



Seminar Report

Swedish Philatelic Federation

The Board for Exhibition and Jury Matters

&



F.I.P Fédération Internationale de Philatélie

Joint Seminar

Postal History and Thematic Philately
Malmö, Sweden, 21-23 August, 2009

Contents

	Page
1. Participants	2
2. Report	4
3. Opening presentations	4
4. Where does international competitive Postal History stand today?	5
5. Where does international competitive Thematic Philately stand today?	9
6. Sigge Ringström's museum for philately	13
7. Examples of exhibits presented by exhibitors	13
8. Panel discussion	19
9. Mr. Wolff Hess: Judging Postal History and Thematic Philately	20
10. Mr. Läge: Notes, observations and the need for conclusions	23
11. Postiljonen and FFE	24
12. Closing remarks	25



The seminar report is prepared by

Mr. Åke Rietz

Swedish delegate to F.I.P.'s commission for Postal History

1. Participants

Seminar chairperson



Mr. Jonas Hällström

FEPA's delegate in the F.I.P. Commission Bureau for Thematic Philately

The Seminar panel



From above in the middle: *Mr. Kurt E. Kimmel*, RDP from Switzerland, Chairman of the F.I.P. Commission for Postal History. From there clockwise: *Mr. Per Friis Mortensen* from Denmark; *Prof. Dr. Damian Läge* from Germany, Chairman of the F.I.P. Commission for Thematic Philately; *Dr. Joshua Magier* from Israel; *Mrs. Patricia Stilwell-Walker* from the U.S.A.; *Mr. Hallvard Slettebø* from Norway; *Prof. Dr. Henrik Mouritsen* from Denmark; *Dr. Med. Wolf Hess* from Germany, F.I.P. juror for Postal History and Thematic Philately.

F.I.P. Officials



In the middle: *Mr. Joseph Wolff, RDP*, President of F.I.P.;
Left: *Mr. Jussi Tuori, RDP*, Vice President of F.I.P.;
Right: *Mr. Knud Mohr RDP* Honorary President of F.I.P.

Official sponsors



Total number of participants



80 people, from 21 different countries in 4 different continents.

2. Report

All participants were given a binder and a CD containing documentation for all the presentations. This report will therefore only give a summary of these presentations. The discussions, question and answer sessions as well as the closing remarks will also be presented in this report.



3. Opening presentations



Mr. Claes Arrrup, representing the official sponsor Postiljonen Auction House, welcomed all the delegates and gave as gift the book “Philatelic Expertising” edited by A.I.E.P. (Association Internationale des Experts en Philatelie).

Mr. Lennart Daun presented the latest issue of books in the XpoNAT series, which is Mr. Bo Grendal’s exhibit “The Deliveries of 4 Skilling Banco 1855 – 1858”, edited by the Swedish Philatelic Federation.

Mr. Joseph Wolff, RDP gave in his opening remarks initially some historic background to philately. He then welcomed the initiative to combine a seminar for Postal History and Thematic Philately, which both are represented by numerous exhibits at all international exhibitions. In many thematic exhibits you find nowadays material that can be found in the other class, and vice versa. And in postal history there have been so many changes that have to be explained. Mr. Wolff finally thanked all the speakers at the seminar and gave special thanks to the organizer of the seminar – Mr. Hällström.



Mr. Jonas Hällström said in his opening presentation that when he became head of the Swedish Exhibit Committee in 2005 he realized there was a need of education for Swedish collectors about exhibiting their collections. The purpose of this seminar is to deal with the very important relationships between Postal History and Thematic Philately and to catch up with latest trends in both exhibition classes.

4. Where does international competitive Postal History stand today?

4.1 Mr. Kurt Kimmel, RDP:

The original purposes of the new regulations



Postal History was introduced as a new FIP class as late as in 1979. The regulations were very strict that caused some jurors to believe that only “rates and routes” is postal history. Marcophily, historical and regional exhibits were awarded lower rewards because they did not satisfy “the rates and routes” expectations. Mr. Kimmel meant that we had ended up in the extreme and that it was the wrong way to go.

Since 1998 there had been a request to include “Social Philately” in the Postal History Class. Social Philately is very popular in Australia and New Zealand. It is obvious that these exhibits would contain more non-philatelic material than other areas in Postal History. Although it was allowed in the previous regulations, it was diluted with the stupid restriction “if absolutely necessary”, which led to the mistaken believe that the inclusion of non-philatelic material was not necessary or even forbidden. With the introduction of the new sub-class “Historic, Social and Special Studies” the non-philatelic material has to be related to the shown philatelic items and should not overwhelm the philatelic material. There is neither percentage nor a minimum or maximum amount of non-philatelic material in order to avoid jurors to have to count the percentage.

Postal History should be exhibited in such a way that it will neither degenerate into an unpleasant cheque book competition nor become a pure academic discipline. Therefore there should not be a filling the pages with stories and text that nobody reads. The flow of the story and the description of the shown material have to be concise and easy to understand. A clear plan and a well structured treatment would certainly achieve this.

4.2 Mr. Per Friis Mortensen: Exhibiting Postal History



The mission of the Postal History Commission is:

- Promoting PH collecting
- Work for better understanding of PH
- Maintain and/or improve SREV and Guidelines
- Information to exhibitors – how to exhibit PH (the Streamline Seminars are examples that can be downloaded on www.fippostalhistory.com)
- Training of jurors in judging PH

Postal History is:

- Rates
 - Rates in figures
 - What is cover by the rate(s)
 - Rate period(s)
- Routes
 - A complete analysis of the route documented by endorsement and/or cancellations
- Regulations. A description of regulations must contain:
 - What the regulation is dealing with
 - What is covered by the regulation
 - How this is documented
- Markings/marcophily
- Historical, social and special studies

Changes in SREV and Guidelines:

- All PH exhibits are classified and judged in three time periods:
 - Up to 1875 (pre GPU)
 - From 1875-1945
 - After 1945
 - Each exhibit fits into the period where it starts or where its main contents lies
- New sub-class: Historical, social and special studies
- Unused stamps and postal stationary are, with rare exceptions, irrelevant, and their inclusion must be justified
- Maps, proclamations etc. should be included only if relevant to the development and documentation
- The relevance, balance and importance of non-philatelic material shown in Historical, social and special studies will be evaluated by the judges. Such material must add value to the story told!
- All PH exhibits must contain an Introductory Statement showing the scope of the exhibit.
- The Title of the exhibit must correspond to the Introductory Statement
- The title page should contain:
 - Relevant PH information on the subject of the exhibit
 - A plan of the structure of the exhibit
 - Areas of personal investigation
 - Details of important documentary sources and references

Changes in and comments to judging criteria:

- 1. Treatment
 - Clear link between title, introduction and content
 - Limitations of time should be logical
 - Secure “the red thread” throughout the exhibit
 - Avoid gaps – if gaps, explain why
 - Balance the exhibit
 - Choose the “right” material – also the difficult
- 2. Knowledge
 - Knowledge is the Key Issue in judging an exhibit (35 of 100 points) and it influences all the other judging criteria
 - The study and right interpretation of the already available knowledge should be considered
 - In cases where a subject has been significantly researched previously an exhibit showing new research and results should be rewarded especially. It is important for an exhibitor to document the findings in philatelic literature!
 - With regard to Historical, Social and Special studies exhibits, the related historical and general non-philatelic knowledge will be considered
- 3. Condition
 - Good average condition could be defined as the balance between experienced and expected quality. If the balance is >1 the condition is better than average and vice versa
 - Exhibitor is responsible for informing about restored and manipulated items as well as forgeries
- 4. Rarity
 - Rarity depends on the degree of possible duplication
 - Rarity is not the same as very valuable items!
 - Rarity could be increase e.g. by knowledge, classified mail, destinations, conditions and varieties

- 5. Presentation
 - Presentation although given only 5 of 100 points influences all the other judging criteria
 - Judges are looking for:
 - The balance on each page
 - The balance in the frame
 - Clear connection between object and text
 - Large “white” spots
 - Appropriate size of text and text-boxes
 - Accessibility
 - Sloppy or careful mounting

Conclusions

- Set up goals for your exhibit
- Choose a strategy
- Find and read literature
- Build up your knowledge
- Buy unusual items
- Buy quality
- No compromises

4.3 Discussion on PH issues

Why are there time periods in the new PH regulations?

- To promote modern PH philately (i.e. post UPU and post 1945), and to give these exhibits a better chance of competing with “earlier” PH exhibits
- The periods chosen are the same as in Traditional Philately regulations
- Mr. Tuori mentioned that at a recent exhibition there were two judging groups for different time periods in the traditional class
- Mr. Kimmel felt that it is positive to have the same periods in PH as in traditional philately, but the third period (after 1945) could be discussed as the peace after World War II did not enter until later in some countries
- Mr. Läge felt that it was good with new time periods, but the “best” will always be the first years of each period

Information from PH Commission – Mr. Kimmel:

- Collectors are encouraged to visit the Postal History Commission website (www.fippostalhistory.com) to find out about news. For cost reasons the newsletters are not distributed any more.
- Collectors are also urged to inform the PH Commission about PH literature (titles) from different countries
- Collectors should also inform PH Commission about faked covers
- Questions from collectors sent to PH Commission will be discussed by the Bureau and answers sent back

5. Where does international competitive Thematic Philately stand today?

5.1 Prof. Dr. Damian Läge: The regulations and their purpose



The current criteria of evaluation

- It is very important to exhibit appropriate material only: all kind of philatelic material in its postal aspects according to illustration, purpose of issue (i.e. private material should not be included in a TH exhibit)
- Successful exhibits trigger evaluation! Successful means what other collectors/exhibitors appreciate of what they see on the frames. Other influences on evaluation come from integrating national traditions and the approach of the leading judges.
- “The state of the play” or the best successful treatment in TH exhibits is a narrative approach (“story”)

Evaluating Philatelic Knowledge

- Philatelic knowledge criterion has been reduced from max 25 points in earlier regulations to present (year 2000 regulations) max 15 points, but in addition Development has max 15 points and Innovation max 5 points in the Treatment criterion
- Judging criteria:
 - Presence of the widest possible range of postal-philatelic material and its balanced used
 - Checking for errors and mistakes
 - Presence of philatelic studies and related skilful use of important philatelic material
- Judging philatelic knowledge could be done according to a “level system”:
 - Step 1: evaluate the range of present postal-philatelic material and set a level accordingly
 - Step 2: deduct one or more points when you detect errors and mistakes
 - Step 3: add points for skilful use of important material and sound philatelic studies
- There are 3 types of “Philatelic studies”:
 - Several pages elaborate a thematically important aspect by the detailed study of the philatelic varieties
 - One page concentrates on a detailed study of the important varieties for an identical thematic detail
 - Two or more items of an identical thematic detail are shown to underline personal knowledge or philatelic importance of the items

Challenges when judging thematic exhibits

- 1. Non-postal elements of philatelic items:
 - No importance for thematic philately
 - They have to be ignored when judging rarity
 - Some examples:
 - Additional private prints on postal stationary
 - FDC illustrations
 - Fiscal stamps
 - Illustrated patriotic covers (in USA)
 - Astro-philatelic items
 - Borderline items:
 - Acceptable only if they form the only means to document thematic details,
 - No philatelic importance and should give no points for rarity, but they can give points for thematic knowledge
- 2. Rarity of unimportant material - Philatelic “core material”:
 - Degree of general philatelic importance can vary significantly.
 - Examples of proofs and essays:
 - World status: essays and proofs for the most classic stamps
 - Lesser importance: preliminary drawings of accepted designs, presentation issues, colour proofs for philatelists, modern colour separations
 - No importance: preliminary drawings of rejected designs, moderns specimen stamps, photographic archive material
 - Examples of fancy cancellation from USA:
 - World status: the 19th century fancy killers on cover
 - Lesser importance: 1927-34 first class covers
 - No importance: 1935-50 cachets, additionally to date stamp
 - Conclusion: the items from lesser and no importance categories do not substantially improve the philatelic quality of an exhibit
- 3. Condition:
 - Needs to take availability (rarity) into account!
 - “Scale” of the maximum of 10 points:
 - Max 5 points:
 - common and modern material in good quality
 - Max 8 points:
 - common and modern material in excellent quality plus
 - all common and scarce items in their best condition
 - Max 10 points:
 - Top rarities are in good condition well above average (9 points)
 - All top rarities are in their best condition (10 points)
- 4. Plan (efficient vs. elaborate):
 - Consistency between plan and title
 - Presence of the plan page
 - Adequacy of the plan page (=efficient for understanding the structure)
 - Coverage of all major aspects necessary to develop the theme
 - Correct, logical and balanced structure (guidelines: the degree to which a “story” is told instead of a list of aspects appears)

- 5. Thematic knowledge:
 - Examples for documenting Thematic Knowledge:
 - New thematic finding for chosen subject
 - Thematic details in text and material
 - Aspects for judging Thematic knowledge:
 - For 12 of maximum 15 points:
 - Appropriateness, conciseness and correctness of thematic text
 - Correct thematic use of the material
 - For additional points:
 - Presence of new thematic findings for theme
 - Use of material that has thematic qualification which is not immediately obvious and needs to be discovered by the exhibitor
- 6. Development:
 - Title & Plan, and Development are components of the main criterion named Treatment
 - Examples for documenting Development:
 - Order and positioning of the items on the page
 - Synthesis of page content by pages titles
 - “Surprising” material (which does not belong to the subject, but thematically fits into the story on the page)
 - Aspects for judging Development:
 - For 12 of maximum 15 points:
 - Correct assembly and positioning of the items in conformity with the plan
 - Connection between the items and the thematic text
 - Elaboration of all aspects of the plan
 - For additional points:
 - Depth, shown through connections, cross references, ramifications, causes and effects
 - Balance, by giving to each thematic point the importance corresponding to its significance within the theme
- 7. How to judge Innovation?
 - Innovation is demonstrated by a personal elaboration of the theme, that transforms an exhibit from a sequence of classified items into an “original” story - something new that makes sense!
 - “Scale” of the maximum of 5 points:
 - 5 points: introduction of new themes:
 - A new theme, by itself, is not sufficient, when not sustained by an innovative plan and development
 - 4 points: new approaches for known themes:
 - E.g. historical approach, that widens the scope for analysis
 - 3 points: new aspects of an established or known theme:
 - New chapters, paragraphs
 - 2 points: application of material:
 - To support new thematic facts

- 8. Consistency in scoring:
 - Evaluation of thematic exhibits requires capabilities on 3 different levels:
 - Level 1: Knowledge and understanding of evaluation criteria
 - Level 2: broad thematic and philatelic knowledge
 - Level 3: consistent allotment of points according to criteria requires an agreement about proper scales
 - “Starting level” at 80%:
 - Average of thematic exhibits at FIP exhibitions (80.5 points)
 - Proposal: 80% = absence of errors, but nothing special

5.2 Discussion on Thematic Philately

Why are there not more multiples in TH like in traditional philately?

- Multiples should not fill space. Better with single stamps than multiples
- Do not have repetition. Repetition was banned in earlier days, but could be accepted if of special philatelic value

Could revenues be included in TH?

- Only postal material should be included
- Revenues are in the borderline material and is allowed to be included, but they should not be judged for rarity
- Revenues could be used for thematic but not philatelic knowledge

“Chequebook collecting” in TH

- Mr. Läge: there is always a temptation to include rare items that do not fit the theme. Jurors recognize known items but not the unknown. Chequebook items are always known rare items. The collectors should be informed to look for unknown rare items, which also give points for knowledge.
Themes in TH are chosen from interest, not from philatelic knowledge. The collector must know which items that exist.
- Mr. Hess: “Rome was not built in one day!” It takes a long time to build an exhibit. You should wait for the items that fit the theme, and you should collect areas that fit your chequebook.
- Mr. Kimmel: 50 years ago only rarity was valid. Each collector should know what exists and wait for the right item

How is imagination considered in TH?

- New research should be especially rewarded!

6 “Sigge Ringström’s museum for philately”



Mr. Jan-Olof Ljungh, Mr. Carl Aspegren and Mr. Thomas Bjäringer, RDP presented the person Sigge Ringström, his collections and the literature he had written.

Sigge Ringström was a very well-known Swedish philatelist, who started as an office clerk, but later on became a full time stamp dealer and collector. He built his collections mainly during the first years after Second World War. He was a collector of such various areas as Classic Sweden, Local stamps from Norway and Suez Canal. At a later stage in his life he and his wife Gurli donated their collections to a foundation. The collections are placed in bank vault in Trelleborg.

Some parts of the collections were exhibited at the office of Postiljonen Auction House in Malmö, and all participants were invited to a reception at the premises followed by a dinner on Postiljonen’s invitation at the nearby restaurant “Prins Bernhard”.

7 Examples of exhibits presented by the exhibitors

7.1 Mr. Kurt Kimmel, RDP: “The Postal History of Yunnan/China 1900-1949” (PH)



- *The most important of the concept is:*
 - It covers the whole story
 - It is easy to follow and understand
 - The title page is consistent with the exhibit, or, the other way round, that the exhibit is consistent with the title
 - Each page enhances the story with a headline telling us what is shown on that page

- *Treatment:*
 - The most important is the correct selection of the best possible material
 - Avoid duplication
 - Avoid items that do not belong
 - Avoid items sent for philatelic purposes, if you can tell the story with commercially used items
- *Presentation:*
 - The main advantage of the PH class is the inclusion of related non-philatelic material is allowed as long as it does not overwhelm the philatelic material (no % will be fixed)
 - This will help to make the exhibits better, easier to understand and attractive!
- *The most important items and why?*
 - The earliest known
 - The only known
 - The highest franking/rate
 - Different route
 - Unusual destination
 - Important combination

7.2 Dr. Joshua Magier: “Land Cultivation from the beginning of Agriculture to present time” (TH)



- *Concept:*
 - Choosing the subject and the name of the exhibit (decisions regarding limits and content)
 - General outline of the plan (which will be modified with the advancement of the development)
- *Treatment:*
 - Thematic study and philatelic research
 - Formulation of the chapters and selection of items
 - Planning the layout of the items and of the thematic and philatelic text on exhibit's pages
- *Presentation:*
 - Presenting the ideas in short but sufficiently explained and clear text
 - Layout of the items and thematic and philatelic text following a flow that is logic and clear to onlookers
 - Pleasant graphic presentation

7.3 Mrs. Patricia Stilwell-Walker: “Baltimore: Postal History from Colonial times until the UPU” (PH)



- *Concept:*
 - Subject challenge:
 - Postal history story of any large country is generally “too large” to be adequately addressed in 128 pages
 - Alternatives:
 - Limit time period
 - Limit to subset of geography
 - Limit type of postal service
 - Each alternative requires “adequate” development
 - Result: The postal History of the United States from Colonial times until the UPU illustrated by material from, to or through one of our major cities: Baltimore, Maryland
- *Treatment:*
 - Scope – time period
 - Begins: “Colonial times” – purposely vague
 - Ends: “the UPU” – purposely vague
 - Approximately 100 years – reasonably broad time (importance)
 - Scope – limit geography
 - Baltimore, Maryland – a major city
 - Scope – postal services
 - All major and many minor US postal services and practices are known with a Baltimore connection
 - Large enough city to receive all US stamp issues in sufficient quantity that material is available
 - Selecting PH focus
 - Domestic rate periods (14)
 - Foreign mail within time limit of each domestic rate period
- *The most important items:*
 - For rarity reasons
 - From Baltimore specifically
 - From the US generally
 - For treatment reasons
 - Justify start date
 - Good/eye-catching cover to begin each section
- *Presentation:*
 - Fonts used: different fonts for section start (14 pt, bold, framed and shaded), running section head (10 pt, bold and framed), page headings (12 pt, bold) and exhibit write-up (10 pt)
 - Tables with rates listed
 - Running heads/page heads extremely important for Treatment – organization and story flow

- Page layout:
 - generally 2 covers per page; exception for rare material
 - covers often “offset” – text placed besides as well as underneath
 - rare/unusual items highlighted with single frame
 - framed/shadowed “rarity” statement

7.4 **Mr. Hallvard Slettebø:** **“World Scouting – Its path to success” (TH)**



- *Concept:*
 - Title and subtitle, which are explained
 - Synopsis: most of the information one would expect to find in a synopsis is included in the title page:
 - Pros: keep it short, to the point and everyone gets to see it, also the general public
 - Cons: not much space
- *Treatment:*
 - Title and subtitle defines the scope
 - Consistency between plan and title is the single most important point!
 - The plan:
 - defines the structure of the exhibit and its subdivisions and covers all major aspects relevant to the title
 - Should be entirely structure to thematic criteria
 - The order of the main chapters and their subdivisions should demonstrate the development of the plan, rather than list its main aspects
 - New type of plan, with text in prose rather than a bullet list
 - Development:
 - Means the elaboration of the theme in depth, aiming to achieve an arrangement of the material full complaint with the plan
 - Such elaboration requires:
 - A thorough knowledge of the chosen theme
 - A degree of philatelic knowledge
 - Appropriate thematic and philatelic text

- Innovation:
 - Challenge 1: scouting is a well-known and well researched topic
 - Challenge 2: many of good Scout postmarks have no thematic information except “Scout camp” or “Jamboree”
 - Need to focus on new aspects, new approaches and new application:
 - Use all thematic information available, and place as many postmarks as possible outside the camp and jamboree sections
 - Research and include material that at first glance is non-Scout, but which, with appropriate explanation, is perfectly logical to include
- *Presentation*
 - Requires an evaluation of the clarity of display, the text as well as overall aesthetic balance of the exhibit
 - Is also part of development and treatment. The thematic text connects the thematic qualification of the items and gives appropriate thematic information. Philatelic text is included where appropriate
- *The most important items and why*
 - We mean philatelic importance (not thematic)
 - When chasing material to this exhibit means to compete with traditional and postal history exhibitors

**7.5 Prof. Dr. Henrik Mouritsen:
“Danish Postal Rates 1875-1906” (PH)**



- *Concept*
 - Planning of the exhibit early on based on a scientific approach to collecting
 - Choosing what to exhibit and why:
 - Realized that first issues of most countries are for millionaires only
 - Find the oldest possible area where I over a period of 20 years can afford to buy all the best items
 - Find an area where key original research has not been done
 - Defining the exact time frame

- Scientific planning of this postal history exhibit:
 - There was no literature and no living philatelist to explain many rates especially to foreign destinations, which lead to:
 - Decision to extract all preserved information for the period chosen
 - Set up camp in the postal museum for copying >20.000 pages
 - Decision to write definite handbook in parallel with the development of the exhibit
 - Make tables of all known major rates for the period chosen
 - Make Top 20+ lists for domestic and international mail based on the survey information
- Goals for this exhibit:
 - All significant rate changes must be shown if items to illustrate them are recorded
 - Common rates must also be shown. Otherwise, the story told would not be complete
 - No duplication!!
 - Try to get maximum variation of material
- *Structure of the exhibit:*
 - Domestic rates divided into each type of mail as separate chapters
 - Local mail at the end of each domestic subsection
 - Same with international rates
- *Presentation and treatment are inseparably connected*
 - The design of each individual page reflects 3 major purposes:
 - 1. To help the viewer and judge to understand the treatment
 - 2. To make sure that any judge spot-checking the exhibit will look at the right pages, and will find the information looked for
 - 3. To make the exhibit look neat
 - 3 levels of information:
 - 1. Must know - on top of each page:
 - chapter number and title page heading
 - Rates
 - 2. Important to know – connected to each item
 - Essential descriptions of covers and rarity statements
 - 3. Nice to know
 - Continuous story line (can be read like a book throughout the exhibit)
 - Stamp identification
 - Interesting side aspects of postal regulations shown by the items

- *The most important items and why*
 - What is an important item? The most important items must be defined relative to the title of the exhibit. The most important items in this exhibit are items where only one or two items can be used to show a major aspect of the story line, which leads to:
 - A detailed survey is necessary!!
 - For this exhibit an international survey made by Mr. Karsten Jensen's and a domestic survey by Mr. Mouritsen are indispensable. ¹
 - Items which are the only recorded item showing a major type of rate
 - Visually appealing and rare covers!

8 Panel discussion



Comment from Mr. Kimmel:

- in order to receive a more balanced evaluation made by the jurors it would be good to have jury groups consisting of members from each continent

Co-operation between commissions within FIP:

- Mr. Tuori: There is no co-operation between Traditional and PH commissions when reviewing the rules.
Proposal: the commission chairmen should discuss rules and trends at the next FIP meeting in Lisbon, 2010
- Mr. Mortensen: There are at present 10 commissions within FIP. It should be better to reduce the number to say 5, which would improve co-operation between different collecting areas
- Mr. Kimmel: the co-operation between commissions is a matter of the commission presidents to have enough time available

Sometimes it is difficult to buy material as collectors do not want to sell or they "hide" their items. Solutions might be:

- Get direct access from dealers
- To exhibit draws attention to the exhibitor's collection, but one participant mentioned that prices went up when he started to exhibit

¹ Can be downloaded at: www.member.uni-oldenburg.de/henrik.mouritsen/frimintr.html

Should there be literature references on title page?

- There could be split of the references: own research on title page and other references in the synopsis
- All general references on title page. Specific reference for a cover as a footnote on the exhibit page

There is a tendency to extend the plan:

- Include philatelic material in the plan
- Underline each chapter by include one or more important item. Not too much text!

How should rarity be presented? What is acceptable/ advisable?

- Mr. Läge: The number of rarity statements in TH is dependent on the availability of documentation in handbooks. The lesser the references the more rarity notices. The rarity statement should give a “Wow-effect”!
- Mr. Kimmel: In PH exhibits it is acceptable for the exhibit to refer to the number of items known. It is not acceptable to refer to an item as “unique”, if that is not explained or substantiated. The expression rare should not be used!
- Mr. Hess suggested that the word “reported” should be used instead of “known”
- Mr. Mouritsen mentioned that in USA the word “known” refer to numbers of items known by exhibitors, but the word “recorded” refer to number of items documented

9 Dr. Med. Wolff Hess: Judging PH and TH



9.1 Postal History

- *Title*
 - Justification of dates
 - Important historical date
 - Earliest and latest dates
 - Appropriate to the items shown?
- *Plan*
 - No plan geographical
 - Frame-by-frame description
 - Table of contents
 - Purely enumerations
 - Chronological plan

- *The title page –appearance and contents*
 - Title precisely define the scope of the exhibit
 - Development of the plan done by “natural” or at least logical sections
 - References and/or bibliography
 - Any illustration
- *Treatment*
 - Headings (bigger size) – making the start of each section
 - Relevant information at the beginning of each section
 - NO!!! repetitions of the exhibit title on each page
 - The “Red thread”:
 - Headings on each page (small size)
 - Short information given on the page
 - Relevant pictures or maps
 - Description of items:
 - Routes
 - Rates
 - Usages
 - Marcophily – earliest and latest known dates reported or researched
- *Challenges of today:*
 - The “story” should be easily to be followed – the “Red thread”
 - Descriptions of items should be correct
 - No pure “chequebook competition” but paying regard with care to the “little pieces”
 - No pure “academic discipline”???
- *Furthermore to be discussed by the PH Bureau:*
 - Judgement of the exhibits in the “Philatelic World” with consistent same “measurements”
 - The explanation of philatelic items (letters) in Marcophily-exhibits to be considered

9.2 Thematic Philately

- *1st “Rule”*
 - Title and plan:
 - A meaningful plan, easy to understand, properly structured and raising interest to the observer is the best possibility to apprehend straight off content and the scope of the theme chosen
 - A well chosen title and a structured plan will also give key to the exhibitor to work out his theme systematically without gaps or unnecessary repetitions
 - Title and plan make sense only if they correspond. Innovating approaches concerning the text and the material are desirable
 - Treatment and development (work out):
 - Facts and contexts generally contain careful investigations. Latter bring the main aspects of the theme in depth, originally and in logical follow-up, accompanied by the best possible choice of philatelic material

- *2nd “Rule”*
 - Knowledge and research:
 - Thematic knowledge is demonstrated by transforming the chosen concept into a detailed plan + workout and the choice of the most suitable material full in correspondence of the FIP-rules (of postal origin, authorized or tacitly agreed by the Posts)
 - Philatelic knowledge is shown by a conclusive choice of the material incorporated in the exhibit
- *3rd “Rule”*
 - Condition and rarity:
 - Versatility, importance and rare philatelic material fascinates even the experienced observer
 - The good condition of the items shown is able to intensify the interest in the exhibit
- *4TH “Rule”*
 - Presentation:
 - An attractive presentation supports additional sympathy from any observer
- *Challenges of today:*
 - Philatelic knowledge!!!
 - Consistency and conciseness of the plan
 - Conciseness of thematic knowledge
 - The consistency of the “Red thread”!!!
 - Tell your “story” properly!!

10 Prof. Dr. Damian Läge: Notes, observations and the need for conclusions



A look at the criteria of evaluation according to SREV for Thematic Philately. A different approach of the criteria could be the following – Requirements vs. “Special awarding”:

- Treatment – 25 points
 - Concept, Treatment, Layout
 - Innovation
- Knowledge and Personal Study – 35 points
 - Research
- Condition and Rarity – 40 points
 - Condition
 - Rarity
 - Importance

Red colour = “Communication”

Green colour = “Explanation”

Blue colour = “Material”

Conclusions:

- A convincing concept is an essential component for guiding the exhibitor and the onlooker
- Top exhibitors identify presentation as a component of treatment!!
- Top exhibitors refer to items, when they speak of importance!!
- Condition cannot be seen as independent from rarity (which sets the level for expected condition)
- Some evaluation criteria have the purpose of awarding outstanding aspects of the exhibit (innovation, research, importance)

11. Postiljonen and FFE

11.1 Postiljonen



Mr. Claes Arrrup presented the history of Postiljonen, which has become one of the most important auction houses for philately in Europe. Postiljonen has hosted 5 philatelic seminars during the period 1997-2004. Postiljonen publish the leading Scandinavian philatelic catalogues FACIT and FACIT Postal and also the FFE Journal (Fakes, Forgeries and Experts).

11.2 FFE Journal



Mr. Knud Mohr, RDP, as editor of the FFE Journals, promoted the latest issue of the Journal. He mentioned that so far 180 authors have contributed to the articles in the 12 journals issued. New articles about fakes and forgeries are welcomed and could be written in any original language, which later on will be added by an English summary.

12. Closing remarks

Mr. Jonas Hällström concluded the joint seminar by pointing out the importance of connections between the two classes: Postal History and Thematic Philately. He thanked all participants for their contributions and closed the seminar.

Seminar Chairperson



Jonas Hällström

Swedish Philatelic Federation
The Board for Exhibition and Jury Matters

Seminar Host



Claes Arnrup

