

INTERVIEWEE: HAROLD J. RUSSELL

INTERVIEWER: DOROTHY PIERCE

December 5, 1968

P: This interview is with Harold Russell, chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Today is Thursday, December 5, 1968; it's 10:00 in the morning. We are in the Executive Office Building, and this is Dorothy Pierce.

Mr. Russell, I would like to begin this interview with a brief background on you and check to see that I have the correct information. You were appointed by President Johnson as chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in April 1964. You succeeded the second chairman to this committee, Major General Melvin Maas at the event of his death. In 1962 you were appointed by President Kennedy as a vice-chairman of the committee when the President reconstituted the committee and enlarged its scope and function.

R: I might add, Dorothy, I was appointed originally to the committee as a member back in 1948 by President Harry Truman, so I've had a long history with the committee.

P: I realize this. This year marks the twenty-fourth observance of the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week in October?

R: Yes.

P: So it does make it all the way back to '48, and you have served on the committee for the entire time.

R: Yes, I have. I've seen a lot of wonderful changes.

P: Since 1948 besides serving on this committee, you have served in the American Veterans' Association, on committees and as national commander. You were one of the founders of the World Veterans Federation, and

worked closely with this organization and its worldwide growth.

Of course this long career in veterans' affairs sprung through your own service in the Army and the accident in which you lost your hands in 1944, and I believe that was on D Day.

R: On D Day, that's right.

P: Is this background information all correct?

R: Yes, it is except for one of the organizations. I served as national commander for the AMVETS--the American Veterans of World War II. This is an organization composed of veterans of World War II at that time, and since then it has been enlarged to take in the veterans of Korea and now Viet Nam.

P: Before we begin discussing this area, I'd like to establish on what occasions that you have met Lyndon Johnson. Do you recall when you first met him and what your impressions were?

R: I recall very vividly the first meeting with him. I was at that time national commander of AMVETS in 1960. I had the occasion to help co-host a young lady from Denmark who was on tour of the United States. This was a high school senior who had won a contest in Denmark and was over here under our auspices traveling through the United States at that time. This was previous to 1960 actually. I think it was about 1957 or '58. Mr. Johnson was then Majority Senate Leader, and he received us in his office. I was amazed at his knowledge of Denmark because he questioned the young lady about Copenhagen and some of the things that she had known over there and so forth. It was a very impressive meeting. I was very impressed at that time, and I've never really forgotten it. As a matter of fact on my mantelpiece at home I still have a picture of Betty and myself and

the Majority Senate Leader, Mr. Johnson.

P: Did you say Becky?

R: Betty.

P: What was her full name?

R: I don't recall it at this moment, I'm sure I have it somewhere.

P: That's all right, you can fill that in.

R: I'm sorry, I don't really have her name, except that I remember it was Betty.

P: That's all right. And since then, Mr. Russell, on what occasions have you met--?

R: Since then in connection with affairs of the committee, I've had the privilege of being with the Vice President and the President a number of occasions. I just recall last summer we had the opportunity. We had fifty Danish handicapped young people over in the United States touring. They were received in the Rose Garden at the White House-- had a long meeting.

And then the first year I was appointed chairman of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, the President appeared at our meeting. We then were holding our meetings in the Departmental auditorium, and President Johnson appeared the first time as President at the meeting, and addressed the group and passed out awards, and met many of the people associated with the President's committee.

P: How would you describe your present relation with him?

R: It has been a wonderful relationship in this respect. I have been since 1948 obviously very interested in the problems of the handicapped and the problems involved with rehabilitation and training and

employment of handicapped people. Aside from my great admiration for the President, I have been most impressed by his knowledge of the field and by the support he has given the whole program. As a matter of fact, the whole story of rehabilitation in the United States is an amazing one in terms of its growth in the last twenty years. And I think in just the last few years it has moved ahead in a tremendous manner. I'm sure that most of it was done by the fact that the President of the United States wholly believed in this program and completely supported it. We've seen more programs. Programs that have been both beneficial to the handicapped people, and those working in the field. We've seen all kinds of support that only the White House can give. And I think this has had great deal to do with moving the program forward. And so this is one of my great memories. It is my great memory of the kind of leadership that he has given our particular sphere of influence--the dealings with the handicapped in the United States.

P: Has the President appointed you to any other task forces or committees outside this committee work?

R: I did serve on the Advisory Council for Vocational Rehabilitation under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for three years. This was a committee of citizens who were interested in vocational rehabilitation and supposedly knowledgeable which recommended specific programs in that field.

P: What period was that?

R: That was about in 1967 ending to 1965--'65 to '67.

P: Did you work completely within the department on that?

R: Yes, we did.

P: Not in terms of with the--

R: Not in terms of with the executive office. I might say that everyone of our annual meetings which are held each year, we've had either the President or the Vice President out to these meetings. Aside from the other meetings that we've had with the President at the White House, we've also had official representation of the White House in terms of either the President or the Vice President at our annual meetings.

P: Is this a usual attendance, or has this changed in this administration?

R: Sometimes it happens and sometimes it does not happen--I wouldn't say that it's usual, but of course it makes the meeting much more important and much more significant. This is the kind of support that I mentioned before that we have under President Johnson.

P: Have you ever traveled for the President or with him?

R: No, I'm sorry I haven't. I haven't had that privilege of traveling with him.

P: I'd like to--before I get into some more specific questions--sort of get you to give a summary on what has happened in this field since the inception of the committee in 1948 by President Truman.

R: Let me briefly say that anticipating a great number of handicapped, disabled veterans coming back from World War II, President Truman created this committee in 1947. And first of all the duty of the committee basically was to support the kind of programs which would enable handicapped veterans and the civilian physically handicapped to take their place in business and industry. This was basically the mission of the committee initially. But since then it has grown and expanded to such terms that it takes in all handicapped people. It takes

6

in physically and mentally handicapped people--the physically handicapped, mentally retarded and mentally restored. It takes in the kind of mission which promotes their employment not only in industry and business, but also in government.

I might say one of the fine things that has been done by President Johnson's executive order is that handicapped people have been given opportunities in government. Today we have more than 5,000 mentally retarded people who are doing the repetitious kind of work (that's difficult to find people who want to do these tasks) for the federal government. Their record has been really outstanding. They've got a very fine history of employment in the short time that this program has been in force. Also there have been many thousands of capable physically handicapped people who've done a fine job working in the employment of the federal government. So this is the kind of leadership that has been exerted by the White House which has opened up employment opportunities not only in industry and business, but in government for the handicapped--both the physical and mental.

P: This may be slightly repetitious, but would you describe the general overall purpose of this committee? You've mentioned of course the rehabilitation and vocational restoration. Are there other areas which you predominantly--?

R: Actually the mission of the committee itself is quite simple. It's to enhance employment opportunities for the handicapped, physically and mentally handicapped in business and industry and government throughout the country; but the work of the committee goes much deeper than that. Involved in the committee are the members of the

cabinet of the federal government who form an advisory committee which meets once a year to advise the chairman on their specific interests and their needs in terms of their various government departments. And secondly, the committee is made up of more than 300 national organizations. The majority of the people that work with the committee all serve as volunteers, as does the chairman, and devote part of their time to this program. Now 300 national organizations work not only in Washington, but throughout the states in promoting this program. And then on top of that there are 53 governors' committees in all the states and territories, and 1500 local committees.

Actually this is a great, mass ground swell to enhance the opportunities of the handicapped. But it gets more than that because part of the job of trying to place handicapped people in employment--either government or private employment--is the fact they must be qualified, must be trained. That's why we talk about qualified, handicapped people. So we've become involved in promoting all kinds of rehabilitation programs, working with various rehabilitation groups in the federal government and in the states to create the proper conditions whereby the handicapped people--we don't actually train or hire them, but we work with the groups that do--will receive the necessary training. And this has been a tremendous program.

And then also this whole program of what we call elimination of architectural barriers. We have had a national program in an attempt to eliminate as many of the architectural barriers which are deterrent to handicapped people entering and exiting from buildings or moving around inside of buildings and so forth. This has resulted in a

federal law being passed last year, which was signed by President Johnson, which tends to try in every way possible to eliminate architectural barriers in buildings that are created by federal money, either wholly or partially. And as a result of this some thirty-seven states have passed this kind of legislation which tends to make it easier for handicapped people, especially those in wheel chairs, to move around, by eliminating these so-called "Architectural barriers." So this has been a part of the program.

So actually our program is one of action and one of information and one of cooperation. Of working for example with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which of course does most of the rehabilitation work as far as the federal government is concerned; working with the Department of Labor which places handicapped people; and working with the Veterans Administration which specifically works for the rehabilitation of the handicapped or disabled veteran. So the program from a little small beginning in 1948 now has branched out into a gigantic effort, I think, which does a great deal of help of handicapped in many, many areas for either employment or rehabilitation.

P: Let me ask you a rather broad question. You've indicated all of the avenues which you pursue, but what do you feel is the role of advisory committees of this kind? Do you consider yourself a coordinator of programs, or an initiator of ideas--sort of a collection house of the areas, or a stimulation of help in this?

R: I suspect we're probably more of a catalyst and a communications center than anything else. The biggest problem of course is lack of communications between organizations, between branches of the

government, and even between the haddicapped themselves. And I think that basically our job is first of all to try to informally bring as many of these groups together so they can work for the common good of rehabilitation; and secondly, to try to communicate with the handicapped and the various organizations; and also to try to get the handicapped to take advantage of the many opportunities prevalent today in the field of rehabilitation so they can receive the training that is so very necessary. So I think we act in this kind of a role. Really in a sense we have no legislative force to compel anybody to do these things, and it's done mostly by volunteers and out of mostly persuasion whenever we can, rather than by direction. But we have been successful in this area I think to some degree.

P: What ways are you able to influence government affairs to fulfill the purpose of your committee, such as getting this federal legislation on architectural barriers? I'm thinking in terms of your access to members of Congress, to the executive department, to the various agencies, that brought about this legislation.

R: Mostly it's through information in either small meetings or large meetings, and then getting citizen action in the states and in the localities, and then transmitting this action into direct communication with members of Congress and members of the cabinet and so forth. We tell them what can be done and so forth, and point out what is necessary to be done in order to make proper use of the abilities and the capabilities of talented, trained, handicapped people. And this is the way we have been able to work. As I said, through the 300 national organizations, through direct contact with members of the cabinet, with the support of the White House, and with communication

with members of the Congress and so forth, we've been able to achieve some degree I think of success in this program.

P: I have to put you in the category of being one of the champions of this field. Can you name some of your associates, perhaps in government, who have really worked for this development?

R: There's one person--and I certainly can give credit to an awful lot of people who have done a tremendous amount, but this one person--a Marine colonel by the name of William McCahill who is the executive director for the President's committee. He was one of the initial staff people of the committee. He has worked long and tireless hours far beyond the requirements of his job to do this kind of thing. In a sense I think he has added the technical finesse and the real guidance to the technical end of the staff people of this program which has made it a successful one. He has done a tremendous job, and he has worked with the White House since 1947 on this program. He has done a great job.

I think certainly in members of the cabinet, Mr. John Macy, the chairman of the Civil Service, has done a wonderful job in opening up opportunities. There are many of course throughout the years. We are a nation of habit, and there are many technical reasons why many qualified people couldn't qualify for employment with the federal government specifically because things weren't written into regulations and so forth. Mr. Macy has done an amazing job in changing, easing whenever possible, or even writing new regulations which were instrumental in bringing many, many handicapped people into federal service. He has done an outstanding job.

Mr. Driver in the Veterans Administration--Bill Driver has been

11

an outstanding administrator in the sense that the opportunities afforded many disabled veterans have been transmitted into action which in a sense help handicapped civilians. So while this program was instrumentally designed to help disabled veterans, in a sense, the true intent of the program was enlarged to such an extent that it helped so many handicapped people. And the Veterans Administration has done an amazing job not only in creating employment for handicapped, but in training, and prosthetic devices, and all the various elements of the total field of rehabilitation. Truly it has been a leader in this field.

P: In your judgment do you feel that this committee has been an effective instrument for the formulation and evaluation of policy or legislation concerning the handicapped?

R: I think it has been valuable in this respect. It has first of all been able to pinpoint the problem. We have tremendous numbers of handicapped people. We really don't know just how many in the United States, but we estimate 10-percent of the population has some kind of a physical handicap. We have more than 5,000,000 retarded; and 1 in 10 has some kind of a mental problem at one time in life. So this is a problem of great scope. And what the President's committee has been able to do, I think, is that it's a focal point representing the spokesmen for these groups. It has been able to pinpoint this problem. It hasn't been able to solve it, not by any means, but the point remains it has been a kind of coordinating force, it has been a vocal force, and it has been able to bring this problem to the attention of the proper people. This is why I said originally the White House was so very important in this whole program. Without the

support of the White House obviously is just couldn't go anywhere. And because we have had that support, we have made tremendous gains in the last years on this thing. Especially under the Kennedy and the Johnson administrations it has been just tremendous in all fields that pertain to the handicapped--rehabilitation, training, and employment.

P: You have mentioned in our discussion so far your working with HEW--Health, Education, and Welfare, and in Labor Department. What is the committee's relationship with agencies and departments of government? I know that they have some rehabilitation programs internally themselves.

R: Yes, they do. Let me say, first of all, we have an advisory council which is composed of several members of the Cabinet which meet once a year. Obviously the members of the Cabinet are represented and either are present at that meeting in person, or their appointed representatives are present. Secondly, we have an Executive Committee meeting which meets twice a year. The executive committee is made up of the leaders of the various volunteer organizations. So what we have here is the bringing [together] of the government and representatives to the Executive Committee and the public organizations that are devoted to this field of rehabilitation, [to] exchange [ideas about] problems, communications, and programs. So I think once again that this is a kind of a function--to open up these avenues of communication.

And speaking also of the help we've received, we've received tremendous assistance from the Department of Labor Under Secretary Wirtz, who has been extremely interested. As a matter of fact

Mrs. Wirtz has been active and interested and chairman of our women's committee, "Project Earning Power" project. And through his efforts we have found that there has been a tremendous amount of actual placement of handicapped people in the local employment offices throughout the country. This has been of great importance in promoting this employment of qualified, handicapped people.

P: Could this committee work be effectively carried out in one of the departments?

R: I don't think, because I think the kind of a committee it is in covering all of the broad avenues without being specific in any one of them--in other words, we're not an employment agency; neither are we a rehabilitation agency. We're more of a public relations tool, I think, to bring all of these various groups together. Because much has been done in this field, many times it tends to become lost because of lack of communication, a lack of public knowledge either by the handicapped or by the other departments that are involved. So I think that the best way that this committee could function is as it does now in the sense without any real authority. It is able to bring together by persuasion the various groups that are involved in it as much as possible so it can get this free exchange of information and cooperation between the groups.

So I think that if it were assigned to one department or another, it would tend to become lost and lose this important factor of opening up these gates of communication between the various government organizations and the various public organizations that are in this field. And also the individuals too. So I think this important aspect would be lost--this communication, which I think

14

is so important in this program. And it's unique in the sense that there's no other group that fulfills this function.

P: In being this channel of communication, do you effectively resolve problems, or is there any problem or duplication arising out of interagency programs and the coordination of your committee?

R: No. Actually I think we always try to get somebody else to solve our problems for us really--that's really what happens. But because we have this communication if there is a specific problem, we can bring it to the attention of the proper organization or the proper government group that handles this kind of thing. In most cases we hope we solve it. In other words what it does is pinpoint the problems so that everybody can see them and then they know how to act in these various things. We don't in any sense tend to try to force any group to try to solve these problems. We try to bring it out as a matter of public relations and through discussion many times there are changes made.

I'm thinking specifically though--there are many barriers to the employment of certain types of handicapped people in the federal government. Through the executive committee this problem was brought out in the open and the result was, with the support and cooperation of Mr. Macy, the necessary changes were made so that the people could qualify. Specifically in many cases of the blind it amounted to an oral test instead of a written test. And in cases of the mentally retarded for menial kind of repetitious jobs, it eliminated tests in many cases so they could be hired on a trial basis for sixty or ninety days and so forth. In other words, these kinds of changes were made because they were brought to the knowledge of

15

people and the people who had the ability to do something about them, Obviously we couldn't do it, but by bringing the problem out in the open, the necessary steps were made to alleviate in many cases these situations.

P: Mr. Russell, could you give me what you consider the most significant developments in this area--I can back it up, I was going to say during your tenure as chairman, but I won't exclude earlier times. Now I know you've mentioned on several of them, but do some of these stand out in your mind as being bigger steps than others?

R: I think the biggest step--and this is a very general one, but it's also very important--is the attitude of our people, most of the citizens of America toward handicapped. In the "old" days--and I say "old" with quotes around it--the tendency was that a handicapped person was somebody that had to be taken care of public support. He couldn't qualify for employment, he couldn't do his job, and the best thing that could happen to him was to be put in a hospital or a home or hidden away in a building and forgotten about. And throughout the years since 1948, and certainly in no sense of the word is this to be given to the credit of the committee, but the point remains that throughout the last twenty years, especially since World War II, there has been a recognition of the fact that many times our handicapped people had certain talents that could be utilized. So the result is we've had a general change in attitudes toward our handicapped people. Now the whole attitude is that by proper training and proper placement they can do a good job and they can make a contribution to society. This has been done generally through this whole program of public relations, if you will, public information, and the support of the government and private industry in putting

these people in the kind of work that they can do. They've been very successful. So this has been the real change, I think, the change of attitude which has contributed to the success of the program. Let me say, we have a long ways to go and are certainly not perfect by any sense of the word. We are really handicapping more people in 1968 by reason of people living longer; by reason of automobile accidents; industrial accidents, than we are able to rehabilitate at this point. But the point remains that the general attitude has now changed toward disability, and we are finding that by proper training and proper rehabilitation people can take their place in industry and business and government and become successful regardless of handicap, either physical or mental.

P: In my reading they have talked about the expansion and reconstitution of this committee in 1962 under President Kennedy. How did this come about?

R: Of course President Kennedy was very interested in the mentally retarded, because of his relationship with the field. And he felt very strongly that a great deal more could be done, especially in the field of employment for the mentally retarded. And as a result of his executive order in 1961, the program was expanded to take in the mentally retarded, the mentally restored. Previous to that time the committee was named the President's Committee on the Employment of Physically Handicapped, and the word "physically" was dropped, and the program was enlarged to take in the mentally handicapped and the retarded. A great deal of work was done in that field in bringing in organizations and groups that were certainly knowledgeable in these areas. And as a result today, we've as I said, just for one

example, there are more than 5,000 now hired by the federal government in various types of specific jobs. There are many, many thousands more hired by private industry throughout the country in specific jobs.

The result is we're finding a very interesting thing. We're finding that most of the mildly retarded people placed on a specific job with proper training can do their job as well and sometimes even better than the so-called normal individual. They tend to be more loyal, they tend to stick to the job longer, and they tend to have a pride in their work which (we're talking about a specific type, repetitious job) we don't find in many areas. So the employers have been very satisfied, and the federal government has had a great deal of success with the people that they've hired. Mr. Macy reports that they have satisfactory performance out of more than 90-percent of them, which is an amazing record. The W. T. Grant Company, one of our big department store chains, has hired the mentally retarded and found that 77-percent of them had a satisfactory employment. So this is an area that hasn't been touched before. The talents of all of these people were obviously going to waste in a time of a severe manpower shortage in the United States. So we find that once again by proper training and proper placement that these people can be utilized in business, industry, and government.

P: The vocational rehabilitation program that this administration did bring about--it didn't bring about, but it expanded and extended it during this administration--to include the socially disabled, has this diluted the impact of your programs?

R: No, it hasn't. This has been a very significant thing, I think,

18

because all of our experts tell us the degree of handicapping, both physically and mentally, among the so-called poor or the disadvantaged, is three times higher than it is in the affluent or the more wealthy individuals. So actually what it has helped us do is to reach down to the real roots, of grass roots, as far as the handicapped are concerned. This is where these people are. And I think that one of the great programs is that for the first time in America we're taking cognizance of the fact that among our poor there are larger numbers of handicapped, physically and mentally; and that something can be done, and should be done, and is being done through the vocational rehabilitation amendments in the HEW programs.

Now under this administration, the significant thing is going to happen in February. There is going to be a national conference for the first time on rehabilitation, which will bring together the disadvantaged and the handicapped. It will take place in Washington late in February. And this is the kind of thing which will pinpoint and highlight the problems and possible solutions of these problems--working not only with the disadvantaged but with the handicapped who are a big part of the disadvantaged in our nation.

P: Is this a new awareness--to consider socially disadvantaged in the category of being handicapped?

R: I think it is, yes. I think it is in the sense that environmental handicapped is a part of it; language handicap; certainly color is a handicap and so forth. What we've done I think is put the potatoes in the potato bin--this is really what has happened. We're recognizing the fact that handicaps come in many, many ways, that there are many other handicaps besides physical and mental. Our

19

field of thought obviously is in that line. The point remains that many times where a person lives, their education, or even their color, or national origin has been a real handicap. So in a sense this is a tribute to the field of rehabilitation, because we have found out by doing things as we have done them in the field of physical and mental rehabilitation that the concept of community action can work in the terms of disadvantaged because the problems are similar. While many of them haven't got a physical handicap or a mental handicap, there are handicap is three times higher. But this kind of concept which has been successful in the rehabilitation and employment of the physically and mentally handicapped can work with other kind of handicaps too, and will work, and is working, I might mention.

P: Who brought about this expansion or inclusion of the social handicapped, or environmentally disadvantaged people, into this area?

R: This was done under the direction of President Johnson who had always had a great feeling for the problems of the poor and so forth. And under his direction, this program was pinpointed for the ultimate benefit of the disadvantaged which include the physically and mentally handicapped. But the thought of using the same ideas, the same techniques, that were used in the rehabilitation of the physically and mentally handicapped was under White House direction. It has opened up a whole new sphere of opportunities for literally millions of people.

P: Was there any resistance that you are aware of to the inclusion of this area into they physically and mentally handicapped?

R: I think that it's human nature to fear change, and I think it's probably true that wherever you have an enlargement of any program

20

there's always a fear among certain groups that they're going to lose the opportunities that they had. But I don't think that this is a major problem. I think this will always go on, and we'll always have it. And I might add as the instrument of this problem that Mrs. Mary Switzer at HEW has done an amazing job with her unbelievable knowledge and interest in rehabilitation in expanding this program to take in the disadvantaged. She has been able to overcome many of the voiced oppositions which said in effect, "Well, if we do this kind of thing we're going to lose all the programs that we have pertaining to the physically and mentally handicapped." It is obviously not so because the point remains with the numbers of the handicapped and the disadvantaged, plus the fact that techniques will be good, we're not really losing but we're gaining from a broader participation in the program. Obviously there is going to be, there will always be opposition to any kind of change. But I don't think it's a major factor, at least I have not seen it in my travels throughout the country and in my discussions with various groups that are interested in this field.

P: In your judgment does the federal government have the responsibility to be a model employer, even at the consideration of expensive changes such as removing architectural barriers?

R: I think the federal government has the responsibility of being the example. It's not necessary in most cases to make expensive changes to accommodate one group or another group. We found for example in the field of architectural barriers that expensive changes are literally not necessary in most cases. For example the ramps instead of stairways in most cases are comparatively cheap, and in

21

terms of convenience and the opportunity they offer make the cost insignificant. I don't think that the federal government or I don't think we should ask industry or business in any attempt to make tremendously expensive changes for the sake of a group of people. We've got to serve the common good. But I do think the federal government has the responsibility of being the examples in this case, which they have been in a sense. And not only in employment, but also in elimination of architectural barriers and other programs that pertain to the general field of rehabilitation.

P: Has the federal government fulfilled this responsibility in your judgment to the fullest extent?

R: Well, I think there are always opportunities for improvement, and obviously we're not reaching as many people as I think that--not completely, but I think that it has done an amazing job of each year more and more qualified handicapped people are being hired by the government. More and more mentally retarded in specific jobs are being hired. I think it has set the kind of example that employers can look at. And I might say this is a comparatively new thing that hasn't happened in the past. While the federal government has talked about the employment, there hasn't been a great concentrated effort up until the last few years to do this kind of thing. And now we're seeing more and more of it.

Another specific example--the government buys a lot of products many times. In many cases the Department of Defense and GSA are making an effort to buy those items that they possibly can through workshops which employ handicapped. This is a new innovation in the sense that never before have they done this kind of thing.

What of course it's doing is enabling more handicapped people, who probably could not qualify for either government employment or couldn't qualify for public employment, to go to work in sheltered workshops. They are supported in a sense by the products they make which in turn are sold to the federal government. The Department of Defense and GSA have been most cooperative in buying the kind of products that these workshops could supply. So that indirectly this whole theme of rehabilitation has been expanded through this one area of workshops, thanks to the purchase of the various government agencies.

P: In thinking of the whole work in this area, are there any things that you could suggest as changes or improvements?

R: I think the things that are happening that need to be done are being done. Obviously, they're not going to be accomplished tomorrow. For example, right now there's a tremendous shortage of qualified paramedical experts in this field--occupational, physiotherapists, prosthetic equipment, supplies, and all the various paramedical groups that are necessary. Now HEW has indicated a program that will try to get more people from medical schools involved in this program of actively taking a professional role as therapists in various aspects of the rehabilitation program. This is one thing that has to be done, and is being done. It's going to take time.

And secondly, one of the major problems is that one of communications. Now the Advertising Council is undertaking a campaign to try to get more handicapped people to take advantage of the various vocational rehabilitational programs which are offered to try to get more of them qualified. There has certainly been an attempt, and has been an elimination of many of the qualifications

that are necessary for vocational rehabilitation programs. These have taken place so that it's easier now for a handicapped person to get vocational rehabilitation. There's an attempt being made now to enlarge the program in such a way that the council will be able to work with all the members of the family of the handicapped person rather than just with the handicapped person alone, which is important. These are the things that should be done and have to be done. And they don't always involve monies in terms of the federal expenditure. For fiscal '69 there will be over \$400,000,000. This is based on the federal expenditure alone; this doesn't count what the states are putting in on a matching program. So the answer is not completely all money--it's more personnel, more facilities, and so forth, more communications and information. These are taking place. But they must I think be accelerated if we're going to start to serve many of our people who are handicapped.

P: Does your group ever appear before Congress to expand appropriations in this area?

R: We do in some cases. For example, we're not really in a sense a lobbying body in terms of rehabilitation. We for example have testified in support of elimination of architectural barriers--Senator Bartlett's bill last year. We of course testify in behalf of our own budget which is less than a half-a-million dollars. But generally speaking, we do not actively participate in legislative endeavors in the sense of the general field of rehabilitation. Once in awhile, specifically in certain cases if we're asked our opinion by the members of Congress, we will certainly render it as it pertains to rehabilitation or employment.

- P: What is the procedure for going about getting a person who, say, suddenly becomes--through industrial accidents or events of war--handicapped? How do you bring him into, or expose him to the programs for rehabilitation?
- R: First of all, obviously if he's a veteran the agency that handles him would be the counsellor for the Veterans Administration. And because the Veterans Administration knows about each veterans--has them on record--this is comparatively easy to contact. They're able to contact him and so forth. Industrial accidents--the industrial laws are sponsored and standardized by the states throughout the nation and they vary in different aspects according to the different states. Some are bad, some are better, and some are excellent. Not very many are excellent, unfortunately. So the Industrial Accident Board in some cases have rehabilitation counsellors or rehabilitation boards which work with them.

The biggest problem is the individual citizen who has nowhere specific to go. Now the parties responsible for the rehabilitation, or the training, or whatever is necessary are the vocational rehabilitation counsellors which are located in all our cities and towns. The extent of vocational rehabilitation involvement varies a great deal with the states. Some states have excellent programs, others have state programs that are not so good as far as actual state and local programs are concerned. So the point remains if the state has a good program, then there's a good avenue of rehabilitation for the injured person. Basically the big problems is to get him as early as possible to the counsellor where the evaluation of the case can be made and proper procedures recommended. The initial

contact should be made between the injured person--the client--and the rehabilitation counsellor, the vocational rehabilitation counsellor.

P: Could you give me just an idea of which states have these better programs and which are not as good as you would like to see them?

R: I really hate to name them because of the fact that we have to go through each state. Recently I was in New Hampshire. Now let me say this: Under the direction of HEW, each state now is doing a complete evaluation of its vocational rehabilitation procedures, and some of these evaluations have not been completed yet. But I was up in New Hampshire just last week where the report was finished and presented to Governor King. It outlined obviously a very poor involvement in vocational rehabilitation. As a matter of fact, it was presented, by members of the committee who were doing the evaluation, the fact that of all the fifty states in the union, New Hampshire has the worst in terms of numbers of handicapped people rehabilitated. As a matter of fact, there were less than 300 in the last fiscal year. So this is an example of a state that doesn't have the kind of involvement in vocational rehabilitation and is trying to do something about it.

One of the important things I think is that all of these programs are now being evaluated, and these will all be finished in the next year or so. So each state will then have a clear picture of the kind of work it's doing. This is a matter that of course obviously is up to the state itself as to the kind of programs it has, because it depends upon the amount of money budget-wise that's spent by the state, which is then supplemented by the federal government appropriation of HEW. So I might say that because of my intimate

knowledge and because of having been in New Hampshire and because the report was made while I was there to the governor, that this is one state obviously that does not have a good program. Some of the other states have excellent programs, and the true nature will be made public when these reports are completed.

P: Can you name one at the other end that--?

R: Well, I think one at the other end is New York State, which has an excellent program. I think Illinois has an excellent program. I might say that Massachusetts has a good program in terms of rehabilitation of handicapped people.

P: What are the steps involved in persuading business and industry to open up job opportunities for the handicapped?

R: We like to think that a committee composed of local businessmen who are involved and who have had actual experience in the employment of handicapped people--we like to think that this kind of a committee; actually holding a seminar for example, which we've done very successfully at which representatives of the insurance industry, representatives of the employers themselves, and representatives of labor, discuss the problems that are involved and the complications in the employment of the handicapped. For example, many employers think that their insurance costs will go up if they hire handicapped people, which is not so. And many of them believe that it will lead to a conflict with the labor unions, which is not really so. And so if a committee of local businessmen, of which we have many throughout the country, have a this kind of a seminar at which representatives of government appear and representatives of the insurance industry and labor and the businessmen themselves, and

then probably an actual demonstration of handicapped people doing specific kinds of work--we find this is the kind of thing that leads to a successful placement.

P: What effect will increasing automation have on vocational restoration of the handicapped?

R: Many people fear that increasing automation will decrease the number of jobs for the so-called handicapped, especially in the lesser skilled area. We found this is not really so. For example, the big increase in jobs in this nation the last few years has been in the service occupations. Obviously these cannot be automated. And the result is that while the total number of jobs have decreased, the fact remains that because the industry has expanded so much there are many more opportunities for people in terms of manpower. As a matter of fact there's a real shortage today of this kind of thing. We found in many firms that automation is too expensive. They just can't afford to automate. And we found also that skilled handicapped--for example, keyboard punch operators, this job can be mastered by handicapped people.

I had the opportunity of working with a young man in Massachusetts who had lost both his hands in a press operation, who was retrained as a key press operator and actually is getting much more money than he received when he was working in this press operation. And so in these terms his handicap led to this kind of training in a new industry--an automation industry--which led to advancement and more money. This is not true in all cases, but in this particular case, and in many others cases we've found that handicapped people with their kind of training can handle this automation which is taking

place in many firms. So I think that in many cases automation has been a blessing for the handicapped. One of the things that the handicapped have difficulty doing is sheer physical labor. Automation of course eliminates a great deal of this. So in many cases it has been a blessing.

P: I noticed in reading some material on your reports that you have pursued the placement of handicapped people in agricultural environments. How do you do this?

R: I might say that this has not been as successful as it might have been. We have been working with the Department of Agriculture in an attempt to develop employment opportunities for those in rural areas. But one of the basic problems in working with the handicapped in rural areas is that there are not the facilities there for training. Working with this program are rural area committees which we have in the Department of Agriculture. We are now making an attempt to find these many handicapped people in farm areas and get them to the place where they can receive the proper training. And while this program is, I might say, just beginning, it's a little more than a year old, I think it will be significant in time to come because of the great support of the Department of Agriculture in attempting to number and actually train many of the rural handicapped in the United States.

P: Again, how did this area get included--how did it come about?

R: We actually only have a staff of thirty-two people, and we try to expand as much as we possibly can. It came through the fact that many of our organizations out of the President's Committee pointed out the fact that a lot of these people are not receiving attention.

And once again, through a cooperative endeavor with the Department of Agriculture and the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture and through a national committee, we were able to set up this program which we hope will eventually reach down to the handicapped in rural areas. It's a new program--something new--and I might say that we've had excellent cooperation from the Department of Agriculture in terms of expanding this program.

P: Are there any other areas in your judgment that not enough attention is being given?

R: Let me say I think that the problem right now for the most part--the prime target must be in the inner city, the so-called ghetto. This is where not enough attention has been given in terms of employment, and in terms of training most of all, because first of all, shortage of personnel, in many cases shortage of money, and in many cases, our inability simply to communicate with the handicapped who live in the ghetto and in the inner city group. And this is where I think it has to be the target area, and this is where not enough is being done, not through any fault of anybody. The fact remains that the overwhelming aspects of the problem means that it's difficult to move in on it wholesale. I think we've got a start. I think that one of the things that has been recommended by HEW is that offices be set up actually in the ghetto so the handicapped in those areas will have easy access to the rehabilitation counselling. And I think that the approach of the disadvantage program in terms of who are disadvantaged, by race, by education, and also by physical and mental handicaps, will help a great deal. Then we'll have the people actually on the spot who are aware of the problems and who

30

can work directly with the handicapped in the ghetto. I think this is a real big problem.

P: I have a sort of concluding question here. However, I'll ask you for any further comments afterwards. But I'd like to ask you, through your long experience in this area what you project or see as the future contributions to this program. Obviously it will be the pursuit of the areas where not enough attention is given, but can you give me some specifics that you think that this will--?

R: Yes, I think that one of the things that is terribly important. Last year alone, the last fiscal year there were over 4,000,000 Americans injured in automobile accidents, and there were more than 60,000 deaths. Obviously those who are permanently disabled, and there are literally hundreds of thousands--maybe a million or more--in this nation in automobile accidents, the benefits of rehabilitation for the most part are not reaching these people. Studies are being conducted along this area. But the fact remains a person who is involved in an automobile accident for the most part his case is under litigation and so forth. Before this litigation even begins, there's no attempt to reach him for rehabilitation, training, or counselling, or anything of that matter. I think that more and more we've got to become involved first of all, with counselling and rehabilitation of not only the automobile accidents, I pinpoint this as one major area, but also the industrial accident, before we can even begin to talk about litigation or insurance claims or anything else. The basic thing is to get that person counselling service, and get him rehabilitation training, and so forth, and get him under the program of rehabilitation. I think that this is one great big problem that

31

we for the most part have ignored and are ignoring. And I would hope that rehabilitation will move in with all its benefits in this whole field, especially automobile accidents.

P: To what would you attribute this administration's attitude toward expanding this program?

R: Well, I think that President Johnson's whole philosophy has been one of education. I like to think about it as helping people help themselves, this is really what rehabilitation means. His attitude toward education of opening up--educational benefits, has been applied also to the field of rehabilitation which is in a sense not helping people, but it's helping people help themselves. And this is where the interest has been, and this is where the direction has been, and where the inspiration has been. No program can be successful unless it has this kind of support. So I think generally the whole attitude of the Johnson administration has been directed toward the thing we need so much for this country and that is not so much helping people, but helping people to help themselves--to give them the tools to work with in not only rehabilitation, but in many other fields. And I like to think this has been the key word.

P: We have covered a lot of different areas of improving the vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped--of all kinds of handicaps, and I know that this is probably very supervicial. Are there any other areas that you would care to comment on that we should include in this interview?

R: I think when we're talking about this whole program, this problem of rehabilitation for children is also one that we haven't really done as much with as we could have. There are many thousands and thousands of young children that not only become [handicapped] in accidents, but

are born with handicaps and so forth. Many times because of the state regulations, because of some federal regulations, they are not applicable or eligible for rehabilitation until they reach a school age. I think one of the secrets of rehabilitation is early treatment--early counselling and early rehabilitation. And I think that in some way the emphasis has got to be changed in such a way as to reach these children as soon as we possibly can in order to prepare them to help themselves to live with their disability. And many times we let this go until such a time as they are able to enter school. By this time their attitudes have hardened and set, and any opportunity for good training has many times been wasted. So I think that this is terribly important too, and I think we're not doing enough in this area.

Obviously we need much more money in special education in order to prepare the proper kind of training and educational opportunities, special classes for retarded or emotionally disturbed children, and sometimes our physically handicapped children, in order to also prepare them to live with their disability, or to overcome it whenever they possibly can. This is another area that I think needs attention.

I think we have a real communications problem with the medical profession. As Dr. Howard Rusk points out--he's probably one of the leading experts in rehabilitation in the United States--many of these, he says, at least 50-percent of the medical profession don't understand the advantages and opportunities afforded by rehabilitation. Many of them are prone to think that once the medical aspect of the treatment is finished that their job is done

instead of directing them to the proper rehabilitation agency. So I think we've got a problem of communication with physicians, and with medical schools, and medical universities throughout this country to make sure they understand the potential of rehabilitation. This is another area that certainly needs expansion.

Then the general public relations, or general information of our program to the general public so that if a person becomes involved in an accident and has a disability, he knows where to go to receive the information and counselling that's necessary to overcome the handicap. So it's a continuing program all the time as we go forward, trying to communicate.

P: Mr. Russell, do you have any further comments?

R: No, except that it has been a privilege for me as one individual to work with the administration in this program. I think I speak for all handicapped people who understand the problem when we say that we deeply appreciate the job that President Johnson has done in opening up many avenues of opportunity in many, many ways for our handicapped population in the United States.

P: Do you think that you have laid a solid foundation, and that attention will continue in this area?

R: Yes, I do think so because I think the success of the program now certainly deters in any sense to any cutback. The point remains that the program has proved successful; it has proved successful from many aspects. It has been successful economically in other words, what we've been able to do is take people in many cases who have been on welfare, on public assistance, and convert them into wage-earners. So in a sense for every dollar that has been spent for rehabilitation,

more than \$7 has been returned to the federal Treasury in terms of tax. But this is only the economic aspect. The human aspect of reclaiming lives has been such a successful one and I think a tremendous one that I don't think there's any deterring this program at this point. I don't see how they possibly could because it has been so successful.

P: I have no other questions to ask you, Mr. Russell, and I want to thank you very much unless you care to add anything else.

R: No, except what I have already said; that we have proved that it's not really important what you've lost, but what you have left and how you use it. With the kind of help that the federal and the state governments can give, a person can make a great deal of their lives in spite of any physical or mental disability in this great nation of ours.

P: Thank you very much.

R: Thank you, Dorothy.

[pause]

P: Mr. Russell, we have concluded this but I have just discovered in talking to you that there is an area that we have not pursued, and this is your effort in communication; and that would be in mass media--I would imagine in news and in TV and radio. What have you done in this area?

R: First of all, we have a continuing program which is aimed at the general public, mostly in attempts to encourage the employer to hire qualified handicapped people. This goes out over radio and television all the time. This is a continuing program. And then we have specialized programs where all of us from time to time make appearances on television and radio, through the newspapers with items and articles

of specific interest to specific disability groups, showing how either rehabilitation has been effective and employment has been effective, the different kinds of jobs that handicapped people are doing and so forth--in other words, highlighting the program.

And we have a continuing program of public information which goes out to the various groups themselves that are interested in disability--various national organizations and tell them what's happening in the field of legislation, what new opportunities in different industries are being opened up for handicapped people. So that this whole program of public relations, of public information, is just a continuing one all the time. And one that obviously we never can get enough of, because communications is one of those things that is a continuing effort. But this is carried on all the time.

And then each October--the first week in October is designed by the President as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. This is the week that we make even a greater effort, if that's possible, in attempting to publicize this program.

One of the things we emphasize from time to time is the qualified trained handicap, because obviously it would be a great turn to the program if we enticed an employer to hire a person that wasn't qualified. So we attempt to point out that what we're talking about is not so much handicapped people, we're talking about qualified, handicapped people who can bring something a little extra to the job and create the kind of employment opportunity which is good for the employer and also good for the handicapped person.

P: Is the news media responsive to your approaches, or do you have to put

much money into this?

R: Actually they've been very responsive. We have a committee which is composed of the leaders in the radio, television, and newspapers. We've had really wonderful cooperation. As a matter of fact, we put very little money into it. Most of this is on a volunteer basis, public service work. Thousands and thousands of announcements and programs are sent out to various radio, newspapers, and television stations, and are usually constantly. As you go around the country you can see and hear them all the time.

P: This more or less is a question out of my own curiosity. Your success in overcoming your own disability must be a very strong incentive to people who have suffered some sort of handicap. Do you find this so yourself?

R: Yes, I do. And the reason I've found it so--one of the biggest assists I received when I was in Walter Reed Hospital in 1944 was meeting a man by the name of Charles McGonigle who had lost both his hands in World War I, and had made a great success of his life and who had spent the major part of World War II traveling around to the amputation centers. Charlie and I became very good friends until his death some five years ago. Any success I've attained has been largely due to his inspiration.

I think this whole business of what I like to call "personalized" rehabilitation or person-to-person rehabilitation is one quite successfully, because if you can show a person rather than tell them that there is an opportunity for them, then you really can help them out. So I think this personalized rehabilitation is tremendously important. And incidentally we use a lot of it. We

have a lot of handicapped people on our committee. As a matter of fact each year we pick one individual who is personified as the "Handicapped American of the Year," somebody in spite of the handicap has done great things. He's presented his award by the President of the United States at the time of our annual meeting. So we attempt to certainly emphasize the fact that in spite of handicaps, that a person if he wants to succeed, he can succeed. And this is very pertinent as far as the rehabilitation of people who can see that firsthand, another form of personalized rehabilitation.

P: I believe another area that we didn't touch on, and I know that you've extensively worked on, is your travels around the country and your speaking engagements. And I believe this is an occasion that led you abroad too. I have really two questions, and I'll get them in and I'll let you talk. What is the success of your travels around the country and your speaking engagements, and how would you compare the efforts in America as to those abroad?

R: First of all, I think it's terribly important for all of us who are engaged in this work to get out in the so-called field. The success of this program depends upon the efforts of the various cities and towns and communities in the so-called grass roots. The more that we can get out and speak to people and meet them and let them know what is happening, the more successful the program will be. I do a lot of it; my staff does a lot of it. As a matter of fact, we're traveling all the time--there are always meetings going on somewhere. We attempt as much as possible to reach the communities where the action, so-called, is taking place.

And in regard to the international aspect, this program as in the United States has picked up a great deal of steam. Rehabilitation

has been quite significant in western Europe for the most part. We have at our annual meeting each year some thirty to fifty people from all parts of the world who attend. I travel extensively overseas. And we find that countries like Sweden, and Denmark, and England have done a great deal in rehabilitation. Other western European countries are doing it. And we find now this new interest and activity in Asia and Africa, and feel that rehabilitation is beginning now--it has begun some five years ago, and it's progressing. Because the so-called nations that are expertise in this sphere send their people out to these countries--so-called countries--that don't have the kind of opportunities. They have rehabilitation that is tremendously important, and is becoming more so. And these people are beginning to understand this and with the help of the experts, are developing programs of their own.

P: There has been much publicity of the effects of the war in Viet Nam on citizens, of course our own troops too so far as maiming people both mentally and physically. Has your group worked on any of the rehabilitation programs concerning replacement of limbs and things like that in Viet Nam?

R: Not directly, but we've been a part of it. For example, a little more than a year-and-a-half ago the Veterans Administration brought to this country about sixty paraplegics from South Viet Nam. They had been members of the Army of South Viet Nam, and they came over here for training and rehabilitation; not only they themselves, but with their doctors and some of the nurses they're at Castle (sp) Hospital in New York. They went back to their country. We were active in helping this program.

We've also been active with organizations that have been sending prosthetic equipment to Viet Nam, which is the great shortage. And also Dr. Howard Rusk has gone to Viet Nam to make an evaluation of its medical potential in terms specifically of not only rehabilitation, but the whole medical picture.

So we have been involved, while we have not been the leaders in this field. Our sphere of influence obviously is in the United States here, but we are also active and have supported many international programs, especially in Asia, and specifically in organizations that are working in Viet Nam for rehabilitation.

P: How does our technology and our receptiveness or response to rehabilitation and training of the handicapped stack up with other nations that are active in this area?

R: Let me answer this not from a professional viewpoint, but from a personal viewpoint. I think ours is better, and I think basically it's a matter of attitude. One of the things that we have done in contrast with some of the countries in western Europe, we have had and continue to have a very fine program of rehabilitation. What we have done is brought in personal involvement and used largely volunteers. In other words, in some of the countries for example just in the area of the employment of the handicapped--some of the countries in Europe have a quota which says that each employer in proportion to the total number of his employees must employ a specific number of handicapped people. We'd like to think that the volunteer system of encouraging or asking any employer to accept a trained handicap on the basis of ability, not charity, is more successful. And I like to think that this whole program, volunteer

40

association with the program, is much more successful than it would be if the government says, "You must do this." This is my personal opinion.

I know that in many European countries and I've seen them--they have fine rehabilitation programs; but I don't think there's any nation in the world that has the kind of personal involvement of volunteer involvement such as we have in the United States. And I like to think, and I feel that I'm correct in a sense, that the program is more successful over the widespread activity when you have people involved than you would if you just had the government saying, "You must do this, and you must do that."

P: Do you have any contact with any of the communist countries and their programs?

R: Not directly. I've been involved with the international programs. I might say that Poland is one nation that has a good rehabilitation program. And interestingly enough, a doctor in the Rehabilitation Institute in Warsaw developed a program of fitting of prosthetic appliances directly after the operation, which has been most successful and has been adopted in many parts of the United States--the Veterans Administration has done this work. In other words, I think that there is a lot to learn in many cases from this thing. We've seen--and some of our people have been to the countries behind the curtain--their programs and they don't begin to measure up to what we have here. I think I can say that without any question of doubt. But the fact remains that there is great interest in rehabilitation in the communist countries, and I think that certainly this would be an area where you could cooperate and you could mutually

41

beneficially exchange some thoughts and personnel, even, on this kind of thing. We've worked with the Yugoslav war veterans in this program of rehabilitation quite successfully. We like to think that we've helped them in the sense of building a better program for their people, especially for their disabled veterans.

P: Do ideological differences even come up in this area?

R: Politics always rears its ugly head at one time or another, but the point remains, we like to emphasize in talking with these people, that the basic thing is to try to help human beings, and that's more important than the political concept. Yes, of course, obviously they do come up from time to time, but we like to overlook and attempt the emphasis to be placed on the medical and rehabilitation aspects rather than on the political aspect. It is sometimes successful and other times it's not, but this is the emphasis we like to take.

P: How much do you travel a year, Mr. Russell?

R: I think I travel about seven months out of the year, either in the United States or outside, which is enough to keep anybody pretty busy.

P: And are these in terms of speaking, or is this organizational work?

R: It's everything. But basically as chairman I supposedly am the spokesman in the sense of making the pronouncements. So I do quite a bit of speaking to groups in various parts of the country, even overseas, on the program.

P: I have no more questions in this area. Do you think we have successfully covered that?

R: I think that we've kind of touched all the bases, and I think we've covered pretty much everything that I can think of at the moment

anyway.

P: Thank you again.

R: Thank you, Dorothy.

[pause]

P: You just started to mention a story to me regarding international involvement in this area.

R: Yes, I talked about the fact that we didn't have too many rehabilitation programs in Asia and Africa. As a matter of fact in Indonesia a number of years ago, a Doctor Soharso was attempting to make artificial limbs out of a catalog that he had found somewhere in Djakarta. And his efforts--he was working in a little garage--came to the attention of Dr. Henry Kessler, who was then representing the United Nations and traveling in that area. And as a result of Dr. Kessler bringing the information back to the United Nations, the World Veterans Federation which I was working with and the United Nations became involved. As a result of all of this involvement, we sent a doctor from San Francisco--a Dr. Douglas Toffelmier--with his nurse went to Indonesia and set up a rehabilitation center working with Dr. Soharso.

At that time that was the only rehabilitation center in Southeastern Asia--this was a number of years ago. The Soharso Rehabilitation Center on the island of Java in Indonesia and it is still operating and doing a tremendous job. And as a result, it has created not only rehabilitated work with a lot of very, very badly handicapped Indonesians, but others have come from all parts of that area to learn about the techniques. I think it has kind of spread. It has earned all kinds of good will and attention for the United States

and for the United Nations and for all of us who are involved in this thing.

Dr. Douglas Toffelmier is now back home, but I think one of the great achievements of his life, as he gave to me not very long ago, is the fact that he'll never forget the opportunity for service in the field of rehabilitation that were presented to him in Indonesia, and the opportunity to do something constructive. So that this program, I might emphasize, has a two-fold purpose--first of all, of actually doing something that's specific and concrete, and helping many, many people that otherwise would never be helped; and secondly, of creating the kind of good will and understanding that we need today in this world, of opening up communications between people. I think it's tremendously important.

P: How do you spell those two doctors names?

R: That's "Dr. Douglas Toffelmier;" I think Soharso--I'd better check that, because it's Indonesian. I'll check it.

P: I recall in my background research that you have been on a consultative situation with the United Nations. What has this involved?

R: Well, actually it involves the World's Veteran Federation. They are on a consultive basis with the U.N. in terms of rehabilitation. We try to offer recommending the kind of programs that can be put into play in their own countries. This is especially true of the Asian and African countries. This concept of rehabilitation was pretty much totally unknown a few years ago, and still is in many parts of Asia and Africa.

P: Have you or the World Federation appeared before the U.N.?

R: Yes, in certain committee meetings and testimonies, and so forth,

and at various affairs of the United Nations.

P: Has this led to action?

R: Yes, in many cases within limitations of budget and personnel. But we have had many programs, but most of all I think the important thing, it's led to action in the sense that it has helped the various countries and their own localities do something specific. In other words, it has given them, once again, the tools to help themselves, which they've been able to do. Actually, we've been able to supply technical college and personnel, and help them get a program going, which they have in many cases.

P: Anything else?

R: I think that kind of covers it, Dorothy.

P: I know if we turn this off, it probably won't be. I thank you.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

Gift of Personal Statement

By Harold Russell

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, Harold Russell, 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

Harold Russell

Date

January 5, 1972

Accepted

Harry J. Lindholm - for
Archivist of the United States

Date

October 4, 1974