

ASHEROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 46 - JANUARY 1, 1955 (Fourth Series - 1954-1955)

\*\*\*\*\*

SIR NICHOLAS WATERHOUSE

For many years past, the foremost collector and student of U. S. stamps and covers in Great Britain has been Sir Nicholas Waterhouse. As far back as 1916 he published a book entitled, "A Comprehensive Catalogue of the Postage Stamps of the United States of America." It was profusely illustrated, a feature that made it quite popular because illustrations of our postage stamps was not permitted by law at that time in the United States.

In 1924, Sir Nicholas disposed of a lot of his duplicate U. S. material at auction in London, retaining his most prized pieces. And next June his U. S. collection is to go under the hammer. This is perhaps due to advanced years. According to latest advices, the sale is to be by H.R. Harmer, Ltd., and will be held in London the week of June 27 next, but the collection will be sent over to New York for inspection by American buyers early in May.

It is stated that there will be offered a number of exceptional postmaster Provisionals, including a 5¢ Milbury, St. Louis Bears, etc., etc., 1847's on and off cover, a fine display of the 1851-1857-1860 issues, many fine things in the 1861-66 issues, including a block of the 10¢ 1861, Type I (so-called August) and many fine covers of the popular 1869 issue.

Dr. C. Bacher of the Westminster Stamp Co., London, who is an outstanding student of U. S., is assisting in the preparation of the sale. No doubt a number of well-known U. S. dealers will attend the sale.

3¢ BANK NOTE COV. I. SELLS @ \$52.50

In a sale by Robert A. Siegel, held in New York on Nov. 24th last, a cover with a 3¢ Green Bank Note, with grill of 1870, sold @ \$52.50. It was described as follows, quote: Lot 220 "3¢ Green, and roller grill (136). Tied to cover from Saratoga, early usage March 24, 1870, slight stain, fine." (unquote)

In the June 1st '54 Issue of this Service, Issue No. 39, page 295, I mentioned this cover as an earlier use than the date of Apr. 12, 1870 listed in the 1954 S. U. S. The cover had the okay of Lester G. Brookman, our foremost authority of grills. Incidentally an "end roller grill" on this stamp catalogues @ 17.50, so this cover was a combination of the grill variety as well as being the "earliest known use of a 3¢ 1870," or of any stamp of the Bank Note Issues. Kindly refer to pages 295, 296 and 297 of this Service.

REPALIATORY RATE PERIOD  
1848

In last month's issue, pages 359-360, I discussed a cover that was coming up in a sale in London by H. R. Harmer, Ltd. on Dec. 6th-7th. This was a cover with a horizontal strip of three of the 10¢ 1847 plus a 5¢ 1847. (See Photo #184). At the sale the cover was purchased by a London dealer at three hundred and eighty pounds sterling and has since passed into a prominent U. S. collection at a substantial advance. With sterling at \$2.80, the sale price was \$1,064.00. In my humble opinion, the buyer obtained a very rare piece of philatelic Americana at a bargain price.

In the same sale, Lot 63 was a cover with a single 5¢ 1847 and a single 10¢ 1847 supposedly used from Buffalo, N. Y. to Lockport, N. Y. in May 1848. This cover went to a U. S. buyer at 220 pounds or \$616.00. It was later submitted to me for my authentication and it is my opinion that the cover is not genuine, as the evidence indicates these particular stamps could not have been used on this cover.

Lot 71 in the same sale was a cover to France from New Orleans in 1854 with the 5¢ U. S. Internal Rate, (under the U.S.-British Treaty) paid by a horizontal strip of five of the 1¢ 1851, Type IV. This is a most unusual cover as this rate was very rarely paid by five 1¢ stamps, payments generally were made with a combination of a 3¢ '51 and a pair of 1¢ '51, or a single 5¢ 1856. The latter is considered in the rarity class but a cover with five 1¢ 1851 that paid the rate is a far rarer item than a cover paying this particular rate with a 5¢ 1856.

A collection that is outstanding is one that includes items that the other fellow does not possess. It is a point that is well worth remembering.

Lot 71, the one cent cover sold @ 21 pounds (\$59.00).

A cover with a single 5¢ 1856 described as a bit close sold \$74.00. I believe that the 1¢ cover is a better investment. Another cover with a single 5¢ 1856 went at \$196.00. It was described as having large margins. A millimeter or two of an added margin may be worth as much as \$100.00.

U. S. MAIL TO CUBA  
IN THE LATE 1840's

In the annual report of the U. S. Postmaster General, dated Dec. 2, 1848, is the following, quote: "On the 17th of October last, the "Isabel" was placed on the line between Charleston and Havana, in compliance with the contract with Messrs. Mordecai & Gourdin and will hereafter perform semi-monthly trips." (unquote)

Mail from the U. S. to Havana was despatched under this contract from Charleston, S. C. to Havana by the mail steamship "Isabel." The single rate was 12½¢ to July 1, 1851, on which date it was reduced to 10¢.

Inasmuch as the U. S. did not have a postal treaty with Spain or her colonies, mail could not be prepaid to destinations. Thus the 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ rate was to the Cuban frontier, with internal postage to be collected. The 1847 stamps were current during the period 1847-1851, but seldom do we run across a cover to Cuba with such stamps. Perhaps the reason is that it cost 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ extra to send a letter by the "Isabel," if one elected to pay the postage by stamps rather than by charge or cash.

Photograph No. 185 illustrates a most unusual and desirable cover from the superb collection of Mr. Paul Rohloff of Chicago. This is a folded letter dated inside, New York Nov 11 1848, but there is no New York postmark. Instead, there is a red "Charleston S.C." of "Nov. 11." In lower left is "SOUTHERNER VIA CHARLESTON," which indicates that the letter was not placed in the New York Post Office but was put aboard the steamship "Southerner," bound for Charleston. This was a U. S. mail ship of a company that held a mail contract. In upper right are singles of the 5¢ and 10¢ 1847, canceled by the bright red grids of the Charleston office. Here we have the two stamps of the first issue of U. S. adhesive postage stamps on a cover to Cuba, and showing an over-payment of 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢. We wonder why the person who sent this letter did not cut the 5¢ stamp in two, so that the letter would show the exact rate of 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢. I have never seen or heard of any such a "bisect cover" but such a use, a 10¢ 1847 and half of a 5¢ 1847 would have been a legitimate use, in my opinion, because at that period there was no postage stamp to pay a 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ or a 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ rate, nor had any "Regulation" been issued prohibiting the use of a half a stamp. Such a Regulation was not issued until the fall of 1853.

On the cover under discussion is a slightly faded red brown marking in the lower right, which was applied at Havana and reads: "EMPRESA - 18 NOV - 1848, N. AMERICA." It is of special interest to note that service by the "Isabel" was inaugurated on Oct. 17, 1848 and that this cover shows a use just several weeks later (for further data on the Charleston-Havana mail route, kindly refer to my article in "STAMPS" - issue of Dec. 11, 1948).

#### AGAIN "STEAMER 10"

In the November issue of this series of this Service, I discussed at some length, the transit marking "Steamer 10" and on page 344, second paragraph from the bottom, I described a cover that came up in the Rust Sale in February 1942, which had two 5¢ 1847 singles tied by several strikes in :ed of the oval "STEAMER 10." I believe this is a most unusual and rare cover and I am pleased to be able to furnish a fine photograph of it in this Service, as per Photograph No. 186 herewith. This folded letter is dated, "Boston August 20 1847," thus an early use of two 1847 stamps, less than two months after issue.

#### A ONE CENT 1851 PAINT JOB

Photograph No. 187 illustrates a vertical pair of the One Cent 1851 that was submitted to me recently for an opinion. The bottom stamp was

Originally a Type II stamp from the bottom row of Plate 2, which some philatelic painter tried to convert into a Type I by painting in the full Type I ornaments at the bottom. This is a greatly enlarged photograph, but it demonstrates the class of work that can be turned out by crooks who prey on the collecting public by devoting their talents to such swindles. Just imagine a person being able to imitate to such a clever degree the fine engraved lines with a paint brush, or whatever kind of instrument that they employ.

This pair is on a piece of cover canceled Richmond, Va., May 15, with the year use probably 1856 or possibly 1857. The item has been branded as a fake and taken out of circulation.

This paint job was done by a person who is very clever with his hands and eyes but we have another class of philatelic crook who is very clever with his tongue. This is the slick talker who sells some fake item with the statement that it had been okayed by this or that recognized authority. Ever so often I have an item submitted to me with the statement that the buyer had been assured I had passed upon it as genuine, though I never saw the thing before. Some of these fast talking crooks make a business of traveling around the country and looking up prominent collectors, and introducing themselves as a close friend of several well-known philatelists. Within the past year one of these chaps paid a visit to a well-known collector in a southern city and gave the usual falsehood about being a very close friend of a number of prominent members of the Confederate Stamp Alliance. His story was evidently quite convincing and the local collector was pleased to have a visitor with whom he could talk stamps and covers. He gave up an evening to his guest and showed him parts of his valuable collection. The next day he found a number of his finest covers were missing, the value running into a considerable sum.

Kindly refer to Photograph No. 165 in the August 1954 Issue of this Service. This is a photograph of a very rare Pony Express cover that was franked as "Free" by a U. S. Senator. This is one of the gems that was missing the day after the charming guest had departed.

#### HOUSATONIC RAILROAD

Photograph #188 illustrates a very beautiful 5¢ 1847 Railroad cover from the Paul Rohloff collection. This is a white envelope with the markings in a bright vermillion. There is no indication of origin or of the year of use, but from the shade and impression of the stamp, I would fix the use as sometime in late 1849 or early 1850. This railroad ran north from Bridgeport, Conn. to Pittsfield, Mass., a distance of 110 miles. The cover is addressed to Hartford, Conn., which was located on a different railroad. The letter was mailed direct to the Route Agent on this particular Mail Route.

#### THE 90¢ 1870 & 1873 ON COVER

Two years ago, in the Service Issue of January 1st, 1953, Issue No. 22,

pages 151 and 152, I discussed the 90¢ stamps of the eighteen seventies of the several different bank note engraving firms and commented upon the scarcity of covers with the 90¢ value of any of the three bank note companies, viz: National, Continental and American.

Whenever an important auction sale is scheduled I generally glance at the National and Continental issues to see if by any chance a cover with a 90¢ stamp is to be offered. A very fine collection may have this or that rare item, but there is one thing that is always missing, viz - a cover with a 90¢ National or a 90¢ Continental. Likewise we never find a cover offered with the 90¢ 1869.

With the expiration of the original U.S.-British postal treaty on Dec. 31, 1867, a marked reduction occurred in the rate of postages to foreign countries, followed by further reductions in 1869 and 1870. Here we have the principal reason why covers with the 90¢ grill of 1867 and the 90¢ 1869 are non-existent in the finest of specialized collections. I have no record whatsoever of a cover with a 90¢ 1870 grill and have little hope that I will ever be able to record such an item.

THE S. U. S. #155 & #166

#155  
&  
#166  
90¢.

In the 1954 "S. U. S." the 90¢ 1870 National without grill is listed as #155 Carmine and Pink Carmine. The 1873 Continental is listed as #166 Rose Carmine and Pale Rose Carmine. The quotations are as follows:

#155 - \$72.50 - \$14.00 - cover \$90.00  
#166 - 52.50 - 15.00 - " 90.00

It is well to remember that both the #155 and #166 were printed from the same steel plate of 200 subjects; both were printed on a hard paper, the grades of which are practically identical, and that #166 contains no secret mark to identify it from #155. Therefore, to distinguish the difference between a National 90¢ and a Continental 90¢ one has to depend on the color alone, unless, of course, one has a genuine cover with a 90¢ with a use before the Continental was issued. Or in lieu of same, some other positive source of identification. I am not quite sure that a stamp off cover could be positively identified by color if laid side-by-side with a known copy of the National or Continental. I have little doubt that this statement would be emphatically repudiated by students who have spent years in the study of the Bank Note Issues.

Further, I hold much the same opinion regarding the two 30¢ stamps of National and Continental and because of the unstable color of the 24¢ purple I believe it is impossible to identify copies by color alone. And this in spite of all that has been written in the past and present by very competent students.

In the reference collection of Philip H. Ward, Jr. is a complete set of National prints in blocks of four which are in an original envelope with a circular distributed by the Post Office Department in 1870. These were discovered years ago by The Scott Company and were acquired by Mr. Ward. For reference purposes the blocks of the three high values, 24¢

30¢ and 90¢, are invaluable, but the question arises - Was every 24¢ stamp printed in the same color as the Ward block? Was every 30¢ printed in the same color as the Ward block and could it be possible that every sheet of the 90¢ printed by the National Company was in the same color as the Ward block?

I believe that some students claim that the 90¢ Continentals can be identified if they are in what is classed as a "Yellowish Carmine." I wonder? Perhaps the yellowish tint may be due to age or exposure, etc.

We started off this discussion on the subject of the scarcity and desirability of any cover with a 90¢ National or Continental and we find we got somewhat side-tracked on the subject of positive identification of the three high values of the two bank note company's products.

90¢ BANK NOTE COVER

VALUE?

#155 And

The "S. U. S." for 1954 quotes both the #166 "on cover" @ \$90.00. No quotation was given in previous editions. I really do not know where such a figure was obtained, but I feel confident it is quite misleading. In my opinion any sort of a cover, large or small, wrapper, court house, etc., etc., showing a 90¢, either #155 or #166 genuinely used is worth far in excess of \$90.00.

Photograph #189 illustrates a "Court House" cover with a 90¢ - 24¢ and three 10¢. The three 10¢ show the secret mark, hence are Continental prints. What about the 90¢ and what about the 24¢? Are they National or Continental? This was a heavy piece of mail showing \$1.44 in postage, or 4 x 3¢. (Note - The rate was 3¢ per half ounce). It was mailed from Brownsville, Texas in June 1875 to Galveston, Texas. A use in June 1875 might indicate that all the stamps are Continental prints, yet when this cover came up in the Judge Emerson sale by Kelleher on Oct. 19, 1937, the 24¢ and 90¢ were listed as National prints. It was Lot #252, and was acquired by Philip Ward, Jr. and later passed into the collection of Wm. West. When the West collection was sold by Ward in April 1943, this cover was Lot #1613 and the 24¢ and 90¢ stamps were listed as #153 - 24¢ National, and #166 - 90¢ Continental. The cover was sold at a ridiculous low price. Evidently everybody was looking out of the window. Perhaps the 90¢ stamp on this cover is a Continental but I wonder if any authority can state with any degree of assurance whether the 24¢ is a National or a Continental?

The S. U. S. does not list a 24¢ Continental "without grill," therefore, indicating that all 24¢ stamps in collections are Nationals and none are Continentals. In spite of this there are some very competent students who believe that the Continental Bank Note Company printed large(?) supplies of the 24¢ value and that many post offices thruout the country were furnished with them.

One might well ask the question - If Continental printed supplies of the

30¢ and 90¢, and these were distributed to post offices throught the country, why should anyone question that similar supplies of the 24¢ were not also distributed and sold to the public? Why every other value by Continental and no 24¢ Continental?

The S. U. S. states under #164 (Continental), quote: "No. 164 is not known to exist without grill." It is my own personal opinion that there are just about as many 24¢ Continentals in collections throught the country as 24¢ Nationals, but I know of no way in which 24¢ Continentals can be positively identified as such. This brings up the subject of listing the 24¢ Continental in the Scott Catalogue. No doubt such a stamp should be listed but the question arises, if it is listed, how would collectors be able to tell the difference between a National and Continental? The only guide that the S. U. S. gives the collector on the 30¢ and 90¢ is the shades. For example, the 30¢ National is listed as "Black" or "Full Black", and the 30¢ Continental as "Gray Black" and "Greenish Black." I wonder if all 30¢ Nationals come only in "Black" or "Full Black" and if no Continentals are found in such shades? In my opinion the same applies to classifying the 90¢ by color or shade.

#### A SUGGESTION FOR LISTING

Inasmuch as the three high values, the 24¢, 30¢ and 90¢, have no secret marks, and in my opinion, the majority of copies cannot be positively identified by color or shade, I suggest that the National and Continental prints, without grill be listed under one heading with a proper notation to the effect that these three values on hard paper cannot be positively identified by color alone. That would do away with guess-work and it would be an honest solution. If the advanced student wishes to classify his three high values as National and Continental there can be no objection, but in my opinion it would be much better to list these two printings as suggested above.

END OF ISSUE NO.46  
(Fourth Series - 1954-1955)  
January 1, 1955

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 47 - FEBRUARY 1, 1955 (Fourth Series - 1954-1955)

\*\*\*\*\*

WARNING

10¢ 1855-1857 - TYPE IV

Had anyone suggested a few years ago that any crook could take a 10¢ imperf or perforate Type III and paint in the top and bottom lines or both and make a Type IV out of it and deceive me with his product, I would have scoffed at the suggestion. In recent months some such faked items have appeared on the market which are extremely clever and they have reduced my ego to the zero mark. I have about come to the conclusion that the only positive way to detect the "paint copies" is to have any suspected specimen plated. I am positive about one thing - the faked copies are so very clever that anyone who examines them with a 6X or 10X glass will be wasting their time. One dealer informed me that he had looked over his stock and was quite sure that all of his copies are genuine. I would not bet a dime he was right. A prominent collector informed me that he was sure all of his items were perfectly good. I sincerely hope so.

The 1954 S.U.S. prices the double recut, plate position 6411, at \$185.00. There was only one position on the plate that was recut top and bottom, and this stamp seems to be the one the forger preferred to change from a Type III to a Type IV.

THE STAMP OF THE ARGONAUTS

It must have been along about 1917 that I first became interested in the 10¢ green and decided to accumulate material and see what I could do toward solving some of the problems of the plate. At that time everyone called it the "10¢ 1851" and we did not have the various types that we have today. For example, a Type IV was a "recut" stamp and a Type I was the stamp with "full shells." We didn't have a "S.U.S." at that time and the Scott listed the 10¢ imperf as #35 - Type I. A minor variety was 35B - "outer line recut." This was priced at \$10.00. All other 10¢ at \$1.50. Under 1857, a Type II, (our present Type V) was added and quoted @ 75¢.

When Major Carroll Chase came home from France after his release from the French army, in 1919, we got together and among other things that we decided was that I was to go ahead with my reconstruction of Plate One of the 10¢, and he would devote his entire attention to his study of the 3¢ 1851-57. We decided to give "types" to the 10¢ and to simplify them as much as possible to adopting the method of the 1¢ '51-'57 types. Thus the near complete 10¢ design - the "full shells" was to be Type I, the 10¢ with unbroken line at top was to be Type II - similar to the 1¢ Type II. The 10¢ with broken line at top and bottom was to be Type III, similar to the 1¢ Type III. The 10¢ "recut" was

to be Type IV, as per the recut 1¢ Type IV and the 10¢ from Plate 2 - with "incomplete sides" was to be Type V. This was indeed a very happy solution. I went ahead with my plate reconstruction work and was the first one to plate the entire bottom row and to prove that the Type I stamps came only from this row on the plate. When I started my reconstruction, the exact positions of the Type IV stamps was not known though it was known that seven of them were grouped together in some portion of the plate in their relationship to each other. When I first discovered the actual plate positions of the eight Type IV stamps I was under the impression that I was the first one to make this important discovery.

In the February 1921 issue of the American Philatelist appeared an article entitled, "NOTES ON THE TEN CENT 1855-1857 UNITED STATES ADHESIVES - By Carroll Chase and Stanley E. Ashbrook." It seems that by that time I had made considerable progress in my reconstruction of the plate and it was in this article that we gave to the philatelic world the new types of the 10¢. As I recall, I wrote most of the article and made all the illustrations, and referring to the recuts, my original manuscript read: "Ashbrook was the first one to discover the exact plate positions of the recuts," but when Chase went over the copy he changed the paragraph to read, quote: "Several years ago one of us (Chase) figured out what he supposed was the correct position on the plate of the various recuts but it remained for Ashbrook, working independently to prove the correctness of these positions beyond doubt, and also to locate the misplaced reliefs, the shifts, and other minor varieties and to reconstruct about 65% of the entire plate." (unquote). See A. P. Vol. 34 - No. 5 - February 1921. At that time Wm. C. Stone, of Springfield, Mass. was Editor.

In the years to follow I completed the reconstruction of the entire plate and about 75% of the Type V, Plate No. 2. I published a second article on the 10¢ 1855-57 that was published in the American Philatelist for October, November, December 1925 and January 1936, (Volume 49 - Nos. 1 to 4 inc., Adolph Fennel, Editor). This article was later published in booklet form by Harry L. Lindquist, (1936). Incidentally for this research work I was awarded the "Crawford Medal" by the Royal Philatelic Society of London. I mention all of the above just to demonstrate a single point. With all my experience with the 10¢ 1855-57, it seems that it was possible for some clever faker to convert a Type III stamp into a Type IV and get several of his copies by me. So if you have any 10¢ 1855-57 Type IV stamps and you are positive everyone is absolutely genuine, it is possible you might be mistaken. The present day philatelic crooks are far more clever than the average collector suspects.

Perhaps the greatest philatelic counterfeiter of all time is the one in Paris by the name of

Jean de Sperati

about whom quite a lot has appeared in the press in recent years. It has been stated by well-informed sources that this forger was known to be turning out counterfeits of rare stamps as early as the nineteen twenties but I doubt if many people in this country were aware that

such a person existed until five or six years ago. I believe that the great majority of Sperati's "imitations" have been British Colonials. It seems that he took common British stamps, bleached out the design, and thus had genuine paper, watermark and perforation. On this he printed his imitation of some rare stamp, and his products in many instances were such perfect imitations that they were pronounced genuine by many leading authorities on the Continent.

The U. S. stamps that Sperati counterfeited are as follows: 5¢ New York Postmaster, 5¢ Providence Postmaster, U. S. City Despatch Post, (S.U. Carrier), 10¢ 1847 and Confederates, the 10¢ Rose of 1862, a lithograph, (#5) and the "TEN," (#9) line engraved, copper plate. These six are the only U. S. stamps that are known to have been produced by him. All the originals were "LINE ENGRAVED" except the Confederate 10¢ Rose which was a lithograph flat print. I have carefully studied all six of these imitations and have little doubt that any one of them would easily deceive the average collector. For example, consider his 5¢ New York, - here is a counterfeit on a paper that was not exactly like the genuine but it is quite similar. The "A.C.M." was poor on the copy examined and lacked the appearance of the genuine. The design had every appearance of a line engraved stamp. I had no trouble at all in plating the copy as it had all(?) the plating marks of position #29 on the issued New York plate of forty subjects. Here was apparently a line-engraved stamp that plated as No. 29 - How could it be bad? This was not a flat print produced by photo-engraving but apparently line-engraved. With the plating marks that are constant on but one position on the genuine plate, one might well inquire how could this specimen be a counterfeit? The answer is that it was produced by the "Sperati method."

#### THE SPERATI PROVIDENCE

The Sperati counterfeit of a 5¢ Providence Postmaster is also an exceedingly clever piece of work. It also is easily identified as an imitation of position #12 on the engraved plate of twelve subjects. I believe there is a difference in certain parts of the design that identifies the imitation from the genuine and some claim that they can readily identify the Sperati by a side-by-side comparison of the paper of the genuine and the counterfeit. I suspect that copies of the Sperati are being offered in New York auctions quite frequently with no suspicion on the part of auction firms that the copies are spurious.

#### THE SPERATI 10¢ 1847

This counterfeit is a rather poor imitation of the original and its workmanship is not in the same class as his other imitations of U. S. line-engraved stamps. I doubt very much if copies can be plated. At least I was unable to identify the plate position of his counterfeit.

#### THE SPERATI METHOD

August Dietz of Richmond, Va., who recently passed his 80th birthday,

has been in the printing and engraving business all of his life and is a master craftsman. I imagine there is little about the art that is not thoroughly familiar to him. Mr. Dietz is also a gifted philatelist and the leading authority on the stamps of the "Lost Cause." Back in 1949 he published in a supplement to "The Confederate Bulletin" of December of that year an article entitled, The "Sperati" counterfeits of the Confederate "TEN." I am sure that many collectors and advanced students have been puzzled as to how Sperati managed to produce such clever counterfeits of line-engraved stamps, not surface print imitations, but line-engraved products, two of which to my knowledge are platable. Because Mr. Dietz is a real authority on this subject, I am taking the liberty of quoting from his article. He stated that "there is no belittling the fact that Sperati made a superb job" and stated, "I know how he did it (made the 'engraved' TEN)," then in a direct challenge to the forger he stated: "You have neither done anything new, nor do you possess a great secret that someday you will disclose or hand down to posterity." Thus Dietz debunked the belief that many held that Sperati had discovered some new and mysterious formula by which he could produce almost perfect imitations of rare postage stamps. Dietz continued: "You should know that any competent photo-engraver can do the same thing. You did not engrave this stamp (the TEN) xxx Your 'TEN' is not from an engraved intaglio plate, but from an etching, probably on copper. There is but a single stamp on your plate. You cannot supply pairs or blocks." Dietz then proceeded to explain how the forger made his imitation of the line-engraved Confederate "TEN." Sperati had a genuine copy, probably an early clear impression that he used for his master. This he put before a camera with a millimeter scale below and "blew it up" probably thrice the size, obtaining a clear, good contrast negative. This was the first step.

Dietz explained the next step as follows: "Then xxx this negative was placed against a white background and another exposure was made, this time reduced to the exact size of the authentic stamp governed by the millimeter scale that traveled with the exposures. This yielded a 'positive' film, on which the design was transparent and the background opaque - just the opposite of the first negative. After carefully developing this 'positive' and a critical inspection with a powerful glass, it was 'printed' on a small sheet of copper, coated with the sensitizing solution, in the usual manner of the photo-engraver, and then etched. This gave an intaglio plate, not for typographic production, but for real recess-plate printing. From this plate impressions were made in the same manner as plate printers work." (engraved work)

Dietz explained that the lines and dots on this etched plate would all be of the same depth, so Sperati "cleared up" some of the lines and deepened others with a "graver" - thus to eliminate "flatness."

In my opinion, the Dietz explanation is not as simple as one would infer. I seriously doubt if even an expert photo-engraver could turn out the class of precision work that Sperati produced unless he had spent years experimenting in the art of producing stamp "imitations." Surely Sperati must have employed the finest of photograph equipment, in fact, the finest of all equipment to produce such perfection in his "imitations."

### SPERATI - A PERFECTIONIST

I imagine that in each step of his work the forger was satisfied with nothing less than near perfection. His photographic work had to be superb, the sharpness of focus, the use of special panchromatic plates, the use of color filters, etc. When it came to the "etching process" I am sure that the utmost skill was required and especially so in the delicate operation of "retouching" his etched "die" from which he struck his impressions.

#### THE PAPER OF THE SPERATI "TEN."

Again referring to the Sperati Confederate "TEN" - Dietz explained that he had a test of the paper made by Raymond E. Kershner, an expert of Philadelphia, and his report stated that in his opinion the paper was composed of linen or cotton pulp. Had the examination disclosed a paper of wood pulp content, this alone would have been conclusive evidence of counterfeiting for only linen and cotton papers were commercially used in the eighteen sixties. Dietz stated: "The test by the Hertzberg formula indicated rag content - therefore it is a very good match-up with the stock of the genuine stamp." And so it is, in my humble opinion.

#### THE WAR RATE OF 1815-1816

We were a very young nation when we went to war with Great Britain in June of 1812. It seems that Congress took a very reckless risk in that step because the revenues of our Government were scarcely more than sufficient for its meager peace establishment. The very Congress, which voted the war refused to provide the taxes which it was told by the Secretary of the Treasury would be necessary to carry it on. The preceding Congress had refused to recharter the Bank of the United States, the Government's only effective financial agency, and the currency was already falling, as a consequence into hopeless confusion, running thru a quick depreciation. Yet we took on Great Britain, and though the British burned the White House and other public buildings Jackson scored a great victory at New Orleans, but before that event, peace had been signed at Ghent the day before Christmas 1814. And then came the job of paying for the war. One of the measures was an increase in the postal rates by 50% - this by an Act of Congress of December 23, 1814, the law to go into effect on February 1, 1815. It is interesting to note the two dates, Dec. 23, 1814, the Act of Congress and Dec. 24, 1814, the treaty of peace.

#### WAR RATE COVERS

The War Rate postage law expired as of March 31, 1816, and on April 1, 1816 the old rates were restored, hence covers of that period are referred to as the Restored Rate of April 1816, or for short, the Restored Rate. Such rates were only in effect during that month of April, because on May 1, 1816, an entirely new schedule of rates went into effect, and remained so until changed slightly by a revision by the Act of March 3, 1825. Thus during 1814 - 1815 and 1816, there were

three very interesting tables of postage rates, viz:

Old Rates to Jan. 31st, 1815 inclusive.

War Rates - Feb. 1, 1815 to March 31, 1816 inc.

Restored Rates (same as Old Rates - April 1 - April 30, 1816, inc.

New Rates - effective May 1, 1816.

#### PHILATELIC AMERICANA

Old covers of that period have long proved most interesting to me because they are truly Philatelic Americana. Every worth while collection that pretends to show something of our postal history should include examples of the War Rate covers and those of the Old Rates, Restored Rates and New Rates. Postage rates back in those early days were governed by two things, viz: (1) number of sheets of paper, (2) distance conveyed. What we term the Old Rates, were established by the Act of March 2, 1799 (1 Stat. 734-738-740). A single letter was composed of a single sheet of paper; a double consisted of two sheets; a triple was three sheets; a quadruple was four or more pieces of paper and weighing 1 ounce, etc., etc. A single letter conveyed not over 40 miles cost 8¢, a double 16¢, a triple 24¢, etc., etc. Over 40 miles, but not over 90 miles, cost 10¢ and so on for distances to over 500 miles, a single costing 25¢.

The War Rate added 50% to these rates, thus all sorts of combinations were possible, as for example, a single letter in February 1815 going a distance over 500 miles cost 37½¢. If it had two sheets of paper, and going the same distance, it was a double and rated 75¢. A ship letter was 2¢ in addition to the regular postage if conveyed beyond the port of entry. Thus a ship letter, single into Boston, addressed to an office 39 miles distant was rated C 8¢ plus 2¢ or 10¢. Seldom was postage prepaid in those days. A person wrote a letter, mailed it and let the addressee worry about the "due" on delivery. Way letters were 1¢ extra, thus we might find a Way cover with 8¢ plus 50% plus 1¢ Way or 13¢ due. Back in those days, the Drop letter rate was 1¢ but oddly enough we very seldom find a "Drop" that was used, say, before 1825.

#### A WAR RATE DROP

Recently my good friend Mr. D. N. McInroy of Seattle, showed me a cover of a class that I had never before run across, read about, heard about or even knew existed. A Drop letter of the War Rate period and showing a rate of 1½¢!!! This was a letter written outside of Albany, N.Y. - carried privately to that city and mailed as a Drop. An item that is many more times rarer (in my opinion) than a Post Express cover, but without the glamour of the letter. Mr. McInroy also showed me another little gem - a First Day cover of the Restored Rate, - a F.L. from New York on April 1, 1816. Just imagine!!! It is hard enough to locate a cover with the Restored Rate because such an item had to be used during one thirty-day period in the history of these United States. No doubt the McInroy cover is a unique item and just as scarce as the famed Hind British Guiana, said to be worth anywhere from \$50,000 to \$65,000. As I recall, Hind paid something like \$32,000 for that small piece of paper at a

Ferrary auction in Paris. I believe it was at that time that the saying originated, "One does not have to be crazy to be a stamp collector but it helps an awful lot." Which reminds me that F. W. R. was some sort of a stamp collector. They said he specialized in Haiti.

Incidentally I have no record of a "First Day," Feb. 1, 1815, War Rate cover.

#### THE LIVINGSTON, ALA.

##### CONFEDERATE POSTMASTER PROVISIONAL

When the war broke out between the states in 1861, the Confederate Government located at Richmond, Va., took over control of the postal system thruout the seceded states, on June 1st, 1861, but it was not until the middle of the following October that the Department was able to place any adhesive postage stamps on sale to the public. In the meantime many postmasters issued their own postage stamps and stamped envelopes. These are known as "Confederate Postmaster Provisionals." They run a wide range from some very crude stickers and handstamped envelopes to wood-cut prints and very handsome lithographs, but no line-engraved.

The Confederacy's most pretentious stamp of the first year of the war was a large size lithograph printed in blue on white wove paper, and issued at some unknown date in the last six months of 1861 by the Postmaster of Livingston, Ala. It is unquestionably the most artistic of the Provisionals.

The Mobile postmaster also issued an adhesive lithograph on similar white wove paper in two denominations, a 2¢ in black and a 5¢ in blue, a blue which is quite similar to the Livingston. Similarity in the designs of the two stamps suggest the possibility that both were the work of the same artist and were produced by the same firm in Mobile. Charleston, S.C. was the only other office to issue a lithograph Provisional and it was doubtless produced in that city.

I seriously doubt if many collectors fully appreciate the extreme rarity of the 5¢ Livingston, and especially of a cover bearing the artistic stamp. In the famous Seybold sale way back in 1910, there were a number of rare Confederate Provisionals but the Livingston was missing. In the Worthington sale in 1917, the Commodore had a wonderful lot of such historic items but again, no Livingston. In the famous Hind sale in the early nineteen thirties there was an off cover Livingston, but no cover. Hind purchased this copy in a Ferrary sale in Paris in the early nineteen twenties but I have no recollection that the famous Ferrary had a Livingston on the original cover.

Another well-known collector of Confederate Provisionals was the late George Wolcott whose Confederate collection was sold at auction in 1935. Wolcott had a single off cover of the Livingston but he did not possess

a cover  
book, "The Postal Service"

The design of the Livingston shows a large shield with stars, each representing a state of the Confederacy. Tennessee, June 8, 1861, being the eleventh and last southern state to leave the Union, hence it is possible that the Livingston stamp was not designed until after that date.

Mr. Harold C. Brooks of Marshall, Mich. succeeded in acquiring two beautiful Livingston covers many years ago and I am producing here a very fine photograph of one of these gems.

Photograph No. 190 illustrates one of the Ex-Brooks covers, a light yellow envelope with a superb single lightly tied by the Livingston postmark dated "NOV 15" (1861), and neatly addressed to "Green City, Ala." At top is "chg box 102." I suppose the writer sent the letter without a stamp to the Post Office by a slave, and the Postmaster attached one of his stamps, charged it to "Box 102" and postmarked same. Inasmuch as the Government stamps had been issued a month earlier perhaps he considered it wise to use up his stamps.

The S.U.S. quotes the Livingston @ \$1,750.00 used, and \$2,500.00 on cover. I consider such quotations are far too low. The last Dietz catalogue of Confederates was published in 1945, ten years ago, and even at that time it quoted the stamp as "used - \$3,000.00" - with no figure given for a cover.

In the issue of "Life" magazine, for May 3, 1954, a whole page of rare Confederate Provisionals were illustrated in color and it was stated that they were from the collection of "Pacificus," who, (quote) "has the world's best Confederate collection." "Pacificus" was none other than Mr. Alfred H. Caspary who passed away early last month.

A cover was illustrated with a horizontal pair of the 5¢ Livingston postmarked "NOV 12," just three days before the Ex-Brooks cover. I wonder if the single and pair were from the same sheet, the size of which is unknown to students of the stamps of the Lost Cause.

The Caspary cover is unique, it is the only cover known with a pair, and the pair is unique as it is the only one known, at least to me. "Life" stated the estimated value of this cover was \$12,000.00. In comparison to the Hind British Guiana said to be worth five times - I wonder?

END OF ISSUE NO.47  
(Fourth Series - 1954-1955)  
February 1, 1955

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 48 - MARCH 1, 1955 (Fourth Series - 1954-1955)

\*\*\*\*\*

THE SAGA OF A RARE STAMP

This story is about a rare U. S. stamp, a One Cent of 1851, from the first 1¢ plate made in the spring of 1851, the Type I, a 77LE, in unused condition, which the 1955 S. U. S. quotes @ \$7,500.00.

Recently it became known that the U. S. and Confederate collections formed by Miss Meta Heathcote, with the assistance of Mr. Perry Fuller, (Baltimore), had been acquired by the Weill Brothers of New Orleans, and that the very fine Confederate collection had been sold intact to an undisclosed client. Those who attended the New York Exhibition in 1947 (Cipex) and the Toronto International in 1951 will doubtless recall the frames exhibited by Miss Heathcote. It was stated that the U. S. collection contained many outstanding rarities, including all of the 1869 "inverts" in unused condition, the 15¢ being from the famous Ferrary collection, dispersed in Paris way back in the early nineteen twenties. And also especially mentioned was an unused copy of the U. S. One Cent 1851, Type I - 77LE. I suppose very few will remember this particular copy or have any record of its history, so for the present and future students of 19th U. S., I will give some facts about this stamp as I recorded them thru the past years.

First, take a glance at the famous names who owned this stamp in the past 35 years - Count Von Ferrary, Arthur Hind, Sir Nicholas Waterhouse, Spencer Anderson and Meta Heathcote.

THE LATE ARTHUR HIND

Perhaps few present day collectors have any knowledge of how Hind became so interested in forming a world famous stamp collection, so for the record, I will give a few facts. Along about 1913 or 1914, a small group of Cincinnati collectors, including Adolph Fennel, Samuel W. Richey, Gustave Mosler, William C. Kennett, Jr., the writer and others formed The Cincinnati Philatelic Society. Not long after this, Kennett's father died and "Bill" inherited something like a half million dollars, whereupon "Bill" decided to take a world tour. This was before the outbreak of World War I. On this tour was a very wealthy plush manufacturer from Utica, N. Y. by the name of Arthur Hind. As near as I can recall, I suppose Hind was in his early fifties at that time. It was not long that the two became fast friends, as they had much in common, especially "Scotch & Soda." Reaching various ports in the Far East, Bill made a bee-line to the post offices to see if any "remainders" were on hand and in this way Hind learned that Bill was a most enthusiastic "stamp collector" and Hind advised Bill that in his youth in Scotland he had collected stamps but had never possessed enough money to make much of a collection. Thus the pair found they had even more in common, and the above is how Hind's latent interest in stamps was renewed.

In the next years to follow Hind was a frequent visitor to Bill's home in Cincinnati and he seldom failed to spend an afternoon or evening in my stamp

den. Hind was very peculiar, and he did not want anyone at that time to know that he was a "stamp collector."

Well do I recall the sale of Commodore Worthington's collection in August of 1917 by J. C. Morgenthau & Co. Hind wanted a lot of the Confederate Postmaster Provisionals and he had me make up the bids. I kidded myself that I knew a lot about the value of such items and Hind must have taken me seriously. It developed that I was so conservative that Hind obtained very few items. Today, glancing thru the catalogue of that sale I note that I was the cause of Hind missing a whole flock of items he should have purchased.

As the nineteens drew to a close, Hind's purchases had become so widespread that it was no longer possible to keep his identity secret, and of course, he startled the philatelic world when he paid something like \$32,000.00 for the British Guiana at the Ferrary sale in Paris in 1922. This set a new record, never before had a canceled postage stamp brought anything like such a figure.

It was at the same Ferrary sale held in Paris, April 5-6-7, 1922, that Hind purchased an unused horizontal strip of the U. S. One Cent 1851, positions 7R1E - 8R1E - 9R1E, Types I - IB and IB, and on his return from France, he sent this strip to me along with a number of other items that he had purchased.

Figure #191 is a photograph of that One Cent strip that I made at that time, and this print is from the original negative. The strip cost him something like \$278.00. Just imagine!!! An illustration of the strip is shown in my One Cent book, Vol. 1, page 119, Fig. 15Z. This strip must have been one of the very earliest of impressions from the new plate because all of the lines of the designs are razor-sharp, in fact, the impression is as "sharp" as an early plate proof.

Naturally Hind's purchase of the famed British Guiana, (a miserable looking thing), made Hind world famous as a very wealthy "stamp collector," and he was deluged with offers from dealers and the public from all over. By the middle twenties his mail was so heavy, Kennett had to spend much time in Utica attending to it and thus "Bill" became known, as Hind's philatelic secretary. Hind died suddenly of a heart attack in the early nineteen thirties while wintering at Miami Beach. I happened to be spending the winter there at the time and was astonished to read in a Miami paper of his passing. I was not aware he was down there.

So much for the famous Arthur Hind, who doubtless received more newspaper publicity about his philatelic activities than any one person in this country before or since.

#### THE FIRST HIND SALE

Kennett and the late Charlie Phillips were appointed by the Executor of the Hind Estate to conduct the first auction sale of the Hind collection. It was held at the old Waldorf Astoria Hotel on NOV. 20 to 24 inc. 1933. The strip with the 7R1E was lot #108 and was described as "unused, no gum - superb," catalogue value \$5,000.00 - One Type I, two Type IB. It was sold to "Burriss"

9  
Page #378

© \$2,500.00. After the sale I lost all track of the item for several years.

#### IN THE WATERHOUSE COLLECTION

The International Philatelic Exhibition was held in New York in May 1936, the first in this country since 1926. Among the fine exhibitions of 19th U. S. was that of Sir Nicholas Waterhouse of London, England, the greatest student and collector of U. S. postal issues outside of our country. In the Waterhouse exhibit was the Ex-Ferrary - Hind 7RLE strip.

In Godden's monthly magazine (London) for February 1937 was an article about the Waterhouse U. S. collection and included was an illustration of the 7RLE strip.

During World War II, there was a "Red Cross" auction sale of philatelic material held in London in May 1943. According to the story as related to me, Sir Nicholas cut off the Type I, 7RLE, and donated it to the Red Cross sale. I have no record of the price it brought but the stamp was purchased by the late Spencer Anderson, well known New York dealer. Sir Nicholas had remaining a magnificent unused pair of the Type IB and in all probability this rare item will be offered in the Waterhouse sale to be held the last of June, this coming summer. Here we have an excellent photograph.

9  
The 1955 S. U. S. quotes the 8RLE (IB), unused, @ \$650.00 and a 9RLE (IB), unused, @ \$200.00. A person collecting nothing but U. S. 19th in unused condition would doubtless find it most difficult to acquire a Type IB in unused condition, much less a pair of 8 and 9.

#### THE FERRARY - HIND - 7RLE

In June 1943 Spencer Anderson sent the 7RLE to me, priced @ \$2,500.00 and wrote, quote: "You are correct, my 7RLE is from the Hind strip. I bought it at the Red Cross auction in London last month, and it was donated by Sir Nicholas Waterhouse." (unquote)

Soon after this, Anderson sold the stamp thru Perry Fuller to Miss Meta Heathcote.

Again, I reiterate, that in so many cases it is the story behind a valuable stamp, or cover, that adds so much to its interest, and possibly to its value. Incidentally, the Ferrary sale of April 1922 was given quite a write-up in the "A.P." for May 1922. It was in this sale that Hind purchased the British Guiana, the 7RLE strip, the Boscawen for \$7,200, and many other rarities. I note an Alexandria brought \$6,400, a Baltimore \$6,400, a Lockport \$8,000 and a New Haven \$5,100.

#### THE 1926 INTERNATIONAL SHOW

9  
In November of 1926, the International Exhibition was held in New York City and Hind exhibited portions of his magnificent collection. I was his dinner guest and sat at his right-hand at the banquet held at the Hotel Astor. Well do I remember how much he coveted the "Grand Award" and how great was his disappointment when the award went to the late Alfred Lichtenstein but he

was a good sport and concealed his chagrin and was among the first to congratulate the winner. Alfred Lichtenstein was a great student of philately, Arthur Hind was no student, but a man with unlimited means who "collected" stamps. I believe that this award demonstrated the fact that an unlimited amount of cash could not purchase an international "Grand Award."

Twenty-one years later, in 1947, at the "Cipex" in New York City, I sat at the banquet table as the guest of the late Saul Newbury of Chicago when the "Grand Award" went to that great philatelist.

#### AND FINALLY

I suppose the Ferrary - Hind 7RLE has by this time passed into the collection of some new owner unknown to me. If that bit of paper could but talk, perhaps it could well remember the "Great Ferrary" and how and when and from whom the Count acquired that strip of 7-8-9RLE of the One Cent 1851.

#### THE 3¢ 1857 - TYPE IIA

The 1955 S. U. S. lists as 1857, #26A - 3¢ dull red, Type IIA, and prices it unused @ \$3.00 and used @ \$1.00. A single on cover is quoted @ \$1.50, and a pair unused @ \$7.50, used @ \$2.50. A strip of three @ \$12.00 and \$4.50 and a block of four @ \$50.00 and \$35.00. It is my conviction that these prices do not reflect the semi-scarcity of the stamp called the IIA. In other words, the S. U. S. quotations are either too low or else singles and multiples are not as scarce as I believe they are. No living person knows as much about the stamp and the plates which produced this type as Dr. Carroll Chase and I understand that the Doctor estimates that the common Type II of the 3¢ 1857 is 16 times more common than the Type IIA. The Type II catalogues at 25¢, and if the IIA is 16 times scarcer, it appears that the latter should be quoted at \$4.00 (used) instead of a dollar. A pair of the Type II is quoted at 60¢ - compared to \$2.50 for the IIA. A block of four of Type II @ \$20.00 compared to \$35.00 for the Type IIA. In my opinion it would be wise to acquire any and all nice items of this under-priced variety before quotations are changed.

I suggest that you refer to page 35 in the 1955 S. U. S. for a well-worded description of the two types, but in brief the side frame lines on the Type II are continuous from the top to the bottom of the plate, but on the Type IIA - the side frame lines extend only from the top to the bottom of the stamp design.

#### THE FIRST S. U. S.

The First Edition of the S. U. S. was published by the Scott Stamp & Coin Co. in 1923. Eugene H. Costales was the Editor. No mention was made of the stamp we know today as the "Type IIA." In the 1924 edition, under the 3¢ 1857, Type II was listed as a minor variety "Vertical frame lines extend only to top and bottom of stamp." The quote was unused \$3.00 - used \$1.00. Through all the ensuing years up to and including the 1952 edition, the Type IIA was listed just the same, as a minor variety, with the same wording as the 1924 edition. In the 1952 the quote was unused \$5.00, used \$1.00. The 1953 S. U. S. at long last, gave recognition to the variety and gave it a major

listing as #26A - Dull Red - Type IIA - July 1857. The quote was, unused \$3.00 and the old 1924 price of \$1.00 for a used copy.

Figure #192 illustrates an unused block of six of the 26A, Type IIA. This block was plated by Dr. Chase as 81R10<sup>L</sup> - 82 - 83, and 91R10<sup>L</sup> - 92 - 93. In other words, from the Late condition of Plate 10 - right pane - ninth and tenth horizontal rows - positions as stated. Incidentally, 91R in this block shows a rather nice double transfer (shift) in the bottom label. And further, this block shows double vertical rows of perforations. Note how the side frame lines are not continuous, but end at the top and bottom of each design.

Serious philatelic research is indebted to Dr. Chase for practically all that is known regarding the Type IIA and the two plates from which the stamps were printed, so bear in mind that all the data that I record is from his marvelous work. The Type IIA comes from the 3¢ 1857 plates 10 and 11, of which there were three states or conditions of each plate, viz: "Early," "Intermediate" and "Late." Thus 200 different positions to each state, or 600 to each plate, or a total of 1200 to the two plates.

9  
I believe that Dr. Chase has practically completed the reconstruction of these two plates in their three different states, some 1200 positions. I have done some original plate reconstruction work in my time, but I marvel at this almost incredible accomplishment by Dr. Chase. Just imagine putting this intricate puzzle together, piece by piece, over long years and being able to discover that each plate had three different "conditions" and being able to reconstruct each condition.

According to Chase, these two plates were surely the first two 3¢ plates made in the spring of 1857 with a six relief transfer roll, each of the reliefs having had the top and bottom lines removed. After the two plates were transferred an engraver went over the 400 positions on the two plates and recut the vertical side frame lines. These two plates were numbered #10 and #11. At the same time, four similar plates were transferred from the same transfer roll, but instead of recutting just the side frame lines on each position, continuous vertical side lines were cut, from the top to bottom of each plate. These four plates were numbered 9 - 12 - 13 - and 14. In months to follow, plates 15 to 28 inclusive, were similarly transferred and recut with continuous side lines. In brief all 3¢ 1857 Type II stamps come from Plates 9 and 12 to 28 inclusive, and all Type IIA stamps come from Plates 10 and 11.

9  
Although Plate 9 was made after Plates 10 and 11, it was given a prior plate number. And incidentally, Plate 9 had two conditions, Plate 9 Early (9E) and Plate 9 Late (9L). Dr. Chase has also succeeded in reconstructing both conditions of this plate. It is his belief, that Plates 12 to 28 inc., had only one condition. All Type IIA stamps look the same to me and I marvel at Chase being able to examine a single and to identify it as coming from one of the six conditions of Plates 10 and 11 and further to identify its relief and lastly the exact plate position. Remember there were 1200 different. If you possess a number of 3¢ 1857, examine them with a good glass and see how many you can identify as Type IIA.

I note in the current number of GOSSIP, issue of February 26, 1955, quite a fine article by Tracy W. Simpson, entitled, "HOW TO IDENTIFY SCOTT'S NO 26A - US. 3¢ 1857." I heartily recommend this article to those who are interested in my remarks as above. The original Chase 3¢ 1851-1857 book was published in 1929 - a revised edition in 1942.

AGAIN WE REFER TO THE  
24¢ - 30¢ and 90¢ of 1870 - 1873

In the January 1955 Issue of this Service, I discussed the three high values of the Bank Note Issues of 1870-1873, by the National & Continental Bank Note Companies and I offered the following:

A SUGGESTION FOR LISTING

Inasmuch as the three high values, the 24¢, 30¢ and 90¢, have no secret marks, and in my opinion, the majority of copies cannot be positively identified by color or shade, the exception being copies of the National on genuine covers with year dates prior to July 1, 1873. I suggest that the National and Continental prints, without grill be listed under one heading with a proper notation to the effect that these three values on hard paper cannot be positively identified by color alone as to whether they are National or Continental. That would do away with guess-work and it would be an honest solution. If the advanced student wishes to classify his three high values as National and Continental there can be no objection, but in my opinion, it would be much better to list these two printings as suggested above.

A WELL KNOWN STUDENT AGREES

Under date of January 12th, 1955, my good friend Lester G. Brookman, wrote me as follows, quote:

"While I think that some of us can tell some of the Nationals and Continentals apart some of the time, I'm certain that none of us can tell all of them apart all the time! Furthermore, it should be recognized that almost without exception we judge these shades on what we have been told are the Nationals and Continentals and not on actual PROOF.

Your idea about only one listing for the non-grilled hard paper 24¢, 30¢ and 90¢ is, I imagine, the only PRACTICAL solution. I wonder if anyone can actually PROVE whether any off cover copies of those stamps is a National or a Continental printing? I know that you and I might be convinced that certain stamps were from certain printings but to prove the point might be impossible. So far as the average collector is concerned, (and most advanced collectors and dealers as well), it has been my experience that they simply cannot distinguish between the stamps involved. Nor could they be expected to do so. I certainly don't think that I can bat 1000% on them, I doubt very much if you, or Perry, or Ward, or any other genuine expert can do so, and I think none of us would claim to do so!

So why not drop the pretense, intimated by the catalog makers, (including myself!), that this can be done. We should quit dreaming and face reality."  
(unquote)

The above was written a couple of weeks before some fiend forced his way into the home of Mr. Brookman one night and shot him point blank with a 32 revolver in the chest. That the bullet missed his heart by an inch or less was a miracle. His legion of friends thank Providence for his recovery.

CONFEDERATE STATES PROVISIONAL  
THE LIVINGSTON, ALA.

In last month's issue of this "Service" I included some remarks on the Confederate, Livingston, Ala. Postmaster Provisional, and since that time I endeavored to learn if any other prominent collections of Confederates possessed a Livingston on cover, but so far that search has been unsuccessful. Covers actually known to me are the -

- Two - Ex-Brooks (singles on cover)
- One - Caspary collection with a pair.

Some believe that the Caspary collection also has a cover with a single, some suggest there are two such covers, but so far I have been unable to locate anyone who is positive. Thus there is little doubt that a Livingston cover is far more rare than is generally supposed, and in my opinion, the quotations in the S. U. S. should be left blank or corrected, if for no other reason than to properly reflect the scarcity of such a cover. Present quotations are purely guess-work.

Mr. T. W. Crigler, Ur. of Macon, Miss., is the efficient Sec'y & Treas. of the Confederate Philatelic Society, called the "CONFEDERATE STAMP ALLIANCE." With reference to a Livingston cover, Mr. Crigler recently wrote me a very interesting letter and with his permission I am quoting from it as follows:

"Speaking of this stamp, reminds me of a very interesting happening of about a year ago. I was on my way home from the coast and stopped by an old house in Meridian, Mississippi, and as usual asked the lady of the house if she had any old stamps. She rummaged around and found some old correspondence, and I got an Atlanta, Georgia provisional envelope, and a couple of covers with 5¢ typos. In the course of the conversation the lady told me that her mother moved to Meridian from Livingston at the outbreak of the war, and that her boy friend wrote her every day, using a stamp made in Livingston. She said as this was not a regular government stamp, she supposed it was of no value! She described the stamp exactly, and further stated that there should still be some of them around the house, as her mother had numerous letters bearing this stamp, and had burned them. I remained around for upward of two hours, and we just about took the place apart, but no luck. After I told her about the stamp and the value, she nearly fainted, as she said she was sure she had also destroyed some of these stamps. As they were not in the best of financial circumstances, a few of these would have been a God send to them." (unquote)

MAIL TO FRANCE

PRIOR TO APRIL 1, 1857

Upon numerous occasions in past issues of this "SERVICE" I have included re-

marks about covers to France, prior to April 1, 1857, with postage payments of five cents, either by cash (stampless) or by postage stamps. Again I mention that this payment on mail to France from February 15, 1849 to April 1, 1857, was the "U. S. Internal" under the U.S.-British Postal Treaty of 1848. It is frequently referred to as the "U. S. Shore-to-Ship Rate," which term is incorrect because prior to the effective date (Feb. 15, 1849), of the U.S.-British Treaty there was a "Shore-to-Ship" charge which was actually the U. S. domestic rate. The "U. S. Internal" was not the domestic rate but was a payment provided under the terms of the said treaty.

"THE FIVE CENTS INTERNAL"

The following remarks have reference solely to -

(1) Mail to France with sailings from Boston or New York, By British Packet, (Cunard, British subsidy) Via England to France - during the period 2/15/49 to 3/31/57 inclusive.

(2) Methods of payment of the five cents by postage stamps.

REGARDING METHODS OF PAYMENT

The remarks to follow are principally devoted to how the 5¢ was paid. From Feb. 15, 1849 to June 30, 1851, inclusive, a single rate (5¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz.), to France could have been paid with a 5¢ 1847. Apparently mail to France at that time from this country was not as great as in the middle fifties and later, and the bulk of such mail seems to have been paid by cash or charge, (stampless). Incidentally, this "5¢ Internal" had to be prepaid. Under the Treaty, payment of this 5¢ was not optional. What I am attempting to fully explain and to emphasize is, that covers to France with the 5¢ 1847 stamp are extremely scarce. They are not just another 5¢ 1847 cover. If you have such an item in your collection you are fortunate, because the chances are, it would bring a great deal more than you paid for it in case you desired to part with it.

Last month in New York on the 24th, Robert Siegel held a sale. Lots 54 and 55 were two covers to England from New Orleans in 1848, prior to the time that we had a postal treaty with Britain. These two covers can be classed as "Shore-to-Ship," but the payments were merely the U. S. domestic rate from origin to port of departure by a British mail ship. Lot 54 with the pair of 5¢ 1847 sold C \$400.00, and Lot 55, the cover with the 10¢ 1847 sold C \$390.00. While I consider 1847 covers to foreign countries very desirable items to include in a collection, such prices as the above seem a bit out of all reason. From the above I again call attention to the fact that there are two classes of covers to foreign countries with 1847 stamps, viz: (1) Before the British Treaty. (2) During the life of the Treaty (1849-1851). I might add that 1847 covers to France, to Belgium, to Holland and the German States are much more elusive than those to Britain.

TO FRANCE, 1851 - 1857

As of July 1, 1851, the 1847 stamps became invalid for postal use, hence the "5¢ Internal" to France, if paid by stamps required a 3¢ 1851 and two of the

1¢ 1851, or five 1¢ 1851. The 5¢ imperforate of 1856 was not issued until March 1856. After that time, there were therefore three ways in which the payment could be made.

I wonder if many collectors appreciate the relative scarcity of such covers, and that a cover with five 1¢ 1851 is far scarcer than a cover with a 5¢ 1856. The usual cover bears a 3¢ '51 and two 1¢ 1851. Much scarcer is a cover with a single 5¢ 1856 and very much more rare is a cover with five 1¢ 1851. In this connection, I have no record, or recollection, of ever seeing such a cover with a vertical strip. I really wonder if such an item exists?

Photograph No. 193, is a print of three photographs showing the three 5¢ payments by stamps. The top cover with a 5¢ 1856 (193A) shows a use from New Orleans on Nov. 16th, 1856. The French due is "13" decimes. The center cover (193B) shows a use from New Orleans, Oct. 1, 1854, with a horiz. strip of five (5) of the 1¢ 1851, Type IV. This also has "13" decimes due. The bottom cover, (193C) shows a use from New Orleans in January 1857 with a 3¢ 1851 and a pair of the 1¢ 1851 - Type IV. The handstamped curved line at right is the French due of 5 decimes.

U. S. - FRENCH POSTAL TREATY OF 1857  
EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 1857

The first postal treaty between the U. S. and France went into effect on April 1st, 1857 and as of that date mail to that country with 5¢ payments were contrary to the terms of the treaty, which required non-recognition of any partial payments of a full rate, single, double, quad., etc. at the rate of 15¢ per quarter ounce.

FRENCH POSTAGE DUE

Up until about Jan. 1st, 1857, French postage due amounts on mail to France by British Packet Via Britain were in multiples of 13 decimes per  $7\frac{1}{2}$  grammes, thus 13 - 26 - 39 - 52 - 65 - 78 - 91 - 104, etc., but on or about 1st of Jan., 1857, a new postal treaty between Britain and France went into effect and the rates as above were reduced from 13 decimes to 8 decimes, and multiples thereof. This means that the French postal due amounts on U. S. mail were different for the first quarter of 1857, than previously. To be explicit they were as follows per  $7\frac{1}{2}$  grammes, - 8 - 16 - 24 - 32 - 40 - 48 - 56 - 64, etc. Covers 193A and 193B show 13 decimes, indicating that these two letters did not weigh over  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce in the U. S. or over  $7\frac{1}{2}$  grammes in France. Cover 193C is of the first quarter of 1857 and shows 5 decimes due. I therefore judge this was a piece of circular mail, as all U. S. first-class mail had a minimum of 8 decimes due in France in the first quarter of 1857.

Photograph #194 is a photograph of three photographs of three interesting covers, numbered 194A, 194B and 194C. Regarding these three items:

Cover 194A. Why 7¢? The answer is obvious, some faker removed a 3¢ 1851 and substituted a 5¢ 1856. This cover was from New Orleans on March 23, 1856, and is in the same class as photos 193A and 193B. This faked cover was Lot 64 in the Gibson sale by Ward on June 14, 1914 and it cost the late Spencer Anderson \$85.00. I suppose the present owner is totally unaware it is a fake.

Probably some of Zareski's monkey-business.

Cover 194B. A 3¢ '51 plus a pair of 1¢ '51 from New Orleans in January of 1857, therefore, a first quarter of 1857 cover. Instead of the former "13" decimes due, this has "8" decimes. Compare this cover with No. 193C. The former has the British "accounting mark" (to France) of "G.B. 40c" whereas the latter (193C) has the British accounting mark of "G.B. 1f 60c." The "40c" is extremely rare on covers of this three months period, whereas the "1f 60c" is the usual type. In this connection, I wish to emphasize that these markings were not used on U. S. mail to France (Via Britain) before Jan. 1, 1857, or possibly before late in December of 1856. They were apparently provided for in the new Anglo-French Postal Treaty of September 1856 which went into effect either sometime in December 1856 or Jan. 1, 1857.

Cover 194C shows a use from New Orleans on Feb. 12, 1856, to Paris, France. It has a horizontal strip of four of the One Cent 1851, Type II and a single Type IV - Similar to covers 193A, 193B and 194A, it shows French due of 13 decimes (approximately 25¢).

IN CONCLUSION

What I had in mind at the beginning of my remarks on 5¢ payments to France was to discuss a very rare cover, photo 193B, a cover that I would much prefer to own than one with a single 5¢ 1856, but to give a true appreciation of this cover I found it necessary to go into much detail.

For the record, this cover was Lot 71 in the sale by H. R. Harmer in London, on Dec. 6, 1954.

\*\*\*\*\*  
END OF ISSUE NO. 48  
(Fourth Series - 1954-1955)  
MARCH 1, 1955.

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE  
\*\*\*\*\*

STANLEY B. ASHBROOK  
P. O. Box 31  
33 N. Ft. Thomas Ave.,  
FORT THOMAS, KENTUCKY.

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 49 - APRIL 1, 1955 (Fourth Series - 1954-1955)

\*\*\*\*\*  
3¢ 1851, S.U.S. #11C - BISECT  
"VERTICAL HALF USED AS 1¢ ON COVER"

Photograph No. 195, illustrates two fake bisects tied by the same postmark of Lowell, Mass. The third item in upper left is a cover with a 3¢ 1851 and a genuine strike of the Lowell Office, a use probably about 1854 or 1855. The 3¢ and 12¢ bisects are both on pieces and both have the same date, viz., "AUG. 3."

Regarding the 3¢, this is on the left end of a buff envelope and shows part of an address. This item has been known for many years, and as far as I am aware, it was never questioned, at least I never questioned it, though I must admit I would have had more faith in it had it been a whole envelope showing an address and the reason why only 1¢ postage was required. This item was illustrated in the Chase book, "The 3¢ 1851-1857," original edition (1929), on page 215. Dr. Chase stated, quote: "As an example of a bisected stamp on part cover, I have the right vertical half of a 3¢ 1851 on one-third of a buff envelope cancelled with a black town postmark reading, "Lowell, Mass. Aug. 3," which covers the cut and ties it to the envelope xxxxx. If the envelope was only entire it could be accepted, etc." (unquote). For the record, the Chase book was first published in a series of articles that appeared in the "American Philatelist" in the middle nineteen twenties. This Lowell 3¢ bisect was illustrated in the December 1924 issue, Vol. 30, No. 3, on page 137. The Lowell postmark covering the 3¢ half appears very similar to the genuine marking of "May 27" but it is surely not from the same stamper. This does not mean that the strike on the 3¢ and 12¢ halves is fraudulent, because there may have been two stampers in the Lowell Office, which were very similar but slightly different. I suppose it is possible that some dishonest person came into possession of one of the original stampers and used it to make these two "rarities," and no doubt others which may be reposing in collections throught the country.

Last summer I acquired the 3¢ item in order to make a careful test of it. I carefully removed the half stamp by moistening the inside of the piece and then I made several enlarged photographs by ultra-violet to see if there was any trace on the part envelope of the postmark under the half stamp. There wasn't the slightest trace, thus proving to my satisfaction that the half 3¢ stamp was on the part envelope when the strike tying it, was made. This convinced me that the item must be genuine. In addition, a careful examination of the genuine black ink on the 3¢ 1851 cover (upper left in photograph) seemed to match that of the bisect.

Last month, I discovered the 12¢ item in the collection of Mr. X (deceased), and it is proof conclusive that both items are fraudulent. The 12¢ is not on a part of an envelope but on just a piece of buff paper, and it is dated the same as the 3¢ fake, viz., "AUG. 3." I believe that the chances are that some person got hold of an old stamper and made these fakes.

For fear that some might question my mention that the 3¢ fake was illustrated in the Chase book, I wish to assure them that Dr. Chase advised me that he did not have the slightest objection. I believe that all fake material should be dragged out into the open and given all the publicity possible. I certainly have no illusion that I am always 100% correct in spotting fakes and I do not consider it a disgrace to be fooled by some clever faker who has spent a lifetime perfecting his dishonest work. Knowing Dr. Carroll Chase as I do, I am sure he feels the same way.

Regarding the 12¢ fake. There was no memorandum as to where the owner obtained this item or the price paid, but I imagine the cost was not cheap, and of course, it will prove a total loss.

FOREIGN RATE COVERS OF THE  
EIGHTEEN FIFTIES

After one has collected and studied foreign rate covers for many years of the period prior to the Civil War, he comes to appreciate the evident scarcity of covers to certain countries in Europe. For example, covers to Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Portugal, and to some extent to Spain and the smaller nations. To emphasize this feature, I am illustrating and describing in detail, a cover to Sweden mailed from a town in Pennsylvania in March 1857. I consider this quite an early date - 1857 - for such a piece of mail, because I doubt if a great many people from that country had emigrated to the States that early. At least, the scarcity of covers sent back to the fatherland would indicate as much.

Photograph No. 196, illustrates the above mentioned item. It shows origin from Columbus, Pa., on March 19, 1857, with a rate of 42¢ (per  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce) prepaid by a horizontal strip of three of the 10¢ 1855 and a horizontal pair and two singles of the 3¢ 1851. This was the rate by "Prussian Closed Mail" at that period. See the Foreign Rate Table, Ashbrook One Cent book, Vol. 2, page 345 - the 1857 P. L. & R. This letter went to New York, thence in a closed pouch thru England and Belgium to Aachen (Prussia), where the bag was opened and mail distributed to various destinations by the Prussian Mail. The rate to Prussia at that time was 30¢, out of which the U. S. retained 23¢ and credited Prussia with 7¢ for delivery in Prussia beyond Aachen. It will be noted there is a red "19" on this cover. This was the 7¢ + 12¢ credit to Prussia, for transmitting the letter from Aachen, which meant, payment to England and Belgium for their part in the transmission. This charge of these two countries was arrived at by bulk weight rather than by a charge for each single letter. The Aachen marking has "5-4" meaning arrival there, on April 5 - and "FRANCO," meaning Paid. Tying the 10¢ stamp at right, is the postmark of Helsingborg, with "8" above a "4" between "18" on the left and "57" to right. In other words, arrival there was on April 8, 1857. On the back is the red "ALL. PKT" of New York dated "Mar 21." The back markings indicate that this letter was sent from Aachen (AIX-LA-CHAPELLE) to Hamburg and thru error was delivered to the Danish Postal Agency, from whence it was turned over to the Swedish P. C. Dept., and thence by ship to Helsingborg as per above arrival marking of Apr. 8, 1857.

A circular marking on back has "KDOPA - HAMBURG," with center date of 6 - 4 (Apr 6). These initials stood for KUNGLIGE DANSK ORTS POST APT, or "Royal Danish Postal District" in Hamburg. Another circular marking reads, "KSPA - 6 over 4 - 1857 - and at bottom, Hamburg." This was "Kungliga Svenska Post

Agenturn" or "Royal Swedish Postal Agency." On the face is a manuscript "F5" in red which was a control mark put on at Aachen for mail to be delivered outside Germany or Austria.

My thanks to Carl Pelander for the analysis of the back markings. He also informed me that the "KLOPA" and the "KSPA" are individual transit markings, but to find both on one cover is most unusual.

Columbus, Pa. is a small village on the Erie R. E. way up in the Northwestern part of the state.

This is quite an interesting and desirable cover.

TO VERA CRUZ, MEXICO IN 1856

Years ago a very valuable "find" of U. S. covers was made in Mexico, consisting mainly of covers from New Orleans to Vera Cruz with singles and multiples of the 10¢ 1855-57, and the 12¢ 1851-57, together with other values of the 1851 to 1860 issues inclusive. This was the "Hargous correspondence" and it furnished U. S. collectors with many very fine and rare pieces.

In the eighteen fifties we did not have a postal treaty with Mexico, hence mail could not be prepaid from Origin in either country to destination in the other. I believe that the bulk of the Eastern mail from the U. S. to Mexico was dispatched via New Orleans by steamship to Vera Cruz. The steamship rate was 10¢ per half ounce.

Photograph No. 197, illustrates one of the superb gems from the Hargous find, a part of a white folded letter from New Orleans to Vera Cruz on May 1, 1856, the six times rate paid by a horizontal strip of six of the 10¢ 1855, Type III, plate positions 65R1 to 70R1 inclusive. There is a black "9" on the face, which was the Mexican postage due. A cover with a horizontal strip of six of the 10¢ stamp of 1855 is most extraordinary and this is really a show piece and genuine in every respect.

3¢ PLUS 1¢

Photograph No. 198, shows a One Cent 1851 used in May 1863 as a "carrier" (collection fee), from a letter-box to the New York P.O. The One Cent stamp was demonetized during the months of August and September of 1861. The original letter is in the envelope and it was from a young female friend to the addressee, a Reverend Anderson, way out in Davenport, Iowa. This young lady was visiting friends at "Bedford, Long Island, N.Y.," which she stated was near Brooklyn. Her letter was dated "May 18, 1863." The writer stated that she and her friends were going to drive over to New York that afternoon to attend a funeral "on 47th St.," and as they proceeded up Broadway she would drop the letter in a "lamp-post box." We wonder where she got this "old stamp" and why she thought she could use it to pay the "Carrier fee" to the New York Post Office. Perhaps not to the main office, but to a branch office. Perhaps the reader will wonder why the P.O. clerk did not mark this letter "Old stamp not recognized," and "Due 1ct." The answer is, that the "collection" carrier fee had to be prepaid, it was not permissible to collect such a fee from the addressee. The official ruling pertaining to a letter dropped in a lamp-post

box without payment of the 1¢ collection fee and no evidence of the address of the writer, was to notify the addressee that the Post Office was holding a letter on which the collection fee had not been paid and if the addressee would forward 1¢, or a 1¢ stamp, the letter would be despatched. If no reply was received the letter was sent in due course to the Dead Letter Office and the writer notified to send 4¢ and the letter would be returned to the writer. Imagine all that red tape to obtain a payment of One Cent. In this case, I suppose the P.O. clerk thought it foolish to go to all that trouble, so he shut his eyes to the old stamp and permitted the letter to go thru in its normal course. Here we have a most interesting and unusual cover, an "old stamp" that "got by." Perhaps the young lady intended that it should and took a chance and her letter "got by."

When "lamp-post boxes" first came into use, a lot of people dropped 3¢ letters, that were addressed to points outside, without payment of the 1¢ collection fee and when such letters reached the main post offices of Boston, New York and Philadelphia (these three for example), the postal clerks stamped them "Due 1 Cent" and sent them on their way. But this practice was soon prohibited by the Postmaster General because a "Carrier's fee" was a "fee" and not "postage" and it was ruled illegal to collect a "fee" as "postage" due. Incidentally, such "Due 1¢" covers are eagerly sought by students of our early Carrier System.

Another point in connection with this cover. This postmark date is "May 19, 1863." A little over a month later, the "collection fee" and "delivery fee" became obsolete as the "new Carrier System" went into effect in certain major cities of the country on July 1, 1863 and the "3¢ plus 1¢" became obsolete.

What an unusual cancellation was used on the 3¢ stamp, a regular "killer" that really killed that 3¢ stamp. It is rather unusual and I wonder if this killer was used at one of the branch New York post offices? It sure is the story behind the cover that lends individuality to it and makes it something more than just another cover.

#### FROM CANADA TO NEW YORK CITY

Photograph No. 199, illustrates a pale blue folded letter dated inside "Quebec - 5th February 1850." It bears two singles of the 5¢ 1847, tied to the cover by a red encircled "10." The red Quebec postmark is, "FE - 5 - 1850." At upper right is the crown marking in red, "PAID AT QUEBEC, L.C." The letter is addressed to "D. S. Kennedy, Esq - New York." At top right is penned "Pd to lines," or to be explicit, "Canadian postage paid to the border." At that period, Canada did not have postage stamps and postages were paid in cash or by charge. On the back is a red postmark of "MONTREAL - FE 7 1850 - L.C." Here we have what I consider a very interesting piece of postal history, i.e., U.S. stamps put on at Quebec, to pay the 10¢ rate from the Canadian border to New York. At this period we did not have a postal treaty with Canada whereby a letter from either country could be prepaid to destination in the other. Some banks and business firms in Canada kept supplies on hand of our 1847 stamps and used them on rail to the States to pay the U. S. rate (domestic). (from the border exchange towns to destinations). As a reminder, the U. S. rates at that time were, "under 300 miles, 5¢ and over 300 miles, 10¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce." The Canadian postage paid was "4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d" or "4 $\frac{1}{2}$  pence currency," (not sterling).

This is shown to right in red manuscript. Montreal and New York exchanged mail in "Through Bags," hence this letter which originated at Quebec was sent to Montreal, put in a sealed pouch, and sent direct to New York, crossing the border at "Rouses Point, N.Y." Incidentally, Quebec is down the St. Lawrence River, 168 miles Northeast of Montreal.

DAVID S. KENNEDY

This letter was addressed to "D. S. Kennedy - New York." Kennedy was the proprietor of a private bank in Wall St., New York, and his bank was the fiscal agent in the U. S. of the Canadian Government. The "Kennedy find" was a large and very valuable philatelic correspondence.

Regarding the red encircled "10" used to cancel the two 5¢ stamps. This was a rating stamp used at the New York Post Office and in this case, it was used merely as a killer. The great majority of mail reaching the New York P.O. at that time in "through sealed bags" from Montreal arrived without payment of the U. S. postage, hence were rated with this rating stamp as "10¢ postage due," thus on a cover with 1847 stamps the stamp was used as a killer.

Photograph No. 200, illustrates a similar cover with a 10¢ 1847. This cover is also addressed to D. S. Kennedy, New York. Many of the Kennedy covers did not have 1847 stamps but arrived stampless and the New York Post Office rated them with postage due of 10¢. Some of these originally "stampless covers" now have 1847 stamps, which were added by fakers. Cover 200 has a 10¢ 1847 pencanceled by black ink, and the pen mark just barely extends beyond the stamp at bottom. We do find genuine Kennedy covers that were sent thru Montreal with 1847 stamps that were pencanceled at New York but the pen markings are generally in the typical blue ink that was used at the New York Post Office in the middle and late eighties and early eighties. As stated, the cover under discussion is canceled with black pen marks. This stamp may have been used originally on this cover and it may not have been. There is no positive evidence that it was not, nor is there any positive evidence that it was.

The letter inside is headed, "Commercial Bank - Montreal, 5 March 1850. The red Montreal postmark on face reads, "MONTREAL - PAID - 1R 5 - 1850 - CANADA." In lower left corner is "Paid to lines - 261" - I imagine this meant, "Canadian postage paid, charge Box 261." The sum charged was 4½ pence as per the red manuscript rate at right. Over the Montreal postmark is the red New York encircled "10." Did this mean that the stamp was not on this blue folded letter when it arrived at New York and that 10¢ was Due from the Kennedy Bank? Who can say positively? Personally, I would have more faith in this cover if the pen marking was in blue ink rather than in black but I know of no evidence that the New York used blue ink on every occasion and did not use black.

1847 STAMPS USED TO CALIFORNIA

Gold was discovered in California early in 1848, but it was not until a year and more later that the gold rush started in any volume. The first U. S. mail route to the Pacific Coast was actually started with the sailing from New York by the first mail steamship, the "California" in October of 1848.

This ship sailed around the Horn and arrived at San Francisco early in 1849. The postage rate to and from California and Oregon was 40¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce. This rate was in effect to June 30, 1851 inclusive. No 1847 stamps were sent to California post offices and any that were used from there, represented stamps that were privately carried to the West Coast. Such covers are great rarities, in fact, far more rare than some high-priced "Postmasters Provisionals." Perhaps a half-dozen covers are in collections with 1847 stamps used to California but all but one were uses in 1850 or 1852. My files record only one cover from the East to California in the year 1849 with the 40¢ rate paid by 1847 stamps. This is a blue folded letter illustrated by,

Photograph #201. The cover has four 10¢ 1847 singles tied to cover by pen markings, and also by a faint blue Philadelphia postmark of "Oct. 1." The letter inside is plainly dated "Philad. Oct. 1, 1849." A clipping from a Philadelphia newspaper was enclosed which reads in part as follows, quote: (The theatre) "Office open daily from 10 till 4. Doors open at 7 o'clock, curtain rises at 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  o'clock precisely. This evening, October 1st, 1849, the performance will commence with the Comic Opera in two acts, etc., etc." (unquote). The letter is very interesting.

On the face of this cover is "Paid" and "40" in manuscript. Two of the 10¢ stamps are very interesting varieties, viz., the stamp to left shows extended frame lines at three of the four corners. Incidentally this is the only 10¢ 1847 that I can recall with three of the corners showing extended frame lines. See photograph #134, Issue of this Service of February 1, 1954. This is an enlarged photograph of a single 10¢ showing very plainly, an extension of the top frame line at upper left corner. The second stamp from left is one of the four double transfers, plate position 2R1, listed in the S.U.S. as "R2," the "B." This cover is an outstanding example of "Philatelic Americana," a "FORTY-NINER."

Photograph No. 31, illustrates a similar cover with a horizontal strip of four of the 10¢ 1847 used from New York on Jan. 28, with no positive evidence of year, but in my opinion the use must have been 1850. This is a "face" of an original folded letter or envelope that has been mounted on the back of an envelope. In upper left in manuscript is "Per Georgia." My records disclose that the U. S. Mail Steamer "Georgia" sailed from New York for Panama on Jan. 28, 1850 with the mails for California and Oregon.

The strip of the 10¢ is canceled with strikes in black of the New York rate stamp, the encircled "80," (for double 40¢ rates). This cover was addressed to the well-known San Francisco firm of merchants of Macdonray & Co. This firm was established in San Francisco in 1848 and is still in business. In 1948 the firm celebrated its 100th anniversary. Many rare and fine "Westerns" in prominent collections thruout the country bear the address of this old and reliable firm.

END OF ISSUE NO. 49  
(Fourth Series - 1954-1955)  
APRIL 1, 1955

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ASHEROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 50 - MAY 1, 1955 (Fourth Series - 1954-1955)

\*\*\*\*\*

CORRECTION

On page 391 of last month's issue in the second paragraph from the bottom, please change "Photograph No. 31" to read, "Photograph No. 202."

THE U. S. TEN CENTS STAMP OF 1855

By the Act of March 3, 1855, the rate from the Atlantic states to California and Oregon was increased to ten cents per half-ounce, from 6¢ paid, or 10¢ unpaid, effective April 1st, 1855. We had no 10¢ adhesive postage stamps, or 10¢ stamped envelopes at that time, hence one was necessary. In May 1855, the Ten Cents green made its first appearance, and this month rounds out one hundred years of its existence. The earliest known use of the stamp is a cover with a single Type II nicely tied by a New York postmark of May 19 (1855) and addressed to London, Canada West. This cover was recorded about seventeen years ago and has remained the "earliest known" ever since. The 1955 "S.U.S. states, "Issued May 19, 1855," but that statement may not be true. An "earliest known use" is quite different from an actual "first day of issue."

One hundred years ago this month. How the world has changed. Suppose someone, a century ago could have predicted that a person could have breakfast in New York or Boston and "supper" that night in Los Angeles or San Francisco. He would have been considered out of his mind. A century ago in 1855, if a person desired to make the trip to California or Oregon, the most rapid transit was by the U. S. mail ships sailing but twice a month from New York for Panama, thence across the Isthmus and by another mail steamer to San Francisco. Or one could have taken passage by the Vanderbilt Line "Via Nicaragua." Such trips occupied on an average a few days less than four weeks. Today the trip between the Atlantic and Pacific can be made by air in a matter of hours. Is it not marvelous to contemplate!!!

And we must not forget that 1855 was another year that was memorable in the improvement of travel and communication to California, because on the 27th of January 1855, at midnight in darkness and rain the last rail was laid on the Panama Railroad connecting the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans and the next day, for the first time, a locomotive passed from ocean to ocean. The road was only 47 miles in length but it had taken nearly five years to build, had cost the lives of many workers and a large sum of American capital.

January of 1855, a hundred years ago. Only seven years previous gold had been discovered on Sutter's Creek and only six years previous the "Forty-niners" were arriving in large numbers. But suppose we go back to the days before the gold rush, for example, to April of 1846, just 109 years ago, when early in that month a party headed overland across the plains from Springfield, Ill. for California. There were some 100 or more persons

in the party, men, women and children from the middle-west when the group reached Independence, Mo. in May. This was the ill-fated Donner Party, which reached the eastern slopes of the Sierras in October of 1846 and were trapped by terrific snow storms. Many of the party died of starvation during that terrible long winter of 1846-1847, while others resorted to the eating of human flesh in order to keep alive. Survivors were rescued late in February and early in March of 1847. I believe it has been stated that the snow reached a depth of some sixteen feet. It took surviving members of this party almost eleven months to reach California. What would any of them thought if the time would ever be reduced to a matter of a few hours? At about the time of the rescue of the survivors of the Donner Party, the Act of March 3, 1847 was approved, authorizing our first adhesive postage stamps.

And I am also reminded that about a week later General Scott began to land his American Army at Vera Cruz in the Mexican War, the ending of which added California and the southwestern states to the American Union.

JUST A CENTURY AGO

The Ten Cents Green is a century old this month, and what a wonderful stamp it is. The Government stamp contractors at that time used two plates for all the 10¢ stamps furnished from 1855 to the middle of 1861, when their contract expired. The first plate "No. 1," gave us four distinct types, and Plate No. 2, made in 1859, consisted of stamps of one type, that we call Type V. The most valuable of the five types is the "Type IV," or the "re-cuts," which came from only eight positions out of the 200 on Plate No. 1. Seven of these were in the left pane and one was in the right pane. The most valuable 10¢ item that I know of is an irregular block of ten (10) imperforates from the left pane of Plate One, which shows a group containing all four types. This block is unique, the only piece known to exist, which shows all of the four imperforate types.

Back in the late nineteens and early twenties when I was working on the reconstruction of Plate One, this wonderful block was unknown to me. I have no idea where it was at that time. I am sure I would have given most anything for a chance to study it. It is, therefore, quite appropriate on the 100th anniversary of this wonderful old stamp to include in this May 1955 issue of the "Service" a photograph of this unique and priceless block.

Photograph #203, illustrates this block of ten, the plate positions in the left pane being as follows:

76 77 78 79  
86 87 88 89  
98 99

Positions 76 and 86 are Type IV, and 98 and 99 are Type I, while 77 to 79 are Type II and 87 to 89 are Type III. Thus the block consists of -

Two - Type I  
Three - " II  
Three - " III  
Two - " IV

Regarding the two Type IV stamps, the top one in the pair to left in the block is the 7611, "recut line at bottom;" the bottom stamp in the pair, 8611 shows the top line recut and also the lines over the two "X" ovals. Regarding 7611, three positions on the plate, all "A" reliefs (guide dots at upper left) had the bottom line recut, viz., 5411, 5511 and 7611. Only two positions had the top line and the lines over the "X" ovals recut, both "B" reliefs (no guide dots at upper left) viz., 6511 and 8611.

The block bears the San Francisco postmark and represented a rate to the east (?) by the "Ocean Mail" Via Panama (?) of at least ten times the single  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce rate.

Service photograph No. 181 shows a cover to France with a vertical strip of three 10¢ 1857, all three stamps being Type IV, plate positions 5411, 6411 and 7411. As previously mentioned, a vertical strip of three, all Type IV come only from these three positions on the plate of 200. This cover has in addition, a vertical strip of three of the 5¢ 1857, Type I rare Brick Red, a 45¢ rate. A "Garnier cover" from New Orleans in May 1859. In the Waterhouse Sale to be held next month in London, Lot 314 is a "Garnier cover" with a vertical strip of three 10¢ 1857, all Type IV and from the same plate positions. Incidentally, in the description of this lot, the statement is made, quote: "With Stanley B. Ashbrook's signed guarantee on reverse." That statement is absolutely not true, I never guaranteed this cover or any other cover in this sale. I merely expressed the opinion that the cover is genuine.

The Waterhouse cover was used from New Orleans several months earlier than cover No. 181, that is, in March of 1859. Two most remarkable covers with strips of three of the 10¢ 1857 Type IV.

→ CAUTION

Extreme caution should be exercised in bidding sight-unseen for lots in the Waterhouse Sale, because there are a number of covers in this sale which are fraudulent.

A VALUABLE 10¢ 1855 COVER

Photograph #204 illustrates a rare cover that was recently loaned to me for recording by Dr. W. S. Pollard of San Rafael, Calif. The 10¢ imperforate stamp is a Type IV, 5511, a bottom line recut. It is tied by the postmark of Muncietown, Ind. The exact year use not evident but possibly in 1855 or 1856. It is addressed to "George Tom," El Dorado County, California. At the left is a rather crude handstamp of the "PIONEER EXPRESS." Here is a cover (white envelope), that entered the U. S. mail at Muncie, Ind. Surely it was sent to New York and went out to San Francisco by the Ocean Mail Route Via Panama. From San Francisco it was surely sent by U. S. mail up to Georgetown, a mining town a short distance north of Placerville. So why the "Pioneer Express" marking and why the "Due 2/8?" It is addressed to "Mr. Madison M. Moody." Mr. Moody was probably a miner and was doubtless moving from one place to another. We suppose he gave an order to the Postmaster at Georgetown to deliver all mail addressed to him to the "Pioneer Express Co.," so that outfit could bring his mail to him. But what about the "Due 2/8?"

That surely stumped me as I had never seen such a due figure before. Dr. Polland suggested that it meant "25¢," or 2/8 of a dollar or "two bits" and I believe his solution is undoubtedly correct.

Back in the early part of the last century Spanish silver dollars had quite a wide circulation thruout the country and in lieu of sufficient amounts of small change, the early inhabitants in remote sections cut the Spanish silver dollars into eight pieces or "bits" thus a "bit" was 12½¢ etc. This also accounts for the manner in which our early postal rates were computed, as for example, the Act of March 3, 1825 fixed certain rates at 12½¢ and 18 3/4¢, and such rates were in effect until as late as June 30, 1845.

Dr. Polland informed me, that to his knowledge only two covers are known with this Pioneer Express marking. I suppose the sum "Due," was left blank and was rated according to the distance a letter was conveyed. There were hundreds of such small "express companies" that served the California gold seekers in this manner. So far away from home, nothing was more welcome to the miner than the semi-monthly mail from loved ones back East. Mention of the "Ocean Mail" reminds me of a most interesting cover that was sent to me recently by Mr. Morris Fortgang of New York City, and which I am illustrating by

Photograph No. 205. Here we have a cover with a 3¢ 1857, Type II stamp, tied by the New York Ocean Mail postmark of "Apr 22" and addressed to Portland, Oregon. At left bottom is the black marking "Due 7" which was applied at New York. (My pencil notation of applied at S.F. was an error). This is a white envelope and there was no mention front or back of the actual year of use. Somebody in New York mailed a letter with a 3¢ stamp at a time when the rate was 10¢ and caused the Reverend addressee to pay 7¢ to obtain the letter. I like covers with this "Ocean Mail" marking and I have the urge to find out all I can about them if they are a bit unusual. Well, this cover is unusual in two particulars, first, the single 3¢ 1857 stamp tied by this marking. If you search for a long time for a cover with a single 3¢ stamp tied by the Ocean Mail you may find a few, but I doubt if it would be more than a very few.

Second, the odd date of Apr 22. Does that mean anything to you? Well, I was curious as to the year that this letter traveled all the way from New York Via Panama and San Francisco to Oregon and that "22" gave me the answer, (in my opinion). If you will refer to my One Cent book, Volume 2, page 248, you will find that in the third paragraph from the bottom is the statement, quote:

"The contract for the Ocean Mail Via Panama, expired on September 30th, 1859, whereupon the Postmaster General contracted for nine month's service with Cornelius Vanderbilt. When this short contract expired a new one was signed with Vanderbilt and starting the 1st of July 1860, the service was placed on a tri-monthly basis. The sailing dates from New York of the 5th and 20th were never changed between 1855 and July 1st, 1860, but after the latter date, the mail left New York on the 1st, 11th and 21st of each month. If any of the dates fell on Sunday, the ships delayed sailing until Monday." (unquote)

There was the answer to the year of use. This was a "tri-monthly sailing" and of course the year could not be 1860, nor could it be 1862 because the stamp

was illegal in that year, so the year of use must have been 1861. Now if April 21 fell on a Sunday in 1861, then I would be reasonably certain that the use was 1861. I then referred to my perpetual calendar and sure enough April 21 in 1861 fell on Sunday, with the sailing delayed to Monday, the 22nd.

It is indeed the story behind the cover that adds so much interest. In philatelic research work, I believe that the student learns something new with each day.

In passing, the thought occurred, if you owned this "Ocean Mail" cover of Apr 22 1861, would you be willing to part with it at what it cost you if you had its story as above?

FROM GEORGETOWN, CALIFORNIA, TO DENMARK

Mention above of the California mining town of Georgetown, reminded me of another interesting cover loaned to me by Mr. Fortgang. A single rate to Denmark in 1861. In last month's Service Issue I commented upon the scarcity of covers to certain European countries, and among those mentioned was Denmark.

Photograph #206, illustrates Mr. Fortgang's cover, showing origin at Georgetown, Calif. on May 31, 1861. The U. S. mail steamship sailed from San Francisco Saturday afternoon June 1st, 1861, for Panama and no doubt this letter went by that trip. The cover is addressed to Denmark and was routed, "Via Prussian Closed Mail." The single rate by that route was 35¢ and was prepaid by a 24¢ 1860, a 10¢ 1857, Type V and a 1¢ 1851, Type I (Plate 12). Quite a nice combination!!! The stamps are canceled by the well-known "star" that was used at the Georgetown Office at that period. Such mail was despatched in closed bags from Boston or New York thru England and Belgium to Aachen. The framed "Aachen" (Prussia) marking appears dated "7 - 8", so no doubt this letter arrived there on July 8th, 1861. The large manuscript "12" is our credit to Prussia of 7¢, plus 5¢ for transit to Denmark. Our share of the rate was 23¢. A cover to most any destination with a 24¢ 1860 has real value. A 24¢ 1860 stamp with a star cancellation is most unusual, and this applies also to a 1¢ 1857, Type I.

THE ONE CENT 1857  
ON CIRCULAR MAIL TO CANADA

For some reason or other circular mail covers to Canada prior to 1862, appear to be quite scarce. We do find such covers with the 1¢ 1857 but it has been my experience that circulars with a 1¢ 1851 are extremely rare. If any subscriber to this "Service" can loan me such an item, will they be so kind as to forward same to me.

Under our postal arrangement with Canada, printed circulars could only be prepaid to the borders in each country and the rate had to be prepaid. The postage could not be prepaid to destinations in either country.

Photograph No. 207, illustrates a typical example. Here is a printed circular with a 1¢ 1857, (Type V) tied by a New York postmark of May 29, 1859, and

addressed to Montreal, Canada. It has a large handstamp "1/2" in black in lower right. This is the Canadian postage due of one-half pence, or approximately one cent in our money. More about this cover later.

Photograph No. 208, illustrates a printed circular with a 1¢ 1857 (Type V) tied by a Boston postmark of Aug. 10, 1861, and addressed to Toronto, C.W. (Canada West). It has a rather large handstamped due marking of "1CT." Why "1/2" on one cover and "1CT" on the other?

CHANGE TO DECIMAL SYSTEM

As of July 1, 1859, Canada changed from a sterling basis to the decimal system, and used dollars and cents henceforth instead of pounds, shillings and pence. As near as I can recollect, this cover, #208, is the only circular rate to Canada that I have ever seen with this "1CT" marking. On covers with the 1¢ 1857, uses with a "1CT" due marking would have to be between July 1, 1859 and September of 1861, when the stamps of the "old issue" were finally demonetized in the eastern section of the U. S. From Boston on August 10, 1861 was quite a late use. Also cover #207 was used about a month before the change was made.

Again referring to cover No. 207, this is a printed circular dated inside, "HATANZAS MAY 21 1859" (Cuba). Whether this circular was printed in Cuba or Boston is not evident. It could have been printed in Cuba and shipped in quantity to Boston for mailing. These two covers make a very interesting and rare pair.

\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*

END OF ISSUE NO. 50

Fourth Series - 1954-1955

MAY 1, 1955

FINAL NUMBER OF THE FOURTH SERIES

were required rather than three because the letter evidently did not go over 15 grammes, which as stated was the equivalent of 0.53 oz. This Waterhouse cover also shows a most attractive combination, viz., imperforates, 5¢ 1856, 3¢ 1851 and a pair of 1¢ 1851. Incidentally covers showing the double 5¢ "internal" to France are most unusual and such a combination with the 5¢ 1856 must be rare indeed. In fact, any cover with a combination including a 5¢ is most desirable.

Please refer to Service Photograph No. 194B. This cover shows the 5¢ U. S. "internal" with the 7½ grammes rate of "8" decimes due.

Also please refer to Service Photograph #89 which is of the period of the first quarter of 1857, and shows a 2 x 5¢ "internal" paid by a 10¢ 1855. The French due is "24" decimes or a triple, i. e., 3 x 8 decimes. In this case, the 10¢, a double rate, paid the rate for as much as one ounce but in France this letter evidently weighed over 15 grammes but not over 22.50 grammes, hence only three rates were due, (3 x 8 dec.).

"TWICE CARRIED - NO PAY"

Photograph No. 212, illustrates a cover that was submitted to me recently for an analysis. The special feature of this cover is a small fancy blue circular marking that appears in the lower left corner. It is approximately the same size as pictured and reads, "TWICE CARRIED - NO PAY." It was new to me, never before had I seen it or even any such wording. This is a white envelope that originated at "NEW HAMBURGH N.Y. JUN 30" in the year 1864. It was addressed to 43 Beacon St., Boston, Mass., and on the reverse it is back-stamped Boston "JUL 2 1864." It apparently laid over 5 days in the Boston office and was then forwarded from there on "JUL 7" to "Caldwell - Warren Co., N.Y.". There is the story but what about the analysis? Where was that blue marking applied and why? Being unable to supply the answer, I sent the cover to our foremost authority on Boston Postal Markings, Mr. Maurice C. Blake, having previously noted no mention of the small blue marking in Mr. Blake's very exhaustive and fine study of Boston postal history. Strange to relate the little blue thing was new to him, but the solution that he advanced was as follows - That the envelope originally required two rates to Boston and that no doubt there had been two 3¢ stamps in the upper right corner. (Note by S.B.A. I wonder if the space was big enough? This photo is supposed to be approximately the same size as the envelope). That the small blue was a stamp used by a Boston letter-carrier (Note - I understand that blue ink was used in the Boston Carrier Division in 1864 and earlier). That the letter-carrier had twice attempted to deliver the letter and had received no pay.

As Mr. Blake explained, quote, "No pay meaning simply to refer to the legal prohibition of the Act of 1863, (March 3rd) of collecting any carrier fee. In that case assuming the two stamps were still on the cover, the "Due 6" (pencil) would be the correct charge merely for forwarding the letter to Caldwell, N.Y. and it may be that the bit of black cancel left on the cover was applied at Boston, being the bottom of one of the style cancellations shown in B.P.M., Plate 62 ("Boston Postal Markings book").

Page #405

Nos. 1018 - 1032 which were in use in 1864." (unquote)

REGARDING THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1863

Act of March 3, 1863 - Sec. 26, provided that double rates of postage be collected on delivery on any matter on which postage "IS REQUIRED TO BE PREPAID AT THE MAILING OFFICE." (unquote)

How about a letter that was forwarded from one office to another without prepayment of the forwarding postage? Was it in the same class as a letter reaching an office without payment and subject to double postage? Suppose we refer to Act of March 3, 1863 - Sec. 30, quote: "Letters may be forwarded from office of destination to any other office, with additional charge of postage thereof." (unquote)

This letter was surely forwarded and the forwarding postage of "Due 6" surely indicated this was a double rate letter. Caldwell, N.Y. was a small town and naturally had no carrier service, hence one can hardly imagine any reason why the small blue marking might have been applied there, hence I think it must be assumed that it was applied at Boston and that Mr. Blake's solution is no doubt correct. I cannot help but wonder why we have never seen an example of this blue marking before. I suppose it could have been in use a short time before the Letter Carrier Delivery System went into effect on July 1, 1863, and indicated that the carrier had called twice to deliver a letter and had received no fee for his trouble.

\*\*\*\*\*

END OF ISSUE NO. 51  
Fifth Series - 1955-1956  
JUNE 1, 1955  
FIRST NUMBER OF THE FIFTH SERIES

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 52 - JULY 1, 1955 - Fifth Series 1955-1956

THE U. S. 5¢ JEFFERSON OF 1856

In last month's issue of this Service I described rather briefly a cover showing the earliest known use of the 5¢ Jefferson of 1856, and now Photograph No. 213, illustrates the cover. A single is tied to a white folded letter by a black postmark of "Philadelphia Pa. Mar 24." The letter inside is dated "Philadelphia March 21 1856." In 1856, March 21 fell on Monday and of course the 26th fell on Wednesday. Bear in mind that the mail ships of the British Cunard Line sailed alternately every other Wednesday from Boston and New York during the eighteen fifties. This letter, addressed to a firm in Halifax, Nova Scotia, bears a routing, "Pr ARABIA VIA BOSTON." We therefore presume that the Cunard liner "Arabia" sailed from Boston for England on Wednesday March 26, 1856, and stopped enroute at Halifax, N. S. as was the usual custom. On the back of this letter, is the black, "BOSTON - MAR 26 - BR. PKT" and also the Halifax black marking reading, "U. STATES - HALIFAX - 27 - MR 1856." All of this means that the letter was mailed on Monday, the 24th, with the evident intention that it reach Boston in time to sail on the "Arabia" on the following Wednesday. Surely this is what happened and it was received at Halifax, N. S. on Thursday, the 27th. On the face is a large black "5" (pence) which was the postage due from the addressee, as the 5¢ 1856, paid the U.S. postage only to the Nova Scotia frontier. (5¢ internal under the U.S.-British Treaty).

Photograph No. 214, illustrates a cover (white folded letter) with a 5¢ 1856 tied by the same type of Philadelphia postmark, in black, and dated "Apr 21." The letter inside is dated "Philadelphia April 21st, 1856, or four weeks later than cover No. 213. Both letters are in the same handwriting. On the back of No. 214 we find three Canadian postmarks, viz., blue "ST. ANDREWS N. B. AP 26, 1856," (circular; black, "ST. JOHNS NEW BRUNSWICK - AP - 27 - 1856" (circular and a black oval "H - MY 1 - 1856 - N.S." (Halifax - May 1, 1856 - Nova Scotia). On the face is a large blue "6." Why a "5" on No. 213 and a "6" on No. 214? The answer is that No. 213 was sent to Boston and thence by sea to Halifax, whereas in spite of the fact that No. 214 was routed, "per Cambria Via Boston," it was not sent by that route but by land mail.

THE CUNARD MAIL SHIPS

It is my understanding, (and I may be wrong), that while the British Cunard mail ships that sailed from Boston twice a month for Liverpool, stopped enroute at Halifax and possibly at St. John, Newfoundland, the Cunard mail ships that departed from New York sailed direct to Liverpool and did not go via Boston or Halifax.

A circular issued by the Boston Post Office, dated November 1st, 1856, entitled "Table of Foreign & Domestic Postages" had the following, quote:

"A mail is made up for the British Provinces, Via Halifax, by the English steamers from Boston. The postage on a single letter thus sent is 5 cents, to be prepaid. The postage on newspapers and periodicals to these places is at the regular United States rates, to and from the line, to be paid in the United States." (unquote)

In the F. L. & R. of 1866, Sec. 260 of the "Regulations" was as follows, quote: "Steamers of the Cunard Line sail from Boston twice each month, touching at Halifax, and when letters are sent by that conveyance for Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, Cape Breton and Prince Edward's Island, the United States postage is five cents, the single rate, to be prepaid. The inland rate is collected on delivery. On newspapers by this route the postage is two cents each." (unquote)

5¢ 1856 COVER WITH THE EARLIEST KNOWN USE

The March 24, 1856 letter went by the Cunarder, "Abrabia" to Halifax and the due "5" shows that the addressee was charged 5 pence which I believe was approximately the equivalent of 6 1/3 U. S. cents at that time, or a total postage of 11 1/3¢ (U. S.).

5¢ 1856 COVER BY LAND ROUTE

Cover No. 214, from Philadelphia on Apr 21 1856, though routed the same as No. 213 was for some unknown reason sent by the "land route" and rated as entirely unpaid with "6" pence due at Halifax. The U. S. rate to Nova Scotia (by land) at that time was 10¢, payment optional. The rate to the Eastern part of the U. S. from Nova Scotia at that time was 6 pence (Canadian), payment optional. Six pence was the equivalent of 10¢ U. S. Each country retained postages collected.

This April letter was sent to Robbinston, Maine, a "U. S. Exchange Office" that exchanged mail across the line with St. Andrews, N. B., the Provincial Exchange Office, from which office it was sent over to Halifax, N. S. This letter has a manuscript "10" in top center indicating it was rated as totally unpaid and that the "10" indicated a single rate (1/2 oz.) which had not been prepaid. In other words, the 5¢ payment on this letter was wasted.

It would appear that the addressor in Philadelphia was in the habit of sending mail Via Boston and in the case of both of these letters he mailed them on a Monday so that they would reach Boston in plenty of time for the Wednesday sailings of the Cunard mail ships. I imagine the sailings in 1856 for the months of March and April was as follows:

From New York	Wednesday	Mar 5 1856
" Boston	"	Mar 12 "
" New York	"	Mar 19 "
" Boston	"	<u>Mar 26 1856</u>
" New York	"	Apr 2 "
" Boston	"	Apr 9 "
" New York	"	Apr 16 "
" Boston	"	<u>Apr 23 1856</u>
" New York	"	Apr 30 "

According to the above, there should have been a sailing on Apr. 23, 1856, but apparently something happened and this April letter went by the "land route." This interesting pair of covers are in two collections. They should be in one and on a page together so that the interesting story that they have to relate can be appreciated.

THE EARLIEST KNOWN USES OF THE 5¢ 1856

I have over many years recorded the following covers showing the earliest known uses of the 5¢ 1856 Jefferson imperforate:

March 24, 1856 (cover No. 213)  
" 27, 1856  
April 2, 1856  
" 4, 1856  
" 21, 1856 (cover No. 214)  
May 5, 1856  
" 6, 1856

I might mention that I wrote an article about Cover #214 that was published in the May 1952 issue of "POSTAL HISTORY," Vol. #1, No. 1, the official organ of the "Postal History Society of the Americas, Inc." Editor, F. L. Scholl, Syracuse, N. Y.

FOR THE RECORD

These two covers #213 and #214, came up in a sale by Kelleher on Nov. 30, 1951. Cover #213 was lot #116 and it sold @ \$195.00. The March date must have been the reason though it was not rated at that time as the earliest known use. Cover #214 was lot #117 and sold @ \$115.00.

THE 24¢ - 30¢ - 90¢ IMPERFORATES OF 1860

In the December 1921 issue of the "American Philatelist," I published an article entitled, "The Ninety Cent of 1860, and some additional remarks on the 24¢ and 30¢ of this issue." There was nothing particularly new in the article and it's main purpose was to register a protest against the listing in the Scott catalogue "as regularly issued postage stamps," the so-called "24¢, 30¢ and 90¢ imperforates" of 1860. May I quote from that old 1921 article as follows: "What is the proper status of these three so-called imperforates? Some call them nothing but proofs. It must be obvious to the reader they are nothing more or less than copies from 'IMPERFORATE TRIAL COLOR SHEETS,' submitted by Toppan Carpenter & Co. to the Post Office Department, and as such have no claim for a legitimate listing in the catalogue, even to the extent of a listing as sub-varieties of the 24¢, 30¢ and 90¢ perforated stamps. To give these 'trial colors' a separate listing as major varieties of U. S. stamps is not only incorrect but most certainly very misleading." (unquote) I repeat that this was published in December 1921. The above was not guess-work or theory because positive proof of the origin of the "trial colors" is found in the correspondence between Toppan Carpenter & Co. and the P. O. Department at the time these three values were being made in 1860.

FIRST EDITION OF THE S. U. S.

The first edition of the "S. U. S." was published in 1923, and in this "Specialized U. S." was listed the "1851-56 Issue." The 12¢ 1851 imperforate was #36 and immediately following without any date heading was #37 - a 24¢ Lilac, #38, a 30¢ Orange, and #39, a 90¢ blue, all imperforate. No intimation was given that these were not part and parcel of the 1851 imperforate issue. In the 1924 edition of the "S. U. S.," appeared the first warning. Above the 24¢ #37 was "1860" and following the 90¢ #39 was the following notation: "From investigation by careful students it seems probable that Nos. 37, 38 and 39 were not regularly issued but came from trial printings. But because there is no positive proof of this and because these imperforate varieties have long been accepted by collectors, we retain them in the catalogue for the present." (unquote) "For the present," lasted for a long time because the above notation was repeated year after year thru the 1936 edition. In the special "TIPEX Exhibition Edition" of 1936, the latter part of the above notation beginning with, "but because, etc." was deleted and the notation read as follows, quote: "From investigation by careful students it seems probable that Nos. 37, 38, and 39 were not regularly issued but came from trial printings." (unquote)

THE "STAMP SPECIALIST" OF 1940

The third edition of Lindquist's "Stamp Specialist," No. 3, Vol. 1, the "Yellow Book," was published in May 1940 and in this I had an article entitled, "The United States 12¢ - 24¢ - 30¢ and 90¢ Imperforates of 1860." Plate No. 3 of the 12¢ was made in 1860 at the same time as the three high values and when Toppan Carpenter & Co. submitted trial printings without perforations to the P. O. Department in that year, a sheet of the 12¢ without perforations was also submitted as a "trial color," hence the inclusion of this item in the above article.

Mr. Lindquist was kind enough to head my article with the following Editor's note, quote: "This article should interest every collector who owns a Scott's Specialized U. S. catalogue, whether he collects 19th or 20th Century stamps. It raises a most important question as to what the catalog should contain and what it should not contain, which applies to every stamp that is listed. It is interestingly written and contains information that every collector should have, in a non-technical language. We have no hesitancy in saying that this is unquestionably the best philatelic article that has appeared in the philatelic press in many moons." (unquote)

THE 1941 S. U. S.

In the 1941 edition of the S. U. S. following on the heels of the above article, there was no listing of #37, 38 and 39 following the 12¢ 1851 imperforate. Instead the following appeared, quote: "The stamps heretofore listed as Nos 37, 38 and 39 are now listed as Nos 52C, 53A and 54A." (unquote) In other words, as minor varieties of the perforates 24¢, 30¢ and 90¢ of 1860.

TRIAL COLOR PROOFS

There is no question but what these bits of paper were nothing more than

"trial color proofs," which were found in the files of the Post Office Department years ago and given to a Boston dealer by the name of Triffet for his work of mounting the Government collection. The 1941 S. U. S. on page 323, listed "TRIAL COLOR PROOFS" but the three "trial colors" of 1860 were not included in that section but were listed as "minor varieties" of the 1860 Issue, and in the current "S. U. S." (1955) they are listed as 37C, 38A, and 39A, and the following notation is found under the 90¢, quote: "From investigations by careful students it seems probable that Nos. 37C, 38A and 39A were not regularly issued but came from trial printings." (unquote) I cannot imagine why they are not listed where they belong.

#### MOST AMAZING

There is a dealer down in Vermont who calls himself "COLSON OF BOSTON," and who issues a small monthly "NEWS LETTER." For several years or more Colson has been offering at private sale various items from the collection formed by a deceased New Englander by the name of Raymond Lapham. In his "News Letter" dated June 1, 1955, Colson gives a brief description of some of the items he has for sale, quote: "in the wonderful U. S. collection which we are now about to break up." (unquote) In his June 1955 News Letter, I note the following amazing statement, quote: "The 1851's come to an end with two fine examples of the 24¢ imperforate, one having sheet margin at the top - the 30¢ completes this issue. These two stamps are catalogued as varieties of the perforated issue but this is not the fact as they were issued prior to the perforated examples of these denominations to fill a request from a foreign government and they should be restored to their old positions at the end of the 1851 issue." (unquote)

I sincerely hope that Editor Gordon Harmer of the "S. U. S." does not take the above absurd statement seriously. I suppose "Colson of Boston" still insists that the "Premiere Gravures" were regularly issued. It seems to be hard for one who has sold so many "Premieres" and "1860 Imperfs" to admit these things were "not regularly issued" and hence are not legitimate U. S. postage stamps.

#### THE 90¢ 1860 ON COVER

In my two-volume study of the U. S. One Cent 1851-1857, I illustrated in Vol. 2, on page 322, what I believe is the finest cover known to philately with a 90¢ of 1860. This was in my collection at one time, and passed to the collection of the late Judge Robert Emerson, and later into the Newbury collection in 1937. In the A. P. article of December 1921, above mentioned, I described this cover in detail. I mention this merely to state that for many years I have made a serious attempt to study cancellations on the 90¢ 1860, and also the postal markings on the very few genuine covers, as well as those on the known fakes.

#### THE ARMITAGE 90¢ COVER

On several occasions in articles that I have published regarding the 90¢ of 1860, I mentioned the "Armitage cover." George Armitage of Birmingham, England, was quite a prominent British collector of U. S. 19th Century

stamps and covers, back in the nineteen twenties. Someone sold him, along about 1920, a "fixed" cover with a 90¢ 1860 which consisted of three stamps as follows: a 30¢ and 90¢ 1860 in upper right corner and a 12¢ 1860, (from Plate 3), in lower left corner - total \$1.32, to Calcutta (East Indies), from New York on "Jan 26" (1861). This white envelope was routed, "Per Overland Mail Via Marseilles." The red New York postmark reads, "NEW YORK AM. PKT. JAN 26." As far as my records disclose, this cover passed from the Armitage collection, in the early nineteen thirties, possibly thru Colson and Kelleher, into the Raymond Lapham collection. At the 1936 New York International Exhibition (Tipex) this cover was in the Lapham exhibit and at that time I made notes descriptive of it.

In my opinion, this cover is fraudulent, that is, the 90¢ stamp was not used on this cover, as I will fully explain. My records disclose that a mail was despatched to Liverpool by "Amer. Packet" on "Jan. 26" 1861, and the ship was the "EDINBURG." And further, that this mail ship had arrived back at New York from Liverpool on Jan. 17th (1861). Incidentally, "Jan 26" in 1861 fell on Saturday, a regular sailing date of "American Packets," for England. The "S. S. EDINBURG" (or Edinburgh) was a ship of the "Glasgow & New York Steam Navigation Co."

NO SUCH RATE IN 1861

I have before me an official table of Foreign Rates of Postage for the month of January 1861, and no such a rate as \$1.32 is listed or any multiple of such a rate. I suppose what the "faker" was attempting to make was a quadruple 33¢ rate, such as shown on my old 90¢ 1860 cover, now in the Newbury collection (\$1.32 to the Cape of Good Hope). The markings on the "Armitage cover," shows that the original rate on this cover to Calcutta was 42¢ and surely paid by the 30¢ and 12¢ stamps. In fact, a double 21¢ rate by American Packet to England. The U. S. postage was "Paid only to London," and from London to Calcutta the letter was sent as unpaid. This is proved by three (3) facts, viz: (1) Had the rate been paid in the U. S. to Calcutta there would have been a red credit (on the face of the envelope) to the British P. O. Dept., for carriage from England to Calcutta. There is none. (2) On the face of the envelope is the British due marking (in manuscript) of 2/? or 2 shillings ? pence. I am not certain how many pence were due in addition to the 2 shillings, but this due marking proves the letter was forwarded unpaid from England. And (3) the due of 2/? proves that the letter was a double, that is, over  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce, hence required two rates in the U. S. (2/? surely indicated two rates were due). The official U. S. rate by this route in January 1861 read as follows, quote: "East Indies, open mail, via London, by Am. pkt . . . . 21¢ per half ounce." This 21¢ paid the U. S. postage only to the British frontier under the terms of the U. S. - British Postal Treaty, viz: 5¢ internal plus 16¢ sea (Atlantic crossing). In my opinion, this "rare cover," originally had in the upper right corner the 30¢ and 12¢ 1860 stamps. I haven't the slightest doubt but what some "fixer" removed the 12¢ stamp and put it down in the lower left corner, and in its place he put a 90¢ stamp with a similar red grid cancellation which he had faked.

"COLSON OF BOSTON & THE LAPHAM COLLECTION"

I have little doubt that "the wonderful collection" that Colson is "now

about to break up" consists of items known to be from the Lapham collection of Boston. In his "News Letter" of June 1955, I was quite amused at the following paragraph, quote:

"The 24¢, 30¢ and 90¢ of this 1857-60 issue are truly magnificent and pages are devoted to the 24¢ and 30¢, both unused and used and all three high values are here in blocks of four unused and all are shown on letters - the finest of all being one of the world's grandest letters bearing a 12¢, 30¢ and 90¢ making the \$1.32 rate New York to Calcutta. No finer example of this beautiful combination exists and the possessor may count himself as one out of possibly three such proud owners in the entire world." (unquote)

That statement is false. Even if the fake "Armitage cover" was genuine, it would not compare in any way, shape or form with the Newbury cover. Just imagine such a silly statement as "no finer example ~~xxx~~ exists." It is worse than the "Colson of Boston" statement that the "1860 imperforates" should be restored to their old positions." (In the Scott catalogue as regularly issued imperforates).

Perhaps Zareski made that 90¢ Armitage fake cover. I wonder what he thinks when he learns that the self-admitted world's greatest philatelic expert "Colson of Boston" pronounced his rank fake as genuine. No wonder Monsieur Zareski is a bit conceited.

THE LAPHAM ONE CENT 1851 BLOCK WITH A 7RLE

In my two-volume study of the One Cent 1851-57, I illustrated in Vol. 1, on page 118, an irregular block of eight (8) of the One Cent 1851 imperforate consisting of six stamps from the top row of the right pane of Plate One Early and two stamps from the second row, the positions being as follows:

4R - 5R - 6R - 7RLE - 8R - 9R  
14R - 15R

I stated that this was an unused block in the Raymond Lapham collection. It will be noted that the 7RLE is the Type I, and the other five stamps in this top row block are all Type IB. Incidentally, the 1955 S. U. S. quotes an unused 7RLE @ \$7,500.00, a 6RLE and 8RLE @ \$650.00 each, and a 4RLE, 5RLE and 9RLE @ \$200.00 each. The two Type II, viz., 14RLE - 15RLE at \$25.00 each, giving this block, (if actually unused and not pencleaned) a total catalogue value of \$9,450.00.

In the Colson "News Letter" for May 1955, this block is described as follows: "Then with the 1851's we note an irregular unused o.g. block of 8 of the 1¢, plate 1 early including positions 4-5-6-7-8-9-14-15-UNIQUE, then comes a beautiful unused single 1¢ Type IA Plate IV, etc., etc." (unquote)

One wonders if Colson overlooked the fact that this block had the Type I, 7RLE and five Type IB? In his June 1955 News Letter, I find the following, quote: "In last month's News Letter we described an irregular block of the 1¢ 1851 and we neglected to say that this block was from the right pane, so the position 7 contained therein is the Type I - the finest piece known showing this rare type. One of our valued customers drew our attention to this omission."

I cannot let loose of "Colson of Boston" without a closing quote from his May 1955 "News Letter," viz: "We are reading descriptions continually of stamps and when we see the stamps so described fine they do not come within miles of the description. This discrepancy arises from the fact that very few dealers ever see very much material and experiences of only twenty-five or thirty years or so have not revealed to such an inexperienced what items are really in existence. That old saying, 'In the realm of the blind the one-eyed man is king' covers much of the misunderstanding in the stamp world." (unquote) To which I might add, "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones." Imagine one who tries to make the inexperienced believe that he knows all the answers making such silly statements as I have quoted.

#### DOMESTIC WATERWAYS

##### "ROUTE AGENT MARKINGS"

"Packet covers" can be divided into several or more divisions, one of which is given the above term by Mr. Tracy W. Simpson, prominent philatelic student and specialist in the 3¢ 1851-57, and Editor of the "3¢ 151-157 Chronicle." Dr. Carroll Chase, in his fine book, called such markings, "Route Postmarks - (of) Inland Steamboat," and he included in his division, such Route Agent markings as "Route 7309," "Cincinnati & Louisville Mail Route," "Louisville & St. Louis Mail Route," "Potomac Steamboat," "W & P River Mail" and a number of others. These markings are supposed to have been applied by regular U. S. mail agents traveling over certain Mail Routes and I have no doubt the supposition is correct. Mr. Tracy explains that he coined his term so as to include such markings as "PAN. & SAN FRAN. S.S.," "Express Mail, Eastport," "Express Mail St. John," "Colonial Express Mail St. John N.B." etc. etc. Though these are not "inland," they are "domestic." There is quite a distinction between this class of "Route Agent markings" and the usual "name-of-steamboat" covers such as "Steamer Hecla," or "Steamer Glendy Burke" or "From Red River Packet Creole." I wonder if many such markings were in the main merely advertisements of the steamboat. Surely all such steamboats were not of a line having a regular U. S. Mail Contract, hence no route agent markings. Just something to think about.

#### THE TEN CENTS RATE TO MEXICO BY STEAMSHIP FROM NEW ORLEANS TO VERA CRUZ

In the April 1955 Issue of this Service, I illustrated a very beautiful cover with a horizontal strip of six of the U. S. 10¢ 1855, Type III, a "Hargous" cover from New Orleans May 1, 1856 to Vera Cruz. The Mexican postage due was represented by a large black "9." See Photograph 197.

Photograph No. 215, illustrates a cover (folded letter) from New Orleans on May 1, 1855 to Tampico, Mexico. The receiving postmark of Vera Cruz of "4 MAYO - 1855" is shown at right. This is a black oval. To pay this single 10¢ rate a vertical strip of three of the 3¢ 1851 and a single 1¢ 1851, Type IV, were used and canceled with New Orleans black grids. The Mexican due was first stamped as "3" but was later corrected to "4."

Photograph #216, illustrates a similar cover, mailed from New Orleans on the same date as the above, May 1, 1855, but addressed to Guadalajara,

Mexico. These two covers were probably from the same firm in New Orleans but addressed by different persons. This cover also shows a Mexican postage due of "4." These two covers show different New Orleans postmarks of the same date.

#### OUNCES VS GRAMMES

In last month's issue of this Service, I discussed at length the fake Waterhouse 5¢ 1856 cover with date of March 15, 1856. On page #399 mention was made of the relation of grammes to ounces. I fully intended to refer to the table that I published in my December 1st, 1953 Service Issue, pages 239 and 240, headed "Ounces Vs Grammes," but failed to do so. If perchance you were especially interested in last month's issue, look up the December 1953 issue.

#### A COVER IN THE WATERHOUSE SALE OF JUNE 28, 1955

Photograph #217, illustrates a cover in the Waterhouse sale of June 28, 1955, Lot #278, and described as two (2) vertical pairs and two (2) singles of the 5¢ 1857 Red Brown, in a deep and brilliant color. This was a double 15¢ rate to France from New Orleans on June 24, 1858, and departure from New York on "July 3" 1858 (Saturday) by the "Havre Line," American Packet direct to Havre, France. While this is a "Carnier cover" and addressed to Nantes, France, it is as good as gold and in my opinion, genuine in every respect. It shows on the back receipt at Nantes on July 14, 1858. The transit of this cover shows 20 days from New Orleans to Nantes which was rather slow as late as 1858. The original credit in the New York postmark was either not legible or was corrected to "6." This "6" was the double rate credit of 2 X 3¢ for the French internal under the treaty.

#### TO FRANCE IN FEBRUARY 1870

Photograph #218, illustrates two covers to France with similar markings in 1870. The top cover in the print (with the 15¢ 1869) is approximately natural size, whereas the lower cover is a photo of a photo print and is not natural size. The 15¢ 1869 cover was Lot 94 in the Pelander Sale of April 29, 1955 and sold for \$75.00. The 15¢ stamp was S. U. S. #118, Type I - picture unframed. Catalogue, "on cover," \$125.00. This cover was from New Orleans on Feb. 1, 1870, and was dispatched to France from New York on Feb. 8, 1870 by "Amer. Packet" Direct to Cherbourg, France. Our 1857 postal treaty with France had expired with the close of 1869. On January 1, 1870 we had no postal treaty with the French Government. The Feb. 1, 1870 cover shows a payment of 15¢ whereas the correct rate, "direct," was 10¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce. The question arises, was this an overpay of 5¢ or was a 10¢ 1869 removed and a 15¢ 1869 substituted? This cover shows the French due of "8" decimes, or approximately 15¢ U. S. which was the unpaid French internal at that time for such an overseas letter. The cover with the 10¢ 1869 shows the correct rate by this route and paid by a 10¢ 1869 from Providence, R.I. on June 20, 1870, and departure from New York the next day. Also the same type of Cherbourg ETATS UNIS French receiving marking. Also the same "8" decimes postage due. Prior to Jan. 1, 1870, the rate to France had been 15¢ per quarter ounce since April 1857. Did the firm who mailed this letter still have a supply of 15¢ 1869 stamps and did they

intentionally overpay this letter by 5¢? Or was this 15¢ a substitution by some "fixer" for a 10¢ 1869? I doubt if any authority could definitely answer that query. One thing in favor of the 15¢ cover is that the New Orleans P.O., at that period, did use a canceling device of small squares such as that which securely ties the 15¢ stamp to this cover.

In the Waterhouse sale of June 29, 1955, Lot #605 was a very beautiful cover with a 30¢ 1869 from New Orleans on Oct. 20, 1869 to France. The stamp was tied by the same type of cancelation as shown on the above 15¢ cover and very similarly. I examined this 30¢ 1869 cover very carefully before the sale and was convinced it was genuine in all respects. I am illustrating the two covers side by side by photograph No. 218 to demonstrate that in all cases an error in rate, for example, an overpay, does not always prove that a cover is questionable. I believe that it is quite possible that the 15¢ cover from New Orleans on Feb. 1, 1870, may be perfectly good.

\*\*\*\*\*  
END OF ISSUE NO. 52.  
FIFTH SERIES - 1955-1956.  
JULY 1, 1955  
Second Number of the Fifth Series.  
\*\*\*\*\*

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 53 - AUGUST 1, 1955. (Fifth Series - 1955-1956)

\*\*\*\*\*

THE U. S. ONE CENT STAMP OF 1857  
TYPES V AND Va. PLATES 5 & 6.  
A MOST IMPORTANT DISCOVERY

Types V and Va. What is the difference between these two types? Type V is the common 1¢ 1857 listed in the S. U. S. as #24, with "side ornaments partly cut away, "or the stamps with "side scratches." Type Va is a minor variety, and upon my advice, not listed in the S. U. S. as a Type. However, recognition is given in the following notation under #24 and just above "Cancellations," quote: "Stamps from Plate VI show almost complete ornaments at sides and sell for almost twice as much as the common type." (unquote)

The "most important discovery" mentioned in the heading above is that it has very recently been discovered that the "Type Va" stamps are not from Plate 6, but are from Plate 5, previously called the "Mystery Plate."

Ever since the types and plates of the One Cent of 1851-1857 have been intensively studied it has been the belief that all the "stamps with almost complete sides" (Type Va) came from Plate 6, and that no stamps with "side scratches" came from that plate. And further, it has been the belief for many years that Plate 5 was the mystery plate.

Several years ago I was shown a horizontal strip of three which showed two types side by side, viz., Types V and Va, the former with the familiar "side scratches," the latter with "no side scratches." Fortunately we were able to plate this strip as coming from the left pane of what we thought was Plate 6, thus revealing for the first time in the study of the One Cent 1857 that the plate we supposed did not produce any "stamps with side scratches," actually did produce such stamps and that they came from the left pane of what we then supposed was Plate 6. And further, much to our surprise, that two different transfer rolls were used, viz., some reliefs with "side scratches" (Type V), and some reliefs from the same horizontal rows "without side scratches." This was indeed a most interesting discovery, but at that time the reconstruction of this "left pane" which we believed was Plate 6 had not progressed sufficiently to give any evidence to indicate that the left pane of the plate that we were reconstructing was other than Plate 6.

In recent weeks Mr. Mortimer Neinken acquired an unused block of 21 stamps, all of which are Type V and to his amazement he discovered that certain stamps in this large block tied in with stamps in our reconstruction of Plate 6 while other stamps in the block tied in with plated imprint positions of Plate 5, hence our entire reconstruction of the two panes of what we believed was Plate 6 was actually Plate 5, and that Plate 5 was not the mystery plate, but that the mystery plate was Plate 6. In this connection I wish to mention several important facts, viz: (1) In all my long experience with the study of the One Cent 1851-57 plates I have never seen an imprint

with the actual number "6." (2) This is the only plate from No. 1 to No. 12, of which we have not seen a plate number. (3) When my two-volume study of the One Cent 1851-57 was published in 1937 I had made considerable progress in the reconstruction of the right pane of what I believed was Plate 6, but which has recently turned out to be Plate 5.

In the late 1940's I again took up the reconstruction of the balance of the right pane and the entire left pane, and made further progress, and since 1951 I have been ably assisted by a very keen "plater," Mr. Morris Fortgang of New York City who has been able to practically complete the left pane reconstruction. At this writing we have unplated, three positions in the left pane and six positions in the right pane, (Plate 5).

(4) When my book was published I had made practically no progress on the reconstruction of the left pane of Plate 7, but I am pleased to state that while Mr. Fortgang and I have been working on the above Plate 5, left pane, Mr. Neinken has practically completed the reconstruction of the left pane of Plate 7, a task that I never had time to complete.

Thus we now have practically complete records of Plates 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10. It has recently been suggested that perhaps there was actually no "Plate 6," and there is some excellent evidence to support this theory.

#### FURTHER REGARDING PLATE 5

The recently discovered block of 21 is an irregular piece containing the following positions in vertical rows: 22L5 to 92L5, 53L5 to 93L5, 64L5, to 94L5, 65L5 to 95L5. We have assumed for many years that the first three vertical rows of Plate 5 were transferred from a roll, which had three reliefs with "side scratches" (Reliefs "B," "C" and "D.") The block of 21 proved that the 2nd to 5th vertical rows were from the same Type V transfer roll, and previous plating showed that the sixth vertical row was from the same transfer roll, and that the remaining four vertical rows (7th, 8th, 9th and 10th) were from a different transfer roll, the one which was used for the entire right pane of Plate 5, (formerly believed to be Plate 6).

#### THE ONE CENT 1857 PLATE #5

The early evidence that we had, indicated that the first three plates made after Plate 4 were made and numbered in the following order: #6 (side ornaments almost complete), no side scratches; #5 - #7 (both with side scratches). However, the recent plating and the discovery of the block of 21 prove that the plates were made and numbered in the following order:

Plate 5 (Types V and Va)  
Plate 6 (undoubtedly all Type V) (if issued)  
Plate 7 (all Type V)  
Plates 8, 9 and 10 (all Type V)

#### THE ONE CENT PLATE THAT WE THOUGHT WAS PLATE 6

In Issue No. 11 of this "SERVICE" of January 28, 1952, page 67, appeared the

following remarks, quote:

"THE ONE CENT 1857 - PLATE SIX

When my two-volume study of the One Cent 1851-57 was published in 1938, comparatively little progress had been made in the plate reconstruction of the left pane of Plate 6, but I had completed quite a bit of the right pane. We were quite sure at that time, (and had been for many years previous), that transfer roll No. 3 was used exclusively on this plate, and produced the unlisted stamps that I designated as 'Type Va' or the 'Type V stamps with almost complete side ornaments.' May I refer those interested to Chapters XXI and XXII in Volume One of my One Cent Book.

Transfer roll No. 3 was a six-relief roller and none of it's reliefs had any of the 'side scratches' at right or left, or both. Transfer roll No. 4 was used on Plates 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10, and it also had six reliefs, three of which had the 'side scratches,' viz., reliefs 'B' - 'C' - 'D.' The other three reliefs 'A' - 'E' and 'F' - did not show the 'scratches.' On Plates 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10, the following horizontal rows had stamps with the 'side scratches' - 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 7th and 8th. None of the other five horizontal rows on the five Type V plates had any 'side scratches.'

In recent years I was shown a horizontal strip of three which contained side by side, a Type V (transfer roll No. 4) stamp with 'scratches' and a Type Va (transfer roll No. 3) stamp with no side scratches.

Never before had I seen such an item and it proved that the original theory that roll No. 3 was used exclusively on Plate 6 was in error. The problem that confronted me at that time was as follows: (1) Were there any Type V stamps with 'side scratches' on Plate 6, that is, did this 'discovery strip' come from Plate 6 or (2) did it come from one of the other Type V plates?

In time, a few other strips were discovered with similar 'type combinations' (V and Va) and eventually I succeeded in plating one of the strips as from the left pane of Plate 6. On page 261 of Volume One of my One Cent study I gave the order of entry of the reliefs of Plates 5 to 10 inclusive. I quote as follows from that page:

'The transferring of all of the six plates was started in the upper left corner of the steel plate, and the transfers were laid down in vertical rows of ten each. On the printed sheets of stamps the order of transfer was 10 R to 60 R, then 70 R to 100 R, followed by 9 R to 59 R, and 69 R to 99 R, etc.

There exists no question but what this order was followed because the proof is positive. If one steps into some oil and walks away on a paved sidewalk, there can be no doubt about the order in which the footprints were left on the walk. In a similar manner I have traced the direction and order of the transferring and proved conclusively several points that heretofore had been puzzling. We not only have one example to prove this order but a number of similar occurrences, the most outstanding of which perhaps are the six 'curls' on the right pane of Plate Seven. These 'curls' are actually the footprints left by the 'F' relief and show conclusively the order of transfer.'

According to the above 10 R6 to 100 R6 were the first ten transfers made on Plate 6, and the first transfer (10 R6) was made in the top left corner of the steel plate. Moving forward on the steel surface to the right the 10th vertical row transferred would be the first vertical row of the right pane on the printed sheet. None of the ten positions in this first vertical row, (right pane) show any stamps with 'side scratches,' hence, in all probability transfer roll #3 (no 'side scratches') was used to transfer all of the right pane of Plate 6, and apparently the 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th vertical rows of the left pane of the plate. At present, my plating indicates that a change took place in the 6th vertical row of the left pane, but so far my plating is too incomplete in the succeeding vertical rows (5th, 4th, 3rd, 2nd and 1st - left pane) to state definitely what actually may have happened.

It is extremely difficult to 'plate' stamps from Plate 6 unless the prints are early enough to show identifying plating marks, thus plateable material is exceedingly scarce. On and off for over thirty years I have been working on the reconstruction of this plate and to date I have succeeded in locating 113 positions out of the total of 200, viz., 41 from the left pane and 72 from the right pane." (end of quote from page 68 - Service Issue of Jan. 28, 1952).

WERE ANY STAMPS ISSUED FROM PLATE SIX

In Issue No. 4 of this Service (August 23, 1951), I stated that at the CENEX held at Philadelphia in July 1951, that Mr. Philip Ward, Jr. had made public for the first time a copy of a very important document that he had recently discovered in the files of the Post Office Department, Washington, D. C. This amazing bit of postal history was the receipt given to Toppan Carpenter & Co. for the dies, transfer rolls and plates which they had used during the term of their contract for supplying U.S. postage stamps to the Post Office Department for the decade 1851-1861. This important receipt was dated, "Phila. Aug. 14, 1861" and listed,

14 Plates of One Cent stamps

We have plate imprint numbers of plates 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, a total of eleven plates, yet the above receipt shows that 14 One Cent plates were delivered to the Department on Aug. 14, 1861, less than a week prior to the issuance of the 1861 Issue.

Were there three One Cent plates made by Toppan Carpenter & Co. from which no stamps were issued to the public and was the mystery plate No. 6 among these and was it given a plate number, but was the plate so defective no stamps were issued to the public? If this is true (and I am not assuming it is), then there must have been two other One Cent defective plates from which no stamps were issued, and which plates never had plate numbers.

SOME COMMENTS BY A VERY KEEN STUDENT  
ONE CENT 1857 - PLATES 5 & 6.

Under date of July 26th, last, Mr. Morris Fortgang wrote me in part as follows, quote:

"Re-- Plate 6. It seems reasonable to believe that this plate had been

manufactured. It also sounds plausible that this plate was damaged before any printings had been taken from it. It is conceivable that the damage occurred to this plate at the same time and place as that of Plate 7. The damage to Plate 6 must have been quite extensive because we know the printers were not phased by such minor things as double entries as shown on Plate 1 late, Plate flaws and blotches on Plate 2, Plate cracks on Plate 3, disfigurement in Plate 7, etc.

I'm quite sure that if any stamps from Plate 6 had been issued to the public you would have discovered some evidence of this in the 'teens, twenties and thirties, when you concentrated on the 1¢ stamps. Having found nary a trace of a Plate 6 stamp, it was logical, sound and inevitable that you should ascribe Type V stamps showing complete side ornaments to this plate. I fail to see why you call this an 'error.' You couldn't possibly have ascribed these stamps to any other plate, and you couldn't possibly have known that there was no Plate 6, and I'm sure you had never heard of a plate that had been entered by two different transfer rolls. Ascribing the Type VA stamps to Plate 6 was no 'error.' True you could have ascribed these stamps to Plate X, but what difference would that have made?" (unquote)

I believe that further study along certain lines will indicate whether any One Cent stamps were ever issued from a plate which we believe was assigned the number SIX.

I have advised Mr. Gordon Harmer, Editor of the S. U. S. to make a correction in the catalogue notation under #24, as quoted in the opening paragraph of this Service Issue.

#### A COVER TO BELGIUM

Photograph No. 219, illustrates a cover from San Antonio, Texas and addressed to Belgium. The postage paid was 21¢, consisting of a vertical pair of the 10¢ 1857 Types III and II and a 1¢ 1857, Type V. No evidence of year use is shown on the cover, but by deduction I believe we can identify it as follows - The New York postmark is dated JUN 25. Inasmuch as the 1¢, Type V, was not issued until the late fall of 1857, the year had to be 1858 or later. The New York postmark has, "A<sup>M</sup> PKT" which reminds us that while the British packets for Europe sailed on Wednesdays, American packets sailed on Saturdays. Thus we refer to our perpetual calendar to find out in which year "JUN 25" fell on Saturday and learn it was 1859. Therefore, this cover was, in all probability, mailed from Texas on June 10, 1859 and from New York over two weeks later. What about the 21¢ payment? Not infrequently we see covers to foreign countries with a marking reading, "PAID ONLY TO ENGLAND" (see Photo No. 7) and with 21¢ postage paid. This cover is in that class, though without that marking. Thus not paid to the address in Belgium but merely to the British frontier under the terms of the U. S. - British Postal Treaty of 1848, (5¢ U.S. internal plus 16¢ sea). The manuscript markings concern the handling of the letter from England to Belgium. At this period the U. S. did not have a postal treaty with Belgium whereby postage in either country could be prepaid to destination in the other. Britain did have such a treaty, hence this letter was treated just the same after reaching England as a letter originating there and forwarded unpaid.

THE 5¢ 1857 - TYPE II - HENNA BROWN

Last month I addressed a letter to Mr. Gordon Harmer, Editor of the Scott catalogues and suggested that the above stamp, now listed as a minor variety in the S. U. S. under No. 28, be given a major listing, such as 28A, or some other special number, and that the old name that was listed in the catalogues for so many years to be restored, viz., "Indian Red." personally I prefer this name to "Henna Brown." The catalogue quotes the #28 Red Brown @ \$35.00 used and the "Henna" @ 265. However, no valuation is given for a pair or strip of three or for a cover with the "Henna." This shade is very beautiful and quite distinctive. No doubt as much so as the major listing #30 of the Type II Orange Brown. What is a single "Henna" on cover worth? I wonder!! Well do I remember a cover with a pair of the Henna used to California from an Indiana town. The color was superb, what I would put in the same classification as the "Pigeon Blood" of the 3¢ 1861 or the 3¢ 1861 "Dark Carmine Lake." Mr. Luff did not list an "Indian Red" or a "Henna Brown" but he did mention "Carmine Brown." I wonder if that is what we know as the "Henna," or "Indian Red?"

1847 STAMPS TO ENGLAND

In the September Issue of this Service I illustrated and described a most unusual and rare cover - see pages 324 and 325 and Photograph #170. This was a cover with two 10¢ and a 5¢ 1847 used to pay the 24¢ rate (1¢ overpay) from Philadelphia on NOV. 3, 1851 to Liverpool, England. A manuscript routing read, "Per Steamer Nov. 5, 1851." The red credit of "19" was the one used at New York and shows that the letter was despatched by British packet. As I have mentioned on numerous occasions, the British Cunard mail ships sailed from Boston and New York on Wednesdays. In 1851, Nov. 5 fell on Wednesday, indicating there is little doubt that this was a use after the 1847 stamps had been demonetized."

In June 1851, instructions were issued to postmasters thruout the country that the 5¢ and 10¢ stamps then current must not be recognized as prepaying letters after the 30th of that month. The public was requested to exchange all of the old for the new stamps to be issued July 1, 1851. I believe that some postmasters and postal clerks deliberately disregarded the demonetization order and permitted some mail with the old stamps to go thru unmolested. This cover (#170) is a fine example and from a large post office.

I am always anxious to record uses of the "forty-sevens," after demonetization, and recently a cover passed thru my hands with a single 10¢ 1847 used from New York to Boston on August 1, 1851.

THE 1847 ISSUE TO ENGLAND

Photograph #220 illustrates a cover with a pair of the 10¢ and a single 5¢ to pay the 24¢ rate (1¢ overpay) to England from Mobile, Ala., June 16, 1850. This cover is somewhat similar to cover #170 but it shows the Boston credit marking "19" which was different from that of New York. This cover, a folded letter, has the following instructions: "Per 22 June steamer from Boston." Evidently this was an error because in 1850, June 22nd fell on Saturday and I have no record that there was a sailing of a British mail

ship from Boston on that date. I imagine the sailing was Wednesday, June 26, 1850. This rare and interesting cover turned up in London in 1943, and later was sold in a London sale by Harmer Rooke & Co. in 1946. In the Robson Lowe publication, the "Philatelist" of January 1955, it was illustrated and described, and in a sale by that firm last January it was acquired by a London dealer. The cover again came up for sale by Herman Herst, Jr. on June 19th last and is reported to have realized \$1,250.00. In a Herst advertisement in "STAMPS" of May 21 last, it was illustrated and described as "one of the rarest 1847 combination known."

THE WATERHOUSE SALE, LONDON, JUNE 27-30, 1955

A number of lots in this sale had notations as follows: "With Stanley B. Ashbrook's signed guarantee on reverse." It is true that I was paid a fee to examine a number of covers that were submitted to me by the Harmer London firm last January and I signed those that I believed to be genuine as I usually do, as follows: "In my opinion this cover is genuine in all respects." I never guaranteed a single item in that sale and all such statements were absolutely untrue. I had no knowledge that my signed opinions were to be misrepresented until the printed catalogues were issued. I immediately registered a strong protest and received an apology. I wonder what the public thought when they read that somebody by the name of Ashbrook was "guaranteeing" covers in the sale? I wonder what my friends thought? Why should I be "guaranteeing" covers in a British sale?

After the catalogue was issued some forty-seven lots that I had not previously examined were sent to me. I advised that quite a few be "withdrawn" and I note that my advice was followed in the majority of lots. Certain lots that I recommended be "withdrawn" were offered and sold, but I suppose were sold "with extension" which meant, subject to a time extension for expert opinion by a recognized authority or expert committee.

A WATERHOUSE 5¢ 1857 COVER - TYPE I - RED BROWN

In last month's issue of this Service I included a photograph (#217) of Lot 278 in the Waterhouse Sale. This was a very beautiful cover (in my opinion) with two vertical pairs and two singles of the 5¢ 1857 Type I Red Brown. The stamps were described as "deep and brilliant color" which is true. This cover sold at 130 pounds or approximately \$364.00.

A WATERHOUSE 10¢ 1857 COVER - V.S. OF 3, ALL TYPE IV

In the December 1954 Issue of this Service I described (page 352) and illustrated an extremely rare cover with a vertical strip of the 10¢ 1857 - all Type IV. See Photograph #181. In the Waterhouse Sale, Lot #314 was a cover with a vertical strip of the 10¢ 1857, all Type IV, from the same plate positions. In the sale catalogue, it was described as quote: "One of the great show pieces of the collection," which was quite true. And also, "With Stanley B. Ashbrook's signed guarantee on reverse," which was not true. Incidentally this very rare cover sold at 550 pounds or \$1,540.00. Someone obtained a real bargain (in my humble opinion).

THE 90¢ 1861  
THE EARLIEST KNOWN USE

In the Waterhouse Sale, Lot 535, was a cover from the well-known Heard correspondence with a 90¢ 1861, a 5¢ 1861 Buff, a 10¢ 1861 Type II and a 3¢ 1861, paying the \$1.08 rate to Hong Kong, China from Boston on Nov. 27, 1861. This is the earliest recorded use of the 90¢ 1861 in my records but in the sales catalogue description, no mention was made of this important feature. I have known of this cover for many years and it's earliest known use of the 90¢ stamp. Sir Nicholas Waterhouse exhibited this cover at the International Exhibition, held at New York in May 1936, and again at Cipex at New York in 1947. In the sale it sold @ 600 pounds or \$1,680.00. The 1955 S. U. S. gives "Sept. 1861," but this is the date that we believe the stamp was placed on sale, not the date of any actual cover.

WATERHOUSE 30¢ 1869 COVERS

In the Waterhouse Sale were two 30¢ 1869 covers. Lots 605 and 606. The former, a cover (double rate) from New Orleans to France in October of 1869. The stamp, canceled by a large black square dots. This cancellation is known to have been used at New Orleans during 1869 and 1870, hence in my opinion, this cover is genuine in every respect. Kindly refer to Photo #218 in last month's Service Issue, a 15¢ 1869 tied by this same New Orleans cancel in February 1870. This cover sold @ 210 pounds or approximately \$588.00. This is a demonstration of the value of a genuine 30¢ 1869 cover. The S. U. S. gives \$300.00.

Regarding Lot 606, the other 30¢ 1869 cover, I advised the Harmer London firm that this cover should be withdrawn. They offered it, and it was sold @ 140 pounds, or \$392.00. I am sure that it will be returned.

In future issues I will discuss other lots in the Waterhouse sale.

\*\*\*\*\*

END OF ISSUE NO. 53

Fifth Series - 1955-1956

AUGUST 1, 1955

Third number of the Fifth Series

\*\*

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 54 - SEPTEMBER 1, 1955 - (Fifth Series - 1955-1956)

\*\*\*\*\*

AGAIN WE REFER TO THE RECENT

WATERHOUSE SALE

IN LONDON

The sale of the U.S. collection of Sir Nicholas Waterhouse occurred at London last June 27-30 inclusive.

In the May 1st, 1955 issue of this Service I stated on page 394, quote: "Caution. Extreme care should be exercised in bidding sight-unseen for lots in the Waterhouse sale, because there are a number of covers in this sale which are fraudulent." (unquote)

Lot 86

For example, Lot 85 was a cover from Philadelphia to Paris, France in May 1848 with a 10¢ 1847. It appeared to be a very beautiful cover, with a four margin copy tied by the well-known framed PAID that was used at Philadelphia. This stamp was pencanceled and cleaned and, in my opinion, was not used on this cover originally. The PAID, in my opinion, being a painted imitation of one of the genuine strikes of this Philadelphia marking on the face of the cover. This pencanceled and cleaned stamp was described as "10¢ superb used on fine and neat envelope, etc." I was informed on excellent authority that before the sale attention of the Harmer firm was called to the fact that the stamp was pencanceled, but thru "oversight," no announcement was made of this fact at the sale and the cover was permitted to be sold at 105 pounds or \$294.00. My photograph of the stamp by ultra-violet brought out all the pen marks. I suppose the cover with my report will be returned to London.

As stated above, this was surely a stampless cover with the 10¢ postage paid in cash (or charge) at Philadelphia. By referring to the illustration in the catalogue it will be noted that when the faker put his pencanceled copy on the cover he only had one blank space and that was the one he used. The Philadelphia postmark occupied the upper right corner, etc.

It is well to bear in mind that in May 1848 the U. S. did not have a postal treaty with France or England, hence this letter only required prepayment of the domestic rate of 10¢ from Philadelphia to Boston, where it was put aboard a British Cunard mail ship for England. In France, the letter was marked with a pen "15" decimes postage due, which represented the transmission from the U.S. frontier to the French address, (under terms of the Anglo-French Postal Treaty).

Lot 88

Lot 88 in the Waterhouse sale was a white envelope with a 5¢ and 10¢ 1847, the former above the 10¢ and both tied to cover with a red-orange circular marking reading, "VERM<sup>T</sup> & MASS<sup>T</sup>S R.R."

The catalogue description included the following quote: "THIS FAMOUS AND UNIQUE ENTIRE IS DESCRIBED BY STANLEY B. ASHBROOK IN 'STAMPS' MAGAZINE 19 JULY 1947." The sale price was 600 pounds or the equivalent of \$1,680.00. I have never seen or examined this cover, and my mention of it in the article in "Stamps" was based entirely on a photograph which was furnished to me some years ago by Sir Nicholas Waterhouse. I assumed at the time the article was written that he was positive that the cover was genuine. I quote as follows from my article in "Stamps:"

"A unique cover. - Illustrated herewith is a very rare and unique cover that reposes in the magnificent collection of an internationally known philatelist. This superb 1847 gem shows both stamps - the entire issue, used on one cover and canceled, not with the usual town postmark or other form of obliteration, but by a postal marking used by a U. S. mail agent on a railroad route. This marking reads, 'VERM<sup>T</sup> & MASS<sup>T</sup>S R.R.' (unquote)

The above covers my entire remarks concerning the cover. Naturally I considered at the time that the cover was perfectly genuine in every way.

THREE CENTS 1861 PINK, BLOCK OF TWELVE

Lot 409 in the Waterhouse sale was a block of twelve (4 X 3) of the 3¢ 1861, described as unused and "PINK," and quote: "The famous block xxxc from the Worthington collection in a very good colour," and also, quote: "With attached article by Stanley B. Ashbrook, 'Stamps' Magazine 23-3-46."

The only time that I have any record of seeing this block was in the Waterhouse exhibit at the Tipex at New York in May 1936. As I recall, it was in one of the Waterhouse frames and the light was not of a kind to distinguish the difference between a Rose and a Pink.

This block was sold to a U. S. buyer in the recent Waterhouse sale @ 480 pounds, or \$1,344.00. I have been reliably informed that since the sale that this block was submitted to the Expert Committee of the Philatelic Foundation, New York, and that the Committee stated, that in their opinion the block was not the Pink.

Again I repeat, that the only time I ever saw this item was behind glass in poor light at Tipex in 1936. It was never submitted to me for an opinion.

In my article in Stamps of March 23, 1946, I stated, quote: "Well do I especially recall one item in the Waterhouse exhibit, (Tipex 1936) and no doubt many others also remember it quite well. It was an unused o.g. block of twelve (12) of the 3¢ PINK of 1861, 4 x 3, with full imprint and plate number 'No. 12' (at the bottom). While the color was not the number one, 'PIGEON BLOOD,' nevertheless, the color was quite a fine 'PINK.'" (unquote). In other words, in 1936 the block was considered to be a "fine PINK." In the summer of 1955, the Expert Committee of the Philatelic Foundation issued a certificate (so I am reliably informed) that this block was not a "PINK."

In the Arthur Hind sale, held in New York in 1933, this 3¢ 1861 block was described as "o.g." and was purchased by Elliott Perry for \$1,150.00. I assume that Perry was acting as agent for Waterhouse. Surely at that time no one in this country was better qualified than Elliott Perry to pass on the color of a 3¢ 1861 Pink or Pigeon Blood. I cannot believe that Perry would have paid \$1,150.00 for this block if he was not sure it was a PINK.

Under date of Oct. 7, 1939, Elliott Perry wrote me a letter from which I quote in part as follows: "~~xxxx~~ the Worthington block from Plate 12 either. The latter was knocked down to me in the Hind sale and altho it was sold as 'o.g.' there was no gum on it. It was different from my idea of a pigeon blood." (unquote).

The late Wm. C. Kennett, Jr. was philatelic secretary to the late Arthur Hind and I inquired of Kennett, some years ago, where Hind obtained the block. Again I quote from my "Stamps" article:

"Where did Hind obtain this block? I cannot answer that question, and in making inquiry of my old friend Wm (Bill) C. Kennett, Jr., I learned he could not remember when or how it drifted into Arthur Hind's possession, but seemed to recall that Charles J. Phillips sold it to Hind, and that it came out of the Duveen collection." (unquote)

After this article appeared, I was reliably informed that the above was correct.

One might well ask the question, "Was this block a Pink when it was owned by Duveen and recognized as a true PINK by Duveen, Phillips, Hind, Perry, Waterhouse and others?"

Again I quote from my "Stamps" article: "Wm. C. Kennett, Jr. ~~xxxx~~ recently remarked in a letter to me, 'I always considered it (the block) a true pink although not the so-called 'Pigeon Blood,' which I think probably is not known unused'." (unquote)

This block came from the Worthington collection which was sold by J.C. Morgenthau & Co. in August 1917. It was lot 249 and sold @ \$1,100.00. It was described as "unused" but no mention was made of gum. It was again sold by Morgenthau in a sale in January 1922 and was described as the "September 3¢ PINK #64" - "unused" - "A remarkably fine and rare block," and "undoubtedly unique, from the Worthington collection." I have no record of the sale price. It is my belief that Duveen was the purchaser thru some agent.

I cannot believe that such a recognized student of early U. S. as J. C. Morgenthau would have sold this block in two different sales unless he was confident that it was a PINK.

In 1955 the Expert Committee of the Philatelic Foundation expressed the opinion that the block was not a PINK. I am not criticizing their action, but merely stating what I believe are facts.

Where did Commodore Worthington acquire this block? As near as I was ever

able to learn, Worthington purchased the block from John Luff in 1905. Apparently there was no doubt in the mind of Mr. Luff that the block of twelve was PINK. Suppose we go way back to 1892 and see what Mr. Luff thought of this block at that time. Writing in the October 1892 "American Journal of Philately, Mr. Luff gave the history of the discovery of this block. At that time Mr. Luff resided in San Francisco, Calif. and he related how two blocks of the 3¢ 1861 PINK had been discovered "among the papers of a lawyer in National City, Calif." who sold them to San Francisco dealers. Mr. Luff stated, quote: (there) "were two blocks of twelve, each bearing the imprint xxxc No. 12 plate. I am happy to say one of these blocks adorns my collection. It is strange that the same plate number appears on both blocks and gives rise to the query, was the three cent PINK printed only from Plate 12?" (unquote)

As far back as 1892 this block has been regarded as PINK by a number of authorities all the way thru the years from Luff to Waterhouse. And now the Philatelic Foundation states (so I am informed) that the block is not Pink, the S.U.S. No. 64. In my 1946 article I stated that while the color was not the Pigeon it was "quite a fine Pink." I had a whole list of authorities before me who were of that belief, hence I assumed that they were correct. What is the answer? Has the original color changed? Was this block a much finer color in former years than it is today? If Mr. Luff was alive today would he class this block as PINK? Would Worthington, if alive today pronounce it a Pink? Would J. C. Morgenthau?

#### A COVER THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN WITHDRAWN

Photograph No. 221, illustrates Lot 664 in the Waterhouse sale. This was described as a 90¢ rose-carmine, S. U. S. #166 (90¢ Continental of 1873) used from "Petaluma, Calif." to Switzerland in "January 1887." The year as given in the catalogue was in error as the use was actually "January 1877," instead of 1887. This was a registered letter, and the registered fee was 10¢ on a letter to Switzerland in 1877. The postage rate was 5¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce according to the "U.P.U." Treaty (Universal Postal Union). Why 90¢ on this cover? Such a rate would represent 16 X 5¢ plus 10¢ registration. A sixteen times would mean 16 X  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce or a letter weighing half a pound. In all probability some faker removed a 15¢ 1873 and substituted a 90¢ 1873 (5¢ postage plus 10¢ registered). Incidentally the fake postmark on the stamp is a very poor counterfeit imitation of the genuine strike to left on the cover. Long before the sale I advised the Harmer London firm that this cover should be withdrawn but it was sold @ 63 pounds or \$176.40. I understand it has been returned with my opinion that it is fraudulent.

#### WHEN WAS THE U. S. DOMESTIC RATE REDUCED FROM HALF-OUNCE TO ONE OUNCE?

I wonder how many students or collectors of U. S. postal history can answer that query off hand? The Act of March 3, 1845, effective July 1, 1845, for the first time, fixed the single rate at one-half ounce. This weight remained in effect for forty years. The Act of March 3, 1885, effective July 1, 1885, reduced the rate on first-class mail from 2¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce to 2¢ per ounce, but the U.P.U. rate was not similarly reduced. The 1955 S.U.S. states on page 58 above #210, quote: "Reduction in first class rate to two cents for each half ounce by Act of Congress, March 3, 1883, effective

October 1, 1883, etc." The S.U.S. makes no further mention of the rate by weight. It should.

FIVE CENTS TO PARIS IN 1856

Photograph #222, illustrates Lot #106 in the Waterhouse sale, a very rare and very desirable cover with a vertical strip of the One Cent 1851, Type II (Plate 2). A cover that is good as gold and genuine in every way. This cover was from New Orleans to Paris, France in May 1856 and the payment was the "U. S. Internal under the U.S.-British Postal Treaty." This "rate" has been repeatedly mentioned in issues of this "Service." In the Durham sale by H.R.Harmer, Ltd., held in London last December, Lot 71 was a similar cover from New Orleans to Havre, France in October 1854 with the "5¢ U.S. Internal" paid by a H.S. of five (5) of the One Cent 1851, Type IV. See Photograph #193 in this "Service," Issue of March 1955. The Durham cover sold @ 21 pounds (\$58.80) and the Waterhouse @ 52 pounds 10 shillings (\$148.00). This five cent "rate," paid by strips of five of the One Cent 1851, on cover are exceedingly rare.

Commenting on this 1¢ 1851 cover months before the sale, Sir Nicholas wrote me that he had never seen another cover like his, with a vertical paying this 5¢ "internal rate."

THE 90¢ STAMP OF 1861. A STUDY OF THREE RARE COVERS

On page #423 of last month's issue of this Service, I briefly described Lot #535 in the Waterhouse sale, a cover from the well-known "Augustine Heard" correspondence with a 90¢ 1861 used to Hong Kong from Boston on Nov. 27, 1861. I mentioned that while the 1955 "S.U.S." gave an "issue date" of "SEP. 1861," this Waterhouse cover was the earliest known use, in my records, of this 90¢ stamp. I have never seen or heard of any other cover with the 90¢ 1861 used any earlier.

Photograph #223, illustrates this exceptional cover. It will be noted that in addition to the 90¢, the cover has a 10¢ 1861, Type I, (August), a 5¢ 1861 Buff, and a 3¢ 1861 Rose. Total postage \$1.08. (Note - thru error, the 10¢ was listed on page 423 this Service, as a Type II). The Waterhouse catalogue listed it as "First Design S.U.S. #58," but strange to relate no mention was made that this cover shows the earliest known use of the 90¢ stamp. This important feature must have been noted by Sir Nicholas on his album page because in correspondence we discussed this cover for twenty years back. In the recent sale the cover sold at 600 pounds or \$1,680. No doubt this is the highest price, by far, ever realized for a 90¢ 1861 cover.

90¢ 1861 - EARLIEST KNOWN USE

This remarkable gem is a folded letter dated inside "Boston, Nov. 27, 1861." There is no Boston postmark on the face but on the back is a part of a red circular marking, "Boston Br. Pkt - Nov 27." Incidentally, the British Cunard mail ships sailed from Boston on Wednesdays (every other) and in 1861, "Nov. 27" was Wednesday. The stamps are canceled three times with the well-known "PAID IN GRID" used at Boston. The cover is routed, "Via Marseilles"

and in November 1861, a rate of \$1.08 represented a letter weighing more than one-half ounce, hence this was a "double." On face of this cover is a red "98" which was added at Boston and represented the U.S. credit to the British Post Office of 98¢. Thus out of the \$1.08 paid, the U.S. retained only 10¢ which was 2 x 5¢, the "U.S. Internal." Instead of being sent by ship around Gibraltar into the Mediterranean and thru Suez, "Via Marseilles" meant that the letter was sent from England "Overland" Via rail thru France to Marseilles, where it caught a mail ship that had sailed from England at an earlier date. On the face of this interesting cover is a London marking of "DEC 9 61." Mails for China "Via Marseilles" were despatched from England on the 10th and 26th. The Hong Kong postmark on back is "Jan 24 62," thus 58 days from Boston.

ANOTHER 90¢ 1861 COVER

Photograph No. 224, illustrates Lot 536 in the Waterhouse sale. This is another 90¢ 1861 cover from the "Augustine Heard" correspondence and a truly beautiful cover that is genuine in every respect. This cover shows a rate of \$1.06 paid by a 90¢ 1861, a 10¢ 1861 Type II, (#68) and two 3¢ 1861, the latter in the rich brownish-rose shade of 1863. The cover, photo 223, shows a rate "Via Marseilles" of \$1.08, whereas the cover under discussion shows a rate of \$1.06. This is because the rate "Via Marseilles" was changed as of July 1, 1863 (?) for a letter weighing over ½ ounce, but not over 1 ounce from \$1.08 to \$1.06. On the front of this cover is a red pencil "96" over a "2." The "96" was the U. S. credit to Britain, leaving our share 10¢ or 2 times the 5¢ "internal." I mentioned above that mail from China routed "Via Marseilles" was despatched on the 10th and 26th of each month. This cover shows a small red London postmark of "Dec. 7 63" and the routing reads, "VIA MARSEILLES - 10th DEC." Thus the "10th Dec" meant from England on that date. In the sale this cover sold @ 200 pounds or \$560.00 in comparison to \$1,680 for the "earliest known use" cover, photo #223.

PAIR 90¢ 1861 ON COVER

Photograph #225, illustrates Lot #537 in the Waterhouse sale, another cover from the Heard correspondence with a h.pair of the 90¢ 1861 plus a h.pair of the 10¢ 1861, Type II, (#68) and a single 12¢ 1861, total postage of \$2.12. This folded letter was apparently from New York on March 28 (Tuesday) and was sent from Boston by a British Packet (Cunard) on Wednesday, March 29, 1865. The small red London postmark on face is "AP 10 65," one of the monthly departure dates for mail to China "Via Marseilles." Covers #223 and #224 were rated in the U.S. as "doubles" (note each has a penciled "2") but #225 was a "quad" - (note the "4"). In upper left is a pen "192" over a "4." The "192" was the credit to Britain of \$1.92, leaving our share of the postage paid, 20¢, or 4 times the 5¢ "internal." At the sale this superb gem sold for 290 pounds or some \$812.00, which was less than half the amount realized for the "earliest," (photo #223). Of the two covers I would much prefer to own the cover with the pair. An "earliest known use" remains as such until an earlier one is discovered but of course in the case of a high value, the 90¢, an earlier use may not even exist.

A 30¢ 1869 cover

In the Waterhouse sale there were two 30¢ 1869 covers, Lots 605 and 606. On page 423, of last month's Service Issue, I mentioned these two items. It is my opinion that Lot 605 is perfectly genuine. It sold @ \$588.00. **Photo 226** In comparison, the other cover, sold @ \$392.00. Photograph No. 226, illustrates this cover, Lot 606, which, in my opinion, is fraudulent, that is, the 30¢ stamp was not originally used on this envelope.

According to the postal markings this was a use in March 1870, (or 1871?) and the rate to Genoa, Italy at that time was 10¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce, by "DIRECT CLOSED MAIL VIA ENGLAND." In my opinion, this was originally not a letter that weighed between one ounce and one and a half ounces, and did not require a triple 10¢ rate, or 30¢. In my opinion, a 10¢ 1869 stamp or a 10¢ Bank Note (1870) was removed (if 1871) and the 30¢ 1869 substituted. The red New York postmark reads, "NEW YORK PAID ALL- BR. TRANSIT - MAR 4." This marking was current at that period.

AN OLD AUCTION CATALOGUE

I have before me an auction catalogue issued by Hugh M. Clark for his 18th Sale scheduled for June 3, 1911, to be held in the Club Rooms of the Chicago Philatelic Society, Chicago. In later years Mr. Clark became the owner of the Scott Stamp & Coin Co. and Editor of the Scott catalogues. He is now retired and living in California. In his 1911 sale I note two interesting lots, viz: "Lot 27 - 1847 - 5¢ - , a horizontal strip of five (5) red cancellations, left stamp creased." No record of price realized. Lot No. 28 was described as follows, quote: "1847 - 5¢ - horiz. strip of six, light red cancellation, a very beautiful strip, cost the owner \$20.00 and worth even more. Probably could not be duplicated for less than \$35.00. Superb." (unquote). I wonder where those two strips are today? Mr. Clark added a note to the effect that "the current quotation of \$1.25 each" for a 5¢ 1847 was "ridiculous" and quote, "They are selling readily at retail from \$1.75 to \$2.50 each for singles and \$4.00 to \$6.00 per pair."

\*\*\*\*\*

END OF ISSUE NO. 54

Fifth Series - 1955-1956

SEPTEMBER 1, 1955

Fourth Number of the Fifth Series

\*\*

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 55 - OCTOBER 1, 1955 - (Fifth Series - 1955-1956)

\*\*\*\*\*

THE TEN CENTS FORTY SEVEN

Earliest known use. Government records disclose that supplies of the "Forty Sevens" were first sent to New York on July 1, 1847, to Boston on July 2, and to Philadelphia on July 7th, yet no cover is known to philately showing an earlier use than July 9, 1847.

Photograph No. 227, illustrates a most remarkable piece of U. S. postal history, the earliest known use of any genuinely canceled U. S. postage stamp. This philatelic gem reposes in the fine specialized collection of the 1847 issue of Mr. C. C. Hart of Kansas City, Mo. It is a blue folded letter postmarked "NEW YORK - 9 JUL" (1847). It is, of course, genuine in every respect, and good as gold. This cover bears a sheet margin copy of the 10¢ (50LL) and is addressed to "Mr. James H. Johnson - Galena, Ills." The letter inside is date lined "New York July 8 1847." The stamp is tied to cover by the familiar red "square grid" which was the earliest canceling device used at New York. The stamper was, of course, very new and was applied so heavily that indentations further tied the stamp to the folded letter. Thus this is also the earliest known use of the New York square grid.

THE CHASE STUDY OF THE 1847 ISSUE

1916

EARLIEST KNOWN USE OF THE 5¢ 1847

On numerous occasions I have referred to the very fine study of the 1847 issue by Dr. Carroll Chase that appeared serially back in 1916 in the old "Philatelic Gazette" which was published monthly by the Nassau Stamp Co. In that pioneer article, the author gave a list and description of the earliest uses he had been able to discover of the 5¢ and 10¢, and he described one cover as follows:

5¢ Value

Used from - New York

Postmarked - "New York - 9 JUL 5cts" in the upper right corner

Addressed to - Middletown, Conn.

Stamp - An uncanceled copy in lower left corner

Dr. Chase stated that the color and impression of the uncanceled stamp indicated the first 1847 printing and that the cover appeared authentic in every way. Thus we have a record of a genuinely canceled 10¢ used from New York on July 9, 1847, and a cover postmarked the same day with an uncanceled 5¢ stamp. Dr. Chase stated the cover had been shown to him by Mr. J. J. Cone, Jr. I wonder where that cover is today? As far as I can recall, I have never run across it and the only record that I have of it is the Chase article.

THE FIRST PRINTINGS OF THE FORTY SEVENS

The Government records show that the first order for the 1847 stamps was sent to the firm of Rawdon Wright Hatch & Edson, the contractors, on June 3, 1847, and called for 600,000 of the 5¢ and 200,000 of the 10¢. As both plates were 200 subjects, this meant 3,000 sheets of 5¢ and 1,000 sheets of the 10¢. Thus, all genuine covers showing uses in the year 1847 and up to March 15, 1848, (when the second order was sent), contain stamps from the first 3,000 and 1,000 sheets, provided the Rawdon firm did not print a greater number for the first order.

5¢ FORTY SEVENS USED IN 1847

Dr. Chase stated that two distinct colors were included in the stamps furnished in the first supply to the Post Office Department, one, quote: "A clear rather dark brown (perhaps the official 'light brown') and the other a 'brilliant orange brown.'" (unquote). On page 226 of the Chase article he listed four shades for stamps found on covers used in the year 1847, viz: Orange Brown, Bright Orange Brown, Dark Brown & Black Brown.

THE 1847 YEAR COLORS OF THE 5¢

Of course, it is possible that the 1847 Orange Brown and Dark Brown were both issued to post offices at the same time in that last half of 1847 but from my study of covers I have found more of the Orange Brown in the early days of the issue, and more of the dark brown in the last weeks of 1847. Regarding this feature, Dr. Chase stated in his article, quote: "Later in the year xxxxx a rare color, indicating a small printing appeared which might be called 'black brown.' This is the deepest shade in which the stamp is found." (unquote)

THE 5¢ COLORS FOR 1848 - 1849 - 1850

For the three years of 1848, 1849 and 1850, Dr. Chase listed such shades of brown, as "dark" - "reddish" - "bright reddish," "grayish," "dark grayish" and "dark Olive" and as a final shade of 1850, he listed the "Orange." For 1851 he gave "dark" and "deep" Brownish Orange. Just in case future students would not know what he meant by his various color names, he gave readings by the Ridgway Color Book of each one. Thus if a philatelic student of today possesses, or has access to the Ridgway book, he can refer to the charts and visualize what Dr. Chase meant by his various color names back in 1916 for the 1847 - 5¢ stamps.

ORANGE AND BROWNISH ORANGE

As an 1847 color Dr. Chase gave orange brown and as an 1850-1851 color, brownish orange. Here is what he wrote about the orange and brownish orange of 1850-1851, quote: "During the latter part of this year (1850) a decided change was made in the ink, and the orange and colors more or less closely related to it appeared. These are described as orange and brownish orange. The typical 1851 shade is also brownish orange, but the shade is darker than the 1850 brownish orange. These to some extent

resemble the orange brown 1847 shade but the two can be differentiated after a little practice, although both are 'early' impressions."(unquote)

#### EARLY IMPRESSIONS OF THE 5¢ IN 1850

What did Dr. Chase mean by the statement "both are early impressions"? At the time he published his article he was of the opinion that three plates of 100 subjects each were used for the 5¢, that the first two plates became badly worn in the latter part of 1850, and were replaced by a third 100 subject plate. It was his theory that the new plate of late 1850 produced the orange and brownish orange stamps of that year, and also those used in 1851, of that color.

Some few years after the appearance of the Chase article, "gutter copies" of both the 5¢ and the 10¢ were discovered, proving that the 1847 plates were 200 subject plates rather than 100. By "gutter copies," is meant, a stamp from the 10th vertical row of a left pane showing sheet margin at right and a portion of a stamp in the first vertical row of a right pane, or vice versa.

In the study of the 1847 stamps and plates I believe that aside from the reconstruction of the 10¢ plate by Elliott Perry that I took up where Chase left off. In 1935, I advanced the theory that the 1847 plates were made of copper and not of steel and that largely due to this, that the reconstruction of the 5¢ plate was not possible. Other factors were, the brown ink, and no recutting of the frame lines as in the case of the 10¢ plate. The records show that 4,400,000 five cent stamps were printed, or some 22,000 sheets. It has been claimed by some prominent philatelic students that it would have been impossible to obtain 22,000 impressions from a 5¢ copper plate. My answer to that is quite sensible, I believe, viz: It depends on the composition of the metal in such a "copper plate."

In my time I have done quite a bit of plate reconstruction work and have studied stamps printed from both steel and copper plates. To my eye, impressions from steel plates are "hard and cold" with razor-sharp lines, whereas impressions from copper plates are "soft and warm" with lines a bit fuzzy, under high magnification.

#### THE WORN PLATE 5¢ STAMPS?

Dr. Chase, in his article advanced the theory that the two first plates became worn and were replaced by a new plate in late 1850. His remarks on this feature were as follows, quote: "xxxxxx the impressions proving the gradual wear of these two plates year by year. Proof of the third plate is found in the fact that copies seen on cover dated during the first six months of 1851, - the last six months of the use of the issue, - almost invariably show either very worn impressions or else clear 'early' impressions in the typical 1851 shade, (Note by S.B.A. - His brownish orange) and the clear impressions are far commoner." (unquote)

#### ONE 5¢ PLATE OF 200 SUBJECTS

If there was only one 5¢ 1847 plate of 200 subjects, and I believe this

to be a fact, how can this fit into the Chase study as above, viz: "worn plate impressions" in the early part of 1850, and "clear fresh impressions" late in 1850? Before going further into this feature we will discuss what some of my research work on the 5¢ developed.

For many years I photographed every sheet margin or corner copy that I could locate. Way back in the nineteen thirties I had the late Judge Emerson loan me a great many such copies from his fine collection, and I made photographs of each and recorded on diagrams all consistent plating marks. My main object was to learn if I could find and identify more than eight corner copies. If not more than eight, then this would indicate only one plate of 200, if more than eight, then there must have been two plates. From many sources I borrowed sheet and corner copies and in time I identified and plated the eight corner positions of the 5¢ plate. I believe that there was only one 5¢ plate because I have never been able to find a corner stamp that was not from one of my eight plated positions. In other words, I have never been able to find a ninth corner copy.

#### AGAIN, - "WORN PLATE"

Again the question arises, if there was only one 5¢ plate, how can we explain the "worn plate" stamps that are found on covers of 1850 and the clear "early" impressions found on covers of 1851? To Mr. Lester Brookman we owe the theory that the 5¢ plate commenced to become quite dirty sometime in 1849 and that by early 1850 it was so dirty that impressions had the appearance of great plate wear. And further, that sometime in the early or middle fifties, the plate was thoroughly cleaned and the "clear" impressions (as noted by Chase) are really not from a "new plate" but from a thoroughly "cleaned" condition of the one and only plate. In this respect I believe we can attribute the very "dirty" state of the plate to the "sticky" composition of the brown ink that was used.

#### THE 5¢ 1847 DOUBLE TRANSFERS

Do the double transfers indicate one plate and that there were two conditions of the plate, "early" (before cleaning) and "Late" (after cleaning and some re-entries)? I believe the evidence that we have indicates that such was the case. Four "double transfers" of the 5¢ are listed in my records and are listed and illustrated in the "S.U.S." In the Chase 1916 article he described and illustrated two that he named as "A" and "B" and stated that they came from positions "80" and "90" in a "plate" of 100. Later they were identified as 80R1 and 90R1.

#### THE "C" AND "D" DOUBLE TRANSFERS

As near as I can recall, it was the late Dan Hammatt (1932) who first discovered the "C." This must have been in the late teens or early 1920. Hammatt sent me an off cover single inquiring if I had ever run across a duplicate and that the "shift" was new to him. Later in going thru the Judge Emerson collection, I discovered a horizontal pair, off cover, with the stamp to left showing quite an unusual "shift." Someone had informed the Judge it was not a plate variety but a "kiss" or "ink shift."

This was the discovery copy of the scarce "D" double transfer. The plate positions of the "C" and "D" have never been discovered. Up to this time I have a record of six and a half copies of the "C" and four copies of the "D."

#### TWO STATES OF THE 5¢ PLATE?

Covers are known showing uses of the "A" and "B" double transfers prior to 1850, hence I attribute these two varieties to the "Early State" of the 5¢ plate. Two covers with the "C" are known with uses in 1851, and the stamps are in the Chase "Brown Orange" color. These indicate the cleaned or "Late State" of the plate. In the Newbury collection is a H.S. of three of the 5¢ with half a stamp to right. This "half" is a "C" double transfer. Among the four known "D" double transfers there is a cover showing a use in March 1851 but unfortunately I do not have a record of the color of the stamp. The other three examples are all off cover.

#### CLEANED AND A FEW RE-ENTRIES

It is my theory that the 5¢ plate was thoroughly cleaned at some period in 1850, and that at that time some of the 200 positions were re-entered, resulting in two new double transfers we call "C" & "D." Deliveries of the 5¢ value in 1850 were as follows: 1,000,000 in February and 1,000,000 in December. The scarcity of examples of the "C" and "D" double transfers as compared to the more common "A" & "B" seems to indicate that sheets containing these two varieties were in the last shipment made by the Rawdon firm in December 1850.

#### THE 5¢ BROWN INK

Again I quote from the fine study by Dr. Chase: "The rarest colors are the true orange and the black-brown, while the bright orange brown, the bright reddish brown, the brownish orange and the dark olive brown are not much commoner. ~~xxxxx~~ Stamps having false colors and various degrees of fading also exist. These usually have been caused by prolonged exposure to sunlight, or by chemicals used in an attempt to remove a cancellation." (unquote)

To the above I might add that a great many of the 5¢ stamps have been badly damaged by storage in damp cellars or exposure to other forms of dampness. Such exposure, due to the iron in the brown ink caused what is commonly called, "oxidized copies." Much of the original color of such stamps can be restored by a bath in peroxide of hydrogen, but it has been my experience that the original fine lines of the design were so badly damaged that their sharpness cannot be restored. For example, a record of a cover that belonged to me one time. It had a single 5¢ '47 used in late August of 1847. The stamp had become almost black from extreme exposure to dampness. The lines of the design were no longer sharp and clear, but very "fuzzy." A bath in peroxide brought back some of the original orange brown but due to the "rust" of the iron in the ink, the lines of the design had "run" and were no longer sharp and clear. This will explain why all covers used in 1847 do not have 5¢ stamps with "fine engravings," that are sharp and clear. Dr. Chase stated that it had been determined by a

well-known chemist of that period that, quote: "the ink used was surely made from one or more of the iron containing brown pigments - sienna, ochre, and umber, and that it is highly probably sienna was the principal pigment used." (unquote) What is Sienna? My dictionary states it is a "brownish orange - yellow natural clay colored with iron and manganese." I suppose if pigments of this clay were mixed with linseed oil and turpentine and other ingredients that the mixture would be some sort of a "sticky ink." Perhaps this "sticky ink" clogged up the fine lines of the 5¢ plate and made ordinary cleaning difficult. Perhaps in this way we can account for the worn plate copies of the 5¢ 1847 which are so noticeable on covers used in the last half of 1849 and early in 1850. This theory was advanced by Mr. Lester Brookman and I know of no evidence to dispute it.

#### THE ORANGE BROWN ON COVER

If one wishes to put together a really fine collection of the 5¢ 1847, he would be wise to acquire every fine cover offered that showed uses in 1847 or 1851, preferably the former, because the 1847 impressions, (if not damaged by dampness or other causes) are generally very fine sharp and clear engravings. In comparison, I believe that the average 5¢ 1847 stamp known to have been used in 1851 and in the brownish orange shade has "fuzzy" or "feathery lines" as compared to the fine 1847 shades of the orange brown, or dark brown. I consider such covers are worth quite a premium over the ordinary run of 5¢ 1847 covers.

#### 5¢ 1847 MINOR DOUBLE TRANSFER (?)

Back in the middle nineteen thirties, the late Steve Brown sent me a cover with a single 5¢ 1847, which had two horizontal lines in the top of the "T" of POST, also a line in the "S" of POST, also two horizontal lines in the lower part of the right arm of the "U" in upper left corner. He inquired if I had ever seen a duplicate. I had not. I failed to make a record of the color of the stamp. Later he discovered a pair, the left hand stamp being from the same position and confirming our belief that the variety was consistent.

In July 1938 Mr. Tracy Simpson wrote me that in his collection of some ten years earlier he had owned a 5¢ 1847 which had two horizontal lines thru the top of the "T" of POST being, quote: "the same thickness and structure as the lines of the background. xxx There were also two distinct lines in the right arm of the U." (unquote) Mr. Simpson mentioned that he had purchased the stamp as a double transfer from R. H. Mower, a San Francisco dealer, and that when he sold his 1847 collection thru Bert Poole in 1928, the stamp was in that sale. I do not know whether this is a plate variety or a very minor double transfer, but whatever it is, it is rather outstanding as a variety of the 5¢ 1847.

In late years, I discovered a cover with this "Mower shift" in the collection of my valued friend M. H. Judd, and it was on a cover used from Boston on "July 5, 1848." In a sale by Kelleher in October 1944 of material from the Sweet collection, there was a cover with a single of this variety used from New York on July 23, 1847, and tied by the red New York square grid.

I recorded the color of the stamp as DARK RED BROWN. Thus I have a photographic record of five stamps with the "lines thru T."

#### THE SCRUGGS CASE

Back in the summer of 1941, a banker in Bradshaw, Nebr., Mr. Chancy Palmer, sent me a small batch of Confederate covers for my opinion as to their genuineness. He advised me that they had been submitted to him on approval by "ALABAMA STAMPS, Box 3064 - Avondale - Birmingham, Ala.," Proprietor, J.H. Scruggs, Jr. I reported to Mr. Palmer that the covers were rank fakes, and not only that but the Confederate stamps were also counterfeits. Much to my surprise I found that Scruggs was member #16118 of the American Philatelic Society. I, therefore, submitted the fraudulent covers to the Board of our national society and requested the expulsion of the forger, with the result that in the summer of 1942, this man Scruggs was expelled from the A.P.S.

It has since been stated that Scruggs was a youngster in high school at the time and did not realize the scope of his crime. This is absolutely not true as the facts will prove. In fact, Scruggs gave his age as 33 when he was proposed for A.P.S. membership in 1939, hence in 1941 he was 35. If he was in his right mind at the time he made and sold faked covers with counterfeit stamps he surely knew very well what he was doing.

#### THE VENDORS OF THE COUNTERFEITS

Where did Scruggs obtain his counterfeit Confederate stamps? The answer is, from an outfit by the name of the "TATHAM STAMP & COIN CO - OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS." I well remember that a number of prominent collectors of Confederates of the late nineteen thirties condemned and tried to prevent the sale of the counterfeits by the Tatham firm.

#### SCRUGGS ELECTED A DIRECTOR OF THE S.P.A.

At the recent Convention of the S.P.A., (Society of Philatelic Americans) held at Louisville, Ky., last month, the above mentioned J.H. Scruggs Jr. of Birmingham, Ala. was elected a Director of that Society.

#### THE FACTS ABOUT SCRUGGS

In the Sept. 1939 Issue of the American Philatelist, (A.P.), Vol. 52 - No. 12 - the application for membership of Scruggs was published. His address at that time was given as "Box 175 - Montgomery, Ala., his age 33, occupation as salesman and he was proposed by the late Eugene Klein. His admission as a "new member" was published in the "A.P." for November 1939, Vol. 53, No. 2, and he was assigned A.P.S. No. 16118. His expulsion from the Society was published in the "A.P." for July 1942, Vol. 35, No. 10, page 674 as follows, quote:

#### "EXPULLED FROM MEMBERSHIP

16118 - Scruggs, J.H. Jr. - 1501 S. 21 St., Birmingham, Ala. Said J.H. Scruggs, Jr. has sold and offered for sale, faked Confederate States covers representing them to have been found at their original sources. In fact, J.H. Scruggs, Jr. knew that the stamps placed thereon and the

cancellations applied thereto, were not genuine." (unquote)

THE CONFEDERATE SOCIETY

Recently this expelled member of the A.P.S. was elected Southern Vice-President of the "C.S.A.," (Confederate Stamp Alliance).

Photograph No. 228, is a print of a letter that I received in 1943 from the A.P.S. Board, returning to me two of the Scruggs fakes, which I still have in my possession. Correspondence between Scruggs and Banker Palmer in 1941 prove conclusively that the addresses on the forged covers ("His. Hon. Jefferson Davis etc.) is in the same handwriting.

I reported the Scruggs case to the U.S. District Attorney at Birmingham at the time as a very glaring case of "using the U. S. mail to defraud" but my appeal for action was ignored.

In my very humble opinion, I think that in cases such as this, that it is the duty of our National Philatelic Organizations to insist upon prosecutions, and to press them with vigor where the evidence is conclusive as it was in the Scruggs forgery. Examples should be set so that other forgers of philatelic material will hesitate before trying such criminal acts.

CLEANED 19th U. S. WITH FAKE CANCELS

Perhaps you have a catalogue of the recent Waterhouse Sale held at London last June. If so please refer to Lot 162, a 5¢ 1856, off cover copy, illustrated on page 27. This stamp was described as used with blue transit marking of "AACHEN-FRANCO." This framed marking was applied at Aachen, Prussia (Aix - La - Chappelle) to U. S. Mail forwarded by the "Prussian Closed Mail." Why is this marking on a U. S. stamp issued in 1856? The answer is that the "rare cancel" on this stamp is a rank forgery. Surely no one would apply a fake cancellation to an unused copy of the 5¢ 1856, so we can rest assured that a former U. S. cancel was removed from this stamp, and the faked one applied in blue.

Mail for the German States and to countries beyond, was forwarded from New York by the "Prussian Closed Mail" and during the life of the 1851, 1856, 1857 and 1860 stamps the rate by that route was 30¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce to Prussia. Such mail was made up at New York and was sent in sealed bags, thru England and Belgium to Aachen, Prussia, where the bags were opened and the mail stamped on face with the Prussian receipt framed marking of "AACHEN" with month and day such as 3 - 4 (Apr 3) and "Franco." (PAID). Why would such a receipt marking of Prussia be used to cancel a U. S. stamp? The answer is, - it was not. A genuine strike, (and no other), on a U. S. stamp would imply that the stamp had escaped cancellation at the New York post office, something that might have happened, but most improbable.

I have a photographic record of a great many covers sent by the "Prussian Closed Mail" and in each and every case the Aachen marking from 1857 thru 1861 and later was applied in red. As far as my record shows, this marking was never applied in blue in the 1850's. I am not sure when red was discontinued and blue was adopted and used thereafter, but I have blue examples as early as 1864 and some with no evidence of year with 1861 stamps that may

have been used in 1863.

Thus in my opinion, a blue Aachen on a U. S. 5¢ 1856 is rather absurd and perhaps on a parallel with a Sperati counterfeit Confederate "TEN" that I examined some months ago. It had a red New York postmark. Imagine!!!

Lot 162 in the Waterhouse Sale brought 48 pounds, or something like \$135.00. It has been returned to England.

Photograph No. 229, illustrates a typical cover by "Prussian Closed Mail" after the prepaid rate had been reduced to 28¢ in the fall of 1861 (28¢ prepaid, 30¢ unpaid). This cover has a 2¢ Black Jack which was issued early in July 1863, hence the date of this cover must be May 1864 or later. A fine plain strike of the blue Aachen is shown on the cover. There was no positive evidence of the year use. The Aachen date is "4 - 6" or "June 4."

Lot 351 in the same sale was also a fake. It was a cover with a 24¢ 1860 likewise tied to cover by a blue Aachen, (no other cancelation). Why would the New York Post Office fail to cancel these two stamps, a 5¢ '56 and a 24¢ 1860 and leave it up to Aachen to do the canceling? I don't know what the faker did to the cover, Lot 351, but from the month and day dates (no year), I fixed the actual use of Lot 351 as 1865. Imagine an invalidated 24¢ 1860 used to pay a 28¢ rate in 1865.

In the upper left corner of this cover is a corner card of a Pittsburg, Pa. business firm. I made inquiry of the Pittsburg Public Library and was informed that the firm was in business there in 1865. This cover was also returned to England as fraudulent.

I probably caused Sir Nicholas Waterhouse quite a loss, by having so many fake items returned.

\*\*\*\*\*  
END OF ISSUE NO. 55  
OCTOBER 1, 1955  
Fifth Series 1955-1956  
FIFTH NUMBER OF THE FIFTH SERIES  
\*\*\*\*\*

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 56 - NOVEMBER 1, 1955 - (Fifth Series - 1955-1956)

THE ERNIE JACOBS SALE BY JOHN FOX

This sale was held in New York on Oct. 25, 1955, at the Hotel Astor, and consisted of a variety of 19th U. S. in very fine to superb Ernie Jacobs condition. Ernie has the reputation of being our top authority on condition, he himself admits it.

Looking over the catalogue and the prices realized I note some unusual items as well as prices. There were two off cover copies of the 5¢ 1847, Lots 12 and 13, both described as early impressions, one as a "sharp early impression." This was Lot 13 and it sold at \$130.00, while No. 12 brought \$57.50. There is as much difference between a sharp early impression and a "dirty plate" impression of the 5¢ as there is between day and night. I doubt if any price within reason is too high for a well preserved four-margin sharp early impression copy of the 5¢ with a light cancelation, that is, one that does not blot out the stamp design and mar the beauty of impression and the orange brown color. Naturally the S.U.S. does not catalogue or attempt to price such stamps.

There was but one 5¢ 1847 cover in the sale and it sold at \$330.00. The stamp is on a folded letter used from Chicago on Sept. 12, 1847. This is truly a gem of a cover and the buyer obtained a bargain. The stamp, a sheet margin copy, beautiful color, superb early impression and tied by the neat little "5" in a spiked circle in red and also by a red grid.

The first lot of the 5¢ stamps received at the Chicago Post Office was on August 5th, 1847 and consisted of 12 sheets of 100 stamps each, or a total of 1200. I imagine the stamp on this cover was one of that 1200, because the next supply was not received until June 16, 1849.

A gorgeous copy of the 10¢ described as a "record copy" with "jumbo margins" and a lightly struck red grid, sold at only \$140.00. Why so low? Just because the stamp was described as "minute thin area in paper, size of pinhead." I think it is absolutely absurd to carry "condition" to this extent. Without that pinhead thin spot, I have little doubt this stamp would have realized \$250.00 to \$300.00. If a Zareski ever got hold of this copy he could fill in that thin spot in such a way as to avoid detection by benzine, or tetro, or perhaps by the ultra-violet, but not by the X-ray(?). I merely mention this to call attention to the possibility that an extreme connoisseur of condition might in the years to come purchase a Zareski patched up stamp at many times catalogue. Only an X-ray examination would show the repair work by a real "artist."

On the face, this 10¢ stamp is a beautiful copy with no intimation of the "pinhead thin spot" mentioned in the catalogue description. Mention in an auction catalogue of the slightest defect, no matter how minor, causes the condition buyer to back away from the stamp as if it had the plague. No wonder some describers overlook minor faults.

1¢ 1851 - TYPES IA & IC

In my One Cent 1851 study, Vol. 1, page 236, I illustrated by Figure 20K, the design of plate position 96RV, and classed this position as a Type IC, with a memo, "Variety Curl in the 'C' of Cent." Lot 16 in the Jacobs sale was described as position (96RIV), curl in "C" of cents, a dark blue Type IA. I believe that Ernie classed his stamp as a IA whereas I call it a IC. Had this stamp had the die design complete at bottom it would surely have sold much higher. These are just little points it is well to remember.

1¢ 1851 - PLATE ONE EARLY - INVERTED TRANSFER

A very fine copy of one of the Inverted Transfers of the 1¢ '51 from Plate One Early, viz., 91LJE brought \$145.00 in contrast to the S. U. S. figure of \$80.00. Some other items in the sale sold as follows: Lot 55, a H.S. of 3 of the 3¢ '51 - orange brown from Plate IE at \$125.00; Lot 66, a 3¢ '51 imprint at \$75.00; Lot 83, a corner copy of the 3¢ '51 at \$72.50; a 5¢ 1856, superb, at \$170.00, (S.U.S. 180) and another at \$110.00; a 10¢ 1855, Type I, at \$345.00 and a vertical pair of the 10¢ 1855, I and III, at \$245.00; a single 10¢ 1855, Type IV, recut top and bottom, at \$240.00, (incidentally, a genuine copy); two singles of the 12¢ 1851, Lots 253 and 254, sold at \$132.50 and \$130.00. They were described as "magnificent" and "gorgeous." A cover with a H.S. of four 1¢ 1857, Type V plus a pair of 10¢ 1857, Type II, from Sumner Kansas Ty to England, sold at \$225.00.

Territorial covers are in excellent demand. Hold tight to your chair while I mention the next item - a 2¢ Black Jack of 1863, a single off cover, Lot 370, described with "fleural design" of Alexandria, brought a record price of \$205.00.

In the 1869 issue Lot 404, a 1¢ tied by the Watkins, N.Y. shield, sold at \$157.50. A twin cover, Lot 405, went for \$33.00. Why the difference? Lot 405 had a "fine stamp except for a small corner piece missing at upper left." In other words, that small piece that was missing was worth approximately \$124.50. Two 90¢ 1869 sold at \$150.00 and \$167.50. A 24¢ '69 with a red cancel sold at \$77.50. With the dollar worth so very little these days, the prices realized were not high. In comparison with the 1925 dollar, the prices were actually much lower than they were thirty years ago. The buyer of the 2¢ Black Jack probably had this thought in mind.

A UNIQUE 5¢ 1847 COVER

Photograph No. 230, illustrates a 5¢ 1847 tied to cover by the "double circle" postmark in black of Augusta, Ga. The cover is in the collection of Mr. C. C. Hart of Kansas City, Mo., and in my opinion, it is genuine. The date of use shows "Jan 8." with no year logo, and the address is "David H. Reid, Esq., Eatonton, Putnam Co., Ga.". Of course, this type of postmark was never used during the life of the 1847 stamps, in fact, the type was not adopted by many post offices until late in 1859 or at various periods in 1860. I made enlarged photographs of the stamp by ultra-violet light and there was no resulting evidence of any former cancellation

removal. The part of the Augusta postmark on the stamp is unquestionably genuine, hence, in my opinion, this 5¢ 1847 was uncanceled when it was used on this cover. My theory regarding this unusual cover is as follows - That this was a use at Augusta on Jan. 8, 1861 or more probably 1862, and the old 5¢ stamp was permitted to pay the postage from Augusta to Eatonton.

Georgia seceded from the Union on Jan. 18, 1861 and became a state of the Southern Confederacy on Feb. 4, 1861. Perhaps some resident of Augusta had an unused copy of the old 5¢ 1847 stamp and decided to use it. The envelope is homemade and out of a piece of brown wrapping paper. This leads me to believe the use was Jan. 8, 1862, rather than 1861 or 1860. Envelopes were not scarce in the South in those two years, but were becoming so by 1862 and many homemade envelopes were being used. Augusta used this type of double circle postmark in 1861, with and without, the year logo, but I have no record of a cover used from that office during the Confederacy with an 1862 year date. Many Southern post offices did not have 1862 year logos to use in their postmark stampers after 1861.

The Confederate P.O. Department took over all the postal system in the seceded states as of June 1, 1861, and the rate of postage for first-class mail was 5¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce up to 500 miles, and 10¢ over that distance. This rating was changed to 10¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  ounce, regardless of distance, effective July 1, 1862. My guess is that this cover was used on Jan. 8, 1862, at a time when Georgia was a state of the Southern Confederacy and the Confederate rate of postage from Augusta to Eatonton was 5¢. I do not suppose we will ever be able to prove that my theory is correct, but the evidence is certainly in favor of my analysis. If perchance this is a 5¢ '47 stamp that was used in the Confederacy, (regardless of the fact whether it was a legal payment or not), it certainly is a most unusual item and no doubt unique.

Three offices in Georgia are on record as having used this type of double circle postmark during the life of the Confederacy, viz., Augusta, Eatonton and Macon. None of the three used a year logo in 1862 to my knowledge.

#### FIRST DAY CONFEDERATE COVERS

As stated above, the Confederate Post Office Department took over all the postal system in the ten states which comprised the Confederate States of America as of June 1st, 1861. The final and eleventh state, Tennessee, did not secede until a week later on June 8, 1861. She was admitted as a state of the C.S.A. as of August 15, 1861.

#### THE ELAIR ORDER

On May 24th, 1861, the U. S. Postmaster General, Montgomery Blair, issued an order suspending postal service in the seceded states, and the discontinuance of mail communication between offices in the loyal states and those of the states in rebellion. This order was effective as of May 28, 1861. The U. S. Congress passed a law, approved February 28, 1861, which provided that whenever in the opinion of the Postmaster General the

postal service could not be safely continued on any post route, he was authorized to discontinue same. Montgomery Blair, the U.S. P.M.G., under date of July 12, 1861, made a report to Congress in which he stated in part as follows, quote: "I directed it to be discontinued on the 28th of May (1861) by an order herewith communicated, in the so-called seceded states, except in Western Virginia, and have since directed its discontinuance in West and Middle Tennessee." (unquote)

Six states formed the Confederacy as of Feb. 4th, 1861, and at the time of the Blair order of May 24th, four additional Southern States had joined. During all this time the U.S. P.O.D. maintained postal service thruout the rebel states. Perhaps many serious collectors have wondered why? Mr. Blair gave the explanation in his report to Congress, quote: "xxx I should explain why I suffered the service to continue so long in these states? The chief reason for this was, that the mails also afforded the means of deffusing any correct information among the people of the South, and disabusing their minds of the prevalent errors which the conspirators had availed themselves to organize the insurrection xxxxxx The Postal Service afforded the best means to communicate to the people of the South the judgement which I was confident the civilized world would pronounce against the rebellion, when its real purposes were distinctly seen; etc. etc." (unquote)

Photograph No. 231, illustrates a marvelous cover which had its origin in Melbourne, Australia, on March 25, 1861, with postage of a shilling eight pence, paid by a Victoria one shilling blue and two Victoria 4 pence rose. The envelope is addressed to a "A. Dill, Esq., Richmond, Va., U.S.A." It was routed Via Marseilles and was dispatched from London on May 13, 1861, and bears the New York postmark of the dead line day of May 28, 1861, as per the Blair order. It was not forwarded to Richmond but was returned to England. Note the British marking, "SENT BACK TO ENGLAND WITHOUT A REASON FOR NON-DELIVERY." The "16 CENTS" (red), was applied at London and was the British credit to the U.S. for the sea carriage by "Am. Pkt." as per the black N.Y. postmark. This postmark is not wholly legible in the photograph because of the miserable red color of the 4 pence stamps but it has a large "5" at the top which meant 5¢ due had the letter been delivered to the Richmond address. The Australian postage payment included pay only to the U. S. frontier. At left is a large "8" in pen, which was 8 pence, no doubt the return postage due from the writer.

In an article that I published in the "Stamp Specialist" - Emerald Book, I illustrated a similar cover apparently from the same origin but to a different Richmond address. Incidentally, the U.S. rate to Australia at that period "Via Marseilles" was 39¢ per  $\frac{1}{4}$  oz., 45¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz., so this letter did not weigh over  $\frac{1}{4}$  oz. ( $1/8 = 40¢$  approximately).

#### FROM BRAZIL

After the collapse of the Southern Confederacy small groups of Southern families of wealth emigrated to foreign countries rather than reside under the Federal Government. Quite a colony settled in a section of Brazil and their experiences there form quite an interesting chapter in the aftermath of the war.

Photograph No. 232, illustrates a cover postmarked (black) "RIO DE JANEIRO - 29 JAN," and addressed to "Miss Kate Holt - United States - Montgomery, Ala." Two stamps are on this cover, a Brazil 200 Reis black and a U. S. 3¢ 1861, both tied to cover by a black, "N.YORK STEAMSHIP" marking with center date of "FEB 26." The Brazil stamp was issued in 1866 and the type of the New York marking on this cover came into use during the latter part of the eighteen sixties.

#### A U. S. MAIL LINE TO BRAZIL

U. S. Mail Steamship Service between New York and Rio Janeiro went into operation as of Sept. 30, 1865. The Line was called the "United States & Brazil S. S. Co." and the mail contract was for ten years. The U. S. rate to and from the Brazilian frontier was the U.S. Steamship rate of 10¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz. Apparently the writer paid the Brazilian postage with the 200 Reis stamp and thought that the 3¢ 1861 would pay the U. S. postage. At left center is the New York (black) marking "Due 7," or 7¢ due from the addressee. There is no evidence that I know of that this letter came from any former Confederate but the Montgomery, Ala. address suggests such a supposition. At any rate, this is an exceedingly nice "combination cover." (A U.S. stamp used in combination with that of a foreign country)

#### FROM NEW YORK TO CANADA IN 1849

A "Paid to the Lines" cover. Prior to April 1851, the U. S. did not have a postal treaty with Canada, hence U. S. payments of postage were generally made to the Canadian border with the Canadian postage due from the addressee.

Photograph No. 233, illustrates such a cover in the collection of Mr. C. C. Hart, with a fine copy of the 10¢ 1847, and postmarked New York "Nov. 23," the folded letter dated inside 1849. It is addressed to "St. Catharines," "Canada, West." The Canadian postmark is "Queenston Nov 25 1849 - U.C." The Canadian postage due of "4 $\frac{1}{2}$ " (4 $\frac{1}{2}$  pence) is in manuscript at upper center. What was the meaning of "4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ?" From Jan. 5, 1844 to April 5, 1851, Canadian rates were based on weight and distance transmitted. Up to 60 miles, the rate per  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz. was 4 pence STERLING, which was the equivalent of 4 $\frac{1}{2}$  pence Currency, hence the "4 $\frac{1}{2}$ " on this letter shows that it did not weigh over  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz. and was not transmitted over 60 miles in the Canadian mail.

St. Catharines is located a short distance N.W. of Niagara Falls, so no doubt this letter was sent in a sealed bag to Buffalo and exchanged across the line with Queenston.

This cover is not unusual in any of the features mentioned above, but what makes it quite a scarce item is the round grid that ties the stamp to cover, because the use at the New York Post Office of a round grid on an 1847 stamp, is most unusual.

Dr. Chase stated in his 1916 series of articles (page 334) quote: "New York also used, though very rarely, the ordinary round gridiron." (unquote) Will those who read these lines look thru their 1847 covers and see if you have a cover postmarked New York with a stamp canceled by

the round grid?

THE 5¢ 1857 - TYPE I - INDIAN RED

This beautiful stamp is listed in the S. U. S. as a minor variety of #28, the Type I Red Brown with the color name of HENNA BROWN. I much prefer the former name of "INDIAN RED." The S. U. S. quotes the stamp at \$65.00 used, in comparison to \$35.00 for the Type I Red Brown. No quote is given for a pair, or a cover. I have long insisted that the Indian Red should be given a major listing with values quoted for pairs, strips, covers, cancellations, etc., etc. The earliest known use in my records of this beautiful color is March 31, 1858. I believe that it was the second color used for the 5¢ 1857. Ridgway called the shade "MAHOGANY RED." Its relation to the red brown could be compared to that of a 3¢ 1861 Pigeon Blood Pink to the 3¢ 1861 Pink.

Photograph No. 234, illustrates a rare 'cover from the Caspary collection with eight copies of the "Indian Red" in a fresh and very gorgeous example of the color of this desirable stamp. The cover also has a 1¢ 1857, Type V and inasmuch as the original rate was 42¢, there is a 1¢ stamp missing. The eight 5¢ stamps consist of three pairs and two singles, and three of the stamps show the plate center line at left. In addition, these three stamps show perforations down the center line, and to the right of the line. This feature is most unusual, as it was the custom to separate the two panes of 100, comprising a sheet of 200 stamps by shears rather than by a row of perforations. This folded letter is postmarked New Orleans, Jan. 18, 1859 and is addressed to Brussels, Belgium. A faint red postmark of Boston shows that the letter was sent to that office and later to New York where it was routed by "Amer. Pkt." to England and thence "by French Mail" to Brussels. The French postmark on face reads, "ET. UNLS. SERV. AM. A.C. 12 (FEV) 59." The rate "by French Mail" was 21¢ per  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz. or 42¢ per  $\frac{1}{4}$  oz. Thus this letter was over  $\frac{1}{4}$  but not over  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz. The U. S. share of this rate was 18¢, (2 x 3 plus 2 x 6), so the credit to France must have been the balance or 24¢. No doubt the faint red Boston foreign exchange marking originally had a large "21." Incidentally, I do not recall having previously noted a cover with as many as eight (8) copies of the Indian Red. I wonder if it is unique?

THE WHEELING PRECANCEL

The so-called Wheeling Precancel was used on some of the 1847 stamps at Wheeling, Va. in 1847 and perhaps at some periods in 1848. It is regarded more as a control mark than as an actual precancel. The Wheeling Post Office received its first supply of 1847 stamps on August 8th, 1847, and this first shipment consisted of 1200 of the 5¢ and 400 of the 10¢. No further supplies were received until Nov. 26, 1849. Apparently the control marking was only placed on some of the six sheets (1200) of the 5¢ and 2 sheets (400) of the 10¢. In the 5¢ and 10¢ 1847 listings in the S.U.S. is the following under "Cancellations" - "Wheeling, W.Va. Grid." There was no West Virginia during the life of the forty-sevens. The Western part of Virginia remained loyal to the Union and became a state on June 19, 1863.

THE WATERHOUSE 3¢ 1861 PINK - UNUSED BLOCK OF 12

In the September 1955 Issue of this Service, I devoted quite a bit of space to this rare block which was Lot #409 in the Waterhouse sale in London last June. At the time my remarks were written I had not seen this famous unused block since it was exhibited by Sir Nicholas Waterhouse at the Tipex in New York in 1936. Early last month the block was submitted to me for my opinion and as soon as I lifted it from the registered package I realized at first glance that this was the PINK. No question about that fact.

For the sake of the record I am including herewith the report that I made to Mr. Cyril Harmer of H. R. Harmer, Ltd., London, England, under date of October 13, 1955, quote:

"Regarding the

3¢ 1861 BLOCK OF TWELVE

Waterhouse Sale -  
London - June 27-30, 1955.

Lot 409 - described as PINK.

The famous Worthington block - Ex-John Luff.

The Scott U. S. Catalogue lists as #64 - 3¢ PINK and 64A as 3¢ ROSE PINK, also #65 as ROSE and 65A as DULL RED.

There is a very rare color which is not catalogued which students of long experience in study of the 3¢ 1861, classify as the PIGEON BLOOD. In my reference collection I classify two examples of the rare PIGEON BLOOD as, (1) DEEP PIGEON BLOOD, and (2) PALE PIGEON BLOOD. Both copies are on a very white paper, which has not deteriorated by age, (the paper yellowed).

My No. 3 reference copy is the PINK and it also is on very white paper. This is the stamp that I consider as the S. U. S. No. 64. This #64 PINK is also found on the white paper which has turned yellowish with age.

I have made a very careful examination of the Waterhouse block of 12 in excellent daylight, and it is my unqualified opinion that this block is the S. U. S. No. 64 - the PINK. It is quite true that it is not a Pigeon Blood, and it certainly is not the No. 65 Rose. The paper of this block is not white but a bit yellowed with age, however, this block is not the 64A which the S. U. S. classifies as a Rose Pink, as the catalogued ROSE PINK in my opinion covers every stamp that has any pinkish tint, as for example, the stamps we call "Pinkish Rose," "Rosy Pink," "Near Pink," etc. etc. In my opinion, the color of the Waterhouse block is far superior to any such classifications.

To sum up, this block is unquestionably the S. U. S. No. 64, the PINK and it has been so regarded by all the leading authorities for the past 65 years." (unquote)

Page #447

On page 427 of this "Service" I remarked, quote: "In my 1946 article (in STAMPS) I stated that while the color was not the PIGEON it was 'quite a fine PINK'"(unquote). And so it is. I also raised the question - Has the original color changed? In my opinion, the answer is "not to any extent."

The Expert Committee of the Philatelic Foundation of New York City should cancel their original certificate which was certainly in error and issue one that is correct. It is bad enough to authenticate a fake stamp or cover, as they frequently do in my opinion, but it is even worse to condemn a rare block, such as the 2¢ block of twelve, with an untarnished reputation extending back for over sixty years.

\*\*\*\*\*

END OF ISSUE NO. 56

NOVEMBER 1, 1955

Fifth Series of 1955-1956

Sixth Issue of the Fifth Series

Five photographs No. 230 - 234 inc.

PHILATELIC FOUNDATION

ASHBROOK SPECIAL SERVICE

ISSUE NO. 57 - DECEMBER 1, 1955 - (Fifth Series - 1955-1956)

\*\*\*\*\*

THE FIRST CASPARY SALE BY H.D. HARMER, INC.  
U. S. Postmasters' Provisionals

This sale was held in New York on November 15, 1955 and consisted of 153 lots of U. S. "Postmasters' Provisionals," from the world-famous collection of the late Alfred H. Caspary of New York City. Three lots in this sale sold at \$10,000.00, \$11,000.00 and \$14,000.00. Another sold at \$9,250.00, another at \$9,250.00, another at \$9,000.00, another at \$7,200.00, another at \$7,000.00, another at \$5,500.00, another at \$4,400.00, another at \$4,200.00 and another at \$4,000.00. Thus there were a dozen lots in this sale that "fetched" a total of \$94,800.00. In other words, a dozen lots in this sale sold at \$4,000.00 or more per lot for a record total of \$94,800.00.

I believe that the results of this sale demonstrate the faith that serious collectors have in the safeness and stability of sound philatelic investments. I have long made the claim that investments made in seasoned philatelic material ranked among the highest form of a safe and sound investment. They have not made any St. Louis Bears, or 5¢ New Yorks or Baltimore Buchanans, etc., etc., in over a century and never again will any of the genuine article be made. There will always be men of wealth and among them an increasing number who will demand the finest and rarest in Philatelic Americana regardless of the price.

Perhaps to those great U. S. philatelists of years long past, such as George Worthington, Henry Duveen, Robt. Emerson, John Luff, Arthur Hind and many others, the prices recorded at the first Caspary sale would seem much too high. I wonder? Perhaps the great philatelists of the years to come will consider such realizations as most reasonable considering the fine quality of the material that was offered in the Caspary sale.

The Alexandria. Lot No. 4 in the Caspary sale was the unique 5¢ Alexandria, Va., black on a light blue wove paper. Well do I remember when this cover was discovered back in the late fall of 1907. The whole U. S. philatelic world was startled by the announcement that America's foremost "stamp collector" of that day, George Worthington of Cleveland, Ohio, had paid \$5,000.00 for this cover. In all the years back to the time when this cover went thru the U. S. Mail in November of 1847, it was only the fifth Alexandria to come to light. It was announced at the time that the original letter, dated Nov. 25, 1847, was enclosed in the buff envelope. It is the only copy known on blue paper. The cover sold in the Caspary sale at \$10,000.00 (S.U.S. \$15,000.00), double the price Worthington was reported to have paid for it.

The 1847 Stamps were issued in July 1847, and this use was in the following

November. I have no record that any of the 1847 stamps were sent to the Alexandria Post Office but large(?) supplies were sent to Washington which is only a few miles distant from Alexandria. The Alexandria is believed to have been issued in 1846 as a cover used in August of that year is known. There is nothing unusual about a postmaster stamp being used after the issuance of the Government stamps. They were, after all, merely a form of receipt given by the postmaster to a buyer for cash received for postage and of course had no standing if used from any office other than that of origin, unless, the letter was addressed to the office of issue.

Covers bearing the 5¢ New York are in existence used from Boston and various other cities and towns, but all are addressed to New York City. Naturally these were rated when mailed at such outside offices as unpaid but when received at New York they were handstamped as PAID, as they bore the receipts for prior payment to that office.

Lot No. 3 in the Caspary sale was another Alexandria on cover, a 5¢ Black on buff, addressed to Leesburg, Va. and postmarked "Sep 10" (1846). It sold for \$9,250.00. In the Hind Sale in 1933, this cover was Lot 16 and was sold to Colson, Presumably for Caspary, for \$4,000.00.

Annapolis, Md. Lot #5 in the Caspary sale was the 5¢ Annapolis with postmark date of "APR 8" (year?). It sold at \$11,000.00. One other such envelope is known with postmark of "20 MAR." The two envelopes were discovered by the late Gus Burger, back in 1895. One was sold to "W. A. Castle," the other one to the famous Ferrari. Arthur Hind bought the Ferrari in a sale in Paris in 1922 and in the Hind sale this envelope was sold to Colson for \$2,600.00, presumably for Caspary.

The Baltimore, Buchanan, 10¢ adhesive. The S. U. S. lists as -  
3X2 - 10¢ black on white - On cover - \$12,500.00  
3X4 - 10¢ " " bluish " " - 15,000.00

In the Caspary sale there were three of these 10¢ Baltimores on covers, two of the #3X2 - black on white, and one of the #3X4, black on bluish. The lots were as follows: Lot 20 - (#3X2) - On white - May-5 (1847) to Hanover, N.H., sold @ \$9,000.00 (Weill). Stated to be the finest known cover. Lot 21 - (#3X2) - On white - March 13 (1847) to Boston. Sold to Colson at \$7,000.00. This cover was purchased by Hind in the Ferrari sale, and in the Hind sale it was Lot 25 and was sold to the Nassau Stamp Co. (John Klemann) for \$4,000.00 (presumably for Caspary).

Lot 24 - (#3X4). On bluish. Addressed to Annapolis, Md. The auction description stated the use was "Jan. 5, 1845" but this was surely an error as these adhesives are supposed to have been first issued in 1846. Perhaps the actual use was Jan. 5, 1847. Further, there was no such a rate as 5¢ in January 1845. The auction description also stated, quote: "Only two copies exist of this fabulous rarity: a copy off cover and this unique cover." (unquote) - The cover was sold to Weill of New Orleans at \$14,000.00, the top price of the sale. This same cover was Lot 26 in the Hind sale (1933) and was purchased by Colson, presumably for Caspary, at \$10,500.00, the highest price for any single lot in that memorable sale.

Re - "only two copies known" - the above cover and "a copy off cover." Back in 1922, the late Charles J. Phillips published a small booklet descriptive of the rare stamps and covers in the Henry J. Duveen collection. It is my recollection that the collection was at that time in his hands for sale. He listed a Baltimore cover in the collection as follows, quote: "1846 - 10¢ black on bluish, on original cover postmark '10' in blue oval. This great rarity of which I know only two other copies, is damaged in lower left corner. The 'JAM' of 'JAMES' is missing, and the corner of stamp below it." (unquote)

The Luff - Clark book on U.S. P.M.P. stamps published in 1937, stated there were only two known copies of the 10¢ on bluish paper (S.U.S. #3X4).

Brattleboro, Vt. In the S. U. S. this stamp is listed as 5X1 - 5¢ buff, i.e., 5¢ black on buff paper and quoted at used, \$1,250.00, on cover \$2,250.00. In the Caspary sale there were five covers with singles that brought \$2,600.00, \$1,500.00, \$950.00, \$1,200.00 and \$1,400.00. Lot 39 was a cover with two singles. It sold at \$3,600.00 to Weill of New Orleans. This is surely a very rare and wonderful cover.

Lockport, N.Y. The S. U. S. lists as "6X1" - 5¢ red & black on buff on cover - \$6,000.00. Lot #10, in the Caspary sale was the unique cover from which the listing was made as this cover is the only one known. It came from the Ferrari collection and was purchased in the Paris sale by Hind in 1922. In the Hind sale it was Lot 30 and was sold to Colson, presumably for Caspary, for \$2,500.00. In the Caspary sale it was purchased by Weill of New Orleans for \$5,500.00. Very little of the history of this folded letter is known. The original owner sold it to the old Scott Stamp & Coin Co., who presumably sold it to Ferrari.

Millbury, Mass. The S. U. S. lists as #7X1, this adhesive as 5¢ (black) on bluish at used - off cover and used on cover \$6,000.00. In the Caspary sale, Lot 42 was described as, quote: "The most beautiful copy known of this classic rarity." (unquote) It was purchased by Ezra Cole for \$9,250.00. In the Waterhouse sale in London last June a cover with this stamp realized 1,500 pounds, or approximately \$4,200.00. Incidentally, Hind did not own a Millbury on cover but his collection did include the Ex-Duveen off cover copy.

New Haven, Conn. The S. U. S. lists this postmaster as "Impressed from a brass handstamp" on envelope, and lists as issued in 1845, five varieties, all 5¢, (There was no 10¢.). Among the five is one that is believed to be unique, viz., #8XU2 - 5¢ red on bluish. No valuation is quoted. In the Caspary sale, lot No. 43 was an 8XU2, described as "5¢ red on light bluish, with the signature of the postmaster, Edward A. Mitchell, in black. This great rarity, the only one known, was purchased by Weill of New Orleans for \$7,200.00. It was acquired by Arthur Hind in the Ferrari sale in Paris in 1922. In the Hind sale it was Lot #33 and was described as not on bluish, but rather as follows, quote: "1845 - envelope, 5¢ red on white. Only one or two others known (photo 18) - \$6,000." It was purchased by Colson, presumably for Caspary for \$2,250.00.

The S. U. S. also quotes "8XU3 5¢ blue on buff - \$10,000.00." In the

Caspary sale Lot 44 was described as "5¢ blue on buff - signature in blue, postmark in red" (No. 81U3) (?). This cover was sold to Molesworth at \$3,100.00. In the Hind sale it was sold to Colson, presumably for Caspary at \$900.00.

The 5¢ New York. Among the off cover copies in the Caspary sale there were 17 listed as unused, viz., three (3) pairs and eleven (11) singles. This appears rather remarkable to me. It seems almost unbelievable that so many copies in unused condition could have survived to the present day, one hundred and ten years after they were issued, and especially in view of the comparatively small number that were printed. The stamp catalogues at \$110.00 unused and \$65.00 used. In the Hind sale there were 14 unused copies. Also rather remarkable. In the Caspary sale Lot #64, an unused H.Pair sold at \$1,200.00. Lot #75 was a cover with two H.Pairs to Mobile, Ala. - in January 1846. These pairs were originally a block of four. It brought \$1,000.00. In the Seybold sale back in March 1910, this cover was Lot #10 and though described as "very rare" it realized only \$36.00.

The 5¢ New York on blue paper. The S. U. S. lists the 5¢ New York as 9A1 as "5¢ bluish" and "9X1A" as "blue paper." I suppose the average collector would wonder what was the difference between a "bluish paper" and a "blue paper?" Incidentally, the S. U. S. quotes the former at \$65.00 used and the latter at \$350.00 used, with no quote for an unused specimen. In my opinion the genuine blue paper is very much more rare than the catalogue indicates, especially in this day of the greatly depreciated dollar. It was Lot #84, in the Caspary sale was described as an unused single off cover. It was purchased by Ezra Cole for \$550.00. It was stated, quote: "only one or two others exist in unused condition on blue paper." If this stamp is actually unused and part o.g. and is actually on the rare blue paper then I wonder if this was not one of the real bargains of the whole sale?

Lot 86 was described as a horiz. pair, off cover, on blue paper, used, and superb. Weill of New Orleans paid \$2,600.00 for it. Lot 87 was another H.Pair described as on blue paper off cover and used, the pair with some defects. It sold at \$510.00.

Blue paper. In the auction sale catalogue of the Seybold collection (1910) it was stated that Mr. Seybold possessed only one copy of the 5¢ New York on blue paper. This was a cover from New York on April 2, 1847 to Washington (Lot #15). Someone obtained it for only \$15.00. Note - For further details re - the "blue paper" see Issue #28 of this Service - July 1, 1953 - pages 201 and 202 - Photograph #100.

5¢ New York, signed "R.H.M." The S. U. S. lists this stamp as 9X1B and quotes it only as used \$400.00, meaning perhaps "off cover." No listing is given for a copy on cover. Lot 88 in the Caspary sale was described as a 5¢ New York, single signed "R.H.M." on cover and used from New York on "13 Mar" (year ?) to New Bedford, Mass. The postmaster, Robert H. Morris, is supposed to have only signed some of the first sheets back in July of 1845. A use in March 1846 or 1847 appears quite late. This

cover was acquired by Weill of New Orleans for \$1,400.00.

The Providence. The S. U. S. lists the 5¢ value on cover, "pen canceled" at \$400.00, but "on cover" at \$600.00. I suppose the latter means if "tied to cover." It is a fact that covers with a Providence tied by the postmark are extremely rare. Covers are also known with the stamps genuinely tied by a pen stroke a "5" or a "PAID." Lots #119 and #120 in the Caspary sale were covers with the 5¢ stamp tied by the Providence postmark. The former went to Siegel at \$1,100.00, and the latter to Ezra Cole at \$1,700.00. Lot 121 had a 5¢ tied by a number "5" and was sold to Jack Dick for \$925.00.

A Providence cover with a severed pair, and an interesting story.  
Lot 122 had a severed horizontal pair, addressed to "Waterman & Burgess - New Orleans, La.," and postmarked "May 18" (1847). A most unusual and a very rare cover. It was acquired by Jack Dick for \$2,700.00. This was undoubtedly one of the real bargains of the sale. More later on its history. The S. U. S. lists the 10¢ Providence as 10X2 - unused \$140.00. No quotation for a used copy and none for a 10¢ on cover. The reason is obvious - no such a cover, to my knowledge, has ever been discovered and strange to relate, only two covers are known showing a 10¢ rate, both paid by two copies of the 5¢. Again referring to Lot 122 as above, the auction description stated, quote: "A beautiful cover of the greatest rarity; possibly one other cover with the 10¢ rate exists. Signed 'W.H.C.' (Colson)." (unquote)

The late A. B. Slater of Providence, known as Uncle John Slater to his philatelic friends, was the recognized authority on the Providence stamps, and in 1930 he published a booklet containing a detailed study of the stamps. He stated, "No 10¢ on cover has yet come to light." In his collection was the only known unsevered pair of the 5¢ used on cover, and he mentioned that there was another cover from the same correspondence with a severed pair. Both covers addressed to Messrs. Waterman & Burgess, New Orleans, La.

#### THE HISTORY OF THE TWO PROVIDENCE COVERS WITH THE 10¢ RATE

Mr. Slater in his book gave a very interesting story of the two covers mentioned above. John Waterman, managing owner of a cotton mill in Olneyville, I.I., in the eighteen forties, formed a partnership with Thomas M. Burgess with headquarters in New Orleans in order to facilitate the buying of cotton. In 1852, the partnership was dissolved and the correspondence and other papers were shipped north to Olneyville and stored in an attic of the Waterman homestead. Subsequently the family moved away, leaving the old papers, etc. The premises were rented to tenants.

At one of the meetings of the Rhode Island Philatelic Society held in Providence, on a rainy night along about 1906, with few members present, a young Italian boy appeared with a cover that he wished to sell and which he stated he had found in the old correspondence mentioned above. It was the cover with the unsevered pair of the 5¢ Providence. B. A.

Webber and Prof. R. F. Chambers both competed for the cover and Webber bought it for \$14.50. Noting that Chambers was disappointed, the boy informed him he had another cover and would bring it to him the next day, which he did. This cover also originally had a pair but the lad had removed it from the cover and cut it in two. Chambers paid the boy about \$9.00 for the cover and two stamps, and later restored the stamps to the cover. The "Webber cover" was postmarked Apr. 23 (1847) and the stamps were positions #8 and #9 on the plate. The Chambers restored cover (Caspary) is postmarked May 18 and the two stamps were stated by Slater to be #7 and #8. Slater further stated that Chambers kept his cover about three years and sold it to Colson. Some years later it appeared in the Gibson collection and in 1926 was acquired by Caspary. Along about 1913 Webber sold his cover to Colson and in later years it appeared in the collection of E. M. Taylor of Altadena, Calif., after whose death Slater acquired it in 1921 from B. W. H. Poole. Personally, I like the background story of a rare item.

The St. Louis Bear. The S. U. S. lists #11X1 as 5¢ black on greenish wove paper and quotes such a stamp as \$600.00 unused and \$375.00 used. On cover at \$600.00. Lot #128 in the Caspary sale was a cover with an uncanceled copy of Type II which was purchased by Ezra Cole at \$2,300.00. Molesworth paid \$2,300.00 for Lot #130, a beautiful cover with a Type III. In the Moody sale this cover sold at \$1,500.00. Lot 133 was described as a pair on part cover, for which Weill paid \$2,700.00. No doubt a real show piece. It would appear that the S. U. S. quote of \$600.00 for a cover with a #11X1 is very much out of line if the above prices mean anything. The S. U. S. lists as #11X2, the 10¢ black on GREENISH WOVE PAPER, and quotes the stamp used as \$400.00. A single on cover at \$750.00 and a pair on cover at \$1,500.00. Lot #134 was a very fine cover with a single. It sold to Daniels at \$1,150.00. Lot #136 was a cover with a V. Pair for which Weill paid \$1,500.00. While the S. U. S. includes a listing of a "V.S." of 3 on cover," no estimate of value is given. Lot #137 was the beautiful "Emerson" cover with a V.S. of three. Weill obtained a bargain in this cover at \$3,100.00.

While on a visit to the home of my old friend Judge Emerson, back in the fall of 1935, I borrowed a number of items to photograph and this beautiful cover was among them. I have before me a very fine print that I made just 20 years ago. The Judge was very proud of this cover. He passed away fifteen months later.

Lot 138 was a cover with four singles of the 10¢ (11X2), the stamps not tied, but each one pencanceled, a 4 x 10¢ rate to Philadelphia. A very rare cover and as good as gold. It sold at \$2,500.00 with Weill the fortunate buyer.

The Bears on the GRAY LILAC paper.

The S.U.S. lists -

- 11X4 - 5¢ at \$600.00 - On cover \$800.00
- 11X5 - 10¢ at \$425.00 - On cover \$600.00
- 11X5 - 10¢ pair at \$1,000.00

- 11X5 - 10¢ V.S. of 3 ... (no figure)
- 11X6 - 20¢ at \$1,750.00. On cover \$2,500.00
- 11X6 - 20¢ pair on cover ... (no figure)
- Pair 10¢ and 20¢ on cover .. (no figure)

Lot 139 was a beautiful right sheet margin vertical pair of the 10¢ off cover with the red St. Louis postmark, for which Weill paid \$1,650.00. Quite a show piece. In the Hind sale this sold at \$610.00, presumably for Caspary.

Lot 141 was described as an off cover "SE-TENANT block of 3 - with two 10¢ and a 5¢, and pencanceled. It was stated, quote: "One of the most outstanding of all 'St. Louis Bear' items known (11X4 - 5)." unquote. This rare piece cost Weill \$3,700.00.

Lots 142 and 143 were singles of the 20¢ (11X6) off cover and pencanceled. The S. U. S. states that a used single of this stamp is worth \$1,750.00. Weill evidently thought such a quote is out of date, as he paid \$2,500.00 for each stamp.

Lot 144 was a wonderful cover from the famous Louisville find made by Charley McKeel many years ago. This cover was a 5 times 5¢ rate to Louisville paid by a single 5¢ (11X1) and a V.P. of the 10¢ on gray lilac (11X5). This cover cost Weill \$3,300.00.

Lot 145 was a perfect gem, a cover with a 10¢ on gray lilac (11X5) and a 20¢ on gray lilac (11X6) and described as "one of the rarest and finest St. Louis Bear covers existing," which is certainly true. Weill had to bid up to \$4,400.00 to obtain it.

The S. U. S. lists as "PELURE PAPER."

- #11X7 - 5¢ Black on bluish - \$2,000.00
- on cover ..... 3,000.00
- pair ..... ?
- pair on cover ..... ?
- #11X8 - 10¢ black on bluish \$2,000.00
- on cover ..... 3,000.00

Lot 146 was a single off cover of the 5¢ (11X7) purchased by Molesworth at \$2,200.00.

Lot 147 was a cover with two singles of the 5¢ (11X7) described with "minor faults" canceled by the red PAID, and tied by a pen stroke. Estimated value \$5,000.00. Howard Lehman obtained this rare cover for \$1,600.00. How buyers do back away when a cataloguer mentions "minor faults." One would think a pet rattlesnake was being offered. This cover was Lot 82 in the Hind sale and was purchased by Colson, presumably for Caspary for \$350.00. The estimated value was given as \$4,000.00. No minor defects were mentioned, except "both with short margins."

Lot 148 was described as a cover with two singles of the same stamp - the 5¢ No. 11X7, both stamps with large margins. This cover cost Weill \$4,200.00.

Tuscumbia, Ala. The S.U.S. lists this envelope as 12X01, 3¢ dull red on buff - \$600.00. It was stated that less than six are known. Molesworth paid \$1,600.00 for the Caspary Tuscumbia, Lot #153.

The First Caspary Sale had only 153 lots, yet the total sum realized was over \$225,000.00. What a demonstration of the very solid foundation upon which philately stands in the year 1955.

AGAIN WE REFER TO THE FAKE 90¢ 1860 ARMITAGE COVER

In the July 1, 1955 Issue of this Service I devoted quite a bit of space to a fake cover which was originally in the Armitage collection. Thus I call it the "Armitage cover." See pages 410, 411 and 412.

Photograph No. 235, illustrates this cover which, in my opinion, in its original condition had only the 30¢ 1860 and the 12¢ 1857. Some faker, in my opinion, moved the 12¢ from alongside the 30¢ and placed it in the lower left corner and in its place he put a 90¢ 1860, with a red faked grid to match the one on the 30¢. As previously stated, there was no such a rate as \$3.32 to Calcutta in January 1861. The use had to be in 1861, because the 30¢ was not issued as early as January 1860 and the 30¢ and 12¢ were no longer recognized for postal use in January 1862. It will be noted that there is no money credit whatsoever to the British Post Office Department, as there would have been had a rate to destination been prepaid, and the reason for this was because the postage was not paid on this letter all the way to Calcutta but only to England. By American Packet, to the British frontier the single rate was 21¢ (5¢ U. S. Internal, plus 16¢ Sea). This letter was a double rate, prepaid 2 x 21¢ or 42¢, and that the letter was not prepaid beyond the British frontier is proved by the British postage due which appears in manuscript as "2/4" or 2 shillings 4 pence, twice the single. This letter was routed "Overland Mail Via Marseilles."

A FAKE COVER PRONOUNCED AS GENUINE  
BY THE EXPERT COMMITTEE OF THE PHILATELIC FOUNDATION

This cover was recently submitted to the above EXPERT COMMITTEE(?) and a certificate numbered 6104, was issued, dated 7th November 1955, which reads - "We have examined the enclosed U. S. A. 1860, 90¢ used with 30¢ and 12¢ on cover submitted by \_\_\_\_\_ xxx and are of the opinion that it is Scott #39 genuinely used on this cover, and that the cover is genuine in all respects." (unquote)

Such certificates are a positive disgrace to serious philatelic research work, but imagine how valuable they are to Zareski and his associates in the faking of U. S. 19th Century covers.

FOR THE RECORD

The following notice appeared in the "New York Evening Express" dated "Wednesday Evening October 2, 1861" on page 4, quote:

"NOTICE

Post Office, New York)

Sept. 23, 1861 )

The new style Government postage stamps is now ready, and for sale at this office. Exchange will be made of the new style for an equivalent number of the old issue during a period of six days from the date of this notice, after which the stamps of the old issue will not be received in payment of postage on letters sent from this office.

Wm. B. Taylor, Postmaster"  
(unquote)

(My thanks to Mr. Morris Fortgang for the above copy)

OLD STAMPS NOT RECOGNIZED

At the outbreak of the war between the states, Southern post offices were well stocked with U. S. postage stamps, hence the U. S. Post Office Department hastened to issue new stamps for offices in the loyal states and to refuse recognition to the "old stamps" after the Northern public had been given time to exchange the old for the new. Of course, all offices could not be supplied at once, but gradually, and so as each office was supplied, notice was given that a period of six days would be given for the exchange. Many offices received supplies soon after the middle of August 1861, and before that month was over, recognition was refused to the use of the old stamps and such mail was forwarded with the postage due. Philadelphia was one of such offices and mail bearing the old stamps were handstamped "Old Stamps Not Recognized."

Regarding the above advertisement which appeared in a New York paper as late as October 2, 1861. According to my records the new 1861 stamps were first placed on sale at New York on Sept. 15, 1861 and a notice was run in the New York papers with that date giving the public six days in which to make the exchange. A second advertisement was again published but dated "Sep. 23, 1861" and giving six days to make the exchange. Apparently the inhabitants of New York City were very slow in making the exchange, and the six days as given in the notice of Sept. 23 was not carried out, because we find that the Notice was published as above as late as October 2nd, 1861. Incidentally, I have no record of any cover postmarked New York with an "old stamp" and the notice, "OLD STAMPS NOT RECOGNIZED." Why?

\*\*\*\*\*

END OF ISSUE NO. 57

December 1, 1955

Fifth Series of 1955 - 1956

Seventh Issue of the Fifth Series

One Photograph No.235