be reinstated, many proponents dropped the idea of a mandatory program; indeed, many went out of their way to stress that their proposal was strictly for a voluntary program. Yet, when asked to describe a "national service program," most people interviewed responded "mandatory and universal." There was little innovation over time and only twice (Panetta and Glenn) did legislation combine a national service proposal with another version of youth service.

Opportunities -- Once a policy is on the public agenda (or, better yet, has been enacted into law), policy entrepreneurs can work to enlarge or expand the scope of their issue area at predictable times such as the budget cycle or when the program comes up for reauthorization. Until the topic is on the agenda, the best policy entrepreneurs can do, so Kingdon's model argues, is be persistent and hope a window of opportunity will open. But Eberly and others sought out opportunities to advance national service. Presidential campaigns offer especially promising opportunities. The 1960 presidential campaign led to the establishment of the Peace Corps. In 1972, Republican presidential candidate McCloskey included national service in his platform. In later campaigns, Eberly surveyed presidential candidates regarding their views on national service.

National service suffered by not fitting comfortably within a congressional committee's jurisdiction. The link with the military might place it under the jurisdiction of committees dealing with defense matters. But the military feared civilian service would siphon off manpower. The Peace Corp fell under the jurisdiction of foreign affairs, yet Eberly's national service proposals were domestic programs. National service writ large bills were sometimes assigned to committees dealing with education or employment topics, but many members of those committees felt that government resources should be targeted to the most needy and opposed a program with a target population of all Americans. Thus, jurisdiction served to hurt rather than help the cause of national service writ large.

Personnel turnover also worked to the disadvantage of national service advocates. Few members of Congress were willing to take the lead on national service. Except for Hubert H. Humphrey in 1960, the advocates were not powerful members in Congress. Nor did any of the members of Congress supporting national service writ large stay in Congress long enough to gain a chairmanship from which that Member could launch an effort to pass national service legislation.

Strategies -- One critic of national service described the idea as a solution in search of a problem (Bubb 1988). As early as 1966, the participants at Eberly's first conference identified numerous reasons for enacting a program of national service.

Through rationales, advocates of youth service tried to relate their proposal to the problems being addressed by Congress at the moment.

Eberly admitted that he always

tried to have on hand an up to date model of national service that relates to the needs of the time. Whether it was the draft or the All Volunteer Force, the environment or illiteracy, high school drop-outs or college students who didn't know why they were in college, I have tried to show how national service would relate to the issue of the day (1988, p. 227).

Beginning in the 1960s, writ large proposals were linked to military problems including draft inequities, conscientious objector programs, AVF recruitment problems, the "citizen soldiers" debate, and reinstatement of draft registration under President Carter. Proponents recalled how the military experience during World War II lessened barriers in social class and race that divided America. They viewed a writ large program as a similar "sociological mixer" that would help break down racial, economic and social inequities and encourage upward mobility. However, Eberly was reluctant to associate national service too closely with the armed services because he feared that a civilian service program tied to the military might be canceled if the draft were abandoned (Eberly 1988).

In the 1970s, youth unemployment was seen as an important policy problem. National service writ large proposals encouraged youth to tackle the country's most urgent problems. Youths in writ large programs could do conservation work but could also work in the areas of social services (elderly, child care), education (literacy), community services or public safety. When, in the 1980s, the focus shifted to problems with the All Volunteer Force, citizenship preparedness, and, to a lesser extent, rising costs of first time home ownership and higher education loan debts, national service writ large policy entrepreneurs were again ready to frame their idea as the solution to the problem of the day.

Eberly and other youth service policy entrepreneurs pursued other activities that are typical interest group functions. They wrote articles and op ed pieces, hosted and attended conferences, approached members of Congress with bill proposals, lobbied federal political appointees, and issued position papers signed by influential Americans. Perhaps the most innovative tactic was the Committee for the Study of National Service's release of 20,000 reports along with a challenge to Governors, mayors and county government officials to continue the dialogue.

But advocates of national service writ large had several serious barriers to adoption of their idea. As Kingdon notes, for a policy idea to succeed, it needs to meet mainstream thinking in the policy community. The proponents of national service writ large could never agree on exactly how a program should operate. Kingdon also argues that policies are more likely to succeed if they reflect limited government, equity, and efficiency. National service writ large proposals were often seen as intrusive and bureaucratic. Finally, the idea was often viewed as risky since there were no previous programs to study.

The target population for most national service proposals was very broad -- all young men or all young Americans. The social construction of that target population, however, was often negative (draft dodgers, at-risk youth, etc.). National service was usually presented as a program that would be good for youth. Rarely was the argument made that national service provided a way for nice kids to do something good for America.

But national service writ large was not the only version of youth service to be promoted by policy entrepreneurs. Chapter 4 describes the efforts to pass a CCC-type youth service bill in the Congress, and Chapter 5 recounts similar efforts by advocates of school-based service-learning proposals.

Chapter 4. Proposals Modeled on the Civilian Conservation Corps

Advocates of "CCC-type" youth service programs trace their intellectual origins to the New Deal Civilian Conservation Corps but the policy community did not form until two small federal CCC-type youth service programs were threatened in the late 1970s. The CCC-type youth service policy community was small and politically weak. As time passed and new state and local programs began, however, the policy community attained considerable geographic representation and grass roots support.

The CCC-type youth service policy entrepreneurs did not wait for windows of opportunity to open; they actively created ways to advance their cause. Because the policy idea was most often framed as a solution to the problem of youth unemployment, the social construction of the target population was politically weak if not negative (at-risk kids, high school drop-outs, juvenile delinquents).

The policy content of CCC-type bills in Congress varied little; one exception involved expanding eligible projects to include urban and/or human service activities. In contrast, state and local programs were highly innovative. But, like the national service writ large advocates, CCC-type proponents were reluctant to have their ideas linked to other versions of youth service policy and the idea of federal CCC-type youth service never won the sustained support of a powerful, national political patron.

New Deal Youth Employment and Service Programs

The closest that the United States has come to meeting William James' vision of teams of youths serving their nation was during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Civilian Conservation Corps spurred President Roosevelt to contemplate a universal youth service program. His ideas were proposed to Congress but ignored as America focused resources on winning World War II.

The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) Program -- The idea for a federal youth service program that engaged teams of young Americans in conservation efforts apparently originated with Roosevelt. He had considered a national youth service program ever since the end of World War I (Schlesinger 1958). In crafting the CCC program, he denied having been influenced either by the writings of William James or by other youth service programs. Several working programs were available that could have been the inspiration for the CCC. The U.S. Forest Service in California and Washington State had organized work crews as a relief project. There were also CCC-type projects in Denmark, Norway, Bulgaria, Austria, the Netherlands, and Germany.

The opportunity presented itself in two areas: conservation needs and unemployment problems. Roosevelt probably drew on his own personal commitment to conservation. He had sponsored a tree planting project on his Hyde Park estate that he proudly displayed to foresters (Lacy 1976); he also supported a state reforestation plan while he was Governor of New York (Merrill 1981). And he was certainly aware of the youth unemployment problem confronting the nation. By the early 1930s, the nation was faced with "Hoover villages," soup lines, and economic despair. Writer Thomas

Minehan referred to the estimated 250,000 young people roaming the countryside in gangs as "the boy and girl tramps of America" (Graham and Wander 1985, p. 62).

No single actor in the American political process can set the public agenda more quickly and decisively than the President. In a March 21, 1933, message to the Congress on unemployment relief, the newly inaugurated President called for a program to utilize unemployed men in cities and rural areas to work in the nation's forests and parks (Merrill 1981). Senate bill 598, the Emergency Conservation Work Act, was introduced in Congress on March 27. Congress passed the bill and it was signed into law by President Roosevelt on March 31 as Public Law No. 5, 73rd Congress (Merrill 1981). The President signed Executive Order 1601 giving effect to the law on April 5, 1933. The law granted authority for two years; it was extended later to March 31, 1937 (Lacy 1976). In his address to Congress, Roosevelt had called his proposal "the Civilian Conservation Corps." The title stuck even though a program by that name was not officially recognized by law until June 28, 1937 with the passage of The Civilian Conservation Corps Act.

The target population was unemployed males. While there is a tendency to think of the CCC as a program for young men, older Americans also participated. The goals of the program were clear: conserve the environment while providing needed work and income to unemployed men. The agents for implementing this new policy were drawn from existing resources. No new federal agency was established to administer the CCC. Roosevelt appointed Robert Fechner, a successful labor leader, to serve as Director of Emergency Conservation Work (ECW) and appointed an Advisory Council composed of the Secretaries of War, Labor, Agriculture and Interior (Merrill 1981). Roosevelt earmarked \$10 million for the ECW from unobligated balances appropriated the previous year for emergency construction of public buildings.

The Department of Labor (sometimes in conjunction with State Departments of Forests and Parks) recruited and enrolled eligible youths. The Army constructed, operated, and maintained the work camps. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior selected camp sites, planned and designed the conservation projects, and directed the workers in the field (Merrill 1981). The War Department accepted the enrollees at induction centers, gave them medical examinations, and dispatched those who were accepted into the program to assigned work camps. Youths with poor health or lack of physical stamina were given transportation fare back to their home towns. The rules and incentives were also clear cut from the start. Volunteers signed up for an initial 6-month period; they could re-enlist for up to two years. Each volunteer was paid \$30 a month of which \$25 was sent directly home to the enrollee's family.

This clearly defined policy idea took shape rapidly. The first enrollee was inducted on April 7, 1933 -- just 12 days after the CCC was officially established (Lacy 1976). The first CCC camp, named Camp Roosevelt, opened at Luray, Virginia, on April 17. In all, the CCC operated over 4,500 camps although the average number of camps in operation at any one time was 1,643. At its peak in 1935, the CCC had over 600,000 enrollees working in 2,650 camps (Merrill 1981). The number of enrollees declined after 1938. The CCC housed, fed, clothed, and provided work and job training for over 3 million "juniors" (young men aged 18 to 25), a quarter of a million out of work World War I veterans, and a substantial number of "Indians" and "territorials."

Whether the CCC represented mainstream thinking from the start, it

soon enjoyed a high level of Congressional support. With camps located throughout the nation, the resulting economic stimulus for the neighboring communities was distributed across many Congressional districts. The CCC provided immediate relief for unemployed American youths and their families. Especially in the early years, the camps and the enrollees enjoyed a good image. The camps were racially segregated and the presence of the Army in the camps gave the program an image of being conservative, traditional, and safe (Graham and Wander 1985).

Perhaps as important, the policy seemed to accomplish its goal. CCC youths worked very hard, often under extreme physical circumstances; in most cases, they performed truly valuable tasks. Scholars have estimated that they expended 6,459,000 man-days fighting forest fires, built 126,000 miles of trails and minor roads into national forests, laid 89,000 miles of telephone lines, built 6,660,000 erosion control dams, protected wildlife, worked on irrigation and flood control projects, restored and preserved historical sites, and demonstrated soil conservation techniques for farmers. The major CCC work activity, however, was reforestation. CCC youth planted 2,356,000 trees (Merrill 1981). Of all of the trees planted in the U.S. up to 1942, 75% were planted by CCC workers (Badger 1989).

As the economy strengthened and threat of war increased, support for the CCC diminished; enrollment in the program declined. In July, 1937, 275,000 enrollees were at work at 1,300 camps; by 1940, there were 200,000 workers in 900 camps (Merrill 1981). The CCC's functions were modified in 1941 to include war preparedness training. Seeking to cut federal programs not directly related to the war effort, Congress voted in July, 1942, to end funding for the CCC and the program was disbanded at that time. All CCC holdings were liquidated one year later (Salmond 1967).

While the CCC is viewed as a youth service program, the NYA is generally regarded as a jobs training and employment program. The NYA was created by Executive Order on June 26, 1935, as part of the Works Progress Administration. The CCC placed only boys and men in residential camps in rural areas; NYA enrollees were both men and women between the ages of 16 to 24 who usually worked in their own communities. Over 4,800,000 youths participated during the NYA's eight years of operation.

The NYA program was divided into two divisions. One division provided funds to employ college and high school students in or around their schools so that they could remain in school (and out of the already tight labor force). By 1937, over 400,000 students were participating in this program although the number of participants dropped in later years. When the program ended in 1943, over 2 million youths had received relief under this part of the NYA program.

The second NYA program division provided training and jobs for unemployed, out of school youth. At the start, youths were given high-visibility, labor intensive projects such as park clean-up and public building maintenance. At that time, the program resembled an urban version of the CCC but with less emphasis on teams or corps and without the residential component. The program soon shifted to an emphasis on activities imparting practical jobs skills. By 1939, the program was involved almost exclusively in defense industry training. This part of the NYA program served more than 2.5 million out-of-school, unemployed youths. Congress abolished the NYA in 1943 (Graham and Wander 1985).

FDR's Plan for a National Youth Service Program -- Today Roosevelt is associated with the CCC-type youth service yet the President evidently gave some thought to a program that would have been closer to Eberly's version of

youth service.

During a June 18, 1940, news conference, Franklin Roosevelt called for disciplining all young people, male and female, through "universal government service" -- a program of government training and labor assignments to civilian and military tasks...Earlier in the same month, First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt had likewise called for a civilian labor conscription for young people (Evers 1990, p. xlii-xliii).

At the news conference, President Roosevelt referred to both military and civilian training and labor programs but he later dropped the military conscription component of his proposal (Evers 1990). In a 1976 unpublished paper prepared for the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. recalls

One of the most telling indicators of my father's views on the future of youth service was the very qualified support he gave a purely military draft. In June, 1940, after the collapse of France, when England stood alone and the armed forces were pressing for a draft, my father met with the Budget Director, Harold Smith. Smith made a note on the conversation: "The President, in confidential and preliminary form, outlined a plan for one year's training for the youth who annually came of age. He asked us to make some preliminary estimates as to the possible number. He has in mind that there might be as many as one million who would be brought into the government service for one year's training without compensation or at possibly \$5.00 a month, this program to be merged with and take the place of the present CCC and NYA. Generally, this training might break down into possible maintenance, radio and other communication, training for industry, conservation work and training and government departments. Consideration should be given to the training of young women" (Smith Diary, June 17, 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library).

All through that summer while the Burke-Wadsworth compulsory military service bill was being considered by Congress, he hoped that the legislation could be broadened into a program of universal military and civilian training (Smith Diary, July 30, 1940, Morgenthau Presidential Diary, August 14, 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library). But the political situation was such that he had to accept the Burke-Wadsworth Bill in its narrower form. Yet fifteen months later, on December 6, 1941, the day before Pearl Harbor, the Budget Director was again with my father to talk about the budget of NYA for the coming fiscal year. Smith made the following note in his Diary: "In connection with the NYA estimate...he took occasion to outline his views with respect to a future youth training program. In general, the President has in mind that youth, as they reach the age of twenty-one should spend a year in the military service, in conservation work, in the NYA type of training program, and possibly other forms of Federal service...the President told us that he had talked to Representative Lyndon Johnson (Texas)

recently with references to a simple form of legislation which would authorize and direct the President to consolidate the NYA and CCC" (Roosevelt and Lash 1976).

Lyndon Johnson had administered the NYA program in Texas (Wofford 1980). On December 10, 1941, young Congressman Johnson introduced a bill to merge the CCC and the NYA into a new entity, the Civilian Youth Administration (Salmond 1967). The idea was dropped, however, as Congress shifted its attention to the war effort.

Two Federal Youth Conservation Corps Programs in the 1970s

The appeal of the idea of a CCC-type program for American youths lasted long after the actual program ceased. A handful of members of Congress sponsored bills that would have resuscitated the CCC but no bill ever passed the Congress. When Congress did enact federal youth conservation programs, the model was the CCC program and, again, the rationales for such a program were youth unemployment and need for conservation. Like the original CCC program, no new federal agency was created to run the YCC and YACC programs and, when the national mood shifted away from concern about youth, the programs were eliminated.

The Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) -- Sponsored by Henry "Scoop" Jackson (D-WA) and Lloyd Meeds (D-WA) and passed by Congress in 1970, the Youth Conservation Corps bill provided an 8-week summer experience for teams of youth. The target population was all youth between the ages of 15 and 18. Participants performed conservation work on federal lands and received 10 hours of formal environmental education each week. The incentives for youths to participate were two-fold. Youths learned about conservation both through formal classroom instruction and through hands-on work projects. In addition, each youth received a payment of \$300 at the end of the 8-week period.

The 1971 summer "pilot program" was funded at \$2.5 million and involved 64 camps in 35 states, the District of Columbia and American Samoa. Over 124,000 youths applied for the 2,200 corps positions. Youths resided at a camp or commuted to the work site each day; 2,676 youths actually participated in the 1971 program. Funds for the YCC were distributed approximately equally to the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Interior (which distributed its funds to the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs), and the fifty states.

Each year, Meeds and Jackson tried to expand the size and scope of the program. At its peak, the YCC's annual budget was \$60 million and it enrolled 32,000 teenagers in camps across 50 states and American territories. In 1981, close to half of the participants were from low-income families; about 20 percent were minorities. Yet the program avoided the label of a jobs program for at-risk youth. The program enjoyed a very low attrition rate and participant surveys indicated a high level of satisfaction with the program. One study calculated a benefit-cost ratio of 94 cents on each federal dollar spent on the YCC (Moskos 1988).

The YCC budget was reduced to below \$10 million in 1981. While the program was dropped from President Reagan's budget entirely beginning in 1982, it was not officially eliminated. Throughout the 1980s, the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture successfully petitioned the Office of Management and Budget to fund a radically scaled back version of the YCC out of the Secretaries' discretionary funds. Due to its small size

and the short-term nature of the program (8 weeks each summer), few Americans were aware the program existed.

The Young Adult Conservation Corps Program -- Meeds and Jackson also worked to enact a full-time, year-round youth CCC-type program. They sponsored joint bills in the 92nd, 93rd and 94th Congresses. When youth unemployment became a presidential campaign issue in 1976, Carter pledged that, if elected, he would create a program similar to the CCC.

Numerous bills on youth employment were introduced in the Congress in early 1977 -- the start of the 96th Congress. The Young Adult Conservation Corps Act (H.R. 32/S. 249) was again introduced by Congressman Meeds and Senator Jackson. The Comprehensive Youth Employment Act of 1977 (H.R. 1733/S. 1713) sponsored by Congressman Paul Simon and Senators Humphrey and Javits included a section establishing a National Conservation Corps for 300,000 youths per year.

On March 9, 1977, President Carter called for year-round youth employment programs including conservation, community improvement, employment and training. Congressman Augustus Hawkins sponsored H.R. 6138, the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act. Title I of that bill created the Young Adult Conservation Corps (YACC) program. It passed Congress and Carter signed it into law on August 5, 1977 (PL 95-93). In October, 1978, Congress reauthorized the YACC under Title VIII of the CETA Amendments (PL 95-524).

The YACC program addressed twin goals of conservation and job creation by providing youths with full-time, year-round jobs. The target population for this program was defined both by age (16 to 23) and geography (youths had to be from areas with substantial unemployment). Moreover, applicants had to be unemployed and out of school.

The program was operated by the Department of Labor's Office of Youth Programs which had responsibility for recommending candidates for the program. Actual supervision of the work camps was provided by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture (sometimes in cooperation with parallel state government agencies). At Interior, programs were administered by the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Water and Power Resources Service, and the Office of Territorial Affairs. Department of Agriculture programs were carried out by the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Science and Education Administration (Human Environment Center 1980).

There was always a tension between the Department of Labor (which saw the program as essentially a jobs program) and the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. At full strength, enrollment was limited to 25,000 positions. Close to 40 percent of the participants were high school drop-outs, one third were minorities and nearly 3 out of 4 youths lived at home and commuted to the work site. Unlike the YCC, the attrition rates were high and some camps experienced disciplinary problems. But the benefit-cost ratio of the YACC was positive -- \$1.20 benefits for every federal dollar spent (Moskos 1988).

Funding for the YACC program ranged between \$220 million and \$250 million per year. Striving to reduce the federal budget in an election year, President Carter cut funding for the YACC for FY 81. After his election, Reagan reduced YACC funding further. Unlike its summer-only counterpart, the YACC program was eliminated completely when it came up for review under its sunset clause in 1982.

Beginnings of a Youth Conservation Corps Policy Community -- It is difficult to determine exactly when a youth conservation corps policy community developed. The programs had a low public profile. Between 1970 and 1982, YCC and YACC provided summer-only and full-time, year-round conservation service opportunities for over 700,000 youth -- an average of a little more than 50,000 per year (Rural Coalition 1984). By comparison, the New Deal's CCC enrolled 300,000 youths at its peak. Nor were the YCC and YACC programs seen as "mainstream programs;" indeed, as a CETA program, YACC bore a negative stigma of a government make-work program for at-risk youth.

The program had talented personnel but there was little communication between the programs. There were few career ladders to help youth volunteers graduate to program leaders. The only visible program champions were a handful on members of Congress. Yet, in the short time the YCC and YACC programs existed, they generated a cadre of supporters who would labor throughout the 1980s to preserve and expand CCC-type youth service programs.

HEC Supports Reinstatement of Federal Youth Corps Programs

Opportunities are sometimes brought on by a crisis; that was certainly the case with the CCC-type programs. When the federal youth conservation corps programs appeared headed for elimination in the late 1970s, a youth service advocate, Sydney Howe, resolved to save the programs. Howe (and, later, Peg Rosenberry) worked to educate members of Congress on the importance of federal youth conservation corps programs. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee passed a CCC-type bill in 1984 but President Reagan vetoed this legislation. Failed efforts in subsequent sessions of Congress eventually led advocates of youth corps to promote programs at the state and local levels.

Human Environment Center Connects with Youth Service -- Just as Don Eberly was the original policy entrepreneur for national service writ large, Sydney Howe was responsible for organizing and leading the CCC-type youth service policy community. Howe was a Senior Associate with the Conservation Foundation in Washington, D.C., when he presented a paper at Eberly's second national service conference in 1967. Eberly

invited Russell Train but he couldn't come to the conference so he sent Syd Howe. Howe argued, "Let's do conservation!" (Eberly Interview 1991).

In that speech, Howe identified numerous conservation projects that would be appropriate for a youth service program including

strip-mine reclamation, stream renewal, highway beautification, and in-town and in-city conservation projects (Howe 1967, pp. 249-253).

In 1976, Howe established a small Washington-based organization, the Urban Environment Foundation, that he later renamed the Human Environment Center (HEC). HEC was formed

as an environmental organization that tries to bring civil rights matters together with environmental issues. It dealt with issues like clean air in cities, toxic waste site location... This was a

way to get minority perspective and representation and a way to place minorities in jobs in conservation. This led to the conservation corps program (Rosenberry Interview 1991).

While Don Eberly's ambition was to create a federal program where one did not exist, Howe's objective was to save endangered programs. When it became evident that the federal government might slash funding for youth conservation corps, HEC hosted a seminar at Howard University to discuss the need for such programs. Program administrators, Hill staffers, and others committed to renew their efforts to get a major youth service bill passed by the Congress. In order to broaden the policy community, HEC hosted a national conference on youth conservation corps in May, 1981, in Washington, DC. One hundred conferees evaluated the performance of the YCC and YACC and generated a set of recommendations for a new corps program. Their recommendations were subsequently incorporated into H.R. 999 (Human Environment Center 1981). The conference proceedings were published as Youth Conservation Jobs and Service--A New National Corps? (Human Environment Center 1981).

Howe realized that when federal funds were withdrawn, states might elect to continue the youth programs with alternative sources of funds. HEC provided technical assistance to states, local units of government and private organizations on how to start and operate youth conservation corps programs (Human Environment Center 1982a, 1982b).

In 1983, Peg Rosenberry joined HEC. Rosenberry had spent the summer following her college graduation working at a Rocky Mountains national park. From 1976 to 1980, she was the Environmental Education Coordinator for the YCC program at the Department of Interior. She had also helped the Department of Interior write the YACC regulations.

HEC strengthened the youth conservation corps policy community by enhancing communication between the programs. At HEC, Rosenberry's task was to share information with the handful of state and federal programs then in operation. She organized youth corps staff training sessions, provided technical assistance to prospective new programs, and publicized successful programs. Along with Howe, Rosenberry provided information to members of Congress. She worked particularly closely with Loretta Newman, a staffer with the House Subcommittee on Public Lands chaired by Congressman John F. Seiberling (D-OH).

Seiberling Champions Federal Youth Conservation Corps -- It took a while for Howe and Rosenberry to generate interest in youth conservation corps legislation on Capitol Hill. No conservation corps bills received serious attention during the 96th Congress (1979-1980), but, in 1981, HEC managed to talk Congressman Seiberling into leading the effort in the House to enact a youth conservation corps program.

Kingdon has recognized the importance of jurisdiction to the fate of a policy proposal. The CCC-type bills dealt with conservation as well as youth employment matters. Therefore, Seiberling's bill was referred both to the House Education and Labor Committee and to the House Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs. Fortunately for the CCC-type policy community, Seiberling chaired the Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks so the bill was referred to Seiberling's subcommittee for consideration.

Seiberling's bill, H.R. 4861, the American Conservation Corps Act, was drafted as a result of a series of oversight hearings held in 1981 that focused on the YCC and YACC programs. Oversight hearings were held on

the YCC and the YACC by the House Committee on Governmental Affairs on June 25 and July 17 (U.S. Congress 1981a) and by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on May 5, May 12, and November 7 (U.S. Congress 1981b). The November hearing also specifically addressed Seiberling's bill, H.R. 4861.

There were two models of CCC-type youth service: the summer-only program and the year-round program. H.R. 4861 provided for both year-round conservation, energy, recreation and urban revitalization projects for 16 to 25 year olds and a summer-only program for 15 to 21 year olds. The year-round program was targeted for unemployed youths. Seiberling's bill sought to establish a strong, new administrative system and implement specific education and training programs. One section called for a study to determine the feasibility of linking the new programs with a military exemption. The bill called for \$50 million in the first year of the program. The bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on May 4, 1982 (U.S. Congress 1982a) and by the House Committee on Education and Labor on May 17 (U.S. Congress 1982b). It passed the House on June 9, 1982 on a vote of 291 to 102.

The Senate companion bill to H.R. 4861, S. 2061, was sponsored by Senators Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY) and Charles McC. Mathias (D-MD). According to a former Moynihan staffer who worked on the bill, Moynihan was contacted by a New York mayor who praised the federal conservation corps programs in his community and felt the programs should be retained. A fan of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Moynihan was proud of the role played by New York Senator Robert Wagner in passing the original CCC legislation. He set out to save and improve upon the federal YCC and YACC programs (Gray Interview 1991). The Senate held a hearing on the Moynihan-Mathias bill in the summer of 1982; no further Senate action occurred, however, during the 97th Congress.

Seiberling reintroduced his bill in the 98th Congress as H.R. 999, the American Conservation Corps Act of 1983. Senators Moynihan and Mathias cosponsored the Senate version as S. 27. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor and Seiberling's Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Eighteen witnesses presented testimony on the bill at a hearing February 8, 1983. The bill drew 186 cosponsors and passed the House on March 1, 1983 by a vote 301 to 87 including all but 5 Democrats and close to half the Republicans (US Congress 1983a).

In the Senate, the bill went to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. It was amended and reported by the committee on May 13, 1983, on a vote of 18 to 1. It was supported by 45 groups but opposed by the Reagan White House and the Department of Interior. The full Senate passed the bill on October 3, 1984. The House passed an amended version of the bill on October 9, 1984 by a vote of 296 to 75 (U.S. Congress 1983b). The bill was forwarded to President Reagan for his signature.

There had been considerable uncertainty as to whether or not Reagan would sign the ACC bill but the conservation corps policy community thought they had reason to be optimistic. The State of California not only had several local CCC-type programs in operation in the early 1980s but could also claim the oldest and largest state conservation corps program in the country. Indeed, the California program had been launched by Ronald Reagan when he was Governor of California. Youth corps advocacy groups had heard that Ed Meese, the President's Chief of Staff and a fellow Californian, was a supporter of youth conservation corps and they hoped that Meese would encourage President Reagan to sign the ACC bill. The day before the

signing, word circulated that a Memorandum of Disapproval had been prepared by David Stockman, Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Stating that the ACC was too costly and was based on a discredited youth employment strategy, Reagan vetoed the ACC bill on October 30, 1984. The window of opportunity for a federal CCC-type youth service program seemed to have been slammed shut.

Unsuccessful Efforts to Promote Modified ACC Bill -- Every Congress presents a new opportunity for policy issues. Congressman Seiberling and Senators Moynihan and Mathias reintroduced their American Conservation Corps Act bills on January 3, 1985, as H.R. 99 and S. 27. Their bills provided jobs for 85,000 youths in conservation related projects. As before, youths would also receive some formal education and on-the-job training. Full-time, year-round positions were available for youths 16 to 25 while summer-only program slots were available for 15 to 21 year olds. This time, all youths were eligible to participate although emphasis was to be placed on economically disadvantaged youth. The bill called for \$75 million between 1986 and 1988.

The House bill was again referred to Seiberling's subcommittee and Seiberling held a hearing on his bill on February 7, 1985. Witnesses included Frank Slobig with the Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project (see Chapter 5), Sydney Howe with HEC, and conservation corps directors and youth corps volunteers from programs in California, Minnesota, and Ohio. The subcommittee marked up H.R. 99 the same day.

Because his bill was almost identical to H.R. 999 in the 98th Congress, Seiberling was anxious to counter criticisms set forth in President Reagan's 1984 Memorandum of Disapproval. At Seiberling's request, the Congressional Research Service analyzed the potential social and conservation benefits of the proposed ACC program based on experiences with the former federal YACC and YCC programs. The very favorable report was available in early February and was referred to in the testimony. A representative from the Department of Interior nevertheless stated that President Reagan continued to strongly oppose H.R. 99.

Seiberling's subcommittee adopted five amendments (including raising the state match requirement from 15 to 25 percent) and approved H.R. 99. The full committee reported the amended bill on a vote of 26 to 10. H.R. 99 had picked up 139 cosponsors and looked like it would fare as well as its predecessor had in the previous Congress. On March 14, 1985, the Interior Committee reported out the bill (U.S. Congress 1985a).

Twelve days later, the House Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities held a hearing on the bill that included testimony by Representative Seiberling. By mid-April, the Committee on Education and Labor had marked up H.R. 99 and, after accepting the Interior Committee's amendments, referred the bill to the full House on an 18 to 10 vote (U.S. Congress 1985b).

While Seiberling's committee treated H.R. 99 as a youth conservation proposal, members of the Education and Labor Committee clearly saw this bill as a jobs bill. The Education and Labor Committee's report (No. 99-18, Part II) was issued on May 2, 1985; the Background and Need section began "Youth unemployment stands out as one of our Nation's most troubling and intransigent economic problems" (U.S. Congress 1985b, p. 15). The first part of the report stressed that conservation programs were productive and cost effective "as well as employment opportunities." It characterized H.R. 99 as an on-the-job training program. Benefits to youth included "rekindling the work ethic, teaching positive attitudes toward work, developing self-

confidence and pride in one's work." Dissenting members feared it would undermine the Job Corps program.

The bill came up for a vote on the House floor on July 11, 1985. To supporters' surprise, the bill passed by only 2 votes (193-191). Howe attributed the close vote to several factors. Members feared appearing soft on budget control. Opponents insisted that there was not sufficient work for youths or that they would be poorly supervised; some argued that youth would be paid to rake leaves or build outhouses. There was also end-of-the-day absenteeism following action on major legislation prior to the vote. A negative "Dear Colleague" letter circulated by Republicans also hurt the bill's chance of passing. H.R. 99 went to the Senate July 15, 1985. It was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. A year later, the Senate had still not taken action on either H.R. 99 or the Senate companion bill, S. 27.

HEC and Seiberling's staff continued to devise a version of a CCC-type youth service bill that the Congress would pass and President Reagan would sign. In August, 1986, Howe retired and Jill Diskin became executive director of HEC. During the 1986 summer recess, HEC staff and Loretta Newman talked the bill's supporters into agreeing to two important changes. First, a greater emphasis was placed on state and local participation; the revised bill would permit Federal agencies to contract with local governments and nonprofit organizations to get work accomplished on Federal lands without exceeding their mandated personnel hiring ceilings. Second, an automatic funding allocation formula was dropped from the bill. The sponsors added competitive criteria for allocation of money to the states including a 50/50 federal/state matching requirement and emphasis on non-cash federal contributions. The purpose of these changes was to spur new and expanded programs without hurting existing programs. The Senate approved the scaled back version of the bill by unanimous consent on October 17, 1986, but House sponsors of the bill rejected the modified proposal when it was attached to two other environmentally objectionable bills in the House. A bill establishing a CCC-type youth service program had once again failed in the U.S. Congress.

The American Conservation Corps bill had passed the House three times and the Senate twice. In the 100th Congress, ACC advocates tried once again to pass the bill. But the CCC-type youth service policy community had lost Congressman Seiberling to retirement and Loretta Newman had lost her job with the subcommittee upon Seiberling's departure. Before he left, Seiberling asked Congressman Udall to carry the ACC bill. Udall introduced H.R. 18, the American Conservation Corps Act of 1987. This bill was identical to the amended bill that passed the Senate in the 99th Congress. With 68 cosponsors, the bill was again referred to Interior's Subcommittee on National Parks and to the Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities. Hearings were held on this bill once in 1987 and several times in 1988.

Panetta Adds a Twist to the Youth Corps Approach -- Up to now, there were two versions of a CCC-type program: summer-only programs and year-round programs. But when a new actor entered the debate, he brought an innovative approach to thinking about CCC-type youth service legislation.

Late in the 97th Congress, Congressman Leon Panetta (D-CA) shifted his effort from seeking passage of a national service writ large bill to promoting a CCC-type youth service bill. He introduced H.R. 6422, the Voluntary National Service Act. The bill's goal was to establish youth

service programs. The target population was all youths between the ages of 17 and 24. As was typical of CCC-type proposals at the time, all youths were eligible but special effort was to be made to enroll economically disadvantaged youths. Under this bill, monies would be allocated on a 50/50 grant funding basis and be administered by states and local units of government. Youths would perform full-time, year-round service for a period of one year or longer.

What was markedly different about Panetta's bill was that it was the first bill introduced in the U.S. Congress to expand the youth corps concept beyond exclusively environmental/conservation activities. It proposed that youths would perform service in urban as well as rural settings and would address not only conservation needs but also human service and social service needs as well. This was not the first time such an approach had been proposed. Urban service and human services oriented projects had been discussed by advocates of national service writ large. But Panetta's proposal represented a shift in scope for the policy community that advocated CCC-type programs. The 50/50 match was also considered to be an innovation in youth service legislation. Panetta would continue to promote this urban/human services model of youth service; a similar version of H.R. 6422 was introduced as H.R. 888 in the 99th Congress and as H.R. 460 in the 100th Congress.

The Martinez Merger Proposal -- As Congressman Panetta's proposal demonstrated, sometimes a fresh face can bring a new perspective to a policy area -- especially if that new face assumes some power by moving into a subcommittee chairmanship. Such was the case with Congressman Matthew Martinez (D-CA). Martinez had long been a strong proponent of conservation corps programs. From an area of Los Angeles troubled by gangs and high rates of unemployment, he appreciated the potential for helping disadvantaged youth that the conservation corps approach offered. Two of his brothers had participated in the New Deal CCC and he was familiar with local CCC-type programs in his district. He recalled

I had a great experience in Los Angeles as a youth in Boys Clubs. I'd seen it redirect a lot of kids into productive activities -- maybe I am one of them...and I'd been involved in community affairs and knew the satisfaction of being able to look at something and say to myself, "I built that." Even if no one knows your involvement, you do and you get great reward and feel pride.

...I saw the conservation corps programs in Oakland and San Francisco. I visited those programs and I saw the kinds of people I'd seen in East L.A. And the kids would rather be there than out selling drugs (Interview 1991).

In 1985, Martinez became chair of the House Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities. Frustrated by failure to pass the ACC bill, Martinez decided in 1988 to merge Udall's pure conservation bill with Panetta's human services bill. Martinez also added a section that strengthened the Job Corps and added 10 percent funding for skills remediation and post-service training benefits. A section was also added that called for a 2-year commission to study youth service opportunities. Martinez always viewed youth service as a job skills development program. A member of his subcommittee staff explained

On a continuum of training sophistication, it was at the bottom - - as rudimentary. At the top was high-tech, in-company training. Then came guild training and employment training such as JTPA. The conservation corps program represented the missing link to get them off the streets...we saw it as a last resort, jump-start approach (Jensen Interview 1991).

The compromise package was known as the "Martinez-Panetta amendment to the Udall bill." The 100th Congress ended without action on any youth service bill but the Martinez compromise was seen as a good sign and favorable action was expected in the 101st Congress.

Late in 1988, Eric Jensen on Martinez' subcommittee staff hosted several large, informal youth service forums. Everyone interested in youth service legislation was invited to participate. Interested staff from both the House and Senate as well as off-the-Hill advocates attended these meetings. Jensen's idea was to search for unifying themes and approaches. By December, 1988, many believed that a "megabill" would receive serious attention in the 101st Congress. Given the disappointments of the past few years, advocates both off-the-Hill and on Capitol Hill were asking "What does it take to enact a federal youth service program?"

State and Local Programs in the 1970s and Early 1980s

The White House and the U.S. Congress were not the only venues for promoting CCC-type youth service programs; there were a few state and local programs as well. California pioneered with both state and local CCC-type programs in the late 1960s and early 1970s but it was not until the mid-1980s that a significant number of such programs were under way. These programs represented additional members of the CCC-type youth service policy community. They also provided variations on the theme thus broadening the idea and application of CCC-type programs.

State Run CCC-Type Programs -- On April 27, 1971, California Governor Ronald Reagan issued an Executive Order establishing the California Ecology Corps. Administered by the California Department of Conservation, the state program was designed to provide work opportunities for 160 Vietnam War conscientious objectors. The first administrator, Joe E. Griggs, noted early on that individuals other than conscientious objectors were also eligible and welcome to participate (NSN 1971a). Governor Jerry Brown reconstituted this program in 1976 into a more traditional CCC-type youth conservation corps program and renamed it the California Conservation Corps. By mid-1979, the program involved 22 centers throughout the state with 60 to 80 participants at each center. Participants could serve up to one year. Enrollees were not targeted -- although most came from disadvantaged backgrounds (NSN 1971b).

Sometimes the closing of a policy window can also lead to new opportunities for policy advancement. The demise of federal funding for the YCC program at the start of the Reagan administration spurred states and cities to sponsor their own programs. In 1980, there were only two active state-based programs: California's Conservation Corps and an Ohio program (Theus 1988, Burkhardt 1990). By 1982, new programs included the Connecticut Conservation Corps, the Illinois Youth Conservation Corps, the Iowa Youth Corps, the Kansas Natural Resources Protection Corps, and the Maryland Conservation Corps. The California Conservation Corps was greatly oversubscribed in spite of its motto of "Hard work, low pay, and miserable conditions" (Howe 1982). Ohio was talking about taking their

program statewide; it was to be operated by an Ohio Office of Civilian Conservation. Alaska, Florida, Maine, Minnesota, New York, Washington, and Wisconsin were said to be exploring the idea of starting a CCC-type youth service program (NSN 1982, p.3). In 1983, state programs had started in Alaska and Wisconsin. Washington State had both a Conservation Corps and a Service Corps program under way.

These and other new programs brought talented, articulate individuals into the CCC-type youth service policy community. In the spring of 1983, Michigan Governor James Blanchard announced plans to establish a statewide youth service program for 18 to 21 year old unemployed youth. By 1988, Michigan was running the nation's largest state-funded summer-only youth corps program with 20,000 enrollees. It was administered by the Michigan Department of Labor and was viewed as a youth employment program. When the state budget got tight in the late 1980s, however, the program was discontinued (Powell 1988).

At a meeting run by Jim Kielsmeier with the University of Minnesota in September, 1984, 50 leading elected officials and civic leaders committed to establish a Minnesota Youth Service Corps for 18 year olds. Don Eberly was the keynote speaker. In 1986, the State announced that it would run a summer-only pilot program through the Minnesota Conservation Corps and Kielsmeier's National Youth Leadership Council.

Pennsylvania also launched a promising CCC-type youth service program. The Pennsylvania Conservation Corps was established in 1984. By 1988, it had a budget of \$13 million and an enrollment of 1,500 youths. On March 23, 1987, Governor Robert Casey swore in Harris Wofford as Pennsylvania's Secretary of Labor and Industry and Casey and Wofford jointly announced a new program, "PennServe: The Governor's Initiative for Citizen Service." John Briscoe, a former Peace Corps volunteer in India, was hired to run PennServe. Following his work with the Peace Corps in the 1960s, Briscoe had worked as assistant to the President when Wofford headed Bryn Mawr College. He had also worked as administrative assistant to U.S. Congressman Bob Edgar (D-PA) for 8 years.

Local and Regional CCC-type Programs -- New talent did not just come from the state government level; cities, counties and private organizations also sponsored CCC-type youth service programs. In March, 1967, a group of San Francisco Bay area citizens pledged to raise funds to support a youth service program. Originally named the National Service Foundation, the program was later renamed the National Voluntary Service. This program offered 2-year positions for youth to work in an inner city service program (NSN 1968). Another regional program, the Tennessee Valley Authority Conservation Works Corps, was established in 1976 but evidently did not continue in operation long.

The San Francisco Conservation Corps was established in 1984. After a summer trial program, Mayor Diane Feinstein began a full-time, year-round program enrolling seventy youths of both sexes between the ages of 18 and 23. A summer-only program for 16 to 21 year olds was also established. Half of the program funding came from federal Community Development Block Grant Public Space Improvement Program monies. The first director of the San Francisco Conservation Corps was Robert Burkhardt, a Peace Corps volunteer who served in Iran in the 1960s and who had worked for the California Conservation Corps since its inception in 1976. A private youth service program, the East Bay Conservation Corps, was also established in California in 1983.

New York City Mayor Ed Koch had supported national service

legislation when he had served in the U.S. Congress. When he was elected Mayor of New York City, Koch decided to take action where he had authority. In January, 1984, he announced that he had developed plans, in consultation with the National Service Secretariat, for a youth service program. Youths would receive a weekly stipend of \$80 plus \$2,500 cash or a \$5,000 education voucher at the end of one year of service. Carl Weisbrod was hired as program director. The following November, New York City's City Volunteers Corps began operation with 35 males and 21 females. In 1985, the program enrolled 720 youths.

Established in 1989, Boston's City Year program was one of the later entries in the youth corps field yet it turned out to be a widely praised model of youth service. After a trial program in the summer of 1988, Alan Khazei and Michael Brown launched a full-time, year-round service program for Boston youth age 17 to 22. Khazei was a recent Harvard Law School graduate while Brown had worked for Congressman Panetta and was previously the head of public relations for New York City's City Volunteer Corps. Like Khazei, Brown was a student at Harvard Law School. They used New York City's CVC program as their model with two major adjustments: the program was run exclusively with private funds and socio-demographic diversity was maintained to foster ethnic and racial tolerance. Working in ten teams of ten youth each, volunteers received a weekly stipend of \$100 plus an end-of-service education or training voucher or \$2,500 cash plus a \$2,500 savings certificate.

Program Growth in Later Years -- The number of programs begun following the termination of the federal YCC and YACC programs attests to the favorable view officials and citizens had of the CCC-type youth service program model. There were 36 youth corps programs in the U.S. in 1985 (Howe 1985). By 1986, 13 states (Alaska, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin) ran year-round corps that collectively served over 1,000 youths. Their annual budgets ranged from \$350,000 (Alaska) to \$44 million (California). There were another 13 local or regional year-round programs with 1,350 enrollees. Five of these local or regional programs were located in California, three were in New York State, and there was one program each in Georgia, Vermont, and Virginia. Local or regional programs were administered mainly by private, nonprofit organizations and financed through local government appropriations, foundation grants, private contributions, in kind services, fees-for-service, and, in some cases, federal JTPA monies.

Five states (Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Vermont) and eight local or regional organizations (in California, Maryland, New York, Oregon and Pennsylvania) ran summer-only programs ranging in size from 18 youths (Pennsylvania) to 12,500 youths (Michigan). Approximately 6,000 youths also participated in YCC programs administered by the National Parks Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and the National Forest Service. The federal programs were estimated to represent expenditures of \$10 million annually. In all, 39 units of government or private nonprofit organizations provided nearly 11,400 year-round and approximately 20,300 summer-only positions in 1986. Besides the 6,000 positions provided through the federal YCC program, three programs dominated in terms of total positions: Michigan (12,500 summer-only), Iowa (3,000 year-round) and the California Conservation Corps (2,200 year-round).

Over the next few years, existing state and local or regional programs expanded and many new programs were begun (see Tables 4 and 5). When

the 101st Congress began in 1989, there were 54 year-round and 20 summer-only state and local or regional programs in the United States. These programs represented grass roots support for a federal CCC-type program and additional members of the youth conservation corps policy community. HEC's challenge was to harness these new resources.

Organizing and Promoting State and Local Programs

In order to strengthen and expand existing youth corps programs, HEC organized the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps (NASCC) -- a trade association for the service corps. Peg Rosenberry became Associate Director and shared office space and staff support with HEC. NASCC conducted workshops, promoted principles of best practices, produced resource papers, profiled individuals and programs across the country, provided technical assistance to new and existing programs, conducted and reported the results of an annual nationwide survey of conservation and service corps programs, and kept members informed on federal legislative initiatives that might affect the service corps field.

In the beginning, NASCC experienced tension between the various types of youth service programs. The business sessions at NASCC's 1987 annual convention were marked by "narrow provincialism... marred by internecine jockeying for power in the leadership cadre of the association" (Streams 1987, p. 2). Following the 1988 annual meeting, a NASCC board member from New York City's CVC program quit in protest stating that NASCC was overly conservation corps oriented and gave inadequate attention to urban programs. But NASCC survived the early days to settle into a comfortable niche and state and local programs continued to spread.

Summary and Conclusions

CCC-type youth service state and local programs and bills introduced into Congress reveal a new set of actors and ideas.

Actors -- A different set of actors was involved with CCC-type youth service programs than were in the national service writ large policy community. The principal players in this area were Syd Howe and Peg Rosenberry. But governors (Reagan and Brown in California, Blanchford in Michigan, Casey in Pennsylvania), mayors (Feinstein in San Francisco and Koch in New York City), and program administrators (Kielsmeier in Minnesota, Wofford and Briscoe in Pennsylvania, Burkhardt and Lennon in California, Khazei and Brown at City Year in Boston), were also important participants in the CCC-type youth service policy community.

Only a handful of members of Congress introduced and worked on bills. In the early 1970s, Henry ("Scoop") Jackson and Lloyd Meeds, two Democrats from Washington State, led the effort. In the 1980s, the battle was waged by Congressman John Seiberling (D-OH) and by Senators Moynihan (D-NY) and Mathias (D-MD). Equally important in pushing the legislation was Seiberling's staffer, Loretta Newman. Two Democratic Congressmen from California, Leon Panetta and Matthew Martinez, introduced innovations to the basic legislative proposal.

The only groups or organizations actively supporting CCC-type youth service programs were Syd Howe's creations: the Human Environment Center and the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps. HEC managed to win support for the ACC bill from the Sierra Club, the National Wildlife Federation, and the AFL-CIO. Through the short-lived federal programs (the summer-only Youth Conservation Corps and the year-round

Table 4.
 Conservation and Service Corps Programs in the United State
 Total Dollars and Number of Enrollees
 By Type of Program, 1986 - 1989

	1986		1987		1988		1989	
	\$ (000)	#	\$ (000)	#	\$ (000)	#	\$ (000)	#
Year-Round	95,454	11,387	106,041	12,448	120,583	12,190	127,896	14,268
State Local/	76,974	10,070	88,160	10,977	97,746	10,752	99,983	12,230
Regional	18,480	1,317	17,881	1,471	22,837	1,438	27,913	2,038
Summer-Only	18,108	14,302	6,783	24,749	30,405	23,217	33,992	23,818
State Local/	17,087	13,538	5,587	23,937	28,532	21,406	32,366	22,112
Regional	1,021	764	1,196	812	1,873	1,811	1,626	1,706
Federal	10,000	6,000	3,000	3,000	NA	NA	3,500	3,000
Grand Total	123,562	31,689	115,824	40,197	150,988	35,407	165,388	41,086

Source: Human Environment Center/NASCC Conservation and Service Corps Profiles 1986-1989

Table 5.
 Conservation and Service Corps Programs in the United States
 Number of Programs by Type of Program
 1986 - 1989

Year	Program Type				Total
	Year-Round		Summer-Only		
	State	Local	State	Local	
1986	14	13	5	8	40
1987	14	14	7	10	45
1988	15	18	9	14	56
1989	15	23	11	13	62

Source: Human Environment Center/NASCC Conservation and Service Corps Profiles 1986-1989

Young Adult Conservation Corp), three federal agencies had some dealings with youth corps: the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Interior, and the Department of Labor.

During much of the life of the YCC and YACC programs, there was little or no policy community. When it appeared the programs would be terminated, a very small but relatively cohesive CCC-type youth service policy community was pulled together by Syd Howe. Later, as more and more state, local, and even private programs began, the policy community grew in size and diversity. The inclusion of human service corps and urban corps added tension within the policy community but strengthened the group as a whole and broadened its base of support.

The development of policy entrepreneurs in this policy community paralleled the growth of programs. In the beginning, Syd Howe and Peg Rosenberry were the only people actively promoting CCC-type youth service. Later, many program administrators (Kielsmeier, Lennon, Khazei, and Wofford) and several elected officials (especially New York Mayor Koch) worked hard to promote CCC-type youth service.

Ideas -- The basic CCC-type program involves youths (usually unemployed males) working on supervised, conservation related projects in teams or corps. The idea for such a program came out of the New Deal and is generally attributed to FDR.

Most proposals introduced in Congress were similar in content to the original CCC. The target population ranged between 15 to 25 years of age. Sometimes the enrollment was open to all, but it was always understood (if not explicitly stated) that special efforts were to be made to enroll disadvantaged youths (at-risk kids, high school drop-outs, the unemployed, the poor, and/or minority youth). Youths carried out planned, supervised activities -- usually highly physical labor -- in teams or corps. The work was originally conservation related; Seiberling expanded the list to include energy and recreation projects, and Panetta added a human services focus. The only other notable change in the proposals was the emphasis on local control (backed by a 50/50 match) added by Panetta in the mid-1980s. The programs were to be carried out by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior; the Labor Department sometimes played a role, also.

The programs begun at the local, state, and regional levels generally mirrored the YACC and YCC programs with three exceptions. Programs located in major urban areas led to rethinking the nature of service activities. Some programs added a human services focus about the time that Panetta was putting that idea into federal legislation. The greatest innovation may have been Boston's City Year program. While its founders had used the New York City program as a model, City Year operated exclusively with private funds. This allowed the program to set and follow racial, ethnic, and gender quotas, which, in turn, helped City Year achieve a program goal of social mixing.

Opportunity -- The Great Depression and his election to the Presidency provided Roosevelt with the opportunity to establish the original CCC program. Passage of the YCC program in the early 1970s is hard to explain; no particular window of opportunity seems to have opened leading to the success of the Jackson/Meed bill. The 1976 Presidential election, on the other hand, clearly opened the window for creation of the YACC. Indeed, pressure by youth advocates, including the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute project (see Chapter 3), pressured Carter into making (and fulfilling) a presidential campaign promise.

New administrations can help or hurt an issue. Carter had already begun cutting back on funding for the federal CCC-type youth service programs, but Reagan (with considerable support from David Stockman) essentially killed the YCC and YACC. Reagan also vetoed the ACC bill passed by Congress in 1984. Ironically, the assumed demise of these programs did not occur; we might say the CCC-type programs were a victim of devolution. While the number of participants did drop greatly, administrators and elected officials recognized that the programs had been worthwhile and many programs were eventually carried forward with state or local funding.

Kingdon identifies jurisdiction as critical to opportunity. In the House of Representatives, primary jurisdiction could have gone to one of two Committees. Rosenberry recalled that when Seiberling was in Congress

The House Education and Labor Committee would just go along. But, when we lost our prime sponsor, there wasn't anybody that was ready to take it up (Interview 1991).

When Seiberling retired from Congress, he asked Congressman Udall to sponsor his youth conservation corps bill, but Udall was ill and youth service had never been a priority for either Udall or his staff.

Strategy -- Howe's goal was to reinstate the two federal CCC-type youth service programs. Thus, the content of his policy proposals was already set. Also set were the rationales for CCC-type programs; the policy was always framed in terms of youth unemployment and, to a lesser extent, conservation needs. Besides imparting needed job skills, advocates argued, these programs were empowering and character building; participants would gain self-esteem and an improved sense of self-worth. Howe's focus was always job creation. He wrote that "A New CCC Would Put Youths to Work" (Howe 1982a) and offer "additional benefits in new confidence and training given to jobless youth" (Howe 1982a). CCC-type programs, he stressed, would "rescue many young men and women from idleness now burdening their lives" and have "both immediate and long term savings in the costs of crime, incarceration, and welfare programs" (Howe 1982b). Howe stressed that "preference should be given to disadvantaged youth from families in poverty" (Howe 1982b).

The social construction of the target population for CCC-type programs was negative -- trouble makers and at risk youths. Opponents felt funds should not be spent on "social programs" (such as the CCC-type programs) when other programs (such as alternative schools) met their needs more directly. Other opponents of CCC-type programs attacked the proposals as costly and utopian. Some argued that there would not be enough jobs available for all the youths wanting to participate; youths would end up in poorly supervised, wasteful, make-work activities.

The late 1980s would bring change to the structure and focus of the CCC-type youth service policy community. Chapter 5 discusses how school-based service-learning proponents infused another set of ideas and actors into the youth service field.

Chapter 5. Service-Learning Proposals and Youth Service America

In service-learning programs, educational experiences are enhanced by incorporating service opportunities into the curriculum. College students sometimes participate in short-term, off-campus internships; more often, service-learning activities are organized and supervised by school personnel. Originally, the target population was college students; in the early 1980s, it expanded to include students of all ages. The school-based service-learning policy community was ill defined. A nationwide association for college service-learning programs was not formed until 1986. There was no pre-collegiate service-learning advocacy organization.

Although innovative student-learning programs were established across the United States in the 1980s, service-learning advocates rarely viewed their programs as part of a larger youth service movement. That changed with the creation in 1986 of Youth Service America (YSA), a nonprofit organization dedicated to "merging" the various youth service "streams." YSA staff aggressively recruited powerful and respected national leaders to the youth service movement. They sought to redefine the social construction of youth from "a problem" to "an untapped national resource." During the 1988 campaign cycle, YSA elicited promises of support for youth service programs from presidential candidates in hopes of securing a youth service champion in the White House after the election.

Early Efforts to Study and Promote Service-Learning

Service-learning has been defined as

the integration of service with academic growth, wherein the service informs the learning and the learning informs the service. Service-learning is more of a process than a program and can be either voluntary or mandatory, paid or unpaid, full-time or part-time (Eberly and Kielsmeier 1991, p. 32).

Eberly recognized the parallel relationships between his vision of national service writ large and the idea of service-learning -- a concept that had been in place for many years. He noted that

One hundred years ago we had experiential learning. Boys worked on farms and girls worked in the kitchens. And boys grew up to be men who ran farms and girls grew up to be women who ran households (Eberly Interview 1991).

Eberly Promotes Student-Learning -- Many members of Eberly's national service writ large policy community were involved in education. Several participants at Eberly's first national service conference were educators and one of the seven conference papers, "A Role for Colleges and Universities in a National Service Program," was presented by the director of a student service program at Franconia College in New Hampshire (Greenway 1967). One panel at the second national service conference

discussed education-based youth service issues. Papers were presented on "National Service as Popular Education," "National Service -- Interlude or Transition?" and "A Role for Socially Valued Service in the Educational Process." Youth service was advocated as a way to improve teaching, as an alternative to college, and as an exploratory period prior to college (Eberly et al. 1969). Harris Wofford's workshop debated whether service programs should exist within or outside the formal education structure. Wofford, who would later serve as president of Bryn Mawr College, suggested

a kind of GI Bill of Rights sponsored by the federal government which would provide a living allowance and fringe benefits to any young person who wishes to contract for a period of service in any approved program, whether connected with the colleges and universities, the lower educational system, private organizations, or government projects (Eberly 1968a).

Wofford's ideas described the basic content of an education-linked youth service program; except for changes in the target population, this content would not change substantially over the next 20 years.

While Eberly's main focus in the late 1960s was national service writ large and the military draft, he did publish articles that linked service with learning (1968b) and promoted off-campus service experiences for college students. In 1968, Eberly struck up a friendship with Joseph Shoben, Jr., the Director of the Commission on Academic Affairs at the American Council on Education (ACE). Eberly and Shoben talked ACE into sponsoring a survey of over 2,000 colleges and universities regarding campus-based youth service activities. Eighty-two of the 634 schools responding said they awarded academic credit for qualifying service experiences (NSN 1968b).

School Support for Service-Learning -- Policy communities are composed not just of individuals but also of groups and organizations. In the education-linked youth service policy community, higher education administrators who were interested in formal programs of service-learning brought their colleges and universities into the policy community as well. Stanford University held a three-day conference in April, 1967, on developing a service curriculum. The following year, Cornell University sponsored a conference entitled "Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibility and the College Student;" close to 200 students from 40 universities attended the conference (NSN 1968b). The American Association for Higher Education passed a resolution in 1968 calling for college students to do community service for academic credit (NSN 1968c) and Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II (brother of Syd Howe) endorsed using students in community service programs in an address to the American Association of University Professors (NSN 1968d).

There was support for service-learning at the high school level, also. In 1974, the Executive Committee of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) began a study of service-learning for youth aged 15 to 20 (NSN 1972). NASSP would later sponsor studies, issue reports, and host conferences on youth service and service-learning. Along with ACTION, NASSP cosponsored a conference on "action learning" at the Wingspread Conference Center in Wisconsin in 1974. Later that year, NASSP mailed out over 30,000 copies of a booklet describing successful service-learning programs in 25 schools (NSN 1974a). Eberly worked with NASSP on several of their projects and wrote articles for the NASSP Bulletin in 1972 and again in 1974. He believed that the NASSP efforts helped considerably to

legitimate the idea of service-learning within the education community (Eberly Interview 1991).

Early Service-Learning Programs

There is a long tradition in the United States of students performing acts of charity. Service activities are an important aspect of membership in many fraternities and sororities. The Madison House at the University of Virginia, Dwight Hall at Yale University, and Phillips Brooks House at Harvard are symbols of the importance given to student service. Public service has been a particularly integral part of the institutional ethic of church affiliated colleges and universities such as the University of Notre Dame and Georgetown University (Gilinsky 1985). Antioch College included a period of work-study in its curriculum as early as 1921 (Eberly 1968b). But only in the last two decades have significant numbers of colleges and universities, high schools, and even elementary and middle schools awarded academic credit for service activities, provided salaried personnel to administer service programs, and given financial support to allow students to participate in service efforts.

Southern Regional Education Board -- One early advocate of service-learning was the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). In 1966, it sponsored a Student Internship Program and promoted service-learning concepts. An SREB publication, Atlanta Service-Learning Conference Report (SREB 1970) argued for merging education and community service (Kendall 1988). Berea College awarded academic credit for internships and, in 1974, worked with the University of Kentucky and SREB to develop an inventory of service opportunities in their region (NSN 1974b, Sexton and Unger 1975).

To overcome the argument that a year of service could place youths behind their peers once they entered the work force, conservative William Buckley urged America's top ten private colleges to require one year of service as a prerequisite for admission (Buckley 1973). SREB sponsored the establishment of two spin-off groups that both began in 1971: the Society for Field Experience Education and the National Center for Public Service Internship Programs; they were merged in 1978 into the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (Kendall 1988).

Federal Support for Service-Learning Programs

A number of federal agencies made small contributions toward advancing the idea of service-learning. One such program was the College Work-Study Program under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Eberly/ACE survey of colleges, however, indicated that only 35 colleges used Work-Study funds for such purposes (Eberly 1968b). During the late 1960s and 1970s, Ford Foundation grant funds were combined with the College Work-Study Program to create Urban Corps programs that offered students off-campus learning opportunities (Kendall 1988). The Department of Labor also had a small fund for college student service programs in 1967 (NSN 1967a). A student service program at California State College at Los Angeles, the Educational Participation in Communities program, was partially funded from Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Eberly 1968b).

The Nixon administration supported youth service and service-learning. The U.S. Office of Education contracted with Amitai Etzioni to study national service (Etzioni 1971) and a White House Conference on Youth at Estes Park, Colorado, generated considerable discussion of service-learning and school-based youth service programs (NSN 1971a). But

service-learning got its greatest boost under ACTION. Eberly went to work for ACTION in 1971. Within a month of its formation, the agency began work on a service-learning project to permit 500 full-time college students at eleven colleges in seven states and the District of Columbia to work one year as "associate VISTA volunteers" (NSN 1971b).

A service-learning group started by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity in 1969 as the National Student Volunteer Program and later renamed the National Center for Service-Learning (NCSL) provided technical assistance for student service programs in high schools and colleges. NCSL was merged into ACTION in 1971. One NCSL program was the University Year for ACTION (UYA). The phrase "service-learning" was first used at the federal level in Title I, Part B, of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 in the section providing for UYA (NSN 1973). Between 1971 and 1979, the program placed over 10,000 college students in one year, full-time anti-poverty programs (Kendall 1988).

ACTION began a second service-learning project in August, 1974. The Youth Challenge Program (YCP) involved youths age 14 to 21. ACTION gave 35 planning grants of up to \$4,000 each to schools in 27 states (NSN 1974c). When Joseph Blanchard left as ACTION administrator, however, Eberly was moved out of a policy position. The Seattle PLS program and the YCP program were soon phased out. Thus, the Health, Education and Welfare, ACTION, and the Office of Economic Opportunity all left their mark on service-learning.

Student Service and Education Reform Proposals

Not all rationales that supported service-learning focused directly on the student; service-learning was also framed as a technique to smooth the transition to adulthood -- especially for those youths who elected not to attend college. Service-learning programs were seen as a way to help young people make the shift from the status of student to that of working adult (Brown 1980). A commission in the late 1970s headed by Clark Kerr identified the problem of "compulsory youth... a twilight zone of uncertainty and ambiguity of status" between dependency and adulthood and recommended a voluntary youth service program to ease the transition (Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education 1979, p. 345).

Over time, youth service became more directly associated with education reform proposals. A national commission chaired by James S. Coleman in the early 1970s feared a trend toward "passive education" and called for more opportunities for youth service (President's Science Advisory Committee on Youth 1973).

Student service was often proposed as a part of education reform studies and ideas on the content of a student service policy were also plentiful. In his book The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education/Work Policy, Willard Wirtz argued for integrating education and work throughout life and proposed that high school students be required to complete 500 hours of service or work (Wirtz 1975). (After serving as Secretary of Labor under Kennedy and Johnson, Wirtz established the National Manpower Institute. In 1976, he was elected to the National Service Secretariat's Board of Trustees.)

Two education reform studies in the first half of the 1980s also linked youth service with education reform. John Goodlad's multi-year research of 1,016 classrooms was sponsored by 13 foundations including the Danforth and Ford foundations, and the U.S. Department of Education. Goodlad proposed restructuring education so that course work typically covered

during the traditional high school period would be completed by age 16. Goodlad proposed a new, two-year program preceding college that would be

essentially a fourth phase in the education/schooling continuum. It would be a combination of work, study and service conducted within an educational ethos (1983, p. 347).

Perhaps the proposal with the greatest stature came from Ernest Boyer with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In his education reform study, High School (1983), Boyer advocated a national program of youth service for all high school students. Student service was as important, Boyer reasoned, as study and should constitute credit similar to course work. He proposed students be required to earn high school credit by performing community service.

A 1987 report of a Carnegie-sponsored survey of 1,100 schools on student service programs was entitled Student Service: The New Carnegie Unit; two thirds of the high schools responding to that survey indicated they had some sort of service program under way (Harrison 1987).

INDEPENDENT SECTOR, a Washington-based organization that represents the nation's volunteer sector, hosted a conference on high school service programs in October, 1986, for students, teachers, and school administrators. It was funded by grants from the Ford Foundation, ARCO, Rockefeller, Hearst, NYT Company, and the Edward W. Hazen Foundation. After the conference, Edward Meade, a Senior Program Manager with the Ford Foundation, held a half-day meeting with 20 key education leaders to discuss the future of youth service in pre-collegiate settings (Streams 1986c). As a follow up to the conference, INDEPENDENT SECTOR published a manual on how schools could start youth service programs (Conrad and Hedin 1987).

More than either the national service writ large or the CCC-type youth service policy arenas, the service-learning policy community attracted a broad range of respected individuals, institutions, and groups. But this policy community, too, lacked political connections.

William T. Grant Foundation's Study of "The Forgotten Half"

Perhaps the most important boost to school-based youth service came from the William T. Grant Foundation's Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship study of "Youth and America's Future." This project was led by a nineteen-member Commission that included The Rev. Theodore Hesbergh, Maryland State Superintendent of Schools David Hornbeck, pollster and political consultant Daniel Yankelovich, lawyer Hillary Rodham Clinton, University of Chicago professor William Julius Wilson, William T. Grant Foundation President Robert Haggerty, New York Chemical Bank managing director Kenneth Rolland, and others. The Commission was chaired by Harold Howe II, Senior Lecturer at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The Commission members were highly regarded individuals; most had national reputations in their fields of expertise. But the political savvy that would eventually help propel youth service onto the national agenda came with Sam Halperin, the staff director of the "Youth and America's Future" project.

Halperin held a Ph.D. in political science from Washington University. He had taught at Wayne State University, American University, Duke, and Teachers College-Columbia University. As an American Political Science Association Congressional Fellow (1960-61), he worked on House and Senate

education committees. He later worked in the Congressional Relations section of the U.S. Office of Education and was Deputy Assistant Secretary at Health, Education and Welfare under John Gardner and Wilbur Cohen.

The Commission's major contribution for youth service was a strategy conscientiously designed to change the way Americans viewed young people. Early on, the Commission determined that youth pathologies such as drugs, school dropouts, suicide, and unemployment had been the subject of much research. Instead, they chose to focus not on what was wrong about America's youth but on what was known about the success of youth as workers, as parents, and as citizens. Halperin recalled the Commission

organized work around known realms of society and their contributions: economic data, family, community organizations, education and training, employers, youth themselves and youth service organizations (both "national service" and "community service"). In looking at the latter, we came to the concept of thinking of youth as a resource versus a problem (Halperin Interview 1991).

One outcome of the project was an effort to revise the social construction of youth. An interim report objected to a

distorted image of youth as "losers," "carefree youth without a thought for tomorrow," "a generation on the skids"...The Commission believes that this portrait of a "troubled and irresponsible" younger generation is largely mistaken (William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship 1988a, p. 3).

The Commission was open about this strategy. The final report, The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families (William T. Grant Foundation 1988b), was released at a press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. November 17, 1988 (Howe 1988). It concluded that existing public programs and policies often ignore the needs of non-college-bound youth; this, in turn, makes it difficult for these youths to execute the transition to adulthood and the work world. Among its recommendations, the Commission advocated programs that would allow high school students to perform community service. At the press conference, Howe noted

the first step in action on behalf of youth must be to establish a new perspective on them. Too often, we think of the Forgotten Half as failures, as second rate, simply because they do not attend college. They must be viewed as our hope for the future rather than as a generation of misfits (Howe 1988) (author's emphasis).

Youth Service Programs At Colleges and Universities

Sam Halperin would become a low-key but wise and useful member of the youth service policy community. Others who would become active policy entrepreneurs for youth service got their start in the school-based youth service arena during the early 1980s. A few university presidents promoted youth service on college and university campuses and urged other college presidents to do the same. College students and recent graduates also

organized service programs.

College Programs at Brown and Stanford -- One pioneer of campus-based youth service was Howard Swearer. When Swearer as a professor at U.C.L.A. in the 1960's, he directed a Peace Corps training program for Africa and Latin America. After seven years as president of Carlton College, Swearer became president of Brown University. He had long been a strong advocate for providing opportunities for youth to participate in service projects. "It seemed to me that a national service scheme made a lot of sense," Swearer observed. "Rather than wait for a national program, I started working at Brown" (Colt 1984).

In 1981, Swearer established the National Service Scholarship Program, the first program of grants to students who completed one or more years of full-time public service. The scholarships were funded from a \$1 million grant from the C.V. Starr Foundation. Swearer hired Susan Stroud to run what came to be called the College Venture Program. Eighteen Starr Fellowships were awarded in the 1983-84 academic year.

On the opposite coast, Stanford University President Donald Kennedy was also promoting youth service. In his 1983 commencement speech, Donald Kennedy urged graduating students to include public service in their future. The response from students was so favorable that Kennedy "made an institutional effort to do more" (Kelley 1984). He arranged for Stanford to host a conference on public service the following February featuring John Gardner as keynote speaker. Out of that conference came Stanford's Public Service Fellowship Program. In the first year, seventy-two students applied for the fourteen fellowships. Catherine Milton was hired to run the program.

Soon more colleges and universities took up the theme of student service. By 1984, programs were underway at Harvard (the Lamont Public Service Fellowships), Dartmouth, Georgetown, Vanderbilt, Notre Dame, Johns Hopkins and several other colleges and universities (Colt 1984).

Campus Compact Founded -- In 1984, Virginia Governor Charles Robb was scheduled to assume the chairmanship of the Education Commission of the States. After a series of discussions, including one with Eberly, Robb announced that youth service would be a major theme of his term in office. A Commission report the following year recommended service opportunities for high school age youth as "the next stage of reform" (Education Commission of the States 1985). The director of the Education Commission of the States, Frank Newman, had been working on a Carnegie Foundation study of higher education; Newman's report was released in September and called for collegiate public- and community-service programs including a program of federal student aid in return for service (Newman 1985).

Swearer and Kennedy joined with Georgetown University President Father Timothy S. Healy, S.J., and Frank Newman to convene an organizing meeting of twelve college presidents at Georgetown University in April, 1986. They developed an initiative to help college presidents support youth service opportunities on their campuses. A press conference in October, 1985, announced that 75 college presidents had joined the coalition and had committed to making youth service an integral component of the college experience. The initiative, "Campus Compact: A Project for Public and Community Service," would provide resources and technical assistance to universities and colleges and support public policies that would advance youth service opportunities.

Like the William T. Grant Foundation project later in the decade, Campus Compact adopted a strategy aimed as reconstructing the social construction of a target population -- in this case, college students.

According to one article, Campus Compact was formed 'to fight the increasingly negative 1980s image of American college students as "money grubbers"' (Streams 1989, p. 3). Officially a project of Education Commission of the States, Campus Compact was located at Brown University's Center for Public Service. Funding was provided by the Ford Foundation, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and the Atlantic Richfield Foundation. Swearer, Kennedy, and Healy served as co-chairs; Susan Stroud handled day-to-day operations. By December, 1986, Campus Compact had a thirteen-member executive committee, a set of specific organizational goals, and a membership of 121 presidents. In 1987, it opened its membership on a dues basis and, by March of that year, Campus Compact included 259 college and university presidents.

Campus Outreach Opportunity League -- Other additions to the school-based youth service policy community came from the student population. College presidents were not alone in agitating for student service opportunities on campus. College students and recent graduates also pushed for college-based programs. One such student was Wayne Meisel. The son of a Presbyterian minister, Meisel worked at Harvard's public service program while an undergraduate at the university. To draw attention to the idea of student voluntarism, Meisel spent the summer of 1984 walking from Maine to Washington, D.C. During the 1,500 mile "Walk for Action," he spoke at 65 college campuses on how to foster and expand college youth service programs.

That fall, Meisel set out to put his ideas into action. With help from classmate Bobby Hackett and a \$17,000 grant from the Hazen Foundation, Meisel established Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) to provide technical assistance and training to students interested in campus-based youth service programs. COOL conducted national conferences and regional training programs. In 1988, COOL and Campus Compact held joint meetings at Tufts University in Boston in March and on the Ohio Wesleyan University campus in April. By then, COOL had an annual budget of \$250,000 and served over 350 colleges and universities.

Congressional Support for Campus-Based Service-Learning -- In the fall of 1986, federal funds became available for student service projects at the college and university level through a program created by Congress entitled Program for Innovative Projects for Student Community Service and Student Financial Independence. The program was funded with monies from Title X, Section C, of the Higher Education Amendments of 1986 -- the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE). It created opportunities for students to do community service in exchange for educational services or financial assistance. Approximately \$1.5 million FIPSE funds were awarded annually to between thirty and forty programs.

One rationale used to support this program was that college students were strapped with debt as a result of high tuition costs. The financial aid would lessen high indebtedness rates of college students. A second rationale used to sell this program employed a negative social construction of the target population; the program was needed because there was a feeling on the part of some "that college students may not be adequately committed to participating in public life or helping others... (i.e., they have) a lessened concern with the common weal" (Office of Post Secondary Education 1988).

Pre-Collegiate Programs in the 1980s

With a target population of students, it was inevitable that the age criteria would eventually be revised to include younger students as well.

And, as grade schools and high schools across the country entered the student service arena, the content of such programs broadened even further (Lewis 1987). This section reviews only a few of the pre-collegiate programs begun in the 1980s.

High School Programs -- In the 1980s, service-learning programs appeared in secondary schools. In 1984, Atlanta, GA, high schools required 75 hours of accredited youth service for graduation (Danzberger and Usdan 1984). That same year, an issue of the NASSP Bulletin called national service "an issue for the eighties" and predicted that national service would be a major issue in Congress by 1990 (National Association of Secondary School Principals 1984).

In 1986, Boston businessman Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, formed the Thomas Jefferson Forum to promote youth service in high schools in the greater Boston area. The privately funded not-for-profit organization encouraged youth to undertake community service by helping high school faculty develop and administer youth service programs. By 1989, the Thomas Jefferson Forum was working with twenty-two high schools in the Greater Boston, Merrimack Valley, and Worcester regions.

Another high school program was designed by the Constitutional Rights Foundation (CRF), a nonpartisan community-based organization established in the early 1960s to promote citizenship and civic education for youths in Los Angeles, CA. CRF began a pilot project of youth service in 1981. In 1985, CRF received funding from the Ford Foundation to work with at-risk youth in twenty-two area schools. CRF developed a voluntary, after school program for the Los Angeles Unified School District that came to be recognized as a model for other secondary schools.

Precollegiate Programs -- Inspired by JFK's call to youth in the 1960s, Springfield, Massachusetts, Mayor Richard E. Neal established a Community Service Learning Program in the Springfield Public School System in the 1980s. Springfield was the second largest urban school system in the state; sixty percent of the youth were minority. Starting in kindergarten and extending through high school, the program provided opportunities for youths of every age and grade level to engage in some form of community service.

By 1987, the State of Vermont was completing its first year of SerVermont, the only state-wide, school-based student service program in the country. Supported by Governor Madeleine Kunin and directed by Cynthia Parsons, SerVermont was funded totally from private sources. The program began in high schools but soon spread to cover grades from kindergarten through twelfth grade. Its purpose was to help integrate service projects into school curriculums. Mini-grants were provided to teachers or groups of students to offset the expense of a project.

Another program aimed at younger participants was "Youth as Resources." This program began in Boston as "Teens as Community Resources," a McGuff educational program of the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC). It specifically stressed the positive role of youth in their communities. In 1987, the Lilly Endowment joined forces with NCPC to test and evaluate the program in three cities in Indiana. The "Youth as Resources" project operated for thirty months in Indianapolis, Fort Wayne and Evansville (Youth Service America not dated (b)).

By 1988, the Council of Chief State School Officials had hired Barbara Gomez to conduct regional conferences on high school service programs in Baltimore, Los Angeles, and St. Paul. In Maryland, the state's chief school official, David Hornbeck, was pushing hard for mandatory youth service

programs in the Maryland high schools. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, daughter of Robert Kennedy and a youth service advocate, was hired as full-time coordinator of school youth service programs in the state of Maryland.

The numerous programs begun or expanded in the late 1970s and 1980s brought many new actors, groups, and institutions into the school-based youth service policy community. With their first-hand experience, dedication, and credibility, they would prove to be influential witnesses at Congressional hearings in the 100th and 101st Congresses. In this policy arena, the policy content varied tremendously. A program's target population might be poor or at-risk, but more often all students were eligible and encouraged to participate. Indeed, many program administrators would insist that open enrollment was the key to a successful program. The target population differed in another important way that was to influence legislation later; participants ranged from kindergarten students to college graduates. The activities that these students carried out also varied greatly. Kindergartners folded napkins while they visited with nursing home residents. Grade schoolers were tutors for younger students. High school students raked leaves and trimmed shrubs around the municipal hospital or put a fresh coat of paint on the home of an elderly or disabled citizen.

The manner by which these programs were administered -- and the agents involved in the administration and carrying out of the programs -- also differed. Most important, like the CCC-type programs in the early 1980s, school-based programs moved the idea of youth service from the abstract to the concrete. Youths as well as administrators and program beneficiaries were eager to attest to the abundant benefits of these programs. These youths would provide compelling testimony at Congressional hearings in the late 1980s.

Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project: Beginning the Dialogue

The efforts of the Wexler-Wofford Committee for the Study of National Service wound down in 1980 and, for the next year or so, youth service advocates focused their energies on nurturing individual programs and projects. Then, in September, 1982, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. held a press conference at the U.S. Capitol to announce that the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute was launching the Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project (RCYP). Accompanied by Sargent Shriver, Vernon Jordan, and Carl Holman, Roosevelt explained that the project would commemorate the births of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1882 and of Eleanor Roosevelt in 1884. A steering committee had been assembled that included Don Eberly, Christopher duPont Roosevelt, Leslie Dunbar, Thomas J. Scanlon, Thomas N. Bethell, Jacqueline Danzberger, Myrtis Mosley Powell, Charles Prejean, Peter Edelman and Robert Taggart (NSN 1982).

Another important youth service policy entrepreneur was brought into the policy community with the hiring of Frank Slobig as director of the RCYP. From 1970 through 1981, Slobig had been a research and evaluation officer for youth programs at the Department of Labor. His responsibilities included overseeing research and demonstration youth programs -- including the Young Adult Conservation Corps -- with a combined annual budget of over \$100 million. Most of those programs were eliminated by the Reagan Administration and Slobig was involuntarily terminated under a reduction-in-force policy in December, 1981. Slobig operated from a desk in the office of Youthwork, Inc, a school-to-work demonstration program that had been funded through the Department of Labor and the Department of

Education, until he went to work for the RCYP.

The Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project began as a national service writ large program. Slobig brought with him a vision of big government programs and a concern for job creation. The original goal of the RCYP was "to focus attention on the nation's young people and increase public understanding of youth development issues" (Streams 1992, p. 4). RCYP activities included networking, information dissemination, a speaker's bureau, and conferences on youth related issues. But by 1982, youth service programs were beginning to appear across the country. In looking at youth employment and job training policies, the RCYP participants recognized the value of youth conservation corps programs.

Slobig obtained additional grant funds from the Mott Foundation and the Ford Foundation for the specific purpose of building bridges between the historical youth employment programs and the nation's active youth corps programs. But still, the RCYP goals were narrow; Slobig was to enhance networking and mutual support between programs.

In 1984, the RCYP held regional meetings in Washington, Atlanta, Detroit, and New York City. From those sessions came a publication entitled A Policy Blueprint for Community Service and Youth Employment (Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project 1984). During the Detroit conference, RCYP staff Frank Slobig and Cal George met with Carl Weisbraud and Ford Foundation Program Officer Gordon Berlin to assess the RCYP in specific and the youth service movement in general. As Slobig recounts

We thought we needed the "BPE" -- the Big Picture Entity! We should have one, single purpose and that should be to promote and develop youth service programs "writ large" and bring the groups under one tent (Slobig Interview 1992).

Shift To The Landrum Paradigm: Let a 1,000 Flowers Bloom -- It was decided that an assessment should be made of the status and potential of the youth service field. Roger Landrum was selected to do the job. After the Committee for the Study of National Service project ended, Landrum had assessed national service programs in West Germany and France and written a report on Peace Corps education programs. He also served as senior policy advisor to Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA) from 1982 to 1984. The Ford Foundation awarded a 6-month grant to Landrum in 1985; he was to visit programs, interview youth service leaders, and develop a coherent youth service investment strategy for the Ford Foundation.

On December 5, 1985, Landrum reported his findings and recommendations in a memo to Gordon Berlin. During his travels, Landrum encountered "extremely gifted practitioners" running "exciting programs" (Landrum Interview 1992). In the course of his research, Landrum experienced an intellectual conversion --

an intellectual paradigm shift from supporting an inside-the-beltway, theoretical search for the best model of centralized, top down, national service writ large to a decentralized, bottom up, grass roots approach -- national service with a small "n" (Slobig Interview 1992).

Landrum summarized his strategy as "Let a Thousand Flowers Bloom."

The memo recommended "national development of a variety of mission oriented service corps" (Landrum 1985, p. 4). Landrum said

I conclude from what I have seen that the correct decision was taken by the foundation a year ago to concentrate on supporting measured steps that advance these programs, rather than becoming excessively involved in hypothetical, massive schemes of national service (Landrum 1985, p. 2).

Indeed, Landrum had become skeptical of national service writ large advocates ("those people," Slobig says, "who are in eternal dialogue with William James"). "The main point here" Landrum explained in his memo, "is to maintain a sharp focus on the advancement of the real world programs rather than on hypothetical schemes" (Landrum 1985, p. 3). He praised the efforts of Howe, Rosenberry, Slobig, Kielsmeier, Meisel and others, calling them "pragmatic strategists" and characterized them as those

who are providing various kinds of technical assistance and pioneering exploration of where things go from here on a national scale...I would contrast the work of these "schemers" with that of the "pure" intellectuals who are attached primarily to their abstract schemes (Landrum 1985, p. 5).

Landrum identified separate "streams" of youth service -- youth corps, collegiate programs, school-based programs, and existing federal programs including the Peace Corps and VISTA. The streams represented a range of programmatic approaches to youth service; all were valid and valuable but they operated in relative isolation. What was needed was a convener, a catalyst, to stimulate collaboration amongst those in the youth service field. Merging the streams would lead to new programs, policies that built on existing successes, principles of best practice, and "a nation-wide network of local programs that can eventually add up to a national, or federal, system, something like the American public school system" (Landrum 1985, p. 4).

To achieve this goal, Landrum recommended an organization be created to absorb the functions of RCYP, HEC and NASCC and utilize the talents of key personnel including Slobig, Rosenberry, and Landrum. This new organization would disseminate information, promote public awareness of youth service programs, provide technical assistance, and "build institutional capacity on many fronts." In the process, it would link service corps "with the higher education programs, secondary school operations, and with federal service programs" (Landrum 1985, p. 14).

With...Gordon Berlin, then a Ford Foundation Program Officer, Landrum and Slobig began a "conspiracy of hearts" that led to the evolution of Youth Service America. With the blessing and encouragement of the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute's Board...the Institute sought and received a nine month planning grant from The Ford Foundation to create a new organization, whose singular purpose would be the promotion and development of youth service in all forums (Streams 1992, p. 4).

Landrum proposed to construct a new, large, politically powerful policy community out of the existing, more narrowly defined youth service related policy communities.

The strategy proposed by Landrum was labeled "the Service America initiative." The Ford Foundation provided \$230,000 to carry it out. Early

organizational goals included greater public awareness of youth service programs, a magazine reporting on the service community, additional human services oriented programs, stable funding, and incorporation as an entity by January 1st, 1987.

In July, Slobig and Landrum began a newsletter entitled "Streams: Service America's national news report on youth service programs;" the first issue reported that

the Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project has been reorganized to help promote and develop an integrated network of youth community service programs in high schools, colleges and universities, and the states and localities... For the remainder of 1986, the primary focus will be on planning an action agenda to be implemented beginning in January 1987 through a separately incorporated successor entity (Streams 1986a, p. 1).

Youth Service America

The first issue of Streams also noted that

new youth service programs are being organized across the country in three streams: in public and private high schools; in colleges and universities; and in full-time service corps in states and localities. A fourth stream, federal programs, the Peace Corps and VISTA, continues (Streams 1986a, p. 1).

YSA's goal, the article declared, was to merge those streams.

The Transition Period -- To initiate a dialog amongst the various members of the youth service community, the Ford Foundation funded a conference for about thirty individuals including Landrum, Slobig, Eberly, Rosenberry, Stroud, Szanton, Kielsmeier, youth corps directors and people from COOL. Hosted by the Youth Policy Institute, the conference involved very broad discussion of national strategies in the fields of education policy, youth policy and youth service policy. In the course of those discussions, participants began to recognize commonalities between their efforts. The next logical step, Slobig and Landrum proposed, was to pool resources in a new, collective entity.

The transition was not entirely smooth. Existing organizations feared losing Ford Foundation funding and some resisted consolidation. HEC and NASCC were reluctant to enter into a merger; HEC's director, Jill Diskin, failed to even mention the idea to her board of directors for seven months (Slobig Interview 1992).

During the 1986 transition period, Slobig and Landrum assembled a steering committee for strategic planning that included the Director of the Peace Corps, Loret Ruppe; the Executive Director of the National Crime Prevention Council, John Calhoun; Harris Wofford; the Director of the Joint Center for Political Studies, Eddie Williams; Peter Szanton; and Joanne Lennon with the East Bay Conservation Corps. Later additions to the group included Senior Economist at the Wharton School in Philadelphia and national service advocate, Bernard Anderson; Eisenhower Foundation chairman, Alanson Houghton; Director of the Community Service Society of New York City, David Jones; former Governor of California, Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown, Jr.; and P/PV President, Michael Bailin.

The strategy of consolidation was clear. What was less obvious was which version of the idea of youth service would come out on top. During one

heated meeting of the steering committee, members debated whether the new entity should be a "national service" organization or a "youth service" organization. A focus on youth won out. By November, 1986, Service America was identifying itself as "a consulting and planning initiative seeking to develop youth service opportunities throughout the United States" (Streams 1986b, p. 1). When Slobig, Landrum, and Szanton incorporated the 501(c)3 nonprofit organization in late 1986, they named the new alliance Youth Service America (YSA).

Participants and Activities -- For its first two years, Slobig and Landrum acted as co-directors; after that time, Landrum became Executive Director and Slobig served as Director of Programs and Policy. Whatever their formal titles, both men fit the definition of a policy entrepreneur. By May of 1987, YSA was assembling a formal board of directors. Landrum and Slobig pursued their strategy of inclusion. Many of those who served on YSA's original steering committee were asked to serve on the board including Bernard Anderson, Eddie Williams, Peter Szanton, and Alanson Houghton. But others were also asked to serve on the board of directors. New additions included the founder of the Thomas Jefferson Forum and Boston businessman, T.J. Coolidge; the founder and head of the Children's Defense Fund, Marion Wright Edelman; Notre Dame University's Rev. Ted Hesburgh; William Josephson; San Francisco Judge Anthony Kline; the founder of Youth Action Program in New York City, Dorothy Stoneman; and Brown University President and co-founder of Campus Compact, Howard Swearer. Gordon Berlin, who had left the Ford Foundation in late 1988 to become First Deputy Administrator for Policy in New York City's Department of Human Resources Administration, also joined the board. Senator Bill Bradley (D-NJ) served as honorary chair. In 1988, Minnesota Governor Rudy Perpich and U.S. Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS) joined the YSA Board. Perpich asked if he could serve on the board and Kassebaum was added to give the board a nonpartisan appearance. (During the 100th and 101st Congresses, Kassebaum opposed and voted against all youth service related bills.)

YSA's watchwords were cooperation, cosponsorship, and, eventually, consolidation of people and resources in the youth service field. Landrum and Slobig convinced COOL, and, later, HEC, to share office space at YSA's headquarters in Washington, D.C. In October, 1986, YSA joined HEC and NASCC in sponsoring a half-day conference in Portland, ME. In June, 1987, YSA and P/PV co-sponsored a conference for 30 conferees at Arlie House in Washington, D.C., on "Building a Mandate for Youth Service." That November, YSA and Campus Compact co-hosted a national leadership conference on youth service at Brown University.

Eventually, members of the various specialized policy communities recognized the underlying commonalities that Landrum had seen back in 1985. At a conference at Providence, RI, sponsored by YSA and Brown University in February, 1988, Slobig presented what he saw as the "big picture" for youth service. Slobig carefully described and illustrated the various "streams" with a set of detailed maps depicting 49 full-time youth service corps, over 400 campus-based service programs, more than 3,000 school-based programs, and 50 plus community-based organizations operating youth service programs. In addition, he identified several federal programs providing service opportunities including the Peace Corps and VISTA. Slobig's maps -- especially when they were combined into one single display -- demonstrated the range of unique approaches to youth service evolving across America. The members of the various individual youth service policy communities came to see themselves as part of a larger

movement.

A National Program Expansion Strategy -- While the policy community that YSA sought to consolidate was substantial, YSA also had a goal of increasing the community. Slobig observed at the time that

our goal at Youth Service America is to significantly expand the opportunities that young people have to serve, beginning in elementary school and continuing throughout their total educational experience. The jewel in the crown of service would be opportunities to serve full time in an increasing array of service options (Streams 1988, p. 1).

In YSA's 1988-89 annual report, Landrum recalled that

From its inception in 1986, YSA undertook two ambitious tasks: defining a vision that could unify the fragmented youth service field around common principles of community service programming and youth development; developing practical strategies for organizing and promoting a grass roots program network and helping to spread effective program models nationwide (Youth Service America not dated (b)).

YSA proposed to increase youth service opportunities via "a decentralized, national network of youth service programs" (Youth Service America not dated (b)). The staff developed strategies for expanding full-time state corps, local corps, college and university programs, junior-high and high school programs, statewide programs such as PennServe, and programs run by community-based organizations and national groups such as the National Crime Prevention Council and the United Way.

On the day preceding a conference at Brown University in February, 1988, YSA held a meeting for YSA staff, board of directors and friends. At that session, Judge Kline argued for expanding the number of urban corps. With help from Mort Raphael, who had formerly worked for the San Francisco Community Foundation, Kline's idea took shape in the form of the Urban Corps Expansion Project, a five year effort to launch urban corps in 15 cities over 18 months. The Urban Corps Expansion Project was launched in 1988 with \$65 million provided by the Ford, Hewlett, Mott, Kellogg, and Rockefeller foundations as well as the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest and William T. Grant Foundations. Public/Private Ventures in Philadelphia was responsible for implementing the urban corps and evaluating the projects. Emphasis was placed on involving and/or serving at-risk inner-city youth. Cities targeted for urban corps included St. Louis, MO; Eugene, OR; Portland, OR; Miami, FL; Jackson, MS; Albany, NY; Fort Lauderdale, FL; and LeHigh Valley, PA.

A second YSA expansion project involved Youth Volunteer Corps of America (YVCA). David Battey began the original YVCA program as a summer program for junior and senior high school students in Kansas City, MO. Participants were organized into racially integrated corps to tackle area projects. Battey's program was initially funded by grants from local foundations and corporations; later, the program became a line-item in the Kansas City area's United Way annual budget. The Kettering Foundation gave YSA a grant to replicate the YVCA model in 40 cities. YSA also helped Battey found a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization in Kansas City.

YouthBuild USA provided another model for urban service corps

programs. Funded with grants from the Mott, DeWitt, and Ford foundations, YouthBuild originated in East Harlem. Inner city minority youth were trained and supervised as they rehabilitated homes of urban poor. Projects similar to YouthBuild spread to other cities over time.

In November of 1987, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation awarded YSA a grant to examine school-based, pre-college community service programs. YSA formed an Education Forum on Youth Service Issues and a project entitled New Directions for Middle School Programs. In the fall of 1988, a group of experts in youth service and education met to consider service programs in grades six through eight. Five model programs were selected for study, evaluation, and, if appropriate, replication. The case studies were Valued Youth Partnership (San Antonio, TX); Clean and Green (Los Angeles, CA); Magic Me (Baltimore, MD); Project OASES (Pittsburgh, PA); and Fresh Force (Minneapolis, MN) (Rolzinski 1990).

Social Construction of the Target Population -- Kingdon argues that for a policy to succeed it must come to be seen as mainstream thinking within the policy community. Landrum and Slobig sought to bypass the task of agreeing on a single, preferred approach. Instead, what came to be mainstream thinking was the idea that youth service could come in a wide variety of shapes and sizes. But for many people outside the policy community, youth service had a negative connotation -- if, in fact, the concept was recognized at all.

In part, this was because judges had been handing out "community service" sentences to juvenile delinquents as well as adult law breakers for several years. More importantly (as the William T. Grant Foundation study articulated so well in 1988), youth were generally associated with negative images: at-risk kids, gangs, unemployment, teenage pregnancy, etc. YSA set out to change the American public's image (i.e., social construction) of youth from a negative problem to a positive resource.

Their strategy was to sponsor a high visibility event that would showcase the positive contributions of youth. The goal of "A Day In The Life of Youth Service" was to highlight the many youth service programs under way throughout the nation. According to YSA's 1988-89 annual report, the event was intended to improve the image of youth.

Responding to the mounting negative stereotypes about young people in America, Youth Service America and Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) organized the first national celebration of youth service on October 13, 1988 (Youth Service America not dated (c), p. 9).

There were side benefits of the event, as well. "A Day In The Life of Youth Service" marked the first time that all of the diverse streams of youth service came together for planning, coordination, and joint activities. Officially co-hosted by YSA and COOL, the day involved multiple events nationwide. For the first time, programs in the same city and, in some cases, programs throughout a state, worked together on common projects. In all, YSA identified as participants in the day's events 27 corps; 297 middle schools, junior highs, and high schools; 215 community agencies; and 192 colleges (Youth Service America not dated (c)). The event was so successful that it has been repeated annually under the banner of "National Youth Service Day."

Other youth service projects recognized the problem with the negative social construction of youth. The "Youth as Resources" project supported

by YSA and operated by the National Crime Prevention Council and the Lilly Endowment also set as one of its goals "to shift public opinion toward an affirmation of youth as community assets" and sought

to change the way in which our country regards and uses the skills of its youth so that young people are not viewed primarily as service objects but as service actors with significant roles to play (Youth Service America not dated (a)).

These efforts highlight the fact that policy entrepreneurs other than elected officials conscientiously seek to reshape the social construction of target populations.

Summary and Conclusions

For a long time, the idea (and reality) of school-based student service programs was a policy without a focus. Then, in the 1980s, groups were established to promote school-based youth service, and advocates from a wide range of backgrounds and interests endorsed the idea.

Actors -- By the mid-1980s, a great number of people had become members of a school-based youth service policy community. The university presidents with the highest profiles included Howard Swearer (Brown University), Donald Kennedy (Stanford), and The Rev. Theodore Hesbergh (Notre Dame University). Researchers and academics including Harold Howe, II, Willard Wirtz, John Goodlad, Ernest Boyer, William Buckley, and Amatai Etzioni also endorsed student service. The National Association of Secondary School Principals and the Council of Chief State School Officials were joined by other influential organizations and their staffs -- especially Frank Newman at the Education Commission of the States and Sam Halperin at the William T. Grant Foundation.

In addition to previously existing groups, new groups were formed and programs administered. Wayne Meisel (Campus Outreach Opportunity League), Susan Stroud (Campus Compact), Catherine Milton (Stanford University's student volunteer program), and David Hornbeck and Kathleen Kennedy Townsend (the Maryland State public schools program) -- all brought enthusiasm and commitment to the policy community.

A group that was conspicuous by its absence was elected officials. Only Governor Robb of Virginia took an active role in promoting student service; Governor Kunin launched SerVermont but was not personally active in promoting school-based youth service. Mayor Neal was instrumental in launching the student service program in the school system in Springfield, MA. But no member of Congress took an interest in promoting a federal role in the student service movement. And while ACTION, the Department of Labor, the Office of Education, and the Office of Economic Opportunity were supporters of service-learning in the 1970s, the only federal student service program in the 1980s was the FIPSE program administered by the U.S. Department of Education.

Indeed, the school-based youth service policy community was small until the 1980s; even after organizations like Campus Compact and COOL were operating, the policy community remained very loose and lacked a common focus. Swearer, Kennedy, Meisel, and Newman were among the few policy entrepreneurs at the national level. There was no central figure or group to lead the education-based youth service community.

Ideas -- If there were few leaders, it may have been because there was little agreement on the content of service-learning programs. Just as it

is impossible to identify an origin of the idea of students performing community service projects, it is difficult to describe a typical program. The one common factor was the target population: students. Change came slowly, but by the mid-1980s the members of this policy community had embraced the idea of students as young as kindergartners being a part of youth service. Except for the University Year for ACTION program, the service activity was always part-time and uncompensated.

Opportunity -- Few events or crises opened windows of opportunity for school-based youth service policy advocates. After the 1960 campaign and JFK's proposal for a Peace Corps, the subject of students performing service activities was seldom raised during elections. Nor were there jurisdictional disputes or social movements that raised the issue. Instead, most school-based service programs were started by people who simply believed youths should be given opportunities to perform service. For those who founded student service programs on college campuses and in high schools and middle schools, the problem, if there was one, was the need to create opportunities for youth to help address society's unmet needs. In viewing youth as an untapped resource, these programs were similar to the Peace Corps; service projects stimulated learning but were also a good thing in themselves.

Strategies -- Originally, school-based youth service was seen as a way to enhance learning while also providing opportunities for career exploration. In that sense, service-learning was promoted as education reform. In the late 1980s, advocates would link youth service proposals with such education issues as rising college tuition costs, increased student loan default rates, overly materialistic youth, and poor citizenship training. Service would also be seen as a way to help noncollege-bound youths make the transition from school to work. But most actors in the service-learning policy community promoted student service simply because they believed that serving others was a good thing to do.

Landrum, Slobig, and Youth Service America -- Recognizing that there were separate youth service policy communities (or, as Landrum described them, streams) including writ large, CCC-type, school-based, and the existing federal programs of Peace Corps and VISTA, Landrum and Slobig resolved to "merge the streams." But even the founders of Youth Service America were uncertain at first of how to define the target population. Rosenberry recalled that the term "youth service" came along in 1985 and that "everyone was operating on different legislative tracks as late as 1986" (Interview 1991).

YSA worked not only at merging the existing policy communities but also at enlarging the new, combined policy community. Landrum and Slobig sought to bring stature and clout to their new organization by placing on the YSA board U.S. Senators Bradley and Kasselbaum, nationally renowned child advocates Marion Wright Edelman and Dorothy Stoneman, and Peace Corps head, Loret Ruppe.

From mid-1986 forward, YSA would conscientiously follow three critical rules: think locally, be flexible, and portray youths as a positive resource. YSA worked to make youth service a positive concept familiar to all Americans. By the time YSA held its first conference in Washington, D.C., in June, 1989, it was ready for success; the upbeat conference theme was "Moving From the Margins to the Mainstream." As narrated in the following chapter, the youth service policy community was about to get some important assistance from a number of outsiders including communitarians, civic education advocates, and the Democratic Leadership Council.

Chapter 6.
Civics, Citizen Soldiers,
and the Democratic Leadership Council

This chapter describes numerous instances where calculating policy entrepreneurs with People for the American Way, the Democratic Leadership Council, Youth Service America, and the National Service Secretariat pursued strategies to create opportunities to expand youth service programs. Youth service was framed as a solution to the problems of civic apathy and rising federal college loan default rates. Efforts to reshape society's perceptions of youth in a more favorable light continued. Once again, innovation was introduced by newcomers to the youth service policy debate. At least one proposal was designed intentionally to be controversial. The policy community had been seeking support of powerful legislators yet involvement of centralist Democrats including Senator Sam Nunn and Congressman Dave McCurdy led to conflict and strife. A better prospect for a youth service champion appeared to be presidential candidates Michael Dukakis and George Bush.

Themes Associated with Youth Service in the 1980s

Since the late 1950s, the idea of youth service had been linked to the military draft, youth unemployment, national conservation needs, and educational reform; in the 1980s, it would also be linked with the themes of patriotism, community, greed, and civic apathy.

Patriotism -- The idea of youth service is often linked with the theme of patriotism. Arguments for a military draft often stress the duties of citizenship within a democracy. One commentator urging reinstatement of the draft observed that

at present citizens of the United States have rights aplenty but few, if any, duties...why shouldn't every citizen be reared to appreciate that defense of his country is a common, shared responsibility (Saikowski 1978, p. 23)

In promoting his youth service bill, Congressman McClosky had argued "that the privilege of U.S. citizenship justifies a universal duty to service to the nation in one's youth" (1979, p. 18).

Janowitz (1983) believed that national service provided a civic education that led to enlightened patriotism and a renewed civic consciousness. Calls for the "reconstruction of patriotism" (Moskos 1988) found much in common with studies denouncing a decline in the sense of community (Nisbet 1953, 1962; Bellah et al. 1985, 1992). In Gratitude: Reflections on What We Owe To Our Country (1990), William Buckley linked civic duty with a national program of youth service.

Community -- Amitai Etzioni also linked youth service with the need to strengthen community. Etzioni had long favored a national program of youth service (1970, 1976, 1982, 1983). He established a journal for communitarian thought, The Responsive Community, to focus discussion less on rights and entitlements and more on collective responsibility. His Public Policy in a New Key (1993a) contained a chapter entitled "Too Many Rights, Too Few

Responsibilities" and, in The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda (1993b), Etzioni recommended one full year of youth service following high school.

Janowitz (1983) and Moskos (1988) stressed the responsibilities of citizenship and recommended linking both civilian and military service to eligibility for public benefits (including access to federal higher education financial aid). This linkage approach was promoted by others in the mid-1980s; Mead (1986), for example, proposed that welfare recipients be required to earn benefits by meeting their obligations of citizenship.

Greed -- At a communitarian "teach-in" for Senators and their staffs in 1991, Etzioni observed that

Each decade seems to open with its own theme...For the sixties, it was civil rights and social reforms; for the seventies, the environment. The eighties were the age of unbridled greed and self-centered behavior. The nineties calls for an age of shoring up morality and the social institutions that sustain it -- family, educational institutions and communities (Taylor 1991).

By 1989, there were numerous references to a society motivated by greed. Broder called it "the self interest decade" (1989) and McCrory reported that "'get yours' was the rampaging slogan of the acquisitive '80s" (1989). Noting that "flashy spending is out, saving and family are in, and helping has become hip," one writer asked of the times "Is Greed Dead?" (Henkoff 1989, p. 40).

The decade of greed theme spilled over to youths who were portrayed as adrift and self-absorbed if not downright materialistic and greedy. Self indulgent youth was not a new theme; Gordon had characterized youth of the 1960s as greedy in Lonely In America (1976) and, of course, self-centered youth played a role in William James' call for national service in the early part of the century. In 1979, Landrum had observed that

The pervasive mood of self-centeredness and self-seeking, and a corresponding loss in the spirit of service to others and the common good, may be explained by an insecurity about careers...but should this mood characterize the coming of age of a new generation, it could represent a corrosive influence within American Society, as dangerous as any outside enemy (Committee for the Study of National Service 1979, p. 77).

The theme of greedy youth gained followers. Townsend worried that economic constraints, women moving into the work force, and other factors had resulted in voluntarism falling out of fashion with contemporary youth (1984). In 1986, Noah proposed a mandatory national service program as

a way to break the apathy and self-absorption that have taken hold of our culture...maybe such a national service program could even help us snap out of today's what's-in-it-for-me zeitgeist (1986).

Eberly wrote that a program of youth service would benefit youths who some characterized as "neglecting lessons to work for \$90 jeans" (Eberly and Eberly 1987). Even Meisel, in his efforts to recruit fellow college students, urged "An End to the "Me" Generation" (1988).

Congressman Dave McCurdy (D-OK) used greedy youth to justify his youth service plan noting "the 1970s and early 1980s featured 'me generations' more interested in their own financial gain and getting BMWs than serving their country" (Wilson, G. 1989). He believed "young people must move beyond the narcissism of the Reagan years" (McCurdy 1989).

Civic Apathy — The sense that youths were driven by material concerns had a reciprocal implication: perhaps more than in the past, youths were seen as estranged, alienated from the community. Boyer saw "a sense of drift" amongst young people (Education USA 1987, p. 137) and Frank Newman feared that "we are in danger of what one might call 'yuppie isolation'... people who grow up in isolation do not see that they have a role" (Sheler et. al 1989). In a review of youth service programs in high schools and colleges Schwartz observed that

many education leaders believe that public and community service can do more than any classroom learning to make social responsibility an integral part of a student's life (1987).

The 1980s were marked by particularly low voter turnout rates which led some to call for better citizenship training for youth and opportunities for greater citizen involvement in the democratic process. In Strong Democracy, Barber (1984, 1992) argued that voting was not enough; a healthy democracy required active participation by its members. He recommended ten policies to promote engagement in civic activities; a program of universal civilian and military service for all 18- to 26-year olds was one of his most important recommendations.

These themes reflected a generally negative image of youth -- what Schneider and Ingram label an unfavorable social construction of the target population. In the late 1980s, several groups and individuals including the public interest group People for the American Way and the Democratic Leadership Council would frame youth service proposals in terms of one or more of these themes.

People For the American Way

In the latter part of the 1980s, several powerful and influential organizations began to actively support and promote the idea of youth service. For the liberal public interest group People for the American Way the issue that triggered interest in youth service was civic apathy on the part of America's youth.

Concerns that youths were not active in the political process -- and indeed lacked the skills even if they had the desire to participate -- were underscored by research conducted by People For the American Way. In 1987, that organization conducted a survey of the civics and government textbooks in use in America's schools. The texts were judged to be bland and uninspiring. Noting a breakdown of mediating institutions such as neighborhood organizations, churches, labor unions, and political parties, society historically relied upon to provide a route into civic participation, the organization determined to study further the ways that America instills civic values and habits in its youth.

A Missing Sense of Civic Duty -- People for the American Way initiated a major study to assess "youth's understanding of and commitment to three important aspects of citizenship in a democracy: meeting personal responsibilities, serving the community, and participating in the nation's political life" (People For the American Way 1989a, p. 11). The study's

advisory commission was co-chaired by former Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell and an attorney and education reform leader from Arkansas, Hillary Rodham Clinton. The 23-member commission included Roger Landrum, Co-Director of Youth Service America; Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, Director of the Maryland Student Alliance program; Harold Howe II, Senior Lecturer on Education Policy and Administration at Harvard University; and Todd Clark, Director of the Los Angeles Constitutional Rights Foundation.

As a part of the study, Peter D. Hart Research Associates conducted a series of focus group interviews with 18- to 24-year old nonvoters to determine youths' attitudes on their prospects for the future, involvement in neighborhood or community service, and politics and national affairs. The findings were unsettling. The

depth of young people's alienation was alarmingly apparent in focus group interviews with non-voters aged 18-24 that People For the American Way conducted last year. When asked to name some qualities that make this country special, the young people sat in silence until one young man offered, "Cable TV." Asked how to encourage more young people to vote, one young woman replied, "Pay them" (People For the American Way 1989a, p. 9).

The researchers concluded that young, nonvoting Americans have little understanding of what citizenship involves beyond not breaking the law. A study from another realm confirmed the Hart findings; Rolling Stone Magazine surveyed baby boomers' attitudes around the same time and found little evidence of a sense of civic duty (Galley 1988).

Low Voter Participation — The low voter participation rates in the fall of 1988 election cycle served to reinforce People For the American Way's commitment to expand ways to develop citizenship skills in youth. Voter turnout in 1988 was 50.16 percent, the lowest rate in 60 years. Less than half of the youths 18- to 24-years old were registered to vote in 1988. Youth voter participation rates had been dropping steadily since 18- to 20-year old American's won the right to vote in 1972. In 1988, less than one third of the 18- to 24-year old populace voted (People For the American Way 1989b). People For the American Way reported these data in a report entitled The Vanishing Voter (1988) and launched another project, First Vote, a "national campaign against youth voter apathy" that sought to register 500,000 youth using a variety of new and innovative strategies.

By January, 1989, People For the American Way was not only following the Congressional debate about possible youth service legislation but proposing its own program ideas "designed to inculcate in American youth the ethic of service and the value of civic participation" (People for the American Way 1989c). The group's chairman, John H. Buchanan, Jr., testified before Congress in favor of youth service legislation. Buchanan had served in the House of Representatives for 16 years and had been a supporter of the Peace Corps and VISTA. In testimony before the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee in early 1989, Buchanan said

we must instill in our young people the spirit of involvement and community participation that has been a traditional mainstay of our democracy...If the "communitarian" spirit that is essential to a democracy is to be revitalized, it must be translated into programs for youth...(for)...at its core, community service is what good citizenship is all about (U.S. Congress 1989).

When the Senate voted on youth service legislation in October, 1989, People For the American Way urged Senators to support the bill as a way of "instilling the traits of good citizenship in America's youth by enabling them to become responsible and contributing members of society" (People for the American Way 1989d). When, in the fall of 1990, the House of Representatives took up major national service legislation, People For the American Way sent a memo to all House members urging them to cosponsor the bill (H.R. 4330) on the grounds that "service invigorates a sense of personal responsibility and fosters citizenship" and noting that "our youth are not unwilling to serve, most of them just haven't been asked" (People For the American Way 1990).

"Democracy's Next Generation" -- On November 20, 1989, People For the American Way released their study, Democracy's Next Generation. The report opened with a call to action:

People For the American Way believes it is time to sound the alarm about the toll that the growing disconnectedness of America's young people will exact from our democracy (People for the American Way 1989a, p. 9).

The study reported that today's youth appreciate the rights and freedoms of a democracy but do not understand or feel a commitment to the obligations of citizenship. The traditional mediating institutions (family, schools, religious institutions, community based organizations, and the government) fail to teach youth about their civic obligations and do not show them how or offer ways to get involved in spite of the fact that most youth interviewed wanted to get involved. The study concluded that "our nation must ask our young people to participate and show them how they can" (People For the American Way 1989a, p. 20). Recommendations included requiring youth to work on a service project as a requirement for high school graduation.

Centrist Democrat Groups Support Youth Service

Another influential group that lent its support to the idea of youth service was the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC). This group of centrist Democrats adopted the youth service issue as early as 1986. Leading the DLC to adopt youth service were Congressman Dave McCurdy, Governor Chuck Robb, Senator Sam Nunn and Charles Moskos.

There was a marked difference, however, between the youth service advocated by People for the American Way and the youth service advocated by the DLC. The distinctions can be seen not only in the policy content but also in the rationales used to promote the idea and in the social construction of the target population. Citizenship, patriotism, and the belief that citizens not only have rights but also obligations to society in a democracy were themes that drew the DLC to the idea of youth service.

Coalition for a Democratic Majority -- Asked where ideas for his national service bills came from, McCurdy recalled

When I was chairing a subcommittee of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, we had a series of meetings on foreign policy. Jim Woolsey was part of that group... We knew Moskos and we thought national service would be a good idea... So we accepted service as a plank and I contacted Moskos to help draft a bill (McCurdy Interview 1991).

McCurdy knew Moskos via "a network of people interested in national security and technology" (McCurdy Interview 1991).

The Coalition for a Democratic Majority was conceived at the Democratic National Convention in San Francisco in the summer of 1984 by centrist Democrats who feared traditional Democrats in the South and West would shift to the Republican party. The group was established shortly after Reagan was reelected. Many of the original members hoped to coax their party back toward a more moderate position on foreign policy and defense issues (Schwartz and Taylor 1986).

The Task Force on Foreign Policy and Defense not only identified issues but also proposed policies for the group's adoption. As he noted, one of the topics that McCurdy's task force identified was national service. In October, 1986, the Task Force proposed a large, voluntary program of national service linked to educational benefits (ERR 1986). With major input from Congressmen McCurdy and Les Aspin and Virginia Governor Charles Robb, the Coalition for a Democratic Majority endorsed national service in their report Military Manpower: National Service and the Common Defense (1986).

House Democratic Caucus -- Under the chairmanship of Congressman Gillis Long (D-LA), centrist Democrats in the House of Representatives also moved towards supporting national service. Long became Chairman of the House Democratic Caucus (the Caucus) in 1980. Alarmed by the loss of the White House to a conservative Republican, Long formed a committee within the Caucus to address party effectiveness. The committee met each Tuesday and Thursday. Al From and Will Marshall staffed the committee. From had worked in the White House under President Carter; he served as chief strategist for the committee. The committee was to assess the party's policy agenda and consider ways to recast the party's message. As a part of their deliberations, the Caucus published two reports: Rebuilding the Road to Opportunity (1982) and Renewing America's Promise: The Democratic Blueprint for Our Nation's Future (1984).

When it became apparent in late 1984 that the Mondale-Ferraro ticket was headed for defeat, Long began calling for more Democratic party attention to concerns of the middle class in hopes of bringing the party back to the political center. Long worked with Sam Nunn, Lawton Chiles (D-FL), Lloyd Bentsen (D-TX) and Max Baucus (D-MT) to install a moderate as chair of the Democratic party. In spite of these efforts, the position went to Paul Kirk, a liberal Democrat who had served on Edward Kennedy's Senate staff. When Representative Long was killed in an airplane accident in 1985, his loose alliance of centrist-leaning Democrats moved their efforts outside the Congress (Galley 1985; Powell 1985; From Interview 1991, Marshall Interview 1991).

On February 28, 1985, thirty people announced the creation of the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC). Founding members were Senator Nunn and Virginia Governor Charles Robb, Senators Lawton Chiles (FL), Dale Bumpers (AK), Al Gore (TN) and Lloyd Bentsen (TX); Governors Bruce Babbitt (AZ), James Blanchard (MI), Bob Graham (FL), Bill Clinton (AK), and Richard Lamm (CO); and Congressmen Richard Gephardt (MO), Leon Panetta (CA), Les Aspin (WI), Jim Jones (OK) and House Majority Leader Jim Wright (TX) (Powell 1985). Al From was hired as Executive Director; Will Marshall became chief policy analyst.

National Service and the Democratic Leadership Council -- A principal goal of the DLC was to reestablish the values of civic responsibility into the Democratic party. Its members supported a move away from what they called

"the politics of entitlement" and towards "the politics of reciprocal responsibility." Under the leadership of its first chairman, Richard Gephardt, the DLC issued Winning in the World Economy (1985), a work promoting the theme of international competitiveness.

Governor Robb assumed the DLC chairmanship the following year. Robb strongly supported national service. At an American Association of Higher Education Conference in March of 1985, Robb had said

I am increasingly persuaded that a broadly framed program of national service may be one excellent way to cultivate the sense of citizenship -- of responsibility -- to give of one's self to the larger community (NSN 1985a, p. 3).

National service was first formally included in the DLC policy agenda in 1986 when Senator Nunn, Senator Gore, and Representative Les Aspin (D-WI) helped the DLC write a white paper on defense policy entitled Defending America: Building a New Foundation for National Strength (Democratic Leadership Council 1986). This report contained a strong endorsement for national service. While the paper was designed to counter Reagan's charge that Democrats were soft on defense, it allowed the DLC to set forth its argument that "the American ideal of equality applies to obligations as well as rights" and that national service can "foster a new spirit of citizenship and patriotism" (Marshall Interview 1991).

In April of 1987, the DLC sponsored a national service forum. Roger Landrum and Richard Danzig debated the merits of mandatory versus voluntary youth service programs. Leading up to Super Tuesday, the DLC also hosted a summit in Atlanta and sponsored debates in Miami and New Orleans at which national service, among other topics, was discussed.

Sam Nunn and National Service -- Senator Nunn's interest in national service was already well known; he had called for national service in 1977 (US News & World Report 1977) and told the Wall Street Journal in 1981 that he supported a mandatory period of national service for all youth (NSN 1981, p. 1). When Nunn became Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee in January, 1987, his new status gave added currency to the concept of national service. In late 1987, the DLC commissioned a poll that showed 87 percent of the 500 Southern respondents favored national service "that would be voluntary but strongly encouraged through access to GI Bill-type benefits" (Morrison 1989, p. 991).

Nunn became the third chair of the DLC in 1988. In his first official speech as Chair at the DLC's second Williamsburg conference on February 29, 1988, Nunn called for restructuring the War Powers Act and linking the federal student aid system to a program of voluntary national service (NSN 1988). One year later, bills on those two themes would be allocated Senate bill numbers S. 2 and S. 3 respectively.

The DLC "Blue Book" -- In the spring of 1988, the DLC released a report recommending a federal program of national service entitled Citizenship and National Service: A Blueprint for Civic Enterprise (Democratic Leadership Council 1988). The DLC report was written by Will Marshall with input from Senator Nunn, Governor Robb, Congressman McCurdy, Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton, and DLC board member Congresswoman Barbara Kennelly (D-CT) (Marshall Interview 1991). Charles Moskos was credited as the principal architect of the study. Featuring a long title and a bright blue cover, the report came to be referred to by youth service advocates as the "Blue Book."

The 66-page report proposed a program of national service that linked availability of federal higher education financial aid to either a period of military enlistment or a period of non-military community service. Under the DLC proposal, up to 600,000 men and women could enlist in a "Citizens Corps" to work at subsistence wages for one or two years on education, human services, conservation or public safety projects. Youths would receive basic pay of \$100 per week and would also earn end-of-service vouchers worth \$10,000 per year. The vouchers could be used for vocational and job training, college education, or payment towards a home. The DLC proposal also proposed to create positions for another 100,000 noncareer military enlistees; these volunteers would receive a monthly stipend plus an end-of-service voucher of \$12,000. Participants must be 18 years of age and have a high school diploma or equivalent. The DLC also proposed positions for 100,000 retired citizens to work in supervisory or administrative positions at \$4 to \$5 per hour. Thus, the proposal's target population was all youth -- plus a limited number of senior citizens.

The DLC plan laid out an administrative structure that was quite similar to previous national service writ large proposals. The voluntary Citizen Corps program would be run by a quasi-public corporation similar to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting but administered at the local level. The cost of vouchers for the 700,000 civilian volunteers was projected at \$7.2 billion per year; another \$7.1 billion would be necessary for wages, health insurance, and administrative costs. State, local and private agencies would be expected to contribute one fourth of the corps operating costs. Part of the cost of the new program would be provided by phasing out the existing federal higher education financial aid program. The DLC estimated the net new federal outlays for their proposal to be \$5.3 billion per year.

Concerns and Goals of the "Blue Book" -- The DLC proposed several rationales for supporting national service. The policy was framed in terms of the AVF, the federal higher education financial aid program, youth job training and employment opportunities, and the need to revive the citizenship ethic "of equal sacrifice for the common good."

The challenge of meeting manpower recruitment levels for the AVF was expected to become more difficult in the 1980s (Congressional Budget Office 1978). The DLC believed their proposal could fill the ranks of the military at reduced cost. With budget deficits, increased concern over the national debt, and a mood of fiscal constraint in the 1980s, student aid funding had declined in recent years. The College Board Review noted in 1983 that

those concerned with the military's recruitment problems have increasingly come to view Pell Grants and other federal student aid as undue compensation. A report of the Atlantic Council observes "we have today a system that in effect offers more to those who do not serve their country than those who do" (Gladieux 1983, p. 18).

The DLC staff disliked the federal higher education student aid program. They cited an Atlantic Council report which had called the current system a "GI Bill without the GI" (Atlantic Council of the United States 1982). Student aid funding was already on the decline and under attack because of rising loan repayment default rates. In 1985, President Reagan had announced that he wanted to reduce federal student aid even further (NSN 1985b). The proposed Citizen Corps, the "Blue Book" argued, offered a more equitable approach for higher education financial assistance.

A third rationale addressed the young Americans whom the William T. Grant Foundation study labeled "the forgotten half" -- the non-college bound. Marshall was proud that he had been able to incorporate the work of the William T. Grant Foundation into the "Blue Book." As he recalled

I kid everybody that I am here to champion the interests of the hard working, middle class folks who have been sort of forgotten by Democrats -- Dwayne and Wanda or Patrick and Stanislovski. We decided to broaden the benefits so that [they included stipends] for job training or home ownership for those kids who do not go to college (maybe don't even finish high school) but who deserve a chance to serve and a reward for that service (Marshall Interview 1991).

Finally, the DLC's proposal stressed the theme of reciprocal responsibility. National service, Marshall argued, represented

a new way of governing. This is a new paradigm or model for government that fuses public and private activism and says that there is no free lunch. As we always put it, it was an alternative to the "Something for nothing" school of the left and the "Every man for himself" school of the right. It was a "something for something" ethic (Marshall Interview 1991).

Observers speculated that the DLC embraced national service in order to "win back suburban voters " (Farney 1988), to appeal to middle class youth (Shogan 1989), or to make the Democratic party "look muscular" (The Economist 1989). Novak observed of national service that "the party that does it well will govern for the next fifty years" (Hallow 1989). At a DLC event in November, 1989, Senator Robb explained how national service fit into the DLC agenda:

Mainstream Democrats believe that a strong ethic of civic responsibility, of equal sacrifice for the common good, is integral to the success and survival of a free society...we seek to enlist citizen activism and private community-based resources in solving some of our nation's problems. We support innovative developments in the areas of voluntary national service, public-private partnerships, and indirect administration of public programs by private and nonprofit organizations (Robb 1989).

As one senior Democrat put it, national service provides liberals with an element of "social solidarity" while bowing to the "social obligations and self-reliance" instincts of conservatives (Hershey 1989).

Opposition to the DLC proposal came from a number of fronts. Students and administrators feared that having to do a year of service would sidetrack youths from pursuing careers and delayed entry into college would reduce the chances of disadvantaged youth attending at all. Some saw the bills sponsored by McCurdy and Nunn as a way to meet military-manpower objectives by raiding the budget of the U.S. Department of Education. Liberals defended the existing needs-based funding approach of the student aid system and characterized the DLC proposal as class-biased and discriminatory.

The Pentagon opposed establishing a separate class of the military and feared a civilian service program would be a disincentive for youths to serve in the regular military. The program might also compete for funding for the new "Montgomery" GI Bill benefits. Libertarians were especially critical of the DLC proposal. A former Reagan policy advisor called it a "mean spirited" proposal that would turn students into "indentured servants" (Sheler et al. 1989). Opponents also argued that the program was too costly and just would not work. The American Council on Education estimated the DLC program would cost \$50 billion annually and Daniel Boorstin (1989) insisted that patriotism could not be legislated.

The DLC announced the national service plan in March of 1988 (Broder 1988a) and released their "Blue Book" at a press conference in May, 1988. The Citizen Corps concept was initially met with enthusiasm (Broder 1988a, New York Times 1988, Kuttner 1988). Criticism, especially from the higher education community, came later (New Republic 1988).

Selling the Idea of National Service -- Presidential campaigns present an opportunity to open a policy window of opportunity. The 1988 campaign was especially promising because the Reagan era was coming to an end; a new administration would enter the White House in 1989. The DLC wanted a moderate Democrat in the White House and used their national service proposal to stimulate debate at the presidential campaign level. Al From said at the time that the DLC's national service proposal was "an effort to focus debate on an idea that will be in the forefront of the political campaign this year" (Barnes and Cohen 1988, p. 1308).

The DLC expected the idea of national service to appeal to middle class voters including the Reagan Democrats who had abandoned their party in recent presidential elections. A DLC spokesman "suggested that the notions of civic obligation and activism" in a national service system could be emphasized in the election year "as an alternative to the Republican party's politics of self-interest and social neglect" (Jehl 1988, p. 4). The "Blue Book" noted that, "because it embodies a civic compact in which benefits are earned, not given, national service can broaden the political base of support for new public initiatives" (Democratic Leadership Council 1988, p. 12). Even after the 1988 election, Al From continued to use national service as a symbol of how Democrats differed from Republicans. Kondracke observed in December, 1988, that the DLC's

From contends that national service embodies the values of upward mobility, opportunity, and citizenship, as contrasted with what he says are the Republican values of self-centeredness, greed, and, at best, noblesse oblige (Kondracke 1988, p. 15).

At the time the book was released, neither of the two major Democratic presidential contenders, Jesse Jackson and Michael Dukakis, had mentioned national service (Jehl 1988). Over the spring of 1988, the DLC promoted their national service proposal to the candidates.

We were trying hard to get all the Democratic candidates because we thought it was emblematic of a new approach to politics and governing for Democrats. It added a crucial moral dimension to the Democratic message that...we were moving away from the politics of entitlement to the politics of reciprocal responsibility (Marshall Interview 1991).

The candidates were not receptive, however. Marshall said

We worked on the candidates. We talked to them all. We tried to get them with logic but they spoke a different language. They were in the paradigm of special interest liberalism and they couldn't see it (Marshall Interview 1991).

Nunn and other DLC members promoted their ideas to the Democratic party platform committee at the National Democratic Convention in July. At one two-hour session sponsored by the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, Nunn, Mikulski, Panetta, Robb, and Minnesota State Attorney General Hubert H. Humphrey III promoted national service (Birnbaum 1988). Hundreds of free copies of the DLC Blue Book were distributed at the convention (Marshall Interview 1991). Nunn observed that the convention was "a good forum -- modest but useful," for promoting his idea of national service; according to a Wall Street Journal story, national service was being touted as a symbol of what was new about the Democratic party -- "a vehicle for a new ethos that the Democrats hope to sell here: that a new era of civic responsibility is dawning" (Birnbaum 1988, p. 42).

The Democratic Party did not adopt a strong statement in support of youth service at the 1988 convention but the DLC was not finished promoting their idea. Following the convention, the DLC sponsored eight national service forums on college campuses across the country. These events featured Nunn and others including Senator Mikulski, Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, and Charles Moskos. In most cases, the students were quite receptive to the idea of a federal youth service program although many were less receptive to the idea of linking federal student financial aid to a service obligation (Stephenson 1988, Marshall Interview 1991).

The Youth Service Community in 1988

By the late 1980s, a consolidated youth service community was taking shape. The only conflict that remained was between advocates of Eberly's top down, writ large approach and those who had adopted Landrum's decentralized "thousand flowers" approach to youth service. YSA pursued policy via a Working Group while Eberly established a Coalition for National Service to demonstrate solidarity in the youth service community. In July, 1988, these two groups combined forces to carry out political strategy.

Youth Service America's Working Group -- From the time that YSA was formed in 1986 until the start of 1988, the organization and its members focused on youth service programs at the state and local level. Landrum described the effort as "adapting (the concept of youth service) to American political culture" (Landrum Interview 1992). He recalled that the bills in Congress at that time were

mostly Johnnie-one-notes stuck on William James...A handful of people who believed in what it could do for American society gave up on the federal approach. Instead, they decided to model development...There was a definite paradigm shift. They decided to do national service where they had policy influence (Interview 1992).

But Landrum and Slobig recognized that presidential campaigns offer a chance to shape national policy. Slobig said they

knew we would have an opportunity in the 1988 presidential campaign to influence the candidates. That was the piece in our policy framework that drove the framing of the legislation (Interview 1991).

YSA hosted a conference in February, 1988, that included a workshop on political strategies. In that session, participants argued forcefully that the youth service community should refocus its attention on national politics. Some urged the drafting and adoption of a single model youth service bill. Others favored hitching the future prospects of youth service programs to presidential candidates.

YSA sponsored a 2-day retreat for 15 key youth service organizations immediately following the conference. The purpose of this symposium was to address youth policy broadly. During that retreat, it was agreed that the youth service policy community needed to act quickly. According to Rosenberry, the William T. Grant Foundation's Sam Halperin

facilitated the meeting at Georgetown with about 20 of us. That's the point at which he said, "Look, we have to start getting active about this because something is going to happen." The DLC stuff was out. The candidates were talking about it at least peripherally . . . and out of that came the Working Group on Youth Service Policy (Interview 1991).

Participants at the retreat decided to follow a two-part strategy. First, a task force was formed to promote youth service to the presidential candidates; the task force would also work to get a youth service policy adopted by the two major political parties at the 1988 platform hearings. The second part of the strategy was the establishment of a Working Group on Youth Service Policy (Working Group). The Working Group originally included Youth Service America, National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, Human Environment Council, Public/Private Ventures, Campus Compact, National Crime Prevention Council, Council of Chief State School Officers, PennServe, Boston's City Year, the William T. Grant Foundation, the National Youth Leadership Council, Campus Outreach Opportunity League, the New York City Volunteer Corps, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, the Thomas Jefferson Forum, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Governor's Association, and the Council of Greater City Schools. (At the peak of the Working Groups' activities with Congress in 1989, the effort also included People for the American Way, the Children's Defense Fund, 4-H, the Girl Scouts, and the National Assembly.)

To demonstrate solidarity and assure that proposals reflected the current best ideas about how to do youth service, the Working Group drafted a statement of common principles of best practice. Over 50 youth service organizations eventually endorsed this statement (Streams 1989, p. 2). The Working Group also crafted and implemented a strategy of state-by-state program growth. With assistance from Governors Richard Celeste (OH), Rudy Perpich (MN), and William Casey (PA), Working Group members made a presentation at the National Governors Association (NGA) 1988 annual meeting. Through Governor Casey, the NGA established a Task Force on Youth Service. That group issued a 108-page handbook describing state youth service initiatives at the 1989 NGA annual meeting (National Governors' Association 1989).

Eberly's Coalition for National Service -- Two years before the Working Group was formed, Eberly also saw the importance of showing solidarity and agreement on a single set of program parameters. To that end, he formed the Coalition for National Service (Coalition) in October of 1986. Original members of the Coalition included Amitai Etzioni; The Rev. Theodore Hesbergh; Morris Janowitz; former Congressman Paul ("Pete") McCloskey; Willard Wirtz; National Urban League President John Jacob; Junior League trainer Kathleen Merchant; Scott D. Thomson with the National Association of Secondary School Principals; Congressman Leon Panetta; Minneapolis Mayor Don Fraser; and President and CEO of the Ogilvy Group, W.E. Phillips (NSN 1986).

Members of the Coalition agreed to (1) endorse a formal statement on national service that stressed voluntary (versus mandatory) youth service opportunities, (2) support state and local youth service program initiatives, and (3) stimulate discussion of national service. Eberly continuously sought other individuals and groups to lend their name to the idea of national service by joining the Coalition. Within a few months, the Coalition had picked up support from Harvard President Derek Bok; Ernest Boyer; George Gallup, Jr. of the Gallup Organization; John W. Gardner; University of Wisconsin President Donna Shalala; Stanford President Donald Kennedy; Robert Clodius; Russell Edgerton; Sam Halperin; Charles Moskos; and many others (NSN 1987).

The Wingspread Conference -- On July 7-9, 1988, 35 members of Eberly's Coalition and other invitees met at the Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin, to review guidelines for a national service plan and draft an agenda for the 1990s. Conference participants included the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, George H. Gallup, Jr., Donald Kennedy, Donald J. Eberly, Sam Halperin, David Hornbeck (Maryland State Superintendent of Schools), Michael Sherraden (Washington University, St. Louis), Roger Landrum (Youth Service America), Bob Burkhardt (President of NASCC), Susan Stroud (Campus Compact), Harry J. Hogan (Council for the Advancement of Citizenship), James C. Kielsmeier (National Youth Leadership Council), former Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, Cynthia Parsons (SerVermont), U.S. Senator (and former Washington State Governor) Daniel J. Evans (R-WA), Congressman Leon Panetta (D-CA), and former Congressman Pete McCloskey. Their findings were published in a report entitled National Service: An Action Agenda for the 1990s (Coalition for National Service 1988).

Conference participants passed a resolution calling on the presidential candidates to support youth service. In a press release following the conference, the Coalition for National Service "challenged Vice President George Bush and Governor Michael Dukakis to commit the next administration to meeting vital needs of society through a system of voluntary national service" (Johnson Foundation 1988). The Coalition also issued a 10-point set of guidelines for a preferred national service program and a draft proposal requesting that state departments of education and school districts provide youth service programs in their schools. Halperin led an effort to outline a proposal to establish a not-for-profit organization that might be named the Service America Foundation. This organization could be funded with \$100 million in public funds and with another \$100 million from private matching funds.

Taking Youth Service To The Candidates

Over the summer, youth service advocates lobbied candidates Bush and Dukakis as well as their campaign staffs; all were urged to include youth service in the candidates' speeches and position papers. The idea of voluntarism (especially local agents addressing social needs in lieu of big government programs) proved to be an idea that candidate Bush could embrace more easily than Dukakis.

George Bush and A Thousand Points of Light -- The Republican Convention was held in August, 1988. In his acceptance speech, candidate Bush paid tribute to the spirit of volunteerism and community in America.

For we are a nation of communities, of thousands and tens of thousands of ethnic, religious, social, business, labor union, neighborhood, regional and other organizations, all of them varied, voluntary, and unique.

This is America: the Knights of Columbus, the Grange, Hadassah, the Disabled American Veterans, the Order of Ahepa, the Business and Professional Women of America, the union hall, the Bible study group, LULAC, Holy Name -- a brilliant diversity spread like stars, like a thousand points of light in a broad and peaceful sky (Noonan 1990, p. 311).

The phrase, "a thousand points of light," was included in Bush's speech by speech writer, Peggy Noonan, who saw the theme of community as "the fist of the speech, the center of intellectual energy from which all else flowed" (Noonan 1990, p. 310). The idea was furnished to her by Bill Gavin, an author and former speech writer for Richard Nixon. Gavin sent Noonan

a little mini-essay on the idea of community, an idea he'd touched on before but that became clearer and more concrete for him when he read the work of William Shambra in the magazine Catholicism in Crisis in 1984... Shambra drew on the work of Michael Novak, who had written in The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics of a growing self-awareness and self-assertiveness among various American ethnic groups who did not wish to accept the imposed values of a single homogeneous national community... Gavin noted that George Bush's views on local control, local involvement, and where the real wellsprings of American energy are (you guessed it -- they're local) were perfectly reflected in Shambra's and Novak's work (Noonan 1990, p. 310).

Pagel and Ruppe Give Meaning to a Phrase -- Bush had been approached by Loret Ruppe and former Michigan Governor George Romney about including youth service in the presidential campaign. Both Ruppe and Romney were close personal friends of Bush; President Bush would later appoint Ruppe to head the Peace Corps. According to YSA, it "was Ruppe... who persuaded Bush to push youth service to the top of his campaign agenda" (Streams 1989, p. 1).

Gretchen Pagel had joined the Bush campaign in June, 1988. In August, she was assigned the task of giving form to the phrase "a thousand points of light." Ruppe and Romney spoke with Pagel about youth service.

Pagel spoke to McCloskey, Moskos, Slobig, Landrum and others. Many youth service advocates also contacted Pagel with stories and ideas. In late August, Pagel wrote a proposal for Bush on youth service called "YES to America" (Pagel Interview 1991).

When Bush mentioned "a thousand points of light" in the September 25 presidential debate, Dukakis derided the idea. Then, on October 4, Bush delivered a speech at the Comstock Club in Sacramento, CA. Written by Noonan (Hoffman 1988), the speech proposed a new domestic program of youth service. Bush called on "the young men and women of our tree-lined suburbs to get on a bus, or the subway, or the metro, and go into the cities where the want is" (Hoffman 1988). Proposing to help create a sense of community and collective responsibility while addressing unmet social needs, Bush tapped into the theme of greedy youth.

We've showered our children with material things and still we have a sense of unease. Do they know they're fortunate? Do they know it wasn't always like this for America -- or for mankind in general? Do they have a sense of thanks? of citizenship? Do they realize that perhaps they ought to be thinking of giving something back? (Bush 1988)

He proposed a foundation, Youth Engaged In Service to America, that would be financed jointly by \$100 million federal funds and \$100 million from the private sector. A Bush advisor said YES "would be different from existing volunteer programs such as VISTA, ACTION and the Peace Corps because it would be targeted to younger people" (Hoffman 1988).

Surprised by Bush's sudden interest of youth service policy, the media speculated on possible motives for the Comstock speech. One newspaper reporter speculated that Bush's

volunteerism appeal here was partly an effort to counter his image as an elitist, which Democrats, including Dukakis, have sought to turn against him (Hoffman 1988).

Another columnist observed that Bush was seen as "cold and aloof" but

the empathy factor was enhanced when Bush proposed subsidizing voluntary social service efforts by affluent young people to aid center-city youths in literacy programs and other self-help endeavors (Broder 1988b).

But members of the youth service policy community knew how candidate Bush had come to endorse a program of youth service. The YES nonprofit corporation proposed by Bush was the exact design that Halperin had proposed at the YSA Working Group meeting the previous February and had reiterated at the Coalition's Wingspread Conference in early July. One youth service advocate observed, "The Comstock speech was a direct result of our efforts. What he said was awful -- but he bit. He committed."

Candidate Dukakis Responds -- The DLC's effort to promote national service to fellow Democrats -- and especially to the presidential candidates -- had not been very successful. The Wall Street Journal observed at the close of the Democratic National Convention, that

Gov. Michael Dukakis, the Democrats' presidential nominee, is hesitant to endorse the notion of a full blown program of national service. But prominent Democrats such as Arkansas Gov. Bill Clinton have been talking to him about it. "I'm fairly sure that Dukakis won't embrace the idea in its full form," Gov. Clinton says. But he adds: "You're going to see parts of it spring up over and over and over again in the election and after the election" (Birnbaum 1988, p. 42).

Nor did members of the YSA Working Group have success reaching Dukakis. When asked who had been the YSA Working Group contact to the Dukakis campaign, one youth service advocate responded "I don't know who the Democratic contact was. No one, maybe! We never got through the Washington-Boston noise!" YSA's Streams reported in June, 1988, that

The Dukakis campaign has had a Washington working group on youth service for several months feeding materials to the campaign headquarters in Boston. While Dukakis generally favors youth service, his inner circle says that youth service is not a presidential campaign issue. One source flatly says, "Nobody is calling for a position on voluntary service" (Streams 1988, p. 3).

Indeed, the Dukakis campaign headquarters in Boston came to be referred to by youth service advocates as "the Black Hole of Boston." Ideas sent to Boston would never surface again. At one point, Dukakis was scheduled to deliver a speech on youth service -- but the plans changed and the speech was never given (Kondracke 1988). Will Marshall recounts

We got calls from the campaign, "He is just about to do something." And I worked with a guy on his campaign. He would walk me through the logic so he could understand it and defend it in the inner councils of the campaign; so I could see that he was agitating for it inside the campaign...But it went no where (Marshall Interview 1991).

On October 3, youth service advocates learned that Bush was going to deliver his major speech on youth service at the Comstock Club on the following day. They called the Dukakis headquarters to see if the Democratic party candidate had done anything yet on youth service. Again, they were told that Dukakis was not ready to endorse youth service. After Bush delivered his speech to the Comstock Club, the Dukakis campaign staff called youth service advocates in a panic and asked what they could do. Dukakis had lost out on being first, the Dukakis staff were told, but he could still get on the youth service bandwagon.

But Dukakis continued to belittle Bush's frequent references to "a thousand points of light." The YES proposal "was derided by aides...as a device to direct attention from Republican efforts to cut government social programs" (Feinberg 1988). Following Bush's speech, "Dukakis aides tried to get (DLC Director Al) From to get Nunn to denounce the idea as Johnny-come-lately stuff, but From refused" (Kondracke 1988, p. 16).

Instead, Nunn continued to push national service. The week following the election, Nunn said there was

a time when I thought Dukakis would see that this is just the kind of idea he ought to favor, that it puts some flesh on his rhetoric and rekindles the best of what we remember about the Democratic tradition. In fact, I spoke to him about it again the other day, because I didn't think it was too late for him to use it actively. He said he wished he'd done it before. He said he was sorry he hadn't (Kramer 1988).

Dukakis did finally endorse national service; Will Marshall recalled

On the last day of the campaign, in his concession remarks, Dukakis lauded national service as the kind of idea that Democrats should embrace -- that would give them a different dimension. And then, on the day after the election, in a post mortem with reporters, it was just the most remarkable thing. He went on at length!...He mentioned the DLC by name. He singled us out for praise. He said, "This is the kind of idea that can unite different strands and it is a basis of a new and refreshing kind of politics." He said all those wonderful things! It was amazing (Marshall Interview 1991).

Summary and Conclusions

Between 1986 and 1988, the cause of youth service was both helped and hindered by newcomers. The People For the American Way brought another rationale for supporting youth service: citizenship. The DLC proposal brought controversy and critics. The high profile and added talent permitted the youth service policy community to better present their ideas to the presidential candidates. Once Bush endorsed the general concept, the policy community focused heavily on the Bush administration.

Actors -- Two new groups within the youth service policy community - Eberly's writ large Coalition members and YSA Working Group advocates of Landrum's "thousand flowers" approach -- worked to expand the community. The Coalition sought to enlist members with national reputations and powerful affiliations, while YSA's Working Group on Youth Service Policy focused on working organizations with youth-oriented policy agendas. Members from both groups later combined efforts to promote youth service to the 1988 presidential candidates.

Two politically powerful groups also brought new actors into the youth service policy community. Through People for the American Way, Melanne Verveer, John Buchanan, and Hillary Rodham Clinton became interested in youth service policy. The DLC brought politicians and political operatives into the policy community, including Congressman McCurdy, Senator Nunn, Governors Robb (Virginia) and Clinton (Arkansas), and DLC strategists Al From and Will Marshall. Also joining the policy community at this time were the communitarians including Etzioni and Barber, the National Governors' Association, and many mayors.

While the policy community membership grew, the community remained bifurcated. There was some personnel overlap between activities of the two groups, but YSA was not a member of the Coalition and the Coalition was not a member of the YSA Working Group. Still, both entities reflected community

cohesiveness to outsiders. One Hill staffer recalled

The Policy Group became a policy sword. When they agreed on principles of best practice, it showed that the various constituencies could work together. Landrum's task was to bring coherence to disparate programs. He provided a sense of structure.

Some of the newest members of the policy community were excellent policy entrepreneurs. Buchanan and Verveer would later prove to be formidable lobbyists during the 101st Congress. One Hill staffer called People For the American Way the most politically sophisticated of the groups that promoted youth service legislation. Nunn and McCurdy worked hard for passage of a national service writ large bill. While Al From and Will Marshall were viewed as outsider renegades by many, they spoke to groups, participated in conferences, and otherwise promoted the youth service debate. The DLC established a spinoff think tank -- the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI). Under the direction of Marshall, PPI published policy papers and press releases defending the DLC proposal. Youth service advocates viewed President-elect Bush as the most politically powerful actor in the youth service policy community.

Ideas -- While it is not certain how the DLC vision of national service took shape, DLC staffer Ed Kilgore was sure

the people at the DLC do not see national service as emerging out of the old CCC programs...and it is definitely not voluntarism... and it had nothing in common with Bush's Points of Light (what I call "smiling faces doing nifty things"). It evolved from the GI Bill and the concept of "earned benefits" (Kilgore Interview 1991).

The DLC's interest in national service was driven by the issue of civic and community obligation that stressed the importance of acknowledging one's debt to society -- what Al From called the "you owe it to your nation" view (From Interview 1991). William James recommended national service as a means of developing a sense of meaning and common national purpose and it was not coincidental that the final chapter in the DLC's "Blue Book" was entitled "The Moral Equivalent of War."

Both McCurdy and Nunn turned to national service in part because of their concern over the AVF and "equity" in the armed forces. The DLC proposal addressed the rising manpower costs by establishing a less expensive 1-year track; the "citizen soldiers" were expected to bring more wealthy and middle class youth into the armed services. Other problems that the "Blue Book" identified included "the student aid dilemma," youth unemployment, prospects for noncollege bound youth -- the "forgotten half." Not surprisingly, the form of youth service proposed in the DLC "Blue Book" fit the national service writ large version of youth service.

Bush's idea of youth service would change over time. His original thoughts were set out in the Comstock speech. His remarks were written for Bush by Noonan but probably also reflected ideas submitted by Ruppe, Romney, and Pagel. The target population for Bush's proposal appeared to be the same individuals who typically volunteer for the Peace Corps: white, educated, affluent college bound suburbanites. Indeed, YSA worried that under the Bush program "underclass youth will be viewed as objects of

service rather than as givers of service" (Streams 1989, p. 1). The target population later expanded to include all Americans. The time commitment was always part-time and Bush adamantly opposed the use of economic incentives to promote service. Paid volunteerism was an oxymoron, his people argued; rather, the tools for the Bush program would be exhortation and recognition.

People for the American Way supported youth service because of a concern over low voter turnout and a missing sense of civic obligation amongst youth. They believed the service experience taught youth about the nature of a free society and represented a form of civic education. The target population was always students. When, in the spring of 1989, they advocated a specific form of youth service, the organization endorsed school-based service programs.

Opportunity -- The political event that drove change in the policy stream was the 1988 presidential campaign. But efforts of members of Eberly's Coalition for National Service and YSA's Working Group to pressure candidates Bush and Dukakis suggests that policy entrepreneurs do not always wait for windows of opportunity to open. They also work diligently to force windows open.

Policy entrepreneurs also tried to sell the idea of national service to other members of the Democratic Party at the summer convention. The Wall Street Journal noted that

the importance of conventions may be diminishing but they remain a great show case for issues on the make, and for good reason. There isn't a larger concentration of party officials, candidates and journalists in a single place, and politicians with a cause try to take advantage of this opportunity (Birnbaum 1988, p. 42).

Strategy -- In early 1988, both Nunn and, to a lesser extent, McCurdy were considered potential presidential candidates; their status gave them extra media coverage. But the DLC's strategy was to generate controversy. Kilgore recalled

the DLC was looking for "break through ideas." Remember that the organization's theme was "enduring values and new concepts" (Kilgore Interview 1991).

The DLC's national service proposal was calculated to be controversial. The ideas set forth in the "Blue Book" were clearly intended to

move the debate. We could have said, "In addition to the existing array of student loans and grants, we want to establish a modest voucher program in which, if you work every other Thursday, you will get a couple of grand to go to college." We had to do something that seized the imagination -- that was a bold challenge to the status quo way of thinking on both sides of the isle (Marshall Interview 1991).

The "Blue Book" proposal allowed the DLC to generate press attention while making a strong statement about what centrist Democrats stood for. The linkage between eligibility for federal aid to higher education and

performance of national service was intentional. That was

the link that made it worth debating and got everyone riled up and really put the thing on the map (Marshall Interview 1991).

By January, 1989, a myriad of youth service bills were expected to be introduced in the 101st Congress. Chapter 7 describes those bills. In addition to national service writ large, CCC-type, and school-based proposals, bills would also be sponsored that linked youth service with federal higher education financial aid eligibility. A fifth type of youth service program, Bush's more noblesse oblige form of volunteerism, is discussed in Chapter 8.

Chapter 7. Youth Service Bills in The 101st Congress

In this chapter, a focus on policy content helps us understand the choices and implications of the many youth service bills sponsored in the 101st Congress. Again, we see little evidence of innovation or willingness to combine program types. Innovative proposals are introduced by the newcomers -- the Democratic Leadership Council's financial aid reform measure, Senator Mikulski's part-time national service program modeled on the National Guard, and Senator Kennedy's school-based service-learning bill. The Mikulski and Kennedy proposals are particularly noteworthy for their positive social construction of the target population -- what Mikulski liked to call "the good kids."

Bills are presented by type of youth service -- national service writ large, CCC-type youth service, bills linked to federal student aid benefits, school-based service-learning, and continuum bills. If information is available, the bill analysis includes the origins of the ideas in the bill, how the idea came to the attention of the sponsoring Member of Congress, any known motivations of the Member for introducing the bill, and what individuals had a hand in drafting the bill.

Writ Large Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress

Three major proposals were sponsored in the 101st Congress that would have established a federal program of national service writ large. Bills were introduced by (1) Senator Nunn and Congressman McCurdy (S. 3 and H.R. 660), (2) Senator Mikulski and Congressman Bonior (S. 408 and H.R. 1000), and (3) Senator McCain and Congressman Porter (S. 781 and H.R. 1951). Congresswoman Kennelly also introduced two modifications of the Nunn-McCurdy bill (H.R. 948 and H.R. 2084).

Nunn and McCurdy Sponsor S. 3 and H.R. 660 -- The DLC report on national service proved so popular that Senator Nunn decided to promote the ideas set forth in the "Blue Book" (Democratic Leadership Council 1988) via a bill in the Congress (Marshall Interview 1991). Congressman McCurdy had sponsored a national service bill, H.R. 1479, in the 100th Congress that had linked national service with higher education funding. Nonetheless, the DLC leadership and staff started from scratch in drafting their bill for the 101st Congress.

Nunn was deeply concerned about equity in the armed forces. He had favored a return to the draft since the mid-1970s and the writings of Janowitz and Moskos had convinced him of the benefits to be gained by providing America's youth with a nonmilitary service option.

While the "Blue Book" set out general concepts and rough numbers, program details had to be worked out. Many of the marathon brainstorming sessions that ensued took place in Nunn's Senate office. The principals involved in drafting S. 3 and H.R. 660 were Nunn; Al From and Will Marshall from the DLC; Julie Abbott, Ginny Jones, and Ed Kilgore from Senator Nunn's staff; Congressman McCurdy and his legislative assistant, Leeann Alexander; and Charles Moskos (Marshall Interview 1991). McCurdy and his staff "stayed deep in the process so as to hold onto ownership of the bill" (McCurdy Interview 1991). Others who had input included Congresswoman

Kennelly, and the Senators who had agreed to cosponsor the bill -- Robb, Boren, Glenn, Breaux, and Sasser.

S. 3 and H.R. 660 created three categories of national service: a civilian corps for nonmilitary service, a citizen corps alternative to the professional military, and a senior corps. Most programs were to be administered by a new Corporation for National Service. States were to provide a 25 percent match for administrative costs and stipends. Like the DLC's "Blue Book," S. 3 and H.R. 660 provided for one to two years of full-time civilian service for individuals 17 or older with a high school diploma or the equivalent. The military option involved two years of active duty plus two years in the Selected Reserves and four years in the Individual Ready Reserve or eight years in the Selected Reserve. Youths earned \$100 per week stipend plus an annual voucher (\$10,000 for civilian and \$12,000 for military service) that could be used toward education or the purchase of a home. Existing federal higher education financial assistance grants and loans would be phased out over several years; with some exceptions, youths would be eligible for student aid only if they participated in the Citizen Corps program.

The bills were introduced in Congress on January 25, 1989, by Congressman Dave McCurdy as H.R. 660 and by Senator Sam Nunn as S. 3, the Citizenship and National Service Act of 1989. National service was Senator Nunn's number one domestic policy priority for 1989. One individual who attended a drafting session was impressed with Nunn's commitment to the bill; he stayed through the entire four-hour session, leaving only when he had to cast a vote on the floor of the Senate (Kery Interview 1991).

The extreme character of the bill surprised and worried many members of the youth service policy committee. Nunn saw the controversial nature of S. 3 as an opportunity. The controversy attracted attention from other members of Congress and the media. A member of Nunn's staff explained

Nunn is the kind of guy who figures if they shoot at you from the right and the left you must be doing something right (Kilgore Interview 1991).

Events outside his control limited Nunn's ability to promote his bill. In early 1989, when Senator Nunn should have been actively pushing S. 3, he was preoccupied chairing the contentious (and unsuccessful) confirmation hearings on President Bush's nomination of John Tower to head the Department of Defense. In addition, Nunn had hoped he would be able to shepherd his bill through the legislative process by having it referred to his Senate Armed Services Committee. Instead, S. 3 was referred to Senator Edward ("Ted") Kennedy's Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

In January, it appeared that McCurdy's bill might do well. H.R. 660 picked up twelve cosponsors including Bonior, Stenholm, Hoyer, and Kennelly. Several members of the House leadership also supported the bill including Democratic Majority Whip Bill Gray (D-PA). The Philadelphia Conservation Corps was in Gray's district and Hoyer was familiar with the youth service program in the Maryland school system (Schacher Interview 1991). McCurdy's bill was triple assigned to the Education and Labor Committee, the Armed Services Committee, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Senator Nunn had said from the first that he did not expect to see a bill pass during the 101st Congress; by late May, 1989, Nunn had agreed to

support a demonstration effort rather than a full-blown program (Abbott 1989). In August, 1989, Nunn joined with Republican Senator McCain to attach wording to the National Defense Authorization Act of 1989 (S. 1352) calling for a national commission to study the costs and benefits of a national service program; the amendment passed the Senate but was dropped in conference.

McCurdy was less willing to compromise. From his experience with a national service bill in the 100th Congress, McCurdy recalled that he

knew that Education and Labor was hostile territory. . . . Their whole philosophy is so alien to that of mine. They are into the entitlement approach. . . . They think entitlement while the DLC thinks in terms of service and individual responsibility (McCurdy Interview 1991).

The House Education and Labor Committee held a hearing on national service on March 15, 1989. Witnesses included bill sponsors Panetta, McCurdy, Bonior, Kennelly and Morella. McCurdy was received coldly by the Committee members. Schacher recalled

one member suggested he was a racist and another said something like "You could never understand what it is like to be black." . . . One member walked out before McCurdy began his testimony saying he wasn't even interested in hearing what the Congressman had to say (Schacher Interview 1991).

According to Rosenberry, McCurdy

handled it extremely well; he was gracious under pressure. There he was, a lone witness. What was fascinating, too, was that it wasn't until they finished beating up on poor Dave McCurdy that the House said, "Well, we got rid of the Nunn bill. Now what are we going to do?" And that is the way they looked at it---as the Nunn bill (Rosenberry Interview 1991).

One DLC staff person summed up H.R. 660:

What happened was, we got this bill written -- it was a leviathan, a giant thing -- and that took a long, long time. And then we quickly realized that we lost the battle right away because the key was getting the bill referred to a friendly committee -- and there wasn't one in the House.

Rep. Kennelly's National Service Alternatives -- As one of the four DLC directors in 1988, Congresswoman Barbara Kennelly (D-CT) helped draft the DLC's "Blue Book" on national service. As late as mid-April, 1988, her office was expressing concern over some cost and equity issues in the draft version of the "Blue Book." Nevertheless, she stood by the DLC report, helped draft the bills, cosponsored H.R. 660, and attended the January, 1989, press conference concerning S. 3 and H.R. 660.

In February, 1989, however, Kennelly introduced her own version of a national service bill, H.R. 948, the National Voluntary Service and Education Opportunity Act of 1989. In late April, 1989, Kennelly sponsored a second bill, H.R. 2084, the National Service, Education, and Housing

Opportunity Act of 1989. For both bills, Kennelly "started from H.R. 660 and modified...No one else was involved; no organizations approached us" (Kery Interview 1991).

Kennelly's first bill differed from the DLC bill in that it did not phase out the existing federal student financial aid programs. The second bill allowed participants to perform community service either before or after receipt of education vouchers. After mid-1989, Kennelly took a low profile position on national service because of pressing responsibilities related to her position on the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mikulski/Bonior Bill Modeled on the National Guard -- Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) conceived the idea for her bill herself and had most of the basics thought out when she shared her idea with her staff (Roberts Interview 1991). She was influenced by her friend, Dr. Arthur Naparstek (Mikulski 1988) and by Habits of the Heart (Bellah et al. 1985), a book that called for a greater sense of civic duty. She often said that her bill was intended to revive the habits of the heart. She may also have read Moskos' book, A Call To Civic Service (1988).

Several factors contributed to her interest in national service. Prior to her election to the Congress, Mikulski was a social worker and neighborhood activist. She appreciated the importance of citizen involvement. She was also concerned about youths who graduated from college strapped by burdensome debts. She believed that the need to earn high incomes in order to pay off college loans was keeping many young Americans from entering low paying public service jobs or taking time to volunteer. Finally, she worried that the skyrocketing price of housing combined with high interest rates prevented young families from purchasing a first home. She often told her staff, "We have to do something for the good kids!" (Roberts Interview 1991).

To help put the finishing touches on her bill and guide it through the amendment process, Mikulski assembled a small group of experts including Art Naparstek and Peg Rosenberry. She visited with experts including Sargent Shriver and the Commandant of the Marine Corps on ways to strengthen her proposal. (Shriver's experience as developer and first head of the Peace Corps as well as his knowledge of the Special Olympics were useful in crafting a bill that utilized large numbers of volunteers.) She also "took in the experience" of the Montgomery County (Maryland) Conservation Corps in designing her program (U. S. Congress 1989, p. 173).

Mikulski's bill was modeled on the National Guard. Volunteers could perform service part-time (two weekends each month and two weeks during the summer or an average of nine hours per week) for a three to six year period. They would receive a voucher of \$3,000 for each year of service which could be used for college tuition or a down payment on a home. The National Guard model not only gave people who worked or attended school full-time a chance to contribute, it also built a platoon spirit of commitment and a sense of pride. Participants had to undergo a six-week period of training without compensation. While anyone could participate in the program, Mikulski's emphasis was always on average Americans rather than the rich and the privileged (Roberts Interview 1991). The program was to be operated by a new, independent federal corporation but projects would be administered at the state level. Mikulski introduced her bill as S. 408, the National Community Service Act of 1989, on February 9, 1989.

One member of Mikulski's staff noted that the national service bill was a natural for the Senator -- it was her. The national service

bill got a higher level of attention than any other of her bills -- it was her main focus in the 101st Congress.

To draw attention to her idea, Mikulski published an Op-Ed piece in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 17, 1988. In this article, the Senator called her proposal a "new social invention" similar to the invention of night schools, the GI Bill, and community colleges.

With Naparstek's help, Mikulski obtained a grant to hire a full-time staff person to work exclusively on her national service bill. Several individuals filled this position over time. They solicited ideas, met with interest groups, and worked to assure that Mikulski's bill survived the Senate and Conference committee negotiation processes (Roberts Interview 1991, Miles Interview 1991, Ganote Interview 1991).

The Senator took advantage of other opportunities to promote her bill. Even though she was not a member of the DLC, Mikulski attended DLC functions and plugged her idea for a part-time service program on the DLC national tour of college campuses. Her position was always that she supported the idea of the DLC bill, but not the bill itself.

The Senator played a pivotal role in passing a national service bill in the 101st Congress. Fearing it would get lost in a huge, established bureaucracy, she opposed having her program be administered by the Department of Education. Instead, she favored the creation of a new, independent corporation. In 1989, Mikulski became chair of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Veterans, Housing and Independent Agencies. As one ex-staffer recalled

It was only later that it occurred to us that she would have control over the agency through her Subcommittee chairmanship. Then much later we realized that her subcommittee status would be a benefit because she was willing to put money into the bill (Roberts Interview 1991).

Congressman David Bonior (D-MI) liked Mikulski's bill and asked if he could sponsor the identical bill in the House of Representatives. While Bonior had never sponsored a national service bill before, he especially liked the concept of community involvement and had cosponsored other youth service bills. He introduced Mikulski's bill as H.R. 1000. Both bills were introduced on February 9, 1989. As a member of Bonior's staff explained

Our role was to carry the Mikulski piece on the House side and help keep it alive in spite of the disdain that existed for the McCurdy bill on the House side (Gilley Interview 1991).

Senator McCain's S. 781 -- Senator John McCain (R-AZ) wanted to offer a Republican alternative to the President's Points of Light Initiative. His interest in a national service program came from the Senator's deep sense of citizenship and duty to country. McCain's grandfather and father were Navy admirals; like them, McCain was a graduate of the Naval Academy. The Senator had been shot down during the Vietnam War and was held as a prisoner of war for five and a half years. As one staffer observed, McCain believed that all Americans have "not a right or a privilege but an obligation to serve....He has this deep-seated sense of citizenship" (Rosacker Interview 1991).

McCain's bill was already in the drafting stages when Rocky Rosacker

joined his staff in November, 1988. A Lt. Col. on leave from the Marine Corps while serving on the Hill as an APSA Congressional Fellow, Rosacker was assigned the task of putting together a national service bill for the Senator to sponsor in the 101st Congress. Rosacker read office files on national service including bills introduced in previous Congresses. He talked to Moskos, Eberly, Danzig, and others in the national service writ large policy community. He read the DLC "Blue Book" and legislative proposal. And, because McCain's views on national service were similar to those of former Republican Congressman McCloskey, Rosacker reviewed criticism of McCloskey's 1979 bill to anticipate what McCain might expect from critics. The McCain bill was finished in late January and introduced on April 13, 1989, as S. 781, the National Service Act of 1989.

McCain would have preferred to sponsor a bill calling for a mandatory national service program. However, he realized such a proposal would meet vehement opposition in the 101st Congress. Instead, he proposed a voluntary part-time program but also called for preparation of a plan for mandatory national service. The target population for McCain's program was youth aged 16 to 24 with a high school diploma or equivalent. Length of service ranged from two to four years. Volunteers would perform 24 hours of community service each month plus two weeks of full-time service each year. The volunteers would work without pay except that they would be paid \$700 for the two weeks of full-time service. An end-of-service voucher of \$2,000 would be awarded at the close of each year which could be used for education or housing.

There was little chance that McCain's bill would progress far. The bill was referred to Senator Kennedy's Labor and Human Resources Committee but McCain was not a member of that committee. McCain had sought input from the White House but the White House had failed to respond to numerous inquiries. Recognizing that his bill would receive little attention, McCain followed a different strategy for getting his views expressed. He introduced numerous amendments to national service bills debated on the Senate floor and voted against other national service bills. But Rosacker believed

the bill put McCain where he wanted to be. It defined the issue for McCain; it let the White House know there were alternative Republican plans for national service; and, we claimed the meaning of the term (Rosacker Interview 1991).

Rep. Porter Joins With McCain -- McCain's bill was introduced on the House side by Congressman John Porter (R-IL). Immediately after being elected to Congress in 1980, Congressman Porter had organized a student forum at Northwestern University and invited Congressman Pete McCloskey to speak on his national service bill. He was impressed by McCloskey's presentation and developed an interest in national service. Porter recalled that

my own experience in the military appealed to me. You get a little more tied to your country and gain a lot of maturity and relate to people outside your own personal socio-economic upbringing. Mine was a positive experience. And that experience can be either through the military or through working on human service sorts of concerns. It cements us together as Americans to give something of creative and personal value to endeavors greater than ourselves (Porter

Interview 1991).

Over time, Porter recalls, national service "got lost in the shuffle" as other issues demanded his attention. Around 1987 or 1988, Northwestern University professor Charles Moskos asked Porter for an appointment. Even though Northwestern University was no longer in Porter's district, they met and discussed Moskos' ideas on national service. Porter's interest in national service was renewed and he assigned a legislative assistant to track national service legislation in the Congress. When that aide heard that a Senate Republican was working on a bill, he contacted McCain's staff about introducing a companion bill. While the interests of McCain and Porter were different, there was room for agreement. Porter introduced the House companion bill, H.R. 1951, on April 13, 1989 (Bradner Interview 1991, Porter Interview 1991).

Both McCain and Porter touched upon the theme of responsibilities as well as rights. In a Dear Colleague letter soliciting cosponsors for S. 781, Senator McCain said

Regardless of whether we label the problem "post-Vietnam syndrome," the "me generation," or a "malaise in nationalism," far too many young Americans have grown up thinking the nation owes them a safe and secure life without any effort on their part (McCain 1989, p. 1).

Porter expressed the rationale for his bill similarly:

The question is, how can we renew young Americans' sense of responsibility to their country (Porter 1989).

CCC-Type Bills in the 101st Congress

Two major CCC-type youth service bills were introduced in the 101st Congress: Senator Moynihan and Congressman Williams sponsored S. 232 and H.R. 1408 and Senator Dodd and Congressman Panetta sponsored S. 322 and H.R. 717. Other CCC-type bills were sponsored by Congressmen Martinez, Gaydos, and Roybal.

Senator Moynihan Introduces S. 232 -- Early in January, 1989, Senator Moynihan introduced S. 232, the American Conservation Corps (ACC) Act of 1989. Cosponsors of the bill were Senators Chafee, Dodd, Burdick, Reid and Leahy.

Moynihan had been introducing conservation corps bills since 1982; and this bill was similar to ACC bills sponsored in previous Congresses. The bill's target population was out-of-school youth aged 16 to 25 for the year-round program and 15- to 21-year olds for the summer-only program; special efforts were to be made to recruit economically, socially, physically, and educationally disadvantaged youth. Projects would involve improvement of public lands. The maximum length of service for year-round participants was two years. Youths would receive minimal wages during their period of service and an end-of-service stipend of \$200 per year. The program was to be administered jointly by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior with consultation with the Department of Labor.

While the basic bill content had not changed over time, by 1989 the rhetoric associated with the bill had adjusted to reflect new social concerns. According to a former staff member, Moynihan's bill

was intended to inculcate civic values while affording youth an opportunity to serve in conservation oriented projects. Youths would learn self-discipline and self-respect while observing the merits of volunteering (Maxwell Interview 1991).

The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The arena for legislative action on youth service proposals in the Senate was the Labor and Human Resources Committee. Like McCain, Moynihan was not a member of that committee and he was only marginally involved in the youth service debate during the 101st Congress.

Rep. Williams Follows Seiberling and Udall -- In 1989, Congressman Pat Williams (D-MO) was chair of the House Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education. He was also a member of the Interior Committee. In the past, Congressmen John Seiberling and Morris Udall had introduced CCC-type bills that had been referred to the Interior Committee. Advocates of CCC-type legislation had previously asked Congressman Udall to sponsor a bill. But in early 1989, Congressman Udall was quite ill and no one was taking the lead on conservation corps legislation in the House. NASCC employees Don Mathis and Peg Rosenberry approached Congressman Williams about sponsoring a CCC-type youth service bill (Weintraub Interview 1991).

NASCC was concerned that current conservation corps bills failed to address three important issues: (1) organized labor wanted to find a way for youths to fill job slots without threatening regular, paid employees, (2) youths' corps experience was not adequately linked with JTPA and ACTION youth programs, and (3) language needed to be added to permit youth to earn equivalent education credits for participating in a corps (Rosenberry Interview 1991).

The bill that Udall had sponsored in the 100th Congress was modified and reintroduced by Congressman Williams as H.R. 1408 on March 11, 1989. As a subcommittee staffer recounted

Ours was a conservation bill that would provide a short term quality experience for youth participating, and they just might come out with a GED. It might help them grow up and do something useful in the process....It was a monument to Udall. He was sick and he was leaving the House of Representatives... Pat wanted to do it for Udall and...he wanted to protect labor (Weintraub Interview 1991).

Congressman Panetta's Proposal -- Congressman Panetta introduced his bill on January 31, 1989, as H.R. 717, the American Conservation and Youth Service Corps Act of 1989. He incorporated material from both his own bill and Udall's bill in the 100th Congress. As in prior Congresses, Panetta's bill was referred to the House Education and Labor Committee and also to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The target population for Panetta's bill was similar to that in the Moynihan/Williams bill; in addition, however, youth had to be high school graduates or have been a high school drop-out for at least three months. Besides improvement to public lands, Panetta's bill included human services activities; youths could be placed in government agencies, schools, hospitals, libraries, etc. Also different from the Moynihan/Williams bill was the method of administration; rather than using the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, the program would be administered by a new

Commission on National Service Opportunities.

Panetta testified on his bill at numerous hearings and reportedly lobbied Education and Labor Chairman Hawkins as well. The Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities approved Panetta's bill on August 3, 1989, but that was as far as his bill progressed. Despite his long time interest in youth service, the Congressman was unable to give his bill the attention it needed. In 1989, Panetta became chairman of the House Budget Committee and had little time to promote youth service (Sofer Interview 1991).

Dodd's Companion to the Panetta Bill -- The companion bill to Panetta's legislative proposal was introduced in the Senate by Christopher Dodd (D-CT) on February 2, 1989, as S. 322. Dodd saw the goal of his bill as helping youth "realize their worth and their contribution to society" (Gillman Interview 1991).

Dodd strongly supported youth service. He served in the Peace Corps in his early twenties and frequently described his service in the Dominican Republic as the most valuable years of his life. Dodd served on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere and Peace Corps Affairs. In 1986, he steered legislation through the Congress that extended cancellation of federal college loan to Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers (Gillman Interview 1991).

Dodd had never sponsored youth service legislation but he chaired the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee's Subcommittee on Children and Families which had jurisdiction over VISTA. When it became apparent, in late 1988, that youth service legislation would be considered by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee during the 101st Congress, Dodd directed his staffer, Joan Hogan Gillman, to look into domestic service opportunities. She was told to determine what had worked in the past and what might be good programs in the future. She characterized her assignment as "If we were to expand on domestic service opportunities, how would we do so?" (Gillman Interview 1991).

Part of researching youth service involved reading recent and current youth service bills. Dodd liked Panetta's bill and the Martinez-Panetta amendment to the Udall bill in the 100th Congress. Gillman contacted Panetta's staff regarding Dodd sponsoring the Senate companion to Panetta's bill in the 101st Congress. Using current state youth service programs including a CCC-type program in Connecticut as their model, the two staffs drafted a common bill. Dodd and Gillman knew the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee "would be the environment and the forum for the national service debate in the 101st Congress." Gillman's task was to shape the bill in such a manner that the Senate version would be referred to that committee (Gillman Interview 1991).

Other CCC-Type Bills Offered in the House -- Three other members of the House introduced youth conservation corps bills in the 101st Congress. On March 16, 1989, Congressman Martinez introduced H.R. 1474, the Community Service Corp Act. The bill was similar to the conservation corps provisions in Panetta's H.R. 717. Martinez' bill received little attention -- in part because Martinez and Hawkins were at odds -- but it did allow the Congressman and his staff to participate in negotiations.

In early February, 1989, Congressman Gaydos introduced H.R. 781, the Civilian Conservation Corps II Act. Gaydos was a fan of the New Deal CCC. He was from Pennsylvania and received help drafting his bill from people with the state's PennServe program. This bill also received little attention during the 101st Congress (Durkin Interview 1991).

Congressman Edward Roybal (D-CA) also introduced a CCC-type program bill, H.R. 1033. Roybal had been a participant in the New Deal CCC program. (One other House member at that time, Charles Haynes, had also served in the New Deal CCC.) Roybal had introduced the same bill in previous years. When he testified in favor of a CCC-type program at a House Education and Labor Committee hearing on May 24, 1988, he spoke of how service in the New Deal CCC had helped him and others but he was not active in the youth service debate (U.S. Congress 1988).

Programs Linked to Student Aid Benefits

The DLC-Nunn-McCurdy bill proposed to convert federal higher education financial aid into an earned benefit available only after providing civilian or military service. Because of the scope of that legislation, it was presented earlier as a national service writ large bill. Other, less ambitious bills in the 101st Congress also sought to link youth service to student benefits. These bills were introduced by Senator Bumpers and Congressman Sikorski, Congresswoman Morella, and Senator Pell.

Loan Forgiveness Bills of Bumpers and Sikorski -- A set of bills sponsored by Senator Dale Bumpers (D-AR) originated with Chuck Ludlum, a member of the Senator's staff. As a student of Stanford University in the 1960s, Ludlum had spent three summers interning for the Congress. Following college, he served in the Peace Corps. By the 1980s, he was working for Senator Bumpers as Tax Counsel on the Committee for Small Business. In his spare time, he worked with Stanford University's internship program that sent approximately 150 students to work on Capitol Hill each summer.

In 1985, a Stanford student asked Ludlum for information on a federal law permitting student loan deferment for youths who did full-time volunteer work following college. Ludlum found that a law had been passed by Congress in 1980 but that, under the Reagan Administration, the Department of Education had never issued rules and regulations for the program. He proposed that Bumpers introduce a bill to force the Department of Education to advertise the existing program. He also promoted college loan deferment or partial loan cancellation for youth service activities. Congress had passed a similar bill sponsored by Senator Dodd in the previous Congress that applied only to youths who served in the Peace Corps or became VISTA volunteers following college (Thomma 1987; Ludlum Interview 1991).

Bumpers adopted Ludlum's proposal in 1987 and introduced S. 759 and S. 760 in the 100th Congress. These bills would have required dissemination of information by the U.S. Department of Education regarding the existing student loan deferment and student loan cancellation programs. They would also have established a program of partial federal student loan forgiveness for college graduates who performed full-time service following graduation. Fifteen percent of the student's loan would be cancelled for each of the first two years of service; another twenty percent would be forgiven for the third and fourth years of service. The bills were drafted as amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Modified versions of these bills, S. 539, S. 540, and S. 541, were reintroduced in the 101st Congress. S. 539, the Student Loan Deferment and Community Service Act of 1989, required the Department of Education to publicize the fact that a program already provided deferment of government student loans if an individual worked in a low-paid, full-time position with a community service organization. S. 540, the Perkins Loan Forgiveness and

Community Service Act of 1989, extended the forgiveness of Perkins loans (the National Defense Student Loans) already on the books for Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers to include individuals who performed comparable service with any tax-exempt community service organization. S. 541, the Stafford Loan Forgiveness and Community Service Act of 1989, extended the program to Stafford loans as well as Perkins loans.

Sikorski Sponsors Companion Bill to Bumpers' Proposal --

Congressman Jerry Sikorski (D-MN) liked Bumpers' bills and introduced them in the House in the 100th Congress as H.R. 2156 and H.R. 2157. Sikorski was very supportive of youth service programs in Minnesota. Indeed, one member of Sikorski's staff had completed 40 hours of community service in order to graduate from high school (Peterson Interview 1991).

Using his chairmanship of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee's Subcommittee on Human Resources, Sikorski convened the first hearing on youth service bills held during the 100th Congress. Witnesses at the April 29, 1987, hearing included bill sponsors Panetta, Bumpers, Torricelli, and McCurdy (U.S. Congress 1987a). Sikorski also testified on his bills at a hearing of the House Education and Labor Committee on June 30, 1987 (U.S. Congress 1987b) and held a field hearing on youth service on November 13, 1987, in St. Paul, MN (U.S. Congress 1987c). When Bumpers revised and reintroduced his bills at the start of the 101st Congress, Sikorski sponsored the same bills in the House of Representatives as H.R. 3039, H.R. 3040, and H.R. 3041.

Morella's Peace Corps Training Bill -- In June, 1987, Congresswoman Constance Morella (R-MD) introduced H.R. 2632, the Peace Corps Volunteer Education Demonstration Act. The idea for this bill came from a speech by The Rev. Hesburgh, Retired President of University of Notre Dame. Hesburgh laid out his proposal in a speech at Arlington Cemetery in September, 1986, during a memorial service for Americans who had died serving as Peace Corps volunteers (McCarthy 1987). Morella's bill was referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs which had jurisdiction over the Peace Corps.

Morella's bill was modeled on the ROTC. It sought to establish a \$5 million annual demonstration project that paid the education costs of undergraduates in their last two years of college in exchange for three years of Peace Corps service. A secondary goal of the bill was increased participation in the Peace Corps by African-Americans; one of the five colleges selected to participate in the demonstration program was to be a historically black college. The bill was similar to one introduced in the Senate three months earlier by Senator Pell (see below).

An amended version of Morella's bill passed the House in the 100th Congress but was never considered by the Senate. The Congresswoman reintroduced her Peace Corps bill in the 101st Congress as H.R. 985, the Peace Corps Volunteer Education Demonstration Program Act. Morella always thought of her bill as a Peace Corps bill -- not as a youth service bill (Powers Interview 1991). It was frequently grouped with youth service bills in bill summaries and other legislative analyses, however, and a version of Morella's proposal was included in the final youth service bill that passed the Congress in 1990.

Pell's College-Linked Service Demonstration Program -- With Campus Compact headquartered at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, it is not surprising that Senator Claiborne Pell (D-RI) also got interested in sponsoring a national service bill around this time. In 1986, Pell and David Evans of his staff met in Newport, RI, with Susan Stroud, Frank Newman,

and Howard Swearer to draft a national service proposal. The bill was introduced in March, 1987, as S. 762, the Voluntary National Service and Education Demonstration Program Act (Flanagan Interview 1991). At the time the bill was introduced, Pell said

My own personal belief is that the United States should have a system of mandatory national service that would apply to everyone. It would involve either military or civilian service and would apply to man and woman alike. While I am strongly committed to this idea, I am also a realist (Pell 1987).

Instead, Pell proposed a demonstration program that would provide educational assistance to participants after they had completed civilian or military service. The bill contained two parts. Title I offered a demonstration program of two years of service for two years of higher education financial aid. Any high school graduate was eligible to participate. Volunteers received a monthly stipend of \$600 per month plus an end-of-service voucher of up to \$7,200 per year. The bill authorized \$30 million for FY 88 through FY 93. It was the staff's expectation that youths would participate in the program after they had completed two years of the college (Flanagan Interview 1991). Title II of Pell's bill set forth a program intended to increase the numbers of youth who volunteered for the Peace Corps -- especially minority youth. This Peace Corps plan was originally proposed by the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh (see Morella bill above).

Pell reintroduced his demonstration program bill -- without the Peace Corps component -- in the 101st Congress as S. 576. This version again sought to test on a small scale the idea of linking community based service programs with post-service educational financial benefits. Participants would work full-time for at least two years before receiving post-secondary tuition benefits or funds to participate in a state approved apprenticeship program. Pell saw the DLC's proposal as going to the heart of everything he believed in and had worked for in making college affordable and accessible to all young Americans (Pell 1989). Unlike the DLC bill, Pell's bill had no effect on current federal student aid programs. Pell's bill was introduced in the House during the 101st Congress by Congressman Robert Garcia (D-NY) as H.R. 1615; Garcia's bill was similar to Pell's except that it would have allowed high school dropouts to participate.

School-Based Youth Service Proposals

The concept of service-learning had been promoted from time to time by members of Congress and education advocates (see Eberly's work at ACTION in the early 1970s). In the mid-1980s, governors and others focused attention on the need for increased funding and reform in the nation's public school system. Programs were proposed that would increase the numbers and role of volunteers in public schools. The proposals were not thought of by their sponsors as "national service" or "youth service" bills and few of these bills found their way into the final bill passed by Congress. The exception was Kennedy's S. 650. Drafted in March, 1989, and aimed primarily at primary and secondary school students, it also included a wide range of program options.

Congressman Atkins' Volunteers in the Schools Bill -- A legislative aide to Congressman Atkins believed that the Congressman sponsored the Business and Citizen School Volunteers of America Act of 1987 at the request of an interest group, the National Association of Partners in Education

(NAPE). The Congressman's father had been an assistant principal and Atkins was a big supporter of school programs. He reintroduced his bill in the 101st Congress as H.R. 2137.

This bill provided federal financial assistance to public school districts to establish programs in schools that would utilize volunteers from local businesses as well as private citizens; Atkins was always interested in ways to get area businesses to invest in schools. He considered his bill an education bill rather than a youth service bill (Kessler Interview 1991).

Chiles-Graham Senate Bill -- A Senate version of Atkins' bill was sponsored by Senator Lawton Chiles (D-FL) in the 100th Congress. When Chiles retired from the Senate in 1988, Senator Bob Graham (D-FL) sponsored the bill in the 101st Congress as S. 382.

A range of factors led Graham to sponsor this bill. A former Chiles staff person working for NAPE asked the Senator to sponsor Chiles' bill. As Governor, Graham had been impressed by a Navy program in Florida that enabled military personnel to tutor and mentor at-risk school children. The Senator's wife had a strong interest in education policy. Graham felt Florida was blessed with untapped talent in the form of retirees. Finally, Graham often spoke of his belief that government should lead by example -- government agencies and employees should serve as positive role models for society in general and youth in particular.

Graham promoted his bill as a best way to encourage voluntarism and providing positive role models for students. The bill would have provided opportunities for senior citizens, business people, and college students to work with youths part-time in the school setting.

Senator Domenici's "Kids Helping Kids" -- Senator Pete Domenici (R-AZ) introduced S. 689, the Kids Helping Kids Act of 1989. Drafted by Michelle Mrdeza on Domenici's staff, the bill amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by adding a 5-year demonstration program to provide grants to local education agencies to establish and operate programs involving students in public and community service. The target population was high school juniors and seniors.

The bill's goal was to strengthen traditional family values plus volunteerism was seen as a way to do something about social problems while strengthening a sense of community involvement. Domenici never saw his bill as part of the national service debate. Sponsored by a Republican who did not serve on the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee and with no House companion bill, this bill received no attention (Knapp Interview 1991, Mrdeza Interview 1991).

Berman's Youth Service Bill in the 100th Congress -- In the second session of the 100th Congress (October 19, 1988), Congressman Berman (D-CA) introduced H.R. 5535, the Secondary School Community Services Act. The bill's goal was to expand youth community service programs in grades seven through twelve. The Secretary of Education would contract with ten state education agencies -- each of which would contract with four local education agencies to run youth community service programs, monitor activities, and disseminate information about their efforts. The bill would also have funded an information exchange, a database of program material, training programs and curriculum materials development.

Senator Kennedy Offers S. 650 -- The key contribution in the category of school-based youth service bills in the 101st Congress was S. 650, Service America, the Service to America Act of 1989. This bill was introduced in the Senate on March 17, 1989 by Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA). As described in Chapter 8, this bill resulted from constituent

lobbying, staff research, input during a policy dinner on youth service at the Senator's home, and a desire to contribute to the Kennedy legacy of encouraging youth to serve.

The goal of S. 650 was to "foster a lifelong commitment to service by starting service experience at an early age" (Kennedy 1989). The bill increased school-based youth service through grants to educational institutions and community based agencies. It also established a CCC-type youth service corps that would be administered by JTPA. It directed the President to design a comprehensive federal strategy to increase youth service opportunities and funded a national clearinghouse to provide technical assistance, information, and training to states and communities. The bill's target population was students from Kindergarten through college; it also funded full-time service corps for out-of-school youth and summer service opportunities for all youth. Because of his interest in intergenerational relationships, service opportunities were also available for adults and senior citizens. Finally, the bill called for a program of national recognition awards.

Rep. Owens Adopts Kennedy's Bill -- In 1989 and 1990, Shirley Sagawa was the Kennedy staff person on the Labor and Human Resources Committee who worked most directly on youth service legislation. In early 1989, Sagawa met with staff of Congressman Major Owens (D-NY), Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Select Education, to discuss the possibility of Owens introducing the companion bill to S. 650. A few days later, Sagawa called Owens' staff to say that the Kennedy bill was being rewritten and that Congressman Bill Ford would probably sponsor the House version of Kennedy's bill. Kennedy had asked the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Augustus ("Gus") Hawkins, to sponsor his bill but Hawkins had refused. Ford was next in line to chair the full Committee and advocates with People for the American Way had convinced Ford to sponsor Kennedy's bill (Goetz Interview 1991, Sagawa Interview 1991).

Congressman Owens liked much of the Kennedy proposal and told his staff to go ahead and introduce it in his name anyway. On April 13, 1989, Owens introduced a modified version of S. 650 as H.R. 1947. Title I of Owens' bill was similar to Kennedy's bill. Titles II through IV differed in that they would have increased the authorization levels and service years for VISTA and appropriated money for the University Year for ACTION.

Congressman Ford showed less enthusiasm. He viewed Dave McCurdy's bill, H.R. 660, as a back door technique to get money for the armed services. He had no interest in national service except as it linked to the needs of inner city youth. According to Ford's staff, the Congressman introduced a House version of Kennedy's bill, H.R. 2591, only as a courtesy to Senator Kennedy and only after McCurdy's proposal, H.R. 660, was clearly defeated in the House. Ford made no effort to advance the bill in the House (Wolanin Interview 1991).

Continuum of Service Bills

As youth service legislation advanced during the 101st Congress, first Senator Kennedy (as Chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee) and later Congressman Hawkins (as Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee) sponsored compromise bills S. 1430 and H.R. 4330 respectively. Because these bills contained a range of types of youth service, Senator Mikulski and others described these bills as offering a continuum of youth service opportunities.

Many Senators and their staffs helped draft the final Senate youth service compromise bill. Numerous interest groups and other experts were consulted for input but the construction of S. 1430, the National and Community Service Act of 1989, was a process of bargaining and compromise among Senators sponsoring bills and the ranking Republican on Kennedy's Committee, Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT).

In the House, drafting a final bill fell to the Education and Labor Committee Chairman, Augustus (Gus) Hawkins (D-CA). As discussed in Chapter 8, Hawkins eventually gave a member of the Committee staff, Gene Sofer, the green light to put together a House bill. Sofer met privately with four politically savvy youth service advocates who Sofer liked and trusted; together they wrote the House bill.

Congressman McCurdy had previously introduced a youth service bill. When the Senate passed Kennedy's continuum bill, S. 1430, McCurdy introduced the exact same bill in the House as H.R. 3807. McCurdy wrote to Chairman Hawkins requesting a hearing on this bill, but Hawkins ignored McCurdy's request.

Bill Content: Similarities and Differences

Up to now, youth service proposals have been classified according to the sub-group within the youth service policy community that advocated the activity. Some insights can be gained from looking for patterns in the content of these bills. This section reviews each type of legislation (full-time national service writ large, part-time national service writ large, CCC-type youth corps, service tied to student aid benefits, school-based programs, and pure voluntarism) in terms of the target population, time commitment involved, incentives offered participants, the model or inspiration for the service type, the advocacy groups that supported the idea, linkages to federal agencies, and the social construction of the proposed program's target population.

Full-Time National Service Writ Large -- This category of service is best represented by the DLC-Nunn-McCurdy proposals, S. 3 and H.R. 660, and by Senator Pell's national service demonstration bill, S. 576. Summaries of these bills are presented in Table 6.

The target population for these bills was high school graduates between the ages of 16 or 17 and 25 (the DLC included some seniors). Pell preferred to target underserved groups. McCurdy and Nunn expected to attract primarily college-bound youth. These programs called for full-time service of one to two years for which the volunteer would be paid a salary during the service and would receive a monetary voucher at the end of the service period. Models that influenced this category include the writings of William James plus the Peace Corps and VISTA. The advocacy groups included the National Service Secretariat, the Coalition for National Service, and the Democratic Leadership Council. The federal agencies linked to these bills were the Peace Corps, VISTA, ACTION and the military.

Over the years, the target population for national service writ large programs was portrayed as draft dodgers, campus trouble makers, unemployed youth, greedy or materialistic Yuppies, and politically apathetic, unpatriotic youth who did not appreciate the benefits associated with being born an American citizen. However, with a target population of all youth within a certain age range, it was impossible to generalize about this group except by age.

Table 6.
 Summary of Major Characteristics of
 Select Full-Time National Service Writ Large
 Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress

Sponsor	Nunn / McCurdy	Pell
Bill No.	S. 3 / H.R. 660	S. 576
Thrust	Education and housing benefits tied to national service	National service demonstration with a Peace Corps section, also
Target Population	Youths 17 and older with a high-school diploma; also, senior citizens.	HS graduates 16-25; esp, underserved groups. Peace Corps: 2 years college
Type of Service	Educational, human, conservation, safety, VISTA & Peace Corps; also military option	All types of service (state higher education agency decides the types)
Length of Service	Civilian: 1 to 2 years of full-time service. Military: 2 years of active duty + 6 years of reserve OR 8 yrs reserve duty	2 full years of service
Incentives	Civilian: \$10,000/year. Military: \$12,000/year for education or housing	\$7,200/year education voucher. Peace Corps: education costs are paid
Stipend	Civilian: \$100/week Military: 66% base pay; Srs: hourly wage	\$600/month
Training	Not specified	Peace Corps: Training provided
Displacement Language	Yes	No
Estimated # of Volunteers	800,000	10,000 (3,500 during the first year)
1st Year Cost/Match	\$5.3 billion* with fedrl financial aid phase out; match = 25% on some costs	\$30 million; \$5 million for Peace Corps program
Federal Admin.	Corporation for National Service	Unspecified
State Administration	Governor prepares State Service plan	
Link to Community	Regional National Service Councils	

* Estimates from Citizenship and National Service (DLC 1988)

Source: Comparison of Senate Bills on Youth Service in the 101st Congress Prepared by staff of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee (Not dated)

Part-Time National Service Writ Large -- Modeled on the National Guard, the Mikulski-Bonior and McCain-Porter proposals called for part-time national service writ large programs. A summary of the major characteristics of these bills is provided in Table 7. While the target population for both bills was all youth, McCain linked his plan to military service. Presumably the target population was self sufficient -- if not financially secure -- since neither bill offered volunteers wages while they were providing service; the bills did, however, provide an end-of-service voucher of \$2,000 to \$3,000 that could be used to offset the costs of education or a first home.

The social construction for the target population of Mikulski's bill was older, college-educated, middle-class youth; Mikulski called them "the good kids." They should have been able to afford a new home but could not. They would normally volunteer but did not because they were strapped with burdensome college tuition debts. McCain put more stress on the rights plus responsibilities theme which gave his target population a social construction that was more consistent with McCurdy-Nunn's apathetic, ungrateful middle-class kids.

CCC-Type Youth Corps -- The major CCC-type bills in the 101st Congress were the Moynihan-Williams bills, S. 232 and H.R. 1408, and the Dodd-Panetta bills, S. 322 and H.R. 717. Summaries of these bills are presented in Table 8.

These bills represented CCC-type youth service as promoted by Syd Howe's Human Environment Center and Peg Rosenberry's National Association of Service and Conservation Corps. Their programs were linked to the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Labor. The target population for youth service programs built on the corps approach were young (generally between the ages of 16 and 25), out-of-school youth.

Modeled on the New Deal CCC, these proposals offered full-time as well as short term opportunities to perform physical labor in closely supervised work teams. Participants were to be paid close to minimum wage during the service period and were also provided (if not required to take) general training courses (literacy, jobs skills, preparation for a GED). These were the only programs that might operate residential programs to take youth out of their home environment. A modest end-of-service stipend was also to be provided.

The social construction of the target population for these bills was generally negative. Historically, the youths who most often chose to participate in CCC-type youth service programs -- especially the full-time programs -- were likely to be economically disadvantaged, members of minority groups, school drop-outs or students labeled as at-risk. They could come out of urban gangs or they might be the off-spring of itinerant farm workers. It is not likely that members of this target population would ever attend college, own a decent house, or participate in volunteer activities.

Student Aid Benefit Programs -- The Bumpers-Sikorski proposals, S. 539, S. 540, and S. 541 and H.R. 3039, H.R. 3040, and H.R. 3041), the Morella bill, H.R. 985, and, also, Senator Pell's bill, S. 576, provided a way for college students to reduce the costs of their education in exchange for service. A summary of major characteristics of these student aid related bills is presented in Table 9. The target population for these bills was college graduates (Bumpers-Sikorski) or college students (Morella, Pell). Full-time service was required although the timing varied. Congresswoman Morella's bill paid for tuition prior to service. Senator Pell's bill required service first (and rewarded the participant with a post-service voucher). The Bumpers

Table 7.
 Summary of Major Characteristics of
 Select Part-Time National Service Writ Large
 Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress

Sponsor	Mikulski / Bonior	McCain / Porter
Bill No.	S. 408 / H.R. 1000	S 781 / HR 1951
Thrust	National Guard model promotion of community service	a) National Guard model b) GI benefits are expanded
Target Population	Open admission; fitness for duty	a) youths age 16 to 26 b) military enlistees
Type of Service	State places volunteer with nonprofit organizations: literacy, health, elderly, public safety, etc.	
Length of Service	3 to 6 years of part-time service: 2 weekends plus 2 weeks OR 9 hours per week average	2 to 4 years part-time (24 hours per month + 2 weeks per year.
Incentives	\$3,000 per year for education or housing voucher	\$2,000 per year for educational or housing voucher
Stipend	none	none
Training	6 weeks required	not specified
Displacement Language	Yes	No
Estimated # of Volunteers	50,000	150,000
1st Year Cost/Match	\$250 million; the state pays the state administrative costs	\$250 million plus such sums as necessary for administration
Federal Administration	Corp for National Community Service	National Service Foundation
State Administration	Governor's designee involved	
Link to Community		

Source: Comparison of Senate Bills on Youth Service in the 101st Congress Prepared by staff of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee (Not dated)

Table 8.
Summary of Major Characteristics of
Select CCC-Type
Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress

Sponsor	Moynihan / Williams	Dodd / Panetta
Bill Number	S. 232 / H.R. 1408	S 322 / HR 717
Thrust	American Conservation Corps (ACC)	ACC plus Youth Service Corps
Target Population	Out-of-school youth aged 16-25 (full-year) or 15-21 (summer-only); special effort to enroll disadvantaged youth	Same including special efforts; must be a HS graduate or have been a HS drop-out for at least 3 months
Type of Service	Improvement of public lands	ACC: Same. Youth Corps: Placed with government agencies, schools, hospitals, etc.
Length of Service	2 years (full-time)	2 years (full-time)
Incentives	95% of pay rate for Grade E-1 members of armed forces less room and board; optional academic credit given	Pay at 50% to 100% of minimum wage. In service job and educational training also provided
Stipend	\$200 per year	100% - 160% of minimum wage for time worked
Training	Required to enhance skills	Same
Displacement Language	Yes	Yes
Estimated # of Volunteers	Not given	13,500 volunteers
1st year cost/match	\$75 million 50%	\$152 million 50%
Federal Administration	Departments of Interior and Agriculture with consultation with Labor	ACC: Same. Youth Corps: Commission on National Service Opportunities
State Administration	Governor's designee	Same
Link to Community	States to provide way that locals can participate	Locals can participate if state opts out

Source. Comparison of Senate Bills on Youth Service in the 101st Congress Prepared by staff of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee (Not dated)

-Sikorski proposals deferred or cancelled existing debts for service following college.

The Morella bill was modeled on the National Guard. The Bumpers-Sikorski bill was modeled on an existing program for Peace Corps and VISTA volunteers; the bill sought to make the same benefits available to a wider population. While Pell's bill echoed several national service writ large proposals of the past; his major contribution was a proposal for a small-scale demonstration program. Advocacy groups for these programs included Campus Compact, the Peace Corps Alumni Association, and Campus Outreach Opportunity League. Federal agencies linked with these proposals were the Department of Education and the Peace Corps.

Can any generalizations be drawn about the social construction of the target populations of these programs? Peace Corps volunteers are traditionally older, better educated, and white (although Morella's bill also targeted African-Americans). The other two bills were targeted to youths who were sufficiently successful in life to have completed at least a few years of college.

School-Based Proposals -- The only bill promoting school-based service-learning programs was Kennedy's S. 650. Domenici's S. 689 and the Graham-Atkins bills, S. 382 and H.R. 2137, can also be grouped in this category. Summaries of these bills are presented in Table 10.

Kennedy's bill targeted youth from kindergarten through college. The service would be performed part-time and included a broad range of activities. The bill was modeled on existing programs. He was particularly familiar with the Springfield, MA, school district program, the Boston area program run by Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, and the privately-funded City Year program in Boston, MA. The federal agency likely to be involved was the Department of Education. Advocacy groups supporting his bill were from schools administering school-based programs.

The social construction of the target population for Kennedy's bill was quite different from all other youth service bills. At the press conference to announce this bill on February 21, 1989, Kennedy said,

Too often, young people are not asked to serve. They are viewed as part of the problem, not part of the solution... Youth are a powerful resource that is largely untapped (1989, p. 1).

A senior youth service advocate characterized Kennedy's contribution to the youth service debate.

I think what he wanted to do was to get this universal idea where it is not just the college elite who go off to the Peace Corps but young people in the inner city... turning their lives around and feeling as though they do have something to contribute... He saw that we were overlooking a tremendous potential in youth. It's not that kids need to be fixed, we just haven't given them the opportunity to be needed (Halperin Interview 1991).

Kennedy's bill provided no economic incentives such as wages and post-service vouchers. Youths participated because they wanted to, because it was a good thing to do, and because their talents were needed and appreciated.

Table 9.
 Summary of Major Characteristics of
 Select Student Aid Related
 Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress

Sponsor	Bumpers / Sikorski	Pell	Morella
Bill No.	S. 539 to 541 / H.R. 3039 to 3041	S. 576	H.R. 985
Thrust	Student loan deferment or forgiveness for services provided	National Service Demonstration with a Peace Corps section, also.	Peace Corps Voluntary Education Demonstration Program
Target Population	College graduates with student loans	HS graduates 16-25; esp., underserved groups; Peace Corps: 2 years of college	Undergraduates in final 2 years of college study
Type of Service	Peace Corps, VISTA, service with non-profit organizations	All types of service (state higher education agency decides the types)	After college, 3 years of service in the Peace Corps
Length of Service	At least 1 full year of service	2 full years of service	3 years Peace Corps service
Incentives	Deferment or partial cancellation of student loans	\$600 per month Peace Corps: education costs are paid	2 years of college; then regular Peace Corps benefits
Stipend	None	\$7,200/year education voucher	
Training		Peace Corps training	Peace Corps training
Displacement Language	No	No	
Estimated # of Volunteers	Unspecified	10,000 (3,500 first year)	1,000 in first year
1st Year Cost/Match		\$30 million; \$5 million for Peace Corps program	\$5 million in first year
Federal Administration	U.S. Department of Education	Unspecified	Peace Corps
State Administration	None		
Link to Community	Unspecified		Unspecified

Source. Comparison of Senate Bills on Youth Service in the 101st Congress Prepared by staff of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee (Not dated)

Table 10.
 Summary of Major Characteristics of
 Select School-Based
 Youth Service Bills in the 101st Congress

Sponsor	Graham / Atkins	Kennedy	Donenici
Bill No.	S. 382 / H.R. 2137	S. 650	S. 689
Thrust	Business and Citizen Volunteers in Schools	Serve America: The Service To America Act	Kids Helping Kids
Target Population	Seniors, businesses, college students	Students K thru college; also, out-of-school youth	HS juniors & seniors
Type of Service	Volunteering in public schools	Community service: All types	Tutoring, mentoring
Length of Service	Unspecified; Part-time	Ongoing Part-time	Unspecified Part-time
Incentives	No financial incentives	Optional academic credit	No \$ incentive
Stipend	None	None	None
Training	Program managers (optional)	Required (all)	
Displacement Language	No	Yes	
Estimated # of Volunteers	Unspecified	2.5 million	Unspecified
1st Year Cost/Match	\$5 million No match required	\$100 million 80% (declining)	Unspecified
Federal Administration	U.S. Department of Education	U.S. Department of Education; consult ACTION	Department of Education
State Administration	State education agency eligible grantee	State education and higher education agencies	Unspecified
Link to Community	Locals design the projects	Same	

Source. Comparison of Senate Bills on Youth Service in the 101st Congress Prepared by staff of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee (Not dated)

Voluntarism -- There is one other type of youth service that has only been touched upon so far: the traditional voluntarism that was the basis for Bush's "thousand points of light" and his YES to America proposal. The time commitment for this form of service was part-time and the model could have been any of the examples Noonan listed in Bush's nomination acceptance speech. No government agency was involved and no natural advocacy group lobbied against other youth service proposals in favor of voluntarism. The specifics of a federal program promoting voluntarism did not take shape until after Bush entered the White House, but Bush did insist from the start that his proposal would never include economic incentives.

The social construction of the target population for Bush's vision of voluntarism was very broad but generally involved privileged youth. Unlike the youth who needed to be forced for their own good into a mandatory, universal program of national service writ large, Bush's volunteers represented one's friends, neighbors, and relatives.

Summary and Conclusions

By early, 1989, most of the youth service bills that would be considered during the 101st Congress were in place. While still fragmented, the youth service policy community had presented a relatively unified front during the 1988 presidential campaign and was dividing its attention between the Bush White House and the Congress. The various ideas about youth service were also fully developed by the late 1980s.

Bill Origins -- Where did these bills in the 101st Congress come from and who was actually involved in drafting the bills? The standard CCC-type youth service bills were simply modified versions of bills from previous Congresses; Moynihan, Martinez, and Panetta essentially reintroduced earlier versions of their bills. Many members picked up and sponsored bills that had been introduced by others. While their staffs may have had some small role in developing the final wording for the version of the bill introduced in the 101st Congress, Bonior, Dodd, Ford, Porter, and Sikorski introduced companion bills developed by others; Kennelly and Owens sponsored reworked versions of the DLC bill and Kennedy's S. 650 respectively. For the above bills, staff were sometimes involved in bill modification; Kennelly and Owens both had input about how and why to modify bills drafted by others.

A second category of youth service bills in the 101st Congress was bills introduced at the request of individuals or groups. At the urging of the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, Williams assumed the mantle of responsibility for CCC-type programs previously worn by Congressmen Seiberling and Udall. As Pell had done earlier, Morella put Father Hesburgh's idea for a Peace Corps ROTC-type program into bill form. Pell's bill had considerable input from two youth service advocates in his state: Brown University's Howard Swearer and Campus Compact. Atkins and, to a lesser degree, Graham introduced their bills at the urging of the National Association of Partners in Education (NAPE).

Two bills were originally conceived by a member's staff. Domenici's staff developed and presented to the Senator an innovative legislative proposal on an issue known to interest the Senator. The bill was never considered by Domenici or his staff to be a youth service bill, however (Mrdeza Interview 1991). In the case of the Bumpers bills, it took Chuck Ludlum several years to interest Bumpers in sponsoring his ideas.

Four proposals -- bills by Nunn and McCurdy, Mikulski, McCain, and Kennedy -- were drafted at the direct instigation of and with major

involvement by members of Congress. McCain essentially turned the task over to Rosacker but controlled the final wording. While Mikulski may have derived her idea from readings and conversations, she brought her idea to her staff and was heavily involved in crafting a program design that had a strong chance of meeting her goals. DLC staff worked with members of Congress and their staffs to develop a major, comprehensive national service proposal. Kennedy solicited input from trusted sources; then turned the drafting of his first bill, S. 650, over to his staff (who continued to work closely with numerous youth service advocates during the bill drafting phase).

No youth service bill drafter worked completely from scratch. Everyone interviewed in this study said they studied at least one -- and often, many -- previous youth service bills introduced in the Congress. In most instances, the "new bills" were modifications of prior bills and represented only minor incremental changes. Even the Bumpers bills extended the scope of a previous bill by Senator Dodd. Innovative contributions came from the DLC with its linkage to the federal higher education student aid program (although McCurdy's bill in the 100th Congress had proposed a similar idea), Mikulski's proposal for a part-time national service writ large program based on the National Guard model, and Kennedy's proposal to expand both the number of school-based youth service opportunities and extend participation to students as young as kindergartners.

Members' Motivations -- Despite Eberly's effort to down play any link to the armed forces, all of the national service writ large proposals were directly or indirectly linked with the military. McCurdy, McCain, and Nunn served on the Armed Services Committees in their respective chambers. Nunn was concerned with issues of equity in the military and McCurdy often discussed military manpower concerns. Porter's support for national service was also linked to his own experience serving in the military.

Mikulski's National Guard model suggested a military over tone, but the Senator was actually motivated to introduced her bill by a desire to stimulate neighborhood activism and promote a sense of community.

The motivations were more diverse for sponsors of CCC-type youth service bills. Moynihan's initial involvement followed concern by a mayor who saw value in the federal YCC and YACC programs. Panetta and Martinez were familiar with highly successful programs in their home state of California. Dodd had a Peace Corps background and, at the time, a state level CCC-type program in Connecticut as a program model.

Turf protection was a motivation for a number of members of Congress who sponsored bills. Williams sponsored a bill in the House largely to protect organized labor interests. Dodd wanted to be involved in the policy debate so that he could protect his jurisdictional territory including the Peace Corps. Owens wanted to protect VISTA and ACTION, two federal programs that fall under the jurisdiction of the Select Education Subcommittee, which Congressman Owens chaired. Pell believed that youth should serve their country either in the military or through community service and often cited the example of national service programs in European nations. Yet Pell also had a long record of support for higher education financial aid programs. Pell

was very much opposed to Nunn's bill; he thought it went to the heart of all he had done in education. (Flanagan Interview 1991).

A number of bill sponsors were bolstered in their views if not inspired to introduce a youth service bill by familiarity with successful youth service programs in their home states. Brown University's program was in Pell's state. There were numerous school-based programs in Sikorski's state of Minnesota. Kennedy could look to City Year, the Springfield school district program, and the Thomas Jefferson Forum projects, to name just a few Massachusetts-based service organizations. A school-based program in Mikulski's state of Maryland was receiving considerable praise in 1989.

Thus, while there were many motivating factors, two that were found in all three subgroups were a familiarity with working programs and an interest in protecting one's turf. By introducing a youth service bill, many members assured that they would at least have an opportunity to participate in the youth service policy debate.

Opportunities (and Lost Opportunities) to Promote Bills -- It was hard for some members to advance their bills because they did not serve on the primary committee of jurisdiction. Martinez was the only early proponent of youth service to serve on the House Education and Labor Committee. Later bill sponsors who served on the committee were Williams, Owens, Ford, Gaydos, and Hawkins; none was strongly committed to the idea of youth service. On the Senate side, Nunn, Moynihan, Bumpers, Graham, McCain and Domenici did not serve on the Labor and Human Resources Committee. That left the major role in drafting a youth service bill to those Democrats who both introduced a youth service bill and who also served on the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. This group included Senators Kennedy, Mikulski, Dodd, and Pell. Nunn and Panetta, as well as Kennelly, might have taken a greater role but they were preoccupied during the youth service debate with other matters. Still, many members of Congress pursued strategies for advancing the prospects of bill passage (see Chapter 8).

Youth Service Ideas Viewed Over Time -- Kingdon argues that it is less important to understand a bill's origin than to understand why a bill takes on a specific form. However, attempting to trace a bill's origin can help explain its nature, evolution, and prospects for passage. As Schick reminds us, "every policy has a past and that past influences both what is now and what might be" (1991).

For example, if one were to simply describe the various incentives for participation included in youth service bills in the 101st Congress, that list would include modest stipends, job readiness training, partial college loan debt cancellation, vocational training, end-of-service vouchers for home purchase, and academic credit. This list suggests that, when youth service rose on the policy agenda and the number of bills introduced skyrocketed, the resulting set of bills provided the Congress with a remarkably wide range of alternatives and options from which to choose. But when the bills are sorted according to type of program (as has been done here), it is seen that the incentives can be classified separately by the type of youth service advocated. Other bill characteristics, including advocacy group support, federal agency, and the social construction of the target population, also vary by the type of youth service proposed.

What the Congress had at the beginning of the 101st Congress was not a wide range of twenty to thirty interesting, innovative youth service proposals. Rather, it was being asked to choose amongst several different types of service activity -- each of which carried with it a different social construction of the target population. If a member of Congress traditionally looked out for the underprivileged in society and that Member had to choose between the youth service options offered, he or she would likely opt for a

CCC-type bill. On the other hand, a Member with an interest in education policy would prefer Kennedy's school-based bill.

In January, 1989, there was not a unified consensus (what Kingdon calls "mainstream thinking") among the members of the youth service policy community about what legislative proposal to support. Two weeks after the Washington Post published Senator Mikulski's Op-Ed piece, the newspaper ran a reply by Donald Eberly entitled "A Hollow National Service Plan." He criticized her proposal for being overly costly, failing to provide stipends to volunteers and an opportunity to live away from home during the service period, and failing to realize that part-time workers are insufficient to address certain needed problems (Eberly 1988). He proposed instead a program of national service writ large. His Coalition for National Service had previously asked the DLC not to introduce a bill based on their "Blue Book" proposal. Youth Service America felt that Kennedy's initial bill was too close to Bush's noblesse oblige voluntarism approach and worried that Bush would propose a program that,

by vacuuming up all available funds, could put the organizations that have created the youth service field -- COOL, Campus Compact, Youth Service America, the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps -- out of business (Streams 1989, p. 1).

Rather than ask members of Congress to choose from among the various program types, Senator Mikulski proposed what she called a "continuum-of-services" bill. She and Senator Kennedy visualized a bill that offered a variety of types of service activities (full-time, part-time, CCC-type, school-based, etc.) for the full range of target populations (young, old, educated, disadvantaged, etc.). Kingdon argues that

ideas, proposals, or issues may rise into and fall from favor from time to time...Proposals may not come back in the same form; rather, they are recast, combined with something else, or attached to a problem different from the one they started with (1984, p. 149).

But, in the case of youth service bills, there was surprisingly little modification or recombination over time. No advocacy group or sub-group of the youth service policy community was willing to give ground in the battle for limited federal funds. Instead, a national understanding of what youth service comprised would be communicated by a few members of Congress who were determined to forge a continuum-of-services bill. This chapter has concentrated on actors and bill content. Chapter 8 describes the opportunities utilized and strategies employed by Nunn, Mccurdy, Kennedy, Mikulski, Martinez, Hawkins, and others to pass a youth service bill in the 101st Congress.

Chapter 8.
Enacting Youth Service
Legislation in the 101st Congress

In 1989, powerful policy makers set youth service high on the national policy agenda. No one waited for a window of opportunity to open (although Senator Kennedy showed great patience and diplomacy in hopes President Bush would not shut the youth service window of opportunity by deciding to veto Congressional legislation). The efforts of Mikulski, Nunn, Martinez, and especially Kennedy confirm the significant role that individuals play in the policy process.

In typical Kennedy fashion, the staff of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee worked to construct legislation that reflected characteristics of the range of youth service proposals introduced in the 101st Congress. The very nature of a "continuum bill" resulted in broadening the target population until the Senate bill's positive social construction balanced with the House's desire to focus public resources on disadvantaged youth. Needy youth could be served by the programs without being labeled or stigmatized as at-risk youth.

This chapter describes the events during the 101st Congress (1989-1990) that led to the passage of PL 101-610, the National and Community Service Act of 1990. A listing of the major events during this period is presented in Table 11.

Start of the 101st Congress

In January, 1989, the DLC-McCurdy-Nunn national service proposal received considerable attention. Incoming Senate Leader George Mitchell (D-ME) assigned Nunn's legislation a priority bill number (S. 3) and stated in his maiden speech as Senate Majority Leader that it was

time to reactivate our idealism and the traditional American commitment to giving a helping hand. A program of voluntary national service is one way to do that. We will give a high priority to developing such a program in this Congress" (NSN 1989, p. 1).

The controversial Nunn bill generated attention. Kuntz observed "The bill hit a nerve. It challenged the very premise of the nation's student aid system" (Kuntz 1989a, p. 645). DLC members held press conferences on their Citizen Corps proposal and made appearances on the dinner circuit. Senators Nunn and Robb appeared on the Today Show on January 4, 1989, to discuss the DLC proposal (Washington Post 1989). Al From publicized Nunn's bill at the DLC's annual conference in Philadelphia on March 25, 1989; he called national service "a cornerstone...It's not the whole building, but it demonstrates an ethic" (National Journal 1989a). The Atlantic Council hosted a Security Issues Forum on National Service on February 23, 1989, in the Dirksen Senate Office Building that featured Robb, McCurdy, and McCain speaking in favor of national service and Doug Bandow, Richard Danzig, and Elliot Feldman speaking against the proposal. But the critical

Table 11.
Chronology of Events
Leading to Passage of PL 101-610
During the 101st Congress

1989

- 1-12 Bush appoints Petersmeyer as the service contact
- 2-13 Kennedy hosts youth service dinner party
- 2-21 Kennedy press conference on his bill, S. 650
- 3- 9 First Senate Labor and Human Resources (L&HR) Committee hearing
- 3-14 Second Senate L&HR Committee hearing
- 3-20 Third Senate L&HR Committee hearing (Dorchester, MA)
- 3-15 First House Education and Labor (Ed and Labor) Committee hearing
- 3-25 Hawkins declares HR 660 "dead" in the House
- 4-21 Fourth Senate L&HR Committee hearing
- 4-19 Second House Ed and Labor Committee hearing
- 4-28 Congressman Martinez' field hearing, San Francisco, CA
- 6-21 Kick off for Bush's YES Initiative at White House
- 6-23 Congressman Martinez' field hearing, Los Angeles, CA
- 6-28 Third House Ed & Labor Committee hearing
- 7-21 Kennedy notifies White House he plans to move youth service bill
- 7-27 Senate press conference on "continuum" bill, S. 1430
- 8- 2 Senate L&HR Committee markup of S. 1430 (passed 11-4)
- 10-23 Bush announces establishment of "Kean Commission"
- 10-26 Senate L&HR Committee releases report on S. 1430
- 11-22 Bush begins issuing daily Point of Light Awards

1990

- 1- 4 Kean Commission issues report with recommendations
- 1-17 Kennedy tells Bush S. 1430 scheduled for floor debate
- 2- 9 OMB issues administration statement opposing S. 1430
- 2-26 Full Senate begins debate on S. 1430
- 3- 1 Senate passes amended version of S. 1430 (78-19)
- 3- 7 S. 1430 referred to House Ed and Labor Committee
- 3-21 Hawkins sponsors H.R. 4330
- 5-17 House Ed and Labor Committee hearing on H.R. 4330
- 7-12 House Ed and Labor Committee markup of H.R. 4330
- 7-17 House Ed and Labor passes H.R. 4330 by voice vote
- 9-13 House considers/amends/passes H.R. 4330 by voice vote
- 10-12 Kennedy/Hatch/White House strike compromise; conferees
approve youth service conference report
- 10-16 Senate approves Conference Committee report (75-21)
- 10-24 House approves Conference Committee report (235-186)
- 11-16 President signs youth service legislation as PL 101-610

player in the youth service debate during the 101st Congress would be Senator Edward ("Ted") Kennedy (D-MA).

Kennedy Enters the Youth Service Debate

Service programs were a family legacy and Kennedy chaired the Senate Committee to which youth service bills were regularly referred. Kennedy assigned Shirley Sagawa to draft a youth service bill for him to introduce. Through hearings and negotiations, it was soon evident that Kennedy's committee would produce a bill with a range of youth service activities.

Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources -- As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Kennedy chose to personally control innovative education proposals that came before his committee. He directed the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities to handle reauthorization bills while all new education programs were to be managed at the full committee level. To handle that function, Kennedy had assembled a personal staff with education expertise that worked directly for him at the full committee level; these individuals were known as "the Kennedy education staff" (Sagawa Interview 1991, Flanagan Interview 1991).

Kennedy had wanted to sponsor a youth service bill for some time. Every six months or so, a friend or constituent would send the Senator a national service proposal with a note urging that he introduce a bill (Sagawa Interview 1991). One example was a note from Sargent Shriver dated February 2, 1987, that included a copy of The Rev. Theodore Hesburgh's September, 1986, Peace Corps Memorial speech. Shriver wrote

Here's an excellent, easy-to-read, lucid proposal written by Father Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame. Do you think his suggestion could be incorporated into successful legislation? (Shriver 1987).

Kennedy would pass such correspondence on to his staff with a directive to look into the topic of youth service.

But when the Democrats regained control of the Senate in 1986, Kennedy's Committee had a backlog of issues including to be addressed including child care, family medical leave, and several labor law bills. In addition, prior to the 101st Congress, the Kennedy education staff was divided into working groups according to issue areas and the topic of national service did not fit naturally into any area.

Shirley Sagawa joined the Kennedy education staff in 1988 and was assigned child care legislation. This topic crossed the existing staff jurisdictional lines. Sagawa recalled that in early 1989

one of those memos [about youth service] floated over to somebody else in my office. I grabbed it and said, "I'll look into this." No one objected because the others were so busy at that time and because Nunn's bill was viewed with suspicion by some of the education people (Sagawa Interview 1991).

Even before Sagawa took up the policy issue, Kennedy was involved in a jurisdictional dispute over youth service legislation. Senate rules state that all tax-related bills must be referred to the Senate Finance Committee. Because a small section in Nunn's bill provided a tax exemption for certain subsidies, the Senate Parliamentarian planned to refer Nunn's bill to the

Finance Committee. Kennedy and Senator Claiborne Pell (who chaired the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities) feared that if Finance got control of youth service bills, it would argue in the future that it should also get student financial aid bills because some college aid (for example, guaranteed student loans) is also not taxable. Members of the Labor and Human Resources Committee did not want to see that precedent set. After a heated debate, Kennedy and Pell convinced the Parliamentarian to refer S. 3 to Kennedy's committee (Staff Interviews 1991, Streams 1989b).

Drafting a Kennedy Youth Service Bill -- Sagawa gathered information, met with experts, reviewed legislation, and consulted with constituents. On the evening of February 13, 1989, Senator Kennedy hosted a "National Community Service Dinner" at his home in Washington, D.C. He often hosted such issue dinners to discuss ideas. According to a staff briefing memo, the dinner was "designed to give you an overview of the issues involved in creating a national/community service plan" (Sagawa and Hartle 1989).

At the dinner were Senator Kennedy, Harris Wofford, Sam Halperin, Peg Rosenberry, Jeff Coolidge (the founder of the Thomas Jefferson Forum in Boston), Bill Taylor (a Kennedy friend who had urged him to include People for the American Way at the dinner), and Melan Verveer with People For the American Way.

Melan Verveer pitched school-based programs as a way to educate children about citizenship. Others argued that young people should have a part to play in providing service and being needed by their communities; they should be viewed as a resource. Peg Rosenberry gave examples of ways that states integrate youth corps into agency activities. Harris Wofford spoke of the advantages of linking service with job training. Why not have youths learn carpentry skills while building low income housing? The group discussed existing programs and what was known about the best ways to utilize youth (Littlefield Interview 1991). One participant later noted that "everything talked about, where there was general agreement, ended up in the legislation" (Rosenberry Interview 1991, Sagawa Interview 1991).

Also in attendance at the policy dinner were several members of Kennedy's staff including Shirley Sagawa, Terry Hartle, Cary Parker, and the new Chief of Staff of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, Nick Littlefield. It was Littlefield's first day on the job and he took careful notes throughout the evening. He left the dinner excited about youth service and made it a committee priority.

Eight days later, the Senator held a press conference to announce his youth service bill, S. 650, Service America, the Service to America Act. The press packet contained a bill summary and letters of endorsement from 22 organizations. Kennedy noted the accomplishments of youths in service corps around the nation and introduced youth in the room from programs in Maryland, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. The excited youths were proudly dressed in their corps uniforms (Littlefield Interview 1991).

The Senator's bill reflected a positive social construction of youth. At the press conference, he said that

Too often, young people are not asked to serve. They are viewed as part of the problem, not part of the solution. And that easily becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy...we do not have to compel young American's to serve their country. All we have to do is ask -- and provide the opportunity (Kennedy 1989a).

A Kennedy "Dear Colleague" letter soliciting bill cosponsors stressed that the bill would show youth "that they can make a significant difference in the lives of others" (Kennedy 1989b). The view of youth as resources was in character. Kennedy is naturally fond of children. One advocate noted "we brought in innumerable young people to testify before his committee. He found their particular stories incredibly compelling...He would gravitate towards the kids." Sagawa said, "Kennedy loves kids....He was inspired by what they were saying" (Sagawa Interview 1991).

Mikulski was promoting a bill that provided a "continuum of community service" (Courier-Gazette 1989) which Bush threatened to veto as too costly and bureaucratic. But, according to Sagawa, Kennedy intended from the start to assemble a bill that offered a full range of service opportunities (Sagawa Interview 1991). A House staffer noted

Kennedy has this style with bills. Everyone introduces ideas, he merges them all into an omnibus bill and then takes all the credit. Everyone gets their piece in the bill, but it is the Kennedy bill.

Merging the various Senate bills would not be difficult. Sagawa saw in the bills a common premise that

if people will perform a certain number of hours of service, it will affect them -- they will become better citizens; they will continue to do volunteer service. That seemed to be the sort of hidden agenda in all of these very complex and grandiose schemes (Sagawa Interview 1991).

The Kennedy staff met with aides of the other Senators who had introduced a youth service bill. Even though Senator Nunn was not on the Labor and Human Resources Committee, he and his staff were invited to participate in the deliberations. This was in part out of Senatorial courtesy and in part to avoid a floor fight from Nunn down the line. By mid-April, Senators knew that the final bill would involve (1) in-school programs (Kennedy and Graham), (2) youth corps for conservation and human service activities (Dodd and Moynihan), and (3) national service writ large demonstration programs for full-time (Nunn and Pell) and part-time (Mikulski) service.

Senate Hearings Focus on Merits of Youth Service -- In the spring of 1989, the Senate Committee on Labor & Human Resources held four public hearings on youth service. A hearing on March 9 gave Senators sponsoring youth service bills an opportunity to promote their ideas. Four bill sponsors (Kennedy, Mikulski, Dodd, and Pell) were members of Committee; each made an opening statement regarding his or her bill. Senators Bumpers, Moynihan, and Graham testified before the Committee. Senator Nunn was unable to attend as he was chairing the confirmation hearings on John Tower's nomination to head the Department of Defense. Witnesses at this first hearing also included national experts on community service and youth volunteers. Testimony covered middle-school, high school, and college programs, literacy programs, VISTA, and RSVP (the federal volunteer program for retired citizens).

The second hearing was held on March 14. Witnesses included Frank Slobig, Peg Rosenberry, Todd Clark, and youth volunteers with Magic Me, the Montgomery County (MD) Conservation Corps, and the Constitutional

Rights Foundation program in Los Angeles. Senator Nunn discussed his Citizen Corps bill (S. 3) while Congressman Sonny Montgomery presented arguments against the Nunn proposal. Finally, three college presidents representing higher education associations testified before the Committee.

The third hearing was held in Dorchester, MA, on March 20, 1989. Witnesses described the Springfield, MA, school program, Boston's City Year, Campus Compact, and the Thomas Jefferson Forum. Fourteen other witnesses represented seven youth service programs; adult leaders were always matched with a youth volunteer from the program.

The final Senate hearing was held on April 21, 1989. Secretary of Energy and Retired Admiral James D. Watkins discussed his experiences with volunteer programs. He said the Bush administration's program would encourage volunteer activities but would oppose any program that provided financial compensation for services. A panel on state youth service programs featured John Briscoe with PennServe, Cynthia Parsons with SerVermont, and youths from those programs. Labor concerns were aired by a panel composed of the National Educational Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the AFL-CIO, and AFSCME. The final panel featured the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National School Boards Association (U.S. Congress 1989a).

Over a spring legislative work period, several Senators held field hearings in their home states. Senator Dodd chaired a hearing of the Senate Labor and Human Resources's Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism on April 25, 1989, in Hartford, CT (U.S. Congress 1989e). The Senate Government Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on General Services held field hearings April 24 and 27, 1989, in four cities in Tennessee that was chaired by Senator Sasser (U.S. Congress 1989c). And Senator Graham held a field hearing of the Senate Special Committee on Aging in Boca Raton, FL, on April 24, 1989 (U.S. Congress 1989d).

Working Out the Writ Large Demonstration Program -- While the hearings were underway, Kennedy's staff met with other Senators' staffs to work out the details of a "continuum bill." In early April, Nunn's office discussed converting S. 3 to a demonstration project and dropping the link to existing federal student aid programs; S. 3 would represent an alternative rather than a substitute to existing Pell grants and loans (Marshall 1989). By the start of June, staff from the offices of Pell, Mikulski, and Nunn had met to develop a pilot national service program. Some meetings were also attended by Senator Robb's Legislative Director, staff from the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Will Marshall, author of the DLC "Blue Book" book on national service.

Like Bush, Kennedy favored a low authorization level for the youth service bill. But a pilot program could not test true interest unless it was open to a large number of youth. Staff suggested funding of between \$250 and \$600 million. Mikulski feared the program would be lost in the Department of Education and urged the creation of a new federal agency. Kennedy agreed with Bush that there was no need to spend addition funds creating another new federal administrative agency. Nunn sided with Kennedy but for a different reason; he did not want implementation of a pilot program delayed while a new agency was organized.

There were differences of opinion on the best level of funding for vouchers; S. 3 called for \$10,000 per year for civilian service while Pell's bill set the level at \$7,200 per year; they compromised at \$8,500. Mikulski held her voucher for part-time service at \$3,000 per year and fought to retain housing vouchers. It was agreed to leave to each state the decision of

whether to include seniors. The military service track was dropped. Senator Nunn would later include a provision in the Defense Department's FY 1988 Supplemental Appropriation bill that required the Army to test a 2+2+4 plan with 10,000 to 15,000 positions in non-combat arms (Abbott 1989, Swoboda 1989).

Senate Action on a Youth Service Bill -- On July 21, Kennedy notified the President's Chief of Staff, John Sununu, that a youth service "continuum bill" was scheduled for markup by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee on August 2. Sununu suggested a delay but Kennedy was determined to see action on the bill.

At a July 27, 19889, press conference, Kennedy, Nunn, Dodd, Pell, Mikulski, Graham, and Robb announced S. 1430 -- the National and Community Service Act of 1989. The bill called for \$300 million per year to be split equally between school-based programs, year-round and summer-only CCC-type youth service programs, and full-time and/or part-time national service demonstration programs. An additional \$30 million was set aside for expansion of VISTA (\$10 million) and volunteer programs for older Americans (\$20 million).

The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee marked up S. 1430 on August 2, 1989. After a number of amendments, the proposal passed the committee 11 to 4. All nine Democrats and two Republicans, Cochran and Durenberger, voted for the bill; four Republicans, Hatch, Kassebaum, Coats, and Thurmond, voted against the bill. Senator Jeffords was absent. As passed by Kennedy's committee, S. 1430 had six titles.

Title I, the school-based programs, contained \$65 million for kindergarten through twelfth grade. An additional \$35 million was provided for college-based programs including an expansion of the FIPSE program, Senator Bumpers' loan deferral and forgiveness clauses, and changes to the college work study program designed to increase the number of students on work study doing community service work. The Department of Education was to administer the school-based programs.

Title II contained \$100 million for CCC-type youth service; a new National Service Board would administer these programs. Title III provided \$100 million for national service demonstration programs while Title IV established a National Service Corporation with an eleven member board. Titles V and VI dealt with VISTA and older Americans volunteer programs.

Kennedy did not immediately send the bill to the Senate floor; out of courtesy to President Bush, the Chairman held the bill until the Bush administration could forward to the Congress a proposal for Bush's YES to America program (CQ Weekly Report 1990a).

House Action on Youth Service During 1989

The legislative arena for youth service bills in the House was the Education and Labor Committee chaired by Augustus (Gus) Hawkins, a liberal Democrat and the ranking member of the Congressional Black Caucus. Hawkins' strategy was to let the Senate act first.

House Committee on Education and Labor -- Principal jurisdiction for youth service legislation was given to the House Committee on Education and Labor. Committee Chairman Hawkins (D-CA) represented the Watts area of Los Angeles, CA, and was a strong supporter of government jobs programs, public welfare programs, high minimum-wage levels, housing subsidies, and other government assistance programs. Along with a number of other like-minded Democratic members of the Committee, Hawkins advocated programs that were targeted to those in economic need. He viewed youth

service proposals as a wasteful way to benefit the rich and middle-class at the expense of the poor. McCurdy's proposal to link youth service to student aid was anathema to members of the Committee.

Youth service legislation was assigned to Gene Sofer, the Committee's Tax Counsel. Several youth service advocates in the House chaired a subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee (see Table 12). As subcommittee chairs, these members of Congress had staff and resources (including the ability to hold a hearing) available to promote youth service. Of this group, Congressman Martinez appeared strongly committed to the idea of youth service. Other youth service proponents in the House, including McCurdy, Kennelly, Panetta, Bonior, Sikorski, Porter and Morella, did not serve on the Education and Labor Committee.

There was no single, major champion of youth service in the House. McCurdy's legislative proposal was considered extreme and, unlike Senator Nunn, McCurdy was unwilling to compromise (McCurdy 1989). Further complicating matters was a House rule that permitted multiple assignment of bills. While youth service bills were assigned to the Education and Labor Committee, they might also be assigned to other committees including Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

House Hearings on Youth Service During 1989 -- The full Education and Labor Committee held three hearings on youth service in 1989. A March 15 hearing featured bill sponsors Panetta, McCurdy, Bonior, Kennelly, and Morella. Hawkins declared himself "very leery" of the idea and walked out of the first hearing before McCurdy's testimony.

On the same day as the first hearing, Congressman Ford authored a "Point of View" article in the Chronicle of Higher Education in which he wondered whether McCurdy had not introduced H.R. 660 "as a way to raid the budget of the Education Department to meet military-manpower objectives" and called the bill "an approach reminiscent of Stalinist industrialization in the 1930s" (Ford 1989a). Ford sent a copy of this article along with a "Dear Colleague" letter was highly critical of H.R. 660 to all House members (Ford 1989b). At the hearing, Congressman Owens suggested to McCurdy that the Armed Forces Committee close some overseas bases in order to beef up the education budget. The hostile treatment of McCurdy and H.R. 660 reassured the Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee because, on March 25, Congressman Hawkins said of McCurdy's bill, "I think its dead" (Kuntz 1989a).

The second hearing of the House Education and Labor Committee took place on April 19, 1989. Three panels of witnesses focused on higher education issues. One panel consisted of five college presidents. The second panel included representatives from the College Board and high school guidance counselors; they stressed the importance of keeping youths on the education track. The final panel featured four students including Wayne Meisel (U.S. Congress 1989b).

During the spring work period, Sam Halperin had set up a site visit for several House staff including Chairman Hawkins' aide, Gene Sofer. They traveled to New York City to see a school-based program in Brooklyn and YouthBuild in Harlem. Sofer also toured several programs in Philadelphia. From these site visits, Sofer saw that youth service

programs had potential and could work. They appeared to be a good way to capture "at-risk" kids (Sofer Interview 1991).

Table 12.

Members of the House Committee on Education and Labor
Who Chaired a Subcommittee
and Also Introduced a Youth Service Bill
During the 101st Congress

Member	Education and Labor Subcommittee Chairmanship
Hawkins	Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education
Martinez	Employment Opportunities
Gaydos	Health and Safety
Williams	Postsecondary Education
Owens	Select Education

Source. Barone, Michael and Grant Ujifusa. 1989. The Almanac of American Politics, 1990. Washington, D.C.: National Journal.

Sofer, in turn, convinced Chairman Hawkins to look at several youth service programs in California.

Congressman Martinez took advantage of the spring work period to hold field hearings on youth service in his home state of California. An April 28 hearing in San Francisco was attended by Committee members Martinez and Unsoeld. Witnesses included Congressman Panetta; a Board member of the San Francisco Conservation Corps, Judge Kline; a Director of the East Bay Conservation Corps, Joanne Lennon; and the Director of the San Francisco Conservation Corps, Bob Burkhardt. A number of service program youth volunteers also testified (U.S. Congress 1989f).

Martinez hosted a second field hearing in his own district, Los Angeles, on June 23, 1989. Chairman Hawkins had recently toured several California youth service programs and attended Martinez' June hearing. Witnesses included Los Angeles Mayor, Tom Bradley; Los Angeles County Superintendent, Edmund Edelman; and former California Governor, Jerry Brown. One panel featured business executives who served on boards of area programs: Rod Hartung, Vice president for Public Affairs at Chevron, and Mickey Kantor, a Partner at Manatt, Phelps, and Rothenberg. This panel included B.J. Collins, a board member of the Cora Foundation but, probably of more importance in swaying Congressman Hawkins, the former director of the California Conservation Corps.

For his June field hearing, Martinez had selected experienced, respected experts who provided practical as well as political advice. Collins' testimony was particularly direct and blunt. His advice to the Committee members was do not coddle, do not target, expect the best, treat youths like Marine boot camp enlistees, encourage initiative, and be flexible. With Hartung and Kantor, Collins advised Hawkins against targeting programs to disadvantaged youth and suggested ways to gain support for programs from the conservatives and the business community.

Five days later, the full Education and Labor Committee held a third youth service hearing on Capitol Hill that focused on labor concerns and state programs. Representatives from the American Federation of Teachers and AFSCME led off. The state programs panel featured John Briscoe from PennServe and Laura Geraghty from the Minnesota Office of Volunteer Services. The third panel featured working programs; it included administrators, students, and program participants from the Constitutional Rights Foundation in Los Angeles; the Springfield, MA, public school program; New York City's CVC; and Pennsylvania programs. Hawkins had used the early hearings to kill the McCurdy-Nunn-DLC national service proposal. By May of 1989, the House was embroiled in a leadership crisis that ended with the resignation of Speaker Jim Wright. The Education and Labor Committee leadership decided to wait on youth service legislation until the Senate had marked up a youth service bill. Members and their staffs were still reticent regarding youth service. Without a champion in either the House of Representatives or the White House, a youth service bill would not move forward.

The Bush Administration's Youth Service Initiative

Early in his administration, Bush appointed Gregg Petersmeyer to head the new Office of National Service in the White House. Still, the Bush program was slow to take shape. In June, 1989, Bush announced a youth service initiative and appointed an advisory commission to make recommendations. Six months later, the Bush administration had a daily Point of Light award program but had still not prepared a youth service

proposal for the Congress to consider. In late February, 1990, without Bush input, Kennedy led the youth service bill to passage in the Senate.

Establishing Jurisdiction and Defining the Issue -- Bush had to assign the youth service policy area to an individual or organization within his administration. Rather than place the topic with an existing agency, the President retained the jurisdiction in the White House. On January 12, Bush appointed Gregg Petersmeyer as deputy assistant to the President for national service and created an Office of National Service within the White House. He also included a request for \$25 million for a YES to America Foundation in the President's February budget submission.

Bush was always ready to encourage youth to volunteer. During a speech to students at Washington University in St. Louis, MO, on February 17, 1989, Bush declared that

From now on in America, any definition of a successful life must include serving others (National Journal 1989b).

But, the Bush administration was finding it difficult to define the YES to America program.

In his testimony to the Senate on April 21, 1989, Admiral Watkins assured the Senators that a Bush proposal for a youth service program would be available within a month. Sagawa and Littlefield met with Petersmeyer, Gretchen Pagel and other Office of National Service staff to discuss the final shape of the Senate bill and to solicit input from the White House on Bush's proposal. Yet, despite calls and another meeting between Sagawa, Littlefield, and White House officials, Kennedy had still not received the Bush proposal for the YES to America program when he spoke at Youth Services America's annual conference on June 11, 1989.

Bush Unveils Points of Light Initiative -- A rumor circulated that Barbara Bush and Greg Petersmeyer would lay out the Bush program June 18 through 21 at a conference in New Orleans sponsored by VOLUNTEER -- The National Center. Instead, Bush kicked off his YES Initiative on the South lawn of the White House with an address to 3,000 youth and various youth service program organizers on June 21, 1989. The President insisted that "you don't have to be bribed with incentives... service is its own reward--satisfaction guaranteed" (Zuckerman 1990b, p. 240). The following day, Bush unveiled the details of his plan for encouraging volunteerism at a luncheon gathering of 1,000 business, education, and community leaders in New York City.

The program was now called "Youth Engaged in Service to America." Bush's program was no longer limited to youth; involving youth was now merely a high priority. YES to America would encourage all Americans to serve their home town and their nation. Bush would serve as honorary chairman of a new Points of Light Initiative Foundation that would run a networking center, a hot-line for matching volunteers with programs, and a Presidential awards program. The foundation would employ around 50 people who would identify -- and encourage replication of -- successful programs. It would also encourage corporations to allow staff to participate in service efforts. The administration would ask Congress for \$25 million (\$100 million over four years) which would be matched by private contributions (Kuntz 1989b).

To work out the structure of the foundation, the President appointed an advisory commission that would be chaired by New Jersey Governor Thomas Kean. The advisory panel was to submit recommendations to the

President within 45 days. The advisory panel may have been a last minute idea; Kean later said that he was first approached on the subject of the advisory commission via a telephone call from Bush at 10 p.m. the evening before Bush's announcement.

Gregg Petersmeyer and other Office of National Service staff circulated among the press following the announcement; the official spin was "This isn't a federal program. This is a movement" (Seib 1989). A White House staffer who had worked on the proposal was quoted as saying

The premise is that volunteer service can get at the root cause of many social ills by restoring a sense of community and engagement (Ingwerson 1989).

The target population appeared to be the same people who are likely to volunteer for the Peace Corps: white, educated, middle- and upper-class youth; it was less clear how disadvantaged youth fit into Bush's program.

Kennedy continued to encourage the White House staff to strike a compromise with Congress. On October 26, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee issued its report on S. 1430 (U.S. Congress 1989g). That same day, Senate staff including Sagawa, Littlefield, and Nancy Taylor of Senator Hatch's staff met with White House staff on national service. The following day, Senator Kennedy met with the White House Director of Domestic Policy, Roger Porter, to discuss a compromise. The White House remained opposed to any paid stipend or voucher and felt the authorization level was too high. Bush threatened to veto any bill that contained a national service writ large demonstration program.

Kean Commission and Points of Light -- Members of the Points of Light Initiative Commission (Kean Commission) were appointed on October 23, 1989; they met once in late October and twice in December of 1989. A meeting was scheduled for late December at which the Commission was to present a completed report to the President but that meeting had to be cancelled when the United States invaded Panama. The Kean Commission report was officially released on January 4, 1990 (President's Advisory Commission on the Points of Light Initiative Foundation 1989). It recommended establishing an electronic bulletin board, a public service advertising campaign, and other public exhortation techniques. The Kean Commission proposals were largely rejected by the Bush administration.

In the meantime, on November 22, 1989, President Bush began issuing a daily Point of Light award to exemplary individuals and organizations that demonstrated a commitment to voluntarism. Office of National Service staff screened nominees for the daily award while the President made the final selection. Other White House staff focused on volunteerism outreach by encouraging corporations, organizations and individuals to participate in community service activities.

By early 1990, the Office of National Service in the White House had 14 staff and 14 interns and volunteers (Johns Interview 1991). Bush eventually established a Points of Light Initiative Foundation and named his friend, Ray Chambers, to head the Foundation's board.

Senate Again Acts Without Bush Input -- On January 17, 1990, Senator Kennedy informed White House Chief of Staff John Sununu that S. 1430 was on the calendar for full Senate debate. Over 100 organizations had endorsed the Senate bill. Kennedy once again urged the Bush administration to forward their youth service proposal so that it could be incorporated into the Senate bill. In his January 31, 1990, State of the Union address to a joint

session of Congress, Bush urged all Americans to "step forward when there's trouble, lend a hand, be what I call a Point of Light to a stranger in need" and ended his speech by challenging all to help one another (CQ Weekly Report 1990b). But the President still refused to forward to the Congress a youth service legislative proposal. Assuming that the White House would follow the recommendations of the Kean Commission, Kennedy prepared to add a section to the Senate bill establishing the Points of Light Initiative Commission and funding it at \$25 million per year for four years. Kennedy, Mikulski, Hatch and others continued to meet with White House officials in an effort to negotiate a compromise. On February 9, the Office of Management and Budget issued a statement of administration policy opposing S. 1430. Talks between the Senate and the White House ended in mid-February, 1990.

Behind the scenes, Senator Hatch offered to serve as broker with the Bush administration. He worked with Kennedy to identify areas where the Senate was willing to concede to the administration. The Senators offered to cut funding from \$300 million to \$125 million over two years. Vouchers for full-time service dropped from \$8,500 to \$5,000 per year and for part-time service from \$3,000 to \$2,000. The three titles were combined into one title and one single grant program; by adding a fourth, innovative option, states were given more flexibility in how and at what level they could choose to participate. Finally, S. 1430 already contained reference to a Corporation for National Service; language was substituted that also established a Points of Light Initiative Foundation.

Although the Senate had still not received a legislative proposal (or any indication of support for the compromise bill) from the Bush administration, Kennedy took S. 1430 to the full Senate on February 26, 1990. Debate lasted three days and was slow going. Thirty amendments -- many of which were not germane -- were offered of which nine were passed. On March 1, S. 1430 passed the Senate by a vote of 78 to 19. Fifty-three Democrats and 25 Republicans voted for the bill; the only Democrat to vote against the proposal was Bob Kerry of Nebraska (CQ Weekly Report 1990c).

As passed by the Senate, the bill contained three titles and funding for a two-year period. Title I contained all programs and allocated funding: school- and community-based programs (\$25 million), youth service corps (\$35 million), full- and part-time national service (\$35 million), the new, innovative program option (\$1 million), and establishment and administration of a Commission on National Service to administer most of the programs (\$4 million). Title II included the higher education (FIPSE) provisions. The final title established Bush's Points of Light Initiative Foundation (\$25 million). The Bush administration was not happy with the Senate bill. One administration spokesperson complained that "Hatch was out there on his own cutting deals with the Democrats" (Zuckerman 1990a, p. 669).

Action Moves Back To The House of Representatives

With passage of a national service bill in the Senate, attention shifted to the House of Representatives. On March, 7, 1990, S. 1430 was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor. But a new bill introduced by Chairman Hawkins reflected a vision of youth service that was very different from the Senate's youth service bill.

Hawkins Drafts His Own Bill: H.R. 4330 -- Thanks in large part to the field tour for Sofer that Sam Halperin arranged and Hawkins' tour of youth service programs in California, Chairman Hawkins agreed to support a youth service bill (Campus Compact Newsletter 1989). Hawkins and other House

members were also being lobbied by a wide range of supportive groups and a few members of Congress. House Budget Committee Chairman Panetta often told Hawkins that youth service was important to him. Senator Kennedy called, wrote, and cajoled House members (especially Hawkins) to pass a youth service bill (Sofer Interview 1991).

With McCurdy's bill dead in the House and Kennedy pressing for action, Hawkins directed Gene Sofer to draft a House bill. To help craft this bill, Sofer called together several off-the-Hill youth service advocates with whom he worked particularly well; together they wrote the House bill. Hawkins introduced the resulting bill as H.R. 4330, the National Service Act of 1990, in late March of 1990. The bill had 127 cosponsors including two Republicans -- Connie Morella (MD) and Peter Smith (VT).

H.R. 4330 called for \$183 million with much of the funds earmarked for job training. Title I provided grants for elementary, secondary and higher education youth service programs to be administered by the Secretary of Education. The Bumpers/Sikorski guaranteed student loan deferment and direct student loan partial cancellation programs were included as was Congresswoman Morella's Peace Corps training program. At Congressman Owens' request, a section provided grants through ACTION to the Youthbuild program to teach participants construction skills. Title II provided grants to establish full-time and summer-only youth conservation and service corps; an American Conservation Corps program was to be jointly administered by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior while a Youth Service Corps and an expanded Foster Grandparent program was placed under ACTION. There was also provision for national and regional clearinghouses as outlined in bills by Senator Graham and Congressman Atkins. The bill contained no mention of the President's Points of Light Initiative Foundation nor was there a full-time or part-time national service demonstration program.

The Hawkins bill categorically rejected any linkage between youth service activities and student financial assistance (Hawkins 1990a). It contained no paid stipends. It was strongly targeted toward disadvantaged youth with programs for a student tutorial corps, a student literacy corps, and numerous in-service training programs; the group drawing up the bill even considered putting the youth corps program in JTPA at the Department of Labor (Youth Service America 1990). In a "Dear Colleague" letter, Hawkins wrote "H.R. 4330 reflects President Bush's belief that service is something which should be truly voluntary. Civic mindedness cannot be bought" (Hawkins 1990b).

H.R. 4330 Receives a Friendly House Hearing -- The Education and Labor Committee held a hearing on H.R. 4330 on May 17, 1990 (U.S. Congress 1990a). The hearing began with opening statements by members of the committee and ended with reflections by Congressman Hayes on the years he spent as a youth serving in the New Deal CCC. The first witness was John Buchanan, former Member of Congress and President of the People for the American Way. Senator Graham then promoted his bill, S. 382, before introducing a panel of education specialists. A second panel featured the YouthBuild program and the final panel focused on the California Conservation Corps. House Budget Committee Chairman Panetta introduced the final set of panelists. The hearing concluded with videotaped testimony from actor Raymond Burr who attested to the benefits that he derived from serving in the CCC as a youth.

On July 12, 1990, the Education and Labor Committee took up consideration of H.R. 4330. Two amendments were considered before final

action was deferred for one week. On July 17, the Committee considered three additional amendments before passing the bill on a voice vote. H.R. 4330 was sent to the full House for consideration (U.S. Congress 1990b).

The full House considered H.R. 4330 on September 13, 1990. In the Committee of the Whole, seven out of eight amendments passed by voice vote. Advocates of the bill were shocked when floor managers allowed an amendment by Goodling to go to a recorded vote; the close vote on this amendment (which was defeated 200 to 212) signaled Bush that the House might not be able to override a Presidential veto. The House incorporated H.R. 4330 into S. 1430 as an amendment and the amended bill was passed by the House on a voice vote.

Not everyone was pleased. McCurdy observed of Hawkins' bill "the committee picked up the ball but forgot to run" (Welch 1990). President Bush threatened to veto the House bill. And a DLC spokesperson said of the final law, "We threw Congress the ball and it hit a single. We would have preferred a home run" (Washington Post 1990).

Cuts and Compromises in the Conference Committee

With passage of separate versions of a national service bill in each chamber, the youth service bill went to conference committee to have the differences worked out. After a last minute compromise with the White House, the Conference Committee issued its report October 12, 1990. The Senate passed the youth service bill four days later and the House passed it on October 24. The bill was signed into law as PL 101-610 by President Bush at a small ceremony on November 16, 1990.

Tradeoffs and Compromises -- After the summer recess, Sagawa and Sofer met several times to work on reconciling the two versions of the bill. When Sagawa and Sofer finally met with the staffs of other House members, Sagawa was surprised to find that House members not only wanted to protect their piece but add to the bill. Meanwhile, Kennedy personally telephoned Senators and House members to encourage cooperation and compromise.

A draft statement of the conference managers in early October showed that several items were still unresolved. The YouthBuild provision was in the House bill but not in the Senate version. The Senate finally receded and included the YouthBuild program to be run through ACTION. The national and community service full-time and part-time demonstration program was in the Senate bill but not in the House version. According to one conference participant, the House

finally receded with the statement, "We trust Senator Pell; if he will take a risk, we will go along with including this program...but we are very concerned!" The House members continued to fear a five year demonstration program would be used down the line to justify a mandatory program.

The final sticking point was the appropriation level. The White House was insisting on a funding level around \$10 to \$20 million. Hatch had already managed to cut the spending levels from around \$300 million to closer to \$100 million. On the morning of October 12, Kennedy, Hatch, and Bush administration personnel agreed to reduce the authorization levels from \$125 million to \$62 million for FY 1991, \$105 million for FY 1992, and \$120 million for FY 1993. (Mikulski was very upset because her appropriations subcommittee had already reserved \$100 million for the first year of the new program.) That same day, House and Senate conferees met and approved the

conference report (U.S. Congress 1990c).

Final Conference Version of the Bill -- The conference report required that all new grant programs be administered by a Commission on National Service. One concession that Hatch won was that the new grant programs would be included in a modified block grant. Hatch had asked for a block grant rather than a series of categorical grants; the modified block grant arrangement left the programs as essentially categorical grants but called for a single application from a state's governor for the grants.

School-based programs in the bill included Kennedy's Service America programs and two programs from the House -- the Schools and Service Learning Act and a Service Programs for Dropouts model program. Higher education programs and youth corps were retained. A national service demonstration program that was based on the Senate bill was added. The Morella/Pell Peace Corps program was retained and rural programs and Foster Grandparent programs were added. The House's regional clearinghouses and YouthBuild program were also included. Finally, the conference report included an authorization of \$5 million per year for the Points of Light Initiative Foundation.

For FY 91, \$55 million was authorized -- \$16.5 for conservation and youth corps programs, \$22 million for full- and part-time national service demonstration programs, and \$16.5 for school-based programs from kindergarten through post secondary education. The Points of Light Initiative Foundation received \$5 million and the new 21-member Commission for National and Community Service received \$2 million.

Dropped from the final conference report were 1) the proposed increase in college work-study funds for community service work, 2) expansion of the State Student Incentive Grant program, and 3) expansion of the loan forgiveness programs (the Bumpers/Sikorski proposal). The rationale was that those proposals could be addressed the following year in the Higher Education Act Reauthorization bill. According to one Senate staffer, "Bumper's bill was unaffordable. No one disagreed with the concept; we just didn't have the money."

Final Passage and Bill Signing -- The Senate passed the conference report on October 16 by a vote of 75 to 21. The House passed the conference report on October 24, 1990, by a vote of 235 to 186. Back in June of 1989, Bush had hosted a "YES" initiative kick-off rally at the White House with 3,000 youths and a rock band but the President invited only a handful of people to witness the signing of the National and Community Service Act of 1990. On November 16, 1990, the President signed the youth service bill in the Roosevelt Room of the White House -- a room that could accommodate only 40 people. Still, PL 101-610, the National and Community Service Act of 1990, was law.

Follow-up and Program Implementation

President Bush took eight months to nominate individuals to serve on the new Commission. The Senate confirmed the nominees quickly and the Commission soon got under way. A year later, grants were being awarded and programs were underway. Bill Clinton did much to advance the size and scope of federal youth service programs. He implemented a summer program and lobbied Congress to enact legislation that increased the funding and modified the nature of youth service even further.

Technical Amendments and Organizing the Commission -- During the bill signing ceremony, Bush stressed that the section of the bill giving Congress power to appoint some members of the Commission was

unconstitutional. He said he would not act on the law until that section was changed (Bush 1990). A technical amendment, PL 102-10, was passed in March, 1991, to correct that and other minor aspects of the law.

Seven months after the bill was signed into law, President Bush nominated 21 citizens to serve on the bipartisan Commission on National and Community Service. Eight Senators had written the President urging him not to delay the program (Lawton 1991). The Senate confirmed the nominees quickly (see Table 13) and the Commission held its first meeting in early October, 1991.

Former Congressman Paul "Pete" McCloskey was selected to Chair the Commission. Shirley Sagawa had left Kennedy's staff to work for the Women's Law Center; she was appointed to the Commission and, along with Alan Khazei of Boston's City Year, selected to served as Co-Chair. Former Washington State Governor and U.S. Senator Dan Evans was also appointed to serve on the new Commission; Evans had been Governor when Eberly had administered ACTION's Program for Local Service in Seattle, Washington.

Catherine Milton had directed the youth service program at Stanford University when Donald Kennedy had served as that school's President. Milton was originally brought in run the new federal agency until a formal search for an administrator could be launched. After several months, the Commission board convinced Milton to accept the permanent position of staff director.

The Commission held several organizational meetings during late 1991 and early 1992. During these sessions, Commission members and staff developed agency goals and staffing plans, worked out the details on youth service program parameters, eligibility criteria, application procedures, and other basic aspects of administering a new program. Regulations were published in the Federal Register on February 13, 1992, and the first youth service grants were awarded in June, 1992.

Postscript: Clinton's National Service Program -- In the fall of 1991, Hawkins' aide, Gene Sofer speculated of youth service legislation that "the House won't be back to this for another 20 years -- if ever" (Sofer Interview 1991). Closer to the truth was an observation made by DLC Director Al From in a conversation in December, 1991, where he opined that

National service is a cornerstone of what the DLC is about. I am convinced that by the end of this century it will be the primary means by which higher education funding is made available to youth in this country.

...but the way you do these things is via the presidential campaign. Remember how JFK brought about the Peace Corps; no one remembers that it was Hubert Humphrey's idea initially.

...[DLC Chairman] Clinton is using national service as a center piece in his campaign...What Clinton is doing is shifting from a broken financial aid program in this country to a national service program.

...I believe that a compelling argument wins in the end... and national service will be that way, too....Ideas have sustaining power; they pick up a life of their own. Ideas are more important than people. Someday, we will have a President who will do it (From Interview 1991).

Table 13.
Original Members
Commission on National and Community Service

Joyce M. Black, Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Voluntary Service, New York

Father William J. Byron, President, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

Thomas Ehrlich, President, University of Indiana and Vice President of Campus Compact

Daniel J. Evans, former Washington Governor and U.S. Senator

Maria Hernandez Ferrier, Executive Director for Community Services in the Southwest Independent School District

Frances Hesselbein, Chief Executive, Girl Scouts of America (1976-1990)

Alan Khazei, Co-Founder and Co-Director of Boston's City Year

Reatha Clark King, President, General Mills Foundation

Leslie Lenkowsky, President and CEO of the Hudson Institute

Jack A. MacAllister, Chairman of the Board, U.S. West, Inc.

Paul N. McClosky, Jr., former Congressman and attorney

Wayne Meisel, Founder, Campus Outreach Opportunity League

"Digger" Phelps, former coach, University of Notre Dame

George Romney, former Governor of Michigan and founding Chairman of The National VOLUNTEER Center

Patricia Traugott Rouse, Co-Founder, The Enterprise Foundation

Shirley Sachi Sagawa, Director, Family and Youth Policy, National Women's Law Center and former Chief Counsel for Youth Policy, Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee

Glen W. White, Director of Training, Research and Training Center on Independent Living, University of Kansas

Gayle Edlund Wilson, First Lady of the State of California

Robert L. Woodson, President, National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise

Karen Susan Young, Communications Director, Campus Outreach Opportunity League

In the 1992 presidential campaign, Arkansas Governor (and Chairman of the DLC) Bill Clinton's national service proposal was one of the most popular planks in his campaign. Upon his election, Clinton appointed Eli Segal as Assistant to the President and Director of the White House Office of National Service. In a message to Congress on May 5, 1993, Clinton asked Congress to consider his legislative initiative to replace Federal guaranteed student loans with direct loans and his national service proposals -- the Student Loan Reform Act of 1993 and the National Service Trust Act of 1993.

The President also sponsored a 1993 Summer of Service -- an 8-week youth service demonstration program. Funded with \$10 million from the Commission on National and Community Service, the program placed 1,500 youth from June through August in a range of service activities that focused on the needs of children at risk. Participants were paid a minimum wage stipend and received a \$1,000 post-service education benefit. The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 (PL 103-82) was passed by Congress and signed into law by Clinton on September 21, 1993.

The law created a new Corporation for National and Community Service that combined two existing agencies -- ACTION and the Commission on National and Community Service. (ACTION was to be merged into the Commission 12 months after enactment of the law). The new Corporation was given a 15-member bipartisan board of directors. At the bill signing ceremony, Clinton announced his appointment of Eli Segal to head the new Corporation.

The major Clinton program was the National Service and Student Loans program. Under the new law, students could earn \$4,725 in benefits for performing 1,700 hours of full-time service each year. Part-time students earned \$2,362 for 900 hours of service per year. The educational awards were to be deposited in a national service trust and paid directly to educational institutions. Participants could serve a maximum of 2 years; they also received stipends and health coverage during their service.

The law also reinvigorated the moribund Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970; conservation corps and urban corps were authorized and participants could receive a national service educational benefit. Kennedy's Serve America program was expanded to include more training, planning and technical assistance for schools and colleges. The national service writ large demonstration program that McCurdy, Nunn, Mikulski and Pell fought so hard for back in 1990 was replaced with the new national service trust (educational benefits for service) program. VISTA was expanded and new programs were added. The Older American Volunteer programs were expanded and renamed the National Senior Volunteer Corps.

Most important, the funding levels for national service programs increased. The FY 1993 appropriation for the old Commission on National and Community Service was \$75.5 million. The FY 1994 appropriation for the new Corporation was \$370 million (through the Departments of Veterans Affairs, and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriation bill -- PL 103-124). Another \$204 million was appropriated for ACTION programs (through the Appropriations for Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Related Agencies -- PL 103-112).

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter introduces additional important actors in the youth service policy process. The primary contribution of the chapter, however, is its focus on the strategies used to advance youth service policy.

Key Actors Within the 101st Congress -- When asked why a youth service bill passed in the 101st Congress, one observer noted that Bush opened the door, Nunn served as a lightning rod, and Kennedy moved into the vacuum, seized the moment, and controlled the process. Kennedy made youth service his number one priority in the 101st Congress (Sagawa Interview 1991). Sam Halperin observed

I have watched the Congress for 30 years. I have never seen a Senator take a piddly little bill and dig in personally like his life depended on it the way Ted Kennedy did on this bill. He put a lot of effort into this bill (Interview 1991).

With Kennedy's blessings, Sagawa worked to expand and organize the youth service policy community. She and Terry Hartle, also on Kennedy's staff, held weekly meetings with all groups interested in youth service and met more often with a subgroup of key youth service organizations. At those meetings, she and other Congressional staff briefed individuals on the status of the youth service legislation, and together they developed strategy for passing a youth service bill. Sagawa asked groups to send signed op-ed pieces to newspapers, publish stories and editorials in their newsletters, send mailings to members, issue invitations to Members of Congress to visit service programs in their district or state and get the media to cover the event, serve on advisory committees, and make visits to key Democrats and Republicans. By the time the bill passed, Sagawa was working with 84 organizations. After Sagawa, probably the most important workers on the Hill were Peg Rosenberry and Don Mathis from the National Association for Service and Conservation Corps and Melan Verveer with People for the American Way.

Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) also made important contributions to passage of the bill. This Republican Senator took a personal interest in the bill. He supported S. 1430 on the Senate floor as Republican floor manager which made it easier for other Republicans to vote for the bill. He made it clear to the White House that he wanted them to support the bill. He critiqued the bill and made many suggestions; he got the cap on stipends so programs could choose to not pay a stipend if they preferred, he asked for the block grant rather than the series of categorical grants, and he reduced the spending levels. He also made repeated calls to the White House to ask for their bill language.

Since funding new programs means cutting funds for other programs, Mikulski also played a critical role in passage of youth service. The House Education and Labor Committee was particularly sensitive about funding. One House Education and Labor Committee staffer summarized McCurdy's proposal thus:

Here comes this guy from the Armed Services Committee saying to us, "Your programs don't work and I've got the answer." Let him pay for his program out of Defense funding if he thinks so much of it.

After Mikulski offered to pay for a new commission out of her appropriations subcommittee, the House of Representatives became more receptive to national service legislation; they realized that funds for the new program would not have to come from their own programs. Mikulski made other

important contributions, too. Her staff organized a national service advisory committee and worked hard to build support for national service among realtors, home builders, fire fighters, higher education advocates, labor interests, and service groups including the Girl Scouts, YMCA's, and the United Way (Roberts, Miles, Ganote Interviews 1991).

Where Nunn was ready to compromise with Kennedy early in the process, McCurdy's style was more confrontational. A House aide commented that

McCurdy never lobbied Hawkins. His approach was to assume the House leadership would make Hawkins swallow the bill.

McCurdy sent few cues and did not meet with Chairman Hawkins to discuss options. A member of the House Education and Labor Committee staff recalled of McCurdy's second bill, H.R. 3807:

He introduced Kennedy's bill in the House and then asked for a hearing -- without ever forewarning the Chairman...He never came to us. He participated in one colloquy on the floor -- but that was very late in the process.

Sagawa summarized McCurdy's bill in the House as "a policy being developed without a political context" (Interview 1991). The contrast between youth service legislation in the House and the Senate underscores the importance of having someone who will take command of an issue. On youth service legislation in the 101st Congress, Kennedy was more than a policy entrepreneur; he clearly provided the leadership that made the difference between debate and passage of legislation.

Another factor that helped youth service was the change in status of several youth service advocates as well as the addition of new advocates. In 1989, Leon Panetta became Chair of the House Budget Committee; one insider observed that Education and Labor Committee members felt that they needed to placate Panetta since he influenced the Committee's appropriations. National service was also a high priority topic for Sam Nunn, Chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and the incoming Senate Majority Leader, George Mitchell. The incoming President had committed himself during the presidential campaign to some sort of youth service program, and the youth service policy community was determined to hold Bush to that campaign promise. But without the pressure from Kennedy and the endless staff work of Shirley Sagawa, it is not certain that any youth service bill would have passed the Congress.

Youth Service Ideas Reflected in Bill Content -- Bills in the 101st Congress reflected the interests of the various youth advocacy groups: writ large, CCC-type, education-based, communitarians, and the DLC rights plus obligations philosophy as well as the more pure volunteerism supported by Bush. The members of the House Committee on Education and Labor were predisposed to oppose youth service legislation as it was taking shape at the end of the 1980s. The Committee members preferred programs that were targeted to disadvantaged youth and saw the Senate proposals as draining funds away from programs such as Job Corps. By letting the House include programs like YouthBuild, Kennedy included in the target population disadvantaged youth.

Multiple Strategies -- Advocates both on and off Capitol Hill sought to commit the political parties and presidential candidates to supportive

positions on youth service programs. Once a position was taken, their task shifted to holding the candidates to their promise. Another strategy was to stop fighting for a particular program approach and, instead, adopt the Landrum philosophy of letting a thousand flowers bloom; the result was the "continuum of service" bill.

Members of both the House and the Senate used Congressional hearings to hurt or help youth service. Several members -- particularly Congressman Martinez -- used their position as chair of a subcommittee to advance the policy idea. Martinez' Los Angeles hearing was particularly effective because Chairman Hawkins attended (it was held in his home city), knowledgeable and politically savvy experts spoke honestly about what works, and the event took place immediately after Hawkins had visited several highly successful youth service programs.

The DLC members and Senator Kennedy hosted large press conferences to announce their legislation. Kennedy's press conferences also included youth volunteers in their corps uniforms and numerous other groups who supported the ideas in his bills. As discussed in Chapter 9, youth service advocates also conscientiously set out to change the social construction of the target population of youth service programs.

Leadership And Plain Hard Work -- Kennedy was determined to pass a youth service bill during the 101st Congress. He solicited a broad range of input on the topic through his issue dinner, hearings, and numerous conversations with colleagues and White House personnel. He furnished his staff with sufficient time, resources, and support. All interested parties including Senators Nunn, Graham, and Bumpers were included in the negotiations. Finally, the Senator compromised repeatedly with Senate Republicans, Congressman Hawkins, and the Bush administration and settled for low funding just to get a program off the ground.

Kennedy dedicated enormous amounts of his own time and attention to getting a bill passed. According to Sagawa and Littlefield, the Chairman talked weekly with the Senate Majority Leader about youth service legislation, badgered the White House to negotiate, called in chits across Capitol Hill, lined up Members on the House side to speak for the bill when it was debated on the House floor, telephoned people in both the Senate and the House, and wrote members thank you notes. He even contacted ex-Peace Corps volunteers in the House for support. A member of Hawkins' staff recalled

Kennedy was absolutely determined to pass his bill. He was always bringing it up. Whenever Kennedy and the Chairman [Hawkins] would meet to talk about something, Kennedy always asked, "When are you doing national service?"

A Critical Jurisdictional Challenge -- As Kingdon has noted, a jurisdictional challenge often opens a window of opportunity for a policy idea. After candidate George Bush adopted youth service as a policy topic, Kennedy fought to get S. 3 assigned to his Senate Committee and held the issue at the full committee level where he could control the debate rather than let a subcommittee have jurisdiction. Kennedy was already familiar with youth service programs in his home state including Boston's City Year project; the Springfield, Massachusetts, school system program; and the high school youth service program in the greater Boston area run by the Thomas Jefferson Forum. Yet he had never introduced youth service legislation before 1989. What changed to motivate Kennedy so?

Senator Kennedy joined the youth service debate in order to reclaim the Kennedy legacy of creating and expanding service opportunities for all Americans. An aide for Congressman Owens said of youth service policy that "Kennedy considered it a family matter." He saw national service as a way to continue a Kennedy tradition. President John F. Kennedy founded the Peace Corps and Robert Kennedy helped create VISTA. Sagawa said of youth service, Senator Kennedy

always viewed it as a family priority. As you know, many members of the Kennedy family are involved in service programs. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend runs the Maryland Student Service Alliance. Sargent Shriver shaped the Peace Corps and runs the Special Olympics. Anthony Shriver runs the "Best Buddies" program. Senator Kennedy often thought this bill would be his own legacy. He talked about it and treated it as the highest priority of the 101st Congress (Sagawa personal correspondence, November 8, 1991).

At the press conference to announce his first youth service bill, S. 650, Kennedy said "I am proposing legislation today to renew President Kennedy's challenge for our day and generation" (Kennedy 1989a).

But Kennedy alone could not make or break a legislative proposal. The key elements of policy success in the case of youth service legislation are discussed in Chapter 9.

Chapter 9. Conclusion

The analytical approach of this dissertation focused on actors, ideas, opportunities, and strategies. The theory represented a synthesis of Kingdon's process-oriented policy model and the content-based research of Schneider and Ingram. Actors included individuals, informal groups, formal organizations (including Congressional committees and federal agencies), and policy communities. The ideas that were reflected in the policy proposals included rules, tools, agents, goals, and target populations. Opportunities for policy promotion indicate particularly good timing for policy advancement. The strategic behavior of participants in the policy evolution process ranged from actions by members of Congress to advance their pet proposals to efforts by advocacy groups to alter the social construction of the target population of youth service programs.

The youth service case study reveals policy entrepreneurs as strategic actors who conspire to force open policy windows of opportunity. The use of framing and rationales to link youth service to various problems suggests some policies may, in fact, best be described as solutions chasing problems (Cohen, March, and Olsen 1972). The youth service case study also demonstrates the benefits of a theory that combines policy process with analysis of policy content. The analysis of policy components provides insights about patterns and sources of innovation and highlights the importance of the role of the social construction of target populations.

Elements from Kingdon's Concurrent Streams Model

Kingdon's concurrent streams model emphasizes the importance of actors, ideas, and windows of opportunity. For the case study of youth service policy, identification of the participants in the policy process over time and by policy content reveal three subgroups within the youth service policy community.

The Problem Stream and Policy Proposals -- For youth service policy, identification of problems rarely preceded discussion of the policy; one exception was a concern over youth unemployment that led to the original CCC and later CCC-type youth service programs. More often, advocates framed their youth service ideas as solutions to whatever happened to be the contemporary problem. Thus, the primary usefulness of Kingdon's problem stream is as a source of reasons to consider a youth service program. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 reveal how youth service policy proposals varied little over time, but the problem that youth service proposal purported to address changed with the times.

The Role of Actors in the Policy Process -- Kingdon's policy stream can be divided into separate but related discussions of actors (individuals, groups, and policy communities) and ideas. By identifying the key players over time and by policy content, we saw that the youth service policy community was composed of quite distinct policy subgroups. Over time, there was little overlap or intermingling amongst members of these subgroups. There were few members of Congress involved; jurisdictional conflicts within and between the House and Senate and member turnover made it difficult to maintain a substantial effort (see Table 14). There was minimal participation by government agencies, although Rosenberry and Slobig came to the youth service policy community via federal agencies.

Table 14.
Youth Service Bills
in the U.S. Congress
(1967 - 1990)

	Writ Large	CCC-Type
90th 67-68	Brewster S. 1213* Kennedy S. 3025*	
91st 69-70	Hatfield S. 1937 Bingham H.R. 1000	(YCC program starts 1970)
92nd 71-72	Hatfield S. 1777 (ACTION formed)	Meeds and Jackson sponsor bills to expand YCC
93rd 73-74	(ACTION's PLS program begins in Seattle, WA)	Meeds and Jackson sponsor bills to create YACC
94th 75-76	(Eleanor Roosevelt Institute conference)	Many youth jobs bills sponsored, considered
95th 77-78	(Committee for the Study of National Service begins meetings, studies)	Meeds H.R. 32? Jackson S. 249 Cranston S. 20 P.L. 95-33 creates YACC
96th 79-80	McCloskey H.R. 2206 Cavanaugh H.R. 3606 Panetta H.R. 6868* Tsongas S. 2159* Panetta H.Con.Res. 271*	
97th 81-82	McCloskey H.R. 1730 Panetta H.R. 2500*	Seiberling H.R. 4861 Moynihan/Mathias S. 2061 Roybal H.R. 3686
98th 83-84	Panetta H.R. 1264*	Seiberling H.R. 999 Moynihan/Mathias S. 27 Panetta H.R. 6422 Roybal H.R. 667
99th 85-86	Torricelli H.R. 1326* Hart S. 536*	Seiberling H.R. 99 Moynihan S. 27 Panetta H.R. 888

Asterik (*) indicates that the bill called for a feasibility study of youth service rather than proposing the implementation of a program.

Table 14. (Continued)
 Youth Service Bills
 in the U.S. Congress
 (1967-1990)

	National Service Writ Large	CCC-Type Youth Service	Education-Linked Youth Service
1 0 0 t h 8 7 8 8	Torricelli HR 1468 [~] McCurdy HR 1479 Toricelli HR 2225 Sikorski HR 3096 [~]	Udall HR 18 Moynihan S. 27 Martinez/Panetta Amendment to H.R. 18 Panetta HR 460 (Same as above amendment)	Morella HR 2632 Bumpers S. 759-60 Sikorski HR 2156-57 Pell S. 762 Berman HR 5535 [~] Chiles S. 2450 [~] Atkins not known [~]
1 0 1 s t C o n g 8 9 9 0	McCurdy HR 660 Nunn S. 3 Mikulski S. 408 Bonior HR 1000 McCain S. 781 Porter HR 1951 Kennelly HR 948 Kennelly HR 2084 Nunn S. 1352	Panetta HR 717 Dodd S. 322 Moynihan S. 232 Williams HR 1408 Gaydos HR 781 Roybal HR 1033 Martinez HR 1474	Morella HR 985 Bumpers S. 539-41 Sikorski HR 3039-41 Pell S. 576 Garcia HR 1615 Graham S. 382 [~] Atkins HR 2137 [~] Kennedy S. 650 [~] Owens HR 1947 [~] Ford HR 2591 [~] Domenici S. 689 [~]

Compromise bills introduced in the 101st were S. 1430 (Kennedy), HR 3807 (McCurdy), and HR 4330 (Hawkins).

Inverted v ([~]) indicates writ large bills calling for a study of youth service rather than implementation.

Backward s ([~]) indicates school-based bills; others in education column represent proposals linking youth service with federal higher education financial aid benefits.

While the policy community remained fragmented, Youth Service America gave the movement visibility and an appearance of cohesiveness. YSA never incorporated the actors or ideas of the national service writ large community nor did it work with people associated with the DLC. Even in the late 1980s, the youth service community was relatively closed; few outside groups were approached until Shirley Sagawa assembled a youth service advisory group for Senator Kennedy. Aside from The Rev. Hesburgh of Notre Dame, religious organizations and religious leaders rarely participated in the youth service debate.

A number of individuals stand out as policy entrepreneurs: Don Eberly; Syd Howe and Peg Rosenberry; Howard Swearer and Donald Kennedy; Roger Landrum and Frank Slobig. Since many of these individuals and the organizations they founded received funding from Ford Foundation grants, the Ford Foundation's Gordon Berlin is also an important, if usually unrecognized, youth service policy entrepreneur.

Politics as Opportunity for Policy Advancement -- Political events are important in the youth service case study because they provide opportunities to press a cause. Presidential campaigns, jurisdictional disputes, and changes in administrations and consequent personnel shifts proved especially critical to adoption of youth service policy.

Kingdon's politics stream includes national mood, personnel turnover, jurisdictional disputes, consensus through bargaining, and the bandwagon effect; all of these topics are featured in the case study of youth service policy. The youth service case study also demonstrates the importance of institutional structure. A bill is less likely to succeed if it is referred to unfriendly committees. With multiple referral in the House, youth service bills often had to win supporters in the Interior Committee as well as the Education and Labor Committee. This was easier to accomplish when legislation offered something for members of both committees (i.e., that contained more than one type of youth service program). Yet such "continuum of service" bills were not introduced in the Congress until Kennedy constructed his bills in the 101st Congress. As Kingdon predicts, a change of personnel associated with a new administration and a jurisdictional dispute moved youth service high onto the Congressional agenda in the 101st Congress.

The Importance of Analyzing Policy Content

This dissertation advocates analyzing policy content across time and across subgroups within a policy community. While Kingdon acknowledges the efforts of policy entrepreneurs, Schneider and Ingram emphasize the importance of strategic behavior including efforts to manipulate the social construction of the target population.

Policy Content -- Over time, there was surprisingly little change in the basic content of policy proposals. There were also few efforts to merge or combine program types within a single bill. The only notable change in the youth service policy debate involved addition of further alternatives from which to choose. In the mid-1980s, the three policy versions (national service writ large, CCC-type youth service, and school-based programs) were joined by service programs linked to federal higher education financial aid and President Bush's purely voluntary, unstipended version of youth service. The closing sections of Chapter 7 describe how the characteristics of policies and bills varied according to type of youth service. Analysis of ideas about policy helps to explain actual policy content (see Table 15).

Table 15.
The Continuum of Youth Service Opportunities
Sorted By Policy Components

	Writ Large Full-Time	Writ Large Part-Time	CCC-Type Programs	Education-Linked	Voluntarism
Target Population	All youths age 18 or older	Citizens of all ages	Summer-only: age 15-21 Year-round: age 16-25	Youths enrolled in kindergarten through college	Citizens of all ages
Social Construction of the Target Population	Draft dodgers; campus trouble makers; unemployed youth; selfish, unpatriotic youth	Good kids who can't afford a first home or who don't volunteer because they are burdened with paying off their college loans	School drop-outs; at-risk youth; poor; minorities; disadvantaged youth	An untapped national resource just waiting to be asked to participate in service activities	Greedy youth; those willing to help who do not know how to get started with volunteer activities
Model or Inspiration	Writings of William James; military, Peace Corps, VISTA	National Guard	New Deal Civilian Conservation Corps; federal YCC and YACC programs	Private programs, FIPSE	Writings of de Tocqueville
Advocacy Groups	National Service Secretariat; Coalition for National Service; DLC	None	Human Environment Center; National Association of Service and Conservation Corps	COOL; Campus Compact; National Association of Secondary School Principals	Points of Light Foundation; Bush Office of National Service
Closest Association with Government	ACTION; Peace Corps; VISTA; military	None	U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Labor	U.S. Department of Education	Points of Light Foundation

Strategies for Advancing a Policy Idea -- Kingdon discusses the traditional strategies followed by advocacy groups to advance their ideas including lobbying and attention seeking through papers, speeches, conference presentations, etc. Schneider and Ingram stress the importance of such strategies as issue framing, the use of rationales to link a policy to a problem, and the shaping of the social construction of a policy's target population. They argue that the

social construction of target populations has a powerful influence on public officials and shapes both the policy agenda and the actual design of policy... There are strong pressures for public officials to provide beneficial policy to powerful-positively constructed target populations and to devise punitive, punishment-oriented policy for negatively constructed groups (1993, p.334).

They also theorize that policy tools will differ according to how the target population is defined. Policies for populations constructed as deserving, i.e., the positive-powerful "advantagedes," will contain entitlements and non-income-tested subsidies, free information, training, and technical assistance; policy tools for the positive-powerless "dependents" target population will also include subsidies, but the "eligibility requirements often involve labeling and stigmatizing recipients" (1993, p. 339). Finally, they observe that "social constructions are manipulated and used by public officials, the media, and the groups themselves" (1993, p. 342).

We have seen that the specification of the target population for youth service programs -- and the social construction of those target populations -- varied according to the youth service policy community subgroup. Some programs offered positive benefits such as stipends, college loan deferments or cancellations, eligibility for college financial aid, vouchers for use as a down payment on a home, and wages while performing service. Under the Schneider-Ingram theory, benefits of these types would go to positive-powerful "advantagedes" target populations including college students and college graduates.

The target population for writ large proposals was often portrayed as draft dodgers or campus trouble makers ("deviants") or as adrift youth and unemployed teenagers ("dependents"). Some writ large proposals targeted all youth (or all males) within a certain age range; such a broad group enjoyed a more benign social construction. Mikulski's program was often grouped with Nunn's because it proposed to accept all comers, but her vision leaned more towards stipend-linked voluntarism, while Nunn's was a civic obligation model. Nunn's target population was described as greedy, thankless, materialistic youth who ought to be required to perform service before receiving federal college financial aid. In contrast, Mikulski defined the target population of her bill as "the good kids" who would volunteer but couldn't afford to because they had to work. i.e., belonging to the "dependents" or, possibly, the "advantagedes" categories.

The Dodd-Panetta youth service bill best fit the House view of the appropriate target population (at-risk youth, school drop-outs, unemployed or economically disadvantaged youth). These youths carried the social construction of powerless and were on the borderline between positive and negative; i.e., they could be classified as "dependents" or "deviants."

An important goal of YSA was to change the social construction of youth from negative to positive. Kindergartners to college students were packaged as an untapped national resource. The target population of Kennedy's bills was always portrayed as a positive national resource with emphasis on the fact that they were future citizens and eventual voters who would help if they only had the opportunity. Thus, youths under the Kennedy bill were positive-powerless "dependents." However, the Kennedy bill also targeted college students who did not need stipends to participate in service programs, i.e., affluent Americans of voting age like the Yale and Harvard graduates who founded COOL and City Year as well as adults and seniors in general. These populations could be classified as powerful-positive "advantagedes" -- the group that Schneider and Ingram argue would receive benefits such as those contained in the youth service legislation.

The effort to shape the social construction of youth permitted members of Congress to vote for youth service programs believing they could explain to their constituents why such "positive" benefits were going to a group sometimes viewed as "dependent" if not "deviant." Schneider and Ingram argue that the social construction of the target population can influence a policy's outcome. For a short time, thanks to the efforts of many groups and individuals, Congress viewed America's youths as positive if not powerful and rewarded them with benefits.

Criteria for Success

Other criteria for public policy success can include technical feasibility, grass roots support, affordability and meeting Kingdon's test of mainstream thinking.

Technical Feasibility -- Despite the success of the Seattle PLS program in the 1970s, national service writ large advocates were always plagued with the question of whether their proposals would actually work. By the late-1980s, due in large part to the efforts of Youth Service America, CCC-type and school-based youth service programs were in operation across the nation. By 1989, there were over 3,000 school-based programs and 500 programs at colleges and universities. There were enough state and local CCC-type youth service programs in operation that both YSA's Working Group and Eberly's Coalition could adopt statements of "Principles of Best Practice." These programs demonstrated that these types of youth service programs did work.

Grass Roots Support -- If there was not major grass roots support for youth service, there were at least programs in many members' states and districts. Many governors, mayors, school principals, and school boards were also interested in youth service programs. Landrum observed in 1991 that "there will be lots happening in Michigan so [that the new Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee] Congressman Ford won't be able to ignore youth service" (Interview 1991).

This could be said for other Members of Congress, too. The college level program at Brown University and the Campus Compact organization were both located in Senator Pell's state. The high school level Thomas Jefferson Forum program in Boston, the Springfield, MA, school district program, and the City Year program were located in Senator Kennedy's state. Congressmen Martinez, Panetta, and, eventually, Hawkins, were familiar with many programs flourishing in California by the late 1980s.

Efficiency (Or, At Least, Affordability) -- Kingdon identifies tolerable cost as a crucial criteria for success. By 1989, the Congress was

reluctant to initiate new spending programs, and cost was more critical than it had been in previous decades. The final youth service bill had a substantially lower cost than many of the bills originally introduced in the 101st Congress (see Table 16).

Public Acquiescence -- Public acquiescence also helps a bill in Congress according to Kingdon. While some continued to oppose the idea of a federal youth service program, candidate Bush's endorsement of a youth service effort increased the likelihood that a bill would be considered by Congress.

By the late-1980s, much of the opposition to nonmandatory youth service had faded although some argued that voluntarism worked well without government intervention. In December, 1987, Gallup reported the highest level of support for a voluntary youth service program ever in its polling (*NSN* 1988), and the press had begun to take note of the many youth service programs in operation (Toufexis 1987, Hammonds 1988, Miller 1988). The controversial Nunn-McCurdy bills caught the attention of the press, and the number of articles on youth service and the pending legislative proposals increased greatly in 1989 and 1990.

Once the threat of "linkage" to student aid programs had been quashed and it was apparent that funding for a new program would not come out of monies currently supporting education and jobs programs, House Democrats dropped much of their opposition.

Mainstream Thinking -- Another criteria for success identified by Kingdon is mainstream thinking within the policy community. By the late 1980s, no particular approach had come to be mainstream thinking; rather, mainstream thinking involved supporting multiple types of youth service. In 19889, Eberly wrote in his biography that he hoped some day to see

a graduated service program in which school children visit the needy and learn about their situation, high school age persons serve part-time during the school year and full-time during the summer, those in the 18-24 year range spend a year in full-time service, college students engage in service-learning programs well integrated with their courses, those between 25 and retirement age have opportunities for one-year service sabbaticals, and retired persons participate in a senior service program that utilizes their talents while easing the burden of social security (Eberly 1989, p. 231).

In explaining why the Community Action Program legislation passed in the 1960s, Polsby observed that the bill "was viewed by a number of influential groups as a favorable response to their own specialized and differing needs" (1984, p. 143); Polsby calls this "disparities in expectations about the ultimate aim of the project" (p. 143). This also happened with the youth service legislation. By constructing a "continuum bill," many different groups (college presidents, high school principals, students of all ages, senior citizens, at-risk youth) could benefit from bill passage. For example, while there was very little targeting written into the final bill, House members "saw the CCC programs as being like the Job Corps...as yet another technique to get at the at-risk kids and get them to stay in school" (Sofer Interview 1991).

Fitting Political Culture -- Landrum recalls visiting with a Carter administration official in the Vice President's office in 1978. At the time, Landrum staffed the Committee for the Study of National Service project.

He said national service was a great idea but what we needed to do was "develop something that fit into the political culture." So I made a shift; I decided to use more indirect routes to getting national service going (Interview 1992).

Landrum explained that we adapted youth service to the American political culture. We identified existing (and promoted new) forerunner programs that could serve as viable models for a national program. The question then became, "How do we use these existing programs to create a movement? How do we weave them back together?"...The youth service bills didn't move; rather it was the creation of the program network that made the difference. The Members of Congress saw something tangible (Landrum Interview 1992).

Table 16.
Target Funding Levels for
Select Youth Service Bills
in the 101st Congress

Sponsor and Bill	Requested Funding Level
Nunn S. 3/McCurdy H.R. 660	\$5.3 billion
Mikulski S. 408/Bonior H.R. 1000	\$250 million (1st year) \$2 billion by 4th year
Dodd S. 322/Panetta H.R. 717	\$152.4 million
Kennedy S. 650	\$100 million
Pell S. 576/Garcia H.R. 1615	\$30 million
Kennedy S. 1430	
As Introduced	\$330 million
As Passed by Senate	\$125 million over two years
Hawkins H.R. 4330	
As Introduced	\$183 million
As Passed by House .	\$193 million
P.L. 101-610	\$62 million (1st year) \$105 million (2nd year) \$120 million (3rd year)

In the 1988-89 YSA annual report, Landrum wrote

In 1985, Frank Slobig and I discovered that we shared a vision -- simple in concept but complex in implementation. A nationwide network of well-organized programs of community and national service could enable the young people of America to make enormous contributions to their communities (not dated (a) p. 3).

Equity and Federalism -- Landrum's decentralized approach to youth service programs reflects one of the strengths of a federal system. Programs were run at the local, regional, or state level with some funding from the private sector and foundations. There were programs for all types of people interested in performing all kinds of service. YSA's philosophy "that all programs are good...Let a thousand flowers bloom and then we will take the best of what is there" (Slobig Interview 1992) promised equitable distribution of limited resources.

The Peace Corps Connection

Why did some individuals work so tirelessly on behalf of youth service? One answer is suggested by a statement made by Eberly at a hearing in 1985. He said

Twenty years ago, when I began discussing national service intensively and extensively, I hypothesized that professionals most in favor would be those whose disciplines led them to it, namely educators, sociologists, and psychologists. I was wrong. When I found some English teachers and economists and scientists supporting national service, I usually discovered it was because they had such experiences as a young person (U.S. Congress 1985, p. 125).

For youth service, Kingdon's policy entrepreneurs were primarily motivated by personal experience. If there are two recurring themes in the national service story, they are funding from the Ford Foundation and members of the youth service policy community who were formerly associated with the Peace Corps. While the Peace Corps is not the universal domestic service program that Eberly originally envisioned, it has been a precedent that youth service advocates looked to as a model. But more important to the youth service movement, the Peace Corps has provided thousands of Americans with a service experience. By the start of the 101st Congress in January, 1989, 130,000 volunteers had served in the Peace Corps; in 1988, 5,700 Americans were serving as Peace Corps volunteers.

Dodd, Tsongas, Wexler and Wofford, Briscoe, Burkhardt, and Landrum were all either former Peace Corps volunteers or staff. Eberly served on the Peace Corps recruitment team. The first Director of the Peace Corps, Sargent Shriver, advised Mikulski and wrote Kennedy about youth service legislation. Landrum also was co-founder and head of the Peace Corps alumni association. And it was the Director of the Peace Corps, Loret Ruppe, who sold the youth service idea to candidate Bush.

The Peace Corps may have influenced Congress in another way. In 1986, it was estimated that 250 Congressional aides were former Peace Corps volunteers (Shute 1986). Chuck Ludlum (who wrote the Bumpers'

bill) and the staff person on Senator Glenn's staff (who formulated Glenn's 1984 youth service presidential platform proposal) were both former Peace Corps volunteers.

At a 1993 youth service hearing, Senator Wofford said of the 1960s a lot of us in those days thought of one, big domestic Peace Corps, run like the Peace Corps, out of Washington, but sending people everywhere around the country (U.S. Congress 1993, p. 102).

But Wofford went on to pay tribute to the Landrum paradigm saying

Now it is coming up from a very different way. It is coming up from the bottom, from the grass roots, from communities, . . . from a thousand different programs around the country . . . instead of one, centrally-organized domestic Peace Corps (U.S. Congress 1993, p. 102).

The form the federal youth service program ultimately took was quite different from the Peace Corps, but like the Peace Corps, it sent a message to America's youth that their government trusts them and needs them and that they have something to contribute to their nation.

Conclusions

The youth service case study suggests interesting lessons about the policy process in the U.S. Congress. Kingdon's model does not necessarily predict when and why a window of opportunity will open. For youth service, the presidential campaign cycle was a critical period of opportunity. Those who argue for a six-year presidential term might consider the trade-offs such a change might involve. It is fashionable for some to argue we have too many elections at too many levels too often in this country. Perhaps elections would be more valued if further evidence could be presented that the election cycle is often a major cause for the opening of Kingdon's windows of policy opportunity.

The history of youth service programs underscores the strength of a federalist system of government. When the nationally funded programs (YCC and YACC) were cut back and terminated, state and local governments assumed responsibility for many programs within their borders. Particularly during the early 1980s, a range of programs developed across the country. For youth service, the federal system provided a "laboratory of democracy." The Landrum paradigm was probably easier to both conceptualize and implement in a federal system than it might have been in a highly centralized system of government.

The classic rules of issue advocacy were apparent for youth service policy. Grass roots support and strength in numbers helped the cause. Indeed, the advocacy group that seemed to carry the greatest influence was People for the American Way, a group only peripherally interested in youth service. But the work of Schneider and Ingram provide additional insights about the nature of policy and its chances for success.

The social construction of the target population for youth service programs changed from benign or negative to positive in the late 1980s. The William T. Grant Foundation presented youth as "partners in today's world and shapers of tomorrow's" (1988, p. 11). YSA presented youth as "a vital resource which can help meet pressing human and environmental

needs in communities across the nation" (Youth Service America not dated (b)). As Slobig stated in his testimony before the Senate Labor and Human Relations Committee on March 14, 1989, youth volunteers

benefit from being resources not recipients, givers not takers, part of the solution not part of the problem. The genius of the best of local programs is that they transform the view of who young people are and what they are capable of (U.S. Congress 1989, p. 180).

The Constitutional Rights Foundation built "service programs on the notion that kids are good, positive, young people who want to be connected to our society, who want to do good things" (U. S. Congress 1989b, p. 400). PennServe believed that

youth service can transform society's perception of youth. Youth can be part of the solution, not part of the problem. Youth, even those commonly viewed as losers, can become winners [because] it treats young people as workers and responsible citizens (U.S. Congress 1989b, p. 374).

And NASCC's Director, Peg Rosenberry, argued that

through youth service, we have an opportunity to fundamentally change the way we view young people -- to redefine their role in society. At last, we could link all government-sponsored services for youth with one powerful concept -- that young people are resources for and not simply clients of our social service, training and education systems (Streams 1989).

Schneider and Ingram attribute strategic behavior primarily to political actors. This case study of youth service policy shows the degree to which nonelected actors also utilize strategies to influence the policy development process. The policy content-based theories of Schneider and Ingram deserve further exploration in future policy studies.

Finally, the micro-level, diachronic approach used in this dissertation portrays a process of policy development more like Kingdon's concurrent streams than the traditional sequential stages of phases of the policy process still taught in many policy text books. But, for this case study of youth service policy at least, it also reveals a process that is considerably more intentional and less random than is suggested by Kingdon's research.

APPENDIX

Individuals Contacted Regarding Youth Service

Julie Abbott	Don Mathis
Sue Armsby	D. Gray Maxwell
Rob Bradner	Dave McCurdy
Bob Brogan	Barbara Mikulski
Jeremy Bronson	Leslie Miles
Kathy Connelly	Catherine Milton
Mary Durkin	Charles C. Moskos
Don Eberly	Michelle Mrdeza
Steve Fischer	Chris Murphy
Sarah Flanagan	Sam Nunn
Steve Ganote	Mary Rose Oakar
Kathy Gille	Cathy O'Brien
Kathy Gillespie	Gretchen Pagel
Joan Gillman	Claiborne Pell
Braden Goetz	Tim Penny
Ron Grimes	Ross Peterson
Peter Dobkin Hall	John Porter
Sam Halperin	Craig Powers
Tammy Hawley	Glenn Roberts
Carrie Hillyard	Rocky Rosacker
Eric Jensen	Peg Rosenberry
Raymond Johns	Shirley Sagawa
Glenda Kendrick	Alden Schacher
Pat Kery	Kerry Walsh Skelly
Jim Kessler	Frank Slobig
Ed Kilgore	Gene Sofer
Mike Knapp	Joe Theisen
Nick Littlefield	Phil Upschulte
Roger Landrum	Winston Warner
Chuck Ludlum	Jon Weintraub
Will Marshall	Tom Wolanin
Matthew Martinez	Leslie Wooley

Most of these individuals participated in an indepth interview that lasted approximately 45 minutes. Some interviews lasted more than 2 hours. While some members of Congress followed my standard interview protocol, many of my contacts with members of the U.S. Congress involved brief, highly focused conversations that took place away from their Capitol Hill offices.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER 1

- Aleman, Stephen and Dale H. Robinson. 1989. National Service: Related Legislation in the 101st Congress (CRS 89-372EPW). Washington: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.
- Hall, Edward F., "National Service," The Litchfield Enquirer, 19 May 1966.
- Heclo, Hugh. 1974. Modern Social Politics in Britain and Sweden. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kingdon, John W. 1984. Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Kingdon, John W. 1994. "Agendas, Ideas, and Policy Change." in New Perspectives on American Politics, eds. Lawrence C Dodd and Calvin Jillson. Washington: CQ Press.
- Polsby, Nelson W. 1984. Political Innovation in America: The Politics of Policy Initiation. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Robinson, Dale H. 1993. National Service: Issues and Legislation in the 103rd Congress (IB 93055). Washington: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.
- Roth, John K., ed. 1971. The Moral Equivalent of War and Other Essays and Selections from Some Problems of Philosophy. New York: Harper and Row.
- Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. 1993. "Social Constructions of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." American Political Science Review 87:334-347.
- Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. 1995. "Controversy: Social Construction (Continued)." American Political Science Review 89:441-446.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1992. Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

CHAPTER 2

- Anderson, James E. 1975. Public Policy-Making. New York: Praeger.
- Bellamy, Edward. [1887] 1982. Looking Backward, 2000-1887. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Bobrow, Davis B. and John S. Dryzek. 1987. Policy Analysis by Design. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Boeckelman, Keith. 1992. "The Influence Of States on Federal Policy Adoption." Policy Studies Journal 20:365-375.
- Braybrooke, David and Charles E. Lindblom. 1963. A Strategy of Decision. New York: Free Press.
- Chamberlain, Lawrence. 1946. The President, Congress and Legislation. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cobb, Roger W. and Charles D. Elder. 1972. Participation in American Politics: The Dynamic of Agenda Building Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cobb, Roger W., Jennie Keith-Ross, and Marc Howard Ross. 1976. "Agenda Building as a Comparative Political Process." American Political Science Review 70:126-138.
- Cohen, Michael D., James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. 1972. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." Administrative

- Science Quarterly 17:1-25.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. [1837] 1945. Democracy in America. J.P. Mayer. New York: Vintage Press.
- Easton, David. 1957. "An Approach to the Analysis of Political Systems." World Politics 9:383-440.
- Glick, Henry R., and Scott P. Hays. 1991. "Innovation and Reinvention in State Policymaking: Theory and the Evolution of Living Will Laws." Journal of Politics 53:835-850.
- Gray, Virginia. 1973. "Innovation in the States." American Political Science Review 67:1174-85.
- Gray, Virginia. 1994. "Competition, Emulation, and Policy Innovation." In New Perspectives on American Politics, eds. Lawrence C. Dodd and Calvin Jillson. Washington: CQ Press.
- Hall, Peter A. ed. 1989. The Political Power of Economic Ideas: Keynesianism Across Nations. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hood, Christopher. 1984. The Tools of Government. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Hoppe, Layne D. 1969. "Agenda Setting Strategies: Pollution Policy." Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Arizona.
- Ingram, Helen, and Anne Schneider. 1991. "Target Populations and Policy Design." Administration and Society 23:333-56.
- Jacob, Herbert. 1990. Silent Revolution: The Transformation of Divorce Law in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- James, William. [1910] 1971. "The Moral Equivalent of War." In A Profile of National Service, ed. Donald J. Eberly. New York: Overseas Education Service.
- Jenkins-Smith, Hank C. and Paul A. Sabatier. 1993. "The Study of Public Policy Processes." In Policy Change and Learning, eds. Paul A. Sabatier and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. Boulder: Westview.
- Jones, Charles O. 1984. An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Kingdon, John W. 1984. Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Kingdon, John W. 1994. "Agendas, Ideas, and Policy Change." In New Perspectives on American Politics, eds. Lawrence C. Dodd and Calvin Jillson. Washington: CQ Press.
- Kirst, Michael, Gail Meister, and Stephen Rowley. 1984. "Policy Issue Networks: Their Influence on State Policymaking." Policy Studies Journal 13:247-64.
- Light, Paul C. 1991. The President's Agenda: Domestic Policy Choice from Kennedy to Reagan. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Lindblom, Charles E. 1959. "The Science of 'Muddling Through'," Public Administration Review 19:79-88.
- Linder, Stephen H., and B. Guy Peters. 1989. "Instruments of Government: Perceptions and Contexts." Journal of Public Policy 9:35-58.
- Linder, Stephen H. and B. Guy Peters. 1990. "The Design of Instruments for Public Policy." In Policy Theory and Policy Evaluation, ed. Stuart Nagel. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Nathan, Richard. 1989. "The Role of States in American Federalism." In The State of the States, ed. Carl Van Horn. Washington: CQ Press.
- Peters, B. Guy. 1983. "Comparative Public Policy." In Comparative Politics: An Introduction to the Politics of the United Kingdom,

- France, Germany, and the Soviet Union, eds. Dan N. Jacobs, David P. Conradt, B. Guy Peters, and William Safran. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Polsby, Nelson. 1984. Political Innovation in America: The Politics of Policy Initiation. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Price David E. 1972. Who Makes the Laws? Creativity and Power in Senate Committees. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Ripley, Randall B. 1988. Congress: Process and Policy. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Sabatier, Paul A. 1991. "Toward Better Theories of the Policy Process." PS: Political Science and Politics. 24:147-56.
- Salamon, Lester M., ed. 1989. Beyond Privatization: The Tools of Government. Washington: Urban Institute Press.
- Schattschneider, E. E. 1960. The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Wilson.
- Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1990a. "The Behavioral Assumptions of Policy Tools." Journal of Politics 52:511-29.
- Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1990b. "Policy Design: Elements, Premises, and Strategies." In Policy Theory and Policy Evaluation, ed. Stuart Nagel. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1993. "Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." American Political Science Review 87:334-47.
- Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1995. "Controversy: Social Construction (Continued)." American Political Science Review 89:441-446.
- Sharp, Elaine B. 1992. "Agenda-Setting and Policy Results: Lessons from Three Drug Policy Episodes." Policy Studies Journal 20(4):538-51.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1981. The Sciences of the Artificial. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Somit, Albert and Joseph Tanenhaus. 1967. The Development of American Political Science. Boston: Allen and Bacon.
- Stone, Deborah. 1988. Policy Paradox and Policy Reason. Illinois: Scott, Foresman.
- Stone, Deborah. 1989. "Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas." Political Science Quarterly 104:281-300.
- Walker, Jack L. 1969. "Diffusion of Innovations Among the American States." American Political Science Review 63:880-99.
- Yishai, Yael. 1993. "Public Ideas and Public Policy: Abortion Politics in Four Democracies." Comparative Politics 25:207-28.

CHAPTER 3

- Albertson, Maurice L., Andrew Rice and Pauline E. Birky. 1961. New Frontiers for American Youth: Perspectives on the Peace Corps. Washington: Public Affairs Press.
- Atlantic Council of the United States. 1982. Towards a Consensus on Military Service: Policy Papers. Washington: Author.
- Bailey, Liberty Hyde. 1919. Universal Service. Ithica, NY: Comstock.
- Bailin, Michael A. 1982. The California Conservation Corps: A Case Study. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.
- Bellamy, Edward. [1887] 1982. Looking Backward, 2000-1887. New York: Viking Penguin Press.
- Bubb, Frank. 1988. "National Service: A Solution in Search of a Problem." Human Events August 6:22-24.

- Coalition for National Service. 1988. National Service: An Action Agenda for the 1990s. Washington: National Service Secretariat.
- Committee for the Study of National Service. 1977. Outline of a Proposal for a Voluntary National Service System. Washington: Potomac Institute.
- Committee for the Study of National Service. 1979. Youth and the Needs of the Nation. Washington: Potomac Institute.
- Committee for the Study of National Service. 1980. National Youth Service: What's At Stake? Washington: Potomac Institute.
- Congressional Budget Office. 1978. National Service Programs and Their Effects on Military Manpower and Civilian Youth Programs Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Congressional Budget Office. 1980 Study Estimating Cost of National Service Washington: Author
- Darken, Arthur H. 1959. Analysis of a Proposal for the Establishment of Point Four Youth Corps (December 17). Printed in the Congressional Record (House), January 14, 1960, p. 492.
- Danzig, Richard and Peter Szanton. 1986. National Service: What Would It Mean?. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Eberly, Donald J. 1959. "A National Service," The Christian Science Monitor, April 18.
- Eberly, Donald J., ed. 1966. A Profile of National Service. New York: Overseas Educational Service.
- Eberly, Donald J., ed. 1968. National Service: A Report of a Conference, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Eberly, Donald J. 1988. National Service: A Promise to Keep. Rochester, NY: John Alden Books.
- Eberly, Donald J. 1991. National Youth Service: A Democratic Institution for the 21st Century. Washington: National Service Secretariat.
- Eberly, Donald J. 1992. National Youth Service: A Global Perspective. Washington: National Service Secretariat.
- Eberly, Donald J. and Michael W. Sherraden, eds. 1990. The Moral Equivalent of War? A Study of Non-Military Service in Nine Nations. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Evans, David. 1980. "The AVF--Making It Work." United States Naval Institute Proceedings. 106:47-53.
- Evers, Williamson. 1990. National Service: Pro & Con. Stanford, CA: Hoover Press.
- Garrettson, Charles Lloyd III. 1993. Hubert H. Humphrey: The Politics of Joy. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Gold, Phillip. 1989. "Volunteer Force a Success, But is U.S. Set for War?" Washington Times, January 28.
- James, William. 1971. "The Moral Equivalent of War." In John K. Roth, ed. The Moral Equivalent of War and Other Essays and Selections from Some Problems of Philosophy, ed. John K. Roth. New York: Harper and Row.
- Janowitz, Morris. 1967. "American Democracy and Military Service." Trans-Action, March.
- Janowitz, Morris. 1981. "Making the All-Volunteer Military Work?" Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 37(February):7-9.
- Janowitz, Morris. 1983a. "National Service and the Welfare-Warfare State." Social Service Review 57:525-544.
- Janowitz, Morris. 1983b. The Reconstruction of Patriotism: Education for

- Civic Consciousness. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, Lyndon B. 1965. Address at the University of Kentucky, February 22, 1965. As cited in Committee for the Study of National Service, Youth and the Needs of the Nation. Washington: Potomac Institute, 1979. p. 16.
- Johnson, Lyndon B. 1966. "Text of President Johnson's Speech at Princeton University," New York Times, May 12.
- Johnson, Lyndon B. 1967. "Text of President Johnson's Message to Congress on the Selective Service System," New York Times, March 7.
- Kennedy, John F. 1960. "Excerpt from Kennedy Speech in San Francisco," The New York Times, November 3.
- King, William R. 1977. Achieving America's Goals: National Service or the All-Volunteer Armed Force? Washington: United States Senate, Committee on Armed Services.
- Knickerbocker, Brad. 1983. "Ten Years of Volunteering for the U.S. Military Service," Christian Science Monitor, November 23.
- Landrum, Roger. 1980. "Voluntary National Service: An Alternative to the Draft." Transatlantic Perspectives (3).
- Lash, Joseph P. 1973. Eleanor and Franklin. New York: New American Library.
- McCarthy, Colman. 1994. "VISTA at 30: Quietly Thriving," Washington Post, May 3.
- McCloskey, Paul. 1979. "National Youth Service as an Alternative." Commonsense Fall:13-19.
- McCurdy, Dave. 1987. "McCurdy Introduces National Service Act." Press Release dated March 9, 1987.
- McNamara, Robert S. 1966. "Voluntary Service for All Youth." Vital Speeches of the Day 16:484-88.
- Millard, Steve. 1983. "The Other Alternative: Voluntary Action and the States." State Legislatures 9:16-19.
- Moskos, Charles C. 1978. "The Enlisted Ranks in the All-Volunteer Army." In The All-Volunteer Force and American Society, ed. John B. Keeley. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
- Moskos, Charles C. 1980. "How to Save the All-Volunteer Force." Public Interest 61:74-89.
- Moskos, Charles C. 1981. "Making the All-Volunteer Force Work: A National Service Approach." Foreign Affairs 60: 17-34.
- National Advisory Commission on Selective Service. 1967. In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve? Washington: Government Printing Office.
- NSN. 1966a. "President Calls For Manpower Service Program." National Service Newsletter, 3:1.
- NSN. 1966b. "AVC Conference Considers National Service." National Service Newsletter, 4:1-2.
- NSN. 1967. "Secretariat Announces Formation of Advisory Board." National Service Newsletter, 6:3.
- NSN. 1971a. "What You Can Do For National Service." National Service Newsletter, 18:1,4.
- NSN. 1971b. "Nixon Moves to Consolidate Service Programs." National Service Newsletter, 18:1.
- NSN. 1972. "Nixon: An Urban Volunteer Corps." National Service Newsletter, 22:3.
- NSN. 1974. "National Service Linked With Unemployment." National Service Newsletter, 27:1.

- NSN. 1976. "Hyde Park Conference on Youth Sees Need for More Than Jobs." National Service Newsletter, 29:1-2.
- NSN. 1983a. "Ford Foundation Makes Grant for National Service Study." National Service Newsletter, 42:1-2.
- NSN. 1983b. "New York City Leaders Call for National Service." National Service Newsletter, 42:1.
- National Service Secretariat. 1969. Statement on National Volunteer Service. New York: Author.
- New York Times. 1966a. "Educators Urge Options To Draft: Peace Corps Service Asked as Military Alternative," May 8.
- New York Times. 1966b. "Testing For The Draft," May 14.
- Nunn, Sam. 1977. "The Draft: Both Sides of the Debate (An Interview with Sam Nunn)." U.S. News & World Report February 14.
- Ostrander, F. Taylor. 1966. The Point Four Youth Corps. In A Profile of National Service, ed. Donald J. Eberly. New York: Overseas Educational Service.
- Polsby, Nelson. 1984. Political Innovation in America. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- President's Study Group On a National Service Program. 1963. "Information on a Proposed National Service Program." as cited in National Service: A Report of a Conference, ed. Donald J. Eberly. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967, p. 593.
- Redmon, Coates. 1986. Come As You Are: The Peace Corps Story. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Janovich
- Reuther, Walter O. 1950. A Proposal for a Total Peace Offensive to Stop Communist Aggression by Taking the Initiative in the World Contest For Men's Minds, Hearts and Loyalties. Detroit: International Union, United Automobiles, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO.
- Rollman, Heinz. 1954. World Construction. New York: Greenberg.
- Sage, Henry J. 1979. "The Drift Toward the Draft." U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings 105:38-48.
- Saikowski, Charlotte. 1978. "Let's Go Back To The Draft." Christian Science Monitor, July 26.
- Sherraden, Michael W., and Donald J. Eberly. eds. 1982. National Service: Social, Economic and Military Impacts. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.
- Tax, Sol, ed. 1967. The Draft: A Handbook of Facts and Alternatives. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thomas, Franklin A. 1984. "National Service: An Aspect of Youth Development." New York: The Ford Foundation.
- Toomepuu, Juri. 1989. Effects of a National Service Program on Army Recruiting; USAREC Study Report 89-1 Ft. Sheridan, IL: U.S. Army Recruiting Command.
- U.S. Congress. 1979a. House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel. 1979. Hearing on H.R. 2206. March 12 and 14, 1979.
- U.S. Congress. 1979b. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Select Education. Hearing on H.R. 2206, April 9-10.
- U.S. Congress. 1980a. Senate. Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Subcommittee on Child and Human Development. Presidential Commission on National Service and National Commission on Volunteerism, Hearing March 13.
- U.S. Congress. 1980b. House of Representatives. Committee on Education

- and Labor, Subcommittee on Select Education. Proposed Presidential Commission on National Service Act of 1980, Hearing June 4.
- U.S. Congress. 1980c. House of Representatives. Committee on Education and Labor. 1980. Presidential Commission on National Service Act of 1980: Report together with additional and individual views (to accompany HR 686) (including cost estimate of the CBO), October 2. (Report 96-1459).
- U.S. Congress. 1982. House of Representatives. Committee on Education and Labor. Subcommittee on Select Education. 1982. Select Commission on Voluntary Service Opportunities Act (HR 2500), Hearing August 11.
- U.S. Congress. 1983. House of Representatives. Committee on Education and Labor. 1983. Select Commission on Voluntary Service Opportunities Act of 1983. A Report together with individual and dissenting views to accompany HR 1264 including estimates of the Congressional Budget Office (Rept 98-158).
- U.S. Congress. 1985. House of Representatives. Committee on Education and Labor. Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities. The Voluntary National Youth Service Act and the Select Commission on National Services Opportunity Act of 1985, Hearing on HR 888 and HR 1326 in New York City on September 27 (Rept. 99-52).
- Wirtz, Willard. 1975. The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education/Work Policy. Washington: New Republic.
- Wofford, Harris. 1966. "Toward a Draft Without Guns." Saturday Review, October 15.
- Wofford, Harris. 1980. Of Kennedy and Kings: Making Sense of the Sixties. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.

CHAPTER 4

- Badger, Anthony J. 1989. The New Deal: The Depression Years, 1933-1940. New York: Noonday.
- Burkhardt, Robert. 1990. Youth Service: The Useful and the Good. Washington: Youth Service America.
- Evers, Williamson M. 1990. National Service: Pro & Con. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.
- Graham, Otis L., Jr., and Meghan Robinson Wander, eds. 1985. Franklin D. Roosevelt: His Life and Times, An Encyclopedic View. New York: Da Capo.
- Howe, Sydney. 1967. "Issues and Needs in Major Service Areas: Conservation." In National Service: A Report of a Conference, ed. Donald J. Eberly. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Howe, Sydney. 1982a. "A New CCC Would Put Youths to Work," Boston Globe, September 13.
- Howe, Sydney. 1982b. "America Needs the CCC Again," The Christian Science Monitor, March 3.
- Howe, Sydney. 1985. "Training Youth for the Future," Washington Times, August 2.
- Human Environment Center. 1980. Youth-Conservation Employment. Washington: Author.
- Human Environment Center. 1981. Youth Conservation Jobs and Service -- A New National Corps? A Report of a Conference. Washington: Author.
- Human Environment Center. 1982a. Action for a State Conservation Corps. Washington: Author.

- Human Environment Center. 1982b. Model State Conservation Corps Enabling Act. Washington: Author.
- Human Environment Center. 1986. Conservation and Service Corps Profiles, November, 1986. Washington: Author.
- Human Environment Center. 1987. Conservation and Service Corps Profiles, November, 1987. Washington: Author.
- Lacy, Leslie A. 1976. The Soil Soldiers: The Civilian Conservation Corps In the Great Depression. Radnor, PA: Chilton.
- Merrill, Perry Henry. 1981. Roosevelt's Forest Army: A History of the Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942. Montpelier, VT: Author.
- Moskos, Charles C. 1988. A Call to Civic Service, National Service for Country and Community. New York: Free Press.
- National Association of Service and Conservation Corps. 1989. Conservation and Service Corps Profiles, August, 1989. Washington: Author.
- National Association of Service and Conservation Corps and the Human Environment Center. 1988. Conservation and Service Corps Profiles, October, 1988. Washington: Author.
- NSN. 1968. "California Group Launches First National Service Project." National Service Newsletter, 15:1-2.
- NSN. 1971a. "Brief Items: Creation of a California Ecology Corps." National Service Newsletter, 18:4.
- NSN. 1971b. "Conscientious Objectors Move Toward National Service in California Ecology Corps." National Service Newsletter, 19:4.
- NSN. 1982. "States Establish Youth Service Projects in Wake of New Federalism." National Service Newsletter, 40:3.
- Powell, Dianne C. 1988. Michigan Youth Corps -- More Than A Summer Job. Lexington, KY: Council of State Governments.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., Jr., and Joseph P. Lash. 1976. Unpublished Document, pp 5-6, as quoted in Sherraden, Michael W. and Donald J. Eberly. 1982. National Service: Social, Economic and Military Impacts. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Rural Coalition. 1984. Crippling the American Conservation Corps: See What Happens to a Good Idea When the White House Decides to Discredit It. Washington: Author.
- Salmond, John A. 1967. The Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942: A New Deal Case Study. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. 1958. The Coming of the New Deal. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Streams. 1987. "Numbness in the Land of NASCC." July/August: 2.
- Theus, Kathryn T. 1988. "Campus-Based Community Service: New Populism or 'Smoke and Mirrors'?" Change 20:27,30-38.
- U.S. Congress. 1981a. House of Representatives Committee on Governmental Affairs. Youth Conservation Corps and Young Adult Conservation Corps, Hearing, June 25 and July 17, 1981.
- U.S. Congress. 1981b. House of Representatives Committee on Interior. Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks. Public Land Management Policy (Public Lands Conservation Rehabilitation, and Improvement Act, Hearing on H.R. 4861, May 5 and 12 and November 7 (97-8, Part VI).
- U.S. Congress. 1982a. House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Report together with Supplemental Views (To Accompany H.R. 4861) Including the Cost Estimate of the Congressional Budget Office, May 4 (Rept. 97-500, Parts I).

- U.S. Congress. 1982b. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor. Report Together with Minority and Individual Views (To Accompany H.R. 4861...) Including Cost Estimate of the Congressional Budget Office, May 17 (Rept 97-500, Past 2).
- U.S. Congress. 1983a. House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Volunteers in the Parks: Report Together with Dissenting and Additional Views to Accompany S 864 Including Cost Estimate of the Congressional Budget Office, (Rept. 98-960).
- U.S. Congress. 1983b. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Report Together with Minority Views (To Accompany H.R. 999), May 20 (Rept 98-140).
- U.S. Congress. 1985a. House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. American Conservation Corps Act of 1985: Report Together with Dissenting Views (To accompany HR 99), March 14 (Rept. 99-18, Part I).
- U.S. Congress. 1985b. House of Representatives. Committee on Education and Labor. American Conservation Corps Act of 1985: Report Together with Minority, Additional, and Individual Views (To Accompany HR 99) May 2, 1985 (Rept. 99-18, Part 2).
- Wofford, Harris. 1980. Of Kennedys and Kings: Making Sense of the Sixties. New York: Farrar, Strauss, Giroux.

CHAPTER 5

- American Council on Education. 1978. Service-Learning for the Future: Domestic and International Programs. Washington: ACTION.
- Boyer, Ernest. 1983. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brown, B. Frank. 1980. The Transition of Youth to Adulthood: A Bridge Too Long. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Buckley, William F. Jr. 1973. Four Reforms: A Guide for the Seventies. New York: Putnam.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. 1979. Giving Youth a Better Chance: Options for Education, Work, and Service. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Colt, Lois. 1984. "They're Making a Difference: Colleges, Students Help Others Through Community Service," Boston Sunday Globe, December 9.
- Conrad, Dan and Diane Hedin. 1987. Youth Service: A Guidebook for Developing and Operating Effective Programs. Washington: INDEPENDENT SECTOR.
- Danzberger, Jacqueline P., and Michael D. Usdan. 1984. "Building Partnerships: The Atlanta Experience," Phi Delta Kappan, February:393-96.
- Eberly, Donald J. 1968a. National Service: A Report of a Conference. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Eberly, Donald J. 1968b. "Service Experience and Educational Growth." Educational Record, 49(2)Spring.
- Eberly, Donald J. 1974. "An Action-Learning Program that Provides a Challenge." NASSP Bulletin, March.
- Eberly, Donald J., Robert J. Havinghurst, and Richard A. Graham. 1972. "American Youth in the Mid-Seventies," NASSP Bulletin 56(367):November.

- Eberly, Donald J., Robert C. Terry, Jr., Louise K. Eberly, and Terrence Cullinan. 1969. An Agenda for Off-Campus Learning Experiences. Stanford, CA: Stanford Research Institute.
- Education Commission of the States. 1985. Reconnecting Youth: The Next Stage of Reform. Denver: Author.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1971. Towards Higher Education in an Active Society: Three Policy Guidelines. New York: Center for Policy Research.
- Gilinsky, Rhonda M. 1985. "When Helping Others Is Part of Learning: More Colleges are Promoting Idea of Service to Public," New York Times, January 6.
- Goodlad, John A. 1983. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Greenway, Robert. 1967. "A Role for Colleges and Universities in a National Service Program" In A Profile of National Service, ed. Donald J. Eberly. New York: Overseas Educational Services.
- Harrison, Charles H. 1987. Student Service: The New Carnegie Unit. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Honnet, Ellen Porter and Susan J. Poulsen. 1989. Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning. Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation.
- Howe, Harold III. 1988. "Remarks at Press Conference at National Press Club, Washington, D.C." Washington: William T. Grant Foundation, November 17.
- Kelley, Barbara. 1984. "Many College Students Again Show an Inclination to Get 'Involved'," Christian Science Monitor, September 7.
- Kendall, Jane C. 1988. "A Commentary on Facts and Faith: A Status Report on Youth Service." In Facts and Faith: A Status Report on Youth Service, ed. Anne Lewis. Washington: William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship.
- Landrum, Roger. 1985. "Memorandum to Gordon Berlin, The Ford Foundation; Subject: Next Steps" December 5.
- Lewis, Anne. 1988. Facts and Faith: A Status Report on Youth Service. Washington: William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship.
- Lewis, Anne. 1987. "Learning to Serve: High School Service Programs." The Education Digest 53:50.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. 1984. "National Service: An Issue for the Eighties." NASSP Bulletin 68:44-51.
- NSN. 1967a. "Labor Department to Support College Service Programs." National Service Newsletter, 13:1.
- NSN. 1968b. "Service Curriculum Findings Tabulated." National Service Newsletter, 15:3.
- NSN. 1968c. "3,000 Educators Call For Link Between National Service and Higher Education." National Service Newsletter, 15:4.
- NSN. 1968d. "Education Commissioner Howe Endorses Service Curriculum." National Service Newsletter, 16:4.
- NSN. 1971a. "Youth Conference Supports National Service Concept." National Service Newsletter, 18:2.
- NSN. 1971b. "New ACTION Agency Prepares to Launch Service-Learning Programs." National Service Newsletter, 19:1.
- NSN. 1972. "Secondary School Principals Launch Youth Service Study." National Service Newsletter, 20:2.
- NSN. 1973. "First Legislative Mandate for Service-Learning Given in New ACTION Act." National Service Newsletter, 25:4.
- NSN. 1974a. "Secondary School Principals Give Thrust To Action-

- Learning in Theory and Practice." National Service Newsletter, 27:4.
- NSN. 1974b. "Kentucky Completes First Statewide Service-Learning Inventory." National Service Newsletter, 27:4.
- NSN. 1974c. "ACTION Launches Service-Learning Program." National Service Newsletter, 26:3.
- NSN. 1982. "Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project Is Launched." National Service Newsletter, 41:2-3.
- Newman, Frank. 1985. Higher Education and the American Resurgence. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Office of Post Secondary Education. 1988. Innovative Projects for Student Community Service: Guidelines for Applicants (December 20) Washington: Author.
- President's Science Advisory Committee's Panel on Youth. 1973. Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Roosevelt Centennial Youth Project. 1984. A Policy Blueprint for Community Service and Youth Unemployment. Washington: Author.
- Southern Regional Education Board. 1970. Atlanta Service-Learning Conference Report. Atlanta: Author.
- Streams. 1986a. "PROFILE: Service America's Mission." July/August:1
- Streams. 1986b. Masthead. November/December:1.
- Streams. 1986c "Crossroads." November/December:4.
- Streams. 1988. "Setting the Youth Service Agenda for 1988." March:1.
- Streams. 1992. "Roosevelt Legacy." Summer:4.
- Streams. 1989. "Campus Compact: An Update." May:3.
- William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship. 1988a. The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America. Washington: Author.
- William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship. 1988b. The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families. Washington: Author.
- Wirtz, Willard. 1975. The Boundless Resource. Washington: The New Republic Book Company.
- Youth Service America. Not dated (a). Changing Perspectives: Looking at Youth as Resources, (Occasional Paper). Washington: Author.
- Youth Service America. Not dated (b). "Tripling the Youth Service Network: Thoughts About Expansion Strategies." Washington: Author.
- Youth Service America. Not dated (c). Youth Service America, 1988-89 Annual Report.

CHAPTER 6

- Atlantic Council of the United States. 1982. Toward a Consensus on Military Service: Policy Papers. Washington: Author.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1984. Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics For a New Age. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1992. An Aristocracy of Everyone: The Politics of Education and the Future of America. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Barnes, James A., and Richard E. Cohen. 1988. "The Politics Page -- DLC Offers Plan for Voluntary National Service," National Journal, May 14:1308.
- Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. 1985. Habits of the Heart: Individualism and

- Commitment in American Life. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton. 1992. The Good Society. New York: Vintage Books.
- Birnbaum, Jeffrey. 1988. "Sen. Nunn's Push for National Service Points Up Use of Conventions for Causes," Wall Street Journal, July 21.
- Boorstin, Daniel. 1989. "Can Patriotism Be Legislated?" U.S. News & World Report, February 13.
- Broder, David S. 1988a. "Citizens Corps: A Bold National Initiative?" Nation's Cities Weekly, May 23.
- Broder, David S. 1988b. "Race Remains Close in California But Quayle Poses Problems for GOP Effort to Attract Ticket-Splitters," Washington Post, October 11.
- Broder, David S. 1989. "The Self-Interest Decade is Over," Washington Post, January 29.
- Buckley, William F. Jr. 1990. Gratitude: Reflections on What We Owe To Our Country. New York: Random House.
- Coalition for a Democratic Majority Task Force on Foreign Policy and Defense. 1986. Military Manpower: National Service and the Common Defense. Washington: Author.
- Coalition for National Service. 1988. National Service: An Action Agenda for the 1990s. Washington: National Service Secretariat.
- Committee for the Study of National Service. 1979. Youth and the Needs of the Nation. Washington: Potomac Institute.
- Congressional Budget Office. 1978. National Service Programs and Their Effects on Military Manpower and Civilian Youth Programs. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Democratic Leadership Council. 1985. Winning In the World Economy. Washington: Author.
- Democratic Leadership Council. 1986. Defending America: Building a New Foundation for National Strength. Washington: Author.
- Democratic Leadership Council. 1988. Citizenship and National Service: A Blueprint for Civic Enterprise. Washington: Author.
- Eberly, Donald J., and Louise K. Eberly. 1987. "It's Time for National Service," The Christian Science Monitor, December 31.
- Economist. 1989. "National Service: Volunteer or Else," January 28.
- Education USA. 1987. "Expanding Youth Service." 29:137-139.
- ERR (Editorial Research Reports). 1986. "What Can Be Done for the Country?" October 31:795-812.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1970. Toward Higher Education in an Active Society: Three Policy Guidelines. New York: Center for Policy Research.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1976. "National Service for Youth." Human Behavior August.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1982. An Immodest Agenda. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1983. "A Remedy for Over Education -- A Year of Required National Service." Change 15:7-9.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1993a. Public Policy in a New Key. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Etzioni, Amitai. 1993b. The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Farney, Dennis. 1988. "Middle Ground: The Democrats Recast the Party to Win Back Suburban Voters They Lost to Reagan," Wall Street Journal, July 19.

- Feinberg, Lawrence. 1988. "Area Colleges encourage Community Service Among Students," Washington Post, October 14.
- Gailey, Phil. 1985. "Dissidents Defy Top Democrats; Council Formed," The New York Times, February 28.
- Gailey, Phil. 1988. "Reviving a Love of Duty," St. Petersburg Times, March 20.
- Gladieux, Lawrence E. 1983. "The Future of Student Financial Aid." College Board Review 126:12-22.
- Gordon, Suzanne. 1976. Lonely In America. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Hallow, Ralph. 1989. "Man of a Thousand Lights (George Bush and Voluntarism)," National Review, May 19.
- Henkoff, Ronald. 1989. "Is Greed Dead?" Fortune 120:40-43, 46, 49.
- Hershey, Robert D., Jr. 1989. "The Ideal of Service By Youth Is Revived," The New York Times, September 14.
- Hoffman, David. 1988. "Bush Urges Teen-Agers to Help Ghetto Dwellers: New Domestic Peace Corps Proposed," Washington Post, October 5.
- House Democratic Caucus. 1982. Rebuilding the Road to Opportunity. Washington: Author.
- House Democratic Caucus. 1984 Renewing America's Promise: A Democratic Blueprint for Our Nation's Future. Washington: Author.
- Janowitz, Morris. 1983. "National Service and the Welfare-Warfare State." Social Service Review 57:525-544.
- Jehl, Douglas. 1988. "Plan Links Student Aid to Public Service," Los Angeles Times, May 12.
- Johnson Foundation. 1988. "Coalition for National Service Challenges Bush and Dukakis; Americans and Soviets." Press Release, July 11, 1988.
- Kondracke, Morton M. 1988. "Nunn's Story," New Republic, December 5:15-16.
- Kramer, Michael. 1988. "Revisiting the Democratic Dream Ticket," U.S. News & World Report, November 7.
- Kuttner, Robert. 1988. "Give the Young a Better Chance to Serve Their Country," BusinessWeek, March 21.
- McCloskey, Paul. 1979. "National Service As An Alternative." Commonsense 2(3):13-19.
- McCrory, Mary. 1989. "A Point of Light (President Bush's Voluntarism Initiative)," Washington Post, June 27.
- McCurdy, Dave. 1989. "A Quid Pro Quo for Youth," New York Times, June 26.
- Mead, Lawrence M. 1986. Beyond Entitlement: The Social Obligations of Citizenship. New York: Free Press.
- Meisel, Wayne W. 1988. "An End to the 'Me' Generation: Getting Students to Volunteer." Journal of Volunteer Administration VII:35-43.
- Morrison, David. 1989. "Fall In, Citizens!" National Journal, April 22:989-93.
- Moskos, Charles C. 1988. A Call to Civic Service: National Service for Country and Community. New York: Free Press.
- National Governors' Association. 1989. Community Service: A Resource Guide for States. Washington: Committee on Human Resources, Center for Policy Research.
- NSN. 1981. "Calls for Study of Mandatory National Service Increase as Major Voluntary Youth Service Programs are Eliminated." National Service Newsletter, 39:2.
- NSN. 1985a. "Brief Quotations." National Service Newsletter, 47:3.

- NSN. 1985b. "Interest Rises in a GI Bill for National Service." National Service Newsletter, 46:1.
- NSN. 1986. "Coalition for National Service Is Formed." National Service Newsletter, 49:1.
- NSN. 1987. "Coalition for National Service is Strengthened with Addition of Bok, Boyer, Gallup, Gardner, Shalala, Wexler and Others." National Service Newsletter, 50:2.
- NSN. 1988. "Senator Sam Nunn Outlines National Service Plan." National Service Newsletter, 52:1.
- New Republic. 1988. "TRB From Washington: Sam Nunn Wants You." June 6:4.
- New York Times. 1988. "The Promise of a 'Citizen Corps' (Democratic Leadership Council Offers Plan of National Youth Service). May 14.
- Nisbet, Robert. 1953. The Quest for Community. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nisbet, Robert. 1962. Community and Power. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Noah, Timothy. 1986. "We Need You: National Service, An Idea Whose Time Has Come," Washington Monthly, November: 35-41.
- Noonan, Peggy. 1990. What I Saw At The Revolution: A Political Life in the Reagan Era. New York: Random House.
- People For the American Way. 1988. The Vanishing Voter. Washington: Author.
- People For the American Way. 1989a. Democracy's Next Generation: A Study of Youth and Teachers. Washington: Author.
- People For the American Way. 1989b. "People For, National Youth Employment Coalition Launch National Campaign Against Youth Voter Apathy." Press Release, January 27.
- People For the American Way. 1989c. "Backgrounder: Youth Service Community Service Programs." Press Release, February 9.
- People For the American Way. 1989d. Letter regarding S. 1430 dated October 3, 1989.
- People For the American Way. 1989e. Democracy's Next Generation: A Survey of Youth Values in America (Released November 20). Washington: Author.
- People For the American Way. 1990. Letter to Members of Congress dated September 11.
- Powell, Jody. 1985. "DLC is a Life Preserver for the Democratic Party," Dallas Times Herald, March 14.
- Saikowski, Charlotte. 1978. "Let's Go Back to the Draft," Christian Science Monitor, July 26.
- Schwartz, Maralee, and Paul Taylor. 1986. "Politics: Senator Cranston Losing Support Among Conservative Democrats," Washington Post, October 8.
- Schwartz, Susan. 1987. "Encouraging Youth Community Service: The Broadening Role of High Schools and Colleges," National Civic Review, July/August:288-301.
- Sheler, Jeffrey L., David Whitman, and Joseph Shapiro. 1989. "The Push for National Service," U.S. News & World Report, February 13.
- Shogan, Robert. 1989. "Democrats Seek New Approach to Social Problems: Volunteer 'Citizen Corps' Proposed," Los Angeles Times, January 26.
- Stephenson, Malvina. 1988. "Citizen Corps: Nunn on Bandwagon for McCurdy Plan," Tulsa Daily World, October 23.

- Streams. 1988. "Dukakis team not biting," June:3.
- Streams. 1989. "Profile: Bush's Bully Pulpit." January:1,2.
- Taylor, Paul. 1991. "An Agenda Focused Less on Rights, More on Responsibilities," Washington Post, November 19.
- U.S. News & World Report. 1977. "The Draft: Both Sides of the Debate," February 14.
- Wilson, George C. 1989. "Bill Links Education Aid, Service: Only Participants Would Receive Funds," Washington Post, January 6.

CHAPTER 7

- Abbott, Julie. 1989. Memo to Pilot Project Participants, June 15, 1989.
- Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swindler, and Steven M. Tipton. 1985. Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Democratic Leadership Council. 1988. Citizenship and National Service: A Blueprint for Civic Enterprise. Washington: Author.
- Eberly, Donald J. 1988. "A Hollow National Service?" Washington Post, July 30.
- Kennedy, Edward. 1989. "Statement of Senator Edward Kennedy on the Service to America Act of 1989." A Press Release dated February 21.
- Kingdon, John W. 1984. Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- McCain, John. 1989. "McCain Introduces National Service Plan." a Press Release dated April 13.
- McCarthy, Colman. 1987. "Training for Peace," Washington Post, June 21.
- Mikulski, Barbara. 1988. "A New Kind of National Service," Washington Post, July 17.
- Moskos, Charles C. 1988. A Call To Civic Service: National Service for Country and Community. New York: Free Press.
- Pell, Claiborne. 1987. "Remarks." Congressional Record March 17:S3269.
- Pell, Claiborne. 1989. "A Two-Tiered System is Unfair?" The College Board News, Summer:56.
- Porter, John. 1989. "National Service: A New Approach," a Dear Colleague Letter dated April 12.
- Schick, Allan. 1991. "Informed Legislation: Policy Research Versus Ordinary Knowledge." In Knowledge, Power and the Congress, eds. William H. Robinson and Clay H. Wellborn. Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc.
- Streams. 1989. "Profile: Bush's Bully Pulpit." Washington: Youth Service America, January:1.
- Thomma, Steven. 1987. "Public Work Proposed to Cut Students' Loans." St. Paul Pioneer Press, April 24.
- U.S. Congress. 1987a. House of Representatives, Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, Subcommittee on Human Resources. Hearing on the Voluntary National Youth Service Act, (Rept. 100-20), April 29.
- U.S. Congress. 1987b. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities. Hearings on Issues Related to National Youth Service, (Rept. 100-42), June 30.
- U.S. Congress. 1987c. House of Representatives, Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, Subcommittee on Human Resources. Commission on Federal Voluntary Service Opportunities for Young

- People Act of 1987, (Rept. 100-38), November 13.
- U.S. Congress. 1988. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities. Hearings on National Youth Corps, HR 18 and HR 460, (Rept. 100-75), May 11 and May 24.
- U.S. Congress. 1989. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. National Community Service Act of 1989 (S. 405), (Rept. 101-140), Hearing March 9, 14 and April 21 in Washington, D.C. and March 20 in Dorchester, MA.

CHAPTER 8

- Abbott, Julie. 1989. Memo to Senator Nunn Regarding National Service dated June 5.
- Bush, George. 1990. "Statement on Signing the National and Community Service Act of 1990." Weekly Compilation. November 16.
- Courier-Gazette. 1989. "Mikulski Writes Proposal to Further Volunteerism." August 23.
- CQ Weekly Report. 1990a. "Issue: Community/National Service." January 6:24.
- CQ Weekly Report. 1990b. "Bush Proposes New Cuts in US-Soviet Forces." February 3:348-50.
- CQ Weekly Report. 1990c. "Senate Votes 17, 18, 19, 20, 21,22." March 3:710-11.
- Ford, William. 1989a. "Bill in Congress on Public Service for Young People Shows Confusion About Student Aid and Patriotism," Chronicle of Higher Education, March 15:A40.
- Ford, William. 1989b. Dear Colleague Letter dated March 15.
- Hawkins, Augustus. 1990a. Dear Colleague Letter dated March 21.
- Hawkins, Augustus. 1990b. Dear Colleague Letter dated April 24.
- Ingwerson, Marshall. 1989. "Bush Unveils Plan That Encourages Volunteering." Christian Science Monitor, June 23:1-2.
- Kennedy, Edward M. 1989a. "Statement of Senator Edward M. Kennedy on The Service to America Act of 1989" February 21:1.
- Kennedy, Edward M. 1989b. Dear Colleague Letter. March 2.
- Kuntz, Phil. 1989a. "Nunn-McCurdy Plan Ignites National Service Debate." CQ Weekly Report March 25:645-648.
- Kuntz, Phil. 1989b. "Bush Outlines His Proposal for Volunteer Service." CQ Weekly Report June 24:1555-56.
- Lawton, Millicent. 1991. "Administration, Belatedly, to Name Board on Youth Service." Education Week June 5.
- Marshall, Will. 1989. Memo to Senator Nunn, Senator Robb and Congressman McCurdy Regarding "Moving National Service Forward," dated April 11.
- McCurdy, Dave. 1989. "A Quid Pro Quo for Youth," New York Times, June 26.
- National Journal. 1989a. "The DLC Wants a Cornerstone for 1992." March 25:749.
- National Journal. 1989b. "Thanks To Bush, Noblesse Oblige Is In Again -- But Is It Enough?" April 22:1006.
- NSN. 1989. "Bumpers, Dodd, Kennedy...Propose Varied Forms of National Youth Service." National Service Newsletter, 54:1.
- President's Advisory Committee on the Points of Light Initiative Foundation. 1989. The President's Advisory Committee on the Points of Light Initiative Foundation: Report to the President December,

1989. Washington: Author.
- Sagawa, Shirley. 1991. Personal correspondence.
- Sagawa, Shirley and Terry Hartle. 1989. "Memorandum To Senator Kennedy Regarding National Community Service Dinner." February 13.
- Seib, Gerald F. 1989. "Bush, With 'Points-of-Light' Plan, Calls For Volunteers to Fight Social Problems," Wall Street Journal, June 23.
- Shriver, Sargent. 1987. Letter to Senator Kennedy dated February 2 Located in the Labor and Human Resources Committee files.
- Streams. 1989. "National Scene Update." February/March:2.
- Swoboda, Frank. 1989. "Bush, Kennedy Share View on Youth Service: Both Proposing Cheap, Voluntary Programs," Washington Post, June 11.
- U.S. Congress. 1989a. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. National Community Service Act of 1989 (S. 408), Hearings. 101st, 1st Sess., March 9, 14 and April 21 in Washington, D.C. and March 20 in Dorchester, MA. (Rept. 101-140).
- U.S. Congress. 1989b. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor. Joint hearing of the Subcommittees on Elementary, Secondary and Vo Tech; Employment Opportunities; Postsecondary Education; Human Resources; and Select Education. Hearings on the Issue of National Service, March 15, April 19 and June 28 (Rept. 101-30).
- U.S. Congress. 1989c. Senate Committee on Government Affairs, Subcommittee on General Services, Federalism, and the District of Columbia. National Voluntary Service, Hearing April 24 (Knoxville, TN) and April 27 (Jacksonville, TN) (Rept. 101-139).
- U.S. Congress. 1989d. Senate Special Committee on Aging. Intergenerational Educational Partnerships: A Lifetime of Talent to Share, Hearing April 24 (Boca Raton, FL) (Rept. 101-283).
- U.S. Congress. 1989e. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism. American Conservation and Youth Service Corps Act of 1989 (S. 322), Hearing. April 25 (Hartford, CT) (Rept. 101-92).
- U.S. Congress. 1989f. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities. Field Hearings on the Youth Service Corps and H.R. 717, Hearing April 28 (San Francisco, CA) and June 23 (Los Angeles, CA) (Rept. 101-29).
- U.S. Congress. 1989g. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. National and Community Service Act of 1989 (Reporting out S. 1430), October 27 (Rept. 101-176).
- U.S. Congress. 1990a. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor. Hearing on HR 4330, The National Service Act of 1990, May 17 (Rept. 101-100).
- U.S. Congress. 1990b. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor. National Service Act: Report Together with Minority and Additional Views (to Accompany H.R. 4330), August 15 (Report 101-667, Part 1).
- U.S. Congress. 1990c. House of Representatives. Conference Committee Report on S. 1430, (Report 101-893).
- Washington Post. 1990. "On Capitol Hill." October 25.
- Welch, William M. 1990. "National Service Bills Stray From Sponsors' Idea." Associated Press Wire Service. September 17, 1990.

- Zuckerman, Jill. 1990a. "Bill to Spur Community Service Wins Approval in Senate." CQ Weekly Report March 3:669-70.
- Zuckerman, Jill. 1990b. "President's 'Points of Light' Still Only a Dim Twinkle," CQ Weekly Report June 27: pp. 240-41.

CHAPTER 9

- Eberly, Donald J. 1989. National Service: A Promise to Keep. Rochester, NY: John Alden Books.
- Hammonds, Keith. 1988. "The New Face of Public Service," BusinessWeek, October 24.
- Miller, Annette. 1988. "The New Volunteerism: High-Paid Yuppies are Penciling Compassion into Their Calendars," Newsweek, February 8
- NSN. 1988. "Support for National Service Reaches Record High of 83%." National Service Newsletter, 52:2.
- Polsby, Nelson. 1984. Political Innovation in America: The Politics of Policy Initiation. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1993. "Social Constructions of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." American Political Science Review 87:334-347.
- Shute, Nancy. 1986. "After a Turbulent Youth, the Peace Corps Comes of Age," Smithsonian, February:80.
- Streams. 1989. "Think Piece." August:4.
- Toufexis, Anastasia. 1987. "Silver Bullets for the Needy; Campuses are Seeking a Renewal of Student Volunteerism," Time, March 16.
- U.S. Congress. 1985. House of Representatives. Committee on Education and Labor. Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities. The Voluntary National Youth Service Act and the Select Commission on National Services Opportunity Act of 1985, Hearing on HR 888 and HR 1326 in New York City on September 27. (Rept. 99-52).
- U.S. Congress. 1989a. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. National Community Service Act of 1989 (S. 408), Hearings. 101st, 1st Sess., March 9, 14 and April 21 in Washington, D.C. and March 20 in Dorchester, MA. (Rept. 101-140).
- U.S. Congress. 1989b. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor. Joint hearing of the Subcommittees on Elementary, Secondary and Vo Tech; Employment Opportunities; Postsecondary Education; Human Resources; and Select Education. Hearings on the Issue of National Service, March 15, April 19, and June 28 (Rept. 101-30).
- U.S. Congress. 1993. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources and the Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism The National Service Trust Act of 1993: Hearings on S. 919, May 11, May 18, and June 8 (Rept. 103-210).
- William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship. 1988. The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families. Washington: Author.
- Youth Service America. Not dated (a). 1988-1989 Annual Report. Washington: Author.
- Youth Service America. Not dated (b). "Tripling the Youth Service Network: Thoughts About Expansion Strategies." Washington: Author.
- Youth Service America. Not dated (c). "Changing Perspectives: Looking at Youth as Resources." Washington: Author.