

**Comments on *Spracklandus* Hoser, 2009 (Reptilia, Serpentes, ELAPIDAE): request for confirmation of the availability of the generic name and for the nomenclatural validation of the journal in which it was published (Case 3601; see *BZN* 70: 234-237; comments *BZN* 71:30-38, 133-135).**

**(1) Raymond T. Hoser, Snakebusters, hands on reptiles, PO Box 599, Doncaster, Victoria, 3108. Victoria, Australia. (email [snakeman \(at\) snakeman.com.au](mailto:snakeman@snakeman.com.au))**

The following rebuts published comments in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature (BZN)* against the above case as published in December 2013 (Hoser 2013b) as published to end June 2014. Background information to the case is in Hoser (2012a) as cited herein and that publication should be read before the relevant material before the ICZN.

What follows is written on the basis that the following publications have been read first (and preferably in chronological order). These are Hoser (2009), Wüster (2009), Wallach *et al.* (2009), Hoser (2012a), Kaiser (2012a, 2012b), Hoser (2012b), Kaiser *et al.* (2013), Hoser (2013), Kaiser (2013), Hoser (2013b), Kaiser (2014), Schleip (2014a), Wüster *et al.* (2014), Thomson (2014) and relevant material cited within these documents. The last four "papers" or "comments" were published in *BZN* in March and June 2014.

Specifically what follows rebuts Kaiser (2014), Schleip (2014a), Wüster *et al.* (2014) and Thomson (2014) only.

Any comments that may be published later in *BZN* are not addressed herein. The rebuttal of the assertions within these four papers is published within *AJH* for the purpose of wide dissemination.

Correspondents on the internet list servers "Taxacom" and the "ICZN list" correctly dismissed the claims of Kaiser (2014a), the similar document Kaiser (2014b), Schleip (2014a) and Wüster *et al.* (2014) as "bluster" (Various authors, 2014a, 2014b).

One response was that:

"the comments submitted by his (Hoser's) enemies (Case 3601) are absolutely laughable in terms of the Code!"

(Thorpe 2014).

This view was repeated in similar words by Dubois (2014), Wellington (2014b, 2014c) and others.

Furthermore all claims raised by Kaiser (2014a), Schleip (2014a), Wüster *et al.* (2014) and Thomson (2014a) are merely a rehash of earlier discredited claims of Kaiser (2012a, 2012b, 2013) and Kaiser *et al.* (2013). These were rebutted in detail by Hoser (2012a) (specific to the *Spracklandus* matter) and Hoser (2012b, 2012c) and Dubois (2014) in relation

to other issues alleged by the group.

However I deal briefly with some of the points for purpose of rebuttal (again), noting that these have been published without direct rebuttal within the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature (BZN)* and may not be known to the relevant audience.

The claim by Kaiser (2014a, 2014b) and Schleip (2014b) that my (Hoser) papers fail to comply with "Article 8.1.1 of the Code" (Ride *et al.* 1999) has been correctly dismissed by taxonomist Stephen Thorpe on 29 April 2014 as "reading into the Code what suits their agenda, and not what is actually written!"

(Various authors 2014a, 2014b).

Claims by Kaiser (2014a) that the Hoser works have been criticized by others (invariably from within his small group) have no bearing on the nomenclature and the case for ICZN confirmation of the nomenclatural availability within the Zoological Code of the name *Spracklandus* Hoser, 2019 (Hoser 2009).

In any event, criticism of scientific papers, even if labelled by critics as "unscientific" is common and normal scientific discourse.

Kaiser has not in fact produced any evidence to suggest that *AJH* Issue 7 did not comply with Article 8.1.3 of the code.

The final product distributed of *AJH* Issue 7 is no different to other acknowledged code-compliant papers published daily. It was published with ink on paper in numerous durable copies.

An alleged printing defect in terms of printing quality control as identified by Kaiser (2014b) does not in any way make *AJH* Issue 7 invalid under the code or Article 8 of the code.

Kaiser's statement that "I have seen no proof that there were ever more than a handful of copies produced" is meaningless. Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence!

Furthermore at no stage has Kaiser, Wallach, Wüster, Broadley or Schleip asked the logical question of me as to whom and where original copies were distributed to.

Hoser (2012a) stated that:

“All issues of *AJH* were published in hard copy (over 100 originals of each) and later online, being posted online on average 10 days after the print copies were first received and distributed, by which stage receipts from recipients had been received and archived.”

None of Kaiser, Schleip or Wüster *et al.* have ever produced a shred of evidence to contradict this obvious fact or properly sought contradictory evidence!

The four grounds used by Kaiser (2014b) alleged to declare *AJH* was in violation of Article 8.1.3. of the code are not valid. In detailed response:

1/ It was published “‘in an edition,’ in the usual meaning and understanding of this word”, and even cited as such by his close colleagues Wallach *et al.* (2009), page 34;

2/ There is uncontradicted evidence that ‘numerous’ copies were made (e.g. Hoser 2012a); the only evidence provided by Kaiser, Wallach, Wüster, Broadley or Schleip is that they made a point of deliberately not making proper or reasonable enquiries as to where copies were distributed to. This included not bothering to check the most likely repositories, such as *Zoological Record* as specified in the code (Recommendation 8A) or persons named in etymologies in the relevant papers;

3/ The original copies were all identical, including in words, fonts, pagination, margins and all other relevant details;

4/ The copies were ‘durable’ in the commonly accepted meaning of the word including being made on high quality white gloss paper (superior to that of most other published journals) and printed in black ink.

Furthermore all Kaiser’s claims against the method of printing of *AJH* in terms of potential code compliance (repeated in part by Wüster *et al.* 2014) are in fact rejected by their own colleague Schleip (2014a) in point 5.

Kaiser has not made a submission to the ICZN to adopt his right of veto for scientific names as outlined in Kaiser *et al.* (2013). Therefore the ICZN cannot issue a ruling in relation to it. In any event, Kaiser *et al.* (2013) steps outside of the Code’s express statement:

“(1) The Code refrains from infringing upon taxonomic judgment, which must not be made subject to regulation or restraint.”

(Eipper 2013).

Kaiser’s threat of mass disobedience against the code in the event of a judgement in favour of *Spracklandus* (Kaiser 2014a), was repeated by his good friends Wüster *et al.* (2014), Thomson (2014) and Schleip (2014a) who said “‘If the Commission,

however, were to vote in favor of Case 3601 and declare the name *Spracklandus* Hoser, 2009 available ... I predict that the majority of herpetologists will follow the recommendations of Kaiser *et al.* (2013) and continue to ignore *AJH* as a reliable source for nomenclatural and taxonomic information.”

This is the same threat made in *BZN* in relation to the Wells and Wellington papers and names proposed within them made by Stone (1988) and others.

Stone (1988) wrote:

“If the Commission takes no action with respect to the nomenclature proposed in these publications other scientists may of course choose to ignore that obligation.”

King (1988) made identical comments to Kaiser *et al.* (2013) when he said:

“If they (the ICZN) fail to do so (suppress the works of Wells and Wellington) they will jeopardise the survival of the system of nomenclature which we all use.”

Following the ICZN’s judgement in favour of the alleged taxonomic vandals (Wells and Wellington) (ICZN 1991) there was no mass disobedience against the code as foreshadowed by Stone (1988) or King (1988) and in the fullness of time the original code-compliant names were accepted and widely used (Shea 2013, Cogger 2014a) and the code survived intact. This usage included the original code-compliant names being used by authors in favour of the junior synonyms coined by the protesters who had hoped the ICZN would formally suppress the earlier code-compliant papers (Shea 2013, Cogger 2014a).

Kaiser’s claim to represent “the herpetological community” (as also made by Wüster *et al.* 2014) is false as demonstrated by Wellington (2013), Wells (2014) and others, but again no different to the claims made by those seeking to suppress the Wells and Wellington papers (Australian Society of Herpetologists 1987, ICZN 1991) so claims made by Kaiser in this alleged respect must also be rejected.

Furthermore the campaign of hatred against all things “Hoser” contrived by Wüster *et al.* is based on obvious lies as seen in many places (e.g. Hunter *et al.* 2004), or including the Wikipedia page they regularly edit (Wikipedia 2004-2014), including for example their ridiculous claim that I have killed six people including my own 10-year old daughter! (Wüster *et al.* 2004-2014).

Furthermore the only pseudoscience documents relevant to the application in Case 3601 are Wallach *et al.* (2009) and peripherally Kaiser *et al.* (2013).

Schleip’s claim: “The existence of this outlet (*AJH*)

was primarily proclaimed in herpetoculture internet forums, and zoologists unlikely to participate in such forums were widely unaware of its existence (see the Code, Appendix B.8, General recommendations)."

(Schleip 2014a) was known to be false to the editors of *BZN* and should have been screened out prior to publication.

In the pre-checking of Case 3601, the ICZN secretariat independently established that *AJH* was sent to numerous places including *Zoological Record* as the most important part of the code's "wide dissemination" recommendation (Recommendation 8A).

Significantly, Schleip's claim is also refuted by his close friend Wuster, who wrote:

"You have been accused of many things. Lack of dissemination of your articles has not been one of them"

(Wuster 2009).

Schleip's claim:

"However, on the date the issue (Issue 7 of *AJH*) was distributed, it was not obtainable by the public." is patently false and should not have been printed in *BZN*. *AJH* was available at all relevant times.

Schleip (2014a) stated:

"In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it is not possible to determine whether or not the copies were printed in accordance with Article 8.1.3 or 'printed on demand.'"

which is a direct rebuttal of Kaiser (2014a) and his unscientific assertion:

"I believe this shows that there really was no print run of 'numerous identical and durable copies'."

The account by Wüster in terms of the availability of *AJH* and the relevant website is incorrect. Printed issues have always been offered for sale, the price of each determined by size. I have often chosen to waive fees to persons requesting issues or photocopies of papers, as was the case with Wallach in 2009.

As each issue of the journal is/was published, the relevant details are added to the relevant part/s of the website in accordance with similar practices by publishers of other scientific literature.

I note that Wüster has not produced any publicly available screen dumps to support his claims of changes of pricing policy of *AJH* and such would not affect the availability of the name *Spracklandus* in any event.

The claim by Wüster *et al.* (2014) that Hoser had unethically scooped their own allegedly pending work by naming *Spracklanus* is rebutted by Wüster himself in Wüster (2009) where six days after the

publication of Hoser (2009a), he condemned the taxonomy in that paper to a global audience and added:

"The case for keeping it (*Naja*) as a single genus was made by Wüster *et al.* 2007."

His mate Bryan Fry followed this on the same date with:

"Wolfgang's 2007 paper already considered the higher order taxonomy of cobras and quite rightly lumped them into a single genus."

(Fry 2009).

Hoser (2009) had clearly rejected Wüster's own published taxonomy and the appropriate code-compliant nomenclature of Hoser (2009) namely *Spracklandus* Hoser, 2009, followed from this.

From the content of Wüster (2009) it is clear that Wüster *et al.* amended their own taxonomic views to align with those of Hoser, well after the publication of Hoser (2009). That meant it was not possible for Hoser to have improperly knowingly "scooped" any work or ideas of Wüster at the time Hoser (2009) was published because in summary Wüster had a different view.

Hence Wüster has knowingly lied to a global audience by more recently alleging I had deliberately sought to scoop his (alleged) work.

In other words, the original submissions by Kaiser (2014a), Schleip (2014a) and Wüster *et al.* (2014) in terms of Case 3601 and other Hoser publications are a collection of misrepresentations and lies.

These men have repeated these in *BZN* the hope that by repetition they will be believed.

The comments by Thomson (2014a) in *BZN* are merely a rehash of those of Wüster *et al.* (2014) and have already been rebutted.

Of note however Thomson has failed to declare to the ICZN his own vested interests in the matter. In 2009, he stepped outside the Code to recklessly overwrite the proper names of Wells (2007) for various tortoise genera and species, using the same creative interpretation of the code as Kaiser (2014a) and Schleip (2014b). This reckless destabilization of the code and the names coined by Thomson and Georges (2009) were comprehensively rejected by the majority of herpetologists as seen in Cogger (2014a), in favour of the correct code-compliant Wells (2007) names that had been assigned on the basis of robust scientific data.

In the face of this, Thomson has continued to recklessly promote his incorrect nomenclature in breach of the code in places such as Wikipedia (Thomson 2014b).

Hence the Thomson (2014a) claim that:

"We are heading down a path that will make nomenclatural instability the norm for decades." is a

direct result of the actions of Thomson and Wüster *et al.* and not those of others. Whether he engages in more destabilizing actions is up to him and no one else.

Noting that Thomson's own code-violating taxonomic vandalism (Thomson and Georges, 2009) is not addressed by the counter-proposals of Wüster *et al.* (2014) and himself (Thomson 2014a), it is clear that the ICZN must support the original Hoser proposal for Case 3601 in order to promote nomenclatural stability and reaffirm the need for zoologists to put the stability of the code ahead of their own personal self-gratification.

As presented, Kaiser (2014a), Schleip (2014a), Wüster *et al.* (2014) and Thomson (2014), provide no hard evidence to rebut any element of Case 3601 as originally published in *BZN*.

Cogger (2013, 2014a, 2014b), Dubois (2014), Eipper (2013), Mutton (2014), Shea (2013a-d), Thorpe (2013, 2014a, 2014b), Wellington (2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c), Wells (2013, 2014), and many other eminent herpetologists have already condemned the grander Kaiser scheme to rename hundreds of valid taxa by numerous authors with their own coined names.

This makes a mockery of the claim by Kaiser (2014b) that he has broad agreement within the herpetological community for his plan to step outside the Zoological Code (Kaiser 2012b).

He does not!

In a public online forum Wells told Wüster and Schleip:

"what you and others are doing in this regard is highly contemptuous of the authority of the ICZN" (Wells 2013).

On 21/05/2013 21:28, on the Taxacom forum Stephen Thorpe wrote:

"At the end of the day, Wolfgang, you are just complaining about the authorship of names which may have to be used as valid ... complaining that they are not yours (or those of people you choose to consider to be colleagues)! This isn't a big issue!" (Thorpe 2013).

Shea (2013a), described Kaiser's plan (Kaiser *et al.* 2013) as being "ridiculous and unworkable", Eipper (2013) noted:

"You cannot use a viewpoint - to act as a veto- to disregard the use of the code."

More recently, on 5 July 2014, Schleip published a paper (Schleip 2014b) renaming *Leiopython hoserae* Hoser, 2000, with his own coined name "*L. meridionalis*". Schleip made the false claim Hoser (2000) did not comply with 8.1.1 of the code (invoking Kaiser *et al.* 2013 and Kaiser 2014b), which reversed his own position in Schleip (2008),

Schleip and O'Shea (2010) and even Kaiser *et al.* (2013) all of whom accepted and used the correct Hoser (2000) name.

Significantly, Schleip (2014b) was published in the face of advice by two separate expert reviewers that his paper's claims against Hoser (2000) were false and that he would be acting in contempt of the Zoological Code (Shea 2014, Raw, 2014). Shea formally recommended REJECTION of the Schleip paper to the editors of *Journal of Herpetology*. The publication of Schleip (2014b) was also condemned by Wellington (2014c), Uetz (2014) and others including former ICZN Commissioner Hal Cogger within hours of its appearance online (Cogger 2014b).

Uetz (2014) asked:

"How can this go past a reviewer or editor?"

In spite of this, within 24 hours of online publication of Schleip (2014b), Wüster and Schleip had managed to cross-post links to the paper on Facebook and elsewhere online more than 200 times!

Hedges *et al.* (2014) used the Kaiser "veto" to overwrite the previously accepted and used *Argyrophis* Gray, 1845 with their own coined name, seriously destabilizing the nomenclature of the Blindsnakes.

Case 3601 as originally put by myself should therefore be upheld by the ICZN Commissioners.

Based on the ongoing actions by Wüster, Kaiser, Schleip and associates detailed herein it is in the interests of long-term nomenclatural stability that the ICZN Commissioners act decisively.

They need to make a strong statement condemning the actions of Kaiser *et al.* who have aggressively operated in contempt of the code (Wellington 2014b).

Failure to do so *will* destabilize taxonomy and nomenclature. This is because like-minded individuals including Thomson, Hedges *et al.* and others will otherwise continue to seek to invoke the Kaiser "veto" and expand its use, as a bogus justification to recklessly overwrite long-established code-compliant names of scientists totally unconnected with myself (Hoser) in any way, whose works they seek to steal (Eipper 2013).

The issue is not "Hoser" but the stability of the code. The ICZN must protect the code from vandals like Kaiser *et al.* and those who will emulate them to create nomenclatural chaos if their current campaign is successful.

#### REFERENCES CITED

Cogger, H. G. 2013. Email to Raymond Hoser. Dated 17 Aug 2013 14:09:26 +1000.

Cogger, H. G. 2014a. *Reptiles and Amphibians of*

- Australia, Seventh Edition, CSIRO Publishing, Sydney, NSW, Australia.
- Cogger, H. G. 2014b. Email to Raymond Hoser, 5 July.
- Dubois, A. 2014. Email to Raymond Hoser, 14 May.
- Eipper, S. 2013. Post on Facebook 16 December 2013.
- Fry, B. G. 2009. Re: Yikes, yikes, yikes, Naja nuked! Post on 29 March at: <http://www.venomousreptiles.org/forums/Experts/42293?page=2>
- Hedges, S. B., Marion, A. B., Lipp, K. M., Marin, J. and Vidal, N. 2014. A taxonomic framework for typhlopoid snakes from the Caribbean and other regions (Reptilia, Squamata). *Caribbean Herpetology*, 49:1-61.
- Hoser, R. T. 2000. A revision of the Australasian Pythons. *Ophidia Review* 1:7-27.
- Hoser, R. T. 2009. A reclassification of the True Cobras; species formerly referred to the genera *Naja*, *Boulengerina* and *Paranaja*. *Australasian Journal of Herpetology* 7 (2009):1-15. (23 March).
- Hoser, R. T. 2012a. Exposing a Fraud! *Afronaja* Wallach, Wüster and Broadley 2009, is a junior synonym of *Spracklandus* Hoser 2009! *Australasian Journal of Herpetology* 9:1-64.
- Hoser, R. T. 2012b. Robust taxonomy and nomenclature based on good science escapes harsh fact-based criticism, but remains unable to escape an attack of lies and deception. *Australasian Journal of Herpetology* 14:37-64.
- Hoser, R. T. 2013a. The science of herpetology is built on evidence, ethics, quality publications and strict compliance with the rules of nomenclature. *Australasian Journal of Herpetology* 18:2-79.
- Hoser, R. T. 2013b. Case 3601: *Spracklandus* Hoser, 2009 (Reptilia, Serpentes, ELAPIDAE): request for confirmation of the availability of the generic name and for the nomenclatural validation of the journal in which it was published. *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 70(4):234-237.
- Hunter, S. *et al.* 2006. Online petition to shut down Raymond Hoser, published at: <http://www.aussiereptileclassifieds.com/phpPETITION>
- ICZN 1991. Case 2531, Decision of the Commission: Three works by Richard W. Wells and C. Ross Wellington: proposed suppression for nomenclatural purposes. *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 48(4):337-338.
- ICZN 2001. Opinion 1970 *Odatria keithhornei* Wells & Wellington, 1985 (Reptilia, Squamata): specific name placed on the Official List. *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 58(1):74.
- Kaiser, H. 2012a. SPAM email sent out to numerous recipients on 5 June 2012.
- Kaiser, H. 2012b. Point of view. Hate article sent as attachment with SPAM email sent out 5 June 2012.
- Kaiser, H. 2013. The Taxon Filter, a novel mechanism designed to facilitate the relationship between taxonomy and nomenclature, vis-à-vis the utility of the Code's Article 81 (the Commission's plenary power). *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 70(4) December 2013:293-302.
- Kaiser, H. 2014a. Comments on *Spracklandus* Hoser, 2009 (Reptilia, Serpentes, ELAPIDAE): request for confirmation of the availability of the generic name and for the nomenclatural validation of the journal in which it was published (Case 3601; see *BZN* 70: 234–237). *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 7(1):30-35.
- Kaiser, H. 2014b. Best Practices in Herpetological Taxonomy: Errata and Addenda. *Herpetological Review*, 45(2):257-268.
- Kaiser, H., Crother, B. L., Kelly, C. M. R., Luiselli, L., O'Shea, M., Ota, H., Passos, P., Schleip, W. D. and Wüster, W. 2013. Best practices: In the 21st Century, Taxonomic Decisions in Herpetology are Acceptable Only When supported by a body of Evidence and Published via Peer-Review. *Herpetological Review* 44(1):8-23.
- King, M. 1988. Comments on the proposed suppression for nomenclature of three works by R. W. Wells and C. R. Wellington (Case 2531: see *BZN* 44: 116-121; 257-261 and 45: 52-54). *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 45(2):150-151.
- Mutton, N. 2014. Email (via Facebook) to Raymond Hoser, 30 May.
- Raw, L. 2014. Email to Raymond Hoser, 5 July.
- Ride, W. D. L. (*ed.*) *et al.* (on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature) 1999. International code of Zoological Nomenclature. The Natural History Museum - Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, UK (also commonly cited as "ICZN 1999").
- Schleip, W. D. 2008. Revision of the Genus *Leiopython* Hubrecht 1879 (Serpentes: Pythonidae) with the Redescription of Taxa Recently Described by Hoser (2000) and the Description of New Species. *Journal of Herpetology* 42(4):645-667.
- Schleip, W. D. and O'Shea, M. 2010. Annotated checklist of the recent and extinct pythons (Serpentes, Pythonidae), with notes on nomenclature, taxonomy, and distribution. *ZooKeys* 66:29-79.
- Schleip, W. D. 2014a. Comments on *Spracklandus* Hoser, 2009 (Reptilia, Serpentes, ELAPIDAE): request for confirmation of the availability of the generic name and for the nomenclatural validation

- of the journal in which it was published (Case 3601; see BZN 70: 234–237). *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 7(1):37–38.
- Schleip, W. D. 2014b. Two new species of *Leiopython* Hubecht (sic), 1879 (Pythonidae: Serpentes): Non-compliance with the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature leads to unavailable names in zoological nomenclature. *Journal of Herpetology* 48(2):272–275.
- Shea, G. 2013a. Email to Raymond Hoser dated Fri, 8 Mar 2013 04:29:39 +0000.
- Shea, G. 2013b. Post on Facebook at: <http://www.facebook.com/glenn.shea.73?ref=ts&fref=ts> on 8 March at 7.51 AM.
- Shea, G. 2013c. Post on Facebook on 20 March at: <http://www.facebook.com/glenn.shea.73?ref=ts&fref=ts#!/bryangrieg.fry?fref=ts>
- Shea, G. 2013d. Post on Facebook on 20 March at: <http://www.facebook.com/glenn.shea.73?ref=ts&fref=ts#!/bryangrieg.fry?fref=ts>
- Shea, G. 2014. Email to Raymond Hoser, 5 July.
- Stone, J. 1988. Comments on the proposed suppression for nomenclature of three works by R. W. Wells and C. R. Wellington (Case 2531: see BZN 44: 116–121 and 257–261). *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 45(1):53–54.
- Thomson, S. 2014a. Comment on *Spracklandus* Hoser, 2009 (Reptilia, Serpentes, Elapidae): request for confirmation of the availability of the generic name and for the nomenclatural validation of the journal in which it was published (Case 3601). *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 71(2):133–135.
- Thomson, S. 2014b. *Myuchelys* (Wikipedia page) including edit history and user:Faendalimas (online at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Myuchelys> and <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Myuchelys&action=history> and <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:Faendalimas> downloaded on 16 July 2014)
- Thomson, S. and Georges, A. 2009. *Myuchelys* gen. nov. a new genus for *Elseya latisternum* and related forms of Australian freshwater turtle (Testudines: Pleurodira: Chelidae). *Zootaxa* 2053:32–42
- Thorpe, S. 2013. Post to the Taxacom listserver, 21 May 2014.
- Thorpe, S. 2014. Email to ICZN, 29 April.
- Uetz, P. 2014. Leiopython: A wulf in schleip's clothing! Post on Taxacom forum on 5 July.
- Various authors (2014). ICZN List archives (January–June 2014), hosted at: <http://list.afriherp.org/mailman/private/iczn-list/>
- Various authors (2014). Taxacom archives (January–June 2014), hosted at: <http://taxacom.markmail.org/>
- Wallach, V., Wüster, W. and Broadley, D. G. 2009. In praise of subgenera: taxonomic status of cobras of the genus *Naja* Laurenti (Serpentes: Elapidae). *Zootaxa* 2236: 26–36 (2009), online paper downloaded from <http://www.mapress.com/zootaxa/2009/f/zt02236p036.pdf> on 27 September 2009, via <http://www.mapress.com/zootaxa/taxa/Reptilia.html>.
- Wellington, C. R. 2013. Post on Facebook 26 December.
- Wellington, C. R. 2014a. Post on Facebook wall of Scott Eipper 6 April.
- Wellington, C. R. 2014b. Response to Yanaga. Post on ICZN List 14 July 2014.
- Wellington, C. R. 2014c. Recent Article in Journal of Herpetology Threatens the Code. Post on ICZN List 14 July 2014.
- Wells, R. W. 2007. Some taxonomic and nomenclatural considerations on the class Reptilia in Australia. A new genus of the family Chelidae from eastern Australia. *Australian Biodiversity Record* (3):1–13.
- Wells, R. W. 2013. Post on Facebook 18 December.
- Wells, R. W. 2014. Post on Facebook wall of Scott Eipper, 6 April.
- Wikipedia 2004–2014. Edit history of Wikipedia page “Raymond Hoser” downloaded 8 June 2014.
- Wüster, W. 2009. Posts on internet chat forum at: <http://www.venomlist.com/forums/index.php?showtopic=24325&st=20>, 29 March 2009.
- Wüster, W., Broadley, D. G. and Wallach, V. 2014. Comments on *Spracklandus* Hoser, 2009 (Reptilia, Serpentes, ELAPIDAE): request for confirmation of the availability of the generic name and for the nomenclatural validation of the journal in which it was published (Case 3601; see BZN 70: 234–237). *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 7(1):37–38.
- Wüster, W., O'Shea, M. *et al.* (2004–2014) Wikipedia page “Raymond Hoser” downloaded 8 June 2014.

**Note: The preceding document is an extended version as submitted to the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (BZN) in 2014 and published in that journal in amended form in March 2015.**

**A summary of the substance of ICZN Case 3601, including correspondence to the ICZN from March 2012 in relation to the matter is to be found on pages 61–64 of *AJH* Issue 14, dated 30 June 2012.**

## Wolfgang Wüster and his contempt for the rules ... Facebook 8 August 2013.

The screenshot shows a Facebook thread with four posts. Each post includes a profile picture, the user's name, the text of the post, and interaction information like 'Like' and a count.

**Wolfgang Wüster** You would want to make sure that you have a broad consensus of opinion on your side before you try to overwrite a code-compliant name. Establishing and demonstrating this consensus within herpetology with respect to Hoser was the aim of the Kaiser et al. paper.  
about an hour ago · Like · 2

**James Mintram** So in a way, it was a "green light" for other scientists to overwrite any name listed that was given by Hoser. If a group of highly respected academics reject his work, and show the support in writing, it makes it valid for everybody else?  
about an hour ago · Like

**Wolfgang Wüster** Yes, exactly, a green light is a good way of putting it. It signals to those contemplating overwriting one of those names that they would have the support of a broad swathe of the herpetological community, and that others would use their new name rather than follow the Code to the letter. Reality trumps rules any day.  
56 minutes ago · Like · 2

**James Mintram** That's good to know. Although it would seem that a 'part 2' will be necessary soon.....LOL

Hoser 2015 - Australasian Journal of Herpetology 27:3-64.