INTERVIEWEE: Thomas Royals

INTERVIEWER: David G. McComb

DATE: November 4, 1968

M: All right, Mr. Royals, to start on your biographical background. I 'd like to know where you were born and when.

R: I was born in 1926 in Chicago, Illinois, on the west side of Chicago; I attended grade school there and St. Mel's Roman Catholic High School. I graduated from St. Mel's in 1944 and entered the army--joined the Army Rangers. I served in Europe as a sergeant with the Rangers and was finally captured at Luxenbourg, became a prisoner of war from February of 1945 through May of 1945. I was wounded three times during the time I was captured and received medical attention from the Germans, and finally was freed in May of '45.

M: Were you in on the Normandy invasion?

R: No, I was late for the Normandy invasion, but right after that I went in. I came back to the states and,after some leave, finished out my army tour as a Master Sergeant and was discharged in December of 1945 and commissioned a second lieutenant in the Infantry. I then attended De Paul University in Chicago and graduated from DePaul in June of 1950 with a Bachelor of Philosophy. My major was Education. Following this, I taught for six months in the public school system in Chicago, and then I was recalled to the service, to the Army, and transferred to the Air Force.

M: You were in the reserves?

R: I was in the reserves, that is correct. I was recalled as a second lieutenant, though, and transferred to the Air Force, worked a short tour in Korea, returned, attended Georgetown University for a year and a half where I received my Master's in International Relations, studied the languages of Afghanistan and Persia, and was assigned to Tripoli in North Africa, and thence to Cairo.

M: Let me get some dates on this. When did you get your Master's degree?

R: I got my Master's degree from Georgetown in 1953.

M: And then you went--

R: To North Africa, to Tripoli--

M: Immediately thereafter?

R: Immediately thereafter to a special unit working in psychological warfare. Then from there I went to Cairo and then returned to the United States in October of 1953--a short tour. I went inactive again from the Air Force and joined Motorola as the assistant director of training at Motorola and stayed with Motorola until January of 1958. When I left the company I was director of training on the corporate staff. We did supervisory training and specialized in the technical training using special technicians to lay out the courses in executive development.

In January of '58, I joined the Department of State for a six-month tour in Japan as a special advisor to the ambassador on industrial education and training. I ran four training seminars

in Japan for the Japanese companies in supervisory techniques and training and how to train training directors and training officers. I worked with approximately forty companies throughout the nation--the different islands in Japan--assisting them in establishing training programs in their companies--in industrial training programs.

I returned to the States in June of '58, and after a period of leave joined the training staff of the then CAA, Civil Aviation Agency, which later became the Federal Aviation Agency. The area of my specialty was first-line supervisory training and instructor training. As you know, every air traffic control tower and air route traffic center in the United States has a number of instructors on their staff. It was my job to make sure that proficiency was upgraded. I also assisted in the establishment of the Dulles International Airport. [I] trained all of the supervisors that subsequently went out to Dulles, from the fire and police to the maintenance personnel.

M: You served with the CAA, or FAA, from 1958 to '63?

R: Till '63. In 1963, in March, I joined the Department of Labor--the Office of Manpower Automation and Training, at that time--to review and evaluate the ongoing on-the-job training programs that were funded and sponsored under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

M: How did you happen to make this transfer?

R: Well, I guess we ought to go back. While I was working at FAA--not only on domestic programs--I also for a year handled the

international programs of training international people, foreigners, who came to this country in various phases of aviation in laying out their programs and also working with our people before they went overseas. I decided that my talents, having worked with underdeveloped countries, could well be used in working with underdeveloped counties here in the United States. So I discussed this with people in the Labor Department and they felt that I could bring some knowledge to the domestic program that we had been experimenting with in the international programs.

So in September of '62 I talked with the Labor Department, and by the time the wheels of the government got ground through it was March of '63 before I was transferred over. Since I had considerable experience in industry and in various types of training, they felt that I would be a good man to go out and check and see what was going on in industry in on-the-job training, first of all in what was actually being funded privately, what industry itself was carrying on, then what programs were being conducted under the Manpower Development and Training Act, which companies were at that time receiving a very small stipend.

The major part of the Manpower Development and Training Act activity, called the MDTA in government gobbledy-gook, was predominately the in-school training where people would either come off of a make-shift job or low-level job or come from the unemployed ranks and attend a course in school from upwards to sixteen through thirty-two to fifty-two weeks. Then they would return to the employment service, and the employment service would try and place them. We had many problems at this time since they'd start a class, let's say,

in welding that would be sixteen weeks long, and there would be a need for twenty welders on the first day of January. However, four months later when the class was completed, there might not be a need for more than five welders, and if twenty started, you had fifteen left over. So slowly it became evident that the on-the-job training effort was really important.

However, there were terrific difficulties. Companies weren't sure exactly what we meant by on-the-job training, how deeply they were going to get involved in government paperwork, plus the fact that the type of training, was it going to be business-as-usual? Now, over the years we have discovered that business-as-usual with people who have been unemployed for a long period of time just doesn't work. You can't place a person at a novice next to another man and expect him to keep his own production rate up and in turn teach this other person what to do. So it takes a rather sophisticated system in some cases to really train people, and the type of training that we were purchasing or assisting with the taxpayers' money in '63 is a far cry from what's happening today.

M: I want to get into that in more detail. But let's follow your career with this, and then we'll come back and take up the development of the act.

R: Okay. All right, then. So, once again, from '58 through '63 I was with FAA. From '63 until the present time I have been with the Department of Labor.

M: Now, was all this work from '63 up to this point, in this Manpower Development area?

R: In '63, as I said, I was with the Office of Manpower Automation and Training, called OMAT, and evaluating on-the-job training. In January of

'65, the new Manpower Administration, Stanley Ruttenberg, placed me on his staff to get deeper involved in the implementation of on-the-job training and working with the various federal and state activities throughout the country.

In the end of '65--January, I guess it was, of '66--I joined the President's Committee on Manpower which is a part of the Department in some ways. The director of the President's Committee on Manpower is Willard Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor. The President's Committee on Manpower is made up of all of the Cabinet agencies; but was staffed mainly by people from the Department of Labor; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, basically the Office of Education people; and from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the OEO people.

M: Is it a permanent committee?

R: It's a permanent committee in that it functions without any funds. Each of the agencies must contribute a little to have it function, and the last year it hasn't functioned to any degree. So from '66 through--or late '65, I guess it really was--through to the end of '66, I worked on the President's Committee on Manpower out in the field. Now we can go into what, as we call it, the PCOM team, the President's Committee on Manpower teams, did out in the field. But chronologically then in 1967 I came back to Mr. Ruttenberg's staff, who was then the assistant secretary and Manpower Administrator in the Department of Labor. My job was working on the Concentrated Employment Programs, establishing them and helping them get funded throughout twenty of the large cities of the nation and two rural areas. That took up most of 1967. And in 1968, I have

been working mainly with the National Alliance of Businessmen for the Assistant Secretary, once again in a very specialized activity of training within industry, what some people refer to it as "sensitivity training" of getting supervisors to better understand how to work with hard core individuals, and middle managers to do this also. So that's where we are today.

M: Now this President's Committee on Manpower, is it still functioning or what?

R: No, PCOM, the President's Committee on Manpower right now is, I guess you might call it in limbo. The Secretary has the title as the director, but hasn't seemed to implement any more activity under the President's Committee on Manpower. There is an executive director, Phil Rutledge, in the Department. However, he devotes a majority of his time to other activities. The President's Committee on Manpower has not met for over a year.

M: And you have nothing to do with it anymore?

R: Not any more, no. So that brings you up to the present date. I start chronologically in 1958 when I joined the CAA. I joined CAA-FAA as a GS-11. Today I am presently a GS-15 in civil service, a career civil servant.

M: And you must still be in the reserves of the Air Force.

R: I am still an active reserve officer. I am assigned to the Pentagon on the Air Force Chief of Staff's roles as a specialist in escape and evasion and prisoner of war activity in which, from my background, as you can well realize, I have a great interest. And I have helped work in the present programs of the last two repatriations. I worked out the plan years ago over there at the Pentagon in this activity. But

most of it is classified.

M: If it is any comfort to you, we are at least in the process of being cleared by the FBI. The clearance should have gone through. I haven't received notification one way or the other. It takes about two months or something. And incidentally these tapes can be classified.

Now to go back a little bit, you went to work in the area of manpower development almost from the time of its conception. As I recall the Manpower Training Act was passed in 1962. It probably took some time to get this going.

R: It did.

M: And you came in about the time that it was in action.

R: Well, the first programs were really started in early 1963 and they were mainly institutional programs with a very few on-the-job training programs. So as I came into the manpower area, we were just getting geared up and trying many things, experimentally and institutionally. You know, over the years we have learned a great number of things of the acceptance of certain people to go to school and how you can't run certain programs in a school situation because these people who dropped out years ago won't go back.

M: Now, apparently, when that act was first passed it was through that it would serve the technologically unemployed, those put out of work by automation.

R: That's right.

M: And this philosophy changed. Is that right?

R: Over the last few years it has changed. There still is a certain percentage--I don't have the figure right here--of people that are still to be served under the act who have been displaced by automation, such

as elevator operators and the likes of this. However, much of the focus--not all, but much--of the act today is working with unemployed or underemployed people. Now, some of them are the so-called hardcore; others are just people who have drifted from job to job to job; or people who have worked on a shipping dock and never got a break any place to move on up. So those are an underemployed person. Our job there is to work in a company that--maybe the company he is in--to get him to move on up the ladder if he so desires and offer new jobs for the people coming in off the street. So that kind of the focus from the automation and training days to the unemployed person has changed. Of course, much of this has changed because of locating people. We had no idea how to reach people in ghetto areas and the President's Committee on Manpower taught us many of these things; how to go out and organize cities.

M: Did automation turn out not to be so frightening after all?

R: Yes. I think you find scholars that go on at this point in great depth that for every machine that replaces a man there are X number of men needed to run and service the machine and do the things that it turns out. So there were a number of people in some high levels that were displaced, but it wasn't the big bad wolf, I guess, that everybody thought it was.

M: Is this part of the reason for the shift in emphasis of the Manpower Training Act?

R: I believe, as the Secretary discussing it with the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity in looking at the needs of the nation, and the needs of the people, found that the shift was really needed from the

the great emphasis on automation to a greater emphasis on unemployed people or underemployed people.

M: Did this shift come gradually, do you know, with the various amendments, or what?

R: Yes, over two or three years we have slowly moved into this area. I guess as we looked at 1965 the Secretary decided to do a survey using the President's Committee on Manpower as a leader in twenty of the large cities in the nation. And we did a survey using the United States Employment Service people of the high intensity slum-ghetto areas whether they be a black ghetto or a Mexican-American ghetto or a north side of Chicago, the uptown Appalachian ghetto area, or what have you, as a spread. Where a city had a 3.5 unemployment rate, well, when we got into that slum area or ghetto area we found that it was 10 or 12 percent, and a lot of the people are the people that never appear as a statistic because they have never held a job or a meaningful job so that they're not getting unemployment insurance and your statistic is based on this. So this sort of information then fed back said, "Look, we've got to make some changes here in the target area of the Manpower Development and Training Act."

And of course at this time we were also aided and assisted and proded, you might say, by some of the things that were going on in the Economic Opportunity Act and the Office of Economic Opportunity. The OEO people were out with their Community Action agencies developing groups who were saying, "Look at that Labor Department; it doesn't understand us at all." And thus it really forced the Department to move certain old-line agencies and bureaus into the twentieth century. As

we used to say some of them came in kicking and screaming, but they came in, because it was either this or to lose the action.

So as we got deeper involved in this problem of the ghettos with the President's Committee on Manpower we found that we can't expect people to take a bus and go six miles or eight miles downtown to your office. Let's get an office, as they called the Unemployment Office, instead of the Employment Office, out in those areas so that the people can walk in. Thus the whole Community Action package working with the United States Employment Service came about for better services, where beforehand the Department was oriented to employers. "What do you want as an employer? I'll look through my cards and see who I've got on the list, and I'll send it to you." Now the Department has changed its emphasis, and is saying, "Look, this is the raw material we have. What can you as an employer do with some of this raw material? Can't you use these people and work them into your system. And can't you help your system change to meet their needs, too?"

M: Did you have anything to do with the emphasis or the attempt to get business to move to the ghetto?

R: Yes. Now, we started at high level--

M: That would follow from this same reasoning.

R: Same sort of reasoning. In having worked on the President's Committee--I worked in the field at first on the President's Committee on Manpower. The cities I worked in were New Orleans, Tampa, Jacksonville, St. Petersburg, Florida, Miami, and I inherited Seattle also--Washington. It was quite a spread. I first worked in the New Orleans area in the five target areas that were laid out.

M: Now, were you gathering information there?

R: We did a number of things. We went out as a three-man team: one man from the Office of Education of HEW, Health, Education and Welfare; one from the Office of Economic Opportunity; and one person from the Labor Department. We had ten teams out covering some twenty or thirty cities in the United States and we rotated, or certain teams had a chairman from the Labor Department, certain from HEW, and certain from OEO. I was the chairman on the team handling New Orleans and the southern areas down there. So we went out, first of all, and met with first the federal people in our regional areas, and from there we went out to the state. Let's take an example of Florida. We went first in Atlanta with all of the federal bureaucrats of the region offices in Atlanta. That would be all the Department of Labor Regional directors, all the HEW regional directors, the Health people, the Welfare people, and the Education people, and then the OEO, the Office of Economic Opportunity, people too. I always want to stay away from these initials. Twenty years from now people won't know what the heck you're talking about. From there we went to Tallahassee and met with all the state counterparts. From Tallahassee we then set up an office in Tampa and we treated Tampa as a separate city from St. Petersburg, although they fall in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical area.

We treated each city as different. We were in Jacksonville, also, and in Miami. Well, now, within those four cities you have peculiar problems: a Cuban problem in Miami, black problem in Jacksonville, a Latin-American and black problem in Tampa, and the same in St. Petersburg. And we would carry on meetings in each of the cities bringing all the

various state and city government people together who worked in these programs--and in many cases we introduced them to each other for the first time. Shocking as it may seem, the Social Secuity Office felt that they didn't need much information from the Education Office or from the Labor Office Employment Service.

We then sat down and said, "Our purpose is to make sure that the federal taxpaying dollar is spent properly and expended to the best extent possible. So we want to know what you're doing." We gave them a two-week period of time, and they in that period of time were to send in an outline of their activities, scope of work, money that is funded to them and how they actually work. We distributed these papers to all the other participants and then at a meeting we had each one got up and explains his little role or his "little piece of heaven," as we tried to say. From there we found we had some overlapping and we had some obvious gaps that things were falling through. We had problems in what do you do with a person who is not fifty-five percent blind, therefore vocational rehabilitation under HEW, under the state level, doesn't cover him for glasses. How does this person get a pair of free glasses or get glasses that he can pay a minimum amount of and somebody else picks up some of the bill? There are a whole number and slug of things like this. So we try to set out and work out working teams.

Then we started involving the chamber of Commerce and in some towns the Chamber of Commerce was terrifically active in getting business. Jacksonville is a wonderful example of this. Other towns, the Chamber

is nothing more than a tourist agency, you know, where they give out information, really don't have much of an input into industry. We tried to work out a relationship and a partnership in this.

At that time, of course, we were experiencing a series of riots and some of us wandered through the streets in Jacksonville during the three days of the riots. I just wandered through. I never got bothered in the least at any time, day or night, and tried to keep things cool and get some of the leaders to understand what we were attempting to do to work with them and for them, you know. So this was some of our outgrowth. From some of this experience, we realized that we had to involve industry a lot deeper. Well, we were finding out during this period of time that we had to have heavy commitment and involvement in industry.

At this very time the Boeing Aircraft Company, airplane company up in Seattle, at Renton had a need for thirty-five thousand people. Senators [Warren] Magnuson and [Henry M.] Jackson called a special meeting here in Washington of the Labor Department people and HEW people and OEO people and said, "Now, what can we do because we have a goodly number of unemployed, and we've got to have a coordinated effort." Somehow, I got elected by some of my friends to be the coordinator of all the agencies, all the federal agencies and their state counterparts, in Seattle. So in addition to my work in Florida and New Orleans, I kind of did an iron triangle travel trip from Washington to Seattle to the South back to Washington again to change your clothes and go on again. With four children and a wife, this is kind of rough, but you get an awful lot of experience.

One of our greatest problems up there was that the people at Boeing wanted to hire were highly skilled people, and the people who were on the unemployment roles were underskilled. So we could try a few matches, but we couldn't do too many, but we at least made an effort in a coordinated way to attack some of this problem. From this, and the outgrowth of this and our coordinated efforts in many of the other cities, came the background of what the President proposed in the Concentrated Employment Program which was sponsored, funded under the Economic Opportunity Act but used both Economic Opportunity Act money and Manpower Development and Training Act money. So at the time--

M: May I make an interjection here? The Concentrated Employment Program means to concentrate activity in the ghetto.

R: Concentrate activity in a specific area of a city or a rural set of counties, and the purpose is--

M: This is concentration of all government services?

R: All government services to people in those areas with the major objective, as far as the Labor Department is concerned, was to get people meaningful employment, assist them in handling their personal health problems or taking care of babysitting problems and nursery problems and this sort of thing.

M: All in the area?

R: Preferably in the area of working with people from a given area and these people could receive medical services or welfare services from maybe a downtown office if they couldn't get a local smaller office out there. We might try and find them employment outside the area. We started this also working outside the area in finding, maybe across

town, where an employer would take people. We were developing this rationale in '66 as to how to do this thing and I think I'm getting a little ahead of myself here. But some of our rationale was--we hadn't thought about moving industry into the ghetto at the present time. We had thought more about taking the people and letting them continue to live there but to find jobs where this business sector was. But hopefully if they would find jobs they would then stay there and upgrade that neighborhood. I think some of the history has proven that once you find a job and you're making better money you want to move out of there.

Now within the Economic Opportunity Act there was also an area called Special Impact. It was the Kennedy-Javits Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act and was to provide special impact funds to a specific ghetto area, but as Senator [Robert] Kennedy and [Jacobs] Javits envisioned, not only would this assist the local residents in welfare and education and employment, but it would also assist them in upbringing or bringing up, bettering their own neighborhood and enticing business to move in. So in November of '66, I was assigned to work in addition to some of my other jobs, in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of New York with a special group of people that Bobby Kennedy, Senator Kennedy, had hired on his own, using his own money and some Ford Foundation money, to put together a Bedford-Stuyvesant Program covering the total Bedford-Stuyvesant area there in north Brooklyn. From this came an organization, the Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation and this restoration corporation and the Bedford-Stuyvesant Development Corporation were composed of residents of the area and some of the

bigger bankers and businessmen in New York, like Mr. Piea and Mr. Watson, many of those large corporate heads.

M: Who is Piea? (sp)

R: He is an investment banker. Ben O. Schmidt from an investment banker's. Douglas Dillon. This is the sort of tenure of people that were into the program. We started working with many, many consultants and government people from the Department of Labor in laying out just what this program could do, taking into consideration programs that were presently going on there, a few community programs, some good and some bad, many city-wide programs that were covering multitude rather than targeting into one area. So we put together a program, bought a building called the Sheffield Farms Building, which was the Sheffield Farms Milk Company building. They are restoring that--and it should be completed by now--to make this a community center for training, for employment, for social activities, and everything else. At the same time, got a feeling from industry, as we were working with this program, to find out what kind of industry could move in there. We came up with a proposal and granted a $7 million dollar grant of money to the Bedford-Stuyvesant Corporation. The Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, I think Sloan was in it, and a couple of others, put backing money into the program also, to match us. So I imagine at this time there has been probably $20 million put into the program--$7 million government money, and other outside money.

M: I get the impression that this was an experiment.

R: It was. It was probably one of the first experiments, and we were

learning. The experiment was, how do you upgrade the neighborhood, upgrade the people, and get industry to move in, also? One of the hunks of the experiment was that working with the community residents we chose six blocks in which the complete fronts of the houses were refurbished. It cost the owner of the house approximately $60-$70 for some raw material. Trainees, then, in turn worked on tuck pointing, painting, door frame activity, ironwork. We had upwards of twenty sample blocks where everybody in that block had their houses completely restored. They, in turn now, these trainees have gone into separate little private companies working on the insides of homes. Well, one of the inferences is, once again, not only are the people getting employment, but by bettering their neighborhood they want to stay there. They don't want to all move out. We are also now moving industry into those areas.

M: Are these people homeowners?

R: Many of them own their own homes. It's not like Harlem. Three-story brownstone is what the Bedford-Stuyvesant area is.

M: Is that a crucial factor, the fact that the people there own their own homes?

R: Oh, yes, very definitely.

M: Now, would such a program work in a place like Harlem, where you have absentee--

R: Absentee land ownership. No, I think you've got to, in cases like that, have the community try and get some of the ownership of the land itself and upgrade it, because what you own you take better care of in many ways. The absentee landlord business has proven very bad. Many of

the things we have discovered in this pilot project we then went on to incorporate into our Concentrated Employment Program. We first started in the twenty largest cities in the nation.

M: Are you impressed, then, that the Bedford-Stuyvesant experiment was a success? Or <u>is</u> a success?

R: I would say that it's on its way--as we are building now down to eighteen months of it almost--it's on its way to proving many of the things that we have hoped, that Senator Kennedy had hoped would happen. It has not done as much as we thought. However, we are finding out many of the ideas we had might have been pie-in-the-sky at that time. We have to get down to the real world and some of it is not as easy to accomplish overnight. But it did serve as a fairly good testing, and it gave us enough basic information to have the President sponsor the Concentrated Employment Program activities.

Also, from this we found that in '67 that the President sponsored a test program, a test program of business and industry working in the ghettos together in five cities--New York, Chicago, San Antonio, Los Angeles, and Boston. We tried this test program in going out and working with industry, talking to them and saying, "We're going to help you and assist you more than you have ever been assisted before by government funds. We're going to give--not give you--work a formula out. We're going to pick up many, many of the costs, training costs, and in some cases in wages and salary for the first six months of a person on your payroll."

You move into a ghetto--" at first it was a sample program that started in Los Angeles with the Watts Manufacturing Company out there,

a subsidiary of Aerojet Junior Company and one of the first programs that we developed was that with the Avco Corporation to put a plant in Roxbury in Boston. Avco came in with an idea on the tenth of November, 1967, and the tenth was a Friday and was a holiday. I and a friend of mine, a man by the name of Hank Prezlomsky who had done a lot of work in on-the-job training, sat down with them all day Friday, all day Saturday. Hank and I then worked out a package Sunday that we thought was very good. We had it typed on Monday, reviewed on Monday afternoon, and on Tuesday the President of Avco and the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce signed the contract. So we call that really moving the bureaucracy pretty fast. It was a program for about $2 million to put a printing establishment in the Roxbury area of Boston and train the residents in seven different occupations, trade occupations, in the printing industry--then some of them silk screen and platement and the like which are very sophisticated activities. We worked out with the unions a understanding that, although this organization is not organized, there is no reason in the world that limits you from trying to organize it. But at the same time we don't want any boycott of this activity, either. So we had good acceptance of it.

Well, this was the first effort in the President's test program of how do we aid and assist, and I guess you might say subsidize, in some way, some of the costs of training people, to get them not only trained but full-time employed and retained in a company. Then from this, of course, we go into the National Alliance of Business Activity that we are so deeply involved today in the government using the taxpayers'

dollar to reimburse companies for their training costs and additional costs, maybe medical costs, education over and above the actual training. Maybe they have to provide basic reading programs and arithmetic programs for these people before they can go on into reading of blueprints of any sort. First, being able to understand what the blueprint is and read the English and then be able to take the blueprint training. So there's a whole gamut of things to learn.

M: Is the federal program tailored to each individual section? I mean, you ask a business to come in and then you sit down with them and figure out what that business needs?

R: This would vary from city to city and from project to project. Each manufacturer has his own needs. Now, I think you have to sit down with a manufacturer and say, Are your needs realistic, first of all? You have maintained that you need a high-school graduate. Why do you need a high school graduate? Or do you need a person that has had X number of hours of algebra or geometry, or are you using this just as a guide becuase people can think better. So how are we realistically working these goals out. Then, what's this business about a police record? Suppose the person does have a police record. Let's go into it a little bit in depth here and find out what really happened, and are you willing to waive some of these? Many of the companies we are working with today are willing to waive this. So we get into a better understanding of the needs of the company meeting some of the needs of the individuals, the goals of the individuals. You try to match this. This is what we are doing today.

Well, we found that as we get deeper involved in this that even though we were providing fairly good on-the-job training, which means that the skilled craftsmen learned a little about how people learn and how to teach people or how to instruct them, we found that there were still people who weren't staying. Now, we have a couple of very great holes in industrial training here in the United States. Many skilled craftsmen are great at running their own machines, but they can't teach somebody else. You've got to understand how people learn. There needs to be more instructor training programs per se, and I think that one of my personal goals is to offer this sort of "How to Instruct" programs similar to what the government did during the War of Manpower days during World War II, when we offered that TWI series, Training Within Industry series.

But we found out that, in this whole effort, that it's not only getting people into the job but getting them, well, first accepted, trained, and retained. That is kind of a slogan. Now how do you get them accepted, and how do you get them retained, besides training? We then sat down with a number of organizations and said, "Well, this is our problem," training companies, more or less. "What have you people done in this?" And we found that Bell and Howell had done a series at one of their new companies, the Human Development Institute of Atlanta, Georgia, in working with employers--top executives,middle managers, and first-line--to get them to better understand the individual coming in, that the raw manpower market today is not like it was years ago. You can't float from job to job and the people that are out there are people that, without help, cannot stay on a job, and yet these are the

only people you have to run your organization so you've got to bend a little and work with them.

So then we went into this area of not really sensitivity training as you think of with the National Training Laboratories up in Maine and what have you, but I guess you could call it "sensitizing" foremen, just giving them an awareness--you can't change any attitudes--but just an awareness that people, no matter what color their skin, do have some certain hangups. If they come from the Appalachian area, it's pretty hard for them to adjust and their goals might not be the same as the middle-class person living in the city today. A job is just a job to make some money, and that's their means to an end. It's not a place where they are going to grow and work their way up the ladder in prestige and everything else. So we've got to better understand this. So we then, in working with the National Alliance of Businessmen--and I was the main project officer on this--established an offer to the fifty NAB--National Alliance of Businessmen--cities a standardized program in"How do you Work With First-Line Supervisors" to help them become aware of the needs of individuals and mesh these needs and goals which these individuals have with the goals of the company to teach the profit-making factor and keep them, retain them, in business. So this is some of our basic effort, and it probably, as you look at it, is the first unified type training program that the government has offered nationwide since the War Manpower, War Production Board days of the forties.

M: Now, your efforts have been mainly selling business on such a program. What about selling the person in the ghetto?

R: Well, it's a two-fold effort. The Department of Labor's effort in this has been, number one, to find a good training organization that could do this. There are many, but we had to give and take and choose one to work with this organization, and many of them being social scientists, are up in an ivory tower, to bring them down to where the majority of American industry would understand what they were talking about and accept some of these ideas that may seem a little bit radical at first.

Now, once we worked this out, in partnership with the National Alliance of Business, that men over at the National Alliance of Business who are on loan from their private own companies--this is a thing that the President put together last year, well, that they are on loan from their private companies--that these men went out and talked to their counterparts, their own other American businessmen, and say,"This is the need you have." So we stayed in the background and they in turn took the Human Development Institution, a subsidiary of Bell & Howell, out and sponsored the program. And some place through it it says, "Well, this is a program funded by the Department of Labor but sponsored by the National Alliance of Business." And we kind of play the angel in the background, making sure that things run smoothly, I am so deeply involved because of my industrial experience, that there are certain things that are palatable to a businessman, and certain things that aren't. And I wanted a real good solid one-day hard-hitting training program, and that's what we have developed, a training program that after a training supervisor or, in some cases a first-line

supervisor, attends, he can take back and put on in his own company. There has been enough of it automated that he can carry it on. Now we are also working with middle managers now and doing the same thing, offering this in the fifty cities for middle managers, the man who supervises a supervisor who has hard core people, a man who is worried about the budget and the production rates and everything else. So this is some of our effort within the Department, working within kind of a close alliance with the businessmen to offer to industry this training.

M: Is there any way to measure the success of that? How do you know you're doing any good?

R: Well, within a program that has really gotten off the ground in September, and this being November '68, that's pretty hard to judge right now. We have been recalled to New York, Boston, and a number of other cities for four or five sessions. Newark is running a session for business every other week up there.

In some companies, the Bell system for one--the Illinois Bell in Chicago, has reported that they have been at this program for a year. They measure success in that a year ago their supervisors, at supervisors' meetings, used to come in and long harrasses about the terrible people the personnel department was sending to them. They've gone through a year of this program. Now the gripes are on production, quantities, various other things. When the personnel department brings up, "Well, what about the type of person?" "Oh, you're sending a new type of person to us now." Well, they really aren't sending a new type of person, but the supervisor has become aware. He has become more human relations conscious.

M: You actually changed his attitude.

R: It changes over a period of time. What we are doing is trying to offer an awareness, to say, "Look at--this is one approach. We've sponsored this company, but there are many companies that you can go out and talk to but your men should become aware that this is a problem. Yet these are the people you have to work with." So this is an effort that is kind of a fringe but really very important.

M In the retraining of these hard core unemployed, do you try to give them some skill that could be applied in more than one job?

R: If you are training a hard core person in a company, usually the company will train him for the immediate job that's going right now. We try to work with the company and say, "Look, if you want to help this person in a career ladder, we would suggest to you that although he will only need a basic amount of training here, maybe you ought to add some of this fringe reading, writing, and arithmetic under our contract that you have with the Department to pick up some of the training costs." And many companies are doing this.

Of course, training people for more than one job is what they are doing in the school system, where they take a person back to a welder again. He not only becomes a spot welder, he gets enough arc welding that he can float from one type to another. Well, industry is not so geared.

However, one important thing in the JOBS program--which is Jobs Opportunities in the Business Sector, JOBS, which works in the NAB, National Alliance of Business, program--is that the person the minute he walks into the company he receives a paycheck. He is a full-time

member of that company, and he is receiving a check every week for his work. This, then, helps change attitudes because you get kind of addicted every week to getting a check, and you find out it's a pretty good thing.

And you find out, of course, that there are problems. You have to get to work on time. In this area, we tried a pilot program this summer in five cities with a buddy system--working with the American Federation of Labor and CIO, Congress of Industrial Organizations, the AFL-CIO, we sponsored a program for rank and file union members in, as I said, give cities in approximately twenty-six companies, and we had ninety-eight buddies. These were rank and file union people who in turn tried to understand some of the problems of hard core people and then work side by side with those disadvantaged people that came into their companies, some with three or four or more, aiding and assisting them by getting them acclimated to the job; if they didn't show up, calling them in the morning. Finally in a couple of cases suggesting that this fellow go on the four o'clock shift because he just couldn't get out of bed in the morning. So now working with the National Alliance of Business we are going to expand this to the fifty cities to organized and unorganized shops. To many industries, of course, that are not union organized, we are offering a buddy program with the NAB people.

M: Have you generally had the cooperation of the labor unions?

R: This time this cooperation has been tremendous. Many of the people that turned out to be buddies had done little or nothing in union activities over the years. The presidents of the local councils, the

presidents of the local labor unions, were really a great help. But the people that volunteered weren't the average --the guy who may have come to a few meetings and maybe hadn't but all of a sudden he found that here was a chance for him to get involved. And the feedback we are getting from the various unions that were involved is that this is a kind of a regenerator or something, but there has been a terrific involvement, that the unions actually feel that they have a role to play--which is very important.

M: What about the unions that seem to have a closed membership? Such as the electricians and some of these. Are they going to cooperate with such a project?

R: Well, we are in the process of--I've also got another fringe program that I'm working with in opening up opportunities for--well, there are two areas. You talk about getting into the union, you talk about getting in through the apprenticeship problem, and that means you must be a youth. We are trying to get them to understand that it is very important that certain things be waived, aid and assist some of the youth--whether they be Mexican-Americans, black, or whatever--into getting into something. But also we are starting to work in the area where we will have Model Cities in working in those ghetto areas, in the reconstruction of the activities in the ghettos, with men who are maybe thirty and thirty-five, to forty years of age, who have quite a semblance of a trade but have never received a card. We're asking the unions to take these men, work with them over a six month period of time, and then give them a card. We're getting an

acceptance from the construction trades here on this. So it's a small step-by-step breakdown of some of their old line activities.

M: But I would say that you might get some resistance from closed unions.

R: Oh, sure you'll get some. You get a resistance, I guess, from the group of people who feel that they are threatened, because they are insecure. I guess it's the people that are a little bit older than you and I, that are maybe fiftyish, who lived through a depression and still feel that this is all they've got to hang onto--where some of us that were, I guess, depression babies but didn't live through it can't quite see that at the time, so we don't feel as threatened. But this is the group that is threatened.

M: Do you have any problem in getting the ghetto person himself, the man who is to be trained, to take part in the program?

R: Yes. Yes, I think you have a problem in getting him, first of all, in finding him, and thus you use a Community Action activity.

M: You've got to contact him first.

R: Yes. So, under the Concentrated Employment Program principle you work with residents in the community to go out and be your recruiters. They go out and find people and bring them into the local organization that's not only doing the hiring but can offer many services to these people. Well, this was kicked around. I don't think we've ever tried it. One time we thought it would be great to let each guy that was a recruiter receive so much of an amount of his salary by the number of people he brought in. I guess that was a little too wild. Maybe we should float it again this year. It might win. But, you know, you might give them a very low flat rate and then give them

a percentage for every person he brought in. I bet some of these fellows could really rustle and some of these girls, too, in bringing in people who, up to now, have been pretty hard to find.

But once you find them there is still a certain amount, if you just think back for a little bit, there is a certain amount of distrust into the world they are going into. Or if you think Mexican-Americans in San Antonio or other places, there is a terrific amount of distrust if, you know, "I've been called a 'greaser' all my life and now all of a sudden they are going to break down and give me a break; something's wrong here." So it's getting them to understand that this organization needs them as much as they need the job within this organization. Of course this buddy system then would help carry them over because the recruiter, having turned them over to the company who in turn turns them over to a guy on the line, who kind of shepherds and works with them over a couple of weeks or a month or whatever period of time it is, to make sure that they are kind of acclimated into the organization. This is kind of a flow that has developed over the years.

M: What do you do with a young ghetto Negro who says, "I don't want to have to work for $1.60 an hour." How do you reach someone like that?

R: Well, it's pretty hard. Some people I don't think you're--you know, it's going to take an awfully long time. Dan Moynihan has gone into this in depth. Some people who wear the $50 alligator shoes and have X number of girls he is hustling, this guy I don't think you're going to reach. The other person, at $1.60 an hour, I guess you just have

to slowly but surely reason with him that this is not the end of the road but the beginning of the road. And, sure, people have got you all charged up that you shouldn't take a job below five bucks an hour or something, but someplace along the line you've got to start. If you're willing to contribute something, there is good faith here. It's just a matter of getting some of his own people who live around with him to slowly but surely reason with him.

M: He's got to have the faith that he will move up.

R: That's right.

M: This is part of your training.

R: It's a part of the training working with the individual, but it's also part of working with the supervisors to aid and assist them to bend over backwards to help these people out.

M: Of the businesses that have gone into a ghetto area, I have someplace a vague recollection that IBM went into some of the New York areas. Was it Bedford-Stuyvesant?

R: Bedford-Stuyvesant. IBM's in Bedford-Stuyvesant.

M: They put a plant in there or something.

R: And they are also going into Watts in Los Angeles.

M: Now, is the company, IBM, satisfied with the program? What are their problems?

R: I don't really know. I mean, I do know that--let's take the Watts Manufacturing operation out in Watts, which is a wholly owned subsidy of Aerojet, Jr., which in turn Aerojet is turning over to those people--they are very satisifed with the way it has gone on. They have had some turnover, but they found some real diamonds in the rough

who make good lead men who other people will listen to. You know, the name of the game is, "We've got to produce to make a profit or we're all out of work." And slowly but surely this is sinking in.

M: Well, the crux for business is they have to make a profit.

R: That's right.

M: You can do so much charity work, but--

R: This is a profitable institution. It wasn't meant to be anything else, you know. You get so many young people and others, I guess, running around today asking for social services this way, but still, capitalism is based on companies making profit. And if you and I have stock in it, we want to see them make a profit.

M: My question is, then, are these companies going in to the ghetto areas satisfied that they are making a profit or will make a profit so that they can stay there?

R: Yes. Yes, they are. Avco feels that they are capable of carrying on their own. They get a chance at some government business, but they are making a profit, and these people understand this. Also in some cases in the riots we found that some places were pretty well protected because, "Let's don't burn that one down because that's where I have a job." That's kind of important also, you see.

M: Well, a company like IBM, or perhaps Avco, have to have seemingly high trained personnel. Is that right?

R: Well, they have to have highly trained personnel, but they also have a step-by-step process, too. I mean, some are skilled artesans in various factors, but there are those who do some of the menial jobs. You start out at the lower rung of the ladder and then work your way on up.

M: This seems a little bit unusual. It would seem to be easier to take, say, a sheet metal shop and put it in a place like Watts than something like IBM.

R: I think that when you think of IBM you probably relate very fast to computers, ticklish wiring diagrams and everything else. But also there is some of the basic electronic designs mean nothing more than putting together what they call a harness, which is a series of wires wrapped around. You have one sample and it doesn't take too much of an education but yet a dexterity to follow and put this sample together. So it's probably just as simple and maybe simpler to put a wiring design like that together than it is to cut out tin from a sheet metal shop.

So there are sophisticated jobs and some very basic type jobs. Watts Manufacturing is making tents which some is very delicate stitching that they had women doing. Others are a pretty rough job and they had the men doing this. So far many companies are interested in moving into a ghetto. Bell and Howell itself now are about to start an experimental glass operation shop in Atlanta, in the ghetto down there. Not glass blowing but--I'm not sure about this activity--but it's glass artesan activity, making glass jewelry and the like. They are going in and start with a limited number of about twenty people who have no knowledge and yet move them on the way up. They feel that this, in a period of time, is going to be good business.

M: In these various manpower programs, the concentration programs, and so on, where you have to work with the Executive Branch such as with HEW, or even HUD, is there any trouble coordinating all this? You spoke of using joint teams when you first started this manpower work. Is there any trouble in coordinating that between the departments?

R: I think that it has taken a period of time. You have to understand that each department has got its own specialty. HEW, especially the Office of Education, feels strongly that classroom training is one of the major efforts that they should be sponsoring and do. There's got to be a definite give and take. But ultimately our purpose is serving people.

Now, HUD -- some of the people they've acquired over the years have come from the Department of Labor and from other departments--and with a new department they're overly protected in many ways and tend to point out many of our mistakes. We readily admit many of our mistakes thought, and yet at the same time we say, "Look at what we're learning." However, we have learned that one of the best things that we have discovered of late is get a person a job on somebody's payroll, and then we'll do some extra supplemental training.

Now HUD, of course, going into the Model Cities Program, has got some people that are kind of ivory-tower, pie-in-the-sky type people. We're trying to help them get down to the nuts and bolt level by saying, "Look, if you're going to redo these areas, just how are you going to do it, and it's not so easy to bring a group of skilled craftsmen in and say,"Give them twenty each and they'll do it." Because this guy has got to have some assistance in training other people, and it takes a period of time before you tear down buildings or build new ones. So cooperation over the years has, my lord, improved 200-300 percent from the days when everybody was warring with each other. I guess you have just to realize who, you know, where the walls are and how you cooperate with each other till each person has got his own little piece of heaven.

M: The Office of Education, I would think, could readily see that retraining of ghetto people, or so forth, vocational training, would be within their jurisdiction, and yet you're involved in this, too.

R: I think that many of the people that we are trying to reach have dropped out of school for one reason or another. School, in the classroom setting is a bad taste in their mouth. Now, we're involved predominantly in the vocational training when it's in a plant. Classroom settings, we say, belong to HEW.

M: This is your wall, in this case.

R: However, in certain things, we find that a local contractor is more acceptable to training people than the public school system. People just simply won't go to that public school system. Well, we are trying to aid and assist them in making the public school system more palatable, the same way as Office of Economic Opportunity assisted us in making our Employment Service more realistic to the needs of people. So some of these walls have got to be broken down.

But people in many cases just have a bad taste in their mouth about schools. It goes back to the time in the service where all people could think about in training is the various classes they have sat through and fell asleep, because they were so boring. Well, today in training programs, even if it is a conference type setup, we try and do more experimental learning where you get involved in doing things and then from this you go forth with what you have learned and how you learned it with a bit of philosophy. So we have changed our techniques of training, and as we changed our techniques of training I think the school system sees that this is another way of reaching people, and I think they are doing this in some of the high schools around town today.

M: Would it make sense to create a Department of Education and Manpower Training--combine it all? You are both involved in education.

R: We are both involved in education; we are both involved in training. I don't know right off the top of my head. It's pretty hard to say. There is the classroom type training, the academic type training, which is one thing, and the industrial education, which is another.

M: But they are both necessary to the individual.

R: They are both necessary to the individual, and it's a possibility that this could be worked out someway.

M: Do you think Selective Service ought to be in such an organization?

R: I do, very definitely. I think that the military, in some of the things they've done, in their acceptance of people that they have never accepted before, and bringing them up, is something that a lot of people should look at. Now, the military over the years have have done some marvelous training programs that industry is very slow to understand or buy. The basic first-line supervisory program, done by the Air Force back in the late forties and early fifties, is one that the average training director relies on heavily today in any company. Yet it's a program that's little known, except for a few training people, that this is some of the basics in supervisory training.

Now, there are many other things that should be handled here that are followed and copied rather than rediscovering the wheel all the time.

M: Is there any coordination now between military training of this nature and what you are doing?

R: There is a small amount of it. Not as much as should be because there are too many fires and not enough people. There is a bit of coordination going on with this type of training, but there needs to be a terrific

amount more.

M: All this manpower work, has Lyndon Johnson as President played a crucial part? Would this development have come anyway? It started in the Kennedy Administration; there was an awareness of the problem; there were studies of the problem. Is this just a continuation of this, or did President Johnson do something that helped it or made it develop?

R: I think that the President's involvement--the expansion of the program was under the President. Also, the need of the National Alliance of Business was under the President's own sponsorship and leadership. Where the jobs are with business and industry and finding the people but not finding them real meaningful employment was a problem. So this is an area of cooperation of government and industry together to reach a goal that thePresident was the leader in, and very definitely this Job Opportunity in the Business Sector is a program that was put together under the President's auspices.

M: Is his leadership necessary to this?

R: His leadership to put this together, to finding Henry Ford to run the program, to sponsor it, and to bring industry in, was very definitely necessary. Nobody else but the White House and the President could have brought these big names in and reach out and pick fifty top industrialists in the fifty top cities in the nation to come in and meet with him and sponsor this sort of a program, to understand that it's a need of America. It's an American problem. It's not a black problem, it's not a Mexican-American problem or Appalachian; it's an American problem. And the President stressed this fact that the jobs are in industry, we can find the people, and between the two of us we can

conquer this American problem.

M: Would this program have developed if Lyndon Johnson had not been President? Say Kennedy had stayed on, is there any way to speculate on that?

R: I don't know if there is or not. I know that the receptibility that my superiors, Secretary Wirtz and Assistant Secretary Ruttenberg, had at the White House in presenting the ideas and the needs for changes and the greater involvement was accepted by the President, the need for closer cooperation of the various departments within the Executive was sponsored and pushed by the President, and I think that his years of experience up on the Hill has taught him of the need for close cooperation of a give and a take, maybe more so than other individuals. So I think his leadership here and his background tends to show you that he has a great understanding of not only education but the need for industrial involvement. That's about all, you know, at my low level that I can speculate on.

M: You mentioned that you met him on one occasion. What was that?

R: I met him when we were putting together the Concentrated Employment Program, and laying out the final details of how this program should work, and the President's test program. The President met with a small group of us--Jim Gaither and Joe Califano--at the White House. We presented some of our ideas --oh, it was about fifteen months ago-- to him as to which way we should go. His reaction was a very positive one of offering greater services to the individuals,of changing the old status quo of some of the line activities, instead of, like in the Labor Department, just servicing industry to be a service to the people out there, and then to involve industry in greater depth. That's the only

time I met the President.

M: But he was receptive to you?

R: Very receptive to us, yes, and wanted to know just what other parts of the government should be involved and how the Small Business Administration should get involved in this, and the Department of Commerce, and all the other agencies. So it was of great help to us.

M: Well, the Concentration Program is still in progress. Are there any problems in this? Has it gone as far as it can?

R: Oh, no. I think it has got to go a lot farther. It's still, in many cases, suffering from people trying to understand just what it's to do, how it's a service to people, how it's not a political program to offer--you know, a political pork barrel, it's nothing of this. It's a job for dedicated individuals who really want to work to aid and assist other people. The problem of local coordinations still rests as a thorny one and will for a good number of years, I believe.

M: You still have lots of people, lots of businesses to contact?

R: Lots of businesses to contact, and we have a multitude of people who need services. So we are just, as we go year by year, it seems it is a long uphill battle. But first of automation days of trying to help people who are underemployed and unemployed, and then from the days of offering a service to the people in their own neighborhoods rather than bring them downtown or to an alien place and aiding and assisting them in more than just finding a job, but in some of their own health needs and what have you, and then to the involvement of industry who control the jobs and getting industry to understand the needs of the people. I think we've gone a long way over the last five years.

M: Does this Concentration Program also apply to rural areas?

R: Yes, we at the present time have got ten rural programs going.

M: The idea is basically the same? To keep the people on the land where they are and finding jobs where they are?

R: Yes, that's right. I helped put together the rural program in northern Michigan covering some of the upper peninsula and the lower peninsula of the northern counties. There are many people living in poverty in rural America, many many more than you find in the ghetto. Yet trying to find them and aid and assist them in types of training and then type of employment is a very difficult situation.

Also, we have the American Indian, on reservations and off-reservations, Indians, who are, you know, living in terrible poverty. Many people turn them off, don't listen to them any more or how very prejudiced in some of these lands about how lazy the Indian is and what have you. We are trying to do some programs which are actual on-going programs bringing industry into the reservation or getting them into some of the cities.

So it's rural and it's big city activity, both, and it's trying to understand the needs of that community. Michigan is an example, where you train a person to be a year-round man so that he not only can offer a skill to a resort operator who runs ski lifts during the winter, but also who needs the assistance of handling boats and engines, motors and this sort of thing during the summer, and working the property all during the off seasons, also. So trying to make an all-round maintenance man out of him and this is a terrific need out in rural America.

M: Then it is not strictly an urban program?

R: No, it's not an urban program. Concentrated Employment Program either concentrates in specific areas of a city or concentrates in areas of a state--four, five, six, maybe twenty counties--in reaching out and finding people. Of course, the job is much tougher because of the distance and land that you have to cover. Maybe, as in Michigan, we had picked four major cities to work around--not major cities, small cities, like Sault Ste. Marie, Petoskey, Alpena, and Traverse City, and thus bringing people into those areas for some training, finding out what their needs were, and then trying to locate them in jobs in and around their own home, if possible, or, if they were interested in moving to other areas. So it's not just city activity. It's city activity plus rural. And of course we anticipate this next year in making sure that we are in one or two cities in each state in the United States offering some of these selected services as well as the regular employment service activities and training that we offer everyplace in the United States.

M: Do you see this program continuing in the future without much trouble?

R: I really believe that the program of working in close cooperation with government and business is the way that it will go in the future, no matter what administration is in. There is no other way of doing it, really. Oh, there are other ways, sure, but it's still the industry that has the jobs. The government of course has jobs and we are trying to break down some of these barriers, too, to get people employed within the government. But industry has the multitude of jobs. Even if it's one or two jobs per company spread, still it takes care of very many people, but it's just a lot of work to reach all. Where you can go

to Ford and pick up 500 people, it's pretty hard to get out in the inter-land when you have to go to 500 companies to get 500 jobs. But it's just a job that has to be done.

M: That's all the questions I have.

R: That's all the answers I have.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

Gift of Personal Statement

By Thomas Royals

to the

Lyndon Baines Johnson Library

In accordance with Sec. 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (44 U.S.C. 397) and regulations issued thereunder (41 CFR 101-10), I, Thomas Royals, hereinafter referred to as the donor, hereby give, donate, and convey to the United States of America for eventual deposit in the proposed Lyndon Baines Johnson Library, and for administration therein by the authorities thereof, a tape and transcript of a personal statement approved by me and prepared for the purpose of deposit in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library. The gift of this material is made subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Title to the material transferred hereunder, and all literary property rights, will pass to the United States as of the date of the delivery of this material into the physical custody of the Archivist of the United States.

2. It is the donor's wish to make the material donated to the United States of America by terms of this instrument available for research as soon as it has been deposited in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

3. A revision of this stipulation governing access to the material for research may be entered into between the donor and the Archivist of the United States, or his designee, if it appears desirable.

4. The material donated to the United States pursuant to the foregoing shall be kept intact permanently in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

Signed Thomas P Royals

Date 22 Aug 1973

Accepted Harry J Middleton for

Archivist of the United States

Date October 31, 1974