

REACHING OUT: AMERICANS SERVING OVERSEAS

**By Lex Rieffel
Visiting Fellow**

**The Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-2103**

December 2005

There is no executive summary for this study.
If you do not have time to read the entire
document, you may wish to focus on Section VI.
Recommendation (pp. 60-62).

SECOND DRAFT:01Dec05

REACHING OUT: AMERICANS SERVING OVERSEAS

Speak softly and carry a big stick; you will go far.

--An African proverb popularized by Theodore Roosevelt,
January 1900

I. Introduction: Overseas Service as a Soft Instrument of Power

The United States is struggling to define a new role for itself in the post-Cold War world that protects its vital self interests without making the rest of the world uncomfortable.

In retrospect, the decade of the 1990s was a cakewalk. Together with its Cold War allies Americans focused on helping the transition countries in Eastern and Central Europe and the former Soviet Union build functioning democratic political systems and growing market economies. The USA met this immense challenge successfully, by and large, and it gained friends in the process.

By contrast, the first five years of the new millennium have been mostly downhill for the USA. The terrorist attacks on 9/11/01 changed the national mood in a matter of hours from gloating to a level of fear unknown since the Depression of the 1930s. They also pushed sympathy for the USA among people in the rest of the world to new heights. However, the feeling of global solidarity quickly dissipated after the military intervention in Iraq by a narrow US-led coalition. A major poll measuring the attitudes of foreigners toward the USA found a sharp shift in opinion in the negative direction between 2002 and 2003, which has only partially recovered since then.¹

The devastation of New Orleans by Hurricane Katrina at the end of August 2005 was another blow to American self-confidence as well as to its image in the rest of the world. It cracked the veneer of the society reflected in the American movies and TV programs that flood the world. It exposed weaknesses in government institutions that had been promoted for decades as models for other countries.

Internal pressure to turn America's back on the rest of the world is likely to intensify as the country focuses attention on domestic problems such as the growing number of Americans without health insurance, educational performance that is declining relative to other countries, deteriorating infrastructure, and increased dependence on foreign supplies of oil and gas. A more isolationist sentiment would reduce the ability of the USA to use its overwhelming military power to promote peaceful change in the

¹ The Pew Global Attitudes Project, June 2005.

developing countries that hold two-thirds of the world's population and pose the gravest threats to global stability. Isolationism might heighten the sense of security in the short run, but it would put the USA at the mercy of external forces in the long run.

Accordingly, one of the great challenges for the USA today is to build a broad coalition of like-minded nations and a set of international institutions capable of maintaining order and addressing global problems such as nuclear proliferation, epidemics like HIV/AIDS and avian flu, failed states like Somalia and Myanmar, and environmental degradation. The costs of acting alone or in small coalitions are now more clearly seen to be unsustainable. The limitations of "hard" instruments of foreign policy have been amply demonstrated in Iraq. Military power can dislodge a tyrant with great efficiency but cannot build stable and prosperous nations. Appropriately, the appointment of Karen Hughes as Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs suggests that the Bush Administration is gearing up to rely more on "soft" instruments.²

The soft instruments of power can be thought of as including a vast array of public sector and private sector activities. They range from the government's position in the international debate about global warming to the Fulbright program of academic exchanges to the behavior of American tourists overseas. For the purposes of this paper they are defined as the residual set of instruments after excluding hard instruments, with hard instruments being defined as all instruments involving any kind of armed military or police force.

The purpose of this paper is to focus on one particular soft instrument in one category of these instruments. The category is activities funded by the federal budget. The instrument is overseas service, typified by the Peace Corps. The central question addressed in this paper is whether federal government funding for overseas service is too big or too small. A preliminary answer involves an attempt to measure the "bang for the buck" in two distinct exercises. One compares the major overseas service programs supported by the US Government—the Peace Corps program—with other soft instruments, such as overseas study. The other compares the Peace Corps program with alternative overseas service programs. Both exercises are constrained by the lack of any broadly accepted methodology for comparing these kinds of apples and oranges.

Part II of this paper looks at the Peace Corps program in the context of other federally-funded soft instruments.

Part III provides some historical context on overseas service by Americans. It traces the growth of overseas service and places it in the stream of public service and national service options.

² Joseph Nye has highlighted the distinction between hard power and soft power. In this paper, the use of the terms "hard instruments of power" and "soft instruments of power" is meant to be broadly consistent with Nye's dichotomy.

Part IV focuses on the options for overseas service that Americans have today. Using the Peace Corps as a benchmark, it examines the scale, cost, and effectiveness of the other options.

Part V examines the policy choices involved in designing a new, catalytic overseas service program loosely modeled on the domestic AmeriCorps program.

Finally, a preliminary design for such a program is presented in Part VI.

II. Overseas Service Programs vs. Other Soft Instruments

All our societies need more social capital ... and in my view the single most promising area of initiative is youth service

--Robert Putnam, at the 2000 Ford Foundation Worldwide Workshop on Youth Involvement

... our assistance to other nations carries the most weight when it involves personal, intimate contact on the community level and provides tangible benefits to everyday people.

--Senator Bill Frist, April 2005, Floor Statement introducing the Global Health Corps Act of 2005

Arguably the most powerful soft instrument is the well-being of American society. If people in the rest of the world look at the USA and like what they see, persuading them to support US foreign policy objectives is easier. If the American "project" works, it speaks for itself; spending budget money to present a favorable image of the USA becomes a low priority. Regrettably there is an abundance of anecdotal and empirical evidence that points to significant concerns among foreigners about life in the United States at the present time. These concerns have been reinforced by the devastation of New Orleans by Hurricane Katrina at the end of August. Progress in addressing problems at home would go a long way toward increasing America's soft power, but it involves policy choices that go far beyond the scope of this study.

Perhaps the next most powerful soft instrument is the spillover of American culture into the rest of the world in the form of TV programs, movies, books, music, the internet, sports, and a myriad of other activities. This flow is driven by the private sector and it responds to foreign demand. The bulk of it happens without any government intervention. Unfortunately, the impact of this spillover on foreign attitudes toward the United States is not wholly positive. While much of American culture is embraced enthusiastically, negative attitudes toward specific forms (e.g., violence in movies, sex on television, fast food restaurants) seem to be growing. Some of this reaction undoubtedly reflects uneasiness with the overwhelmingly dominant military power of the USA, and with the ability and eagerness of the US Government to utilize this power. Again, however, changing the mix of America's cultural exports goes beyond the scope of this study.

A related mega- or meta- instrument is access for foreigners to the USA, especially for educational opportunities. For people throughout the world, the United States is the Mecca of education. The benefits to Americans of letting foreigners study in their country are palpable. The educational experiences of foreigners in the USA have been overwhelmingly positive for decades. The graduates of high school exchange programs, colleges, universities, and countless training programs have become leaders in every field after returning to their countries and have clearly had a positive impact on the

diplomatic, economic, and other relations between their countries and the USA. Also important has been access to the USA for government officials, business persons, people affiliated with NGOs, and just plain tourists. Regrettably, since 9/11, access for many categories of visitors has been adversely impacted by visa and entry procedures to the point of becoming an important national issue.

The position of the US Government on major foreign policy issues and the concrete steps it takes to implement these policies are part of the broad category of soft instruments featured in this study. High profile issues today include combating terrorism, preventing nuclear proliferation, health threats such as HIV/AIDS and avian flu, poverty in developing countries, and global warming. These are somewhat less important in shaping foreign attitudes toward the USA because they are relatively easy to change and they do change with every new administration.

This brings us to the narrow category of soft instruments directly relevant to this study: programs funded by American taxpayers through the federal budget.

A. The Budget for Soft Instruments

Describing what the government is now spending on the soft instruments of power is not a simple exercise. The obvious starting point is Budget Function 150 (Foreign Operations). However, other activities with an international dimension are scattered throughout the budget. A few examples:

- The Office of the Special Trade Representative, included in the White House's budget, negotiates multilateral and bilateral trade agreements with foreign countries that have a greater economic impact on many countries than all US aid programs combined.
- The Environmental Protection Agency is involved in working with foreign countries on the impact of environmental hazards on child health.³
- The Centers for Disease Control under the Department of Health and Human Services, is deeply involved in health activities globally, including heading off threats such as the SARS virus and the avian flu virus.
- The Treasury Department works closely with foreign countries on issues such as avoiding double taxation and combating terrorist financing.

Virtually every department and agency of the US Government is involved in some international activities. For the sake of simplicity, this paper does not attempt to list or evaluate all of these activities. An effort to do so could be worthwhile and could reveal some programs that deliver substantially more bang for the buck than the programs in the 150 account, but this too goes beyond the scope of the study.

³ Conversation with Greg Berger, October 4, 2005

Table 1 places spending on International Affairs in the context of total federal spending in FY 2004, which totaled \$2.3 trillion. At \$34 billion, International Affairs spending represented 1.5 percent of the total. However, non-discretionary (“mandatory”) spending for social security, Medicare, Medicaid, other programs, and interest on debt amounted to \$1.4 trillion, leaving \$895 billion for “discretionary” spending. Thus spending on International Affairs was 3.8 percent of discretionary spending. By contrast, spending on the hard instruments of power—taking the defense budget as the proxy for these instruments—amounted to \$454 billion or 51 percent of discretionary spending in FY 2004.

The test we will apply to the various federal spending programs is to compare the “bang” produced by spending an additional \$100 million on overseas service programs (starting with the Peace Corps) with the bang produced by spending the same amount on another program. In the crudest possible terms, another \$100 million for the Peace Corps on top of the current spending level of \$317 million would raise the number of volunteers in the field from roughly 8,000 to roughly 10,700, an increase of 2,700 volunteers. This could be done by expanding the number of volunteers in the 71 countries where the Peace Corps is now operating, or by opening programs in another 8-9 countries.⁴

It is not possible to measure quantitatively the increase in goodwill or mutual understanding or support for US foreign policy objectives that would result from such an increase in the Peace Corps program, but a first approximation would suggest that it would be proportional to the increase in volunteers, in other words one third bigger. How much of an increase in national security would result from spending an additional \$100 million on hard instruments? A first approximation would suggest very little. The benefits might even be negative because America’s use of hard instruments since 9/11 seems to be associated with a lower sense of security.⁵

While it is not the purpose of this study to make the case for re-allocating budget resources away from hard instruments to soft instruments, a premise of the study is that a shift of any amount up to \$1 billion would yield better results in terms of national security and well-being.

⁴ In an often-repeated quote, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated categorically in the 1960s that “The Peace Corps is not an instrument of foreign policy because to make it so would rob it of its contribution to foreign policy.” (Emphasis in the original, as given in Wofford, 1966, p.131). This subtle distinction is consistent with the approach taken in this study, which recognizes that the effectiveness of the Peace Corps is closely linked to its non-political character. Thus the Peace Corps can be a soft instrument of US power without being an instrument of foreign policy.

⁵ Another \$27 billion was spent by the Department of Homeland Security in FY 2004, but the increase in security produced by this spending is questionable. Effective use of soft instruments might reduce sharply the need for budget funds in this area.

**Table 1: The Budget Context for Spending on Soft Instruments of Power, FY 2004
(Budget outlays)**

	\$ billions	Percent	Percent
Total Budget Outlays	2,292	100.0	
<i>Total Mandatory + Interest</i>	<i>1,397</i>	<i>61.0</i>	
Social security	491		
Medicare	265		
Medicaid	176		
Federal retire. and disab.	95		
Unemployment	42		
Other	226		
<i>Offsetting receipts</i>	<i>-58</i>		
Interest	160		
<i>Total Discretionary Expenses</i>	<i>895</i>	<i>39.0</i>	100.0
National defense	454		50.7
Education and training	75		8.4
Transportation	63		7.0
Health	52		5.8
Income security	52		5.8
Justice	38		4.2
International Affairs	34	1.5	3.8
Natural resources	30		3.4
Veterans administration	28		3.1
Other	69		7.7

Source: FY 2006 Budget, Historical Tables.

Notes: The \$34 billion shown here for International Affairs is not easy to reconcile with the \$30 billion shown in Table 2 for Budget Function 150 (without Iraq), but is not different enough to change to significance of the numbers.

B. Competing Soft Instruments

More narrowly, the question is whether budget resources currently allocated to certain international programs would produce more bang for the buck if they were re-allocated to the Peace Corps and other overseas service programs.

The Peace Corps program is the only long-term overseas service program funded by the federal government. There are several small short-term programs funded by the federal government, such as the International Executive Service Corps (IESC), but the aggregate federal spending for these programs is less than \$50 million. In FY 2004, the Peace Corps spent \$308 million of federal budget funds. For this exercise we take the Peace Corps program as the proxy for all federally-funded overseas service programs.

Table 2 places spending for the Peace Corps in the context of spending on all programs falling under Budget Function 150 (International Affairs). Omitting the exceptional spending for Iraq Relief and Reconstruction, the federal government spent \$30.3 billion on soft instruments of power in FY 2004. Thus the Peace Corps component was almost exactly one percent. Within total discretionary budget spending, the Peace Corps' share is microscopic: one percent of 3.1 percent, or thirty-one thousandths of one percent, or 0.00031.

A first step in attempting to compare the effectiveness of spending for the Peace Corps (and other overseas service programs) with other soft instruments is to divide up the international affairs budget of \$30.3 billion into a small number of analytically useful categories. Seven categories have been created for the purposes of this study. A second step is to consider how \$100 million added or taken away from each category would compare with giving the Peace Corps an additional \$100 million.

- **State Department Administration (\$6.3 billion).** This is the cost of maintaining a corps of Foreign Service officers willing to serve overseas and use their diplomatic skills to advance the foreign policy objectives of the United States. A substantial portion of this budget item represented the costs of maintaining 260 embassies, consulates, and other posts overseas. Almost one third of this item was for spending on security enhancements. Thus there could be substantial savings in this area if more effective use of soft instruments leads to a reduction of threats against Foreign Service officers and their work places. At the same time, there is much evidence that the State Department is stretched thin. There is no compelling reason to believe that an additional \$100 million allocated for State Department administration would yield more bang for the buck, but this is not one of the obvious areas to cut back.
- **“Strategic programs” (\$9.0 billion).** Sixty percent of this amount represented the sale of military equipment and the cost of military training. The remainder represented money given to foreign governments, largely in the form of grants, to

advance a broad range of economic and foreign policy objectives. The biggest component (\$897 million requested in FY 2006) consisted of grants to Egypt and Israel to support the Middle East peace process. Another \$960 million consisted of aid to countries in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union to support their transition to market-based democracies. Not all of these programs have been obvious winners. It is conceivable that in their absence some friendly governments would have been replaced by unfriendly governments and the world would have been plagued by more international aggression and internal strife. It is equally conceivable that these programs simply postponed inexorable changes thereby making them more painful when they occurred. An expanded overseas service program might contribute to conflict prevention and economic growth and thereby reduce the need for this kind of funding. This is one of the more obvious areas for a re-allocation in favor of the Peace Corps and related programs.

- **“Drug programs” (\$1.2 billion).** Most of this amount went to the “Andean Counterdrug Initiative”. The rest was scattered around the world. These programs are unlike all others, however, and assessing the relative benefits of putting more money into them introduces new and complex factors. It seems best to simply set this category aside.
- **“Political programs” (\$1.6 billion).** These are programs intimately linked to the diplomatic activities of the State Department and a number of global political concerns. They include the dues paid to the United Nations and 43 other international organizations of which the United States is a member, the US share of UN peacekeeping missions, and nuclear non-proliferation/anti-terrorism/demining programs. Migration/refugee assistance accounted for almost \$800 million. As much as \$250 million in this category supported small programs (UNDP, UNICEF) that carry out activities similar to those undertaken by the Peace Corps. The problem with these programs from a narrow taxpayer perspective is that most of the benefits they produce carry the United Nations “brand”, or the brand of some other multilateral agency, rather than the US brand. In the Cold War era, this kind of branding was important because the Communist brand was a visible and powerful competitor. Today the US brand is unchallenged and has become a source of discomfort in many parts of the world. This general sense of discomfort is aggravated by a feeling that the USA is behaving more like an overbearing father than a team captain or coach. Today putting more budget resources into multilateral institutions and campaigns looks like a good investment in terms of global influence. Admittedly many of the multilateral institutions appear inefficient compared with equivalent bilateral programs, but the shortcomings in operational efficiency are offset by the increased comfort elsewhere in the world of seeing the USA being a strong team player. The benefits of allocating more funding to this category seem to be in the same range as the benefits of allocating more to the Peace Corps.

Table 2: Federal Budget Spending for Soft Instruments of Power, FY2004
(Actual Outlays, \$ billions)

Budget Function 150 Total		49.6
Iraq Relief and Reconstruction		19.3
Budget Function 150 without Iraq		30.3
State Department administration		6.3
Ongoing operations	4.3	
Security personnel upgrades	0.6	
Embassy security, construction, and maintenance	1.4	
State Department programs		2.7
Contributions to International Organizations	1.0	
Contributions to International Peacekeeping	0.7	
<i>Information and exchange activities (1)</i>	1.0	
Foreign Operations		20.9
Foreign Military Financing	4.713	
Economic Support Fund	3.288	
Assistance to Eastern Europe, Baltic States, and Former Soviet Union	1.027	
<i>(“strategic” sub-total)</i>		<i>(9.028)</i>
Peacekeeping operations	0.124	
Migration and Refugee Assistance	0.781	
Non-proliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining	0.396	
International Organizations and Programs	0.295	
<i>(“political” sub-total)</i>		<i>(1.596)</i>
International Financial Institutions	1.383	
<i>(“multilateral aid” sub-total)</i>		<i>(1.383)</i>
Agriculture programs	1.235	
International Disaster and Famine Assistance	0.544	
Millennium Challenge Corporation	0.994	
Child Survival and Health Programs Fund	1.824	
Global HIV/AIDS Initiative	0.488	
Development Assistance	1.364	
USAID Administration	0.786	
<i>(“bilateral aid” sub-total)</i>		<i>(7.235)</i>
Andean Counterdrug Initiative	0.738	
International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement	0.460	
<i>(“drug” sub-total)</i>		<i>(1.198)</i>
Peace Corps	0.308	
10 small programs	0.097	

(Table 2 continued)

Sources: (A) FY 2006 Budget, Historical Tables and Appendix. (B) State Department, Fiscal Year 2006 Budget Request: International Affairs Function 150--Summary and Highlights

Note 1: This item is comprised of three distinct activities: (a) Information programs amounting to \$592 million funded by the Broadcasting Board of Governors including Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Asia, Radio Liberty, Middle East TV (and Radio) Network, and TV/Radio Marti; (b) Education and exchange programs amounting to \$317 million; and (c) a group of seven special programs amounting to \$78 million in FY 2004 including the National Endowment for Democracy, the East-West Center, and the Asia Foundation. The FY 2006 budget request for education and exchange programs was \$430 million, broken down between the Fulbright program and English language programming (241), professional and cultural exchanges such as the International Visitor Leadership Program (140), and outsourced administrative support for these programs (49).

- **“Multilateral aid” (\$1.4 billion).** Most of this amount is the US contribution to the World Bank’s soft loan window (IDA). The rest is divided among half a dozen development banks and funds. Like the programs in the preceding category, large amounts of multilateral aid have been given to many countries without getting the good governance and sustainable economic growth they are designed to produce. At the same time, the rest of the world wants to put more money into these programs and the US is making this difficult because of the sharing formulas used and the reluctance of the US to increase its contributions or reduce its share. Additional US contributions to multilateral aid tend to be highly catalytic, matched several times over by contributions from other donors. Here also, the benefits of allocating more budget resources appear to be comparable to the benefits of spending more for the Peace Corps.

This leaves two categories of programs that have a close affinity to the Peace Corps program and therefore require closer examination: **bilateral development aid** (\$7.2 billion) and **information and exchange activities** (\$1.0 billion).

The **bilateral development aid** category can be further divided into five components:

- ***Agriculture programs (\$1.2 billion).*** From a public diplomacy perspective, the P.L. 480 Title II program is a mixed bag. A large portion of the surplus agricultural commodities given to foreign countries is used for disaster relief. It is appreciated, it is cost effective, and American volunteers often have a role in the distribution of these commodities. However, a sizeable portion is used for humanitarian interventions that have some negative aspects. Specifically, a substantial body of experience suggests that giving cash to households living at subsistence levels is more effective than giving food in kind for three reasons. First, imported food is more expensive than locally-produced food. Second, imported food can act as a disincentive to local food production. Third, with cash, poor families can choose the mix of commodities that yields the greatest well-being. A re-allocation of \$100 million from this area to overseas service is highly likely to deliver more bang for the buck. (The reason why this has not been done already, of course, is political pressure from American farmers for a support system that regularly produces commodity surpluses.)
- ***Development assistance (\$1.4 billion) and USAID administration (\$0.8 billion).*** In FY 2004, USAID had about 2,000 direct hire employees and close to 90 missions in foreign countries. Development assistance funds are used as grants to finance technical assistance activities performed primarily by American contractors. The results associated with USAID programs have been outstanding in some countries and some sectors and greatly disappointing in others. It is difficult to see any improvement in USAID’s effectiveness over the past 20-30 years. Overall, the effort is worthwhile in terms of national security, and a strong

case can be made for increasing the budget for this soft instrument, but the bang for the buck at the margin appears to be lower than spending on the Peace Corps.

- ***Millennium Challenge Corporation (\$1.0 billion)***. The MCC is a new bilateral aid instrument created in 2004 to make grants to low-income countries on the basis of objective indicators of performance (ruling justly, investing in people, economic freedom). It was designed to produce tangible results in terms of improving the lives of poor people. The current level of funding is far below the \$5 billion per year proposed by President Bush when he announced the initiative in 2002. Assuming the MCC can produce the promised results, allocating more budget resources to this instrument will be easy to justify. It will be several years, however, before the MCC's results can be measured and compared with those of overseas program. Thus in this exercise we set the MCC aside until more evidence of its effectiveness is available.
- ***Child Survival and Health Programs Fund (\$1.8 billion) and Global HIV/AIDS Initiative (\$0.5 billion)***. The strong congressional support for these programs appears to reflect exceptional taxpayer support across the USA. Appreciation of these programs in the target countries also appears to be high. There are some concerns about the source and cost of drugs, but not enough to offset the positive features of these programs. Peace Corps volunteers and non-Peace Corps American volunteers are deeply involved in these programs. At the margin, the benefits of more budget funding in this area are probably comparable to the benefits of increasing the Peace Corps' budget.
- ***International disaster and famine assistance (\$0.5 billion)***. Disaster and famine aid clearly rank among the most effective soft instruments of power. The favorable impact on Indonesian attitudes toward the USA from the relief provided in the wake of the December 2004 tsunami was striking. Because the timing and scale of disasters is unpredictable, it is essential to maintain the capacity to deliver large amounts of assistance on short notice, which argues against any cutback in this area. Volunteers also play a key role here, including Peace Corps/Crisis Corps volunteers. Recent experience suggests that the benefits of increasing spending for disaster and famine assistance might be greater than the benefits of increases in any other area, including the Peace Corps.

The **Information and Exchange Activities** (\$1.0 billion) category is probably the closest competitor of the Peace Corps for budget funds. It can be further divided into three sub-categories:

- ***Broadcasting (\$0.6 billion)***. This sub-category, which includes Voice of America, is controversial. Compared with the impact of federally-funded broadcasting programs in the Cold War era, today's programs seem to be less effective. One simple reason may be the cacophony of media messages that is now universal. Another may be the emergence of the USA as the world's only

superpower. These factors suggest that there is little bang for the buck at the margin in this program.

- ***Democracy-building (\$0.1 billion)***. This sub-category, dominated by funding for the National Endowment for Democracy, is hard to distinguish from many development assistance activities and is only listed separately because it is managed by the State Department rather than USAID. It gets the same bang-for-the-buck rating as development assistance: a notch below the Peace Corps.
- ***Academic and cultural exchanges (\$0.3 billion)***. This sub-category includes a number of high-value programs comparable to the Peace Corps. The Fulbright exchange program for students and teachers stands out.⁶ The International Visitors Program and the Humphrey program are also long-time winners. English language training is grossly under-funded relative to the value to Americans of being able to communicate with foreigners in our own language. Given the perception of the USA in the rest of the world today, the decision to shut down the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) in 1999 appears short-sighted. A substantial expansion of the libraries and information centers that remain in operation, that are not barricaded by layers of security, and that appeal to young people who want to be good global citizens is one of the most obvious things to be done to improve foreign attitudes toward the USA. The benefits of more spending on these programs appear comparable to the benefits of increased spending on the Peace Corps.

To recapitulate, as we have grouped them, there is one area of spending that seems likely to deliver more bang for the buck at the margin than the Peace Corps: disaster and famine assistance, funded at the level of \$544 million in FY 2004. There are four areas that appear to offer roughly the same bang for the buck: the “political programs” of the State Department (\$2.7 billion), multilateral aid (\$1.4 billion), the Child Survival and Health Programs Fund (\$1.8 billion), and academic and cultural exchanges (\$345 million). It is significant that the Peace Corps, funded at a level of \$308 million, is the smallest of the lot.

The conclusion from this exercise is that there are few soft instruments currently being used that offer as much bang for the buck as the Peace Corps and other federally-funded overseas service programs, and all are larger. The implication is that a re-allocation of federal spending from international programs that have a lower impact at the margin to overseas service programs would make sense from the perspective of US taxpayers interested in creating a world in which it is easier for Americans to live, do business, and visit.

⁶ As an illustration of the impact of the Fulbright Program, its alumni have received 35 Nobel prizes, more than 60 Pulitzer prizes, 21 “genius” awards from the MacArthur Foundation, and 15 Presidential Medals of Freedom. From remarks by Robert A. Corrigan, President of San Francisco State University delivered at a meeting of the Lincoln Commission on September 26, 2005.

Before looking more closely at the range of overseas programs that currently exist in the USA, it is worth looking at two proposed programs that will be competing for any budget resources that may be re-allocated toward soft instruments of power: the Global Health Corps and the Abraham Lincoln Fellowship program.

Global Health Corps. The majority leader of the Senate, Bill Frist, introduced a bill in April 2005 to establish a Global Health Corps (GHC) with three purposes: (a) improve the health, welfare, and development of communities in select foreign countries and regions; (b) advance US public diplomacy in such locations; and (c) provide individuals in the United States with the opportunity to serve such communities. In his speech introducing the bill, Senator Frist evoked the spirit of the Peace Corps when it was founded and stressed its public diplomacy role.⁷

The bill provides for the establishment of an office within the Department of Health and Human Services and authorizes appropriations as necessary to implement the GHC. The scale of the GHC has not been spelled out in the bill, but is suggested by a provision in the bill calling for the Secretary for Health and Human Services to designate at least 500 employees of the Public Health Service as GHC volunteers, including 250 employees who would be deployable to anywhere in the world on 72 hours notice. Other Federal employees and Peace Corps volunteers could be designated as GHC volunteers together with trained health care professionals and practitioners from the private sector. All GHC volunteers would be required to complete up to six months of comprehensive basic training. They would serve overseas without remuneration but would enjoy the protection of volunteers serving domestically under federal programs. The bill authorizes budget funding of travel costs for all volunteers but not for in-country expenses (per diem). While not including any specific limitations on length of service, the GHC appears designed primarily to operate through short-term (a few weeks or months) assignments. No price tag has been attached to this proposal yet, but it has the character of the Freedom Corps and other “bare bones” Bush Administration initiatives.

Coincidentally, the Institute of Medicine (a component of the National Academy of Sciences) released a report proposing the creation of a Global Health Service (GHS) to work on the global campaign to address the HIV/AIDS epidemic.⁸ The chairman of the panel that produced the report, Fitzhugh Mullan, described it as “a Peace Corps for health”.⁹ In contrast to the GHC, the GHS is designed to encourage longer and more productive periods of service overseas. Initially, the GHS might have 150 members who would be government employees and would be assigned to one of the 15 countries targeted under the President’s Emergency Program for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). The main component, however, would be the employment of 1,000 experienced health professionals to work abroad under one-year fellowships for \$35,000 in remuneration.

⁷ The idea is not brand new. HHS Secretary Tommy Thompson threw out the idea of creating a volunteer medical corps in Africa to fight HIV/AIDS in July 2001. He suggested branding it the “Paul Coverdell medical scholarship program”. (Connolly, Ceci (2001) “Thompson Cutting Medicaid Red Tape” *Washington Post*, July 10, 2001, p. A19) In all likelihood, even earlier variations on this theme were proposed.

⁸ Drawn from Brown, David (2005) “Global Health Corps proposed to fight AIDS”, *Washington Post*, April 20, 2005, p. A23. The IOM press release can be found at : <http://www.iom.edu/report.asp?id=26494> [10/5/05]

⁹ Brown, David (2005) *Washington Post*, April 20, 2005, p.A23.

Another component would allow newly trained health professionals to earn \$25,000 to pay off education loans in return for a year of work abroad. These components imply a program in the range of \$50-100 million. Importantly, GHS members would not work in the field for US Government agencies but would work for philanthropic or academic NGOs.

The GHS proposal has not yet been reflected in any legislative proposals. Given the pressure to hold the line on federal spending, most recently associated with the costs of reconstruction after Hurricane Katrina, it seems unlikely that funds will be appropriated in FY 2006 or FY 2007 for any form of the GHC or GHS proposal. Nevertheless they illustrate the continuing power of the Peace Corps model for overseas service and reflect the practical difficulties of using the Peace Corps to address new foreign policy priorities of the United States.

Abraham Lincoln Fellowship Program. In 2003, former Senator Paul Simon began to seek broad support for a bold initiative to sharply increase the number of American undergraduates studying overseas, especially in developing countries. He envisioned a 10-year federally-funded program that would support 500,000 students with scholarships averaging \$7,000 per year for a total cost of \$3.5 billion.

The momentum behind this initiative was so great that it continued beyond Senator Simon's death at the end of 2003. The Omnibus Appropriations bill passed in January 2004 provided funding for a Congressional Commission to recommend a program along the lines he had advocated. The Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program was formed later in the year with 17 members under the chairmanship of Peter McPherson, president of Michigan State University. The Commission held its first meeting in December 2004 and held four more meetings in the first nine months of 2005. It appears to be well on track to submit its recommendations to the Congress by the target date of December 2005.

Reflecting current budget constraints and the country's conservative attitude toward the role of the federal government, the Commission is zeroing in on a program that will involve much smaller amounts of federal funding than proposed by Senator Simon but many more American undergraduates studying overseas ten years from now. From a level of 175,000 undergraduates studying overseas in 2003, the Commission has estimated that organic growth would raise the level to 580,000 undergraduates in 2017. The Commission is putting the finishing touches on a program that would raise the number to 1 million. The strategy adopted to keep the budget cost low is to use federal funding catalytically to help colleges and universities across the country initiate or expand their own overseas study programs. Around 80 percent of the federal money would be used for competitive scholarships, with the remaining used to support institutional development. In the first year, for example, the Abraham Lincoln Fellowships might provide an average of \$1,000 to 40,000 students to cover part of the cost of their study overseas, for a total cost of \$40 million. No student would get more than \$5,000. The Fellowship awards and the number of students supported in this fashion would be adjusted as necessary to achieve the program objective within the evolving

budget constraints and national priorities. Crudely extrapolating from the base year, the program might award an average of \$3,000 each for 200,000 students for a total cost of \$600 million in FY 2017.

In contrast to the Global Health Corps/Global Health Service proposals, the odds of getting funds appropriated in FY2007 to launch the Abraham Lincoln Fellowship program appear favorable. The preparation has been exemplary in terms of capturing a bipartisan spirit and mobilizing a strong constituency in the large universe of American colleges and universities. Furthermore, the recommendation taking shape appears consistent with budget realities, possibly to the point of being insufficiently ambitious.

From the perspective of this paper, a significant shortcoming of the work of the Commission so far is its narrow focus on undergraduate study abroad. Regrettably, it does not address the related issue of overseas service. Two aspects of the Lincoln Fellowship program are relevant to this study. First, “service learning”, where course work and public service are combined, is an important and growing part of the educational experience at many American colleges and universities.¹⁰

Second, the Lincoln Fellowship program is justified by the contributions it will make to “national security, public diplomacy, and economic competitiveness”. For the same amount of money, a program to expand overseas service options for Americans might make even bigger contributions to these objectives. Specifically, a program that builds on existing programs in the private sector in the way that the Lincoln Fellowship program has been re-designed to be catalytic, could have a great impact with the same initial funding of \$50 million per year and could grow in the same fashion. In other words, an overseas study program and an overseas service program are two potentially powerful and complementary soft instruments of power. Overseas study can make overseas service immensely more productive and overseas service can make overseas study immensely more rewarding.

¹⁰ As an example, George Washington University was recently ranked as the fourth best university in the USA for its commitment to national service by Washington Monthly. In the 2004-05 academic year, GW students provided 13,424 hours of service in the Washington metropolitan area, valued at more than \$235,000. Across the country, the time spent by student volunteering for the 950 colleges and universities that are in the Campus Compact coalition that year was worth \$4.45 billion. (GW News Center Press Release, October 10, 2005, from website www.gwu.edu.)

III. The Legacy of Overseas Service

"The health of a democratic society may be measured by the quality of functions performed by private citizens"
—Alexis de Tocqueville

Volunteer service has roots that go back before recorded history, most simply in various forms of mutual self-help beyond the family unit. It is encouraged by all of the world's great religions in the form of charitable activities. It is also deeply woven in the fabric of American society. An altruistic streak was one of the distinctive characteristics of life in the United States when Alexis de Tocqueville surveyed the young country in the 1830s.

One of the earliest examples of secular service to advance national goals emerged in England in the late 1800s when the settlement house movement began to address the embarrassment of extreme urban poverty. The movement quickly spread to cities and rural backwaters in the USA, bringing highly educated men and women into slums and hollows to help impoverished families rise above their desperate circumstances. In 1904, William James went so far as to propose conscripting young men to fight poverty in America.

Throughout the last century the number of organizations mobilizing volunteers to serve disadvantaged groups such as the physically handicapped and the elderly grew steadily. Other organizations were created to channel volunteer energy into special areas such as mentoring school children or maintaining trails in national parks. Advocacy groups also proliferated by organizing volunteers concerned about drunk driving, historic preservation, the arts, and a host of other social issues.

The American Field Service was one of the earliest organizations dedicated to service overseas. It began as a group of volunteers driving ambulances in France during World War I. Today, known simply as AFS, it places every year almost 2,000 American students, young adults, and teachers in foreign countries, brings 3,000 more to the USA, and arranges another 6,000 exchanges between other countries. The Experiment in International Living began in 1932. It has evolved into an international organization called World Learning with four distinct programs: the original exchanges for high school students, undergraduate and graduate education overseas, technical expertise for development projects, and cross-cultural training for businesses. Almost 4,000 Americans participate in these programs each year.¹¹

American missionaries have worked in foreign countries for decades. The Mormon Church among others has encouraged young members to work in poor communities overseas. The International Voluntary Service was founded in 1953 by Christian leaders from several countries. It placed college graduate volunteers in

¹¹ Conversation with Tony Allen, World Learning, November 1, 2005

developing countries for two years of work at the grassroots level. The work of medical doctors like Tom Dooley after World War II helped to focus public attention on how much Americans could do to help less fortunate people in Southeast Asia and other Third World regions.

The establishment of the Peace Corps in 1961 represented a quantum leap in America's commitment to overseas service. Proposed by President Kennedy when the nation was pre-occupied with the growing nuclear might of the Soviet Union and its success in waging the Cold War, the Peace Corps was the quintessential soft instrument of power. Within five years, more than 15,000 Americans were serving as Peace Corps volunteers in fifty countries.¹²

Since the high-water mark for the Peace Corps in 1966, there have been two divergent trends in overseas service by Americans:

- The number of Peace Corps volunteers in the field dropped sharply at the end of the 1960s, hovered around 6,000 during the 1970s, and remained below 5,000 for most of the 1980s before pushing slowly up to the September 2005 level of 7,810.
- The number of Americans performing volunteer service overseas in other programs grew rapidly from a number in 1966 that was probably smaller than number of Peace Corps volunteers in the field at that time to a number today that is a multiple of the number of Peace Corps volunteers and probably above 50,000.

A. *Government Policy and America's Commitment to Service*

To quote Paul Light, “volunteering has been a staple of presidential agendas since 1961.”¹³ President Kennedy's clarion call to service in that year still resonates: “Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country”.

President Kennedy was concerned on that occasion with defending freedom from threats emanating from abroad and was looking for a “glow ... that ... can ... light the world”. The instrument he chose for that purpose was the Peace Corps.

A series of federal programs created to promote volunteerism domestically began in 1964 when President Lyndon Johnson created Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA). It was quickly followed by the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program, the Foster Grandparents Program, the Senior Companion Program, and the Small Business Administration's Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE).

Under President Nixon, a Cabinet Committee on Voluntary Action was created along with an Office of Voluntary Action with the Department of Housing and Urban

¹² Conversation with Doug Moors, Peace Corps, October 31, 2005.

¹³ “The Volunteering Decision: What Prompts It? What Sustains It?” *The Brookings Review*, 20/4 (Fall 2002). Pp. 45-47. The second quote in this paragraph and the quote in the next paragraph are from the same source. Both of the Kennedy quotes are from his Inaugural Address.

Development. Nixon launched a National Program on Voluntary Action and established a non-profit organization (the National Center for Voluntary Action) to implement the program. In 1971, Nixon combined the Peace Corps, VISTA, and the other existing programs into a new federal agency called ACTION, which gained increased authority under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act passed two years later. Nixon also signed an Executive Order in 1974 proclaiming a National Volunteer Week, which has been repeated every year since then. President Ford is the only president in the past 40 years who did not undertake a major initiative in this area.

Volunteer service was not a federal priority in President Carter's administration, but he did disentangle the Peace Corps from ACTION to give it greater autonomy. President Reagan's approach to volunteer service was also low key. However, one of his first moves was to establish the Office of Private-Sector Initiatives in the White House.

President George H.W. Bush re-focused attention on volunteer service in his election campaign and in his inaugural address.¹⁴ As a result, the non-profit Points of Light Foundation was established in 1990 "to engage more people more effectively in volunteer community service to help solve serious social problems".¹⁵ The Points of Light Foundation has grown over the past 15 years to become a high-powered operation, with a federal grant of around \$10 million representing half of its income.

President Clinton increased federal funding for volunteer service by several orders of magnitude as a result of the passage of the National and Community Service Act of 1993 that created the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) to administer the newly-created AmeriCorps program along with pre-existing programs such as VISTA and the Foster Grandparent program. For FY 2006, the budget request for CNCS is \$921 million, of which \$396 million is for the AmeriCorps program.

President George W. Bush has raised the bar even higher, for both domestic and international volunteers. He included a call to service in his first inaugural address in 2001. A year later in his State of the Union address, as part of the response to the terrorist attacks on 9/11/01, he challenged Americans to spend 4,000 hours in their lifetimes serving their communities, the nation, and the world. He committed to doubling the Peace Corps from 7,000 volunteers to 14,000 within five years. He created the USA Freedom Corps as a central point for mobilizing Americans interested in voluntary

¹⁴ "I am speaking of a new engagement in the lives of others, a new activism, hands-on and involved, that gets the job done. We must bring in the generations, harnessing the unused talent of the elderly and the unfocused energy of the young. For not only leadership is passed from generation to generation, but so is stewardship. And the generation born after the Second World War has come of age. I have spoken of **a thousand points of light**, of all the community organizations that are spread like stars throughout the Nation, doing good. We will work hand in hand, encouraging, sometimes leading, sometimes being led, rewarding. We will work on this in the White House, in the Cabinet agencies. I will go to the people and the programs that are the brighter points of light, and I will ask every member of my government to become involved. The old ideas are new again because they are not old, they are timeless: duty, sacrifice, commitment, and a patriotism that finds its expression in taking part and pitching in." Inaugural Address, January 20, 1989.

¹⁵ From the mission statement on the Points of Light Foundation website: <http://pointsoflight.org/about/mission.cfm> [October 12, 2005]

service in support of national goals.¹⁶ At the same time, he formed the USA Freedom Corps Council, which he chairs, to provide political visibility and policy guidance for service programs under the direction of ten federal departments. In 2003, he signed an Executive Order inaugurating the Volunteers for Prosperity Initiative designed to match highly-skilled Americans with volunteer opportunities overseas related to five federally-funded programs.¹⁷ He also created the President's Council on Service and Civic Participation to recognize the important contributions of individual volunteers.

To illustrate the impact of these effects, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that 64.5 million Americans performed volunteer service in 2004, an increase of more than 5 million since 2001. This number represents 22 percent of the country's population of 295 million.¹⁸

Two other aspects of volunteering in the current policy context that merit attention are national service and the outsourcing of public sector functions.

National Service

What is service? The Global Service Institute proposes to define service as “an organized period of substantial engagement and contribution to the local, national, or world community, recognized and valued by society, with minimal monetary contribution to the participant.”¹⁹ But this definition leaves out public service performed by government employees at every level, including teachers and firemen. It also leaves out military service, which some view as the highest form of service. While politicians of every hue extol the virtues of service they have divergent and often irreconcilable views on key issues such as compulsory service or the use of tax revenues to support service programs.

A broad definition of national service was used in an exceptional volume of essays compiled by the Brookings Institution under the title *United We Serve: National Service and the Future of Citizenship* (Edited by E.J. Dionne, Kayla Meltzer Drogosz, and Robert Litan, Brookings Institution Press, 2003). The editors point out that the diversity of views about service “are rooted deeply in our history”. For example, the volume highlights the positive impact of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, on a citizenry that seemed to be losing interest in service. It also provides a basis for skepticism about how long the renewed interest will last. As another example, the volume includes a widely-quoted op-ed by Congressman Charles Rangel advocating the resumption of the military draft (mandatory national service) to meet the manpower requirements of the intervention in Iraq in an equitable manner. It also includes an essay contributed by senior Bush Administration officials stating that the “new direction in

¹⁶ Executive Order 13285, January 30, 2002.

¹⁷ The Volunteers for Prosperity program is described in more detail on page 29.

¹⁸ Source: USA Freedom Corps website, http://usafreedomcorps.gov/content/about_usafc/overview/index.asp [October 19, 2005].

¹⁹ From the website of the Global Service Institute Network: <http://gwbweb.wustl.edu/csd/gsi/> [October 13, 2005]

national and community service” reflected in President Bush’s State of the Union message in 2002 “put[s] to rest the idea ... that national and community service should be made mandatory”.²⁰ Such passionate and conflicting views could make it difficult to reach a national consensus on federal support for volunteer service overseas.

For the purpose of this study, we are focusing on “voluntary” service, with the emphasis being on work performed with no monetary compensation or with compensation substantially below the market rate for such work. Furthermore, it seems helpful to distinguish between community service (work performed in the volunteer’s home community), and national service (work performed outside the volunteer’s home community, usually under a program that is nation-wide in scope).

Outsourcing public sector functions

Democracy in the USA is an evolving social experiment. The same comment applies to the system of governance adopted by every other country. Within the lifetimes of most Americans alive today, we experimented with expanding the role of government in the Great Society approach under President Johnson in the late 1960s and now we are experimenting with reducing the role of government by outsourcing to the private sector all kinds of services previously performed by government employees. It is possible to look at the emphasis on volunteering over the past 15 years as part of this outsourcing experiment. From a financial perspective, there is no better way to reduce the cost of government than to have government services performed by volunteers.

As with most public policy issues, however, this approach is no panacea and has some natural limitations. One limitation is diminishing effectiveness. As more paid services are converted to volunteer services the overall quality may fall. Think of fire fighting, where fire departments in most metropolitan areas have full-time paid fire fighters and where most rural areas are served by volunteer fire departments. It is hard to imagine the quality of urban fire departments remaining high if they are systematically converted into volunteer units. Another limitation is equity and employment. Thousands of houses are constructed each year by volunteers organized by Habitat for Humanity and similar organizations, in effect taking jobs away from people who would like to make a living by constructing houses.²¹

²⁰ John M. Bridgeland, Stephen Goldsmith, and Leslie Lenkowsky. “New Directions: Service and the Bush Administration’s Civic Agenda”, in Dionne et al., *United We Serve*, Pp. 55.

²¹ In their introductory chapter for the edited volume *United We Serve*, Dionne and Drogosz highlight a related concern: “Service can become a form of cheap grace, a generalized call on citizens to do kind things as an alternative to a genuine summons for national sacrifice or a fair apportionment of burdens among the more and less powerful, the more and less wealthy. But when service is seen as a bridge to genuine political and civic responsibility, it can strengthen democratic government and foster republican virtues.” (p5)

B. *The Drivers of Service Overseas*

Before examining the options for overseas service available to Americans, it is useful to examine the supply and demand factors that determine the number of Americans who choose to serve abroad rather than at home, the kinds of skills they bring to their work, and how they distribute themselves among alternative geographic destinations.

Supply-side factors

Eight factors that appear to have a significant impact on the number of Americans who perform voluntary service overseas are: the mission, demographics, employment opportunities, compensation, prior experience, technology, and safety and security. Together these six supply factors appear favorable in the near term and seem likely to become more so in the long-term until disparities in standards of living around the world diminish.

The mission. President Kennedy's challenge to serve overseas in the Peace Corps at the beginning of the 1960s resonated in remarkable ways. Part of the attraction of his proposal was simple charisma: many young Americans were interested simply because he said it was worth doing. But the context was also critical. The proposal came in a short window after dozens of new nations emerged from colonial rule and before Americans became disillusioned with the war in Vietnam and cynical about the effectiveness of foreign aid.

A much shorter window opened up after 9/11 when applications to the Peace Corps soared. It began closing after the military intervention in Iraq by the US-led coalition failed to produce the enthusiastic welcome by Iraqis that had been predicted and instead appeared to encourage global terrorism.

At the present time, individual concerns about global problems such as poverty and HIV/AIDS seem more important than national goals in motivating Americans to serve overseas. This is perhaps a positive change, because it fits better with the changing demand-side factors. Governments in many developing countries are more sensitive to allegations that they are encouraging the hegemonic role of the United States.

Over the past forty years, the dominant mission for Americans serving overseas has been to help disadvantaged people improve their lives. This rationale for overseas service seems to be reaching the end of its shelf-life. A new rationale, however, can be discerned: building social capital. Recent academic work, in particular by Robert Putnam, has suggested that the well-being of people is closely linked to the richness of interpersonal ties, through face-to-face group interaction, in their communities and their nation.²² By extension, global well-being will be enhanced by expanding interpersonal

²² An excellent introduction to the subject that reviews the experience of the United States, the United Kingdom, and five other leading developed countries can be found in Robert D. Putnam (Editor), *Democracies in Flux: The Evolution of Social Capital in Contemporary Society*, Oxford University Press, 2002. Unfortunately no

ties across borders. No political leader has yet packaged this concept in a form that has captured the imagination of their fellow citizens, but the world seems ripe for a step of this kind.

Demographics. Unlike the situation in a number of other high-income countries, the population of college-age students in the USA continues to grow. Historically young adults have been more likely to perform voluntary service overseas than middle-age adults and senior citizens. Therefore America's demographic profile is likely to be a positive factor for some time to come. Another demographic is the gender split, with a steadily increasing share of overseas volunteers being women. (Around 60 percent of Peace Corps volunteers are now women.) There are no obvious reasons to believe the split will go much further in the direction of favoring women. A more important demographic is probably the "baby boom generation", which is now reaching retirement age. There are signs that the interest in overseas service among this group is a long way from peaking.

Employment opportunities. Not surprisingly, interest in overseas service is linked to the business cycle in the USA. Some of the surge in Peace Corps applications after 9/11 is believed to reflect the tougher job market facing university graduates at that time. Many young full-time volunteers, at home as well as abroad, would prefer to have entry-level jobs with career prospects. Many opt for volunteer work because the experience they gain makes them more competitive in the job market and puts them in contact with prospective employers. The business cycle also affects the supply of older volunteers, although it cuts both ways. In periods of expansion the risks of taking time out for volunteer service are reduced for men and women who are well-established in their careers. In slow periods, the self-employed can fill in gaps and gain useful experience by taking on volunteer assignments.

Compensation. The range of compensation arrangements associated with volunteer service is remarkably large. At one extreme are high-cost programs where the volunteers not only pay for travel and away-from-home living expenses but also pay for overhead costs. These costs can easily add up to \$10,000 for a 6-month period of service, putting it in the range of tuition/room/board at a private university. At the other extreme are programs that cover all travel and living expenses and also provide a generous honorarium usually related to the skill of the volunteer (e.g., corporate lawyer, medical doctor).

Each of the components of compensation has an impact on supply and they do not necessarily move in the same direction at the same time. The declining cost of air travel for Americans over the past 20-30 years has clearly made overseas service more

consensus exists on how to define social capital. The following working definition was used in a recent study carried out under the auspices of the Centre for Civil Society at the London School of Economics, in collaboration with Robert Putnam among others: "Social capital is a resource, both private and public, inherent in the structure of relationships in inter-personal and organizational networks." See Halima Begum, *Social Capital in Action: Adding Up Local Connections and Networks*, National Council for Voluntary Organizations (NCVO), London December 2003.

attractive. The high and rising cost of living in Europe has contributed to diminished interest in volunteer service in that region, while the low costs and rising standards of living in most of the developing world has been a major attraction. Looking forward, living costs in developing countries are likely to rise steadily and may become a major deterrent if the dollar depreciates sharply as many economists expect. Medical care is easy to overlook but may be a major factor now and could become more important given the current concerns about HIV/AIDS, avian flu, and other epidemic illnesses.

Behind all of these compensation components is the role of the federal government. Budget constraints have arguably had the biggest impact on the size of the Peace Corps program. Until this constraint is lifted or more catalytic forms of support for overseas service are adopted, the supply of American volunteers interested in serving overseas is likely to grow at a slow pace. An almost invisible but potentially important element is the tax treatment of volunteer service. At the present time, direct out-of-pocket costs are tax deductible but time on the job is not. The tax treatment of volunteer activity could change in either direction and could have a significant impact on the supply of volunteers.

Prior experience. Tourist travel and overseas study expose Americans to foreign countries and make it easier for them to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of service abroad. These experiences may become a more important supply factor in the future, especially if study abroad is scaled up. Foreign language ability is part of this factor, although foreigners seem to be learning English at a faster pace than Americans are learning foreign languages. The growing prevalence of English, means that more American volunteers who do not speak a foreign language will be able to perform meaningful service.

Technology. When the Peace Corps began it was impractical to phone home and letters could take a month or more to travel from remote villages abroad to rural homes in the USA. Now internet access is available in every sizeable town, even in the poorest developing countries, and cell phones are becoming ubiquitous. The ability to remain in touch with family and friends at home clearly lowers an important psychological barrier to overseas service.

Safety and security. Most of the supply factors mentioned above have worked to increase the supply of volunteers for overseas service. Safety and security concerns, by contrast, have increased significantly in the past ten years. It is hard to say whether this will be a long-term problem or a passing phenomenon. With rising standards of living and vastly improved communication, Americans living in developing countries should be safer and feel more secure. Right now, however, Americans are not viewed as positively as they have been in the past in many developing countries and therefore some will be discouraged from serving overseas due to safety and security issues.

Demand-side factors

The factors that drive overseas demand for American volunteers are harder to analyze. Somewhat arbitrarily, we divide them between the mission and global politics. Together they present a mixed picture. While the current demand for American volunteers appears to be greater than the supply at the present time, overall demand does not seem to be growing and may be diminishing. At the same time, the demand depends critically on how the role of volunteers is portrayed.

The mission. From the earliest programs established almost a hundred years ago, overseas service has been performed in a have/have-not context. Americans have it and the people in other countries don't. Thus Americans have been going overseas to give what they have as an act of generosity or charity. When the Peace Corps was established, what Americans had—even liberal arts college graduates—were skills required to build prosperous and free nations, a relatively minor variation on the main theme. As a result, countries that opted to host Peace Corps volunteers bought into the notion that they needed help from Americans without being too fussy about who these Americans were.

Before long, however, this somewhat paternalistic relationship became untenable in some countries. The Peace Corps responded by recruiting volunteers with more advanced skills and experience and sending them out to work in specific areas (such as business development) where local capacity was weak. Nevertheless, skepticism about the value of volunteers is a major obstacle today to having Peace Corps programs in countries that consider themselves too advanced to need this kind of help from the USA. The concerns in some host countries reflect the fact that their universities are turning out more graduates than their economies can absorb. Thus they see Peace Corps volunteers as depriving their own citizens of jobs. The seriousness of these concerns is reflected in the absence of Peace Corps programs in five of the biggest developing countries: India, Indonesia, Russia, Brazil, and Nigeria. It is also reflected in the small size of the programs in China and Mexico.

As long as the mission remains helping “backward” countries, the demand for American volunteers is unlikely to grow significantly, at least in government-to-government programs like the Peace Corps. The demand for volunteers in private-to-private programs is difficult to measure, but it may be growing at a strong pace now and might grow more swiftly in the future.

A less paternalistic approach by the US Government could sharply increase the demand for volunteers. In particular, an approach that was premised more on building social capital internationally, that was more of a two-way street bringing volunteers to the USA in exchange for Americans accepted by host countries, could be quite appealing.

Global politics. The Peace Corps was a product of the Cold War era. That era ended fifteen years ago. The decade of the 1990s focused on the transition from authoritarian political systems and centrally-planned economies to democratic systems and market economies, and it was a boom period for volunteer service. Supply and demand both increased. Since the turn of the century, global politics has been dominated

by the struggle with terrorism, which has been bad for volunteer service. It has depressed both supply and demand.

It is hard to know what will be driving global politics a decade from now. A more protectionist mood in the USA and growing concerns about the position of the USA as a super-power, however, may represent tides that no government programs can overcome.

IV. The Universe of Overseas Service Options

... over the years, due to my close contact with and exposure to AmeriCorps, Peace Corps, and many other volunteer organizations around this nation, I've come to believe that it's the very essence of patriotism because I believe the essence of patriotism is service to a cause greater than one's self-interests.

--Senator John McCain at the Brookings Institution forum, United We Serve: National Service and the Future of Citizenship, 30 July 2003

Two reference points for this survey of overseas service options for Americans are the Peace Corps program and Volunteers for Prosperity (VfP). The Peace Corps program is by far the largest (measured in Volunteer Service Months) and the best known, and it is fully funded by the federal budget. VfP is a portal or network, not a program, but it was recently created by the Bush Administration and represents a polar opposite in terms of federal budget support. After presenting short profiles of the Peace Corps program and VfP, we classify and examine the other programs.

A. *The Peace Corps and Volunteers for Prosperity (VfP)*

Peace Corps

In the context of this study, the most distinctive features of the Peace Corps are its status as a federal agency and the status of its volunteers as federal employees.

Size of program. At the end of FY 2005, there were 7,810 Peace Corps volunteers in the field, a 30-year high. Since 1961, almost 180,000 volunteers have served in more than 138 countries.²³

Funding source. One hundred percent of the funding for the Peace Corps program comes from the federal budget. The Peace Corps does accept small contributions in cash and in kind from individuals and companies under its Peace Corps Partnership Program. These contributions are tax-deductible. Volunteers may apply for small grants from this program to meet some of the cost of community-based projects.

Service commitment. Volunteers must commit to two years of service following three months of training, for a total commitment of 27 months.

Compensation and benefits. Volunteers receive three months of in-country training, including intensive language training. They receive outstanding medical care

²³ At the beginning of 2002, President Bush announced the goal of doubling the Peace Corps to a level of 14,000 volunteers by 2007. His budget requests for FY 2003-2005 includes amounts sufficient to meet this target, but the Congress cut these requests sharply to keep the Peace Corps on a path of slow growth. The President's request for FY 2006 effectively abandoned the doubling target but held to the slow growth path.

while in the Peace Corps. They receive a local-currency living allowance that varies from country to country. They are expected to have the same basic standard of living as their host-country counterparts (except for medical care, which is superior). They travel locally by bicycle or public transportation and do without amenities such as telephones and air conditioners in their living quarters. Volunteers accumulate a “readjustment allowance” –currently \$225 per month, \$6,075 for 27 months of training and service—that they receive in a lump sum at the end of their service. They also receive some post-service support with job placement and educational placement.

Cost per volunteer. For FY 2005, the Congress appropriated \$320 million for the Peace Corps program. Based on 7,810 volunteers and trainees in the field at the end of the fiscal year, this works out to a cost of \$41,000 per volunteer, equivalent to \$3,400 per month. In the context of this study, \$3,400 per month looks like a lot. However, the cost of maintaining overseas military personnel, diplomats, USAID employees, and contractors is a least three times this amount.²⁴

Geographic coverage. The Peace Corps is currently operating in 72 countries in every region of the world. The ten countries with the largest number of volunteers projected in FY 2005, in descending order, are: Ukraine (313 volunteers), Honduras, Bulgaria, Morocco, Paraguay, Tanzania, Kyrgyz Republic, Guatemala, Dominican Republic, and Kenya (160 volunteers).

Priority sectors. The activities in which Peace Corps volunteers are engaged are not easy to categorize, but the agency breaks them down into seven categories in its FY 2005 Budget Justification: education (34 percent), HIV/AIDS (20), environment (16), business development (16), agriculture (7), youth (3), other (5).

Volunteer profile. Fifty-eight percent of the volunteers serving at the end of FY 2004 were in their twenties while six percent were over the age of 50. Fifty-eight percent were female, and 11 percent were married. Ninety-eight percent had at least a bachelor’s degree and 13 percent had a master’s degree or a higher degree.

Effectiveness. As articulated by President Bush in his 2002 State of the Union address and on other occasions, the Peace Corps contributes to the strategic objective of “ensuring a future of peace, hope, and promise for all people”. This statement would be a good standard against which to measure the Peace Corps’ effectiveness, but it is too ambitious and long-term to be a practical measure. The three goals of the Peace Corps,

²⁴ In 2003, the base pay of an Army private serving in Iraq was around \$15,000 per year and a second lieutenant around \$26,000 with each getting an additional \$3,000 per year in combat pay. (Source: Rieffel, *The Peace Corps in a Turbulent World*, p. 14) But the cost of accommodations and meals and other support costs were multiples of this amount of course. In the case of USAID, salaries and benefits for about 700 direct hire American employees in overseas missions came to \$103 million in FY 2004, equivalent to \$147,000 per person—perhaps the number most comparable to the Peace Corps figure of \$41,000 per volunteer. Salaries and benefits for about 1,300 employees in the Washington headquarters were \$161 million, or \$121,000 per person. Dividing the total operating expenses of USAID by the total number of American employees yields a cost of \$348,000 per American employee. Adding 4,900 foreign service nationals brings the cost down to \$102,000 per employee. (Source: USAID, Budget Justification—FY 2006)

since its inception have been to provide trained manpower, promote better understanding of the American people on the part of people in the countries where volunteers serve, and promote better understanding of these people on the part of Americans. Even at this level, no one has found a way of measuring results against these goals quantitatively. However, the broad support for the program in the USA and the bipartisan support it enjoys in the US Congress suggest that it is achieving impressive results given the scale at which it operates. Furthermore no other US Government program appears to deliver more bang for the buck in “winning hearts and minds” with the possible exception of the Fulbright program, which operates at a far smaller scale. The anecdotal evidence in support of the Peace Corps is powerful. Returned volunteers have excelled in government, business, academia, the arts, and many other fields. Overseas, distinguished individuals who give some credit to the influence of Peace Corps volunteers include at least one head of state, the current President of Peru.

Text Box 1 contains a vignette of Peace Corps volunteer’s experience in Mali. Text Boxes 2 and 3, also included in Part III of this paper, offer vignettes of the contrasting volunteer experiences in Romania and Indonesia.

Volunteers for Prosperity (VfP)

President Bush announced the establishment of USA Freedom Corps in his 2002 State of the Union address as a coordinating entity in the White House charged with “promoting a culture of service, citizenship, and responsibility in America”. According to its website, USA Freedom Corps “promotes and expands volunteer service in America by supporting Federal service programs, serving as a resource for non-profits, recognizing volunteers, and helping to connect individuals with volunteer organizations within their communities.”²⁵ The federal service programs supported by USA Freedom Corps are AmeriCorps, Citizens Corps, Learn and Serve, Senior Corps, and Peace Corps. In other words, USA Freedom Corps is a small office within the White House whose main mission is to encourage Americans to respond to the President’s call to service by participating in both domestic and overseas service programs.

History and Mission. VfP was created by Executive Order No. 13317 signed in September 2003 as part of USA Freedom Corps. VfP’s mission is to “promote the energy and idealism of the United States through support of international volunteer service by highly skilled American professionals that meets the global health and prosperity goals of the U.S. government.”²⁶

Structure. VfP does not directly recruit or support volunteers. Instead, VfP coordinates with U.S.-based partner organizations to direct skilled American professionals interested to international service opportunities. To date, VfP has developed formal relationships with 220 partners who represent a pool of over 50,000 doctors, nurses, engineers, teachers, business executives and others. In FY 2005 VfP’s

²⁵ www.usafreedomcorps.gov/overview [October 12, 2005]

²⁶ www.volunteersforprosperity.gov/about [December 8, 2005]

partner organizations placed 12,000 volunteers overseas which represented a 70 percent increase over the previous year.

Funding Source. VfP receives federal funding as part of USAID's budget. Through EO 13317, VfP can help to ensure that VfP partner organizations become more competitive for federal grants when applying for funds associated with the other presidential initiatives served by VfP. VfP does not itself provide grants for international volunteer service opportunities to partnering organizations. Additionally VfP plans to improve the functionality of the VfP website through additional new features, including a fully operational VfP Giving Portal.

Service Commitment. Unlike Peace Corps, VfP volunteers terms of service are flexible and range anywhere from a few weeks to a year. Each volunteer works with the VfP partner coordinating the deployment to determine the most appropriate length of time for service.

Priority sectors. VfP serves as a clearinghouse for volunteer opportunities overseas, with priority being given to six other presidential initiatives relating to international development: the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), the Middle East Partnership Initiative, the Digital Freedom Initiative, the Water for the Poor Initiative, the Trade for African Development and Enterprise initiative, and the Millennium Challenge Account. In 2005, VfP partner received in excess of \$22 million in federal grants related to these initiatives.

Volunteer profile. Most volunteers have professional training and experience including, but not limited to: medicine, business, engineering, and law.

Effectiveness In 2005, VfP placed 12,000 volunteers which represented a 70% increase over the previous year.

TEXT BOX 1**Serving with the Peace Corps in Mali**

It was 1996. Spring of senior year. Graduation from a pricey university was just months away and I was wrestling with the eternal question of what do I want to do with the rest of my life. One of my former classmates mentioned that the Peace Corps was looking for French-speakers to work in West Africa. As I watched other soon-to-be-grads in their business suits preparing for interviews with recruiters from private sector, I suddenly felt like I had a good answer.

After a competitive application process stressing applicant skills, adaptability and cross-cultural understanding, I was invited to train for Peace Corps service as a health extension agent in the West African nation of Mali. To illustrate the extent of my naivete at this point, I had never heard of Mali and was not sure that Tombouctou was a real place. Nor did I understand that I had just committed myself to eating with my hands for the next two years.

The intensive ten-week training program took place twenty miles outside of the capital city in a small village called Katibougou. We spent eight to ten hours each day with host country national trainers learning local language skills, technical health issues, cross-cultural matters, and community development studies. In the evenings, I would go “home,” paired with another volunteer, to a small hut in a host family compound. Although challenging at times, given the language barrier, this arrangement was an excellent crash course for my new way of life.

After training, I was assigned to Solo, an agrarian village with a population of 1,500, about 100 miles south of the capital city, Bamako. I was the only foreigner living in Solo. To see another American I had two choices: an hour’s bike ride into the bush or hitch a two-hour ride to another town. You can imagine how I felt that first day when the Peace Corps land cruiser pulled away leaving me in Solo all by myself!

Thankfully, I was not alone for long. I was adopted into the village chief’s family and given the name Aminata Doumbia. The chief’s daughter-in-law, Seniba, was my host mom. Malians think it’s odd for a person to live by him/herself, so Seniba would usually make sure that someone, even if it was a neighborhood 3 year-old, was keeping me company. Kids would sit for hours in my yard talking with me, playing with pens and paper, or looking at my American magazines.

The village chief was a member of the Bambara tribe and practiced Islam, yet there were also Dogon residents who were Christians. From time to time, people of the Fulani tribe, part of the largest nomadic society in the world, would walk through my yard with their cows on their way to get to the well for a brief respite. Animism, belief that nature has a soul, was also alive and well in Solo. Every change of seasons was marked by a festival of some sort accompanied by drums, singing, masked dancers,

and with all of the village residents decked out in their holiday best. I took part in these celebrations and the Malian people could not have made me feel more at home.

My work took me to outlying villages where I would collaborate with traditional birth attendants to program monthly infant growth monitoring sessions. I trained my counterparts to weigh the babies, keep record of their growth on a growth development chart, and further to explain to their peers how the chart indicates whether a child is healthy or at risk. Together we developed lessons promoting better health and nutrition for presentation to the village women. Themes included: nutrition, breastfeeding, weaning techniques, disease prevention, hygiene, vaccinations, child spacing and family planning.

For me, the most valuable part of my Peace Corps experience was the mutual understanding and friendship I was able to build with my Malian family, friends, and colleagues. Despite our differences, we were able to talk, laugh, cry, work, and eat together under the same sky for two years. Just the other day I taught my daughter a game that my Malian sister, Ma, and I used to play. There is no doubt in my mind that people in Solo still tell stories about Aminata Doumbia too.

--B.H., November 2005

B. *Beyond the Peace Corps and Volunteers for Prosperity*

The universe of overseas service programs beyond the Peace Corps and Volunteers for Prosperity is large and appears to be growing more rapidly.

There are many ways of categorizing this universe of programs. Among the most obvious are by size (more than 200 volunteers per year vs. less than 200 per year), length of assignment (short-term vs. long-term), by nationality (US-based vs. foreign-based), by cost to the volunteer (high-cost vs. low-cost), by the degree of professionalism (generalist vs. professional), by religious orientation (faith-based vs. non-faith-based),²⁷ by taxable status (non-profit vs. for profit), by extent of federal budget support (some support vs. no support), by corporate sponsorship (corporate support vs. no corporate support), and by effectiveness (high impact vs. low impact).

In this study, three lists have been compiled. Each of these lists has some value but also some serious limitations.

- In Appendix A, capsule descriptions of fifteen leading programs (by size or impact/visibility) are provided to highlight the variations across programs.
- Appendix B lists 52 programs for which numbers of volunteers are readily available. The number of volunteers sent overseas in the most recent year reported by each program adds up to 38,430. This list is further broken down between generalist, professional, corporate, and faith-based programs.
- Appendix C lists the 205 partner organizations that have affiliated with the federally-sponsored Volunteers for Prosperity program. This list is broken down into the four categories used in Appendix B, and further broken down between profit/non-profit and secular/faith-based programs.

In the following paragraphs the main features of the different categories of programs are described, examples are given, and some general observations are offered.

Large vs. small

The only program in the world that comes close to being as large as the Peace Corps (measured in Volunteer Service Months) is the UN Volunteers program. It had around the same number of volunteers serving in 2004: 7,300 men and women from 166 different countries serving in 140 countries.²⁸ Because it has been growing more rapidly, it may have more volunteers serving in 2005 than the Peace Corps. Like the Peace Corps, the vast majority of UN Volunteers commit to long-term service (1-2 years), but a

²⁷ Faith-based organizations that primarily provide humanitarian and development assistance are included in this study. Faith-based organizations that primarily send volunteers overseas to proselytize are excluded.

²⁸ United Nations Volunteers Program www.unv.org [October 31, 2005]

substantial fraction are domestic volunteers (developing country nationals serving in their own country).

There does not appear to be any US-based program other than the Peace Corps that supports more than one thousand volunteers on assignments longer than one year, and very few that support more than five hundred.

In terms of numbers of individual volunteers, the largest program after the Peace Corps appears to be Habitat for Humanity International with around 5,100 volunteers serving overseas in the latest year reported.

Short-term vs. long-term programs

The average length of assignment is a critical variable in terms of cost and impact. The 52 programs listed in Appendix B supported volunteers overseas at the rate of more than 38,000 per year, compared with the Peace Corps at 7,810. Assuming the average length of assignment for these 48 programs was one month, however, this works out to about 2,700 Volunteer Service Years, roughly one-third of the intensity of the Peace Corps. Even if the average assignment is two months, the intensity is still well below that of the Peace Corps.

After the Peace Corps, the program that appears to have the largest number of long-term volunteers (one year or more) is the Mennonite Central Committee with under 1,000 volunteers.

High cost to the volunteer vs. low cost

The Peace Corps stands out as being virtually the only US-based program where the volunteers come out ahead financially. From the moment they are accepted into a training program, all of their costs are met: travel, training, living allowance, medical care, and field staff support. In addition, they accumulate a “readjustment allowance” that is paid as a lump sum at the completion of their assignment. This allowance is intended to be a net financial gain.

A number of programs cover all out-of-pocket costs, but most of these are geared to professionals who are not being fully compensated for their skills and experience. Examples are Doctors Without Borders and the International Executive Service Corps (IESC).

Most programs require the volunteers to bear some or all of the costs, including administration. The variations on this theme are vast. In the WorldTeach program, for example, volunteers pay as little as \$1,000 and as much as \$6,000 for a one-year assignment. The low-cost options reflect cost-sharing with a host country government or a sponsoring institution (e.g., university) in a host country. For this fee, virtually all out-of-pocket costs are covered.

At the other extreme, Cross-Cultural Solutions sends volunteers out for service assignments up to a maximum of 12 weeks and charges close to \$5,000 for a 12-week program, equivalent to a rate of \$20,000 per year.

TEXT BOX 2

Serving with Global Volunteers in Romania

My 25-year successful consulting business was fading: changing technologies, changing client faces, changing motivation on my part. After 44 years of full-time employment, I was ready for something new and something a little exotic. I saw an article on volunteer vacations in *Business Week* describing the Global Volunteers program. Onto the website and off to rural Barlad, Romania I went to care for babies from birth to three years in a hospital-sponsored clinic for abandoned children.

Global Volunteers runs programs ranging from one to three weeks in 20 countries and has been previously active in 26 countries. The fee-based programs (about \$2500 for three weeks in Romania, for example, plus round-trip airfare) provide volunteers with lodging, food, an English-speaking team leader, and all local transportation. Some of the fee is used for developing and maintaining the programs. At the clinic for abandoned children in Barlad, Global Volunteers pays for additional staff to care for the children, heat, food, electricity, equipment such as washing machines and dryers, and supplies. The Romanian government provides only basic resources. As one of the staff said, “without the volunteers and support from Global Volunteers, we’d be dead”.

My initial two-week experience in December 2004 was unusual even within Global Volunteers 20-year history: I was a team of one. I fell in love with the children and the people who are emerging from one of the most oppressive Communist dictatorships. I recruited my husband, and returned with a team of ten in April 2005. Both of us are now committed to these children and the staff of the clinic and we will be returning with four friends in January 2006. We’re raising money, sending supplies and spreading the word.

Between visits I correspond with Global Volunteers staff in Romania, communicate with other volunteers, keep updated via the Global Volunteers website with developments in Romania, send items by mail and through other volunteers, raise money and do presentations on this program for churches and civic groups. I’ve developed a website with photos and journals of my experience and get countless letters from prospective and former volunteers, parents of new volunteers who are going to Romania and feel safer after hearing from an experienced volunteer, and reporters. This work has become a part of my life.

Continued involvement in this, and probably other international volunteer experiences, has become important to me because:

- I feel I make a difference. I matter. I won’t solve the total problem, but I am a bead in a continuous chain of people working with a specific group of children and staff whose world would be much worse without us.

- It's on my terms: time-defined involvement with a beginning and end that fits into my schedule. I don't have to commit to two years or six months which would be difficult for me now. This program makes it possible for someone without foreign language skills to "be" in another country and culture. The English-speaking Romanian team leader makes the work possible. At this point it would be difficult if not impossible for me to invest the time to develop adequate language skills to work in non English-speaking countries. I could never do this on my own.
- I am working with direction in a structured program. My basic needs for safety, food, lodging and transportation are met. Little or no energy goes into that part of this experience. Not luxury... not primitive. Adequate.
- I am learning about myself, other people, the European Union, America. I have new perspective.
- I am changed. Things matter less. Being matters more. Doing matters most.
- I love these children. I have no children of my own and the bonding and affection and love have exploded within me to my great surprise!
- I matter to them and to their guardians.

Could one ask for anything more?

--G.G., October 2005

Benefits also vary greatly from program to program. Not all programs provide training or international travel. All programs, however, appear to provide medical insurance including emergency evacuation back to the USA.

The cost to volunteers, however, is not the same as the cost of fielding volunteers. Data on the total cost of fielding volunteers for the different programs is not readily available. Even if it were, it would still be difficult to present the data on a comparable basis. The problems can be illustrated by looking at the Peace Corps program. In FY 2005, the Peace Corps program cost \$320 million for roughly 8,000 volunteers. This works out to \$41,000 per Volunteer Service Year, or \$3,400 per Volunteer Service Month. Not all of this cost is related to recruiting, training, and supporting volunteers in the field. A portion of the Peace Corps' budget, some 2-3 percent, is spent on "Third Goal" activities in the USA to make American communities more aware of other countries and cultures and on several other peripheral activities.

Several other factors explain the relatively high cost structure of the Peace Corps. First, it has a relatively large and well-paid headquarters staff. Second and more significant, the field offices of the Peace Corps are well-staffed and provide exceptional support to the volunteers. Third, the Peace Corps' commitment to training is unique, especially language training. Currently the Peace Corps teaches 180 languages to its volunteers. Fourth, the Peace Corps provides exceptional medical support to its volunteers.

Generalists vs. professionals

The Peace Corps began as a program that selected candidates on the basis of their commitment to overseas service and then provided the training necessary to work in specific areas such as education or agriculture or health. Over the years, however, the Peace Corps has moved slowly toward more skill-based recruitment.

The faith-based programs tend to attract generalists and most of the high-cost programs are more geared to generalists than professionals. The largest of the professional programs by number of volunteers appears to be Doctors Without Borders, which currently sends around 3,400 American medical personnel overseas per year.

Faith-based vs. secular

Deciding whether a program is faith-based or secular is not always easy. Habitat for Humanity International, for example, describes itself as a Christian organization and therefore it is classified in this study as a faith-based program. The religious content of its activities is minimal, however, and it is widely known and admired for its development impact.

An important distinction is made in this study between missionary programs, which are excluded, and service programs, which are included. However, in some cases it is hard to tell whether service or proselytizing is more important.

The largest of the faith-based service programs appears to be the Mennonite Central Committee, which supported around 1,200 volunteers in the most recent year reported. It is possible that the number of faith-based programs exceeds the number of secular programs because of the numerous congregations that send members overseas. The vast majority of these programs probably send fewer than 50 volunteers overseas per year. A fair number of these programs offer long-term assignments of a year or more.

Non-profit vs. for-profit (including corporate volunteering)

Most of the overseas service programs are administered by non-profit organizations. The number of for-profit organizations that offer volunteer opportunities to the general public appears quite small.

Corporate volunteering overseas, however, may be the fastest growing segment of the universe of overseas service options for Americans. We are speaking here of companies that encourage their employees to perform volunteer service overseas or otherwise facilitate such service in some manner, such as extra leave time. This is part of the Corporate Social Responsibility movement that has been gaining speed over the past decade.

According to an Issue Brief produced by Business for Social Responsibility, a leading organization active in this area, one-third of large US companies have formal policies for employees interested in taking time off to perform volunteer, pro bono service. “Release time” (paid time for such service) takes three forms: a set amount of time during regular business hours, matching time where every other hour of time contributed by the employee is paid, and social service leave where the employee is working full-time for an NGO or some other community or service organization.²⁹

The boundaries of this segment of the volunteer universe are particularly fuzzy. For example, many Americans are employed abroad in non-American multinational corporations and some of these corporations encourage volunteer service. Also some American corporations have policies that encourage volunteer service by employees in their foreign subsidiaries, but do not differentiate between American nationals and foreign nationals so that getting data by nationality is difficult.

Some examples may help to highlight the impressive range of activity in this area and the potential for rapid growth:

- GE Corporation chartered an independent membership organization named Elfun in 1928 to encourage volunteer activity by active and retired employees, a kind of

²⁹ From the website of Business for Social Responsibility. “Volunteerism and Release Time” <http://bsr.org/BSRResources/IssueBriefDetail.cfm?DocumentID=49764>

corporate Rotary Club. Elfun scaled up its activity sharply in the 1980s. In 2003, 53,000 Elfun members in 139 chapters in 46 countries contributed 1 million volunteer hours (equivalent to roughly 50 Volunteer Service Years). Much of this service was performed overseas, but much of it was also performed by non-Americans.

- BuildingBlocks International (BBI) was created in 2000 to encourage companies to “build the next generation of leaders through community service”. BBI is working with multinational corporations to develop corporate service fellowships in which employees apply their management skills for one-month up to one-year assignments overseas. BBI convenes companies such as Pfizer, UPS, King & Spalding, PwC and Cisco, to improve the quality and increase the quantity of such fellowships. To date, 2,165 corporate employees have participated in corporate service fellowship programs – their goal is to more than double this number to 5,000 within the next five years.
- Pfizer was an early leader in corporate volunteering. Since 2002 it has provided 77 relatively long-term (3 to 6 months) volunteers in overseas positions.
- Microsoft began working on a pro bono basis with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in 1999 to help register refugees from Kosovo. The support to UNHCR from Microsoft volunteers has expanded since then.
- Accenture recently created Development Partnerships, an affiliate that offers consulting services at half price for pro bono projects.
- In October 2005, Operation HOPE created HOPE Global Initiatives place corporate volunteers in developing countries, with an emphasis on Africa.

Supported by the US government vs. not supported

Only a handful of other programs depend heavily on funding from the US government and they tend to provide only short-term opportunities. These other programs include the International Executive Service Corps and the Financial Services Volunteer Corps, both of which are funded by USAID.

Another handful of programs get a substantial amount of funding from the US government to supplement funding from individual contributions or other sources. Examples include ACDI/VOCA and the Citizen’s Development Corps. Another example is a set of programs sponsored by the American Bar Association that sends lawyers, judges, and other legal experts to Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union, and to developing countries in Africa and Asia.

Significantly there is no AmeriCorps-type program for overseas service. The AmeriCorps model for service in needy communities in the USA is quite powerful. AmeriCorps volunteers (called “members”) are not federal employees on a par with

Peace Corps volunteers. Instead they are employees of the NGOs that recruit, train, and support them. AmeriCorps volunteers commit to long-term assignments (normally one year) and accumulate an education award that is available at the completion of service to pay down outstanding educational loans or meet new education expenses. Federal funding is provided via the Corporation for National and Community Service, and goes to sponsoring NGOs selected at the state level that are financially viable without federal funding. The AmeriCorps program supports almost ten times as many volunteers in the field (75,000 vs. 7,810), but the budget cost of the program is only 75 percent larger (\$555 million for AmeriCorps vs. \$320 million for the Peace Corps).

US-based vs. foreign-based

Some of the overseas service programs available to Americans are not US-based. Here again there are a number of sub-categories. The UN Volunteers program is in a sub-category of its own. It is affiliated with the UN Development Program (UNDP) and is based in Bonn, Germany. Most of its headquarters funding comes from the contributions of UN members (including the United States) to UNDP. Most of the support costs for UN volunteers, however, come from the budgets of the UN agencies (UNICEF, WHO, etc.) with whom they are placed.

A second sub-category consists of programs based outside the USA that recruit internationally. A newcomer in this category is the World Education Corps, based in the United Kingdom, which placed its first group of volunteers in 2005. Ten volunteers from nine countries (two from the USA) will be serving one-year assignments in ten different countries. Over the next five years the program aims to expand to 50-75 host countries with 250-300 volunteers.

A third sub-category consists of programs based outside the USA that have established affiliates in the United States with formal non-profit status. Doctors Without Borders, based in France and known as Medecins Sans Frontieres is a leading example.

On-line volunteering

The newest form of volunteering seems to be on-line, where Americans at home communicate with correspondents overseas to provide help in a vast range of activities. It is exceptionally difficult to count the number of Americans who are involved in on-line volunteering but it is easy to imagine that the number is growing at a brisk pace. Some of these arrangements arise spontaneously, through chat rooms, for example. Some grow out of tourist, or study, or service travel abroad, or out of contacts with foreigners encountered in the USA. Some are organized by professional associations.

One measure of the potential for online volunteering is the Online Volunteer Service, administered by the UN Volunteers program, which celebrated its fifth anniversary in March 2005. The Online Volunteer Service grew out of the NetAid campaign in 2000 with critical support from CISCO. According to its website, 15,000 volunteers have accepted assignments posted by 600 organizations over the past five years. The number of American

volunteers is not given, but it is probably in the range of 10-30 percent. The amount of online volunteering is likely to grow rapidly in the future as more people in developing countries gain access to the worldwide web, the cost of web access declines, and as technology facilitates audio/video communication via the web.

High impact vs. low impact

One of the most important features of any overseas program is its effectiveness. As noted earlier, effectiveness in this area is hard to define and harder to measure. A narrow approach to effectiveness would focus on the impact volunteers have on the countries where they serve. This would be measured, for example, by the number of students who learn English or the number of farmers who have adopted improved agricultural practices. Another relevant measure would be any change in the image of Americans and the USA as a whole among the people with whom they interacted. A broader approach to effectiveness would include the impact of overseas service on the volunteers themselves and more broadly back home in the USA. The impact on the individual would be measured by ability to speak a foreign language, knowledge of foreign countries, self-confidence, employability, etc. The impact back home would be measured by knowledge of foreign countries transmitted to family, friends, and home communities, by career choices, by volunteer service domestically, etc.

CNCS has commissioned an independent evaluation of the AmeriCorps program that began with a survey of entering AmeriCorps volunteers in 1999 and has re-surveyed them at intervals since then. According to a report on the survey issued in December 2004, the impact of AmeriCorps service was generally positive across a range of civic engagement, education, employment and life-skills outcomes.³⁰ The survey did not attempt to measure the impact of AmeriCorps volunteers on the communities in which they served. FORUM, the leading umbrella organization for international volunteer organizations, recently initiated a research program designed to yield useful measures of the impact of volunteers, but results of this work have not yet been reported.³¹

Lacking better empirical studies, generalizations about impact are necessarily highly judgmental. With this reservation in mind, the following generalizations are offered:

- Impact appears to be directly related to the length of assignments. In other words, the impact of volunteers who spend six months on a specific project (such as assisting in the drafting of a new bankruptcy law) is likely to be greater than the impact of volunteers who only spend one week in the field. This is not simply the total impact; it also applies to the impact per time unit impact. In other words the impact of a volunteer serving for 24 weeks may be more than 24 times as large as the impact of the one-week volunteer.

³⁰ Source: http://www.americorps.gov/pdf/04_1214_longstudy_factsheet.pdf [October 31, 2005]

³¹ Source: <http://www.forum-ids.org/#research> [October 31, 2005]

- Impact appears to be directly related to the professional skills and experience of the volunteer. The impact of a professional carpenter on a one-week Habitat build will be bigger than the impact of an undergraduate student on the same build.
- Impact appears to be directly related to the ability to speak the language of the community in which the volunteer is working.
- It is tempting to say that impact is directly related to age, but the impact associated with a 60-year old volunteer may be less than that associated with a 25-year old volunteer because the 25-year old will utilize that experience for 35 more years (assuming the same age of death) than the 60-year old. On the other hand, the 60-year old may have skills and experience that offset the disadvantage of his/her advanced age.

TEXT BOX 3**Teaching English in Indonesia**

Right after graduating from college, I began a two-year fellowship from the Oberlin Shansi program to teach English at Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Oberlin Shansi, a small organization with a long history in Asia, had a strong impact on my fellowship experience. It has built a superb support network for the fellows during its long-standing relationship with Gadjah Mada University. In times of crisis, as well as for everyday needs, there is a whole host of people to turn to. Because it is a two-year program, you have someone from the year before to show you the ropes when you are getting settled in. In your second year, you see just how much progress you have made when the new fellows arrive. It also gives you the time to develop deep friendships. The amount of money we received from Oberlin Shansi was small, but enough to afford a moderate lifestyle by Indonesian standards. They paid a monthly stipend and covered health insurance and travel costs. Most importantly, they paid for language classes. Not having to worry about teaching extra classes to pay rent meant that we had more time to learn about the community. Having the language skills meant that we could be more active participants.

Even with all this support, my time in Indonesia was a humbling experience. It's like becoming a child again and having to relearn everything. The day I was able to navigate the post office for the first time ranks up there with learning how to tie my shoes as a milestone in my life. At the same time, as a teacher at a highly respected university, I was expected to be an upstanding citizen. I was usually the youngest person in my class, yet as the teacher I was accorded a high degree of respect. My students were professors and junior lecturers at the university, leaders in their respective fields, some of whom were more than twice my age. As a result, the expectations were even higher for me than normal, yet as a foreigner I knew very little of the culture in my first months.

The fellows are generally expected to become involved in some sort of community activity. I began tutoring street children with a local non-profit in my second year. At first the kids were a little shy around me. At six feet, I'm already tall by U.S. standards, but in Indonesia I was generally a full head taller than anyone else. Coupled with my big pointy nose, freckled skin and hairy arms, I must have looked like some kind of ogre. One plucky boy came up and touched my nose to make sure it was real. After that everyone was a little less shy. I would go with a group of friends a couple nights a week to help the kids with their homework. I have to admit, I'm not sure who learned more, the students or me. When it came to history, I still had a lot to learn about Indonesia myself. I was more helpful with math, geography, and English. But often as not, by the end of the evening the kids would grow tired of their assignments and start teaching me the Javanese language or explaining local traditions.

One of the most defining events of my fellowship experience actually occurred after I returned home. My fellowship ended in the summer of 2001, just a few months before the September 11th terrorist attacks. I had just spent two years living in the world's most populous Islamic nation. Like the rest of the country and much of the world, I struggled to

make sense of the attacks. Friends and family would turn to me for explanations. Not sure what to say, I usually spoke about Indonesia's religious and ethnic diversity, and about how my Indonesian friends were just as horrified as we were. That generally seemed to be reassuring.

In the end, I don't think it mattered so much where I was. Talking with others who have spent time abroad, there always seems to be a common understanding, a shared experience. There is something ironic in the fact that uprooting your life to become immersed in a foreign country ultimately gives you a different perspective that helps to deepen your roots as an American.

-- D.W., November 2005

V. Policy Choices

...Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.

--Margaret Mead

This study focuses on overseas service as a soft instrument of power. It is premised on a belief that the objectives of national security and well-being for the United States will be advanced by relying more on soft instruments than the country is doing at the present time.

We have attempted a crude comparison of overseas service programs with other soft instruments and have concluded, admittedly in a highly judgmental fashion, that the Peace Corps falls in a group of six soft instruments that seem to deliver a high level of “bang for the buck”. We have also looked at the Volunteers for Prosperity (VfP) initiative of the Bush Administration and have concluded it is a small scale operation. In short, neither the Peace Corps nor VfP are getting the job done.

We have explored the universe of overseas service programs beyond the Peace Corps and found it to be remarkably diverse and dynamic. We have taken note of AmeriCorps and been intrigued by the power of its approach: using federal dollars catalytically to scale up domestic service programs that have established solid track records.

These steps point to a gap in the soft instruments being used by the US Government to advance the country's national security and well-being: a program that uses budget funds catalytically to help successful overseas service programs in the private sector boost the number of Americans they recruit, train, and support.

In the process of designing an AmeriCorps-type program for overseas service, at least eight policy choices need to be examined: the objectives of the program, the “branding” of the program, the “flavors” offered, catalytic forms of cost-sharing, the link to overseas study, volunteer exchanges, the tax treatment of payments and contributions, and organizational options.

A. *Program Objectives*

The objectives of the Peace Corps program, carved in stone more than forty years ago, are to provide skilled manpower to less privileged countries and to foster mutual understanding between Americans and the people in these countries. From the beginning, however, the emphasis has been on mutual understanding. The stated objective of the VfP program is less ambitious, to help Americans with professional

expertise find volunteer service opportunities overseas. Promoting mutual understanding is implicit in the program but not a prominent feature.

The objectives matter because they affect both the foreign demand for American volunteers and supply of Americans seeking an opportunity to serve overseas. The critical choice here is between professional programs in which skill transfer and capacity building are emphasized, and generalist programs in which mutual understanding and social capital are emphasized.

The Bush Administration has chosen to focus the VfP program on highly-skilled Americans. A new overseas service program could retain this focus but deciding which participating organizations are recruiting professionals and which organizations are recruiting generalists would probably end up being rather arbitrary. At least until some experience has been gained, a program that works with both professional volunteers and generalist volunteers is likely to be more broadly supported by American taxpayers. It would also seem strange to model an overseas program on AmeriCorps, which is distinctly at the generalist end of the spectrum, and then limit it to professional volunteers.

A wide-open program would also be more consistent with the immense variation that exists from host country to host country and even within each country. Without arbitrary limits, a catalytic program may become more oriented toward professionals as the skills base improves in the host countries. It is also possible that over time, however, the host countries will place greater value on mutual understanding than skills transfer and will adopt a more positive attitude toward generalist volunteers from foreign countries. Over time the host countries will also presumably acquire the capacity to pay the market price for the skills they need and will get higher quality assistance as a result.

The mission could also be narrowly focused on a particular sector, such as health, or a particular region, such as Sub-Saharan Africa. A narrower focus might make a new overseas service program more feasible by capitalizing on current political sentiment and global challenges. Political sentiment tends to be short-lived, however, and global challenges are constantly changing. Therefore a more sustainable approach would be to give the program the broadest possible mandate at the outset and give its management the authority to change priorities in response to evolving domestic sentiment and global developments.

As there is with the Lincoln Fellowship program, perhaps there should be a medium-term goal. In the case of the Lincoln Fellowship program, the goal is to have 1 million Americans studying overseas in 2017. Not all of these will have Lincoln Fellowships. The Lincoln Fellows will in effect be the blue-ribbon students, the leaders of the pack. Similarly, the Peace Corps is the blue-ribbon program for overseas service. Currently, there are around 175,000 Americans studying overseas each year, with a full 4-5 month semester being the norm. By contrast, without trying hard, we have found around 30,000 Americans performing volunteer service abroad, although the average period of service is probably less than three months. The actual number is likely to be at

least 50,000. The amount of federal funding required to catalyze 3 months of overseas service is not necessarily higher than the amount required to catalyze a semester of overseas study. This implies that for the same budget cost, a new overseas service program in 2017 might boost the total number of Americans serving overseas to around 300,000. With a well-designed program, it is conceivable that the contribution of these 300,000 volunteers to US national security and well-being could be as great as the contribution of 1 million students overseas. Even if the impact is only one-third as much, this is likely to represent a significant and palpable impact.

B. The Brand

The Peace Corps is a strong brand. Volunteers for Prosperity is a weak brand, but it is also a new one that has not had much time to build recognition.

One option for a new overseas service program would be to adopt the Peace Corps brand and attach it to any American volunteer who works overseas in a program that is partially funded by the federal government. Resistance to such a move from the community of returned Peace Corps volunteers is likely to be considerable and it is hard to imagine taking this step without diluting significantly the value of the brand. For example, why make a commitment for two-years of uninterrupted service when the same status of being a former Peace Corps volunteer can be obtained from a one-month assignment?

At the other extreme, an argument can be made for having Americans serve overseas in multilateral programs, like the UN Volunteers program, that do not operate under the American flag. Specifically, a number of countries that are reluctant to host American volunteers (for nationalistic or other political reasons) may be eager to have Americans serving as UN volunteers. In some countries, American volunteers may be significantly safer and more secure if they are working under the UN flag. Another advantage associated with all multilateral programs is that other countries would bear most of the cost. With the US government contributing as little as twenty percent of the funding, more than thirty percent of the volunteers might be Americans. As the largest single source of funding, the US government would be in a strong position to influence where the multilateral volunteers are sent and which sectors are given priority. While the advantages of a multilateral program are substantial, domestic political support to go in this direction as an alternative to a bilateral program is likely to be thin in the foreseeable future. Both the Administration and the Congress remain strongly attached to bilateral approaches. Making it easier for Americans to join these programs could, however, be a useful complement to a new overseas service program.

Branding is more complex in the case of AmeriCorps, in part because there are four main programs and several minor ones, each with a different flavor. The four main programs are VISTA (originally Volunteers in Service to America), National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC), National Direct, and State. What they all have in common is some AmeriCorps training and an AmeriCorps t-shirt. Volunteers in the VISTA and NCCC programs have no other brand identity. Volunteers in the National Direct and the

State programs, however, work within a large variety of organizations including faith-based, community-based, national NGOs, schools, municipalities, state and national parks, and Indian tribes. In effect, AmeriCorps volunteers under these programs wear the t-shirt of their sponsoring organization.

This kind of fuzzy branding could work well in a new overseas service program, as long as it is not the Peace Corps brand. If the new program were named after Presidents Theodore and Franklin D. Roosevelt, for example, all volunteers who went through the basic training would get Roosevelt Fellow t-shirts. Some of these might then enter groups that are supported in the field directly by the program staff and have no other branding. Others would enter groups supported by US-based NGOs, academic institutions, professional associations, or even profit-making businesses and would normally wear the t-shirt of their sponsoring organization.

C. The flavors

The Peace Corps is one flavor: every volunteer basically serves under the same terms and conditions. VFP is infinite flavors, with a disposition to expand the available choices. AmeriCorps is four main flavors: VISTA, NCCC, the national direct program, and the state program. Even more flavors can be found under the umbrella of the Corporation for National and Community Service, including including Senior Corps and Learn and Serve America. As an illustration of the differences within AmeriCorps, NCCC only accepts volunteers in the 18-24 age group. A more subtle difference is that NCCC volunteers get their length-of-service award after ten months of service. National direct and state volunteers get the same award after 12 months of service. The difference between the Peace Corps and AmeriCorps in this area is noteworthy. After ten (or twelve) months of service, AmeriCorps volunteers get a length-of-service award of \$4,725, equivalent to \$472 per month. Peace Corps volunteers get a length-of-service award of \$6,075 for 27 months of service, which means it accumulates at the rate of \$225 per month. The awards are not comparable dollar for dollar, however. The Peace Corps award is paid in cash and can be spent freely. The AmeriCorps award accumulates in the National Service Trust and is paid out by the Trust to a qualifying educational institution or college/university loan program. Both awards are subject to federal income tax but the majority of recipients are probably in the zero tax bracket for the year (or years in the case of AmeriCorps) in which the awards are paid out.

A new overseas service program loosely modeled on AmeriCorps could have a single flavor, like the national program, for example. Or it could have a small number of flavors. The advantages of having more than one flavor appear compelling. As with AmeriCorps, some could be administered by the staff of the national program while others could be administered by NGOs or universities or other sponsors. One of the flavors could be the Global Health Corps program that has been proposed by Senator Frist. Another could be the Health Service Corps proposed by the Institute of Medicine.

A particularly challenging issue is how to design a flavor for corporate volunteers. Travel costs and medical care may not be significant obstacles to volunteer service by

corporate volunteers. Similarly, the modest length-of-service awards offered by the Peace Corps and AmeriCorps would presumably be of little interest to corporate volunteers who are coming from well-paid jobs with benefits and will be returning to these jobs. By contrast, the sponsoring corporations might appreciate being able to put their volunteers through training/orientation programs at no cost or at a nominal cost, which would relieve them of the burden of providing this often-critical component of the volunteer experience.

D. Catalytic forms of cost-sharing

Between the Peace Corps' formula of paying for everything and VfPs formula of paying for almost nothing, there are myriad variations. To limit the exercise to a manageable number, we focus on six cost components: travel, medical care, training, field support, headquarters support, and the length-of-service award.

Travel

The biggest difference between domestic service and overseas service is foreign travel. Roundtrip travel to countries in Latin America can be arranged for less than \$1,000 per trip but travel to countries in the rest of the world generally costs between \$1,000 and \$2,000 per round trip. For 8,000 volunteers, a group the size of the Peace Corps, travel costs alone would amount to \$8-10 million, depending on how the volunteers are allocated among regions.

The US government could cover some or all of the cost of international travel for qualifying volunteers. One basic qualification would be that volunteer assignments would have to be arranged and supported by an eligible organization. Another qualification could be the length of service commitment, with a minimum commitment of three months, perhaps, to qualify for US government paid travel. This could be used as an incentive for longer service.

Given the financial weakness of the major US airlines at the present time, there would probably be strong political support for restricting the use of US government funding to travel on US airlines.

Paying for international travel is a relatively small cost and it could have a large impact on the supply of Americans interested in overseas service. It is also a cost component that should be relatively easy and inexpensive to administer. Indeed this work could be outsourced.

Medical care

Americans who perform voluntary service overseas are almost always in locations that put them at high risk of contracting infectious and other diseases and have poor medical facilities by American standards. One of the outstanding features of the Peace

Corps is the health care it provides for its volunteers, which may exceed the standard of care the average volunteer would get in the USA.

Most other existing overseas service programs offer volunteers medical insurance including emergency medical evacuation back to the USA. This support, however, falls far short of what the Peace Corps offers and leaves most volunteers exposed to significant risks.

Under an AmeriCorps-style overseas service program, the US government could offer a range of medical support. At one extreme, it could offer in-country care equivalent to what Peace Corps volunteers get, perhaps with a substantial premium. Alternatively, it could cover the full cost of basic medical/emergency evacuation insurance. The cost of such coverage currently is on the order of \$370 per year. This is substantially less than the cost of covering international travel but the impact on supply could be comparable.

Training

The Peace Corps puts all of its volunteers through three months of training in the country of service, including intensive language training. Currently around 180 different languages are taught. This is perhaps that single most impressive number associated with the Peace Corps program. Peace Corps training is a major cost factor, but has always gotten high marks. Based on anecdotal evidence, it is an important factor in the effectiveness of Peace Corps volunteers relative to volunteers from other programs. There is also of course an important link between training and the length of a volunteer's service commitment. One illustration of the link is that in the early years of the Peace Corps the three months of training were included in the two-year service commitment. Now Peace Corps volunteers must serve a full 24 months following their three months of training. This change appears to reflect a conclusion that the longer period of service is required to justify the level of training provided.

Other overseas service programs provide varying degrees of training, much of which is more properly described as orientation. For a two-week service program, training/orientation is usually compressed into one day, either in the USA or in the capital of the country of service. Training is also part of the AmeriCorps program, although the form it takes varies considerably across the range of AmeriCorps options.

Under an AmeriCorps-style overseas service program, the US government could provide in-country orientation and training, perhaps building on the Peace Corps' expertise in this area. As one of many variations on this theme, the Peace Corps Act might be amended to allow the Peace Corps to offer language instruction to volunteers on a reimbursable basis, or even to provide the full three months of training for volunteers committed to serving for at least a year.

Field support

One of the strengths of the Peace Corps is its strong field offices staffed with a mix of Americans and host-country nationals. These field offices work with the host-country government to ensure that Peace Corps volunteers are assigned to high-priority sectors or regions, identify and prepare specific sites for volunteer service, arrange training, provide support as needed to the volunteers, and deal with the inevitable problems that arise, such as illnesses and accidents. Necessarily these field offices push up the cost of the Peace Corps program far above the cost of most programs that either manage without field offices or have much thinner offices.

Following the AmeriCorps model, a new overseas service program could have field offices in some countries but not in others. In countries with few new-style volunteers, for example, sponsoring organizations would be selected that had adequate field offices already operating. In other countries, the new program could establish a field office to manage its own (“direct” in the AmeriCorps terminology) volunteer programs and also to coordinate and backstop the activities of the separate sponsoring organizations operating in that country. In some cases, the new program might establish a field office that serves as a base for a number of sponsoring organizations, offering them economies of scale.

US embassies and USAID missions appear to be less and less knowledgeable about the countries in which they are located, in part due to the isolation associated with the security requirements imposed on them. As a consequence, the value of field offices physically separated from embassies and more attuned to local developments (as are Peace Corps offices today) may be much greater than in the past.

Headquarters support

AmeriCorps’ national direct and state programs operate through grants to sponsoring organizations (“grantees”). Under the national direct program for FY 2006, the US government contributes \$12,600 per Volunteer Service Year to each grantee. Grantees must pay their AmeriCorps volunteers a living allowance of at least \$10,900 and at most \$21,800. Furthermore, grantees must provide 33 percent of total operating costs and 15 percent of all volunteer support costs. The grantee share of total program costs increases gradually to 50 percent by the tenth year and stays at that level thereafter.

A new overseas service program could adopt a similar shared-support formula, paying a fixed amount to each grantee (sponsoring organization) per Volunteer Service Year, setting a maximum and minimum living allowance for volunteers that would vary from country to country, and establishing thresholds for the share of total operating costs and volunteer support costs that the grantee must meet. These thresholds could also be increased gradually to make the US government’s contribution more catalytic.

Length-of-service award

A new overseas service program could offer volunteers a lump-sum cash payment at the end of their periods of service (as the Peace Corps does), or it could set aside funds that could only be used to pay off outstanding educational loans or new education-related expenses (as AmeriCorps does). It might also offer a choice between a cash payment and an education award. To reflect the greater value associated with long-term assignments, length-of-service awards could be limited to volunteers who serve for a minimum of three months and could set at higher levels for volunteers serving for more than six months and more than one year. The awards feature of any program deserves particular attention because it could have a major impact on supply and it could be a major cost element.

E. The link to overseas study,

The US Congress is interested in expanding overseas study by Americans and the Abraham Lincoln Fellowship Commission will be shortly recommending a specific program designed to lift the number of Americans studying overseas from around 175,000 in 2003 to a million in 2017.

A new federally-funded overseas service program operating in parallel with but completely separated from a new federally-funded overseas study program looks inefficient. Interest in “service learning” has been growing rapidly in US colleges and universities, and it seems intuitively obvious that an American who has studied overseas will be more productive as a volunteer overseas, and an American who has performed volunteer service overseas will be a more motivated and directed student overseas.

Finding effective ways to link overseas study and overseas service may not be easy, however. A useful first step would be to study the academic programs that already have an overseas service component and look for ways in which modest amounts of federal funding could make these programs more attractive, or for making overseas service more attractive as a prelude to overseas study.

The idea of linking overseas service with education has been around for decades. In an essay on “The Future of the Peace Corps” published in the May 1966 issue of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Harris Wofford, a member of the first generation of officials involved in starting the Peace Corps, wrote: “To find its context may be the major problem of the Peace Corps’ next five years: to find its context not just within the government, but within American higher education—with colleges and universities, with faculties, and with the new post-Kennedy student generation.” He went on to propose several steps that could be taken to develop this context, including the incorporation of Peace Corps service into undergraduate and graduate curriculums and creating a five-year “Peace Corps B.A.” degree. Such steps would help the Peace Corps and American higher education move “from a collision or a flirtation to a marriage”.

F. Tax issues

Federal income tax regulations impact overseas service in three ways.

First, the length-of-service awards given to Peace Corps volunteers at the end of their service are taxed, as are the education awards given to AmeriCorps volunteers.

Second, volunteers in programs that require participants to pay some or all of the costs can deduct these payments from their taxable income. These deductible costs include the organization's fee and international travel as long as the purpose of the travel is exclusively to perform volunteer service (i.e., only if the work is not combined with a vacation). Volunteers are not able to deduct the value of their time, even if they are highly-skilled professionals, and this same rule applies to voluntary service within the USA.

The third impact is more complicated. Corporate volunteer programs come in many flavors. In some of these, there is a financial contribution by the corporation involved. Along with other "corporate social responsibility" costs, these contributions may be treated as ordinary business costs.

Exempting from federal income tax length-of-service awards for overseas service would be one of the most ambitious steps that could be taken to encourage Americans to serve abroad—ambitious because of strong resistance in the Administration and in the Congress to steps that will reduce revenue. The value of this incentive is also questionable because the awards are so small, and because presumably many volunteers have incomes that fall in the zero-tax bracket.

This is another area, however, where further study may be appropriate.

G. Volunteer Exchanges

In Part III where the various "demand factors" were being described, the point was made that a program involving two-way exchanges could help the USA move beyond the paternalistic approach of the past toward an approach based more on building social capital internationally. This aspect of international volunteering was encountered in the process of trying to understand why the Peace Corps does not have any volunteers (or only a handful) in some of the biggest developing countries in the world, including Mexico, Brazil, Russia, India, China, Indonesia, and Nigeria. In each of these cases it appeared that the one-way nature of the Peace Corps was a serious obstacle in the receiving country to get the necessary political consensus in favor of requesting Peace Corps volunteers. At the same time, the existence of a remarkable program came to light that currently places more than 1800 foreign teachers in elementary, junior, and high schools in five states.³²

³² The Visiting International Faculty Program is active in California, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. See www.vifprogram.com.

It is probably too much of a stretch to try to create a new federal program that includes an exchange component at the outset. The obstacles the Peace Corps encountered in attempting to do this in the past were formidable. However, if a new federal program to encourage overseas service by Americans is established, it would be smart to provide the administrators of the program with the authority required to experiment with reverse volunteer or exchange programs at some appropriate point in the future.

H. Organizational options

The feasibility of launching a new federally-supported overseas service program depends in part on the bureaucratic structure selected to administer the program. Four distinct options are giving it to the Peace Corps, giving it to the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), creating a new Corporation for International Service, and giving it to State or USAID.

Peace Corps Plus

The main advantage of giving a new overseas service program modeled on AmeriCorps to the Peace Corps is that it knows the territory. With volunteers and field offices in more than 70 countries today, and with experience in another 60 countries over the past 45 years, the Peace Corps is in a good position to put volunteers into promising job sites and provide the support required to maximize their impact.

The main disadvantage is that the Peace Corps is a gem with a powerful constituency of former volunteers and staff members and supporters who have repeatedly fought off proposals for significant changes. This is not necessarily a negative in terms of the ultimate objective. There is value in having a blue-ribbon operation like the Peace Corps as a benchmark against which to measure other programs. A separate program could, indeed, enhance the Peace Corps by boosting the number of Americans attracted by its merits, thereby allowing it to be more selective in recruiting volunteers. Keeping the Peace Corps separate might also boost the demand from host countries because having a Peace Corps program would appear less political when there are a substantial number of non-Peace Corps volunteers working in these countries.

Another disadvantage may be the uniqueness of the Peace Corps bureaucracy in limiting most staff appointments to a period of five years. Retaining this limit for a staff administering a considerably larger and broader program would probably reduce the efficiency of the staff significantly. Changing the rule would be fiercely resisted by hardcore Peace Corps supporters.

CNCS Plus

The main advantage of giving a new overseas service program to the CNCS is that it has ten years of experience working with American NGOs, academic institutions, and other organizations recruiting, training, and supporting volunteers. It has defined programs with new flavors and redesigned programs with old flavors to make them more

responsive to today's pool of prospective volunteers and the range of social challenges facing our communities.

The main disadvantage is that the CNCS has no institutional experience overseas, although it does have on its staff many returned Peace Corps volunteers. The scope of CNCS operations is already vast. Its budget is close to \$1 billion. Putting it in charge of a new overseas service program could be a step too far, leading to a loss in focus and weakening the bipartisan support it now enjoys.

A new Corporation for International Service

The main advantage of creating a new agency to administer an overseas service program modeled on AmeriCorps is that it would be highly focused on its mission and therefore would have the potential of being highly efficient. Another important advantage is that it would probably be easier to recruit a high-powered individual to head an independent agency than to head a program embedded in an existing bureaucracy.

The main disadvantage is the general reluctance of both the executive and legislative branches to create new federal agencies.

Following the example of the Peace Corps and CNCS, a new Corporation for International Service could be created by an Executive Order and subsequently funded after passage of the necessary authorizing and appropriations legislation. Alternatively, following the example of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Administration could begin by introducing authorizing legislation and seeking appropriations in its next budget request. Staffing such an agency could be greatly facilitated by hiring Peace Corps staff members at the end of their five-year appointments, and recruiting from the CNCS, the State Department and USAID.

How large would a new Corporation for International Service be? The Peace Corps has a staff of about 1,000 with an annual operating budget of around \$330 million. The Millennium Challenge Corporation is aiming to have a staff of no more than 200 to administer a program now operating at an annual rate of \$1-2 billion per year but designed to operate at a rate of \$5 billion per year. The CNCS has a staff of around 640 with an annual operating budget of around \$920 million.

Using some heroic assumptions, a \$100 million-per-year overseas service program administered by a staff of 100 could support 5,000-7,000 volunteers overseas on one-year assignments. The critical assumption is the catalytic effect of federal funding. These assumptions put the federal contribution at \$14,000-\$20,000 per volunteer year, compared with \$40,000 for the Peace Corps and \$4,000 for AmeriCorps. The cost advantage relative to the Peace Corps comes from cost-sharing with sponsoring organizations that will recruit, train, and support the volunteers. The cost disadvantage relative to AmeriCorps comes from the higher cost of overseas travel and compensating staff in field offices. These costs might be mitigated to some degree through outsourcing. It is worth noting in this context that the administration of the Fulbright program has been

outsourced by the State Department to the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES), a division of the Institute of International Education.

State/USAID

The State Department has many years of experience administering cultural/educational exchange programs and USAID has recent experience with mobilizing highly-skilled volunteers to support US technical assistance programs overseas.

An obvious disadvantage of putting a new overseas service program in the State Department is that this department is already stretched thin. Even if the new program were organized as a separate agency like USAID, the oversight responsibility would be an unwelcome burden. Another disadvantage is that the program would inevitably be more politicized.

A serious disadvantage of putting a new overseas service program in USAID is low visibility. Giving the new program visibility approaching that of the Peace Corps would make the program more attractive both to prospective volunteers and to host countries.

This is not to say that the new program should operate independently from State and USAID. In any case, a federal program of this kind would have to take policy guidance from the State Department and the head of any field office would have to be accountable to the US Ambassador in that country. A close working relationship with USAID could also be highly advantageous in those countries where USAID is active.

VI. Recommendation

Great power and great wealth do not necessarily produce greater respect or greater security... [An] effective foreign policy in the age of global politics must combine power and cooperation.

--Daalder and Lindsay in *Agenda for the Nation*³³

The U.S. military provides the glue that holds alliances together and the stability necessary for the world's major economies to flourish.

--Aaron, Lindsay and Nivola in *Agenda for the Nation*³⁴

The hard power of the U.S. military may be a necessary form of glue in today's rapidly changing and turbulent world. But is it sufficient? Is there perhaps a better kind of glue?

Global developments in the past two years have highlighted the limitations of military power. These developments include the war in Iraq, the Indian Ocean tsunami, high oil prices, and recent concerns about the avian flu virus.

In the survey of soft instruments undertaken in this study, only a handful of international programs funded by the federal budget appear to offer as much value as the Peace Corps in terms of advancing the security and well-being of Americans.

At the same time, the study has revealed a remarkable number and variety of programs in the private sector offering overseas service opportunities for Americans that may have just as beneficial as the Peace Corps, and the study has found inspiration in the AmeriCorps approach to using federal budget resources catalytically to sharply boost the quantity—and possibly quality—of private sector volunteer programs.

Thus the main policy recommendation emerging from this study is to establish an AmeriCorps-type program to push the number from Americans performing volunteer service overseas from the current level of perhaps 50-60,000 to a level on the order of 300,000 over the next ten years. The major benefits of doing so would be more favorable attitudes among foreigners toward the United States and greater understanding among Americans of the perspective of foreigners. Both would tend to enhance national security and well-being and could make the United States less dependent on hard instruments of power, which tend to have a much higher budget cost.

This recommendation is not intended to diminish the role of the Peace Corps in any way. The Peace Corps remains a high-value program and the basic arguments for establishing a new overseas service program are all arguments for expanding the Peace Corps. Instead, the recommendation is to establish a separate program that complements

³³ Henry Aaron and others, *Agenda for the Nation*, Brookings Institution Press, 2003, pp. 288 and 290.

³⁴ Henry Aaron and others, *Agenda for the Nation*, p.11.

the Peace Corps. Combining the two would tend to dilute the impact of the Peace Corps or hobble the growth of the new program.

Because the devil is always in the details, the study has examined a range of policy choices in designing a new overseas study program supported by the federal budget. This examination suggests that the program begin with the following features:

- *Program objectives.* Like the AmeriCorps program, a new overseas service program is more likely to command wide support among American taxpayers if it has a broad mandate. Focusing narrowly on highly-skilled Americans as Volunteers for Prosperity does, or on medical professionals as the proposed Global Health Corps does, would limit the appeal of the program. Mutual understanding as an objective is not obsolete; it looks more like the wave of the future. Setting a numerical goal, as does the imminent Abraham Lincoln Overseas Study program, is a difficult exercise because of the sketchy information that exists at this stage about the number of Americans currently performing volunteers overseas and how different forms of support would impact on supply and demand. A goal of putting 300,000 volunteers in the field by 2018 appears to represent a level of effort that could have a measurable impact and still be feasible in the context of significant budget constraints over the medium term.
- *The Brand.* Like AmeriCorps, having a fuzzy brand appears to have more advantages than disadvantages. This means that volunteers under the new program could normally carry the brand of the American private sector organization that recruited them, trained them, and found a job site for them. Or they could carry the brand of the non-American organization they are working with in the field. Labeling the volunteers “fellows” rather than members of a “corps” has the advantage of getting away from the military connotations of a “corps”. For non-native speakers of English, corps is not common word and is easy to confuse with “corpse”. The power of the Fulbright program brand, which perhaps inspired the branding of the Abraham Lincoln Overseas Study Program, could be emulated by naming the new overseas service program after Presidents Theodore and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Thus members of the new program might be called Roosevelt Fellows.
- *The Flavors.* While the Peace Corps derives strength from being a program with one flavor (the terms of service are the same for all volunteers), the AmeriCorps program has multiple flavors and this approach appears far more suitable for a new overseas service program. There is, however, a trade-off between choice and efficiency. To be efficient, especially at the outset, it will probably be necessary to limit the flavors to less than half a dozen.
- *Cost-sharing.* The smartest approach to cost-sharing may be to experiment freely. It may not be easy otherwise to know how catalytic budget funds can be when targeting distinct cost components such as international travel, medical care, training, field support, shared support, and the length-of-service award. Giving

the program the flexibility to mix and match is likely to yield a more effective program in the medium term.

- *Overseas study.* It would be a serious mistake to launch two major federal programs, one to promote overseas study and the other to promote overseas service, and to ignore the natural links between the two activities. The sensible alternative is to direct the organizations responsible for each program to develop links and to give them the legislative flexibility to be innovative in this effort.
- *Tax issues.* The treatment of various components of an overseas service program for federal income tax purposes could have an important impact on the supply of volunteers and their qualifications. However, the natural resistance to creating rules for narrow groups of taxpayers is very strong. Accordingly, this is one aspect that is probably not worth pursuing at the present time.
- *Organizational options.* The weight of the evidence appears to favor the establishment of a separate Corporation for National and Community Service that, like AmeriCorps could administer programs funded under the budget of the State Department, the Education Department, the Department of Health and Human Services, or other departments. As noted earlier, the Peace Corps program would not be put under this new corporation but would remain as an independent federal agency.

Appendix A – Fifteen Leading Programs *

Organization	# Vol.	Length	Training provided	Local support	Areas where they work	Who are the volunteers?	Funding and admin of the program	Cost to the volunteer
ACDI / VOCA * www.acdivoca.org Professional Not for Profit Secular	600 annually	2-4 weeks	No specific training provided.	Support provided by local partner organizations and in country staff.	Accounting, Agriculture, Business Mgmt., Community Dev., Cooperative and Assn. Dev., Domestic and Intl. Marketing, Enterprise Dev., Entrepreneurship, Information Technology, Manufacturing, Policy Reform, Rural Credit, Trade Assns. Projects in 142 countries around the world.	Experienced professionals with at least 5 years of experience in business, agriculture, banking and financial services, marketing, cooperative development, food processing, etc.	Funding generated through contract and grant revenues mostly for the Food for Development Europe / Asia Program and the Community Development Program. An estimated 9 million is received from government grants and contracts for volunteer program. U.S. Government donations primarily through USAID and Dept. of Agriculture.	Volunteers only contribute time and expertise. All of the airfare, passport, visas, lodging, room and board, immunizations and health insurance is provided by ACDI/VOCA.
Amigos de las Americas www.amigoslink.org Generalist Not for Profit Secular	700 annually; 637 volunteers in 2004	6-8 weeks	Basic training covering the essential skills for living abroad	Live with host families and a local organization hosts each trip.	Community nutrition; developing healthy households and communities; promoting understanding and use of digital technologies; and building life skills and leadership among youth.	At least 16 years of age; Completed at least the Sophomore year of high school and two years of Spanish training.	\$2.2 million (84%) revenue from vol. contributions. 80% is spent on program operations (\$1.9 million), 12% on fundraising board. (\$305k) and 8% (\$179k) on general and administrative costs.	\$3,700 per assignment which includes travel, supplies, medical insurance and room and board.
Building Blocks International www.bbblocks.org Professional Profit Secular	113 annually; 500 goal in 2010 year	4 weeks - 1 year	Training is dependent on the corporate program.	Supported by the local client companies where they are placed.	Health, Information technologies, homelessness, poverty, etc. Regions: Latin America, Africa, Middle East, Eastern Europe, Asia.	Selected through corporate partnerships. Each corporation has particular requirements.	Funding is received from corporate and private contributions.	All of the program costs are covered by the sponsoring corporate organization.
Child Family Health International www.cfhi.org Generalist Not for Profit Secular	More than 500 annually.	4-8 weeks	A country handbook and program guide. Allplanning and placement is coordinated through US Based staff and medical directors.	Assigned a host family. In country, they receive training: workbook, program assessment and language materials. 24 hour staff available in case of problems	Medical or health rotations mostly in Latin America. Also have sites in India and South Africa.	At least 21 years of age; generally working toward a medical degree, or some other health related degree.	46% of all revenue from program fees, 50% from in kind donations. 92.5% goes toward program administration with 50% dedicated to support for the communities -- home stay families, clinical preceptors and local healthcare projects.	\$1675-\$1800 per assignment for predeparture materials, accomodation and meals, and in-country materials and meetings. Plus international travel costs.
CIEE www.ciee.org Generalist Not for Profit Secular	300 U.S. citizens. More than 3,000 total annually but U.S. volunteers limited to 2 per project.	2-3 weeks in duration.	No formal training prior to departure.	Accompanied by one or two group leaders at each site who facilitate the activities.	Over 500 projects in Africa, Europe, Latin America, Asia and North America. Projects include: social service, cultural, environmental protection and agriculture, archaeology, and renovation and conservation activities.	Target young individuals 18-24 who are looking to boost their professional skills while also participating in cultural exchange activities.		\$1,200 per assignment plus a \$395 program fee, international travel, visas and immunizations.

* Receives federal funding

Organization	# Vol.	Length	Training provided	Local support	Areas where they work	Who are the volunteers?	Funding and admin of the program	Cost to the volunteer
Cross-Cultural Solutions www.crossculturalsolutions.org Generalist Not for Profit Secular	2,000 sent abroad in 2004	ranges from 2-12 weeks; average is 2 weeks	Pre-departure handbooks and one-on-one conversation with local program manager	Works under the guidance of the staff during the entire program.	Brazil, China, Costa Rica, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Peru, Russia, Tanzania and Thailand	At least 18 if unaccompanied by a parent. Health volunteer placements available. General project themes include: health, social services and education. No special skills required.	All funding from volunteer contributions with 88% of revenue for volunteer program and field expenses. The program fee is allocated in the following manner: \$616 program dev. and mgmt; \$455 outreach; \$305 vol. coordination; \$389 admin.; \$522 two weeks field expenses; \$102 in country start up.	\$2279 for 2 weeks plus \$261 for each additional week. 6 weeks is \$3433 for volunteering and \$3733 for internship; 12 weeks is \$4799 for volunteering and \$5099 for interns.
Doctors without Borders www.msf.org Professional Not for Profit Secular	More than 3,400 volunteers to 18 country sites annually	Normally 6 months; may be as long as 9-12 months; highly qualified personnel may go for only 6 weeks	Trained medical professionals, but receive a briefing on their field placement before departure, including security regulations.	Work with local staff members throughout their placement and support local medical professionals.	More than 70 countries around the world --Africa; Americas; Asia and the Pacific; Caucasus and Central Asia; Europe; Middle East	Must be qualified medical personnel with at least two years of professional experiences, current credentials and 6 months of availability. Must submit CV, motivation letter, undergo an interview and reference check to be selected. Volunteers come from around the world, and the program also allows non U.S. citizens to volunteer.	80% of funding raised from individual donors and 20% comes from governments. In 2004, 91 million in public support and \$626,000 in other revenue including interest and grants.	All costs are covered by MSF including: round trip air; accomodation in NYC/Europe during briefing and debriefing; medical insurance; accomodation in the field; per diem while on mission. Volunteers also receive a stipend of €600 per month.
EarthWatch www.earthwatch.org Generalist Not for Profit Secular	2,200 U.S. volunteers and 4,129 total volunteers from 79 countries in 2004.	10-14 days but they also have 1 week and 3 week and weekend opportunities	"Expedition Briefing" manual available to each volunteer	Guided and accompanied by Principal Investigators and their field staff.	All regions of the world: 140 expeditions in 48 countries. Areas include: archaeology, biodiversity, conservation, cultural diversity, endangered ecosystems, global change, oceans, scuba and world health.	No special skills required. Minimum age is 16 and there is no maximum age limit. They also have corporate volunteer programs.	50% of revenue covers field costs; 34% to planning, reconaissance, team recruitment and logistical support, and 16% for administrative support, communications and post expedition follow-up. FY 2004 revenue: 6.8 million from volunteer contributions; 9.99 million from grants, partnerships and other contributions	\$1,800 per assignment including travel to / from the site on average. Costs can range from \$700 to \$4,000.
Financial Services Volunteer Corps * www.fsvc.org Professional Not for Profit Secular	400 annually	1-2 weeks	A full pre-service project briefing focusing on the host country and the conditions at the field site.	Locally supported by the host organization.	Afghanistan, Croatia, Jordan, Russia, Albania, Egypt, Macedonia, Ukraine, Bosnia, Indonesia and Morocco. All of the projects center around the financial sector.	Ten years of experience in their field and may include: commercial bankers, investment bankers, capital markets experts, regulators, lawyers, and experts in insurance and pension reform.	58% of revenue generated from donated services (\$6.6 million) and 37% (\$4.2 million) from government grants. 87% of all expenses dedicated to program services and the international and training programs. USAID is the primary funder and has contributed \$45 million over the past 11 years.	Volunteers only contribute time and expertise. All costs covered by FSVC.
GE Elfun Program www.elfun.org Corporate Volunteer Program Professional Secular	3,874 estimated volunteers but 38,736 total members	1 day to ongoing	No specific training is provided.	Supported by the host volunteer organization and the appropriate structure.	Habitat for Humanity, United Way, literacy programs, Red Cross and Red Crescent, Special Olympics, food and clothing drives.	Employees of GE and retirees.	Has it's own Board of Directors and Bylaws and is funded by money from electric services.	All costs are covered by the Elfun program.

Organization	# Vol.	Length	Training provided	Local support	Areas where they work	Who are the volunteers?	Funding and admin of the program	Cost to the volunteer
Habitat for Humanity International www.habitat.org General Not for Profit Faith-Based	5,134 volunteers in 2004	Global Village Program -- 1-3 weeks. International Volunteer Program -- 3-24 months.	The GVP training materials are provided by the local affiliate and vary. The IVP program training materials may be more extensive and also vary by program.	Local Habitat affiliates work with the team leader. The entirety of the trip is spent with local employees.	The IVP Pilot is now operating in: Armenia, Costa Rica, Dominica Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Mongolia, Sri Lanka, Tanzania and Uganda. The GVP program is global.	Participants vary in age, background and skill levels. No particular skills are required, however minors must be accompanied by an adult.	Most of the HFHI funds are received through private contributions. In 2004, these contributions amounted to a total of 120 million which was complemented by 16 million in government grants.	IVP program \$450 per month, plus \$300-400 in upfront program fees. GVP Program \$1,200-1,800 per assignment plus travel expenses.
I to I www.i-to-i.com Generalist For Profit Secular	4,000 volunteers sent in 2004 to 27 countries.	Trips range from 1-24 weeks.	The training provided varies by project length and subject, and is also dependent on the skills of the volunteer.	Local partners provide in country support.	Volunteers work in 27 countries throughout Europe, the Americas, Asia and Africa. Themes range from teaching english, to conservation, to building, and community development which includes health.	North American volunteers made up a total of 17% (675) of the 4,000 volunteers and went to 25 of the 27 countries. Specific two week programs target 16-19 year olds, but volunteers range in age and skill levels.	The program administration and funding costs are raised primarily through volunteer contributions. No financial data is available on the website.	\$1600-\$2500 depending on the length of service. Fee covers food, accommodations, meals, orientation, insurance and in-country support. The cost of international travel must also be paid by the volunteer.
Mennonite Central Committee www.mcc.org Generalist Not for Profit Faith Based	1,200 volunteers in 2004.	3-5 years for the majority; a few projects only last 1 week - 1 year	Orientation includes an introduction to the mission and program and covers: Christianity, cultural adjustment, peace and justice.	On site training including: goals, objectives, cultural background and language study. No specific job training is provided.	Volunteers work in Africa, Asia, Latin America & the Caribbean, Europe, the Middle East, Canada and Asia. The thematic areas include: health, management and office support, peace, education, agriculture and community and economic development.	Most volunteers already have a bachelor's degree and are over 18. Many long term volunteers serve as a family. Some shorter term opportunities are available for those who have not yet graduated from college.	In 2000, 86.7 percent of MCC international resources came from supporters' financial contributions and donations of material resources. About 10.4 percent came from grants, including grants from private foundations and from the Canadian International Development Agency.	MCC covers costs for food, housing, round-trip transportation, medical (including dental and optical) and related program expenses. There is also a small monthly stipend (currently \$90 Cdn/\$62 U.S. per adult) and vacation allowance. Some money is available for non-deferrable college loans.
Volunteers for Peace, Inc. www.vfp.org Generalist Not for Profit Secular	1,200 volunteers in 2004.	The average workcamp volunteer placement is 2-3 weeks.	Prior to departure volunteers do not receive any formal training. However, they are provided with an "Information Sheet" about their particular workcamp and preparatory measures.	The local host community supports the volunteers during their stay and determines the specific area of focus for each work camp.	Volunteers typically assist with construction and restoration of low income housing or community buildings; environmental projects such as park maintenance and organic farming; social services including AIDS education and arts projects; and historic preservation and archaeology.	Volunteers range in age, however most are between the ages of 18-25. They do have specific programs catering to teenagers, and separate programs targeted the older population.	All of the funding received comes from members. They also received some seed money from the US Peace Foundation and the Points of Light Foundation.	Each trip costs \$250 for registration, however some programs can cost as much as \$500. All of the transportation costs must be paid by the volunteer. Volunteers are also required to pay a mandatory membership fee of \$20.
World Teach www.worldteach.org Generalist Not for Profit Secular	Approximately 300 volunteers.	A summer to a full year.	Pre-departure: welcome handbook; teaching english as a foreign language; and program specific information. 3-4 week in-country orientation: teaching; language lessons; health and safety information; and cross-cultural adjustment and culture shock. Mid-service and end of service briefing.	Supported by the local host institutions, and have access to 24 hour field staff support. Local staff conduct personal visits to volunteers' placement sites and are available to address any problems that might arise.	Volunteers serve as teachers and mentors in developing countries. Most volunteers teach english, however some may teach math, science, basic skills or HIV/AIDS awareness.	Year long programs-- at least a bachelor's degree. Summer volunteers-- at least 18 years of age. Volunteers must be native English speakers, however there are no citizenship requirements.	An estimated 70% of the program fee is expended directly on logistics, training and support of volunteers; the remaining 30% is allocated to recruitment, admissions and administration.	From \$1,000 for locally subsidized programs to \$5,990. All summer programs are \$3,990. The fees do not cover travel costs but do include health insurance. Local host organizations provide housing and living allowances.

Appendix B –Americans Volunteering Abroad: A Conservative Estimate

Name of Organization	Website	# of Volunteers
Peace Corps	www.peacecorps.gov	8,000
<u>Generalist Programs</u>		
Earthwatch	www.earthwatch.org	4,100
I to I	www.i-to-i.com	4,000
Cross Cultural Solutions	www.crossculturalsolutions.org	2,000
Global Volunteers	www.globalvolunteers.org	2,000
Volunteers for Peace	www.vfp.org	1,200
Kibbutz Program Center	www.kibbutzprogramcenter.org	1,000
Peacework	www.peacework.org	750
Amigos de las Americas	www.amigoslink.org	700
Global Crossroads	www.globalcrossroad.org	600
Global Routes	www.globalroutes.org	350
CIEE	www.ciee.org	300
World Teach	www.worldteach.org	300
ARCAS	www.arcasguatemala.org	260
IPS-L	www.ipsl.org	250
UREP	http://extension.ucdavis.edu/urep/	200
Operation Crossroads Africa	operationcrossroadsafrica.org	160
Amizade	amizade.org	160
ICADS	www.icads.org	140
Global Citizens Network	www.globalcitizen.org	100
IICD	www.iicd-volunteer.org	70
Peace Brigades International	www.peacebrigades.org/usa	60
	Subtotal	18,700
<u>Professional Programs</u>		
Doctors without Borders	www.msf.org	3,400
Flying Samaritans	www.flyingsamaritans.org	2,300
Operation Smile	www.operationsmile.org	750
ACDI/ VOCA*	www.acdivoca.org	600
Child Family Health International	www.cfhi.org	500
Financial Services Vol Corps*	www.fsvc.org	400
IESC*	www.iesc.org	350
Health Volunteers Overseas	www.hvousa.org	350
FFA Organization	www.ffa.org	300
Interplast	www.interplast.org	280
Flying Doctors	www.fdoamerica.org	150
CNFA*	www.cnfa.org	90
Citizen's Development Corps*	www.cdc.org	70
American Bar Association - CEELI	www.abanet.org/ceeli	50
	Subtotal	9,590

* Receives Federal Funding

<u>Name of Organization</u>	<u>Website</u>	<u># of Volunteers</u>
<u>Corporate Volunteer Programs</u>		
Business Volunteers Unlimited	www.businessvolunteers.org	1,000
General Electric Elfun Program**	www.elfun.org	700
Building Blocks International	www.bblocks.org	100
Pfizer	www.pfizer.com	80
Timberland **	www.timberland.com	60
Ford Motor Company	www.ford.com	50
Oracle Corporation**	www.oracle.com	100
Cisco Systems, Inc**	www.cisco.com	70
	Subtotal	2,160
<u>Faith-Based Programs</u>		
Habitat for Humanity International	www.habitat.org	5,100
Menonite Central Committee	www.mcc.org	1,200
Food for the Hungry	www.fh.org	520
Maryknoll	www.maryknoll.org	350
Pastors for Peace	www.ifconews.org	300
Catholic Medical Mission Board	www.cmmb.org	190
Christian Peacemaker Teams	www.cpt.org	190
Jesuit Volunteer Corps	www.jesuitvolunteers.org	70
American Jewish World Service	www.ajws.org	60
	Subtotal	7,980
GRAND TOTAL (without Peace Corps)		38,430

* Receives Federal Funding

** Based on a Conservative Estimate that 5% of international volunteers are Americans

Appendix C – Volunteers for Prosperity Partner Organizations

Organization	Region(s)	Sector(s)
<u>Generalist Programs (117)</u>		
<i>For Profit Programs (4)</i>		
FINCA International (C)		
Digital Partners (C)		
Land O'Lakes International Development Division (B)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB
Pfizer (A)	Af	HA
<i>Not-for-Profit Secular Programs (80)</i>		
A Call to Serve International (A)	E- Georgia	CB, H, IT, WY
ACDI/VOCA (A)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB, EG, NR, W
Afghanistan-American Foundation (A)	Afghanistan	R
Amazon-Africa Aid Organization (C)	Af, LA	H
American Near East Refugee Aid (A)	As	Ed, H
America's Development Foundation (B)	Af, As, E, LA	All
American Society for Testing and Materials Int'l (A)	Af, As, E, LA	EG
Building Blocks International, Inc. (C)	Af, As, E, LA	R
Children's AIDS Fund (D)		
Citizens Development Corps, Inc. (A)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, EG
The Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs (A)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB, EG, Ed
CityLinks Partnership Program (C)	Af, As, E, LA	R
Compatible Technology International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
Coore Foundation (C)		
Counterpart International, Inc. (A)	Af, As, E, LA	H, R
Cross Cultural Solutions (A)	Af, As, E, LA	R
Curamericas (C)	LA	Ed, H
East Meets West Foundation (C)	As - Vietnam	Cb, Ed, H, NR, W, WY
Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation (C)	Af, As, E, LA	H, HA
Feed the Children (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag
Florida A&M University (C)		
Focus Humanitarian Assistance USA (A)	Af, As, E	CB, IT, NR
Foundation for Democracy in Africa (A)	Af	R
Foundation for Sustainable Development (A)	Af, As, LA	Ag, EG, Ed, H, HA, IT, WY
Free Muslim Coalition Against Terrorism (C)	As	R
Global Giving (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB, Ed, Eg, H, NR, WY
Global Partnerships (A)	LA	CB, EG, H, IT
Global Service Corps (A)	Af, As, E, LA	H
Global Volunteers (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ed, H, NR
Globe Aware (A)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB, EG, Ed, H, IT, NR, WY
Haiti Connection/Newman Catholic Ctr of East. II. U. (B)		
Health Volunteers Overseas-USA (A)	Af, As, E, LA	H
Help Africa Relief and Development, Inc. (C)	Af	CB, Ed, H, W, WY
Hopital Albert Schweitzer/The Grant Foundation (A)	LA	Ag, CB, EG, Ed, H, HA, IT, W, WY
Humanitarian International Services Group (C)	Af, As	CB, ED
Int'l Assoc.of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials (A)	Af, As, E, LA	NR, W
International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (C)		
International Cultural Adventures (C)	As, LA	CB
International Executive Service Corps (A)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, EG
International Foundation for Education and Self-Help (C)	Af, LA	Ed, R
International Real Property Foundation (A)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, EG
Interns for Peace, Inc. (C)	Af, As	CB, EG, Ed
Jagriti Foundation (A)	Af, As, LA	Ed, HA, IT, WY
The Joint Business Development Center, Inc. (A)	Af, As, E, LA	Eg, IT
Kids Around the World, Inc. (C)	As, E, LA	WY
Maine Adoption Placement Service (MAPS) (C)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
Maternal Life International, Inc. (A)	Af, As, E, LA	H, IT
MBA Corps (C)		
Medical Missions for Children (A)	Af, As, E, LA	H, IT
New Frontiers Health Force (A)	Af, As, E, LA	H
Nonprofit Clinic (C)		
Northwest Medical Teams International, Inc. (A)	Af, As, E, LA	H
Partners of the Americas (A)	As, LA	Ag, CB, EG, Ed, H, IT, R
Partnership for the Environment (C)	Af, As, E, LA	NR
Peace Corps Encore (D)		
The Peregrine Fund ()	Af, As, E, LA	CB
PEP Foundation, Inc. (C)		
Practical Compassion Inc. (A)	LA	EG, Ed, H, W, WY
Project Concern International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, H

(A) link to Organizational website on the VfP website; (B) direct link to the organization's volunteer page; (C) link to the organizations webpage; (D) no link available

Organization	Region(s)	Sector(s)
Not-for-Profit Secular Programs (cont'd)		
Project C.U.R.E. (C)		
Project HOPE (D)	Af, As, E, LA	H
Project Management Institute (PMI) (C)	Af, As, E, LA	EG
Reach the Children (A)	Af	Ag, CB, EG, Ed, H, HA, W, WY
Rotary International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	EG, Ed
Safe Blood for Africa Foundation (C)	Af	H, HA
Service for Peace (C)	As, LA	Ag, CB, Ed, EG, WY
SOZO International (C)	As	Ed, EG, H
SPW International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ed, H
Technoserve, Inc (A)	Af, As, E, LA	EG, IT
Trickle Up Program (D)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, EG, Ed
United States Energy Association (A)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, EG, R
Visions in Action (A)	Af, LA	Ag, CB, EG, NR
Volunteer Peten (D)	LA	Ed, NR
Volunteers in Technical Assistance, Inc (A)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB, EG, IT
Water For People (C)		
Wings of the Dawn International Institute for Children (A)	Af, LA	Ed, IT
Winrock International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB
Women in Progress (C)	Af - Ghana	CB, EG, Ed, WY
World Association for Children and Parents (C)	Af, As, E, LA	H, R
World Conference of Mayors, Inc. (D)	LA	CB
Not-for-Profit Faith Based Programs (33)		
American Jewish World Service, Inc. (A)	As, As, E, LA	CB, EG, H
Alliance for African Assistance (D)	Af	CB, Ed, H
Aquaculture International, Inc. (A)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB, EG, HA, NR, W, WY
Association of Jewish Family & Children's Agencies (D)		
Catholic Medical Mission Board, Inc. (B)	Af, As, E, LA	H
Center to Bridge the Digital Divide (A)		
CERT International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ed, H, W, WY
Christ Outreach Ministries (C)	LA	CB, H
Christian Communications Inc. of USA (C)		
Christian Medican and Dental Associations (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB, Ed, EG, HA, H, NR, WY
Christian Mission Aid (C)		
CURE International (A)	LA	Ed, H, WY
First Love (C)		
Foods Resource Bank (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB
Glendale Corps (C)		
Good News International Foundation (D)	As	CB, Ed, EG
Habitat for Humanity International (B)	Af, As, E, LA	Ed, R
Holy Land Christian Ecumenical Foundation (A)		
Islamic Free Market Institute (A)	As	EG, R
Kids Alive International (C)		
Living Water (C)		
Lott Carey Baptist Foreign Mission Convention (A)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
Life House Ministries (A)	Af, As, E, LA	Ed, h
Lumiere Medical Ministries (A)	LA	Ed, HA, H, W, WY
Mercy Ships (C)	Af, As, E, LA	H
Mission Connect, Inc. (C)	E - Romania	Ag, CB
National Day of Care (C)		
Operation Blessing Int'l Relief and Dev. Corporation (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, EG, Ed, NR
Partners for Christian Development (A)	Af, As, E, LA	EG
Salvation Army World Service Office (C)		
Samaritan's Purse (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB
Volunteer Missionary Movement (C)		
World Witness (A)	As, LA	CB, Ed, HA, WY

(A) link to Organizational website on the VFP website; (B) direct link to the organization's volunteer page; (C) link to the organizations webpage; (D) no link available

Organization	Region(s)	Sector(s)
<u>Generalist and Professional Programs (6)</u>		
<i>For-Profit Programs (2)</i>		
EDS (D)		
Plexus Consulting Group, LLC (A)	Af, As, E, LA	EG, H
<i>Not-for-Profit Secular Programs (4)</i>		
Coastal Resources Center	Af, As, E, LA	CB, NR
Innovations in Civic Participation (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, Ed
Operation Hope, Inc. (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, EG
Relief International (C)	As	Ed, EG, H, WY
<u>Professional Programs (57)</u>		
<i>For Profit Programs (18)</i>		
Bank of America (D)		
BearingPoint, Inc. (C)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
CCIM Institute (D)	Af, As, E, LA	EG, Ed
Computer Frontiers, Inc. (C)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas (D)	Af, As, E, LA	EG
HP (C)		IT
The Institute of SME Finance (C)	Af, As, E, LA	EG
Integration Technologies Group (ITG) (D)		
Int'l Media, Dev., Peacebuilding Consulting (C)		
Ishtirak (C)	As	R
Knowledge Planet (D)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
MIT Center for Technology Policy (D)		
Newdea, Inc. (C)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
ShoreBank Corporation (C)	Af, As, E, LA	EG
TeckChek (C)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
Unext (C)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
Vidyah, Inc. (C)	Af, As, E, LA	H
Voxiva, Inc. (C)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
<i>Not-for-Profit Secular Programs (35)</i>		
African Medical and Research Foundation (B)	Af	H
American Association of Cereal Chemists (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag
American Association of Engineering Societies (A)	Af, As, E, LA	CB
American International Health Alliance (C)	Af, LA	H, HA
American Oil Chemists' Society (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, I
American Public Works Association (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, W
American Society of Agricultural Engineers (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, NR, W
American Society of Civil Engineers (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, Ed, EG
American Society of Mechanical Engineers Int'l (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB
Architects without Borders (A)	Af, As	WY
Bridges.org (C)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
Business Volunteers Unlimited (C)		CB, EG
CHF International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, EG, Ed, NR, R
Coffee Quality Institute (C)	Af, LA	Ag, CB, EG
The Endocrine Society (C)	Af, As, E, LA	H
Engineers Without Borders-USA (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, NR, W
EnterpriseWorks (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB, EG, Ed, NR, W
Financial Services Volunteer Corps (A)	Af, As, E, LA	EG
Foundation for Understanding and Enhancement (I)	LA	Ed, H
Global Business Development Group, Inc. (C)	As	CB, EG, Ed
Global Neuroscience Initiative Foundation	Af, As, E, LA	CB, Ed, H
Information Technology Association of America (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, IT
Institute of Food Technologists (IFT) (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag
Institute of Internal Auditors, The (The IIA) (C)	Af, As, E, LA	EG
International Economic Development Council (C)	Af, As, E, LA	EG
International Municipal Lawyers Association (IMLA) (C)	Af, As, E, LA	R
Junior Chamber International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	EG, Ed, IT, R
MicroMentor (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, Ed
National Association of Retired Federal Employees (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, EG, Ed, R
National Corn Growers Association (C)		
National Ground Water Association (NGWA) (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, NR, W
National Peace Corps Association (C)		
Pathologists Overseas (C)	Af, As, E, LA	H
SRI International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	CB, EG
Students In Free Enterprise (C)		
<i>Not-for-Profit Faith Based Programs (2)</i>		
Christian Connections for International Health (C)	Af, As, E, LA	H
Engineering Ministries International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Cb, EG, Ed, W

(A) link to Organizational website on the VfP website; (B) direct link to the organization's volunteer page; (C) link to the organizations webpage; (D) no link available

Organization	Region(s)	Sector(s)
<u>Insufficient Information to Determine Generalist / Professional Classification (19)</u>		
<i>For-Profit Secular Programs (8)</i>		
Greater Philadelphia Global Partners (C)		
Innovation Philadelphia (C)		
ManyFutures, Inc. (C)		
Morocco Trade and Development Services (C)		
Orbis Management International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB, EG, Ed, H
Productivity Point International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	IT
Timmons Group (C)		
Volunteer Consultants International (D)		
<i>Not-for-Profit Secular Programs (6)</i>		
Action Against Hunger (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, H, R, W
Dalit Freedom Network (C)	As - India	CB, Ed, H, WY
Family Health International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ed, HA, H
Institute for Sustainable Communities (C)	As	CB, Ed, EG, WY
PEOPLink (C)	Af, As, E, LA	EG
Washington State University/International Programs (D)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, CB, EG, Ed, WY
<i>Faith-Based Programs (5)</i>		
Children's Christian Storehouse, Inc. (D)	Af, As, E, LA	CB
CitiHope International (C)	Af, As, E, LA	Ag, H
Datelinehealth - Africa Inc. (C)	Af	Cb, Ed, HA, H, WY
Family Outreach Ministries International, Inc. (D)	Af, As, E, LA	CB
St. Joseph's Healthcare System, Inc. (C)		H
<u>Insufficient Information for Classification as Secular / Faith-Based or Profit / Non-Profit (6)</u>		
Alcom Transportation Group (D)		
ASTM International (C)		
Foundationalnet, Inc. (D)		
GCN/GIIC (D)		
Project DAWN, Inc. (D)		CB
Shelter For Life International (D)	Af, As, LA	Ag, H, NR, R

(A) link to Organizational website on the VfP website; (B) direct link to the organization's volunteer page; (C) link to the organizations webpage; (D) no link available

References

Americorps (2005). Homepage. Retrieved on October 30, 2005 from:
<http://www.americorps.org>.

Barrett, Barbara M. (Chair) (2004, September 28). *Report of the United States Advisory Committee on Public Diplomacy*. Submitted to the President, Congress, the Department of State and the American people. Retrieved on October 30, 2005 from:
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~ournews/2005/september/091505Cultural-Diplomacy-Report.pdf>

Bush, George W. (2002, January 28). *State of the Union Address*. Speech presented to a Joint Session of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, DC

Collins, Joseph, Stefano DeZerega, and Zahara Heckscher (2001). *How to Live Your Dream of Volunteering Overseas*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (2005). About us. Retrieved November 17, 2005 from <http://www.lincolncommission.org>.

Dionne, E.J., K.M. Drogosz, and Robert Litan (Eds.) (2003). *United We Serve: National Service and the Future of Citizenship*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Djerejian, Edward P. (Chairman) (2003). *Changing Minds, Winning Peace: A New Strategic Direction for U.S. Public Diplomacy in the Arab & Muslim World*. Report of the Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World. Submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives. October 1, 2003.

Frist, Bill. (2005) Frist Introduces Global Health Corps Act of 2005. Press Release. 19 April 2005 Retrieved on November 1, 2005 from:
http://frist.senate.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=PressReleases.Detail&PressRelease_id=1912&Month=4&Year=2005

Nye, Jr., Joseph S. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. U.S.: Public Affairs.

Nye, Jr., Joseph S. (1991). *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power* U.S.: Basic Books.

Online Volunteering Service. (2005) Homepage. Retrieved on November 21, 2005 from:
<http://www.onlinevolunteering.org>.

Peace Corps (2005). *A Legacy of Service and Compassion – Peace Corps Congressional Budget Justification FY 2006*. Washington, DC: Peace Corps.

Pew Global Attitudes Project (2005). U.S. Image Up Slightly, But Still Negative: American Character Gets Mixed Reviews. Retrieved on November 2, 2005 from: <http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID=247>.

Putnam, R. (Ed.) (2002). *Democracies in Flux: The Evolution of Social Capital in Contemporary Society* London, UK: Oxford University Press.

Rieffel, Lex (2003). *Reconsidering the Peace Corps*. Policy Brief #127 (December). The Brookings Institution.

Rieffel, Lex (2003). *The Peace Corps in a Turbulent World*. Working Paper. October 27, 2003. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. Available from: <http://www.brookings.edu/views/papers/rieffel20031015.pdf>

United Nations Volunteers (2005). *Annual Report 2004/5: Gaining Ground* New York, NY: United Nations.

United States Corporation for National and Community Service (2005). Homepage. Retrieved on October 30, 2005 from: <http://www.nationalservice.gov>.

United States Government (2005, February 2) *Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2006*. (U.S. Government Printing Office No. 041-001-00617-6) Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget

United States Government, Department of State (2005). *Fiscal Year 2006 Budget Request: International Affairs Function 150 – Summary and Highlights*. Washington, DC: Department of State.

USA Freedom Corps (2005). Homepage. Retrieved on October 30, 2005 from <http://www.usafreedomcorps.gov>

Volunteers for Prosperity (2005). Homepage. Retrieved on October 30, 2005 from <http://www.volunteersforprosperity.gov>

Wofford, Harris (1966). "The Future of the Peace Corps." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 365:129-146.