

# Species Limits in Birds: A Response to Watson

**D**avid M. Watson (2005) purports to propose a whole new set of methods for avian taxonomic studies, but his arguments actually amount to a misguided attempt to bolster the phylogenetic species concept (PSC). His first claim, that bird taxonomy depends on field marks, misses the point that subtle but crucial distinctions in plumage and morphometrics are often revealed by hand-held material. His second, that use of field marks represents a consistent bias, is contradicted by his own graphs, which show distributional, behavioral, and habitat data being used more in new avian descriptions than for other taxa. The only evidence that bird studies miss, *fide* Watson's charts, is internal morphology, but this is also rare in amphibian and reptile

studies. He confidently presumes that rectifying this omission will improve avian taxonomy, but produces no evidence that internal morphology might indeed be of value: syringeal studies are not new (and should anyway be reflected in vocal characters), while skeletal characters perform weakly at the species level.

Watson then suggests that molecular information is also overlooked by avian studies, but his data reveal genetic characters in use just as often in bird descriptions as elsewhere. No light is shed by his example of a bird showing "deep genetic division" between two morphologically similar populations, and his implication that earlier taxonomists were biased in their treatment of this bird is baffling, considering the novelty

of molecular techniques. In any case, genetic studies, like skeletal characters, are far from unequivocal in species-level assessments.

Nevertheless, Watson suggests that birdwatchers and checklist committees inhibit "the widespread acceptance of valid species," describing the latter's decisions as "merely opinions." He complains this is "at the expense of...new taxonomic concepts" and resents the dominance in ornithology of the biological species concept (BSC), yet later he asserts this "is not a 'splitting vs. lumping' issue, nor is it a question of...choice of species concepts"! He criticizes Collar's view that the number of PSC species would be "prohibitively large" as (a) fundamentally incorrect

## 2005 Tyler Prize



The Tyler Prize Medallion

**Charles David Keeling**  
Scripps Institution of Oceanography  
University of California, San Diego

**Lonnie G. Thompson**  
Byrd Polar Research Center  
The Ohio State University

*Tyler Prize*

The Tyler Prize was established in 1973 by the late John and Alice Tyler as an international award honoring achievements in environmental science, policy, energy and health of worldwide importance conferring great benefit on humanity. The Tyler Prize consists of a cash award of \$200,000 and a gold Tyler Prize medallion.

**T** Tyler Prize Executive Committee announces the awarding of the 2005 Tyler Prize for Environmental Achievement on its thirty-second anniversary to Dr. Charles David Keeling, Professor, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego and Dr. Lonnie G. Thompson, University Professor, Byrd Polar Research Center of Ohio State University. Drs. Keeling and Thompson are recognized for their pioneering research, which has laid the foundation for and provided the clearest evidence of the growing impact of global climate change.

Charles David Keeling is recognized for his rigorous time series measurements of atmospheric carbon dioxide and their interpretation. These carefully made observations conducted over four and a half decades, and continued today, have revealed world wide increases in carbon dioxide with striking spatial and temporal patterns of variability that show relationships between the carbon cycle and climate, and reveal unanticipated links between these components and the earth system. From his remarkable lifetime of scientific investigations, we know that humans are altering the global physical environment. Web: [http://earthguide.ucsd.edu/globalchange/keeling\\_curve/01.html](http://earthguide.ucsd.edu/globalchange/keeling_curve/01.html)

Lonnie G. Thompson is recognized for his pioneering work in the collection and analysis of valuable climatic information contained in tropical glacier ice cores from all over the world. These tropical ice cores have provided understanding of paleoclimatic conditions against which current climate changes can be compared. The high altitude collection of these evidences of past climatic conditions is a heroic feat of mountaineering that requires courage, daring and physical endurance comparable to the legendary explorers of yore. Web: <http://www.geology.ohio-state.edu/modules.php?op=modload&name=Faculty&id=thompson.3@osu.edu&file=faculty.profile>

For additional information contact Dr. Linda E. Duguay, Executive Director, The Tyler Prize  
Phone (213) 740-9760, Fax (213) 740-1313,  
Email [tylerprz@usc.edu](mailto:tylerprz@usc.edu) • Home Page [www.usc.edu/tylerprize](http://www.usc.edu/tylerprize)

The Tyler Prize is administered by the University of Southern California

and (b) irrelevant. But how can he be sure of (a)? Any geographically isolated yet morphologically ill-distinguished population might prove in some degree genetically distinct. How many such populations are there in the world? Thousands? Millions? And if the question is irrelevant because what matters is “to discern the total number of evolutionarily distinct units as accurately as possible,” then what is Watson’s objection to *subspecies*, which can also represent evolutionarily distinct units?

Meanwhile, Watson ignores the PSC’s fundamental problem with character triviality. How minor can a character be before (in what will essentially be “merely opinion”) it gets discounted as defining an evolutionarily distinct unit? Watson accuses the BSC of fueling “unreliable and unstable taxonomies,” but these are more likely to result from PSC-type approaches. When Cracraft (1992) assessed the birds of paradise (Paradisaeidae) on PSC principles, the number of species changed from 40–42 to 80–120, a jump in uncertainty over species limits from 5% to 50%. This kind of problem will emerge repeatedly with PSC-type applications to avifaunas, and it will not be resolved by methods imported from other taxonomic disciplines.

NIGEL J. COLLAR  
 Department of Zoology  
 Downing Street  
 University of Cambridge  
 Cambridge CB2 3EJ, United Kingdom

CLAIRE N. SPOTTISWOODE  
 Department of Zoology  
 Downing Street  
 University of Cambridge  
 Cambridge CB2 3EJ, United Kingdom

#### References cited

- Cracraft JA. 1992. The species of the birds-of-paradise (Paradisaeidae): Applying the phylogenetic species concept to a complex pattern of diversification. *Cladistics* 8: 1–43.
- Watson DM. 2005. Diagnosable versus distinct: Evaluating species limits in birds. *BioScience* 55: 60–68.

#### Response from Watson

**C**ollar and Spottiswoode clearly missed the point. I did not “propose a whole new set of methods,” advocate a particular species concept, or recommend any technique as definitive. Rather, I evaluated current practice in bird taxonomy to learn how species-limit decisions are made in ornithology.

*My central tenet is that birds are treated differently than other vertebrates; birds are described and diagnosed primarily using traits we can see and hear under field conditions. This is not an unqualified opinion nor a position statement, but an objective conclusion based on quantitative analyses of species descriptions during the last decade. Using detailed case studies, I demonstrate that field marks do not necessarily represent overall variation—some birds vary in ways we cannot detect in the field. Instead of dismissing this issue or ignoring the associated implications, I proposed several solutions. Using morphology, anatomy, molecular differences,*

*or any other objective attributes, we can complement these visible characteristics and improve our understanding of how many species we are really dealing with. And yes, this will result in more species under any species concept. This is neither good nor bad; it’s merely a better representation of actual diversity.*

DAVID M. WATSON  
 Applied Ornithology Group,  
 Johnstone Centre  
 Charles Sturt University  
 Albury, New South Wales 2640,  
 Australia

#### Letters to the Editor

*BioScience*  
 1444 I Street, NW, Suite 200  
 Washington, DC 20005  
 E-mail: bioscience@aibs.org

The staff of *BioScience* reserves the right to edit letters for clarity without notifying the author. Letters are published as space becomes available.

## College-level Biology Software

Simulations in ecology,  
 physiology, evolution,  
 behavior, etc

(>40 programs)

For both **Windows** and  
**Macintosh**

Checkout **Oakleaf Systems** website  
 for program descriptions



[www.oakleafsystems.net](http://www.oakleafsystems.net)