

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the William J. Clinton
Presidential Library Staff.**

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: National Service

Series/Staff Member: Eli Segal

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 1295

FolderID:

Folder Title:

Service Organizations: Northwestern University (Charles Moskos)

Stack:

S

Row:

66

Section:

2

Shelf:

8

Position:

1

but not
"like change"
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

file

Department of Sociology
Evanston, Illinois 60208-1330
Telephone (708) 491-5415
Fax (708) 491-9907

January 20, 1993

To: All Interested Parties

From: Charles Moskos

Subject: Discussion Points for National Service Implementation:

A. Three models:

1. local youth corps, built on "team" principles, e.g. Boston's CityYear

a. high costs due to fairly heavy staffing

2. individual placement in existing agencies, e.g. Seattle's Program for Local Service, Germany's program *800 people → 150,000 saved* *Ebony*

a. low costs due to sponsoring agencies

3. federal corps, e.g. a Civilian Conservation Corps. *CETA lowing. will save, mind*

a. high costs due to residential program, though some economies of scale

4. all above amenable to Mikulski part-time duty

B. What For

1. benefits for server *self reliance; discipline*

2. civic culture *homework*

3. service performed

a. "real work"

b. will server be missed

c. can be more effectively delivered otherwise

C. Costs:

1. Four Components

a. enrollee stipend

b. health insurance

c. administration

d. post-service benefits

2. note German civilian service

a. \$20,000 per annum net saving to state

b. 800 staff for 150,000 youth

3. long-term savings harder to quantify

4. set-asides for experimental programs, advertising, research office

3.5 billion
out the
window
on look
ahead
low
(IRS collection?)

We can separate
loan & m'l
service



COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

D. G.I. Bill Principle

1. pre-service rather than post-service benefits
2. 1% of GNP in 1949
3. 600,000 expected users to over 7 million users / out of 12 million
4. public willingness to pay for service-based benefits
5. education lobby unease with service-based entitlements

E. Real and Potential Opponents

1. libertarian conservatives
2. entitlement liberals
3. labor unions
4. budget savers
5. established youth corps YSA/
6. defense department
job training establishment

Service based not popular with more

NAT'L ACK:

B IN PROGRAM THRU CONSERVATION

PILOT vs. BAEENNING

NUNN -- ultimately to replace
should come.

F. General:

1. need for high visibility
 - a. "federal vs. local programs
 - b. "federal" not necessarily more expensive than decentralized,
- e.g. Medicare vs. Medicaid, VISTA vs. CETA
2. better fewer enrollees, more GI-Bill benefits than vice versa
3. do not make mainstream America uncomfortable with national service
- i.e. national service part of liberal political agenda
4. how to get "honor" of military in civilian service

VISTA within the CETA

None - doesn't
know the
number

most service done upon college degree

open opportunities

NCSA at 1980 - real

U.H - no on social extension
no on part junkies

GRATITUDE - Bill Bailey

spread to participants
small ch. cost
admin

Favors - teachers corp
public corp
ROTC. } o Ball
N. K. S. L. S.
Part-time
period

Arrangement o military

PREVENTION o civil

Table D -- find plot
project.

- Organism should pay credit - no free
manpower

- ties into cost relief in medicare

- roll out before you will

- Return NCO's to earn... Nat'l guard

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Jack

File

December 7, 1992

Department of Sociology
Evanston, Illinois 60208-1330
Telephone (708) 491-5415
Fax (708) 491-9907

To: Bill Galston

From: Charles Moskos

Subject: National Service

We are all very grateful that you will distill the sense of our December 4, 1992, meeting. This is indeed a labor of true national service.

The meeting was productive and went more harmoniously than one might have expected. As I see it there were some areas of high consensus as well as the expected points of dispute. Let me offer my reading for what they are worth.

High Consensus. (1) More emphasis on pre- and no-college youth than on graduating seniors. This departs from the present National Service Trust Fund emphasis. (2) Insuring openings for college graduate who pay back loans through service. (3) The principle of a GI-Bill type benefit for civilian service. (4) "Real work" rather than what service does for the server. (My criterion is would the service be missed if the server did not exist.) (5) National service as a new civic transformational institution. (6) Need for race/class mix rather than targeted programs. (7) Minimum \$10K post-service benefit per year.

Controversial. (1) My call for universal national service registration, i.e. "big bang" school of national service.

Left Vague. (1) A unitary, overarching program versus a decentralized program. The original DLC approach leaned toward the unitary model. (2) Three basic models are: (a) "team" programs a la Boston City Year, (b) individual placement a la Peace Corps and contemporary Germany, and (c) CCC-type residential program. I felt the latter was not given enough attention at the meeting. (3) Relationship between federal, local, foundation, and private funding. (4) Where to place budgetary emphasis, i.e. on maximum number of enrollees or on GI-Bill benefits. In the formative stages, better to come down heavy on fewer enrollees and heavier GI-Bill benefits per enrollee, rather than vice versa.



COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES