

The

# PHILATELIC EXHIBITOR

Volume II, No. Three

April, 1988



*Who is this man . . . ?  
See page 3*

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PHILATELIC EXHIBITORS

FOUNDED 1986

Recipient of Gold Medals

STaMpsHOW '87

MIDAPHIL '87

CHICAGOPEX '87

**ANDREW LEVITT, PHILATELIC CONSULTANT**  
*presents for your consideration*  
**THE WILLIAM LANDAU COLLECTION**

The Landau Collection of United States Stamps was assembled over a 40 year period by a knowledgeable philatelist with a penchant for quality. All stamps were selected for their superior centering, freshness, color and original gum. Many of the stamps are in never hinged condition and certified. The Collection encompasses virtually all significant 19th and 20th century issues, including the airmails. We present here a small sampling from the Landau Collection and invite your inquiry regarding other stamps you may need.



#27, rich color, VFOG w. minute thin, PFC ..... \$5,000



#117, 1869 Pict., XF OG w. PFC, well centrd ..... \$1,750



#196, Soft paper Special Printg, XF w. PFC ..... \$3,500



#363, 8c Bluish, VF NH Scarce, w. PFC ..... \$15,000



#595, Coil Waste, XF NH w. pencil notation, well centrd for difficult stamp ..... \$300

For more than 28 years, we have assisted leading philatelists in quietly locating or placing great philatelic holdings.

MAY WE ASSIST YOU?



**ANDREW LEVITT**  
**PHILATELIC CONSULTANT**



Box 342-PE • Danbury, Conn. 06813 • (203) 743-5291

*Life member APS, ASDA, Philatelic Foundation, Classic Society, Collectors Club of N.Y.*

*Bank references and letter of credit available.*

"This mixed franking of two 3-cent green Bank Notes and a 6-cent Hawaii is an unusual, hard-to-find cover."

*Barbara Stever*



Cover from Honolulu Aug. 5, 1878 to Aberdeen, Scotland. Pays 6c treaty rate plus 5c U.P.U. rate plus 1c overpayment.

From the Collection of Barbara Stever

At The Empire Group we use our philatelic knowledge and market expertise to locate elusive pieces such as this for you. Talk to us. How can we help you reach your collecting goals?

## The Empire Group

Box 2529-E

West Lawn, Penn. 19609

Philip T. Bansner  
(215) 678-5000

Albert F. Chang  
(213) 656-6472

William T. Crowe  
(203) 794-9225

## FOR THE SPECIALIST

*Covers Fine Stamps  
Proofs and Specimen Stamps  
Postal History Material of all Countries*

Buyers of specialised collections, covers and Postal History  
Sales of important material can be negotiated by Private Treaty

When in London visit our Gallery

**Argyll Etkin Limited**

Enquiries invited — ensure that your name and interests are  
recorded in our Register of Specialists

48 CONDUIT STREET, NEW BOND STREET, LONDON W1R 9FB ENGLAND  
Telephone: 01144-1-437-7800 (6 lines)

## WE CAN OFFER YOU . . .

. . . quite possibly the largest, most diverse postal history stock  
in America for the philatelic exhibitor. U.S., British Common-  
wealth, and worldwide. Write to us or visit us at these (and  
other) 1987 shows:

WESTPEX / April 29 - May 1      ROMPEX / May 20-22  
PHILATELIC SHOW '88 / May 6-8      COMPEX / May 28-30

## MILLS PHILATELICS

Post Office Box 549  
Goshen, NY 10924

# THE PHILATELIC EXHIBITOR

Official Publication of the American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors



Vol. II, No. 3

ISSN 0892-032X

April, 1988

John M. Hotchner, Editor  
P.O. Box 1125  
Falls Church, VA. 22041-0125

Janet Klug, Assistant Editor  
R.R. 1, Box 370-B  
Pleasant Plain, Ohio 45162

THE PHILATELIC EXHIBITOR is published four times a year in January, April, July and October. The subscription price is \$8 a year (which is included in the AAPE dues of \$10) and is published by the American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors, 10660 Barkley, Shawnee-Mission, KS 66212-1661. Application to Mail at Second Class Postage Rates is Pending at Shawnee-Mission, KS. Postmaster: Send address changes to AAPE, P.O. Box 7088, Shawnee-Mission, KS 66207.

TPE is a forum for debate and information sharing. Views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the officers of the AAPE. Manuscripts, news and comment should be addressed to the *Editor* at the above address. Manuscripts should be double-spaced, typewritten, if possible.

Membership Dues—If joining in

Jan-March	\$10.00
Apr-June	\$ 7.50
July-Sept.	\$ 5.00
Oct-Dec.	\$12.50

Correspondence and contributions to *The Philatelic Exhibitor* should be directed as shown on page 4.

Deadline for the next issue to be published on or about July 1, 1988, is May 15. The following issue will close August 15, 1988.

Reprints from this journal are encouraged with appropriate credit.

**ON OUR COVER:** W. L. ("Pete") Davidson, Jr., Director of the USPS Office of Stamps and Philatelic Marketing, is an often unseen contributor to stamp shows as the man behind the setting up of first day ceremonies and USPS participation with cancels, exhibits and/or give away literature for youth and novice collectors.

## In this Issue

### Features

- 17 Exhibiting and Judging in Great Britain *by John O. Griffiths*
- 27 The State of Topical/Thematic Exhibiting and Judging — An Interview with Col. Stephen Luster USA
- 31 A Show Review
- 37 Editorial: "Judge Bashing"

### Regular Columns

- 15 Concerns *by Randy Neil*
- 25 Exhibiting and Youth *by Cheryl Edgcomb*
- 33 Exhibits Committee Clearinghouse *by Stanley Luft*
- 35 Ask Odenweller *by Robert Odenweller*
- 40 "The Fly" — Buzzes Around The Jury Room

### Departments and AAPE Business

- 5 Editor's and Readers' 2¢ Worth
- 16 Activity Beat
- 16 AAPE Awards of Honor; Nominations for '88-'90; Back Issues; Life Memberships
- 20 News From Clubs and Societies
- 24 Report of the Critique Service
- 24 Coming Attractions
- 26 Show Listings
- 32 Classified Ads
- 32 An Exhibitor's Code of Ethics?
- 34 Q & A
- 34 "Why Do You Exhibit" Winners
- 40 Editor's AAPE of the Month
- 44 From the Secretary
- 44 The Treasurer's Treat

# AAPE STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors has been formed in order to share and discuss ideas and techniques geared to improving the standards of exhibit preparation, judging and the management of exhibitions. We exist to serve the entire range of people who work or have an interest in one or more of these fields; whether they be novice, experienced or just beginning to think about getting involved. Through pursuit of our purposes, it is our goal to encourage your increasing participation and enjoyment of philatelic exhibiting.

## AAPE: THE LEADERSHIP

### PRESIDENT

Randy L. Neil  
P.O. Box 7088  
Shawnee-Mission, KS 66207

### DIRECTORS (1986-90)

Cheryl Ganz  
Stephen Schumann

### DIRECTORS (1986-88)

William H. Bauer  
Dane Claussen  
Clyde Jennings  
Leo John Harris

### VICE PRESIDENT

Mary Ann Owens  
P.O. Box 021164  
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11202-0026

### COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS

Local/Regional Exhibiting: Cheryl Ganz  
National Level Exhibiting: Clyde Jennings and  
Stephen Schumann

### SECRETARY

Steven J. Rod  
P.O. Box 432  
South Orange, NJ 07079

International Exhibiting: William Bauer

Youth Exhibiting: Dane Claussen and  
Cheryl Edgcomb

Thematic/Topical: Mary Ann Owens and George Guzzio  
Show Management: Steven Rod

### TREASURER

Paul Rosenberg  
5 Mill River Lane  
Hingham, MA 02043

Exhibitors Critique Service: Harry Meier & Lowell Newman  
(Box 369, Palmyra, VA 22963)

### EDITOR

John M. Hotchner  
P.O. Box 1125  
Falls Church, VA 22041-0125

#### Send:

- Requests for back issues & proposals for association activities — to the President
- Membership forms, brochures requests, and correspondence to members when you don't know their address — to the Secretary
- Manuscripts, news, letters to the editor and to "the Fly", exhibit listings and member adlets — to the Editor.

---

### MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

TO: Steven Rod, Secretary  
American Assn. of Philatelic Exhibitors, P.O. Box 432, South Orange, NJ 07079

Enclosed are my dues of \$\_\_\_\_\_ in application for my membership in the AAPE, which includes \$8 annual subscription to the *Philatelic Exhibitor*. (See page 3 for remittance schedule).

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY: \_\_\_\_\_

STATE: \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

PHILATELIC MEMBERSHIPS: APS # \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

BUSINESS AND/OR PERSONAL REFERENCES: (NOT REQUIRED IF APS MEMBER)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## My 2¢ Worth

by John M. Hotchner, Editor, P.O. Box 1125  
Falls Church, VA. 22041



### LETTERS AND SPACE; A PLEA

*One of the phenomena which marks a successful periodical is a mixed blessing: the need to print ever more interesting and important Letters to the Editor. On the one hand, TPE's success in establishing a reputation as a forum for discussing the serious procedural and philosophical questions is a tribute to all connected with the journal. On the other hand, all those Letters take space from other possible content. Please keep the Letters coming, but please be understanding of the fact that I must be selective about what I print and even those must be shortened to conserve space.*

*One other quick item: I need a volunteer to do an Index covering the first two Volumes of TPE. Vol. II will close with the next issue and I'd like to publish an Index in Vol. III #1 — October, 1988. Write to me at the above address if you can help.*

---

## Your 2¢ Worth

Jacqueline Alton — Frederick Pyne — Robert Collins — John Cali — Brian Green — Earl Galitz — Clyde Jennings — Dan Laursen — Larry McInnis — Harry Sutherland — G.F. Oxley — Dorothy Blaney — Carl LeMar John — Jo Bleakley — Victor Berecz — Paul Hirsch — Jim Stever

## Chicagopex '88 — AAPE Convention

Chicago in the fall is a great place to visit and we hope that you will join us for CHICAGOPEX '88, for the Annual Convention of the American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors. This will be a truly enjoyable and memorable event.

CHICAGOPEX '88 will be held on the weekend of Nov. 4-6 at the O'Hare Expo Center, 5555 North River Road, Rosemont, Illinois (near O'Hare Airport). This year CHICAGOPEX will include more frames, more dealers, and more meetings, lectures, and seminars. Meetings, etc. will be in the adjacent Conference Center.

Hotel accommodations have been arranged at the new (April '87) Hotel Sofitel, 5550 North River Road, Rosemont, just across the street from the Expo Center. The hotel and the Expo Center are connected by a covered overpass. The special show rate is \$69 per night, single or double. Reservations must be received no later than October 10, 1988.

In addition to over 300 16-page frames of philatelic material on display, we will hold our 22nd Annual Literature Competition for philatelic handbooks and periodicals. We will also have a special junior exhibition section.

AAPE participation will be highlighted by a Cocktail Reception on Friday evening and the AAPE Annual Meeting on Saturday, November 5, at 1:00 p.m. Additional specialized meetings are being planned and information will be available as soon as plans are complete.

We are looking forward to greeting and meeting all of you at CHICAGOPEX '88. So, make your plans now to attend this exciting weekend!

For exhibit prospectus (philatelic and/or literature) and hotel reservation cards, please write: CHICAGOPEX '88, P.O. Box A3953, Chicago, IL 60690-3953.

Sincerely,  
Jacquelyn S. Alton, President, CPS

## Article Helpful

To the Editor:

A.D. Jones' article on his new #C3 cover in the January '88 "Philatelic Exhibitor" was a delightful, interesting, and extremely informing piece. As are so many of your readers, I am interested in, but have not yet prepared my first exhibit. Jones' article helped provide some background into how the arrangement, setting and write up gets prepared. Keep these kinds of things coming — They are just the sort of article your readers should be looking for!

Frederick W. Pyne  
Frederick, Md.

## Literature Judging Revisited

To the Editor:

My copy of the *Philatelic Exhibitor* arrived today and as usual I couldn't stop reading it until I had gone cover to cover.

There was a letter to the editor that brought back some memories for my wife and I from this past summer. Like most of you, I belong to several clubs all catering to various collecting interests. I am a silent member of most but in one I take an active part. Since 1959 this club has published a club journal every other month. The search was on for a permanent editor and one day my phone rang. The club president asked me to take over as editor. I advised him that I had little experience. He talked my wife into helping and informed me that he and the former editor would give me all the help they could. With that I took on the job, with the issue of February 1985. We tried to make our journal interesting and to have something for all members to enjoy.

A year later it was suggested that we enter the journal in literature competitions. We thought it would be a good way to get exposure for the club, and possibly pick up a few tips from the judges.

We entered our journal in a top national show this past summer and were able to attend the literature critique in person. When we asked the judges' opinion we got several negative comments; some of which were beyond our control and were due in part to our small size and low budget. There were also several constructive suggestions and advice on how to make im-

provements. The judges took time to talk with us after the critique was over and we were still getting tips as we were walking down the hall from the critique. Thank you judges, very much!

We had started in 1985 with a journal of 16 pages and now have 28. The quality of our journal is a lot better and I am sure the membership is appreciative. This is my way of saying THANKS to the judges.

Robert W. Collins  
Westlake, Ohio

To the Editor:

I was not present at the literature critique on which Messers Foley and Winick exchanged views in the January 1988 issue, but have been in attendance at similar critiques.

Negative comments are not beneficial to an exhibitor unless coupled with constructive methods for improving an exhibit. This is too often not done.

Mr. Winick feels that the chips should be allowed to fall where they may but it should be remembered that we are dealing with human beings with the usual set of emotions. Yes, the same as the judges!

The basic question here appears to be one of conduct more than anything else. The simple rules of human courtesy should be observed.

John Cali  
Fulton, NY

## THE CHIEF JUDGE RESPONDS:

To new parents, their offspring is the most beautiful in the world — and simply by virtue of the fact it is theirs and they produced it. True, this progeny could later be a teenage Miss America, but have a 10 year old sister who wouldn't need make-up for a part in a horror movie. That is not to say the younger sibling could not later be made attractive, with time and the help of a little cosmetic surgery. And all this sometimes applies to some philatelic exhibits.

First, I must disagree with Mr. Green that the lack of a CSA specialist was reflected in "several of the judging decisions." As Chief Judge I was very well satisfied with all of the judging decisions, including the fact both the Grand and the





FOR PHILATELIC EXHIBITORS

The clear, strong, inert, dimensionally stable film we use is DuPont's "Mylar"\* Type D only!



(215) 566-7067

Taylor Made Company  
P.O. Box 406  
Lima, Pa. 19037

- 8 Styles
- Your gauge choice
- Your size choice
- Other "Mylar" products

\*MYLAR IS A TRADE NAME OF DUPONT

Reserve Grand went to Confederate exhibits.

For the record, no judges' names were recommended by CSA to the then President of the Florida Federation who also assembled the panel. I wouldn't call myself a Confederate neophyte. It is true, and unfortunate also, that one judge did miss the key frameline copies in 2 exhibits (though framelines are not always that obvious to all), and further embarrassed himself by so stating at critique. But his one opinion alone did not result in "downgrading" either exhibit since the awards were consensus oriented. In fact, a review of my notes reveals that particular judge voted "gold" for each of the two exhibits in question.

Now to that particular exhibit by Mr. Green, the one he says was "singled out as being too new in its approach." Newness is great, readily accepted by most, but that newness alone garners few points in a judge's overall estimate of an exhibit. It appears to me Mr. Green defeats his own purpose in referring to those "red underlines." In the exhibits with which he says he won over a hundred Golds, red undies and all, it is obvious the material and overall presentations so far overshadowed the red lines no one even noticed them — at least they did not detract noticeably to the point of producing a Vermeil or less.

In this exhibit, though the material obviously was there, the varying sizes and finishes of the oversized photos of the generals so detracted from the overall presentation that those red lines also stuck out like a sore thumb. Combined, the photos and the red lines were what the observ-

er first saw — casual onlookers notwithstanding. Too bad they had no vote, since the panel voted one vermeil, 3 silver, and one silver/bronze. Try a little of the above mentioned cosmetic surgery, Mr. Green, and good luck in your future exhibiting.

Clyde Jennings  
Jacksonville, Fla.

## Dinosaur Judging?

To the Editor:

It was my understanding that the AAPE was formed for the purpose of fostering and encouraging philatelic exhibiting, be it by seasoned or neophyte exhibitors, as well as to attune judging into progressive and meaningful decisions reflective of modern times.

Recently, an experience at FLOREX '87 leaves me wondering if the purposes are being met. The APS qualified judging panel included members of the AAPE. Accordingly, one should expect meaningful and progressive judging. One unfortunate aspect of the panel was the lack of a CSA qualified judge since the show was hosting the annual convention of the Confederate Stamp Alliance. This did reflect in several of the judging decisions.

One Confederate exhibit was downgraded because of a lack of "Frameline" stamps (Scott #10) within it. At the critique, the exhibitor pointed out that there were four present in the exhibit. The judge handling that part of the critique was somewhat embarrassed, but this damage had been done. Another exhibit was also downgraded for not having a "Frameline" stamp. The exhibitor, a neophyte, point-

ed out to the judge (the same one as previously mentioned) that two of these stamps were present in the exhibit. Again, embarrassment for the judge and discouragement for the exhibitor who told me that he doubted if he would ever exhibit again. Is this what we really want to achieve?

A well-known and respected Confederate postal historian's collection was singled out as being too new in its approach to merit the award its material truly deserved. Never mind that the material was extremely rare and with items from name collections including Ferrary and Hind. Never mind that the collection followed its objective as outlined in the title and presentation pages. Never mind that the exhibit found great favor among the viewers, both collector and non-collector. Getting people, especially the non-collector, to look and study the exhibits should be encouraged as the editor of this journal has frequently written about in various philatelic publications.

All the panel could say about the exhibit was the distraction of the red underlines (never mind that the exhibitor won more than 100 national and international, including 12 gold medals with the latest at AMERIPEX '86, awards with the self same red underlines) and the photos used to bring life to the exhibit, for which the exhibitor was complimented time and time again by the viewing public.

This sort of judging is far from progressive and constructive. It is more reflective of the dinosaur age and can only discourage the non-veteran exhibitor and perhaps some veterans as well. This is the type of thought that the Wright brothers had to contend with. However, they persevered and today flight is commonplace, even to being utilized by some of the FLOREX judges.

One should not have to wait 100 years in order to be appreciated. Instead, judges should be more innovative in their outlook and in the decisions reached. After all, we want our hobby to continue and grow and not follow that of the Victorian rage for birds' eggs into extinction. The quotation by Randy Neil in his November column in the AP about the judges being on trial could not be more apropos.

Brian M. Green  
Rutherford, New Jersey

## Covers Needed?

To the Editor:

I have been exhibiting at national level shows for only two-three years now, and have previously shown postal stationery and postal history. I am now preparing a "traditional" exhibit, i.e., one of stamps alone. We exhibitors have been led to believe that in the distant past exhibits of the traditional type were more acceptable than now, and that today even in "stamp" exhibits there is benefit of including covers. Was the "traditional" exhibit without covers really the norm, and is it passé today?

Earl Galitz  
Miami, Fla.

## Cornered . . .

To the Editor:

On Thursday, Feb. 18, when Filatelic Fiesta '88 was being set up in San Jose, a couple came down from San Francisco to mount an exhibit. When they learned their showing was going to have to be mounted in such a way as to "go around a corner," they became very upset, refused to mount, and left.

Meantime another exhibitor was busy mounting his 8 frames nearby. He had two on the end of an outside row, then four along the adjacent wall at the end of the room, with the final two out in a hall around another corner! Did it faze him? No way. He is an accredited judge, himself, and is readily aware that "going around a corner" has absolutely no effect whatsoever in a judge's consideration of the merits of an exhibit.

The exhibitor? Steve Schumann. The exhibit? Sarawak Postal Stationery. The award? The show Grand! Now if that's not proof positive going around a corner is meaningless I'm sure I'll never see a better example.

And, oh, that's not all. The hall in which the last two frames reposed contained two small overhead lights, I'd say no more than 60-75 watts each!

Clyde Jennings  
Jacksonville, Fla.

## EXHIBITOR, AUTHOR, DEALER & AUCTIONEER . . .



- We have exhibited nationally since 1969, and our current exhibit has won gold medals each time it has been shown . . .
- We have written many articles for various publications, and our current book "Collecting United States Covers and Postal History" is available in softbound for \$15.00 and hardbound for \$25.00 postpaid anywhere in U.S. . . .
- Our stock of United States covers is one of the largest in the world . . .
- We conduct regular auctions in New York City covering the entire world of philately . . .
- We are qualified to help serious exhibitors to acquire items of need, with emphasis on United States, Possessions & Confederate Postal History, Fancy Cancellations, Essays, Proofs & Stamps. Advise us of your needs and we will supply photocopies or actual material on approval.

**W. R. WEISS, JR.**

PO. BOX 5358 • BETHLEHEM, PA 18015 • (215) 691-6857

MEMBER OF THE 15 LEADING PHILATELIC ORGANIZATIONS • ESTABLISHED 1972

### McInnis on Odenweller on CAPEX

To the Editor:

Robert Odenweller, in his "The CAPEX Judging: Myth vs. Fact," dismissed criticism or complaint as "rantings." He flies into hyperbole with "misstatement of unattributed 'facts' has been made for questionable purposes, and the flames are being fanned."

"It may make good copy for the silly season of summer, but does a disservice to philately," Odenweller wrote.

His patronizing attitude notwithstanding, there has been no disservice to philately done by the critique of CAPEX 87, either as an international exhibition generally, or from any other aspects of CAPEX — mostly the commercial aspect.

Odenweller defeated his purpose of defending the indefensible with his comment: "Oh, the usual joke was made in the first briefing about keeping down the number of golds, but when it seemed that one or two of the non-English speaking judges may have taken it seriously . . ."

According to the CAPEX 87 final report, there were 35 jurors. Odenweller represented FIP (USA) and R.M. Rosende represented the U.S., with Paul A. Larsen as an American apprentice judge. Canada had eight jurors, one of which was French-Canadian. The others would, I hope, and am sure, would have some knowledge of French and, perhaps, other languages.

Is Odenweller saying those whose first language was not English were disadvantaged? If that was so, it's outrageous in a

bilingual country (English, French) sponsoring an international show.

The very foundation of AAPE and its immediate success is indicative of the concern collectors have about exhibiting, exhibitions, and judging.

Odenweller's patrimony, "a few facts from those who were on the jury should put the matter to rest" will not put it to rest. It was a bum show, not a bum rap. The more said about it the better.

Larry McInnis  
Beauharnois, Quebec

### Odenweller responds:

It is interesting that Linn's contributor McInnis styled my introductory "hook" as being patronizing. Since so many articles on the subject of CAPEX have been "me-too", I wanted to make sure it was not going to be dismissed as just another. It seems I succeeded.

The judges who were confused by the attempt at humor were Spanish speaking, and they usually wait for the formal speeches to end to get a quick translation afterward. Such happenings are quite common in virtually ever international jury. There was certainly nothing, implied or otherwise to offend bilingual Canada.

I am most pleased, however, that while Mr. McInnis concentrated on the style of my article, he had nothing to say about its substance, that is, the judging results themselves, as compared with previous performance of the exhibits. In that sense I feel that I have indeed defended the "indefensible".

Robert P. Odenweller

## Right he is

To the Editor:

Question: Isn't Cathie Osborne a little off track in thinking (TPE Vol. II #2 p. 10) when she says: "But it is discouraging exhibiting *against* them." (The gold medal winners). I thought that every single exhibit was judged on its own merit.

Dan Laursen  
Tucson, Arizona

## Sutherland on CAPEX

To the Editor:

As Vice-Chairman of the Jury at CAPEX '87 I am most grateful to Bob Odenweller for putting the CAPEX judging picture in its proper perspective.

One of the difficulties in commenting on international judging — so far as the judges are concerned — is that the discussions in the jury room are confidential and cannot be disclosed.

While I personally would be quite happy to participate in a critique at the international level, and indeed have attempted where requested to assist individual exhibitors with their exhibits, any formalized critique at which all judges attend is, I think, just not workable.

Incidentally, I am getting somewhat annoyed at the statement that there was "an impassioned tirade by a senior jury member against postal history." I can assure you I heard no such comment and that if any comment had been made during a session of the jury I, as Vice-Chairman, would promptly have ruled the comment out of order. Even if a private comment of this kind were made about postal history I would relate it to the ease or otherwise of obtaining a medal in one class as opposed to another, e.g. certainly far less money — although not less energy or effort — would ordinarily be required to obtain a gold medal in thematics as opposed to postal history.

On a closing note I would point out to you and your readers that HAFNIA was roughly the same size as CAPEX and whereas CAPEX had 32 large gold and 92 gold, the HAFNIA awards were 29 large gold and 81 gold.

H. Sutherland  
Toronto, Ontario

## What's In A Name?

To the Editor:

It has become common usage since the emergence of postal history as a major area of interest and study for it to be regarded as a branch of philately. Indeed some writers when referring to the hobby of philately state or imply that they include postal history.

However the approach to postal history, particularly where the investigation of routes and rates is concerned, is very different from philately which is connected with the detail of postage stamps; the only matter in common being the need to undertake some element of research.

The depth of research required in placing in context an adhesive stamp or letter and its postal markings can range from reference to an already published work such as a catalogue or book devoted to the country or subject in question to prolonged investigation in postal or public archives.

Research is the common factor in all sections of the hobby which now includes Aerophilately, Astrophilately, Maximapily, Postal History, Thematics and perhaps more to come particularly if Marcophily establishes itself.

It appears that the hobby needs a title which could be all embracing. The word "philately" is too narrow as a title, as explained above. "Postal history" too is inadequate as it has become to mean, somewhat restrictively, the study of the interaction between postal routes and rates and the consequent postal markings. The title "postal history" to a person outside the hobby could include the investigation of postmen's uniforms, the furniture in travelling post offices, pillar boxes and many more which are not regularly researched by collectors.

As the common factor in all branches of the hobby is research, it is suggested that a title could be "Postal Studies" of which all the subjects mentioned earlier would form sections.

What do readers think?

G.F. Oxley  
London, England



## AUCTION PREVIEW

for

**Zurich**

**16-19 May 1988**

### EUROPE

including Austrian classics and cancellations, post offices abroad with exceptional Levant, the Orient Express, etc., Danish West Indies, Germany, Switzerland, Turkey. Also specialized collections, the "Nafplion" Greece, the "Arlberg" Italian States and Roumania, Great Britain essays, proofs and errors.

### ASIA

including the Adrian Hopkins Afghanistan, China, Japan, Persia with the Mercedes specialized

### NEAR EAST

with Egypt, the Holy Land forerunners and Saudia Arabia.

send for a copy  
to

## **Christie's**

**502 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022**

**Tel: (212) 546 1000**

**Head Office:**

**8 King Street, St. James's, London, SW1Y 6QT**

**Tel: (01) 839 4034    Telex: 916429**

**Facsimile: (01) 839 1611**

## Prospectus Question

To the Editor:

"This exhibit has previously won the following awards?" Why is the question ever included in a prospectus for an exhibit entry? Do the judges need an experience factor to guide them in their decision? I hope not.

As I re-arrange an exhibit each time that it is shown to fit the frame requirements, add material as acquired, or omit a section that seems weak, it is never the identical exhibit. Also, I don't want the judges to be influenced for better or worse by prior decisions.

I recommend that the question be omitted from any prospectus and that exhibitors, just not answer the question when it is part of the prospectus.

Carl LeMar John  
Tucson, Arizona

## Walking Tours

To the Editor:

Our Exhibition Chairman for the Pittsburgh Philatelic Society, Regis Hoffman, is a knowledgeable young man who affects others with his enthusiasm.

At PITPEX, he gathered together eight of us and we started an impromptu tour of our exhibits, heckling, criticizing and making both derogatory and complimentary comments. It was great fun! As we went, we gathered more and more people and we found our comments becoming more and more earnest. It became a walking seminar on exhibiting that was actually informative and helpful.

I found out from a member why a cover I exhibit has so much postage due on it! Another gave me additional information on a censored cover. Our member who designs our cachets was great in suggesting subtle changes in page designs which would enhance the aesthetic presentation.

For my part, I had the first example of "windowing a cover" that many of them had ever seen; and my title page received favorable comments. Some exhibits had none at all.

We toured again the next day. In fact, we had to do it twice because of the number who joined us. We had first timers at a show, many timers, never exhibited, and

often exhibited. Again it was informative and the spontaneous humor made it enjoyable. Each time different comments and additional knowledge came to the fore.

The results are: we had people tell us they had never enjoyed a show so much because for the first time they had some idea what they were looking at; many who collected but did not understand exhibiting; and exhibitors who acquired excellent information. Also gained was a greater warmth of friendship and a respect for the range of knowledge possessed by the members of PPS.

We intend to do the same thing next year and will possibly give it some publicity — that tours will be made. I would recommend that other shows give consideration to adopting such touring "critiques" by the exhibitors and all others who wish to join in the fun.

Dorothy Blaney  
Perryopolis, PA

## Modern Material Thematics

To the Editor:

In my opinion, the difficulty in earning a gold medal for a modern material Thematic is a two-fold problem.

To present a Thematic exhibit, one must research, develop and write a story; then use philatelic elements to present it as a book report. The text must be brief.

Problem #1: Many exhibitors do not research deeply enough to discover what they can use other than the obvious: modern stamps, proofs and first day covers. Postmarks, meters, postal markings and postal stationery are ignored and so the exhibit lacks "patina." Write-up is difficult without an item to depict the text and the story-line is feeble or non-existent.

Problem #2: As a result, judges see exhibits severely lacking in philatelic knowledge and elements. Many traditional judges are not familiar with topicals, thus they have difficulty suggesting specific items that might be available to enhance the exhibit. The conflicting "unwritten rules" presented by some Thematic judges are causing confusion and frustration.

Thematic exhibiting in this country is in its "toddler stage." The International

# WE SPECIALIZE IN U.S. REVENUES, TELEGRAPHS, LOCAL POSTS, CINDERELLS

How may we serve you?

Eric Jackson  
Post Office Box 1209  
Herndon, VA. 22070-1209  
703-481-1356

Thematicists: (Mary Ann Owens, George Guzzio, Charlie Fitz, Hugh Johnston, John Griffiths, Steve Luster, etc.) have "nursed" topicals through their infancy. Mary Ann, George and Hugh matriculated through the "school of hard knocks." Their "bruises" brought dignity and acceptance to U.S. Thematic exhibits.

I think that Thematic exhibiting at our national level is in fair to good shape and progressing to fine/very fine. However, there is a definite need for better communication as to the dividing line between national and international requirements.

Jo Bleakley  
"Frog" exhibitor

## Palmares

To the Editor:

In the last issue (p. 15), a question is posed concerning the meaning of the word "Palmares." It is the plural of the latin "Palmaris," i.e. of or connected with victory or such as deserves the prize.

Paul Hirsch  
Surbiton, England

## How Many Golds . . .

To the Editor:

I would like to respond further to "How Many Gold Medals are Enough?" My exhibit and my collection are basically one and the same. First, it's a field in which I have a significant interest — both philatelic and non-philatelic. Secondly, I narrowed the field to be able to develop a good showing given the funds I can apply to my collecting.

I'm not sure whether it was luck, talent, good planning, unusual material or a combination of these, but after a couple of local shows I was awarded a Gold in my first national level attempt in 1974. At that time I set my exhibiting goal as a Best in Show that would allow me to participate in the World Series of Philately. Since then my "Pioneer Period of Hungarian Airmail" exhibit has received twelve almost consecutive Golds at WSP-qualified shows. But, still no "brass ring." I only exhibit about once a year, and I try to be present personally. I have tried to make significant improvements in the exhibit between each show. I consider this a responsible ap-

## Germany

For the past 33 years we have specialized exclusively in the stamps of Germany, building and maintaining what is by far

### THE LARGEST STOCK IN THIS HEMISPHERE.

Whether you collect mint VF Old German States, or FDCs of new issues, or anything and everything in between **WE HAVE WHAT YOU ARE LOOKING FOR.**

**NOVICE?** We have price lists for every German Area from 1849 to date, including special discount prices for Complete Year Collections, Third Reich, WW II Occupations, FDCovers, etc.

**SEND FOR FREE, ILLUSTRATED PRICELISTS!**

**SPECIALIST?** We have helped build some of the finest award-winning collections in the country: when not available from our own stock, we provide automatic and non-obligatory advice on what you need, as soon as we locate it: our contacts abroad, built up over years of travel, are tops in their fields, whatever your specialty. **WHAT DO YOU NEED?**

Our prices are **ALWAYS** competitive and our service is friendly and efficient.



☎ 201-236-9211  
P.O. Box 527  
Flemington, NJ 08822



**RICHARD  
PYZNAK**



Since 1955



*A HIT AT AMERIPEX!*  
*... and it's available now!*  
**THE OFFICIAL AAPE PIN**

Here is the distinctive gold, red and blue cloisonné pin displaying the blue ribbon emblem of THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PHILATELIC EXHIBITORS. Help your AAPE by showing your early support for philately's proudest new organization.

\$4.00 postpaid

Send check to:

AAPE, P.O. Box 7088, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66207

proach aimed at a difficult, but reasonable goal — not an effort to see my "name in the paper."

I take exception to those who would have blackballed my exhibit after three Golds — or consider my continued efforts to be "greedy." Remember judging is supposed to be against standards, not against the competing exhibits. Therefore, pursuing my exhibiting objectives shouldn't hurt you in the pursuit of yours. Hopefully someday both of us will achieve our goals.

Victor G. Berez  
Reston, Va.

### Ver-what?

To the Editor:

Vermeil. The pronunciation should reside in the mind of the exhibitor. For instance, if you are a hopeful person and believe that at a future show you may get a gold, then you should think of it as a ver-MAY. On the other hand, if you believe it was the last controversial call by the judges before they went to dinner, you should think of it as a ver-MEAL. Of course, if you believe your collection is worth millions and this was the judges' way of acknowledging its great worth, then you got a ver-MIL.

But, if you are convinced your gold medal exhibit just wasn't appreciated, you should hark back to the origin of the word. You see, it stems from the Latin "vermis," meaning worm, and you are perfectly justified in thinking, "Those worms on the judges' panel have downgraded me again."

Jim Stever  
Corpus Christi, TX

### Nominations for 1988-90 AAPE Officers

A reminder; those interested in running for office should refer to page 19 of the January, 1988 TPE for essential information on how and to whom to make your wishes known. Time is of the essence.

### BACK ISSUES of The Philatelic Exhibitor

are available while supplies last from Randy L. Neil, P.O. Box 7088, Shawnee-Mission, KS 66207. Vol. I, #1 — \$5.00. Vol. I, #2-3 — \$3.00 each, Vol. II, #1-2 — \$3.00 each.

**NOTICE:** I will make full size Xerox copies of exhibit pages shown in this issue of The Philatelic Exhibitor, and pages used in Mary Ann Owens' articles in prior issues of TPE. Cost will be 15¢ per page. Payment in stamps or by check acceptable.

Request copies by identifying article and page number from:

Harry C. Meier  
Box 369  
Palmyra, VA 22963



## CONCERNS by Randy L. Neil



Did you watch the 1988 Winter Olympics? If you did, then like me, you probably loved the figure skating. What style and grace . . . what beauty and charm. And for the love of Mike, what kind of judging was going on?!?

I mean . . . I simply loved Debbie Thomas — but who was kidding who that last night when lovely little Canadian Elizabeth Manley skated rings around everyone? Gold medalist Katarina, sultry eyes and all, couldn't touch that little lady's 1,000 per cent performance.

Anyway, it kinda reminded me of philatelic exhibiting — except for one key aspect: our form of subjective judging is fairer. The last I heard, our juries choose our champions based on "actual performance" and not on who is "supposed" to win. Oh there may be a few people who might dispute me on that fact, but normally, even if a "famous exhibitor" fails to live up to expectations, he will not be automatically handed the gold.

I mention these points because, if we exhibitors ever think we've gotten the proverbial raw deal, we have only to view an ice skating competition. Here are kids who spend lifetimes working six hours every day polishing their skills and when they fail to achieve their goals, the result is terrifying psychological depression.

But somehow, they all seem to pick themselves up and go right back out there to work and fight and skate another night.

Not so at many stamp shows. Some exhibitors say they'll "never exhibit again" after only winning their first bronze medal. It seems they coveted a silver. Back home they go, and into the darkest corner of the closet goes that "first time" effort.

Other exhibitors absolutely expect the judges at stamp show B to give them the same gold medal they got at stamp show A. All the while not realizing that, like the skater, each appearance on the ice is a "whole 'nother ballgame." Same rules, just new judges.

Like world competition is for the skater, exhibiting is the supreme test of the philatelist's proficiency with this, the most time-honored of pastimes. One doesn't achieve success without acquiring a few tender bruises and torn ligaments along the way.

Yeah, it's tough sometimes. It can hurt. You work for years to get that gold . . . and suddenly, it finally comes. Then another jury bats you back down to silver again. Mama goose! Is there no justice at all?

Well, yes there is. For somehow, after 13 big and little hard knocks, the persistent and patient exhibitor finally begins to see those "wished-for" awards come in a regular flow.

And like Brian Boitano, perhaps there is a tear and an arm of exultation raised in the air.

**SIGN UP A NEW MEMBER TODAY!**

The Secretary will gladly send you some  
AAPE membership applications.

## ACTIVITY BEAT

LET'S CLEAR UP A FEW LOOSE ENDS . . . this time around. The AAPE has grown so fast that, sometimes, a few "bottlenecks" have gotten thrown in our way. All members please note:

**NO PLASTIC MEMBERSHIP CARDS . . .** will be available. We needed a minimum of 150 orders so that this idea could work. Less than 25 people wanted one. So the idea goes out the window; probably because few people carry membership cards anymore.

**THE AAPE DOES NOT ISSUE MEMBERSHIP CARDS.** Many organizations now do not do this . . . simply because it would mean about \$2.00 more per year in dues.

**WE ONLY HAVE A FEW COPIES OF VOLUME I, NO. 1** of "The Philatelic Exhibitor." In fact, very few (about 25). Price: \$5.00 each. **NOTE ALSO:** Vol. I, Nos. 2 and 3 (there was no No. 4 in the first volume) and Vol. II, Nos. 1 and 2 are still available at \$3.00 each. Send check to: AAPE Back Issues, Box 7088, Shawnee-Mission, KS 66207.

**DON'T FAIL TO SEND YOUR "CHANGE OF ADDRESS" WHEN YOU MOVE.** If you don't, your copies of "THE PHILATELIC EXHIBITOR" will be sent back to us and you will be sent a bill of \$1.00 each in order to have them sent back out. That's what "returned copies" will cost us. Send address changes to: AAPE, Box 7088, Shawnee-Mission, KS 66207.

**THE EARLIEST FOUNDING MEMBERS** (who joined before mid-1986) will be up for membership renewal on June 30, 1988. You will receive a bill at that time. Dues renewal for you will be \$15 which will give you membership through December 1989 — or 18 full months. This is being done to bring all membership renewals to an annualized basis.

**AAPE'S 3RD ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION . . .** where else but CHICAGOPEX! It's Nov. 4-6, 1988 and one of America's biggest shows. The giant event will be in the O'Hare Expo Center, home of AMERIPEX . . . and our host hotel is the SOFITEL right across the street. This brand new hotel has \$69 room rates and an exquisite French atmosphere that is unmatched. Want to exhibit, too? Better apply soon. For prospectus and hotel reservation card, write: CHICAGOPEX '88, Box A-3953, Chicago, IL 60690-3953.

**HIGHLIGHT OF AAPE MEETINGS AT CHICAGOPEX** will be Friday night's annual "Cocktails Reception" at the Sofitel. We'll also have a broad slate of instructive seminars, social activities and our annual members open meeting. No wonder CHICAGOPEX will be 1988's biggest philatelic event!

### AAPE "AWARDS OF HONOR" AVAILABLE

Stamp shows of all sizes are eligible to present the AAPE "Award of Honor" to recognize and encourage exhibitors who have worked hard for excellence of presentation. The awards are in the form of an attractive pin, given as follows:

WSP — Champion of Champions (Nationals) — Two Gold Pins

Local Shows — 500 or more pages — Two Silver Pins

Local Shows — Fewer than 500 pages — One Silver Pin

Write to Felix and Cheryl Ganz, P.O. Box A3953, Chicago, IL 60630.

# EXHIBITING AND JUDGING IN GREAT BRITAIN — Part I

By John O. Griffiths

May I first explain why I am invited to write this article. For nine years I was National Judge for two shows each year in Great Britain; now there is only one. During the past six years I have been judging in the United States and am an accredited A.P.S. Judge.

The British approach for various reasons I shall explain, varies quite a lot from ours in United States. However each has its merits and has evolved from the particular free society we live in. Each molds its criteria for exhibiting and judging, based upon the rules and regulations that are laid down by the F.I.P. for international showing. The beauty of the two systems is that they are forever changing within themselves to improve a productive outflow of exhibits for exhibitors; at the same time endeavoring to maintain the high standard required in international philately.

Britain has a population of fifty-six million, a little over double that of California, but its land mass is smaller. Most main towns have stamp societies and this is where competition begins for those that want to participate — no more than twenty percent.

Annual competitions are held at almost all. These consist of six, eight, or nine sheets per exhibitor depending upon the club. The main purpose is for the president to discover new talent with exhibits able enough to include when invited displays are given at other societies during the following season. But the odd collector after the first taste of competition decides to try his or her luck with the federation level.

In Britain the country is divided geographically into federations and it is here that true competition begins. Again once per year, those who wish to compete exhibit eight or nine pages depending upon the bylaws of the federation. Most people at this stage do not want any more pages as they consider that the amount of time for preparation is all they can handle.

The Judges are two — normally officers of another federation or prominent members of the Royal Philatelic Society, London with judging experience.

At Federation level the exhibitor who wants to achieve chooses a story which can be told by stamps, covers, or both in the eight or nine pages with decent quality material. Rarity is not an important factor but creativeness is.

There are also yearly inter-federation competitions which normally consist of three such bodies. These competitions have judges of national status. The competing federations have group exhibits of eight/nine sheets, depending upon the bylaw. Each exhibit within the group tells a story, and collectively produce a harmonized balance. The judges are now more concerned with individual and collective presentation. As a result of these competitions it is hoped that any exhibitor who wishes to try his hand at the national level is schooled enough to be able to work within the guidelines expected and as laid down in the prospectus. Of course you always get the odd one like me who twenty odd years ago did not belong to a society, and had never been to an exhibition, but did read the prospectus, and then proceeded to put up an exhibit of my interpretation of what I had read. The judges realizing I was a "new boy" were most supportive.

Stamp collecting is first and foremost a hobby from which to derive joy and relaxation. Therefore the majority of collectors in Britain do not wish to go beyond Federation level, and it is no more than three or four members from any local society of sixty or more, who ever go on to show nationally. It is with this collector we now concern ourselves.

As I have written there were two National Shows per year. In 1986 this changed

and they combined as "Britain's National Stamp Exhibitions." Last year's "Autumn Stampex/B.P.E. 1987" is quite a mouthful. It occurred September 22-27, '87. Total fees were \$24.00. The exhibitor supplies his or her own insurance coverage. The charge pays for two international frames of 16 sheets.

The frames are those used at "London '80" and in all probability used again in Britain's next international "Stamp World London '90". About 500 are available for use at these nationals while a further 3,700 lie in storage in Northampton. I have a special liking for these frames as I designed them in principle and had them made.

For the first time exhibitor afraid of transition from 8/9 sheets to thirty two, he or she is allowed a single frame exhibit at a reduced cost. Since 1980 the exhibitors have been running from 260 Frames to 300 per exhibition. But this year with the lead up to "Stamp World London 90" there will be up to 400 available and enough for 200 Exhibitors. The exhibition is under the "umbrella" of The British Philatelic Federation (B.P.F.) which like the American Philatelic Society is the national body recognized by F.I.P.

This British organization has all federations, important philatelic societies, and study groups affiliated to it. Each pays a fee based upon the number of members. BPF also includes The Royal Philatelic Society, London and the British Philatelic Trust; the latter providing the money to further British philately.

Money accrued for this purpose from the souvenir sheets issued by the Post Office for London 1980. Each sheet carried a surcharge of twenty per cent, the maximum amount permitted by British law at that time. It created a fund after London '80 large enough to adequately support British Philately and also retain its principal up to the present time.

The entries arrive a month prior to the opening of the exhibition. A week later they are judged at an independent building in central London where 50 frames are erected for the purpose. There are a total of eight classes in the exhibition. Two are held in other buildings: Youth class and the Literature class, to be written about another time. The venue I write about here handles the other six:

#### Four Primary

- **Traditional Class**, in 3 sections: Great Britain, Commonwealth and Foreign. Also, a second group consisting of local, revenue and other non-postal stamps.
- **Postal History Class**, again in three sections: Great Britain, Commonwealth and Foreign. Two different approaches are allowed: rates and routes, or studies of markings and cancellations.
- **Aerophilatelic Class**
- **Thematic Class**, based on a theme or subject. Either must have an introductory page which must include a plan.

#### Two Secondary

- **Federation Class**, where each competing Federation puts up 64 sheets (8 sheets from each society member; 8 people in all) on a specific area. This year it is Aerophilately. In 1988 it will be Thematic; 1989 Traditional; 1990 Postal History . . .
- **International Class** consisting of exhibits which have previously won Vermeil or Gold medals at a National Show.

Normally the Jury consists of 22 Judges plus a secretary. One of the judges is the Chairman; the other 21 being split into groups of three each chosen as specialists in their own field. Each group has a senior member who heads the team, and another acts as Secretary filling in the sheet that is provided for each exhibit. This includes the judges' markings; also their joint constructive comment, plus the judges' signatures. Copies of the judges report sheets are available to exhibitors upon request.

The following awards are given: Diploma: 40% marks; and medals in the metal stated:

- Bronze 50%
- Silver Bronze 60%

- Silver 70%
- Vermeil 75%
- Large Vermeil 85%
- Gold 90%

There are a further 18 Special awards available plus four at the judges discretion. These Special awards are held for one year and then returned. But keepsake trophies are also given.

The national judges include four ladies in the primary classes. With regard to the men, at least four are members of the trade; very fine collectors in their own right who sometimes judge internationally. At least nine others are international jurors. The balance are federation or Royal officers who have expert knowledge in their own fields. Marking is on the following basis for Traditional, Postal History and Aerophilatelic Classes:

Philatelic Knowledge	40
Originality and importance	25
Relative condition and rarity	20
Presentation, write up and arrangement	15

For the Thematic Class:

Presentation	10
Plans and its implementation	20
Development of theme	25
Originality of theme	10
Philatelic knowledge	20
Condition and rarity of items shown	15

Each group of judges works through its assigned exhibits then asks for further exhibits to be put up. If the group by its initial marking finds it has ended with a weak vermeil for an exhibit it will go back over its markings. The reason for this is that Vermeil is a very important level as it is a ticket to international showing. International Philatelic Exhibitions are not as likely to accept, for example, another country's postal history of a town, or a pure plating study of a foreign single middle issue stamp.

With the Postal History example, the markings for 'Philatelic Knowledge and Originality;' plus the importance marking, would be looked at and suitably adjusted. In the course of the plating study, the group would mark down 'Philatelic Knowledge or Importance' if it decided there was no true depth of material and weak in rarity. I do not wish to cast aspersions on such collectors who can spend decades seeking material and put much research into their study. The problem is that exhibits that cover such a narrow field do not lend themselves to international interest unless shown in their own country, although they can be worked in, if justified, under the 25% first time exhibitor program recently introduced by F.I.P.

As noted above, to receive a British medal a mark of at least 50% must be given. The next 24 marks include 3 medal levels. It is in this area that the great majority of exhibitors obtain their award.

The two frames shown must tell a complete story. This of necessity is in concentrated form. But it is no good putting up page after page of great pieces without any continuity. The exhibit will suffer in philatelic knowledge, personal study, and possibly arrangement.

British judges, unlike their American colleagues, are very much concerned that when they award vermeil and above they are certain that if and when the exhibit is shown internationally, it will at worst drop one level with knowledgeable judges. More often than not it goes up a level as happened with me the first time I showed seventeen years ago.

When the group of judges awards at the highest levels it also marks the sheet for an appropriate special award. The following day the heads of each group meet and discuss who should receive the special awards; but it is not unusual for none to be award-

ed. Large Vermeil is a new level and probably nine or ten will be the average. Vermeils will number around sixteen but this is out of 150 exhibitors.

The Federation Class is for competitors who feel safe with the protection of their federation rather than to go it alone. They do not want the bother of writing up more than eight pages, or to go out of their way with collection and delivery; nor necessarily do they have to invest a deal of money into their collections. But at the same time are able to be involved in the thrill of competition.

The final class is the international class for exhibits that have previously won a vermeil or gold medal in one of the four main classes. They put up 64-96 sheets, and are judged at international standards by judges of international experience. The entrants vie for two special awards. The purpose, although not obligatory, being to prepare would-be international exhibitors who wish to represent their country.

This article will conclude in the next issue of *The Philatelic Exhibitor*.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: John Griffiths has an impressive list of philatelic accomplishments including International grand Prix D'Honneur Awards with two different exhibits, over 30 international Large Golds and National level awards too numerous to list.)



## NEWS FROM CLUBS AND SOCIETIES

This Department is for clubs and societies to communicate with exhibitors, judges and exhibition administrators. Is your society looking for a show to meet at in 1989 or 90? Why not invite inquiries here?

Have you an award you'd like shows to give? Advertise it here.

Has your club drafted special guidance for judges who review your specialty for special awards? Use this space to pass them along to the judging corps.

**The Ukrainian Philatelic and Numismatic Society (UPNS)** announces its annual "Golden Trident Award" to be presented to the exhibit of Ukraine or Ukraine-related material judged best among annual entries. The award will be conferred for the third time at UKRAINPEX '88 this fall. The only eligibility criterion is that the exhibit has received an award at a local, regional or national show. Membership in UPNS is not necessary to apply. Application may be made by the exhibitor or by an exhibit chairperson, by sending a photocopy of the exhibit to the GTA chairman: D.P. Belesky, P.O. Box 798, Beaver, WV 25813. Each entry will receive a certificate of participation bearing the UKRAINPEX commemorative postmark with the best entry receiving an appropriately engraved plaque.

The photocopy becomes a part of the permanent UPNS archives. Confidentiality will be maintained where requested. The society has photocopies of 12 exhibits on file, with material ranging from studies of Trident overprints to topicals dealing with Ukrainian achievements in science and technology. Material from Carpatho-Ukraine is well represented.

**American First Day Cover Society (AFDCS)** has announced that Martin H. Feibusch is the new Exhibiting/Awards Committee Chairman.

The Exhibition Awards Program has been revised with an AFDCS Honorable Mention Certificate, that had not been used for years, being reinstated to the Awards offered by the Society.

The AFDCS offers free show listings in **First Days**, the Society's award winning publication, to exhibitions offering AFDCS Awards if the awards request is received four months prior to the date of the show.

For awards applications or more information, write to Martin H. Feibusch, AFDCS Exhibiting/Awards Chairman, 3665 Benton St. #141, Santa Clara, CA 95051.



*Habsburg, Feldman S.A.*  
GENEVA  
(formerly David Feldman S.A.)

SELL IN SWITZERLAND

We are one of the world's most important auction houses.

Regular auctions of world-wide interest, always good sections of Switzerland, Brit. Commonwealth, Europe, USA, Asia, Airmails, etc.

Buying or selling - call us now for advice, information etc.

The Swiss auction house with the International outlook !

**HABSBURG, FELDMAN S.A.**

C. P. 125, 1213 Onex, Geneva, Switzerland

Tel. 022/572530 - Tlx 422747 HIF SA CH - Telefax 022/576498

# HERE! IMMEDIATE SHIPMENT!

## THE PHILATELIC EXHIBITOR'S HANDBOOK

By *RANDY L. NEIL*

Over three years in preparation, THE PHILATELIC EXHIBITOR'S HANDBOOK is the most extensive instructional text ever written on how to produce competitive exhibits. With the help of over 30 major award-winning exhibitors, the author gives the reader easy step-by-step guidelines (aided by scores of illustrations) for all forms of philatelic exhibiting — traditional, postal history, topical/thematic. A key addition to any philatelist's library . . . to be published in a softbound 8½" x 11" format with color covers.

17 DETAILED CHAPTERS  
220 + PAGES — PROFUSELY ILLUSTRATED  
FOUR APPENDICES

THE JOY OF PHILATELIC EXHIBITING  
EXHIBITING JUST FOR FUN  
HOW TO PLAN YOUR EXHIBIT  
PAGE LAYOUT AND DESIGN  
THE TITLE PAGE  
THE POSTAL HISTORY EXHIBIT  
EXHIBITING AND YOUR HOME COMPUTER  
THE JUDGES CRITIQUE  
INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITING

LAYING THE GROUNDWORK  
SUBJECT MATTER SELECTION  
AN EXHIBITOR'S TOOLS  
THE WRITE-UP  
THE TOPICAL/THEMATIC EXHIBIT  
THE YOUTH EXHIBIT  
HINTS ON SPECIAL TECHNIQUES  
STORING AND SHIPPING AN EXHIBIT

RANDY NEIL received a youth gold medal at FIPEX in 1956, a gold medal at AMERIPEX '86 . . . with over 40 U.S. Gold medals in between including grand awards at ARIPEX '72, MIDAPHIL '84, MILCOPEX (twice). He is not alone in the writing of THE PHILATELIC EXHIBITOR'S HANDBOOK . . . having received the personal counsel of experienced exhibitors from all fields. Many of their exhibits are illustrated.

Published under the Auspices of the American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors

**\$24<sup>95</sup>**

plus <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>" shipping  
**SOFTBOUND**

**\$39<sup>95</sup>**

plus <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>" shipping  
**HARDBOUND**

Return to: \_\_\_\_\_ SOFTBOUND  
THE TRADITIONS PRESS \_\_\_\_\_ HARDBOUND  
c/o ICF, Inc.  
10660 Barkley  
Overland Park, Kansas 66212

Please send me \_\_\_\_\_ copy(ies) of THE PHILATELIC EXHIBITOR'S HANDBOOK. Enclosed: \$\_\_\_\_\_  
Make checks payable to THE TRADITIONS PRESS.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_

State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code: \_\_\_\_\_





## DO YOU COLLECT U.S. OR WORLDWIDE STAMPS AND POSTAL HISTORY? ARE YOU A SPECIALIST?



### WHAT IS A SCHIFF "ESPECIALLY FOR SPECIALISTS"® AUCTION?

It's an auction designed with YOU in mind. Whether you are a buyer or a seller—each specialized area of collecting is listed in a separate section, making it easier for BUYERS to locate lots of particular interest and for SELLERS to realize maximum exposure for their material.



If you do not get our catalogues you are missing out! Send \$8.50 (\$12.50 overseas) for a full year's subscription to Schiff auction catalogues and prices realized or send \$1.00 (\$1.50 with prices realized) for a Sample copy of our next sale. If picked up at our office the catalogue is complimentary.

We invite you to consign individual stamps or covers, entire collections or estates—for unreserved Public Auction or Private Treaty Sale. WE ALSO PURCHASE OUTRIGHT! Contact us first, describing your material. Include your address and telephone number(s).



Jacques C. Schiff, Jr., Inc.

195 MAIN STREET

RIDGEFIELD PARK, NEW JERSEY 07660

Phones: (201) 641-5566 — From N.Y.C. 662-2777

Licensed & Bonded Auctioneers—Established 1947



# SELLING AT AUCTION

If your collection is worth \$20,000.00 or more net, it will be worth your while to contact us.

We are the oldest action firm in the United States under original ownership. Our charge is 10% of the hammer price; there are no other charges. We produce a very attractive catalogue with liberal photos, have one of the largest mailing lists in the profession, and offer full settlement in 40 days.

Should you wish to discuss your situation further, please call on our toll free number. . .

**1-800-645-3840**

**NYS Residents 516-354-1001**

• Request a sample catalogue •

**JOHN A. FOX**

141 Tulip Avenue Floral Park, N.Y. 11001

## REPORT OF THE CRITIQUE SERVICE

By Harry Meier, P.O. Box 369, Palmyra, VA 22963

For the year ending 1987, 19 exhibits were received by the critique service. The exhibits covered a wide range of subjects and were mostly beginning exhibitors. The predominant subject was in the thematic area. With few exceptions all exhibits were returned within our 30 day guideline. While we only have a few judges that have asked to be part of the service, a number of the exhibits have been sent to judges selected from the APS list of judges due to their specialties and the exhibits being in their area of expertise.

For the most part, the judges contacted have been willing, cooperative and have done very good jobs in their critiques of the exhibits. I have received a number of letters and phone calls of thanks for the critiques as well as follow up as to awards won and comments by other judges.

It appears that the service has been performing the function that it was created to do: help exhibitors.

Critiqued exhibits seem to have done well in subsequent showings. A survey is planned during 1988 of the exhibits that have been through the service to gain a better sense of the value of the critiques.

The biggest problems that the exhibits seem to have is difficulty with their organization. This applies at all levels of exhibiting, and whether the exhibitor is a first timer or advanced. The exhibits often don't "flow" and are hard to follow. If they are hard to follow when a judge has plenty of time to look at them, consider the judges at the show when typically there is only a minute or two per frame to try to figure out what is being done.

Under this constraint one can easily see why awards in many cases are lower than the material might earn. Of the exhibits that have been received, there are many in areas that have never or seldom been shown before.

It might be noted that most exhibits have been sent back with one to four page letters in addition to comments on the pages. In many cases information on the

subject, when available in a reviewer's clipping file, is sent along.

Please exhibitors: read and follow instructions on the application blank and the appended slip. Exhibits have been received without envelopes, envelopes of poor quality, short postage and incomplete information. Envelopes should be the sturdy KRAFT envelopes and not the thin paper or plastic type envelopes with green borders. The latter do not provide adequate protection. The flap should be taped. I'd appreciate the use of commemorative stamps on the envelopes sent in as the stamps are removed and put into a box for junior activities at VAPEX.

## COMING ATTRactions

The deadline for the July, 1988 issue of *The Philatelic Exhibitor* will be May 15, 1988.

We will continue to set a suggested theme for letter writers, columnists and feature authors to mull over. As in the case of this issue, some have chosen to speak to it; others have not. The theme was "Why is it so hard to earn a gold medal with modern material?"

For the next two issues, the themes will be: *July issue*: "Is single frame exhibiting a wave of the future?" (Deadline: May 15, 1988), *October issue*: "What changes can we expect to see in exhibiting in this country in the next 10 years?" (Deadline: August 15, 1988).

If you have strong opinions on these issues, let's hear from you. This is your chance to convince your colleagues in exhibiting who make and administer the rules!

If you would like to suggest a theme for a future issue, write to the Editor.

# EXHIBITING AND YOUTH THE TIME FOR TRANSITION

By Cheryl B. Edgcomb  
P.O. Box 166, Knoxville, PA. 16928

When is a young exhibitor ready for the transition from creative or beginning exhibit format to that of traditional? There is no easy solution to this question, but this column will present several factors that may help you in determining when the time is suitable for your child.

**No Two Alike:** There is no set age level when this transition period should begin, just as there are no two youth exhibitors that are totally alike. Each child matures at a unique pace and this maturity factor must be taken into consideration.

Some children adapt more readily to traditional exhibiting. They can be encouraged along these lines. On the other hand, an artistic youth involved with creative exhibiting over an extended period may need a gentle mentor's "nudge" into traditional format. Your child's concerns and interests are very important in this transitional phase. He should be allowed to voice his desires, and you should be willing to take these into account.

As a youth approaches the "teen" years, most have mastered the techniques of research and report writing from their daily school activities. You will find most have the basics necessary to begin a traditional exhibit at this suggested age level.

Observe your youngster's study habits. Is he capable of researching an interesting subject without becoming fidgety? Inquire as to his attention span at your next "meet the teacher" session. Research and subject knowledge play an important role in the preparation of a traditional exhibit. Does your young exhibitor enjoy researching the philatelic materials, or does he find it trying?

Don't rush the research process, or frustration will likely set in and may deter your child from finishing. Select research materials that will be of interest and that are geared to your child's age level. Allow him to set the pace, while you act as the guide. Let him determine the points of in-

terest he feels are important to include in the exhibit text, so that his own style and characteristics are allowed to surface.

**Identifying Important Elements:** When you begin this exhibiting transition, the American Philatelic Society's "Manual of Philatelic Judging" can serve as a useful reference for you both. Unless he is at a sufficient age to be capable of doing so, don't suggest he read the Manual for himself. Instead, you, the mentor, should become aware of judging criteria and proceed to guide in a manner that will include and explain them.

Are there sufficient philatelic items to project a good amount of philatelic knowledge? Is the subject complete? When appropriate, is the story-element maintained throughout the exhibit?

How many pages will successfully cover the exhibit subject adequately? Is your youngster eager enough to prepare that amount, or should the subject matter be scaled down to accommodate his current capabilities and interest level?

Only the two of you can determine the best answers to these questions.

**Competitive Criteria:** Assuming you have concluded that your child has developed sufficiently to begin this transition phase, one final factor should be considered. Philatelic exhibiting is a competitive process and as such, your youngster should realize there is the possibility that his efforts may not immediately gain an award. He should be mature enough to accept panel decisions, and sufficiently prepared to ask the Judges about suggestions for exhibit improvements at the critique. With critique results and your guidance, he can continue to improve his exhibit and feel positive about improving as new material and information is acquired.

If you create a constantly reassuring atmosphere, encouraging as you go, you will soon see the transition period through.

## SHOW LISTINGS

AAPE will include listings of shows being held during the six months after the face date of the magazine if they are open shows and if submitted in the following format with all specified information. World Series of Philately shows are designated by an "\*\*\*\*". Because of space limitations, only those shows that are still accepting exhibit entries will be listed.

**April 30 - May 1. HUNTSEX '88**, Huntsville Philatelic Club, Park Inn International, Huntsville, Alabama. Six (8½" x 11") pages per frame. Adults \$2.50 per frame. Juniors \$1. Entries by April 23, 1988. Data from Exhibit Chairman, P.O. Box 4395, Huntsville, AL 35815.

**\*May 27-29. PIPEX '88**, Northwest Federation of Stamp Clubs and Greater Eugene Stamp Society. Held at Eugene Hilton Hotel, Eugene, Oregon. Frames hold 15 (8½" x 11") pages. Adults \$6.50 per frame (maximum of 10 frames). Juniors \$1.25 per frame (maximum of 6 or 8 frames). Entries close April 30. Info from PIPEX '88, P.O. Box 734, Eugene, OR 97440.

**\*May 28-30. NAPEX '88**, Sheraton National Hotel, Arlington, Virginia. 16 (8½" x 11") pages per frame. Adults: \$7 per frame; Juniors \$4. 300+ frames. Minimum 2; maximum 10. Prospectus from Gordon Torrey, 5118 Duvalle Place, Bethesda, MD 20816.

**\*Sept. 30 - Oct. 2. AIRPEX XIII**, Dayton Stamp Club. To be held at: Dayton Convention & Exhibition Center, Fifth & Main Sts., Dayton, Ohio. Frames: 16 pages (8½" x 11"), \$6 per frame (Adults), \$2 (Youth), minimum 2 frames. Entries close Sept. 1, 1988. Annual convention of the American Air Mail Society. Prospectus/Hotel information from: Martin Richardson, P.O. Box 1574, Dayton, OH 45401.

**\*Oct. 14-16. SESCAL '88**, sponsored by the Federated Philatelic Clubs of Southern California; at L.A. Airport Hyatt Hotel, 6225 W. Century Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90045. Frames: 16 (8½" x 11") or 12 (10½" x 11") pages. Adults, \$6 per frame, from 2 to 12 frames; Juniors \$2 per frame, 1 to 4 frames. Entries close Sept. 10. Data from Robert W. Thompson, P.O. Box 42148, Point Mugu, CA 93042. *Includes literature exhibition.* Info available from Robert de Violini, P.O. Box 5025, Oxnard, CA 93031, w/SASE.

**\*Oct. 21-23. SEPAD '88**, Associated Stamp Clubs of Southeastern Pennsylvania & Delaware. Valley Forge Convention & Exhibit Center, 1200 First Avenue, King of Prussia, PA. Annual Conventions of American Helvetia Philatelic Society, Postal History Society and Baltic States Study Group. Frames: 16 (8½" x

11") or 12 (10" x 12") pages. Adults, \$7 per frame (2 to 10 frames); Juniors, \$2 per frame (1 to 6 frames); Junior First-time Exhibitors, up to 3 frames free. Entries close Sept. 9, 1988. Prospectus from Stephen S. Washburne, P.O. Box 1916, Philadelphia, PA 19105; Hotel & Show Information from SEPAD, P.O. Box 731, Horsham, PA 19044.

**\*Nov. 4-6. CHICAGOPEX '88**, Chicago Philatelic Society. New location: O'Hare Expo Center, 5555 North River Road, Rosemont, IL (near O'Hare Airport). Annual conventions of the AAPE and APC. Frames: 16 pages (8½" x 11") — Adults, \$6 per frame, from 2 to 10 frames; Juniors, \$3 per frame. Special section for Juniors. Deadline: Aug. 1, 1988. Literature exhibition for handbooks and periodicals — \$6 per entry. For prospectus (philatelic and/or literature) and reservation card, write: CHICAGOPEX '88, P.O. Box A3953, Chicago, IL 60690-3953.

**\*Nov. 12-13. SUNPEX '88**, Sunnyvale Stamp Society. Held at Community Center. 12 (8½" x 11") pages or 9 (9" x 12") pages per frame. \$3 per frame (Adults), \$1 per frame (Juniors); minimum two frames per exhibit. Entries close Oct. 15, 1988. Info from Roger Skinner, P.O. Box 60082, Sunnyvale, CA 94088.

**\*Nov. 18-20. MIDAPHIL '88**, The Collectors Club of Kansas City, Hyatt Regency Hotel, Kansas City, Missouri. 9 (8½" x 11") page frames. Adults: \$3.00 per frame. Juniors free, maximum 18 frames. Info: Mike Schrampf, 705 New Orleans Ct., Lee's Summit, MO 64081.

**\*Nov. 18-20. VAPEX '88**, Virginia Philatelic Federation. Pavilion Convention Center, Virginia Beach, VA. 16 (8½" x 11") page frames; Adults: \$7 per frame — minimum 2 frames; Juniors: \$3.50 per frame. Info: VAPEX '88, P.O. Box 5367, Virginia Beach, VA 23455.

**International: PHILEXFRANCE '89 (7/89)**. Forms due by June 1, 1988. Contact U.S. Commissioner Raymond L. Gaillaguet, 15 Fletcher St., Rumford, RI 02916.

**Attention Show Committees: Send complete information for future listings to the Editor.**

# THE STATE OF TOPICAL/THEMATIC EXHIBITING AND JUDGING

An interview with Col. Stephen Luster, USA

This journal stands for the premise that open discussion is preferable to whispering campaigns; and the often unfocused response or incompletely heard explanation. In this spirit, the Editor has distilled into three questions the written and oral complaints he has heard on the state of topical/thematic (T/T) exhibiting in the United States. He has put these questions to Col. Stephen Luster, an experienced T/T exhibitor, APS judge, and a newly accredited ATA judge. It can be fairly said that he has grown up under the T/T discipline as it is today and that he has an acquaintance with the work and personalities of the leaders in American T/T philately.

JMH: I have heard it said that T/T judging is getting too detailed with its rules, and that some of them aren't rules at all but the opinions of an elite.

SL: I think it is fair to say that there is more being heard in America today than ever before about T/T exhibiting (and rules). One reason is because more forums exist than ever before for getting the word out; not the least of which is the PE. Rules for T/T judging have always existed (as have rules for most other types of philatelic judging).

If there was a problem in the past it had to do with the fact that most of the major philatelic organizations in the world (FIP, APS and ATA), had differing standards for T/T judging. What you are experiencing today is the result of a concerted effort from a few dedicated people, to make judging rules more standard . . . and to ensure that the T/T exhibiting community is made aware of these rules.

It is true that many exhibitors have never been exposed to the judging "rules." I used to joke that I learn one or more new rules each time I receive a judge's critique. The fact is, that I never took the initiative to learn the rules. But more to your specific question, why the new emphasis on the rules?

To address that question it is important to understand that in years past there existed a disparity between "top" U.S. T/T exhibits and the best T/T exhibits coming from other parts of the world, primarily Europe. This was evident when these "top" U.S. exhibits competed at the international level. It didn't seem to make much difference if the exhibitor came up through the ATA, APS or both ranks. U.S. T/T exhibits, with few exceptions, didn't measure up.

Then, in the early 1980's, the ATA took the opportunity to invite to its annual convention Dr. Ing. Giancarlo Morolli (the President of the thematic commission of the FIP). I believe that Dr. Morolli's lecture at that convention marked the turning point in T/T judging in the United States. Anyone who wants to know what the message was has only to read Dr. Morolli's comments which are in print . . . or attend one of his lectures or famous "Walk-throughs" (he gave them at AMERIPEX and CAPEX). I am hard-pressed to understand how there can exist credible criticism that there are no rules, only opinions, considering what has been written and said on the subject. In my opinion, the critics ought to take the time to examine the record . . . or speak to specific points.

How does one address the question regarding rules being made by an "elite?" Let me say this. *No one* is trying to dictate how any person collects or exhibits. Those choices are left to the individual. The point is this . . . collect what you want, exhibit what and how you want. But remember, exhibiting is a competition . . . and if you want to do well, you must follow the rules. Now, who makes the rules? I do not believe that the efforts of a handful of people should be criticized.

Today we are seeing more cooperation between major philatelic organizations than ever before. The APS and ATA have agreed to methods of standardized judging of T/T exhibits and the cross-accreditation of judges. Both organizations are now in line

with FIP standards. To the contrary, the whole purpose of the effort is to improve the state of T/T exhibiting in the United States . . . and if recent successes are any test . . . then I say we need more of what we are getting . . . not less.

There are many exhibitors out there who want to do it their way. To them I say that they should. I hate censorship in any form. But, it is important to keep in mind that when an exhibitor chooses to enter an exhibit into competition in a show sponsored by the APS, ATA or FIP, their exhibit will be judged against a set of rules . . . and if the exhibitor fails to follow those rules (however they may "hate" them) . . . they should not expect to receive a high level of award.

So, if those dedicated judges and philatelists who have devoted countless hours of their time to getting the word out, are to be labeled as the "elite" for their efforts, then I say "viva la elite." I'll be the first to admit that some changes may be necessary, but if change is needed, let the critics work from within instead of sniping from the sidelines.

How do I address the issue of opinions? Every judge has a personal bias. By establishing a uniform approach to judging and exhibiting, by providing written and oral comments to exhibitors, by having exhibitors progress through many different levels of competition . . . improvements are inevitable . . . improvements in exhibits and improvements in the quality of judging.

I too have been confronted by biased judges from time to time. I try to deal with them in a straightforward manner. Some judges I have been able to bring around to my way of thinking; other times, not. I believe that there are good T/T judges in the system and more coming into it each year. That, coupled with the check that APS is doing on proposed jury compositions for shows it sponsors, will ensure, in my opinion, that T/T exhibits will get a fairer shake than ever before.

I have also heard some complaints that the "elite" people tend to judge hard. In my own experience, the easy judges gave me great encouragement and my level of awards steadily improved. It was years later than I found out that I had not received the type of guidance that I needed. The level of award being given to my exhibit was too high compared to a theoretical standard of excellence for comparable material. It was only when I began receiving the "hard" critiques from knowledgeable people that real improvements began. We should always be grateful to judges who are not afraid to look us in the eye and "tell it like it is."

JMH: It is said that favorites are being played at the highest levels, to wit: There are recognized **IN** people and **OUT** people; and their awards reflect their status, not the merits of their exhibits.

SL: John, you and I both came up in the same "system." We know that there are "In" people in the sense that these are the people that: join organizations, work for those organizations, join and work for many stamp clubs, serve in office, write articles, attend exhibitions and bourses, aspire to and become judges. Yes, these people are known throughout the hobby. So I guess it's OK if those people are known as the IN people. If by "OUT" people, you mean faceless individuals who are known only by their exhibits . . . then I suppose it's fair to put exhibitors into IN and OUT categories.

However, I do not accept as an absolute that IN people are always given favored treatment. The fact that high level awards are won by unknown and/or first-time exhibitors disproves the point. In my view, the best exhibits usually get the top awards. IN people have usually worked long and hard and have taken their knocks along the way. They are the people who have heeded the judges' advice over the years, learned the rules, endured the hardship needed to improve their material . . . and have done all of the other things necessary to make their exhibit the best possible.

The problem as I see it with the OUT people is that they seldom know or follow the rules. Yes, some of them do have good exhibits and they have done well with them in the past . . . then they arrive at the national or international level where the judges know and follow the rules. There, these exhibits tend not to do so well . . . and the exhibitors cry foul.

I'd be foolish to suggest that judges don't play favorites. I'm sure that some do. However, in my experience, those judges are few and far between. Other judges on the panel wouldn't stand for such shenanigans.

As a judge, I can assure you that the most significant thing I look for when determining the level of award, is the merits of the exhibit. You and I have judged on the same panel before and I know it's your style too. I'm hard pressed to think of a judge who makes decisions based on who owns the exhibit rather than its merit . . . we wouldn't stand for it.

JMH: It seems that there is a muddle being created by international judges who are forcing international precepts on even beginning T/T exhibitors in this country.

SL: I don't see anyone "forcing" anything. What I see is judges who, even though they may be accredited at the international level, using standards of judging appropriate for the level of show being judged. The problem is that when asked for their opinion, they give the best possible advice. In other words, they try to get all exhibitors on a path that will cause them to start and continue towards the highest goals of exhibiting.

I know that very few exhibitors will ever get to the international level, and this gives rise to the criticism you mentioned. However, would you want the judges to give advice on how to achieve a lesser standard, or award? Or give gold medals to lousy exhibits? Come on!

The most often asked question of a judge is . . . what will it take to improve my exhibit . . .? Should a judge hedge his comments? I think not. That's what got you and me into trouble during our "formative" years. No John, when I ask what it will take . . . I want the best possible advice. Tell me what it will take to get to the top . . . then I'll decide if it's worth it to follow the advice.

I believe that too many beginning exhibitors are putting their exhibits into national level shows. That's rarely a place for a beginner. There's no muddle. If you place your exhibit in front of the best and most knowledgeable judges, then you have got to be prepared for the criticism . . . if such is deserved. Beginners are often not prepared for the criticism . . . or don't want to hear it. Some of them feel that just because they won the grand award at LOCALPEX, they should do all right at the national level. It 'ain't necessarily so!

National level show committees are caught between the rock and the hard place. They could help by not accepting exhibits until they are ready for national level competition. We do not have a system in the U.S. like some other countries have, whereby an exhibit has to acquire a "pedigree" before it can aspire to higher levels of competition.

Because we do not have such a system, we often see exhibits at the national level which in my opinion, do not belong at that level. This situation often results in show chairpersons pleading with juries to give an award to all exhibitors, even the undeserving . . . they claim it has something to do with the prestige of the show. I don't buy that argument. I think judges do a great injustice by taking the path of least resistance by giving undeserved awards.

I think there are some things wrong with a system which allows exhibits to get to the national level simply by having their owners pay the frame fees. But unless or until another system comes along . . . we'll have to do the best we can.

In the meantime, I'd like to see show committees set aside a certain number of frames for first-time exhibitors so they can have their "day in court."

I'd also like the committees to set aside another group of frames for non-competitive exhibits. These could be judged and the results of the critique conveyed to the exhibitor without medal levels getting in the way.

I suppose that the current controversy will drive some exhibitors away from the "game" . . . or keep others from making the plunge. What a shame. In my opinion, I never really understood the full measure of the hobby until I started exhibiting. Vistas were opened for me that I never knew existed. We live in a permissive society and that might be the reason why we have lost sight of the fact that exhibitions are competitions . . . and tough ones to boot. None-the-less, I'd like to see more people take the

plunge. It won't be easy . . . but I'll guarantee they'll enjoy the hobby more for the experience.

**Editor's Note:** What seems clear to me after rereading this exchange a fourth time is that we have a "ships passing in the night" sort of situation. On one side of the channel, good hearted T/T judges acting as missionaries are trying hard to prepare all T/T exhibitors for the rocky road up the mountain. On the other side, only a very few T/T exhibitors have any intention of storming the International heights. They do not want to be told what they must do to win International golds when their sights are set for the National level.

In traditional exhibiting, a National gold does not mean that the same prize will automatically follow at the International level; nor should it. There is a sharp demarcation line between the two levels and the national exhibitor need not concern himself with international rules until making a conscious decision to step up to that level.

My sense is that the majority of T/T exhibitors at the national level are happy there and would like the same privilege.

---

Since the editor should not have the last word, the final draft of this article was submitted to Col. Luster for review. His response to my note is:

SL: John is right . . . and his ships passing in the night is an appropriate analogy. However, regardless of what level the exhibitor sets his sights on . . . there should not be any reward unless there is a corresponding amount of effort and achievement. I do not believe that there is as sharp a demarcation between the top of the national level and the ability to compete successfully at the international level as John states. Further, it is the major U.S. national society (APS) that runs most of the national level shows, writes the manual of philatelic judging, and serves as the U.S. Representative to the FIP . . . so, if there is a beef, the target should be obvious.

I do agree that most T/T exhibitors would be happy at the national level . . . and I do not see that judges are trying to force them into the international arena. Rather those judges are trying to judge T/T exhibits by the standards that have been set for them (and which those judges are sworn to follow). It is the T/T exhibitors who may not be happy with the levels of award that result. So who's to blame?

## When writing up your exhibit: Ponder the following

Lincoln's Gettysburg Address has 266 words.

The Ten Commandments have 297 words.

The Declaration of Independence has 300 words.

An Agriculture order setting the price of cabbage has 26,911 words.

**MORE IS NOT ALWAYS BETTER!!!!**

Ella Sauer  
Dent, MN

### LIFE MEMBERSHIPS AVAILABLE

LIFE MEMBERSHIP is available. The cost is \$300.00. The LIFE MEMBERSHIP dues may be paid in three installments of \$100.00 each. The entire amount is due one year from the date of application. To change your status to that of a LIFE MEMBER, please send \$100.00 down (or the entire amount, if you wish) to: Steven J. Rod, Secretary, AAPE, P.O. Box 432, South Orange, NJ 07079.



[EDITOR'S NOTE: *The following review of a specific national level show is presented because it contains criticism that should be of interest to all shows at any level. The names of the reviewer and the show are not germane to the issues discussed, so they will remain anonymous. I have deleted the reviewer's conclusions in favor of facts.*

*There is a school of thought which suggests that philatelic publications should avoid washing dirty laundry in public. I agree that character assassination, name calling, unsubstantiated interpretation and other such material should not be dignified by publication in a reputable journal. It is however, the duty of our publication to serve as a forum to discuss objectively all practices and policies which affect us, and to point up instances when we can and should learn from others' mistakes. It is in that spirit that this review is presented.]*

## A SHOW REVIEW

On set-up Thursday, although many exhibitors were there as early as 4:00 p.m., the frames weren't ready until about 10:00 p.m. If they had security there, I didn't see it. Open doors all over the place, people coming and going into and out of the exhibition area absolutely at will and never so much as a question asked as to who this person might be, let alone what the person was doing in the area and certainly not to mention what it was that the person was taking out of the area.

O.K., some of the exhibitors were there slightly in advance of the time at which the exhibits could be mounted. What to do? Well that was simple — baby sit the exhibit that was to be mounted. How about leaving the exhibit in the hotel safe and heading off for the pool. Sorry. The hotel safe was not large enough and the pool closes at 7:00 p.m. Never mind, head for the bar. Ha! The tiny bar was packed. Go sit in the lobby and wait there? Fewer than 10 places to sit in the cavernous lobby. O.K., up to the room to watch TV. Boring. Run back to the exhibition area from time to time — and drag the exhibit with you — only to find that they **still** aren't ready to mount exhibits, etc., etc., etc., **ad infinitum**.

At both set-up and take-down time, there was an unattended box of those special screw drivers needed for the AMERIPEX-type frames. It would have been a simple matter for anybody to help him — or herself to a screw driver **and** whatever album pages seemed interesting.

Would you like me to make a prediction? At some future exhibition where those AMERIPEX-type frames are used, there will be a very, very unfortunate incident. It will be discovered that **somebody** got into many of the frames and numerous, valuable philatelic items came up missing. The subsequent investigations will turn up the fact that the tool which allowed the culprit to get into the frames was stolen from that unattended box of such tools.

The layout of the exhibition? Awful. I counted no less than 15 "split exhibits," by which I mean exhibits which went around corners or crossed rows, all of which could have been avoided with a little advance planning. A typical case: a 10 frame exhibit started with the first three frames as the final three of this row. The remaining seven frames were around the corner in the next row. Then came a three-frame exhibit. Don't ask me why they didn't put the three-frame exhibit at the end of the one row and the 10-frame exhibit together around the corner in the next row. How distressing it must have been to an individual who worked and worked and worked on an exhibit to have this show split it.

The judging? Incredible. But I can't fault the judges. After all, they walked into this 300 + 16 page frame exhibition with no advance knowledge at all of what would be there; not even an advance list of exhibit titles! Were the judges briefed? No. Were they given at least a pad of paper and a list of which exhibits were to be considered

for this or that special award? Ha! About all the judges had was the show program, which also listed names of exhibitors.

The critique? I felt so sorry for the judges. Most of them are outstanding judges; no question about that. Yet, virtually the entire critique consisted of comments about "presentation," "organization," "logic of order," "logic of flow," "borders or no borders around covers and pages," etc., etc., etc. Apart from a comment or two about the condition of an item, not so much as a single comment such as to how an exhibit could be improved by the addition of this or that item, how this or that area of the exhibit might be explored further by the inclusion of this or that type of material, or how an exhibit was lacking this or that type of coverage. But then isn't that the kind of critique one would expect from judges who have no advance information and therefore no way to do their homework at all? It sure is.

Yes, the dealers were good. I'll say that. The hotel? Too hot for me, and it was out in the boonies. Interestingly, all food service at the hotel shut down for a couple of hours in the early afternoon, for siesta, I suppose. Only the bar continued to have food and service, but such a limited selection. When the food service was open, the service was wretched. Did we get hungry! But I understood why in our room there was a large card extolling a pizza delivery place.

## CLASSIFIED ADS WELCOME

Your ad here — up to 30 words plus address — for \$5. Members only. Send ad and payment to the Editor, P.O. Box 1125, Falls Church, VA 22041-0125. Next deadline: May 15, 1988.

• **SOUTH PACIFIC, BRITISH BORNEO.** If you want to add Postal History material to your exhibit, write to the specialist. I have a nice stock of covers, proofs, Specimens, postal stationery. Howard Lee, Box 636PE, New York, NY 10163.

• **FROG/TOAD:** especially French Guiana 1947 postage due ON COVER, worldwide postmarks, receiving marks, pictorial cancels, meters, errors, freaks wanted. Will trade for what you need (?) or will purchase. Jo Bleakley, 15906 Crest Dr., Woodbridge, VA 22191.

• **URGENTLY NEEDED:** interesting and unusual usages of plate number coils, particularly foreign destinations, APOs, etc. I also need ordinary usages of PNC precancels on cover. Buy or trade. Ken Lawrence, P.O. Box 3568, Jackson, MS 39207.

• **CUSTOM GRAPHICS** on album pages, other media. In ink, professional quality. Postmarks, maps, diagrams. Free details from W. Dean, c/o Nayaug Graphics, Box 25, S. Glastonbury, CT 06073.

• **2c STAMP OF 1890:** Seeking accumulations, and exhibit items; also information and fellow collectors. A. Herrmann, Box 551, Wilmington, DE 19899.

## An Exhibitor's Code of Ethics?

by Randy L. Neil

Member Robert E. Picken of Holt, Michigan has suggested that the drafting of an Exhibitor's Code of Ethics would be a useful thing to do as a supplement to the formal rules that guide us now.

I would like to hear from the membership on three subjects:

1. Opinions on the need/utility of such a Code
2. Expressions of interest in coordinating such a project, should AAPE adopt it
3. Thoughts on items to include.

Please write to me at P.O. Box 7088, Shawnee-Mission, KS 66207.

## Exhibits Committee Clearinghouse

By Stanley J. Luft

c/o ROMPEX, P.O. Box 2352, Denver, CO 80201

Deadlines, as usual, are working against me. I had to assemble this column before the hoped-for flood of letters generated by the previous column can reach me. Fortunately there is a small backlog of correspondence that either arrived too late to meet deadline for the previous number, or just simply fell through the cracks. Thanks this time for help received from Crystal Eikanger, Joe Nichols, and yes, Janet Klug, too.

Joe (and I) wish that Jury Chairmen would refrain from discussing the merits of Gold-bemedalled exhibits until others' exhibits are critiqued. When Joe was a novice exhibitor and the recipient of a bronze (he's done much better since!) he was so overwhelmed by praise — and also adverse comments — bestowed upon the top exhibits that modesty and embarrassment precluded his requesting much-needed advice at that particular critique. Probably the same has happened to many of us at one time or another.

I do know several Jury Chairmen who set the ground rules with a statement that golds are to be covered last if at all. We would like to see this become a general rule. Gold-medal exhibits should not be ignored, however; almost all can stand some additional improvements — or at least give the jurors an opportunity to learn where they might be off base.

Here's a suggestion I'd like to pass along to other exhibits committees. After our awards banquet, those attendees who care to are invited to visit the exhibits, and our security people are instructed to let them into the hall for perhaps 45 minutes, during which time they are chaperoned by committee members. This is often the only opportunity for spouses and guests to see what a philatelic exhibition is all about. Even more importantly, it enables exhibitors to explain their material to interested judges, in a way that (because of lack of time, shyness, whatever) cannot possibly be done at the critique or in the normal presence of casual visitors present during normal show hours. This can truly educate the judge, the exhibitor, and others.

I join several respondents in a desire to see a good mix at the awards banquets: exhibitors, dealers, judges, committee members, etc. scattered about rather than clustered together. I have been to shows where judges were segregated at a single table, presumably for their own protection. They've certainly seen enough of one another the previous day(s) and should be encouraged to mingle, perhaps even entertain, certainly edify their table mates.

While on the subject, I have been to shows with a head table and to others without one. Having to sit at a rectangular head table very much curtails the possibilities for multiple conversations, and can be a very lonely experience. Please have only round tables about the floor. All the furnishings that are really necessary for a speaker and an awards ceremony are a display table for the awards, a dais, and an open microphone. No one needs to eat atop these during the course of the evening (or morning).

A.1-7. (On entertaining non-collecting accompanying family members). Such non-philatelic activities don't seem all that important. If needed, arrangements should preferably be made directly with the show hotel or with professional tours (also through the hotel). Let's give the show committee a bit of a break!

Q.2-3. Smoking in public is under fire, to put it mildly. It is also beginning to polarize attendees at stamp shows. Though I suppose that bourse dealers who must smoke should be permitted to do so at their tables — not having any other place to go to for hours at a stretch, what about smoking by (a) clients at bourse tables, (b) walkers-

by the frames, (c) judges at work amongst the exhibits, (d) attendees at meetings and programs, (e) attendees at awards ceremonies, (f) any other categories? Am I opening a can of worms here? Must one attempt to mollify everybody while pleasing perhaps only a very few?

Q.2-4. It is not unusual at many non-philatelic affairs, where talks and/or ceremonies follow a repast, to permit people to enter gratis after the meal so that they may listen to the address or ceremonial undertakings. On the assumption that some people don't care for the typical banquet fare, are on special diets, can't stand the smoke (see above), or don't wish (or can't afford) to undergo the expense, what are your opinions regarding "opening the doors" to newcomers who wish to participate only in the awards ceremony part of the program? One obvious objection is the possible loss of revenue by the hotel or caterer — which might have to be made up somewhere along the way through higher levies upon the show treasury. Still, it is a subject well worth tackling.

Sometimes I do read my own scribbles. As a follow up to the lead paragraph in V. II, No 2, the ROMPEX bolt-tightening crew will henceforth be furnished with carpenters' aprons. These were donated to us by a local building-supply firm and of course bear its advertising — which is fine with us. Other show committees please copy.

Finally, kudos of the first order to Roger Skinner of SUNPEX for averting a potential "horror" story and for easing one anxious exhibitor's mind when her Express Mailed exhibit failed to arrive by the day of the show. Mr. Skinner left no stone unturned, from calling the exhibitor to ascertain she hadn't forgotten what weekend it was, to eventually locating the package sitting forlornly at his local post office the following Monday, to reassuring her it had been found, to refunding all frame charges. This story does have a happy ending, for the retrieved exhibit won a gold at a subsequent national-level show.

Please write. This column needs a lot of help!

**Q&A.** Your questions are welcome here — as are your answers to questions posed. Please send in care of the Editor. Questions 4, 5 and 6 from the previous two issues have not drawn answers. Can *you* help?

Q7. Please define "First Time Exhibitor." I know this seems simple enough but I know of instances where a long time exhibitor entered a new exhibit and got the first time award; and of older exhibits which hadn't been shown for a few years coming back as a first time exhibit of a new exhibitor and getting the award. What is the rule? (Conrad Bush)

## "Why Do You Exhibit" Winners

Winners of this contest, announced in the October, 1987 TPE are:

**First Place:** Dennis Ryan — "Philatelic exhibiting is an act of creation and self-discovery . . ."

**Second Place:** Barbara Wirta — "I exhibit turtles because of the lack of dinosaurs . . ."

**Third Place:** Michael Strother — ". . . My second reason to exhibit was because a judge said it couldn't be done . . ."

**Fourth Place:** Frederick Dickson ". . . found two Priests on their knees before my exhibit . . . And they were laughing."

Thanks to judges Joan R. Bleakley, Jane King Fohn, John M. Hotchner and Randy L. Neil. The four winning entries will appear in the next four issues.

## Ask Odenweller — How to Educate the Judges

by Robert P. Odenweller "Chalon," Round Top Road,  
Bernardsville, N.J. 07924-2101

The more highly specialized the subject you are exhibiting, the higher the likelihood that a given judge will not know much about it. At national shows the problem becomes even more acute if the material is from a country other than your own, since the latter is one area most judges are likely to know best. (This is not the case with exhibitions which have invited groups and conventions, since they usually have judges who specialize in the area of the group.)

How, then, do you "educate" the judges about the mysteries of your field?

There are two approaches to the answer. One is the short term, and the other is a long term one. First we will consider the short term solution since it applies to virtually all exhibits.

### At the Exhibition:

By way of starting, I should point out how NOT to do it. In 1976 I was team leader in Milan at Italia '76. One rather obnoxious exhibitor made a point of standing near his exhibit and, while we were looking at the exhibit mounted on the opposite side of his, he "explained" loudly how he had been misjudged before and what great material he had. When we rounded the corner, it took all the efforts of one of the team members, who was also from England, to get rid of the exhibitor so we could evaluate it in peace. It was then necessary to clear the air and to persuade the team not to react to the events, but to evaluate the exhibit as we saw it, rather than to be more critical of it as might have been a natural tendency after the blatant attempt to influence the jury.

The right way to do it is much easier. In an earlier column I explained how to make proper use of the introductory page and the "showcasing" of your key pieces. This is a strong step in the right direction, and should be enough to educate judges who have a brushing interest in your area. There is not much more that can be done at this point, since the time restrictions on the judges are usually quite tight, and any solution based on more text will probably fall short of the desired result.

Another potential is provided by the newly approved FIP General Regulations for Exhibitions (October, 1987). These permit the commissioner from a country to be present at the exhibits to explain them **if the jury desires**. In a sense, this may be superfluous, since the jury has always had the right to ask any specialist or expert for advice on a subject about which it feels ill informed. In practice, I have only seen this done a few times, often more to "prove a point" between two teams that may disagree, rather than to educate the jury.

The earlier form of this idea, which was not approved, was to have the commissioner or exhibitor present at the time of judging to give a 5 or 10 minute explanation of his exhibit. Other than the obvious problems in scheduling, lack of specific knowledge (by the commissioner — and sometimes the exhibitor!) about the exhibit, and difficulty of communication, the additional time needed for the judging process, assuming all went like clockwork, would be impossible. For example, in Copenhagen one judge had assigned 96 exhibits. If each exhibitor waited patiently and then gave the 10 minute explanation, the explanations alone would have taken two 8 hour days. Add to that a similar time for discussion and more to move from place to place and you will have

already exceeded the total time allowed for the whole judging process. However, there remains the equivalent of two more day's worth of meetings and other procedural matters.

The foregoing notwithstanding, it is essential for the exhibitor to communicate his knowledge in the pages of the exhibit. If he has not, and rather is in need of a short presentation to get his point across, then he has failed to satisfy that requirement and the jury should probably give a lower award for that deficiency.

Clearly there are more problems with that suggestion, but again, the best education at this moment remains the skill with which the exhibitor draws the judge's (and viewers) attention to the high points of the subject without getting bogged down in details.

Another technique which is occasionally used, at times misused, and of somewhat questionable value, is the attaching of a book by the exhibitor/author to the first frame. The not so subtle idea is that the exhibitor has written a book on his subject, and that it is evidence of his depth of knowledge. Too often the book disappears from the frame in fairly short order, leaving only a chain and bits of paper as evidence that it was here.

Judges react differently to this technique, but most seem to discount it as trying to take unfair advantage over those who only put material into the frame, and consider that if the book were to be a part of the display, it should be a separate entry in the literature section.

A plastic enclosed "guide to the exhibit" often fares the same. The feeling is that if the exhibit has failed to give sufficient explanation in the frames to require a separate guide, then the exhibit is probably in need of help.

So in the short term, once you mount the exhibit, it is pretty much on its own. How well you have put it together and made the key pieces stand out is likely to be reflected in the awards list.

#### **The Long Range View.**

Don't despair. There are other ways to educate judges, and they can be very effective. Both involve getting out the word about your specialty, and are the obvious ones; speaking engagements and specialized articles in various philatelic publications.

Speaking engagements have great potential, but are most effective when the audience is likely to contain judges, such as at the Royal Philatelic Society, London, or The Collectors Club in New York. Naturally, it is difficult to get an invitation to speak at one of these top level organizations, but there are quite a few at a slightly different level and most are always looking for new blood.

Signing up with the APS Speaker's Bureau may be a way to start if you don't know of any places that might need new lectures. If your subject is small and you share similar interests with one or two others, you might try making it a package deal. The only thing to be careful of, if getting to non-specialists is the idea, is to try to speak at functions which are **not** in your area of specialty. After all, you want to educate those who don't know your area well, if at all. A little ingenuity on these lines may bring big rewards.

Another version of this education is to offer to the organizers of a stamp show to give a talk on your specialty. Such talks are very often interesting and informative, but suffer from a usual potential for small audiences and seldom draw the judges who have their work to do before they can relax.

The final, and strongest potential lies in the written word. A short article or series on your subject, printed in one of the major magazines such as the *American Philatelist* or the *Collectors Club Philatelist* will reach more judges and is likely to be read than almost any other source I can imagine. Trying to get into print in one of these is not as hard as you might suspect, since the editors are usually interested in something off-beat but reasonably erudite. The *American Philatelist* may be good, but tends to avoid some of the more esoteric subjects, especially since the editor tends to favor articles which appeal to a somewhat broader audience than other magazines.

The article could be a mini-handbook but should always be well illustrated with

good photographs of the key material. The text should be balanced, readable, and logical.

Used properly this educational "tool" can have many good results. New material may come from dealers who, upon reading it, will know where to place the odd item that has long waited for a happy home. Correspondence may develop from others who share your interests, and, yes, a judge who read the article may nod approvingly at the exhibit when he sees it, armed with a new appreciation of your efforts.

## EDITORIAL — "Judge Bashing:" An Innocent Pastime *Isn't*

Among the games exhibitors play, Judge Bashing is a favorite. I've done it myself. Why, the miserable vermin have caused me **pain** by not giving my exhibit what I thought it deserved! Can that event reflect a deficiency in the exhibit? Certainly not! So it must be the Judges!

Now, I know for a fact that some of those who are drafted or seek to judge from local through national levels are something less than the model that we'd all like to see. The APS accreditation process weeds out most of these before they can do widespread damage and does a reasonable job of teaching the newcomer judging ethics and manners, but there are a few problems even at the accredited strata.

My observation is that there are enough unfortunate instances of judging malpractice to fuel the widespread complaints. But I believe that there are more complaints than is justified by the small percentage of malpractice.

This upsets me, perhaps because I'm a judge, but even more so because many exhibitors have developed a penchant for blaming judges for everything about exhibiting that is not to their liking. This attitude makes it too easy for judges to ignore valid criticism by exhibitors, and for exhibitors to pass off as unworthy all critique of an exhibit made by the judges.

Also, it must be said that the tendency to lay all problems at the feet of the judges subtly and unjustifiably eats away at the presumption of objectivity and fairness on which our competitive exhibition system must be based if it is to survive.

There is no faster way to destroy competitive exhibiting than, through the power of repetition, to convince newcomers and people on the way up that they can't get a square deal.

Those among us who have become chronic complainers must understand that such negative thinking poisons the well. Exhibitors must all learn to accept critical comments, offered in the spirit of helpfulness, without attacking the person who makes them. And we also have to learn to laugh off the occasional bad call. If, however, you are convinced that a judge needs to be bashed, it should be done face-to-face or by letter, so both parties have a fair chance to learn from the exchange.

We exhibitors who have been at it a while generally have a 'horror story' to tell, and sometimes we have embellished it to make the story better. We often think of ourselves as succeeding in spite of the judges. But I believe that — if polled objectively — we would say that our exhibits have most often been fairly treated and in a clear majority of cases even helped by critiquing.

— JMH

## "THE FLY" . . . BUZZES AROUND THE JURY ROOM



What do you mean, my exhibit received a silver-bronze medal? . . . came the anguished cry of an unhappy exhibitor at a recent critique. In response, the judges tried to offer suggestions for improving the exhibit, but after his questions were answered, did the exhibitor really know why his exhibit received a silver-bronze medal? Maybe . . . maybe not.

How are medal levels determined? "THE FLY" can't speak in all cases, but what follows, is a pretty good approximation of how it is done at national-level shows.

At most of these shows, the jury is broken down into two panels with an apprentice judge accompanying each panel. Where there is only one apprentice, he/she is usually assigned to the jury chairperson's panel. Both panels judge all exhibits. The division into panels is typically made to reduce the number of judges trying to look at the same exhibit at the same time. An excellent byproduct of the two panel system is that it precludes one judge from exercising undue influence over the entire jury prior to the deliberative process.

During the judging, each judge is supposed to follow the guidelines in the APS' "Manual of Philatelic Judging" to determine the medal level earned by each exhibit. The level is supposed to be earned by comparing what the exhibitor intended to accomplish, the degree of difficulty in accomplishing that end, and a theoretical standard of excellence for an exhibit of that material. Don't for a minute think that's the way it always happens.

Upon completing their review of all exhibits, the judges retire to deliberate. Most jury chairmen require each of the apprentice judges to speak first so that their expertise can be assessed. The apprentices are asked to indicate the level of award they would give to the exhibit, and justify their award. This is done alternatively so as to equal out the pressure put on the apprentices. They are asked to speak first so they do not get the benefit of learning how the accredited judges feel about each exhibit.

Next, each judge is asked to vote for a medal level for each exhibit. The chairperson usually rotates the first vote as the jury considers the exhibits in turn. Sometimes a judge will indicate by voting with "plus" or "minus" that a particular exhibit fell at the high or low end of the medal range.

All votes are recorded. Often, one of the apprentices is designated by the chairperson to serve as recorder. One practice that I don't like is when the show organizing committee provides a recorder for the jury. In my experience these people never know when to keep quiet. Their gratuitous comments are never welcomed by this insect. I also know for a fact that these people are sometimes "spies" and have been known to tell their friends what went on during the jury's deliberations . . . although they are always asked not to. I know of one case where the committee appointed recorder was also an exhibitor!

In any event, each judge's vote is recorded. All jurors' votes for a gold medal would result in an exhibit receiving that award. All votes for a bronze would result in the award of a bronze and so forth. When the votes are divided, the technique most often is one of striking a simple average. So, if there were two votes for silver, one for vermeil and two for gold, the exhibit would probably receive a vermeil medal . . . without serious discussion, unless your exhibit has a supporter who is willing to speak up when they see what they believe is an injustice being done. If no one wishes to speak up, it is my experience that the "simple average" method will prevail.

There is often discussion on the infrequent occasion when one or more jurors are way out of line. Say that an exhibit received three gold medal votes, one for vermeil and one for bronze. In most cases it is the judge who voted for the bronze medal who



is out of line and that judge's vote is quickly changed. Then from that new point, the simple average method is employed.

The fact that one or more judges showed a lack of knowledge never enters into the equation. Only the apprentices are at risk. "The Fly" would like to see more jury chairpersons "blow the whistle" on incompetent accredited judges.

How are the grand and reserve grand awards determined? I've seen two methods employed. In one, the votes are examined to see how many exhibits received all votes for a gold medal. If there was only one then that exhibit receives the grand award and the exhibit receiving the next highest vote count receives the reserve grand award. In this method, judges' votes of plus and minus are often taken into serious consideration.

In the second method, each juror is asked to nominate a favorite exhibit from among the gold medal recipients. These are then discussed in detail and a number of votes taken until the grand and reserve grand award winners are determined.

If you've ever wondered why an exhibit of German (or any other) material usually wins the grand or reserve grand award at the show at which the German (or other) society has its annual convention, sometimes it is because the participation group brings out particularly strong exhibits in its area. Sometimes it is because of the latter method of award determination. The same system may result in the "local hero" being given one of those prestigious awards. As you can imagine there is lots of opportunity for chairpersons or strong willed jurors to bully other members of the jury. Oh well, that's what makes the "game" all the more interesting.

"THE FLY" doesn't mean to imply that the system is crooked. It most assuredly is not. It is, however, this insect's intention to expose you to the realities of what goes on.

Enough on that subject. In a subsequent column I'll explain how special and society awards are determined.

. . . and now on to the regular feature of the column . . . recognition of those people who, for better or worse, make a difference . . .

**Gold Flyswatter** — To "Bill" Bauer and George "Claude R. Penguin" Guzzio. It was reported in Linn's that there is cooperation at last between the APS and the ATA in areas of interest to exhibitors. These two gentlemen were instrumental in working out a joint proposal between their two organizations, which will establish a common judging scheme for topical/thematic exhibits, and another proposal that will facilitate the cross-accreditation of judges.

**Gold Flyswatter** — again to "Bill" Bauer. One of my confidential sources said that Bill conducted a terrific judging seminar at this past VAPEX. Attendance at a judging seminar is a requirement for accreditation as an APS judge. Attendance is highly recommended for all exhibitors and those who think that they might exhibit some day. There are many people who conduct these seminars, however, if you ever have the chance, don't miss one given by Bill. A tip of this insect's wing for a job well done.

**Gold Flyswatter** — To the APS which is now assessing the capabilities of proposed jury panels for APS shows. Organizing committees have been asked to send their proposed jury slates to the APS where they are being examined not only to ensure that all proposed judges are currently accredited, but also to ensure that the panel represents a good mix of philatelic knowledge. You may recall that "THE FLY" called for such a "scrub" in an earlier column. Of course I'll be watching to see if the "old boy" network is used during the process. We don't want any judges selected out for the wrong reasons.

**Fly Bite** — To all of the APS accredited judges who did not judge in the past few years. Remember, I've been keeping tabs on you. Now the APS is going about the business of reexamining its list of accredited judges. This is done periodically to bring the list up to date. I trust that all of the judges who have failed to meet the APS's standards will be dropped from the roles. "THE FLY" has been told that some of the "favorites" have been allowed to "slide" in the past. No more of that . . . I'll be doing the comparisons . . . and I'll let you know if I detect any "Hanky-Panky."

**Fly Bite** — to whoever was responsible for pest control at the Virginia Beach Coliseum

um. I've told you in the past that "THE FLY" is everywhere, but one of my sources told me that I was in far too great a number during VAPEX. He said there were flies everywhere . . . particularly in the meeting rooms where they did everything possible to do the things that flies are famous for . . . what a nuisance. I'm not a cannibal and certainly don't want my species to disappear . . . but do you suppose someone can clean up that place. (I guess I'm not the only one that wants to see the fly brought under control.)

**Fly Bite** — to the dealer who upon being approached by a topical collector said ". . . your kids have more normal taste; not that people who collect rainbows are abnormal you understand; but if you don't want to collect anything you should just say so; you don't have to hide your hate of collecting by saying that you collect something that no dealer has anything of (sic). . ." It's always nice to know how much the dealers really like us. Tell you what my dealer friend. How would you like to see your name in print? I suggest you mend your ways. After all, it's us who support you. How long do you think you'd stay in business if we didn't do business with you?

## Editor's AAPE of the Month

In recognition of their contributions to the success of the AAPE and *The Philatelic Exhibitor*, thanks and a round of applause to:

**January, 1988:** Mainline Printing, 818 Adams, Topeka, Kansas 66601, which took over the printing of TPE with Vol. II #2, and has done a first class job.

**February, 1988:** Keith Wagner, Gini Horn and Frank Sente and others at APS who are providing the facilities and support that allowed the establishment of the APRL-AAPE Exhibition Archive Project (see page 19).

**March, 1988:** Secretary Steven Rod and Treasurer Paul Rosenberg who have (as this is being written) weathered the incredible amount of work involved in the first large group of dues renewals; Steven especially since he handled the sizable correspondence (questions, suggestions, observations, and even compliments) that came in with many many dues submissions.

**April, 1988:** Mary Ann Owens and Paul Rosenberg who, acting as the AAPE Finance Committee, have established our accounting systems and drawn our cash flow and budget statements.

**POSTAL**



**COVERS**

Postal History  
Covers  
of the World

Specialized  
Philatelic  
Literature

**MAIL BID SALES**

P.O. Box 8809  
Anaheim, CA 92812

## NEW CATEGORY FOR PHILATELIC EXHIBITING?

by Robert Metcalf

**Recommendation:** Establish a new category for philatelic exhibits to permit emphasis on the addressor/originator and addressee/receiver of mail.

**Reasons for Recommendation:**

1. The most important reason for all mail or written communications and a postal system is the need to send a message; from one party (addressor/originator) to another party (addressee/receiver).
2. Current exhibit categories; i.e., thematic, topical and postal history, place primary emphasis on "what carried the mail" — the postmarks, postal markings, stamps, etc. Any emphasis or use of advertising covers, return address corner logos, steamboat covers, addressee names, cover docketing and autographs, usually result in a downgrade of medal level in the major exhibit categories now established.
3. Mail cannot be carried without being addressed and a return address becomes extremely important in efficient mail handling.
4. Much exhibit detail of historical importance and educational value on industries, equipment, supplies, individuals, families, trends and events is discouraged by present exhibit categories and judging criteria.
5. There is a sizable body of collectors and dealers that would like to view exhibits emphasizing the addressee and/or addressor blocks. Therefor, adding this exhibit category would generate new enthusiasm for the hobby of philately, as well as build demand and value for a wide range of philatelic properties.
6. Without the opportunity for an equal competitive position, many potential exhibitors will not make the efforts necessary to build exhibits with covers that emphasize advertising, events or famous people.

**Discussion:** Establishing an open exhibit category ("Special Philatelic Studies"), ("Collector's Potpourri"), ("General Mail Studies"), ("Cover Research & Study") would be in the best interests of Philately. It will bring more people into the field of exhibiting, broaden the range of presentations and generate more viewing interest.

By going beyond "what carried the mail", i.e., the marking and/or the adhesive postage stamp, and allowing emphasis on a cover's addressor and addressee blocks; (the primary reason for all mail and written communications), a tremendous quantity of presently "ineligible" items can be utilized.

Philately is a hobby meant for fun and enjoyment. Exhibiting is a means of further expressing and presenting this great avocation and should not be restrictive by having a void in its allowable categories.

**Next Steps:**

1. Survey the membership of the AAPE for:
  - A. Endorsement and acceptance of the idea.
  - B. Development of a name for the exhibit category.
  - C. Building a set of judging rules and eligibility criteria.
2. Set up a timetable for introducing the new category at a national philatelic exhibition.

---

If you have an opinion on this recommendation, please complete this form or a facsimile of it and send it to: AAPE Survey, P.O. Box 1125, Falls Church, VA 22041.

I support the establishment of a category for philatelic exhibits to permit emphasis on the addressor/originator and addressee/receiver of mail. Name the category:

I do not support such a category.

## The Value Of A Critique . . . How To Use It Despite Some Common Faults

by William H. Bauer, Chairman APS Judges Accreditation Committee

In recent years the judges critique has become a feature of many philatelic exhibitions in the United States, and a critique is a mandatory requirement at all nationally accredited (APS Champion of Champions) shows.

Little more than ten years ago a critique session for exhibits was at best a rare occurrence. In fact it was often difficult for an exhibitor to find anybody with whom to discuss his exhibit or who could authoritatively explain the reasoning for the awards given. The result was little opportunity for the exhibitor to learn his exhibit's failings, to correct his mistakes, and to improve the exhibit and its award level.

A few philatelic judges realized the problem and believed that they had a responsibility to face the exhibitors they had judged and to offer to them suggestions to improve the exhibits. Therefore some shows began scheduling critiques and the public response was so favorable that the APS soon made the critique a requirement for all of the Champion of Champions National shows.

A critique is a help session and should be beneficial to all involved. It is an opportunity for the exhibitor to meet the judges and to ask questions and to hopefully receive definitive answers. The critique is also a chance for all collectors and those who are not exhibitors at that show to listen and to learn from the experiences of others. The critique makes the judge more conscious of his responsibility to be objective in his findings and to have reasons other than personal prejudice for his decisions-rendered.

Since a critique could easily become an adversarial forum, it is not an easy event to conduct. There are exhibitors who are insulted that their exhibit received anything less than the Grand Award and refuse to accept the possibility that their self-evaluation is not on the mark. Also, there are judges who speak flippantly or harshly without thinking how their casual remarks can be mis-interpreted or whether they have allowed their personal prejudices to take command. It is up to the Chairman of the Jury, who moderates the critique, to see that the discussions do not get out of hand, or degenerate into a verbal brawl.

When such a situation arises the Chairman must terminate the argument. Usually this can be done by suggesting a meeting between the exhibitor and one of the judges after the critique, for a personal discussion at the exhibit. The Chairman must give all exhibitors a chance to ask their questions. This can be accomplished by permitting one question and one follow-up question. It is hoped that the non-exhibitors and gold medal winners present will hold their questions until the other exhibitors have had their chance.

The Chairman needs to not only control the audience, but the panel as well. Some judges are all too willing to talk at length on any exhibit while others are reticent to say anything even though they might have the most pertinent comments to offer. This problem can, to some extent, be resolved by assigning each exhibit to a specific judge for "first comment" responsibility.

A well conducted critique should leave a happy audience, at least happy in that they feel they were given fair and even treatment and that there were solid reasons why a higher award was not given. At times this is not an easy task to accomplish. It is very difficult to tell an exhibitor that his hard work has been totally misdirected and that he must start over or find another path to his goal. However, it is equally wrong to give encouragement where no amount of work will result in a significant improvement in attainment. It is also difficult to tell an experienced specialist what

material he needs; he should know better than anyone else what is missing from his exhibit.

One of the most difficult concepts for a judge to accept is that no answer is better than a bad answer. We are often reluctant to admit our ignorance and to say "I don't know." Instead we focus on some minor or insignificant point and wind up looking silly to the audience.

We should all remember that the overlying principle of the critique is to help the exhibitor to attain a better award. The comments offered are suggestions and are not mandatory. They also represent the opinions of one small group of people and may vary from those of another panel. However, if heeded with thought, those suggestions will often produce a higher award. The exhibitor should remember that no amount of advice can guarantee a Grand Award. That is a matter of head-to-head competition and depends solely on which is the best exhibit on that day.

I urge all exhibitors, and potential exhibitors, to attend every critique they possibly can. They will learn something at each one. I also urge every show whether large or small to hold a critique even if it must be done at a subsequent club meeting.

## Why Is It So Hard To Earn A Gold Medal With Modern Material?

by Harry Meier

A very good question. From my observations as an exhibitor and judge, it seems that many of the judges — *older in thinking rather than years* — seem to determine good and scarce material by age alone. Much modern material is harder to come by than some of the older classics. Also, the information on newer material is difficult to research, at least when it comes to postal history items. The older material is well documented and if one has a suitable check book, the material is available at auction in a relatively short period of time. Modern material requires searching and digging to find, and then requires much correspondence to be able to describe each item properly. Yet it seems there is a bias by a number of judges against anything modern and the reasons they give as to why the exhibit won a vermeil and not a gold are very very thin. The thinking of some seems to be *if it is new it can't be worth very much* and many equate dollar signs with difficulty of acquisition. They are not the same!

If the exhibit is modern postal history it has a double whammy from judges who don't think much of postal history. Fortunately many of these judges are phasing out of judging and with the exception of a very few of the newer judges this thinking is coming to an end. For the most part the newer judges have a much more open point of view when it comes to looking at exhibits and will not let age or novelty of the area being exhibited determine awards. As a result, modern exhibits and new areas are receiving awards more in line with what they should get.

In defense of the judges however, it should be pointed out that in many cases the collectors of modern material and new areas have not helped their cause by not getting the word out on their exhibiting area in the philatelic press. This allows the judges to read and learn something on the subject. I am referring to places like the **Congress Book**, "Linn's," "Stamp Collector" and the **American Philatelist**. I have to admit that it takes some doing to prepare an article for the publications but it should at least be tried. I live in a glass house so I can throw stones. I have been remiss myself in not getting anything into print.

## FROM THE SECRETARY

Steven J. Rod, P.O. Box 432, South Orange, NJ 07079

The following list reflects all members joining AAPE from October 1, 1987 through February 27, 1988. Members joining after that date will be listed in the next issue of TPE. Welcome to the AAPE!

CHANGE OF ADDRESS: You won't have to miss *The Philatelic Exhibitor* if you send your change of address at least 30 days prior to your move.

MEMBERSHIP RECONCILIATION as of February 27, 1988.

1. Total Membership as of Sept. 30, 1987	1189
2. Dropped due to death, unable to find	- 3
3. Resignations received	- 6
4. Dropped non-payment of dues	- 85
5. Reinstatements	0
6. New Members Admitted	86
<b>TOTAL MEMBERSHIP: FEBRUARY 27, 1988</b>	<b>1181</b>

1208 Dan Laursen	1230 LeRoy Lipman Jr.	1252 Paul Hirsch FRPSL	1274 Michael H. Uhl
1209 Allan A. Levy	1231 Wayne Amuth	1253 Duane Larson	1275 William D. Simpson
1210 Dr. Baruch Hurwicz	1232 Ranes Chakravorty	1254 John D. Arn	1276 LCDR Richard A. Schutz
1211 Alfred A. Gruber	1233 Jean Crozier	1255 Margaret P. Hamilton	1277 Gib Stephens
1212 Robert W. Lang	1234 Austin Philatelic Club	1256 William P. Shea	1278 Robert B. Morgan
1213 Vernon Moore	1235 Piet Steen	1257 Dennis J. Lesko	1279 Ian McTaggart Cowan
1214 George C. Branam	1236 Phyllis M. Vonnegut	1258 Richard A. Beauchesne	1280 LTC Michael J. Brown
1215 Charles R. Swann	1237 Howard P. Gates, Jr.	1259 Jay Jennings	1281 R. Malcolm Hooper
1216 Jeff Rudolph	1238 Peter C. Speers	1260 Michael L. Holly	1282 Bedford F. Joyner
1217 Ann M. Triggie	1239 Ray Pietruszka	1261 William Skinner	1283 Harry A. Roark
1218 Jerry F. Eggleston	1240 Maurice Bouzek	1262 James F. Taff	1284 Dr. Frans H.A. Rummens
1219 Prof. Dr. C. Bruhl	1241 Adam P. Hermann	1263 Gerard Vaness	1285 I.A. Miller
1220 George W. Brooks	1242 Robert E. Manley	1264 Maj. Kurt A. Sanftleben	1286 Trevor Davis
1221 Thomas O. Dekle	1243 James P. Lavelle	1265 William E. Winter	1287 Clarence A. Strandell
1222 Barbara J. Fraize	1244 Russell L. Case Jr.	1266 Sidney J. Davis	1288 Dr. John M. Powell
1223 Gilbert M. Hulin	1245 Ralph C. Belgard	1267 William Gersch	1289 Donald T. Eggen
1224 H.G. Lubke, Jr.	1246 Irwin J. Gibbs	1268 George W. MacLellan	1290 Richard F. Thill
1225 Rev. John R. Tollan	1247 Douglas J. Uzakewicz	1269 Charles Jacobson	1291 Robert T. Kinsley
1226 Martin Garfinkel	1248 Kenneth P. Pruess	1270 John T. Grabowski	1292 Henry P. McGhee
1227 Richard J. Anastasio	1249 John P. Campbell	1271 Michael J. Morrissey	1293 Marion J. Dudek
1228 Erich G. Sopp	1250 G.F. Oxley	1272 John M. Burt	1294 Charles D. Rudd
1229 L. Wallace Dean III	1251 Rose Ann Dillenschneider	1273 Prof. Asiatu Von Wilpert	

## THE TREASURER'S TREAT by Steven J. Rod

Each week, the Secretary's post office box brings exotic mail addressed to the AAPE. Many of these covers contain new memberships, questions, compliments, or heaven forbid, complaints!

The Secretary offers the lot of these covers to the highest bidder, willing to make his or her bid a donation to the AAPE treasury.

The first quarter of 1988's lot contains: beautiful Austrian and Vatican Registry covers ("gems!"); 18 various U.S. covers; 8 Canadian covers; 3 Israel covers incl. one registry; covers from India, Britain, Denmark, Australia and more . . . about 40 covers in all.

AAPE members interested in helping the treasury and their modern postal history collection at the same time should send their bid to the Secretary (address above) on a 15¢ postal card. Note it as "1st Quarter Treasurer's Treat Bid" and put the highest donation you are willing to make. We will award the lot to the highest bid. Bids will be checked on May 31, 1988, and the highest bidder notified to send a check to our Treasurer. What a treat for the Treasurer. BIDS MUST BE DIVISIBLE BY 25¢. We thank you for your bid!

# in•teg•ri•ty (in•teg'•rə•tē) *n.*

1. Uprightness of character; probity; honesty.
2. Unimpaired state; soundness.
3. Undivided or unbroken state; completeness.
4. **Products and services as provided by David Champagne, Inc..**

Send \$1.00 for your fully illustrated catalogue of excellent United States stamps.



- *Aggressive buyers of quality U.S. Stamps.*
- *Expert appraisals and collection consultation.*
- *Personalized want list service.*

## **DAVID CHAMPAGNE, INC.**

POST OFFICE BOX 361095

MELBOURNE, FLORIDA 32936-1095

305 773-9217



# RICHARD C. FRAJOLA, INC.



## UNITED STATES POSTAL HISTORY

PRIVATE TREATY SERVICES

PUBLIC AUCTIONS

*Our auction catalogs have received awards as literature, find out by subscribing today. A subscription for the next 5 catalogs, including prices realized after each sale, is \$15.*



**RICHARD C. FRAJOLA, INC.**

85 North Street  
Danbury, CT 06810  
Telephone (203) 790-4311