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It comes as a surprise, even to many close observers of social program developments, that a hardy remnant of the 1960s' War on Poverty programs has survived in the form of Community Action Agencies or CAPs (Community Action Programs), as they are called in Minnesota. Hundreds of these entities continue to exist throughout rural and small town USA, providing a separate delivery system of programs and services designed to serve low-income constituencies.

In Minnesota, CAPs have been recognized by state statutes in order to “help develop the full potential of each of its citizens so that they can live in decency and dignity and so that they can contribute to the strength of the state as a whole.” They receive tangible support in terms of supplementary state appropriations which are added to the federal monies to support the work of local CAPs.

A study was undertaken last year to explore how these long-standing advocacy groups, the Community Action Agencies, with a stated mission of concern for low-income constituencies, are faring under the new arrangement of increased local control, by county commissioners, over social services and social programs. We chose to examine the role of rural CAPs and their interactions with local county governments, now empowered with block grants for social services under the Community Social Services Act of 1979. Although three urban CAPs are part of the Minnesota system (Minneapolis Community Action Agency, Ramsey Action Programs, and the Duluth Community Action Program), we concentrated on rural CAPs with the knowledge that these organizations could, potentially, play a pivotal role in advocacy and influence at the local level. Generally, in rural areas, there are few interest groups that can mediate between low-income constituencies and county authorities. Indeed, CAPs in rural areas may be the only organized groups that are representative of a broad range of low-income interests.

Sources of Information

A series of semi-structured interviews was conducted with the twenty-three directors of Minnesota's rural CAPs. The interviews were conducted, chiefly, by six graduate students from a class in community development at the School of Social Work, University of Minnesota. The interviews took place during spring quarter of 1981.

In one instance an assigned deputy director was interviewed in lieu of the director.
Further interviews and exchanges were conducted with selected staff members of the State Office of Economic Opportunity, the Association of Minnesota Counties, and the Department of Public Welfare. Selected papers from the University of Minnesota’s CSSA Research Project were reviewed as well as previous studies on Minnesota CAPs. In addition, profiles on each CAP that had been prepared for the 1980 legislative session were examined.

It should be noted that more than two-thirds of the interview respondents requested confidentiality. Therefore, the data have been aggregated without attribution to any individual CAP respondent. Only information which has been obtained from published or public sources has been identified by name.

The interviews were conducted at a time when the organizational survival of CAPs was in question. Day-to-day rumors and speculation abounded as Congress debated whether or not to “block” CAPs into the Social Services Block Grant. The political turbulence, at the time, could reasonably account for the cautious and constrained perspectives that pervaded some of the interviews and certainly explains the high number of requests for confidentiality.

What are CAPs?

Community Action Agencies were fundamental to the strategies embraced by the War on Poverty, inaugurated in 1964 with the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act. Conceived and nurtured at a time when presidential advisors had identified political powerlessness as a chief attribute of poverty, Community Action Agencies were recommended as the remedy:

...to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, state, private and federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families and low-income individuals of all ages in rural and urban areas to ... secure the opportunities needed for them to become self-sufficient.

The realities of the intervening years have exposed the apparent contradictions in assigning to CAPs this “impossible” mission: the performance of roles in advocacy, service delivery, institution building, creating strategies for social change, while at the same time assuming the stance of master planners and coordinators of local resources for the poor. The stress laid on active participation and cooperation with elected officials appears to have set the clear limits of this grandiose mission. A stream of critical literature has explored the nettlesome mix of advocacy and service goals for CAPs, documenting the “taming” of its social change mandate through congressional action and regulations.

The problems CAPs have faced were rooted in the ambiguities surrounding the relationship between CAPs and elected officials at the local level. It is generally conceded that the Community Action Agency, as a concept, was a prime example of the fiscal link between the federal government and a para-governmental agency existing largely independent of established governmental units at the local level. Suspicions persisted that the “feds” had created an agency solely to prod locally-elected officials to be more sensitive to the needs of the poor.

However, CAPs managed to keep their footing in the treacherous sands of shifting political ideologies both at federal and local levels, functioning as a useful bridge between the federal government and local communities for delivering certain human services that local governments could not be counted on to provide for low-income populations. Their enduring presence testifies to their usefulness as an alternative or complementary system for delivering social services and programs.

CAPs, especially in the rural areas, are now multi-purpose local institutions, receiving and managing a complex series of grants and contracts targeted for low-income constituencies.

Nationwide, a network of 897 Community Action Agencies exists in more than two-thirds of the nation’s counties, receiving and expending some $2 billion dollars from a variety of programs and contracts. In Minnesota of twenty-six CAPs, twenty-three are rural. Of eighty-seven counties, only six remain “uncapped,” and even in those counties some services are received under contract from neighboring CAPs. As Table 1 shows, the entire CAP network is a substantial part of the social service system in Minnesota.

Rural CAPs are organized around multi-county jurisdictions. The board is generally composed of two county commissioners from each county, holding at least one-third of the board membership; low-income persons, holding another one-third; and representatives from community groups making up the final one-third. Dividing representation among the public, private, and low-income sectors emphasizes the ties of CAPs to the local community. This structure tends to offset the charge that CAPs represent the intrusive role of the “feds” in local affairs.

Five basic programs operate under the community action concept: local initiatives; senior opportunities and services; community food and nutrition programs; energy conservation and winterization; and community economic development programs. Most rural CAPs also operate Headstart programs, senior citizen projects, and information and referral services. A small number of counties contract with CAPs to operate CETA and housing redevelopement programs. Projects which have community organization features are strikingly absent in this array of programs.

CAPs in rural Minnesota are organized as private, non-profit corporations. They cannot, by law, be established in a community without the consent of the locally-elected officials and these officials may eliminate them, although this act would be subject to review and appeal.

Two-thirds of Minnesota’s CAP directors are “first generation,” having been with their program since its inception. Of the twenty-six CAP directors in the state, twenty-four are men. Most outreach coordinators, on the other hand, who live in a wide network throughout the small towns and farms of the rural sector, are women. An Economic Opportunity Office in the Department of Economic Security has a general coordinating and advisory role to the twenty-six CAPs, the Migrant Community Action Agency, and the CAPs associated with Indian tribal governments.

Differing Perspectives

While CAPs and county government are both delivery systems for social services and income maintenance programs for low-income persons, striking and significant differences are revealed in their organizational context. Examining missions and mandates, perceived constituencies, ideologies and goals through the eyes of CAP directors and county commissioners, one sees the organizational differences as they are outlined in Table 2.

---

Table 1. MINNESOTA CAP INFORMATION (excluding urban CAPs: Ramsey, Minneapolis, and Duluth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of employees</td>
<td>2,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of low-income persons served, all programs</td>
<td>187,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding sources for CAP program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget for all CAPs</td>
<td>$91,040,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median percent of administrative costs for all programs delivered</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Minnesota CAP Association, Inc., St. Paul, MN.
Table 2. DIFFERING PERSPECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cap Directors</th>
<th>County Commissioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Fiscal conservatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Extend the acquisition of resources</td>
<td>Keep the tax rate down Re-election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Reduce spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>Disadvantaged in the community</td>
<td>The taxpayer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. DIFFERING FUNDING SOURCES (in percents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAPs</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*21% represents CSSA funds.
**2% represents cash funds, the remainder are "in-kind" funds.

Differences are also perceived in their intergovernmental relationships. CAPs are, in effect, fiscal agents for the federal government, receiving a smaller share of their resources from state government than the county does and only 3 percent from local government (see Table 3). On the other hand, county governments bear a heavy local cost for their programs despite intricate allocation formulas which reflect federal and state shares. Overall, 53 percent of social service costs are borne by the counties.

Further differences are noted in the knowledge and skill in dealing with intergovernmental affairs. CAP directors and their staffs have become expert at obtaining grants, skillful in negotiating contracts, and astute in their lobbying efforts at the state and congressional levels. County commissioners rely very heavily on their paid staffs for these activities and on their own, chiefly informal networks. Their orientation is local. Both, however, have associations that provide coordination and lobbying functions.

A significant distinction arises in the area of accountability. CAP directors have unusually wide latitude in controlling their resources and they are accountable to the public only indirectly through reports to state and federal administrative agencies. However, the election process forces accountability for commissioners at regular intervals with their local constituency. Moreover, the complexity of regulations narrows their control over resources. Presumably this will change when the widened discretionary powers associated with block grants increase the decision-making options for county commissioners.

Differences in programming distinguish CAP services from county services. The county supplies direct services to people in the areas of health, corrections, mental health, mental retardation, child welfare, and family services. Programs under Title XX, the chief social services funding stream, are mainly related to strengthening families. They include such services as marital counseling, direct service to adolescents, chemical dependency, and services to children in need of protection from neglect and abuse.

CAP programs, on the other hand, are more involved with community initiatives for individuals and families where income insufficiency is the principal handicapping factor. Local people are encouraged to create and run groups that will help them help themselves. Thus, under local initiatives, planting vegetable gardens, learning to can food, and organizing clothing exchanges are typical projects. In addition, CAPs have proved to be a useful vehicle for carrying out emergency programs that come up from time to time under special circumstances. Thus we find, for instance, that fuel assistance to the poor is provided through CAPs and the government cheese giveaway was conducted through CAPs.

The constituencies served by county social services and CAPs, while they may differ in some respects, are, in fact, often indistinguishable. The recipients of county aid and CAP aid share a common trait: they are the poor in local communities. In sum, the county and CAPs carry on different activities for the same constituency.

The style of delivering services is most frequently referred to as an essential difference between the two systems. "We're basically optimistic about people; CAPs are laid back, less bureaucratic than 'welfare'... we don't wear a shirt and tie; we don't call anybody a 'client.'" This observation of one CAP director was amplified by the others. Typically, a contrast was drawn with county systems where eligibility investigations reinforced the "shame" of seeking help, an attitude which CAP directors assert is widely held in rural areas.

Finally, staffing patterns also reveal striking differences. CAPs are staffed, chiefly, by low-income persons, and in the historic legacy of the "War on Poverty" days, they are for the most part "indigenous" and non-professional. The outreach coordinators are principally women, and a great many have known the AFDC program as recipients. The median salary for outreach workers in Minnesota was $10,000 in 1981.* They are not unionized. County government social service workers, however, tend generally to have some professional background. They work in bureaucratic settings within a civil service system. Increasingly, these staffs are joining unions. Pay scales are substantially above those in the CAP pattern.

A Comparison of Resources

Comparing the financing of social services in Minnesota under the county government and under programs administered by CAPs reveals substantial symmetry in the size of their resources.** Overall CAPs were funded with $91,018,363 in 1980 while the county programs received slightly more, $104,051,767. Of the eighty-five counties under consideration, more than half (fifty-three) had CAP programs that were funded with more than the county social service programs. In sixteen counties the CAP funding is twice or more that of the county, but, on the other hand, ten counties are funded with more than twice the funding given to their CAPs (see Figures 1).

A perspective from which to judge the comparative expenditures is revealed in the data of the "distressed" counties (Table 4). These are counties that are so designated by the state. A special equalization grant is provided by the state in recognition of the fact that these local units of government suffer from the fiscal disparities of high need and a low taxable base. One notes with interest that in these counties the CAP funding, which is spent in the community, is substantial and that, in fact, for eight out of the eleven so-called distressed counties, the CAP monies are greater than the county's monies, offering a substantial contribution to the local economy.

---

*Data from Minnesota CAP Association, Inc., St. Paul, Minnesota.
**Though CAPs are administered on a multi-county basis, each Minnesota CAP furnished data (April 7, 1981) on their funding by county, for the legislative hearings in 1981. Thanks to this data supplied to us by the Minnesota CAP Association we were able to make the county-by-county comparisons presented in this section.
Findings of the Survey of CAP Directors

CAPs operate in a multi-county framework. The administration of programs in counties that are widely different in philosophy, organization, and resources stretches the "umbrella" concept of organization to its limit. Glimpses of this complex environment were revealed throughout the interviews.

Sorting out details in the interview data reveals a complex and subtle picture rooted in a mix of formal and informal relationships. Spurring for territorial and resource advantage, the CAPs and counties show relationships that span the continuum from subdue hostility to "live and let live" arrangements. Clouding the entire context, however, is the fact that these two entities generally know very little about each other's operation. Competitive and uneasy tension, generally, marked the formal relationships between CAPs and counties. Details on the role of CAPs in the CSSA planning process, their influence on county decision-making, and their role as advocates for the poor are to be found in the full study.

The Political Environment for Low-Income Constituencies

Several questions in the interviews related to attitudes toward the needs of low-income and underserved people in the CAP jurisdictions. One question asked: Which of these statements would you support?

1) "Advocacy groups and service providers are concerned about the future in the fear that client groups for whom they speak will be hurt by county board decisions that may change the pattern of services and may reduce services to certain client groups. They think it leads to too much conflict in the hands of locally-elected officials."

2) "Specific needs and targeting of resources can best be determined at the local level by elected officials rather than on a statewide basis by the legislature in the state bureaucracy."

The frequency and constancy of comments in support of the first statement was striking. In the open-ended comments that followed this question there was a general view that while some counties could be characterized as "very conservative," "conservative," and "middle of the road," only two could be called "liberal" in terms of understanding the needs of low-income people and fully accepting the responsibility of local government to respond within the limits of budget restrictions.

The unequivocal perception was that personal destinies could not be trusted to local government, especially for those people who belonged to certain categories of poor. AFDC clients were perceived as being especially disfavored. "There is a reservoir of compassion only for certain
groups," was the way one CAP director put it. Most frequently mentioned as "deserving poor" were the disabled and mentally retarded. While senior citizens were regarded as "worthy" in most counties, one director observed, "even seniors are thought to be too greedy."

Local political forces were judged to be the most influential factor in making decisions at the county level. "What county commissioners are likely to give priority to the poor in the face of middle income demands and vested interest?" This observation of one CAP director captures the sentiments of many responses to questions about the local political environment vis-a-vis attitudes toward the poor.

Aside from political factors, inexperience and personal values were most often mentioned as determinants in shaping the decisions that would be made under CSSA. One CAP director’s comment amplifies a general concern over the personal values of county commissioners. "CAPs run fuel assistance so conservative commissioners cannot influence the program. County commissioners know what they are going to do for roads and bridges in the next five years. But they haven’t a clue about what to do with social services. Some of them don’t even understand what they are and others will not want to learn. We are far away in this county from having anything that resembles a comprehensive look at what should be done for poor people."

These perceptions, however, are too broad for easy generalizations.

One cannot categorize all county commissioners as "hard-nosed managers" protecting the public purse from the underserving poor. Nor can one lump all CAP directors as "ardent advocates" of the poor. Therein lies the dilemma in sorting out the political context at the local level. Objective data on the values, political pressures, and attitudes of Minnesota’s 443 county commissioners have yet to be acquired.

An Interpretation of the Findings

The Minnesota Community Social Services Act, a model block grant system, assumed that as the state and federal role was withdrawn, local government would change from simply implementing and delivering services into establishing social policies as well. This would mean making the critical decisions about how funds would be allocated; establishing levels, standards, and the modes of delivery for a variety of social services and programs; and evaluating the implications of allocation decisions.

Renewing a historic belief that local government is best able to respond appropriately to the needs of its citizens, a rational planning system was incorporated in the CSSA legislation with a number of assumptions. First, a planning model based on needs assessment, citizen participation, and access of advocacy groups to elected officials was instituted to reflect the variations in needs of local communities. Further, it was intended that a high degree of coordination could take place among public, private, and non-profit agencies; and that, at last rid of the straight-jacket of federal and state regulatory processes, flexibility and innovation would emerge—that the presence of advocacy and interest groups would ensure equity. Indeed, any irrational tendency inherent in improvised decision-making could be curbed by an alert citizenry. Here the assumption was that the citizen is the best watchdog of public business.

The examination of how CAPs operate alongside of the block grant system is instructive. CAPs as well as being a delivery system of community services can also be described as "advocacy agencies." They have a mandate to represent interests for a specific constituency, in this case, low-income persons. They have access to resources specifically linked to this constituency and they have an organizational presence within a system of services for that constituency.

CAPs’ advocacy role, however, has historically and up to the present become an area of conflict in local communities. Here the “competitive tension” between the two systems emerges. On the one hand, there are CAPs with their extensive network of outreach coordinators actively uncovering persons in need while, on the other hand, the counties, as “keepers of the community bank,” are struggling to confine the numbers of persons consuming their dwindling resources. Underlying this tension is a conflict over ideology, mission, and constituency. The adaptation of CAP directors to this tension appears to range from purposeful isolation to an uneasy exchange with the counties that borders on being adversarial. Many CAP directors maintain an uneasy exchange with the counties.

Complexities and contradictions appear to be characteristic of the interactions between CAP directors and county commissioners. In the view of the CAP directors surveyed, decision-making at the local level seems to be shaped by a mixture of three distinct, but inter-related factors.

1) **Personal Ideology.** Decisions of elected county officials appear to be made often more on the basis of the comparable worth of various client groups than on the effectiveness of programs. Further, personal experiences often shape decisions. The ideology of CAP directors is equally important in shaping their decisions and how they interact with county commissioners.

2) **Local History.** Decisions are also shaped by historic antagonisms revealing local passions and prejudices against certain groups. Women on AFDC, Indians, and unemployed single adults are often deemed to be morally culpable and therefore undeserving. CAP directors were well aware of these historic prejudices. In some counties locally-elected officials asked for names in order to review caseloads so that they could personally determine a recipient’s eligibility.

3) **Political Context.** A hierarchy of tastes exists among county commissioners. Economic and political interests often influence commissioners’ decisions. In one case a commissioner had an economic interest in a facility for the chemically dependent. One CAP director reported that in another instance, a commissioner compared costs between pre-school programs for developmentally disabled youngsters and programs that provided hot lunches for the elderly and voted for the latter, noting the political power of the elderly citizens in his county.

Another fact that influences decision-making is the recommendations of profes-

---

**Table 4. "DISTRESSED" COUNTIES: A COMPARISON OF COUNTY AND CAP FUNDING FOR SOCIAL SERVICES—1980**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CAPs</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>CAPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beltrami</td>
<td>$1,299,973</td>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>$1,234,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>436,737</td>
<td>Kanabec</td>
<td>394,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koochiching</td>
<td>960,751</td>
<td>Mahnomen</td>
<td>297,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mille Lacs</td>
<td>1,116,390</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>987,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>1,121,601</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>911,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadena</td>
<td>463,485</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,148,158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sional staffs. In some counties it appears that there is a rising conflict between professional staff and elected officials. In others, the county commissioners, unfamiliar with social service systems and their intent, rely very heavily on professional staff. Systematic data on the role of professional staff in decision-making have not as yet been collected. Some elected officials relish the take-over permitted under CSSA, others are content to “rubber stamp.” The differential factors have not, as yet, been ascertained.

While no clear pattern of decision-making emerged, the political nature of the environment was persistently noted in our interviews with CAP directors. Observations such as, “They will go a long way to accommodate to the powerful and influential members in the community,” were recurrent.

Another frequent observation was: “In rural communities, interactions are personal, it is the only game in town.” The factor of personal relationships and their impact on decision-making appears to be powerful. In this instance, it was noted that CAPs, by their clear identification with low-income people are perceived as having greater political power in rural communities.

Two items were mentioned by CAP directors as over-riding concerns for county commissioners: avoiding controversy and keeping the advocacy role of CAPs within permissible bounds. The following strategies were identified as common among the elected officials.

1) Double voting patterns; voting for programs for low-income persons within a CAP board meeting, but reversing the vote at the county board, where the final vote must be taken.
2) Keeping controversial items off the agendas.
3) Setting controversies in off-the-record meetings.
4) Avoiding public debate on issues of controversy by not publicizing the time and place of meetings.

Perhaps the repetitive references to these strategies reveal more than other data, the lack of trust between many CAP directors and county commissioners, and the uneasy relationship between the two.

Why CAPs Have Persisted

The anxious interplay between CAP and county has been compounded by the uncertainties of recent federal budgetary actions. The federal Community Services Agency, which administered CAPs, has been eliminated. An office in the Department of Health and Human Services will administer the dwindling activities of the nation’s CAPs. Federal funds for CAPs are expected to be reduced by 70 to 85 percent in 1983. If CAPs are to survive, new funding will have to come from state government and local governments.

Minnesota’s experience is worth recording. Despite the precarious existence of CAPs nationwide, they have enjoyed strong legislative support in Minnesota. Since 1973 the legislature has appropriated funds for CAPs each year. In the 1982 legislative session, amendments to the 1981 Act revealed the durable acceptance of CAPs as an indispensable part of the state’s resources for low-income people. While rumors persisted that the counties would oppose legislation to maintain CAPs, when the amendments were proposed the counties offered no opposition. Indeed, in pre-hearing negotiations, there was a reluctant realization that CAPs had important uses that counties could not reproduce.

The amendments as they were approved encourage closer coordination between CAPs and counties: CAPs are to be informed of new outreach programs for low-income persons, CAPs are to be consulted on needs assessments, and CAPs are encouraged to monitor county social programs. Counties are prevented from vetoing any CAP program. Federal dollars consolidated within a block grant must be maintained for anti-poverty purposes and cannot be absorbed for other purposes. On the other hand, specifying specific components of CAP services (such as employment, education, family planning and alcoholism treatment) was repealed so as to assure counties that duplication of services would be avoided.

The Governor, in signing the bill, commented that the “competitive tension” provided by CAPs was important for the state. CAPs received by these amendments a firm endorsement as an indispensable component of the social services’ and programs’ delivery system.

Unquestionably, the economic role of CAPs in local communities is one of their features that is valued. Over an eighteen year period they have become organizations with resources that sometimes overshadow those of the county for human services. Money, personnel, and a large client group form a power base which provides, as one CAP director put it, “the bargaining chip” when organizational survival is threatened. Indeed, the economic power of CAPs, especially in distressed counties, is formidable. In some of these counties, CAPs rank as the fourth or fifth largest employer. Their skill and sophistication in securing federal grants is illustrated by the Arrowhead CAP in the northern part of the state with a budget for 1980 of $14,264,406. “No other single agency in the rural areas has such a major involvement with the federal government,” is a common observation, confirmed by the annual reports of the state Office of Economic Opportunity. CAPs’ economic contribution is not lost on local enterprises. “It is a major flow of money in this region and banks know it,” commented one CAP director.

Further, they are a convenient conduit for soft money programs that must get out quickly and efficiently to the low-income sector. The fuel assistance and weatherization program illustrates the usefulness of a CAP agency with its well-developed outreach networks that stretch across the towns, villages, and farms of rural Minnesota.

CAP outreach coordinators, low-income persons themselves, are distinguished by their special brand of “needs assessment.” Based on informal, neighborly knowledge of how people are trying to survive, they are truly “grass roots” in their approach of door knocking, visiting, and exchanging information and referral in literally hundreds of communities in the state. Where the values in a rural context are antithetical to economic dependency and the culture attaches shame to seeking help, the distinctive style and outreach of CAPs make them an essential alternative delivery system for poor people.

CAPs were also mentioned as a political convenience for county government. “When you have a controversial program, or where it is a soft money program that’s going to be here today and gone tomorrow, it’s better to have the CAPs do it and catch the flak when the programs disappear.” The political value of having an agency that insulated elected officials from the heat of controversial services is quietly acknowledged by astute members of local government.

A controversial “strength” of CAPs is uncovered in the observation that CAPs can deliver services with efficiency and economy. Stressing their flexibility, because of their private non-profit status, the organization is identified as one that is now weighted down with the paraphernalia of civil service systems and rigid staffing patterns. CAP directors also mention the low administrative costs associated with their program delivery. More than one observer pointed out to us, however, the irony of this assertion. The question was raised as to whether or not an organization mandated to improve the economic status of poor people, could itself, justify paying low wages to its own staff and discouraging unionization.

A less noted but important contribution that CAPs make derives from their capacity to coordinate the participation of community groups and volunteers. The CAP presence, for example, has been identified as a significant contribution in making nutrition programs for the elderly and other senior center programs available and accessible.

In total, CAPs emerge as a useful and important presence in rural Minnesota. They provide economic resources, a useful outreach network, and a political shield for “unpopular” programs.
Recommendations

The social program arena is now one in which fiercely contending needy groups vie for favorable attention within a block grant system. Political pressure is focused on locally-elected county officials. The protection of categorical grants is diminished. Local prejudices attached to “deserving” and “undeserving” groups endanger the principle of equity. Disfavored groups are especially vulnerable given the monopoly role assigned to elected county commissioners under the CSSA.

The importance of a countervailing force is essential in subduing the concentration of power with the county boards and constraining the personal vagaries of elected officials.

The assumption that the planning processes for allocating resources under a local block grant system are open has been called into question. One study notes the decline in the number of hearings. Others have pointed out the routine and shallow nature of needs assessments. How to safeguard the rights of minorities in environments which may be inhospitable as a result of the “passions and prejudices” of local history is an essential question. Can CAPs assume the role of monitor and advocate?

The strengths of CAPs, their flexibility as social program delivery systems, their outreach capabilities, and their skills in negotiating inter-governmental programs, have already been noted. They have, however, rarely sat at the negotiating table when CSSA plans were shaped. And they have not emerged in a monitoring role to safeguard the interests of disfavored low-income persons.

A central issue, therefore, emerges. To what extent can CAPs be freed from the intimidating environment which places them at risk, since they serve at the pleasure of county officials? Realistically, there is very little room for CAPs to move beyond the permissible bounds of the advocacy activities which have already been set: to continue to do outreach, to present information and insights on needs assessments, and to encourage citizen participation for their low-income constituents. Even these activities have, at times, been circumscribed by various “cease and desist” messages and limited by the perceptions of CAP directors who have chosen “isolation” as a survival strategy.

The monitoring role for CAPs needs to be strengthened. Attendance at board meetings, participation in advisory committees, and observation of appeals procedures need to be safeguarded from reprisals. In this connection an evaluation of the effectiveness of CAP boards is in order and accountability measures for CAP directors should be instituted. Indefinite tenure, which appears to be the general practice, should be examined.

A block grant system requires checks and balances. While the role of CAPs in providing an advocacy organization centered on organizing low-income constituents to confront county commissioners is not a viable concept, they can contribute information, outreach, and a point of view that will have fundamental value for the mix of local political decision-making.

The isolation of CAPs from the elected county structures is a loss to the state. Active exchanges between these two entities will enlarge the understanding of the needs of low-income populations—populations that are sparsely represented in the rural milieu where decisions are made.

Environmental Directory Published

Over 200 citizen and professional organizations are actively involved in environmental issues in Minnesota. Who are they? What do they do? A new directory just published by the Minneapolis Public Library should prove useful in answering these and other questions. Minnesota Environmental Organizations: A Directory includes information on all 200 organizations.

The Environmental Conservation Library (ECOL), a section of the Minneapolis Public Library, and CURA worked together for the past year to produce the new directory. It is the second edition of the directory and supersedes the 1978 edition. Entries for each organization include address, phone number, contact person, a statement of purpose, a description of major activities, publications, and size of membership.

Three additional sections list government agencies involved with the environment, inactive and defunct environmental organizations, and other helpful directories. A subject index and a geographic index (by region and county) are also included.

The directory is three-hole punched and shrink wrapped in plastic. The looseleaf format of this edition will facilitate easy updating. Copies may be purchased at the downtown Minneapolis Public Library for $5.00 or by mail for $6.00. Send orders to: Minneapolis Public Library and Information Center, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN 55401, Attention: Business Office. Checks should be made out to Minneapolis Public Library and Information Center.
The Hmong and Their Neighbors
by Douglas Olney

Douglas Olney is a graduate student in anthropology at the University of Minnesota who has a special interest in the Hmong. He has been employed as a research assistant with CURA's Southeast Asian Refugee Studies Project for the past two years. He prepared A Bibliography of the Hmong (CURA 1981), now being updated for a second printing, and was co-editor with Bruce Downing of The Hmong in the West (CURA 1982).

The arrival of more than 10,000 Hmong refugees in the Twin Cities has been felt in many ways by the recipient communities as well as by the refugees themselves. The influx of these preliterate agriculturalists from the hills of Laos has put great stress on a number of sectors of the community. Social service providers have been forced to adapt existing programs to meet the challenge presented by people who have little experience with western ways of life. A few areas of the Twin Cities, particularly low income neighborhoods, have been particularly affected. However, the Hmong themselves have faced the biggest burden of adjustment. They have moved to a nation overwhelmingly different from their homeland. Almost every aspect of their traditional lifestyle faces change, adjustment, or even extinction in this new environment.

During the summer and fall of 1981 one small part of the Hmong's total adjustment process was examined through a field project on Hmong relations with their American neighbors in the Phillips neighborhood in Minneapolis. The results of that research are presented here along with some discussion of the background of the Hmong and the neighborhood.

Hmong Background in Laos

The Hmong are a people with a strong ethnic identity that they have actively worked to maintain throughout their history. Before moving into Laos, beginning about 150 years ago, the Hmong lived as a minority in the mountains of southern China. Over the centuries the Chinese had tried to subjugate the Hmong and other minorities. A strong sense of Hmong identity as a free and independent people developed in response to the repeated attempts at subjugation. It might be argued that Hmong identity has been reinforced by each attempt to bring them into a larger social and political system. One of the reasons for the Hmong migration to Laos was to escape further attempts by the Chinese to either annihilate or assimilate them. Laos, Vietnam, and Thailand appeared to provide the ideal setting in which the Hmong could live undisturbed.

The population of Laos is made up of a diverse mix of peoples. The dominant Lao, who have traditionally lived in the lowlands, make up about 50 percent of the population. The rest of the population includes about fifty different ethnic minority groups. Before the war and diaspora, the Hmong made up roughly 10 percent of the total Lao population, or about 300,000 people. While the Hmong limited their contacts with other people, contact was inevitable and the Hmong were quite aware of the cultural differences between the various people of Laos.

In general, the Hmong and other people in Laos seldom came into direct conflict. Hmong seem to have preferred to move when faced with local disputes rather than fight. The pattern of avoiding conflict, assimilation, and domination by moving is one important aspect of Hmong life carried over to the United States. Moving in order to avoid trouble, in fact, is one of the elements that goes into Hmong decisions to relocate within the United States.

The life of the Hmong in Laos changed drastically with the escalation of the Laotian civil war in the early 1960s. The Hmong were caught up in a complex struggle. They were fighting for their freedom, their mountain villages, and for a new recognition of the Hmong as a distinct and influential group within Laos.

The war created large numbers of internal refugees in Laos and brought many of the different ethnic groups together in the refugee camps. With the war a new type of interaction with others began. Hmong began to feel closer to other ethnic minorities. The traditional animosity of the Lao for the minorities began to be reduced and the Hmong took a leading role in the minority cause through the efforts of several Hmong leaders and the strength of the Hmong army.

The Phillips Neighborhood

The Twin Cities metropolitan area contains several concentrations of Hmong: a number in St. Paul, the Phillips neighborhood in Minneapolis, and scattered pockets elsewhere. Phillips is a low-income inner-city neighborhood with a high percentage of rental housing, a significant transient population, and a relatively large number of minority people. Before the Hmong arrived, the neighborhood was made up of whites, Incians, blacks, and Chicanos in descending proportions. Now there are between 1,000 and 1,200 Hmong in and around the neighborhood, and the Asians may be the second largest minority group. The 1980 Census shows roughly 17,000 people in the neighborhood—18 percent American Indian, 9 percent Asian, 8 percent black, and 2 percent Spanish origin.

During the winter of 1981 there was much concern among community workers that the neighborhood might explode the next summer because of tensions created by the arrival of the new ethnic group. The Hmong were perceived as "clannish," sticking to themselves and avoiding involvement with others. This trait was seen as a problem by community planners in their attempts to involve the Hmong in the neighborhood and help ease the tensions between the Hmong and others. Some neighborhood residents had suggested that the Hmong only planned to be there for a short time before they moved on. This project was undertaken in an attempt to evaluate how much the Hmong are interested in becoming involved with their neighbors, how they perceive them, and in general how they feel about living where they do. An attempt has been made to represent the Hmong point of view. A companion piece on what long-term neighborhood residents feel about the influx of these people would be useful.

Methods of This Study

The primary data for this study were collected through thirty survey interviews in Hmong households. The interviews were conducted in Hmong with the help of a Hmong bilingual University student. A standard questionnaire which had been translated into Hmong was used. The Hmong households were selected from addresses made available by a Hmong community leader and from the phone book. It was not possible to do random sampling, and even locating the current addresses of the people who lived in the neighborhood was difficult because the Hmong families moved so often. But, by comparing the families in our survey with those surveyed in other cities, we feel confident that a fairly representative sampling of families was interviewed. We interviewed twenty-seven men and three women, ranging in age from 18-77 years. The average household size
was 7.9 persons, average time in the United States 24.2 months, and average time in current residence 9.5 months. Seventeen of the thirty families came directly to Minnesota from Thailand. In general the person interviewed was the household head, but in seven cases the household head, usually a woman or old man in these instances, designated another spokesperson. It is assumed that the experiences of the entire family were represented in the interview.

Time was also spent in the neighborhood observing the Hmong as they moved about outside, during the summer and fall of 1981. These observations on the streets and in the parks, were useful in noting the types of cross-ethnic interactions that occurred.

Finally, supplementary interviews were conducted with several Americans who work with service organizations in the neighborhood. A survey by the Phillips Neighborhood Improvement Association, conducted in 1979 prior to the influx of Hmong refugees, also proved useful in gathering background information about the neighborhood.

**Hmong Acquaintance With Neighbors**

One question asked in the survey was the degree to which Hmong knew their American neighbors. Two categories of relationship were used: *know* and *friend*. In this study to *know* someone was to be able to recognize and occasionally speak to that person. The name of the person might or might not be known. *Friend* was defined by Hmong as a person who helps and socializes on a somewhat regular basis, but again the name of the person might not necessarily be known.

The survey indicates that while the Hmong do know some of the people around them, they do not know many. Table 1 shows that while 83 percent knew neighbors in the same building, only 23 percent knew non-Hmong in their building. Overall less than one-third (30 percent) knew non-Hmong in their neighborhood and less than half (43 percent) knew non-Hmong in the entire Twin Cities area.

When asked about friends, not just acquaintances (those you *know*), only six of the Hmong (20 percent) indicated they had any non-Hmong friends in the neighborhood. One-third of the Hmong we interviewed (ten families) had non-Hmong friends somewhere in the Twin Cities area. But all of the Hmong indicated they would like to have American friends.

The Hmong were asked about the ethnicity of the non-Hmong friends and acquaintances. Table 2 shows that relationships with whites predominated.

The survey data tell only part of the story of how Hmong interact with others. Observation revealed several things that make it difficult to generalize about how Hmong interact with their neighbors as opposed to the way Americans interact with their neighbors. In one building, which had nine units, all the apartments were occupied by Hmong. The author assumed that the build-
Hmong Attitudes Toward Americans

Five of the people I talked to expressed a fear that Americans did not really want to know Hmong. They felt they were already being placed at the low end of American society. "I would like to get to know Americans but I don't think they want to know the Hmong," was the way this usually was expressed. While this is an upsetting generalization about Americans on the part of the Hmong it is not entirely wrong.

Just as Americans tend to view the Hmong as one homogeneous group, the Hmong tend to lump various groups of Americans into homogeneous units. When talking about American ethnic groups my Hmong informants were quite aware of the differences, and their terminology reflects this awareness. For the Hmong the term American only refers to white Americans and the terms black, Indian, and Chico refer to each minority group. Their assumption appears to be that other minorities are not fully American just as they are not. On the one hand this represents a misperception on the Hmong's part, on the other hand it represents a recognition of the problems of ethnic minorities in American culture. It may also indicate that the Hmong are interpreting the society around them to be similar to the society they knew in Laos. There most Hmong never really felt equal to the Lactians, nor did they feel a strong identity with Laos as a nation. The Lao seldom considered minority persons to be citizens with full rights.

The Hmong seem to have perceived rather quickly the ethnic differences that exist in the neighborhood and the relative status of each ethnic group. In the interviews there was no indication as to where the Hmong feel they fall in this hierarchy of peoples, but they do feel that they lack equal status with white Americans. Yet it is to white Americans that they look for support and friendship. The Americans that are helpful to them are by far mostly white: the English teachers, sponsors, and volunteers. These Americans are special people;

Table 1. ACQUAINTANCE WITH NEIGHBORS

Percent (absolute numbers in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Know Others</th>
<th>Know Hmong</th>
<th>Know non-Hmong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In same building</td>
<td>83 (25)</td>
<td>67 (20)</td>
<td>23 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In adjacent houses</td>
<td>30 (9)</td>
<td>17 (5)</td>
<td>17 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Twin Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. ETHNICITY OF NON-HMONG FRIENDS AND ACQUAINTANCES

Percent (absolute numbers in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Acquaintances (Know)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17 (5)</td>
<td>27 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. ACQUAINTANCE AND FRIENDSHIP WITH NON-HMONG AS RELATED TO EACH LEVEL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS

Percent (absolute numbers in parentheses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have non-Hmong acquaintances or friends?</th>
<th>Do you speak English?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (11)</td>
<td>A little (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintances</td>
<td>64 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>55 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent are calculated within each skill level: thus, 7 of the 11 who speak English have non-Hmong acquaintances—they represent 64 percent of those who speak English.
Americans on the street often seem withdrawn and uninterested to the Hmong. Some Hmong expect never to be accepted into American society. A couple of men expressed a sense of irony because they felt they had already paid their dues by fighting for Americans in Laos and the Americans here should welcome them. These men feel they had no choice but to come to the United States—they had no place else to go—so they desperately need to be accepted. This is a debt that many Americans do not recognize. Some associate the Hmong with the general American guilt about the war in Vietnam and do not like the reminder. Americans also have difficulty in recognizing the differences among the various ethnic groups from Southeast Asia let alone the differences among the Hmong.

Racism is an important element in all this. There have been scattered reports of racist behavior, from discrimination in housing and jobs to a general dislike of Asians. There are second-hand reports of problems between racial groups in schools; and in the parks primarily segregated activities can be observed. There is little doubt that many Americans are upset about the influx of a new and different group of people into their city and neighborhood.

Language Difficulties

Although the Hmong have a desire to get to know their American neighbors, they have, as they see it, one very large problem: their inability to speak English. Only one third (eleven) of those interviewed said they could speak English and of those only three felt comfortable enough to do the interview in English. Another eight said they knew "a little" English. There appears to be a direct relationship between the ability to speak English and the likelihood of having American friends. This is shown when we examine the English proficiency of those who said they knew or were friends with non-Hmong (see Table 3). Of those who said they spoke English, 64 percent had non-Hmong acquaintances and 55 percent had non-Hmong friends. Whereas for those who spoke no English only 27 percent had non-Hmong acquaintances and only 9 percent, non-Hmong friends.

For many Hmong the only thing that they feel comfortable saying in English is "H," and they are afraid that even that may elicit from an American a response they do not understand. On the other hand, many would welcome a chance to try to converse in English, Hmong, and sign language about various everyday topics. Lack of language proficiency leads to other problems, such as a perceived lack of aggressiveness. But it must be pointed out that a limited foreign language ability was part of Hmong life in Laos too. However, the Hmong regularly came into contact with speakers of other languages. In Laos the Hmong were usually able to communicate their needs when necessary; they are experienced in living in a multilingual environment. It is Americans who lack experience in communicating with speakers of other languages.

Linguists have suggested that in normal daily life a Hmong does not need to use English very much. There is often a bilingual spokesperson for a family group to carry out the necessary contacts with the English-speaking world. The people the spokesperson represents may be going to school to learn English, but they never have occasion to practice what they learn. They do not build on what they have been taught. American neighbors could provide an opportunity for practice. A friendly and patient neighbor will be less threatening to a Hmong who wants to try out a few words than will a stranger in a strange situation. But the customary use of spokespersons also serves to inhibit interactions with neighbors. Typically, one family member may speak to the neighbors, or the children may talk to the neighbor children, but the other household members feel they cannot talk—someone else does it better, so why should they bother?

Language difficulties do not exist only for the Hmong. There are many Hmong who can speak English well enough to be understood, but are frustrated by Americans who do not have the patience to try and understand them through their thick accent. It appears that many Americans are only tolerant of their own style of speaking and do not bother trying to understand others.

Shyness

Aggravating the language problem is a general shyness about interacting with Americans. Hmong, for many good reasons, are not comfortable in interactions with Americans. Many of the Hmong interviewed said that though they would like to have American friends, they cannot make friends because they are shy. On the other hand they would welcome overtures by Americans.
This shyness must not be interpreted as passivity. Hmong are not shy when they interact with other Hmong. In every situation the author has observed, Hmong are very talkative, even with Hmong they do not know. The Hmong in Laos were seldom shy with their neighbors. In relations with other hill people the Hmong usually had the upper hand, and it was the Hmong, of all the minorities, who were able to gain some influence in the Lao government. Some Hmong even seem to be tired of being reticent with Americans and are ready to take a more aggressive stance when they are having problems.

**Knowledge of Community Resources**

Hmong reticence, however, is a factor in how Hmong go about becoming involved in community activities. In the survey the Hmong were asked about their knowledge of community resources as well as their participation in community activities.

Waite House is a neighborhood center which is run by Pillsbury-Waite Neighborhood Services. Nineteen of the Hmong we interviewed (63 percent) knew where Waite House was and thirteen (43 percent) had been there. According to a past director at Waite House there was an effort to have activities that interested and involved the Hmong. Hmong children were offered day care and there were some English language classes and tutoring available. In addition, special programs at Waite House included the American Indian Feast and the Indochinese Cultural Festival. The American Indian Feast, in the spring of 1981, was held by the Indian community to welcome the Hmong. About one quarter of those we interviewed had attended each of these events.

Another neighborhood resource is the block clubs, organized by the city as a way to bring neighbors together for protection, sharing of information, and social activities. Nineteen of those interviewed lived on a block with an active block club; of these only two knew about the block club. One Hmong had attended a meeting of the block club. Though Hmong attendance is low it is not that different from attendance of neighborhood residents as a whole. In the survey conducted by the Phillips Neighborhood Improvement Association in 1979, 10 percent of those interviewed went to block club meetings while 60 percent indicated that they were interested. In our survey, all the Hmong were interested in the block club idea when they learned about it and thought it might be a good way to meet people who lived around them.

While Hmong attendance was limited in community activities such as the American Indian Feast and the Indochinese Cultural Festival, the interest in going to such events in the future was high. It is significant, however, that almost half said they would go only if they were specifically invited, not if they simply saw a notice posted somewhere. A few informants commented that they would only attend activities if they knew that other Hmong would be there.

**Neighborhood Problems**

The Phillips Neighborhood Improvement Association (PNIA) survey also questioned residents about neighborhood problems. Among the problems in the neighborhood, vandalism (49 percent), residential burglaries (47 percent), alcoholism (47 percent), and garbage and litter (39 percent) were considered “big problems.” Thirteen percent noted racial tension as a major problem. It must be kept in mind that this was a report of problems as perceived by the respondents. In our survey of the Hmong we asked about actual problems that had occurred. Table 4 shows what problems were reported by the Hmong. Fifteen of the thirty households reported that they had had some problem in the neighborhood.

Sixty-nine percent of the respondents to the PNIA survey felt that the reason crime was a problem in the neighborhood was that the people did not know each other; 67 percent also felt it was because the children were uncontrolled. The PNIA survey indicates that people in the Phillips neighborhood were experiencing in 1979, before the Hmong moved in, many of the same problems that the Hmong complained about in our 1981 study. The Hmong said that most of the problems were caused by children. One Hmong man asked me to tell their neighbors to control their children better. The Hmong seem to perceive, as do other residents, that if they get to know the people around them better there will be fewer problems.

Table 4. PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Hmong</th>
<th>Non-Hmong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>27 (8)</td>
<td>17 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputes with neighbors</td>
<td>17 (5)</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment on street</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hmong families lived along with many other families. The Hmong were suffering from harassment—broken car windows, slashed tires, and name calling—so that the Hmong leader who lived there decided all the Hmong should move. Soon all the families were living elsewhere.

People working with service organizations in the community reported no generalized problems between the Hmong and more established residents. This project was originally conceived at a time when the community workers sensed a real rise in tension in the neighborhood, centering on the increased competition for housing and also a perception that the Hmong were receiving preferential treatment from social service organizations. It was feared that during the summer of 1981 the neighborhood would explode and there would be more racial violence. As the summer proceeded virtually nothing happened. The level of violence and crime in the neighborhood did not seem to change. It may be that activities and programs aimed at diffusing tension actually worked, but there really were not enough of these activities to have a great effect. Rather it seemed that people, for whatever reason, began to learn on their own that the new people were not really affecting the neighborhood that much.

Concern about rising tensions occurred as Hmong families were moving in very rapidly—late 1980 and early 1981. The Hmong became highly visible on the streets and in the stores. Even today it seems that one sees more Hmong than other people out and around the neighborhood. Considering that they still constitute a small percentage of the total population the Hmong were and are disproportionately visible. The rapid growth and almost instant visibility of the Hmong in the neighborhood were enough to cause concern among the residents. Rumors developed and tensions rose. Early in 1981 the influx of Hmong slowed and stabilized in the Twin Cities and in the neighborhood. When this influx stopped, many residents began to realize that their neighborhood was not being completely taken over by the Hmong, and as people who lived in the area became more accustomed to the sight of Hmong in their midst, the tensions seemed to drop.
Conclusions and Recommendations

From this study it appears that the Hmong in Phillips are beginning to get along fairly well with their American neighbors. The problems the Hmong have are no greater than those which existed in the neighborhood before they arrived. The biggest negative problem is the persistence of rumors that the Hmong receive preferential treatment in obtaining public services. This problem may still intensify as public resources continue to shrink and special programs, such as economic development projects, are developed for the Hmong.

Contrary to the belief of some Americans in the neighborhood, the Hmong are very interested in becoming good neighbors, getting to know Americans, and participating in neighborhood activities. This finding differs from one in a similar study in Long Beach, California. The California study showed that Hmong there felt that their inner city neighbors did not provide positive role models and they, consequently, did not want to interact with their inner city neighbors. The Hmong in Long Beach did want to get to know Americans—white Americans living outside the area. The difference is perhaps attributable to the difference in the structure of the inner city neighborhoods in the two cities: Minneapolis is a calm and pleasant place, even in inner city areas, relative to many other cities in the nation.

Both the California study and our Minneapolis study find that there is a strong desire to become incorporated into American society, but this is a very slow process for the Hmong. The process could be hastened by increasing the interaction of Hmong with their neighbors. A start could be made through greetings and friendly overtures on the streets from both Hmong and Americans as well as by developing more neighborhood-centered activities that would encourage all the residents to become involved.

Several recommendations can be made on the basis of this project. Though tension in the neighborhood seems to have dissipated, there is a potential for problems as poor residents continue to compete for shrinking public resources and the Hmong are thrown into the general welfare system. To alleviate potential problems, planners must find ways to bring the new and old
Residents together. The Hmong want to know their neighbors and they want to stay in the neighborhood. Programs like community potluck dinners combined with some cultural sharing and education would be very helpful. It must be remembered that the Hmong need direct invitations to events and activities in order to feel truly welcome. The block clubs organized in the neighborhood could be a useful way to bring people together; block captains should attempt actively to recruit the Hmong to come to meetings. American residents should be encouraged to stop and talk to their Hmong neighbors while they are out on their porches and in their yards.

Tutoring activities should be encouraged in the neighborhood. The Hmong know they have to learn English, but they also need to have someone to talk to. One potential is getting some of the aged residents who live in the neighborhood to tutor and work with some of the older Hmong who feel especially lonely.

In the development of programs for the Hmong in the city, planners and others must be careful not to single out the Hmong as the people receiving all the attention. Multicultural programs need to be developed that appeal to all types of residents.

While the Hmong have had a long history of operating independently in a world full of other kinds of people, they have never been faced with a situation like the one in the United States. They want to maintain their traditions, but they also want to become Americans and become involved with people who already are Americans. It is up to the Americans who live around them to remember the struggles of their immigrant ancestors and welcome the newest immigrants into the city.

———

Links Between the Corporate World and Nonprofit Organizations

A study which began with CURA support five years ago has expanded and promises to flower into a book. Joe Galaskiewicz, Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology, began looking at the links between Twin City corporations and cultural organizations as part of a class project in the spring of 1977. Funds from CURA allowed him to take a closer look at these ties and the results of the study were published in the CURA Reporter in March 1980. His original research design was then expanded to include corporate links with other nonprofit organizations in the Twin Cities. Thanks to a number of grants, including major support from the National Science Foundation and additional funds from the Program on Nonprofit Organizations (Yale University) and the Graduate School at the University of Minnesota, the project has continued and will be completed next summer.

Galaskiewicz has profiled nonprofit organizations in the Twin Cities, surveyed a group of community elite (prominent citizens and philanthropic leaders) to get their opinions on local nonprofit activities and corporate contributions, and profiled corporate donors. Preliminary findings of the three surveys are now available. The entire study will be published as a book after its completion this summer. CURA has a limited number of copies of the preliminary findings (Corporate-Nonprofit Linkages in Minneapolis-St. Paul) available free of charge. Please phone 612/373-7833 to order a copy or use the CURA Publications Order Form in this Reporter.

———

New CURA Publications


A summary of this monograph is presented in this Reporter, pp. 1-7.


This bibliography provides a collection of references for books, articles, reports, and conference proceedings dealing with the production of biomass as a renewable energy source. Major emphasis is on the environmental, economic, and social impacts of these non-traditional crops—crops such as cattails, reeds, black spruce, willows, poplars, and cottonwoods. The entire bibliography has been available in a computerized retrieval system called INDEX, at the Minnesota Department of Energy, Planning, and Development, and is now made available in booklet format with this publication.


This handbook is designed to provide a brief overview of the survey research process and its uses, an introduction to the important issue of estimating costs, and a description of the survey research services that are available to organizations in the Twin Cities area. It is intended for the administrator, manager, or policy-maker who might benefit from the use of survey research results but who has little familiarity with the survey process, its planning, or how to locate appropriate agencies (commercial or public) that provide survey services. Those well versed in survey design will likely find little new in this handbook, except perhaps for the information on survey costs and available survey services.

The approach is to discuss the various uses of surveys for administrative or policy decision-making and to briefly describe the
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general survey process and the basic survey variations. Survey costs estimation is discussed and actual estimates from survey research firms are reviewed. Finally, the reader is offered a listing of research firms and agencies and an inventory of the survey services that they can provide to organizations in the Twin Cities area.


We've published a new version of an old favorite, the population change map. With data from the 1980 census, population changes are shown both in absolute numbers and in percentage changes. This wall map is printed on both sides. On one side, a dot map is presented with each dot representing a one-hundred person increase (black) or decrease (red) in the local population. An inset is provided for the Twin Cities area. On the other side, the percent of increase or decrease is shown for Minnesota cities and townships in a graded key, again with red for decreases and black for increases. A small map of Minnesota is also printed to show percentage increases and decreases on a county-by-county basis.

**Update on State Management of Peat Development.** Deborah Karasov. 1982. CURA 82-5. 13 pp.

Minnesota's Department of Natural Resources has adopted cautious leasing policy for the development of peat as a source of energy in Minnesota. This working paper reports on the DNR’s current management activities and the status of present leases. It is designed for those who have been following the issues of peatland development in Minnesota.


Originally written and published in Thailand in the mid-1960s and recently revised by the author, these lessons were designed for use by Americans and missionaries in Hmong village settings. The book presents a set of structured lessons, however, that should be usable by Americans in the United States. White Hmong is one of the two major dialects of the Hmong language and is widely spoken by the immigrant Hmong here. The lessons should be studied with the help of a Hmong speaker.


Have you been perplexed about what CURA actually is and what we do? Have you ever had difficulty explaining us to a friend? Relief has arrived. We've just published a short, easy-to-read brochure to explain what CURA is to those who don't know.

CURA publications may be ordered by phone (612/373-7833) or on the CURA Publication Form below.

---

**CURA Publication Order Form**

- [ ] Update on State Management of Peat Development. Deborah Karasov. CURA 82-5. 13 pp. Free.

Other Publications About the Hmong
- [ ] Indochinese Refugee Settlement Patterns in Minnesota. Glenn Hendricks. CURA 81-3. 7 pp. and 3 maps. Free.
- [ ] The Hmong in the West: Observations and Reports. Bruce T. Downing and Douglas P. Clancy, eds. CURA 82-1. 401 pp. $7.00* plus $1.25 postage.

*Minnesota residents add 6 percent sales tax.

I enclose a check or money order for $ ____________.

__________________________
name

__________________________
address

city state zip code

Send to: CURA
313 Walter Library
117 Pleasant St. S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
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The Center for Urban and Regional Affairs was established to help make the University of Minnesota more responsive to the needs of the larger community and to increase the constructive interaction between faculty and students, on the one hand, and those dealing directly with major public problems, on the other hand.
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