

The

PHILATELIC EXHIBITOR

Vol. 7, No. Four

OCTOBER, 1993

OCTOBER 1916 - EARLY "HEJAZI POST" STAMPED MAIL.



Sent by T.E. LAWRENCE "OF ARABIA" from Jeddah 16/10 on 1 qishr FOREIGN rate. With no other markings, it presumably went via military or private channels.



JEDDAH 16/10 from Political Officer Storrs to the future King of Egypt. Per Royal Navy Vessel, arriving CAIRO 21/10; forwarded 22/10 to ALEXANDRIA (back), and to BULKELEY PALACE that evening. Sherif Hussein had ordered 3 values from the Survey of Egypt in July. Although displeased with the texts, he authorized their use 14/10/16.

See How This Grenada '92 Page Evolved
Over Three Years - See Page 11.

Buying or Selling...

The Great Collectors Turn to Andrew Levitt

Over the course of a lifetime in philately, Andrew Levitt, Philatelic Consultant, has handled more than \$230,000,000 in rare properties and has served such world-renowned philatelists as **John Boker, Lou Grunin, Marc Haas, and Jack Rosenthal.**

Since his return last year to full-time philatelic activity, Levitt has handled these important properties:

- The Morton Dean Joyce Collections (Including the great booklet pane collection and the most outstanding Revenue collection ever assembled).
- The Jack Rosenthal Columbian and Trans-Mississippi World Columbian Stamp Expo Court of Honor Collections.
- The Dr. Helme Gold Medal Canal Zone First Issue Collection
- The Max Guggenheim Yukon Territory Collection.
- The Wes Dunaway Canal Zone Collection.
- A Major Pony Express Collection.
- The Morton Schwartz United States Collection.



Unique horizontally imperforate upper plate block of the 8 cent Trans-Mississippi Issue. We are acting as agent for Jack Rosenthal in the sale of his Columbian and Trans-Mississippi Collections.



The United States 1c Z Grill. The rarest U.S. stamp, only 2 known. We acted as agents for purchase at auction, November, 1986, for \$418,000.

The greatest cancellation cover in existence, the Waterbury, Conn. Running Chicken. Realized \$264,000 in 1979, with Andrew Levitt as auctioneer and President of Sotheby Parke Bernet Stamp Auction Co.



Andrew Levitt Philatelic Consultant

Box 342, Danbury, CT 06813 • 203-743-5291 (Fax 203-730-8238)

"In The Tradition of the Great Philatelists"

(Life Member APS, ASDA, Philatelic Found., Classics Soc., Collectors Club, N.Y. Bank reference & Letter of Credit available.)



A BADGE OF HONOR . . .
. . . AND IT'S AVAILABLE AGAIN



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 support for philately's proudest organization.

\$4.00 postpaid
Send check to:

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

**WE SPECIALIZE IN
U.S. REVENUES, TELEGRAPHS,
LOCAL POSTS, CINDERELLAS**

How may we serve you?

**Eric Jackson
Post Office Box 728
Leesport, PA 19533**

**LET US HELP YOU
WITH YOUR SPECIAL EXHIBIT**

**U.S. REVENUES
BACK-OF-THE-BOOK
OUTSTANDING STOCK**

- Revenue Proofs
- Revenue Essays
- Match & Medicine
- Classic Proofs
- Classic Essays
- Trial Colors
- Telegraphs
- Officials
- Official Specimen
- Taxpays

**BUYING! SELLING!
WANT LISTS FILLED PROMPTLY**

GOLDEN PHILATELICS

Jack & Myrna Golden
P.O. Box 484, (516) 791-1804
Cedarhurst, New York 11516

FAX — 516-791-7846

ARA

BIA

APS

SRS

IMPERIAL RUSSIA

1913

The Tercentenary of the

ROMANOV DYNASTY

The "Norman Epstein"
collection

Argyll Etkin are breaking up what is probably the finest collection of Essays, Proofs, Colour Trials, Presentation Sheets and Imperforate Stamps of this issue ever put together.

It has now been priced and is available for inspection at our Gallery. Photocopies of selected pages can be sent on request. Please contact Eric Etkin or Michael Goldsmith by post, phone or fax.



Argyll Etkin Limited

LEADING BUYERS — RECOGNIZED VALUERS

— THE BRITISH EMERALD GALLERY

48 CONDUIT STREET, NEW BOND STREET, LONDON W1R 9FB ENGLAND
Telephone: 071 437 7800 (6 lines) Fax: 071 434 1060



WE CAN OFFER YOU ...

... quite possibly the largest most diverse postal history stock in America for the philatelic exhibitor. U.S., British Commonwealth, and worldwide. Write to us or visit us at these (and other) 1992 shows.

- STAMPEX/LONDON
October 12 - 17
- CHICAGOPEX/ROSEMONT
November 12 - 14
- ASDA'S MEGA/NEW YORK
October 27 - 31
- LOS ANGELES INT'L STAMP FAIR
November 20-21
- FLOREX/ORLANDO
November 4 - 7
- ARIPEX/PHOENIX
January 7 - 9
- ORCOEXPO/ANAHEIM
January 14 - 16

ARE YOU CONSIDERING **CHANGING YOUR EXHIBITING AREA**? IF SO, WE WOULD BE INTERESTED IN PURCHASING YOUR OLD INTEREST, AND HELPING YOU WITH YOUR NEW INTEREST.

THEMATICISTS
DROP BY AND SEE MY WIDE STOCK FOR COVERS THAT WILL FIT INTO YOUR EXHIBIT.

MILLS PHILATELICS

P.O. Box 221
Rexford, N.Y. 12148-0221

Phone: (518)
384-0942

ACID FREE 100% RAG CONTENT

.008 THICK - BLANK DISPLAY STOCK
BUFFERED FOR LASTING Ph NEUTRALITY
IDEAL FOR USE WITH P.C. COMPUTER PRINTERS

**CUSTOM CUT IN ANY SIZE FROM
8½ X 11 TO 24 X 32 INCHES**

SEND SIZE REQ. AND No. 10 S.A.S.E. FOR
PRICE AND MATERIAL SAMPLE

TOM HOMA
P.O. BOX 771161
LAKEWOOD, OHIO 44107
MEMBER A.P.S., R.P.S.C., A.A.P.E., E.S.C., P.S.E.

NEW!

Clear Corner Mounts For Covers

- * Self-adhesive--makes your exhibit covers secure on the page.
- * Archival safe. Developed for the art conservation industry.
- * 35mm size (1 3/8 in.)
- * \$11.95 per 100 postpaid in US. PA buyers add 6% sales tax.

R. COLBERG ENTERPRISES
P.O. BOX 10082
LANCASTER, PA 17605-0082

AAPE Founding Member
And Exhibitor

THE PHILATELIC EXHIBITOR

Official Publication of the American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors



Vol 7, No. Four

(28)

October, 1993

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

Sanford Solarz, Ad Manager
12 Fallenrock Rd.
Levittown, PA 19056

Assistant Editor — Michael Milam, P.O. Box 100644, Denver, CO 80250

The Philatelic Exhibitor (ISSN 0892-032X) is published four times a year in January, April, July and October for \$12.50 per year (AAPE dues of \$15.00 per year includes \$12.50 for subscriptions to **Philatelic Exhibitor**) by the American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors, 222 E. Torrence Rd., Columbus, OH 43214

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to **The Philatelic Exhibitor**, 222 E. Torrence Rd., Columbus, OH 43214

TPE is a forum for debate and information sharing. Views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those 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.

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

Deadline for the next issue to be printed on or about Jan. 15, 1994: Nov. 20, 1993. The following issue will close on Feb. 20, 1994.

BACK ISSUES of **The Philatelic Exhibitor** are available while supplies last from Van Koppersmith, Box 81119, Mobile, AL 36689, Vol. 1, 2 and 3 — \$5.00 each, Vol. II, 1-4, Vol. III, 1-4—\$3.00 each Vol. IV, 3-5—\$3.00 each, Vol. V, 1-4, Vol. VI, 1-4, Vol. 7, 1-3—\$3.00 each.

FUTURE ISSUES

The deadline for the January, 1994 issue of **The Philatelic Exhibitor** is Nov. 20, 1993. The theme will be "Rewards of Exhibiting - Why do you exhibit? Prizes? Ego? Recruiting? Sharing?..."

For the April, 1994 issue - Deadline Feb. 20, 1994 - the theme will be: "Exhibiting Modern Material Nationally and Internationally - Why bother?"

Your experiences, thoughts, ideas and suggestions are welcome for sharing with all AAPE members.

If you have an idea for a future theme, drop me a postcard; address above. - JMH, Editor.

In This Issue

Features

- 11 Write Up: The Proper Balance
by Tarik Alireza
- 12 Point — Counterpoint
by Jennings and Hotchner
- 13 Rookie Reflections *by David Herendeen*
- 14 ...One Frame Exhibits *by David Herendeen*
- 15 The Bad and the Ugly of AmeriStamp Expo '93
by John Hotchner
- 20 Polska '93 *by Henry Hahn*
- 24 Stamp Forgeries *by Varro Tyler*

Regular Columns

- 8 Synopsis Page of the Issue
by Harlan Stone
- 9 President's Message
by Steve Schumann
- 10 Concerns
by Peter McCann
- 17 Ask Odenweller
- 18 As I See It....
by John Hotchner
- 19 The Mail-In Exhibitor *by Charles Luks*
- 21 "The Fly"
- 23 How To Chief Judge
by Hotchner and Jennings

Departments and AAPE Business

- 5 Editor's and Members' 2¢ Worth
- 10 Activity Beat
- 16 Newly Accredited Judges
- 20 Show Listings
- 25 From the Executive Secretary
- 25 Classified Ads

Reprints from this journal are encouraged with appropriate credit.

Editor's AAPE(s) 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:

August, 1993 Ray Ireson, our man in Canada, who handles distribution of AAPE Awards to Canadian shows - and serves as a one man recruiting dynamo.

September, 1993 Clyde Jennings, who lives, eats, breathes and sleeps philatelic exhibiting, and who delights in sharing his experiences and insights with TPE readers.

October, 1993 The American Stamp Dealers Association for its increased support of exhibiting and for its invitation to AAPE for mutually beneficial cooperation at its Mega-Events (see back page).

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 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

Stephen D. Schumann
2417 Cabrillo Drive
Hayward, CA 94545

VICE PRESIDENT

Dr. Peter P. McCann
8710 Redbud Ln.
Lenexa, KS 66220

SECRETARY

Ralph S. Herdenberg
P.O. Box 30258
Chicago, IL 60630

TREASURER

Earl H. Galitz
1103 Biscayne Bldg.
19 West Flagler St.
Miami, FLA 33130

EDITOR

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

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Dr. Russell V. Scavaril
222 E. Torrence Rd.
Columbus, OH 43214

SOCIETY ATTORNEY

Earl H. Galitz

DIRECTORS (to 1994)

Joan R. Bleakley
Harry Meier

DIRECTORS (to 1996)

Richard Drews
Ann Triggie

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT: Randy L. Neil

COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS

Local/Regional Exhibiting: Vacant
National Level Exhibiting: Clyde Jennings and Stephen Schumann
International Exhibiting: William Bauer
Youth Exhibiting: Cheryl Edcomb
Thematic/Topical: Mary Ann Owens and George Guzzio
Show Management: Steven Rod
Exhibitor's Critique Service: Harry Meier

Box 369, Palmyra, VA 22963
Conventions and Meetings: Ralph and Bette Herdenberg
P.O. Box 30258, Chicago, IL 60630

Publicity: Darrell Ertzberger

American Youth Stamp Exhibiting Competition (AYSEC) Director:
Michael Jolly, P.O. Box 759, Mahwah, NJ 07430

Computers in Exhibiting: Dr. Paul Tyler, 1023 Rocky Point Court NE,
Albuquerque, NM 87123

Send:

- Proposals for association activities - to the President
- Membership forms, brochures, requests, and correspondence — to the Executive Secretary.
- Manuscripts, news, letters to the Editor and to "The Fly", exhibit listings (in the proper format) and member ads — to the Editor.
- Requests for back issues (see page 3) to Van Koppersmith, Box 81119, Mobile, AL 36689

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION TO: Dr. Russell V. Scavaril, Executive Secretary
American Assn. of Philatelic Exhibitors
222 E. Torrence Rd., Columbus, OH 43214

Enclosed are my dues of *\$15.00 in application for my membership in the AAPE, which includes \$12.50 annual subscription to **The Philatelic Exhibitor**, or \$300 for life Membership. (Life Membership for those 70 or over: \$150; Life Membership for those with a foreign mailing address: \$500)

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____

STATE: _____ ZIP CODE: _____

PHILATELIC MEMBERSHIPS: APS # _____ OTHER: _____

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

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

*Youth Membership (Age 18 and under) \$7.50 includes a subscription to *TPE*. Spouse Membership is \$7.50 — *TPE* Not Included.

My 2¢ Worth

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



Different Venues

I love to see good articles on exhibiting submitted for publication in **TPE**. The only thing I love more is to see a good article on the joys and pleasures of exhibiting in a journal that reaches lots of people who have not tried exhibiting yet.

Here in these pages we are largely preaching to the converted. In other journals, we have an excellent opportunity to encourage confirmed non-exhibitors to get their feet wet. As an example, I'd like to compliment Martin Margulis who did a wonderful article titled "Confessions of a 'Novice' Exhibitor" in **La Posta** of July, 1993.

It's a balanced first person description of the trials and tribulations of the student exhibitor; and also the paybacks: his sense of accomplishment through the growing mastery of exhibiting techniques, and the pure joy of creating a work of art. It doesn't say that exhibiting is easy, or that it is for everyone. It does say that the challenges are worthy ones, and that resources (including **AAPE**) exist to help the exhibitor progress.

It's a fine recruiting piece; something to help the potential exhibitor feel comfortable enough to overcome the inertia and get going.

The point is that YOU too can inspire others to get started in exhibiting. There are literally hundreds of club and society journals that need practical "How To..." and "How I did..." articles to survive. I'd bet our membership covers nearly all of them.

Any one of them would welcome your experiences toward de-mystifying exhibiting. You would be supporting both **AAPE** and your society/club. And if you are not a practised writer, it's also an opportunity to get your feet wet as an author.

This is not to say we no longer need articles here at **TPE**! Indeed, we no longer have the backlog we once did, and we can use articles, opinion pieces, and "shorts" that would be helpful to exhibitors, show administrators, and judges. They need not be finished items. We also welcome concepts in progress with which you would like help. Write to me or to Assistant Editor Mike Milam. We are anxious to help you see your name in print!

Your 2¢ Worth

Ernst Cohn - Andriž Solczanyk - John Taylor - Paul Jensen

Bob Corless

To the Editor:

I have written obituaries for many years already. But when you get to be my age, you start reading death notices more carefully anyhow. Thus, I was sorry to see the brief mention in the July 1993 issue of **TPE** of Bob Corless' death.

I corresponded with him only twice that I can remember. The first time I may or may not have ordered some album pages from him - I didn't keep that correspondence. Anyhow, what I bought were heavy pages with sharp corners, 3-hole punched, each carrying the main title of my exhibit. I ordered a little more than twice what I figured I needed just then, to take care of typing errors (no word processors available at that time) and of new acquisitions.

Tastes changed in time. I found that "printed" pages such as mine were not in favor anymore. 3-hole punched pages were looked down upon by some judges - no point aggravating them. And acid-free pages, of weight suitable for use in computers and word processors, are now in vogue.

So when the time came to remount my exhibit once more, which I had done half a dozen times already, I was running out of page stock. I wrote to my two potential suppliers from **SPA** days, only to find that Bob Corless was the sole survivor. I ordered a supply of

acid-free, thinner, unpunched, unprinted pages with rounded corners from him - again, about twice what I thought I should need over the next few years.

His price was quite modest in 1984, and when I got the shipment in June of that year I found it very satisfactory. Haven't exhibited since then and the pages may have to wait a few years before I do so. If and when I do, Bob's "Specialist Quality Album Pages" will serve as a reminder about a quiet, unobtrusive philatelist who served his fellow philatelists well.

Ernst M. Cohn
Dothan, AL

'Russia' Inaccurate

To the Editor:

There are very interesting articles in the July issue, but one statement in the article Stamp Forgeries by Varro E. Tyler bothers me.

He is grouping independent states like Ukraine, Georgia and Armenia under Russia. It indicates that the author still is living behind the times when Soviet and Russian empires existed.

Does not he recognize the present reality that these are independent states. Do not they deserve separate listings? How long will some people think in terms of Russian empire?

Especially Bulat's work covers Austrian stamps that were overprinted

for Western Ukraine and has nothing to do with Russia.

Hope that such errors will not happen again.

Andriž D. Solczanyk
Media, PA

Editor's Note: If there is any fault here, it is mine. The list was made before the break-up of the USSR. It simply didn't occur to me to dis-aggregate these entries. Rather, I looked at it as a 'collecting area'. My apologies.

Bronze Give-Away?

To the Editor:

'Should a Bronze have to be earned?' was a question posed by Dann Mayo in the July issue. My answer is a resounding Yes!

Mayo raised several points, excepting the most important - the use of the Certificate of Participation. This 'award' for want of a better term, has been given in every National Show that I have been involved with, and is normally given to those who fail to meet the Bronze standard. It should be noted however, that the majority of these exhibits should not have been accepted in the first place, probably being the victims of poor or over generous adjudication at the Local/Regional level, thus giving the Selection Committee a false evaluation of their true worth.

**TAYLOR
MADE**

PROTECTIVE POUCHES

**PAGE PROTECTORS
FOR PHILATELIC EXHIBITORS**

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

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

"MYLAR" IS A TRADE NAME OF DUPONT

☎ 215-459-3099

Send \$1.00
for sample
and design
literature

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

Another question 'What is a Silver?' Briefly I believe it to be a better than average award in most cases. There are fewer Golds and Vermeils at any given show than Silver Bronze and Bronze.

How can we best put this into perspective? I believe that a four day National show I entered in New Zealand a few years ago holds some of the answers. With the returned exhibit (I was given the same award as in its North American showings) I received a Judging Sheet, including a boxed point count, points per medal, and a very accurate critique by Laurie Franks dealer and International judge; now sadly deceased.

In part the form states:

| | |
|--|----|
| "For Postal History Stationery and Aero Philately" | |
| Presentation | 10 |
| Importance | 15 |
| Treatment | 20 |
| Knowledge | 20 |
| Research | 10 |
| Condition | 10 |
| Rarity | 15 |

| | |
|--|----|
| With 78 exhibits the medal breakdown was awarded | |
| Gold 85-100 | 2 |
| Vermeil 75-84 | 9 |
| Large Silver 70-74 | 9 |
| Small Silver 65-69 | 10 |
| Silver Bronze 60-64 | 18 |
| Bronze 55-59 | 12 |
| Certificate of Merit 45-54 | 7 |
| NO AWARD | 11 |

I do not like the point count, as in my opinion it is open to too much interpretation, but with the extra day they get the job done in New Zealand.

As can be seen eleven 'exhibits' were well below standard for no award, while seven were only good enough for Certificates with nearly 25% below the Bronze standard. Those above Bronze medals were truly earned.

It may also be noted that the Silver, as Mr. Mayo suggested, is an above average award. I especially like Small and Large Silvers, as, with these, aspiring exhibitors can tell how much more work they might have, to obtain a coveted Vermeil or Gold.

There are of course exceptions, I recall one Regional show where a Silver was just about the lowest award. Three months later another established Regional had no Golds and only one Vermeil.

To conclude, in my opinion, an unearned Bronze is detrimental to both exhibitor and exhibition no matter what the level. Consider too the thoughts of the winner of a Bronze for a small exhibit of good cancellations, being given an equal award as one of stamps on stamps. What the latter

Germany

For the past 37 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 FDC's of new issues, or anything and everything in between - WE HAVE WHAT YOU ARE LOOKING FOR.

NOVICE? We have the price lists for every German Area from 1849 to date, including special discount prices for Complete Year Collections, Third Reich, World War II Occupations, FD Covers, etc.

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.

SEND FOR FREE, ILLUSTRATED PRICELISTS!



908-236-9211
P.O. Box 527

Flemington, NJ 08822 FAX 908-236-7015



**RICHARD
PYZNER**



SINCE 1955

needs are tips on what and how to exhibit instead of an award.

P.S. Just for the record.

I have been accredited as a Regional Judge by the Royal for the past dozen years and am now serving as a National Apprentice in Canada. I have exhibited at three internationals, and, just for the record the NZ show was Birdpex 90 my award was large silver for NZ Pigeon Post.

John Taylor
Burnaby, BC, Canada

On Write-Ups at the International level

To the Editor:

I have studied Mr. Hennig's article in the April issue with great interest. As an international judge in the postal history class I should like to put forward my views as well.

In international exhibitions one occasionally comes up against the problem mentioned by Mr. Hennig. The general rule is that if in doubt, the exhibit should be judged in the class where it can get the best award.

When exhibiting in the postal history class it is essential that all relevant postal history information related to the material shown be given. Technical details about the postage stamps used are generally not given additional score except if an unusual usage of a postage stamp is shown. The pointing out of a rarity of some kind will also improve the score.

In the traditional class it is obviously important to identify properly the stamps used on covers showing usages. Information about routes and rates can surely also add to the score. However, additional information of this kind should not be so overwhelming that it will distract from the actual philatelic items on the page.

In international exhibitions the philatelic material, properly described, is what is being judged. If one can find room for two covers on a page it is in my personal opinion better than showing just one cover very heavily written up.

I had the great pleasure of being invited to judge in FLOREX 91 where I learnt the great difference between national judging in open shows and international judging in class divided shows. Both ways have their merits, but I still prefer the international way.

The greatest hazard U.S. exhibitors can meet in an international exhibition is showing an exhibit which does not fit into any international class at all. This is a much greater hazard than risking to get postal history mixed up in a traditional exhibit.

Paul H. Jensen
President, F.I.P. Commission
for Postal History
Norway



ONE OF THE WORLD'S LEADING AUCTIONEERS OF
FINE STAMPS

COLLECTIONS, POSTAL HISTORY AND ALL TYPES OF
PHILATELIC MATERIAL

ESTABLISHED IN DERBY IN 1952

SITWELL STREET, DERBY DE1 2JP

TELEPHONE: (0332) 46753

FAX: (0332) 294440: FAX

MANAGING DIRECTOR: J.L. GRIMWOOD-TAYLOR, M.A.
CONSULTANTS: D.G. MANTON,
F. LAYCOCK M.C., & G.H. WHITEHEAD
COMPANY SECRETARY: P.W.S. GRIMWOOD-TAYLOR B.A.

WITH COMPLIMENTS



VAT REG. NO. 354 5663 38

Philatelic Printers

Complete Typesetting, Printing and Bindery Services

Multi-Color and Four Color Process

- Monographs
- Handbooks
- Specialty Albums
- Cachet Covers
- Bi-Monthly & Quarterly Publications

ESSIG ENTERPRISES, INC.
KETTLE MORAINÉ PRINTING
P.O. BOX 251
WEST BEND, WISCONSIN 53095

ROLAND ESSIG
APS — ATA — AAPE

414-338-1030

Synopsis Page Of The Issue by Harlan Stone

SWITZERLAND'S IMPERFORATE SITTING HELVETIA - PRODUCTION AND USE, 1854 - 1863

A SYNOPSIS

1. Scope

31 basic stamps (and many color varieties) now more clearly identifiable through on-going studies by Swiss and American researchers.

2. Organization

Arranged by numbers in Zumstein catalog, the only common point of reference with all 31 stamps (including new listing of 23f). All recent and current researchers refer to these numbers in their writings (see bibliography).

3. Importance

A classic issue illustrating the difficulty that the Swiss experienced in meeting rising demand for stamps with primitive equipment and complex production methods after obligatory prepayment took effect.

4. Treatment

Used examples of all 31 stamps off cover and 30 on cover, the exception being the rare 27E (about a dozen mint and used copies known).

5. Knowledge/Research

Exhibit reflects on-going research into paper sources, paper thickness, colored threads, cliché settings, degree of embossing, ink shade differences, issue (not printing) sequence, periods of use, and postage rates under recently compiled foreign treaties. New research shows, for example, that the F stamps appeared before the E stamps, and that there are no Aa and A stamps printed on "thin" (.03-.05 mm.) paper.

6. Condition

Very fine condition often required mutilation of eight stamps in a block of nine to obtain the middle stamp with four frame lines and four margins. Although most stamps in this exhibit are fine to very fine, lesser quality is included where necessary to show examples of production varieties (cliché gutter widths, color shades), grill cancellations, postmark dates and unusual uses.

7. Rarity

Key items are 22Aa (including cover with three), 26Aa, 27E, 23F, all values possible in mixed frankings with later perforated Sitting Helvetia issue (including both 10c. values on same cover), and probably unique mixed franking including pair of high-value 1fr. to Trebizonde in Asiatic Turkey.

8. Bibliography

"Schweiz, Neu Klassierung der 'Strubel' Ausgaben sitzende Helvetia ungezähnt, 1854-1862" by Walter d'Aujourd'hui. Basel: Schweizerischer Philatelisten-verein, 1982, 64 pages.

"Strubel, Helvetia assise non dentelee, 1854-1962" by Hans F. Hunziker. Bern: Zumstein & Cie., 1986, 139 pages.

Nine articles by Herbert Brach in "Tell," journal of the American Helvetia Philatelic Society: March 1990, pp. 49-58; May 1990, pp. 194-197; January 1991, pp. 33-37; March 1991, pp. 52-56; May 1991, pp. 99-106; November 1991, pp. 198-207; July 1992, pp. 127-130.

"Listing of Strubel Usages" (1991) and "Update" (1992) by Herbert Brach. American Helvetia Philatelic Society, 6 pages and 1 page.

"Strubels, The So-Called Emergency Printings on Thin Paper, Series E and F" by Herbert Brach. American Helvetia Philatelic Society, 1991, 20 pages.

"Spezialkatalog uber die Briefmarken der Schweiz" by Zumstein & Cie., 1992, pp. 45-62.

Synopsis pages for publication in future issues should be sent to the editor, P.O. Box 1125, Falls Church, VA 22041

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

by Steve Schumann 2417 Cabrillo Dr., Hayward, CA 94545



After long and hard work by Jim Bowman the IRS has granted 501 (c) (3) - exempt from Federal income tax - status to the American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors.

Because AAPE is a relatively new organization the IRS is not making a final determination as to our foundation status as yet. During this advance ruling period, which ends December 31, 1997, the IRS will treat AAPE as a publicly supported foundation.

During this advance ruling period AAPE must show, through donations received, that we are a publicly supported foundation. Now is the time to make that donation to put the publication reprint fund "over the top"; fund the awards program of the North American Youth Stamp Exhibiting Championship and put AAPE on a firm financial footing for the future.

Newly Accredited APS Judges

A free copy of the current list of APS Judges is available from Frank Sente, APS, P.O. Box 8000, State College, PA 16803. Enclose a \$1.90 in mint postage to cover the cost of mailing. Please identify yourself and the show with which you are connected.

- **Edgar A. Heath**, P.O. Box 611, Arnold, MD 21012 - Germany; German States; Western Europe
- **Peter Martin**, P.O. Box 505, Springfield, VA 22150 - Literature
- **Thomas C. Mazza**, Rm. 2300, 1301 Sixth Ave., New York, NY 10019-6092 - U.S.; Postal History
- **Paul J. Phillips**, P.O. Box 240, Knoxville, TN 37901-0240 Postal History; Great Britain; U.S.; Poland; Croatia; World War I; French/Belgian Africa
- **Kenneth Trettin**, Rockford, IA 50468-0056 - Literature
- **Peter McCann**, 8710 Redbud Lane, Lenexa, Kansas 66220-3308

COMMUNICATED

Now that the Stamp Exhibition is a matter of history, a few suggestions that are the result of study of the individual exhibits and the opinions of the rank and file collectors.

In the first place, while criticism is always cheap and plenty, it seemed that the local collectors felt that there might have been a few corrections in the location of some of the awards that would have been for the good of Philately.

Notably the criticism regarding the so-called Research trophy. Personally I believe that a "Research" trophy should be awarded to the collection that is the result of the greatest and most thorough individual effort. It cannot be research when a man exhibits a collection, 80 percent of which was bought as exhibited, or in which the expert is paid for at so much per page.

The fact that any man has funds enough at his disposal to buy a specialized collection, or income enough to pay any one of half a dozen willing experts to mount, collate, letter, or undertake the classifying of his holdings, does not make that individual entitled to a "Research" trophy.

When the grand moguls come out frankly and state that this or that collection is prepared for exhibition by this or that expert, there is no criticism, but the same collection presented in bulk, with no statement as to the origin of its notes, mounting, etc., in competition for a Research trophy would be open to much more than quiet criticism.

The limits of consistency are overrun by not taking into consideration the fact that "research" means one thing, and that bulk, condition, arrangement, value, scope and rarity, by themselves mean another.

Thus, any collection (accumulation), without notes, even if containing every known variety, could not, to my mind be said to indicate "research" on the part of its owner, and if noted, etc., by a paid expert, it still falls short of "research" by the man that profits by the reward.

To judge the value to Philately of any exhibit, by the buying capacity of its owner, or the value of the notes on a page to the science, by the name on the entry blank, would seem to be beyond the limit of reason.

Why judge the "research" value by these measures?

To prove that the contention is made in a purely unbiased mood, I stand ready, through **Everybody's**, to donate a Research Trophy to the next Exhibition, the terms of the competition to exclude all notes, etc., not made by the owner-exhibitor personally. Mounting notes and material to be wholly of the exhibitor's own brain, not bought in bulk, or hired done.

How does this sound for real "Research?"

From **Everybody's Philatelist**, Jan., 1914 (with thanks to Ken Lawrence)

"With a great number of new duties falling upon me these days, I am gratified and honored to pass the pleasure of writing this column to Dr. Peter McCann, your AAPE vice president and one of philately's most devoted advocates of competitive exhibiting and judging. He has great insight into matters that concern us all. Meanwhile, I offer you my very warm thanks for all your wonderful support over the years."

Randy Neil

I just spent an extremely pleasant weekend at SESCAL (October 7-9) at the Hyatt Hotel at the Los Angeles International Airport. I drew double duty as a jury member and presiding officer at the annual convention of the AAPE in the absence of Steve Schumann, our President, who was on the jury at Bangkok '93 the same week. Overall, I personally had a great time. I saw old friends from the AAPE Board such as John Hotchner, Ann Triggler and Rich Drews as well as the ever-dashing and colorful Clyde Jennings. I participated in a packed jury critique presided over by John, our Jury Chairman as well as a crowded AAPE seminar which drew 40+ people and certainly was one of the most lively sessions that this member has ever experienced. The literature critique was a thoughtful discussion of the entries presided over by Alan Warren along with Ann, Ken Lawrence and Winand Hess. The SESCAL hospitality provided by General Chairman Wallace Craig and his committee including Werner Helms, Bob Thompson, Jim and Marian Bowman, and Al Hardy was superb, some of the best I have ever experienced. The AAPE events went off without a hitch as usual, planned by our able Secretary and spouse duo, Ralph and Bette Herdenberg. The AAPE breakfast on Saturday presented Jim and Marian Bowman Life Memberships for their efforts in getting the AAPE tax exempt status, and then finished off with an exceptional talk by 1992 Champion of Champions winner Jamie Gough on "How he did it", the long term evolution of his now International Large Gold exhibit on postage dues. The final AAPE event was the AYSEC Junior Exhibiting Competition which drew entrants from 18 of the World Series of Philately APS shows. Mike Jolly ably honchoed the event and Andrew Kelly is the New AYSEC Champion.

Overall, this sounds like almost a laundry list of fun things we all did together, and isn't the AAPE annual convention a wonderful thing, and shouldn't we all go next year! Well frankly the fly in the ointment (excuse the phrase) was the fact that we didn't all go. The only people that really came were the various AAPE Board members and Committee Chairs who were supposed to be there, specialist society exhibitors, and southern California collectors who are collectors and were coming to SESCAL anyway. We only had enough interest to sign up 25 people for our breakfast and the AAPE seminar drew about the same number of attendees we would have at any national show. My question is then, does the AAPE really need an annual "national convention" at a WSP show? We now have well attended seminars at each of these WSP shows and many regional and local shows with numerous exhibitors. But do these same exhibitors want to travel to an annual meeting of the AAPE or would they rather go to a meeting of their own philatelic collecting specialty. I think the answer is obvious.

The AAPE is now sponsoring the AmeriStamp Expo show (more on this below) and it is evolving into our own unique one-frame exhibition. At AmeriStamp Expo '93 this past April, more than 45 of the exhibitors traveled to Kansas City for the show. There already seems to be a similar in-

terest and enthusiasm for AmeriStamp Expo '94. Perhaps we should be changing our thinking about our national annual meeting. Does it have to be tied to one of the national WSP shows? Should we be thinking about having our meeting at our own AAPE national one frame event? I invite your comments.

I think we must be careful to be open to evolution and positive change in the AAPE in response to changes in exhibiting and judging. In fact, we must be leading these changes or become just another stamp collectors society doing the same things year after year.

AmeriStamp Expo '94 is scheduled for June 17-19, 1994 at the Convention Center in Indianapolis, Indiana, site of the annual September INDYPEX. Co-Chairs Jim Adams and Bob Zeigler promise the second AmeriStamp Expo will surpass the first. Prospectuses are already printed and can be obtained from Jim Adams at P.O. Box 40792, Indianapolis, Indiana 46240-0792. Every member of the AAPE will receive a prospectus with the January issue of TPE, but if you want more information or can't wait until January, write today.

STAMPS FOR THE WOUNDED SEEKS DONATIONS

As Fall comes around and inside stamp projects beckon, please remember Stamps For The Wounded when you sort and dispose of your excess philatelic material.

SFTW, founded by Ernie Kehr in 1942, exists to provide stamps and philatelic materials to collectors (both new and old) in Veterans Hospitals and Convalescent Centers. Stamps, covers, and collecting literature and supplies of any type, in any quantity are needed for use in long-term therapy.

Stamps spell H-O-P-E for patients who use them to develop goals that keep up interest in the hobby, and in life itself.

SFTW is an authorized non-profit organization, now operated under the sponsorship of Lions International.

Donations for which a tax receipt is requested should be sent to SFTW/LI, P.O. Box 1125, Falls Church, VA 22041-0125, along with a listing with valuation of the material according to catalogue value, or on some other basis.

All other donations may be sent to SFTW/LI, P.O. Box 9176, Silver Spring, MD 20916.

Write - Up: The Proper Balance

by Tarik A. Alireza

My exhibit, in the Postal History category, is titled "SAUDI ARABIA: DEVELOPMENT OF THE POSTAL SERVICE 1836-1934". When I first exhibited, I felt that judges would have very little knowledge of Saudi philately, especially as much of the information in early reports and studies was erroneous. However, it has continued to be the basis for both general and specialized catalogue listings; although a few necessary revisions have been made recently.

I also believe that visitors to stamp shows, especially younger ones, can't be expected to have a great deal of knowledge about the geography and history of countries outside their own and neighbouring ones. So I have tended to draw criticism for the length of my write-ups, though I have tried a more minimalist approach lately.

I will take as an example of how I have approached the problem over four years an important cover from the man who was to become famous as "Lawrence of Arabia", bearing the first stamp of what was eventually to become the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

My first attempt at exhibiting was at the London STAMPEX national show in 1989. I was delighted to be awarded a gold medal (90 points), although somewhat chastened to have it criticized as "heartily overwritten!" Much of the information given belongs more properly in a Traditional exhibit, however, I had found that details of the earliest stamps, as given by the printers in a handsome souvenir book, and others, were wrong. This misinformation was in all current catalogues, so I felt a need to correct it.

OCTOBER 1916
FIRST OF TWO EARLIEST RECORDED HEJAZ POST STAMPED COVERS



Cover from Jeddah to Cairo with overseas rate 1 qirsh or piastre in dark metallic blue of the first printing, Perf 12, tied by DJEDDAH 3 date of 18/10/16 and 18/12/34 A.H. It was probably delivered to the Sevoy Hotel, Cairo, which was British C.H.Q. at the time, through Royal Navy channels, as mentioned in a letter home of 18/11/17 by its sender, T.E. Lawrence. Captain Ormsby-Gore was a Member of Parliament, to whom Lawrence had referred in a letter of 10/10/16 as having recently joined his Intelligence unit.

This cover was sent on the day that Lawrence first arrived in the Hejaz with Ronald Storrs to help promote the Arab Revolt. Storrs had, through Lawrence, organized the design and printing of the new stamps in Cairo, and partly in gratitude for his help with this, had asked Lawrence to join him. Lawrence had just applied for a transfer to the Arab Bureau from Military Intelligence and was then on leave.

According to the Survey of Egypt, which produced the stamps, 2900 of this issue were printed and released officially on 20/8/16, although samples had been distributed earlier by the Director General, R.M. Dawson, about half of the total were sent to philatelic societies, the Postal Union, etc.

No details have been found regarding the actual delivery of the stamps to Sherif Hussein and his Postmaster: they probably went via British diplomatic or military channels to the Agent in Jeddah, Col. Wilson, and then via official approval and receipting of the authorization of 'FEE PAID' handstamps on 14/10/16, before their eventual release to the Mecca and Jeddah post offices.

STAMPEX '89

OCTOBER 1916 - EARLY HEJAZ POST STAMPED MAIL

Sherif Hussein ordered stamps from the Survey of Egypt to help, through Prince, Officer Ronald Storrs, who passed on the request to T. E. Lawrence. After making military plans for the Hejaz, three values were partly designed and approved by Lawrence, and sent to him by the printers in Jeddah and Damascus, although not yet approved or accepted by the Hejazis. They were distributed by Lawrence and the Survey of Egypt, the B.C.P. London, and elsewhere, from mid-August. Some were sent to Sherif Hussein and the Director of Hejaz, who rejected them. The British had to force the Sherif to accept them, which he finally did by authorizing their use from October 14. Storrs and Lawrence came to the Hejaz two days later, to help the Arab Revolt.



JEDDAH 18/10/16 on 1 qirsh foreign rate in a notable Member of Parliament in Lawrence's Intelligence unit with in other markings it presumably well via military channels.



JEDDAH 18/10/16 from Storrs in the Future King of Hejaz, part of a mailing to include the Arab Revolt, stamped through stamps shipped per Bank, very unusual, arriving JEDDAH 22/10, ALKHARJA (then) to BULKELEY PALACE that evening.

TOKYO '91

OCTOBER 1916
VERY EARLY HEJAZI POST STAMPED MAIL

Stamps printed by the Survey of Egypt were finally approved and issued in the Hejaz in mid-October. These covers were sent from Jeddah by stamp designers T.E. Lawrence and his superior, Ronald Storrs, on 18/10/16, the day they arrived to assist the Arab Revolt. Foreign 1 qirsh rate.



TOP: Cover to a notable Member of Parliament in Lawrence's Intelligence unit with no other markings. It presumably went via military or private channels.

BELOW: Cover from Storrs to the Future King of Egypt - part of a mailing to publicize the Arab Revolt - stamped through stamps. Shipped per Royal Navy vessel, arriving Jeddah (Cairo) on 21/10/16, forwarded next day to Alexandria and arriving Bulkeley Palace that evening.

LONDON '90

My previous award had enabled me to participate at London '90. I greatly reduced the amount of writing, and added another cover to the page. Again I managed to get a gold, with felicitations, but was told my pages were rather crowded.

For TOKYO '91, I felt that Japanese viewers would need more details about the Arab Revolt than Western viewers. I also wanted to stress the research I had done regarding this first stamp issue; it aroused so much speculation in Egypt, where the stamps were distributed before reaching Hejaz post offices, that provisional "FEE PAID" hand stamps had to be introduced for several weeks after the alleged dates of issue.

I got a gold medal again (91 points), and by this time was able to meet many advanced exhibitors, as well as judges and national commissioners, to find out how to improve my exhibit. I was again advised to cut down on the writing, among other things.

So for GRANADA '92 (front cover) I reduced the texts considerably. Gold award once more (93 points), but still the large one eludes me. I recently availed myself of the AAPE critique service, and was duly told that my pages are still a bit crowded, and to reduce both material and writing.

Point - Counterpoint "Plus" - "Minus" In Judging

Point: I would like to address, please, the casting of "plus" and "minus" votes by APS accredited judges at deliberations. All we judges have experienced this, so I want to express my opinion, and seek yours.

I think it's "hedging". There, I said it! Years ago, at national and international shows, there were three medal levels: Gold, Silver and Bronze. Recognizing there really were "in-between" exhibits, nationals went to five levels -- adding Vermeil and Silver/Bronze -- and internationals went to ten -- adding large and small in each of the five levels.

At deliberations, as they are called, judges, after having evaluated the exhibits, are called upon in turn to render their respective opinions on the medal levels for each exhibit. At this time, some judges would have you believe there are still a number of those in-between exhibits, so they will vote "Gold-minus", for example, or "Vermeil-plus", etc. I say hog-wash -- there are five medal levels, so use 'em. Make up your mind, and if you don't know, say so. No dishonor there. No one can know it all, APRIL notwithstanding.

I think a lot of times, as I said, they are hedging. They know the exhibit is good, but how good? Gold? Maybe. Vermeil? Maybe. So they vote in between the two, and then later change the vote to help achieve a consensus, if need be. Of course, if they should really goof, and vote Bronze-plus, and the

consensus is Gold -- or even Vermeil -- then they are in DEEP doo-doo, aren't they?

Clyde Jennings
Jacksonville, FL

Counter Point: "Hog-wash"? There IS a 'Gold plus' just as there is a 'Bronze minus'. The other three medal levels can also be strong or weak. It's not hedging -- it's more accurate for me to be able to so state in casting my ballot in deliberations. It's also useful to the other jury members to know where I stand. If I vote 'Vermeil plus', the other jury members are on notice that I will not be predisposed to negotiate down to a Silver. Conversely, I might be convinced that a weak Gold might be appropriate.

We're talking about communications systems. I think that any system which allows for the expression of shades of grey is better than one that doesn't. I agree that such systems can also be used to obfuscate, but that's no reason to ban them.

'Silver Bronze plus' or 'Gold minus' are shorthand. If they are being misused, it's easy enough to tell: the user won't be able to articulate the reasons for the plus or minus, let alone the medal level. Judges who can't explain the basis for their decisions are of little help to a jury whether they use plus and minus or not.

John Hotchner
Falls Church, VA

Unfortunately, early Saudi covers tend to be much larger than their European and American contemporaries, so I often have to use overlapping and windowing, just to get two items on a page. As far as write-ups are concerned, I reckon I can prune the odd word here and there. Otherwise it seems that, to help judges to assess my exhibit properly, my only alternative is to publish articles from time to time, and eventually write a definitive book on my field, which is in fact in the pipeline.

But I still believe that perhaps too much in stamp exhibits is for the benefit of judges, and with regard to their very limited viewing time, but can be uninteresting to non-specialists in that particular field. And it may become, frankly, quite boring to the average show visitor, who enjoys the occasional eye-catching picture sides of portcards, while I have been praised for removing them.

Perhaps historical and other background information, of interest to the general public, could be placed at the bottom of the page, with a note in the title page that judges need not read it. It could also be put in brackets, or in a different font, to make this point clear.

So, I greatly look forward to hearing readers' views on this very difficult topic.

WIN A

KACHINA

Original - Handmade

ARIPEX '94

JAN. 7th-9th, 1994



APS Champion of
Champions Show
plus special one-
frame exhibition

Come to Mesa
Arizona for The Sun,
The Fun and The Show!
Special Show rates for the
Mesa Sheraton Hotel. Free
transportation to and from
Phoenix Sky Harbor Air-
port (12 miles).

CALL OR WRITE FOR
PROSPECTUS

Barbara Johnson 602-878-2080
Jon Denney 602-468-1444
Harold Egy - P.O. Box 3861
Phoenix, AZ 85030

USE AAPE's
CRITIQUE SERVICE

To help improve your
exhibit, and raise its
medal level. Write
for instructions:

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

Rookie Reflections

by David L. Herendeen

It was extraordinarily invigorating when my good friend and biggest booster, Jamie Gough, called to tell me that my exhibit *A Taxonomy of British Colonial Postage Due* had won a large vermeil in Poland! Such news made the seven preceding months of agony worth it. I had prepared and mounted more than 1000 exhibit pages! I would be embarrassed to say how many hours this required. Thank heaven that my wife, while not philatelically inclined, is very understanding and supportive.

Imagine that in seven months I was able to go from a first-time silver medal in a world series event to such a wonderful international award. The importance of this should not be overlooked. If I could do this, then so can you!! All you have to do is get started and take the plunge.

Naturally, it is not quite that effortless. It takes work, dedication, and almost certainly, the help of others in the collecting and judging fraternity. Rather than discuss any of the technical aspects of exhibit preparation, I would rather reflect on the human side of the sport.

Early on, it became obvious to me that the key to successful exhibiting is the judging critique, and if possible, the walk-through of your exhibit with one or more of the judges. I quickly learned the three important rules that you should follow at the critique: *listen, listen, and listen*. If necessary, you might also consider writing down comments so that they are not lost during the ensuing period of euphoria or misery (pick one). This applies equally well to any walk-through that an especially interested judge will give you. I strongly recommend that you use this technique. I have found nearly all of my judges to be helpful. Most are true boosters of philately in general and exhibiting in particular.

Once you have all of this new input, you must determine its value. As that wonderful gentleman Clyde Jennings told me, you must distinguish between fact and opinion. Facts you must act on (if you're smart) and opinion you must weigh. At my first exhibit in Los Angeles, I was presented with few facts and much opinion. Although my silver award was not inconsequential, I was very disappointed primarily because I did not hear any concrete explanation as to why it was not higher. I went back to the drawing board and considered the opinions I heard. They mostly expressed a confusion caused by my exhibit's worldwide coverage and nontraditional organization. My

attempts at complete coverage of my subject also led to the observation that I had too many common stamps. After much soul searching, I decided that these opinions were not unreasonable and might well be shared by many judges. I dutifully rewrote my entire exhibit to address these issues, reduced the cheap material, added new and important items, and prepared to try again.

It was then on to San Diego. This exhibit met with substantially more useful critique by a very experienced panel. While my award rose only one level, I now felt that I was given more facts and less opinion. I also was fortunate to receive a special award which helped inspire me to press on. The principal problems were still the nontraditional organization and my apparently arbitrary elimination of certain colonies from the exhibit. Back to the drawing board again for a complete rewrite which included the missing colonies.

Now I was off to Florida for back-to-back shows on both the Gulf and Atlantic coasts in a nine day period. The first show had another wonderful panel which included Dr. Jim Mazepa of Chicago. My exhibit had been accepted for Poland and Jim was the commissioner. He provided me with an extraordinarily thorough and comprehensive critique of my exhibit. It was very specific in nature and contained much more fact than opinion. Of particular importance was the continuing observation that the exhibit organization was confusing. While there was nothing I could do before the next weekend, I was already formulating plans for my international exhibit.

This was the home stretch. Off to West Palm Beach where Clyde Jennings and a very seasoned jury provided additional moral support by their positive comments. I was very pleased to also receive the APS Research Award and the AAPE Creativity Award. Perhaps I was doing something right!

Back to the drawing board for the last time. But **TIME OUT!** First I have to prepare a one frame exhibit for AmeriStamp Expo. How hard can 16 pages be? This exhibit was a lot of fun to prepare, and my very surprising result, along with great encouragement from Dr. Peter McCann, gave me sorely needed impetus for my final task. The good news was that I was allocated only five frames in Poland. Surely I could get through another 80

pages — couldn't I? I reorganized my entire exhibit to hopefully alleviate its still confusing aspects. Because I had such limited space, I reduced the scope of the exhibit to only the British colonies. It was a joyous day when the exhibit went into the mail!

So, just what is it that I have learned? I have learned that nearly all of the judges and collectors that I have encountered in my rookie season are gracious, helpful and giving people. I wish there was sufficient space here to acknowledge them all as well as many collectors and dealers who have also helped me along the way. The judges simply ask that you open yourself to their experience and take both fact and opinion in a mature and well-natured manner. They are genuinely trying to help, not hinder, your progress. As for the changes I have made to my exhibit, I feel they are totally justified. Consider that your exhibit is simply a form of communication. To blindly ignore the fact that you are not communicating well is a mistake. There is no merit in stubbornness. I hope to continue exhibiting in the future and hope that I can return some of the positives that I have received to others in the collecting and exhibiting fraternity. (Note: I did create an exhibit in 1987 that was shown once.)

FIP Exhibition Calendar

| |
|---|
| Jan. 1994 - Hafnia '94 (Literature) |
| Aug. 16-26, 1994 - PhilaKorea '94 - Seoul |
| Sept. 23-25, 1994 - Gabra III (Postal Stationery) |
| Nov. 18-21, 1994 - Aeropex '94 - Adelaide |
| May 10-15, 1995 - Finlandia '95 - Helsinki |
| Sept 1-10, 1995 - Singapore '95 Singapore |

SOME GUIDELINES

When submitting xerox copies of exhibit pages to be used with your manuscript, may we suggest:

- Clean unblemished copies.
- If the copy machine does not make clean copies, find one that does.
- Don't staple the copies together with your manuscript.
- Whenever possible submit pages that do not show punch holes.

Your printer

Some Thoughts On The One Frame Exhibits

by David L. Herendeen

The recent AmeriStamp Expo was a great success. It seems evident that the 158 exhibits tendered indicate a significant enthusiasm for this exhibiting format. As an active, though novice, exhibitor who has completely redone a ten frame exhibit four times in seven months, the preparation of a mere sixteen pages was a welcome relief.

The first minor problem that I encountered was not knowing anything about a one frame exhibit. My entire knowledge was limited to articles found in this journal. These addressed more the merits of this exhibiting style rather than the axioms of developing the exhibit. Now that I was suitably disarmed, I decided that I would create an exhibit which formed a subtheme within my colonial postage due exhibit. The De La Rue keytype postage dues of the British Empire were selected because they are particularly interesting to me and because it appeared that their story could be told in a single frame.

I spent about 80 hours studying available material and developing the theme, or story, that I wanted to tell. I had a vision of what the exhibit should look like even though I had no role model. My intent was to show all facets of these issues for all of the territories that shared the keytype design. To this end, essays, proofs, specimens, stamps, covers, and plate varieties were shown. I was thrilled and surprised to receive a platinum award and the reserve grand. I decided it would be useful if I documented the facets of the one frame exhibit that I used. Perhaps others would find them helpful.

First, you must formulate a *highly focused theme* and make sure that you develop it thoroughly. Simply selecting sixteen pages from your international gold medal exhibit is not generally sufficient. The theme must then be fully crystallized in a *clear and detailed title page* which precisely defines the parameters of your exhibit. While the title page is important for all exhibits, it is crucial in the one-frame. I also feel that you must include philatelic material on this page since your space is already so limited. For example, in my case I was able to show two proofs and an essay of the first issues of the De La Rue keytype postage dues. These fully describe what will be seen in the remainder of the exhibit. This technique would be natural if you are showing any limited range of stamps, postal markings, fancy cancels, or just about anything imaginable.

Next, you must show *comprehensive coverage* of the theme. Every piece that you select must provide a direct amplification of your thesis. The more exhaustive this coverage, the better. Finally, you must use *brief and pointed text* to describe each item and its relationship to the theme.

You will note that none of these characteristics are monetary in nature. Naturally, many themes may be developed which include very important and pricey items. However, I firmly believe that *The Theme's The Thing*. The success of so many new and novice exhibitors at AmeriStamp Expo, including the grand award winner, seems to substantiate this belief.

Everyone can develop a one frame exhibit. Give it a try at a local show or at next year's one frame exhibit. It will provide you with hours of fun and hone your skills for preparing the *big one* you always hoped to create. Good Luck!!

The De La Rue Postage Due Keytypes 1885-1981

This exhibit studies the development of the De La Rue postage due keytypes of the British Empire. This simple and efficient design, with only a single major and several minor modifications, served the Crown Agents for nearly a century and is certainly familiar to all stamp collectors. The two principal designs are described as the Curvilinear Design and the Rectilinear Design, named for the basic shape of the frame design. The former was introduced in 1885 in Trinidad and the latter in 1882 in Grenada. A proof of the first design, and both a 1/4 and 1/2 stamp and large die proof of the second are shown on this page. A description of their significance is given on pages 2 and 7 of the exhibit, respectively.

Shown below are three designs. These continued their use after gaining independence. All 19 of these are represented in the exhibit. A summary of the entries and the periods they used the keytype dies is given below:

| CURVILINEAR DESIGN | RECTILINEAR DESIGN |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Trinidad and Tobago: 1885-1981 | Grenada: 1882-1982 |
| Barbados: 1885-1981 | FR 1213 |
| Bahamas: 1924-1988 | St. Vincent: 1885-1924-1926 |
| British Guiana: 1840-1985 | Gold Coast: 1922-1982 |
| Gibraltar: 1885-1971 | British Honduras: 1825-1972 |
| Tristan da Cunha: 1927 | Northern Rhodesia: 1922-1982 |
| POSTAL MARKINGS | POSTAL MARKINGS |
| Ghana: 1887-1981 | Southwest Africa: 1922-1981 |
| Guyana: 1887-1973 | St. Lucia: 1825-1985 |
| | Nyasaland: 1945 |

The exhibit is organized by stamp design, first the curvilinear design, and then the rectilinear. Within these design groups, issues are shown by colony in chronological order. The only exception is the one page study of the English Colonial varieties of the one cent keytype which spans both colonies and designs.

A traditional layout is employed which shows archival proof material, LPO specimens, original designs, and images on cover of such issued pieces. Note that specimens are identified using the numbering system developed by Satchell, (Specimen Stamps of the Crown Colonies 1857-1982)

Due to space considerations, the exhibit does not include those which are not easily discerned visually. In particular, this includes the watermark varieties of the 1885s and the most popular varieties of the post-war era. Especially significant items are described in detailed print. Special facts which trace the development of these designs are denoted by the special symbol π .

The CURVILINEAR DESIGN TRINIDAD — 1885



The MISSING LINK ESSAY GRENADA — c1981



The RECTILINEAR DESIGN GRENADA — 1882



THE CURVILINEAR DESIGN 1885-1981

On January 1, 1885, the Crown Agents introduced the first British colonial postage due stamps in Trinidad. These stamps, in fact, predated the postage dues of Great Britain by nearly 30 years. The design was very simple and efficient: a rectangular frame enclosing any and every inscription. While varying around the central portion of the design which indicated the rate value. This important design will be called the Curvilinear Design. A proof of the first design, probably a carbon die proof removed from the De La Rue apparatus bank, is shown on this page.

TRINIDAD — 1885-1961 (Trinidad and Tobago)

ESP First British colonial postage dues.



Specimens: Types 012, 018 and 021. The only "set" of British colonial dies showing both left and right-hand types used 1885 and later (1885 through 1920) and a perforated (1844-5) type.

The Bad And The Ugly Of AmeriStamp Expo '93 (We've Already Heard About The Good)

by John M. Hotchner

Enough of the positives of AmeriStamp Expo (ASE) have been written about in the philatelic press. Well, maybe not enough, but plenty. Here I will deal with some lessons learned and a few areas in which there is less than universal agreement on the merits. I'll tell you where I believe the proper path is. The object is to be helpful to those who come after the first running as show administrators, exhibitors, and judges. If you disagree with any of my recommendations, I invite you to write a Letter to the Editor to express your view(s).

The material that follows has been gathered from many of those involved in this year's show, written reviews and thoughtful observers. If the totality sounds negative, please don't assume the experience or the show were negative. It's just that I don't intend to spend time or space recapping the many positives or thanking the many people who put in long hours to make it happen. That's been done elsewhere, and the object here is plow some new ground.

The Purpose There are those who thought that ASE was intended to make exhibiting into a level playing field where cleverness and knowledge would count for more than monetary resources. They were disappointed. The essence of philatelic exhibiting, especially competitive exhibiting, is the philatelic material. Scarce, difficult to acquire material without a comprehensive concept to give it meaning, plus proper treatment and write-up, won't score very well. But scarce, difficult to acquire material properly framed and described will always do better than easy material properly framed and described.

The judging criteria were drawn to assure that nonmonetary considerations were given considerable weight, but ASE was never intended to be a show in which scarcity, difficulty and value of what was shown didn't matter.

Awards Some were unhappy that no society awards were solicited. I recommend that this practice be continued. The reason was that the judging process was unwieldy as it was. Adding the deliberation time to award 15 to 25 special prizes on top of 165 decisions would have come close to cruel and unusual punishment. There is one exception: each category ought to have a classy Novice Award. The attracting of philatelists to try exhibiting is what this effort was all about, and I expect it will continue to be a focus.

Some people felt that the new Platinum level of award was too controversial. Most seemed to like it. On balance, I recommend that it be kept. It is a distinctive challenge unique to one frame exhibiting, and will draw participants.

The pins given as a remembrance, instead of medals, drew a mixed response. Some would have preferred the usual medal. The majority seemed to be quite pleased to have something they could wear proudly. Some of them, however, suggested that the pins might be larger and that, in addition to the different color schemes for each medal level, that each state the award level. On balance, I agree.

The Exhibits The major problem was the fact that many exhibitors defined their subject/theme too widely for it to be covered in 16 pages. Part of a larger exhibit can be shown in one frame, but the exhibitor must be careful to narrow the larger scope. Just taking 16 of the best pages from a 160 page exhibit did not score well.

Be sure the title reflects what you're trying to do, and then be sure you have done what your title says you are going to do.

Introductions to.... Highlights of.... A....Sampler, are generally miscast as one framers, if the exhibitor's object is to gain high awards. Prima facie, they lack depth, and often are just representations of the significant breadth that can't be adequately covered in one frame.

The Exhibitors A large percentage checked off the wrong exhibiting class (thematic, country collections, postal history, and special collections) when they applied. This is probably par for the course with a lot of new and inexperienced exhibitors participating - a small price to pay, in fact. But the person initially receiving the exhibit entry and assigning the frames needs to have the knowledge, authority and responsibility to change classes as the entries are received in order to be able to group the entries in the frames and facilitate the judging.

Too many exhibitors did not provide a useful title page and/or synopsis page with their entry. This contributed to the above problem, and missed an opportunity to help the judges focus on their effort before the show. Though the ASE prospectus did request these and explain why, it seems the subject needs to be highlighted better.

Too many did not follow the instructions for providing a prepaid mail-back container. What is a minor inconven-

ience for 10% of 25 to 30 exhibits becomes a major problem with 10% of 160.

Fees There were a good many questions as to why the entry fee had to be \$25 for one frame. Consider that the costs of the 13 judges (the magnificent sum of \$200 per, plus banquet tickets and a working breakfast) came to over \$3,000 of the \$4,000 in entry fees. Then there was the cost of pins, ribbons, the new evaluation forms, prospectuses and other exhibit related costs. This leaves 0 to contribute to the hall rental or other show expenses. \$25 may be too high for the purpose of getting

Special Judging Criteria

Clarity (15). A sharply-defined and easy-to-follow theme or subject; properly labeled by the title.

Coverage (15). The major aspects of the subject or theme are developed and presented using philatelic material. **Accuracy (15).** The material is correctly identified; information is correct.

Relevance (15). Every philatelic piece presented is essential to the subject/theme being developed.

Knowledge (10). A high level of knowledge in the exhibitor's development of subject or theme, the material used to illustrate it, and/or the write-up. It can be enhanced by use of the widest possible variety of philatelic elements consistent with the subject/theme.

Quality (10). The highest possible level of quality that exists for the material presented. Commercial value is preferred where it exists. **Brevity (6).** The write-up is the minimum essential to conveying relevance of philatelic material and answering questions the material, itself, raises.

The Challenge Factor (5). The material goes beyond that which is most easily available for the subject/theme, and is balanced.

Presentation (5). The philatelic material stands out. Exhibit encourages the viewer's attention.

Research (2). New conclusions on the subject/theme or individual items included are reached and properly stated. **Creativity (2).** Development of the subject/theme (unusual or not) is from unusual perspective and/or using unusual philatelic material.

100 points possible.

more novices involved, and perhaps that ought to be looked at by committees that run subsequent ASEs.

Judging Forms With judging criteria and maximum points printed, and point awards and written out comments added, the forms were generally quite popular with the exhibitors, but this memo for future judges: Some comments were perceived to be too short or obscure. Others complained that comments essayed humor and failed, or that comments were unduly harsh; not keeping with an atmosphere in which we are trying to encourage novices.

Judging Criteria and the Point System (See box) Research and Creativity were not treated as consistently as I had hoped. Also, if the exhibit lost all four points, as often happened, the exhibit was already virtually ineligible for a Platinum. Since it is the unusual exhibit that these days shows real original research (as compared to an excellent accumulation of knowledge), and creativity is a nice addition, but not an essential, I am persuaded that the two categories should be dropped to one point each, and made bonus points. To fill in the four points to make up 100, I recommend taking those and one point from Brevity to give a maximum of 15 points for knowledge.

Because of problems that developed in the judging, I agree with several judges who suggested that the definition of Coverage be changed to: "The major aspects of the subject or theme are developed with some depth using philatelic material". (Bolded portion added.)

Judging Methods A practice session was scheduled for Thursday night before the show opened on Friday and formal judging began. For many reasons we didn't get it done. The judges were nearly unanimous that we should have tried harder to have it; that Friday would have gone more smoothly if we had.

The judges felt, and I agree, that we should have given copies of all title and synopsis pages to all judges, rather than giving them just the ones for the section they would initially judge. We all reviewed the initial awards for the full show, and the extra knowledge of the other exhibits would have been helpful. And, the judges would have had to have the title and synopsis pages earlier.

Most judges felt that they would have benefitted from having more time to review the initial awards by other teams. Since the planned amount of time had to be shortened, I agree that at least 60 minutes should be allocated, and 90 minutes if the schedule can accommodate it.

Individual Country and Postal History exhibits were divided by the first letter of the last name of the exhibitor for purposes of assignment to the teams. Several judges involved in those categories felt, and I agree, that they should be divided into continents or subject (e.g. British Colonial) for purposes of assigning judging responsibility. This would promote matching judges' areas of expertise to exhibits.

Seminars and Critiques There was too much jammed into one day. Seminars ought to run on Friday through Sunday morning, and the critiques should not run for three continuous hours. The Chief Judge should moderate all the critiques rather than leaving that task to a designated Team leader.

Set Up Working sheets listed all exhibits in order in the frames should be prepared before the show in order to facilitate the judging process once team results are in and during deliberations.

Youth Area There was none at this running of ASE because the person who usually handles it for MIDAPHIL couldn't handle another of her usual extravaganzas at this time of year. While sympathetic, and recognizing that it is a lot of work, I think some sort of youth area is better than no youth area. Even if it can't be done on the sponsoring committee's usual scale, something should be done.

Completing The Circuit by Clyde Jennings

Well, I have just completed a cycle, one might say. There are 34 APS accredited national level shows, and now I have been a judge at every one of them at least once; a few several times. There are even three more that have gone by the board, so to speak, at which I was privileged to be invited to judge: FRESPEX, SOJEX, and SUNPEX. I did not start out with the intention of judging all of them. The invitations just seemed to come along, and about two years ago while looking at a list of the shows I realized I had judged all but two: Boxborough and PIPEX. Somehow Peter McCann learned of this, and next thing I know I was in Boxborough, thanks to good friend Guy Dillaway. I guess it was just fitting that PIPEX be the last since it's about the farthest I ever had to go! It was in Vancouver in '93. Not exactly sure how this one came about, though Charles Verge was the one who wrote, said he was Chief Judge and would I like to join him. Thanks Peter, Guy, and Charles.

Must tell you something beautiful that happened at PIPEX. When the critique was finished Chief Verge said he had an announcement, and asked me to stand up. He then told about this being my 34th out of 34 shows, and

presented me with a handsome desk pen set. I thanked him and set the gift down on the table. "No", he said, "turn it over". I did, and promptly dropped the pen on the floor! On the back was a list of 48 names, all of whom had contributed to a request by Charles, and he presented me with a check for \$1000 (U.S.!) made out to The Postal History Foundation Fran Jennings Memorial Fund. Yep, those of you know me well are correct: I did come unglued! A ton of thanks to each of you beautiful people.

Why do I continue to judge? Two reasons: I enjoy it a great deal, and I have never yet judged a show at which I did not learn something. I might even add a third: fun, and after all that's what the hobby is supposed to be all about. Hard work, sometimes, yes. Lots of zingers, sometimes, yes. But I still have fun.

I related a couple of little judging stories in the July '92 issue, and pleasantly received several favorable comments from a few who said they enjoyed 'em. So maybe you'd like another one. This one happened at AIRPEX a few years back, and at that time I was Chief Judge.

We finished our work on Friday, ribbons were posted Saturday, and all the

rest of the day all I heard about was an unhappy exhibitor who was going to take my jury apart on Sunday. He had a most esoteric exhibit. Some sort of a revenue showing from some way out country as I best recall. We had no so-called expert in that area on the jury, nor anyone present at the show upon whom we might call for help, but overall I sincerely felt we had given more than a fair shake with a Vermeil. When the floor was opened up for questions at critique his was the first hand up. I recognized him, and he lit in with a vengeance. I stopped him, and said, "I beg your pardon, sir, but what is your name?" He told me, and I immediately countered with, "And what was your exhibit and its award?" Again he told me, and I came right back with, "Sir, if this jury, in its infinite wisdom (!), had given you a silver, would you be here now fighting for a Vermeil?" "I sure would", he all but yelled. So I just said, "Next question, please".

Never heard another word from him. I hated to lead him down the garden path, but I sure had to do something. And I figured that was my best "out".

ASK ODENWELLER

by Robert P. Odenweller



FIP Option at Houston

The FIP Guide to Exhibiting and Judging Traditional and Postal History Exhibits is printed, or so says a fax I received just prior to going to STAMpsHOW in Houston. That's the good news. The bad news is also in the fax. For some reason, as yet unknown, they are being held in Taiwan where they were printed two months ago. No explanation why or date on which they may be expected to be sent. You'll hear when there's a change. As the author, I had hoped at least to have a chance to see it in its production stages, but since I provided camera-ready copy, perhaps that is not necessary. We'll keep our fingers crossed...

Another of my children, the FIP Option, received a second try in Houston after a one-year hiatus following its start. John Hotchner, Dan Walker, and I received 25 requests this time, and only had two days in which to do it all. Each exhibitor received a printed critique (that I prepared within 24 hours after returning home based on the perceptions of all three of us), along with a set of general remarks that discussed a number of problems we noticed and offered suggestions to improve on them. Since they have wide validity we agreed to share them with you.

General Remarks Concerning the FIP Option Exhibits at STAMpsHOW '93

Of the 25 exhibits at STAMpsHOW '93 that requested the FIP Option judging, twelve were in the World Series and thirteen in open competition. Some exhibitors may have requested the process to obtain a written critique, while others were clearly looking forward to international competition. Whichever the motivation, the team had a sizeable task to finish in two days, and one comparable to that facing the normal international team at a FIP show.

A number of general comments can be made about the exhibits. Primary of these is that few exhibitors seem to understand the importance of a good title page, and how to use it to best effect. For a number of years after it was required, many exhibitors found it a convenient place to place a "shopping list" of the best pieces, listed in a single location to make sure the judges wouldn't miss them. That approach is no longer looked on with favor. It annoyed certain frequent international

judges who felt that the exhibitors were bludgeoning them with the rare and expensive. So those are now "out". An equally valid way still exists, however, to mention those pieces. It requires that the exhibitor be a bit more careful in composing the discussion on the title page so that it includes the key pieces. Better yet, the unusual treatment of items on the pages is still the preferred approach.

One exhibitor mounted his best pieces on a background paper that was a golden yellow color rather than black. It was almost as though someone had put a very small gold trim around the items. Yet when I took a number of exhibitors to look at the frame, some of whom didn't know the material well at all, and asked them to indicate the major pieces, they unflinchingly pointed out the ones rimmed in gold. When I asked how they knew, they said they didn't know. Then I pointed out the gold trim, at which point they said that they hadn't noticed it before I showed them. That's subtle. Better yet, the exhibitor did not mention on the title page that he had done this. No sense doing something subtle and then blowing it by hitting them over the head with a blunt meat-axe.

Another difficulty of quite a few exhibitors at this show was the feeling that they had so much to say that they needed two title pages to say it in. *Wrong*. FIP does not tolerate a second title page. Space is too precious to waste that way. So how do you do it? A new trick I've been pushing is what I call the "internal heading." You start on the title page with a brief outline and cover the really important stuff about the exhibit. Then, when you get to the beginning of each section on the internal part of the exhibit, you start with a new section heading, but usually no more than about a third of a page—and for heaven's sake, *include some material on the page!* Every page should have material with the possible exception of the title page, which doesn't need it, and which probably shouldn't have any in some disciplines such as postal history. In this internal heading you can go into the detail you would have put on the title page, but now you talk only about what is coming in that section. Think of it as you would of the chapters in a book. This way you can concentrate on what is immediately to follow, rather than

refer to something on the title page and then come to it 9 or 10 frames later when the eye has been saturated with lots of other goodies. Used properly this can be quite a tool. Think about it and do with it what works best with your material.

At the FIP level a third of the evaluation is not only on the information you know, but more importantly how well you know how to put it on the page. Too many of the exhibit pages here were put up just for us to enjoy—it must have been that way, because there was no write-up at all. Cancellations were shown in some cases combining many of the same type on a single page, but rather than identifying any special ones, just had a group heading at the top. At least these could have had a single line at the bottom describing what the cancellation was used for, how many varieties there were of the specific marking, which of the markings is common and which are more difficult to find, or any of a number of remarks that might be appropriate to that specific type of marks. Don't assume that the viewer knows anything, and that goes for the judges, too. Very often the exhibitor knows much more than any judge is likely to about his own specific specialty. It is not incorrect to have at least one word of write-up under each piece. Not many years ago, exhibitors were inclined to say "the material speaks for itself." It still may do so, but I have a feeling that there are more people out there who don't know the language being spoken, and again, that includes the judges. But even if they *do*, they don't know that you know what you've got unless you tell them.

In the "good old days" (only a few years ago), write-up was not as important as it is now. The judge was supposed to look at all the varieties the exhibitor put on the page and appreciate the many lovely varieties and shades without any further prompting. The judges who could do that for more than just a very small specialty are becoming fewer in number each year. Today's better judge is one who has a good depth of knowledge about a few broad areas and a specialist knowledge of a few more refined ones. The exhibitor must know to expect limitations and can greatly help the exhibit by leading the judge on a nicely laid out path through it. If the judge emerges at the far end with a solid appreciation of

what he has seen and can relate it to the scheme of philately worldwide, the exhibit will get a good evaluation. Make it hard and you'll suffer.

A few final remarks. Too many exhibitors mixed type-faces in exhibits and used other illustrative devices such as photocopies, maps, and pictures. Anyone tempted to put such items on their pages (instead of stamps and covers) should ask a simple question—will it add to the exhibit in such a way that it must be there, or if it is left off will it matter? If it *must* be there, then the answer is to make it look as attractive as possible. Photocopies are rarely attractive. A neatly done tracing is much better, and there are many ways to do it even better than that. For the hi-tech exhibitors, a scanner may be just the thing. Maps must have a reason for existence, not just to show where a place may be. If they are used, they should be done so as not to be too obtrusive. Again, there are many ways

to use them, but they should never overpower the philatelic element of the exhibit. Photographs are also sometimes of use, particularly to show small details that cannot normally be seen, or that need some extra identification added to them to make philatelic points clear. They should not be put up because they are attractive.

Treatment of the reverse of covers by photography is a sensitive matter. If photos are too good and look too much like the original, the judge may not realize at first that they are photographs and when they do, they might feel "cheated" by the exhibitor who is trying to make his exhibit look as though it has more material than it really does, and react negatively. Some exhibitors make the photos a smaller size, others use black-and-white, others just "explode" the cover. There is no simple answer to this, but color photocopies are not a very good answer.

The points shown on the form for the various categories are mostly in answer to the generic questions found below them. When the criteria comprise more than one group of sub-criteria, the breakdowns are shown as a fraction of the numbers possible, with the total following. In the haste to get these finished and in the hands of the exhibitors as soon as possible, a few have minor corrections, but the totals are correct.

We hope to have helped each exhibitor to a better understanding of the "total exhibit" concept of how they would fare at the international level. Our results could be slightly different, when the exhibits are seen by other judges. This is normal. Nevertheless, it is my feeling that we have come up with a quite representative response in each case and are prepared to sign our names to those results.

As I See It...How About You? Should The Gold Medal Be Split?

by John M. Hotchner

The annual APS STAmPsHOW gathers enough of the faithful that sparks and interesting ideas can be found in profusion. If you have not been to one, I recommend you come to Pittsburgh next year from August 18 to 21, 1994. Write to APS - Attn. Dan Asmus, PO Box 8000, State College, PA 16803 to get on the list for information, and to ask for an "open" or literature competition prospectus.

This year's show highlighted a simmering issue; one which deserves discussion and probably action. Nearly half of the open competition exhibits received Gold medals this year. And this was no push-over jury. The fact is that such results are increasingly the norm at the better known shows where exhibitors tend to congregate.

Some suggest that this means Gold medals are getting to be too easy to get, and/or that they are becoming meaningless. I don't buy either argument. If anything, the standards have become more rigorous over the last 10 years as judges have worked to be better prepared when they arrive at the frames. I can tick off a dozen exhibitors who can give first hand testimony to this based on a drop in their medal level from 'the good of days'.

I see several phenomena at work:

a. It is much easier than it used to be to get help and critique that, if heeded, lead to a Gold medal.

b. A much wider range of material is philatelically respectable. At one time,

Golds rarely went to modern (read post-1900) material. The fact that they do today doesn't mean they are easy Golds; only that other challenges are now recognized for the substantial difficulty they truly represent.

c. There is a parallel phenomenon: One can earn a Gold through first class personal study as reflected in the frames, and through meeting a high standard of difficulty of acquisition. The old emphasis on evident dollar content of the frames has become a dinosaur. Dollars can help the exhibitor, but generally, they neither guarantee a Gold, nor does lack of them prohibit one.

d. There are more students of the craft of exhibiting, who CAN handle the heat, and who persevere to the Gold level. In fact, my sense is that the average gold level exhibitor of today wins one and then goes on to win another, and even more. In other words, today's aristocrats of exhibiting are not the people who have one fabulous exhibit. They are the people who enjoy exhibiting so much that they constantly look for new challenges. Perhaps George Kramer, named Champion of Champions for a second time at Houston this year, is the perfect modern role model!

So, does the increase in Gold medal numbers mean that the medal is meaningless? Hardly. Just ask the many exhibitors who are still working to earn one.

Is there a problem? If so, what is it? And how can it be fixed?

Michael Dixon, in a recent study covering national level shows spanning 1988 through 1992 shows that 27.62% of national awards were Golds. Given that there are six possible award levels (including certificate), a 28% incidence of Golds doesn't scream for correction. Still since the trend is upwards, I think we ought to look at what might be done.

For an answer, I go to my experience as a show judge, and the fact that there are recognizable levels within the Gold medal category. There are those exhibits which are virtually faultless, and with strong material besides. Perhaps these should be thought of as the contenders for the Grand Award.

Then, there are the solid efforts justifying Gold but with work yet to be done to make these exhibits all they can be.

Should these recognizable categories be split into two different medal levels (Large Gold - Small Gold; Platinum -Gold; or?) This question was discussed at the STAmPsHOW Judges' Round Table, at the AAPE meeting, and everywhere else that exhibitors met. There were plenty of opinions but no resolution.

So let's throw this open, take an opinion poll, and talk this out in these pages as an assist to the APS Judges Accreditation Committee and the APS Board which will ultimately have to make changes in the present system...if warranted.

If you have an opinion, let's hear it. Write to me at P.O. Box 1125, Falls Church, VA 22041-0125.

The Mail-In Exhibitor

by Charles K. Luks 409 Halsey Rd., Parsippany, NJ 0754-5214

I'll start as usual by thanking all the exhibitors who took time out to send in score sheets and comments. Thanks, you are the heart of the column. In fact I have received so many scores and comments I don't know if I'll have room for all of them, but I'll try.

In order to save space I'll use letters like NCP, no certificate, NAL, no award list and NR for no ribbon. Since so many readers keep complaining about meter stamps I will just put an (M) where the shows return with metered postage.

CINPEX - 100 +

DELPEX - 100

GARFIELD PERRY (M) 100

MEGA SHOW (MAY) (M) 100, 100, 95, 90 no award notice sent

NOJEX 100 +, 100 +

OKPEX 100 +, 100, 100

PHILATELIC SHOW, 100, 100, 98 not packed well, 75*

PLYMOUTH 100

POLSKA (Poland) 95, misspelled name

ROMPEX 100 +, 95 no ribbon

ROPEX 100

SANDICAL 100

TOPEX - 100, 100

VAPEX - 100

EUR-APEX - (London) - 90, NAL, NR

TEXPEX - 90 NAL, NR-85 NAL, NR, not returned as requested. Award list, certificate, program and show covers sent on request.

SPRINGPEX 85, no AL, no award received as of mid-July, show was 3/6-7

*PHILATELIC SHOW - I, and another exhibitor had no trouble, (the two 100s), the 98 "used all packing materials provided but sort of threw it all together". The other exhibitor, 75, states "no acknowledgement of acceptance received", only knew exhibit was accepted when cancelled check received and calling a friend in the area". Exhibit was not packed well on return, moving around loose in container. Award not engraved, no date, no name, no award level. Show chairman wrote me a letter which I passed on to exhibitor with explanation.

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Acknowledgement of acceptance or rejection | 10 |
| Exhibit mailed back within 3 days of show closing | 20 |
| Exhibit returned as directed | 20 |
| Exhibit returned safely, well packed | 20 |
| Ribbon (s) and certificate (s) enclosed | 10 |
| Award enclosed or notice sent | 10 |
| Program enclosed | 5 |
| Award winners list enclosed | 5 |
| Total | 100 points |

BALPEX, the two exhibitors who complained about not receiving awards finally received them; one quite late.

AMERISTAMP One Frame Exhibit - (M) - From my reading of the show there were at least 127 mailings back to exhibitors. That is quite a job. I only received two letters on the show and both were from upset exhibitors. First exhibitor states "Despite my clear instruction to use the inbound cardboard type mailing container for the return of exhibit pages, the show personnel used a soft manila envelope with internal plastic 'bubble' padding". The envelope was punctured somewhere en route. Luckily no damage was done to the stamps. "The mailing envelope used does not preclude folding or bending, nor was there any instruction (on the envelope) to not fold or bend." His preaddressed mailing label was not used. The exhibit contained very valuable stamps and the writer concludes "please consider placing a strong admonishment in your TPE column to never, ever let this situation happen again, by any exhibit committee".

The second writer who took a bronze states "I opened the package, took out the exhibit, the judging sheet and bronze ribbon and the small award pin, and I do mean small. I needed a magnifying glass to read the pin. -----As I looked over the (award) list, I wondered how the other award recipients, who may have attended the awards banquet, felt when they received the same lapel award pins for their platinum, gold, and vermeil level exhibits. I'll bet they were thrilled." (Ed. Note: The pins differ for each award level.)

A nice gesture was the return of his priority mail packaging but a committee person had put the yellow frame number sticker right on top of the \$2.90 eagle stamp, and the \$9.95 return eagle express stamp was pen cancelled.

He Continues: "AmeriStamp Expo '93" charged \$25.00 per frame which if

my math is correct generated about \$4,000 in frame fees. I think some better quality awards and certificates could have been given to everyone who entered. As a founding member of AAPE I am really disappointed and feel, as a mail-in exhibitor, I have been slighted".

There, we have heard from two unhappy exhibitors and I can't blame them. I have forwarded their complaints to persons who promised to take it up with the AmeriStamp Expo committee and I hope to report in the next issue that action has been taken to correct these problems.

Exhibitors have told me that Philatelic Show and TOPEX are including score sheets in their returned exhibits. Thank you for joining "the club".

According to the exhibitor who gave the MEGA SHOW 90, he never received the AAPE Creativity Award, as of the end of July, that was published in the program. He did give them credit for very prompt return, returning of his address panel with \$14 in used new Columbians, and for providing individual envelopes for each frame of the exhibit, a very thoughtful extra. The down side was the meter, no return of \$6 in overpaid postage, no show cover, and award ever sent.

The exhibit chairman from WESTPEX wrote to me and said "we have never put excess postage on a package to use up the monies an exhibitor has sent" and stated "frequently an exhibitor does not think of the weight of medal, program, etc. and does not enclose enough money for return postage". I mailed a copy of his letter on to the exhibitor, but I'll still stand by what I said in the last paragraph of my column in the April '93 TPE.

I hope all this can be squeezed in. Keep those score sheets and comments coming.

Show Listings

AAPE will include listings of shows being held during the seven 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.

★ Oct. 28-31. **New York Postage Stamp Mega-Event.** Semi-annual American Stamp Dealers Association show at Madison Square Garden. \$8 per 16-page frame. Youth fees donated by Philatelic Foundation. Info from ASDA, 3 School St., Suite 205, Glen Cove, NY 11542, 516/759-7000.

★ Nov. 12-14. **CHICAGOPEX '93.** Chicago Philatelic Society's 107th Annual Philatelic Exhibition, O'Hare Expo Center, 5555 North River Road, Rosemont, IL (Chicago suburb near O'Hare Airport). Hotel at reduced rate. FREE ADMISSION. Hours of show: Friday -10 a.m. to 6 p.m.; Saturday - 10 a.m. to 6 p.m.; Sunday - 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Hosting the Annual National Convention of the American Revenue Association. JUNIOR EXHIBITS WELCOME. Frames hold 16 (9 x 11-1/2) pages. \$7 per frame (adults), \$1 per frame (Juniors). For show prospectus (philatelic and/or literature) and hotel reservation cards, write: Ms. Simine Short, P.O. Box 291, Downers Grove, IL 60515.

1994

Jan. 28-29. **York County Stamp Show.** Sponsored by the White Rose Philatelic Society of York. Held at the York Fairgrounds Horticulture Hall, 334 Carlisle Ave., York, PA. 150-16 page frames available at \$5 per adult frame and \$2.50 per junior frame. Exhibit entry forms, dealer information and general show information is available from: York County Show, C/O P.O. Box 85, Glen Rock, PA 17327.

Feb. 26-27, 1994. **LINPEX '94.** Sponsored by the Lincoln Stamp Club. Held at the University of Nebraska East Campus Union, 35th and Holdrege Streets, Lincoln, Nebraska. Frames hold 16 (8.5 x 11) pages, \$5 per frame (adults), \$2.50 (juniors). Minimum 2, maximum 10 (adults), 5 (juniors), one frame exhibits (\$10). Deadline: Feb. 5, 1994. Prospectus from: Lawrence Kinyon, P.O. Box 22412, Lincoln, NE 68542.

March 12-13, 1994 **FRESPEX '94.** Sponsored by the Fresno Philatelic Society: Held at the Fresno Fairgrounds, Junior Exhibits Bldg., Butler & Chance Avenues. 200 12 page frames, \$3 adult, \$1 junior. Free admission. For further information and prospectus, contact Ruth Seibert, 6158 N. College, Fresno, CA 93704.

March 19. **OXPEX '94 and OTEX '94.** Sponsored by the Oxford Philatelic Society, Woodstock, Ont. 6 page frames - 12 frame maximum. No charge. Entry deadline, March 7. Information from Gib Stephens, P.O. Box 20113, Woodstock Centre P.O., Woodstock, Ont. N4S 8X8, Canada.

★ March 26-27. **Filatelic Fiesta.** Sponsored by the San Jose Stamp Club. Held at the San Jose Scottish Rite Temple, 2455 Masonic Dr., San Jose, Ca. Adults \$6 per frame, juniors \$2 per frame. Frames hold 15 8 1/2 x 11 sheets (5x3). Show admission free. Prospectus and details from: M.R. Renfro, Box 2268, Santa Clara, CA 95055.

Attn: Show Committees: When sending your exhibits list to your judges, send a copy (of title pages, too) to Gini Horn, APS Research Library, P.O. Box 8338, State College, PA 16803. Doing so will help Gini and staff to locate background literature of help to the judges, and thus facilitate the accuracy of results! Please cooperate.

Polska '93 World Philatelic Exhibition

by Henry Hahn

This, the third such show in Poland, commemorated the 100th Anniversary of the Polish Philatelic Movement. Polish President Lech Walesa was listed as the "Protector of the Exhibition". The show took place in Poznan May 7th - 16th, under the auspices of FIP, in a large, modern exhibition complex, which simultaneously housed an auto and truck show plus a few others. Since a single ticket served as admission to all the shows, we will probably never know how well POLSKA '93 was attended.

About forty seven (47) exhibits by US collectors fared rather well, though the judging was a bit uneven in comparison with, say PRAGA '88, which was the last FIP show which this observer attended as an exhibitor. It is possible that this unevenness was at least in part due to the much smaller jury, compared to PRAGA '88 where the jury numbered 55. Aside from jury size, jury selection as it currently appears to be practiced, does not seem to be optimally responsive to the range of material exhibited. Instances of duplication in expertise, and expertise by a few jury members in philatelic areas absent (or nearly absent) at POLSKA '93 were evident.

While PRAGA '88 was a larger show, the range of material shown at POLSKA '93 appeared equally broad, if not broader due to the addition of at least one new category. As a result, there were some gaps. For Czechoslovakia material, the subject of this exhibitor's entry, the absence of a jury member competent in this area was readily apparent. While a Czech judge was listed, he served as the jury's Secretary Apprentice and did not judge the Czech exhibits. This was particularly disheartening since at least 14 Czech or Czech-related exhibits were present. As a result, at least two Czech exhibits were significantly misjudged (not this writer's), one overrated by two levels compared to its most recent and correct rating at a FIP show, and one significantly underrated. Neither was a US entry.

Additional gaps were pointed out in exhibitor "bull sessions", but these were not verified by this observer.

A positive feature in the POLSKA '93 Palmares is the listing of point count along with the award level. This, presumably, tells how "solid" the award was, and how close the exhibit was to the next higher (or lower) level. The exhibitor is thus made to feel good or lucky having received small vermeil

with 80 points, and not so good or lucky having received a large vermeil with 89 points.

From the constructive point of view, it would be an order of magnitude more valuable to the exhibitor if the count were broken down by grading category, of which there are four in most exhibiting classes. This would indicate where the weakness or strength of an exhibit lies, and hence provide the exhibitor with the direction in which improvement is indicated. For example, while most exhibitors can't do much in the area of "philatelic importance" (unless they wish to make very basic changes in their exhibit), many exhibitors would appreciate knowing how they did in displaying philatelic knowledge, condition, rarity, etc.

Having participated in one FIP judging procedure as an apprentice, I fully appreciate the difficulty of recording, averaging, and reporting such massive data. For 400 exhibits, 40 judges, and 4 categories, we would generate 64,000 data points, not to mention special awards, debates, etc. Might require a bit of computer networking in the jury room or at least some voting machines - who knows.

But sweet it would be!

"The FLY"



Lands on Some of

"Those" Societies

This column is not an indictment of the many philatelic societies that do such a great job of promoting and fostering this wonderful hobby of ours. Rather the column brings together from a number of diverse sources, a series of society behaviors relating to exhibiting that I feel are inappropriate. The column is loosely based on the facts and combines behaviors reported from several different sources.

THE PHONE CALL - Hello, is this "THE FLY" who is the chairman of FLYSPEX '93? Yes, I replied. Well I'm Mr. Drack, the president of the Philatelic Exhibitors of Stamps and Things Society (PESTS) and I was wondering if there is a place in your show for us to hold our annual convention. I know that it is only several months away, but we would really like to convene at your show. Circumstances beyond our control precluded us from selecting a site before now. (This last is code for... I forgot to make the arrangements).

THE REPLY - Well Mr. Drack, as you've said, the show is just around the corner. We have several societies that decided to convene with us and they have been on-board for about a year now. All of our publicity has been prepared, programs, flyers and other items have been set. We have selected the jury and it has been approved by the APS. We have allocated most of our exhibit frames already and only have a few not yet assigned. Notwithstanding your late request, I have spoken to my committee and we feel that, rather than having the PESTS unable to convene this year, we will agree to allow you to have your annual convention with us providing you agree that we will not be able to respond to many demands because of the proximity to the show date.

DRACK REPLIES - We accept your terms with pleasure and I promise you that we will not be a bother. We are grateful that you have agreed to let the PESTS hold their annual convention at FLYSPEX '93.

CHAIRMAN FLY CONTINUES TO PLAN FOR FLYSPEX '93... and then the first letter arrives...

THE FIRST LETTER - Dear Fly, pursuant to our recent telephone conversation, the PESTS will want you to reserve 100 frames for our members. We have an active exhibiting membership and expect to fill these frames without any difficulty. "THE FLY" responded by reminding Mr.

Drack that no commitment of frames could be made but that every effort would be made to accommodate the PESTS.

THE SECOND LETTER - Dear Fly, I cannot believe that your exhibit chairman has placed several of our exhibits on a waiting list. After all, the PESTS are convening at FLYSPEX and our members should be given preferential treatment when it comes to accepting exhibits. "THE FLY" reminded Mr. Drack that most of the frames had been allocated prior to the acceptance of the PESTS request to hold their convention at FLYSPEX... and that every effort was being made to reduce the size of large exhibits, add more frames to the show, and generally do whatever was necessary to bring as many PEST exhibitors to the show.

THE NEXT LETTER - Dear FLY, your reply is hardly acceptable and I am thinking of pulling the PESTS out of FLYSPEX if we don't get all of the frames we requested. (Making a long story short, "THE FLY" was able to accommodate all of the PEST exhibitors who applied for frames... the sum total of the frames subscribed was 54... a far cry from the 100 frames "demanded.")

THE NEXT LETTER - Dear Fly, please reserve 50 banquet tickets for the PESTS. We will not be attending the social hour prior to the banquet but we will want 5 ten person tables reserved for our members... and these should be the five tables across the front of the banquet room.

Dear readers, you have to understand that the FLYSPEX banquet costs \$45.00 per plate, but the banquet tickets are sold for only \$30.00. The committee believes in putting on a first-class banquet and doesn't mind underwriting some of the cost. Therefore it is with some pleasure that a reservation for 50 additional banquet tickets was received. The guaranteed minimum number of dinners was increased because the hotel needed the information and a close-to-actual count.

Let I get too far ahead, here is what happened... When Mr. Drack arrived at the show, he came to the table where banquet tickets were being sold and introduced himself. When he was informed that we were holding the 50 tickets the PESTS had requested, he asked how much a ticket cost. When he was told \$30.00, he went into a tirade claiming that the PESTS were not used

to paying that much for a meal. He doubted that he could use all of the 50 tickets. With heart pounding, "THE FLY" asked Mr. Drack how many tickets the PESTS were prepared to purchase against their reservation of 50. They bought 5. FLYSPEX "ate" the loss.

THE NEXT COMMUNICATION - Dear FLY, I am chagrined that no one on your jury is a member of the PESTS. We have several APS accredited judges in our ranks and feel that you have deliberately slighted the PESTS by not putting one of them on the panel. I'm taking a lot of heat from my members over this matter. They feel that you are treating us badly and they want to pull out of FLYSPEX. (Please do, I thought).

THE REPLY - Look... the jury was selected months before you decided to come to FLYSPEX and you know that. Further, we have a jury of the most prominent philatelists and philatelic judges we would assemble... many of them are international judges to boot. Believe me when I tell you that the jury is quite able to judge PEST material. Also, we will make available to the jury, one or more PEST experts who can be consulted if necessary.

Mr. Drack replied that he would take up the issue with his membership and let the world know what a lousy show FLYSPEX was... so I added one of his suggested jurors to the jury... and FLYSPEX ate the cost.

THE NEXT COMMUNICATION - Dear FLY, I cannot comprehend how you could be in charge of a national show. To date, while we have been contacted by your society coordinator on a number of subjects, no one from FLYSPEX has offered to sponsor our social hour and society dinner and breakfast. What kind of a fly-by-night (no pun intended) show are you running. I have never seen such a lack of concern for a prestigious society like the PESTS.

What could "THE FLY" do. Despite telling Mr. Drack that he would have to make all of his own arrangements directly with the hotel, there continued an exchange of communications to the point where "THE FLY" took it upon himself to act as the PESTS local representative, and the arrangements were made for the PESTS.

THE NEXT COMMUNICATION - Dear FLY, I forgot to mention that the PESTS will need a room for 250

people to meet, all day, every day of the show. We will also need a podium, public address system, two telephones, coffee service (with Danish), a slide projector and screen, three easels, five frames for member exhibits during our show-and-tell, and a VCR. Of course we expect these items to be provided at no cost to the PESTS because we have blessed FLYSPEX with our attendance. So "THE FLY" ate the cost of all this as well.

THE NEXT COMMUNICATION

-Dear FLY, the PESTS will be putting up a series of special prizes that must be awarded to all members of the PESTS who exhibit. I expect that you will provide me with sufficient time at the awards banquet so that I can make a speech, introduce all of the PESTS who are in attendance, read the roster of present and former members, tell three or four off-color stories, and I want to make the PEST awards without any help from the FLYSPEX committee.

Because I'm an easygoing insect, I agreed to all of the PESTS demands. He spoke for over an hour, his off-color stories caused three people in the audience to faint, and a sexual harassment complaint was filed by the wait staff against FLYSPEX, its officers and directors, the members of the committee, and the hotel. The prizes he awarded were ribbons that looked like they had been recycled from other show awards.

THE NEXT COMMUNICATION?

I was hoping for a letter thanking the FLYSPEX committee for all it did to accommodate the PESTS... but that was too much to hope for. Nothing was said... to this day.

Look, "THE FLY" is not against any society... but is against some outrageous behaviors. It seems to me that if a society wants a certain number of frames reserved for exhibits... then they ought to fill them. Far too often, the societies come up short of what they asked for, and this leaves the show in a dilemma. The Solution is to make the commitment for frames and then release the frames back to the show about a month or so before exhibit applications are due to close. In this way the show can maintain a waiting list and also accept late arrivals while allowing the society to fill its frames early... if it can.

Also, from now on, no more being nice when it comes to banquet tickets. You want one? Enclose a check. If the society wants to attend the banquet, then it should encourage its members to purchase tickets in advance.

I would be remiss however, if I didn't award a "GOLD FLY SWATTER" to the many societies who go out of their way to be helpful. The foregoing story is of course written with a fair amount of poetic license, but... take a look at how your society behaves... and if any part of the story applies... make a concerted effort to turn the situation around. Peace!

GOLD FLY SWATTER - To Mary Ann Owens who despite her most impressive philatelic credentials (and advanced age... happy 65th darling), could be seen at the MEGA-SHOW in New York, assisting exhibitors with the mounting of their exhibits, and securing frames after the mounting.

GOLD FLY SWATTER - Also to Mary Ann who is now a signer of the Roll of Distinguished Philatelists.

GOLD FLY SWATTER - To Joe Savarese, the Executive Director of the American Stamp Dealers Association for purchasing the youth awards at the MEGA-SHOW and for developing and producing a beginners stamp album designed to attract youth to the hobby. Joe knows that the future of the hobby lies with the youthful collectors and he and the ASDA have gone out of their way to help.

FLY BITE - To the USPS for withdrawing its support of the Ben Franklin Stamp Clubs. I read the article in Linn's and all I can figure out is that the support was pulled because it isn't a money maker for "carvin" Marvin Runyon. Well Marv, you missed the boat. Investing in the kids today will reap far more profits than you can count in the future. Shame!

FLY BITE - To those shows that take the trouble to provide name tags for exhibitors... but the writing on them is sometimes so small that you need a magnifying glass to read the name. (I thought that all philatelists carried magnifying glasses at all times... so what's the problem?).

FLY BITE - To those exhibitors who raise Cain at critiques but who have obviously not made themselves aware of the APS Manual of Philately

Judging... or who have not joined the AAPE. C'mon do us the courtesy of understanding the "rules" before you indict the system.

GOLD FLY SWATTER - To ROMPEX for putting on a first-class show.

GOLD FLY SWATTER - To Mary Ann Owens (again) and Dr. Peter Iber, commissioners for BANGKOK '93. They created a great newsletter (6 issues up to the time this column was written) for prospective exhibitors, arranged for tours, travel, etc.

GOLD FLY SWATTER - To Philatelic Show '93 for taking the initiative to mount acetate strips in the frames to keep the tops of exhibit pages from folding down and falling out of the frames during mounting, or when the frame is being closed.

GOLD FLY SWATTER - To NAPEX '93 for sending a great letter of explanation to those exhibitors whose exhibits did not make it into that oversubscribed show. Nice touch!

GOLD FLY SWATTER - to WESTPEX for being one of the best organized national level shows around. Why can't more shows get the frame number assignments and title pages to the judges as far in advance as WESTPEX seems to be able to do? Well done!

GOLD FLY SWATTER - To judge Gale Raymond who is an inspiration to us all.

GOLD FLY SWATTER - To Bud Sellers who keeps pressing on despite the recent loss of his wife. Bud, we love you and you too are an inspiration to us all.

...and finally... in response to a letter received from ARIPEX '93...

FLY BITE - To "THE FLY" because the reason that some exhibitors were late arriving was due to severe weather conditions resulting in canceled flights... and not due to "nefarious activities that might have been implied in the "bite." ARIPEX reminds us that there wouldn't be a problem if more exhibitors mailed their exhibits to the show. This is particularly true when shows are held in the stormy months and in places famous for bad weather.

SHOW AWARDS CHAIRMEN, PLEASE NOTE: THE AAPE AUTOMATIC AWARDS PROGRAM

AAPE "Awards of Honor" for presentation, and the "AAPE Creativity Award" are sent automatically to World Series of Philately (WSP) Shows; to the person and/or address given in the American Philatelist show listing. All local and regional (non-WSP) shows are entitled to present "Awards of Honor" according to the following:

U.S. & Canadian Shows of 500 or more pages-Two Silver Pins

U.S. & Canadian Shows of fewer than 500 pages-one Silver Pin

All requests must be received in writing at least four weeks in advance of the show date. Canadian requests should be sent directly to our Canadian Awards Chairman: Ray Ireson, 86 Cartier, Roxboro, Quebec H8Y 1G8, Canada.

All domestic U.S. requests should be sent to Dr. Russell V. Skavril, AAPE Awards Program, 222 E. Torrence Rd. Columbus, OH 43214

Our 4¢ Worth - How to Chief Judge

Handling The Apprentice(s) by Clyde Jennings and John Hotchner

Apprenticing is one of those "good news-bad news" events that are available in life. The good news is that it gives the Apprentice a window on judging - and on exhibit preparation - that can't be matched by any other experience. The bad news is that it is a difficult and demanding task that puts the Apprentice in the hotseat; being evaluated even as he or she is evaluating the work of others.

No one, least of all a Chief Judge, should expect perfection of an Apprentice. What we should expect is an increasingly competent display of the characteristics of a good judge over the course of the four apprenticeships; including a fine appreciation of what one does **not** know, and a sincere effort to prepare oneself to be functional in those areas. By apprenticeship #4, the performance should reflect the attributes of a full fledged judge; or the Apprentice should not be recommended for accreditation.

Thus, while the Apprentice has a difficult task, you as the Chief Judge have an equally difficult one in making the apprenticeship a good learning experience. That includes taking the time to observe the Apprentice at work, providing feedback on both positive and negative aspects of the performance (the former in public; the latter in private), and then, in doing your Apprentice report for the judges' Accreditation Committee.

In doing that report, you must look upon yourself as nothing less than a guardian of the reputation of the entire corps of accredited judges. Will the behavior of the Apprentice as a fully accredited judge tend to reflect credit on the corps of judges; or tend to bring it into disrepute?

What can the Chief Judge do to make the Apprentice's experience meaningful? Many Chiefs do a pre-show letter to the panel. We recommend this as a means of communicating both the mechanics of how the jury will function, and the Chief Judge's expectations regarding preparation for and level of effort at the show. Either in the letter, or in the pre-judging discussions, be certain to let the Apprentice(s) know that they will be expected to give the first opinion when the jury sits down to award the medals. Here you might note that you expect that the Apprentice will have read and be familiar with the Manual of Philatelic Judging (3rd Edition), published by the American Philatelic Society.

Before the show begins, the Chief Judge will consider with whom to have the Apprentice(s) work. Many Chiefs opt to have the most - or the least - experienced Apprentice go with him or herself while reviewing the frames. That is workable, but runs a risk of giving one of the two Apprentices short shrift. Instead, we recommend that you have two two-judge/one Apprentice teams, and that you float back and forth between them during frame review. In this way you can see how both Apprentices perform, and can ask questions at the frames that will reveal both their knowledge and their level of preparation.

In assigning the Apprentice to a team, the Chief Judge should consider the relative experience, expertise, and personality of each of the other team members, and then form teams that will help the Apprentice to see and be seen through new eyes. This means, in general, that an Apprentice should not troop around with old friends who collect the same things he or she does.

When there is only one Apprentice to a team, the Chief Judge should consider the relative experience, expertise, and personality of each of the other team members, and then form teams that will help the Apprentice to see and be seen through new eyes. This means, in general, that an Apprentice should not troop around with old friends who collect the same things he or she does.

When there is only one Apprentice, some Chief Judges attempt to shuttle him or her between the two teams. We recommend against this as being confusing rather than enlightening. The judges the Apprentice didn't work with during frame review will still have an opportunity to review performance during deliberations and the critique.

Now it's time for deliberations, and this is where the Apprentice(s) get the chance to shine. If there are two, they should take turns giving first opinion, and three to five observations that support the medal level they have chosen. If there is only one Apprentice, that individual handles first opinion on all the entries. (Incidentally, we recommend that you alternate the first opinion among the accredited judges, too. That way the Apprentice gets a more diverse experience, and a wider range of reaction to his/her initial suggestions.)

The apprenticeship program is based upon the tenet that the Apprentices do not get a vote in the final determination of medals. We have seen that ignored in an effort to make the

Apprentices feel good. We recommend against it. A well prepared Apprentice who speaks from solid knowledge properly will have considerable influence on the rest of the jury. But it is impossible for a Chief Judge to make consistent rational judgements about the degree of experience and preparation of newly encountered Apprentice(s). Better to follow the rules than make a serious mistake.

Keep in mind as you conduct the deliberations that Apprentices don't get any special deal. Some may try to skip a vote, excusing themselves because they don't know anything about the area, because they didn't have a chance to look at the exhibit in sufficient depth, because they are a drinking buddy of the exhibitor, etc., etc. The Chief Judge should allow very little of this; almost none - unless through unavoidable problems, the Apprentice truly did not see an exhibit, or was a participant in creating an exhibit. Otherwise, Apprentices are subject to the same requirements as the accredited judges, and can not refuse to judge an exhibit.

Likewise, though without a vote, the Apprentice(s) should participate in the awarding of the special prizes right up to and including the Grand Award. They should take part in the nomination of exhibits, and the discussion of their worthiness. This is as much a part of their training as any other part of the process, and it gives you that much more performance upon which to do your evaluation.

At the end of the awarding of medals and prizes, you have two more tasks with regard to the Apprentice(s):

1. Apprentices should be given first response assignments for the Critique right along with the rest of the panel. They should pull their weight according to how much experience and knowledge they have. If a fourth time effort, we expect them to be able to defend a jury conclusion with which they do not themselves necessarily agree.

2. Especially for first and second time Apprentices, the Chief Judge MUST remind them before they leave the jury room that the awards are to be treated as secret until the host committee puts up ribbons or makes announcements at the banquet. Likewise, the deliberations themselves are privileged, and the Apprentice(s) are not permitted to reveal the voting or the jury discussions that led up to it.

To do so is cause for a negative report to the Chairman of the Judges Accreditation Committee.

3. Speaking of which, at the very end of deliberations, you should excuse the Apprentice(s), and get from the accredited jurors their frank evaluation of Apprentice performance. What goes into the report form is yours alone to determine, but it is the wise Chief Judge who listens to the experience of the other jurors in this regard.

When you have dismissed the jury, we recommend that you go over the results of the deliberations while they are still fresh in your mind. One of us (John) likes to put down on the rating form an objective calculation of how the voting went; for instance:

Apprentice X was high by 2 levels compared to the accredited jury on

3 exhibits; high by one level on 8 exhibits; right on target on 11 exhibits; low by one on 7; and by two levels on two.

There are any number of legitimate reasons why an Apprentice may not agree with the jury, but we are looking at trends here; and I (John) would want to see the two level disparities decrease and the "right ons" increase as the Apprentice progresses through the four apprenticeships.

Finally, the Chief Judge should bear in mind that the Apprentice should be given every consideration and every bit of encouragement possible. After all, it is a big step he or she has taken; one that will ultimately benefit philately and its exhibiting community in the years down the road. The Apprentice is even doing this at his or her own ex-

pense since few shows give even a partial honorarium to Apprentices. Furthermore, it is not easy to put oneself in harm's way the way an Apprentice must be willing to do. Treat him or her with the respect you would expect to give a colleague, for that is what your Apprentice will most likely be one day.

This does not mean that you should not criticize the performance where improvements can be made. To do less is to be untrue to your responsibilities, and unkind to your Apprentice(s). They need both positive and critical feedback; the latter hopefully given with suggestions for improvement, to become all they can be as an accredited judge.

Stamp Forgeries - The Non Periodical Literature

Part III

by Varro E. Tyler

Editor's Note: We complete here Varro Tyler's list of essential references on fakes and forgeries; both for the use of exhibitors and the education of Judges. Part I will be found in TPE of 4/93, p. 20-22. Part II is in TPE of 7/93, p.21.

Samoa

Hall, Samoa Express (1983) - illustrated data on forgeries, remainders, and reprints.

Ship Stamps (Private)

Ringstrom and Tester, 3 vols, Caribbean; Australia, Europe, South America; Suez Canal (no dates-vols. 1 and 2; 1985-vol. 3) - excellent coverage of forgeries.

Spain

Graus and Soro, Postal Forgeries (1977) - excellent, comprehensive study of postal forgeries (Spanish).

Graus, Spain (1981-date) - continuing, comprehensive, illustrated study of all issues; loose-leaf format, 7 vols. to date (Spanish).

Monne', Forgeries of Spain (1966) - useful, illustrated coverage of all issues (Spanish).

Spain, Cuba, and the Philippines

Graus, Catalog of Postal Forgeries (1986) - detailed study of these issues; well-illustrated.

Sweden

Ahman, Yellow 3 sk. Banco (1975) - interesting defense of the genuineness of this great rarity (Swedish and English).

Switzerland

De Reuterskiöld, Cantonals (1889) - the classic study, still useful but lacks good illustrations.

Tibet

Waterfall, Tibet (1981) - useful information on forgeries.

Transvaal

Curle and Basden, Transvaal (1940) - useful comments on forgeries.

Luff, Otto's Printing (1913) - the classic study.

Mathews, et al., Transvaal (1986) - the definitive study; well-illustrated.

Meisel, First Republic (1985) - detailed study of these complicated issues.

Turkey in Asia (Anatolia)

Mayo, Anatolia (1990) - excellent definitive study of all aspects of the stamps of this region; colored illustrations.

United States

Huntington (Hearst), Kans.-Nebr. Overprints (1948) useful information.

Patton, Local Posts (1967) - excellent coverage of forgeries of New York State Local Posts.

Perry, U.S. Locals - Pat Paragraphs (1981) - originally researched studies on various local issues.

Schmid, United States Washington-Franklin Issues of 1908-1923 (1990). Detailed information and excellent illustrations permit the detection of the numerous fakes of these issues.

Schoen and DeVoss, Kans.-Nebr. Overprints (1973) - best available work on these issues.

Sloane, Sloane's Column (1961) - very useful background information on U.S. forgeries.

Upper Silesia

Urban, Upper Silesia (1984) - English translation of German original discussing and illustrating 22 different forgeries of the March 20, 1921, Plebiscite issue.

Uruguay

Hoffmann, All issues (1948) - well-illustrated, excellent study (Spanish).

Victoria

Pope, Victoria (1989) - comprehensive, illustrated coverage of these classic issues.

Wadhwan

Benns, Wadhwan (1990) - the definitive study of these stamps and their forgeries.

From The Executive Secretary

Dr. Russell V. Skavaryl, 222 East Torrence Road, Columbus, Ohio 43214-3834
Telephone: (614) 262-3046 (with answering machine) FAX: (614) 261-6628

This report was prepared on August 11, 1993 and is based upon new memberships, resignations, etc. received through that date.

It is a pleasure to welcome the following 27 individuals as AAPE members:

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1899 Susan Chapman | 12555 Guy J.L. Hamilton | 2016 Jeffrey Switt |
| 2000 Winand Hess | 2008 Lillian H. Evidente | 2017 Robert I. Benner |
| 2001 Eric Knapp | 2009 W. Bruce Matson | 2018 John L. Briggs, Jr. |
| 2002 John L. Kimbrough | 2010 Tom Lis | 2019 Martin F. Hollenbeck |
| 2003 Louis G. Martin | 2011 Michael D. Mueller | 2020 Dorothy Smith |
| 2004 Dr. Reinhard Krizkalla | 2012 Nancy Drost | 2021 Susan Herker |
| 2005 Fred J. Tabah | 2013 Wm. P. Barlow, Jr. | 2022 Glen L.C. Roberts |
| 2006 Dr. Bruce Nesbitt | 2014 Allan Schefer | 2023 Robert J. Kurek |
| 2007 R. Narbonne | 2015 Nikolai Lau | 2024 Garland T. Reigel |

The following former member has been reinstated:
1467 Suzanne L. Haney

MEMBERSHIP RECONCILIATION as of August 14, 1993:

| | |
|--|------|
| 1. Total Membership as of May 14, 1993 | 1205 |
| 2. New Members | 27 |
| 3. Reinstated | 1 |
| 4. Correction to match actual number of members recorded on computer | -24 |
| 5. Total membership as of August 11, 1993 | 1209 |

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 the first of the month in which the journal is issued. Please send your change of address to the Executive Secretary, Dr. Russell V. Skavaryl, 222 East Torrence Road, Columbus, Ohio 43214-3834. There is now a \$3.00 fee charged to cover our expenses of remailing the journal when you fail to send advice of your change of address in a timely manner.

CLASSIFIED ADS WELCOME

Your AD HERE - up to 30 words plus address - for \$5.00 per insertion. Members only. Send ad and payment to the Editor, P.O. Box 1125, Falls Church, VA 22041-0125

- **WIT AND PRACTICAL WISDOM** As a Holiday gift. Order John Hotchner's **Facts and Fantasy about Philately**. \$7.95 postpaid. 21st Century Stamp Co., P.O. Box 1987, Melbourne, FL 32902-1987.
- **AUXILIARY MARKINGS** Showing delays in U.S. mail, 1934 Christmas Seals on cover, EKKO Labels, Pentothal Cards, U.S. oddities wanted. Write John Hotchner, P.O. Box 1125, Falls Church, VA 22041-0125
- **AUTHORS:** Your philatelic monograph quality edited/produced by experienced professional. You receive royalties, provide no investment. SASE to ENVISION, P.O. Box 4226, Sidney, OH 45365
- **OLYMPIC GAMES 1896-1968 WANTED:** Covers, slogan meters, special cancels, registered from Olympics, essays, proofs, Greece 1906 Olympic imperfs. U.S. 1932 naval covers with Olympic cancels. Haiti 1939 Coubertin covers. Sherwin Podolsky, 16035 Tupper, North Hills, CA 91343-3045.

DID YOU REMEMBER TO:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read the Ads and mention TPE when you respond | <input type="checkbox"/> Send your synopsis page for a future issue (p.8) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Order the back issues you need (p.3) | <input type="checkbox"/> Send in your show listing early and in the proper format (p.18) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Suggest a theme for a future issue (p.3) | <input type="checkbox"/> Donate to SFTW (p.24) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Plan a trip to ARIPEX '94 (p.7) | <input type="checkbox"/> Plan a visit to ASDA MEGA (back page) |

Postage Stamp Mega-Event

STAMPS • COVERS • POSTAL HISTORY • STATIONERY • LITERATURE • SUPPLIES

ATTENTION MEMBERS!! The American Association of Philatelic Exhibitors

*will be hosting a lounge at the next
American Stamp Dealers' Association
Postage Stamp Mega-Event
at Madison Square Garden,
Oct. 28 - 31, 1993*

*National and International dealers
Award winning exhibits
Over 250 frames
Lectures
Seminars
... and much more!*

Show Hours:

Thursday - 12 noon - 8:00 P.M.
Friday - 10:00 A.M. - 6:00 P.M.
Saturday - 10:00 A.M. - 6:00 P.M.
Sunday - 10:00 A.M. - 4:00 P.M.



American Stamp Dealers' Association
3 School Street - Glen Cove - NY - 11542
516-759-7000

Free
Admission
Beginner Area
Bring a guest