Community Service Learning in the Face of Globalization: Rethinking Theory and Practice

Novella Zett Keith
Temple University

Globalization is a multifaceted phenomenon that does not yield easy definitions. The author examines three of its interconnected faces—neoliberalism, time-space compression, and globalism—to trace their implications for two principles of service-learning practice: reciprocity and meeting community needs. The article reconceptualizes these two principles, concluding that interdependence is a better fit with the values and practices of the field than reciprocity; conceptions of community should emphasize difference and intersection of public and private spaces; and community needs should be defined to support citizenship action, public work, and social justice.

We can't resist this trend if we just stick to education because all the most human aspects of our societies are being commercialized. It's a worldwide battle we have to wage against the excesses of economic modernization.

"A controversial debate," *Education Today Newsletter*, UNESCO, July-September 2003

Trends in global economics, technology, communications, and people's movements, documented by writings in the growing field of globalization, leave little doubt that a historic juncture is upon us, with its attendant challenges and opportunities. Writers have examined many of the implications of these multifaceted trends for educational institutions but, with few exceptions, have yet to address the intersection of globalization and community service learning. Concerns for diversity, global citizenship, youth empowerment, community development, and the like which can be theorized as aspects of globalization, are evident in the field's literature and practice, but have not been linked through a theoretical framework that could help service-learning educators consider the implications of globalization for our work.[1]

Beginning this task is the purpose of this article, which is necessarily exploratory rather than exhaustive. Theoretical development is needed to avoid responding piecemeal only to those aspects of globalization that emerge into one's view, without clarity about the more complex whole.[2] As a complex phenomenon that does not proceed inevitably in directions beyond reach, globalization includes some trends that may not be in our immediate control and thus call for adaptation; but there are always fields of action where it is possible to respond con-

sciously and in accordance with alternative values and agendas, rather than simply comply with agendas defined by dominant actors in society. Theory can thus be very practical, helping determine when and how to align practice with these important trends as well as when to act in ways that counter their negative effects. In fact, this article was prompted by the desire to understand how service-learning might best advance the social justice agenda that is an *Other* face of globalization (see Falk, 1999) and stands in opposition to its currently dominant face—neoliberalism. This agenda draws strength from the commitment of much of the service-learning field to ways of knowing that are engaged and dialogical, and practices that bridge the borders of difference and hierarchy—a commitment that speaks as much of a movement as it does of a type of practice (see O'Byrne, 2001; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999).

Globalization: An Overview

It would be impossible to review globalization in a single article. The point here is to open a window that provides a broader perspective on service-learning. The view is from the North, that is, from my personal and social location as a faculty member in a university in the United States, which influences what emerges as important for service-learning theory and practice. In globalization parlance, the North stands for those countries (also termed developed or First World) that are at the core of world power, mostly ex-colonizers. The South includes countries that were colonized (also termed developing, Third World, or periphery). While Northern, my view also encompasses the dispersed and displaced: I am one of the in-between people—an immigrant forced into dias-

pora by economic compulsion, and a border crosser.

Globalization is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon that is theoretically contested and does not yield easy definitions (Kellner, 2000). It is generally agreed that the practices that constitute what is now termed globalization have been growing over a long period of time and have accelerated in the last quarter century through technological innovations, the communication revolution, and—with the fall of the Soviet Union in 1989—the removal of the checks that the Soviet bloc and its allies constituted for the spread of capital and its related institutions. Although these trends can be seen as evolutionary, their combined and accelerated effects over this period make a qualitative difference in how we live and act in our lives.

One influential political scientist, David Held, proposes that globalization entails "the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa" (cited in Morrow & Torres, 2000, p. 29). Others speak of a fundamental restructuring of economy, politics, and culture, emphasizing the impact of corporate decisions and technological innovation on long-developing historical trends. For instance, the global economy heightens the ongoing fragmentation of production processes and services across the globe, through advances in communications technology and information processing. At the political level, there is a shift in the role and importance of the nation-state, as financial and corporate actors, international institutions, and global social movements step in with different visions of a new "order" to fill the vacuum in global governance. Culturally, there are processes leading to homogenization alongside a renewal of interest in and struggle for the local and the indigenous. These factors must be seen as interacting rather than isolated, and responsive to the interests and actions of different social agents, rather than the result of blind forces.

I will conceptualize globalization in terms of three interconnected phenomena: neoliberalism, time-space compression, and globalism.[3] Anticipating the discussion below, neoliberalism takes the central tenets of free market economics and makes them into the general principle for creating the good life and good society. This translates into a view of people as rational choosers who seek to maximize their self-interest, and a preference for private property and market competition over the role of the state as protector of the public good. This trend is propelling universities, schools, and communities toward privatization, entrepreneurship, measurable forms of accountability, and new forms of poverty. The preferred approach to service-learning here involves direct service, especially in areas from which the state is withdrawing, rather than the action of engaged citizens acting in common to advocate alternative visions. Time-space compression involves a change in how people experience time and space that is due to the communications revolution. For instance, people are now able to maintain far flung ties that support multiple identities and constructions of belonging, so that it is hardly possible to speak of the local community, as such. For its turn, the culture industry promotes tendencies toward cultural homogenization, while also generating new cultures and politics of resistance. There are implications here for the community needs to be met through service-learning, such as the need for people to come together, across differences, to address local and global issues and develop more expansive communities. Finally, globalism (also termed "globalization from below") involves an emerging system of values and the attendant political and social movements that stress difference, dialogue, and an ethic of collective responsibility for the world. These values provide strong support for service-learning practices that advocate for multicultural and global citizenship, and economic and social justice.

These aspects of globalization are not separate but interact dialectically: they involve trends and countertrends that mutually influence one another but exist in tension, as a unity of opposites. For instance, the excesses of privatization that come with economic neoliberalism engender resistance from peoples' movements, while the technology and communication revolution that supports the worldwide spread of capital also makes excesses and corruption more visible. New social movements emerge and connect, spreading a new ethos that is about "a radical reclaiming of the commons" (Klein, 2001). As these new voices of difference emerge, they are also accompanied by a different kind of reclaiming—the attempt to return "home" to fundamentalist religion, family values, and singular worldviews.

These three aspects of globalization provide a framework through which I will examine and reconceptualize two important service-learning principles (Billig, 2000; Honnet & Poulsen, 1989) that my review suggests most closely intersect with globalization theory: reciprocity and meeting community needs. The elements of globalization also interact in multiple ways with these principles. For instance, time-space compression is for David Harvey (1990) the most important cultural change derived from neoliberal economic globalization. Globalism, as a carrier of postmodern difference, must confront the autonomous modern individual and instrumental rationality of neoliberalism. The dialogue that happens when difference talks back to this autonomous

individual has implications for how to conceptualize the relationship between the server and served, replacing reciprocity with interdependence. Time-space compression and globalism both relate to identity, community, and values and thus have implications for how to define and meet the needs of communities, pulling toward global citizenship and social justice. Service-learning educators are already doing much that conforms with these reconceptualizations, so the issue is more about clearly aligning theory and practice than about pointing in entirely new directions.

The rest of this section involves an extended discussion of the selected aspects of globalization. The next section focuses on the service-learning principles, exploring how they are transformed through interaction with globalization, while the conclusion suggests some additional implications for service-learning theory and practice. Putting the newly defined principles into practice should increase the relevance of service-learning for students and communities. These themes and their implications for service-learning are presented in Figure 1, which provides a schematic guide for the rest of the discussion.

The section on neoliberalism focuses mostly on political-economic factors, including the impact of neoliberal globalization on poverty: as service-learning is frequently implicated in alleviating poverty, the new dynamics that create it must be understood. Cultural, social, and psychological implications of neoliberalism that relate to the other aspects of globalization are discussed in the sections that follow.

Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism has been called a potent discourse (Fitzsimons, 2000), because it is not limited to any given sphere of activity (say, the economy) but offers instead a comprehensive theory of society that invokes universal laws and includes a theory of human nature, political philosophy, and theory of governance. I do not agree with Fitzsimons that neoliberalism is *the* theoretical underpinning of the current wave of globalization (also see Rizvi, 2000); rather, it has been emerging as the dominant government philosophy and policy in the United States, Britain, and other Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)[4] countries since the 1980s and has been the underpinning of the global governance regime since the 1970s, through the policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank with regard to economic development in the South and the free trade policies of the World Trade Organization (WTO) since its inception in the mid-1990s.

Liberalism sees the marketplace, whether of goods, services, or ideas, as central to the exercise of freedom of modern individuals, who, as self-regulating subjects and self-seeking profit maximizers, make choices guided by rational calculation rather than by so-called traditional prejudices. Tyrannical states or communal traditions that interfere with this process are thus impediments to human and social development. Following this trend, theorists of neoliberalism, including Nobel laureate Milton Friedman, equate freedom of choice in the market with true democratic participation. As the free (unfettered, competitive) market is considered superior in meeting all human needs, most regulatory and redistributive activities government assumed over time to safeguard the commons, provide for basic needs, and support equity and equal opportunity (including schools, prisons, health care, social welfare, and so on) should be privatized, becoming the province of either for-profits or charitable and volunteer organizations. Further, as government regulation interferes with the proper workings of free markets, the sphere of government must be strictly limited except in one crucial area: intervening to support the freedom of economic actors from state interference. In the age of globalization, this means support for unhampered freedom of trade, now safeguarded by the World Trade Organization.

There are, however, major differences between historical liberalism and current neoliberalism. Historical liberalism was about freeing (and creating) the individual subject from the tyranny of tradition and freeing state subjects from the tyranny of the state. I will discuss the first in the next subsections and only confine my comments here to the role of the state. For John Locke, Adam Smith, and early theorists of liberal democracy and free-market economics (or competitive capitalism) the tyranny of the state stood for royal encroachment on property rights, including its support for the mercantilist system of trade (Held, 1995). Neoliberalism returns to original principles and applies them to a present that is quite different from this history. Rather than struggling against a powerful tyrannical state, we have powerful financial and corporate actors using economic and state power to further extend a reach that is global as well as personal. Joseph Stiglitz, another Nobel laureate who chafed as a member of the neoliberal "Washington consensus" (he was chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors and chief economist of the World Bank under President Clinton), adds his support for this view:

> The end of the Cold War opened up new opportunities to try to create a new, global economic order…that was based more on a set of principles, on ideology, on ideas of social justice. The world had the chance to set up a level playing field. We missed that opportunity. . . .

Figure 1

Three Aspects of Globalization with Implications for Service-Learning

	NEOLIBERALISM	TIME-SPACE COMPRESSION	GLOBALISM
KEY POINTS	• People as interest-seeking profit maximizers and rational choosers • Intensified privatization of state functions and deregulation in economy • Democracy as freedom of choice in competitive private markets • Tyrannical corporations, not state • Independent North (Self) vs. dependent South (Other)	• Communications/ technology revolution changes experience of time and space • Hypermobility of goods and capital • Dissemination of cultural forms and information. • Hypertransience • Problematic social solidarity and thin community • Neoliberalism appropriates to further own project • Facilitates emergence of globalism	• Grounded in difference • Globalization from below • Postmodern philosophical perspective, decentered and multivocal • Acknowledges interconnectedness, interdependence, and struggles of Other. • Dense network of global organizations and social movements • Values global ethics and social justice
EXPRESSIONS	• Disappearance of the political (volunteer and consumer, not citizen) • Dual economy and peripheralization of core • Intensification of inequality, inequity, social divisions • Increased migration to escape poverty • Sharing of "bads" • Race to bottom in North and South • Deepening crises and global disintegration	• Orientation to consumption and ready-made goods (including community) • Culture industry and colonization of lifeworld • Disembedding from local • Increased need for connections • Multiplicity and choice of communities and identities • Supports both dialogue and flight into fundamentalisms	• Shift from independence-dependence to interdependence • Awareness of interconnection of local and global • New, decentralized democratic practices • Importance of dialogue and surfacing/ addressing conflicts • Diversity as strength • Potential for violence as resistance to new values practices
IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE-LEARNING	• Principles of reciprocity and meeting community needs are based on liberal/ neoliberal view of people and society (rational, calculable exchange) • Charity and service orientations fit well into neoliberal agenda • Need to resist transformation of citizens into consumers • Need bridging social capital • Need to reconstruct spaces for citizen work • Need projects that address new poverty	• Community must be problematized • Strengthen local community • Culture as resource for community building • Need inward-oriented and outward-oriented projects that support identities and communities • Develop play and relational dimensions of projects • Honor and respect marginalized	• Service as public work for social justice • Conflicts and process of struggle as opportunities for learning across difference • Address power asymmetries through communicative practices • Create spaces for communicative democracy • Recognize and develop all partners' resources, assets, and capacities • Support dialogical and communicative approaches to community problem solving

> Most people . . . did not have a clear enough vision of what we wanted or what should have been created. But the commercial and financial interests did . . . . They wanted to seize this new opportunity to expand—to create a world that would open up new markets for themselves, for the corporations of the advanced industrial countries. And they used the U.S. government to advance that perspective. (Stiglitz, n.d.)

With the vast expansion of the capitalist system, supported by institutions of global governance, "the market" becomes capable of tyranny, while the state, dwarfed by the corporation, turns into a willing ally and appendage of global capitalism. As David Korten remarks in his book, When Corporations Rule the World, "we are ruled by an oppressive market, not an oppressive state. . . . Market tyranny may be more subtle than state tyranny, but it is no less effective in enslaving the many to the interests of the few" (Korten, 1995, pp. 157-158). Korten is not anti-business but simply wants economic interests to be removed from the center of human existence, so they can be reinserted into the nexus of community life and human values. The ideology central to the system of global governance, however, enshrines financial and market considerations above all else: as an example, the IMF and WTO always put concerns about inflation and trade regulations above unemployment and reduced quality of life (Stiglitz, 2002). These organizations are not open to public scrutiny, however, and have no institutionalized channels for democratic action.

What can be expected from neoliberal global governance? The experiences of the South can be informative because much of it has been operating under its influence for at least the past 30 years.[5] Neoliberal development organizations often support their practices with reference to the so-called "Asian miracle" that includes Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and South Korea, which were at a low stage of economic development after the second world war but grew subsequently into wealthy industrialized economies. The evidence, however, is that they did so because activist states controlled the terms on which they engaged the global economy, spending heavily on research and development, education, human services, and regulating financial markets (Greider, 1997; Stiglitz, 2002). These interventions mitigated the inherently uneven nature of capitalist development, maintaining high employment and creating a strong middle class. Amartya Sen, another Nobel laureate, sees a close relationship between "the injustices that characterize the world . . . [and] various omissions that need to be addressed, particularly in institutional arrangements" (2002). These include fair trade, environmental restraints, and the like. Yet, neoliberal ideology does not countenance such arrangements.

There is overwhelming evidence that neoliberal economic policies foisted on the South through global governance and on the North through current government policies vastly exacerbate inequities and social divisions. Countries in the South that were caught in the so-called debt trap and were constrained to engage the global economy following the neoliberal dictates of the IMF, termed structural adjustment, did not fare well, with negative results especially notable for the poorest. As Hans-Peter Martin and Harold Schumann tell it, we are becoming a "20-80 percent society—one where the great majority, the 80 percent, live in poverty and with hardly any decision-making power over conditions affecting their lives, while the 20 percent live in abundance, are always short of time, and make far-reaching decisions affecting everyone" (in Brock-Utne, 2000, p. 132). As neoliberal governance gains strength, even the Asian miracles experience negative effects with regard to equity: between 1997 and 2001, poverty increased by 50 percent in Singapore and doubled in South Korea (Goldsmith, 2001).[6] In spite of the negative effects, structural adjustment regimes remain in effect, behaving in ways that are charitably described as neocolonial and paternalistic: they see the world as a progressive and independent North whose ways a backward and dependent South must imitate by modernizing and explain wealth and poverty through theories of personal, cultural, and societal merit and deficit.

And yet, as Princeton-educated Philippine activist Walden Bello remarks, "people in industrialized nations are being 'structurally adjusted' too" (in Ainger, 2002, p. 343). As neoliberalism comes home to the North, people become one world through application of neocolonial mantra: reduce public expenditure, privatize functions previously carried out by public bodies (including education), collect fees for services, deregulate economic and financial activities, and abandon protection for local industries, labor, and the environment. Not unexpectedly, there is now the phenomena of the new working poor, refugees of deindustrialization whose jobs no longer provide living wages; mass movements of legal and illegal migrants, escaping an increasingly crushing poverty in the South; the growth of the permanently marginalized and unemployed; the reappearance of the sweatshop in the North; not to mention the global magnitude of environmental devastation. Noted sociologist Saskia Sassen (1998) refers to the attendant intensification of inequality as the peripheralization of the core. This means that concepts such as the hourglass economy and dual

labor market are no longer sufficient to explain the dynamics and depth of segmentation and marginalization experienced across and inside core countries (the North) as well as the periphery (the South).[7] To speak, instead, of the peripheralization of the core means that social conditions thought to have disappeared from the North and only occurring in "poor" countries, are reappearing. Neoliberal globalization seems to be taking segments of people across the globe into a race to the bottom.

The advance of neoliberalism thus carries with it deepening crises, which generate resistance and opposition not only from those it marginalizes but also from within the ranks of capitalists and erstwhile supporters of the system. The movement that is termed globalization from below, to be discussed under globalism, emerges from a growing recognition of these commonalities: we, in the North, are not independent entities, not immune from the corporate excesses and the cycle of greed that is enveloping the planet. As old certainties that provided living wages, health care, pensions, and comfortable lives for the many are undermined, we begin to realize that we are them. Replacing the non-relationship of independence-dependence (independent North and dependent South) with the idea of a meaningful interdependence emerges in part from the recognition that we are similarly affected by the global reach of corporate priorities, including through sharing the growing *bads* they produce, such as the pollution that spoiled even the Asian miracles (see Keith, 1999). As George Soros, who gained his vast wealth from neoliberal globalization comments, "I cannot see the global system surviving... In my opinion, we have entered a period of global disintegration only we are not yet aware of it" (in Greider, 1997, p. 248).

Time-Space Compression

Marshall McLuhan's (1964) metaphor of the global village is a useful starting point for thinking about some of the socio-cultural implications of globalization. Though it has by now become a cliché, McLuhan's original understanding was that the communications revolution and mass media were implicated in dismantling the barriers that time and space created for human communication. In the 1960s, it was not yet clear the extent to which the exponential growth in the commercial uses of technology, increasingly under neoliberal governance, would conspire to transform the "village" into a mega shopping mall. The new technology enables the hypermobility of all kinds of goods and capital—human, informational, financial—and creates the opportunity for corporate and financial interests to further the neoliberal project to which the epigraph alludes—

commodifying just about everything. While the technology and communications revolution facilitates the dissemination of cultural forms and communication among people, neoliberal globalization uses it to further fragment the production of goods and services and escape any national controls, especially those over financial markets (Greider, 1997). Thus a budding and diverse global culture is threatened with takeover by the global culture industry and the fundamentalist resistance that is its counterpart (Barber, 1995). Time-space compression is the creature of a technological revolution that neoliberalism appropriates for its own project, but it also facilitates the alternative project of globalism. It is important to see political decisions here, rather than the blind and unstoppable march of technology.

Beyond its immediate economic and political aspects, time-space compression is implicated in transforming the ways people experience and live in their physical and emotional spaces, and thus their sense of community and of themselves. Whereas the traditional concept of community is linked to a place, the global village changes this geography, enabling people to construct identities and communities by interacting with those who share a common language, ethnic identity, or other orientations, memories, and histories, regardless of their location in space (Held, 1995). The global village thus rearticulates cultural spaces, constituting multiple imagined communities that crisscross and at times overlap, but are disembedded from the places where people live. Disembedding occurs when technology such as the Internet and cell and video phones intensifies interactions that allow people to maintain relationships across distance, creating alternatives to networks of relationships that are embedded in a circumscribed geographic locality (Beck, Giddens, & Lash, 1994). A group of researchers studying the construction of community in the East End of London describes this process:

> The knowledge which is used in these constructions of belonging is produced and transmitted through telephone conversations, religious ceremonies, newspaper accounts, television and radio programmes and videos and music recordings, through a global network of social and technological linkages. Visits to friends and relatives, interactions with colleagues at work and other forms of 'community' involvement employ this global network to produce 'locality.' (Albrow, Eade, Durrschmidt, & Washbourne, 1997, p. 24)

Community here becomes linked with the process of identity formation. Tied to the imaginary and to choice, it is constructed to suit one's chosen identities, or subjectivities, and varies in ways that are not

visible but require understanding of people's inner horizon. People become not individuals but many as, through interaction between their own and others' subjective understandings and experiences of the world (that is, intersubjectivity), they discover new and marginalized parts of themselves and so create multiple selves, in relationship to different communities. As people must find who and what they are through dialogue with others, the need for connectedness increases, supporting emerging identities on the basis of the struggle against particular modes of oppression that target race, sexual preference, gender, and the like. For instance, in the above passage, the immigrant who would eventually have assimilated into the dominant culture may now assume, instead, a diasporic identity, connected to a real or imaginary "home" place and community, or a hybrid identity that is located in an in-between place, a borderland that is neither the homeland nor the new place.

The life circumstances of this new, postmodern subject are quite different from those that gave rise to the rational, modern individual that is the centerpiece of neoliberalism. When liberalism emerged as a political philosophy, people were enmeshed in a system of traditions, both communal and institutional, that largely regulated life and from which, as it was thought, the self-legislating subject should be rescued. The emergence of the modern individual did not signify the complete rule of reason, because custom remained hale and well and thus freedom from tradition was relative: the nonrational and noncalculable were simply demoted and relegated to the private sphere, chiefly familial relations, where they became the province of women, servants, and other marginalized *Others*. Note that this is a starting point for critique, as the bracketing of the nonrational from the rational becomes an oppressive binarism (to be further discussed under globalism and the section on meeting community needs).

As long as the marketplace and public places existed alongside a realm of customary relations and habits that retained their vitality, the importance of these relations in sustaining what Habermas (via Husserl) terms the lifeworld was hardly recognized—liberal theory simply does not account for it.[8] The *lifeworld* is the sphere of cultural habits and traditions that provide meaning for one's life and which is diminished to the extent that it is penetrated or colonized by the *system*. This is the technical-instrumental sphere of efficient organizations, corporations, science, and experts that neoliberalism prizes and that creates tensions and distortions, reducing all of life to rational, means-ends calculations—for instance, college as a means to a job, the worth of a job in terms of its monetary value, and the possessor of the job as human capital. Neoliberalism's emphasis on the commercialization of all spheres of life, which is destructive of all collectivities (Bourdieu, 1998), leaves the *unencumbered* citizen-turned-consumer and person-turned-into-capital open to the further encroachment of the system, as the lifeworld is now penetrated at its deepest emotional levels through market persuaders that manufacture reality in the quest for market share.[9] This is the deeply personal side of neoliberal globalization.

As the Other inside us and facing us talks back, the world opens up and singular views and identities give way to dialogue and multiplicity, but these discursive spaces are fragile, because the openness, uncertainty, and even destructiveness of this new freedom, especially given the context of political-economic neoliberalism, may also bring into the open fears and conflict, and the refusal of dialogue. Zygmunt Bauman (2001) argues that the "ties that bind" many of these new forms of community can be quite thin, as they are based on hyper-transience that signifies the illusory freedom to opt out at the first sign of conflict, difficulty, or boredom. In fact, a characteristic of consumerist society that time-space compression heightens is the sense that all things come to us ready-made. Totally severed from production processes that are increasingly fragmented through the global division of labor and as the visible economy shifts from production into distributive and service activities, people are also severed from the experience that building anything, including community, takes time. Other values are influenced in turn—for instance, freedom to consume becomes the highest freedom. Less willing to struggle together, people become instead choosers and consumers of community.

The resulting associational field, as many observers have noted, can become empty indeed, leaving people's very inner being open to colonization by the culture industry and its manufacture of images, meanings, and desires. When old certainties are experienced as comforting rather than oppressive, dialogue ends in the refusal of discursive space that is one definition of fundamentalism: indeed, calls for the neo-traditionalism of family values and fundamentalist forms of religion, nationalism, and politics thus become local and inner expressions of globalization, as do problematic relationships, growing rates of depression, increasing senseless violence, exclusivist identities and extremist movements, including ultra right racist movements (Giddens, 1994). The Southern Poverty Law Center, an organization dedicated to promoting tolerance, reports that "hate activity among kids has probably never been more widespread, or more violent" (Anon, 2004, p. 1).

Understanding these developments will deepen if globalization is seen in terms not of single factors, such as culture, technology or economics, but of their dialectical interaction: that is, globalization brings into play forces that are connected but also have opposite tendencies; the resultant tensions create crises that also include possibilities for generating new solutions to social problems. Bauman's (2001) and others' analyses that stress a problematic social solidarity, manufactured identities, and like negative phenomena explain some of the cultural effects of globalization but provide only a partial lens. Moving past the limitations of traditional cause-effect ways of thinking, we need to consider the ways that time-space compression heightens and magnifies the crises that are present in the system, and thus give rise to opposite phenomena than those that are immediately visible. This is the subject of the next section.

Globalism

Globalism here refers to an emerging framework that stands in dialectical opposition to neoliberalism and also benefits from the technological revolution discussed under time-space compression. Globalism is not a comprehensive, strong theory in the same way as neoliberalism, not only because of its counterpoint status, but also because it is grounded in difference and as such does not strive to achieve the status of a grand narrative. I will discuss it in terms of three interrelated moments. First, it is a philosophical perspective and view of reality that is essentially postmodern, that is, it is dialogical and multivocal, asserting difference and multiplicity over singular worldviews. Second, it draws from and acts on values that acknowledge the significance and struggles of Others—postcolonials, women, people of color, gays—and shows awareness of the world's interconnectedness, along with a sense of collective responsibility for the well-being of the earth and its creatures and support for global equity, peace, and justice. Third, it is an increasingly dense network of global organizations and a developing global social movement. The growth of third sector or nongovernment organizations (NGOs) that see their sphere of action as global is part of this moment, as is a more activist strain that is expressly opposed to neoliberal globalization and that networks a large number of diverse groups under an umbrella slogan proclaiming that "another world is possible." Expressions of globalism go by many names, including global ethics, global civil society, global citizenship, and various modifiers to globalization that announce an alternative agenda: democratic globalization, grass-roots globalization, and globalization from below.

First I address the philosophical component. Globalism announces and intensifies the sense that we are interconnected and potentially a global community, a realization to which we are led by what is termed the dissolution of the Center. In North-South relations, including those between colonizer and colonized, this refers, for instance, to the shift mentioned above, from independence/dependence to interdependence, as the North can no longer avoid the political, social, and ecological consequences of its practices given that *bads* and risk become shared by all. Anticolonial and postcolonial movements, and movements to assert rights and identities by Others, all speak to a shift from the asymmetrical union of Self-Other toward a nonhierarchical connection grounded in difference; that is, the binary thinking that creates opposites, where one is privileged and superior (Self—Western, male, White, reason, technology) and the other is subordinate or its shadow (Other—colonial, female, Black, emotion, earth) comes increasingly to be replaced by a recognition of the authenticity of the claims of the Other. As the modernist paradigm can no longer control or address these claims, the Self is displaced as the autonomous center and is seen increasingly for what it is—one of a multiplicity of interacting worlds of experience, or subjectivities. Rather than systems of dominance and privilege that feature some actors who consider themselves independent and singular while others are made dependent, globalism entails the recognition that we are truly interdependent (Taylor, 2004). The point is not that the values of globalism are achieving dominance; indeed, implying this would mean freezing a dialectical process. But there is no question that we are some way from the easy assurance of the privileged who sent "their best" to take up Rudyard Kipling's (1899) *White Man's Burden* to go and civilize "new-caught sullen peoples, Half devil and half child."

At a second and more concrete level, we can thus think of globalism as emerging through the process of resistance, struggle, and dialogue that begins when groups that were suppressed and silenced come to voice and bring to the table different perspectives and understandings of history and experience, which members of dominant groups are called upon to recognize. Recognition, of course, is far from a given. Struggles for power and voice are met by violence and repression, as privilege does not yield easily. Nonetheless, the world is changed by the struggles of oppressed people, as new knowledge and understandings that cannot be easily excised seep into everyday awareness and take social forms. Theorizing about Self-Other and difference would not be possible without the historical experiences through which the Other has burst onto

the scene and declared her presence. Globalism is part of a deep crisis that is forcing a reevaluation of the values, positions, and interests of all sides. Post-colonials come "home" and make the colonizer's world aware of its oppressive absences: as Paul Gilroy (1991) articulated it, "There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack." Global, post-colonial, and diasporic movements that cross borders make us increasingly aware that problems are not local but are in fact interconnected. This adds to the loss of certainty and rootlessness brought on by economics, and to potential ethnic conflicts that emerge in resistance to Others and that feed into ultranationalisms and particularly virulent forms of racism, including ethnic cleansing.

At the third level are the rise of globally-oriented non-government organizations and activist social movements driven by concerns for the environment, peace, human rights, people's rights, sustainable development, and human survival, and that are creating what is generally referred to as a global civil society. As world order theorist Richard Falk remarks, this activist strain of globalism is "an expression of the spirit of 'democracy without frontiers,' [which]…is seeking to extend ideas of moral, legal, and environmental accountability to those now acting on behalf of state, market, and media" (1993, p. 40). Transnational activism has a long history that includes Pan Africanism and international labor and solidarity movements, but it achieved new prominence starting in the 1980s, with the growth of organizations like Amnesty International, Greenpeace, Doctors Without Borders, new social movements working in solidarity with Black people in South Africa, and indigenous people and women elsewhere. The more activist strains now gathered under the umbrella of the World Social Forum came into view in the 1990s, its origins imputed alternatively to a 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, the first intercontinental meeting of people against neoliberal globalization, organized by the Zapatistas of Mexico in 1996, or the first large-scale demonstrations against the WTO, which took place in Seattle in 1999.[10] A global ethics that uses diversity as a strength and is driven, to an extent, by the imperative of solidarity in the face of monumental global problems seems to be replacing, at least in some quarters, a politics of narrow self-interests. Using the Internet and other media generated by the so-called third technological revolution (Stefanik, 1993), these movements are developing new democratic practices that undercut media control, support greater citizen involvement, and facilitate collective work by diverse and decentralized actors.

Globalization and Community Service Learning

It is time to bring this discussion back home: how does globalization relate to service-learning or, more specifically, what are the implications of its three interconnected faces for two important principles of good practice, reciprocity and meeting community needs? Recalling that one of the characteristics of globalization is its unevenness, globalization theory should be seen not as a set of universally valid tenets, but as a framework for interrogating policy and practice and acting through the particulars of a site. The two principles are discussed in separate subsections below. In each case, I consider first the perspective of the field, which entails asking how the principle is defined and put into practice and what actual or implied purposes it serves. The discussion then becomes more critical, asking how well the principle meets these purposes. Finally, I bring the perspective and contributions of globalization into the discussion. I find that both principles have their roots in exchange theory and suggest reconceptualizations that move us away from liberal and neoliberal notions of contractual relations among independent and self-interested individuals and toward approaches that consider human interconnectedness and global ethics. I am not proposing that the current principles be entirely abandoned, but that in using them to inform practice that links the global and the local, we become more aware of their implications. I do maintain however that, given the historic dimensions of globalization, it is important to consider our practice and principles in its light.

Reciprocity

This section develops two main themes. The first is that there has always been, at best, only a partial fit between the concept of reciprocity and the practice it is called upon to foster. This argument leads to the second, which proposes that the concept of interdependence is a closer fit with the aims of the field and is also more in line with the social justice and global citizenship agenda that constitutes the emergent project of globalization as globalism.

The principle of reciprocity in service-learning emerges from the need to address a recurring negative tendency in the server-served relationship. As Jane Kendall explains, "problems with paternalism, unequal relationships between the parties involved, and a tendency to focus only on charity—'doing for' or 'helping' others—rather than on supporting others to meet their own needs all became gaping pitfalls" (in Rhoads, 1997, p. 137). While a moral imperative seems to take center stage here, it is integrally joined to a pedagogical one: the issue is how to

support relationships that are not only not exploitative, but contribute something of value to all participants, understanding that these kinds of relationships and their attendant experiences are also responsible for a deeper kind of learning. For Kendall, reciprocity means an "exchange of both giving and receiving between the server and the person or group being served" (in Rhoads, p. 137), one in which all parties are learners and all are involved in determining what will be learned (also see Honnet & Poulsen, 1989). Other influential writers support this position. In a text that Campus Compact cites in its glossary, Barbara Jacoby asserts that reciprocity is needed to develop a community of learners in which "those serving and those being served [are] indistinguishable in principle, if not in practice" (in Campus Compact, n.d.). Barbara Holland (2002) adds the goals of "respect for different sources of knowledge, different contributions of each participant, a fair exchange of value, and the assurance of benefits to all participants" (p. 2). A key issue is "balancing the different perspectives that make up [service-learning] partnerships" (p. 2). It is this act of balancing service and learning and benefits to students and to the community that constitutes high quality SERVICE-LEARNING in Robert Sigmon's typology of the continuums of service and learning (Furco, 1996).

How well does reciprocity, as a concept, serve these goals? One of its important meanings is conveyed by its Latin counterpart (still used in the law), *do ut des*, literally, "I give so that you will give." Much as in a barter or market transaction, this reminds us that reciprocity is rooted in exchange theory, which looks at social networks in terms of the exchanges (material, social, psychic, political, and so on) involved in them. With its focus on calculable transactions among self-interested individuals, exchange can be seen as the sister of neoliberalism. Reciprocity is a particular kind of exchange, which, when taken beyond personal relationships to the societal level, is linked to trust and solidarity in social groups, and is thus considered an important factor in overall social integration—the glue that holds society together. But only certain kinds of exchanges are reciprocal. In a seminal article that attempted to unpack the concept, sociologist Alvin Gouldner (1960) argues that exchanges involve rights and obligations—the obligation to give and right to receive—and that reciprocity connotes a specific kind of complementarity, in which both parties have the obligation to give and right to receive. Cultural anthropologist Marshall Sahlins adds to our understanding through a well-known typology based on the interests behind the exchange, its immediacy (that is, time lapsed between giving and receiving), and its equivalence.

Gouldner's (1960) reciprocity turns out to be similar to Sahlins' (1972) *balanced reciprocity*, where there is mutuality of interests, the exchange is equitable, and parties are willing to accept a relatively short delay between giving and receiving. The ability to forgo immediacy depends on the kinds of relationships that exist between the parties, since it is the history of people's past behaviors toward each other, rather than their standardized social roles, that sustains norms of reciprocity. What obtains is a social obligation, often tinged with moral duty, to reciprocate to people with whom one has an ongoing, non-family-like relationship (close family and clan relationships fall under a different type, *generalized reciprocity*, which shades into altruism). Failure to reciprocate, such as accepting, but not returning a colleague's dinner invitations, will strain the relationship. This means that exchange relationships are easily sustained, absent some kind of compulsion, only between people who can and will reciprocate; it means, further, that except in the case of strangers engaging in barter, where reciprocity is immediate because there is no trust (Sahlins' *negative reciprocity*), those who engage in the exchange relationship are relying on a larger group's norms of reciprocity, which also include the ability to sanction deviance through such means as shame, guilt, or expulsion from the community. The classic example comes to mind of diamond dealers engaging bags of uncounted diamonds among one another, building and relying on networks of trust (see Putnam, 1993).

What does all this mean for reciprocity in the context of service-learning? It seems fairly easy to conclude that reciprocity, as here defined, is beyond the reach of typical service-learning relationships. Take, for instance, an extreme case of a type to which Kendall (in Rhoads, 1997) alluded, direct service to people of lower social status and in *needy* circumstances, as in a soup kitchen: even if powerful critical reflection deepens the students' understanding of the structural causes of hunger, and even if people who need them get nutritious meals that are respectfully served, there is exchange, but not reciprocity, in either Gouldner's (1960) or Sahlins' (1972)—or, indeed, Kendall's— terms. It seems that norms of charitable giving and responsibility to one's fellow human beings would need to be invoked to sustain involvement here, rather than reciprocity, which may also go some way toward explaining why charity orientations keep recurring.

However, as the earlier discussion of globalization suggests, twin problems arise with this orientation. First, it is likely to be an instantiation of univocality, where the server, as the dominant pole of the relationship enacts the Self, the independent one who *knows* and who *helps* a dependent Other. This is also

the orientation and nonrelationship that leads students so often to reflect on how lucky they are, in comparison to those they served, how thankful to their families and their support, in comparison to the families and lack of support of those they served—reflections that let us know, as educators and community partners, that we have failed in some important respect. Second, as multivocality erupts into the open and demands to be heard, the response of the Other to the helper's efforts may be, as it well should, other than what univocality would expect. In a different example, the hapless university students who stumble into a community meeting in an inner-city neighborhood may realize for the first time that they and the university are seen less as saviors than as self-serving intruders (Keith & Hafiz, 2002). The tensions that follow must be addressed, but reciprocity is not equal to the task. What is needed is a different kind of interaction, one that emphasizes respectful listening of perspectives and histories, together with community building and possibly advocacy in an environment that acknowledges and addresses the difficult emotions and political choices that accompany these tensions, on both sides. The important issue here, which I discuss further in the next section, is how to help these would-be partners come to dialogue and social action.

The ideas of exchange and reciprocal exchange have been further developed through the concept of social capital, and what is termed *bridging* social capital is especially relevant for service-learning, as it refers to dense networks of exchanges and relationships that support and extend trust (or generalized reciprocity) horizontally across different groups and so helps develop a sense of solidarity (and thus a kind of community) even with strangers. Youth service, as Putnam suggests, is an important way to develop this kind of social capital (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003; Siisiäinen, 2000). Returning to the examples of the soup kitchen and community meeting, the key would seem to be to promote multiple and ongoing interactions between students and participants in these other community-based activities, so that over time trust and generalized reciprocity can develop. This notion supports the importance of sustainable service-learning partnerships and has some merit, but omits important points. Kendall (in Rhoads, 1997) is right that the absence of reciprocity is especially problematic in the context of asymmetrical power relations, which easily result in deficit conceptualizations of persons of lower status—the recipients of service, in the context of the served-server relationship and the students, in the context of the student-faculty relationship. Overvaluing of one's assets and a corresponding devaluing, often to the point of invisibility, of the assets of those without access to institutionally controlled resources comes about when institutional power allows one to define the situation, determine needs, and impute value to whatever assets (knowledge, skills, resources) parties bring to the table. What is at work here is a privileging process that is normative in both elitist and meritocratic social systems, as hegemonic assumptions accord moral superiority to the socially superior, through privilege created by class, race, gender, morality, civilization, and the like.[11] Again, recall the North-South, Self-Other interaction discussed above. Can youth service be expected to help change these hegemonic assumptions, and if so, what principles shall be invoked to support practice oriented to this project?

This discussion brings home the fact that the principle of reciprocity is meant to be counternormative and even, potentially, counterhegemonic, as it proposes alternative ways of being and working with those who are, and are constructed as, underresourced with respect to oneself, which are meant to redress these asymmetries and foster more equitable exchanges, relationships, and communities—including the exchange of knowledge. The issue is how to surface, make visible, further develop, and equitably reassess the value of the resources of these "lesser" groups. This seems to be what Kendall, Jacoby, Holland (2002) and others have in mind, but this is also where reciprocity finds its limits. Shifting from paternalism and charity to this version of exchange theory does not provide a solid enough grounding for the equitable and respectful relationships across social borders that characterize high quality service-learning. In an important sense reciprocity and its related concepts remain rooted in a (market) accumulation process, which presses people into giving and receiving and ultimately creating social networks as a way of *having* more. But, as multivocality emerges from the dissolution of the Center, it calls on us to find new ways of *being* together, as interdependent global citizens and members of expanding communities. Reciprocity also falls short, therefore, because it addresses only one part of our selves, the part that stresses the rational, instrumental and calculable, that recalls Habermas' (1984) system. Globalism reminds us of the parts of our selves that speak of our interconnectedness and interdependence, and need to be reinserted into the fabric of our lives.[12]

Service-learning must thus involve more than contractual relationships, calling for dialogue not only as an exchange of ideas but as an encounter between fellow human beings. Service-learning educators need to promote the interdependence of partners rather than reciprocity between server and served. In support of this orientation, I propose refraining (and

will do so for the rest of the article) from using the terms *server* and *served*, referring instead to the service-learning relationship as a partnership (I will return to this topic in the section on meeting community needs). As used in the literature, partnerships involve more than exchange based on self- and mutual interests, and nurturing their relational aspect is an essential part of sustainability. Paulo Freire captured well the importance of dialogical encounters when he wrote, "I do not authentically think unless others think. I simply cannot think for others…or without others" (1995, p. 116). We should add, "I cannot know myself and the world except in dialogue with others." In this context, the reaction to service that says, "I am so lucky" speaks of failure because it assumes independence and separation: the other has nothing to do with me. Were a relationship of interdependence established, we may hear instead, "I was born with certain privileges and I now understand that the other side of privilege is oppression. Because I recognize myself in the other, I cannot stand by and allow the inequity continue." This is not the obligation to do for others known as *noblesse oblige.* Rather, intersubjectivity presses us toward interdependence because it is through others and in relationship with them that we come to know and fulfill a more complete sense of ourselves and the world.

Meeting Community Needs

The previous discussion has already introduced most of the concepts needed to explore the principle of meeting community needs. This principle highlights the perspective of community partners, saying, in effect, that the partner who is seen as bringing valued resources to the table will not dictate the uses to which these resources are put. As was the case for reciprocity, the principle is thus a corrective for power asymmetries: self-determination by the less powerful is a path to interrupting domination and univocality that favor the Self. This is an important point as, according to Young (2000), self-determination is one of the markers of a social justice agenda. That this agenda is central to significant segments of the field is evident through the use of asset-based approaches to identifying community projects (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993), concerns about the service-politics split (references) and, especially, *new citizenship* approaches that see service-learning as a vehicle for promoting democratic participation and public engagement (Barber, 1998; Boyte & Kari, 1996). Emphases on voice and empowerment (for students as well as the community) in the definition of needs can also be placed under this umbrella. I will return to these orientations below, as they provide some seeds for thinking about the purposes of service-learning in the context of globalization.

The above does not represent a consensus, however. When uncritically applied, as is often the case (Musil, 2003), the principle also lends support to practices anchored to service provision and even charity: the community may be construed simply as a service provider or the people in a geographic locality, who identify needs for which they have a client base, and whose mediation is not questioned. This definition of community needs is not arbitrary but derived from one of two root words for community: com-unis and com-munis (Corlett, 1993). The first means "united as one" and is the root of the concept embraced by communitarians, which emphasizes shared meanings, bonds, and a sense of belonging. Needs here emerge through a process that seeks to identify the common good. The second, which recalls the everyday sense of the term (as in "university-community partnership") means "united through service."[13] This is a minimalist community whose members are linked through reciprocal duties and obligations involving services such as those provided by a municipality. The needs that emerge as important in such a community are derived by aggregating private interests, which are then advanced through the process of interest-based politics. As the language suggests, this is the preferred conceptualization of liberalism. Following Corlett, I will use *communion* for the first and *remunity* for the second.[14]

I have already alluded to the problems that emerge from the liberal parentage of both principles under discussion. Globalization compounds the problem, since in its context certain needs become crucial and make it imperative to develop stronger versions of community that help to move from the language and assumptions underlying exchange and service provision, toward the language of interdependence, social justice, and global, multi-ethnic citizenship. Communion is also not problem-free, however, given the importance of multivocality to service-learning partnerships. There are also different definitions of citizenship here, and the one adopted should foster dialogical relationships, support communicative democracy and advance the capacity of all partners across social divisions to contribute their knowledge and resources toward public work.[15] An alternative is needed that escapes this binarism. I will temporarily postpone this discussion, since it needs to be informed by a prior accounting of the implications of globalization for the principle of meeting community needs.

Globalization, communities and their needs. Based on the earlier discussion, it is not difficult to consider the implications of globalization for how to understand the communities with whom and for

whom we work, and the factors to consider in identifying important community needs and in linking these needs to the interests of students and community partners. Considering first the socio-political realm, rebuilding social connectedness and communities that support the lifeworld is itself a community need. In this context, participants' identity needs should be important considerations in service-learning projects, beyond more visible material needs. There is a need to rebuild discursive and public spaces in local communities, which have been undermined through the combined effects of neoliberalism and time-space compression. Also essential is the need to sustain interaction and relationships across difference, promoting new democratic practices. The call is for reconstructing participants as active citizens rather than consumers, and as self-developing human beings who are members of communities. Here is the rationale for approaches to service-learning that are inward-oriented, meaning that their purpose is to support identity and community needs of service-learning participants themselves, as well as outward-oriented—partnering with others to reach toward more inclusive and expansive communities.

Second, with specific but not exclusive reference to the political-economic level, the goal of reinserting democracy and social justice into the social fabric is also deeply implicated in the project of redressing the excesses of the neoliberal corporate agenda. Social justice, as Young (2000) conceptualizes it, involves two requirements: promoting capacities for self-development and for self-determination.[16] Self-development, which is the counter to oppression, involves a set of capacities that just social institutions support when they "provide conditions for all persons to learn and use satisfying and expansive skills in socially recognized settings, and enable them to play and communicate with others or express their feelings and perspectives on social life in contexts where others can listen" (Young, 2000, pp. 31-32). Self-determination, again following Young, "consists in being able to participate in determining one's action and the condition of one's action; its contrary is domination" (p. 32). I should stress that in both instances the reference goes beyond the personal and relational, addressing institutions and social structures.

A nonexhaustive list of needs to be met through service-learning that is consciously constructed as public and democratic work and as an option for social justice would include the following. First, as the communities that are served tend to include people and organizations that are poor and underresourced, a focus on neoliberalism helps explain the systemic causes of poverty and loss of resources and identify possible solutions. For instance, there

are limits to service that prepares those at the bottom for jobs that continue to disappear; alternative directions must be considered, such as service-learning that supports sustainable communities and local economic activities (see Shuman, 1998). Second, the growing reach of private (i.e., corporate and, increasingly, religious) institutions versus public ones means people are looked upon more as customers and volunteers than as citizens. This fact reasserts the need for service-learning that stresses citizen-oriented action in public spaces, rather than defining citizenship as character education and turning students into service providers in the name of civic responsibility. It is quite laudable for college students to engage in such activities as tutoring inner-city children in reading, but it should not be to the detriment of change-oriented projects where students join others in advocating for equitable funding for urban schools. Such action may also involve what Young (2000) terms the process of struggle, that is, engagement in a politics that insists on raising issues even though those in differing social positions may feel threatened by them and would rather leave them unattended. Third, globalization influences the ways poverty is defined and experienced. Poverty here is not only a matter of the material and social resources a person has or does not have, but also of the capability to mobilize and use resources in ways that allow people to grow and act as they would wish to—again, the reference is to an expansive view of social justice, as defined above. For instance, people who cannot mobilize global technologies are at an added disadvantage, regardless of their absolute resources, as being marginalized from the technological revolution creates a new kind of poverty. The growing pressure on one's time, as job responsibilities increase, creates another. In this context, service-learning for social justice would mean supporting people's ability to mobilize (materially, socially, politically, and so on) capabilities for self-development and self-determination. This adds to the imperative of seeing service-learning work as simply meeting community needs but locating the principle squarely on the ground of global citizenship and social justice.

Creating public spaces for global citizenship and social justice. It is time to return to the question of community: What sort of collectivity should service-learning invoke, that overcomes the limits of both remunity and communion, and affirmatively supports the project indicated by my subsection title? The notion of partnership has some merit, although it needs to be rescued from its usual referent, the private sphere, and be considered a public space, in the same way that family and home are now used by some as metaphors for intersecting the public and

private—public homeplaces—in ways that blur these distinctions but ultimately support a more democratic public life and public goals (see Belenky, Bond, & Weinstock, 1997). Barbara Holland proposes that projects that join the university and the community develop lasting, sustained relationships, described as partnerships:

> effective partnerships operate as true learning communities. In a learning community and a campus-community partnership that works, every member is learning, teaching, contributing and discovering. All forms of expertise are valued, and we recognize that we have divergent goals, but by combining our different strengths, each of our needs will be met. (2002, p. 13)

This conceptualization overcomes the limits of remunity and communion in that there is a sense of collectivity that goes beyond exchange—a community of learners who are joined in ways that encounter difference as a resource and a strength. Rhoads puts these emphases in terms of traditional versus postmodern models of community: whereas a traditionalist might ask "How do we overcome our differences to create a common bond," a postmodern understanding of community would lead to the question, "How do we build upon our differences to create joint action?" (1997, pp. 86-87). Others conceptualize the relationship as democratic communitarianism, situated community, and the like (Corlett, 1993; Frazer & Lacey, 1993). In all instances, the issue becomes one of being able to connect and work together across difference. This idea brings us close to Boyte's (1996) notion of public work, which suggests a linking of the problematic of community and the problematic of the active, participatory citizenship of strong democracy. The question involves forging ways to work together that respect each participant, support their capacities, and foster their contribution to joint action. There is a connectedness and solidarity here. But what is involved in activating them in service-learning partnerships?

I believe the starting point, as both Corlett (1993) and Young (2000) suggest, is in the notion of situatedness, which means recognizing that participants are entering the field as subjects with histories, experiences, relationships, social positions, and that situatedness creates the window through which people look at the world and interact with others. I want to look at the idea of situatedness and consider that a major task of service-learning is not forming bonds of communion but reaching for understanding across difference in ways that enable working together toward goals of social justice. It is this understanding, I argue, that is necessary for valoriz-

ing the assets of the other and seeing difference itself as an asset rather than a deficit. And it is only when we accomplish this goal that we are able to combine the situated knowledge each of us has, creating social knowledge that can be applied to our (public) work in common. Globalization greatly adds to the need for public spaces for dialogue, as its multiple and vastly complex problems cannot be solved by experts but require the collective knowledge of differently positioned people. Recall, however, that these same people who should work together may resolve identity and community problems as discussed under time-space compression, by returning to different kinds of fundamentalisms that essentially entail the refusal of dialogue, as Self and Other affirm oppositional (binary) constructs of the world in terms of evil wrongdoers and innocent victims.

Understanding across difference is a central focus in Iris Marion Young's (1997) book, *Intersecting Voices*. Young argues that it is not possible or advisable to follow the old metaphor of putting ourselves in the other's place when attempting to understand their perspective; instead, we should use the metaphor of voice and communication:

> The way I come to understand the other person is by constructing identification and reversibility between us, which means I am never really transcending my own experience. But we can interpret understanding others as sometimes getting out of ourselves and learning something new. Communication is sometimes a creative process in which the other person offers a new expression, and I understand it not because I am looking for how it fits with given paradigms, but because I am open and suspend my assumptions in order to listen. (pp. 52-53)

There is no need to start out with shared goals and bonds. The bonds are created, rather, by sharing one's own gifts and telling and listening to the stories that do connect us. Young adds:

> A condition of our communication is that we acknowledge . . . that others drag behind them shadows and histories, scars and traces, that do not become present in our communication. . . . This implies that we have the moral humility to acknowledge that even though there may be much I do understand about the other person's perspective through her communication to me and through the constructions we have made common between us, there is also always a remainder, much that I do not understand about the other person's experience and perspective. (p. 53)

This means that practices that stress the rational and the calculable, as is the case with democratic

deliberation and the task- and goal-orientation that prevails in bureaucratic institutions and what Habermas (1984) calls systems, need to be complemented with processes and narratives that support the lucid and relational sides of community building and create new supports for the lifeworld. Young (2000) discusses communicative democracy as involving three modes of communication which, added to deliberation, support practices of inclusion: the greeting, rhetoric, and story telling. Narrative, in particular, "exhibits the situated knowledge available from various social locations, and the combination of narratives from different perspectives produces a collective social wisdom not available from any one position" (Young, p. 76).

Clearly, it is not a matter of instituting new practices, as they already exist, but of giving subaltern and marginalized practices an honored, respected, and legitimate public space alongside the dominant discourse modes that have traditionally looked on them with suspicion, impatience, and disdain. This will signal openness to multivocality and invite interactions that support people in communicating socially situated knowledge as a necessary contribution to collaborative involvement in community problem solving—an important aspect of global citizenship.[17] In this regard, the identification of needs should be dialogical and driven by the values of social justice rather than univocal, as under the aegis of "meeting community needs." Power should not fall back on the professionals and experts, but it is essential that both local and expert knowledge be seen as equally valued contributions.

On the level of service-learning as (global) community problem solving, this orientation supports the sense of interdependence, since we become aware that alone on our own or with people we think are like us, we create a vision of the world that does not work. Gated communities do not work; development as the growth of the GNP and the "bads" does not work; univocality and the expert do not work, and neither does retreat into fundamentalism. What is needed is multivocality and interdependence as a global ethic that is not based on idealistic, rose colored glasses, but on the solid understanding of a reality that stands counterposed to the singular, partial, and dark colored glasses of neoliberalism. Ultimately, I listen and engage in dialogue and storytelling not because I want to be nice but because, on so many levels, it answers my personal and our collective needs.

Service-Learning in the Quest of Globalism

Listening for our own deep needs and hearing the reality of the others thus becomes a central goal of service-learning. What do I tell you, my readers, and my students about this purpose and how one encounters it? At first, I created a list. Then I thought of two stories.

Situatedness and belonging. I stand in the hallway of the school, near the main entrance, waiting for our high school partners, as I have done so many times before. A buzzer, an unpleasant ring, and the empty place is suddenly full of young people greeting, smiling, hugging, recognizing each other and being happy for it, forgetting that they are going about what we call changing classes. I stand outside the moment, separated from it in so many ways. And yet I smile too, comfortable with the seeming chaos, the life of it, as I did not when I first came. I will never really belong here and the bonds of trust will always need reweaving and repairing. But I have so many stories to tell, good stories and hard stories, stories of learning. These traces, these memories that are not visible to the students who throng the halls, greeting, hugging, laughing, forming communities of which I will never be a part—these memories are now part of me. This space has become me through my experience, and over time it has changed me and the stories I tell. I do not belong here, but long-term connections have made these spaces and the people in them familiar and softened the feeling of strangeness. I care about this place and the people in it.

Learning for global justice. This is not my personal story but I did connect with it, in a strong sort of way. It is the story of a group of middle-school children and the webs of connectedness they wove with their questions and needs. As told through a new film, *Paperclip*, it illustrates a developing global ethics and global community, facilitated by the new media, and has implications for both the principles of interdependence and global justice.

Through an after school project in a small, White protestant town in rural Tennessee, teachers and students embarked on trying to understand the enormity of the Holocaust (http://www.marionschools.org/holocaust/index.htm). Learning through the Internet that Norwegians had pinned paperclips to their lapels to symbolize their "binding together" in protest against the Nazis, the students decided to collect 6 million paperclips, one for each person killed in the Holocaust. Their Web site caught the attention of a Holocaust survivor and German journalists in the Washington area. As the project became known, others got involved, and paperclips started pouring in, eventually from 49 states and 19 countries, each with the name and story of a family member who had died in the camps or, less often, survived them. People in the town started talking, not only about the Holocaust, but also about local and personal issues. One told a story of a Black roommate in college, regretting how he had treated him. A rail car like the

ones that had carried Jews to the concentration camps was transported to the town from Germany, becoming the Children's Holocaust Memorial, which houses 11 million of the paperclips collected (29 million in all), and their stories (Milk, 2004).

A close reading of the story reveals that much giving and receiving happened in the course of the project, but my sense is that reciprocity would not help understand what makes it so wonderful and cannot help consider how to construct similarly wonderful service-learning experiences. The students started collecting paperclips because they could not comprehend the enormity of the Holocaust and asked, out of their own need, for a way to experience it. What happened subsequently speaks of a desire to share who we are and of the powerful learning that comes when we expand our understandings and our worlds by reaching toward one another. Recognition of the other brings a deeper kind of learning that spreads outward and does create a larger sense of humanity, as only the poet can express it: "I am large. I contain multitudes" (Whitman, 1900). There is giving and receiving, but not as an exchange. Instead, relationships are forged that help us understand our reality as connected to the reality of the other, that build communities to sustain the lifeworld, and create memories and traces that remind us of the needs of the world and call on us, through struggle, to work to make another world possible.

Notes

[2] On service-learning as relates to topics linked to globalization, see Barber, 1998; Boyle-Baise, 2002; Claus & Ogden, 1999; Harkavy, 2004; Hyatt, 2001; Rhoads, 1997; Westheimer & Kahne, 2002. On service-learning and globalization, see Subotsky (1999a & b) on university-based service-learning to counter negative effects of globalization in South Africa; and Gillespie (2003) on designing partnerships for international exchange programs based on genuine reciprocity.

[3] For some sources on the commercialization of universities (one effect of neoliberalism), see Enders, 2004; Fusarelli & Boyd, 2004. For the more general topic of globalization and education, see Burbules & Torres, 2000; Reynolds, Griffith, & Gunn, 2004. On specific aspects of globalization and education, as relates to diversity, world peace, language rights, immigration, and equitable partnerships, see Banks, 2003; Gillespie, 2003; Suarez-Orozco, 2001. On the spread of neoliberal reform policies that emphasize privatization, decentralization, business partnerships and increasing inequality, see Blackmore, 2000;

Fitzsimons, 2000; Lipman, 2003; Spring, 1998).

[4] The OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) includes 30 powerful countries—most of the North, plus Turkey, Mexico and some Central European, formerly socialist countries. One of its major roles is to collect data for policy development. See http://www.oecd.org/home/. The IMF and World Bank were created by the major world powers in the aftermath of World War II, to promote international trade and economic development, largely as defined by and in the interest of these Northern powers. The South is not represented on these bodies. For overviews, see Isbister, 1998.

[5] With its roots in a philosophy and politics that saw the North as modern and civilized and the South as backward, savage, and needing to be *modernized*, neoliberal globalization can be seen as part of a long trend of expansionism that includes voyages of exploration as well as colonial and neocolonial exploits (see Blaut, 1993; Bodley, 1982). The ascendancy of neoliberalism as a specific economic theory that supports development (and modernization) through the free market, however, dates to the 1970s. There is also a history of resistance, the main forms of which involved delinking from the global capitalist system or attempting to negotiate dependence on it (for instance, dependency theory; African or democratic socialism. See Isbister, 1998).

[6] Most benefits from free trade liberalization accrue to the already privileged in the top income brackets. In Mexico, for instance, the top 10 percent income groups gained the most (Stiglitz, 2002). A study by the International Labour Office (ILO, 2004) found that young people (ages 15 to 24), who represent 25 percent of the world's working population, constitute 47 percent of the 186 million who are out of work.

[7] The dual or segmented labor market refers to the increasing gulf that separates those who retain well-paid jobs with benefits, career ladders, and the like in the relatively privileged sectors of the economy from the so-called flexible sectors whose part-time workers form a new underclass that does not receive benefits, job security, or a living wage. See Beck, Giddens, & Lash, 1994.

[8] Different conceptions of the political subject as either the rational, unencumbered individual or the embedded and embodied member of a community constitute a major debating point between liberals and communitarians. Habermas' contribution, by way of critical theory and discourse ethics, makes him, per Frazer & Lacey (1993), a "kind of communitarian."

[9] This is linked to the technology revolution that is at the core of time-space compression. The culture industry is increasingly able to use communications media to produce hyperreality, which evacuates cultural products of their meanings by using them in ways that reproduce only the empty appearances of an artificial reality. Market researchers are known to use psychological tests in focus groups to determine which emotions attach to their products, so as to better manipulate our buying habits. Some use hypnosis to reach into participants' deeper emotional states. *Frontline*, National Public Radio, November 9, 2004.

[10] See Della Porta, 2003; Falk, 1993; Stefanik, 1993. For

a critical theory perspective on these new social movements, see Kellner, 2000. For an accessible teaching-oriented publication, see Bigelow & Peterson, 2002; also http://www.rethinkingschools.org.

[11] Poverty and other markers of inequality are constructed as individual or cultural deficits rather than in terms of oppression and structured social inequalities. Deficit constructions are a more pronounced problem in direct or indirect service, and less so when service is constructed as advocacy.

[12] Other definitions of reciprocity have not been taken into account in this review. For instance, in psychoanalysis: "'Reciprocity' is a condition of the ethical relationship, whereby both self and other are obliged to transcend their narcissistic egoism. Mutual recognition of this obligation includes searching for commonalities and points of difference, as well as the recognition of the other's singularity." See Wrye (1999). For a discussion of reciprocity that focuses on the pedagogical relationship in service-learning, see Ramsdell (2004).

[13] According to Ed Cohen (2003), "the root *munis*, from which we also derive our contemporary word *municipal*, gestures toward responsibility for 'shared duties, charges, or services.'" In its original Roman usage, *munis* signified a range of possible social practices and obligations: service, function, duty, gift, favor, kindness, tax; public entertainment, gladiatorial show, tribute (to the dead), rite, sacrifice, public office. *Munera* were those specific practices that defined the public burden of Roman citizens and therefore were incumbent upon them as citizens."

[14] Liberal theorists are also called "reciprocity theorists" (see Corlett, 1993). Remunity relates to the cost-benefit calculus, as in *remuneration*. There is a huge literature on the liberal and communitarian approaches to community and an equally huge literature of critique and attempts to get beyond the binary opposites through which the two perspectives are often constructed (i.e., individual freedom versus the bonds of belonging), by writers in the feminist, postmodern, and postcolonial vein. I have found interesting insights especially in Corlett (1993), Frazer & Lacy (1993), and Young (2000).

[15] The concept of public work was developed by Harry Boyte (see Boyte & Kari, 1996). As defined in the Center for Democracy and Citizenship, which Boyte co-directs, "Public work is sustained, visible, serious effort by a diverse mix of ordinary people that creates things of lasting civic or public significance... Public work is different than citizenship as charity, or community service where the emphasis is on helping the needy. It is also different than protest politics, which demonizes an enemy. Public work interacts with the world to leave a leggy. It changes the community, the larger world, and the people involved." www.publicwork.org/1_2_philosophy.html.

[16] Amartya Sen (1999), whose work informs Young's, argues that poverty should be measured not by lack of material possessions but in terms of "capability deprivation," that is, development should be about expanding the capability (freedom) of people to lead the kind of lives they value-and have reason to value" (1999, 18). This has to do

with "understanding poverty and deprivation in terms of lives people can actually lead and the freedoms they do actually have. The expansion of human capabilities fits directly into these basic considerations" (1999, p. 92). "Income poverty" and "capability poverty" are related.

[17] A hugely important task here will involve surfacing and addressing fears and conflicts among participants. See Keith et al., 2003; Rojzman, 1999.

References

Ainger, K. (2002). To open a crack in history; Movements for global justice in the 21st century. In B. Bigelow & B. Peterson (Eds.), *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world* (pp. 342-345). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Albrow, M., Eade, J., Durrschmidt, J., & Washbourne, N. (1997). The impact of globalization on sociological concepts: Community, culture and milieu. In J. Eade (Ed.), *Living the global city; Globalization as local process* (pp. 20-36). New York: Routledge.

Anonymous (2004, September). Hate among youth becomes widespread. *Southern Law Poverty Report*, *34*(3), 1.

Banks, J.A. (ed.) (2003). *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barber, B. R. (1995). *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Times Books.

Barber, B. R. (1998). Democracy at risk. *World Policy Journal*, *15*(2), 29-42.

Bauman, Z. (2001). Community; Seeking safety in an insecure world. Cambridge, MA: Polity.

Beamer, G. (1998). Service-learning: What's a political scientist doing in Yonkers? *PS: Political Scientist & Politics*, *31*, 557-61.

Beck, U., Giddens, A., & Lash, S. (1994). *Reflexive modernization; Politics, tradition, aesthetics in the modern social order*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Belenky, M.F., Bond, L.A., & Weinstock, J.S. (1999). *A tradition that has no name: Nurturing the development of people, families and communities*. New York: Basic.

Bigelow, B. & Peterson, B. (Eds.) (2002). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world* (pp. 342-345). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Billig, S. H. (2000). Research on K-12 school-based service learning: The evidence builds. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *81*(9), 658-664.

Blackmore, J. (2000). Warning signals or dangerous opportunities? Globalization, gender, and educational policy shifts. *Educational Theory*, *50*(4), 467-486.

Blaut, J. M. (1993). *The colonizer's model of the world; Geographical diffusionism and eurocentric history*. New York: Guilford.

Bodley, J. H. (1982). *Victims of progress*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Bourdieu, P. (1998, December). Utopia of endless exploitation; The essence of neoliberalism. *Le Monde Diplomatique*. Retrieved January 17, 1999, from http://www.en.monde-diplomatique.fr/1998/12/08/bourdieu.html

Boyle-Baise, M. (2002). *Multicultural service learning: Educating teachers in diverse communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Boyte, H.C. & Kari, N.N. (1996). *Building America: The democratic promise of public work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Brock-Utne, B. (2000). Peace education in an era of globalization. *Peace Review*, *12*(1), 1313-138.

Burbules, N.C. & Torres, C.A. (Eds.) (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Campus Compact (n.d.). *Glossary*. Retrieved November 3, 2004, from http://www.compact.org/aboutcc/glossary/glossary.html

Claus, J. & Ogden, C. (Eds.) (1999). *Service learning for youth empowerment and social change*. New York: Peter Lang.

Cohen, E. (2003). Metaphorical immunity: A case of biomedical fiction. *Literature and Medicine*, *22*(2), 140-163 (Muse database).

Corlett, W. (1993). *Community without unity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Della Porta, D. (2003). *Democracy in movement: Organizational dilemma and globalization from below*. Colloque "Les mobilisations altermondialistes," December 3-5, Paris, France. Retrieved March 29, 2004, from http://www.afsp.msh-paris.fr/activite/groupe/germm/collgermm03txt/germm03dellaporta.pdf

Enders, J. (2004). Higher education, internationalisation, and the nation state: Recent developments and challenges to governance theory. *Higher Education*, *47*(3), 361-382.

Falk, R. (1993). The making of global citizenship. In J. Brecher, J.B. Childs, & J. Cutler, (Eds.), *Global visions: Beyond the new world order* (pp. 39-50). Boston: South End.

Falk, R. (1999). *Predatory globalization: A critique*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Fitzsimons, P. (2000). Changing conceptions of globalization: Changing conceptions of education. *Educational Theory*, *50*(4), 505-520.

Frazer, E. & Lacey, N. (1993). *The politics of community; A feminist critique of the liberal-communitarian debate*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Freire, P. (1995). *Pedagogy of hope; Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Furco, A. (1996). Service-learning: A balanced approach to experiential education. In *Expanding boundaries: Service and learning* (pp. 2-6). Washington, D.C.: Corporation for National Service. Retrieved December 20, 2004, from http://www.floridacompact.org/resources/files/furco.html

Fusarelli, B. C. & Boyd, W. L. (Eds.) (2004). Introduction: One nation indivisible? An overview of the Yearbook. *Educational Policy*, *18*(1), 5-11.

Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond left and right: The future of radical politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gillespie, S. (2003, Winter). Toward "genuine reciprocity"; Reconceptualizing international liberal education in the era of globalization. *Liberal Education*, 6-15.

Gilroy, P. (1991). *'There ain't no black in the Union Jack': The cultural politics of race and nation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goldsmith, T. (2001). Poverty: The child of progress. *The Ecologist*, *31*(6). Retrieved from http://www.theecologist.org/archive_article.html?article=107 (December 20, 2004).

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The Norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review* 25: 161-178. Retrieved April 4, 2004, from http://www2.pfeiffer.edu/~lridener/courses/NORMRECP.HTML

Greider, W. (1997). *One world, ready or not: The manic logic of global capitalism*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Habermas, J. (1984). The theory of communicative action, Vol. 2. Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason. (translated by Thomas McCarthy). Boston: Beacon.

Harkavy, I. (2004). Service-learning and the development of democratic universities, democratic schools, and democratic good societies in the 21st century. In M. Welch & S.H. Billig, (Eds.), *New perspectives in service-learning; Research to advance the field* (pp. 3-22). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the global order*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Holland, B. A. (2002, April 17). *Every perspective counts: Understanding the true meaning of reciprocity in partnerships*. Keynote address at the Western Regional Campus Compact Conference, Portland, Oregon. http://www.acadweb.wwu.edu/campcomp/pdf/5thCOSAnnualProceedings.pdf

Honnet, E. P. & Poulsen, S. J. (1989). *Principles of good practice for combining service and learning*. Racine, IL: Johnson Foundation, Wingspread Conference Center. Retrieved May 6, 2002, from http://www.johnsonfdn.org/principles.html

Hyatt, S.B. (2001). From citizen to volunteer: Neoliberal governance and the erasure of poverty. In J. Goode and J. Maskovsky (Eds.), *New poverty studies: The ethnography of politics, policy and impoverished people in the US*. New York: New York University Press.

International Labour Office (2004). *Global Emploment Trends for Youth 2004*

Isbister, J. (1998). *Promises not kept; The betrayal of social change in the Third World*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian.

Keith, N. Z., Cavanaugh, C., Islam, S., Hafiz, F., Malandra, K., Mather, K., et al. (2003, March). *Partnerships as new ground: Between private enterprise and democratic possibilities*. Practitioners' keynote, Ethnography in Education Raesearch Forum, Center for Urban Ethnography, University of Pennsylvania.

Keith, N. Z., & Hafiz, F. (2002, October). *Working "with" the community; Service learning, community partners, and learning in partnership*. Paper presented at the annual International Service Learning Research Conference, Nashville, TN.

Keith, N. W. (1999). *Reframing international development; Globalism, postmodernity, and difference*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kellner, D. (2000). Globalization and new social movements; Lessons for critical theory and pedagogy. In N.C. Burbules & C.A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 299-321). New York: Routledge.

Kipling, R. (1899, February). The White man's burden: The United States and the Philippine Islands. *McClure's Magazine*. Retrieved February 15, 2005, from http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5478/

Klein, N. (2001, May-June). Reclaiming the commons. *New Left Review*, *9* (Online).

Korten, D.C. (1995). *When corporations rule the world*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian.

Kretzmann, J. & McKnight, J.L. *Building communities from the inside out*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, Institute for Policy Research.

Lipman, P. (2003). *High stakes education; Inequality, globalization, and urban school reform*. New York: Routledge.

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media*. New York: Mentor.

Milk, L. (2004, Aug.). "Can you feel the souls?" How a children's memorial of 11 million paperclips came to touch many lives. *Washingtonian Online*. Retrieved December 15, 2004, from http://www.washingtonian.com/people/paperclips.html

Morrow & Torres, C.A. (2000). The state, globalization, and education policy. In N.C. Burbules & C.A.Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 27-56). New York: Routledge.

Musil, C. (2003, Spring). Educating for citizenship. *Peer Review*. Retrieved January 18, 2005, from http://www.aacu-edu.org/peerreview/pr-sp03/pr-sp03feature1.cfm

O'Byrne, K. (2001, Summer). How professors can promote service-learning in a teaching institution. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *114*, 79-87.

Putnam, R. D. (1993, Spring). The prosperous community: Social capital and public life. *The American Prospect*, *13*, http://epn.org/prospect/13/13putn.html.

Putnam, R.D. & Feldstein, L.M. (2003). *Better together: Restoring the American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ramsdell, L. (2004, June). *Reciprocity: The heart of service-learning*. Paper presented at the International Literacy and Education Research Network Conference, Havana, Cuba.

Reynolds, C., Griffith, A., & Gunn, G.I. (2002). *Equity and globalization in education*. Detselig Enterprises.

Rhoads, R. A. (1997). *Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Rizvi, F. (2000). International education and the production of global imagination. In N.C. Burbules & C.A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 205-225). New York: Routledge.

Rojzman, C. (1999). *How to live together: A new way of dealing with racism and violence* (English translation published by Acland Press, St. Kilda, Western Australia).

Sahlins, M. D. (1972). *Stone age economics*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.

Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and its discontents: Essays on the new mobility of people and money*. New York: The New Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Anchor.

Sen, A. (2002). How to judge globalism. *The American Prospect Online*, *13*(1).

Shuman, M. (1998). *Going local; Creating self-reliant communities in a global age*. New York: Free Press.

Siisiäinen, M. (2000). *Two concepts of social capital: Bourdieu vs. Putnam*. Paper presented at the Fourth Conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research, Dublin, Ireland, July 5-8. Retrieved December 2, 2004, from http://www.jhu.edu/~istr/conferences/dublin/workingpapers/siisiainen.pdf

Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the rise of the global economy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Ehrlbaum.

Stanton, T.K., Giles, D.E., & Cruz, N.I. (1999). *Service-learning; A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stefanik, N. (1993). Sustainable dialogue/sustainable development. In J. Brecher, J.B. Childs, & J. Cutler (Eds.), *Global visions: Beyond the new world order* (pp. 263-272). Boston: South End.

Stiglitz, J. (n.d.). *We have to make globalization work for all*. YaleGlobal Online. Retreived April 2, 2004, from http://globalenvision.org/library/3/551

Stiglitz, J. (2002, Jan. 1). Globalism's discontents. *The American Prospect Online*. http://www.prospect.org/web/printfriendly-view.ww?id=5992

Suarez-Oroszco, M. (2001). Globalization, immigration, and education; The research agenda. *Harvard Educational Review*, *71*(3), 345-365.

Subotsky, G. (1999a). Alternatives to the entrepreneurial university; New modes of knowledge production in community service programs. *Higher Education*, *38*, 401-440.

Subotsky, G. (1999b). Beyond the entrepreneurial university: The potential role of South Africa's historically disadvantaged institutions in reconstruction and development. *International Review of Education*, *45*(5/6), 507-527.

Taylor, R. (Ed.) (2004). *Interpreting global civil society*. Hartford, CT: Kumarian.

Walter, T. (2000). The service/politics split: Rethinking service to teach political engagement. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *September*, http://www.apsanet.org/PS/Sept00/robinson.cfm

Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2002). Educating the "good" citizen; The politics of school-based civic education programs. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association, Boston, August 2002. Retrieved October 12, 2004, from http://apsaproceedings.cup.org/Site/papers/009/009001Westheimer.pdf

Whitman, W. (1900). "Song of Myself," 51. In Leaves of Grass. Retrieved February 15, 2005, from http://www.bartleby.com/142/14.html

Wyre, H. K. (1999). Shadow of the Other; Intersubjectivity and gender in psychoanalysis, by Jessica Benjamin. Reviewed by Harriet Kimble Wyre. Book Review. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, Vol. 47. Online, Dallas Society for Psychoanalytic Psychology. Retrieved December 18, 2004, from http://www.dspp.com/reviews/wrye.htm

Young, I. M. (1997). *Intersecting voices: Dilemmas of gender, political philosophy, and policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Author

NOVELLA ZETT KEITH is a sociologist whose work straddles Third World studies and urban education studies. She is a lead faculty for service-learning in the College of Education at Temple University and secretary of an NGO, Edu-Tourism, which brings groups to Jamaica for international service learning that interfaces with local community development. She is interested in service-learning that supports democratic practices and building communities of difference.