

**Conflict of Authorship: Corporate Body vs Corporate Body.**  
(Cataloguing problems. 10). (Comparison of CCC and AACR. 6).

**S R Ranganathan**, *National Research Professor in Library Science, and Honorary Professor, Documentation Research and Training Centre, Bangalore 3, and*  
**G Bhattacharyya**, *Lecturer, Documentation Research and Training Centre, Bangalore 3.*

[A conflict of authorship should get resolved at the stage of the definition of the term 'Author' and of the terms denoting the different kinds of author. In the case of the conflict "Corporate Body vs Corporate Body", each of the initial Formal Definitions requires to be propped up by an appropriate Interpretative Definition as a sequel to it. Many of the Cataloguing Codes do not give an explicit Interpretative Definition. But they are implied in their rules for Choice and Rendering of Heading; and they can be distilled out of these rules. A critical and comparative study of how RDC and the different editions of AACR and of CCC resolve the conflict "Corporate Body vs Corporate Body" is made on the basis of the relevant Interpretative Definitions—either explicitly stated or distilled out from the rules implying them. Conflicts centring round the following kinds of Corporate Bodies are considered: (1) Government; (2) Near Sovereign Body; (3) Quasi Government; (4) Institution; and (5) Conference. A separate part is devoted to each kind of Corporate Body. Each part begins with a section on Terminology giving the precise definitions of the terms needed to develop the ideas systematically. The specific issues considered generally in relation to each kind of Corporate Body are: (1) Whole Corporate Body vs Its Organ of Remove 1; (2) Organ of Remove 1 vs Organ of Remove 2; (3) Corporate Body vs Its Quasi Independent Institution; (4) Corporate Body vs Its Organ Conference; and (5) Corporate Body as a Delegated-from-Body vs Conference. Impact, if any, received by any Code from the earlier Codes, is indicated. Wherever necessary, the Interpretative Definitions for inclusion in CCC (Ed 6) are given.]

## ABBREVIATIONS USED:

AACR = Anglo-American cataloguing rules. By American Library Association and others. Its three editions are distinguished by adding after the abbreviation their respective years of publication, as for example, AACR (1908).

CCC = Classified catalogue code. By S R Ranganathan. Its five editions are distinguished by adding after the abbreviation their respective years of publication.

Heading & Canons (1955) = Heading and canons: Comparative study of five catalogue codes. By S R Ranganathan. 1955.

RDC (1904) = Rules for a dictionary catalogue. Ed 4. By Charles A Cutter. 1904.

Theory (1938) = Theory of library catalogue. By S R Ranganathan. 1938.

**A Structure of the Paper****A1 DISTILLED DEFINITION**

Obviously, the resolution of a conflict of authorship should be done at the stage of the definitions of terms. A precise definition of each of the terms 'Author' and 'Collaborator' and of those denoting different kinds of author would go a long way. But in certain cases, specially in the case of the conflict "Corporate Body vs Corporate Body" it is difficult to make the Formal Definitions sufficiently helpful. In such a case, each of the initial Formal Definitions requires to be propped up by an appropriate Interpretative Definition as a sequel to it. This Interpretative Definition has often to be in an Illustrative Enumerative form. Many of the Cataloguing Codes do not give an explicit Interpretative Definition. But they are implied in their rules for Choice and Rendering of Heading. It is possible — it is indeed convenient and even necessary for each Code to have the Interpretative Definitions "distilled" and explicitly stated to secure clarity, and conformity to the Principle of Unity of Idea in each Rule. At any rate, this is necessary in this paper to make the comparative study of the different Cataloguing Codes meaningful. Such a definition got out of other rules may be denoted by the term 'Distilled Definition'.

**A2 EXPLICIT FORMULATION OF DISTILLED INTERPRETATIVE DEFINITION**

A properly drafted Cataloguing Code would give the necessary Formal Definition and its associated Interpretative Definitions of the term 'Corporate Author' of a work in respect of each of the possible forms of the conflict "Corporate Body vs

Corporate Body". But, hardly any Code stands up to this standard. Therefore, in the comparative study of the different Codes we are obliged to begin with a statement of the necessary Distilled Definition implied in the different Codes wherever they do not exist, and otherwise with the Definition as given in the Code. Here, each edition of a Code is treated by itself. Each section of Distilled Definition cites the Codes in chronological sequence. Under each Distilled Definition, the relevant extract from the Rule implying it is cited for ready reference.

#### A3 THEORETICAL BOOKS

In the chronological sequence, either the guidelines or the definitions contained in two theoretical books, are also interpolated in their proper place.

#### A4 MNEMONIC SECTION NUMBER

Wherever possible, the subsections of this paper are numbered mnemonically to facilitate easy reference. This has been done according to the following table:

Code and other Books	Definition/Quotation	Commentary
RDC (1904)	a	A
AACR (1908)	b	B
CCC (1934)	c	C
Theory (1938)	d	D
CCC (1945)	e	E
AACR (1949)	f	F
CCC (1951)	g	G
Heading & Canons (1955)	h	H
CCC (1958)	j	J
CCC (1964)	k	K
AACR (1967)	m	M
CCC (Ed 6)	n	N

#### A5 VARIETIES OF CONFLICT

The major varieties of the conflict "Corporate Body vs Corporate Body" are stated below:

1 The Corporate authorship of a work may go solely with a Whole Corporate Body. In this case, the Whole Corporate Body is the sole author — that is, *de jure* as well as the *de facto* author.

2 In some cases the *de jure* authorship alone may go with the Whole Corporate Body, and the *de facto* authorship with an Organ of it — that is, a dependent non-autonomous Corporate Body created by the Whole Corporate Body. In such a case, the Whole Government *cum* Organ is the *de jure cum de facto* author of the work.

3 In some other cases, the authorship may go with a Quasi Independent Institution — that is, a Corporate Body created by a Parent Corporate Body, and the latter not owning any responsibility for any work of the former.

These varieties are reflected in the different parts of this paper mentioned in Sec A6 below ;

#### A6 PARTS OF THE PAPER

The succeeding parts centre round the following kinds of Corporate Bodies:

- B Government;
- C Near Sovereign Body;
- D Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body)
- E Institution; and
- F Conference.

Part G gives a sum up of the findings.

#### B Government, Its Organ, and Its Quasi Independent Institution

##### B1 TERMINOLOGY

**B11 Government.**— Generic term to denote 'Whole Government' and 'Organ-of-Government'.

**B12 Whole Government.**— Corporate Body with full or limited sovereign power over a territory. It has generally functions of execution, legislation, justice, and administration. Other functions, such as defence, taxation, regulation of commerce, public transport, communication etc, will vary with the degree of limitation in sovereign power.

**B13 Organ-of-Government.**— Non-autonomous part of a Government formed by

1 The constitution of the Government for functions, such as legislative, deliberative, executive, and administrative; *or*

2 A legislative, executive, or administrative measure, for a defined piece of deliberative, executive, or administrative work within the field of function of the Government, for an undefined period; *or*

3 A legislative, or executive, or administrative measure for a specific piece of work within the field of function of the Government, for a specific limited duration.

**B131 Organ-of-Government of Remove 1.**— Organ deriving its functions and powers directly from the constitution of the Whole Government, or from the executive or occasionally from the legislature, to discharge its stated functions and powers in the name of the Whole Government to the prescribed extent.

**B132 Organ-of-Government of Remove 2.**— Organ of an Organ-of-Government of Remove 1 deriving some stated functions and powers of the Whole Government *via* the said Organ of Remove 1.

**B133 Organ-of-Government of Remove 3 onwards.**— The definitions are analogous to that of Organ-of-Government of Remove 2.

**B135 Permanent Organ-of-Government.**— Organ-of-Government formed for an undefined period.

**B136 Temporary Organ-of-Government.**— Organ-of-Government formed for a specific piece of work for a defined limited period.

**B137 Administrative Organ-of-Government.**— Organ-of-Government formed by a legislative, or executive, or administrative measure, for a defined piece of deliberative, executive, or administrative work within the field of function of the Government, for an undefined period.

**B138 Constitutional Organ-of-Government.**— Organ-of-Government formed by the very constitution of the Government.

*Note.*— The substance of the above definitions was given for the first time in *Heading & Canons* (1955) and has been repeated thereafter in *CCC* (1958) and *CCC* (1964). But, no other Code has attempted this, except that *AACR* (1967) gives its Footnote 15 defining the term 'Government' alone.

**B14 Governmental Quasi Independent Institution.**— A Corporate Body created by a Government and whose functions are outside the traditional primary functions of the Government and which is autonomous within its own sphere of functions — though financed and owned by the Government.

**B141 Permanent Governmental Quasi Independent Institution.**— Governmental Quasi Independent Institution created for an undefined period.

**B142 Temporary Governmental Quasi Independent Institution.**— Governmental Quasi Independent Institution created for a defined limited period.

**B2** WHOLE GOVERNMENT Vs ITS ORGAN OF REMOVE 1

**B2a** *Distilled Definition from RDC (1904)*

In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Government of Remove 1, the Whole Government *cum* Organ is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

“48. Enter under the place [countries or parts of countries] the reports of governmental departments, bureaus, offices, etc., and the works published by them or under their control.”

*Examples from Rule 324:*

“1 United States. *Department of Interior*;

“2 United States. *Department of Navy*; and

“3 United States. *Department of War*.”

**B2b** *Distilled Definition from AACR (1908)*

Same as in Sec B2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 58:

“58. Enter under names of countries, states, . . . etc. official publications issued by them or under their auspices. The names of the departments, bureaus, etc, from which the publications emanate are to be given as subheadings.”

**B2c** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1934)*

Same as in Sec B2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

“1231. If the Corporate Author is a Government and not only specific part of it, the Heading is to consist of the English name of the Geographical Area whose affairs are governed or administered by it. If the Corporate Author is a Part of a Government, the above Heading is to be used as the Main Heading.” [Then follow rules on the rendering of the subheading to be added].

**B2e** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)*

Same as Sec B2c of this paper.

**B2f** *Distilled Definition from AACR (1949)*

Same as in Sec B2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

“72A. Enter publications emanating from the various agencies of government under the names of the agencies (legis-

lative bodies, courts, executive departments, bureaux, etc) as subheadings (under country, or other jurisdiction) . . .”

**B2g Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)**

Same as in Sec B2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule: “123108. If the Corporate Author is not the Government as a whole, but a Dependent Body of it, subheadings are to be added according to the following and analogous rules.”

**B2h Relevant Quotations from Heading & Canons (1955)**

“430 Parent Body vs Organ.— . . . A difficult matter often turning up for judgment in the choice of corporate author is:—

- 1 Is it the parent body as a whole, or
  - 2 Is it an organ of it, of the first remove? . . . . .
- “2285 . . . For works bearing on the discharge of primary functions — administration reports, reports of deliberation, direction, and so on and in general for thought created and expressed by an Organ of government of first remove, second remove etc, as defined in sections 2221 to 2228, the government, or its appropriate organ, as the case may be, should be taken as its author.”

**B2j Distilled Definition from CCC (1958)**

Same as in Sec B2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the Interpretative Definition of the term ‘Corporate Author’ given in Sec 1431. Besides this, Rules 232 and 233 on the Rendering of the names of Organs-of-Government have also served as Source-Rules for distillation. All of them are quoted below.

“1431 For a work bearing on the discharge of primary functions — administration report, report of deliberation, direction, and any kindred work embodying thought created and expressed by an organ of government of first remove, second remove, etc as defined in rules 12211 to 12217 — the government or its appropriate organ(s), as the case may be, should be taken as its author.

“232 If the Corporate Body is an Organ of a Government, a Multiple Corporate Heading is to be used.

“233 The First Heading in rendering of the name of an Organ of a Government is to be the name of the Government as a whole as prescribed in Rule 231.”

[Then follow the rules on rendering the Second Headings].

**B2k Distilled Definition from CCC (1964)**

Same as in Sec B2j of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the Interpretative Definition of the term 'Corporate Author' given in Sec GD2. Besides this, the Rules on the Rendering of the names of Organs-of-Government given in Sec JC21 and JC22 have also served as Source-Rules for distillation. The contents of the sections referred to above are respectively the same as that of Sec 1431, 232, and 233 of CCC (1958) quoted in Sec B2j of this paper.

#### B2m *Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)*

Same as in Sec B2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rules:

"18A. Enter a work specifically and prominently attributed to a subordinate unit of corporate body under the heading for the subordinate unit unless the unit simply acts as the information or publication agent for the parent body.

"78B. If the body is not one of the types listed in A above [Bodies with non-traditional, non-primary functions of the Government] . . . enter it as a subheading under the heading for the government . . . . .

"Gt. Brit. *Parliament*

"New South Wales. *Department of Railways*

"U.S. *Dept of Commerce*"

#### B20 *Evaluation*

The distilled Definition is the same in all the Codes. The Rules on Choice and Rendering of Author Heading from which they are respectively "distilled" are sufficiently simple to make the "distillation" easy in all the Codes except AACR (1967). This Distilled Definition from RDC is still valid today.

#### B2A *RDC (1904)*

It is evident that RDC has not seized in theory the conflict "Whole Government vs Its Organ of Remove 1", though it has recognised it in action.

#### B2B to B2C *AACR (1908) and CCC (1934)*

Analogous to B2A

#### B2D *Theory*

The Theory is the first work to isolate "Conflict of Authorship" as a distinct problem to be considered all by itself. It distinguishes the following two broad categories:

- 1 Person vs Corporate Body; and
- 2 Corporate Body vs Corporate Body.

But, it fails to isolate the conflict "Whole Corporate Body vs



Its Organ of Remove 1” and similar details.

B2E to B2G CCC (1945), AACR (1949) and CCC (1951)  
Analogous to B2A

B2H *Heading & Canons* (1955)

*Heading & Canons* (1955) is the first work to isolate the conflict “Whole Corporate Body vs Its Organ of Remove 1”. Further, it gives the necessary definition directly turned on the resolution of this conflict. But, this definition is simultaneously turned on the resolution of the conflicts “Whole Government vs Its Organ of Remove 1”, “Organ-of-Government of Remove 1 vs Organ-of-Government of Remove 2”, and so on. In this, it violates the Principle of Unity of Idea. As a result of this, this definition remains to be somewhat vague to express all its intention explicitly.

B2J to B2K CCC (1958) and CCC (1964)  
Analogous to B2H.

B2M *AACR* (1967)

The rules of AACR (1967) on Choice and Rendering have proved to be too complex to derive easily the Distilled Definition implied in them. Its Rule 18A is declared to be a rule on the Choice of Heading. It is presented under the caption “Works with Authorship of Mixed Character”. Further, this Code states in its Introduction “. . . choice of entry has been treated as a problem of determination of authorship responsibility”. It is evident from the above facts that AACR (1967) intends to isolate out the resolution of the conflict of authorship as a distinct problem. In this respect, it follows CCC (1958) which incorporates the findings of *Heading & Canons* (1955). But it fails to implement the suggestion of *Heading & Canons* (1955) by mixing deliberately this problem with that of Choice of Heading. Further, Rule 18A, and Rule 78B, have to be read together to derive the Distilled Definition.

B2N *CCC* (Ed 6)

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the distilled Interpretative Definition given in Sec B2a of this paper.

B3 ORGAN-OF-GOVERNMENT OF REMOVE 1 VS ORGAN OF REMOVE 2

B3a *Distilled Definition from RDC* (1904)

In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Government of Remove 2, the Whole Government *cum* Organ of Remove 2 is

the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following

Rule:

"49. Reports by a subordinate office to a department go under the office making the report

"Ex The report of the Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs to the Secretary of War goes under United States. *Bureau of Insular Affairs.*"

**B3b *Distilled Definition from AACR (1908)***

1 Same as in Sec B3a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 59:

"59. Enter government bureaus or offices subordinate to a department directly under the country, not as subheadings under the department."

2 In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Government of Remove 2 forming a Minor Division of an Organ-of-Government of Remove 1, the Whole Government *cum* Organ of Remove 1 *cum* Organ of Remove 2 is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract of Rule 59:

"59 . . . Minor divisions and offices are usually to be subordinated to the bureaus or departments of which they form a part.

"U.S. *Department of agriculture. Division of otany.*"

**B3c *Distilled Definition from CCC (1934)***

1 In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Government of Remove 2, with a Unique Name of its own, the Whole Government *cum* Organ of Remove 2 is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 12314:

"12314 If the Corporate Author is a . . . subdivision of a Department, the subheading is to consist of the name of that specific body provided the name of that specific body does not occur also as the name of a subdivision of some other department."

2 In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Government of Remove 2 with no Unique Name of its own, the Whole Government *cum* Organ of Remove 1 *cum* Organ of Remove 2 is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 12315:

"12315 If the Corporate Author is a subdivision of a Department, whose name occurs also as the subdivision of some other Department, the first subheading is to consist of the name

of that ... Department ... The second subheading is to be ... the name of this specific body ..."

**B3e** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)*  
Same as Sec B3c of this paper.

**B3f** *Distilled Definition from AACR (1949)*  
1 Same as 1 in Sec B3c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 75A:

"75A. Enter bureaus or offices subordinate to an executive department, ministry or secretariat directly under the name of the jurisdiction, not as a subheading under the department, ministry or secretariat. When, however, the bureau or office does not have a distinctive name so that one of the same names might exist in another department, enter under the department."

2 The second sentence of the above rule gives rise to a Distilled Definition same as 2 in Sec B3c of this paper.

3 In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Government of Remove 2 forming a Division of an Organ-of-Government of Remove 1, if required, the Whole Government *cum* Organ of Remove 1 *cum* Organ of Remove 2 may be taken to be the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 75B:

"75B. Divisions ... of departments ... are usually entered, if required, as subheadings to the departments ..."

**B3g** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)*  
Same as Sec B3c of this paper.

**B3h** *Relevant Quotation from Heading & Canons (1955)*  
"430 ... A difficult matter often turning up for judgment in the choice of corporate author is ...

"2 Is it an Organ of it, of the first remove? or

"3 Is it an organ of a later remove?"

"2285 ... For works bearing on the discharge of primary functions — administration report, reports of deliberation, direction and so on and in general for thought created and expressed by an organ of government of first remove, second remove etc, as defined in sections 2221 to 2228, the government or its appropriate organ, as the case may be, should be taken as its author."

**B3j** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1958)*  
Same as 1 and 2 in Sec B3c of this paper.

These definitions are distilled from the following rules in

## CCC (1958):

"1431 [Same as Sec 2285 of Heading and Canons (1955) quoted in Sec B3h of this paper].

"2363 If the Administrative Department is an Organ of Second ... Remove and if its name is not individualising or if a Homonym cannot be resolved without the addition of the name of the Organ of Earlier Remove in its hierarchy, such name is to be interpolated as Subheading between the name of the Government as a Whole and of the name of the Administration Department in question ... "

B3k *Distilled Definition from CCC (1964)*

Same as 1 and 2 in Sec B3c of this paper.

These definitions are distilled out from Rules GD2 and JC66 of CCC (1964). The contents of these two Rules are the same as that of Rules 1431 and 2363 respectively of CCC (1958) quoted in Sec B3j of this paper.

B3m *Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)*

1 Same as 1 in Sec B3c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:  
 "79A. If a government body that is to be entered under the name of the government according to 78B above is subordinate to another such body, treat it as a direct subheading under the name of the government if its name has not been or is not likely to be used by another body in the same jurisdiction."

2 Same as 2 in Sec B3c.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:  
 "79B. If the name of the body does not meet the above condition or if there is doubt, that it does, treat it as a subheading under the lowest element of the hierarchy that can be entered directly under the name of the government, omitting any intervening unit in this hierarchy that is not likely to be essential to distinguish bodies with the same name or to identify the body."

B30 *Evaluation*

The Distilled Definitions of the different codes do not contradict one other. They differ, primarily, in their coverage.

B3A *RDC (1904)*

It is evident that RDC (1904) has not seized in theory the conflict "Organ-of-Government of Remove 1 vs Organ of Remove 2", though it has recognised it in action. It has failed to recognise the case in which the Organ-of-Government of Remove 2 having the same name but deriving its responsibility *via* two or more

organs of Remove 1 happen to be the author of their respective works.

**B3B AACR (1908)**

As regards Distilled Definition 1, the remarks are similar to that given in Sec B3A of this paper

Distilled Definition 2 prescribes that the "Minor" status of the *de facto* author calls for its being taken along with two *de jure* authors — the Whole Government, and the Organ-of-Government of Remove 1. The term 'Minor' is an undefined term. Its implications are not clear.

**B3C CCC (1934)**

CCC (1934) recognises the conflict under consideration. It is evident that it has seized the criterion "Unique Name" — though the term itself is not used — to decide the right authorship in this context. This is certainly a helpful criterion. Further, the two Distilled Definitions succeed in covering the whole problem adequately.

**B3D Theory (1938)**

Theory does not isolate the conflict under consideration.

**B3E CCC (1945)**

Analogous to B3C of this paper.

**B3F AACR (1949)**

AACR (1949) appears to have followed CCC (1934) to make up for the inadequacy of its earlier edition. The Source-Rule for the Distilled Definitions here uses the term 'Distinctive Name' in the place of the term 'Unique Name.' However, AACR (1949) does not throw off its tradition totally; it is continued in its Distilled Definition 3, where the criterion "Minor Division" of its earlier edition is replaced by "Division" and the condition "if required" is added with this prescription.

**B3G CCC (1951)**

Analogous to B3G of this paper.

**B3H Heading & Canons (1955)**

Analogous to B2H of this paper.

**B3J to B3K CCC (1958), and CCC (1964)**

The remarks made in connection with Heading & Canons (1955) in Sec B2H of this paper are equally applicable to CCC (1958) and CCC (1964). Besides this, it becomes evident from

Rule JC66 that CCC (1964) has failed to seize in theory the conflict under consideration, though its Interpretative Definition GD2 indirectly implies the resolution of this conflict.

**B3M AACR (1967)**

AACR (1967) appears to have followed CCC (1958) to rectify the short-comings of its earlier editions in respect of the conflict under consideration.

**B3N CCC (Ed 6)**

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the distilled Interpretative Definitions given in Sec B3c of this paper.

**B4 GOVERNMENT VS GOVERNMENTAL QUASI INDEPENDENT INSTITUTION**

**B4d Interpretative Definition from Theory (1938)**

"Bodies created by the State for the direct performance of its primary duties in newly appropriated spheres like education, research, religion, public utilities, commerce and industry are to be treated as institutions; while all the divisions of the State and bodies created by it whose function is mainly co-ordination, deliberation, legislation, adjudication and/or administration are to be treated as parts, departments, and dependent bodies of the Government." (Page 330).

Regarding the 'resolution of the conflict under consideration' at the level of definition, Theory (1938) states:

"The primitive method of definition by enumeration will always be helpless to meet new situations effectively on their own terms. If they are to be met at all our definition must be a touchstone which applied to any corporate body old or new, will at once determine whether it is a government or an institution." (Page 332-3).

**B4e Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)**

In the case of a work by a Governmental Quasi Independent Institution, the responsibility for the work — that is, its authorship — rests solely with the Institution.

The above definition is not distilled directly from any Rules in CCC (1945). For the purpose of resolving the conflict "Government vs Governmental Quasi Independent Institution", CCC (1945) in its page 54, refers to Chap 54 of Theory (1938), containing the extracts given in Sec B4d of this paper.

**B4f Distilled Definition from AACR (1949).**

Same as in Sec B4e of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule

in AACR (1949).

"72 Exception.— Certain classes of institutions and other bodies created maintained, controlled or owned by governments, but not direct agencies of government are, however, to be treated according to the rules governing these bodies as authors, e.g., colleges, universities, schools, libraries, museums, galleries, observatories, agricultural experiment stations, hospitals, asylums, prisons, theatres, chambers of commerce, botanical and zoological gardens, banks, business corporations, churches, societies, etc."

**B4g** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)*

Same as Sec B4e of this paper.

**B4h** *Interpretative Definition from Heading & Canons (1955)*

"2285 . . . Any autonomous or non-autonomous organisation, engaged in the work of research, production, commerce, and supply of commodities and services to the public, is deemed to be the author, as an institution, for all works containing thought and expression created by it. It is so even if the institution is owned and managed by the government.

"2288 . . . *Group 1* Each of the following institutions should be taken as author of its works, as if it were independent of the . . . government [creating, financing and owning it]

Bank	Post Office
Board of Trade	School
College	Telegraph Office
Exchange (Money)	Telephone Exchange
Firm	University
Park	

"2288 . . . *Group 2* Each of the following institutions should be taken as author of its works as if it were independent of the . . . government [creating, financing and owning it], provided it has a distinctive name [!]

Botanical Garden	Library
Experimental Station	Museum
Exhibition	Observatory
Festival	Shop
Hospital	Zoological Garden
Laboratory	

"If any of the institutions has no distinctive name, it should be treated as an organ of its parent body [the government]" [!].

**B4j** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1958)*

Same as in Sec 4Be of this paper.

The above definition has been distilled out of the Interpretative

Definitions. 1432, 1461, and 1462 which are respectively the same as the 3 Definitions quoted in Sec B4h of this paper.

**B4k** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1964)*

Same as B4j of this paper; But the sections are renumbered respectively as GD3; GD81; and GD82.

**B4m** *Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)*

Same as in Sec 4Bj of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

"78A. Enter a corporate body created and controlled by a government under the general rules for corporate bodies, i.e. 60-71, as qualified by 98-99, regardless of its official nature or of whether or not it is subordinate to an agency of government, if it is one of the following types:

"Type 1. Organisations engaged in commercial, cultural, or scientific activities, or the promotion of such activities;

"Type 2. Institutions (typically with their own physical plant);

"Type 3. Installations and parks;

"Type 4. Bodies created by inter-governmental agreement;

"Type 5. Authorities and trusts for the operation of utilities and industries;

"Type 6. Banks, corporations, manufacturing plants, farms, and similar specific enterprises; and

"Type 7. Established churches."

**B40** *Evaluation*

The Distilled Definition in all the Codes is, in essence, the same; but there exists a marked difference between CCC and AACR as to their respective Source-Rules. For instance, the Source Rules in the different editions of CCC are themselves Interpretative Definitions, though generic and not specific. On the other hand, the Source Rules in the different editions of AACR are rules for rendering the names of Corporate Bodies.

**B4A to B4C** *RDC (1904), AACR (1908), and CCC (1934)*

Evidently, RDC (1904), AACR (1908) and CCC (1934) fail to recognise the conflict "Government vs Governmental Quasi Independent Institution."

**B4D** *Theory (1938)*

Theory (1938) is the first work to isolate the conflict under consideration. Not only that, it took the appropriate course of resolving the conflict at the level of definitions of terms. That a definition by enumeration alone is helpless to meet new situations—is an important finding of Theory (1938). Its Inter-



pretative Definition to resolve the conflict under consideration is virtually the same as the Distilled Definition given in Sec B4e of this paper.

**B4E CCC (1945)**

Analogous to Sec B4D of this paper.

**B4F AACR (1949)**

AACR (1949) appears to have adopted the findings of Theory (1938). It prescribes through an illustrative list that an Institution engaged in a sphere, such as education, research, religion, public utilities, commerce, and industry, is to be treated as the author of its work.

**B4G CCC (1951)**

Analogous to Sec B4D of this paper.

**B4H Heading & Canons (1955)**

The generic Interpretative Definition of 'Quasi Independent Institutional Authorship' given by Theory (1938) is backed by Heading & Canons (1955) by the addition of two more (2288 Group 1 and 2) Illustrative Enumerative Definitions, spelling out the generic categories into specific ones. In day-to-day cataloguing, this spelling out is no doubt helpful.

But the Illustrative Enumerative Definition given in Sec 2288 Group 2 of Heading & Canons (1955) is open to criticism. It utilises the factor "Possession of a Distinctive Name" as the criterion to determine sole authorship. This is faulty; because, the appropriate criterion to determine the sole authorship of a work is the "Function" covered by the work and not the "Possession of a Distinctive Name". The addition of this proviso nullifies the generic Interpretative Definition. This is the inexcusable effect of the wrong tradition about "Distinctive Name" originated by RDC. Wrong traditions die hard as the saying goes.

**B4J to B4K CCC (1958) and CCC (1964)**

Analogous to Sec B4H of this paper.

**B4M AACR (1967)**

AACR (1967) appears to have adopted the essence of the contents of the Interpretative Definition given in Sec 2285 of Heading & Canons (1955) (See Sec B4h of this paper), in its Rule 78A on the rendering of the names of Institutions created and controlled by a Government. Like its earlier editions it is still continuing the tradition of not realising that the resolution

of the conflict of authorship is to be dealt with at the level of definition and not to be left to be inferred from the rules on Rendering Author of Heading.

**B4N CCC (Ed 6)**

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the distilled Interpretative Definition given in Sec B4e of this paper.

**B5 GOVERNMENT Vs GOVERNMENTAL ORGAN CONFERENCE**

**B5c Distilled Definition from CCC (1934)**

In the case of a work by a Governmental Organ Conference, the Government *cum* Conference is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

"1234 If the Corporate Author is a Dependent Body, the Main Heading and subheadings are to be constructed as for the parent Body and thereafter a further subheading is to be added using the name of the Dependent Body.

"Example Madras. Collectors' Conference. Ootacamund. 1918."

**B5e Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)**

Same as Sec B5c of this paper.

**B5g Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)**

Same as in Sec B5c of this paper.

The Source-Rule occurring in CCC (1945) is omitted in CCC (1951). Therefore, this Distilled Definition is based on the following example occurring after Rule 123162, but without any specific rule:

"Other Dependent Bodies.

"Example Madras. Collectors' Conference. Ootacamund. 1918".

**B5j Distilled Definition from CCC (1958)**

Same as in Sec B5c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rules:  
 "255 If a Conference is the Organ of another Corporate Body, it is to be given a Multiple Corporate Heading.

"2551 The Heading in which the name of the Conference is rendered is to be preceded by the Heading(s) specifying its Parent Body which may itself be an Organ

"Example Madras, Collectors' Conference (Ootacamund) (1918)".

**B5k Distilled Definition from CCC (1964)**

Same as in Sec B5c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the Rules JE5 and JE51, the contents of which are the same as that of 255 and 2551 of CCC (1958), quoted in Sec B5c of this paper.

**B50 Evaluation**

The problem under consideration has been seized by CCC alone; but it has done only in action, and not in theory.

**B5A to B5B RDC (1904) and AACR (1908)**

RDC (1904) and AACR (1908) do not appear to have seized the conflict "Government vs Governmental Organ Conference".

**B5C CCC (1934)**

The only evidence of CCC (1934) recognising the conflict under consideration is the example quoted in Sec B5c of this paper. But it has not been given any special mention in the Rule itself.

**B5D Theory (1938)**

Theory has not isolated the conflict under consideration.

**B5E CCC (1945)**

Analogous to B5c of this paper.

**B5F AACR (1949)**

Analogous to Sec B5A to B5B of this paper.

**B5G CCC (1951)**

Analogous to Sec B5C of this paper. The new fault here is that this edition has, perhaps, inadvertently, omitted the rule given in its earlier editions.

**B5H Heading & Canons (1955)**

Analogous to Sec B5D of this paper.

**B5J to B5K CCC (1958) and CCC (1964)**

The Source-Rule for the Distilled Definition is directly turned on the conflict under consideration. This is the first time that this has happened. The emergence of this explicit recognition of the conflict under consideration has taken a whole generation.

**B5M AACR (1967)**

Analogous to Sec B5A to B5B of this paper.

**B5N CCC (Ed 6)**

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the distilled

Interpretative Definition given in Sec B5c of this paper.

**B6 SOVEREIGN GOVERNMENT Vs DEPENDENCY GOVERNMENT,  
LOCAL BODY, OR INSTITUTION**

**B6b *Distilled Definition from AACR (1908)***

In the case of a Charter granted by a Sovereign Government to a Dependency Government, or to a Local Body, or to an Institution, the Dependency Government etc is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 70.

"70 Enter charters under the name of the country, state, city, or corporate body for whose benefit they are granted . . . "

**B6f *Distilled Definition from AACR (1949)***

Same as in Sec B6b of this paper.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 87:

"87 Enter charters for colonial, provincial, or local governments, and for other corporate bodies under the name of the government or body to whom the charter is granted . . . "

**B6j *Interpretative Definition from CCC (1958)***

"1491 (1) Charter.— The author of the charter granted by a government to a city or a rural district or any other body is the government and not the recipient of the charter."

**B6k *Interpretative Definition from CCC (1964)***

Same as in Sec B6j of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

"GD911 Charter. [Same as Sec 1491 (1) of CCC (1958) quoted in Sec B6j of this paper.]"

**B6m *Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)***

Same as in Sec B6b of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 22A1:

"22A1. Enter a . . . charter of a political jurisdiction under that jurisdiction . . . "

**B60 *Evaluation***

In the case of a charter, there is always a sovereign Government which grants it. There is also another Corporate Body which receives it. Obviously, the sole responsibility for the work rests only with the Sovereign Government granting it; and

therefore, according to the definition of the term 'Corporate Author', this Government is its author. The recipient is only the "Subject" of the Charter. Normally, a charter should not give rise to a conflict of authorship, warranting a specific Interpretative Definition to meet the situation. But unfortunately, AACR has established a wrong tradition by prescribing the name of the subject for the Heading of an Author Entry. This false prescription has mesmerised the cataloguers, as it were, and disabled them from seeing the fault. CCC has corrected this wrong tradition.

**B6A RDC (1904)**

Evidently, RDC (1904) does not recognise the conflict under consideration as a case of conflict of authorship.

**B6B AACR (1908)**

The Distilled Definition from AACR (1908) wrongly determines the recipient of a Charter to be the author of the Charter.

**B6C CCC (1934)**

Analogous to Sec B6A of this paper.

**B6D Theory (1938)**

Theory quotes Rule 70 of AACR (1908) as given in Sec B6a of this paper along with the following examples from the same:

"BALTIMORE. *Charters*. The new charter of Baltimore City. Published under resolution of the City Council of Baltimore City, adopted April 5, 1898.

"Added entry: MARYLAND. *Statutes*."

On the above quotations, Theory (1938) comments as follows:

"Here . . . the deviation is due to conflict between Author Entry and Subject Entry. Either this charge or that of a violation of the Canon of Relevance will have to be faced by this rule. The author of the charter is certainly the Government of Maryland; Baltimore merely forms the subject of the charter."

**B6E CCC (1945)**

Analogous to Sec B6A of this paper.

**B6F AACR (1949)**

AACR (1949) continues the mistake committed by its earlier edition. (See Sec B6B).

**B6H** *Heading & Canons* (1955)

*Heading & Canons* (1955) reiterates the points raised by *Theory* (1938) in the following words:

"The revelation of the fault of prescribing subject entry in the place of another entry reaches its height in this rule. The Corporate Author is the Corporate Body responsible for and conferring the charter. In the case of a charter of a city, it is the government of the country or the state within whose territory the city lies. Surely, the city is not responsible for the charter; nor does it confer it."

**B6J to B6K** *CCC* (1958) and *CCC* (1964)

To counteract the wrong tradition brought into vogue by the earlier edition of *AACR*, *CCC* (1958) treats the conflict under consideration as if it were a problem warranting a specific Interpretative Definition to resolve it, and gives the definition. *CCC* (1964) continues what is given in *CCC* (1958).

**B6M** *AACR* (1967)

*AACR* (1967) appears to have been unmindful about the mistake of its predecessors, committed in spite of *Theory* (1938) *Heading & Canons* (1955) and two successive editions of *CCC* having laid it bare.

**B7** GOVERNMENT AS A DELEGATED-TO-BODY VS NEAR SOVEREIGN BODY OR CONFERENCE**B7f** *Distilled Definition from AACR* (1949)

In the case of a work by a Governmental Delegation to a Conference, the Conference *cum* Delegation is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 79:

"79. Enter a delegation, delegates or delegate officially representing a country at a conference or congress, under the name of the conference or congress ... "

**B7j** *Distilled Definition from CCC* (1958)

In the case of a work by a Governmental Delegation to a Conference, the Government *cum* Delegation is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following Interpretative Definition:

"1471 The Delegated-from-Body should be taken to be the parent body of a Delegation to a Conference in respect of any work embodying any thought and expression created by the delegation."

**B7k** *Distilled Definition from CCC* (1964)

In the case of a work by a Governmental Delegation to a

Near Sovereign Body or to a Conference, the Government *cum* Delegation is the author.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from the Interpretative Definition GD71:

"GD71 The Delegated-from-Body should be taken to be the parent body of a Delegation to a Conference in respect of any work embodying any thought and expression created by the Delegation."

**B7m Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)**

Same as in Sec B7k of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 86:

"86. Enter a delegation, commission, etc., representing the government of a country in an international or intergovernmental body, conference, undertaking, etc., as a subheading under the country represented . . . ."

**B70 Evaluation**

According to the definition of the term 'Corporate Author' a Governmental Delegation to a Conference or to an international body, such as the United Nations, is the *de facto* author of its works, such as memoranda submitted, resolutions tabled, and utterances made by the Delegation. The *de jure* responsibility for such a work rests only with the Delegated-from-Government. In this sense, "Government as a Delegated-from-Body vs Near Sovereign Body, or Conference" is not a true case of conflict of authorship, warranting a specific Interpretative Definition to meet the situation. But unfortunately, the earlier editions of AACR have established a wrong tradition by taking the Delegated-to-Body as if it were the Parent Body from which the Governmental Delegation derives the responsibility for its work. To correct this wrong tradition CCC has treated it as if it were a case of true conflict and has given a general Interpretative Definition pertaining to the conflict.

**B7A to B7E Codes before AACR (1949)**

No Cataloguing Code before AACR (1949) recognises the conflict under consideration as a case warranting a specific Rule or Interpretative Definition to resolve it.

**B7F AACR (1949)**

The Distilled Definition from AACR (1949) wrongly determines the Delegated-to-Body as the Parent Body of a Governmental Delegation.

B7G CCC (1951)  
Analogous to Sec B7A to B7E, of this paper.

B7H *Heading & Canons* (1955)  
Commenting on Rule 79 of AACR (1949), *Heading & Canons* (1955) says:

"Delegation to a Conference looks amphibious. A delegation is itself a Corporate Body. It implies the existence of two other corporate bodies — Delegated-from-Body and Delegated-to-Body . . . The delegation is not an independent body. It is an organ . . . The question is, "Is it an organ of the Delegated-from-Body or of the Delegated-to-Body?" Again, "which body takes the ultimate responsibility for the thought content of the document created by the delegation?" "Is it the Delegated-from-Body or the Delegated-to-Body?" There can be no difference of opinion about the answers to these questions. The ultimate responsibility rests with the Delegated-from-Body. The delegation is an organ of that body. Rule 79 of *Ala* [AACR (1949)] is, therefore, faulty."

B7J CCC (1958)  
To correct the wrong tradition brought into vogue by the earlier editions of AACR, CCC (1958) treats the conflict under consideration as if it were a problem warranting a specific Interpretative Definition to resolve it, and gives the necessary definition.

B7K CCC (1964)  
Analogous to Sec B7J of this paper. Besides this, CCC (1964) is the first work to isolate the conflict "Government as a Delegated-from-Body vs Near Sovereign Body" and to provide a specific Interpretative Definition to resolve it.

### C Near Sovereign Body, its Organ, and its Quasi Independent Institution

#### C01 *League of Nations*

Of late, a new situation has arisen. It first took shape after World War I in 1920 with the establishment of the League of Nations, a collective body acting as a forum for the Sovereign Governments of the world to discuss international problems and settle them amicably. It was not perhaps intended that the participating Sovereign Governments should surrender to the League of Nations any fraction of their sovereignty. In fact, the League of Nations had no sanction to enforce the decisions arrived at under its auspices.



**C02 *United Nations***

In 1946, after World War II, the United Nations (= UN) came into existence to deal with certain specified problems of international interest. It has created its own organs to carry out its work, *eg*, General Assembly, Security Council, Secretariat, etc. It has also created Quasi Independent Institutions, such as International Labour Organisation (= ILO), Food and Agriculture Organisation (= FAO), United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (= UNESCO), and World Health Organisation (= WHO). The UN has handed over certain non-political problems to the care of these Quasi Independent Institutions.

**C1 TERMINOLOGY**

United Nations is neither a Government nor an Institution. Bodies similar to the UN form a distinct category of Corporate Bodies. CCC (1964), for the first time, has recognised the UN as a Corporate Body creating problems in Cataloguing in relation to works of Governmental Delegation to the UN (*See* Sec B7k and B7K of this paper). But it has used the term 'International Body' to denote the category to which the UN belongs. AACR (1967) has recognised problems of cataloguing created by the UN in relation to "Charter" (Rule 22B) and "Agreement" (Rule 25B1). It has used the term 'Intergovernmental Body' to denote the category to which the UN belongs.

"Some of the basic principles of the United Nations as outlined in art. 2 of the charter are as follows: . . . each member must assist the organisation in any action it takes under the charter . . .". This implies the willingness on the part of the participating Sovereign Governments to surrender to UN a fraction of their sovereignty—however small it might be. It also provides some sanction to enforce its decision, though this has not yet worked satisfactorily. Colon Classification (= CC) (1960) describes the UN as a Near Sovereign Formation. Following the line of CC, the category of Corporate Bodies to which the UN belongs may be denoted by the term 'Near Sovereign Body.'

**C11 *Near Sovereign Body and Conflict of Authorship***

The following conflicts of authorship may arise centring round a Near Sovereign Body:

- 1 Whole Near Sovereign Body vs Its Organ of Remove 1;
- 2 Organ-of-Near Sovereign Body of Remove 1 vs Organ of Remove 2;
- 3 Near Sovereign Body vs Its Quasi Independent Institution;
- 4 Near Sovereign Body vs Its Organ Conference;
- 5 Near Sovereign Body vs Its Participating Sovereign Government; and

6 Near Sovereign Body as a Delegated-from-Body vs Conference.

C12 *Rules Analogous to those for a Government*

No Cataloguing Code has yet categorically dealt with all these conflicts. Obviously, the rules to resolve the conflicts of authorship centring round a Near Sovereign Body should be analogous to those used for the resolution of such conflicts of authorship centring round a Government.

Therefore, in respect of the resolution of the conflicts of authorship centring round a Near Sovereign Body, a general rule, as given in Sec CN below, will prove sufficient.

CN CCC (Ed 6)

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the following Rule:

“The Rules to resolve the conflicts of authorship centring round a Near Sovereign Body are analogous to those used to resolve such conflicts centring round a Government.”

**D Quasi Government [Omnibus Local Body], Its Organ, and Its Quasi Independent Institution**

D0 DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL BODY

D01 *Local Body*

Historically, an Omnibus Local Body was formed by Law for each locality to take care of all local services and other local problems such as, maintenance of the roads and streets of the locality, local lighting, local water supply, local sewage, local elementary education, and in extreme cases even local police. Such a Local Body was given the power of local taxation (local rates) to meet its expenditure.

D02 *Local Authority*

In course of time, some of these local functions were transferred to the care of different *ad hoc* Local Bodies — which we shall denote by the term Local Authority to distinguish them from an Omnibus Local Body — such as, Water Board, and Elementary Education Board.

D03 *Organ and Quasi Independent Institution of Local Body*

Prior to the formation of *ad hoc* Local Authorities for specific local functions, such bodies were organs of Remove 1 of the Omnibus Local Body. There were also Organs of Remove 2, 3 etc. There were also Quasi Independent Institutions, such as Elementary Schools.

**D04 Local Self Government**

An Omnibus Local Body was usually said to be in charge of the Local Self Government. It had no political function, or any other traditional function going with a Government. It was merely a creature of the Government of the country or of the Constituent State as the case may be.

**D05 Treating an Omnibus Local Body as if it were a Government**

And yet, it was doing the work allotted to it by law. On account of its autonomy including power of taxation and on account of its description as a Body for Local Self Government, in cataloguing practice, it had been treated as if it were a Government.

This treatment is not given to an *ad hoc* Local Authority, but is given only to a Local Body having the residue of the original omnibus functions.

**D06 Treating an Ad Hoc Local Authority as an Institution**

An *ad hoc* Local Authority for a specific function is treated in cataloguing practice as an Institution.

**D07 Terms to Denote the Two Kinds of Local Bodies**

A Local Body having the residue of the original omnibus functions and the power of local taxation may be denoted by the term Quasi Government. On the other side, an *ad hoc* Local Body devoted to a specific function usually without power of local taxation may be denoted by the term 'Local Authority'. The definitions of these terms are furnished in the following section.

**D1 TERMINOLOGY**

**D11 Quasi Government [Omnibus Local Body].—** Generic term to denote 'Whole Quasi Government' and 'Organ-of-Quasi Government'.

**D12 Whole Quasi Government [Whole Omnibus Local Body].—** Corporate Body in charge of the regulation, promotion, and/or provision of several specified local public services in an area, under power delegated by the government within the territory of which its own area lies, and with a defined extent of autonomy, and with power of taxation.

**D131 to D138 Different Kinds of Organ-of-Quasi Government.—** Analogous to the definitions of the different kinds of Organ-of-Government given in Sec B131 to B138, of this paper.

**D14 Quasi Independent Institution of a Quasi Government.—**

A Corporate Body created by a Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body) and whose functions are outside the deliberative executive and administrative functions of the Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body) and which is autonomous within its own sphere of function — though financed and owned by the Quasi Government.

**D141 to D142 Different Kinds of Quasi Independent Institution of a Quasi Government.**— Analogous to the definitions of the different kinds of Governmental Quasi Independent Institution given in Sec B141 to B142.

**D16 Local Authority.**— Corporate Body in charge of the regulation, promotion, and/or provision of a specified local public service in an area, under power delegated by the government within the territory of which its own area lies, and with a defined extent of autonomy, but usually without power of taxation.

*Note.*— The term 'Local Authority' is introduced to distinguish it from 'Quasi Government' (Omnibus Local Body). For cataloguing purposes, a Local Authority can be treated as if it were an Independent Institution.

**D2 WHOLE QUASI GOVERNMENT (OMNIBUS LOCAL BODY) /s ITS ORGAN OF REMOVE 1**

**D2a Distilled Definition from RDC (1904)**

In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Quasi Government of Remove 1, the Whole Quasi Government *cum* Organ is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 48:

"48. Enter under the place [cities or towns] the reports of [quasi] governmental departments, bureaus, offices, etc, and the works published by them or under their control."

*Note.*— By implication, the term 'Government' in RDC (1904) includes 'Quasi-Government'.

**D2b Distilled Definition from AACR (1908)**

Same as in Sec D2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 58:

"58. Enter under names of . . . cities, towns, etc. official publications issued by them or under their auspices. The names of the departments, bureaus, etc from which the publications emanate are to be given as subheadings".

**D2c Distilled Definition from CCC (1934)**

Same as in Sec D2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of Rules 1231 and its subdivisions quoted in Sec B2c of this paper.

*Note.*—In CCC (1934) the term 'Government' includes 'Quasi Government' (Omnibus Local Bodies) (Rule 123).

D2e *Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)*

Same as Sec D2a of this paper.

D2f *Distilled Definition from AACR (1949)*

Same as in Sec D2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 72A:

"72A. Enter publications emanating from the various agencies of a [quasi] government under the names of the agencies ... as subheadings under ... jurisdiction [cities or towns]".

D2g *Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)*

Same as in Sec D2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of Rule 123108 quoted in Sec B2g of this paper.

D2h *Relevant Quotation from Heading & Canons (1955)*

Same as Sec B2h of this Paper.

D2j *Distilled Definition from CCC (1958)*

Same as in Sec D2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the Interpretative Definition of the term 'Corporate Author' given in Sec 1431. Besides this, Rules 232 and 233 on the Rendering of the names of Organs-of-Government (including those of Quasi Government) have also served as a source for distillation. All these Sec are quoted in Sec B2j of this paper.

D2k *Distilled Definition from CCC (1964)*

Same as in Sec D2j of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the Interpretative Definition of the term 'Corporate Author' given in Sec GD2. Besides this, the Rules on the Rendering of the names of Organs-of-Government (including those of Quasi Government) given in Sec JC21 and JC22, have also served as a source for distillation. The contents of the sections referred to above are the same as that of Sec 1431, 232 and 233 respectively of CCC (1958) quoted in Sec B2j of this paper.

D2m *Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)*

Same as in Sec D2a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of Rule 18 and 78B quoted in Sec B2m of this paper.

#### D20 *Evaluation*

RDC does not define the term 'Government'. The earlier editions of AACR follow RDC. CCC (1934) is the first work to define the term 'Government'. It has explicitly mentioned Quasi Government as Government in its Rule 123 of its Ed 1, 2, and 3. CCC (1958) clinches this traditional idea by enumerating in the definition contained in its Rule 1222, both Sovereign Government and Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body) as two different categories of Government. Even AACR (1967) has not come forward with a substantive section defining the term 'Government' in the text itself. But, perhaps due to the impact of CCC (1958), it seems to have felt obliged to give a definition of the term 'Government' in its Footnote 15. It reads as follows: "The word 'Government' is used here to mean the totality of Corporate bodies, executive, legislative, and judicial, exercising the powers of a given jurisdiction". It implies also 'Quasi Government' though it is not explicitly mentioned — that is, it still follows the RDC tradition in substance.

The resolution of the conflict "Quasi-Government vs Its Organ of Remove 1" is analogous to that of "Sovereign Government vs Its Organ of Remove 1". No Code has yet seized in theory this conflict, though each has recognised it in action — that is, in its rules on rendering Author Headings.

The Distilled Definition is the same in all the Codes, and it is in conformity with the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'

#### D2A to D2M *RDC (1904) to AACR (1967)*

The comments on each of the Cataloguing Codes under consideration are respectively analogous to those made in Sec B2A to B2M of this paper.

#### D2N *CCC (Ed 6)*

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the distilled Interpretative Definition given in Sec D2a of this paper.

#### D3 *ORGAN-OF-QUASI GOVERNMENT (OMNIBUS LOCAL BODY) OF REMOVE 1 vs ORGAN-OF-REMOVE 2*

As already mentioned in Sec D20 of this paper, the term 'Government' has been used to denote both 'Sovereign Government' and 'Quasi Government' (Omnibus Local Body) by all the cataloguing codes. The resolution of the conflicts of authorship centring round a Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body)

are analogous to those centring round a Government. Therefore, it may be interpreted that a Source Rule for a Distilled Definition turned on a specific conflict of authorship centring round a Government is equally applicable to a similar Conflict centring round a Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body). For this reason, we have not devoted a separate section for each of the Code in respect of this conflict, though no Code has consciously stated this analogy, nor even cited examples in support of this analogy.

**D4 QUASI GOVERNMENT VS ITS QUASI INDEPENDENT INSTITUTION**  
**D4a Distilled Definition from RDC (1904)**

1 In the case of a work by a Quasi Independent Institution of a Quasi Government, the Institution alone is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 61:

"61. Enter corporations and quasi corporations both English and foreign under their names as they read . . .".

2 In the case of a work by a School maintained by a Quasi Government, the Quasi Government *cum* School is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

"69 Schools supported by public taxation go under the name of the city or town maintaining them, whether they have an individual name or not.

**D4b Distilled Definition from AACR (1908)**  
 Same as 2 in Sec D4a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 86:

"86. Enter all schools supported by taxation under the name of the place . . ."

**D4d Interpretative Definition from Theory (1938)**  
 Same as in Sec B4d of this paper.

*Note.*— The term 'Government' in Theory (1938) includes 'Quasi Government'.

**D4e Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)**

In the case of a work by a Quasi Independent Institution of a Quasi Government, the responsibility for the work — that is, its authorship — rests solely with the Institution.

For the purpose of resolving the conflict under consideration, CCC (1945), in its page 54, refers to Chap 54 of Theory (1938) containing the extract quoted in Sec D4d of this paper. The

above definition has been distilled out of that extract.

D4f *Distilled Definition from AACR (1949)*

Same as in Sec D4a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from rule 107.

"107. Enter all elementary and secondary schools supported by taxation under the name of the place . . ."

D4g *Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)*

Same as Sec D4e of this paper.

D4h *Interpretative Definition from Heading & Canons (1955)*

Same as Sec B4h of this paper.

D4j *Distilled Definition from CCC (1958)*

Same as in Sec D4e of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Interpretative Definitions:

1432, 1461, and 1462, which are respectively the same as the 3 Definitions quoted in Sec B3h of this paper.

D4k *Distilled Definition from CCC (1964)*

Same as in Sec D4e of this paper.

These definitions have been distilled out of the following Interpretative Definitions:

GD3, GD81, and GD82, which are respectively the same as the 3 definitions quoted in Sec B3h of this paper.

D4m *Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)*

In the case of a work by a Quasi Independent Institution of a Quasi Government, the Quasi Government *cum* Institution is the author, provided the name of the Institution consists solely of

1 A common word or phrase followed by the name, in noun or adjectival form of the municipality; or

2 Such a word or phrase modified by an adjective, such as city and municipal.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extracts from Rule 99:

"99. If the name of such a body [educational institutions, libraries, galleries, museums hospitals] consists solely of (1) a common word or phrase followed by the name, in noun or adjectival form, of the municipality . . . or (2) such a word or phrase modified by an adjective [such as "city" and "municipal"], enter the body under the jurisdiction that is named or implied,



followed by the name of the body.”

#### D40 Evaluation

In a Cataloguing Code, to leave the resolution of the conflict “Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body) vs Quasi Independent Institution” to the analogy of what has been prescribed for the resolution of the conflict “Sovereign Government vs Quasi Independent Institution” is too naive. This naivety stems from the use of the term ‘Primary Traditional Functions’ to differentiate between what should be taken to be of Sovereign Governmental Authorship on the one hand, and of Quasi Independent Institutional Authorship on the other. This differentiation is based upon past history and experience. But a Quasi Government is relatively of very recent origin. All its functions are enumerated in the statute creating it. Therefore, the test of traditional functions or of primary functions is not applicable here.

Again, in the case of a Sovereign Government, new functions — other than traditional primary functions — are being added from time to time. They are therefore, easily identified, and any work concerning them is easily determined to be of Quasi Independent Institutional Authorship.

On the contrary, in the case of a Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body), one or other of such functions — such as, water supply, electricity supply, and sanitation — enumerated in the original statute is being taken away from time to time and given to the care of an *ad hoc* Local Authority independent of the Quasi Government. It may be assumed that a work on any such function should be deemed to be of “Quasi Government *cum* Organ Authorship” until the function is taken away and given to the care of a Local Authority. Thereafter, such a work has to be deemed to be of “Institutional Authorship”.

A transfer of this kind demanding a changeover to institutional authorship happens listlessly and at different times in different countries. This creates a difficult situation in cataloguing.

Another approach. Instead of making the assumption above that all works on functions of Quasi Government not taken away from it should be deemed to be of Quasi Government *cum* Organ Authorship, we may make a list of the functions which have already been transferred to *ad hoc* Local Authorities and add to this list analogous functions and take works on any function so listed as of Quasi Independent Institutional Authorship though the function has not been taken away from the Quasi Government.

D4A RDC (1904)

1 RDC (1904), appears to have treated a Quasi Inde-

pendent Institution of a Quasi Government as the *de facto* as well as the *de jure* author of its work.

2 But it makes exception in the case of a School maintained by a Quasi Government. In this case, the prescription that, in the Author Heading the name of the city/town etc should be prefixed to the name of the School lends itself to regard the School as an Organ of the Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body) of the city/town etc.

D4B *AACR* (1908)

Analogous to Sec D4A (2) of this paper. This is only a reiteration of the general Rule 82 reading "Enter an institution under the name of the place in which it is located". This causes confusion in the idea about authorship. This will be taken up in a later paper on the rendering of the name of an institution when used as author heading.

D4C *CCC* (1934)

*CCC* (1934) has no specific rule on this conflict because it has included "Quasi Government" in the definition of 'Government'. Thus, the implication is, whatever has been said about Sovereign Government in Sec B4C is equally applicable to Quasi Government.

D4D *Theory* (1938)

*Theory* is the first work to break the wrong tradition established by RDC in respect of a School maintained by a Quasi Government. Its interpretative Definition covers all the Quasi Independent Institutions, whether maintained by a Sovereign Government or a Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body).

D4E *CCC* (1945)

The specific Distilled Definition from *CCC* (1945) is derived from the general Interpretative Definition given by *Theory* (1938). Therefore, the remarks here are analogous to that given in Sec D4D.

D4F *AACR* (1949)

Analogous to Sec D4B.

D4G *CCC* (1951)

Analogous to Sec D4E.

D4H *Heading & Canons* (1955)

Similar to Sec B4H.

4DJ to D4K CCC (1958) and CCC (1964)  
Analogous to Sec D4H.

D4M AACR (1967)

The occurrence or non-occurrence in the name of a Quasi Independent Institution, of a word indicating affiliation to a Quasi Government cannot resolve the conflict under consideration.

D4N CCC (Ed 6)

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the distilled Interpretative Definition given in Sec D4e of this paper.

D5 QUASI GOVERNMENT *Vs* ITS ORGAN CONFERENCE

No Cataloguing Code appears to have seized consciously the conflict "Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body) *vs* Its Organ Conference" — either in theory or in action. The nature of this conflict is similar to that of the conflict "Sovereign Government *vs* Its Organ Conference". And the resolution of this conflict can also be similar.

D5N CCC (Ed 6)

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the following Interpretative Definition:

"In the case of a work by an Organ Conference of a Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body), the Quasi Government *cum* Conference is the author."

D6 QUASI GOVERNMENT AS A DELEGATED-FROM-BODY *Vs* CONFERENCE

No Cataloguing Code appears to have seized consciously the conflict "Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body), as a Delegated-from-Body *Vs* Conference", — either in theory or in action. The nature of this conflict is similar to the conflict "Sovereign Government as a Delegated-from-Body *vs* Conference". And the resolution of this conflict can also be similar.

D6N CCC (Ed 6)

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the following Interpretative Definition in respect of the conflict under consideration:

"In the case of a work by a Quasi Governmental (Omnibus Local Body) Delegation to a Conference, the Quasi Government *cum* Delegation is the author."

**E Institution, Its Organ, and Its Quasi Independent Institution**  
**EI TERMINOLOGY**

**E11 Institution.**—Generic term to denote 'Whole Institution' and 'Organ-of-Institution'.

**E12 Whole Institution.**— 1 Independent Corporate Body — other than a Government, or a Near Sovereign Body, or a Quasi Government (Omnibus Local Body) — constituted formally, or informally and voluntarily; or

2 Autonomous Corporate Body created by a Sovereign Government, or a Near Sovereign Body, or a Quasi Government, or an Independent or Autonomous Institution, provided that it has or it is intended to have continued existence and functions beyond that of merely convening a Conference — *ad hoc* or periodical.

*Note.*— 1 Category 2 includes a Local Authority — an *ad hoc* Local Body devoted to a specific function without any power of local taxation — as defined in Sec D16 of this paper.

2 For cataloguing purposes, no distinction is made between the two categories of Institution.

**E13 Organ-of-Institution.**— Non-autonomous part of an Institution formed by

1 The constitution of the Parent Institution for functions, such as deliberative, executive, and administrative; or

2 An executive, or administrative measure for deliberative, executive, and administrative work within the field of function of the Parent Institution, for an undefined period; or

3 An executive, or administrative measure for a specific duration for a specific piece of work within the field of function of the Parent Institution.

**E131 Organ-of-Institution of Remove 1.**— Organ deriving its functions and powers directly from the constitution of the Whole Institution, or from its executive to discharge its stated functions and powers in the name of the Whole Institution to the prescribed extent.

**E132 Organ-of-Institution of Remove 2.**— Organ of an Organ-of-Institution of Remove 1 deriving some stated functions and powers of the Whole Institution *via* the said Organ of Remove 1.

**E133 Organ-of-Institution of Remove 3 onwards.**— The definitions are analogous to that of Organ-of-Institution of Remove 2.

**E135 Permanent Organ-of-Institution.**— Organ-of-Institution formed for an undefined period.

**E136 Temporary Organ-of-Institution.**— Organ-of-Institution formed for a specific piece of work for a defined limited period.

**E137 Constitutional Organ-of-Institution.**— Organ-of-Institution, formed by the very constitution of the Parent Institution.

**E138 Administrative Organ-of-Institution.**— Organ-of-Institution formed by an executive or administrative measure, for deliberative, or executive, or administrative work within the field of function of the Parent Institution, for an undefined period.

*Note.*— The substance of the above definitions was given for the first time in Heading & Canons (1955) and repeated thereafter in CCC (1958) and CCC (1964). But no other Code has attempted this.

**E14 Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution.**— A corporate Body created by a Parent Institution and whose functions are outside the deliberative, executive, and administrative functions of the Parent Institution and which is autonomous within its own sphere of function — though financed and owned by the Parent Institution.

**E15 Permanent Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution.**— Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution created for an undefined period.

**E16 Temporary Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution.**— Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution created for a defined limited period.

**E2 WHOLE INSTITUTION Vs ITS ORGAN OF REMOVE 1**

**E2c Distilled Definition from CCC (1934)**

In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Institution of Remove 1, the Whole Institution *cum* Organ is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the extracts from Rule 1232 and 12321 respectively.:

"1232 . . . If the Corporate Author is a . . . division or sub-division of an Institution, the above Heading [the name of the Parent Institution] is to be used as the Main Heading."

"12321 . . the subheading [the name of the division etc] is to be constructed on the analogy of Rules 12314 and 12315 and their subdivisions.

"*Example* University of Madras. Academic Council."

E2e *Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)*  
Same as Sec E2c of this paper.

E2f *Distilled Definition from AACR (1949)*  
In the case of a work by an Organ of Remove 1 — such as, a legislative and administrative department and organisation, local administrative unit, board of executive and special committees — of a Denominational Body, the Denomination *cum* Organ is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extracts from Rule 120D(1), 120E, and 126D respectively:

“120D(1). Enter the legislative and administrative departments and organisations of a denominational body under the name of the denomination. [Example] Presbyterian Church in the USA. *General Assembly*.

“120E. Enter local administrative units ... under a heading consisting of the name of the denomination followed by the name of the administrative unit ... [Example] Church of England in Canada. *Dioceses. Huron*.

“126D. Enter the ... boards of executive of a Church ... also special committees appointed by the church, as subheadings under the heading used for the church.

[Example]—New York. Trinity Church. *Men's Committee*.

E2g *Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)*  
Same as in Sec E2c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extracts from Rules 123208 and 12321 respectively:

“123208. If the Corporate Author is not an Institution as a Whole but a Dependent Body of it, subheadings are to be added on the analogy of Rules 12311 to 12316 and their subdivisions [relating to Government].

“12321. If the corporate Author is a department or a division or a subdivision of an Institution, the subheading is to be constructed on the analogy of Rules 12314 and 12315 and their subdivisions [relating to organs-of-Government].”

E2j *Distilled Definition from CCC (1958)*  
Same as in Sec E2c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:  
“243 The rendering of the name of an Organ of an Institution is to be made on the analogy of the Rules 232 to 237 [relating to Organs-of-Government]” [See Sec B2] of this paper].

E2k *Distilled Definition from CCC (1964)*  
Same as in Sec E2c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of Rule JD3 which is the new number for Rule 243 in CCC (1958) quoted in Sec E2j of this paper.

E2m *Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)*

In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Institution of Remove 1, the Whole Institution *cum* Organ is the author, provided the name of the Organ

1 Includes the entire name of the Parent Body; or

2 Contains a term, such as 'division', 'section', and 'committee'.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 69.

"69. Enter a subordinate body as a subheading under a higher body if its name belongs to one or more of the following types:

"Type 1. A name that includes the entire name of the higher body . . .

"Type 2. A name that contains a term that by definition implies that the body is a component part of something else, e.g. . . . division, section . . .

"Type 3. A name that contains a word ordinarily implying administrative subordination, e.g. "Committee" . . ."

E20 *Evaluation*

The nature of the conflict "Whole Institution vs Its Organ of Remove 1" is similar to that of the conflict "Whole Government vs Its Organ of Remove 1". It was first seized by CCC (1934). AACR (1949) has seized it in relation to Denominational Body only. AACR (1967) has extended its scope to all kinds of Institution.

E2A to E2B *RDC (1904) and AACR (1908)*

Evidently, RDC (1904) and AACR (1908) have not seized the conflict under consideration, either in theory or in action.

E3C *CCC (1934)*

CCC (1934) is the first work to seize the conflict under consideration only in action; and its resolution of the conflict is in conformity with the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'.

E2D *Theory (1938)*

Theory does not isolate the conflict under consideration.

E2E *CCC (1945)*

CCC (1945) continues what is given in CCC (1934)

## E2F AACR (1949)

AACR (1949) has seized in action the conflict under consideration only in relation to Denominational Body. Its distilled definition conforms to the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'.

## E2G CCC (1951)

CCC (1951) continues what is given in CCC (1934).

E2H *Heading & Canons* (1955)

*Heading & Canons* (1955) does not isolate the conflict under consideration.

## E2J to E2K CCC (1958) and CCC (1964)

CCC (1958) and CCC (1964) continues what is given in CCC (1934).

## E2M AACR (1967)

AACR (1967) appears to have adopted the findings of CCC by recognising that the scope of the conflict is not peculiar to a Denominational Body only but is common to all kinds of Institution. Its distilled definition is in conformity with the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'.

E2N CCC (*Ed 6*)

In CCC (*Ed 6*), it is proposed to incorporate the distilled Interpretative Definition given in Sec E2c of this paper.

E3 ORGAN-OF-INSTITUTION OF REMOVE 1 Vs ORGAN OF REMOVE 2  
E3c *Distilled Definition from CCC (1934)*

1 In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Institution of Remove 2, with a Unique Name of its own, the Whole Institution *cum* Organ of Remove 2 is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 12321.

"If the Corporate Author is a . . . division, or a sub-division of an Institution, the subheading is to be constructed on the analogy of Rule 12314 and 12315 [relating to Organ-of-Government]. (The relevant extract from Rule 12314 has been already given in Sec B3c of this paper.)

2 In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Institution of Remove 2 without a Unique Name of its own, the Whole Institution *cum* Organ of Remove 1 *cum* Organ of Remove 2 is the author.

The above definition also has been distilled out of the extract from Rule 12321 given above. (The relevant extract from Rule



12315 has been already given in Sec B3c of this paper).

E3e *Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)*  
Same as Sec E3c of this paper.

E3g *Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)*  
Same as Sec E3c of this paper.

E3j *Distilled Definition from CCC (1958)*  
Same as 1 and 2 in Sec E3c of this paper.  
These definitions are distilled out of the following Rule:  
"243 The rendering of the name of an Organ of an Institution is to be made on the analogy of Rules 232 to 237." In this context Rule 2363 is relevant. It has been already quoted in Sec B3j of this paper.

E3k *Distilled Definition from CCC (1964)*  
Same as 1 and 2 in Sec E3c of this paper.  
These definitions are distilled out of the following Rule:  
"JD3 The Rendering of the name of an Organ of an Institution is to be made on the analogy of Sec JC2 to JC8." In this context, Rule JC66 is relevant. The text of this Rule is the same as that of Rule 2363 in CCC (1958) quoted in Sec B3j of this paper.

E3m *Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)*  
Same as 1 and 2 in Sec E3c of this paper.  
These definitions have been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 69A.

"69A. Enter a body treated subordinately as a sub-heading of the lowest element in the hierarchy above it that may be independently entered. Omit intervening elements in the hierarchy that are not essential to clarify the function of the smaller body as an element of the larger one . . ."

### E30 *Evaluation*

The nature of the conflict "Organ-of-Institution of Remove 1 vs Organ of Remove 2" is similar to that of the conflict "Organ-of-Government of Remove 1 vs Organ of Remove 2". RDC (1904) and AACR (1908) fail to seize the conflict under consideration. CCC (1934) is the first to have seized it; and its distilled definition conforms to the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'. AACR (1949) fails to recognise the conflict, although CCC (1934) and CCC (1945) have brought it up to surface. All the later editions of CCC have been continuing what is given in CCC (1934). At long last, AACR (1967) has virtually followed CCC.

## E3N CCC (Ed 6)

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the distilled Interpretative Definition given in Sec E3c of this paper.

E4 PARENT INSTITUTION Vs ITS QUASI INDEPENDENT INSTITUTION  
E4a Distilled Definition from RDC (1904)

Group 1. In the case of a work by any one of the following kinds of Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the Parent Institution *cum* Quasi Independent Institution is the author:

Alumni Association of School or College (Rule 68)

College of an English University (Rule 65)

College Society (Rule 67)

Observatory of a University (Rule 78)

Professional school of an American University without a Unique Name (Rule 65)

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extracts from Rules 65, 67, 68, and 78:

"65. The college of an English University and the unnamed professional schools of an American University go under the university's name . . .

"67. Local college societies go under the name of the college . . .

"68. Alumni and Alumnae associations go under the name of the school or college.

"78 . . . university observatories go under the university . . . "

Group 2. In the case of a work by any one of the following kinds of Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the Quasi Independent Institution alone is the author, provided it has a Unique Name:

Observatory (Rule 78)

Professional School of an American University (Rule 65).

The above definitions have been distilled out of the following extracts from Rules 65 and 75.

"65 . . . Such professional schools [Professional schools of an American University] if they have distinctive name [a name beginning with a proper noun or adjective (Rule 77)], particularly if at a distance from the university, . . . go under their own name.

"78 . . . any observatory having an individual name [a name generally taken from the name of a person (Rule 70)] may go under that."

Group 3. In the case of a work by any one of the following kinds of Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the Quasi Independent Institution alone is the author:

Greek Letter Fraternity (Rule 67)

Intercollegiate Society (Rule 67)

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extracts from Rule 67:

"67 . . . intercollegiate societies and Greek letter fraternities [go] under their own names."

E46 *Distilled Definition from AACR (1908)*

Group 1. In the case of a work by any one of the following kinds of Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the Parent Institution *cum* Quasi Independent Institution is the author:

Affiliated Society without a unique name (Rule 79)

Alumni Association of a School or College (Rule 75)

College of a British University (Rule 84)

College Society (Rule 76)

Hospital

Laboratory

Library

Museum

Observatory

} of a College or University  
(Rule 85)

Professional school of an American University without a Unique Name (Rule 84)

Shop of a College or University (Rule 85)

University Society (Rule 76)

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extracts from Rules 75, 76, 79, 84, and 85.

"75. Enter alumni associations under the name of the school or college.

"76. Local college or university societies. Enter local college societies under the name of the college.

"79. Enter local branches of affiliated societies under the name of the general organisation when this forms part of the name of the local society . . .

"84. Enter the colleges of British university and the professional schools which form an integral part of an American University under the name of the university . . . with the name of the college or school as subheading.

"85. Enter college and university libraries, museums, laboratories, observatories, hospitals, shops, and similar institutions under the name of the college or university."

Group 2. In the case of a work by any one of the following kinds of Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the Quasi Independent Institution alone is the author, provided

it has a Unique Name.

Affiliated Society (Rule 79)

Professional School of an American University (Rule 84).

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extracts from Rules 79 and 84:

"79 . . . Local branches [of affiliated societies] having individual names which do not include the name of the general organisation are to be entered as independent bodies . . .

"84 Commentary. Professional schools [of American Universities] whose names begin with a proper noun or adjective may be entered under their names . . ."

**E4c** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1934)*

*Group 1.* In the case of a work by any one of the following kinds of Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the Parent Institution *cum* Quasi Independent Institution is the author:

Alumni Association  
College Society  
Library of a University  
School Society

The above definition has been distilled out of the following

Rules:

"1234 If the Corporate Author is a Dependent Body, the Main Heading and subheadings are to be constructed as for the Parent Body and thereafter a further subheading is to be added using the name of the Dependent Body.

"*Examples.*

"Presidency college. *Madras*. Mathematics Association.

"Hindu High School. *Triplicane*. Masters' Association.

"Hindu High School, *Shiyali*. Old Boys' Association.

"University of Madras. University Library."

**E4c** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)*

Same as Sec E4c of this paper.

**E4f** *Distilled Definition from AACR (1949)*

*Group 1.* In the case of a work by any one of the following kinds of Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the Parent Institution *cum* Quasi Independent Institution is the author:

Altar of a Church (Rule 126B)  
Alumni Association [Rule 101B(1)]  
Archive (Rule 80C)  
Baptistery of a Church (Rule 126B)  
Bible Class (Rule 126E)

Branch of a Federated Society without a Unique Name (Rule 99)  
 Chapel (Rule 126B)  
 Chapter of a Cathedral Church (Rule 126C)  
 Chapter of a Collegiate Church (Rule 126C)  
 Church (Rule 126A)  
 Church Auxiliary Society (Rule 128)  
 College Society (Rule 101A)  
 College without a Unique Name (Rule 102)  
 Faculty (Rule 102)  
 Fund [Rule 101B(1)]  
 Hospital (Rule 102)  
 Library (Rule 102)  
 Museum (Rule 102)  
 Professional School without a Unique Name (Rule 102)  
 Shop (Rule 102)  
 Sunday School (Rule 126E)  
 University Society (Rule 101A)  
 Unorganised Group of the Members of a Church (Rule 126F)

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extracts from Rules 80C, 99, 101A, 101B(1), 102, 126A, 126B, 126C, 126E, 128:

"80C. Enter institutional [and] society . . . archives under institution [or] society . . . with a subheading consisting either of the name of the archive or the word *Archives*."

"99. Enter local branches of federated societies under the name of the general organisation when this forms part of the name of the local society.

"101A. Enter societies of students, of faculty, or of both under the name of the institution . . .

"101B(1). Enter general alumni associations . . . under the name of the school, college, or university.

"102. Enter the various faculties, colleges, professional schools, laboratories, libraries, chapels, museums, . . . hospitals, shops, etc., which forms an integral part of a university or other institution under the larger institution with the name of the particular entity as subheading.

"126A. Enter the churches of monasteries, abbeys, convents, etc., as subheadings under the heading appropriate to these institutions . . .

"126B. Enter alters, baptisteries, chapels, etc., subsidiary to the main church edifice, as subheadings under the heading appropriate to the main edifice . . .

"126C. Enter a cathedral and collegiate chapters as subheadings under the heading for the cathedral or collegiate church . . .

"126E. Enter Sunday school, Bible classes, etc, that is, all institutions whose purpose is to advance the religious knowledge of the church members as subheadings under the heading used for the church.

"128. Enter church auxiliary societies as subheadings under the heading for the church in which they function."

*Group 2.* In the case of a work by any one of the following kinds of Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the Quasi Independent Institution alone is the author, provided it has a Unique Name:

Alumni Association comprising a Professional Group  
[Rule 101B(1) Exception]

Branch of a Federated Society (Rule 99)

College (Rule 102 Exception B)

Professional School (Rule 102 Exception B)

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extracts from Rules 99, 101B(1) Exception, and 102 Exception B:

"99 ... local branches [of federated societies] having individual names which do not include the name of the general organisation are to be entered as independent bodies.

"101B(1) Exception. When the association of alumni comprises a professional group ... entry may be made under the name of the association.

"102 Exception B. Colleges or professional schools whose names begin with a proper noun or proper adjective may be entered under their own names ...

*Group 3.* In the case of a work by any one of the following kinds of Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the Quasi Independent Institution alone is the author.

Affiliated Society (Rule 100)

Observatory (Rule 102 Exception 4)

The above definitions have been distilled out of the following extracts from Rules 100 and 102 Exception A:

"100 Enter affiliated societies under their own names ...

"102 Exception A. Exception may be made in the case of an observatory [that is, enter an observatory under its own name]".

E4g *Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)*

Same as in Sec E4c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

"123208 If the Corporate Author is not an Institution as a whole, but a Dependent Body of it, subheading is to be added on the analogy of Rules 12311 to 12316 and their subdivisions [relating to the different kinds of Organs-of-Government]."

“Examples

- “Presidency College. Madras. Mathematics Association.
- “Hindu High School. Triplicane. Masters' Association.
- “Hindu High School. Shiyali. Old Boy's Association.
- “University of Madras. University Library.”

E4h *Interpretative Definition from Heading & Canons (1955)*

“2287 Institution vs Institution. The choice between a present institution or one of its organs on the one side, and an autonomous affiliated institution on the other, in the claim to be deemed as author of a work, should be decided along lines analogous to the choice between the claims of government and institution set forth in section 2285.”

(Sec 2285 is quoted in Sec B4h of this paper).

2288 . . . *Group 1.* Each of the following institutions should be taken as author of its works, as if it were independent of the institution [creating, financing and owning it].

Abbey	Firm	Political Party
Bank	Foundation	Produce Exchange
Cathedral	Guild	Religious Order
Cemetery	Masonic Body	School
Church	Monastery	Stock Exchange
College	Mosque	Temple
Convent	Mutt	University
Endowment	Park	

“2288 . . . *Group 2.* Each of the following institutions should be taken as the author of its works as if it were independent of the parent . . . institution, provided it has distinctive name:—

Botanical garden	Laboratory
Chapel	Library
Experimental Station	Museum
Exhibition	Observatory
Festival	Shop
Hospital	Zoological garden

If any of the institutions has no distinctive name, it should be treated as an organ of its parent body.

“2288 . . . *Group 3.* Any formal or informal group of the members of the parent body formed for recreative, ameliorative or any other economical or social purposes other than any forming distinctive purpose of the parent body, should be treated as an organ of the parent body even if it has a distinctive name.

“2288 . . . *Group 4.* Each section or branch of an institution should be taken as author of its work, provided it has a distinctive name not involving the name of the parent body.

“If a section or a branch does not have a distinctive name

not involving the name of the parent body it should be treated as an organ of the parent body.

**E4j** *Interpretative Definition from CCC (1958)*

The contents of Sec 1187 and 2288 of Heading & Canons (1955) are reproduced in CCC (1958) in its Sec 145 and 146.

**E4k** *Interpretative Definition from CCC (1964)*

The contents of Sec 2287 and 2288 of Heading & Canons (1955) are reproduced in CCC (1964) in its Sec GD6 and GD8.

**E4m** *Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)*

*Group 1.* In the case of a work by a Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the Parent Institution *cum* Quasi Independent Institution is the author, provided its name is

1 Of a University school or college that simply indicates a particular field of study; or

2 Entirely descriptive of the body's functions and that has a character that is common to the names of both subordinate bodies and independent bodies, e.g. many "institutes", "centres", "laboratories" etc., of universities; or

3 Not a Unique one; or

4 Contains the entire name of its Parent Institution either internally or at the end; or

5 Normally used in association with the name of its Parent Institution.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rules 69 and 71A:

"69. Enter a subordinate body as a subheading under a higher body if its name belongs to one or more of the following types: . . .

"*Type 4.* A name of a university school or college that simply indicates a particular field of study.

"*Type 5.* A name that is entirely descriptive of the body's functions and that has a character that is common to the names of both subordinate bodies and independent bodies, e.g. many "institutes", "centres", "laboratories", etc., of universities.

"*Type 6.* Any name that is so general that the name of a higher body is required for its identification."

"71A. Enter a society, association, or other body as a subheading under the heading for the body to which it is related if its name (1) contains the entire name of the body to which it is related, either internally or at the end, (2) is insufficient for identification without the addition of that body's name, or (3) is normally used only in association with that name."

*Group 2.* In the case of a work by a Quasi Independent



Institution of a Parent Institution, the Quasi Independent Institution alone, is the author, provided its name does not belong to any one of the categories mentioned in Group 1 above.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 70A.:

"70A. Enter a subordinate body directly under its own name if its name does not belong to one of the types described in 69 . . . "

#### E40 Evaluation

The nature of the conflict "Parent Institution vs Its Quasi Independent Institution" is similar to that of the conflict "Government vs Its Quasi Independent Institution", and even better the conflict "Quasi Government vs Its Quasi Independent Institution." All the Cataloguing Codes have seized the conflict. But, they do not agree as to its resolution. They differ in their recognition of the conflict both in Theory and in Action or in Action alone. "Action" is seen in the Rules for Rendering the Heading. They also differ in their respective coverage of specific issues. Perhaps the Parent Institution may be brought as *de jure* author though not *de facto* author only in the case of a work concerning its general deliberative, executive, and administrative functions. On the contrary, a work bearing on functions entrusted to the Quasi Independent Institution of the Parent Institution — such as, a College of a University entrusted with the function of teaching; an Observatory maintained by a Research Institution, and a Laboratory maintained by a Council of Scientific Research of a country — should be taken to have the Quasi Independent Institution as its sole author.

#### E4A RDC (1904)

RDC (1904) is the first Code to have seized the conflict under consideration. Its recognition of the conflict is not in theory, but in action—that is, the relevant Interpretative Definitions are implied in its rules on Renaming Author Headings.

A Quasi Independent Institution is the *de facto* as well as the *de jure* author of its works.

The Distilled Definition relating to Group 1 in RDC (1904) makes a mistake in recognising the Parent Institution as the *de jure* author of a work by any one of its Quasi Independent Institutions.

The Distilled Definition relating to Group 2 regards the possession of a Unique Name as the criterion to determine the authorship of a work. This is faulty, because, it is only the "function" and the "responsibility" that determine the authorship of a work.

The Distilled Definition relating to Group 3 is in conformity with the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'

E4B AACR (1908)

AACR (1908) has followed RDC (1904) in respect of the Distilled Definitions relating to Group 1 and 2; and it has extended the list of Group 1. All the remarks made about RDC (1904) are applicable to AACR (1908). AACR (1908) has omitted Group 3 of RDC (1904). The reason for this deviation from RDC is not obvious.

E4C CCC (1934)

CCC (1934) also has followed RDC (1904) to some extent. It has recognised only one Group corresponding to Group 1 in RDC (1904). But the kinds of Quasi Independent Institutions included in this Group are reduced to two only — viz, Institutional Society, and Institutional Library.

E4D Theory (1938)

Theory does not isolate the conflict under consideration.

E4E CCC (1945)

CCC (1945) continues what is given in CCC (1934).

E4F AACR (1949)

AACR (1949) has followed RDC (1904) with a few additions to the list of Group 1. All the remarks made about RDC (1904) are applicable to AACR (1949).

E4G CCC (1951)

CCC (1951) continues what is given in CCC (1934).

E4H *Heading & Canons* (1955)

*Heading & Canons* (1955) is the first work to seize in theory the conflict under consideration. It has recognised that the nature of this conflict is similar to that of the conflict "Government vs Its Quasi Independent Institution"; and has prescribed its analogous resolution.

But it has failed to recognise that the criterion used in the Governmental context is not on all fours with Institutional context. However, it makes up for this through its illustrative enumerative definitions.

Its Distilled Definition relating to Group 1 is quite in conformity with the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'.

In using the phrase 'provided it has a distinctive name' as a criterion in respect of Group 2, is a perpetuation of the fault of earlier Codes. If it is not a Unique Name, an Individualising

element should be added to it. The name of the Parent Institution itself can be the Individualising Element. Prefixing the name of the Parent Institution amounts to treating a Quasi Independent Institution as if it were an Organ of the Parent Institution. This fault has not been recognised.

The fault is even more serious in respect of Group 3, because it categorically says that a Quasi Independent Institution for purposes other than those of the Parent Institution should not be given the right of sole authorship of its own work, but should be taken to be only its *de facto* author, leaving the *de jure* authorship to the Parent Institution, which has no responsibility whatever for that work.

The prescription about Group 4 is terribly faulty. It is an unthinking blind perpetuation of the fault originated in RDC (1904).

E4J to E4K CCC (1958) and CCC (1964)

All the remarks made about Heading & Canons (1955) are applicable to these two Codes.

E4M AACR (1967)

Group 3 in AACR (1949) enumerates only two kinds of Quasi Independent Institution — *viz.*, Affiliated Society and Observatory — to be treated as the sole author of their respective works. Group 1 in Heading & Canons (1955) extends the list to 23 kinds. Group 2 in AACR (1967) approximates to Group 1 in Heading & Canons (1955). In this respect, the impact of CCC on AACR (1967) is evident.

Group 1 in AACR (1967) impliedly includes Group 2, 3, and 4, of Heading & Canons (1955). The remarks made in Sec E4H are applicable to Group 1 of AACR (1967).

E4N CCC (Ed 6)

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the following Interpretative Definition.

"In the case of a work by a Quasi Independent Institution of a Parent Institution, the former alone is the author."

(For definition of "Quasi Independent Institution" see Sec E14 of this paper.)

E5 INSTITUTION *Vs* INSTITUTIONAL ORGAN CONFERENCE

E5a *Distilled Definition from RDC (1904)*

In the case of a work by an Institutional Organ Conference, the Institution *cum* Conference is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 93:

“93. Enter reports, journals, minutes, etc., of conventions, conferences, etc., under the name of the bodies [parties, religious bodies, societies], holding the conference, etc . . . ”

E5b *Distilled Definition from AACR (1908)*

Same as in Sec E5a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 105 (1):

“105(1). Enter conventions, conferences, and assemblies of societies, political parties, religious denominations, etc under the names of these bodies . . . ”

E5c *Distilled Definition from CCC (1934)*

Same as in Sec E5a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

“1234 If the Corporate Author is a Dependent Body, the Main Heading and subheadings are to be constructed as for the Parent Body and thereafter a further subheading is to be added using the name of the Dependent Body.”

E5e *Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)*

Same as Sec E5c of this Paper.

E5f *Distilled Definition from AACR (1949)*

Same as in Sec E5a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

“135A. Enter institutes, meetings, conferences, etc., under the name of the meeting, except when they are meetings of the members of a society or other body and have no distinctive name of their own.”

E5g *Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)*

Same as in Sec E5a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

“123208 If the Corporate Author is not an Institution as a whole but a Dependent Body of it, subheadings are to be added on the analogy of Rules 12311 to 12316 and their subdivisions [relating to the rendering of the names of Organs-of-Government].”

E5j *Distilled Definition from CCC (1958)*

Same as in Sec E5a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rules:

“255 If a Conference is an Organ of another Corporate Body, it is to be given a Multiple Corporate Heading.

“2551 The heading in which the name of the Conference

is rendered is to be preceded by the Heading(s) specifying its Parent Body which may itself be an Organ."

**E5k** *Distilled Definition from CCC (1964)*

Same as in Sec E5a of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of Rules JE5 and JE51. The contents of these two rules are respectively the same as that of Rules 255 and 2551 of CCC (1958), quoted in Sec E5j of this paper.

**E5m** *Distilled Definition from AACR (1967)*

In the case of a work by an Institutional Organ Conference, the Conference alone is the author.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extract from Rule 87:

"87. Enter conference, congress, or other meeting under its name . . ."

**E50** *Evaluation*

The Institution *cum* Conference is the *de jure cum de facto* author of a work by a Conference organised by a Parent Institution or whether the Conference alone is its sole — that is, *de jure* as well as *de facto* — author, should be determined by two factors:

1 Whether the Conference is confined to the members of the organising Parent Institution alone; or

2 Whether the Conference includes persons other than the members of the Organising Parent Institution.

In the case of Category 1, the organisation of the Conference by the Organising Parent Institution, should be deemed to be one of its functions, whether mentioned in its constitution or not. Such a Conference will only discharge some function or other of the Organising Institution; and the former cannot be separated from the latter. Therefore, the Conference itself can only be taken as the *de facto* author of its work, but the *de jure* author should be taken to be the Organising Institution functioning through the Conference. To put it in other words, such a Conference Author really connotes an "Institution *cum* Conference Author." In the case of Category 2, the Conference alone is the *de jure* as well as the *de facto* author of its work, though organising such a Conference is laid down by its constitution as a function of the Organising Parent Institution.

The nature of the conflict "Institution *vs* Institutional Organ Conference" is similar to that of the conflict "Government *vs* Governmental Organ Conference". All the Cataloguing Codes have seized the conflict. Except for AACR (1967), all of them

agree on the resolution of this conflict.

E5A RDC (1904)

RDC (1904) seizes the conflict in action only, and not in theory. Its Source Rule 93 is not specifically turned on the conflict under consideration; its scope is wider. And according to it any Conference, if organised by a Corporate Body of any kind, is to be taken to be only the *de facto* author of its work, the *de jure* authorship being left to go with the Organising Body. Such a prescription is not in full agreement with the definition of 'Corporate Author' given in Sec E50 above. However, Rule 93 serves as the Source-Rule for the Distilled Definition of RDC (1904) which is in conformity with the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'.

E5B AACR (1908)

AACR (1908) also seizes the conflict in action. The scope of its Source-Rule 105 (1) is sufficiently narrowed down; and it appears to be specifically turned on the conflict under consideration. The Distilled Definition conforms to the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'.

E5C CCC (1934)

CCC (1934) recognises in action that the nature of the conflict under consideration is similar to that of the conflict "Government vs Governmental Organ Conference." Its Distilled Definition is in conformity with the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'.

E5D Theory (1938)

Theory does not deal with the conflict under consideration.

E5E CCC (1945)

CCC (1945) continues what is given in CCC (1934).

E5F AACR (1949)

AACR (1949) seizes the conflict in action. Its source Rule 135A rightly mentions, for the first time, that the Conference is merely *de facto* author of its work; the *de jure* authorship goes with the Parent Institution, only if the Conference is confined within the members of its Parent Institution.

E5G CCC (1951)

CCC (1951) continues what is given CCC (1934)

E5H *Heading & Canons* (1955)  
*Heading & Canons* (1955) does not deal with the conflict under consideration.

E5J CCC (1958)  
 CCC (1958), defines the term 'Organ-Conference' for the first time. The formulation of the Source-Rules 255 and 255I becomes very precise due to the use of this defined term 'Organ Conference'.

E5K CCC (1964)  
 CCC (1964) continues what is given in CCC (1958).

E5M AACR (1967)  
 There appears to be no Rule in AACR (1967) which is specifically turned on the Conference confined to the members of its Organising Body. In its absence, Rule 87 dealing with Conferences, in general, is applicable to such a situation. The Definition distilled out of Rule 87 to resolve the conflict under consideration violates the definition of the term 'Corporate Author'. It is not known why it omits Rule 135A of AACR (1949) which has a rational basis established after long struggle since the days of RDC (1904).

E5N CCC (Ed 6)  
 In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the distilled Interpretative Definition given in Sec E5a of this Paper.

E7 INSTITUTION AS A DELEGATED-FROM-BODY VS CONFERENCE  
 It is possible to isolate the conflict "Institution as a Delegated-from-Body vs Conference". *Heading & Canons* (1955) is the first work to have seized it. CCC (1958) adds the following Interpretative Definition to resolve such a conflict:

"1471 The Delegated-from-Body should be taken to be the parent Body of a Delegation to a Conference in respect of any work embodying any thought and expression created by the delegation."

This Interpretative Definition is in conformity with the definition of 'Corporate Author'. It is generic in nature, and can be applied to resolve a conflict centring round any kind of Delegated-from-Body, be it a Government, a Quasi-Government, or an Institution. CCC (1964) continues what is given in CCC (1964).

E7N CCC (Ed 6)  
 In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the following

**Interpretative Definition:**

"In the case of a work by an Institutional Delegation to Conference, the Institution *cum* Delegation is the author.

**F Conference, and Its Organ****F1 TERMINOLOGY**

**F11 Conference.**— Generic term to denote 'Whole Conference', and 'Organ-of-Conference.'

**F12 Whole Conference.**— Independent Corporate Body with the following attributes:

- 1 Not a Government, or a Near Sovereign Body, or a Quasi Government, or a Local Authority, or an Institution;
- 2 Being convened and organised formally or informally by one or more persons and/or other kinds of Corporate Body;
- 3 If convened by one or more Corporate Bodies, not being confined only to the members of such Corporate Bodies;
- 4 Being meant to function only once or periodically;
- 5 The purpose being deliberation, or formulation and expression of opinion or sentiment; and
- 6 The purpose not being merely the framing of the constitution of a Sovereign Government, or a Near Sovereign Government or an Institution.

*Note.*— A Conference held for any purpose enumerated in Category 6, will be deemed to be an Organ Conference of the Corporate Body for the framing of whose constitution, the Conference was convened or organised.

**F13 Organ-of-Conference.**— Non autonomous part of a Conference formed by

- 1 The constitution of the Conference for functions, such as deliberative, executive, and administrative; or
- 2 An executive, or administrative measure for deliberative, executive, and administrative work within the field of function of the Parent Conference for an undefined period; or
- 3 An executive or administrative measure for a specific duration for a specific piece of work within the field of function of the Parent Conference.

**F131 Organ-of-Conference of Remove 1.**— Organ deriving its functions and powers directly from the Constitution of the Whole Parent Conference, or from its executive to discharge its stated functions and powers in the name of the Whole Conference to the prescribed extent.

**F132 Organ-of-Conference of Remove 2.**— Organ of an



Organ-of-Conference of Remove 1 deriving some stated functions and powers of the Whole Conference *via* the said Organ of Remove 1.

**F133 Organ-of-Conference of Remove 2 Onwards.**— The definitions are analogous to that of Organ-of-Conference of Remove 2.

**F135 Permanent Organ-of-Conference.**— Organ formed for an undefined period, by a Conference, held or intended to be held periodically.

**F136 Temporary Organ-of-Conference.**— Organ formed for a defined limited period, by a Conference, held or intended to be held periodically.

**F137 Constitutional Organ-of-Conference.**— Organ-of-Conference, formed by the very constitution of the Conference.

**F138 Administrative Organ-of-Conference.**— Organ-of-Conference formed by an executive, or administrative measure, for deliberative, executive, and administrative work within the field of function of the Conference.

**F2 WHOLE CONFERENCE VS ITS ORGAN OF REMOVE 1**

**F2c Distilled Definition from CCC (1934)**

In the case of a work by an Organ-of-Conference of Remove 1, the Whole Conference *cum* organ is the author.

The above definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

“1234 If the Corporate Author is a Dependent Body, the Main Heading and subheadings are to be constructed as for the Parent Body and thereafter a further subheading is to be added using the name of the Dependent Body.

“*Example.* International Congress of Orientalists. Committee on Transliteration.”

**F2e Distilled Definition from CCC (1945)**

Same as Sec F2c of this paper.

**F2g Distilled Definition from CCC (1951)**

Same as in Sec F2c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following Rule:

“123308 If the Corporate Author is not a Conference as a whole, but a Dependent Body of it, subheadings are to be added on the analogy of Rules 12311 to 12316 and their sub-

divisions [relating to the rendering of the names of Organs-of-Government]”.

F2j *Distilled Definition from CCC (1958)*

Same as in Sec F2c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the following extracts from Rules 251 and 243

“251 The rendering of the name of a Conference is to be on the analogy of the Rules of Chap 24 [devoted to the rendering of the name of Institutions].

“243 The Rendering of the name of an Organ of an Institution is to be made on the analogy of the Rules 232 to 237 [relating to the rendering of the names of Organs-of-Government].

F2k *Distilled Definition from CCC (1964)*

Same as in Sec F2c of this paper.

This definition has been distilled out of the extracts from Rules JE1, and JD3. The contents of these two Rules are the same as that of Rules 251 and 243 of CCC (1958) quoted in Sec F2j of this paper.

F20 *Evaluation*

RDC (1904) and all the editions of AACR have failed to seize the conflict under consideration. CCC (1934) is the first to have seized it at least in action. Theory (1938) and Heading & Canons (1955) do not deal with the conflict. All the later editions of CCC have continued what is given in CCC (1934).

The Distilled Definition from CCC conforms to the definition of the term ‘Corporate Author’.

F2N *CCC (Ed 6)*

In CCC (Ed 6), it is proposed to incorporate the distilled Interpretative Definition given in Sec F2c of this paper.

G *SUM-UP*

In the course of writing this paper, it has been realised that the resolution of the conflict “Corporate Body vs Corporate Body”, in respect of the authorship of a work, is indeed a difficult one. It presents a knot which is too complex to be disentangled completely. Moreover, works involving difficult knots are only of comparatively recent origin, and even now they are not sufficiently plentiful. In the case of a difficulty arising only occasionally, the human mind naturally takes shelter under the Law of Least Action. The Cataloguing Code may even close its eyes to it. We have seen examples of this in the preceding sections. At least, a Cataloguing Code seeks to resolve in action rather

than resolving in theory a problem of such infrequent occurrence. To resolve in theory will be to give an adequate definition of the term 'Corporate Author'—sole or *de jure cum de facto* as the case may be. The Cataloguing Codes have evidently found the task of establishing such a definition too exacting to overcome the pressure of the Law of Least Action. They seem to have preferred to meet the situation by resolution in action, to resolution in theory. Though the resolution in action, by a particular Cataloguing Code, may not cover all kinds of the conflict "Corporate Body vs Corporate Body", wherever it has been covered, the resolution is hidden, as it were, in the Rules prescribing the Choice and Rendering of the name of a Corporate Author in the Heading of the Author Entry. Such an evasion of examining the problem squarely at its face at the stage of defining Corporate Authorship has led to some faults in a few cases. This paper has made an attempt to lay bare such faults and to replace resolution in action by a conscious resolution in theory—in the very definition of Corporate Authorship. It is not claimed that it has succeeded in covering all possible varieties of conflicts. It can only be claimed that it has reduced considerably the gap between

1 A complete resolution of the conflict "Corporate Body vs Corporate Body" in respect of the authorship of a work, at the definition stage itself; and

2 No resolution at all at the definition stage.

## INDEX TO PAPER G

*Note.*—Index number is Section Number

Abbreviations used :—

*def* = Definition

*irt* = In relation to

*qirt* = Quoted in relation to

AACR

1908 *irt*

Dependency Government

Distilled def from B6b

Evaluation of B6B

Governmental

Organ Conf B5B

Quasi Independent Inst B4B

Institutional Organ Conf

Distilled def from E5b

Evaluation of E5B

Organ of Govt of Remove 2

Distilled def from B3b

Evaluation of B3B

Quasi Independent Inst

Distilled def from E4b

Evaluation of E4b

of Quasi Govt

Distilled def from D4b

Evaluation of D4B

Whole

Govt vs Organ of Remove 1

Distilled def from B2b

Evaluation of B2B

Institution E2B

Quasi Govt D2b

1949 *irt*

Dependency Govt

Distilled def from B6f

Evaluation of B6F

Governmental

Delegation to Conf

Distilled def from B7f

Evaluation of B7F

Organ Conf B5F

Quasi Independent Inst

Distilled def from B4f

Evaluation of B4F

Institutional Organ Conf

Distilled def from E5f

Evaluation E5F

Organ of Govt of Remove 2

Distilled def from B3f

Evaluation of B3F

Quasi Independent Inst

Distilled def from E4f

Evaluation of E4F

of Quasi Govt

Distilled def from D4f

Evaluation of D4F

Whole

Govt vs Its Organ of Remove 1

Distilled def from B2f

Evaluation of B2F

Institution E2F

Quasi Govt D2f

1967 *irt*

Dependency Govt

Distilled def from B6m

Evaluation of B6M

Governmental

Delegation to Conf B7m

Organ Conf B5M

Quasi Independent Inst

Distilled def from B4m

Evaluation of B4M

Institutional Organ Conf

Distilled def from E5m

Evaluation of E5M

Organ of

Inst of Remove 2 E3m

Govt of Remove 2

Distilled def from B3m

Evaluation of B3M

Quasi Independent Inst

Distilled def from E4m

Evaluation of E4M

of Quasi Govt

Distilled def from D4m

Evaluation of D4M

United Nations C1

Whole

Govt vs Its Organ of Remove 1

Distilled def from B2m

Evaluation of B2M

Institution

Distilled def from E2m

Evaluation of E2M

Quasi Govt D2m

Ad hoc Local Authority

as an Institution D06

Administrative organ of

Conference, *def* F138

Institution, *def* E138

Government, *def* B137

Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules  
See AACR

CCC

- 1934 *irt*  
Dependency Govt B6C  
Governmental  
Organ Conf  
Distilled def from B5c  
Evaluation of B5C  
Quasi Independent Inst B4C  
Institutional Organ Conf  
Distilled def from E5c  
Evaluation of E5C  
Organ of  
Conf of Remove 1 F2c  
Govt of Remove 2  
Distilled def from B3c  
Evaluation of B3C  
Inst of Remove 2 E3c  
Quasi Independent Inst  
Distilled def from E4c  
Evaluation of E4C  
of Quasi Govt D4C  
Whole  
Govt vs Its Organ of Remove 1  
Distilled def from B2c  
Evaluation of B2C  
Institution  
Distilled def from E2c  
Evaluation of E2C  
Quasi Govt D2c
- 1945 *irt*  
Dependency Govt B6E  
Governmental  
Organ Conf  
Distilled def from B5e  
Evaluation of B5E  
Quasi Independent Inst  
Distilled def from B4e  
Evaluation of B4E  
Institutional Organ Conf  
Distilled def from E5e  
Evaluation of E5E  
Organ of  
Conf of Remove 1 F2e  
Govt of Remove 2  
Distilled def from B3e  
Evaluation of B3E  
Inst of Remove 2 E3e  
Quasi Independent Inst  
Distilled def from E4e  
Evaluation of E4E  
of Quasi Govt  
Distilled def from D4e  
Evaluation of D4E  
Whole  
Govt vs Its Organ of Remove 1  
Distilled def from B2e  
Evaluation of B2E

- Institution  
Distilled def from E2e  
Evaluation of E2E  
Quasi Govt D2e

1951 *irt*

- Governmental  
Delegation to Conf B7G  
Organ Conf  
Distilled def from B5g  
Evaluation of B5G  
Quasi Independent Inst  
Distilled def from B4g  
Evaluation of B4G  
Institutional Organ Conf  
Distilled def from E5g  
Evaluation of E5G  
Organ of  
Conf of Remove 1 F2g  
Govt of Remove 2  
Distilled def from B3g  
Evaluation of B3G  
Inst of Remove 2 E3g  
Quasi Independent Inst  
Distilled def from E4g  
Evaluation of E4G  
of Quasi Govt  
Distilled def from D4g  
Evaluation of D4G  
Whole  
Govt vs Its Organ of Remove 1  
Distilled def from B2g  
Evaluation of B2G  
Institution  
Distilled def from E2g  
Evaluation of E2G  
Quasi Govt D2g
- 1958 *irt*  
Dependency Govt  
Evaluation of B6J  
Interpretative def from, B6j  
Governmental  
Delegation to Conf  
Distilled def from B7j  
Evaluation of B7J  
Organ Conf  
Distilled def from B5j  
Evaluation of B5J  
Quasi Independent Inst  
Distilled def from B4j  
Evaluation of B4J  
Institutional Organ Conf  
Distilled def from E5j  
Evaluation of E5J  
Organ of  
Conf of Remove 1 F2j  
Govt of Remove 2  
Distilled def from B3j  
Evaluation B3J  
Inst of Remove 2 E3J  
Quasi Independent Inst

Evaluation of E4J  
 Interpretive def from E4j  
 of Quasi Govt  
 Distilled def from D4j  
 Evaluation of D4J  
 Whole  
 Govt vs Its Organ of Remove 1  
 Distilled def from B2j  
 Evaluation of B2j  
 Institution  
 Distilled def from E2j  
 Evaluation of E2j  
 Quasi Govt D2j  
 1964 *irt*  
 Dependency Govt  
 Evaluation of B6K  
 Interpretive def from B6k  
 Governmental  
 Delegation to Conf  
 Distilled def from B7k  
 Evaluation of B7K  
 Organ Conf  
 Distilled def from B5k  
 Evaluation of B5K  
 Quasi Independent Inst  
 Distilled def from B4k  
 Evaluation of B4K  
 Institutional Organ Conf  
 Distilled def from E5k  
 Evaluation of E5K  
 Organ of  
 Conf of Remove 1 F2k  
 Govt of Remove 2  
 Distilled def from B3k  
 Evaluation of B3K  
 Inst of Remove 2 E3k  
 Quasi Independent Inst  
 Evaluation of E4K  
 Interpretive def from F4k  
 of Quasi Govt  
 Distilled def from D4k  
 Evaluation of D4K  
 United Nations C1  
 Whole  
 Govt vs its Organ of Remove 1  
 Distilled def from B2k  
 Evaluation of B2K  
 Institution  
 Distilled def from E2k  
 Evaluation of E2K  
 Quasi Govt D2k  
 Ed 6 *irt*  
 Governmental  
 Organ Conference B5N  
 Quasi Independent Inst B4N  
 Institutional  
 Delegation to Conf E7N  
 Organ Conf E5N  
 Near Sovereign Body CN  
 Organ of  
 Conf of Remove 1 F2N  
 Govt of Remove 2 B3N  
 Inst of Remove 2 F3N  
 Quasi  
 Govt  
 Delegation to Conf D7N  
 vs Its Organ Conf D5N  
 Independent Inst E4N  
 of Quasi Govt D4N  
 Whole  
 Govt vs Organ of Remove 1  
 B2N  
 Institution E2N  
 Quasi Govt D2N  
 Classified Catalogue Code  
*see* CCC  
 Conference  
 and Its Organ F  
*def* F11  
 Conflict  
 in Corporate body vs Corporate body  
 Varieties of A5  
 of Authorship *irt*  
 Near Sovereign body C11  
 Constitutional Organ of  
 Conf, *def* F137  
 Govt, *def* B138  
 Inst, *def* B137  
 Corporate body vs Corporate body  
 Varieties of conflict in A5  
 Dependency Govt, Local body  
 or Inst in cataloguing codes B6  
 Distilled definition A1  
 Explicit formulation of A2  
 Evaluation of Cataloguing Codes *irt*  
 Dependency Govt B60  
 Governmental  
 Delegation to Conf B70  
 Organ Conference B50  
 Quasi Independent Inst B40  
 Institution vs Institutional  
 Organ Conf E50  
 Organ of  
 Conf of Remove 1 F20  
 Govt of Remove 2 B30  
 Inst of Remove 1 vs Remove 2 E30  
 Parent Inst vs  
 Its Quasi Independent Inst E40  
 Quasi Govt vs  
 Quasi Independent Inst D40  
 Sovereign Govt vs  
 Dependency Govt B60  
 Whole  
 Govt vs its Organ of Remove 1  
 B20  
 Inst vs Its Organ of Remove  
 F20  
 Quasi Govt D20

- Government  
 as a Delegated-to-Body  
 in cataloguing codes B7  
 Evaluation of B70  
*def* B11  
 its Organ and its Quasi  
 Independent Institution B  
 vs Governmental  
 Organ Conf in Cataloguing Codes  
 B5  
 Evaluation of B50  
 Quasi Independent Inst in  
 Cataloguing Codes B4  
 Evaluation of B40
- Governmental  
 Delegation to Conf in Cat Codes B7  
 Organ Conf in Cat Codes B5  
 Quasi Independent Inst  
*def* B14  
 in Cat Codes B4
- Heading and canons* (1955)  
*irt* Dependency Govt B64  
 Governmental  
 Organ Conf B5H  
 Quasi Independent Inst  
 Distilled *def* B4h  
 Evaluation of B4H  
 Inst Organ Conf E5H  
 Organ of Govt of Remove 2  
 B3H  
 Quasi Independent Inst  
 Evaluation of E4H  
 Interpretative *def* from E4h  
 of Quasi Govt  
 Evaluation of D4H  
 Interpretative *def* from D4h  
 Whole  
 Govt vs Organ of Remove 1  
 B2H  
 Institution E2h  
*qirt*  
 Organ of Govt of Remove 2 B3h  
 Treatment of Govt Delegation  
 in AACR (1949) B7H  
 Whole Quasi Govt D2h
- Institution  
 as a Delegated-from-Body  
 in Cat Codes E7  
*def* E11  
 Its Organ and Its Quasi  
 Independent Inst E  
 vs Institutional Organ Conf  
 in Cat Codes E5  
 Evaluation of E50
- Institutional  
 Delegation to Conf in Cat Codes E7  
 Organ Conf in Cat Codes E5
- League of Nations C01  
 Local  
 Authority  
*def* D16  
 Development of D02  
 Body  
 Development of D01  
 Its Organ and Quasi  
 Independent Inst D03  
 Self Govt D04
- Mnemonic section number A4  
 Near Sovereign body  
 and Conflict of Authorship C11  
*irt* Cataloguing Codes C12  
 its Organ and its Quasi  
 Independent Inst C
- Omnibus local body  
*See* Quasi Govt
- Organ  
 and Quasi Independent Inst  
 of Local Body D03  
 of  
 Conf  
*def* F13  
 of Remove  
 1, *def* F131  
 in Cat Codes F2  
 Evaluation of F20  
 2, *def* F132  
 3, *def* F133
- Govt  
*def* B13  
 of Remove  
 1, *def* B131  
 in cat codes B2  
 2, *def* B132  
 in Cat Codes B3  
 Evaluation of B30  
 3, *def* B133
- Institution  
*def* E13  
 of Remove  
 1, *def* E131  
 in Cat Codes E3  
 Evaluation of E30  
 2, *def* E132  
 3, *def* E133
- Quasi Govt  
*def* D13  
 in Cat Codes D3  
 Evaluation of D30
- Parent Inst vs Its  
 Quasi Independent Inst in Cat  
 Codes E4  
 Evaluation of E40
- Permanent  
 Governmental Quasi

- Independent Inst, *def* B141
- Organ of
  - Conf, *def* F135
  - Govt, *def* B135
  - Inst, *def* E135
- Quasi Independent Inst, *def* E15
- Quasi
  - Govt
    - as a Delegated-from-Body
      - in Cat Codes D7
      - def* D11
    - its Organ and its
      - Quasi Independent Inst D
    - treating as Govt in Cat Codes
      - D03
    - vs Its Organ Conf
      - In Cat Codes D5
      - Evaluation of D50
    - Its Quasi Independent Inst
      - in Cat Codes D4
      - Evaluation of D40
  - Independent Inst
    - def* E14
    - in Cat Codes E4
    - Evaluation of E40
  - of Quasi Govt
    - def* D14
    - in Cat Codes D4
    - Evaluation of D40
- R D C (1904) *irt*
  - Dependency Govt B6A
  - Governmental
    - Organ Conf B5A
    - Quasi Independent Inst B4A
  - Institutional Organ Conf
    - Distilled *def* from E5a
    - Evaluation of E5A
  - Organ of Govt of Remove 2
    - Distilled *def* from B3a
    - Evaluation of B3A
  - Quasi Independent Inst
    - Distilled *def* from E4a
    - Evaluation of E4A
  - of Quasi Govt
    - Distilled *def* from D4a
    - Evaluation of D4A
  - Whole
    - Govt vs Its Organ of Remove 1
      - Distilled *def* from B2a
      - Evaluation of B2A
    - Institution E2A
    - Quasi Govt D2a
- Sovereign Govt vs
  - Dependency Govt
    - in Cat Codes B6
    - Evaluation of B60
- Temporary
  - Governmental Quasi
    - Independent Inst, *def* B142
  - Organ of
    - Conf, *def* F136
    - Govt, *def* B136
    - Inst, *def* E136
  - Quasi Independent Inst, *def* E16
- Terminology *irt*
  - Conference and its Organ F1
  - Government, its Organ and
    - its Quasi Independent Inst B1
  - Institution E1
  - Near-Sovereign body C1
  - Quasi-Govt D1
- Theory of lib catalogue* (1938)
  - irt*
    - Dependency Govt B6D
    - Government
      - Organ Conf B5D
      - Quasi Independent Inst B4D
      - Institutional Organ Conf E5D
      - Organ of Govt of Remove 2 B3D
      - Quasi Independent Inst E4D
      - of Quasi Govt
        - Evaluation of D4D
        - Interpretative *def* from D4D
    - Whole
      - Govt vs Organ of Remove 1
        - B2D
      - Institution E2D
  - qirt* Interpretative *def* of
    - Govt vs Governmental
      - Quasi Independent Inst B4d
- United Nations C02
- Whole
  - Conference
    - def* F12
    - vs Its Organ of Remove 1
      - in Cat Codes F2
      - Evaluation of F20
  - Government
    - def* B12
    - vs Its Organ of Remove 1
      - in Cat Codes B2
      - Evaluation of B20
  - Institution
    - def* E12
    - vs Its Organ of Remove 1
      - in Cat Codes E2
      - Evaluation of E20
  - Quasi Govt
    - def* D12
    - vs Its Organ of Remove 1
      - in Cat Codes D2
      - Evaluation of D20