

TRICHOPTERA NEWSLETTER

=====

No. 16

APRIL, 1989

Dear Trichopterologist,

The outstanding event of this year is the 6th Symposium on Trichoptera in Poland. Please find some information about it in this number.

In Newsletter no.15 I asked you to complete a form and to return it to me. After 15 years, the list of addresses must be revised. It makes no sense to send the Newsletter to people who have moved, died or cannot be found. In many countries the postal services do not return printed matter. Also, I wanted to know the general feeling about some other questions.

Of approximately 400 copies sent out, 117 forms were returned which means a response of 30%. If this is a complete response, it means a loss of 70% in the post. If this should be true, the circulation system must be revised. However I do not believe it, and ask now that all those who have not sent back the form, should use the last page of the present no.16. Those who have not responded to either request may be deleted from the mailing list. Each copy costs about 3 US \$ which should not be wasted.

Many colleagues have given useful hints and personal comments. I am grateful for all of this; please understand that I cannot answer all of them personally.

You may be interested in the general opinions on the questions asked.

One point of discussion was about using the Newsletter for short scientific contributions. Using it for short contributions without nomenclatorial consequences was supported by 88; 15 were opposed, and 13 had no comment. Using it for contributions with nomenclatorial consequences (descriptions of new taxa etc.) was supported by 30; 65 were opposed, and 21 had no comment. From a democratic point of view, the results are clear. But this is not a matter just for a majority decision. From the answers, it became clear that those who have easy access to formal journals were opposing the idea of including descriptions of new taxa, but those who have not such access, generally agreed with this idea. So I ask all readers to find a better solution. Among the 117 who responded, 19 were editors of scientific journals, and 22 were members of the editorial boards of such. I am therefore asking all these colleagues to send me short notes of the conditions under which their journals will accept taxonomic papers, and whether they are willing to support this proposal. Provided there is no page charge, and the texts are published within a reasonable time (i.e. less than one year), I would be glad to include as many such notes as possible in the next Newsletter. Meanwhile I have, in spite of the strong

minority who agrees with it, no reason to reject this kind of contribution, so one of these papers is enclosed here.

Among the conditions required for an acceptance of taxonomic papers in the Newsletter were the following: quality of reproduction; coverage by abstracting services; circulation and keeping by libraries; peer-reviewing.

The reproduction quality is poor, and as shown below, there is no hope of improving it under the present conditions.

Coverage by the main abstracting services: This is not my job, and I have no idea about the policy of editors to include or exclude journals. This policy is obviously purely commercial in many cases, so that many local and regional journals are not covered. But I am thinking as a scientist, so I try to include all relevant papers in the Newsletter; this is the purpose of our literature list.

Circulation and availability in libraries: The Trichoptera Newsletter has now an ISSN-number and is therefore available through the Austrian National Library which is one of the largest in the world. If any other libraries wish to have it, they are free to ask for it, and they will get it under the same conditions as everyone else.

Peer-reviewing: This is a controversial topic. In my opinion, peer-reviewing of manuscripts is, to vary a well-known expression by the Austrian writer Karl Kraus, ... 'that sickness which considers itself to be its own therapy'. It may prevent major mistakes, but it also hinders individual creative work. A glance at current literature may confirm this.

I also asked for opinions on holding future symposia in temporal and spatial proximity to other meetings. The answers were as follows:

Plecoptera Symposia:	53 Yes	20 No	43 no answer
Ephemeroptera Symposia:	49	21	46
SJL-Congresses:	35	28	53
International Congresses of Entomology:	33	34	49

Other meetings proposed were: Meetings of the NABS (3 Yes), on Odonata (1), Chironomidae (1) and various others (2). So I feel that there is no urgent need to change the present system of organizing our Symposia.

Finally, but no less important is the question of money. Until now, my Institute has paid the cost of the Newsletters, but I cannot expect that it will do this for ever. With only two exceptions, all colleagues have agreed to pay for the Newsletter if necessary, but 16 have no convertible currency.

(By the way, a point of information for all Americans: The US \$ is indeed a convertible currency !). The Newsletter is now produced at extremely low

cost. All the necessary work, including typing, sorting, stencilling and mailing, is done by myself. Printing is done by a friend with his private Gestetner machine, who asks only for the cost of paper and printing ink. Including the envelopes, postage and the estimated costs of the distributors this means a cost of 3 US \$ per copy. If money were to be asked for, it would mean including the shared cost for those who cannot pay, and including the cost of collecting the money from about 40 countries, a price of 5 US \$ per copy. According to the answers, the maximum which individuals are willing to pay, is between 1 and 20 US \$. A price of 5 US \$ would be accepted by 30 workers, but it is too high for 41. Reducing the size of the Newsletter to half-format would result in a price of 4 US \$ which is acceptable for 32, but too high for 39. So I cannot see, for the moment, any solution other than to continue in the present way. Any commercial production would increase the cost very much.

In October last year I was in Yugoslavia with Ciril Krusnik, searching for breeding material of limnephilids. We were successful and found practically all species 'on the wing' at this season (some of them are unable to fly), including rarities such as *Potamophylax winneguthi*, *Anitella apfelbecki*, *Chaetopteryx goricensis*, *Ch. clara* and *Vareshiana singularis*, and a new species, *Chaetopteryx marinkovicæ*. All species oviposited, and the larvae are now growing well in my laboratory.

With all the best wishes,

Yours Hans Malicky

x x x x x x x x x x x x x

Cover: The world's first caddisfly stamp?

The United Nations Postal Administration has announced the issue of six stamps on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the UN Office in Vienna. One of the stamps, created by the Austrian artist Rudolf Hausner, depicts a phantastic object of which the wings are obviously those of a caddisfly. It is not a realistic caddisfly, but after about 3000 butterfly and moth stamps issued by many countries, this appears to be the first stamp with a caddisfly - or does someone know another one?

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Trichoptera Newsletter](#)

Jahr/Year: 1989

Band/Volume: [16](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Malicky Hans

Artikel/Article: [Dear Trichopterologist 3-5](#)