

COMMENTS ON CRITERIA OF PUBLICATION AND A
PETITION TO THE COMMISSION FOR A DEFINITIVE RULING
ON THE PUBLICATION VALIDITY OF DISSERTATIONS *ET*
AL. Z.N.(S.)2328.

By D. Haman and R.W. Huddleston (*Chevron Oil Field Research
Company, P.O. Box 446, La Habra, Calif. 90631*)

A situation was recently encountered where deficiencies in the Criteria of Publication (Chapter 3, Art. 8, 9) as detailed in the draft third edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature were evident.

2. This has prompted us to offer the following comments and to petition the Commission for a definitive declaration on the publication validity of dissertations, theses, and allied works.

Comments on the Criteria of Publication

3. Neave, 1939, (*Nomenclator Zoologicus*, p. vii) observed that there was an 'absence from the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature of any clear definition of what constitutes publication'. The draft third edition of the Code, while attempting to rectify this situation, some 40 years later, has still not defined the criteria of publication with enough precision to satisfy zoologists.

4. Zoologists have already commented on the deficiencies of this chapter in the third edition (see Clark, 1979; Steyskal, 1979). We agree with the views put forward by these scientists particularly with respect to the usage of the imprecise words 'numerous' and 'multiple' in Art. 8(2) and Art. 9 (example). Precision with regard to these words is required and new definitions as to the intent and meaning of them in their context must be addressed by the Commission. Steyskal, 1979, raised a legitimate objection to the use of the word 'identical' (as in Art. 8(2)) which he regarded as too restrictive for the type of copies of articles. He indicated that by definition the use of this word would nullify copies that differed in size, binding, or the nature of material (paper or synthetic sheet). We suggest that the syntax of Art. 8(2) be changed to reflect the need to accommodate greater precision with these terms. We support the *recommendation* by Clark, 1979, that authors be required by mandate to submit a copy of their work to the *Zoological Record* for abstracting, indexing, etc. We strongly support the recommendation by Clark, 1979, that a more rapid method of publication of the *Zoological Record* be explored.

Petition for Definitive Declaration on Publication Validity of Dissertations et al.

5. In the *Zoological Record* (1977, Introduction, p. v), Theses, it is stated 'these are not generally recognized as published in the conventional sense and are not, therefore, included in *Zoological Record*. However, it appears that theses from two sources may meet the requirements of publication (basically that they are printed in ink on paper and available without restrictions)'. The use of the words 'generally', 'conventional', 'may meet', and 'basically' in the above statement makes it valueless from a practical point of view.

6. The draft Code (Arts. 7-9) does not specifically address itself to the publication validity of a dissertation or allied work. The only reference to such a work is in the example following Art. 9(11) which essentially states that a thesis issued publicly for permanent scientific record in a printed or microfiche edition of multiple copies is a valid publication whereas a thesis deposited in a library and only issued in multiple copies as xerox or microfilm is not a publication.

7. This cannot be regarded as a definitive statement, particularly in view of the discussions and comments on the validity of microform for publication (e.g. Crosskey *et al.*, 1977, Durham, 1977, Sarjeant, 1977, Sohn, 1977, Dickins, 1978). Further, as discussed, the use of the word 'multiple' plus the imprecise use of xerox (vs. xerographic) detracts even more from the usefulness of the statement.

8. There exists among certain zoologists the arbitrary point of view that if they have access to a copy of a specific dissertation, thesis etc., they regard it as a valid publication, while on the contrary, those that do not have access to the work arbitrarily reject it as invalid. Thus, due to the lack of a definitive ruling by the Commission the Law of Priority is in danger of degenerating into a "Law of Have or Have Not." Copies of most dissertations can be obtained by one means or another but whether these dissertations can be regarded as 'readily available' is a moot point.

9. If dissertations are to be regarded as publications the Commission must address itself to the question of whether other works pursued towards degrees below the doctorate level, e.g. master, bachelor, diploma, are valid publications. Indeed, one might be forced to consider the validity of 'special project' or 'term' papers. Bearing in mind the literature proliferation in 'accepted' journals the thought of validation of the above, which doubtless contain valuable data, is interesting.

10. The Commission might consider the following. Numerous dissertations are deposited in libraries or distributed privately.

Some dissertations are 'printed' and distributed. These latter dissertations invariably bear the publishing house *imprimatur*. Might the *imprimatur* be considered as a criterion of publication validity?

11. We wish to support the statement by Durham, (1977, p.9) who stated that 'the Commission should give major attention to the goals that need to be satisfied in legal "publication" and try to establish rules which will serve as legal "guidelines" rather than prescribing certain techniques and proscribing others'.

12. In the interests of the Principle of Priority (Art. 23) and in order to elucidate the Criteria of Publication (Arts. 7-9) the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is petitioned to:

Provide a definitive, unequivocal, statement on the publication validity of dissertations *et al.*, irrespective of availability and reproduction criteria.

The following scientists within our Corporation support this petition:

W.H. Akers
R.C. Blaisdell
K.D. Berry
E.J. Bolin
F. Bourgeois
E.W. Christensen
C.S. Collie
A.E. Dresser
W.S. Drugg
K.L. Finger
G.W. Gregory

J.E. Kilgore
B. Kohl
W.J. Lewis
D. Mason
M. Polugar
G.S. Robinson
N.J. Tartamella
W.P.S. Ventress
P.R. Wesendunk
V.D. Wiggins
C.F. Williams

We are indebted to Chevron Oil Field Research Company for permission to submit this petition.

REFERENCES

- CLARK, R.B., 1979. Draft third edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: Further Comments by Zoologists. Z.N.(S.)2250, (1) Chapter III, Criteria of Publication Arts. 7-9; *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 35, pt. 3, pp. 136-138.
- CROSSKEY, R.W. et al., 1977, Comments on microform as publication; Z.N.(S.)2182, (2); *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 34, pt. 3, pp. 134-135.
- DICKINS, J.M., 1978. Comment on microform as publication Z.N.(S.)2182; *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 34, pt. 4, p. 201.
- DURHAM, J.W., 1977, The status of microform as publication Z.N.(S.)2182; *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 34, pt. 1, p. 9.
- NEAVE, S.A., 1939, *Nomenclator Zoologicus*. The Zoological Society of London, v. 1-4 et supp.

- SARJEANT, W.A.S., 1977. The status of microform as publication Z.N.(S.) 2182; *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 34, pt. 1, pp. 9-10.
- SOHN, I.G., 1977. Comments on microform as publication Z.N.(S.)2182; *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 34, pt. 3, pp. 133, 134.
- STEYSKAL, 1979. Draft third edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: Further Comments by Zoologists Z.N.(S.)2250, Miscellaneous Comments; *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 35, pt. 3, pp. 138-144.

THAIDIDAE (GASTROPODA): PROPOSED AMENDMENT
OF ENTRY IN THE OFFICIAL LIST OF FAMILY-GROUP
NAMES IN ZOOLOGY. Z.N.(S.)2307

By W.O. Cernohorsky (*Auckland Institute and Museum,
Auckland, New Zealand*).

In Opinion 886 (1969) the Commission placed the family-group name THAIDIDAE Suter, 1912 on the Official List of Family Group names in Zoology, Name No. 439, the original reference being Man. N.Z. Moll: 42.

2. It appears that this will need to be emended in view of the existence of an earlier usage of the name as follows:

THAISIDAE Suter, 1900, *Subantarctic Islands of New Zealand*, Art. 1: 1-57

THAISIDAE Jousseaume, 1888, *Mém. Soc. zool. France* vol. 1: 165-223

3. The International Commission is therefore requested to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology THAIDIDAE (correction of THAISIDAE) Jousseaume, 1888, *Mém. Soc. zool. France* vol. 1: 179.

4. I have already mentioned the earlier authorship in *Rec. Auckland Inst. Mus.* Vol. 15: 76, 1978.

5. At the same time, the name THAISIDAE Jousseaume, 1888, should be placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology as an incorrect original spelling of THAIDIDAE.



Haman, D and Huddleston, R W. 1980. "Criteria Of Publication And A Petition To The International Commission For Zoological Nomenclature For A Definitive Ruling On The Publication Validity Of Dissertations Et al." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 37, 145–148.

<https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.5157>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44479>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.5157>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/5157>

Holding Institution

Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by

Natural History Museum Library, London

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.