

Transcript of National Archives Assembly Legacy Project Interview

Subject: Judith Koucky

Interviewer: William Carpenter

Date: Feb. 22, 2007

CARPENTER: This is a National Archives Assembly Legacy Project oral history interview with Judith Koucky. My name is William C. Carpenter. Today's date is February 22, 2007, and the time is a few minutes past ten o'clock in the morning. This interview will consist of a few general questions in the beginning, followed by more specific questions toward the end, and we may diverge from the questions entirely during the interview. The first question—and some of these are standard questions that we use throughout the oral history/Legacy Project project—the first question has to do with your background. How did your education influence your decision to work at the National Archives?

KOUCKY: Well, my undergraduate major was French, but I did take the equivalent of a major in history, because I liked history. And then I switched to history in graduate school at the University of Michigan, and it was really at the University of Michigan that I learned to do research in primary sources. So, my field was modern German history, and for my dissertation I was going to do some work on the Maginot Line, the German conversion of the Maginot Line into a German defense after the defeat of France. So in the summer of, I am not sure, but I think the summer of 1969, I did come for the first time to do research at the National Archives. So I spent three weeks here, actually looking at captured German microfilm, the microfilm of the captured German records that are in RG 242. Most of that work was just looking through the microfilm to decide which rolls I wanted to order. But it was a good exposure to research at the National Archives and meeting a couple of staff members. But my real introduction to the archival profession occurred between 1971 and '74, when I had a job in Ann Arbor as assistant to the then-Secretary of the Society of American Archivists, Robert Warner, who then later became Archivist of the United States. It was in that job that I got to meet members of the archival profession nationwide, at the annual meeting and other meetings, and [in] telephone conversations with them, and [by] reading *The American Archivist* before it got mailed out to everybody, so I learned a lot about the profession. It was in the course of one of those meetings that I got to have a conversation with Mabel Dietrich. Dr. Dietrich was then the chief of the Military Archives Division, and she said to me, "Why don't you submit an SF 171 [application for Federal employment]?" So she put the thought in my head, but I didn't do anything about it until 1974, when they were going to set up a permanent office for the SAA, the Society of American Archivists, in Chicago. And Ann Campbell had been selected at the society's first Executive Director, and I actually helped her move the office equipment from Ann Arbor to Chicago in a big rented truck. But I did have a decision to make. I could have moved to Chicago and continued on the staff, or I could submit the SF 171, and I chose to do that. That changed my life!

CARPENTER: Great! When you joined the National Archives, did they provide any additional training, any archival training programs?

KOUCKY: It was very much on-the-job training. My first—I think it was the entire first year—was just on my assigned job in the Modern Military Projects Branch. Then the second year I was with a class of beginning archivists for a two-week cram course in archival administration. It was by lecture, and pretty much office heads would come and tell us what they did. After, the rest of that year was rotational assignment. You had to have at least one in a non-textual unit, and so on. So my rotational assignments were first in the Military Reference Branch, and then in Cartographic, which I liked very much, because I got to arrange and describe blueprint maps of the Philippines that had been done by General MacArthur's father, Arthur MacArthur, in, I think, 1912, around there. That was very interesting. My next assignment was Still Pictures; that was a very monotonous assignment of arranging and describing photographic prints of Veterans Administration hospitals that apparently were built on the same pattern, much as Pizza Huts are, so it was dreadfully boring! And I also had an assignment in the Washington National Records Center. And there, of course, they gave me records that were packed in twenty-five pound boxes on the top shelf; my most difficult assignment was getting the boxes down.

CARPENTER: Right! And then after those rotations you went back to your home office?

KOUCKY: That's right, I did.

CARPENTER: How long were you there at your first assignment?

KOUCKY: In Modern Military Projects? I have to look at my little chronology here [refers to papers on her lap]. I think that was July 1974 to May 1977.

CARPENTER: Where did you go after that?

KOUCKY: Well, in Modern Military, my first project was a microfilm project. So when I said "on-the-job training," it was, "Here are these records; do a microfilm publication." These were Army General Staff, War College Division record cards of the early twentieth century. So in the course of doing that project I got to learn about filing schemes and how important it was for archivists to know how agencies filed their records. But I also got to learn about preservation techniques, because these record cards are about three and a half [inches] by six and a half [Judy approximates size of cards with her hands], and each one was a number. And some of them became very voluminous, so they were all glued together at the top. So for microfilming purposes I had to get the glue off. I worked with a very wonderful man, Mr. Mario Lopez from Preservation, who rigged up what he called "my invention," [spoken in an accent]—he was Cuban—that looked like a little guillotine. You suspended the record cards upside-down into this solvent, so that the glue was softened, and we could very carefully separate the pages with a knife. And that way we preserved the text. I learned a lot in that first assignment. Then I had subsequent assignments there. In May 1977 I became the head of a very small staff within the Archivist's Office that was called the Mandatory Review Coordination Staff. I replaced a member who went on maternity leave and then took another position in the Archives

when she came back. This was a small staff of four people, and we acted as a clearinghouse for mandatory [declassification] review requests that came in for presidential materials. So the requests came through the Presidential Libraries; we then made copies, sent them along to the agencies, got the agency replies; so we were the middle organization...

CARPENTER: ...the coordinating agency...

KOUCKY: Yes, we coordinated. There, in that unit, first of all I learned the difficulties of supervising. It's very difficult to supervise, and I give people who are experienced supervisors all the credit for doing that. I also learned all about national security classified records: how we kept them secure, how we reviewed them. I learned the executive orders governing the declassification of classified records. That is an important part of an archivist's education at the National Archives. So anyway, from then I moved on to the Office of Presidential Libraries, because the mandatory review function itself moved from under the Archivist to under the Chief of the Office of Presidential Libraries. That was in 1979. So all during the 1980s, from '79 to '89, I worked in the Office of Presidential Libraries, and I continued to do the mandatory review middle-person work, but also answered almost all of the general correspondence, and by that I mean the general inquiries. Most of those came from school students, from elementary on up, asking things about presidents. So I got a good education, not only into presidential materials—which acts governed which presidential materials—but all about presidents whose papers weren't even administered by the National Archives. I think my outstanding event during that period was that I gave some assistance to a woman who was doing some work into the first ladies, and actually what I didn't know was that she wrote the comic strip on first ladies, and it showed up syndicated nationwide, just one strip about this, and she gave me credit! All my relatives who read the funnies saw my name, so I was immortalized in the comics!

CARPENTER: That's great!

KOUCKY: After Presidential Libraries I came back to the Office of the National Archives, but this time in the Archival Publications and Accessions Control Staff. The acronym was NN-E, the chief was Sharon Thibodeau. I worked under Bob Matchette, who was general editor of the *Guide to Federal Records in the National Archives of the United States*, shortened to "NARA Guide." That was absolutely great experience, because Bob had developed the format for the Guide, and we went record group by record group. Then Bob left to take the Space Management job, because we were moving at that time. I don't know if you were here or not, but we were already in the course of moving from Archives I and [the Washington National Records Center at] Suitland [Maryland] to out here [to Archives II]. We were trying to write the Guide even as the records were moving! [Laughs] That was one difficulty. But Bob left to take that position at Space Management, so for the very last year or year and a half of the Guide's life, Anne Eales and I did the finishing job on the publication.

CARPENTER: That is probably the last paper Guide.

KOUCKY: Right. It will be the last hardcover Guide. We were very proud of our accomplishment, because originally it was thought that we could do Guide description just by using existing finding aids. What we discovered was about a 20-year backlog of records that had been accessioned but no finding aids existed for them. So we did primary description work for many of those record groups. If Bob Matchette consents to be interviewed at some time, he can tell you all about our experiences in that regard. So then after the Guide was published—and it was published the first year that our staff moved out here to Archives II—I expected to continue as Guide editor, but Sharon Thibodeau had other ideas for me, and she appointed Mike Anderson as the NARA Guide manager, which he still is today. She said, “We are going to have a person who is going to be in charge of record group-level administration, and that is going to be you.” So, the name of our staff changed, eventually, to “Records Control Staff,” and that same staff, augmented by holdings management people, is now called the “Holdings Management Staff,” or NWCM. I also acquired a couple of other jobs. There was the record group-level administration, but also donated materials. We had to come up with an entirely different scheme for administering our donated materials, because when Trudy Peterson was the head of the Office of the National Archives, she decided that the record group concept should be used only for Federal records. And up to that time donated materials had gone into record groups; Record Group 200 was the biggest one...

CARPENTER: I have seen [Secretary of State Robert S.] McNamara records...

KOUCKY: ...but there were three others as well. All of the Polar materials, Record Group 401. Then the National Trust for Historic Preservation; that is not a government agency, that is a private organization; that had a record group. And the fourth one was the National Academy of Sciences; that was a private record group. So under Trudy’s mandate, those four Record Groups were abolished, so we had to come up with a whole different scheme for administering donated materials, and I did that, with Sharon’s advice, of course. What we did in place of a record group number was to apply an alphabetic designator to each body of donated materials. Then I have since redone the titles of each of these bodies of donated materials so that they accord with Archival Research Catalog—ARC—rules. That was a big job. My other job was providing reference service to Record Group 64, that’s the records of the National Archives and Records Administration.

CARPENTER: You still retain responsibilities even after retiring?

KOUCKY: I shouldn’t say that! Yes, Richard Crawford has succeeded me as the record group-level administrator, but Richard has the equivalent of a full-time job in processing, so the two of us have been working together on that, but eventually I will have to give that up. But we have been working together.

CARPENTER: I have some more specific questions, now that we have gone over the initial ones. How did your earlier experience at the National Archives prepare you for your work in record group administration?

KOUCKY: It was really the Guide experience. Because what we on the Guide staff discovered, was that nothing much had been done at the record group level for years. Very few new record groups had been created. And the result was that records had been accessioned into record groups of successor agencies, or records of a given agency had been accessioned into a record group of a predecessor agency, and the title had never been changed, so people did not know from the title, at all, what that record group contained. Still other records were, for lack of a better place to put them, accessioned into a sort of “all-purpose” record group. The most outstanding example of that was Record Group 338, which was for modern Army commands, and it ended up being something like 35,000 cubic feet of military miscellany. So something had to be done. Sharon Thibodeau took action on that, and she devised in 1991 a form, called a “Record Group Allocation Statement.” In order to explain that, I wonder if I could digress a little bit, and talk about the history of record groups around here?

CARPENTER: Sure!

KOUCKY: I will try to be as brief as I can about that, but for the first five years that the Archives was in existence, so from 1936 to 1941, we administered our records by accession—individual accession. So every time a few cubic feet of records came in, it would get the next accession number, whatever that would be, and custodial units were assigned stacks. I am not sure, but they probably tried to group their accessions in a rational manner, but all the paperwork was by individual accession. Those accessioning documents that went with that [accession] were being used as finding aids for research in the National Archives. So in 1940 the Archivist established a “Committee to Study Finding Mediums,” that was the name of the committee, and they were supposed to recommend some standard kinds of finding aids that we might develop. But before the committee could even make any kind of recommendation, it had to decide what kind of overriding, overarching principle we ought to have. So this committee held 14 meetings, and we have the transcripts of all the meetings, except the crucial last meeting, unfortunately! [Laughs] But they deliberated a lot about the European *fonds*, “F-O-N-D-S,” we all have heard that; and the consensus, I think, was that just wouldn’t fit American records, because agencies didn’t keep their records the way Europeans kept their records—with a registry, registering each document, and so on. From my reading of those committee meetings, I gather it was the Director of Publications who really came up with the idea of a “Record Group.” He was Solon Buck, who became the second Archivist of the United States. At that time, though, he was working on the very first Guide which came out, the 1940 Guide. What the staff saw when they encountered all of these little tiny accessions, was that they couldn’t describe by individual accession; they had to lump things together. So they lumped things together by what they called a “record group.”

CARPENTER: A reasonable enough thing to call it!

KOUCKY: Reasonable! Interestingly enough, for a long time in these deliberations, Solon Buck did not make the connection between what he was doing, describing in the Guide, and what the committee was supposed to be doing. He did come up with the term,

“archival group,” but at the crucial last meeting, which occurred on January 15, [1941], they must have determined to call this new concept a “record group.”

CARPENTER: Just follow the practice.

KOUCKY: That’s right. They came up with a number of recommendations on preliminary inventories, select lists, things that we know as traditional finding aids. What they did say was that, “From now on, control will not be exercised by accession number, but by record group.” And they came out on February 28, 1941, so almost exactly 65 years ago, is that right? The Archivist produced a memorandum in which he defined the record group, and that still stands as the definition. I wrote it down here somewhere [looks at a paper in her lap], and I quote it: “A major archival unit, established somewhat arbitrarily,” I love that, “...somewhat arbitrarily, with due regard to the principle of provenance, and to the desirability of making the unit of convenient size and character, for the work of arrangement and description, and for the publication of inventories.” That gives you a lot of room.

CARPENTER: Sure.

KOUCKY: A lot of room. Additional instructions went out to the custodial units in June 1941, and one key instruction was, every item of archival material in the National Archives is to be allocated to a record group, and only to one record group. So every item has to be under the record group system, but each item must be assigned only to one record group. This seems so logical to us today, but archivists in the ‘40s, many of them, were still thinking in terms of individual library accessions, and how you treat those. Custodial units were asked to come up with a tentative list of record groups. Wartime intervened, but by 1944 they actually had an approved list of 200 record groups. And these are our first 200 record groups, and in them you will find the pattern for all subsequent record groups—because most record groups contain records of a single autonomous recordkeeping agency. What that turns out to be, for organizations of the Executive Branch, is what we used to call “bureau-level” organizations. But so few government organizations call themselves “bureaus” anymore, it is really the second level down in an Executive department. These would be program agencies, agencies that actually fulfill a stated mission of that department, as distinguished from a “housekeeping” agency. And in addition to bureau-level, or second-level, organizations, of the big departments; if you made that your primary kind of record group, then what do you do with department-level records? What they decided to do was, any organization at that level—that is, with department-wide functions—would go into what they called a “general” record group. That’s why we have some record groups entitled, “General Records of the...” as in, “General Records of the Department of State,” Record Group 59; “General Records of the Department of Justice,” Record Group 60. So you have general record groups, you have your ordinary record groups, and then they also thought of “collective” record groups. Now, our founding fathers, when they thought of collective record groups, were still adhering to the principle of provenance. They thought that if a department had field records, then you should make a separate record group for field records. But because there are many different field offices, they called that a collective

record group. Over the years, a collective record group came to mean a record group consisting of records in small volume of organizations not necessarily related to each other by provenance, but by some other common factor. And I will say that those record groups have always been difficult to administer. If you ask a reference archivist, they will say so. Because you can't tell from the title; you just don't have a clue...well, you might have a clue from the title, but a lot of times, it is a surprise to find what's in that record group. So, you have a record group for anniversaries and memorial commissions; that could contain many different things, and so on. So I think we have not carried through that original intent of the archivists of the '40s. But otherwise, we have.

CARPENTER: Do you think that collective record group idea should just drift away?

KOUCKY: I will say that under Sharon Thibodeau's guidance, we have discouraged the establishment of collective record groups. We did do one, and that was for the Center for Legislative Records. They asked for a collective record group for records of Congressional Commissions and Boards. Not committees, because those are permanent, standing committees. They wanted that record group for things like the 9/11 Commission. They needed to have a record group like that. So we did that. I am digressing a lot, but I wanted to say [glancing at notes in lap], that from 1941 to '73, we administered record groups from what we called a "Record Group Registration Statement." So any time a new record group was established, the custodial unit filled out this form, which was called a Registration Statement, containing the record group number, the title, a brief administrative history, what records were in the custody of the National Archives, and what records were not yet in the custody of the National Archives. So, there was an idea of the lifecycle of records already. That was good. But Record Group Registration Statements were descriptive: they described what we already had. Then, as I said, the whole thing fell apart around 1973. The last registration statement that I find is for Record Group 418 [Records of St. Elizabeths Hospital], and it is from 1973. I asked Sharon about that a couple days ago, and what she thinks happened, is that we were then going into our first automated descriptive system, NARS A-1, you may have heard of NARS A-1.

CARPENTER: Yes.

KOUCKY: We were so enthusiastic about NARS A-1 that we dropped a lot of forms that ordinarily we would have filled out, and thought somehow that that information would "show up" in NARS A-1. It didn't. There was no field for a registration statement, though if you look at NARS A-1 printouts, you will see the old registration statements, for part of them are kind of summarized at the beginning of the printout for a record group. But I looked at our official record group files, and I see that in the 70s and 80s we hardly created any new record groups. That, of course, now brings us up to the story about the Guide, and the fact that, "Oh, here we have all kinds of things that are just not right." So Sharon devised a record group allocation statement, which is not descriptive, it is prescriptive. It is intended for the accessioning archivist, and it tells the accessioning archivist, after giving the administrative history, and mission, and functions, and transfers, and so on; it tells them, "Allocate to this record group records of ..." And it

says what the main agency is, the predecessor agencies, and whatever should go in that record group. Then if there is any possible confusion over some body of records that we might take in, it says, "Do not allocate to this record group records of ...; allocate those records to..." and then you must give another record group. It sets boundaries, in other words, to a record group. There is a lot of freedom within the boundaries, but it does set boundaries. I think that is really the important thing.

CARPENTER: Can you talk a little bit about record group reallocation, and what decision-making process occurs to break record groups apart?

KOUCKY: You mean Record Group 338 [Records of Army Commands] in particular?

CARPENTER: That's one example.

KOUCKY: There are times—in fact, there are more times than not—where records have been incorrectly in a record group for so long, where researchers have used them, and have cited that record group in their monographs, or their books, where we don't reallocate. We just leave them where they are. But with the computer, now, of course, it is much easier to do a search and find them than it used to be. Now, with regard to RG 338, for years people knew that something had to be done, because we couldn't retrieve what we had. We didn't know what we had. I came in at the tail end of this story; so some of this is hearsay. RG 338, I think, was out at Suitland. I am not sure if the whole record group was, but the bulk of the records were. A couple of archivists were assigned the task of seeing whether they could create new record groups out of RG 338 and give us something manageable and convenient for arrangement and description. Both of the archivists who came up with this plan had their experience in nineteenth-century military records. So many of the record groups they proposed, the archivists who were in modern military records opposed, for being just not practical or not right. There were some personality difficulties, but the big difficulty arose because one of these archivists went ahead and put the record group stamp right on [the boxes]. And the "sacred label;" they put a *new* record group on there. Eventually the controversy reached the point at which the head of the Office of the National Archives, Mike Kurtz, tabled the whole thing. He just said, "Let it rest for a while." So then we moved over here [to Archives II], and RG 338 moved over here. Sharon [Thibodeau] said, "Judy, the time has come." [Laughs] But, in the meantime, Bill Getchell, who had worked with those records for many years out at Suitland, was also over here, and he came up with a scheme. His scheme called for the creation, I think, of 26 new record groups, most of which were World War II record groups, but some of which were post-war, or even record groups that would continue to accession records. My job was simply to broker—to go between Bill, on one hand, and the current Modern Military Reference staff on the other. And they were colleagues anyway. They had worked together out at Suitland. So really, I was just a kind of go-between. We managed to cut down the number; we didn't make 26, but I think we did make 16 new record groups, though, out of RG 338. But people were satisfied. The archivists were satisfied with that arrangement. And then I would say under Becky Collier's [of Modern Military Reference] capable hand, that following summer they just pulled boxes off the shelves in [Stack] 290, and set them in the aisles and physically

rearranged all those boxes. That was a tremendous job. And other archivists joined in. Dave Giordano, I think, played a part in that, and intermittents as well. If I left out anyone, I apologize. And it is working.

CARPENTER: Can you speak a little about the creation of new record groups? For example, when a new executive agency is established, or, in the military, a new combatant geographic command is created?

KOUCKY: Right. Actually, I think that brings up one of your other questions, which was, "How does the records lifecycle affect record group administration?"

CARPENTER: Yes, that's the question.

KOUCKY: Here's how it does. I am pleased to report that the lifecycle concept has really taken root among the records officers of all the government agencies. I think that our present Lifecycle Division of Modern Records Programs, NWML, has done a superb job of educating records officers in the concept of the lifecycle of records. Because they understand now that the records that are under their purview are in the "creation" stage, and then they go into a sort of semi-retirement stage, and then the permanent ones are offered to the National Archives and the others are destroyed. And they understand that. So, how does this affect new record groups? Almost all our proposals for new record groups come from NWML, from the archivists who are working with the records officers, because the record group number is actually included in the records schedule number. So a new agency has to have a record group number right away. Now, many of them are really successor agencies to a previous agency. What we can do there is to expand the existing record group to include the records of the new agency, change the title so that it has the title of the new agency. We do that as much as is archivally correct. But in many cases, the new agency cannot be connected to a single predecessor agency, so we establish a new record group. May I give you an example? A current example would be the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security [RG 563]. Right off, you know you've got to have a new record group at the departmental level, so we have the General Records of the Department of Homeland Security. But what do you do about some of these other agencies? I will give you my main example, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, because it was abolished, and its functions were actually dispersed between two agencies of the Department of Homeland Security, and a remnant function actually stayed with the Department of Justice. So what we did, then, was to take the record group, Record Group 85, INS records, and we closed the records at the date on which it did its last full day of business. A "closed" record group does not mean that you don't accession any more *records* into the record group, but you accession only the records it [the agency] created and maintained. Then we created two new record groups for the Department of Homeland Security agencies, those two agencies that inherited the INS things [RGs 566 and 567]. And I did all of this in collaboration with Larry Baume, actually, of NWML. We took it all the way through. So what you asked about, it is really NWML that I hear from, or have heard from, before I retired. And I still do!

CARPENTER: Do you have much contact with agency records officers yourself?

KOUCKY: No, I don't. Because that's NWML's job, so I let them do that.

CARPENTER: OK.

KOUCKY: I think they're happy with that arrangement. You mentioned unified commands [of the Department of Defense, such as United States Central Command]? Didn't you just mention a new unified command?

CARPENTER: Yes.

KOUCKY: As an example... As a matter of fact, we have a little backlog here; but we're working on that. U.S. Northern Command was established as a new command in 2002. And that is just now wending its way through managerial review. All of these proposals are reviewed by the NW managers, and by NR, the Office of Regional Records Services. And then comments come back, and we take those into consideration, and re-do the allocation statement before Mike Kurtz approves it. And after a new record group, or a revised record group, or even a cancelled record group is approved by Mike, then our official list of record groups—what we call colloquially the “ABC” list—that's the *List of Record Groups [and Donated Materials Groups] of the National Archives and Records Administration*. It's called “ABC” because it is divided into three parts; that's explained on the website. So that's...let me see [looks at papers], there was one other thing. How does the lifecycle concept affect our work? Well, it's because almost all of those proposals come from NWML, which means, then, that new record groups are established years and years before we ever accession any records and allocate them to that record group. That record group number is used while that record group is active in the agency; it is used in the records center, and it is all the more important now that we get those record group numbers straight, because agencies pay rent, as you know, for the deposit of their records in records centers, and the accounts are organized by record group number. As the NR people do the accounting, they want to know right away who is going to pay for the records in this record group for the rental.

CARPENTER: So Northern Command might not actually be retiring any records for 15 or 20 years, and we might not get them for 25 or 30 years...

KOUCKY: That's right, we might not.

CARPENTER: And the command might even be dissolved by then!

KOUCKY: We have found that with one agency. It was the “Risk”...I can't remember now, but it has “Risk” in it. [Laughs]

CARPENTER: OK.

KOUCKY: Before we accessioned any records, they had already been abolished. They did create records, but they are easily absorbed by another record group, so we did cancel that record group.

CARPENTER: Here's one other question. How do you think technology has changed the work of record group administration?

KOUCKY: I thought and thought about that, Bill. First of all, just the technology we use, the way we administer by computer, I think, certainly allows us to create larger record groups, in fact, because we have much better intellectual control over them through the computer than we did before. On the other hand, it may not come to pass. Reference archivists may still say, "Hey, wait a minute, it's getting too big, I can't find it." So I am not sure. But looking at it the other way, we are accessioning electronic records, and that may be what you are interested in, about how I think that kind of technology has affected record groups. So, I made some inquiries among our electronic records staff; the two staffs, NWME [Electronic and Special Media Services Division] and the ERA [Electronic Records Archives] staff. And I hadn't really thought about it, but they said they didn't foresee any particular change in the future, because no matter what the medium is of the record, we still have to have some overarching organizing principle. And for us, the record group—as we have defined it—has worked. I will be interested though, to see if eventually that we won't need record groups.

CARPENTER: There could be some large government-wide electronic system that would not easily be allocated to one record group.

KOUCKY: Exactly, that's right. We can't foresee it. Well, I can't, anyway.

CARPENTER: Anything else you want to talk about?

KOUCKY: No, I think I've done a lot of talking!

CARPENTER: Well, great! That's about it. The time is now approximately a quarter to 11.

KOUCKY: Very good.

CARPENTER: Thank you.

KOUCKY: Thank you. A pleasure.

Gift of Historical Materials of **Judith Koucky** to
The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA)

1. In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 21 of Title 44, United States Code, and subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, I, **Judith Koucky** (hereinafter referred to as the Donor), hereby give, donate, and convey to the United States of America, for eventual deposit in the National Archives of the United States (hereinafter referred to as the National Archives), the following historical materials (hereinafter referred to as the Materials):

Recording (media) of an oral history interview with the donor conducted on February 22, 2007, by William C. Carpenter on behalf of the National Archives Assembly Legacy Project.

Transcript of an oral history interview with the donor, conducted on February 22, 2007, by William C. Carpenter on behalf of the National Archives Assembly Legacy Project.

2. Because the Materials were generated in connection with the National Archives Assembly Legacy Project—an oral history project designed to capture the institutional memory of retiring NARA staff—the Donor stipulates that the Materials be accessioned into the National Archives and allocated to the donated historical materials collection of the National Archives Assembly. This collection is designated as NAA and is entitled, Records of the National Archives Assembly.

3. The Donor warrants that, immediately prior to the execution of the deed of gift, she possessed title to, and all rights and interests in, the Materials free and clear of all liens, claims, charges, and encumbrances.

4. The Donor hereby gives and assigns to the United States of America all copyright which she has in the Materials.

5. Title to the Materials shall pass to the United States of America upon their delivery to the Archivist of the United States or the Archivist's delegate (hereinafter referred to as the Archivist).

6. Following delivery, the Materials shall be maintained by NARA at a location to be determined by the Archivist in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 21 of Title 44, United States Code, and provided that at any time after delivery, the Donor shall be permitted freely to examine any of the Materials during the regular working hours of the depository in which they are preserved.

7. It is the Donor's wish that the Materials in their entirety be made available for research as soon as possible following their deposit in the National Archives.

8. The Archivist may, subject only to restrictions placed upon him by law or regulation, provide for the preservation, arrangement, repair and rehabilitation, duplication and

reproduction, description, exhibition, display, and servicing of the Materials as may be needed or appropriate.

9. The Archivist may enter into agreements for the temporary deposit of the Materials in any depository administered by NARA.

10. In the event that the Donor may from time to time hereafter give, donate, and convey to the United States of America additional historical materials, title to such additional historical materials shall pass to the United States of America upon their delivery to the Archivist, and all of the foregoing provisions of this instrument of gift shall be applicable to such additional historical materials. An appendix shall be prepared and attached hereto that references this deed of gift and that describes the additional historical materials being donated and delivered. Each such appendix shall be properly executed by being signed and dated by the Donor and the Archivist.

Signed: Frank A. Koucky
Donor

Date: 12/14/07

Pursuant to the authority of Chapter 21 of Title 44, United States Code, the foregoing gift of historical materials is determined to be in the public interest and is accepted on behalf of the United States of America, subject to the terms and conditions set forth herein.

Signed: Allen Weinstein
Archivist of the United States

Date: 1/15/08