

Experiencing Citizenship (Washington: American Association of Higher Education, 1997)
Richard Battistoni and William Hudson, Editors

The Work of Citizenship and the Problem of Service-Learning

Harry C. Boyte and James Farr
Center for Democracy and Citizenship
Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota

The debates about service learning are not merely internecine squabbles between educators over methods and manners of out-of-class instruction. Or at least they don't have to be. For they reflect and are implicated in broader debates about community service and civic education more generally, as well as about citizenship, public policy, and even our understandings of American democracy and history. Take a couple of snapshots of these broader debates, now and then.

Throughout 1995, the national service initiative -- AmeriCorps -- became a sacrificial offering by the Republican leadership on the altar of a balanced budget. The question allegedly was whether government should be in the business of "promoting voluntarism": whether, in particular, AmeriCorps members should get paid for what citizens are supposed to do anyway on a voluntary basis. This rendering of what was at stake with a national initiative of this kind illustrated how much had been lost from understandings of "service" -- and of citizenship itself.

The debate about AmeriCorps and voluntary service can be contrasted with the public and political overtones that once existed in service initiatives like the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s and early 1940s. The Corps enlisted over three million young men, mainly poor and unemployed youth from rural areas and small towns, in public projects that ranged from contour farming to building dams, bridges, and national parks. Veterans from the CCC -- men now in their late 70s or 80s, of all political persuasions -- continue to meet all across the country, in commemoration of what for many was the transformative experience of their lives.¹

There was never a question about whether CCC members should be paid. Indeed, monthly stipends of \$30 a month were enough to support most members during the Depression. Service was understood to be work with civic overtones and implications: determined, hard civic effort to produce a public good, to meet critical public challenges.

These traditions and understandings continued. For instance, in the early 1950s the well-known educator Lewis Mumford warned about the rise of a bureaucratic, narrowly technical civilization and the loss of an ethos of citizenship based on public work. In *The Conduct of Life* -- what he called the "culmination" of his career -- Mumford argued that "our present civilization lacks the capacity for self-direction because it has committed itself to mass organizations and has built its structures from the top down, on the principle of all dictatorships and absolutism, rather than from the bottom up." Mumford believed technological civilization was "efficient in giving orders and compelling obedience and providing one-way communication; but it is . . . inept in everything that involves reciprocity, mutual aid, two-way communication, give and take."

To counter such trends, Mumford proposed a "public work corps" which would put each young man and woman to work "doing a thousand things that need to be done, from planting

forests and roadside strips, supervision of school children in nurseries and playgrounds to the active companionship of the aged, the blind, the crippled, from auxiliary work in harvesting to fire fighting." Broad education -- including ways young people might experience a larger public of different cultures, regions, points of view and modes of life unlike than their own -- was essential to his plan. Education for citizenship through public work was, for Mumford, even more important than the particular tasks themselves.²

Yet overall, Mumford's voice was the rare exception. The social, political and economic forces of the time dramatically eroded the explicit language and the everyday experiences of public work, work that had larger public purposes and overtones. With the loss of "public work", the concept of "service" changed its meanings, as well.³

Today, participants in contemporary versions of the conservation corps, part of the larger AmeriCorps service initiative, often see a clear distinction between what they are doing and the way it is described; they lament the absence of public urgency that once framed the CCC. "The Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s was successful because it sought to address a national emergency," argued Steve Guetterman, of Montana Conservation Corps. Guetterman observes that "our problems today are more pronounced, and embedded in social and environmental structures. Yet as a nation, we have not declared 'war' on any of these problems."⁴

AmeriCorps and other service initiatives, such as Campus Compact, may well hold the potential to help revitalize the concept and practice of public work, as well as to make service-learning explicitly contribute to the education of citizens. But for such potential to be realized will mean understanding exactly what we want from service-learning, rethinking our history, and retrieving what we have largely failed to remember.

Service and Citizenship

American history can be told, in one of its most crucial dimensions, as a story of the struggles of most of its denizens to become citizens: as a narrative about conflict over the fundamental issue of membership, of exactly *who* are to be included as citizens. This dramatic and tumultuous tale has as its actors colonists, workingmen and women, (emancipated) slaves, and immigrants.⁵ Today this story of membership and inclusion continues, as can be seen in the often acrimonious debates over immigration or, especially on campuses, over multiculturalism and cultural pluralism.

Yet American history can also be told in terms of another, rather less-explored dimension of citizenship: namely, *what* is a citizen and what does a citizen *do*? Three main conceptions have arisen in our history, each tied to a distinctive conception of service. Citizens have been understood as:

- 1) rights-bearing members of a political system who choose their leaders, preferably men of distinctive virtue and talent, through elections;
- 2) caring members of a moral community who share certain values and feel common responsibilities towards each other; and as
- 3) practical agents of a civic world who work together in public ways and spaces to engage the tasks and try to solve the problems that they collectively face.

Each of these conceptions may be thought of as an "ideal type" (in Max Weber's sense), picking out but refining, stylizing, and generalizing certain particular features of the real world of citizenship. In the actual debates of American history, these ideal-types often run into and overlap with one another. But each is sufficiently distinctive, with clear and powerful voices behind them, as to organize our understanding of the past and our orientation to service and service-learning.

The first conception of citizenship, what is these days often called a liberal view of citizenship though it has roots also in a classical republican tradition, is based on the idea that a citizen is a bearer of rights. The liberal citizen's liberty is understood in largely negative terms: namely, as rights to protection from harassment, unjust imprisonment, or unwarranted interference from others. When it comes to acting and practicing their citizenship, citizens are mainly to vote, to petition for redress of grievance, and perhaps to organize with others into groups to convey their interests. But these citizen actions and practices are directed at or mediated by the government itself. Although its powers are to be kept as minimal as possible with respect to the rights of citizens, the government and the leaders who run government are at the center of action.

This was the view of citizens voiced by Founders like James Madison. In Federalist 10, as is well-known, Madison distinguished between "democracy," where the entire citizenry participates, and a "republic," where authority is delegated to "a small number of citizens elected by the rest." Madison argued for representative government, based on his assertion that the deliberations of "a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country" would tend to "be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves."⁶

This approach was closely associated with republican ideas of public service as the mark of gentlemen who put aside their private interests to pursue the common good. Such men were to serve in government as members of a special class known for its virtue and talent. Service, in this sense, was sharply distinguished from work, especially manual labor. Over time, the republican elitism regarding service receded, only to be replaced within liberalism by a professional ideal. This ideal -- the notion that politics and public affairs are what professionals do -- dominates in our time. When analysts and activists refer to politics, whatever their political persuasion or partisanship, they generally mean politics of this liberal, professionalized sort. Ordinary citizens still discharge their electoral activities, periodically voting to endorse or reject the policies that professional politicians create. Their role is institutionalized in this way.

The view of civic education that flows from such institutional citizenship is rather straightforward. It is what we know as **civics**. If the center of action in governance and public affairs is government, then the key subject matter of education is what happens in government: How a bill becomes law; how professional lobbyists succeed; how parties mobilize constituency interests.

Service-learning is not generally a term of art for civics, though analogues of it may be found in those out-of-class activities that are preparatory for (later) public service of a professionalized kind. Student government, mock conventions, and leadership training activities are the conventionalized forms of such an education, as also are internships where students learn as they serve their legislative representatives or party officials.

These service-learning analogues of civics serve educative functions in our polity, of course, but they are open to the same criticisms that may be charged against the liberal, professional, institutional politics to which their view of citizenship and public service is attached. Today, for example, few would agree with Madison's sanguine view of the wisdom of elected officials or of the later liberal view of the expertise of professional politicians. People decry a separation between citizenry and officials. As a recent Kettering Foundation study discovered, Americans are angry that a seemingly unaccountable, self-referential group of politicians has effected a veritable takeover of the political process, turning the idea of "government of and by the people" into a sordid spectacle.⁷

The federal government stood at the bottom in polling about faith in major American institutions, with only 8 percent expressing "a great deal of confidence." According to a *New York Times* poll in August 1995, "frustration runs deep, perhaps deeper than any other time in modern American history." Seventy-nine percent of the public, the highest in several decades, believed that the government is pretty much "run by a few big interests looking out for themselves." Fifty-eight percent of those polled believed that people like themselves "had little to say about what the government did."⁸

Resentment of politics, politicians, and government is the tip of a larger iceberg of general discontent, anger about every institution, and fear for the future. Harvard political scientist Robert Putnam found that Americans' affiliations with civic institutions that have a face-to-face quality -- from churches to PTAs to service groups like Kiwanis -- have declined over the last generation. In his much-discussed essay "Bowling Alone," Putnam pointed out that though more Americans were bowling -- no mean statistic, since more Americans bowl each year than vote -- far more were bowling by themselves. Bowling league participation has sharply declined. The industry was alarmed because alleys gain most profit from concession sales of products like beer and pretzels, consumed mostly as a social activity. Putnam had other worries attendant to the isolation of bowling alone. In the 1960s, he observed, two-thirds of the public expressed trust of other citizens, while one third was distrustful. By the 1990s, figures had reversed themselves: two thirds distrusted other people.⁹

The general citizenry itself is scarcely innocent in the problems with our democracy, however. Increasingly Americans have come to think of themselves as clients and consumers. This is an even further step away from citizenship conceived as voting or the bearing of rights. While people complain, they look to government to provide answers or services. This means people see themselves as innocent, even victimized, as lacking any civic responsibility for what happens or for civic work that needs to be done. Such a view was epitomized on a talk show not long ago by one man who said none too coherently that "taxpayers shouldn't have to pay for the S&L mess. Government should pay for it!"¹⁰

Today, furthermore, the nation is in danger of splitting into a myriad of different rights groups that see themselves as consumers of professionalized government services: young Americans versus seniors on Social Security, blacks versus whites, suburbanites versus inner city residents, environmentalists versus ranchers.

Fragmentation of groups and rights without responsibilities have led to the resurfacing of a second -- essentially communitarian -- view of citizenship, grounded in ideals of moral community and deliberation about the common good. In this perspective, voiced by people like Robert Bellah, Amitai Etzioni, Michael Sandel, Michael Lerner and many others, citizenship

means participation in a shared way of life and a common system of moral values.¹¹ Thus, for instance, William Sullivan, co-author of the modern classics, *Habits of the Heart* and *The Good Society*, proposes a vision of "commonwealth" involving a virtually unbounded "covenant morality." To Sullivan, the good society is one in which we "as citizens . . . make an unlimited promise to show care and concern to each other." Such a "way of life," in his view, "stands in opposition to the life of self interest." Its aim is "universal sympathy" that grows from a "mutual commitment to a common good."¹²

The reference to "covenant morality" recalls the important religious dimensions of American history, and thus of one tradition (or set of traditions) lying behind contemporary communitarianism. Communitarianism also recalls strands of the classical republican tradition, as well, especially in terms of virtue and public service. However, communitarians have tried to displace the elitism of classical republicanism, finding in the people -- or at least in members of the moral community -- the repository of virtue and talent. Hostile to liberalism -- especially to its preoccupation with rights and to (what Sandel calls) its view of an "unencumbered self" -- communitarians have helped to reconceptualize citizens as moral selves, fully "situated" in a community.¹³ Such selves, to quote Sullivan again, make "an unlimited promise to show care and concern to each other," thereby invoking the importance of voluntarism within the communitarian conception of citizenship.

What do citizens do, then, on the communitarian account? They serve one another, but especially those who are most needy of sympathy, care, and concern. Citizens do voluntary deeds for the good of others in a community in which they themselves are situated (either geographically or morally).

A conception of service-learning follows almost seamlessly from this conception of citizenship. Indeed, the contemporary service-learning movement -- if it can properly be called a movement -- has, it would appear, a made-to-order ally in communitarianism. Students and young people learn about citizenship (by definition), as well as about themselves, when they serve others in the community. Thus, service-learning, its communitarian advocates claim, prepares a self-centered generation for citizenship. For instance, the Grant Commission's report *Youth and America's Future* stated that "if the service commitment begins early enough and continues into adulthood, participatory citizenship would become . . . traditions of local political participation that sustain a person, a community and a nation."¹⁴ Using this rationale, community service initiatives expanded rapidly in the late 1980s and the 1990s. Detroit schools now require 200 hours of community service for graduation. Atlanta adopted a 75 hour minimum requirement to increase "understanding of the obligations of a good citizen." Minnesota and Pennsylvania have developed state-wide financing for service.¹⁵

Community service in this sense mainly refers to a variety of individual voluntary efforts, from work in food banks to homeless shelters, from helping in nursing homes or hospitals to tutoring projects and literacy campaigns. It is only a short step from here to philanthropy, with its injunction to "Do Good." In schools today, however, service-learning programs also stress personal growth. Educational objectives reflect this emphasis: "self-esteem," "a sense of personal worth," "belief in the ability to make a difference," and "consciousness about one's personal values."¹⁶ It is only a short step from here to therapeutic interventions, with their injunction to "Feel Better." Together, the philanthropic and therapeutic dimensions of service-learning lead us to "Do Good, Feel Better."

Service-learning understood in this way can make a number of educational contributions -- connection with others, help to the needy, and personal growth. Communitarianism more generally has properly reintroduced notions of communal responsibility and civic values as central to the very idea(1) of citizenship. However, there are reasons to fear that communitarianism in theory and service-learning in practice tend to romanticize the idea of community and to sentimentalize the idea of the situated self. There can be many disturbing features about actual community life, especially for those whose "way of life" falls afoul of so-called community standards, much less a "covenant morality." There are also reasons to suspect that the conception of citizenship at stake here tends strongly to *purify* democratic politics and public life of power, interests, and practical purposes. It tends to assume or to aspire to a world, indeed "the good society" itself, terribly far-removed from the complicated, complex, challenging, and everyday actions of citizens who work to get things done. In this way, it tends to overlook extraordinary lessons for civic renewal from American history. These lessons, in turn, help us revitalize a third conception of citizenship, one more attentive to practical problem-solving, the public dimensions of work, and the very idea of public work itself.

Service as Public Work

As new scholarship has begun to emphasize, the distinctive feature of the American Revolution was neither a Lockean-liberal focus on rights nor a classical republican concern with civic virtue. Rather, America's revolution produced a political culture that was practical, down-to-earth, work-centered, and energetic. As Gordon Wood put it in his recent work, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, "when [classical ideals of disinterested civic virtue] proved too idealistic and visionary, [Americans] found new democratic adhesives in the actual behavior of plain ordinary people."¹⁷

Work on common projects of importance -- in offices and schools, factories and farms, government agencies or inner city communities, paid or unpaid -- continued to be the way diverse people forged connections with each other and addressed the nation's problems and challenges. Through work, people developed trust in others different from themselves, gained visibility and authority, and reached larger intellectual horizons. They saw themselves as creators of their communities, stakeholders in the country, and builders of the commonwealth.

Abraham Lincoln's idea of work-centered government, the instrument of common purpose, remained vibrant well into the twentieth century. Belief in the dignity of labor fueled popular reform movements for change. For instance, in the first decades of this century the Country Life Movement, with land-grant colleges playing central roles, called for renewal of rural democracy and rural life, based on the long history of agriculture as "democratic public work," not simply commercial farming. Many jobs, local schools, community projects and other experiences provided rich experiences in public work. In the Great Depression, images and themes of work, tied to democracy, filled popular culture -- Will Rogers movies, Langston Hughes poetry, post office art. These experiences and the larger culture of public work formed the background for understanding service: as seen, for example, when millions of poor and unemployed youth put their talents to work in the Civilian Conservation Corps, building dams and bridges and planting forests.

Such experiences fired the imagination of mid-twentieth century educators like Lewis Mumford, whose call for a "public work corps" we quoted earlier, or John A. Hannah. In 1944,

as President of Michigan State College, Hannah reflected on land-grant colleges like his that were founded in strong work activities and dedicated to forging strong links between career training and citizen education.

Our colleges should not be content with only the training of outstanding agriculturalists, or engineers, or home economists, or teachers, or scientists, or lawyers, or doctors, or veterinarians -- it is not enough that our young people be outstanding technicians. The first and never-forgotten objective must be that every human product of our educational system must be given that training that will enable him to be an effective citizen, appreciating his opportunities, and fully willing to assume his responsibilities in a great democracy.

Words such as these and the work of generations of American citizens can and should still fire our imaginations today. They can help us rekindle a conception of citizenship as work with civic overtones, what we have called "public work." Public work is the expenditure of visible efforts by ordinary citizens whose collective labors produce things or create processes of lasting civic value. Public work is work by ordinary citizens who build and sustain our basic public goods and resources. It solves common problems and creates common things. It may be paid or voluntary, done in communities, or as part of one's regular job. Public work takes place with an eye to general, other-regarding consequences. It is also work done "in" public -- in places that are visible and open to inspection. And it is cooperative work of "a" public: a mix of people whose interests, backgrounds, and resources may be quite different.

What do citizens do, then, when they engage in public work? They work together to specify and then try to solve problems and address the tasks that they face in a complex and complicated public world. Under such a conception, citizens are best thought of not as clients, customers, servers, or mere voters, but as workers, collectively trying to solve problems and to create civic products. Emphasis falls upon the skills and productive capacities -- not so much the virtues or values -- of citizens who need to work together with their fellow and sister citizens, rather than do things for or to them. They share problems and labors; they need not share a profession, a party, or a moral community as such. The associations of this conception of citizenship are pragmatist and populist, fully attentive to the filiations between political action and productive economic life that, until recently, have been silenced in democratic theory or theories of citizenship.¹⁸

Substantial civic education through "service" in this third conception of citizenship requires that young people be thought of as productive actors, citizens in the present not citizens-in-the-making, who have serious public work to do. When thinking about "service-learning," public work means the creation and sustenance of projects for which young people are taken and take themselves to be accountable, serious creators and producers. It also means that young people themselves identify the problems that they wish to set themselves to solve through their collective labors in and around their own spaces -- whether schools, churches, or youth group sites. Furthermore, for this form of self-consciously civic and work-oriented "service-learning" to contribute to generalized civic education, adults who work with young people in the field of youth development -- including teachers, youth workers, counselors, clergy and others -- need to engage in public work *with* young people, both challenging and learning from them. Such experiences help youth develop a sense of themselves as effective, public-spirited citizens.

In this way they cultivate capacities for life-long learning and for productive contributions through whatever jobs they do. Such a notion of service-learning is quite plainly a challenge to the analogues one finds in civics where, we have noted, a professionalized and institutionalized notion of politics predominates. It is also quite plainly a challenge to the therapeutic and philanthropic orientation that pervades much of what passes for service-learning today.

A work-centered view of citizenship and service-learning must be sensitive to the problems it faces in the world we now live in. Today, unfortunately, opportunities for young people's public work are rare. Most youth development workers see young people themselves as "problems" to be managed, clients to be served, or as consumers of knowledge -- in ways that unwittingly limit their talents and potential. Moreover, these youth development workers share in the conventional wisdom that teenagers and young adults are deeply disenchanted with politics and public issues. Times Mirror Center reports that for the first time since World War II, young people show less interest in public affairs than their elders. Only one in five follows major issues "very closely."¹⁹

In fact, youth today have a more complex set of attitudes about the world than polling suggests. More detailed probing finds a generation not so much apathetic as furious at adults' apparent inaction on mounting social problems. Young people are angry at what they perceive as adults labeling of them as "problems." They are usually not enthused by sixties-style protest. They worry about future work prospects and are uncertain about how to respond to the problems they see all around them. Senior trips to Washington, D.C., or exhortations to be "good citizens" -- the stuff of earlier generations' civic education -- do not much address such problems.

The conception of citizenship as public work, tied to practical problem-solving, not only has the historical legacy alluded to above. It animates the concatenated programs and practices that we have tried to develop at the University of Minnesota under the aegis of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship (and its predecessor, Project Public Life), including in the fields of service and service-learning. Indeed the very idea of citizenship as public work was an emergent property of our efforts. The Center originally grew out of a series of questions: How could the lessons from the "Citizenship Schools" of the Civil Rights Movement as well as citizen action groups be translated to work settings? How could professional practices and identities be "liberated" into more productive public work? In order to answer these questions, we had to think of work as a kind of citizenship, as having civic or public dimensions and consequences. Having made this conceptual move, it was an altogether complementary one to think of citizenship itself as work, as public work. A virtuous circle was completed.

The Center's strategy has been to develop democratic theory strongly enriched by practice. To this end it engages with groups across many different work and institutional cultures to compare lessons from an array of experiments in civic renewal and the creation of cultures of public accountability. Settings have ranged from cooperative extension service to hospitals, middle schools, high schools, youth groups, a large nursing home, a Catholic women's college, a Korean youth center, a public health teen project, local government, and the Corporation for National Service. These settings were chosen because they provided ones that fit the Center's efforts in the overlapping fields of youth development and community service; health; higher education; and citizen-government partnership. These have proved to be the seedbed for developing a theory and practice of public work, and thinking differently about service and service-learning.

The main vehicle for experimenting with a work-centered, problem-solving approach -- or alternative -- to service-learning has been Public Achievement, a youth and politics initiative spearheaded in 1990.²⁰ Sharing service-learning's intention to provide experiential learning and community involvement for students, Public Achievement has nonetheless been very self-conscious in trying to pass along to participants a conceptual framework about politics and civic engagement that we have found is largely missing from most service-learning activities. That framework valorizes not only public work and problem-solving, but also the unsentimentalized notions of power and interest. But it mainly strives to pass along the skills and civic capacities for teamwork, rule-making, negotiating, deliberating, debating, public-speaking, and "mapping" the environment in terms of powerful agents and diverse others with whom younger and older citizens must work.

While some Public Achievement teams have worked in various kinds of community service capacities, we have focused our greatest energies on working with young people. That is, college-age students have done their "service" with even younger students, in middle schools, high schools, theatre programs, and other youth sites. The college-age students act as "coaches" (a term that the younger students themselves helped establish, as opposed to teachers, mentors, big brothers or sisters). Coaches self-consciously work to pass along both the conceptual framework, as well as the skills and civic capacities, which the younger students will need to negotiate the broader world of work and politics. The problems that the coaches take on are those that the younger students themselves have established as the important ones in and around their schools, neighborhoods, or youth sites. Sometimes these problems have standard recognizable community service orientations -- from violence prevention, neighborhood clean-up, or recycling to helping food shelves, homeless shelters, or seniors' homes. But sometimes the problems are quite plainly school- or youth-site related, from getting playground equipment or juice machines, to changing uniform or playground policies. But whatever the problem specified, the younger students -- along with help from their coaches -- learn to engage a broader public world, to master its rules, to map its power, and to organize to change it. In short, they learn the skills -- and the necessary concepts -- to engage in public work.

Like any practical experiment, Public Achievement has faced challenges and difficulties. Many of these have been those that various community service programs or even internships have faced. Others have been brought on precisely because of the ambitious, self-conscious attempt to pass along a conceptual framework of politics that itself requires students to think about themselves and the world around them in civic terms. But challenges notwithstanding, the responses by younger students, college-age coaches, teachers, principals, parents, and community leaders have reinforced the importance of thinking of "service-learning" in these terms and thus of helping to revitalize a conception of citizenship as public work.

This form of youth citizenship and civic education "allows me to do something I want, not just something the teachers tell me to do," explains Tracy Veronen, an eighth grader at St. Bernard's Middle School in St. Paul. Jeff Maurer, a teacher in the school, says the trick is to guide or coach instead of to lead or command. "Adults feel like they have to jump in and fix everything," explained Maurer. "I have developed a new appreciation and respect for my students as I watched them identify issues, devise strategies to deal with them, and evaluate their own progress." "I felt that we needed to have ways to take kids more seriously. That's why I was interested in Public Achievement," explains Dennis Donovan, Principal of St. Bernard's.

"We thought that learning citizenship skills would influence relations in schools, the curriculum and the way we taught," says Donovan. "It has. Many kids are much better at expressing their interests and negotiating with teachers. Teachers have begun to base their teaching more directly on what kids are interested in."²¹

Young people's experiences in public work of this kind are not unique to Public Achievement. For instance, accounts from young people involved in Children's Express, a project that produces a youth perspectives news service to papers across the country, show the enhanced sense of civic efficacy and public involvement that these kinds of work experiences can generate.²² Other examples from the service-learning movement may well be found, as well. These examples suggest the elements of a fundamentally different approach to youth development based on the revitalization of a notion of citizenship as public work. "Youth development to date has been defined within a human services framework that uses a language of personal growth," says Nan Skelton, a leader in the field. "It will require a major shift -- a paradigm shift -- to see youth as citizens who actually produce things of value. But this shift will also open up many new forms of work, new occupations, and new ways of understanding the social value of young people as co-producers and co-creators."²³

What is true of youth development in general is true of service-learning in particular. It is our strong belief that service-learning should be thought of as citizen education; and citizen education in turn should be thought of as an education in and for public work. Work is and should be at the center of citizenship, and this should be the problem for service-learning. Returning work to the center of discussion about democracy and citizen education opens up enormous new possibilities for democratic renewal. The service-learning movement should make the work of democratic renewal its own work.

Endnotes

1. For further discussion of the Civilian Conservation Corps in terms of public work, see Harry C. Boyte and Nancy N. Kari, Building America: The Democratic Promise of Public Work (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996). Not everything in the CCC is above criticism, needless to say. See, for example, Eric B. Gorham, National Service, Citizenship, and Political Education (Albany: SUNY Press, 1992), chs. 4 and 7.

2. Lewis Mumford, The Conduct of Life (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1951), pp. 276, 278.

3. This is an important example of conceptual change amidst political innovation. In general, see James Farr, "Understanding Conceptual Change Politically," in Terence Ball, James Farr, and Russell L. Hanson, eds., Political Innovation and Conceptual Change (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), ch. 2.

4. Interview March 3, 1995.

5. See, for example, James H. Kettner, The Development of American Citizenship, 1608-1870 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978).

6. Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, The Federalist (New York: New American Library, 1961), pp. 81-2.

. The democratic upsurge abroad has been accompanied by a sharp decline in participation in American politics, cited regularly as a model by our leaders and by aspiring reformers abroad. A growth industry of American consultants have visited -- one might plausibly say plagued -- new democracies. At the same moment, every index -- from voter turnout to opinion polls -- demonstrated increasing cynicism and anger about politics within the nation. See E. J. Dionne, Why Americans Hate Politics (NY: Simon and Schuster, 1991) for an insightful discussion of the moralized posturing that emerges from the political class's isolation; and Harwood Group, Citizens and Politics: A View from Main Street America (Dayton: Kettering, 1991), for the description of Americans' attitudes toward that class.

8. Figures from Business Week, March 13, 1995; New York Times/CBS News poll, August 12, 1995. Fifty-nine percent of the Times-CBS poll said there was not a single elected official they admired.

9. Robert D. Putnam, "Bowling Alone," Journal of Democracy 9 (1995), pp. 65-78. See, more generally, his Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

. Quoted from Harry C. Boyte, "Building Blocks for American Renewal," Los Angeles Times, December 25, 1991.

. See, for instance, Robert Bellah et. al. Habits of the Heart (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); Michael Lerner's editorials in Tikkun on "the politics of meaning," 1992-93; Michael Sandel, Liberalism and the Limits of Justice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); and Amitai Etzioni, The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities, and the Communitarian Agenda (New York: Crown, 1993). For a balanced overview, see Will Kymlicka, Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), ch. 6.

. Sullivan, Reconstructing Public Philosophy (Berkeley: University of California. 1988). For the ties of service to communitarian philosophy, see the bulk of the essays in Jane C. Kendall, Combining Service and Learning (Raleigh: NSIEE, 1990).

13. See "The Procedural Republic and the Unencumbered Self," Political Theory 12 (1984): 81-96.

-
14. Grant Commission, "Pathways to Success: Citizenship Through Service," in Jane Kendall, ed., Combining Service and Learning (Raleigh: NSIEE, 1990), p. 441.
 15. Figures on service from Alonzo Crim, "The Obligation of Citizenship," Ibid., pp. 240-41.
 16. For a representative listing of learner outcomes, see for instance, Ibid.; also Sandra LaFave, "Letter to the Editor," Harper's, February, 1991.
 17. As Wood further observes, this "was momentarily radical in the long sweep of world history up to that time." Gordon S. Wood, The Radicalism of the American Revolution (New York: Vintage, 1992), p.ix.
 18. See Joshua Cohen and Joel Rogers, eds., Associations and Democracy (New York: Verson, 1995); and Benjamin R. Barber, Jihad v. McWorld (New York: Times Books, 1995).
 19. For figures on youth disenchantment from politics, see for instance, Michael Oreskes, "Profiles of Today's Youths: Many Just Don't Seem to Care," New York Times, June 28, 1990; "An Indifferent Age?," Christian Science Monitor, July 9, 1990; and "Children's Moral Compass Wavers," Christian Science Monitor, May 16, 1990.
 20. For background and analysis, see the master's thesis by Melissa Bass, "Toward a New Theory and Practice of Civic Education: An Evaluation of Public Achievement," Minneapolis, Humphrey Institute, 1995. Also see the discussion in Farr's essay on "Political Theory" in the next section of this monograph.
 21. Interviews at St. Bernard's Middle School conducted in August and September, 1995, in the course of an evaluation of Public Achievement.
 22. Interview, August 24, 1995; quotes from Children's Express staff from REPORT to Lilly Endowment (Indianapolis: Children's Express Indianapolis News Bureau, 1995).
 23. Interview, September 6, 1995.