

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Kevin Marsh, ACOC representative
Subject: Revision of RDA 11.2.2: Heads of State and Heads of Government

ACOC thanks the ALA representative for preparing this revision and offers the following comments on the points offered for discussion:

- a. Regarding generic vs. gender-specific terms, ACOC offered additional language, but we believe that this was based on the assumption that the name was being recorded in the language of the jurisdiction. LC, on the other hand, strongly preferred generic terms for the title of the office. The third paragraph of the revised 11.2.2.21.1 does this. Does JSC agree?

ACOC agrees. ACOC's suggestion was based on the assumption that language of jurisdiction would be used. Now that the instruction refers to the language preferred by the agency the suggested addition is no longer appropriate.

Note – ACOC is not certain how many agencies might have a preferred language that has no gender neutral term, but if this is an issue, additional guidance might be needed after this paragraph of the instruction:

“If the title varies with the gender of the incumbent, use a general term (e.g., *Sovereign* rather than *King* or *Queen*).”

- b. In the third paragraph of the revised 11.2.2.21.1 (“If the title varies ...”), John Hostage asks whether the instruction should read “If the title in the language preferred by the agency creating the data varies ...” because the title in the official language of the jurisdiction may not vary. It seems to me that the first paragraph of 11.2.2.21.1 makes it clear that the title is recorded in the language preferred by the agency creating the data, and that it is unnecessary to repeat this in subsequent instructions. Does JSC agree?

ACOC agrees. The first paragraph is clear, it is usual in RDA for the instruction about language to be in the base instruction, and applies in all subsequent instructions unless otherwise specified.

- c. In the same paragraph, John noted that it is often difficult to determine the title for a head of government, particularly as the resource being described is likely to contain the title only in the official language of the jurisdiction. The literal English translation of *Bundeskanzler* and *Bundeskanzlerin* is *Federal Chancellor*, and that English equivalent is used on the official

website (<http://www.bundestkanzlerin.de/Webs/BK/En/homepage/home.html>); *Chancellor* is often used as a short form, but literary warrant for that might be more difficult to find. My sense is that this is an application issue, and that RDA need not provide further guidance on how to determine the equivalent in another language. Does JSC agree?

ACOC agrees. No further guidance is needed in RDA.

- d. ACOC suggested using an English example for the titles that vary with the gender of the incumbent, and suggested the heading for the current British monarch. My original intention was to include the following headings for both a king (George I), a queen (Elizabeth II), and a joint incumbent (William and Mary):

Great Britain. Sovereign (1714–1727 : George I)

United Kingdom. Sovereign (1952– : Elizabeth II)

England and Wales. Sovereign (1689–1694 : William and Mary)

Unfortunately, Adam Schiff informs me, because of complications in the implementation of headings for Great Britain and the United Kingdom in the NACO authority file, the Examples Group — with JSC approval — determined not to include examples for these jurisdictions in RDA. Although I believe that this situation ought to be resolved, I have also avoided the issue, by using the examples of Charles II as King of Scotland, and Mary Stuart as Queen of Scotland; I believe that the heading for William and Mary may be used. Which headings does JSC wish to include in the third paragraph of 11.2.2.21.1?

ACOC retains its preference for the inclusion of an English example; it seems odd not to include such examples when so many Canadian, British and Australian cataloguers would be making use of these instructions.

ACOC wonders whether the NACO issue can be resolved by a policy statement attached to this instruction. Speaking personally, I'm not clear on the history of this discrepancy and how it arose, but it's preferable that RDA is internally consistent, and that the situation is resolved.

- e. It was not clear from the JSC discussion whether the preferred name for ruling executive bodies (proposed RDA 11.2.2.21.2) should be recorded in the language preferred by the agency creating the data or in the official language of the jurisdiction. Because of the variety of designations for ruling executive bodies and the lack of commonly-used generic terms, we are recommending that the name be recorded in the official language of the jurisdiction.

Does JSC agree? If not, what English equivalents would you recommend for the examples given in 11.2.2.21.2?

ACOC agrees. Attempting to record the ruling executive body in the language preferred by the agency is likely to create more issues than it solves.