Most of you have heard about the recent loss of Peter Martin as editor of both the American Philatelist (the monthly journal of the American Philatelic Society) and the Philatelic Literature Review (the quarterly journal of the American Philatelic Research Library). You probably have also encountered various versions of the actual events and their background, speculation on what might happen next, and some creative spins on what dire effects this will have on the two organizations. At the risk of spoiling a good story, here’s a recapitulation of the situation.

We’ll start with the news. In March 2001, Peter Martin was appointed to fill a newly established position as APS Director of Development—essentially a promotional and fund-raising job, and one with the tacit expectation that the additional funds received would as a minimum pay the incumbent’s salary.

In June 2001, Bill Welch retired as editor of the American Philatelist and the Philatelic Literature Review. Given Martin’s considerable experience in philatelic writing and editing, it seemed natural for the APS and APRL to take advantage of his availability and name him interim editor of the two journals. His main responsibility and salaried function continued to be that of Director of Development. In November 2001, when it subsequently became apparent that the fund-raising office was not economically justifiable, the position was terminated, together with Martin’s part-time duties as interim editor. (This history can be reviewed in APS press releases of the time, still available on the society’s web site at http://www.stamps.org, the November 2nd one is reproduced in full on page nine.)

The cost of the American Philatelist has been a concern to the APS for several years; in some circumstances the cost of the journal has been higher than the subscription price. Editor and staff expense, printing costs, mailing fees, all have been carefully examined to keep the costs down. (See for example the minutes of the August 2001 APS Board meeting, available on the APS web site.) One of the suggestions raised involves contracting out some of the pre-publication functions now done in house at State College, which seemed to me to be a reasonable idea worth further study. As I told Rob Haessler prior to his article in Linn’s, should such a step be taken it would involve mechanical functions only; the APS would decidedly not give up policy, editorial and content control. (Since most of our slick-paper philatelic journals are published by commercial printers—generally non-philatelic ones—I don’t have a problem with the concept. In fact, the Chronicle of the U.S. Classic Postal Issues, which I edit, is published and distributed by Standard Printers, a general commercial establishment in Canton, Ohio.) For some reason, this emphatic assurance apparently didn’t get through to Linn’s Editorial Director, Michael Laurence.

In the meantime, Barbara Boal continues to manage the American Philatelist. Managing Editor since August 1990, and increasingly responsible for the journal toward the end of Bill Welch’s tenure, she now serves as interim editor. The journal faces no immediate content or production difficulties, with a good supply of articles on hand.

The situation with the Philatelic Literature Review is somewhat different. Until 1984, the PLR had always been edited on an expenses-only basis (the last such volunteer editor was myself, from 1968-1983). Through 1980 it was produced by one of the last, great hot-type philatelic printers, Harlan Miller of Lawrence, Kansas. When he retired, the PLR went to offset (and became the first philatelic journal with a racing stripe on the cover), with production control through the APS. I continued as editor for several more years, but finally resigned in 1983. Dick Sine became the first State College-based PLR editor, and the first to put the editorships of the PLR and the AP under one hat. It was a reasonable solution at the time, although I feel that it may have worked to the detriment of the PLR over the long run.

Peter Martin worked up the 4th Quarter 2001 PLR prior to November, and Barbara Boal—the current interim editor—has seen it through to publication; it should be out by the time this article appears. The 1st Quarter 2002 issue is in the planning stages. Unfortunately, unlike the case with the AP, there’s no stockpile of articles for later issues.

As a final note: I’d like to go back to dedicated editorship of the Philatelic Literature Review. The journal was at its best when it enjoyed the primary focus of its editor on a continuing basis. To do that, we need to seek out someone with strong literature, library and/or bibliographic interests—which probably applies to the entire WU membership. Anyone out there who is interested in being considered for the editorship, or has a nominee, please write, e-mail (cj7777@aol.com) or call (301 776-9822). (I enjoyed my stint as editor, and I’d love to go back to those thrilling days of yesteryear, but I’ve got too many other demands on my attention. However, I do promise to provide help, encouragement, planning guidance, suggestions, identification and cajoling of potential authors, as well as occasional writing, to whomever does become PLR editor.)

Editor’s Note: Charles J. Peterson is currently president of the Board of Trustees of the American Philatelic Research Library. In addition to having served as editor of the PLR, he has a long list of services to philately including former president of WU30 where he continues to provide a critique service and he is a respected authority on philatelic literature on an international level.

Note: Charles J Peterson is currently president of the Board of Trustees of the American Philatelic Research Library. In addition to having served as editor of the PLR, he has a long list of services to philately including former president of WU30 where he continues to provide a critique service and he is a respected authority on philatelic literature on an international level.
There is quite a mix in this issue. On the one hand Lititz's has shared their Writers Guidelines and on the other they have been taken to task on their recent treatment of APS. Council Member Lloyd de Vries provides a change of pace. Radio is not a medium we give as much thought to as we might and Lloyd provides some useful insight. The beginning of an ongoing feature "Editors FAQ" by Larry Goldberg is on page 8.

DO YOU REALLY WANT A GOLD MEDAL?

What a silly question—of course you do! But... I wonder? Let's step away from philately and consider literature in general. You enjoy reading a good book on vacation or on a long plane trip. You can take James Joyce's Ulysses or Tom Clancy's latest thriller. I'm a "loyal Irish-American" and Joyce is certainly in the gold medal category, but if I want a "good read," guess what...?

Back to stamps. Collecting statistics are down just about across the board. If you are editing a journal - newsletter, call it what you may, and your membership numbers are doing better than the "big boys," you've got a winner—no second thoughts needed! You may be entering competitions and getting a silver. If your members are happy, just accept the silver with whatever good grace you can summon and continue your good, indeed very good, work.

By the way, I've started Ulysses three times. One of these days, I'll finish it. Clancy? — I've read some of his until the wee hours of the morning, and then some.

WRITERS BREAKFAST

There will be a Writers Breakfast at the APS Winter Meeting, Ameristamp Expo, Riverside, California. It will be Sunday morning, 8:30 a.m., February 10, 2002 at the Mission Inn, one of the official convention hotels, one block from the Convention Center where the show will be held. Cost is $17.50/person until Jan. 15, $20 after. Contact Ken Martin at APS headquarters, Box 8000, State College, PA 16803, for tickets. Menu: fresh orange juice, scrambled eggs, link sausage, breakfast potatoes, assorted Danish, muffins and croissants, coffee, decaffeinated coffee and specialty teas.

The customary drawing for rare and valuable philatelic literature will be featured. Speaker and topic are yet to be announced.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Response to the questionnaire that was in the last issue was somewhat underwhelming. This may mean either complete contentment or abject apathy. Probably somewhere in-between. There is continued interest in help on illustrations and there were some adverse comments regarding some of the less civil exchanges we have had in these pages. My thanks to those that took the trouble to respond.
President's Message

by Dr. Dane S. Clausen

The issue of judging auction catalogs as philatelic literature was aired at CHICAGOPEX in November. This year’s Chicago show saw perhaps the largest number of auction catalogs so far entered in the literature division of any national show. Of course this was far from the first time that auction catalogs have been judged as literature, but the large number of them and varying quality of their text and photography (not to mention binding and other aspects) prompted discussion among the judges during judging and also between the judges and audience at the judges’ critique.

One could arguably say that judging philatelic literature has long been something like judging a cat show open to all comers. For switching gears between judging commercial periodicals, society journals, club newsletters, stamp catalogs, long articles, series of columns, handbooks, auction catalogs and later CD-ROMS and Web pages is not always easy. (For the record, I’ve never judged a CD-ROM, but I have judged dozens of Web pages for that division of MIDAPHIL.) Yet as I found out in Chicago, I’m not the only one who thinks that auction catalogs present more questions than initially meet the eye. Nor am I the only one to notice that—unless I missed something—auction catalogs are not separately and specifically addressed in the APS judges’ manual.

The arguments to judge auction catalogs the same as any other philatelic literature are many. They are printed distributed to the public; generally available before, during and after the auction; their textual content is written, edited, proofread, organized and bound; they generally are well-illustrated (although, like all other published works, the quality of photos varies widely); many of them contain research conducted by collectors selling their collections through the auction house and/or by the auction house staff; and they have reference value, as is evidenced by the collections of auction catalogs retained by individuals, stamp dealing firms, and philatelic libraries. It is also easily argued that market prices, available from the Prices Realized sheets, provide as good or better a guide to value than standard catalog values, which are always derivative when researched at all. Finally, it is argued that an auction catalog, when it offers one or more advanced, specialized collections, is almost always more complete than what a collector-exhibitor showed publicly or what a collector-author had published in journals and even monographs.

Sometimes, collections sold at auction will have never been exhibited and/or never documented in print. For all of these reasons, none of them new to WU#30 members, at least some auction catalogs can have tremendous reference value.

Many literature judges and others prefer that any consideration of auction catalogs as philatelic literature stop there, in which case it is conceivable that the auction catalog for any and every high-profile exhibit/collection (and perhaps lesser lights simply written up and presented well) will receive a gold medal essentially automatically. For those of us who remember when awarding a gold medal in the literature division was something like the pope granting an audience, this would take some getting used to, to say the least.

CHICAGOPEX 2001’s literature prospectus did recognize that auction catalogs are different than other philatelic literature by stating, “Auction Catalogs are eligible which contain original research, or important compilations of previously published material, and which have significance as a reference work in the same field or area as the major material in the auction. Auction catalogs that contain only lot listings, descriptions and illustrations are not eligible.” This rule—which I like—eliminated from consideration many auction catalogs that clearly do not have reference value, but asks almost as many questions as it answered. For instance, if we are going to judge some auction catalogs, why not judge all auction catalogs? (After all, we don’t say that some periodicals or handbooks can be entered and others can’t.) In addition, whose “original research,” and original research when?

If the original research was conducted primarily or solely by a collector whose collection is being sold, and I’d like to give the medal to him, not the auction house that publishes the catalog. This would be consistent with the practice of handbooks usually (although not always) being entered by their authors and/or editors, not their publishers and/or printers. (At least, I’d like to encourage catalogs for big-name collections to be entered in competition by the collector, if he completed most of the research published in the catalog.) If the auction house conducted significant research of its own, then let’s give the medal to the auction house and let that firm and the collector(s) squabble over it.

Why would I treat auction houses any differently than other publishers of philatelic literature? I have several reasons. First, one of the historic reasons for judging and awarding medals to philatelic literature has been to encourage research and writing; giving a medal to an auction house that often simply publishes research conducted by the collector whose collection it is selling is rewarding the wrong entity—the publisher/printer, not the researcher/writer. (This is not to say that auction houses shouldn’t be encouraged to publish research in their catalogs, but the smart ones already are being encouraged by money, not medals.) Second, auction catalogs are “accidental literature”, a stamp catalog publisher is in the primary business of publishing and selling catalogs, a handbook publisher is in the business of publishing and selling books, a newsletter editor is in the “business” of editing and distributing newsletters. Auction houses, however, are in the primary business of holding auctions, not publishing. (CHICAGOPEX also discriminated against “for profit” publishers by barring “commercial publications that are issued on a regular sustained basis”); I’m not sure I agree with that decision, but suffice it to say that

>>> continued on page 7
From the Top of the Pile to the Circular File

by Michael Schreiber

In response to our invitation to participate in this series, Linn’s managing editor, Michael Schreiber, has furnished a revision of the 1991 Linn’s Writers’ Guidelines pamphlet. In his e-mail he noted “It’s likely we will never do another pamphlet — e-mail is good enough for most inquiries, and photocopies can take care of the others.”

LINN’S WRITERS’ GUIDELINES
© 2001 Linn’s Stamp News

GENERAL

The goal at Linn’s Stamp News is to create a weekly publication that is indispensable to stamp collectors. Everything we do, from the broadest editorial policy to the most trivial stylistic idiosyncrasy, is thought out in the light of this one overriding goal.

We try to achieve indispensability in various ways:

Every collector, from the beginner to the most sophisticated, wants to know the news. Our aim is to provide all the news, as conveniently and as accessibly as we can. In this regard, we feel we are the New York Times of philately.

In stamp collecting, the news is not just club and show announcements, new issues and auction realizations. New discoveries are constantly being made, sometimes involving material that is decades or even centuries old. We cover this news too, relying on the worldwide network of columnists and correspondents who contribute to our pages.

Of course, we rely on these contributors for much more than hard news. Many of the feature items in Linn’s, which make up the bulk of our editorial content, originate with free-lance contributors in the collector community. Here Linn’s performs an important educational function, by bringing to the attention of approximately 55,000 subscribers (and many more readers) a diverse selection of facts, thoughts and observations about stamps, postal markings, covers and stamp-related subjects.

Writing in Linn’s, the free-lance contributor has the opportunity to share his specialized knowledge with the largest stamp collector audience of any periodical in the world.

It should go without saying, then, that Linn’s features are aimed at a broad group of relatively novice collectors, whose average level of sophistication, on any given subject, is less than that of the specialist author.

Linn’s writers should keep this general interest level of the audience uppermost in mind. Advanced or more sophisticated collectors, as many of our columnists tend to be, must also avoid writing down to the reader.

The goal in writing for the Linn’s audience is to provide information that makes stamp collecting more interesting to more people. Ideally, every feature we run promotes the hobby.

A Linn’s article is not the appropriate place to showcase everything the author knows, nor is it a lofty podium from which to speak over people’s heads.

The Linn’s writer must strive to reach out and embrace the reader, to invite him in, even to hold his hand along the path. This attitude of friendliness and openness in one’s prose is difficult to articulate, but it’s extremely important. It is very much a part of our desire to make Linn’s accessible to all collectors, and to help them grow as philatelists.

Without condescending, the Linn’s writer should assume that the reader knows little or nothing about the specific subject at hand. Complicated terms or unfamiliar words should be defined, even if they might be familiar to the more advanced philatelist.

The Wall Street Journal is a good model here: Every time it uses the phrase “short sale,” it defines what a short sale is. Linn’s strives to be similarly introductory in its approach to the jargon of philately.

The ideal Linn’s feature would contain enough new (or newly presented) information to instruct even the specialist in the field, written in a way to capture the attention (and hold the interest) of the beginning collector.

While the scope of our editorial interest ranges as widely as philately itself, many of our features focus on U.S. and U.S.-related material. No matter what his collecting specialty, the Linn’s reader still maintains an interest in the stamps and postal history of his own country. Week after week, Linn’s offers the most complete coverage of the U.S. philatelic scene available anywhere.

This is not to say that we ignore the philately of the rest of the world – quite the contrary. We have regular columns in many non-U.S. areas; we record and notice the new issues of the entire world; and our feature writers routinely range the globe, writing on subjects from classic to contemporary.

Linn’s is also big enough to accommodate a wide range of writing styles. Many of our columnists have individual voices, and we don’t discourage this. We will always try to preserve a writer’s style, if it is a style worth preserving.

TERMS

We purchase first worldwide periodical rights plus a non-exclusive right to anthologize or otherwise reuse on a proportionate royalty basis, and to use the artwork online.

We want to be the first periodical to publish the work. The author is subsequently free to resell the work elsewhere, 60 days after we’ve published it; but here we’d like to be credited. We reserve the right to reuse all works published in Linn’s (in our almanac or in an anthology, for instance), and we will pay an appropriate royalty for such print reuses.

The specific legal details of our purchase are spelled out in the “Standard terms governing acceptance of original material” section at the end of this guideline.

Articles submitted should be exclusive to Linn’s. We are not interested in material that is simultaneously submitted to other publications (except press releases, of course, which are not part of this discussion).

Thus, we want to see original e-mail files, faxes or typescripts. We reserve the right to edit, cut or reject anything
submitted. Unsolicited materials will be returned only if accompanied by an addressed envelope, suitably franked.

Articles accepted may not appear immediately. Please be patient. The acceptance/rejection process is fairly quick (about four weeks), but accepted pieces sometimes sit for months before publication.

Payment for features and columns is made upon publication. Checks are mailed monthly, shortly after the 5th of the month. Thus, in the ordinary course of events, writers should have received, by the middle of the month, our check for whatever of their works was published in the issues of Linn's cover-dated the previous month.

Rates vary, generally between $25 and $100 per feature. We do strive to pay every contributor who produces original work for us. This is more by way of saying “thank you” than providing a livelihood, because the economics of newspaper publishing don't sustain magazine rates.

Payment varies according to quality, craft, degree of difficulty, previous work done for Linn's, number and quality of visuals, and length.

We do not pay by the word. Longer is not necessarily better. In fact, the longer a feature, the less likely we'll have room for it.

We usually have a large inventory of half- to full-page features (over 750 words) and a screaming need for shorter items (200-500 words).

ILLUSTRATIONS

Include illustrations wherever possible: stamps, covers, postmarks or whatever other visual material supports your text.

Many would-be contributors seem to break down here. For Linn's, a picture is indeed worth, if not 1,000 words, at least 250. More frequently than we would prefer, we find ourselves returning otherwise publishable work because it lacks the necessary visual support.

As a general rule, the best way to write an article on almost any philatelic subject is to have the photos, scans, stamps or covers in front of you before you begin. That way you are sure to properly illustrate your subject, and your text is fairly certain to explain what's in its pictures.

Conversely, an easy way to get into trouble is to write an article with no visual support, in the expectation of finding a photo after the article is done. Nine times out of 10, the result is a text that lacks illustrations or doesn't connect to them.

On the other hand, bear in mind that in final page make-up there must be a balance between illustrations and text. Too many illustrations can overpower a skimpy text and make it difficult (sometimes impossible) for us to lay out the words.

We prefer separate (not embedded) jpg or tif scans at 300dpi twice the size of the original item. Crisp, sharp-focus, high-contrast glossy black and white photos can still be used, but here no color is possible, of course. Each of our weekly issues includes approximately three to five pages with color editorial news or columns.

A few items that have no tonal gradations, postmarks or surcharges for instance, can be reproduced adequately from photocopies. Stamps and covers cannot.

If you can't provide decent photos, send us the stamps or covers and we'll make the scans or photos here. (Clear this with us first if the value is substantial.)

Please don't expect us to seek out your visuals for you; we don't have the time or the resources.

Our typical purchase includes the acquisition of the illustrations. If you want any photos returned, we should discuss this beforehand. Include your name and full address on the reverse of each photo.

Along with illustrations, we expect you to provide captions. Please provide captions on a separate sheet of paper, not embedded within your manuscript.

The ideal caption should explain what the picture shows and make the reader want to read the accompanying text. At the very least, a caption should explain what's in the picture. Identify all people and everything else that would provoke reader curiosity. “Figure 1” with no explanation is not an acceptable caption. All information in a caption must also be in the text of the article.

Don't paste visuals or captions onto your manuscript. Don't embed scans into a text document. Keep them separate.

COPY PREPARATION

Copy should be prepared in a standard electronic format, such as Microsoft Word or similar software, and submitted on a disk with a paper copy. With the managing editor's permission, it can be submitted by e-mail.

If typewritten, it should be double spaced with ample margins, on one side only of sheets of white 8½-inch by 11-inch bond paper. Put your name and the page number in the upper-right corner of each page.

Those still using a typewriter should avoid typewritten strikeovers, especially with figures. Better to cross it out and say it again. Clarity is more important than neatness.

Footnotes and bibliographies are not appropriate to our newspaper style. If attribution or citation is essential, then it's important enough to be worked into the text.

Refer to illustrations as Figure 1, Figure 2, etc. Avoid eye directions such as above and below, which might be contradicted by page makeup.

For similar reasons, charts in the text should be avoided. They typically run wider than one column width, and cause difficult (sometimes impossible) make-up problems. You must include a chart, prepare and discuss it separately, as if it were a photo.

Submit articles to Managing Editor, Linn's Stamp News, Box 29, Sidney, OH 45365.

STYLE: GENERAL

Linn's is a weekly magazine in newspaper format. Our editorial style is designed to communicate information as quickly and as clearly as possible. Stylistic quirks that hinder rapid communication are discouraged. Our basic reference in matters of editorial style is The Associated Press Stylebook, available from AP at 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020.

Even though your subject might be specialized, write it understandably. Always explain terms. Remember that Linn's...
is read by tens of thousands of readers who don't know your subject as well as you do. Reach out and help them.

Avoid lengthy paragraphs. One typewritten line makes two lines of type in Linn's. Our newspaper style calls for very short paragraphing. This also aids readership.

Don't use lengthy sentences. Two or three short sentences are easier to read than one long one. Never use parentheses or dashes when commas or separate sentences will serve the same end. Never use a comma when a period will do.

Avoid cliches. Don't try to be cute. Reread your sentences to see if you can express the same thoughts in fewer words.

Check and double check all facts, especially names, addresses, catalog numbers and other critical bits of information. We rely on you for the accuracy of your prose.

Don't be afraid of the first person. We'll be publishing your work under your name. "We" or "this writer" are pedantic and often confusing. Say "I" if it's appropriate.

Use a dictionary or a spelling guide. Frequent misspellings suggest a lack of attention to detail that is inappropriate to the craft of journalism. The back pages of Webster are useful regarding punctuation and grammar.

Avoid jarring repetition of the same words or phrase. There are many ways to say the same thing.

STYLE: LINN'S

Never refer to a stamp by Scott number only. Describe it first and then add the Scott number if needed. As an example: "The U.S. 10¢ 1869 stamp (Scott 116) . . ." In a series, it's Scott 51-58: 233-37.

Spell out numerals one through nine, then use figures for 10 and higher. Don't use decimals after an even number of dollars (we say $20, not $20.00). For large numbers, insert the comma beginning with 1,000. Generally, figures are used in ages; always in percentages.

No comma after a month without a day (March 1983); adding the day requires the comma (March 13, 1983). The reverse "13 March 1983" takes no comma, but is difficult to read and should be avoided. We abbreviate months when used with days (Aug. 12, 1869) but not without days (August 1869). We never abbreviate the five short months: March, April, May, June, July.

We never use italics or quotation marks for emphasis. If you want to emphasize a word or a point, write emphatically. Don't use quotation marks to indicate anything other than a quotation. Periods and commas go inside the quotation marks; semicolons go outside.

Abbreviations: We use the old style state abbreviations. We don't abbreviate Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Ohio, Texas, Utah. Two-word states are abbreviated with no space: W.Va. We only use the two-letter postal abbreviation when an address is given.

Mr. is used only with Mrs. or when the man is dead. Mrs. and Miss are generally unnecessary. We never use Ms.

We don't use periods with most well-known organizations: USSS, APS, UPU, USPS, UNPA, APO, GPO, etc. However, we do use periods with country initials as an adjective: U.S., U.N.

Postal administrations and other organizations take the singular: APS will stage its spring meeting, UNPA will announce its 2003 stamps.

Note the punctuation and separation of the following: American Stamp Dealers Association, Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee, price list. The following are all one word: mailcoach, handcancel, handstamp, datestamp, semipostal, multicolor, steamship.

Our general style is lowercase. When in doubt over whether a word should be capitalized, leave it down.

STANDARD TERMS GOVERNING ACCEPTANCE OF ORIGINAL MATERIAL

Linn's Stamp News, a division of Amos Press Inc. (the publisher), accepts original copy and/or artwork subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. First Worldwide Periodical Rights and Electronic Rights. The contributor grants to publisher the exclusive right to be the first to publish the article and supporting artwork in whole or in edited fashion (sometimes referred to collectively as the "work") in Linn's Stamp News, and to use said work in advertising and/or promotion. The contributor also grants to the publisher the non-exclusive right to publish in electronic form, on any Internet web site created or maintained by Linn's Stamp News, any and all stories and/or photos that Linn has purchased, or will purchase, from the writer. This authorization for electronic publishing may be terminated at any time by written notice to Linn's Stamp News, which notice shall be effective with respect to such stories and/or photos received by Linn's after receipt of the written notice.

2. Subsequent Use. The contributor retains the right to sell the work elsewhere provided such subsequent sale occurs no sooner than sixty (60) days after publication by Linn's Stamp News. The contributor agrees that any subsequent reprint will appropriately reference Linn's Stamp News copyright. The contributor grants to publisher a right to reuse said work in any publication of the publisher, subject to publisher's payment of an appropriate fee to the contributor.

3. Copyright. The contributor grants to the publisher the right to obtain copyright on the work in the publisher's name in the United States and any other country, subject to the contributor's retained non-exclusive right to reuse as set forth above.

4. Indemnity. The contributor warrants and guarantees that he is the sole proprietor of the work; that said work does not violate any existing copyright, in whole or part, that it contains no libelous or otherwise injurious matter; that the work has not herebefore been published; that he is the sole and exclusive owner of the rights granted herein to the publisher; and that he has not herebefore assigned, pledged, or otherwise encumbered said work. At his own expense, the contributor will protect and defend said work from any adverse claim of copyright infringement and shall indemnify, defend and hold the publisher harmless from asserted claims of whatever nature, damages, costs and expenses that the publisher may incur as a result of the publication of said work and/or subsequent reuse.

5. Payment. The contributor accepts such amount as is tendered by separate check from the publisher as payment in full for the rights in the work granted herein to the publisher; provided, however, that it is agreed that additional monies may be due only as a result of subsequent reuse as set forth
in paragraph 2 hereof.

6. Rights Reserved. All rights in the work not specifically granted to the publisher are expressly reserved to the contributor.

7. Applicable Law. The agreement between the contributor and publisher shall be governed by the law of Ohio and shall be deemed to have been entered into at Sidney, Ohio, as of the date of the issuance of publisher’s check in payment of the amount due to the contributor pursuant to paragraph 5.

8. Arbitration. Any claim, dispute or controversy arising out of or in connection with the agreement between the contributor and publisher or any breach thereof, shall be arbitrated by the parties before the American Arbitration Association under the rules then applicable of that association. The arbitration shall be held in the city of Sidney, Ohio.

9. Successors and Assigns. The agreement of the contributor and publisher shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of each of their respective heirs, successors, administrators, and assigns.

10. Entire Agreement. It is understood by the contributor and publisher that these Standard Terms And Conditions and publisher’s check tendered in payment in accordance with paragraph 5 set forth the parties’ entire agreement regarding this work and may not be varied except by an additional writing signed by the contributor and the publisher.

Literature Exhibition Calendar

Coordinators of Literature Exhibitions are encouraged to submit full information, including a prospectus, for these listings. Please contact the editor well in advance of the closing date for entries.

February 15-17, 2002
COLOPEX, Columbus, Ohio, entry fee $25, deadline for entries is Jan. 4, 2002. For information & prospectus contact Larry Richards, 1194 Manfield Dr., Columbus, OH 43227, phone: 614 861-8302, e-mail: richards ll@att.net.

August 15-8, 2002
A.P.S. STAMP SHOW, Atlantic City Convention Center, Atlantic City, NJ, entry fee $25, deadline for entries is May 15, 2002. For information contact Ken Martin, A.P.S. Box 8000, State College, PA 16803, phone 814 237-3803 ext 218, fax 814 237-6128, e-mail: stampshow@stamps.org, Website: www.stamps.org/directories/dir_Sho w s_Exhibitions.htm.

October 4-6, 2002
SESCAL, Los Angeles, Calif. Website: www.sescal.org.

November, 2002
CHICAGOPEX 2002, Donald E. Stephens Convention Center (formerly Rosemont Convention Center), 5555 North River Road, Rosemont, Ill., Website www.chicagopex.com.

November 29-30, 2002
Chester 2002, North Western Federation of Philatelic Societies on behalf of the Association of British Philatelic Societies. Literature judged to the Stampex standard as. Entry fee 15. Deadline for entries Aug. 31, 2002. Information from Michael Birks, 36 Trevor Road, Flixton, Manchester M41 5QK England, e-mail: mpbirks@36trevor.freeserve.co.uk

President’s Message (continued from page 3)

Auction houses are nothing if not “commercial.”) Ah ha, you may argue, well, why not reward auction houses for producing something so valuable that is simply a byproduct of what they really are in the business of doing?

That is a good question that brings me to my third point: auction catalogs are, in many ways, quite different from every other type of philatelic literature in one or more important ways, and are different from journalism or nonfiction generally.

Auction catalogs usually do not include an index, a bibliography or a list of references, made all the worse by their cryptic references to literature in their description text (“ex-Chase,” “as reported by Neil,” “documented by Hahn,” etc.). Auction catalogs will not tell you about disagreements between specialists, as a good handbook, journal article or newspaper article will. Auction catalogs will not tell you what is missing, while handbooks and stamp catalogs must tell us what their authors/editors don’t own and often what they’ve never even seen.

Auction catalogs will not tell you the full rationale behind estimates, unless they’re based on a standard catalog, and—as works in progress of a sort—are never called to account for the differences between their estimates and prices realized. This is despite the fact that these auctioneers/publishers represent themselves as experts of a sort and their publications (catalogs) are used for reference value. Auction catalogs are not updated with future editions or issues. Their publishers do not publish corrections or amplifications days, weeks or even months after the auctions are held.

Philatelists have not developed much systematic secondary literature commenting on and correcting auction catalog texts. And so on. But perhaps even more significant is the fact that auction catalog texts are solely designed as, and primarily if not solely used as, sales pieces, with the reader neither expecting nor receiving information that is cautious, judicious, sober, discreet, detached, unbiased, unprejudiced, neutral, impartial, candid, strictly factual or even completely fair to the seller, buyer and future students. In short, auction catalogs—unlike just about any other philatelic literature that we judge, with the possible exception of columns and editorials—make no pretense of either attempting or achieving whatever mere mortals may attain in the way of objectivity.

Unlike columns or editorials that are opinionated to lesser or greater degrees, auction catalogs do not attempt any systematic argument, they cannot be responded to in a “figure or discussion. In short, do we really want to be giving gold medals in philatelic literature (ideally produced through thorough research, careful writing, and wise editing) to people who “write” stuff like this:

"#1, 5c Red brown, barely used, radically large to huge margins, incredibly fresh color (like it just came off the press) and amazingly fine impression, incredibly blue but faint cancellation (it’s like a whisper), extremely fine gem; an astonishingly phenomenal example—you’ll cry if you don’t snap up this one.”

You know that I am exaggerating only a hair.
It’s Radio!

by Lloyd A. de Vries

Most of the discussion in these pages is about writing for stamp collecting readers, often quite knowledgeable and focused. For the past five years, I have been writing for non-stamp collecting LISTENERS. It’s not quite the same thing. In radio, you’re writing for the ear. There are no pictures or “supers” (superimposed text) to help the audience. Someone listening to a radio report can’t go back to the previous paragraph to reread it.

The audience often is doing something else while listening to the radio: Driving a car, making breakfast, perhaps even showering. Therefore, the style of radio writing is different than print writing: It’s more conversation and casual, for one thing. The sentences are shorter, like these. And jargon and multi-syllabic words are rarely used, and explained when they are. On that last point, if you go over the scripts of the more than 740 pieces I have written in the past (nearly) five years, you will find few uses of the words “philately” and “philatelic.”

You can see the scripts, he said in an unabashed plug, at www.virtualStampClub.com and click on the microphone. You can also download audio files of them there. Oh, and by the way, I have never, in 30 years, used a microphone like that for anything other than a prop in a photograph!

There are other strictures (a word I’d never use on the radio) on these scripts besides style: Each must be exactly 60 seconds long, and there’s one every week. OK, OK, some were :59 and some were :61. When I began the CBS Radio News Stamp Collecting Report in April, 1997, I was producing a package of weekend radio news features for affiliated stations of the CBS Radio Network. I kept pestering my superiors to allow a stamp collecting feature, without luck, until one day, one gave me the rousing approval I had sought: “Yeah,” he sighed, “go ahead.”

The features are offered to stations, but they are under no obligation to use them. Some use all, some use none, and some use a few, and which stations are doing what may change from week to week. None of the features is sponsored, so stations have no obligation to report back to the network which ones they are using, or when. The other features in the package ran anywhere from 40 seconds to nearly two minutes. Some fluctuated wildly.

Realizing that Radio Free Stamps was going to be a tough sell, and that the trend in radio news is for shorter and shorter reports, the package producer (me) told the stamps feature producer (me) to make each piece exactly 60 seconds. In nearly five years, there have only been two repeats in the entire series: One resulted in a miscommunication between me and my predecessor as the feature package producer, the other, in October, was due to an illness. Otherwise, I prepare pieces called “evergreens” to be used in case I’m not available, either because I’m traveling to a stamp show or out sick.

I now have the capability of recording material in locations other than in a studio, and sending them via e-mail to CBS, although I have not yet done so with the feature. Lest you think I’m getting rich from the CBS Radio News Stamp Collecting Report, it pays far less than you think: $25.25. And because I’m in a union-represented market, it requires membership in the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, at approximately $150 per year.

Where is it heard? It’s hard to say, since few stations tell the network when they use these features, but I believe it runs on KCBS San Francisco, KNX Los Angeles, and possibly WBZ Boston. It ran on WWJ Detroit, but the present news director there, when she was at WBBM Chicago, refused to consider it. WCBS New York won’t run it, and WTOP Washington and KMOX St. Louis invited me to find sponsors for the program. No mention was made of advertising commissions.

Editor’s Note: Lloyd A. de Vries began his career in radio news in 1975, and has worked for stations in Syracuse and Washington, DC, and for the NBC, National Public Radio and CBS radio networks. Two years ago, he switched to the Internet, and now writes, edits and produces for CBSNews.com. He also manages the Virtual Stamp Club on the Internet, is Secretary of the American Philatelic Society, and a council member of WU 30.

Seventy-year Collection of Argentinian Philatelic Publication Given to British Library

David Beech, Head of the British Library’s Philatelic Collections, recently announced a significant addition to the Library. Jeremy Howat, a retired Anglican vicar has given a collection of Revista de la Sociedad Filatélica to the Library.

The collection runs from 1894 to 1964. It was left to Howat by Charles Jewell a noted philatelist and postal historian. Howat commented “The time has come to pass the wealth of information contained in these volumes on for wider use, and it gives me great pleasure that the British Library has agreed to receive them.”

Additional information on the British Library may be obtained from their Website: www.bl.uk/collections/philatelic/.

EDITORS’ FAQ

by Larry Goldberg

Q. How important are graphics, i.e. photos, illustrations, graphs, and the like?
A. Absolutely critical. The right graphics can attract people to a page where a lack of graphics could make them skip an article. It’s all like fishing... hook them, give them a little line and then reel them in! Graphics make great bait!

Q. Should the type I use for tables match the type that I use for text?
A. My preference is to use a sans serif face, quite frequently a condensed face. Helvetica condensed and Futura condensed are very readable in tables.

Every writer I know has trouble writing. —Joseph Heller
Bill Welch did a thorough job of identifying the "Negatives" and the "Positives" in the introduction of this column in the last issue of *The Philatelic Communicator*. So I am going to identify a current situation suggesting that many philatelic journal editors appear to have moved potential manuscripts from the "Top of the File" to the "Circular File" without giving consideration as to whether or not they deserve to be published.

Editor Joe Foley appropriately featured a timely "In Memoriam" on the cover of the last issue of *The Philatelic Communicator* by extending Wiliam E. "deepest sympathy to the families and loved ones of the victims of the dastardly and cowardly acts" on September 11. Then in his "The Quill" column in the same issue, Foley observed that "many of us have received messages of stamp collectors in other countries expressing condolences and sharing our grief."

How many of the philatelic journals, especially those published by stamp collectors' organizations, have shared such letters with their readership? At least so far, not many! Aside from *The Philatelic Communicator*, the only other philatelic periodical that I have seen devoting editorial space to the implication of the September 11 "dastardly and cowardly acts" is John F. Dunn in *Nicked's and Stamps*.

Even then, Mr. Dunn did not share with readers any letters that he might have received from stamp collectors residing in various parts of the world.

Such letters are not designed exclusively for the editor, but are intended to be shared with the entire readership. Therefore, I devoted a special page entitled "In Remembrance" in the November-December 2001 issue of *Topical Time*, bimonthly of the American Topical Association. Here are several of these letters expressing sympathy from overseas members:

"Heartfelt sympathy goes to all my friends in America after the shocking tragedy of September 11th, especially those who lost loved ones." Tom Wilson, Great Britain.

"At exactly 12:00 noon in Prague, thousands in streets and squares stood in silence for three minutes to express our sorrow and sympathy with the U.S.A. after the terrorist attacks." Lumin B rendl, Czech Republic.

"The most heinous and tragic incident in America has shaken the whole civilized world. We pray God to grant peace to all our ATA friends." Pradip Jain, India.

Philatelic publications from overseas have not been hesitant to convey their feelings toward America. For example, the program for STAMPEX in Great Britain devoted an American flag-embellished page extending "deepest sympathy and affection to the people of America at this traumatic time." The STAMPEX Committee also extended best wishes to the U.S. dealers "who managed to turn up despite flight problems." Why haven't more U.S. publications expressed similar sentiments such as those published in the British STAMPEX program, in the letters from overseas members published in *Topical Time*, and/or a statement analogous to the "In Memoriam" published in the last issue of *The Philatelic Communicator*?

The lesson to be learned here may be that editors of philatelic journals need to give more reflection before automatically moving potential manuscripts from the "Top of the File" to the "Circular File." Editors should share with their readers those "letters to the editor" that are fashioned by the letter writer for the benefit of everyone who reads their journal.

**Obituaries**

CURTIS B. PATTERSON 1908-2001

Curt Patterson, a charter member of the American First Day Cover Society and one of its past presidents, died July 1 in Dover Del. after a long illness. Curt served AFDCS not only as president but also as cachet chairman, convention chairman, bylaws chairman, and established the society's archives, which now reside in the American Philatelic Research Library in State College.

He recorded more than thirty interviews with important cachetmakers, prepared slide programs for the society, and wrote more than sixty feature articles for their journal FIRST DAYS. After serving AFDCS as regional vice president and executive vice president, he served two terms as president (1966-1970 and 1973-1978). He collected FDCs of the 1920s and 1930s, and, with Harry Themal, developed a catalog of all known cachets of the 1938 Swedish-Finnish tercentenary issue.

Curt is survived by his wife of sixty-seven years, Verna, sons Gary and Wayne, three grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

*Alan Warren*

T. ROBERT SAMUEL 1940-2001

One of New Zealand's most prominent philatelists and president of the Royal Philatelic Society of New Zealand, Robert Samuel, has died aged sixty-one. He was also a member the Royal Philatelic Society London and held memberships in the American Philatelic Society and United Postal Stationery Society. He just completed this year a book on the postal stationery of New Zealand that will be published shortly by the Royal Philatelic Society of New Zealand and will be Volume IX of the Postage Stamps of New Zealand series.

He is survived by his partner Cheri Williams and two daughters from an earlier marriage. Memorials are suggested to the Robert Samuel Memorial Lecture Fund of the Philatelic Foundation Christchurch (Inc.), P.O. Box 1129, Christchurch, New Zealand. For many years Robert Samuel had suggested that speakers be financed to travel to New Zealand to provide a series of philatelic lectures. That suggestion never came to fruition. The Robert Samuel Memorial Lecture is a development from that concept. The publication of such lectures will also reflect his interest in philatelic literature.

*Stephen D. Schumann & Robert Duns* □
The Results From HAFNIA 01 World Philatelic Exhibition, October 16-21, 2001

by Joseph Monteiro

HAFNIA 2001, the third major world philatelic event in 2001 besides BELGICA and PHILANIPPON, is over and the results have come down. The Exhibition marked the celebration of the 150th Anniversary of Denmark's first stamp, the 4 Rigsbank Skilling, which was issued on 1st April 1851. Copenhagen where the exhibition occurred is the capital of Denmark. It is a city that combines the old and the new. It has more than 1,000 years of history and if you have a bit of an imagination even the tales told about the Vikings could become real. The city also has the old architecture, the Royal Residence and the museums to visit. Thus what the famous Danish poet, Hans Christian Andersen, wrote in a poem is true even today: “Copenhagen, you cheerful city, so old and yet so young.”

Table 1 - A Comparison of Literature and Philatelic Awards at HAFNIA 01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Philatelic Exhibition (Traditional)</th>
<th>Philatelic Exhibition (Thematic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Gold</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
<td>50 (27)</td>
<td>19 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Vermeil</td>
<td>26 (16)</td>
<td>41 (22)</td>
<td>18 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermeil</td>
<td>32 (20)</td>
<td>43 (24)</td>
<td>36 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Silver</td>
<td>33 (21)</td>
<td>21 (13)</td>
<td>23 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>34 (21)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>18 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Bronze</td>
<td>20 (12)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>160 (100%)</td>
<td>182 (100%)</td>
<td>125 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from “Palmares, HAFNIA 01 World Philatelic Exhibition” October 16-21, 2001, Copenhagen.

PHILATELIC LITERATURE AND PHILATELIC EXHIBITS AT HAFNIA 01

There were one hundred and sixty literature entries that received awards. The distribution of awards is shown in Table 1. The distribution follows the usual bell curve that appears sharply skewed to the lower awards. The awards peak at silver with only 7 percent receiving a large gold or gold and sixteen percent receiving a large vermeil.

There were one hundred and eighty-two philatelic exhibitions in the thematic class and one hundred and twenty-five philatelic exhibitions in the traditional class. The distribution of awards in the traditional class follows a bell curve that peaks at the gold medal, remains at nearly the same level for the large vermeil and vermeil medals and then drops sharply thereafter. The distribution of awards in the thematic class also follows a bell curve that is much more normal peaking at vermeil.

A COMPARISON OF LITERATURE AND PHILATELIC EXHIBITION AWARDS AT HAFNIA 01

A comparison of the awards indicates that while 7 percent obtained a gold in literature, 33 percent obtained a gold in philatelic exhibiting (traditional class) and 17 percent obtained a gold in philatelic exhibiting (thematic class). As for the large vermeil award, 16 percent obtained it in literature, 22 percent obtained it in philatelic exhibiting (traditional class) and 14 percent obtained it in philatelic exhibiting (thematic class). This suggests that philatelists aspiring to reach the top are likely to fare much better if they concentrate their efforts on philatelic exhibiting.

It is worthwhile noting that the previous statement does not mean that it is easier to get to the top in philatelic exhibiting. Philatelic exhibiting has a much longer history in world exhibitions and entrants have much greater experience in this older form of competition. The statistics of HAFNIA 01 and ESPANA 2000 when compared indicate that the entrants were more successful in obtaining a large gold and gold in literature and philatelic exhibiting at HAFNIA 01.

THE COUNTRIES THAT FARED THE BEST

The countries that fared the best in literature obtaining large gold or gold or large vermeil awards at HAFNIA were: Italy (7), Denmark (6), Norway (5), USA (4), Great Britain (3) and Switzerland (3). In philatelic exhibiting (traditional class), the countries that fared the best were: Denmark (19), USA (8), Great Britain (7), Germany (5), Canada (5) and Spain (5). In philatelic exhibiting (thematic class), the best performers were: Germany (8), Great Britain (4), France (4), Israel (4) and USA (3).

A FEW CONCLUDING REMARKS

Even if you did not succeed in winning the gold award or bringing back the Little Mermaid named after a fairy tale by Hans Christian Andersen, it was an excellent show and the awards were quite innovative and impressive. They were wrist watches for medals. The Wrist watch dial and outside chrome was in silver or gold for individuals winning a silver or gold award. They inscribed your name on the dial and the emblem of HAFNIA 01 appeared on the dial in the upper left corner.

Rocky Mountain Philatelic Library

An organization that is “on the move” is the Rocky Mountain Philatelic Library. They have their own building in Denver, Colorado, a great group of dedicated and knowledgeable collectors, the services of a professional librarian and a large and growing collection.

As noted in their bimonthly publication Scribblings, they are open on most days from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. except Thursdays 2:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. The library is usually closed on Sundays. Drop in if you are in the area. The address is 2034 South Pontiac Way, Denver, CO 80224. The phone is 303-759-9921. If you can’t visit, try the Website at http://www.collectors-mall.com/philib/RMPL.htm.

Talent alone cannot make a writer. There must be a man behind the book.

—Ralph Waldo Emerson
Responsible (?) Journalism

by Joseph E. Foley

In their November 19th front page story, Lim's, once again, feebly attempts to emulate a supermarket tabloid. In both the lead article by Rob Haeseler and the editorial by Mike Laurence, the APS is castigated for even considering alternatives to the present arrangements for the production of the American Philatelist.

The general tenor of Lim's treatment differs markedly from the APS report that is reproduced in full in the adjacent column. Outsourcing various elements of a publication do not necessarily carry with it a loss of editorial control. Even a cursory glance at the AP shows four people involved at APS headquarters. This may not include additional support functions or people. Involved here is not only salary, but benefit package, office space and equipment, supervision and overhead.

Complete vertical integration of a publication would include printing and distribution. On a grand scale, a position in the paper industry might be considered. At the other end of the spectrum, the in-house function might be limited to editorial control, perhaps by a single person, with all other functions outsourced.

Frankly, I was favorably impressed with the APS Board being open to a discussion of alternatives on this, or for that matter, any aspect of managing the Society. Lim's may rant about “behind-the-scenes discussion” and “secret session,” but this strikes me as a reasonable topic for a private and, obviously, a very preliminary conversation.

Lim's makes much about the discussion being brought to the table by Wayne Youngblood, a former editor of Scott Stamp Monthly and currently with Krause Publications. Wayne's term was then just about up as a Board member and obviously he would not be on the Board when any decision was reached on this matter. Perhaps Lim's consternation might be more attributable to their lack of awareness and having been beaten to the punch. Haeseler, in his article, places Amos Press at the top of his list of potential publishers with experience in stamp publishing and tosses a harpoon at John Dunn in characterizing him as a "lesser light." Positioning?

A shot is also taken at Barbara Boal. “Boal is not a stamp collector.” Overlooked is the question of who was editing the AP during Bill Welch's severe and lengthy illness. Subject matter expertise is vital. Take a look at the APRL. There in the person of Gini Horn we have just that—and she had done an admirable job. By the way, she's a professional librarian and not a stamp collector. Let's remember the field where we need the expertise.

Lastly, there is the question of Peter Martin's departure. He is entitled to privacy. However, I cannot end this article without noting that, personally, I have found him to be a person of extraordinary ability and impeccable integrity. I think he will be missed.

I believe more in the scissors than I do in the pencil.
—Truman Capote

APS Eliminates Fundraising Position


The American Philatelic Society announced today that it has eliminated its fundraiser position effective November 2. The position was established last February to raise money for a number of Society projects including the Society's headquarters expansion. The decision to eliminate the position was made on financial grounds, according to Executive Director, Robert E. Lamb. Lamb said "the past eight months of experience showed that the level of fundraising for the Society and the APRL does not justify the overhead required for a full-time staff person." With the elimination of this office, all Society fundraising will once again be coordinated on a part-time basis by other Society personnel, as was the case prior to February 2001.

Peter Martin, a former editor of Scott Stamp Monthly, held the position of fundraiser for the APS. For the past four months, Martin has also served as interim editor of The American Philatelist, the Society's monthly magazine, and the Philatelic Literature Review, the quarterly publication of the American Philatelic Research Library. These functions were held by Martin on a part-time basis, in addition to his primary position as Society fundraiser. With Martin's departure, the Society and the APRL are currently considering how they will handle the editing of these two publications.

For the interim, Barbara Boal has been named Acting Editor of the two publications. Boal, who has been working with The American Philatelist since 1981, has been Managing Editor since August 1990. Boal's tenure has seen many important innovations to the magazine including the introduction of color in 1995 and the automation of the magazine production.

Before conducting a search for a new editor, the Society plans to explore several options for the future of the magazine. At the concluding session of the last APS board, in a brainstorming session about Society finances, an outgoing board member proposed that the Society consider contracting production of the magazine. At its upcoming meeting in Riverside the APS Board of Directors will be asked to consider whether there could be an advantage to more outsourcing of the production of The American Philatelist.

APS President Peter P. McCann stated that "the future of the magazine is an important issue for the membership and requires a full discussion by the Board." In his opinion, "it is very unlikely that any decision will be taken on the AP prior to the Riverside meeting.”

Dutch Index

The May 2001 issue of Netherlands Philately (volume 25, number 3), the journal of the American Society for Netherlands Philately, contained a cumulative index by subject matter. The index was compiled by Ed Matthews and covers volumes 18-23 (Sept. 1993 - May 1999). Previously, a similar index was published in volume 18, number 1, of the journal and that one covered volumes 1 to 17 inclusive.

Until now Greenland postal history collectors relied pretty much on Poul Frolund’s 1984 booklet. However, the rates covered in that booklet were only since 1938. Now we have a much broader time span. Although there is very little text, since the book is made up mostly of rate tables, any descriptions are given in both English and Danish. This book expands on the earlier one by including additional services such as postal due, money orders, COD, and the “Gehr” or special fees. Most of the tables cover 1938 to 1999. However, there are a couple of tables that list the rates for letters and parcels to and from Greenland, using Danish stamps, prior to 1938.

One feature that is found in Frolund’s earlier work is a listing of the Greenland stamps from 1938 to 1984 indicating the different values, colors, and intended services they were issued to pay. However, the much broader rate information in the new book makes it the one of choice. The new booklet is handy and can be carried easily to a show bourse to check rate information on the spot.

Alan Warren


The Brookman stamp catalog has come a long way since the pocket-sized booklet of years ago. Like the Stanley Gibbons catalog, the Brookman 2002 is actually a price list that can be used by collectors to estimate the retail value of stamps. Scott catalogs compete most closely with Brookman, but they are not directly comparable. Brookman 2002 covers United States stamps and first day covers (FDCs), complete US booklets, and state and Indian reservation duck stamps, items also listed in the Scott US Specialized catalog. Brookman 2002 also covers stamps of the Confederate States, UN, and US overseas territories, and major imperforate and color errors, all found in Scott 2002 Volume 1. Brookman 2002 lists the errors in a separate table. Brookman 2002 also has United Nations FDCs and 70 pages of autograph valuations for famous people by category, not found in any Scott catalog.

Comparing Brookman catalog values to Scott values is not straightforward: it requires adjustments to values and condition. The standard grade for Brookman pricing is fine (F) for US stamps of 1847 to 1888, and fine to very fine (F-VF) thereafter. The standard condition throughout Scott is VF. Scott defines and illustrates VF with photos in its introduction, but clearly notes those exceptions when it is normal for the margins to be small or very small: Scott II 5-11, 17, 18-49. Brookman 2002, however, has a sliding three-part scale to define VF, from “Perforations will clear design on all four sides” to “Design very well centered within perforations.” The former definition applies to all US issues from 1847 until 1898, and to a few thereafter. The latter definition is for issues after 1935. For stamps in the years between, “... well centered ...” applies. A Brookman VF Scott #14, priced at $4,000 unused with original gum, would have perfect clear of the design. (Brookman provides grade-related factors to convert F or F-VF prices to VF prices for all US stamps.) For a Scott VF #14, priced at $3,500, the “design will be well clear of the edge” and “The stamp will present a nice, balanced appearance.” It appears that Brookman 2002 does not even price a stamp of such quality, so the two catalogs are not quite comparable for most US classics.

Putting aside the difference in definitions of stamp grade, I made a numeric comparison of a variety of US stamps in VF condition. For the 19th century, I chose the same stamps that Lin’s uses for tracking US stamp values (8 used, 7 unused, 2 mint) plus three more mint issues. Brookman averaged 40 percent higher for the used classics, 17 percent higher for the unused classics, and 16 percent higher for the mint classics. Six sets I randomly selected from the first half of the 20th century averaged 47 percent higher in Brookman. Four sets and a single from the second half of that century averaged 82 percent higher in Brookman. Unquestionably, there are significant differences in values between Scott and Brookman, with Brookman apparently higher. I can see why retail dealers like to use Brookman for pricing their stamps.

Why would I want to buy Brookman 2002, if I already had a Scott 2002 Volume 1? The Brookman gives pricing or a correction factor for two to three different grades of all US stamps. Scott does not even describe how to estimate a stamp’s value for any grade but VF.

On the other hand, Scott 2002 Volume 1 has all of the A and B countries of the world. Scott’s photos of stamps are much better than Brookman’s; in most cases, the Brookman photos are too blurry to read inscriptions, but in Scott they are quite legible. The detailed descriptions and sketches of types for identifying US classics in Scott Volume 1 are not found in Brookman. In other words, Brookman is for pricing only, not for identification. The retail price of Brookman 2002 is $18.95; Scott 2002 Volume 1 retails at $40. If I were tempted to buy Scott every few years, and Brookman in between to save money, if the grading and pricing in the two catalogs could be more easily correlated. Until then, I will use Scott’s VF values as benchmarks, and apply factors in my head the way Brookman does explicitly. You really have to give credit to the Brookman catalog for its innovative grade-related pricing strategy. I do.

William D. Ellis, PhD
This work contains some 728 entries, a few of which reference older bibliographies. Virtually all of the important books and papers on DWI philately published, between about 1900 and 2000, in English, Danish, German, and a few other languages are included. It will serve well as the primary bibliography for students and researchers of DWI stamps and postal history. Each reference entry is in alphabetical order by author. Where the author is not known, the entries are curiously found under “E” as Editor followed by the initials of the journal. Authors’ names lack diacritical marks. Each entry is assigned a unique number and also a four-digit index number so that the reference can be located through the author’s indexing system.

The index is organized by subject with a major focus on the individual stamp issues. For example, the 2200 series is devoted to the bicolor stamps with subordinate numbers relating to individual stamp values, printing, forgeries, proofs and essays, and other aspects. Then the author lists the index numbers in order followed by the reference numbers so that researchers can examine all of the references for a specific stamp issue or cancel type, etc.

The weakest aspect is that much material that is relevant to DWI postal history, but which does not contain specific or numerous references to the Danish West Indies, has not been included. Nor are there many entries referencing maritime or geo-political material concerning the Caribbean and other regions of interest to the postal historian of DWI mails. For example, the 1998 study: “The United States and Brazil Mail Steamship Companies 1866-1893”, by J. DuBois, published in The Congress Book, 1998 is not referenced, presumably because it is primarily maritime history, although this company figures prominently in the air mail closing times in various Australian cities and towns, by month and year.

There are two sections “Airmail Statistics (Internal and External) pre 1940” and “Airmail Statistics (Internal and External) post 1945.” These list the number of letters carried and pounds of mail carried by year. And finally there is a section listing Railway Timetables in 1927 between various cities and towns. I am not quite sure why these have been included in a history of Australian air mail.

In my opinion, the CD could have been considerably improved if it had included photos of the aircraft involved, the pilots, and other related photos. Also, I was quite disappointed when I found no scans of air mail covers, such as first flight covers, crash covers, etc. There is plenty of space on the CD, and hopefully, any future editions will include such material. While this is a rather new method for publishing an Air Mail History such as this, the inclusion of photos and covers would have greatly enhanced its...
LETTERS


The ZIP should read 90710, NOT 97010. Hey, the guy's entitled to sell his books and not to have orders returned to sender. 'Sides, he's a Writers Unit 30 Veep.

Editor's Note: Copies of the following e-mails were received by the editor. Both Bob Rawlins and Alan Warren agreed to them being published in this section.

From Bob Rawlins (to Alan Warren): My copy of 3Q01 TPC arrived last week and I was pleased to see that the Committee is in fact revamping the chapter in the Manual of Philatelic Judging for judging literature exhibits. The article noted that consideration is being given for separate categories for society journals based on the number of members. I think this is a mistake and hope that you will reconsider. The logic to divide competition for philatelic journals by society size escapes me. Clearly, the average specialty journal does not have the resources available in the 50,000+ member base of the APS. But, I believe that except for the ATA and AFDCS, nearly all of the specialty societies range between a few hundred and 1,500 members. That's a ratio of only up to 5 to 1, not 100 to one as compared to the APS. I pay dues to a dozen or more philatelic societies but only contribute regularly to one and occasionally to two others. I know that many philatelists have multiple society memberships. Inactive members thus bulk up society membership without really contributing to its journal. Of course, they do pay dues, but most journals run on a break even basis, so membership dues alone do not contribute all that much to the journal strength or weakness.

Presumably small societies would get some consideration in evaluating their journal because of a small membership base. Where would be the break between a small and a large society - 200, 500, 1000? If, say 500, would it be logical to treat differently a society of 450 from one of 550? I would say not. And why is a specialty society small? Does it have very low membership because it is just starting or ready to fold? Or is interest in the subject not sufficiently widespread? Here the subject of importance (some say significance) rears its ugly head. Society membership saw tooths throughout the membership year. When is the official time for the membership count - at its nadir immediately after dropping members who fail to renew, or the month or two before when it is highest, or as an annual average? I know of only one specialty society, the USCS, which regularly publishes a membership tally in its journal. No chance of fudging there. Of course, that number can be obtained by asking for it on the prospectus, but is that information actually germane? The number of members has little bearing on the quality of a journal; the composition of the membership is far more important. For example, the U.S. Classics Society counts among its membership a super guggale of the most distinguished philatelists in America - international judges and exhibitors, Champion of Champion aspirants, editors/authors of respected research volumes, and experts in every imaginable classic area. Along with that array of talent, the Editor in Chief of The Chronicle has ten associate editors to screen input to the journal. La Posta, a journal dedicated to postal history while not a society has, on its subscriber list, virtually every serious philatelist interested in some aspect of postal history. The editor, too, has a half dozen associate editors to input to the journal. I may be wrong, but I firmly believe that few other editors enjoy the array of talent found in the two examples cited.

While size certainly can be important in many areas, Sumo wrestling, for example, it is not the critical aspect in most endeavors. You can be short or slim and still be high school valedictorian or a CEO of a Fortune 500 company. Neither should size of readership be a key factor in judging philatelic literature. Instead of size, I propose that frequency of issue be considered in establishing philatelic journal competitive divisions. As you know, I edited a monthly which is really a combination newsletter and journal. I truly believe that my job was considerably more than three times as difficult as the editor of a quarterly. The majority of the members in my society collect contemporaneous material rather than classic. Most members want to know what the ships of the fleet are doing now, and what new postmarks and cachets are available now rather than last year or in prior decades. Of course, we also provide historical information in the Log, but the requirements to be current and pertinent present a particular challenge with which editors of a quarterly, semi annual, or annual simply do not have to deal.

I am not implying that editing a quarterly is a piece of cake. It's not. However, the difference in editing a quarterly (or less frequently published journal) as opposed to a monthly or a bi-monthly is significant and one which, in fact, merits separate categories. A particular challenge for a monthly editor is getting the publication to the members in time for the news portion to be of use. I was under the gun to insure that all deadlines were met so that the publisher could get every issue in the mail at the very beginning of the issue month. My publication was sent either by periodical (former second class) or by first class/air mail to those who so opted. USCS members expected their Log to be delivered by a certain date of the month and I invariably heard complaints if that did not occur.

Most, if not all the quar terlies to which I subscribe are, I believe, mailed bulk rate. I really never know when they will arrive and it is of little consequence if the editor is a week or two late. Indeed, the editor of the current issue of TPC commented, without apology, that he ran late and why. However, the delay mattered not at all since there was nothing particularly time sensitive in the issue. His case, I'm certain, is not unique among editors of quarterlies and points up another reason for creating judging divisions by frequency of issue. I urge the members of the committee to read again John Hotchner's comments in The Philatelic Communicator, 4Q2000, page 11. John suggested that each division be judged against the best of what it can be. Generally, a publication will state its purpose or raison d'être in the banner or masthead to provide the necessary guidance for evaluation of what it can be. If the committee simply takes the present criteria in the Manual of Philatelic Judging and shuffles the point count depending on the divisions decided, we will be no better off than now and, in fact, we will have retrogressed.

What should be a consideration in evaluating the journal is how many members (percentage not number) actually support the journal with articles, letters, and other contributions over the course of the year. In the Editors In-Box in the 2Q2000 TPC, two editors provided insight into the perennial problem of many editors of periodicals, i.e., lack of member input. One editor detailed the subterfuges by which he obtained input; the other
noted that he often resorted to reprints where there was insufficient original input. One quarterly journal which I receive routinely has up to 30% reprinted material. Other editors write a significant quantity of material themselves to fill space. I think the quantity of member input, as well as quality, should be a factor in evaluating a periodical. The editor has to do it all, or has to rely on copying material from other sources, the publication is clearly not the best it can be. John also noted, earlier in his letter, that one of the major reasons for holding stamp and cover exhibitions is to reward accomplishment and thereby to encourage more of the same. And so it should be with literature competition.

The judging criteria MUST reflect the progress that an editor has achieved toward a practical end rather than a fairyland comparison to an idealized, unrealistic, standard. I am a member of two non-philatelic organizations both of whom are searching for an editor for their monthly newsletter. Neither editor is particularly challenging - both simply present current news of the organization along with future events and meetings. After two months of search, no one has stepped forward. If a replacement cannot be found, there is a good chance that both organizations will fold. Now, I'm not proposing that kid gloves be employed in judging philatelic literature exhibits, but I would emphasize that the job is tough enough without having to compete against standards which defy rational thought.

From Alan Warren (to Bob Rawlins): I already forwarded your e-mail and attachment to the committee members. The membership numbers aspect was an early suggestion by a committee member, and the more I thought about it (before seeing your letter), the more I felt that was not a good idea. The Postal History Society and the Carriers and Locals Society put out gold level journals with small membership.

Reviews (continued from page 13)


This is the first in a series being planned by the author for various parts of the British Commonwealth. It is a listing of various cancellations by post offices. The author has provided a permutation by various characters of the town name, e.g., first two characters, middle three characters, etc. This should be particularly useful in identifying the cancellation on those stamps off cover, or for matter, on cover but with indistinct or partial strikes.

Interspersed throughout the book are illustrations of attractive covers. The introduction is useful and includes illustrated stamps as examples of how to proceed in using this reference to identify the marking.

Type size is quite readable and the spiral binding allows the book to lay flat—a useful attribute in a work of this nature.

J. E. F.


This compilation primarily spans the period of adhesive stamps but it includes some references back to the Spanish colonial era. Most of the publications cited are from the English and Spanish language communities; the front matter of the present work is bilingual as well.

The authors chose to organize their information by topic, author, title, publication, and date. The topic categories are presented in the table of contents and the reader would do well to spend time becoming familiar with it. The broadest topic is “Stamps for ordinary mail” with sub-categorization by quarter century. This topic covers almost twenty-five pages. Then we have listings for airmail, special services (such as registration, etc.), forgeries, catalogs, stationery, revenues, proofs, etc. Postal history is divided into several categories. We have two pages of topical tides, and two pages for “miscellaneous and unknowns.” The authors devote the final seventeen pages to the states and departments.

Arranging the material by author name means that in some topic categories we end up with extensive listings for “anom.,” that most famous of authors. It also means that if a researcher does not know (or remember) the author’s name, she is in for some extended work. The user should also recognize that some titles are listed under more than one topic.

Publication names use abbreviations to conserve space; a table at the end of the book lists all of these. The tabulation of titles also has a column to indicate if the publication is held in the COPAPFUL library.

Philatelic bibliographies seem to be of most use to specialist collectors/researchers. They provide a helpful indication of “what exists” as a jumping off point or assist in tracking the provenance of information. On more than one occasion, researchers have discovered that what is taken as “received wisdom” today began only as supposition a century ago but never verified. Having bibliographic tools available in database form permits researchers to quickly sort and search the information into the most convenient format for particular purposes. The Mitchell-D’Elia tabulation lends itself ideally to such an application, one hopes that COPAPFUL will see fit to place it on their Website. For those without Internet access, or the more occasional user, a hard-copy is probably the next best application.

Production qualities are excellent, although the type size is small. If you collect this area of the world, you will want a copy of this publication or access to its database.

E. E. Fricks
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DOCUMENT RETENTION
Drafts and manuscripts will usually be retained for approximately ninety days after the issue in which the article, etc., appears is published. Correspondence will normally be discarded after approximately six months.

WU 30 CRITIQUE SERVICE
Past president Charles J. Peterson operates the WU30 Critique Service. There is no charge for the service. Details are:

Periodicals—Submit the four most recent issues. Include postage equivalent to four times the first class mailing fee. Any unused amount will be returned. Critiques can be expected in about 30 days.

Books/manuscripts—Inquire before sending, with a brief description of the item. Please include a stamped, addressed envelope for the reply. The time element for a book or manuscript can vary depending on length, other similar requests at hand and other commitments.

All submissions & correspondence should be sent to Charles J. Peterson, Box 5559, Laurel, MD 20726, phone 301-776-9822, e-mail: cjp7777@aol.com.

SECRETARY-TREASURER'S REPORT
By the time you receive this issue of the Philatelic Communicator, your dues notice should be in the mail. Prompt payment is always appreciated. My address and the rates are given on page 2. A great gift for a friend is a membership in WU30.

Style is effectiveness of assertion. —George Bernard Shaw