Chapter Two: Part II:
Planning and Paying for Spontaneous, Free, Voluntary Participation:
Experience as the Moral Basis of Civic Participation

The Moral World of the Volunteer

The ideal source of volunteers' inspiration was supposed to be deeply heartfelt, personal, and individual. A model was experience that VJ, a successful teen volunteer, president of the Regional Youth Empowerment Project (the Regional YEP, a socially diverse county-sponsored service club of about 20, that met monthly to plan volunteer projects) described in a proud but humble voice at the group's meeting:

> I went to Disneyland over Spring Break and there was this family that had taken their child there. She was terminally ill, and going there was her one big wish. She was so skinny and pale, but she was so happy to be there! They let me go around with her one day—I'll never forget it—I was just so-I mean, I couldn't go to work for four days after that. I couldn't leave the house without thinking of this little girl and everything she was going through. I wrote about it for my college entrance essay and gave it to my English teacher. He really liked it—he said it was so touching, it actually made him shed a tear.

This was the kind of experience that adults and youth alike held as the goal; something life changing, frightening, touching one's core, coming straight from a common humanity, personal, fervent, individual, direct. Such poignant, personal, spontaneous experience was rare, and to be treasured.

The group was excited by the idea, but, alas, it turned out the hospital had rules about visitors: the group's first choice was to throw a party for the hospitalized kids, but that would involve exposing the volunteers and the sick kids to unpredictable germs. It would require getting approval for each ingredient of each brownie and cupcake, for kids whose illnesses often involved special diets—too much work for the hospital, in other words. Then the youth volunteers decided that maybe just reading to sick kids would be good. But volunteers under 18 years old require intense supervision, and that required a large investment hospital staff's time—too large, unless the kids were planning on working there weekly for a year or more, which they were not.

After these backs-and-forths, it turned out that there would be almost no possibility of direct contact with kids, except for those who were not very sick. VJ reported to the group,

> This policy might change soon, especially if the Regional YEP shows itself to be responsible. So, in the meantime, the hospital suggested helping decorate the walls for Christmas.

When the time came, the project no longer felt so heartfelt; only three of the 20 or so Regional YEP teens participated, along with about fifteen kids from the local university, who had also come for a plug-in

volunteering opportunity, through their own service-learning program. Still, the original inspiration was so perfectly in harmony with the moral world of the volunteer, the tale of the hospital visit was retold often (minus the part about only three kids coming, of course).

Civic organizations and community service groups like these, the world over, often say that they're modeling their work after American civil society, à la Tocqueville: classic volunteer groups composed of small, hands-on, unfunded, grassroots, self-organized local citizens who band together to accomplish something that affects them directly, based on their own, detailed, direct experience of a unique locale.

They base their work on the "*moral world of the volunteer*."

While this moral world's volunteer work is "free" in both senses of the word--costless (Free kittens!) and uncoerced, unconstrained, not compelled by any thing beyond its own steam (Free political prisoners!)--nobody in the hybrid youth groups settings could avoid noticing that volunteering was not free in either sense. Volunteering cost money and it took many layers of paid employees' elaborate advance planning and justifying. As the stories will show, these top-down efforts do not work like volunteer groups. They do *not* promote democracy and civic engagement the way that classic volunteer groups do, but they *do* promote them in some ways that classic volunteer groups do not do.

Everyday experience and everyday life, according to adults' image of volunteer work, is supposed to be the volunteer's source of inspiration; but in the scrambled youth programs, most of kids' everyday lives outside of school were spent in these hybrid youth groups: semi-government, semi-large non-governmental organization (NGO), semi-family, semi-voluntary associations. Activities that got called "volunteering" did not bubble up from the community directly; they happened only because large bureaucracies spent time and money on encouraging both youth and adults to volunteer. Experience, community, voluntary participation; each step was a puzzle.

The problem, for adults' understanding of volunteering, is that institutions are, themselves, part of experience: adults did not want this to be the case, but adults and youth alike implicitly knew that the hybrid youth programs had to *create* "experience" actively, from the top down. They could not talk about that without undermining the moral world of the volunteer. Organizing spontaneous voluntary participation

took a lot of money and planning. It had to be done on purpose, measured and made explicit and publicly accessible.

Despite the explicit moral world about volunteer work, young people quickly developed an "institutional intuition" about the settings--a stock of "experience" that was, in fact, the experience of institutions. We could say that the young people were "thinking through organizations." That is, when asked to "draw on your own experience," to dream up projects, "no matter what the cost," they often just stayed realistic, dreaming only of projects that local scrambled organizations were *already doing*. These beacons—the other hybrid organizations, that is--marked the social horizon the way buoys mark a bay.[1] When asked to "draw on your experience," youth did exactly that, realistically drawing on their experience of local scrambled organizations and of the types of projects those organizations do.

But adults had another unspoken idea of "experience" in mind. Adults, as we will see here, in this chapter, shared a more mystical ideal about volunteering, which roots democratic character in the soil of deeply private, local experience (Kateb 1992, Stout 2002, e.g.). In the adults' understanding of volunteer work, this intense, private experience, is, in turn, the basis of a deep connection with others: as 19th century essayist and poet Ralph Waldo Emerson put it (in a once-canonical essay for U.S. high schools, "Self-Reliance"), "the most personal is the most universal." Volunteering is, in the adults' minds, the opposite of institution, repetition, calculation, money, planning and bureaucracy. The history of this moral world will be discussed in Chapter Nine; it has many sources, going all the way back to the Puritans' belief in the importance of experiencing God directly rather than through the medium of the church hierarchy. But whatever its roots, it treats participation as something that has to draw on very individual experience, that can never be explicitly taught, but can only be experienced first hand, directly; and that must be based on "local knowledge (Geertz 1970)"--deep familiarity with people and places, not abstractions. Each local group is supposed to discover it for itself, each individual for him or herself. In this way, voluntary participation connects personality, good citizenship, and spiritual wholeness, all in one stroke (Henkel and Stirrat 2001; Wuthnow 1999; Lichterman 1996). In the eyes of these fairly typical Americans, paying

[1] The importance of this may become clearer through a bit of etymology: word "repertoire" comes from the French word "reperer," which means to get one's bearings; these organizations formed their repertoire, they were the landmarks, the statues that you use to orient yourself, the list of plays you need to be literate, the way a repertory theater performs a stock of standard plays.

attention to institutions, organizations, social pressures and material pressures would have mean losing the game before it started.

The moral world of the volunteer required a lot of work to maintain in these scrambled organizations. To continue to exist, youth civic engagement projects needed public funding. That meant they had to talk about volunteer work *explicitly and measure it*, to prove to various publics that they were encouraging kids to do the kind of deeply personal, soul-searching community-based volunteer work that Americans value. They had to document it, per hour of work, per ton of food delivered, per capita, or by some other measure that would be easy to communicate quickly to potential funders. To get funding, adults also had to plan far in advance, even before most members had joined the group, but they had to make sure kids felt that they had done the planning themselves, or at least looked like they had.

And the groups had to make sure that they were equally accessible to all, so they had to attract new volunteers, volunteers who did not fit the typical image, who maybe were not doing so well in school, or maybe were not very sociable, not "the usual suspects," in a city administrator's frequent words. So they also had to make sure volunteering was *easy*. How, if at all, does the meaning of volunteering change when it is made explicit, publicized, and measured, planned months or even years in advance, made easy and accessible? Here, the moral world of the volunteer smashed into all these procedures of accounting, and of rendering transparent and accessible to all; how does this situation matter, if at all?

Adults' goal was to encourage youth to reach what Emerson called the "internal ocean" that stretches on, infinitely blue, past the limiting horizons of institutions, to a place where each individual stands alone, whole, free of social conditions. This love should have no "conditions (Nussbaum 2000, Dumont 1996);" young people were thought to be more able than jaded old adults to reach down into that universal self; youth embodied this mystical, utopian hope in the life of the local culture. But the young people could not ignore the usual ground on which they walked, which was chock full of organizations, groups, rules, categories like rich and poor, black and white, and funders of various sorts, not just individuals. Active youth participants eagerly learned, through observation, the difference between, for example, "nonprofits," "city agencies," donors who had no ulterior motive and commercial donors; they; knew that the hybrid groups existed only because of "conditions"—poverty, racism, suicidal loneliness, the black-white achievement gap (that was so well-known in town, kids themselves made public reference to

it!). Young people's institutional intuitions were clear, but it was hard to make adults talk to them about them.

The mystical moral world had to be proclaimed directly, before many different audiences. In trying explicitly and quickly to put the story of this emotionally powerful model of direct experience in play, adults thus inadvertently ignored kids' direct experience. While adults explicitly measured conditions for funders, and filled out applications long in advance, they tried to make their groups' institutional "conditions" invisible to the youth participants. But the game of hide-and-seek was impossible to keep up for more than a few minutes at a stretch. The moral world of the volunteer hits different frictions in these hybrid groups than it could hit in "classic volunteer groups (Hustinx 2001)," in which money and public justification and equal access are not mandatory conditions for a group's existence.

Here are people trying hard to put a world in play in an unlikely situation; they invoke this world all the time, while at the same time, every step they take registers their knowledge of the ground on which they walk: that it is not exactly "free, voluntary, spontaneous and local." This chapter, and the book as a whole, traces these sleights of hand, this dance of implicitness and explicitness in the civic engagement project that the scrambled organizations sponsor. What good does it do to try to put this moral world in play here? What harm? What can be said, and what cannot? How do discourses soak up meaning from the contexts in which they are spoken, from members' knowledge of the speaker and the intended audiences? What do participants think they are learning? What do they learn without knowing that they have learnt it?

PAYING and PLANNING: Expensive Volunteering

The departure from the first definition of free—"costless"-- was never far from organizers' minds—neither youth nor adult organizers'. One of the projects on which many youth volunteers worked every year was the planning of Snowy Prairie's annual Martin Luther King Day. This may sound like a small, inconsequential affair, but one-day-long youth-led events like this were the mainstay of local youth volunteering, and planning for the January events began in August each year. Roberta, the Metropolitan Snowy Prairie Recreation Programs coordinator of youth volunteering, was late to this Martin Luther King

Day planning meeting in the Teen Community Center. About twelve young people and eight adults waited for her.

> Connie [adult paid part time, by federal grants and city money, to help young people plan the local celebration of Martin Luther King Day]: What should we do till Roberta gets here?
>
> Jim [employed by Urban League]: The goal is to get *youth* to organize, so let's just get *them* to talk!
>
> [The teens and youth workers alike keep asking, "What happened at Martin Luther King Day last year?" and those who were involved answer, but hesitantly, since the goal is to have to youth be *leaders*, not follow in anyone's footsteps.]
>
> Roberta walks in [*wanting* to assume that kids are already taking leadership in planning, and business can continue without her, the adult leader]: Sorry I'm late--I don't mean to interrupt.
>
> Connie: You're not interrupting.
>
> Destiny [adult employee of a community center]: How much money do we have?
>
> Jim and Roberta both say, at once: About $10,000.
>
> Jim: Do you have an agenda?
>
> Roberta: First: if there's no funding, do we still want to do it?
>
> Destiny: I think so.
>
> Connie: What's the 'worst case scenario?' Do it in a high school [that is, some cheap but drab place, not a treat for a day off of school]?
>
> Roberta: The plan is to have a workshop in the morning, community service in afternoon; if we don't get the grant, we're not tied to doing it.

Roberta subtly kept trying to steer the conversation back to the question of "what youth wanted, ideally, regardless of funding and sources."

These youth planners of Martin Luther King Day were eager to know what other people's planning had looked like in the past, or in other places. Of course, learning incrementally by building on blueprints from the past what not the model of "experiential learning" that adults had in mind, but should come as no surprise that kids often thought up projects that were remarkably similar to projects that other kids in other towns thought up (DMaggio and Powell, 1991, Dekker 2001).

Another evening meeting shows how carefully the adults tried *not* to put words in kids' mouths; they wanted whatever happened to emerge from kids' own experience. Teens who had already participated in civic engagement projects before knew that they should not ask too much about the history of the event,

or to expect to rely on precedents, or to demand information about the planning process, but the participants who were new to these kind of projects would not stop asking about the history of the event. Adults did not want to tell kids what to plan, or what had been done in the past. And adults kept emphasizing that *whatever* had been done about Martin Luther King Day in the past, it was now completely free of the weight of history: it was in the kids' hands to decide everything about it.

It was the perfect Emersonian ideal, except that considerations of history, money and time would not leave:

> *An adult: You can't get it till you know what you want it for.*
> *Roberta [the recreation coordinator]: I know you can't commit individually but ideally, how would youth be involved in planning process? If you could plan the ideal youth involvement, what would it look like?*
>
> *Olympia, tentatively: Maybe school-based, I don't know, each school is different [some discussion about student government, and how student councils don't do anything]*
>
> *Roberta: Think of a way you and your peers could be involved--what about someone doing what I'm doing, facilitating, and I could take notes and help out with things like 'Oh, I know that person, I could give them a call.'*
>
> *After a bit, we are back to the questions about what the point of the holiday is. Kids who are new to this kind of group want an answer, but adults refuse to give one; the newcomers are unsure how to interpret adults' reticence: A newcomer kid: Who thought up last year's Martin Luther King Day? When did it start?*
>
> *Rob Strauss [an older, tall, authoritative man with a booming voice, head of the Paragon County Youth Office] finally answers: Oh, do you know the story? It started in 1986, celebrated by participating in your community, free community suppers. But there was not as much emphasis on service; it was more about recognition and celebration. The 'youth service' focus is a new thing.*
>
> *Olympia, a fairly new youth participant: Is the 'service event' on Martin Luther King Day because it's an opportunity, because it's a day off from school anyway? Or are those things happening on that day because it's a day that's about Martin Luther King?*
>
> *Roberta, the Recreation District coordinator: That is a good question--whether it's a day for doing things we're doing anyway, or if it's about Martin Luther King, and all these things are happening because of him and his teachings [notice: she affirms Olympia by saying that it's a good question, but does not answer it, on purpose, because of what Rob says next]:*
>
> *Rob: "Ownership," "control," "initiative." You could make his life more central. It's up to you.*
>
> *Roberta: It's up to you to decide which and plan accordingly, but there's no money yet, so have to keep that in mind.*
> *(…)*
>
> *Someone asks how it was funded last year.*
>
> *Roberta: Local funders and a big grant—Snowy Prairie was one of the few cities to get all it asked for. But [she twists the discussion back her goal: inviting youth participation] it depends on*

what we plan. Those of you who want to be actively involved in planning [looking around at the young people]: what do you need to get done by August?

[adults bandy idea about who would be available—and not too expensive--to invite to speak at the event]

Roberta: What I'm saying is, you guys have a lot of control."

(…)
Various youth: Will the theme be "hunger" again? Will it be at the Snowy Prairie Convention Center again? Will there be speakers and service (like the year before)?

Later, another adult in response to more such questions: You can do what you want with it. Or not do anything with it.

Corrine [a black teen, vaguely]: How about Coretta Scott King [Martin Luther King's widow]?

The next question was about how much it would cost to bring Coretta Scott King, a popular national figure, to Snowy Prairie—here we are, back to money, and whether we should count on having such a big budget.

At another meeting, Roberta begins by asking if they talked about the next Martin Luther King Day—"what you would do, what kind of control you wanted." And yet another meeting:

At many meetings, I heard something like this, that I heard at a meeting of youth and adults planning youth volunteer activities:

Fred [an executive in Parfait County Youth Office]: There is this President's Award challenging kids to do 100 hours of community service.

Teen volunteer: What is that? Do you just do it by yourself?

Fred: It's doing service to people, whether with a church group or babysitting for a family that can't afford it or volunteering at St. Matthew House--We're leaving it pretty open and undefined.

Teen: Got it.

Kids wanted to know what the precedents were, but adults wanted them to develop it all from scratch.

The dance of applying for grants was difficult to square with "youth leadership:" if youth were leading, they pretty much had to lead in a direction that funding agencies wanted to fund, and youth understood that completely. The youth were never *forced* to lead in directions that funders might fund, but in fact, they always did, because they wanted the money too—for a nice meeting place, for food, for payment for good musicians and speakers--and also because it was hard to imagine measuring success in any other way.

The dialogue was typical, and yet remarkable. The adults were using government funds to try to encourage grassroots participation. But this voluntarism could happen only if adults were paid to make it happen. For example, just to get kids to the meetings required money for transportation; public transportation in this sprawling city was like most American cities'; so slow, it could take hours and involve multiple bus connections to make a trip that would have taken 45 minutes on foot. Money was needed: to make volunteering possible for a range of kids, not just those whose parents could drive them; to bring diverse youth together, and not just work within their own segregated neighborhoods; to help get kids involved whose parents were busy piecing together three minimum wage incomes together; to involve kids who had "leadership potential" but were not "yet" leaders (more on that later).

Participants in these youth civic engagement projects learned this implicit lesson about money, but to be good participants, they had to learn to appear not to have learned it.

They learned that the adults' refusal to tell them what had been done before *was* the central lesson—adults wanted to cultivate "youth leadership." Inexperienced participants, in contrast, were puzzled, assuming that adults knew the right answers and were just not telling them because it would be like giving away the answers to a quiz; those kids persisted in asking questions about precedents. But adults had a powerful theory of "experience" in mind here, and relying on the past was not in that theory. The experience of "working within a medium," as Dewey put it—the institution of the scrambled organization—did not count as real "experience," in their eyes. Adults also did not want to crush kids' imaginations by telling them who might be too expensive to invite.

This urge not to crush kids' imaginations by telling them what was possible was, in turn, part of a broader effort on the part of the scrambled organizations' directors to keep an open mind themselves, to make the process one of discovery. Connie, the new adult leader of Martin Luther King Day described an idea for a project she had in mind for her group, and then stopped midstream, in a meeting of Youth Organizing Project:

> Connie: Is it in my jurisdiction to explore that idea?
> Rob: I think it is. Anything that is about youth and service, and service learning.

In other words, Rob does not want to define anything in advance as being "irrelevant." In an earlier meeting that month, another youth worker had pointed out that "service learning" has 105 definitions,

according to some dictionary she cited. Rob did not want to rule out any activities, but his wish met some friction.

Youth Time vs. Bureaucratic Time Lines

Getting money and planning projects had to happen simultaneously; you cannot get money until you have a project in mind, and you cannot have a project in mind until you know what the funds will be—how much, for what purpose (drug prevention, encouraging girls to play sports, boosting grades, promoting the arts, for example). But the time-line for getting funding is long, while the time-line for getting youth to plan, start and finish a project is short. So, how did adults, in fact, balance these two modes of measuring time?

The process begins with adults securing money, even if they then later earnestly wanted youth to plan the event from the ground up. Usually, adults began by reading a grant application. They "brainstormed" together for a project to do that would yield "measurable" outcomes that fit the grant's specifications: for drug abuse prevention, anti-racism, anti-tobacco, gang prevention, whatever. Then, they subtly suggested this project to the young people. Finally, the adults imperceptibly handed it over to the youth, who took it up as their own as if they themselves had planned it.

At several meetings, Bing, an old community activist who now had a job in city government, drew time-lines on the whiteboard or newsprint, showing which week of the year the different bodies of legislators, NGO's, and other funders make decisions about funding. The lead time was different for each group, and much of the funding was only "seed money," good for one or two rounds of a project, after which it would have to find funding elsewhere. *Since funding was almost always temporary, fund-raising was constant*, and money could never be far from their minds.

Here is a typical example showing how the planning unfolded in time. In an August meeting of adult social service workers, Rob Strauss asked whether to include a food pantry as one of the organizations involved in the proposal he was writing (an excerpt of this discussion appeared in Chapter One):

Government and nonprofit youth workers—all adults--at a lunchtime meeting:

> Erin [employed by Paragon County to organize the Regional YEP] reading from a federal grant's guidelines: 'We expect well designed activities that meet compelling community needs and lead to measurable outcomes and impact."[2]
>
> Sheila [employed by county to help Erin with the Regional YEP; then later, got a job as the public relations director of a nonprofit afterschool program]: We need to beef this part up.
>
> Rob Strauss [the county head of youth programming] adds: To say what service projects people actually did.
>
> Sheila: Do we need to get feedback from recipients? And from students: 'Did this actually change you in any way?'
>
> Emily [the dedicated paid leader of Community House, who worked there about 70 hour a week for four years, so she the only one at the meeting who really was intimate with any potential participants]**:** Yeah, like impacts based on spirit? Like *'Did it affect your spirit?'*
>
> Sheila: Yeah, like "Did it change anything for you?"

Sheila then tells story of Daisy, a youth volunteer who had been nearly suicidal till she learned about volunteering at the first Martin Luther King Day when she was 13. That day saved her life; that day, Daisy found meaning in life, by becoming deeply involved in community service.

Rob Strauss says that he does not think that that is what the grant application means; "they want something measurable." Volunteering cost money, so it needed to be measured. If it is not measured, donors cannot be sure the money is being spent wisely; the civic engagement projects needed to be "transparent" and "accountable." "Effects on the spirit" do not fit the bill. Perhaps with sophisticated sociological techniques, researchers can measure effects on the spirit, but even if this is so, these measures would be complex, not quick and easy enough to communicate to the various projects' various publics.

> Roberta: We could say 'We delivered a ton of food for 70 families, painted the YMCA Annex.'
>
> Rob: I think that's what they mean: *real changes*.
>
> Erin [employed by Paragon County to organize the Regional YEP]: But what could we say: "we read to seniors at senior centers?" That sounds kind of vague.
>
> Rob: I don't know what kids think but I think that the association of food with service makes sense. Do you think kids would want to keep the focus on 'hunger?'
>
> Sheila: I'm guessing that hunger comes up every year.
>
> Erin: Definitely!

By the end of the meeting, Rob read what they would say on the application:

---

[2] Corporation for National and Community Service, in consultation with the MLK Center for Nonviolent Social Change, Inc. (http://www.nationalservice.org/whatshot/notices/801000mlkday.html),

> 'Youth will read to 1,000 people. Collect two thousand pounds of food.' These are real--real *graspable*, by participants, and by media.

They also decide to send evaluations to the recipients.

A month later, the Martin Luther King Planning Committee starts up for the school year, and Rob subtly introduces youth to the idea of collecting food:

> I'd like to join a volunteer committee, specifically, to try a food drive, to get a ton of food to food pantries and homeless shelters, Sundale kids could go to the Wal*mart there, Snowy Prairie kids could go to Food-a-rama, I'd like to work on that. If any of you wanna work with—
> *[he paused, and I actually held my breath, because I had been consciously wondering if he would say 'with me,' because that was exactly what he could not say—it would make him seem to be leading—so he left out the word "me" and rearranged the sentence]*
> --want to work on that, I'd like to join.

None of the young people in the room join this committee; Rob's sub-group had just two adults in it. Then, magically, the youth took on the project as if they themselves had planned it. At the next meeting of the Regional YEP, Samia, an active youth member of the Martin Luther King Planning Committee (who was from Community House), gave a report about the MLK group's plans. Reporting on the meeting in which Rob Strauss had presented the idea of the food project, she said,

> They [the youth-led MLK committee] are going to organize volunteer projects such as food drives at grocery stores.
>
> Jenny [an active teen member of the Regional YEP; asking one of those questions that youth kept assuming adults had already answered]: Is Martin Luther King Day focusing on hunger and literacy or just hunger?
>
> Emily: Both. *And there's a third thing, but I can't remember what it is.*

So: first it was discussed in the meeting between adults, in which they explored the possibilities for measurable actions, then announced as a possibility by Rob who invited youth to join [him], then a day later at Regional YEP meeting as a *fait accompli* by Samia. The clashing time-lines seemed to merge, as Samia simply did not say how the decision got made…by Rob, the city official! Young people's direct experience vanished from the public story-telling.

Once in a great while, teens offered a gentle critique of the bureaucratic time line. On learning that soup kitchens for the homeless would be closed on a holiday for which the group was planning a "community service day," a teen wryly muttered, "People aren't hungry that day."

Organizers had to start from scratch very year because each year they got different participants. Kids who did the project for which the group got funding were usually not the same ones who were involved when the adults filled out the applications. The adults had to guess, based on this year's kids, what next year's kids might want to do. In April one year, a group of youth workers met over lunch in the clean little meeting room of a hybrid social services agency, to plan autumn activities. Dubiously, the leader of one youth group said, "I could *try* to have youth lead these projects, but 80% of my kids are graduating in May." She said she could not predict what the new kids would want. "And if they didn't plan it, they won't want it anyway," she added, now quite certain. At another meeting, she observed that her group's membership changed weekly. Such a group could not plan ahead, but it still had to look as if youth were taking leadership on service projects, somehow. Different time-lines and different messages for each different audience clashed.

While bureaucracies aim not to reinvent the wheel, youth volunteers usually wanted to start each project afresh, on their own terms, not following in anyone's footsteps. The old mural at Community House had to be painted over, rather than repaired, partly because this group had not been the painters, and partly because the '70's clothes, hair-do's and TV shows depicted in the painting were out of style. This year's stationery had to be different from last year's, so that this year's group could exercise its own creativity, and the youth artist could get a chance to express herself. In meetings planning the third youth-led Martin Luther King Day, Emily, the dedicated and loyal leader of Community House, emphatically told us *not* to have the same topics for workshops as last year, and *not* invite the same workshop leaders that led them last year; she warned us that if we did, Martin Luther King Day would get "stale real quick."

When participants—adults and youth alike--got into the swing of this kind of volunteer work, they began to experience time differently. It collapsed. When two young teens were planning a workshop for fifteen kids, they wondered how different theirs had to be from other workshops done that year, which led to a discussion about the timing.

> Wanda: But we're doing that [kind of workshop] at the Youth Leadership workshop. This (Martin Luther King Day) is so soon after.
> Miracle: Not really
> Wanda: It's Oct 26 for the one, and Jan 15 for the second. Oh, I guess it's not that close. I'm doing so much, I'm doing one thing right after another, it seems like it's just the day after to me!

Just before Martin Luther King Day, Samia said something similar: "The words "Martinlutherking" are getting to be just like one word, like it doesn't mean anything, all we're doing is planning it." I heard adults say similar things; *each event felt less unique when set on a long time line alongside all the other events like it*.

> Buzz: It's easy to get money from non-profits that doesn't have to go through budgets and prioritizing committees and the County Executive.
>
> Doug, the Youth Resources Network member who ran the youth section of the city website: What kind of entity is the Youth Commission?
>
> Buzz: It's not an entity--it's a committee (he draws a flow chart for money and time). So: the Network of Youth Organizations is nothing.
>
> Steph: It's not a place, there's nowhere to go.
>
> Doug: To accept 100 thousand dollars you have to ask, it takes a number of months to work it through.
>
> Connie [newly appointed to head up this year's Martin Luther King Day celebration; comes with a Master's in Policy and Administration]: Thus, your suggestion to work through a non-profit is more streamlined.
>
> Buzz: The disadvantage is that if you get it built into the county government, it's more long term.
>
> Linda [an older woman, head of public relations for a nonprofit afterschool program]: You have to plan so far into the future and have such a long time horizon, when the time actually comes it feels like: it's already past, it's not really happening, and you're on to planning the next six months!

Wanda and Samia, as well as Linda and the other adults, were experiencing time through the medium of the bureaucratic time-line. Does this count as the kind of "experience" that the civic engagement projects aimed to draw upon and cultivate? Samia's and Wanda's experiences of time collapsing was not "real experience" in the eyes of the adult leaders. No, the knowledge that kids gained from this experience had to remain implicit when they were talking to adults. This knowledge offered an important lesson in how certain things work, but it does not adhere to the moral world of the volunteer. This knowledge, that they could not help but acquire, hindered them when they were asked to answer the utopian questions that the adults kept asking them: "what would you do if money and time were not an issue?"

Ironically, teens who became serious volunteers were not considered good "representatives of youth in the community," because their experience was no longer typical of "The Youth Experience." So,

the more a teen volunteered, the less her experience counted as real, so the adults were always looking for new participants.

Planning is partly about time. Can youth ever be in charge of planning "life-changing" projects with a long time line? The time-lines of these different goals clash; to have a long time line, you would need something like a bureaucracy to plan spontaneous voluntary participation. Or at least you would need teens who were willing to act like bureaucrats, to become so deeply familiar with the innards of a bureaucracy that they no longer could act as "Representatives of Youth." They would *enter another moral world*, with different taken-for-granted assumptions, different explicit stories, different silences.

Measurable Effects on Givers or Receivers Don't Always Coincide

While it might appear, from this discussion, that collecting the 2,000 pounds of food was, in fact, a clear, measurable goal, it worked more as a marker, a way of saying that the group was really active. If you reread the dialogues above, you will notice that no one became very attached to any one practical object—the food for the homeless, the books for the penniless day care, the litter removal—and people sometimes even forgot what the material goals were. Youth workers treated the very fact of teens desire to "serve"--and even just being in the same room together--as a good in itself.

It was not easy to balance this evanescent, sporadic desire to volunteer with the needs of the labor's recipients—the homeless, the day care children. For example, when a fun or exciting volunteer opportunity arose, too many kids often signed up. VJ's idea of playing with or reading to sick children at the hospital was *too* popular; the hospital wanted only a few volunteers at a time. Erin said, "The only problem is that too many people in our group want to go--we can only have ten or 12. We could contact other hospitals so everyone gets a chance to go." In another meeting, Emily asked if anyone knew of a project going on in Snowy Prairie that could use 100 people right away; she had some eager youth volunteers. Martha, from a large nonprofit agency, said, "Drat! I just gave one away. Shoveling [snow], for the Mercer Senior Center."

Similarly, too many volunteers offered to clean up the riversides on Clean Ducks Day. A noon meeting of youth workers included a long discussion of whether the coordinator of Clean Ducks Day would be overwhelmed by too many youth, whether the coordinator had done it before, under what auspices she

had done it. We met in a typical site of our meetings: in Rainbow Family Resources Care Center, an institutionally hybrid agency to which potentially abusive parents could bring their children for periodic babysitting, housed in a flat little one story building with a view of a gas station parking lot and Quik-Pik convenience store. In the meeting room there, we wondered:

> Erin: How many does she want?
>
> Rob Strauss: Could we rachet it up to 400?
>
> Roberta: She said "not 1200."
>
> Magenta [a youth worker at Mercer Community Center, jokes about having too many kids cleaning in one spot]: 'Hey, we need more litter!'
>
> Tom: She has a network of environmental groups, so we supply the team and—
>
> Erin: But seriously, we should not over-recruit for her and cause her problems. Now wouldn't *that* be a nice problem to have!

So adult leaders had to find something else for volunteers to do that would be *like* cleaning litter from riverbanks. Regulating the flow of volunteer labor was part of their work, making sure that everyone who wanted to volunteer could find a problem worth solving.

The goal was to "generate enthusiasm" as leaders often put it, and it did not much matter what the project was that reached that goal. Some non-governmental organization had clients—homeless people, for example--who desperately needed something: food, for example. Youth workers dreaded having to work with the head of the local food bank, Jennifer Barth, because she never "got it" that the goal was "democracy," and making youth into "leaders." Jennifer always missed the point; she thought the point was to get food to the homeless! She annoyingly asked, every time she came to a meeting, how much food would get to whom, and when. After one meeting, Rob Strauss said, "*she's missing the point: it's all about leadership, and democracy*."

The point of the fundraisers, walks for this or that disease, mitten-gathering and turkey-giving was almost never actually about the money, mittens or turkeys; it was about "raising awareness" or "raising community spirit" rather than providing homeless or ill people with things they needed. Since raising awareness and spirit was the main point, volunteer work did something to raise volunteers' spirits and demonstrate that "someone out there cares," but did not necessarily have to do much for the recipients of

the indirect aid. The NGO's and state are asking the leaders of the service projects to serve two clients (the hungry and the kids).

On the other side of the same coin were youth civic engagement projects that yielded too *much* stuff. In a meeting of the Community House Board of Directors, we talked about the rummage sale, which always included hundreds of pounds worth of books:

> The director said, "The guy who donates used books runs a used book store, and can give as many books as we can take in our cars, as many trips as we want to make." This is like the traffic in sweets: there is much too much stuff that needs to be gotten rid of. [fieldnotes]

Gathering the food for the homeless or the litter in the park was good, according to most youth workers, mainly because the *process* was good for the youth who gathered the food, for example. And, there were the funders, who needed accounts of the volunteer work's effect on the volunteers: hours of youth voluntarism, percent of "at-risk youth" prevented from abusing drugs or getting pregnant. Finally, there were recipients on the other end, who needed food.

Startlingly, sometimes, young people were encouraged to "participate," even if it possibly harmed the recipients of their aid. For example, one kid from Community House was going to be part of a Snowy Prairie youth delegation to Nicaragua; Emily was going to go, as well, and there was a discussion of what the Snowy Prairie group should do there. The trip's sponsoring organization was trying to help a small village with development projects, in a way that gave equal voice to the Nicaraguans and their visitors from the US. But adults here were eager to validate and encourage all input from youth, to "generate their enthusiasm" for civic engagement in general. In this meeting to discuss what we should do for them, all suggestions were taken seriously, though the kids had not yet learned anything about Nicaragua or this village.

The very fact that the kids had come to the meeting was as important to adult leaders as anything they did once they got there. But here, their much-appreciated suggestions undermined the Nicaraguans' ability to "participate" according to the participatory principles of the trip's sponsors (see Munkres 2003 for brilliant insights on this sort of project). When two different groups are invited to "participate" spontaneously, to dream big, to dip deeply into their imaginations, their dreams might conflict. There is no space for that possibility in the moral world that links experience, community, and volunteering in one mystical whole. For that Emersonian ideal, "the most personal is the most universal." Here was a project

that looked really good for funders. But up close, there were many audiences for the youth civic engagement, and their standards for a good performance did not match.

INADMISSIBLE PUBLIC JUSTIFICATIONS

Explaining Family-Like Relationships in Public: The Importance of Not Just Getting "The Usual Suspects" to Volunteer vs. Accepting that Launching Pad for Civic Engagement is a Family-like Relationship

Since volunteering transforms teens, and since adult organizers wanted teens who could "represent youth," in their often-repeated phrase, enlisting the same five youth volunteers time and time again kind of missed the point. But the only kids who really made decisions about civic projects together were Emily's Community House girls, Marisol, Bonita, Marie, and Samia.

Emily and her four special girls' closeness arose partly in the course of managing all the details of their many civic projects; the closeness, in turn, fed their civic engagement. Without this intimacy, it is hard to imagine this group's civic engagement; it was the heart of their civic engagement. Neither came first in time; this intimacy was both cause and result of the civic projects, over the course of nearly five years of being together many days a week.

But this intimacy could not be made public. First, it was too quirky and personal, with in-jokes and funny habits that would not translate into a public arena. Second, it ran against the principle of including all kids *equally*, because secretly, Emily adored these girls more than she adored some of her other kids, partly because of who she was and partly because of who they were, and partly because she had known some longer than others. Usually, only a few kids participated actively in the civic engagement projects, though several came along to meetings just to have somewhere to go at night—to stay away from their abusive or unpleasant relatives, according to Emily.

The kind of idiosyncratic, special, unique, not-easily-reproducible long term relationship that Emily and her girls had would be fine for a family, but if Community House as a whole is supposed to be a civic group, Emily should make sure that *all participate equally*. Her program's moral and monetary worth was measured, in part, by how *many* kids participated in civic projects.

For example, in a meeting of adults who coordinate youth civic engagement projects, Emily offers her girls to help in the planning of an annual event that showcased "positive youth engagement." Rob

Strauss, the city administrator who did not work directly with youth, but who was very committed to getting a socially diverse mix of kids involved, says (I heard him repeat this message in various other words in other meetings; this was typical), "*And maybe we can get some people beyond 'the usual suspects.*" He meant Marisol, Bonita, Samia and Marie.

She glared and said nothing. Emily is not superhuman, she cannot get all of her kids, no matter how restless or uninterested in civic affairs, to come sit in meetings late at night. She was not very fond of Mr. Strauss' frequent critiques of her seeming particularism. She vented to me from time to time, saying that she is getting tired of her "job…I should just focus on my girls." The girls no longer seemed to be just a "job," but sometimes, taking care of the other kids felt like just a job.

Emily has an individual, unique, idiosyncratic relationship with her girls, and it is precisely that intimacy that launches her girls into active civic participation. So, on one account, she should be full of pride. But launching a few participants into civic life, and forming a family like relationship with them are not the only central goals of Community House. She is supposed to treat all the kids who come to her afterschool program equally. And on that third account, she is not winning, because not *all* her kids are involved. Her attachment with a certain number of them is personal, or it is too personal, depending on which bookkeeping device one uses. But this kind of personal relationship was the *only* route to civic participation in the free (for low-income families) community centers like Community House. That would fit the moral world of the volunteer, but the moral world filtered through the situation in this twisted way here, through all the accounting devices of all the different parties.

This intimacy was, ironically, also a problem when the socially diverse Regional YEP service club met at Community House. When Community Center kids held meetings amongst themselves, the family-like feeling merged with the civic, and it was awkward to incorporate others, either kids or adults. As we will see in Chapter Four, adult volunteers who worked with the hybrid youth programs wanted quick closeness, and wanted to help with civic projects, but on their time budget, civic engagement was impossible to cultivate.

Some meetings of the Regional YEP and other socially diverse civic groups were held at Community House. But when the strange youth volunteers entered the homelike atmosphere of Community House, it was a problem. A typical meeting without any strangers, for example, was in the

most private room, the art room—that inner sanctum to which Bonita, Samia, Marie and Marisol retreated when they wanted to escape the unhelpful volunteer homework helpers. The kids had been playing loudly on the computer, doing homework, gossiping, and jumping around when Emily summoned them all to the art table. It felt like a family moving from the living room to the kitchen table, for dinner-time, but instead of eating, they were planning a five-day field trip to a big city. They needed to raise funds, and to do that they had to establish themselves as an "organization."

The "organizational form," on paper, would look like a perfect imitation of an open, voluntary association's form: following the usual form of American voluntary associations, Emily told them to elect a President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer. Some theorists observe this longstanding American custom of taking political forms and using them in lowly places like Community House; the form links the little local group to a long tradition of American democracy and to all the organizations that have made it possible (Tocqueville 1968; Skocpol 1998, e.g.). But equally important is the style for putting this government-like form into play; here, the form felt like a family dinner. Emily and her kids made some quick plans for their trip, and then quickly went back to telling funny, detailed stories about the littler kids in the program, wondering what to do about the most unruly kid, who screamed and complained a lot all the time, most recently because she saw a worm while they were on a field trip to a lake in the nearby hills. Emily was alternating between laughing at the girl's ridiculous complaints and soothing everyone's worries about this girl, reminding them all of how much better she was this year than last year. Here, again, is the familiarity that comes from togetherness over time: Emily can afford to joke about this girl, because she also obviously cares about her, defends and protects her. Taking care of the squeamish girl is part of the group's business. The group is taking care of all its business, not just the trip to the big city.

The small family-like group switched, only momentarily, to an organization with an Agenda and Minutes. This family-like feeling to the planning of civic events was typical there. When Emily and her "girls" planned meetings, made up agendas, checked to see whether they had made the phone calls they had promised to make, and did all the rest that goes into participating in a civic group (see more on this in Chapter Five), they hid in Emily's closet-sized office. So, conversely, when the teens in the Regional YEP came to Community House for meetings, the visitors seemed like intruders, through no fault of their own. They seemed obviously to be invading those private spaces that Samia, Marisol and the other inhabitants

had made their own. As soon as the non-Community House teens drove off after one meeting, for example, we six put our feet up on the table, tried on each other's glasses, joked about lice and rice being in our hair, made jokes that would be incomprehensible to someone who had not been at Community House long enough. You might think that this was just class or race resentment, since the other Regional YEP kids were those mostly white, college-bound CV-stuffers who drove their own cars and lived in the middle class suburbs. That was often the case, as the running joke about the "baby blue cardigan with pearlized buttons" will show in the next chapter, Community House girls made up jokes about their wealthier counterparts' fashionable clothes. But class inequality was not the main problem at the moment; the main problem at the moment was that the non-Community House teens had barged in on the Community House girls' private space.

The long arm of the grant and the account book took many forms. "Even if it turns one kid's life around, it is worth the effort," was a phrase adults often used—instilling in them an ethic of service and possibly saving them from misery or suicide, as it did in the case of Daisy, a girl who discovered community service at her first Martin Luther King Day when she was thirteen, and continued for five more years to be an active volunteer. Adults were proud of this inspiring young activist, but they could not use her in all of their accounts to all of their multiple audiences, because they were supposed to have a broad affect, and not just save the spirit of this one exceptional girl.

In an evening meeting of the Regional YEP, the adult leader of the Prevent Alcohol, Tobacco, and Drugs Organization (PATADO), a program for low-income and minority elementary school-age children (who were slated to be addicts, apparently), misunderstood the process for winning the award, and tried to "sign up" her whole group at once. In a meeting of the Regional YEP, she announced to the meeting chair, in a tone that sounded like a bet in a poker game, "I'll take 500 [hours]." One of her 6-10 year olds said "Jeez," and laid his head on the table in pretend despair. The process, in fact, was that kids should each do as many hours as they can and count them up at the end of the year. But her misunderstanding of the process made perfect sense, in this context: she thought that you sign up the group in advance, and then make your youth program members volunteer. Nobody corrected this program leader, though her kids complained that 500 sounded like a lot. "There's five of you'all—gotta make it a challenge," she retorted. Her kids were supposed to enter as a unit, she assumed.

Parethetically, a parallel book to this one could ask how millenia-old conceptions of charity in the world's religious traditions percolate through this plug-in volunteering. Here, for example, is a quote from a flyer for a Jewish service learning program in Los Angeles: ""You and your peers volunteer in meaningful service learning experiences more than any generation in history and we want everyone to know it!" The flyer includes "a recognition ceremony…verification of hours MUST be received by May 1, 2006 to be included in the ceremony…" You get a different level of recognition (named in Hebrew—Chaver, Kavod, or Tzedek) depending on your hours of service and whether or not you have written an essay about it. The flyer also says that this Center for Jewish Service Learning is "registered to give out the Presidents' Volunteer Service Awards given by the President of the United States." Do these newly prevalent forms of volunteering turn back, in turn, to redefine fundamental religious concepts like "charity" or "justice?" Judging from the numbers of volunteers who were coming from religious institutions, I am sure that the answer is "yes;" these scrambled institutions are, in turn, feeding back into the religious traditions that seem, on the face of it, not to be scrambled, thus scrambling them, in turn. The driving force for the religious organizations is not government or NGO funding, however; this plug-in-and-be-counted way of doing volunteer work is diffusing far beyond the scrambled organizations with their needs for money.

In these ways (as well as those reported in Chapter One), measuring the work often overtook the meaning of the work. A few Regional YEP members met at Blondies' Pizza one evening. A new member, Andrew, asked VJ, a long-term member, if the group kept a record of what they have done; the most recent example was a trip to the local hospital. VJ just naturally assumed that Andrew was asking about getting credit, but Andrew's question had actually been about how to learn from the past:

> No one is keeping a record for the group, but individually, you send in your hours, on those sheets. If you need them signed, you can go to Mary, if you're working in the hospital."
>
> Andrew: No, I meant is there a record for the future, so you can go back next year and look at what you did and how it went and how you got there and who to contact.

The question of individual, personal dedication wafted in and out of the discussion, and direct attention to the institutional basis of volunteering also floated in and out, on the wings of tangents. But the main topic was, for a good chunk of every meeting, measuring.

In small groups of three or four, outside of public meetings, youth workers sometimes called the possibility of accurate measurement into question. In a typical discussion between youth workers about "cultivating youth leadership," the question arose of "how to tell when a program is working?"

> A city-employed youth worker: If I were writing a *grant*, I would write 'greater retention in organizations.' But then when I got the grant, I'd have to explain why it's impossible to show that any one thing caused 'greater retention.' 'Because you ate pizza and got to socialize on Friday night, do you feel better about your group? Do you feel better about yourself?' The effect is more intangible. So, there shouldn't be a pre- and post test. More easy to demonstrate would be: linkages between more groups, and more diverse groups participating.

Being Willing to Fail Every Day: public speech about the spirit that moves inside you

How did all this measuring accompany the unfathomable, mysterious good that comes from selflessly serving from the bottom of one's heart? A favorite speaker at youth events was a Jamaican musician, a born-again Christian, Jamaal. At a "Youth Serving the Community Day," (another one-day event, held on days that schools were closed but parents still had to work), he was asked to describe the inspiration for volunteering, in terms of the day's theme of "leadership." His story evoked the heartbreaking, spiritual ideal that VJ's Disneyland story called forth, of volunteering that touches your core--your soul, in fact (he even mentioned Jesus, which offended some of the college-bound, suburban volunteers and some youth workers; who all said that they liked his "culture" but wanted him to subtract the Jesus part).

> Pacing across the school auditorium's stage, building up a sweat, tossing his clean dreadlocks:
>
> Leadership. That's what they want me to talk about. It means taking risks, joy AND pain, risking getting lost. You have to know what it is to be lost. How many of you have been lost?
>
> [enthusiastically shouting from the audience, as if at a prayer revival meeting]
>
> So you know how it is to be lost. Leadership: It's failing. Failing every day… Leadership: It's sharing--some days it feels like give, give give…it's a spirit that moves inside you. *Nobody can see it, but you know it's there*.

"What a moving message," I thought. "This is why volunteering is so important! You recognize the unfathomable mystery of each other; 'nobody can't see it but you know it's there.'" What is respect, if not respect for this unfathomable source of goodness?

But the youth civic engagement projects in Snowy Prairie never *did* those kinds of soul-changing projects. A few minutes after the assembly was over, when kids divided up into smaller groups, some were asked for examples of "service," in a workshop that Samia, Bonita and Marisol bravely led, called "How to Start a Group." Kids gave realistic examples, like the projects that they usually conducted, and adults approved. Marisol bravely stood at the head of the classroom, in front of a group of about 30 kids, many resting their heads on their desks, looking pale, tired and grumpy. It was a school holiday for their friends, but these kids' parents made them come to this event so they would be safely occupied instead of home alone. The day's slogan, written on folders and posters, was: "It's a day on, not a day off." She asked:

> Marisol: how many of you have ever volunteered?
> Lots raise hands.
>
> Marisol: What did you do?
>
> Voices from audience pitch in:
> Concessions stand at a soccer game.
> Cleaned litter on a highway.
> Volunteered at Snowy Prairie Festival.
> Blood drive.
> Volunteered in my church.
>
> Adult leader of a rural Youth Center, turning to the highway cleaner-upper: IS it a lot of work, or not too bad?"
>
> Kid: It's a mile stretch, you go 3-4 times a year; it's not too bad.

Next was a long discussion of how easy it is, about dates, and about how it does not happen in the winter.

The idea was to attract as many youth as possible, by making it sound easy and fun, *not* risky, terrifying, or painful in the ways that the Jamaican speaker described. Of course, having the litter picked up is better than not, but that was not the point. In the youth programs, adults like the idea is that just having a taste of volunteering might whet a few students' appetites for more, serious, dedicated, soul-changing work. Just getting kids in the door was almost all that mattered; once in the door they would be "off the street" and possibly hooked on volunteering, self-propelled at some other point in the future. The adults figured that these projects were just the launching pad. Adults talked about these projects in front of the kids as if the projects were *just like* the kind of self-directed, soul-changing, soul-threatening work that Jamaal described, but they were not. What it had to recommend it over some other forms of volunteering was that it was easy to see and measure. It was easy and inviting, it was not full of "risks and pain," you could *not* get "lost."

Present for Unfathomable Reasons: The Case of the Mini-Sized Nacho Doritos Bags Tower

Goals like "effects on the spirit" or "feeling good about your group" would never be completely measurable, *because no one was completely certain why some participants were there in the first place*. *And this was as it should be, the adults thought*: the goal was to "respect youth," and the adults thought that they should honor their desire to participate without forcing them to explain themselves. In the mode of justification that focused on "getting lost" rather than measuring, adults recognized that there are reasons of the heart that no one can fully know, even the individual him or herself. But this was confusing for the kids who went to meetings thinking that they were there to deliver tons of food to the needy or pick up litter—who thought that they main purpose was to help someone else, not just feel better about themselves.

For example, adults often said that certain kids who they knew well volunteered simply because home was too unpleasant, bleak, or worse. These kids were participating in the civic engagement projects for no discernable reason, and adults did not want to force them to account for their presence. Respecting individuals as individuals means leaving space for the unknowable, the mysterious, the unfathomable, and that meant not pressuring kids into having discernable reasons for attending meetings.

In February, after the January Martin Luther King Day celebration one year, many of the youth planners wanted to keep meeting, for some mysterious reason. The puzzled but pleased adults complied with their request, even though there was nothing kids could do about Martin Luther King Day for another eight months, and even though the young people who had begged to hold the meetings then proceeded to sit in stone silence at the meetings that the kids themselves had requested:

> Sheila (adult leader of Martin Luther King Day planning committee): Do you want to do a community service project?
>
> No one answers.
>
> Emily (the much-beloved Community House leader): What's the weather gonna be like? Does anyone know?
>
> No one answers.
>
> Emily: What do you think about doing a community service day?
>
> No one answers.
>
> Sheila: Should we do something on April 8, like last year? What day is that? Is it a Saturday?

No one answers.

Emily: Do you want to do a project?

Kid: Like a walk-a-thon, bowl-a-thon, slide-a-thon?

Another kid: Or a bike-a-thon, or that kind of thing? Like we did last time?

Emily: Yeah, or a run--we'd just have to figure out which and reserve a space and get sponsors. So what do you think, guys, should we do something like that?

Kids say yes, whispering.

One kid--Raul--just kept twiddling his mini-sized Nacho Doritos™ bags, trying to balance one full Nacho Doritos™ bag upside down on top of an empty one. He never looked up and never said a word except that he was going to Mexico soon, to visit his father and other relatives. From Raul himself, no one could learn why he attended these meetings; once in a while, his sister Bonita complained about their mother's drug dealing and mean boyfriends. But no one could be sure that that was Raul's reason for coming.

Emily artfully avoided putting pressure on kids like the one who built Doritos towers, figuring that they all had their private, quiet, un-articulable, unspoken, implicit reasons. In contrast to Emily's quiet art of not pressuring kids to have any reason for being there, other adults considered active, verbal, articulate participation a mandate, though. "Participate!" was the only rule. At a Regional YEP meeting, Miracle said that her school was already working on a project that the group was discussing. Miracle, a long-necked black girl who lived way out in a semi-suburban, semi-rural part of the county, had never spoken in a meeting before.

Cindi, another teen volunteer: Erin, that should go in the minutes, that Miracle said more than five words!

Davey: Hey, are you making fun of her??

Tandy: She never *talks* and she's so *nice*.

Erin: She *is* sweet.

Miracle burrowed deep into her hooded sweatshirt and looked down, as if she was about to cry.[3]

[3] I was sitting next to her and passed her a little note saying "I never said a word a single word in school till my third year of college, and now I'm a professor!" This was easy for me to say since it was true, but it also handily coincided with the ideal that most of the youth workers held, of not forcing the kids to participate if they felt uncomfortable. She looked really pleased and actually talked to me afterwards, saying that she wants to be a math teacher for 10th grade. Needless to say, I felt the (excessive) pride that adult volunteers are supposed to feel in these situations. For more on this kind of puzzle in the field, see the methods section.

Forcing participants to make their participation explicit was important, but in person, this was often the result. In the dance of things visible and invisible, sayable and unsayable, kids' reasons for participating had to be left unsounded in these contexts, even though they had to be documented in others.

At another Regional YEP meeting, Erin asked for volunteers to head a committee. When no one stepped forward, she "volunteered" Miracle, saying, "You'll have to do it some day. You'll have to say something in a meeting some day. What do you think, kids, doesn't she?" Once again, Miracle burrowed into her oversized hooded sweatshirt.

The alternative to not pressuring youth to speak, though, was to keep going *as if* kids were "participating," even when all they were doing was fiddling with Doritos bags. Emily was a master at marching resolutely through this magnificent silence. In these institutionally ambiguous settings, it is hard to tell why some youth are there, but probably some would want to be prodded into speaking and others not. Developing a general policy about how to leave some motives implicit would be impossible.

Emily went back and forth about how much she should actively encourage or pressure active "participation," how much she should allow kids to space out and goof off, how much free time should be allowed. She often remarked, "All the boys want to do is play basketball, and all the girls want to do is sit and talk. And," she would add, a little defiantly, "what's wrong with sitting and talking?" She wanted unstructured time. On the other hand, she wanted to make her Community House kids do lots of projects, partly because "doing projects" got funding, and partly because she wanted her kids to have all the opportunities that wealthier kids got. She wanted her kids to do "something more," just as the highly cultivated wealthier kids did after school, as they shuttled in their parents' minivans from one lesson to another (Lareau 2000). Encouraging her kids to take advantage of such opportunities was also part of Emily's job description. But—a third layer on the layer cake of stories and actions--she could only make her kids take advantage of the opportunities when she formed a private, special relationship with them, and hid in her closet-like office to plan civic events, and this relationship was incompatible with the exigencies of the public agencies that wanted her to be equally close to all her kids.

Here are these layers upon layers of experiences and stories, experiences and stories, presentable to different audiences. Some lessons can be made explicit, and some must be kept implicit. Emily and her kids spent hundreds of hours a month together. But only some of what they did together bubbled up to the

linguistic surface, solidifying into one of moral worlds that they could make explicit to each other or to one of their many publics. Some had to be hidden; some went without saying; meanwhile, adherence to the moral worlds of "the volunteer" and "choice" had to be proclaimed loudly and frequently, even when they had little to do with what was going on.

Present for Even More Unfathomable Reasons

Another sort of participant, present for even less discernable reasons, posed even greater puzzles for the adults' need to account for the unaccountable: the *middle class, white* kids who loudly joked and flirted in meetings, and did not help with any of the community service projects. Adults implicitly presumed that an immigrant who lived in a housing project, like Raul, or a black teen, no matter where she or he lived, needed to be "prevented" from something--though, on the principle of respect, adults could not say more specifically what it was. Raul never disrupted meetings; in contrast, these rowdy suburban white kids were very disruptive, and, on the face of it, seemed less deprived. Nobody could really *tell* why they were there—they could not "tell" in both senses of the word: they could not figure it out, and they could not make it explicit.

But that should, in the adults' minds, not be a reason for kicking them out. As one adult said, somewhat equivocally, after a meeting that some youth called "The Disorderly Meeting," in which these white suburban kids were so loud, the meeting ground to a halt several times,

> A lot of little towns have a big drug problem—it's not just all cute and storybook there. Who are *we* to tell these kids what to get out of the program? What would they be doing instead? [puzzling aloud] It's gotta be doing *something* for them, or they wouldn't keep coming back.

At another mid-day gathering of youth workers, Erin and Hsiau [an Urban League employee] described Davey, a kid who had disrupted the previous night's meeting, infuriating the kids who wanted to plan volunteer projects:

> Erin: It's hard, because you don't want to tell people to leave, but that's what we'll have to do.
>
> Rob Strauss: What happened? Someone was disrupting the meeting last night?
>
> Erin: Let's keep it positive.
>
> Emily said that she has that problem with her kids too: It's hard to get them to focus. That's part of why I want them to participate: to learn to concentrate.

But the more serious Regional YEP members like Jenny and VJ disagreed with Emily's approach, and reserved their most harsh wrath for the white suburban kids who disrupted meetings. They thought that if the group really had a purpose beyond self-help and therapy, then a person who is not performing should be kicked out.

The Regional YEP had began in September, and now it was nearly Christmas time, and the group had not yet done any community service projects. VJ, Jenny, and some of the other middle class teens worried about this and invited everyone to an informal party at Pizza Pie. But only VJ, Jenny, and two other suburban kids came. Almost the entire conversation was about how annoying it was that everyone came to meetings to plan community service activities, and signed up to come to them, but then never showed up. They said the group should, as Jenny put it, "have some standards, some requirements, not just be open to anyone:"

> Jenny [describing two disruptive while middle class kids in the group]: They only count for half a person each! Just half, not a whole person!...There could be a rule that you have to do two service projects a year or something [this idea was repeated three times that evening; VJ and Jenny had discussed it before, as well]. The meetings are already too big--the bigger they are, the more out of control they'll get [Jenny said this several times, too]. Getting more people isn't the problem, but getting them to do something other than go to meetings is.

These very active volunteers did not understand that being "present for no discernable reason" *had to be ok*. By definition, meetings could, in adults' legers, *never* be "too big," because the main point was to get youth to attend. The puzzle for adults was that they had to open the group up to young people who seemed to have no discernable reasons for coming.

When justifying it to funders, it made sense to name it "prevention," and offer statistics from national surveys--not to treat it as an unfathomable mystery. But when adults were with the kids themselves, there was no way to talk about the money and time spent on getting disruptive or bored kids to voluntarily and spontaneously serve. There were three good reasons for the silence: they had to respect kids' unfathomable mystery, and they could not explicitly label kids by race, class, and other demographic conditions, and they had to be open to all youth, not just those who "already were leaders, but also those who had "leadership potential" that no one had yet seen (everyone, in other words). But *those silences*, in turn, puzzled and annoyed the kids who were trying to get credit for volunteering, to use it to beef up their CV's to get into college.

"Choice"

A solution that seemed respectful and seemed to comply with all the criss-crossed demands for clashing justification focused on "choice." Youth were congratulated at every turn for their voluntary choice-making. Along with "volunteering, "choice" was a favorite explicit moral narrative used to explicate youth's implicit unfathomable reasons. As Emily put it when she was the emcee at Martin Luther King Day, "you guys have made a very good choice by being here today." Every adult speaker repeated the theme of "choice" that year. But the adults recognized that the usual definition of voluntary choice did not exactly fit here. After another meeting like the one with the Doritos tower, Emily told me,

> A lot of my kids couldn't follow the Regional YEP meeting at all. In the car on the way back [she drives kids, in her own car], they were asking, "Huh, what happened? What did we decide?"
>
> NE: I've heard the same thing after other meetings. But it's hard to make those meetings do all things for all kids, because some kids just whizz so quickly, I can't even follow.
>
> Emily: Exactly! And most of my kids aren't going because they're really into it--a lot of them are going because they just don't want to go home. It doesn't hurt to go, and I figure maybe something will rub off on them.

The moral world of the volunteer confers a certain kind of respect upon kids who are "present for unfathomable reasons." There was a hope that the moral world of the volunteer would *eventually* fit those kids, even if it did not yet. The only problem was that in the meantime, this story was not true, and everyone knew it. As we heard, kids like VJ and Jenny, complaining at the pizza place, knew it. Adults knew it, too:

> Roberta said the youth activities give them an opportunity to have contact with youth from across the county (Erin chimed in, "Yeah, rural and urban."), not just give parents an opportunity to not deal with their kids for a day. Because, face it, that's why a lot of kids are there: because it's someplace parents can send their kids for a day. But it an opportunity to find common ground with youth of all races, cultures and income levels.

None of this could be said directly to kids, but kids understood it, anyway. They were learning something that they were not supposed to learn.

Thinking Through Organizations

Some adults—Rob Strauss, the city administrator, for example--said they drew their inspiration from radical Brazilian educator Paolo Freire whose works they had encountered when they were studying

in education schools. They tried inviting kids to think of a social problem in their communities and then imagine ways of solving it. But it did not work the way it worked with Freire's slum dwellers, who knew what their "community" was, and whose community existed apart from the institutions designed to serve them. In contrast, before thinking of social problems to solve, Snowy Prairie kids would imagine the range of organizations that were already in place aiming to solve social problems. The kids' expressed desires and concerns that would match the possibilities: a social vision that invited participants to love their own fate—to recognize the possibilities and learn to desire them.[4] Kids were not starting from a blank slate; after working in these semi-volunteer groups for a while, kids knew what was there, who is working on what, and they did not imagine solving something that no one had ever named as a problem or formed an organization to address. In fact, many were understandably proud of how many acronyms they knew and how much they knew about which organization was connected to which other and what "nonprofit" meant; these proud teens bandied the acronyms about in rapid fire in some meetings, while everyone else gazed in awe.

For these proud young people, the horizon was not empty, not that deep ultramarine expanse that Emerson imagined; it was chock full of new, little, wall-to-wall carpeted buildings with names like the Rainbow Family Resources Care Center (for potential or actual child abusers), on the slushy parking lot between Quik-Pik convenience store and Sunoco gas pumps. Their own "experience" of civic engagement was of these institutionally ambiguous organizations. After being involved in these sorts of groups for a while, youthful participants would often learn how to walk easily on the institutional footing

At one Martin Luther King Day meeting, we broke up into small groups, to discuss what we could do that day that would be "on the themes of peace and nonviolence and the other themes that Dr. King promoted." I sat on a folding chair knee-to-knee with Wanda and Miracle, in a cavernous, dark gym at the Community Prevention Building on the far edge of town. Community Prevention program also met in this building; it was for older men who had committed crimes or spent time in jail, and was fitted with lights that glared at us from the ceiling like interrogation lamps. Our group's assignment was to think up "break-

[4] This, by the way, would be rather different from Pierre Bourdieu's (1984, 1989, e.g.) rendition of "amor fati," which an individual carries around with him or herself in the form of the "habitus." Here, if anything, would be a situational, institutional, group-based "habitus"—not about personal biography, but about situation. Anyone in this situation would face the same horizons, no matter what his or her class background.

out ideas" [that is, ideas for one-hour workshops for groups of 20 or so youth that would convene after the 500+ person assembly]. My group thought by naming organizations.

Emily, the adult Community House leader, introduced our topic by handing us a sheet with examples:

> "Health topics"
> Healthy Self, Healthy Family [health promotion team, sponsored by:] Paragon Tech University Health Services, and Paragon Tech University nutrition department
>
> "Community organizations"
> Mercer Community Center, Franklin Community House [other community center programs]
> Boys and Girls Club
> West Snowy Prairie Positive Option Program [keeping kids off drugs]
> Rainbow Family Resources Care Center
> Paragon County Regional YEP

These were Emily's examples. Wanda and Miracle said they were still not sure what the question was. Emily explained that it was to think up topics and then think up people and organizations who could address them. But it was almost impossible for the girls to think of the two separately! This was our list:

> The 'No More Tobacco' Team of Paragon County
> Miracle suggested it but Wanda kept saying it was boring. Miracle insisted that No More Tobacco was at another event she went to, implying that it must be a good idea to invite them.
> Teen Peer Educators [a group, sponsored by schools and a grant, in which young people teach their peers not to insult and tease one another],
> Games for the World [an organization that taught groups how to do "ice breakers"] ["But that was there last year, Wanda worried.]

Miracle barely audibly offered the only suggestion that did not have a ready-made institutionally ambiguous organization to represent it: "How to Get a Club Started." (All of these organizations came to the final event. For the "How to Get a Club Started" workshop, Community House kids made up their own presentation).

I asked, "Are there any *issues* you want to talk about? Like stuff that's happening in the world? Like war and or poverty or stuff? Or the environment? "

Wanda, Miracle and I had had fun in other situations together, at parties, watching movies, eating, making jokes under our breath at meetings, in vans or backseats driving here and there. But at my question, Wanda gave me the kind of look that people give to unshaven homeless people who talk to themselves on the street: "Huh?"

> I stumbled, "Like, I don't know--war? Or whatever the opposite of that is--peace, I guess? Or the environment? Stuff like that."
> To this, Wanda contributed: Drugs. Like the High on Life Team at The Truth Summit [another event of mixed sponsorship, aimed at getting youth to think up projects aimed at discovering, and then solving, youth's shared problems].

There it was again: Wanda was thinking by naming organizations. I heard this pattern often; adults and kids thought about problems by thinking about agencies that dealt with the problems. The map these groups had in mind was full of social service agencies and nonprofits.

> Miracle, earnestly trying to grapple with my impossible question, repeated her barely audible suggested of earlier: We could tell people how to do community service project. They could contact the Paragon County Regional YEP to learn how to start a club, to do something about animals, or old people, or whatever they want--how to start a club about the environment.
>
> At that, Wanda summoned Erin, the adult director of the Regional YEP, pretending to cry out in pain, "We need your help!" We showed her Emily's and our suggestions, and Emily rattled off several more ideas:
>
> Holly House [a partly nonprofit, partly government sponsored, partly volunteer-run teen mental health agency]
>
> Educare [a similar agency helping educate people about HIV/Aids]
>
> Head to Head [a similarly sponsored agency helping troubled teens create skits to teach other teens about being tolerant of differences]
>
> One of the girls said, "We said health topics was just *one* possible topic." So Emily offered more quick ideas of non-heath related topics, but the form was the same: not to name a topic or issue or dilemma but to be more practical, to name a state-funded, nonpolitical agencies involved:
>
> Justice for Youth—that's an agency that works on alternatives for kids who break the law--like community service options.

The maps adults were filling in for Wanda and Miracle contained the world of local therapeutic/political/volunteer/nonprofit/educational/grant-driven agencies. Intuitively, all participants knew where they were standing, but it was hard for group members to address this institutional intuition head-on, to ask whether or how it shaped their volunteer efforts. The adults needed to take youth's goals and transform them into ones that could realistically be met. On the other hand, the adults wanted youth to speak with the fresh voice of direct, youthful experience—a notoriously unrealistic, romantic, rebellious, agitated voice. The possibility that youth would think up unrealistic goals, however, almost never arose, though, since the young people were already thinking through organizations.

As a result of this way of organizing volunteer work, youth had the possibility of learning how state and nonprofit agencies work. They often got an inside glimpse into the seemingly boring institutional

decision-making processes that shape the world-- even though adults tried so hard to encourage the youth to pay no attention to those pesky operations of money and power.

For example, in a youth program aimed at getting teens to educate their peers about the dangers of smoking, the adult leader says, over and over, "I might not be around." Brian wants to start this program at other schools, "If I'm around," he keeps saying. "There's this question of funding." He keeps coming back to this. He might not get funding for next year. He says this five times, in fact.

> First, he explains the finances in great detail:
>
> If not me, then some other people might be laid off. There are four of us, two might get cut, some overlap—two people are basically doing the same job. There's someone from Paragon County and someone from Public Health basically doing the same job. So I might not have my job next year.
>
> [Later in the meeting]: Usually, the state gets 15 million for tobacco research and programs, but it'll be down this year, to 10 million, and half goes to the university. But I'm making this manual so you guys know what to do when I'm gone.

This way of talking was unusual, and probably most adult leaders would have considered it a mistake. But it was a mistake that got made more than once, and it was a mistake that was surprisingly educational.

The focus on time-lines was not always a problem, but it was always there, usually as an unspoken backdrop. At a lunchtime meeting of adults who are interesting in cultivating "youth leadership," leaders did not even notice that their thoughts and inspirations corresponded with the funding and evaluation cycle:

> Bill, the leader of the 4H Club [a national youth organization with a several local chapters]: We met last night. It was a very interesting discussion that lasted almost till midnight, about youth leadership and about what *adults* need to do to be more inclusionary of diverse youth. I was so wound up from this discussion, I couldn't get to sleep till almost two!
>
> He goes over premises of the philosophy of "youth leadership," that was our guiding set of principles, in the amazing notes he took from last time], saying: Visualize this coalition in 4 years.
>
> Someone asks "why 'four years' in particular?" This leads to some discussion: it corresponds to the cycle of funding or evaluation in 4H.
>
> After this detour [or is it a detour?] into the funding schedule, we are back to the more philosophical discussion: What outcomes? What would tell you this coalition has been successful? Think about why people said they're here.

Sometimes, this focus on money and advanced time-lines surprised me so much, I thought I had not heard correctly. At one meeting planning the mural painting at Coummunity House, an

adult introduced herself to me by telling me her name and then saying, "I'm the coordinator of volunteers at Fox School, and I'm also running an art program for disabled people—we got a grant for it." Financing was at the very top of her head, right up there with her name. This *is* the experience of working in these organizations; organizational affiliation and funding is as important for adults as their names. This was part of the reality that could not be spelt out, while the moral world of the volunteer had to be made explicit even when it had almost nothing to say about anyone's actual experience.

Conclusion: Youth Volunteers in a Semi-voluntary Association

Voluntary associations, according to common sense as well as much social theory, capture average citizens' wisdom like this, as it bubbles up from the deep spring of personal, lived experience, before this living wisdom becomes tainted by institutions. Adults wanted youth to participate in community service projects as full equals, as spontaneous volunteers, as conduits for the infinite creativity of the local community. Leaders in Snowy Prairie need to prove their organizations' local rootedness, using measurements that distant publics can understand. Funders want quality assurance (Power 1999, Strathern 2001), and they want to know that the quality comes from deep within local and free groups. While the youth civic engagement projects in Snowy Prairie have to provide systematic accounts for their actions, the accounts have to demonstrate that these are no ordinary old-fashioned, stiff, top-down bureaucracies: empowerment projects like these have to prove, using measurable criteria, that they are drawing on local habits and customs, volunteer spirit and enthusiasm. The funding for this kind of organization is short-lived, so scrambling for funds is incessant; that makes it hard to find separate times for conversations about money and inspiration. This, too, poses puzzles that an old-style bureaucracy does not usually pose.

Through these everyday ways of balancing the planning and paying for grassroots voluntary participation, abstract definitions of local spirit have to define what can count publicly as "local" and "community" and "volunteer" and "intimate." But our story does not end there, because there still are activities that participants share, and situations that do feel comfortably local to them. The balance between these and the publicly documented activities is shifting, and that shifting boundary is where the action is.

As observers and helpers, we can ask what the moral worlds do when they hit the ground in real life contexts. The adults constantly offered a utopian lesson that kids found unconvincingly detached from their actual activities. Kids could not just answer the question of "what would you do if money and time were not considerations?" because they could not subtract themselves from the world they inhabited. Inside the group meetings, the connection between the social conditions, money, bureaucratic planning and their groups' volunteer work was not supposed to be discussed, but *not* speaking about social conditions was impossible in these settings, because adults had to speak about conditions to get funding and kids knew that very well.

So, kids learned something about institutions, through their own experience in them. All of the attention to time, money, planning and accounting might seem impossibly bleak, but, on the other hand, the process of planning voluntary spontaneous participation potentially gave youth an unexpected, odd kind of knowledge, as they learn how to make things happen, not in a dream world, but in this dreary and un-utopian world. They were learning about this *moral medium of institutions*. But talking about this medium was impermissible. To understand these organizations—any organization, in fact—we have to ask how members' practical knowledge that "goes without saying" works with the stories they tell each other about what they are doing together. So, what kids were learning, above all, was a group style, a stable method for disconnecting word and deed.

Kids and youth workers know that time and money matter; they know that volunteering is almost never as dramatic and soul-changing as the Jamaican speaker said it is; they know that they are together because publicly-supported hybrid organizations have brought them together. But the kids and adults cannot speak about these intuitions together. The moral narrative of the volunteer thus tells—but does not show—kids that their own insights, intuitions and experiences are the wellsprings of goodness. To recall Dewey's metaphor of the watercolor vs. the fine-line ink pen drawing, the youth volunteers are working in a medium that they cannot discuss together; conversely, they *are* discussing a medium in which they are *not* working—the volunteer group.

No moral world can work the same way in all situations, no organization can make all of its conditions explicit, and no story perfectly fits the action. In any organization, there are assumptions that must remain unspoken because they threaten the group's glue, and there are always taken-for-granted

assumptions that no one needs to say, because they are so obvious. All organizations disconnect word and deed; the method of disconnection is part of what make a group make sense, just as in art. In art, there is always a disconnection between the inert pigments and the sense of the picture, and people are always trying to do things with pigments that no one thought possible. There are always experiments, as people try to do new things with old media. The point is to ask what the story and the action do together, and how the stories make some actions easier to imagine than others, some feelings easier to have than others.

What is lost and what is gained, with this dance of the visible and the invisible, the sayable and the unsayable? What does the moral world do?

One exigency of these organizations is the need to win public funds. The moral world of the volunteer filters through this requirement; the results are:

- More meeting-time is given over to counting volunteer hours than any other single topic;
- There is a game of hide-and-seek between the moral world of the volunteer vs. the constant need to pay for and plan voluntary, spontaneous participation;

These transformations of the moral world of the volunteer would be unnecessary in a group that was not publicly-funded—in a "classic volunteer group," that is.

A second obvious quality of these civic engagement projects shapes the ways that they incarnate the moral world of the volunteer: these semi-public organizations have to be open to all, accessible to all. For some programs, larger numbers of participants meant larger budgets, but money was not the only reason not to exclude potential participants. Adults also believed in the healing power of civic participation, and wanted everyone to feel included. The moral world of the volunteer filters through this requirement, for this audience, resulting in:

- constant recruitment of new members rather than relying on "the usual suspects" who already love to volunteer, and know how to do it, so that kids who are not already leaders will come.
- Constant invitations to new young people who are strangers to one another, who do not feel comfortable together yet, on the assumption that comfort will come with time.
- volunteer work that will be "easy," rather than "soul-changing," so that new members will come.
- acceptance of youth volunteers who do nothing, fiddle with their Doritos bags, or who even disrupt meetings, because a group that is equally open to all cannot be inaccessible to some people, even if their reasons for coming are hard to discern.

These transformations of the moral world of the volunteer would be unnecessary in a group that did not need to be "equally open to all and serving all"—a classic volunteer group, that is, that forms when a local group bands together to fix a shared problem, to address a need that feels close at hand to all participants.

The moral world of the volunteer hid some relationships that all participants knew were in play, as well:

- Kids learned an "institutional intuition" about their groups' sponsorship, which they needed in order to make sense of their lives in these organizations. But it remained an intuition, because it so deeply violated the basic premises of the volunteer world.
- Family-like closeness was impossible to document and account for publicly, even though it was the basis of the active Community House kids' civic engagement.

In all these ways, the situation transforms the world, and the world, in turn, transforms the situation. The world worked hard, making some relationships necessary, desirable, or possible, while rendering others invisible or unsayable. Usually, in a more stable, standard, easily recognizable kind of organization, the ways people disconnect the world and the medium in which is operates are less startling or obvious, because the methods of connecting and disconnecting word and deed are more habitual, familiar, seemingly obvious, and enduring. Here, we can see the process, as it is unfolding, of rendering relationships visible and invisible, speak-able and mandatory and impossible. Here, the story aims to translate the immeasurable qualities of local volunteering into items that can be transmitted to many larger publics. The translation does not leave the original untouched.