Comments on the work ‘The White-cheeked Geese: Branta canadensis, B. maxima, B. lawrensis’, B. hutchinsii, B. leucopareia, and B. minima. Taxonomy, ecophysiographic relationships, biogeography, and evolutionary considerations, Volume 1, Eastern taxa; Volume 2, Western taxa, biogeography, and evolutionary considerations’ by Harold C. Hanson: proposed suppression for nomenclatural purposes
(Case 3682; see BZN 72: 209–216)

(1) Edward C. Dickinson
Flat 3, Bolsover Court, 19 Bolsover Road, Eastbourne BN20 7JG, U.K.
(e-mail: edward@asiaorn.org)
As a member of the Working Group on Avian Nomenclature of the International Ornithologists’ Union I contributed an opinion on the draft of the proposal by Banks, LeCroy & Schodde and supported their application. As Managing Editor of the 4th Edition of the Howard & Moore Complete Checklist of the Birds of the World, of which the non-passerine Volume appeared in 2014 co-edited with J.V. Remsen Jr., consideration was given to the Hanson monograph. At our request our friend Norbert Bahr listed the new taxa proposed in Hanson’s book. The three line introduction to that list (pp. 394–397 in the Checklist) stated that the Volumes awaited assessment by the American Ornithologists’ Union’s Committee on Classification and Nomenclature. The checklist editors decided to prevaricate in this way because they could not seriously accept Hanson’s proposals, but nor did they feel that authority to reject them in whole or in part lay elsewhere than with the competent North American ornithological community. We were already aware that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service considered Hanson’s work to be a major potential destabilisation of the debate about species limits in this complex and that many of the subspecific proposals were based on specimens collected in their winter quarters without knowledge of their home range and thus had the potential to create serious confusion.
I have no hesitation in recommending that the Commission consider the proposed suppression of this work to be both appropriate and justified.

(2) Daniel Klem, Jr.
Department of Biology, Muhlenberg College, 2400 W. Chew St., Allentown, PA 18104, U.S.A. (e-mail: klem@muhlenberg.edu)
I write to strongly support the requests stated in Case 3682 to suppress this work by Hanson. Banks et al. have given a compelling detailed description, explanation and rationale, which justify this critical action based on an objective and reasonable assessment of your defining and guiding Code.

(3) George Sangster
Department of Bioinformatics and Genetics, Swedish Museum of Natural History, P.O. Box 50007, SE–104 05 Stockholm, Sweden (e-mail: g.sangster@planet.nl)
Vladimir Yu. Arkhipov
Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Biophysics RAS, Pushchino, Moscow Oblast, 142290, Russia (e-mail: arkhivov@gmail.com)
We are writing to register our support for the proposed suppression of the work ‘The White-cheeked Geese. . .’ by Harold C. Hanson. Suppression of entire taxonomic works for nomenclatural purposes should be considered only in exceptional cases. We believe this is such a case. The aforementioned work introduces an extreme number of species-group names on the basis of inappropriately chosen types and inadequate diagnoses. These and other issues identified by Banks, LeCroy & Schodde (BZN 72: 209–216) would cause an unacceptable number of problems for ornithological nomenclature, which are best avoided by suppressing the entire two-volume work and placing it on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature.

I am in complete agreement with Banks, LeCroy and Schodde that the works by Hanson on white-cheeked geese (Branta) should be suppressed for purposes of nomenclature. As the authors have abundantly demonstrated, the works were undertaken with little or no regard or knowledge of proper nomenclatural procedures. It might also be noted that failure to suppress this work might actually discourage future researchers from undertaking the studies still needed to determine the extent and geographical limits of variation within this complex group, as no one would wish to be saddled with the unrewarding task of trying to relate their legitimate results to these confusing accounts by Hanson.
I strongly support the suppression of the work by Harold C. Hanson (2006–2007), as proposed by Banks, LeCroy & Schodde. The comprehensive work done by these authors clearly shows that, if not suppressed, Hanson’s work will create both nomenclatorial and taxonomic confusion and eventual chaos among those dealing with the taxa involved. Furthermore, I do not believe that any of the other options discussed by Banks, LeCroy & Schodde in their paragraph 11, other than complete nomenclatorial suppression of the entire work, will succeed in solving the great number of irregularities and flaws contained in Hanson’s work.

Letters of support for Case 3682 were also received from Daniel D. Gibson, (University of Alaska Museum, Fairbanks, Alaska, U.S.A.; e-mail: avesalaska@gmail.com), Bruce M. Beehler (Division of Birds, MRC 116, National Museum of Natural History, PO Box 37012, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC, U.S.A. 20013; e-mail: brucembeehler@gmail.com) and Jay M. Sheppard (Ornithological Literature, Laurel, Maryland, U.S.A.; e-mail: jaymsheppard95@gmail.com).

2. Illiger in Kugelann & Illiger (1798) introduced the name Obisium Illiger, 1798 for ‘Scorpio cancroïdes et cimicoïdes Fabr.’ [i.e. Acarus cancroïdes Linnaeus, 1758 and Scorpio cimicoïdes Fabricius, 1793] in a simple list of taxa. No diagnosis was