

Memorandum

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up

TO: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR DATE: May 14, 2007

FROM: Barbara B. Tillett, LC Representative

SUBJECT: Addition to "Other agreements involving jurisdictions"

At the April JSC meeting in Ottawa, the Library of Congress was asked to merge the proposal in 5JSC/CCC/1 with proposal Q in 5JSC/LC/5/Rev. The CILIP representative would assist in generalizing the instruction for the Holy See to apply to all ecclesiastical agreements.

Both proposals were based on the 7.9.5 instructions in the original chapter 7. Those instructions combined provision of access points and selection of what was called then the primary access point (context now is the name of the work). Instruction numbers and references included in revised wording will need to be checked by the Editor.

Provision of appropriate access points

The aspect addressed by the 5JSC/CCC/1 proposal was the lack of an instruction "addressing a treaty between a national government, a Native American nation, and a government below the national level." That proposal noted that a footnote in the original chapter 7 clarified that the term "*National governments* includes bodies exercising treaty powers such as Native American nations and African tribal governments." That footnote appears at 6.7.5.1.1 in the revised chapter 6. Two instructions in revised chapter 6 together provide for access points for national governments and a government below the national level:

6.7.5.1. National government as a signatory to a treaty, etc.

6.7.5.1.1. For a treaty or any other formal agreement to which one or more national governments is a signatory, provide an access point for each national government that is a signatory.

6.7.5.4. Other jurisdiction as a signatory to an agreement

6.7.5.4.1: For an agreement between two or more jurisdictions below the national level, or between one or more national governments and one or more jurisdictions below the national level, provide an access point for each jurisdiction below the national level that is a signatory to the agreement.

It appears that no further work is necessary to reflect the intent of 5JSC/CCC/1.

However, might we consider collapsing these – the instructions say the same thing – to just declare that an access point should be given for each jurisdiction that is a signatory? For indexing and keyword purposes for the RDA Web tool, we could include the terms

‘national governments’ and ‘other jurisdictions’ somehow. What is JSC’s view?

Name of the work

The proposed revision of 7.9.5.1 in 5JSC/LC/5/Rev (section Q) addressed removing the preference for English alphabetic order in selecting the name of the government to be given as the first part of the name of the work. The proposed solution was to change the name of the work to the title proper or the preferred title for the treaty.

Instruction 13.5.2.2.1a.1 in the Sept. 2006 Editor’s draft of Part B already includes jurisdictions below the national level with treaty-making powers. Below is a proposed rewording of 13.5.2.2 to reflect the intent of 5JSC/LC/5/Rev’s section Q. Also below are proposed rewording of 13.5.2.1 and 13.5.2.3.1 to be consistent with other possible revisions.

13.5.2.2 One treaty, etc.

13.5.2.2.1 ~~Formulate the title to be used in a name title or title access point representing a single treaty, etc., as instructed below.~~

~~a) Two or three parties~~

~~Use a title beginning *Treaties, etc.* the title proper or the preferred title as the access point to name the work~~ for a treaty or other agreement between two or ~~three~~ more of the following:

- a) national governments
- b) international intergovernmental bodies
- c) ~~the Holy See~~ ecclesiastical bodies with treaty-making powers
- d) jurisdictions now below the national level but retaining treaty-making powers.

~~If there is only one party on the other side, add the name of the other party.~~
If the title does not include the year of signing, add, in parentheses, the date, earlier date, or earliest date of signing in the form: year, abbreviated name of the month (see appendix B), number of the day.

[revised examples from sections a) and b)]

~~b) Four or more parties~~

~~For a treaty, etc., between four or more parties, use the name by which the treaty is known. Use an English name if there is one. Add, in parentheses, the year, earlier year, or earliest year of signing.~~

13.5.2.1 Compilations of treaties

13.5.2.1.1 Use the title proper or the preferred title as the access point to name the work for a compilation of treaties and/or other agreements between two or more of the following:

- a) national governments
- b) international intergovernmental bodies
- c) ecclesiastical bodies with treaty-making powers
- d) jurisdictions now below the national level but retaining treaty-making powers.

13.5.2.1.2~~4~~ Make *see also* references from the access point representing the compilation to the access points for the single treaties (see 13.11.2).

~~13.5.2.1.1 Use, as the collective title for a compilation of treaties and/or other agreements between two parties, *Treaties, etc.* followed by the name of the other party.~~

[example]

~~13.5.2.1.2 Use *Treaties, etc.* alone for a compilation of treaties between one party and two or more other parties.~~

[example]

~~13.5.2.1.3 If a compilation of treaties, etc., is identified by a collective name, use that name followed in parentheses by the year, earlier year, or earliest year of signing for an item containing all the treaties, etc. For a single treaty, etc., in the compilation, see 13.5.2.2.~~

[example]

~~13.5.2.1.4 Make *see also* references from the access point representing the compilation to the access points for the single treaties (see 13.11.2).~~

13.5.2.3 Protocols, etc.

13.5.2.3.1 Use, as the ~~title portion of an~~ access point representing a separately catalogued protocol, amendment, extension, or other agreement ancillary to a treaty, etc., the access point title for the original agreement formulated according to the instructions given under 13.5.2.1-13.5.2.2 followed by *Protocols, etc.* and the date of signing or, if more than one protocol, etc., is involved, the inclusive dates.

Generalizing instruction referring to the Holy See

The CILIP representative has raised the question of how explicitl RDA should be in spelling out the relationship between the Holy See and the Catholic Church. He notes that some catalogers may not realize that the “church” as used in 6.7.5.3.1 is the Catholic Church; one possible revision would be to change that instruction to replace “... provide an access point for the church as a signatory” to “... provide an access point for the Catholic Church.”

In 13.5.2.2.1 above and in 6.7.5.3 below, one version of generalized wording has been given.

6.7.5.3 ~~The Holy See~~ Ecclesiastical body with treaty-making powers as a signatory to an agreement

6.7.5.3.1 For a concordat, *modus vivendi*, convention, or other formal agreement to which ~~the Holy See~~ an ecclesiastical body with treaty-making powers is a signatory, provide an access point for the ~~church~~ body as a signatory.