

Đđ ãĩą ą> ą̇ py 8ž pyyyV W X Y Z [\] ^ _ ` a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z { | }
 ~ € , f „ … † ‡ ^ %
 Š < Œ yyyyy
 ð ÿ -Ü bjbjI2I2 " "XX-Ō yŷ yŷ yŷ '2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 F @ \$ @ \$ @ \$ @ \$
 %\$ İŞF Äp ¶'I 'I 'I 'I 'I 'I 'I 'I cp ep ep ep ep ep ep vq R Ès 'ep 2 ['I 'I [[ep 2 2 'I 'I zp p p p
 [¼ 2 'I 2 'I cp p [cp p ('p 2 2 'p 'I † p 'İZaC @\$ Èa & ?p cp p 0Äp ?p ,t ño ,t ?p F F 2 2 2 2 ,t 2 ?
 p \$I t N . p 4Q Œ AS M 'I 'I 'I ep ep F F V Jz dª p F F Jz
 March 15, 2007 **Keith Bantz, M.D.** <Keithphilately@cs.com>

Thanks, Ken, for making sense of this latest development. At this point I have to believe that we just have to sit back and enjoy the ongoing saga. It certainly is the most fascinating story in philately in my lifetime and I forward to and all new developments. I look forward to seeing you at the Summer Seminar. Finally, good luck in your campaign for the presidency of A.P.S. When we've spoken it is clear that you have the clearest vision where the A.P.S. has to go. You have my support and vote....

March 15, 2007 **Ken Lawrence**

Keith.

That's not the sequence. Mystic accepted the stamps on consignment, and exhibited them at Washington 2006. Afterward in July, Dick Celler and I discovered the two genuine Missionaries on the card. The offer to sell was withdrawn, and the Arrigos sought additional tests by Gene Hall at Rutgers, hoping that the Grinnells would match the two genuine stamps.

No doubt they were disappointed in his results as they were reported here. Meanwhile the Shattuck heirs gained ownership of three stamps on the card that had previously been part of the consignment, including one of the genuine stamps.

I have no idea what Mystic paid for the stamps, but I presume it was a lot less than the amount the Arrigos originally hoped to realize when they consigned the stamps to Mystic.

March 14, 2007 **Keith Bantz, M.D.** <Keithphilately@cs.com>

I received my Linn's yesterday and the Grinnell Missionaries story was page one, as it should be. I would like to read Ken Lawrence's take on what it all means. I think it is a bit unethical for Mystic to have been trying to market these stamps for the past year and even drumming up support for their authenticity in the philatelic community while behind the scene it appears that they intended to buy them if no buyer could be found. Some might think that Mystic even guaranteed their sale with some sort of reserve that they would have to pay if no sale resulted: how else to explain the fact that they will not reveal the price they paid? The story of these stamps becomes more and more fascinating!

March 10, 2007 **Richard Frajola**

I received a Grinnell press release from **Don Sundman** which is [here](#).

February 14, 2007 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

Richard Malmgren

Thank you – in response to your question here are my thoughts on the issue of how the Grinnells were printed - photography vs. movable type:

I have read the posted articles including those of Scott Trepel and David Shumaker. I expected and hope that some response might come from the RPSL committee since they were unequivocal in their conclusion that the Grinnells were printed from movable type. Their conclusion followed two years of access to the actual material. The card of 10 apparently added eight examples (G73-79) to the body of evidence, but those additions do not appear to be pivotal to the arguments made.

It might be overlooked that the expert committee observed progressive wear developing value to value (5-cent, 2-cent, 13-cent, in that order) as the Grinnells were printed. How that would result from the photographic method? Maybe there are ways. But I haven't seen that aspect addressed.

My knowledge of the technical aspects of printing is very limited. Zero is an apt description. What I can do is bring to light any relevant evidence I have. That's what I did with G39 when Scott's paper appeared. I lost some interest for advancing any kind of argument in this forum when G39 was cast as enigmatic and suspect from the very outset. It could be an important piece of evidence. Let it speak.

Scott T's article asserted (if I may summarize) that the Grinnell tiny marks are different from the genuine tiny marks in that they appear with more consistency than the genuine tiny marks and when they do appear they don't move around and change shape like the genuine tiny marks do.

I'm not sold. Could the Grinnell marks observed result from dirt and smudge - just as with the genuines - if the Grinnells comprise a relatively small printing with a relatively high survival rate? That could be the case whether they are genuine or forgeries - I'm just speaking of printing method. So I do understand the contention. I just don't find it sufficient. And then there is G39 - a 13-cent stamp having some of the tiny mark attributes of the 2-cent. That has not been explained.

I'm not at all familiar with the photographic process hypothesized in David S's article so I look forward to Part 2. Again I understand the observations and think the analysis of the Grinnell images is well stated and developed. I don't have the background to support or argue the conclusion.

Overall it seems in 2007 the printing method behind the Grinnells should be a matter of forensic certainty, yet the philatelic positions expressed are at odds. We have papers posted on this site and published findings of experts after long study with the items themselves and they don't agree. That's disappointing, but I look forward to any contributions that help get to the bottom of it.

I will definitely call when/if in H. – thank you. And having spent days in those archives, I appreciate the frustration with the limited hours open when you have another job to attend to.

February 14, 2007 **David Shumaker**

Any confirmation on the alleged aniline ink on G81? has there been any re-testing of any Grinnells in the same apparatus and along with G81 to determine if the cancel inks are absolutely different?

February 12, 2007 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken Lawrence

The difficulty for some of us who would like to perform more research at the Hawaii State Archives is their schedule. The archives are open neither nights nor weekends. It does not matter whether we are good looking or not, tall or short, thin or thick or, more significantly, desirous of researching an arcane subject pertaining to Hawaiian philately that at least 3 people might care about.

That means I have to take off work. It will be awhile before I can get away and spend a couple of days.

February 12, 2007 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

Yes, I am eagerly awaiting the results of your archival search whenever you have the time. I do not regard the quest for truth as embarrassing, regardless of how many paths along the way fail to reach that destination. I thought you'd be gratified by the detail I provided in response to your request.

February 10, 2007 **Andy Waters** <mako992@hotmail.com>

Richard M:

Sorry, I have no agenda regarding the Grinnells. What "agenda" I do have, when I'm not peacefully collecting material from my own chosen area, is regarding the way that the current philatelic world is happy to deface and destroy material to meet certain present-day market demands.

I guess our "goals" don't necessarily intersect. Sorry.

February 10, 2007 **Richard Malmgren**

Pat Culhane

With reference to my immediate prior posting on Grinnells and photography and when I give thought to the analysis posted on the Grinnell Reference Board by multiple people subsequent to the revelations associated with the Card of 10, it occurs to me that I am indeed very interested in your comments on the current state of affairs.

Regardless of any financial interest, the arguments you have presented from the other side of the play yard have not been without logic and reason. What have you to say? I am truly interested if you care to share.

And if you ever vacation in Hawaii, then please give a call.

February 10, 2007 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Andy Waters

As for 'embarrassment', my personal guess is that Ken Lawrence may be slightly red faced by the gentlemen's February 8 comment on the Big Boy's Board that in the entire philatelic world, only Ken Lawrence is qualified to determine the genuineness or not of a Missionary vs. a Grinnell.

For many years, I have thought both the Philatelic Foundation as well as the Expert Committee of the Royal Philatelic Foundation London could do such. I even thought there were a few individuals who could do such. For awhile I briefly had delusions of grandeur that I could do such, although I would have to go into my little cubby hole and spend hours looking at things to be sure that I was not really looking at just an ordinary Numeral.

The suggestion by the gentleman on the Big Boy's Board was to the effect that were an auctioneer to present an alleged Missionary Stamp for auction (with specific reference to Scott Trepel of Siegel and the upcoming Twig-Smith sale) and to not obtain a certificate with 'Mr. Lawrence's signature on the certificate', then such action by the auctioneer should/could/would/ought-to-be construed as neither proper nor morally correct.

O.K., knowing Ken Lawrence slightly, but admittedly only slightly, he is probably not embarrassed to the point of either humiliation or mortification, but neither do I think he paid the gentlemen for his posting. (You didn't really do that did you Ken?)

Incidentally and for those who care, I have not yet made it to the Hawaii archives regarding the alleged sale of those Missionary Stamps. Work keeps rearing its nasty head and getting in the way. But I will. I will.

And as yet one more incidentally posting, the steam does seem to be dissipated, presumably because it has become too difficult to defend the Grinnells as being printed directly from type as opposed to being created with the aid of photography.

February 10, 2007 **Andy Waters** <mako992@hotmail.com>

Just for the record: "Andy" is not me. In fact I have been a reader of this board for quite a long time, and "embarrassing" is the last thing I would call such a debate.

I do particularly care whether they are genuine or not, and any outcome can have no real impact on my life. But I find the fact that people can and will devote time, effort, and expertise to solving such a puzzle to be heartening....

And, yes, I overuse the :) emoticon. So sue me....

February 08, 2007 **Andy**

Sheesh! Grinnells. How embarrassing :)

February 08, 2007 **Andy Waters** <mako992@hotmail.com>

Am I wrong, or has discussion on the Grinnells slowed substantially? :)

I have really enjoyed following the cut and thrust of the debate (especially the thrust, although the cut had its moments...), but the steam seems to be gone.

Personally, I would love to see this debate (or at least the highlights) bound and published. I, for one, would pay for it (although I guess I could just print it on A4 for posterity -- ummm, copyright?).

Anyway, what future? Are people waiting for the next sale, or has the debate effectively died?

February 08, 2007 **Andy Waters** <mako992@hotmail.com>

Robert Novosad

I am very interested in your auction. Thank you for mentioning it.

I would have been happier if you had posted it on Mr. Frajola's main board, where more people (including me, except by chance) would see it.

If you would like to, please go to <http://www.kbnet.com/book/html/frajolaboard.html> and follow the link.

(I hope this advice is OK, Mr. Frajola)

February 02, 2007 **Robert Novosad** <filatelia@filatelia-novosad.sk>

Dear Friends.

We started 10th auction of philatelic material with closing day 1.3.2007

Auction catalogue is on website: www.filatelia-novosad.sk

You can find in the catalogue material including postal history, postal stationery and covers, stamps, Zeppelin mail, the Napoleonic and Prussian wars, Field Post, postcards, railway mail and ship mail, polar mail, censorship, Judaica, propaganda, UN missions, Olympic Games and sport, photographs, books etc.

January 16, 2007 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

This past week I had the opportunity to visit the Royal Philatelic Society London. If any Board reader travels to London and has not visited the RPSL, then I encourage you to do so.

The RPSL premise is not unlike that of the Collectors Club of New York. At the moment, an interior renovation is nearing completion. The library is not quite finished, thus I was unable to peruse their collection. Based upon older photographs and observable shelf space, their resources are hardly insignificant.

The downstairs museum is extraordinary. I did recognize the significance of several items. But due to ignorance, I am certain that I underappreciated a number of treasures. Perhaps one of their members will create labels with a storyline that can be placed in front of items to assist those of us whose knowledge does not measure up to what is before us.

Both the administrative staff and the members I met were most courteous. On meeting days, several members first gather around noon at a pub located two blocks away. Not a bad way to start their 5 pm meetings that are held most every other Thursday.

I also had the pleasure of spending several hours at the British Library Philatelic Collections. The British Library is now housed in its own building, separate from the British Museum where it was housed on my last visit to London nearly 25 years ago. It has a most knowledgeable staff that extended great courtesy to me. If the resources of the library of the RPSL are not insignificant, then wait until you see what this library holds. In addition to philatelic literature, they have some terrific stamp collections donated over the years, including the Tapling Collection which contains Hawaii material that is near and dear to my heart.

So if anyone has plans to visit London, then you should include both the RPSL and the British Library Philatelic Collection on your schedule. I do not think you will be disappointed.

Incidentally, this is not a paid commercial announcement.

January 13, 2007 **Bill Longley**

[Grinnell](#)

January 12, 2007 **Bill Longley**

[This](#) 1919 Grinnell Litho Co is much closer to the missionary period.

Excuse my last post, in error.

January 12, 2007 **a**

THIS 1919 example of the Grinnell Litho Co..

January 12, 2007 **Dave S**

I don't usually post up to this page, but in my ebay searches, [this item](#) jumped out at me.

Note the words "Copyright by Grinnell Litho Co. NYC"

Any connection to your favorite gentleman?
Seems at least one Grinnell was in the printing business.

December 29, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Link below is to a news article describing it.

December 29, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Virus Warning Be wary of emails titled "Happy New Year" and containing an attachment "postcard.exe" or "postcard.zip". It is a virus. [here](#).

Bill

December 29, 2006 **David Beech** <David.Beech@bl.uk>

Bewhere of the questions after your Paper, they are always most testing, suit or no suit!

With best wishes for 2007.

December 28, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Stanley

I believe there to be many, many, many of the 6c & 8c mint sheets out there.

I suspect they are in the hands of a few (less than 3-4 people).

Purely for my curiosity, do you happen to know who today?

Given the quantity that I believe exists, they are not being sold nor have they been sold over these last many years.

P.S. We're having a meeting in January. You can e-mail Gary or Keith for the exact date.

P.P.S. Would you believe that Judie and I are going to be in London the second week in January giving a babble about Hawaiian Postage Stamps to the RPSSL? Judie just took me to the store to buy a suit on sale (last day of post Christmas sales here). Who in Hawaii owns a suit anyway? There are probably more of us who own a tux than a suit. I'm not to sure what that says, but it could be true.

December 28, 2006 **Stanley Piller** <stmpdlr@aol.com>

Richard M

Bob Siegel had maybe a hundred sheets of the 2 common values, the 6c and 18c. I remember seeing then in a pile in his safe in 1974 when I worked for him

December 24, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Happy Holidays to all, and a Prosperous 2007.

December 24, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Merry Christmas

December 08, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

1893 Discovery

The earliest report I've found is in the California Notes column of the September 14, 1893, Mekeel's, which begins "Advices received in this city several weeks ago from Honolulu brought the information that two complete sets of the first four stamps of Hawaii, viz: the 2 cent, 5 cent and 13 cent of 1851, and the 13 cent of 1852, all blue, were found in a safe in one of the Government buildings by the officials of the Provisional Government. This news came from a most reliable source, and the next steamer out from San Francisco carried an offer of \$500 for each set. . . ."

It goes on to quote a letter from Theodore C. Porter, ex-Minister of Finance, replying to J. Berolzhine Esq. of San Francisco, which does not confirm the report directly, but does say, in reply to the offer of \$500 "One thousand dollars is freely offered for the four stamps first on your list—2-cent, 5-cent and the two 13-cent—and \$100 each for the old numeral stamps."

An article titled "The Hawaiian Stamp Craze — A Situation that Attracted the Attention of Philatelists the World Over" from the San Francisco Call is reproduced in the November 1893 issue of The Metropolitan Philatelist. I don't know the date or original publication, but it is a greatly expanded version of the Mekeel's report.

It is mostly about speculation in the provisionals. But it goes on, "About two months ago the news was brought to this city from the Hawaiian capital that two complete sets of the first four stamps issued by Hawaii, viz. the 2 cent, 5 cent and 13 cent of 1851 and the 13 cent of 1852, all blue, were found in a safe in one of the Government buildings by the officials of the Provisional Government." And then quotes the Porter letter.

The report in Le Collectionneur de Timbres-Poste of January 1894 mentions "un certain M. Holdsworth d'Honolulu." Stanley Gibbons Monthly Journal of February 28, 1894, cited the French report.

Guessing the time from the San Francisco report to eventual publication in Mekeel's at about two weeks, and then going back "several weeks" earlier, I'd guess

late June or early July would be a good place to begin your search.

December 07, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

I should have added that the Kahului Railroad issues are not listed in 'standard' catalogues since they are private issues and not postage stamps; consequently, it would hardly be surprising were an otherwise knowledgeable person who, for example, might sponsor a 'Board' for philatelists turn out to be ignorant of this issues since only Hawaii focused people know this kind of stuff. Alternatively, such an otherwise knowledgeable person could also claim that he is 'merely' a postal historian. Either explanation works.

December 07, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

I'll bet that the sheet pictured is sans gun.

December 07, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Stamps? What do I know from stamps???

Thanks - I've relayed your message to the auctioneer. I think he questioned the items because he was consigned several sheets of both 6c and 18c denominations.

December 07, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Incidentally, sheets of 6c and 18c are not particularly uncommon. The prices paid for multiples vary all around the block. E-Bay lists them now and then. Auction houses have a sheet or two (of the 6c and 18c) not and then. I'm aware of someone with scores of sheets.

There is an old (true) story about how a 'brick' of stuck together sheets were used as a door stop.

December 07, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Richard Frajola

What you pictured is not a Hawaiian revenue stamp.

What you pictured was printed by the American Banknote Company for the private use of the Kahului Railroad on the island of Maui.

It is believed that the Kahului Railroad used their stamps as an accounting mechanism for packages carried on the railroad.

Most of the issued values are in multiples of 5c. It is questionable whether the 6c or 18c issues (the two non-5c or 5c multiple values) were ever legitimately used (although there are crayon cancels on a few as is the case with the 5c multiple values).

There are also a couple of 6c stamps on cover with PF Certificates. I and Robert Hill are in the process of writing a long article on the issues. We believe the 'used' examples on cover (regardless of the Certificate) are creations and the PF issued a Certificate simply because they were somewhat ignorant of the stamps and their use.

December 07, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I have been asked about the Hawaiian revenue [here](#). Genuine, forgery, or reprint?

December 06, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

John - That stamp is a forgery (as the seller probably knows).

December 06, 2006 **JOHN CHUNKA** <jchunka@comcast.net>

Hawaii thirteen cent stamp 290059320314

December 05, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken L

When you get your file in hand, please provide me with a simple summary of each of the newspaper references you have (paper and date) as well as the name of the Hawaiian government official (assuming he was actually named and not an anonymous person) who is referenced in Meekel's.

I will use all of that information to see if I can find anything in the Hawaiian Archives re the alleged 1893 'discovery' of Missionaries in the files of the Hawaiian Post Office.

December 02, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

I have no newspaper report published in Hawaii for the 1893 find, but Meekel's quoted a letter from a Hawaiian government official to a California collector about it.

That file is not at hand right now, but when I retrieve it I'll provide specific dates. The reports were late in the year and in 1894.

December 01, 2006 **David Beech** <David.Beech@bl.uk>

Ken,

Yes, the lack of illustrations is the big problem with early philatelic literature. So many wonderful items came up in auctions, but which wonderful item, it is almost impossible to tell. I have looked at most of the Crawford Library's 4,500 volumes since becoming Curator 23 years ago and have yet to find an unrecorded item!

Quite a bit of the Tapling Collection was acquired in 1887 when he purchased part of the Collection formed by the brothers Gustave and Martial Caillebotte of Paris. While I have no proof, certain issues/counties would have been (?) slightly more fashionable/available in either London or Paris. For example the rather good Uruguay section (including both 1858 tete-beche) may well have been largely a "French" country, as may have been the large holding of Mexico. What about Hawaii? But at this distance in time, who can tell. What we need in philately is a time machine; perhaps this would solve the Grinnell question!

November 30, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Gentlemen & Gentlewomen

While anything is possible, I suggest that one does not use verbiage to the effect that the 1893 'discovery' of 1 copy of each of the 2 types of each of the 4 values (O.K., 2 of which are 13c values) of the Missionary Stamps (a total of 8 copies) is indeed a fact.

It would certainly be neat were there 6 more XF copies of the other 3 Missionary Stamps out there somewhere.

When I have some time, I will visit the Hawaii State Archives and see if I can find anything.

Ken – Please list again what is the earliest supposed date of discovery to help my search of the archive files plus anything that was suppose to be from a local newspaper report as opposed to a foreign report (i.e., foreign meaning outside of Hawaii). It seems to me that such would be in the local newspapers or in local postal records. It is, of course, the archival postal records that most interest me.

If you previously posted such, then I either forgot it or overlooked the posting.

For sake of discussion, I would love to be wrong in my belief that the event did not occur.

November 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David,

If I do, I'll surely let you know. The trouble is that no exact images of individual Hawaiian Missionary stamps and covers were published before the mid-1890s. After that, I can track many of them, but that's too late for Tapling's stamps. I'd guess that some or all of them passed through Stanley Gibbons, but I can't prove it.

The Hawaiian government sold a lot of stamps at the 1876 Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia, where Gibbons had the biggest philatelic display. It's tantalizing to speculate about deals that might have occurred among standholders as they were setting up, before the show opened.

November 28, 2006 **David Beech, the British Library, Philatelic Collections** <David.Beech@bl.uk>

Tapling Collection Missionaries

Ken,

Just to report for the record that we have never worked out from whom Thomas Tapling purchased his copies of any value. If you do discover we would be pleased to know.

David.

November 27, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve,

If the wealthiest collector or his agent(s) got first refusal or second chance, they went to Ferrary, as I suggested when I first raised the question about the 1893 find.

Ferrary owned the only two sound 2¢ Missionaries, one of each type, and did not sell soon enough for Worthington. Where did he get them, and when?

How far back can the Gaston Leroux 2¢ Type II be traced? The origin of that stamp, now regarded as uncanceled, has always been a mystery to me. It was "the world's most valuable stamp" at the Ferrary sale until Hind bought the One Cent Magenta in 1923.

The Ferrary-Champion-Lichtenstein-Phillips-Twigg-Smith stamp is the best 2¢ Type I.

Those are possibilities.

As far as I can tell, neither stamp was in any of the collections formed earlier -- Thomas Thrum, William Brown, Henry Crocker, Frederick Ayer, L.L. Green, Tapling, and a handful of lesser lights who could not have competed for a 2¢.

November 27, 2006 **Steve W**

Richard M raises a good point about the 1893 discovery - what became of the XF 2c types I and II? Are any of the known copies in perfect condition?

November 27, 2006 **Jerry Shean**

Richard Malmgren -

Thank you for providing the full quote. That confirms (to me, anyway) that the bible (Book of Sermons) was in the hair trunk, and Shattuck knew it was in the trunk, but he did not know of its origin.

I have insufficient evidence, insufficient time, and insufficient knowledge to argue that the Grinnells are a genuine printing that ended up in the Book of Sermons, but I want to be sure the evidence we are all considering is accurate and complete. Thank you again for providing the quote.

November 27, 2006 **David Beech** <David.Beech@bl.uk>

I have been so busy during recent weeks and away on holiday that I have not had the time to respond to both Scott Trepel or to Ken Lawrence.

Scott Trepel

Re: Your post of 27th October. You are quite right I have not made any comment on your article about solid plates v loose type. This is an aspect of the Grinnell debate that I have not got (or gotten, as you say in the US) into. Thus I have not formed a view. I think that your work and that of David Shumaker is an important contribution. By important (for those who have questioned my use of the word) I mean that they need to be published in the printed research literature for use in the future as part of the research process of establishing the truth. As principal Curator at the British Library, Philatelic Collections I am daily involved with the collection and use, for mainly research purposes, of both philatelic material and written research materials. With the latter group it is important that it is collected and made available. Web site contributions are likely to be short lived.

As I have always said, including at my Smithsonian NPM Maynard Sundman Lecture in 2003, I am not a member of the Royal's Expert Committee. I do not speak for the Expert Committee. Thus I am free to discuss the Grinnell issues.

Ken Lawrence

If you would like to e-mail me with a note of your postal address (or I could use APRL if you wish) I will send you a copy of the paper:

Beech, David, Dr Tracey Chaplin, and Prof. Robin Clark. "Hawaiian Missionary Stamps: Analysis by Raman Microscopy". [Paper submitted to the Expert Committee] 2001

November 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

I don't know if your interpretation is correct. It looks to me like the mitered right edge rules were pushed outward to the right at the bottom of both 2¢ clichés (also the 5¢, but to a lesser degree), yielding the result you observe. If the same spacers remained in place when they were locked up again, that would be the logical result, I think.

Carl's scan appears to show that everything else remained square, except for the bottom corner ornaments that abutted the shortened and filed side ornaments.

Cordrey is not very helpful on this point, because he thought there were about five different settings of the 2¢. I think these just reflect excentric and uneven shrinkage.

November 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Thanks. Is there any significance in the counterclockwise rotation of the Type II cliché relative to the Type I? Shouldn't they align? Or, better asked why wouldn't they be normal to each other?

Is there any significance in the Type II numeral being normal to the Type I cliché but not to its own cliché? The "1" of "13" does this also, but without straight segments it's hard to judge the "3".

November 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

Ordinarily the comp stick would be used for the original setting, but changes would be made either by simply loosening the forme and changing it in the chase or by unlocking and lifting the chase to leave the full setting on the galley and making changes there. Or tied with string if it was set aside between printings.

Fitting in one longer line of type would most easily be achieved by pushing out the border rules, agreeing with your observation.

Pulling prints from inked type with a mallet or roller was the traditional way of proving a setting on the galley before it was locked into the forme, hence "galley proof."

November 26, 2006 **Shu**

Oops, I meant wider at the bottom than the top.

November 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Lurker,

I've been hogging the board for some time, but it's gone quiet and so I'd like to respond to your concern with some thoughts. If you look at the pairs of the Two Cents, for example, you will see that the bottom frame of the Type II cliché is rotated counterclockwise relative to the Type I. If this was due to fish eye

distortion, these frame lines would curve, not rotate. If a trapezoidal distortion, the top and bottom frames would be straight while only the verticals would be out of plumb. I can't see how a distorted image can explain why the bottom (and top) frame lines make a turn from the Type I to the Type II.

If you look at the Mystic publications these pairs show the same rotation of the cliches as the images posted on this site. It seems that the rotation has to do with the cliches being wider at the top than the bottom, on all three denominations.

I still wonder about the lack of rotation in the numerals "2" between cliches in the pair. I can see why this could be the result of drawing in two central numerals on a photo of a model pair, but I can't see why, if typeset, the central numeral in the Type II is not rotated with the cliché, and therefore normal to and flush with the surrounding filigree "type." Especially if locked tight enough to prevent movement between impressions.

I wish I knew if Cordrey found any significant movement of elements within individual denominations, but my impression is that he relied on overall measurements whose variables could be explained by paper shrinkage. That would not take into account a single piece of "type" moving about as the Two Cents were printed. Scott Trepe's conclusion that a fixed plate was used has been out for a while and would have been easily challenged had such internal movement of elements been detected by Cordrey within the same printing.

If, in tightening a typeset forme, shims were used to right the central numeral in relation to Type I, why were they not employed in between cliches to counter the rotation of the whole Type II cliché? That is, in noticing the cliches were not aligned, why didn't the printer align the cliches instead of aligning ONLY the central numerals?

What I'm getting to is that the rotation between cliches indicates that, if typeset, a comp stick was not used. If the individual pieces of "type" were held together with string, I'd think there should be ample examples of these pieces moving in relation to each other within each denomination. I'm not talking about differences between the Two Cents and Thirteen Cents; I'm talking about lining up several Type I Two Cents (for example) and seeing type shifting among them. Any such documentation?

November 24, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Last call for bids for my public auction tomorrow. Besides the great Canada (of course) , there are nearly 200 lots of worldwide including a big Germany collection.

You can see it online at www.longleyauctions.com.

Bill

November 24, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

I'm starting to clear out some duplicate books -- just listed copies of the Mayer and Gifford Hawaii books on eBay.

November 23, 2006 **Carl Roberts**

Lurker...

You raise a valid point about the accuracy of images.

Much earlier in the discussion here, when Richard (our host) first provided the means for large images to be downloaded and accessed, I tried some experiments that involved overlaying one image superimposed on another to make comparisons. I gave up, but others prevailed and brought up some very interesting observations, especially about the possible printing methods used.

But for me, I couldn't control the images enough to achieve any valid comparisons - but the very large images are indeed very helpful.

But particularly in looking at the distortions in the shape of the stamps, it is important to know, as you suggest, that the original source is accurate. One of my favorite online stamp sellers uses a camera instead of a scanner, and his auction images have that unmistakable fisheye lens look, with the stamps appearing to bulge wider in the middle due to close-up photography. The same thing to a lesser degree could happen with other camera lenses, as would distortion if the camera was not centered in relation to the stamp.

Of course there's also the problem of knowing which stamps have been repaired, touched up, and painted in.

But we have the advantage here of having multiple images provided to us by owners of the "same" stamp, some as singles and a few in pairs. So if, for example, we are unsure of the design details of a Grinnell 5c Type I we can use other images of the same type to make comparisons.

That doesn't erase all doubt, but it sure helps.

-Carl

November 23, 2006 **Lurker**

People looking at the rectangular/trapezoidal thing? I guess you are looking at the originals and not reproductions of some sort? If reproductions, you do surely, I assume, know the reproduction method used? Or at least you have certified, accurate measurements to hand?

I thought the green-square thing was rather persuasive (i.e. a design square not matching the overall trapezoid). Then the "corner" post showed it probably matched the overall trapezoid, and hence was just a possible/probable reproduction factor....

November 23, 2006 **Shu**

Richard M.

I have not read the results of Hall's examination. I'm sure someone will post a link or a summary when it's published.

Trying to answer my question as to how Grinnell fooled the experts is leading me to different scenarios. Ken's posts regarding actual testimony makes me wonder if such a meeting as Klemann pictured in his mind ever happened.

Yes, Grinnell received a lot of money for the fakes, but Poole and Wood got substantial money from all directions without any risks that I can see, except for the rejected offer of Wood's guarantee that would have left him holding the bag.

Grinnell brought the goods and the story behind them to the table. Poole brought expertise and claim of a concrete \$60K offer. I think Klemann needed all these things to have bought them so wrecklessly.

I'm not suggesting that Grinnell and Poole acted together, but if in fact Taylor made no offer, Poole never actually examined the stamps against the genuine, and Poole declared the Grinnells to be fakes just as he testified, then Klemann would not have bought the stamps from Grinnell. That's my conclusion. Ken L's question to Poole on the stand is a great one.

So this is more of a two-tier fraud, where one man gets away with defrauding thousand\$ because other reputable men made thousand\$ by enabling the first man. Perhaps Grinnell, or whoever was behind this venture, counted more upon the greed of the individual participants than on the need to counter their collective expertise. That is, Grinnell need not have a complete or even a particularly successful meeting with Taylor if he figured the various people having their hands in the till would tell Kleeman whatever necessary to get Grinnell's stamps sold and everyone paid. Divide and conquer. Poole's testimony certainly indicates he was less than straight with Klemann.

November 23, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Hey Big Island guy

We just got an Emergency Alert on Honolulu TV about your latest earthquake.

Everything O.K.?

November 23, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Shu

At this stage of the game, the origination of G80 & G81 is, of course, speculation on anyone's part.

My speculation remains that several of the folks who were acquainted through the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles (including both Grinnell and Thompson) were all involved in the manufacturing of the Grinnells and the subsequent fraud. No proof, but it is the best connection of which I am aware. Of course, that does not speak to the origin of G80 & G81.

One or more of the folks – Poole, Taylor, Wood - who meet to 'verify' the genuineness of the Grinnells trial testimony have always been suspect to me as being part of the fraud – but still speculation. The story just doesn't feel quite right to me. (Who cares whether the price was \$60,000 or \$65,000. If they were offered to me back then and I did not have the money and I believed for whatever basis they were genuine, then I would have put together a group to buy them for no other reason than my reasonable certainty that we could turn around and sell them in small lots at a substantial profit. My guess has always been that they were sold as a single lot because it was felt to be 'safer'.) But neither does that speak to the origin of G80 & G81.

Assuming G80 & G81 are genuine, I'm not a fan of their having emerged in 1893 from the archives of the Honolulu Post Office, but each to his/her own. I do not have a convincing explanation for their apparently superior condition. Still, I wonder where all of those other 'perfect' copies are now were the Post Office archives indeed the source.

I do not discount that one of the group (meaning Grinnell and the Southwest Museum group) effectively pilfered them – regardless of whether they originally emerged in 1893 from the Post Office archives into the hands of somebody else. But if they were effectively pilfered, then from who and where? As far as I know, the shell lady remains a possible.

And has there been a final report on the cancel of G80 and I just missed it or do we still need to wait on the official reporting?

November 23, 2006 **Shu**

Actually, what I wrote about the central numerals may not apply to the 5 Cents. The central 2 and the numeral "1" of the 13 have straight edges that are easy to align. The fives only have a short part that is straight. There seems to be a slight rotation from the left to the right 5, but the top filigree are hard to use as reference points since they are different sizes for each Type.

November 23, 2006 **Shu**

Richard M.

Since we now know what Sterling didn't know, that Grinnell possessed G80 and G81, and we can therefore reasonably assume for the purpose of our discussion that Mr. Grinnell was a party to this venture, what is the part that you think Thompson played in this venture?

Your past posts make clear that you think the chances are slim to none that G80 and G81 came from Shattuck's trunk in 1918. Do you think Thompson may have supplied them, as Ken L. seemed to say was a possibility?

November 23, 2006 **Shu**

"Visible," though I retain the rights to the word "vivable."

November 23, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Carl R.

Roger H. is onto something. One clearly visible trait in the Grinnells is that the Type II cliché is rotated a couple of degrees counterclockwise from the Type I cliché. Or more accurately, the right frame of Type II is rotated a degree or two from the left frame of Type I at the other end of the setting. Even so, there is NO perceivable difference in the spacing between the two clichés. That suggests a gradual widening of the stamp design at the bottom.

The Two Cent Type II that you posted has a freakishly rotated right frame, but even if put back against the filigree it still demonstrates this rotation.

How can the cliches rotate if made upon a composition stick? Ken has suggested that they were tied together with string, which I think is the only way this could happen. Still, the counterclockwise rotation on each of the three denomination pairs seems to be the same, regardless of which should have the wider bottom label. The possibility that each denomination has the same rotation should be verified. Roger?

However, there is another intreaguig aspect of the Grinnell "settings". Looking at the pairs again, notice that the central numerals are NOT rotated in relation to each other. When viewed individually, the 2 and 5 Type II have numerals that are slightly rotated clockwise, the 13 Type I counterclockwise. But looking at the pairs again, it is the cliches of those denominations that are rotated, not the central numeral. A clue as to how they were made, perhaps?

November 23, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Jerry Shean

My apology!

In decades past, I first read of the 'bible' being referred to as the 'Book of Psalms'. The 'Book of Psalms' description is still implanted in my memory bank. It is the term that is still first to come to my mind instead of the more correct term 'Book of Sermons'.

November 23, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Jerry Shean

On November 22 you essentially asked that I provide you with a fuller quote from Herb Sterling's January 11, 1956 letter in which he wrote to Stanley Ashbrook that the Book of Psalms (i.e., the 'bible' referenced in the letter) having originated in the old trunk is uncertain according to the particular Shattuck to whom Herb Sterling spoke.

The applicable paragraph follows:

"I am also sure that Mr. Grinnell was not a party in the venture. I have but one man that I have met, that I might "wonder" if he had anything to do with them.... The strange part to me is, the many things that came out of the old 100 year old hair trunk in the Shattuck attic. The Shattucks would never be a party to messing in a deal that was dishonest. The pictures, the Shattuck seaman's bible, coffin plates, plus many other items from the Hawaiian Islands were in this hair trunk. Shattuck knew they were in the old trunk but the bible he never knew where it came from - if it was a part of his grand-father's things or not --- they died in the islands and were buried there...."

The 'I' is Herb Sterling. The 'one man' is, I believe, a reference to Charles Sydney Thompson. This reference becomes more obvious from additional correspondence.

To repeat old information, Charles Shattuck (from whom George Grinnell allegedly obtained the Book of Psalms) was the son of Jesse Shattuck. Jesse Shattuck was the husband of Hannah Shattuck who corresponded with Ursula Emerson while Ursula was in Hawaii. Ursula Emerson was the mother of William Emerson who some have suggested was the originator or whatever of the Grinnells. Consequently, the reference to 'grand-father's things' is, I believe, a comment from a son of Charles Shattuck.

I assume you could argue that the Book of Psalms came from an Uncle if you wish; however, I am surprised that anyone would still judge the Grinnells to be a genuine printing that ended up in the Book of Psalms.

And do not forget it was a son and daughter of Charles Shattuck who revised their sworn court room testimony as to what they recollected was or was not originally in the trunk.

November 23, 2006 **Carl Roberts**

Thanks Ken.

You saw more in the image than I did, which is to be expected from an expert.

Thats the difference between a chess player and a checkers player.

Think diagonal.

About the brightness of the red cancels, and their being in an envelope...

Imagine the belongings of a departed stamp collector (young Emerson?) being dispersed. I suggest a stamp collector because both mint and used Grinnells (and G90 and G81) were kept, carefully preserved. Why wouldn't that person keep all of the stamps in books? Two books, a book of sermons and a Bible. Upon dispersal, someone wanted the Bible and someone else received the stamps and the other book. The stamps in the Bible were transferred to an envelope and we end up with those in the trunk, exactly whre we'd expect to find that sort of stuff.

Seems logical.

King me.

-Carl

November 23, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Carl,

Your rendering suggests that the RPSL was right. Resetting the bottom inscription, for which "Two Cents" is wider than "13 && Cents .", pushed the right edge rules out at the bottom. The widening is certainly not an artifact of photographic perspective or optical distortion. If these images were cut-and-paste tracings, we should not observe this result. Think vertical.

The lowest side ornaments are trimmed at the bottom on all denominations of Missionaries and Grinnells, so the corner pieces would be out of square if the filed

edge of the adjacent side ornament wasn't square.

November 22, 2006 **Carl Roberts**

G squared - Grinnells, that is...

Roger I took the liberty of modifying one of your examples, because I see something there that apparently you didn't notice.

It's the 2c Grinnell that has the outer border most extremely out of square.

[corner](#)

I've added a purple line to help show that the lower left ornament is way out of position in relation to the other three corners, and thus doesn't really fit in your green box as it first appears. The purple line should hit the corner, and equal parts of the design should be on each side of the purple line, like the other three corners.

Imagine where what has been called the "propeller" should be drawn, and imagine how there should be equal parts of the outer curved line. Put those missing elements into the picture, and the corner of your box moves significantly to the left.

Rather than draw the boxes, I'd suggest looking at four points, illustrated using just two orange boxes on this image because missing details don't allow for proper location of the other two. Anyway, on the other stamp images, visually looking at the amount of separation at those four points - both Grinnells and known genuine Missionaries - should indicate to some degree of accuracy whether the designs follow the out-of-parallel shape of the stamps.

But what does it all prove?

If the 13c stamps have parallel sides but the other values do not, how would a forger get that detail right if two 13c stamps served as a pattern?

Now, if the opposite were true, if all Grinnells had parallel sides, everybody would be driving one more nail in the coffin, but I seriously doubt if anyone will consider the true situation as an indication that the stamps might be real. Or at least not a product of poor old George.

Also, when one considers that only a genuine Missionary apparently failed the spectrographic analysis, the story gets even more bizarre. But nobody has pointed out the obvious, the Grinnells passed a test so stringent that a genuine stamp failed.

I'm starting to think that our forger had powers beyond that of a mere mortal man.

Perhaps the work of a woman.

-Carl

November 22, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

The other difficulty is that Grinnell said the unused stamps were in the prayer book and the used ones were in an envelope, yet Poole attributed the brightness of the cancels to preservation in the prayer book ("bible").

November 22, 2006 **Jerry Shean**

Richard,

Can you provide any more context to the questioning of Shattuck or reprint the full relevant quote? The language can be interpreted to mean that Shattuck didn't know where the book of Psalms came from originally - e.g. maybe it was his uncle's, not his grandfather's. The quote given does not necessarily mean that the book was not in the trunk or that the stamps were not in the book.

November 22, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Gee whiz!

With all of this current dialogue, nobody wanted to pick up on any of the crumbs I threw out.

O.K., let's try this one again.

Herb Sterling, who as far as I know had no axe to grind other than believing that on a moral basis his good friend George Grinnell was a probable candidate for Eagle Scout and conceivably Sainthood, said that with regards to the Book of Psalms (aka 'the bible'), Shattuck knew that a bunch of other stuff was in the old trunk, "...but the bible he never knew where it came from - if it was a part of his grand-father's things or not..."

We are talking here about all of those Grinnells that supposedly reposed in the Book of Psalms (aka 'the bible') for oh so many decades.

I do not know where Mr. Sterling obtained his information (presumably from Shattuck the younger who is probably the Shattuck referred to in the quote); however, if any one has ever read Mr. Sterling's several letters on the Grinnells, then I you will probably conclude there to be no indication that Mr. Sterling fabricated things. This is not to say that he was necessarily always correct (witness his belief of George Grinnell's moral fiber) - but simply to say that he was apparently writing down what he believed to be the truth.

The truth according to Mr. Sterling is that the Book of Psalms having originated in the old trunk is questionable.

November 22, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

IF Poole told the truth under oath. That's why this is a morality play about intrigue and treachery, not a story about mere stamps. Don't forget Klemann's \$5,000

bribe for Wood to talk Grinnell down to \$65,000. The questions I can't answer are why Poole was called as a witness, and whose interest his testimony served. When this is cast on the big screen, I doubt viewers will root for any of these guys.

November 22, 2006 **David Shumaker**

I just assumed, perhaps incorrectly but perhaps not, that Klemann's \$65K offer was to outbid Taylor's \$60K offer, and nothing else. I can't understand why Taylor did not buy these stamps unless either he didn't like them or Grinnell wanted more. How could Grinnell walk away from \$60K, even if the stamps were genuine, without having secured a higher offer?

If Taylor had no interest, as Poole testified (in this story Poole was only at the meeting to bring Taylor's stamps and for no other reason), then who do we suppose told Klemann he had to beat \$60K to get the "genuine" stamps? Hmmm... Poole or Tinkerbell?

November 22, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

You couldn't make this up either. Poole testified that Col. Taylor had no interest in buying Grinnell's stamps and made no offer for them. Makes you wonder why they made the trip to the bank with Wood and Grinnell.

Grinnell's original deal with Wood was a commission of one sixth. Presumably Wood would have had to split that with Poole if Taylor had bought the stamps.

Klemann promised Wood \$5,000, so I imagine that's what he promised Poole also, but I don't recall whether I've seen that figure.

Choose Steve's option No. 3. I think Poole must have imbibed before he took the stand.

November 22, 2006 **Roger Heath**

second correction:
or do [this](#) in a more refined manner.

November 22, 2006 **Roger Heath**

correction to link:

or do [this](#) in a more refined manner.

November 22, 2006 **Roger Heath**

At this time I'm not sure how I can make one stamp semi-transparent and overlay it onto another. To make all the left side frames vertical required shifts of .5° to 2° of rotation, clockwise or counterclockwise, depending on the alignment when they were scanned. A very time consuming part of all this computer playing around is taken up sizing the different scans from the various sources. I've done my best to make sizes close but can't guarantee I can be accurate when creating overlays. It would be possible if the overlays were created scanning stamps on the same scanner and processed using the same software.

This could be just a matter of showing a "green" rectangle aligned to other components of the stamps. Such as these, where I don't see any significant "out-of-squareness" of the ornaments

[2 cent from card](#)

[5 cent from card](#)

[G-62](#)

[NPM Y4](#)

or do [this](#) in a more refined manner.

Roger

November 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Thanks. I wonder if Taylor's offer of \$60K was the greatest influence in Poole's communicating to Klemann the stamps were good. Maybe Klemann offered a high commission to Poole than did Taylor. What did Klemann pay Poole in commission? Seems that Poole testified he was more an agent than expert in this case, which was likely where his heart was, but Klemann's testimony clearly indicated that he believed that Poole looked at the stamps along with Taylor and confirmed to him the stamps were good. If Poole was actually as aloof as he testified under cross examination, then perhaps he didn't pay much attention until Taylor made the \$60K offer.

Roger H.

I had it backwards - it was the Two and Five that had the longer labels and the gaps between O-5 and C-3. Anyway, your comparison with the genuine demonstrates the Grinnells do taper.

Question: what happens when you lay one image atop another? I'm curious if the trapezoid effect is only the frames out of whack. If the entire Grinnell bottom is out of scale with the genuine, then when stacked the Grinnells' bottom label letters will gradually outpace the genuine if the entire design is distorted. If only the right frame is rotated, then each letter in the bottom labels will align, and the spaces between the letters and the frames will vary.

Or, if the top is too small, then the other way around...

November 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

Grinnell said that Poole and Taylor examined them at the bank when the four of them were there, with Taylor's stamps and his together on the table, and declared them genuine.

Taylor thought the cancels on the Grinnells looked too bright. Poole said that preservation in the prayer book all those years -- he called it a bible -- would account for that.

Steve W,

That's what I've been saying from the beginning, ever since I wrote my Rashomon scripts.

November 21, 2006 **Roger Heath**

David S -

Surprise the 13 isn't tapered!

The trapezoidal effect is on the 5 cent and 2 cent Grinnells, not the 13 cent. The 13's are a very good [rectangular fit](#), as shown in this comparison between the middle stamp on the card and Y-109. The top narrows a little on the [5 cent](#) Grinnells, then goes further on the [2 cent](#) examples.

Authentic Missionaries I've worked with today seem to have random borders, [2 cent](#) and [5 cent](#).

General conclusions are that the 13 cent stamps, G80-81 are rectangular as are the other Grinnell 13 cent stamps. The 5 cent stamps have the right side taper inwards towards the top, the 2 cent Grinnells taper more.

There is no generalization that I can make concerning the symmetry of authentic Missionaries as they seem to be much more variable.

Roger

November 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Interesting stuff. What was Grinnell's recollection of the meeting with Taylor, Wood and Poole, as far as Poole's involvement?

November 21, 2006 **Steve W**

Maybe there is a movie here...

November 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

Taylor's collection consisted of 13 presumably genuine Missionaries -- four Scott 2, four Scott 3, and five Scott 4.

One of Taylor's stamps is Scott's census 119, a 13¢ with a black grid cancel. Poole produced one Missionary stamp at trial that he testified he had bought from Taylor, which had a Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands cancel, therefore a 5¢. (Taylor did not own a 2¢.)

As for your choices, I'd opt for No. 3. How else can you explain this?

At trial, Poole testified that he had examined the Grinnell stamps and declared them counterfeit on December 24, 1919, and denied that he had examined them for Taylor or had served as Taylor's agent.

So why did he advise Klemann to purchase them? I'd have asked Poole if he made a business collecting fat commissions on fraudulent sales of forgeries.

On cross-examination he agreed that he had brought Taylor's collection (which he had mounted) to the bank in November 1919 with Taylor, Wood, and Grinnell, and had all the Taylor Missionary and Grinnell stamps before him together on a table, but said he did not examine them. "Mr. Grinnell, I think, asked me what I thought of them, and I may have said they looked all right." "But that is not an opinion."

But Klemann testified:

"The reason I went to see Poole about this matter was, at that time he was the first one I had received word of this find from, and I wanted to assure him that I would pay him a commission that he was entitled to, on this deal. I also wanted confirmation of what Wood and Grinnell had told me about this transaction, that Poole and Taylor had been to the safe deposit box, Taylor bringing his collection of Missionary stamps, and both had made a careful comparison of the stamps, and both had said they were genuine, and thereupon Taylor had offered \$60,000 for the stamps. . . .

"I asked Poole, 'Are the stamps genuine?' I came into Poole's office, only having a few minutes to spare, having made an appointment to meet Mr. Grinnell at Goodman's book store in a hour's time after he left the safe deposit vault, and wanted to meet my appointment promptly. I said to Mr. Poole, 'I am here about that Hawaiian deal. I will look after you as far as the commission is concerned. Are the stamps O.K.?' He said, 'Yes, they are, you can see the blowholes in the type.' I said, 'All right,' and started out to go over to Goodman's book store."

That was before Richard M did not inhale at Berkeley. It's a script I could not make up.

November 21, 2006 **Steve W**

If Taylor's stamps were genuine, it seems improbable that they would have compared well with the Grinnells unless:

1) Grinnells were not used

- 2) Wood, Poole or Taylor was in cahoots
- 3) Richard M supplied some spiced wine beforehand

November 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

I agree with the principle, but everyone seems to agree that both Wood and Poole compared Grinnell's stamps to Taylor's when they authenticated them.

When Klemann gave Grinnell his down payment, he had Grinnell ship the stamps for safekeeping in escrow at the Crocker bank in San Francisco, where Henry Crocker's collection was still intact in the vault. Klemann told Grinnell he planned to ask Crocker's widow to give him access to that collection for comparison, but as far as I know there is no record of whether that occurred when Klemann completed the payment and retrieved the stamps.

November 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard F.

There's alway moving targets for paintballs and other things on this board! Caspary finds the cancellation inks bleed when dampened and concludes aniline ink. Then Dr. Hall tests several Grinnells and did not report aniline. Now Dr. Hall tests one accepted genuine Missionary in Grinnell's possession and finds that cancel to be aniline (allegedly)!

Someone just dump the lot of them in water and see what comes out in an hour... PLEASE!

Roger H.

I think if you look at all the filigree on each type you will find too much variation in the sizes and shapes for these to have been anything other than extensively redrawn. Plus, the shading lines in the pearls are almost always completely wrong when compared to the genuine ornament. I think enlarged photographs were traced in the first step, giving a full contrast model from which to make further photographs. I think that after tracing the models (leaving out certain details), the next step was making a photographic paste-up for each denomination and type, modified as required, then re-photographed for reduction in the manner you have suggested.

About the trapezoidal shape of the Grinnells, are all denominations trapezoidal, or just the 13 cents whose wider bottom lable required swinging the right frame out at the bottom (producing the wider space between O-5 and C-3)?

I still wonder about the degradation of the filligree from left to right when observing pairs. This is not from printing because it is consistent, so it seems to recall the condition of the surface of the plate, degrading from right to left. Why?

November 21, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

I was at the PF last month, and they asked me to look at some French patients that had been submitted. These were stamps from the first three imperforate issues. Other reviewers had examined them to determine that they were neither French Colonies nor 1862 official reprints, and concluded that they must be genuine. Having grown up around forgeries, I took literally one glance and recognized them as Fournier forgeries.

Why do I relate this story on the Grinnell Board? Fournier forgeries are not great forgeries, but when looked at in isolation, they can legitimately fool many people. You have to have looked at a lot of frogs to be able to identify one when it is not sitting next to a toad. This is why reference collections (of both genuine and forged material) are so important to expertising.

When I apply this to people looking at Grinnells, which are dangerous forgeries, I am not surprised that people can't pick them out easily in isolation. What is more germane is that every time that they have been compared side-by-side to accepted Missionaries, they have been condemned.

November 21, 2006 **Shu**

"if Grinnell hadn't gotten them"

November 21, 2006 **Shu**

"too convenient"

November 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

I'll let my research speak for itself, and I certainly welcome alternative explanations.

However, let me say that while the method of production of the Grinnell plates is theoretical, the ruling out of both typesettings and stereos is definite. The movements I found within what should be single pieces of type are concrete and widespread, and my research is easily repeatable by any other person who wishes to.

Take a Rembrandt that some art experts agree is genuine, and if I can demonstrate decisively that the most basic element of the painting, the brush stroke, is not applied by hand (which is the opposite of what I demonstrated with the "metal type") then I will have shown it to be fake. Regardless of peripheral arguments of provenance, style, possible student involvement, questions of restoration, paint and canvas spectroscopic examination, etc. Likewise, show me a brass ball that people think is gold and if I can demonstrate that the basic building blocks, the atoms, are copper and zinc and void of gold, then I would have put that fantasy to rest as well.

Lately I've been thinking of whether Grinnell acted alone or in concert. I thought we were working together when I asked who could have provided G80 and G81 in Grinnell hadn't gotten them from Shattuck and you suggested that Thompson may have acquired them through purchasing collections. So, I stepped back a couple of days ago in my post entitled ten things needed to open Klemann's wallet; in other words, if the reason for producing the Grinnell fakes was ultimately

for defrauding a wealthy dealer or collector, then these ten things had to have occurred just as they did. Some participants are known, some are suspected and others are yet unnamed. From that list, I cannot rule out either a one-man ops or a full-blown conspiracy.

In writing the list I found a few steps that seemed insurmountable. The first was possession of the real Missionaries. Many experts on forgeries reasoned that Grinnells being fake was highly unlikely without having the genuine to work from. And of course, everyone assumed that was impossible for Grinnell alone. Then BOOM... this summer, there they were, G80 and G81. One incredulous senario is now fact.

Ask anyone who has ever doubted these stamps could be fakes about his possession of G80 and G81 (were they still alive) and i'd think you'd get a lot of changed minds.

The next biggest difficulty was getting Woods, then Poole, then Taylor then Klemann to buy in knowing these men had expertise and genuine Missionaries to work with. It's far from conspiratorial or circular logic to think a second surprise is lurking out there to explain how that meeting went in Grinnell's favor. assuming they simply missed the differences is simply to convenient as well as contrary to a philatelist's nature.

I don't know how Grinnell did it, but I do know that he had genuine Missionaries all along. You say that using those two stamps for comparison to Taylor's is unlikely, and I don't fault you reasoning, but those two were in fact all that he had. Maybe Grinnell took the two genuine AND one or two "loaners" from another source? Impossible? More or less impossible than having two genuine Missionaries in his possession when he passed away?

November 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

I have only an actual size photo copy of some Grinnells, not originals, but measuring those I find that some have perfectly parallel side rules and others are wider at the top than the bottom or vice versa. So in my opinion these are not artifacts of photography. They probably account for the varying measurements that the RPSL Expert Committee recorded, which led Patrick Pearson to state emphatically in blod type that the Grinnells were printed from loose type. But as several observers have noted, another possibility is that the paper did not shrink uniformly as it dried.

November 21, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

We have seen "trivial" differences pointed out by both Scott and Bill. As you know, if photographs were made of No 80-81 and enlarged, an artist could have gone into the photograph and enhanced, strengthened, or changed the lines and ornaments as he thought necessary, as many times as he felt he needed until he got it "right". That is not a difficult concept, the making of the Grinnells didn't require only a single process as you always imply. He could even cut out and replaced the central numeral with another number, if necessary.

You wrote of me, "he anticipated that a comparison (by Caspary) of Grinnells with Missionaries would be fatal". Of course I did! Caspary returned the stamps, right? I only asked what the basis was for the return of the stamps and wanting his money back. I'm certain Caspary knew more about Missionaries than I do, so I'll accept his reasons and conclusion, they are fakes.

I'm not redesigning any theory. You are providing me with additional facts every time pertinent questions are posed. I appreciate your research, but as each day goes by I feel more assured my theory is valid. Every other anecdotal theory seems to require a redesign and stretch of the imagination, not mine. The evidence points to photographic reproduction with artistic enhancements, no redesigning of theory necessary on my part. I'm waiting for any evidence the Grinnells **could not** have been created photographically.

Here is a repeat of an earlier post where I [compared the lower left corner ornament](#) on the Grinnells with #80-81. I would like to know where my theory is inaccurate or misleading. No comments were ever made by anyone at the time, so I'm open to ideas different than my own.

When I posted the link on November 7, your only comment concerned the hypothetical glue that might have been used by a paste-up artist to glue *)-82 to the card. You didn't address a single point made in my post about the trapezoidal shape of Grinnells, nor the comparison of the ornaments themselves. It's disappointing to illustrate a theory and not have valid feedback. Maybe Caspary and I would have had an interesting discussion, but I don't think he required to know how they were made, only that he knew they were fake.

Roger

Rembrandt and other master painters have been copied throughout history, often by their own students. Some were so good they painted all of the painting except the face of the subject. The further in time one gets from the original the more difficult it becomes to make "good" copies. One reason it is not possible for me to replicate the Grinnell paste-up process is that I don't have access anymore to the materials available as recently as 1975. If anyone wishes to subsidize the project I could probably locate the required equipment and demonstrate my theory. Using a computer to demonstrate the process doesn't work, I've tried it.

November 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

As an example of the circular process that goes nowhere, note my exchange with Roger. He asked for Caspary's testimony because he anticipated that a comparison of Grinnells with Missionaries would be fatal.

In fact it was the cancels, not the stamp prints, that Caspary found wanting, whereas he could find only one useful print difference on one denomination. Other differences were trivial, so Caspary attributed the trivia to degradation during "photographic processes." (By Bill's and David's theories they should actually be enhancements, not degradations.)

This was sufficient for Roger to turn away from his question and return to his single tune.

Guess what? I already knew that Roger thinks the Grinnells were reproduced photographically, a theory he has redesigned to accommodate each new fact.

But to offer a wealthy stockbroker's opinion that this was easily done because he lived during the time is like saying it's easy to forge a Rembrandt because the observer is aware that copyists exist.

John Klemann and his agents in California devoted considerable effort to finding out how and where and by whom the Grinnells might have been made by electrotpe, and came up empty, as he ruefully reported to Stanley Ashbrook. He also lived during the time.

Continually lowering standards to accommodate evidence that resonates with favored terms is not solving the mystery.

November 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

I understand your theory. I think I understand each of the theories that have been advanced here. One of them might be right. But the intellectual consequence of holding fast to a theory regardless of the evidence is not pretty to watch.

First the G80 black grid cancel was fake. Then it was genuine. Now it is fake again. Each view confirmed by plating. All in service of the same outcome. That is rationalization, not reason, but it cautions me against drawing overarching conclusions from slender and ambiguous evidence.

It's good to advance alternative hypotheses. It's unwise to commit all to one until the evidence is in.

My intention is to gather all the evidence I can, and then to see if I can explain it all with a solution that does not require avoiding or twisting parts of it.

There's also the problem of rhetorical devices, from petulance to truculence, from repetition to condescension. These may resemble paintball games to readers; they do not advance the project. I'm as skilled at those as anyone here, but as Reverend Steve pointed out, our host has limited patience for such antics.

My opinion is that we need more and better evidence. I'm working on that.

November 21, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I have been less than active in reading what someone else has referred to me privately as the "paintball games" here. However, I find it interesting that Caspary apparently performed the old standard "ink blot" test on the Grinnell cancels and they failed this basic test.

Personally, I would give more credence to this test, and Caspary's report of the results, than recent tests. After time, that test is less reliable - that is, negative results mean less although a pistive response is still bad.

November 21, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Photographic process -

So Caspary opined and testified in 1922 that the "loss in definition in the reproduction of objects" could be attributed "by photographic processes".

Why, in 2006 am I to believe the photographic process wasn't possible due to lack of suitable technology, when Caspary believed photography was used prior to 1922? He was much closer in time and apparently surmised how the Grinnells were created. His statement confirms the use of photography in creating these forgeries, as he described the characteristics of a forgery created via the photographic process. He also knew newly created photographic forgeries were on the market.

His closeness to the beginnings of photographic forgery process is comparable to our present day computer generated fakes that fool reporters and election officials. I hope the recent "Inverted Jenny" episode isn't used by future researchers to verify the possibility that at least one Inverted Jenny was lost in a shredder!

Roger

November 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

I'm having a hard time playing this game. I understand you are passing on giving us your opinion on whether the Grinnells are fake or genuine in some capacity, but my study and others have convinced me and others they are fakes. Grinnell kept the two genuine and some fakes for himself, so KNEW which stamps were HIS genuine models and which were HIS fakes. Please do not confuse the board with whether Grinnell could tell the difference between his stamps and the genuine Missionaries in general. I'm sure he was proud of them.

Also, I think it is you who are reading history backwards. Grinnell did not have the evidence you have accumulated that shows these supposed experts would likely be rather easy to fool when he and his stamps went to the head-to-head meeting with them and with genuine Missionaries. I think he would have been in awe of these folks and would have had a plan that would avoid direct scrutiny of the fakes against genuine references. That is not conspiratorial; that's common sense.

And I don't know why you dragged up the Advertiser "Grinnell wanna be" unless that stamp was sitting next to an actual Grinnell for comparison and nobody caught the fact they were different. Was that the case? I am trying to figure out how anyone who was looking to spend hella-dollars on the Grinnells would find them equal to the genuine article WHEN COMPARED DIRECTLY with a genuine stamp. That is not conspiratorial. It happened. It is a historical fact. I simply don't believe that Grinnell went to that meeting without a plan to insure success, because I think he knew he had fakes and was shooting for the most money possible.

Unless, of course, he was only a face man who was protecting the reputation of the true mastermind should the plan fall apart. Perhaps, then, G80 and G81 were the payoff to Grinnell. That's not unreasonable given the stakes.

I do not consider expert opinions on any Missionary, real or otherwise, germane to this discussion when not opined using a reference copy. I understand people misjudged these stamps when viewed without context.

Until you admit that these stamps are fake, I don't think you can ever find the truth. Being versed in printing, maybe it would be helpful if you could give us your opinion on how early photo-reproduction and photoengraving of plates, as I and Klemann and Galvez and Richard M. and Scott T. and Roger H. and Bill L. believe is the case, could have technically been feasible? That would help date these stamps and maybe determine if they could ever have been official Hawaiian P.O. reproductions.

November 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott,

Thanks. I was recalling Varro's frustration when I wrote that.

November 21, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Ken L:

"So pervasive was the inability of experts to recognize Grinnells that Varro had difficulty returning the stamp for a refund. Finally Fred Gregory came through for him and agreed that the Advertiser forgery was not a Grinnell."

Not quite true. Varro's claim that the stamp was not a Grinnell was verified, as would any other claim for return, and the sale was cancelled without "difficulty." Twigg's recollection of the acquisition made him feel the stamp had to be a Grinnell or Grinnell-related. Once that was ruled out, Varro's money was refunded.

November 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

I have stated from the very beginning, and have never stated otherwise nor strayed from the project, that my purpose is to solve the Grinnell mystery, and to pursue the evidence wherever it may lead without a preconceived outcome. You and others, most notably Walter P, have tried to impute beliefs and motives to me that I have never held.

Alfred H. Caspary's testimony was read into the trial record as evidence. As you'll see below, I was mistaken in part yesterday, because he did record the difference in the large figure 2.

"The thing that struck me first was, on an examination of the entire lot, was the appearance of the cancelled copies. The cancellations struck me as rather suspicious."

"The brightness and color of the postmarked specimens."

"Because postmarks of the period were different in color, had more orange in them, and on further examination I found the inks used in the postmarks of the stamps under examination were of an aniline character."

"On dampening these stamps, color was discharged from these postmarks and diffused through the paper on the stamps. The inks used in 1851 were either vegetable or mineral base, and were fast in color. I have subjected letters with postmarks of the period with the original cancellations to all possible tests, and the color is immovable."

"The general design of the stamps was carried out with considerable accuracy and with the exception of a few minor differences, which would be accounted for by loss in definition in the reproduction of objects by photographic processes, there was but one salient difference in the design, and that only on the 2-cent value."

"On exhibit 1-E the flourish projecting from the base of the figure 2 is different in these stamps from that in any of the seven or eight well known specimens of this stamp in various collections. I have examined six of the known copies, either from photographs or directly. I have seen, outside of the specimen in my collection, three specimens of two's in various collections. The rest I have seen photographs of."

"In all known copies of this stamp the flourish consists of a perpendicular line, without variation in the breadth, which meets the base at a right angle, whereas in the stamps under observation there is an observable thickening of the line as it meets the base on the inner side."

[Questions, objections, argument, and court rulings omitted.]

November 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Still more stuff!

In John Klemann's letter that Richard Malmgren takes as true and I do not, he wrote, "Grinnell spent no money on case and paid everybody off in counterfeits the ex district attorney his lawyer got a pair 2c Wood his introducer & agent got a 5c the Shattucks the younger got stamps to make them change their testimony Walsh secret service man retired was paid in cfts etc etc."

We know Grinnell did spend money. If he gave any stamps to Lawler or Walsh, I've seen no evidence of it. According to the RPSL list, Wood was given G12 2¢, G13 2¢, G32 13¢, G62 5¢, G64 5¢, and the mysterious "G72 - Unknown Stated to have been given to Mr. Wood after trial." The Shattucks changed their testimony after a promise of 50 percent of the sale price, not an offer or transfer of stamps. The division of stamps between the families occurred after several attempts to sell the stamps had failed.

I don't know whether Richard Malmgren takes Klemann's entire letter as gospel, or just the part of it that appeals to him. My interpretation is that the letter is a blend of fact, speculation, and fertile imagination, which appears to be how Ashbrook, the recipient, treated it.

November 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

Another difficulty with your theory is that to some extent you are reading history backward from what you know today. As recently as a year or so ago, our best experts could not identify Grinnells according to the criteria we have developed here. Two of them continued to believe that the Advertiser forgery was a Grinnell, based on Thurston Twigg-Smith's faulty memory of where and from whom he had purchased it, which I finally was able to correct when I found Twigg's letter in Varro Tyler's file. So pervasive was the inability of experts to recognize Grinnells that Varro had difficulty returning the stamp for a refund. Finally Fred Gregory came through for him and agreed that the Advertiser forgery was not a Grinnell.

November 21, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

More stuff!

Those who are into the Grinnell stuff (obviously juvenile people all!) know the name Herb Sterling. Herb Sterling wrote a number of letters in the 1950's, mostly on the Sterling Food Products letterhead, pertaining to the Grinnells. Mr. Sterling was a friend of George Grinnell and carried the Grinnell 'torch' upon Mr. Grinnell's death. My prior comment discounts, of course, George Linn's 'torch carrying contributions'. Mr. Linn was, you may recollect, a gentleman who was in the business of selling a stamp magazine and who came down on all sides on the Grinnell issue.

On February 2, 1956, Mr. Sterling wrote to Stanley Ashbrook that "I, perhaps knew Grinnell better than most of his friends. I do not think Mr. Grinnell believed other than the stamps were genuine."

The above does not necessarily make Mr. Sterling correct about Mr. Grinnell's moral fiber, but it does make clear Mr. Sterling's apparent belief on the subject.

But much more interesting and a month earlier on January 11, 1956, Mr. Sterling wrote "The strange part to me is, the many things that came out of the old 100 year old hair trunk in the Shattuck attic. The Shattucks would never be a party to messing in a deal that was dishonest. The pictures, the Shattuck seaman's bible, coffin plates, plus many other items from the Hawaiian Islands were in this hair trunk. Shattuck knew they were in the old trunk but the bible he never knew where it came from – if it was a part of his grand-father's things or not..."

Now some of this stuff doesn't track with original testimony in the 1920's courtroom by the then living Shattuck relatives (wife, son and daughter, one of whom perjured herself either before or after the trial depending upon your viewpoint and two of whom recollected conveniently and differently afterwards depending upon your viewpoint), but still I find Mr. Sterling's comment to be most interesting.

To repeat, Mr. Shattuck, according to Mr. Sterling, never knew where 'it' (i.e., the Book of Psalms) came from.

So what does this mean?

Beats me. Interesting though?

November 21, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

David Shumaker

I have been away for three days. I have read some interesting postings since I expressed my belief that folks should not take for gospel that in 1893 eight virgin Missionary stamps were found in the archives of the Hawaiian Post Office.

My quick scan of the Board reveals that (1) not only do some suggest that I am less than scholastic (True of course, I am a contractor for gosh sakes. What do I know? UC Berkeley was merely an interlude. Heck, I don't remember either the 60's or the 70's. A joke of course. I have never smoked it, although I did once inhale some smog that blew my way) and that (2) I should believe story lines written in times long, long ago (especially if written in 1893) if for no other reason that the story lines were written in times long, long ago and that (3) I am now hosting everyone at the house in order to buy a bunch of counterfeits. (I think I will serve last years Beaujolais Nouveau or maybe a carton of the white zin. The stuff in the carton is really good. I think it is a relatively recent June vintage.)

In any event, a lot has occurred in three days.

As to how to sell to me, I'll leave that to the other responders as I am curious as to how people will structure your proposed 'deal' (although I do read that Ken doesn't want to play).

As to my other sins, I am somewhat hesitant to respond, given my upbringing and all, but I will make a couple of rejoinders, only because it is nearing the end of the day and the June white zin has not chilled sufficiently.

I have read on this Board that the Numerals are, in fact, not typeset, but a stereo or whatever, and by extension, why not the Missionary stamps? Somebody 100 years or so ago wrote such to be true about the Numerals; therefore we were asked a couple of months ago to believe it. I do not believe it. (Incidentally, I will be the first to say that merely because Klemann reported that the shell lady said that it was Grinnell and not Thompson who made the big switcharoo does not make it true. It is only what Klemann said; however, I believe it. Others may disbelieve as they wish and say that it was really Thompson and Klemann was wrong.)

I have also read on this Board in prior months - without any qualifying statements whatsoever - that photography had no role in the manufacturing of the Grinnells. I did not believe it then. I do not believe it now.

The above are not intended as cheap shots. Every one errs. I once erred. You may remember in an earlier posting many weeks ago that Scott T admitted that he too once erred. (I personally was shocked.)

So, with regards to the stories that are suppose to date back to the wild and wooly 1890's, please allow me to share with you the following two stories:

Story 1

1. George Linn wrote to Stanley Ashbrook a letter of which I do find a copy.
2. Stanley Ashbrook responded to George Linn on 09/15/51 as follows:
 "I hasten to reply to yours of the 14th and to state emphatically that I never had anything to do with any Hawaiian stamps in 1893 or 1903 or in any year. I have absolutely no knowledge whatsoever regarding any deal in fake or genuine Hawaiian stamps in Cincinnati or Cleveland. If Frank Goodhue used my name in any way in connection with any such deals he was out of his mind or was lying.
 "I never heard of anyone in stamps by the name of Stanley C. Ashbrook – never heard of anyone other than myself who was named Stanley Ashbrook. I never knew of a person by the name of Hazen and I have no recollection whatsoever of ever hearing a New Yorker by the name of Costan.
 "If I failed to emphatically deny any knowledge of the alleged statement made by the Los Angeles reporter in 1920 I assure you, that such was not intentional. The statement that I had anything to do with a sale of \$7,500 of Hawaii stamps in 1893 is absolutely silly. It would still be utterly untrue if the amount was \$75 or even \$7.50. And this applies to any other year, as stated above."
3. Ashbrook wrote more in the same letter in the same vein, including his opinion that John Klemann had a bad reputation back in the 1920's in reference to Klemann buying the Grinnells for \$60,000 and sold a portion of them to Caspar for \$75,000.

Story 2

1. George Linn wrote to Stanley Ashbrook on 10/28/51 the following:
 "I had a letter from Cap. A. C. Townsend. He is now in his 80's and an old timer. He wrote me and asked me if I had ever heard of the man Spreckles, the sugar Spreckles I believe who was going to purchase a lot of Hawaiian Missionaries in San Francisco in 1896 and when he had the stamps sent to New York to be expertized they came back and were called fakes. Cap asks me if this might have been the Grinnell stamps. If so they laid hid from then 1896 until 1918. Did you ever hear of this occurrence. I have insisted that I believed Grinnell believed he had made a find. The fact that he spent the last 27 years of his life trying to find evidence to support his stamps makes me believe that he believed they were o.k. Thus could they have been a plant.
2. Stanley Ashbrook wrote to John Bash (a co-author of the Meyer Harris book on Hawaii) on 11/01/51 the following:
 P.S. – Did you ever hear that a "big find" of Missionary stamps were offered in 1896 to Spreckles of San Francisco – the story is that he sent them to New York and they were pronounced to be forgeries. If there is any truth in this rumor do you suppose there is any connection with the Grinnell things?
3. Stanley Ashbrook wrote to George Linn on 11/02/51 the following:
 "Re-the 1886 story which involved Spreckles of San Francisco. I am wondering if Gus Burger could give you any information regarding the tale. Aug Dietz also might remember something about it."

4. George Linn wrote to Stanley Ashbrook on 11/07/51 the following:

"I will inquire of Burger and Dietz as to the Spreckels story."

5. The above is the last of the correspondence that I immediately find on the subject, but then I have not been sent copies of everything in the APRL files pertaining to Grinnells, contrary to someone's statement to the contrary. (Are we allowed to use double negatives? Does contrary to the contrary constitute a double negative? What ever happened in the '60's and '70's anyway. Now I want everyone to take that as a joke. The only thing I smoked was cigars – and then only because my boss smoked cigars and I was an impressionable youth.)

So what do the stories mean?

Beats me. But there are a lot of interesting stories from the time period.

November 20, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

What features of the Grinnells convinced Caspary the stamps he "bought" were fake?

Was/is there any document or description written by Caspary when he returned the stamps to Kleeman documenting his reasoning?

It seems that once again when Grinnells are directly compared with real Missionaries, the Grinnells fail the test of authenticity.

Presently you seem to be swayed in the direction of "forgeries", but appear most interested in the origin of the stamps, the Whodunit aspect. Is this a correct assumption or am I reading too much into your posts? I admit it is a good story, but is it really important to philately? How much am I missing in the current literature that is not reported being reported here? Who else is writing about this story other than those who have posted papers on the Grinnell Reference Page or this Board? I'm beginning to think this story has ended as there are no responses to the technical papers presented by other here?

Roger

November 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

Grinnell did not know the difference between Grinnells and Missionaries. Edward Stern's letters to Stanley Ashbrook testify to that.

The main differences that we use today to identify Grinnells were not recognized by any of those experts. I think the differences in the large numerals of value were not reported until 1951, after Grinnell was dead.

Galvez's evidence consisted of flyspecks, repeated by Klemann in Res Adjudicata, repeated by Meyer and Harris, repeated by Cal Hahn this century.

At this point, you not only disbelieve Grinnell, you disbelieve all the witnesses. They agreed that the experts declared the stamps genuine based on careful comparison with Taylor's stamps. As I wrote earlier, the most important Grinnells to everyone were the 2¢ and the unsevered pairs.

Talk about conspiracy theories. You are asking our readers to support you with counterfactual assumptions denied by all testimony and documentation. And you dance away from inconvenient facts, such as who employed Poole.

That might make for a fine movie, but it is not what happened, so it isn't helping to solve the mystery before us.

November 20, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Thanks for the correction. It was not Poole but Wood that provided the guarantee that was torn away by Klemann. However, my central point is that Klemann put a lot of stock in the opinions of Poole and Taylor. Even Wood's willingness to provide the guarantee probably meant something to Klemann. This was not an academic exercise - \$65K was on the line. It says a lot about these men's reputations that Klemann would have been persuaded to pay such an astronomical amount of money.

I think that these men were able to tell the difference between a "Grinnell" and a genuine Missionary had one been available for comparison. Regardless of what I think, I do not think Grinnell would have made the assumption they could NOT, especially with Taylor's example or examples laid beside them. I think he had a plan, whether or not he ever needed it.

Here was Grinnell going to a meeting with, as I understand it, Poole, Taylor and Wood for a serious scrutiny of the "Grinnells" by experts against genuine examples. This meeting, if I remember correctly, was to offer these stamps to Col. Taylor with Wood as the agent. Grinnell knew that his stamps were not genuine and knew that the central numerals were different, etc.

If accepted as genuine, he was in the money. If found to be fake, he would face the humility alone. Needless to say, this meeting was for "all the marbles." All subsequent history flowed from this singularity in time. Any suspicion by these men would have killed Grinnell's aspirations.

So as a question for the entire board this time, tell me how you would have gone about it. Let's say you have printed up a mess of Missionaries and you want to sell them. You get Ken Lawrence to act as your agent and you are both going over to Richard Malmgren's pad to see if he is a willing buyer, where Patric Pearson is waiting to see them as well. Do you just saunter in with your fakes, hoping for the best, or do you have a plan, perhaps involving the two genuine stamps you do own and maybe even a loaner or two? How would you fool them?

November 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

You have mis-stated the events. Bertram Poole represented first Taylor, then Klemann, as their expert, and they paid him. George Grinnell did not pay him.

S.L. Wood worked openly on commission for Grinnell as his agent, and eventually received \$5,000 from him (and another \$5,000 bribe secretly from Klemann to betray Grinnell, disclosed at the trial). Both Klemann and Poole were experts; both could tell genuine Missionaries from counterfeits, as could all the other experts of the day.

Klemann demanded a guarantee from Grinnell which Grinnell refused to give. Grinnell told Klemann that he (Grinnell) was not an expert, and that Klemann

would have to accept the sale based on his own or others' expertise, which Klemann eventually did. He himself (Klemann) said they were good, as did Wood, as did Poole, at the negotiation, when Grinnell was withholding all but 46 stamps. But there is no dispute that Klemann was on notice that Grinnell explicitly and in their contract offered no guarantee, which was the issue on which Lawler expected to prevail at trial or on appeal. The entire case turned on that issue.

The only stamps Hawaiian experts could not tell from Missionaries are Grinnells. If the 1893 stamps were Grinnells, your point would be valid, and would open the way to the possibility that the Grinnells originated in Hawaii. If not, the stamps were probably genuine.

Like Steve Walske, I suspect that two of those stamps may have reappeared, and are genuine. Neither of us has asserted it as a fact, only as an intriguing possibility that would help explain their remarkable condition.

Incidentally, the two genuine Missionaries on the card could not plausibly have been used as you suggest, because Scott 3 stamps are the most "common" of all Missionaries. The Grinnells of greatest interest to all the prospective buyers and their agents were the 2¢ stamps and the unsevered pairs, which they scrutinized carefully.

November 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

John F,

What's left of the Luff reference collection is at the PF, by way of Scott Publishing Company.

November 19, 2006 **Shu**

Ken L.

Regarding experts and such, if they cannot tell a genuine Missionary from a good fake without a genuine example for comparison, or even occasionally when one is available as you have suggested, then what do we make of the reported find of Eight Obsoletes in 1893? Why, as I asked Steve W., should we presume them to be genuine and not fakes held as references? Was the reporter even minimally versed in Hawaiian philately? Was the 1893 find compared to a genuine example prior to the story being published? Aren't the eight fake stamps mentioned by Phillips and confirmed by Luff most likely, in the tiny world of Missionaries, the eight stamps from 1893 anyway?

Again, I feel I'm being asked to believe contrary things; on the one hand, the 1893 Missionaries must be genuine because the press said so, it's a published fact, but on the other hand we cannot believe what anybody says about a given Missionary's authenticity when viewed alone, nor can we be confident of most people's opinion when comparison to a genuine example is involved.

Seems to me that the 1893 discovery is at a dead end unless these stamps re-appear as definitely genuine and can be traced back to Hawaii. Have you begun to rethink this connection as even being possible?

November 19, 2006 **Shu**

Big question:

Did Klemann know Poole accepted \$5000 from Grinnell for his guarantee prior to agreeing to the deal? That's about \$200K in dog dollars, and was probably worth every penny given the deal likely would have gone south had Poole said their authenticity was doubtful. The RPSL booklet (p. 33) says that payment only came to light at the trial. If true, the fact that Klemann didn't jump on the witness stand at that moment and strangle Poole says a lot to me about his temperament.

Yes, I know Klemann tore off Poole's guarantee (which was to Grinnell, not Klemann), but it served to shape Klemann's belief in the stamps authenticity, which I believe was critical in a time where expert committees were unheard of. Does anyone reading this board doubt that bad stamps get traded daily having good certificates from expert committees, whose purchaser's look no further than the paper certificate for confidence in their purchase? Nothing has changed. Had he any real doubts, Klemann would have gotten the guarantee from Grinnell, who actually owned the stamps, already knowing Poole's opinion which he respected. Owners provide guarantees; experts provide opinions. But, the guy had a date with Caspary and I guess he didn't want to leave Cali empty handed.

November 19, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

I think you should reconsider the importance of the meeting with Taylor. We know the Grinnells are different than the genuine. Grinnell knew. But, even if everything you believe about the inability of those men to tell a real Missionary from a fake, if YOU were George Grinnell heading for a meeting with the genuine articles and several experts to boot, would you have banked on it? I do not believe Grinnell was foolish enough to assume his fakes would not be detected and fly by the seat of his pants. He had a plan.

The fact that those who have handled genuine Missionaries cannot tell good from bad without a genuine reference is not material to the fact and the history that those who HAVE compared the Grinnells to the genuine have all concluded that they are different and therefore fake. You can dispute that different means fake, but you cannot dispute that Caspary and others, when using authentic copies for comparison, all found them bad.

Except, of course, when Grinnell brought some of his stamps for comparison with Taylor's genuine Missionaries, where they got the thumbs up. I find that far more remarkable than dismissable. I'm partial to sleight of hand.

The example of the Card of Ten on display in Washington is not a good one, in my opinion. We were told that the stamps on the card were newly-discovered Grinnells, and the Grinnells had been condemned as fakes again by the RPSL. We were not asked to buy them as genuine stamps as Taylor and Klemann were.

Had the stamps been displayed as genuine Missionaries and NOT Grinnells, that would have invited the scrutiny you have assumed experts indulged. It would have been red meat for the Grinnell critics' buffet anyway.

Besides, you can't take folk's reaction to stamps on display behind glass, placed vertically in less-than-ideal lighting, and go on to predict the same results had those same stamps been examined by a prospective buyers utilizing all the necessary instruments, under the proper lighting, that one would insist on having if purchasing them without a certificate.

The Card of Ten example goes more to explain why Klemann paid such an enormous amount based only on what those who have handled Missionaries believed to be true. He was told they were real, and he trusted those who told him so. After all, why would they lie to him? Same with the Card of Ten.

November 19, 2006 **John Forsyth**

Aren't the Luff papers etc at the PF?

November 19, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

Those are the reasons that one must ponder H.B. Phillips's attempt to link the SF forgeries to the Grinnells. Personally I think he was trying to sensationalize his report. (Everything Steve W wrote about the SF collector's misfortune is true.) But if there's any possibility that those stamps really do match the Grinnells, it would undermine many assumptions. I'd love to examine the photographs that Phillips sent to Luff.

David S,

Both Wood and Klemann had bought and sold genuine Missionaries, as had Poole. None of them could tell the difference, just as no one who examined the card of ten at Washington could see a difference.

In fact, today's experts can't tell the difference between genuine original and fake painted elements of Missionaries today. Without cheating, look at the Missionary images on the reference page and tell me which parts of which stamps are not genuine. I'll bet you can't.

November 19, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

It would be, in my view, highly unlikely, if not close to impossible, that the Grinnell stamps are some kind of official or even semi official reprints of genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps.

The basis for my line of thinking, is that, if the Grinnell stamps were officially or even un-officially reprints of the 1851 Missionary Issue, that why are there no other 're-print stamps,'[Grinnells], known to be available for collectors, aside from George Grinnell's purported 'great find.'

I would think that, and I may be wrong here, but I think not, that if these stamps 'the Grinnells' are official re-prints of Hawaii 1851 Missionary stamps, then why do they only come from one source, namely our friend, George Grinnell?

If the 1851 Missionary Issues were re-printed officially or semi-officially, than other stamp collectors and dealers would have bought them and they would have been dispersed into many different collections, would they not?

Further to that, I don't think that any right minded person would adopt the idea that the Grinnell stamps were official reprints of genuine Hawaii 1851 Missionary issues, because to do so, one would have to believe that the entire re-printed stock of stamps were sold or given to only one person, who put them away out of sight, where they were not discovered until George Grinnell made his purported find.

Also, are we to believe that only 80-90 re-prints were officially or semi-officially printed of these stamps, because that is all the stamps Grinnell came up with in his find. Unless, of course the Arrigo's have the rest of the the re-prints squirrled away, as nobody, except the Arrigo's knows for certain, how many Grinnells there actually are? For all we know there could be sheets of Grinnell stamps being held by the Arrigo's?

I know that you were just floating this official re-print idea around, as a possibility, albiet an extremely remote possibility, but in the end I think you would have to agree, that without even a shread of concrete evidence, this idea should be a non-starter, should it not?

Board Readers:

Please note, that I have taken some pains here in trying to make my point to Ken in a civil manner, and therefore, if anyone finds my post to have any sort of underlining negative tone, or to be designed to provoke Ken in any way, I can assure you that was and is not my intention. I want to play nice here.

I just think that the suggestion that the Grinnell's may be some kind of official or semi-official Hawaii Missionary Stamp re-prints is not even a remote possibility.

November 19, 2006 **Shu**

Top Ten things essential to getting Klemann to open his wallet:

- 1) A person to provide the two genuine stamps as models - a MIGHTY hurdle.
- 2) Grinnell's knowledge of Shattuck's family history to build a "find" around him (whether or not a real Missionary came forth) - sheer luck.
- 3) A witness to connect stamps with Shattuck other than Grinnell (Perkins).
- 4)A process for producing credible linotypes (as laid out by Galvez).
- 5) A source for credible paper and inks (like a museum).
- 6)Someone with technical knowledge to put #4 and #5 together (Kenyon?).
- 7)Someone with philatelic knowledge regarding Missionaries (Kenyon?).
- 8) The successful comparison of pieces from the find to a genuine Missionary - a MIGHTY hurdle indeed.
- 9) Poole's authentication for Klemann.
- 10)Klemann's lack of incredulity combined with an understandable greed factor.

Contrary to what has been written before the discovery of G80 and G81, Kenyon is still a candidate for inclusion, even if only for technical assistance. Maybe Kenyon assisted Thompson in making these Missionaries using Thompson's stamps as models to market as reprints, which is probably acceptable to most

collectors, but got an idea to create a "find" to cash in big when Grinnell showed off his book and seaman's letter he got from this Shattuck guy?

November 19, 2006 **Steve W**

Shu,

The only hope for the Grinnells, faint though it may be, is that they are "official" Hawaiian reprints with faked cancels.

The "find of eight", if actually true, may alternatively represent "offical" reprints. If so, the unfortunate SF collector who paid \$10,000 for them in 1893 had a rude surprise per Phillips.

These two theories are, however, mutually exclusive given the number of Grinnells extant.

November 19, 2006 **Shu**

Then Ken, there's the angle. Wood authenticates the Grinnells, Wood gets \$5000 for doing so. Steep for even today's PF cert costs. Well, maybe not entirely for authentication, but he'd got nada if he'd declared them fake.

November 19, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

I really don't want this discourse to come down to pseudo-legal twaddle, but I think I have the right to ask for a more specific answer to where this 1893 find is going.

Are you suggesting the possibility that the Grinnells themselves are late-Nineteenth-Century Hawaiian reproductions? Or are you suggesting that there is a possibility that reprints of some kind could have been prepared officially, and therefore readers who have favorable inclinations towards the George Grinnell and his find may rightfully assume his stamps are those reprints, replete with favor cancels, unless and until evidence to the contrary is forthcoming?

I think Klemann believed the prosecution's experts as to what is real and what is fake. I think his description in *Res Adjudicia* was his summary of Galvez's expert testimony. Galvez, as it turns out, was closer to anyone has ever gotten to the nature of the Grinnell plates. He knew what he was talking about regarding contemporary photoengraving processes, yet he has been maligned many times by many experts since. He only tripped up when he said that touched-up photographs were utilized. Those who doubted him did so based on the assumption that Grinnell had no genuine stamps for photographic reproduction. They were dead wrong. However, the photographs were entirely traced, not simply retouched, and it was those artistic tracings that were manipulated to make the various settings seem to be typeset.

I do not think that the Hawaiian P.O. in fulfilling collector's want lists would have gone about making these stamps in this way in the late 19th Century.

November 19, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Amending my earlier post, the Scott 4 rejoined pair must have been taken from mail, because the Advertiser sale description says it has a faint red San Francisco cancel. However, it cannot have come from the Dawson find as Scott Trepel speculated, because Crocker exhibited it in 1901.

Before publishing his report, Phillips confirmed with John Luff that the eight stamps in the SF collection were counterfeit.

Stamp dealer and museum curator and Weekly Philatelic Gossip editor and American Philatelic Congress Book author Charles Sidney Thompson lived until 1960. Hector Alliot was the man who died before George Grinnell pitched his stamps to S.L. Wood.

S.L. Wood had authenticated the same 46 stamps that Grinnell sold to Klemann after Grinnell declined Col. Taylor's offer, by comparing them to Taylor's stamps. Wood signed the authentication on one of the cards to which the stamps were affixed, which Klemann tore off and threw away. Wood also accepted the attached pair of 2¢ Grinnells, which he considered authentic for the same reason.

November 19, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Steve W.

Thinking about your point #2, there is no reason to believe that the people reporting the "find" of Eight Obsoletes were as adept at telling the difference between genuine and fakes as anyone else has been. Without a known genuine example with which to compare, what confidence in their being genuine, if they existed at all, should we have? Even with Col. Taylor's genuines for comparison, some Grinnells passed inspection by Taylor, Wood and Poole (perhaps G80 and G81 were furnished for direct comparisons?). Ken said Phillips saw eight counterfeit stamps in a S.F. collection; perhaps Phillips' judgement was correct?

I also find Grinnell's possession of those two stamps hard to figure, but only in the case of a larger conspiracy. If Thompson, the stamp dealer, was the person who provided G80 and G81 as models for the Grinnells, and if Grinnell was used as the face man only because he had discovered a Hawaiian connection when buying Hawaiian things from Shattucks trunk, then G80 and G81 should have reverted BACK to Thompson, not be found in Grinnell's possession. I've wondered if someone other than Thompson, a person who passed away before the trial, actually provided the two genuine stamps, - had such a conspiracy existed.

If Grinnell acted alone, then of course he did not pay \$2500 or anything close to that for them. His would have been a crime of opportunity, having only the two Scott #3 to work with, completely unable to make a Scott #4.

Which gets me to what I think is one of the biggest mysteries of this saga. Much has been written about the possible authenticity of the Grinnells from examining them directly, even scientifically; but rarely, until now, have direct Grinnell-to-genuine side-by-side comparisons been made. The few times this happened - with Caspary, at the 1922 trial, presumably when submitted to committee in the 1940's and at the RSPL - the Grinnells were found wanting. Except one time. When compared to Taylor's stamps, presumably reasonably intelligent and learned men concluded that they were a match. That was enough to help persuade Klemann. What did Grinnell take with him that day for comparison with the genuines? G80 and G81, perhaps?

November 19, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

Your summary is similar to my thinking (although I want to know more about the G80 cancel before condemning it), but much could have transpired in the 25 years between the 1893 discovery and Grinnell's acquisition of the two stamps if that was their origin.

November 19, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

If G80 and G81 are models, as you believe, they could have been the models for reprints or official reproductions that RPSL said did not exist (which are the same as counterfeits except for who printed them).

There certainly was a lot of incentive to refute the original reports if they had turned out to be fake, because the reports were as sensational as the recent Jenny invert reports from Florida. But on the contrary, the letter from a Hawaiian official verified the initial reports and the high prices paid.

I called attention this morning to the interesting coincidence that thirty years later, after the Grinnell trial, H.B. Phillips discovered that a San Francisco collector had what he described as eight counterfeit Missionaries in his collection, and slyly suggested they might be Grinnells.

The Hawaiian post office applied cancels to reprints that the Hawaiian postmaster general himself denounced as forgeries. Make of that what you will.

I have not suggested that anything should be tossed. I've suggested that when faced with conflicting evidence it's wise to apply one's intelligence to evaluate which if either version is more likely to be right, not to select the evidence that best coincides with the conclusion you happen to desire.

You cannot read Res Adjudicata intelligently and believe that Klemann could tell the difference between a Grinnell and a Missionary, but it's not possible to know what he really believed. Klemann told the PF he had provided all his evidence against Grinnell for its permanent records, then later wrote about Mrs. Carpenter for Ashbrook, which he had previously withheld. If you think that adds to his credibility, I suppose that's what juries are for.

Richard Malmgren has changed his stance each time I have found a new citation for the 1893 discovery in order to avoid addressing their substance. First he belatedly announced that the report in an obscure French journal was old hat to him, not credible because there was no supporting report. And so forth. Is that how you think intellectual discourse is conducted?

My method is the opposite. I have continued to gather more evidence, hoping to narrow the possible explanation, and continue to find surprises that broaden the possibilities instead.

Sure, it's possible. Maybe the Scott 4 models were the reconstructed pair (hard to imagine together on a letter, canceled with three strikes of the black grid) and perhaps the reproductions or counterfeits were in the collections that H.B. Phillips examined and a Gatherin bought. Besides Stan's Grinnell, it would be interesting to compare the cancels on those two stamps with G80.

Personally I doubt that Phillips could have identified a Grinnell any better than Klemann could, so his innuendo is probably misleading. But suppose he could. In that case, our assumptions about a single hoard need to be revised.

November 19, 2006 **Steve W**

Notwithstanding the debate over the credibility of the 1893 report, there are two facts/contentions that make an intriguing combination:

1) G80 and G81 are genuine stamps in perfect condition, although at least one has a fake cancel. They have been hidden from philately by a philatelist for over 150 years, even though they represent a sensational and valuable find. Their "perfect" condition is a marked departure from Missionaries which were used on letters, so it seems plausible that they weren't used postally.

2) Eight (one of each type) apparently "perfect" Missionaries were discovered in 1893. G80 and G81 represent two of the eight different types purportedly discovered.

It is not far-fetched to suspect that G80 and G81 came from that find, although if someone actually paid \$1250 per stamp in 1893 it is hard to imagine how they came into the hands of Grinnell, and even more unlikely that someone would put a fake cancel on one or both.

November 19, 2006 **Shu**

BTW, as a personal prejudice of mine, I know how the press works. Just as there's been no rush to counter all the hopeful press that the Grinnells could be, no, probably are genuine with all the subsequent contradictory evidence reinforcing the fact that they are fake, there was likely no hurry to follow up on the 1893 report of genuine Missionaries having been found in government records had those stamps been determined shortly thereafter to have been fakes.

November 19, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

I'm having a hard time following this discussion. Are you suggesting there is a possibility that G80 and G81 are reprints that Whitney put together for collectors using the the Eight Obsoletes from government files as patterns, or are you suggesting that G80 and G81 are in fact two of the Eight Obsoletes and the "Grinnells" are possibly official reproductions made in Hawaii in the late 19th Century?

Also, who put the cancels on these stamps? I can believe that the aniline grid could have been an old obliterator that turned up at the P.O., but the red CDS is a fabrication. Wouldn't the official fabrication of a cancel applied to an official reprint still be a forgery? At the least it would be forged history.

As far as history goes, Klemann's opinion that the Grinnells are fakes and made using a photo-reproductive process were published in Res Adjudicia and onward for thirty years afterward. He expressed such in letters. Only now do we know the genuine stamps were available for such a purpose. He did write that Mrs. Carpenter said Grinnell visited her and not Thompson. He did accuse Grinnell of playing the game openly at the museum. All that should be tossed, you have suggested, in favor of one person stating Klemann always felt the stamps were real and for your supposition that when Mrs. Carpenter said Grinnell she meant Thompson. Yet you jump on Richard M. for not entirely embracing the reports of an 1893 Missionary find in Hawaii as ignoring history in favor of a course "he wishes... had occurred."

Since we're open to all possibilities, isn't it possible that the eight stamps found in the P.O. records were examples of COUNTERFEIT stamps, kept for identification by the government, released because they were no longer necessary to keep, were desired by collectors even as fakes, and may in fact have been the eight fakes that ended up 30 years later in the hands of a "serious S.F. collector?"

And one last question: if the Grinnells are children of the eight stamps that came from the government file, where the h**l are the Scott #4 reproductions?

November 19, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

It's difficult to answer a man who decries rewriting history in one sentence, while in another he refuses to acknowledge contemporary reports that contradict the course of history as he wishes it had occurred. If I take Richard Malmgren literally, I'm faulted for that. If I take him figuratively, I have to wonder why he picks nits while shunning essence.

Long ago, when I made my first mention of the 1893 discovery, as reported in that obscure French stamp paper, it was to challenge the RPSL's flat assertion that official reprints were not possible because no Missionaries were available to copy. I still think that was wrong, even though it might be improbable.

According to more than one source, a complete set of eight Missionaries (four designs, two types each) turned up in official government files along with other obsolete stamps. A wealthy collector took \$10,000 in cash on the first boat to Hawaii, and snagged the lot, disappointing other wealthy collectors who attempted to buy them by mail.

Thirty years later, Henry B. Phillips reported seeing a full set of eight Missionary counterfeits in the album of a serious San Francisco collector, which he linked by innuendo to the Grinnells. Probably that was nonsense (Grinnells are known only in six types, not eight), but if it wasn't, then possibly there were others, including more of the alleged counterfeits and the exemplars from which they were copied, which arrived in San Francisco while Charles Shattuck was resident there.

If the manufacturers were Hawaiian officials operating under the color of their office, those would be official reproductions, not counterfeits.

None of this is likely, but it is not refuted by averting one's eyes from perfectly credible news reports.

November 18, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

I think Richard's comment about paper and ink not mattering was with respect to the abundant body of evidence that the Grinnells are forgeries. Previous discussions about paper and ink had been in the context of proving that the Grinnells are genuine, but a different type than accepted Missionaries.

Richard's point is that the evidence produced on this board (including the latest surprise of a forged cancel on G80) has put that debate to rest. The Grinnells are forgeries, and all that remains to be determined is who made them.

Having said that, the provenance of G80 and G81 is extremely interesting and probably germane to the identification of the forger. With the benefit of limited actual knowledge, it still seems to me that Richard is too hasty in dismissing the link to the reports of the 1893 discovery.

November 18, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

Did someone forge your name to the post below that included this sentence?

"And it doesn't matter what type of paper was used or what was the components of the ink."

I learn things every day.

November 18, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

I am going to have to start calling you the 'learned' Richard Malmgen from now on.

November 18, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

I was not aware that the components did not matter to me. I learn things every day.

Neither was I aware that the issues are settled and the mystery is unimportant to me. I learn things every day.

Learning these particulars about me reminds me of other particulars that have been expressed on this board, including that the provenance of the Grinnells is one of their strong points. Grinnells are not photographically reproduced from Missionaries nor are they copied from Missionaries, stereotypes were used to print the Numerals and therefore why not the Missionaries, a Ramage (or a proof press) were the only presses available to print Missionaries, etc.

That the above particulars have generated discussion can be considered a good thing.

And to the extent that the particular about the 1893 reporting of Missionary stamps stored in the Hawaiian Post Office generates productive discussion can also be considered a good thing.

But believing the above particulars is something else. I do not. Additional unearthing may revise my belief.

Incidentally, I am unaware of what press printed a tiny two-subject forme onto tissue paper but I do not believe it was a Ramage nor do I believe that ganged stereotypes were used.

Incidentally too, I guess that no one is arguing any more that the Grinnells are other than counterfeit and that is a good thing.

We'll never know for sure about the shell lady and her husband's collection. I think it would be an interesting story were we to know all of the particulars. Unfortunately we do not.

Charles Posner's conspiracy theory about the errors in the Provisional Government overprint errors is interesting to read. Conspiracy theories are almost always

interesting to read. Here in Hawaii we are reinventing history daily in support of Hawaiian Nationalism. Why should we not place the whole Provisional Government overprint issue and their errors upon the shoulders of the leading philatelic men in Hawaii who were allegedly rigging things so that they could cash in? And here I always thought that the 1893 overprinting of the Banknote Issues that portrayed Hawaii's royalty was done because there was a new government in power. And to think that one of the main alleged conspirators, namely Thomas Thrum whose collection is now in the Bishop Museum and who was a printer himself, actually complained about the stupidity of someone wasting their time and money on overprint errors – after all said Thrum, they are only the result of a printer's errors and Thrum was not about to waste his time and money on the goofs of other printers. And as far as conspiracy theories go, don't lose track that most all business people and government people in Hawaii either knew or knew of one another in those days since Hawaii was not that big of a place.

Incidentally, maybe we should simply stick to commentary about philatelic aspects and not about what one does or does not think matters to someone else.

November 18, 2006 **Walter P**

Re: Last two posts:

The 'Clash of the Titans.'

Both writers raise some interesting points. It should be interesting to see what comes next?

Richard's position is easy, the Grinnell stamps are counterfeit, and as of today, nobody can prove they are not.

Ken's, presents more questions than answers. Ken's problem, as I see it, is that to put it bluntly, none of the participants that matter, Shattuck, his heirs, Grinnell and Klemann are still alive, and even if they were, there is a credibility gap to deal with, the size of the Grand Canyon.

The Grinnell mystery, may not be able to be solved, however Ken is certainly giving it a good try.

November 18, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

To you the components don't matter. To many others, they do matter. To some of us, solving the mystery is the essential project. To you, the issues are settled and the mystery is unimportant.

By your standard, every report of a Missionary discovery before about 1888 should be regarded with suspicion, because few were later verified. Even the story of the Dawson discovery was obfuscated, with no report at all of the initial discovery, and subsequent single reports, separately to different parts of the globe, partially contradicted by Batchelder's toast, only after the covers were restored. Shall we therefore disbelieve those?

The 1893 story was told by independent witnesses. No one at the time doubted that one or more wealthy buyers had purchased the stamps. But you disparaged each report in succession of my mentioning them here. First it was an obscure French report. Then British. Then San Francisco. Finally the daily press. Then follow-up reports of the failed attempts to buy the stamps by collectors who tried too late, including the text of a letter from a Hawaiian official to a California lawyer on the subject.

As far as I can recall, even with some unanswered questions, that is more documentation than exists for any other 19th century original Missionary discovery.

As far as I have been able to determine, the report was never challenged by any of the leading authorities of the day -- Henry Whitney, Thomas Thrum, Walter Giffard, Bruce Cartwright, or C.A. Brown -- though some of them would have read it, and Giffard was the correspondent for several publications that reported it, so he might have been its source.

Charles Posner's theory that the leading philatelic men in Honolulu cashed in on the annexationist coup by flooding the U.S. stamp market with stamps manufactured for the purpose adds plausibility to the report, which may have been the first notice of that marketing effort.

Which of those presses printed a tiny two-subject forme onto tissue paper in your opinion? It looks to me as though you verified the point of my article.

November 18, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

There is no compelling connection between Shattuck and the Grinnells or between Shattuck and G80/G81.

There is no compelling connection between Shattuck and/or Grinnell and G80/G81 and the alleged 1893 Missionary discovery.

There is no compelling connection between G890/GT81 and the shell lady's husband's collection.

I have maintained and shall continue to maintain that the provenance of the Grinnells is their weakest, not strongest link.

As to Shattuck and the Grinnells, Charles Shattuck himself had no comment of record since he passed away before the trial. Mrs. Shattuck either perjured herself during the trial (Yes, I swear to tell the whole truth before God) or after the trial in saying that there were either no Grinnells or there were Grinnells depending upon when you asked -- before or after being promised a bunch of the Grinnells. The kids seemed to have been along for the ride for the same promise of a bunch of Grinnells.

As to Shattuck and G80/G90, I refer you to the above.

As to anyone and the 1893's alleged Missionary discovery, I suggest that we are a long way from proving that there even was such a discovery. Why are there no follow-up stories on the alleged Missionary discovery? I find it at best fishy to believe that there was this great discovery of Missionary Stamps that were reported for a relatively brief period and that they then went off the radar screen. I suggest that nobody should take the alleged discovery as fact. An interesting story of course.

As to the shell lady -- who knows? Whatever may be the connection with the shell lady, the biggest reason for doubting Klemann's writing about Grinnell making a substitute can hardly be someone's suggestion that the Carpenter collection (i.e., the shell lady's husband's collection) would have been offered as evidence in the 1922 trial if it included real Missionary stamps. That is simply silly. In my own case, most everyone in the collecting arena who knew or cared anything about Hawaii exhibits (i.e., all four people) thought for years that all I did was collect Hawaiian Revenue stamps for the simple reason that I was fortunate enough to assemble the definitive exhibit on the subject and it was the first exhibit I exhibited. And I subsequently exhibited Hawaiian Stamped envelopes. And I subsequently exhibited Hawaiian Postal Cards. All what some people consider to be back of the book stuff. That I subsequently exhibited Hawaiian Postage Stamps, an exhibit that includes 8 Missionary Stamps, was a surprise to most everyone who knew me. Why? Because I simply did not tell everyone everything

that I had.

There are many, many collections 'out there' that we do not know anything about. Why? Because the collector simply does not tell anybody. Did G80/G90 come from the shell lady? Who knows? Nonetheless, Klemann still wrote that the shell lady said that that Grinnell made a switch regardless of what anyone today alleges.

The bottom line is that the Grinnells are counterfeit. G80/G81 were models. Grinnell's credibility is somewhere between zero and none despite efforts by some to allege otherwise. And it doesn't matter what type of paper was used or what was the components of the ink. Counterfeit they are.

November 17, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

I have personally seen hundreds of documents (which are simply a small part of the originally printed thousands) and government publications that evidence other than a Ramage press.

The direct quote from the Honolulu Advertiser website regarding the press first used by Whitney is not definitive; however, it was not a Ramage.

To quote directly:

"In 1856, The Advertiser pressman stood in an ink-smudged apron, his nimble fingers plucking lead type from compartments in a tray. He read the story on a sheet of paper while setting it in type. He set the type into a metal form one column wide, called a "stick," that he held in his left hand. The type spelled words backwards because the words in type had to be a mirror image of the words printed in the paper.

Young Henry Whitney, who founded The Advertiser, started as a printer in New York. He could earn 20 cents for setting 1,000 pieces of type.

Whitney later bragged that he started The Advertiser with a new press. That wasn't true. The sailing ship didn't get to Hawai'i in time, so Whitney printed the first issues on an older, smaller press. The pages set in type were placed onto the flat bed of the printing press, known as the flatbed press.

The hand-powered press passed an inked roller over the type, then printed the page by rolling a cylinder over the paper. The printer fed paper into the press by hand. Whitney was proud of his new "power" press.

A power press could be hooked up to a steam engine. But Advertiser presses would not be driven by steam until 1880.

Most likely, Whitney was referring to the foot power that turned the flywheel and left the printer's hands free to feed paper to the press. The printer's foot pushed a treadle that powered a flywheel, which in turn kept the rollers of the press in motion."

In any event, merely because a certain type of press was used in a shop to print a newspaper does not mean that the same press was used for all printing jobs.

November 17, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

Every new coincidence is stranger than the last. I learned today that Charles Shattuck moved from New England to San Francisco in about 1860, and resided there or in that vicinity for most of his later years, only later relocating to Los Angeles. So he was probably in SF when the 1893 discovery was reported in the SF press. But there's no evidence that any Shattuck collected stamps.

However, I think the Shattuck connection is well established. Grinnell's visit to Shattuck was never in dispute; only whether Shattuck could have given him a hoard of stamps, a letter, and a prayer book. But if he gave him only two stamps and a letter, that would not have required the baggage that family witnesses denied at the trial, and might even make the \$5 tip more credible.

But the 1893 find is the only time I can recall when more than one Missionary stamp was found in presumably sound condition, so we cannot ignore it in analyzing the possible origin of G80 and G81.

David S,

No, Gene Hall's reference material corresponds to 1850s pigments and printing ink components. I doubt that a micro Raman spectrograph would be the preferred instrument for detecting complex organic materials, which is why I'm skeptical about the aniline report.

I don't think you can show a simple pen cancel on a Missionary. They are all ugly obliterations, or none at all. I carefully examined both stamps for evidence of cleaning using philatelic expertizing tools, and found none.

November 17, 2006 **Walter P**

Veronica:

Glad to hear from you.

November 17, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Let me rephrase my question: From what you observed during the tests on the G80 cancel, are you comfortable that no nutgall or logwood ink is hiding beneath, perhaps lightened or removed entirely? For a scam operation as important as this appears to have been, if a pen cancel had to be replaced with a G4a grid (for whatever reason) wouldn't the players have endeavored to find a person to remove a simple pen cancel?

November 17, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter P.

Interesting story. I thought it was going to end with the friend's safe under three feet of water! At least the stamps weren't destroyed.

I can't see Grinnell or anyone tracing over a cancel on a \$500 (1918 dollars) stamp to make it that dark if it was to "improve" the stamp. There is no upside to that black blob. Besides, it still appears that there was no other cancel underneath, if the spectrograph was read correctly. I still wonder if Hall tested specifically for fountain pen ink, having some reference material written upon with nutgall or logwood inks.

Ken L.

So I'm asking. Were the spectrums of 19th century pen inks referenced by Dr. Hall to see if any such ink lay beneath the black grid? I have just assumed so, since reference material was provided. It would only be a trace amount so might get drowned out?

You seem to be saying that if Grinnell didn't find the two Missionaries for five bucks then it is likely that the stamps were provided by someone like Mr. Thompson, as I suggested. That would mean Grinnell may have only been a face man after all, perhaps not even responsible for manufacturing the stamps. In such a conspiracy, would it be reasonable to suspect Perkins' testimony was bought, since was the only person who could have connected stamps with Shattuck (as you know the family, though recognizing Grinnell, denied any stamps could have come from that trunk. Even though they changed their minds later, that testimony was not available at the trial)?

Steve W.

Since no one has responded, let me say that if Grinnell acted alone, then given Shattuck's connection to Hawaii and Grinnell's apparent salary level, he most likely found them with Shattuck instead of purchasing them from collectors and dealers. There are no facts to substantiate either possibility that I am aware of. However, because I am convinced the Grinnell Missionaries are fake, I do not think stamps as sound as G80 and 81, and as heavily cancelled as G80, were good or necessary models when damaged and pen-cancelled copies would have been sufficient and found for less money. Besides, if Grinnell didn't find at least one Missionary with Shattuck, he sure lucked out on the Hannah-Ursula-William connection at that particular address if he made the whole thing up!

November 17, 2006 **Veronica**

Walter -

You once told us you had a pleasant personality. In a later post, you said you'd put a cork in it.

Now that you've insulted nearly every respected name in modern philately, could you kindly produce one or the other of the above? There are serious men of integrity here trying to do exactly what we've asked - serious inquiry into the mystery of the Grinnells. Unabomber Manifesto-style ramblings about seances, people rocking out with Al Sharpton and other nonsense isn't adding much to the academic discourse.

Please...

November 17, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

You are correct, we are all friends here. However, even the best friendships can be strained, and at times, frustrating.

We may not always agree with each other, however, in the end, I must admit that I do look forward to reading your learned posts, and have great respect your vast philatelic knowledge, which you share with us, on his Board.

Richard Malmgren:

In reference to your interesting post regarding printing in pre-1851 Hawaii, I offer the following information:

Another very small and remote pre-1851 country that had a printing press was Montenegro. In fact, the first printing press in Eastern Europe started to print books in Cetinje, Montenegro in 1493.

In 1893, Montenegro issued a set of postage stamps, SC. 22-31 to commemorate the 400th Anniversary of the introduction of printing to Montenegro.

What makes this interesting is that in 1492 Montenegro there were very few people who could read and write. With the exception of some nobleman, church officials, and a few merchants, everyone else was illiterate.

November 17, 2006 **Steve W**

The possible connection between G80/G81 and the 1893 Missionary discovery is very intriguing. I wonder how that can be further explored. I don't see any compelling connection between Shattuck and G80/G81, unless I'm missing something.

November 17, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

I still think Charles Shattuck was the most probable source of the two Missionaries, but the strange G80 cancel demands consideration of other hypotheses.

To answer your questions:

Henry Whitney died on August 17, 1904. Until then, he was always accommodating to his stamp collector friends, including Thrum and Giffard. I don't know when other black cancellation ink may have been introduced, but that's a worthy subject for study.

Besides being a Los Angeles public school administrator and Southwest Museum curator, Charles Sidney Thompson was president of the International Philatelic Association, a member of the Metropolitan Philatelic Association (which broke the story of the 1893 Missionary discovery), APS, and ASDA. Judging by his magazine advertisements, he must have been the most important mail-order stamp dealer in Southern California.

Like every other stamp dealer, Thompson probably got his best material by buying collections and estates.

I have traced several Missionaries in the Advertiser census to early 20th century owners who are not credited in the provenance: Pickman, Lombard, Crehore, Foster, and L.L. Green. They were not all held by Tapling, Ferrary, Atherton, Ayer, Crocker, Crocker, Taylor, Mirabaud, Duveen, Burrus, Champion, and Col.

Green. So it's all but certain that others were owned by collectors not recorded in the literature.

November 17, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

If you can provide a reference to a press other than a Ramage at the mission or government printer before 1856, I'd like to see it. I have not, despite my thorough search for scholarship on the history of printing in Hawaii. When Henry Whitney left the government to start the Advertiser, Ramage was his press of choice if you believe the Advertiser's official history.

Even if another type of press was present, my essential point remains: the absurdity of printing images onto fragile tissue paper from a two-stamp-size forme on a lever press whose bed and platen accommodated broadside sheets. I would amend that to include similar smaller presses that printed commercial stationery if they were present that early, though I have not read of any. The same comments would apply, but less forcefully, to an older screw press, which by the 1850s would have been used only for proving.

In this context, without disparaging splendid Hawaiian firsts, the frontier was everything west of the Eastern seaboard, where large Hoe roller presses were the most efficient, but which were not available in the West. It's true that the U.S. West Coast was behind Hawaii in settlement and development, which is indicated also by the old Ramage press that went from Honolulu to Oregon to assist its literacy.

November 17, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

I had not previously understood friendship to be a curse. I thought we were all striving to be friends here. Forgive me for being so naive.

November 17, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken L

Regarding your September 13 Grinnell Reference Page article entitled 'How were Hawaiian Missionaries Printed?'.

My November 15 comments relative to my belated reading of your 2-month old article was resultant to my surprise that you were suggesting that only a large Ramage press or, alternatively a proof press, were all that was available for printing of the Missionaries. The absurdity (your phrase) of printing the Missionary stamps on a Ramage led to your speculation that a perhaps a proof press or your theory of a forme with the print generated by a mallet strike or a gang setting of stereotypes were utilized. For whatever reason, you opted not to theorize that a smaller press was used.

Thousands upon thousands upon thousands of pages, large and small, were generated by the Government Press prior to and during the time of the printing of the Missionaries. I have personally seen multiple hundreds of the same printed document (the fill in the blank type of thing) in the files of the Hawaiian Archives – all printed prior to the Missionary stamps. I personally own scores of fill-in-the-blank type of documents (they are part of my revenue stamp collection) printed prior to the Missionary stamps.

I no more believe that each one of these documents was printed on a Ramage press than the man in the moon.

To suggest that small job type presses were not available on the 'frontier' may be an accurate quote from a reference book relative to the frontier of the continental United States; however, applying it to Hawaii at the time of printing of the Missionary stamps is simply inaccurate.

Hawaii has a phenomenal number of 'firsts' west of the Mississippi. That is to say that when Hawaii was up and running and printing Missionary stamps, the 'frontier' of the continental United States was still sucking eggs. The California Rush only began in 1849 (O.K., gold was discovered a year earlier, but the rush occurred later.) My favorite Hawaii first is that the oldest reinforced concrete structure west of the Mississippi is in Hawaii. And guess what? It is the old post office in downtown Honolulu.

My recollection (I'll stand corrected by a year or two) is that the first printing in Hawaii occurred in 1822. And without looking up a reference, my recollection of the first newspaper in Hawaii was in the 1830's.

Whether a Ruggles Rotary Card and Bill-Head Press as suggested by Westerberg for printing the Numerals was used to print the Missionary Stamps or some other small 'job' press that was multiple times faster than a Ramage is unknown to me; however, to apply the 'frontier' passage to Hawaii and to consequently make deductions that stereotypes or something must have therefore been used in printing the Missionary stamps is a faulty deduction.

My goal in my posting is the hope that folks do not come to the belief that only a Ramage was available in Hawaii for printing the Missionary stamps.

November 16, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker -

Taking a break from e-bay packaging, let me give you an example of strange things people do, even in stamp collecting.

I knew this German fellow, whom I met through a friend, about 15 years ago. My friend told me that this fellow had the most fabulous stamps even though he was a delivery truck driver for most of his life. This person lived in a small apartment in Vancouver, BC, and never married.

However, what he did was, through a series of good auction buys, trades, and direct purchases, put together a stamp collection, or rather I would say an accumulation of a large amount of some very expensive stamps.

I was invited, by my friend one day to meet with the German fellow to have a beer at a pub, where lets just say, I would not normally go to, in a rather seedy part of town. During the conversation at the pub my friend would mention a certain stamp like the Luxemburg Intellectuals Issue and the German fellow would say, I have those in MNH Blocks of four. This went on for quite awhile, when the German fellow reached into a bag he had with him, and pulled out a stamp stock book album. He started to turn the pages and the book was full of MHH stamps like the Austria Dollfuss Issue Scott 380, where there was about 6 pages of them. The rest of the book was loaded with other rare MNH stamps. He pulled out about four of these binders all loaded with like stamps, all MNH, including large multiples. There must have been \$25-30,000 worth of stamps in these albums. I was starting to get nervous because of where we were and the value of these stamps.

My friend told me that the German fellow had showed him at his apartment about 40 other stock albums all loaded with mid 20th century MNH stamps, blocks of

four, and sheets. His holdings were in excess of over \$1,000,000. A Vancouver stamp dealer whom I knew for many many, knew this fellow well, and confirmed that he had also been shown most of the stamps this fellow had in his MNH accumulation.

This is where the story gets really strange. Being to cheap to rent safety deposit boxes, the German fellow gave most of his stamp albums to a 'friend,' who was recently arrived from Germany, to put in his safe, for safekeeping. About a year later the German fellow I knew died suddenly of a heart attack.

When his brother came to Vancouver to attend the funeral and to gather his belongings he could not find any trace of the stamps he knew his brother had in his small apartment. Not knowing that his brother had put the stamp albums in his 'friends' safe, for safekeeping.

When the brother asked my friend where the stamps were, my friend directed him to the German fellow who had the safe, and his brothers stamp albums for safekeeping. When the brother went to the house that this fellow rented, he found the fellow had 'flown the coup,' and left Vancouver, right after the death of his brother, and returned to Germany.

The last I heard of this, was from my stamp store owner friend, who said he had been interviewed by the Police, and that Interpol was searching for the German fellow in Europe, with so far, no luck.

Coming around full circle, the moral of this story is that stamp collectors do, in fact, do strange things. Would you give over a million dollars of MNH stamps to a friend you did not know that well for safekeeping? Would you even think that this could even happen?

The truth of the matter is, 'that truth is often stranger than fiction,' and this is the kind of stuff George Grinnell legends are made of.

Why would it be so strange that George Grinnell would glue down two genuine Missionary Stamps onto a cardboard card. Would it equally be so strange that George Grinnell would enhance or improve a cancellation on a genuine Missionary Stamp?

Your thoughts?

November 16, 2006 **Shu**

Walter P.

Thanks for your phrasing suggestions. Personally, I like when Jim Rome adds "allegedly" to the end of a scandalous rumor - after a brief pause, of course.

November 16, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Regarding the favor cancel angle, I can see that being a possibility after having seen an apparent genuine cancel on a fake Missionary, which would only be possible if the stamp was made to fill collector's requests as you suggested earlier. However, was aniline dye ever used in black cancellation ink in Hawaii or anywhere? I've seen purple fugitive cancels but not black. I would think that if applied by Whitney from devices laying around the P.O. as late as 1893, he would have used contemporary black ink, same as on any letter.

I understand how extraordinary finding two Missionaries in wonderful condition would be, but think how much more extraordinary would be finding two such stamps on the market at about the same time. What is nearly impossible to believe is that they were purchased by a school teacher instead of by the most prominent philatelists of the day (who would have been presented this material as soon as the dealer(s) secured them). Credulity creeps under the strain of the brazen production of fake Missionaries utilizing the genuine as models as part of a scheme to defraud big-time dealers, some of whom would have likely been the ones who sold the school teacher one or both of the genuine to begin with. To place a cherry atop this incredulity parfait: neither dealer nor collector one ever came forward, despite all the publicity surrounding the find and the trial, to say "I recall selling two of the most fabulous Missionaries ever to none other than a school teacher. He outbid Caspary. Darnedest thing ever."

Which all seems to point to a dealer being involved with this whole drama, as Piller theorized, if indeed G80 and/or G81 were obtained in the market and not soaked off old letters. If that is a favor cancel on G80 it went directly to a dealer, or maybe to a collector. Even with a favor cancel it would have been prohibitively expensive.

Ken, how do you suppose a favor-cancelled Missionary got into Grinnell's possession?

I still think finding the two genuine stamps is the most likely scenario among a bunch of unlikely scenarios, unless and until it can be demonstrated that he had the assistance of others. But even if Grinnell was only one of a number of conspirators, one of whom offered up the genuine pair as models, how did he end up with the genuine stamps if he was not the rightful owner?

Is there any record of a collector or dealer capable of possessing two fine Missionaries passing away between 1918 and 1922, leaving Grinnell holding them? What about Shell Lady's husband?

November 16, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

Walter P;

Ken Lawrence would probably be the first one to tell you that I would be the last guy to stick up for him (or anyone else) if I thought he was wrong. Ken and I have had LOTS of disagreements, I assure you and I doubt that anyone who knows me for any length of time would accuse me of being a passive person.

I may not have ever told you this Walter, but I too was an aggressive Union supporter, a Shop Steward at Bethlehem Steel and I missed being elected to the Local Grievance Committee by less than 50 votes out of thousands cast, so I know a little bit about Union/Company relations. I also spent half my Steelworking career as a Company Foreman, which enabled me to walk away from it all after 20 years - forced retirement really due to shop closings - with a much better understanding of how BOTH sides operated, and I assure you that what I learned was that BOTH sides are quite capable of "playing around", as you put it. Unions represent bums just like they do honorable workers, and they fight for the bums just like they do those that are legitimately harmed. But that is a discussion for another place, not here. I just wanted you to know of my union background, so you will understand that I can relate, but this still isn't a bullfight.

November 16, 2006 **Different Annoyed Lurker**

Bill W

By Jove, I think you've nailed it. Who can blame Ken for trying to ignore this annoying Walter person. Even a polite response to him just elicits a big ole' list of

new Union Demands. Here's a solution: rather than shut the board down, just ban 'Internet Lawyers', like Walter.

Friends of Ken Club? Have we been reading the same board? He's [walter p] just trying to stir up another round.

Lets' Vote:

Ban Walter P
~~Keep Walter P~~

November 16, 2006 **Walter P**

Bill W, Steve W -

A lot of what you say is true, in that it has been ingrained into me that people who play everyone around, answer questions with questions, pretend they don't understand what your saying, when they do, and generally all the nonsense that Ken gets away with on this Board, makes participating in these discussions, often an exercise in frustration. This was the same nonsense I had to deal with when I worked with the Union, as the company knew all the tricks on how to play the union around by not providing any straight answers to questions, and by not acting in good faith. Sound familiar?

I understand that you are all for the most part personal friends of Ken Lawrence, and this Board, so to speak, is an 'old boys club,' that for some reason looks the other way when Ken starts being Ken.

Old habits die hard, and that goes for everyone, so in the interests of not wanting to be labelled, as some kind of Ken Lawrence 'goader,' I will try hard to look the other way so that we can all go about posting, having fun, exchanging information, and opinions on this Board, regarding George Grinnell, his 'Grinnell Stamps,' and the constellation of theories that abound in this most interesting mystery.

I now have to try to clean up the mess I made by posting 110 books and auction catalogues on e-bay in three to four days. I have never sold anything on e-bay before, and I can tell you now that it can be over whelming when the sales start coming in one after the other and everyone wants their items won shipped yesterday. Guess I was not as smart as I thought I was on this one, hey.

November 16, 2006 **annoyed lurker**

Bill Weiss,
 Thank You!!

November 16, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

WALTER P;

It seems to me, as a relatively disinterested reader, with no horse in this race, that Dr. Hall is a scientist, who conducts tests and draws conclusions from them. I can think of no reason why he would do anything other than simply report his findings, without bias.

I also completely agree with Steve W. that your posts are always laden with provocation. It's almost as if you somehow got stuck in time back when you were a union advocate, always presuming that the "company" was out to get everyone, all the time, and that distorted view has carried over into your postings, goading at Ken as though you think that you are the bull and he's the matador.

Other respected readers, including Scott Trepel, and now Steve Walske, have previously appealed to you about this, and now, so am I. Ken is not the Company and you are not the Union. This isn't a bullfight, it's a philatelic discussion.

November 16, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve,

The G80 grid looked to me under magnification like a single strike. I know that's impressionistic, but I've done a lot of ink-in artwork, and that always looks painted. So I strongly doubt it. Stan did condemn it reflexively, I think because it so closely resembled the grid on his stamp. That's why I'd like to analyze and compare that one too. But never say never. We need to consider all these hypotheses, including Scott's. This was definitely the biggest surprise of the day at Rutgers.

November 16, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

Bear in mind that if the G80 cancel is aniline, it still might be genuine -- not as a postal cancel, but as a favor added to a Missionary between 1860 and 1893.

This is not so far-fetched as it seems at first blush, because the condition of G80 and G81 is so extraordinary that it's hard to imagine they originated from the same kind of transpacific beating as the majority of canceled missionaries.

So if G80 and G81 were among the stamps found in 1893, say, they might have been struck at any time with old cancelers. That would give renewed plausibility to Scott's analysis of the grid cancels, but would stretch the Shattuck connection beyond belief.

November 16, 2006 **Steve W**

Walter - I don't understand why you need to continually provoke Ken with poorly-disguised innuendo. If we don't raise the congeniality of the dialog, then Richard is likely to shut down this Board again.

Ken - What do you think of Scott's conjecture that the aniline comes from a tracing and filling in of the G80 cancel? Although I was one who thought the G80 cancel was good, based on its structural characteristics, it does appear to be "colored in" with stronger edges. Stanley, to his credit, latched on to this immediately.

November 16, 2006 **John [watches the board]**

Is "Your" Canadian for "You're"?

November 16, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Thanks.

November 16, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

I did not inquire about what books Gene Hall keeps in his library. Science is not "tainted" by education of a scientist, and in any event, Gene Hall is not a stamp collector and he has no stake whatever in any outcome of his tests.

November 16, 2006 **Jerry Shean**

Ken,

Hang in there.

November 16, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

Look at the graphs on page 68 of the RPSL book for reference. As the scan moves across the X axis from left to right, the curve rises and falls on the Y axis. The sharp peaks indicate the concentrated presence of specific chemical elements.

Gene Hall has representative stored data from scans of Tapling Missionaries, NPM Missionaries, Arrigo Grinnells, and Shattuck Grinnells. The software can overprint elemental symbols at their appropriate wavenumbers on the X axis, to make them direct-reading charts of the chief components.

The first spike on the left graph represents carbon. I don't recall what the second spike represents, but in the current London Philatelist, Dr. Robin Clark scolded Patrick Pearson for concluding that the higher second peak on the Grinnell black cancel curve represents ultramarine (called "Prussian blue" in the book). The red ink is vermilion (mercury sulfide), so its peaks represent mercury and sulfur.

The G80 curve is very different from these, with a broad loop of a curve but no prominent spikes. I don't know how this came to be interpreted as aniline, because aniline is coal tar, a complex organic compound. But then, all I know about this technology is what I learned from Gene Hall and from studying some on-line references.

I'm concerned that aniline may be a deduction rather than a demonstrated analytical result. That's why I'm reserving judgment until I see a report, even though I have great respect for Gene Hall.

That's also why I'd like to see a scan of the black cancel on Stan's Grinnell.

November 16, 2006 **Walter P-**

Ken Lawrence-

Settle down and read your original post and my post to you, and you should see that the point I was trying to make, which appears to allude you, was that Dr. Hall was commissioned to conduct some tests on some Grinnell stamps and he should have issued his report first, before reviewing any literature on the Grinnell stamps controversy, so that his report may not run the risk of being tainted or bias in any way.

Your a smart guy Ken, I think you can see what my question was, so if you don't want to answer my question, that's fine with me.

No slight on your intelligence was intended. I thought I had put a basic straightforward question to you, but if not, I am not going to apologise to you simply because you either failed to grasp the question in the first place, or in your own way, you are declining to answer my question.

Either way, it's your call to either answer or decline to answer the question, with no hard feelings on my part.

November 16, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Technical question for you, hoping you might have discussed the spectrograph at this depth with Dr. Hall: Does this spectrograph have a data base of spectrum profiles that are compared to the specturm of the patient by computer, or does it need to "sniff" sample material each time it performs a test? Specifically, 1) would Dr. Hall have seen a definite aniline signature in the peaks, 2) would he have seen constituent element peaks from which he drew a conclusion of aniline dye, or 3) does the machine have a pre-programed signature that verifies the presence of specific compounds such as aniline dye, not just the presence of individual elements?

November 16, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

It isn't I who insults intelligence.

I presume Gene Hall may have read scientific publications, or consulted scientific colleagues, or both, after the day we spent making the tests, to learn what could have caused the unusual results.

The publications you mentioned are not scientific treatises on Raman spectrography and x-ray fluorescence, and cannot help him with that, so it isn't my intelligence that lacks substance here.

As for whatever value and entertainment those publications may bring, they did not exist when Gene Hall conducted his original tests of Missionaries and Grinnells, so he could not have studied them then. The current tests were designed to incorporate tests of the ten stamps on the card and another look at the Smithsonian's Dawson cover into the earlier data.

It was partly Gene Hall's 2001 test results that supported a new expert examination of the Grinnells. That's the reason that the experts' misleading summary of the science is a cause for concern.

November 16, 2006 **Shu**

Where's Rick A.?

November 16, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L. and Walter P.

If the result is as Dr. Hall was quoted as saying, that the cancel is aniline and without carbon, then I think we can agree that the cancel is fake. We can also agree that the person who applied the cancel seems to have possessed the G4a canceling device in the damaged state. Having this device, this person likely had other artifacts pertaining to the production of the Grinnells and likely knew which stamps were genuine and which were not. I think we can also agree that if no other Grinnell Missionary cancel has tested positive for aniline ink, its appearance on one of the genuine Missionaries is intentional, regardless how incredible that seems.

The problem is that we know all other G4a cancels are carbon black, so the person who struck the aniline cancel seems not to have the knowledge and/or attention to detail of the person who applied the cancels to the Grinnells. Unless Grinnell did so himself because the composition of the ink was not important for the purpose he had in mind. Two things are for sure: 1) The stamp was altered to show someone a G4a grid, not to be hidden away on a card, and 2) if Grinnell applied this cancel himself it was not so conclusions could be reached upon the eventual revelation of the card of ten, which he never intended to be known to exist.

November 16, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Then what did you write in your post, or rather mean, in your post, regarding your statement below?

Ken, you said, in part in reference to Dr. Hall:

"I imagine that after he conducted the tests he studied publications." What publications would Dr. Hall have studied, the three Mystic Booklets, your Scott Journal articles, the RPSL Report by Patrick Pearson?

As usual, you failed to address any of my questions in my post, which is your right to do, but please, don't insult our intelligence by stating, "That is not what I wrote in my post."

November 16, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

That is not what I wrote in my post.

November 16, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

I believe all those were tested in the first round, before they went to RPSL. I'm still hoping David Beech will link the reports so we can read them. But if my inference is right, those are all carbon black ink.

November 16, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I am somewhat disappointed, in that, in your post you state that Dr. Gene Hall may have read the printed Grinnell background material after he conducted his tests, and before he wrote his report, so that he would be aware of all the factors that surround the Grinnell case.

Would you not agree with me, that if this is so, than his report may be tainted, because his role in the Grinnell Stamps investigation was to conduct scientific tests on the ink used to print the Grinnells submitted to him, and on the ink composition of the obliteration on the used stamps submitted for testing.

As a scientist, would it not have been wiser to write his report first, and then read all he wants about the Grinnell stamp background story and investigation findings? Hopefully, this did not occur, and you were just thinking out loud, as you appear to not know what Dr. Hall did actually read, about the Grinnell Stamps, if anything, before he writes his report.

David Shumaker-

Don't worry, you would not be sued, as long as when you post your suspicions on this Board regarding the Grinnell Stamps, that you use such words as, it may have, it appears that, it may be conceivable that, or any similar phrase that alludes to, but does not definitively state that any person did anything that may be illegal or immoral, so post any.

Scott Trepel-

Sorry for the pseudo-legal twaddle above. Looking forward to viewing the upcoming, Thurston-Twigg's RAS Sale in December 2006, I am confident we will not be disappointed and as usual your sale will be most impressive.

November 16, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,
I see five "twins" to the G80 cancel on Frajola's reference page:
G8 - Cullhane 2c
G10 - Piller 2c
G24 - Arrigo 5c
G60 Cullhane 5c
G36 Arrigo 13c

Have any of these been tested for cancel ink composition?

November 16, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

No one after Grinnell realized that the two 13¢ stamps were genuine until I discovered one and Dick Celler the other in July.

I personally still can't imagine anyone ruining a genuine stamp with a counterfeit cancel. If you study the Missionaries that were known at the time the Grinnells became known, that's the kind of cancel that was routinely being removed or lightened by Sam Simon and other stamp doctors. Manuscript cancels were favored over heavy obliterations that concealed so much of the design.

I'm waiting for an actual report from Gene Hall. We have seen too many partial and mis-stated results in the past, which have fueled a lot of false hopes. I imagine that after he conducted the tests he studied publications and/or consulted colleagues to learn the meaning of surprising and unexpected results.

The newspaper articles are a publicity bonanza for stamp collecting, but not necessarily for advancing the cause of truth about the Grinnells, despite the reporter's sincerity and diligence. It's not a story that lends itself easily to lay interpretation when so much of the history is itself the subject of controversy and doubt.

My understanding is that Stan's stamp was in the Arrigos' possession until the 1960s, when it was borrowed for study by a scholar who died without ever returning it.

November 15, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Is there a dependable provenance for Stan's Grinnell? When did it leave Grinnell's possession? If also aniline, and has been known for decades, that would make me feel more comfortable knowing they are not of recent vintage.

Have you followed up with Dr. Hall about his quote in the Star Ledger, attesting to aniline ink, to find out why he did not inform you, nor the owners I assume, of the aniline signature? When you said he spoke with you about the lack of carbon but never mentioned the aniline, it came across that he told the newspaper before anyone else. Was he mis-quoted?

November 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

I think we need to know the chemical profile of the black grid on Stan's Grinnell also. That one appeared to be the twin of G80.

November 15, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Test,

Speaking for myself, the alleged aniline cancel is pivotal, and I await confirmation that there is indeed only that cancel and none other.

That cancel was touted as being the "legs on the fish," meaning that it was a Grinnell grid on a genuine Missionary. As Don Sundman has said, it was what the nay-sayers have demanded to see.

Now that the ink appears to not chemically match the cancellation ink of the Grinnells, may we ask if those legs were painted on that fish to fake a Grinnell-to-genuine connection? In short, it all seems a big "set up" to make the argument for the authenticity of the Grinnells, and thus for making money. That would be the most logical reason for a fake cancel vandalizing a genuine Missionary.

Now the question of who applied the ink comes to two scenarios: one where Grinnell found it necessary to dress up G80 for show, and the other where someone other than George painted legs on the fish. No further speculation can be posted without uncomfortable and unsubstantiated implication of living people having a hand in the application of the fake cancel. It's just not worth getting sued over.

I am, however, waiting for someone to argue that if indeed Grinnell applied an aniline cancel to a genuine Missionary, it only proves that the carbon black cancels on the Grinnell Missionaries are not his. After all, if he used aniline on a genuine Missionary, he surely would have used the same ink on the fakes as well! This is the kind of spin on developments that has kept this mystery alive.

November 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

I think you avoided reading what I wrote, preferring to impute what you could ridicule instead. A Rampage press was the most efficient equipment then in existence on the frontier for printing bokiks and broadsides, but not for printing on tissue paper from a two-nch by three-inch forme. If you prefer not to comprehend that simple point, enjoy your wine.

November 15, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

I just read for the first time an article that posted September 13, 2006 on the Grinnell Reference Page entitled 'How were Hawaiian Missionaries Printed?'.

The gist of the article is that printing the Missionary stamps on a Rampage Press is cumbersome to the point of absurdity and that a Rampage Press was "...the only practical equipment available to the frontier before the 1860's..."

Assuming that the frontier being referenced is Hawaii, don't think for a moment that the Rampage Press was the only available. Broad-sides, handbills, invoices, and thousands of copies of hundreds of different private and government forms were being printed in Hawaii in the 1860's and they were not all done on a Rampage Press. That would be cumbersome to the point of absurdity.

Thousands upon thousands upon thousands of pages of 'stuff' was printed up and bound in Hawaii and there were not all done on a Rampage Press because that would be cumbersome to the point of absurdity.

November 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Test

Yes, we are all patiently waiting for some credible rebuttals to the articles posted on this Board from anyone, that's anyone, who still believes that the Grinnells are not counterfeit Missionary stamps.

Are any such rebuttals forthcoming? I think not.

Tick Tock Tick Tock.

November 15, 2006 **Test**

Anyone there?

November 10, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter,

Aniline ink being fugitive would likely prohibit the use of soaking to get it off. Unless it could be established that some kind of artist's paint was used that would wash off entirely. I guess it stays on for good :(

November 08, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker,

As interesting as your theory may be, the only way to know for sure would be to lift the applicable stamp from the card of ten.

I very much doubt that the owners of the card of ten would allow this, but then again, it can be argued that Vince and Carol Arrigo are just full of surprises?

An example being, the Arrigo's revealing the existence of the Card of Ten.

How many more surprises do the Arrigo's have in store for us, stay tuned, we probably won't be dissatisfied?

November 08, 2006 **Walter P**

Stephen Tedesco-

Sorry, my last post should read:

'may be the written report that was submitted to the RPSL Expert Committee by Dr. Hall."

November 08, 2006 **Walter P**

Steven Tedesco-

On further contemplation, the other Report you refer to may be, the written report that was submitted to the RPSL Expert Committee, which has not been included in the 2006 RPSL Narrative Report.

Perhaps Ken Lawrence has had access to, or has reviewed, Dr. Hall's written report to the committee?

Perhaps, David Beech would be so kind as to forward a copy of Dr. Hall's written report on the composition of the ink used to obliterate the Grinnell stamps that were tested for this investigation to Richard for inclusion on the Grinnell Reference Page?

November 08, 2006 **Walter P**

Steven Tedesco-

Steve, I will add that the 2006 RPSL Narrative Report is a report of the RPSL Expert Committee stating their findings, conclusions formed, and expert opinions that are based on the scientific testing and investigation conducted, which includes Dr. Hall's participation in the investigation.

In short, the RPSL Narrative Report is a report from the RPSL Expert Committee, and not from Dr. Hall.

November 08, 2006 **Walter P**

Steven Tedesco-

Firstly, I have read literally hundreds of narrative reports concerning many different areas, mostly railway accident or industrial health and safety investigation reports.

All of these types of narrative reports, including the RPSL Report, all have a common thread, which is:

The 'Narrative Report' persay, is a written overview of the investigation and is crafted in such a way that the overall findings of the investigation are summarised in a written report, usually in subject by subject form, as is the format used in the RPSL Report.

In Narrative Reports of this nature, that is, reporting the results of an investigation, individuals are rarely directly quoted, and their findings are presented in summary form.

One has to remember that the RPSL Narrative Report, is, simply put, an overview of the RPSL investigation with an accompanying narrative of the conclusions drawn from that investigation, by the RPSL Committee charged with conducting the investigation of the Grinnell Stamps.

In answer to your question, "who said Prussian Blue and Carbon Black," if not Dr. Hall?

The RPSL Committee did on page 68 of the RPSL Narrative Report. In fairness to you, I will say that the RPSL Committee, when crafting their report, attributed this conclusion to the scientific testing and findings of Dr. Hall.

The RPSL Narrative Report on page 68 also states their finding, in part, "The inks used for the black obliteration on the Missionaries and the Grinnells are clearly different."

Considering the above, I would hope that an explanation from Ken Lawrence, regarding the discrepancy between Ken Lawrence's last post to yourself, and your last post to Ken Lawrence, will be forthcoming?

I hope this answers your question?

November 08, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter,

I'm still thinking about a genuine, sound, unused Missionary in the possession of Grinnell having an alleged fake aniline-ink cancel. That is an extraordinary event. The best information we've got says there is no carbon black ink beneath the aniline (whether nineteenth century writing ink spectra were compared to the sample spectrum signature is still unclear). Most likely the two genuine stamps were found, not purchased. They were used to make 79 more copies that were at first accepted as genuine, then rejected. Grinnell never relinquished the two genuine, but at least one has an alleged fake cancel that was a copy of a genuine cancel of ink that differs from the "Grinnell" grids. Sometime after cancelling the "Grinnell hoard" but prior to placing G80 on the card, that cancel was applied. What is that cancel hiding?

You need not know why a murder was committed to know to search a nearby pond for the weapon. I think the aniline cancel was akin to throwing the gun into the pond; not directly related to a crime, but a residual action taken out of desperation. As you know, desperation leads to errors of judgement. Those errors can be learning tools even if Grinnell took his secrets with him.

November 08, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

I suppose that most of the scenarios posted on this Board regarding 'why' Grinnell glued the two genuine Missionary Stamps onto the card are in some cases possible, and in a few cases plausible.

Not being able to look into this particular criminal mind, I would have to say that some are possible and few are plausible, but in the end, it is not possible to know with any degree of certainty.

The real issue is, how much time do we want to spend on this particular subject, and how much does it actually matter in the overall scheme of things?

Grinnell did what he did for reasons known only by himself and he took those reasons to the grave with him.

Seeing as we can no longer ask Grinnell why he did what he did, I suppose, in the end, we are going to have to be satisfied with the most plausible explanation, and move onto other more important areas, like the composition of the black cancellation ink applied onto some of the Grinnell stamps.

I would like to hear what Ken Lawrence has to say about the conflicting posts yesterday, where Stephen rightly points out that Ken Lawrence's last post to himself, is at odds with the information stated on page 68 of the 2006 RPSL Narrative Report concerning the composition of the black ink used for applying cancellations on some of the Grinnell stamps.

November 08, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Walter P.

You stated, "I fail to see how the RPSL report paragraph, as quoted above, can be attributed, as being a comment from Dr. Hall." I read, "Analysis by Dr. Hall",

by meaning: according to; from the opinion, evidence, or authority of. I take the sentence structure to imply Dr. Hall has said. This is why I kept asking Ken L. about the color differences. Ken stated that Dr. Hall, both verbally and in his report, found only carbon black. Ken stated I was quoting the RPSL report and not Dr. Hall.

If the RPSL is a report, in part on Dr. Hall's findings, then something is amiss, because if they are not indirectly quoting from his report, "analysis by", then they are certainly misinterpreting his work, if he has stated that only carbon black was found on the obliterations. Or there is another report, which Ken L. has suggested.

So Walter, if I may ask your comment, who said, "Prussian Blue and Carbon Black." if not Dr. Hall? Please add, "the inks used...are clearly different".

November 08, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter P.

Thinking about your question of WHY Grinnell glued the ten stamps to the card: isn't preservation of fragile stamps a reasonable explanation? Instead of viewing the Card of Ten as either printer's proofs or as a souvenir card, consider the inclusion of eight additional "Grinnells" as subterfuge?

Look at it from Grinnell's perspective. You want to keep for yourself the two genuine, undamaged copies in pristine condition. You decide to attach them to a card and put them away. Many Missionaries have been rebacked, so that appears to be an acceptable preservation technique. But you realize that if ever the card was discovered having only these two stamps, perhaps when handed down through the family, people may ask, "Why only these two? Why only the Thirteen Cents? Why not the rarer Two Cent?" They may even come to realize that these two stamps are the key to the production of the "Grinnells." If instead of a Card of Ten there was a Card of Two genuine stamps, imagine how this board would have reacted.

So, perhaps he simply glued some of the fake examples down with the genuine to make the card pass as his personal collection of exceptional specimens, scribbling notes thereon that it never be sold. That way, he hid them in clear view.

November 07, 2006 **Walter P**

Stephen Tedesco-

After reading your post to Ken Lawrence, I carefully reviewed page 68 of the RPSL narrative report. Although you have quoted the passages from page 68 correctly, I must say that in my reading of page 68, there are no direct quotes attributable to Dr. Hall on this page.

All the page text states, is that there was an analysis of the inks, used for the obliterations on the Grinnells performed by Dr. Hall, and the result was that the composition of the ink was a mixture of Prussian Blue and Carbon Black.

In my reading of this page, I find that the report states in the next paragraph, "The inks used for the black obliterations on the Missionaries and the Grinnells are clearly different."

However, try as I may, I fail to see how the RPSL report paragraph, as quoted above, can be attributed, as being a comment from Dr. Hall.

I do not think that you can find any direct comments that are attributable to Dr. Hall, in the RPSL Narrative Report, or at least on page 68 of the RPSL report.

In addition to the above, I fail to draw the same inference as you do, regarding page 68 of the RPSL Narrative Report.

I am not saying that you are not raising a valid point in your post to Ken Lawrence, I am just pointing out to you that you are incorrect in stating in your post, that Dr. Hall made any comments that are reported on page 68 of the RPSL Narrative Report.

The RPSL Narrative Report clearly is in part a report on Dr. Hall's findings by the RPSL and no comments made by Dr. Hall appear on page 68 of the narrative report.

However, having stated the above, and after reading Ken Lawrence's preceding post addressed to yourself, I must agree with you that something is amiss in that Ken Lawrence's post is at odds with the RPSL findings articulated on page 68 of the narrative report.

Unless, a clarification of Ken Lawrence's post to yourself is forthcoming, that would explain the concerns above? Yes, we should all be concerned.

November 07, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Ken Lawrence,

Thank you for the reply, and more for your patience. I just wanted to have my facts strait and the correct comments from Dr. Hall brought forward.

As you are aware, on page 68 of the RPSL publication, it states and I quote again, "Analysis by Dr. Hall of the obliterations on the Grinnells showed that the black was a mixture of Prussian blue and carbon black." Am I to understand that they are linking his name to something he refutes? Is this a typo?

The very next line states the black obliterations between the two stamps are different. This statement placed directly after the above quote from Dr. Hall brings direct inference, at least in my mind, to Dr. Hall. Something is amiss to put it lightly and I don't understand why more readers aren't concerned.

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Stephen T,

He said and he wrote both. Gene Hall and his British colleagues wrote that the Grinnell and Missionary black cancels were carbon black, and Gene Hall told me that. If there is a scientific report that states the Grinnell black cancels are a blend, it has not been released. I have asked David Beech to link all those reports.

November 07, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Ken Lawrence,

Thank you for the post from London Philatelist. I am waiting to receive my copy of the article. I still read different results then what you have posted. Perhaps you will clarify the following," He **said** that all the black cancels on Grinnells and Missionaries". Does that mean that he commented to you personally or said means in the RPSL report?

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

I could not tell what the glue is, but I can assure you it is not cement that would ever be used by a paste-up artist. I hope it's water soluble. The glue was off the Raman scale.

Walter,

I think everyone wants to know the truth. I imagine the owners entertain hope that their stamps are genuine, but they have proven value regardless. I doubt Don Sundman cares much about a commission one way or the other, and I know he's delighted every time we make a new discovery.

If money were my object, I would not be devoting much time to this pursuit. Whatever I learn is interesting to my readers.

November 07, 2006 **Steve W**

I think we need to keep in mind that, damaged or not, genuine Missionaries were not (and are not) easy to find. Sperati never made forgeries of #'s 1-4 because he couldn't get an acceptable model for the stamp, and he couldn't obtain satisfactory paper to match the genuine.

November 07, 2006 **Shu**

Walter P,

I was just saying that the stamps may not be destroyed by having glued them down. Not like the destrucion the fountain pen cancel wrought - allegedly.

November 07, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

What does it matter anyway? If as Grinnell wrote on the back of the card of ten, words to the effect stamps mounted on the card were to be kept and not sold?

If G80 and G81 were the models used to print the counterfiet Grinnell Stamps, than these stamps could never be sold in Grinnell's lifetime, and still avoid the risk of detection. Perhaps, George Grinnell wanted to keep the the two genuine Missionary stamps now known as G80 and G81 as a legacy for his heirs?

Considering the condition of the front of these two unrepaired genuine Missionary stamps I would hazard a guess that the back of these stamps are also sound.

That is exactly the point, as stated previously by Ken Lawrence, G80 and G81 are in exceptional condition as far as genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps go.

If Grinnell would have tried to sell these stamps after his failed sale to Klemann, he knew that he would have surely been found out.

November 07, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

As pointed out in your post this morning, you can work a theory from either end, depending on where you are sitting?

I would imagine that the Grinnell owners are not spending a great deal of time and money, and Donald Sundman is not wasting his valuable time and energy to prove that the Grinnell stamps are counterfiet.

The RPSL findings, albiet somewhat, but not fataly flawed, has already shown us that the Grinnell Stamps are counterfiet.

Call me dumb, but for the life of me, I can't figure out why the Grinnell owners are having these tests performed? What is in it for them as this exercise must be costing them a fair amount of money?

I can understand that if there was even a slight hope that the Grinnell Stamps may be genuine, than considering the financial gain at stake, I can see the owners wanting to explore every possibility.

In your view, do the Grinnell owners still hold onto a faint hope that the Grinnell stamps may be genuine, and are in fact, a separate Hawaii Missionary stamp printing that was unknown of, prior to the supposed Grinnell Missionary stamp find of the Century?

Or perhaps, the owners, like us, just want to know the truth, no matter where that leads?

In any case, I am grateful that the owners have decided to take their present route, as Dr. Gene Hall's scientific investigation will no doubt bring this mystery closer to an end, or will it.

November 07, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

What are your impressions of the "glue" adhering these stamps to the card? Any possibility of getting a spectral analysis of residue along the edges?

November 07, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter P. and Steve W.

Do we know enough about the "glue" to jump to the conclusion it is permanent and thus destructive? Consider the frailty of a genuine Missionary. What would protect it better: a hinge at the top or the total adhesion to cardboard? Logically, the latter provided one could "unstick" them. I understand that many Missionaries are rebacked, usually after being repaired, to protect them from further deterioration.

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

The stamps did not come from an old lady's attic. The Carpenter collection was mounted in an album, was understood to be valuable, and was not for sale.

According to Klemann's letters to Ashbrook, "Grinnell" (I suspect Thompson) visited her to examine her seashell donation to the Southwest Museum and asked to see her ex-husband's splendid collection of classic Hawaiian stamps, allegedly soaked off mail from his parents when they were missionaries in Hawaii.

Mr. Carpenter of Pasadena was known to have owned a great collection of Hawaiian Numerals. If anyone had believed he owned genuine Missionaries, his collection would have been offered as evidence in the 1922 trial. That's the biggest reason for doubting Klemann's embroidery long afterward.

The origin of the counterfeit Missionary in Carpenter's album is anyone's guess. By his own admission, Klemann did not report it to anyone until after Grinnell was dead, even though he had been telling the world that Grinnell was a liar and a fraud for 35 years.

November 07, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Maybe the printer glued down the real stamps to the card. When told "don't lose these and keep them all together", he glued them safely onto a piece of board would have been natural for a paste-up specialist. Keep in mind that for the stamps to have been photographed without distortion they had to be flat, under a thin pane of glass is normal.

I have noticed when working with the available scans that the Grinnells are consistently slightly narrower at the top than the bottom. This is shown when using the rectangle tool for selecting the stamp to be cropped and saved. When I crop and size to make all the Grinnell examples consistent I have been rotating the stamps until the left frame is vertical. This always causes the right frame line to "toe in" towards the top of the stamp. This indicates to me that the camera on the copy stand was not exactly plumb to the center of the stamps. The normal method is to have a center point marked on the copy surface and the camera lens centered directly above that point. If the camera was just slightly tilted making the plane of the stamp and the plane of the film surface nonparallel, the copy material will become slightly trapezoidal. Any of the authenticated Missionary I've worked with don't show this characteristic, if anything their four sides are randomly different and don't align.

Is it possible the forger used a straight edge to strengthen and "square" the frame lines, then photographed the paste-up, not realizing his finished products were all slightly tapered?

[This image composite](#) shows what I believe to be the progression followed by the forger in creating his stamps. The from left to right, the lower left ornament gets progressively weaker until the forger "reentered" and strengthened some of the lines which were dropping out. The center examples come from the Card of 10, those above and below from examples on the Grinnell Reference Page.

Sorry, it's all visual, rather than text!

Roger

November 07, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Regarding the last paragraph detailing the condition of G80 and G81: Thanks.

However, I have seen a fake red Type 1 cancel recently that was placed on an obviously fake Missionary. This cancel, enlarged several times and compared to genuine strikes, is arguably identical to the genuine examples. And it was impressed so strongly in the stamp that it displayed shadows in the scan. I wonder now about the red cancel since we suspect tampering, at the very least, with the black grid. I do think the exact geometry of the red cancel should be examined very closely.

As far as deception goes, in truth I am only interested in deception by the man whose story of what, when and how the Grinnell Missionaries came to be has led to the greatest philatelic mystery. Did he find 81 Missionaries? No, he did not. I do not know why he did what he did, but we are beginning to see how.

The senario in which Grinnell was led to a "find" was logically dismissed for reasons I outlined several days ago, long before the aniline cancel came to be. I know you are simply citing an example of how easily accusations can fly, but the logic is hardly circular. I repeat -

Reasons why G80 and G81 were not purchased for use in a premeditated forgery scheme, using Grinnell as a dupe and knowing Shattuck had Hawaiian ties:

- 1) No Scott #4. If one began from scratch to imitate a hoard of Missionaries, one would have to plan on making the #4 and endeavor to secure a copy. However, obtaining by chance the two #3's from Shattuck, there was no opportunity to model a #4.
- 2) There would need to be a Mr. X to purchase these stamps to disassociate Grinnell's name from those known by the philatelic community to possess the real deal. Where was the profit for Mr. X?
- 3) Grinnell possessed G80 and G81, not Mr. X
- 4) G80 and G81 are much better and more expensive examples than necessary to produce the "Grinnells" from. Why not buy crappy 5 and 13 for alot less, and wing the "2"? Such stamps were more widely available anyway. Fault free examples almost unheard of.
- 5) G81 has a cancel that obscures many features - for a photo-reproductive process, why not secure a crappy pen-cancelled copy cheaper and easier?

And now: 6)A duped Grinnell would have had no reason to apply fountain pen ink to a beautiful, genuine, unused Missionary that he wanted to keep for himself forever.

Together, we can take all we know and reason through these arguments to see that some hold water and some do not. Not all theories are equal.

November 07, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

No matter the odds, it is a undeniable fact, that people, even intelligent people, do things that on the surface appear to be unwise or even what most people would consider stupid.

To support my post, I refer you all to the fact, that the prisons in Canada and the United States are full of such people, and likewise, so are the divorce courts.

Instead of expending a large amount of grey matter pointing out the stupidity of Grinnell glueing the two genuine stamps onto the now infamous card of ten, why not spent that energy figuring out why the two stamps were glued down onto the card of ten?

Some reasons may be:

Grinnell could not bring himself to destroy the two incriminating genuine Missionary stamps;

Grinnell wanted to keep the two incriminating stamps separate from the rest of the Grinnell counterfiet stamps that he planned to sell;

Grinnell knew he could never sell these two stamps without risking detection;

Grinnell believed there was something incriminating on the bottom of the two stamps so he glued them to the card of ten;

Grinnell made up a souviner card of his handywork to gloat at every, now and then;

Grinnell, like other criminals, thought he was smarter than everyone else and wanted to keep the two stamps, because he believed his deception would not be discovered.

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott,

Gene told me that the G80 cancel contained no carbon. None. So if it is a tracing, there is no carbon in the thing being traced. The Raman intensity was essentially nil at all the points where carbon peaks.

Gene did not tell me it contained aniline, nor that he could determine aniline. The Star-Ledger reporter called me and said that Gene had determined it contains aniline, and asked me to comment.

Perhaps Gene consulted references to interpret data that was unfamiliar to him when he was conducting the tests. I'm eager to read his report when he finishes it.

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

The Piller copy wasn't examined by RPSL, so there must be seven (you wrote five but listed six certificates) plus G80. I believe all the certified Grinnells were examined, but unfortunately we haven't seen the reports. That's why I asked David Beech to link them here.

I believe Gene Hall examined all the Arrigo and Shattuck Grinnells previously except for the card of ten. He has published representative curves in the report that the RPSL cited, but not examples of every stamp. He said that all the black cancels on Grinnells and Missionaries are carbon black except for G80, which took him by surprise, so he redid that one several times in several locations.

Gluing the stamps to the card was a travesty, no question, but some of the finest Missionaries that were known in those days were glued to white cards, so that may not have been as strange in 1918 as it seems to us today.

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

I don't disparage Gene Hall's results. I accord them great respect. He's very thorough, diligent, and skilled in his profession.

He's not a philatelist, so it's his philatelic deductions that may or may not be accurate. After all, he and two British scientists originally reported that the Taplings and Grinnells were printed on paper from the same ream. For reasons not yet explained, the RPSL Expert Committee accepted some portions of that report but did not accept that deduction. As Len Piskiewicz stated at the Chicago meeting, we need to clarify the distinction between scientific facts and the conclusions we draw from them.

The record has abundant examples of deception on every side. Most of the interpretations presented here involve circular reasoning, using imputed deception to support an imputed fraud. Using that technique, I can show any number of villains.

You can as easily work the deception argument from the opposite end: What if Grinnell did get all the stamps and the letter and the prayer book from Shattuck, just as he said? Does that mean Shattuck conspired with the forger to dupe Grinnell? Did the forger later confess to Grinnell and hand him a card of ten for his collection? Maybe it happened that way, but it doesn't get us closer to a solution.

The two stamps on the card are genuine, and one has a genuine cancel. Neither is damaged, altered, or repaired. The strip of three stamps on the Smithsonian's Dawson cover and one certified Missionary owned by Mystic Stamp Company are extensively repaired and painted by experts in the 20th century, difficult to detect under ordinary expert examination, so those were good references.

November 07, 2006 **Steve W**

Scott's theory on the aniline ink makes the most sense to me.

November 07, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

If I understand Ken L. correctly, Gene Hall's tests showed that the G80 grid has an aniline (nigrosine?) component and the other Grinnell grids tested do not.

Is that correct?

If so, it seems to me that the G80 stamp either has a genuine grid that has been manipulated with aniline ink, possibly in the process of creating a fake grid, or that it was a test example of the fake grid, using an aniline ink.

Aniline inks were used in fountain and drafting pens. If the genuine grid on G80 was carefully traced in ink, then used to create an impression on cork or other carveable matter, the trace elements of aniline bleeding thru the tracing paper might have affected the test results.

I am always skeptical of "scientific" tests, because of the variables that can affect the results.

November 07, 2006 **David Shumaker**

If finding genuine, undamaged and unaltered Missionaries has lower odds than survival from a lightning strike, then may I respectfully suggest that insofar as we know one of the two "genuine" Missionaries on the card likely has a forged cancel, let's STOP refer to those stamps as genuine. In fact, odds are they are both FAKE. Makes much more sense to assume a fake cancel was put on a fake stamp created at the faker's pleasure than the incredible scenarios of (1) two undamaged stamps having been found by Grinnell or (2) two undamaged stamps being purchased by him at tippy-top dollar and forgotten by whichever dealer sold them, even with all the press swirling about the trial and subsequent crusades to vindicate Grinnell.

There is a difference in talking odds of outcome and odds of being, so we have to be careful in making those comparisons. If there are 200 genuine Missionaries known and but one is undamaged and unaltered, the odds of purchasing that one would be 1 in 200. OK, so far so good.

The odds of surviving a fall from a ten storey building may be 1 in 100, in which case you would die 99 times and survive once in 100 tries. Good thing we're not test subjects for an insurance company, eh?

Now, out of 300,000,000 Americans, what are the odds you are you? You have only a 1 in 300,000,000 chance of being yourself. Most likely you are someone else. Even Ken L. has only about a 1 in 10,000,000 chance of being a respected and widely-read philatelic writer. The likelihood that he is a philatelic writer therefore strains my credulity. :)

Ken is obviously a fine writer, as evidenced by his work. I couldn't touch him ever, ever. And, we are who we are. My point is that some things simply ARE and should therefore not be ruled out because of ridiculously low odds when facts that define BEING can be compiled.

November 07, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

There are five Grinnells with the G80 Type G4a 7-bar grid (RPSL certificate #'s 726, 732, 733, 745, 755 and 762). If one is the Piller copy, then have the other four been tested for ink composition?

I'm still intrigued by the fact that the stamps were glued to the card of 10. Your comments about the absolute rarity of XF Missionary stamps are quite correct, so gluing them down is yet another puzzler.

November 07, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

A couple of years ago on eBay a family in Brighton, England, offered 4-5 registered letters from BPO's in China, circa 1870, to Scotland. They were started at \$10 each, and eventually sold between \$20,000 and \$35,000 each. Knowledgeable analysts suggested they would have realized more if offered at a major British auction house.

If the Missionaries came from an old lady's attic, one or two is a reasonable find. Not all little old ladies follow the philatelic press and keep up on catalogue value of the stamps they really don't remember owning. What is special about the 1917 Missionary find is that persons unknown wanted to financially maximize their discovery and attempted to cheat those who could afford to pay.

Roger

November 07, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken,

I don't think you are dumb in any way. But, how can you demand that we accept your observation that nothing is beneath that aniline cancel while at the same time suggesting we take Dr. Gene Hall of Rutgers' scientifically-established conclusion (that the cancel is aniline) with a grain of salt?

I understand that Klemann could not tell the difference between genuine Missionaries and fakes. He bought the Grinnells, didn't he? The overarching point is that if these stamps did not come out of the Shattuck trunk then Grinnell did not tell the truth about the find. That is central to the Grinnell story because it is Grinnell's version of the find that has perpetuated the controversy beyond the merits of the differences in design and in the cancels that routinely condemn other stamps.

Whether the shell lady was or was not a source of a genuine Missionary, whether Grinnell or Thompson acquired it if so acquired, is splitting hairs. There is deception here. Further deception is indicated by the aniline cancel, if it is indeed aniline.

I would assume that during your thorough investigation of what lies beneath the aniline cancel you would have noticed any repairs so extensive as to require a fake cancel to be applied as part of that repair job? You brought up this possibility, so I assume you were looking for repairs? After all, I cannot because I have never examined the stamp, as you have rightly pointed out. So I am at the mercy of those who have examined it. Did you notice any wicking into the disturbed

fibers in the repair areas?

Let's say it is a repaired stamp with a fake cancel to obscure the repair. That doesn't sound like a virgin find, meaning it had been bought. By a schoolteacher. Really? Or, let's say he found it but it was damaged so he had it repaired. And covered the repair by fabricating a grid cancel that so closely resembles the genuine, or the "Grinnell" version, that one wonders how much more he or his cohort could fabricate? My head spins.

Yes, I do think the aniline cancel is hiding something. Maybe hiding a genuine cancel, or that it was stolen, or that it did not come from the same source of the "Grinnell" Missionaries.

Maybe the 20th century-type ink exposes the fact that the person applying it was uninformed of its provenance, did not know it was a genuine Missionary, assumed the stamp was identical to the other Grinnells and thus no less expendable?

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger H,

I believe all the Arrigo and Shattuck stamps have been tested, but the RPSL has not made public the results of the tests on which the Expert Committee relied, except in summary form that has been partly disowned by its scientific consultant. You may recall that I asked David Beech to link those reports here, and he replied that he'd look into it.

The reports that have been published agree with the RPSL's statement that all the red cancels consist of vermilion but do not agree with the RPSL's statement that the black cancels consist of Prussian blue and carbon black. Gene Hall's reports written before the disclosure of the ten stamps state that the black cancels on Taplings and Grinnells are all carbon black.

I believe the only black Grinnell cancel that hasn't been tested is the one on the Grinnell that Stan Piller sold.

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

I've spent many research hours recreating the culture of those times and the popular image of Hawaiian Missionaries -- the backdrop of sensational realizations in the Ferrary sales, especially the record price for his 2¢ Missionary; and circulating reproductions of stamps in the greatest Missionary collections, including Crocker's, Ayer's, and Tapling's.

To discover one genuine unaltered unrepaired undamaged 13¢ Missionary stamp in a condition that exceeded all those is the equivalent of being struck by lightning and surviving. That might be a reason why Fred Gregory has expressed skepticism that the two stamps on the card are genuine despite a consensus here that they are.

To find two is even more improbable. To have found two in two separate places exceeds the limits of my credulity, as does obliterating one of them with the least desirable of all the recorded cancel styles.

November 07, 2006 **Roger Heath**

It would be really nice to have a table listing those Grinnells which had their black cancels tested, and those that haven't. I find it incredible that only one Grinnell reportedly has a fake cancel (aniline ink) based on chemical analysis. Are we to believe that all the fake Grinnells have authentic ink (carbon black), but the "authentic Missionary" does not?

It's time for a census of the Grinnells listing which have been tested, which haven't, and who conducted the testing. Which stamps have been tested by more than a single service? Which stamps have had paper samples taken to determine composition? Etc.

I know I will be told this has been done and that I haven't studied the references, but since we are discussing the stamps on this forum it would be useful to see the census posted as is the cover census. We certainly don't have 81 examples, or whatever the number is, images of Grinnells to view. Which of the 32 examples shown on the Grinnell Reference Page have been scientifically tested? Which were taken to Dr Hall? What chemical signatures were found when the red ink was tested? If the Card of 10 was taken to Dr Hall, were direct comparisons made with the Smithsonian examples? Was there any attempt to analyze the adhesive, which may have leached through the paper?

Roger

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

Between 1917 and 1922, three collections of classic Hawaiian stamps were owned by people who claimed that they originated on family mail from Hawaiian Missionaries. All three were shown to experts who declared the Missionaries in the collections to be counterfeits. Two of the collections included counterfeits of all four Missionary stamps, and one of them included both types of all four. So Mrs. Carpenter's claim of provenance fits the same profile.

John Klemann could not tell the difference between genuine Missionaries and Grinnells. His published evidence relies on flyspeck details developed by others, not on obvious large differences. Yet he immediately spotted the counterfeit in the Carpenter album. So I think it was probably one of the same crude counterfeits as were in the other two collections.

Because this seems to have been a chronic problem, I think probably collectors who received on letters or were bequeathed Hawaiian stamps wrote back to their Hawaiian relatives to complete their collections, and what they received were counterfeit Missionaries because no genuine ones were available.

Obviously this deduction can't be proven, but I'm confident that if Julius Loeb had confirmed Klemann's story, Ashbrook would have published it, because Ashbrook did publish all the information about Grinnell that he was able to verify.

Some of you have a different opinion. That's fine too, but it isn't helping to explain how only one black grid cancel has an aniline profile (if it does), while all the others are carbon black. If your speculation about a hidden mark underneath had merit, carbon would have been a more effective obliterator.

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

That's a good question. I think it's true, as David S wrote, that most or all uncanceled Missionaries were actually used but not canceled. But I also think we need some more provocative inquiry, and yours is a good start. If the cancel is counterfeit, and if the Grinnells are counterfeit, do the two necessarily have the same origin? If yes, why is this grid different from all the Grinnell's we have tested?

I personally wonder if one or both of the stamps originated on an envelope that contained the seafarer's letter. That artifact looms over every interpretation of the Shattuck story, yet it's never been explained why he had saved it or why he gave it to Grinnell.

It's true that David S doesn't know what might or might not be under the grid, because he hasn't examined the stamp. It's unfortunate he thinks we were too dumb to consider the possibility. One reason I asked Wilson to bring the Smithsonian's Dawson cover to Gene Hall's lab was to see what we could learn by studying known alterations.

Here's a thought:

Stan Piller declared the grid cancel fake as soon as I reported the existence of two genuine Missionaries on the card, and I personally thought the grid on G80 matched the grid that I had examined on Stan's Grinnell. Then Scott persuaded most readers that the grid was genuine. Now Gene Hall says it is not genuine. Would the collector who bought Stan's Grinnell submit it for micro Raman spectroscopy and x-ray fluorescence tests? If that cancel shows the same chemical and elemental profile as the G80 grid, it might bring us closer to a solution. But if that grid is carbon black, the plot remains murky.

November 07, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Steve W.

Even though your question was to Ken, I'd like to say that we do not know there is not another cancel, like a pen mark, beneath the aniline. Only the spot that the laser transversed will be analyzed; perhaps missing an old obliteration? That cancel is HIDING something. This is the last and greatest mystery about the "Grinnells".. WHAT IS THAT GRID HIDING?

BTW, it was mentioned on this board that many of the known unused Missionaries originated from covers where the stamps were not cancelled, if I remember correctly.

November 07, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard, Walter, Ken,

Consider also the possibility that one came from Shattuck (which would have been a great find) and one came from the seashell lady. Either man could have performed the switch, regardless of the fact that Grinnell ended up with the switched stamp. Especially if there were other conspirators; most likely, George was only the face man. Perhaps the decision to deface G80 was not his?

One became two, then two became.. 81 at last count. Ken, as far as Grinnell's stated belief in their authenticity, I believe the most capable con artists are those who manage to fool themselves. Achieving that, one can con anybody.

November 07, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

If G80 was originally unused, then the story gets more complicated. How would Shattuck have gotten an unused 13c Missionary stamp? There would have been no need to send it to the family for return postage because the 13c rate was only used on eastbound mail. Was he a stamp collector as well?

November 07, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Does evidence matter?

The "only records available on the incident in question" state that Mrs. Carpenter had "one Hawaiian Missionary."

A record about that collection written and published more than 30 years earlier referred to it as a well known collection of Hawaiian Numerals. But that record was written by George Grinnell, who had heard about the legendary Pasadena collection but had not seen it himself, so I guess Klemann's recovered memory is superior even if he was wrong about the number of Missionaries.

A live witness today, who knew Klemann well, says Klemann always believed the Grinnells were genuine.

When exactly did Klemann tell the truth? Which of his truths offers persuasive evidence that Grinnell stole two Hawaiian Missionary stamps from anyone? Are we now to hypothesize two thefts?

Thompson was a seashell expert and major ASDA stamp dealer with large ads in stamp magazines; Grinnell was a botanist and collector who did not deal in stamps until much later, and never on a significant scale.

Which man do you think Hector Alliot would have sent to examine a seashell collection being donated to the museum? Which man is more likely to have removed the stamps from the seashell boxes, repaired them, and sold them?

After sensational newspaper publicity that identified George Grinnell as a stamp collector associated with the Southwest Museum who sold Hawaiian Missionaries to John Klemann, whose name is a lady recalling a visit from a museum representative who looked at her Hawaiian collection most like to recall when Klemann visited her?

All hypotheses are welcome in my book, and worthy of being tested, including those favored by Richard Malmgren. He hasn't yet commented on my article that scrutinized Thompson's career from 1917 to 1960, so I don't know which parts he found wanting.

Personally I think the evidence is most plausible that Grinnell got the two stamps and the seafarer's letter from Charles Shattuck, whatever else may have transpired.

If what Gene Hall told the Star-Ledger is true, theories about G80 still need to explain why it has a black grid cancel of ink that is not found on any other canceled Grinnell or Missionary.

Contrary to speculation here, there is no evidence of any other cancellation ink present, nor of a cleaned prior cancel, nor of a preprinting paper fold. Cleaning and repair are common features of Hawaiian Missionaries, easily revealed by modern forensics.

November 06, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Walter P

I think I had an erroneous double negative in there somewhere.

Shift-F7 doesn't correct that type of thing.

November 06, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

On one hand, I do agree with you that it is possible that George Grinnell stole the Hawaii Missionary stamps now known as G80 and G81 from the Seashell Lady vis-a-via a 'light handed switch.'

On the other hand, as is often the case in stories of flights of fancy, there is always an element of truth attached to the story. This case is no exception, and based on that premise, I think it more likely than not, George Grinnell acquired G80 and G81 from Shattuck.

As for the rest of George Grinnell's story that elevates Grinnell into being the Indiana Jones of Philately, by discovering a great hoard of Hawaii Missionary Stamps, is, shall we say, 'pure poppycock.'

As for the sporadic contradictory postings of Ken Lawrence on this subject, when Ken finally makes up his mind on who said what to who, and who did what to who, and who showed up, and what was switched, and some other reasons he posted, that I forget. I think I can better utilize my time in some other more productive areas, than going over once again, what amounts to some smoke and mirror postings, designed to confuse the issue in a vain attempt to rehabilitate George Grinnell's reputation, by placing the blame on Mr. Klemann and or Mr. Thompson.

What Ken was saying, was, it wasn't George it was the other guy.

November 06, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Walter P

Yes, there is another alternative.

As previously posted and based upon the only records available on the incident in question, George Grinnell visited the lady with the seashell collection who also had her ex-husband's Hawaiian stamps that at one time apparently included some Missionary stamps. According to the only recordation of that meeting, the lady said that the switch of the real Missionary stamps for counterfeits was made by George Grinnell.

You may also refer to Ken L.'s prior responses that he does not believe that the only recordation of the meeting is not true based upon Ken L.'s argument that Mr. Kleeman is a terribly bad person and can not be believed and Mr. Kleeman must have made all of it up and besides which it was Mr. Thompson who must have been the one who showed up and made the switch as well as some other reasons that I forget.

November 06, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter,

While I agree with most of your theory, there is absolutely no reason to put a cancel on the genuine stamp as a model. Drawing a complete cancel on a blank sheet of paper would have been sufficient.

If Grinnell intended to hide the models forever on the Card of Ten then he would not have found it necessary to deface them. That means the stamp was "cancelled" for PRESENTATION, not for storage. Afterward, it was RETIRED to the card.

I can believe a stamp worth \$1000 was defaced if done as part of a scheme to make tens of thousands of dollars more, but for reasons other than making the stamps themselves.

Remember we talked earlier about "setting up the mark." Comparing "Grinnells" to genuine copies was part of that set up. Suppose G80 was "dressed up" for the meeting with Col. Taylor's Missionaries? I have wondered how the Grinnells could have so successfully passed muster when viewed together with genuine examples by experts, so perhaps G80 and G81 were representative examples provided to Poole and Taylor that day? If G80 had a pen cancel, that might have posed a problem since no other Grinnell had one, so the pen mark was lightened and a proper grid applied. Grinnell wouldn't want Klemann to ask about that pen cancelled copy when it came time to sell them, would he?

November 06, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

To put this another way, can anyone give us a more plausible explanation than my theory, that I have long maintained on this Board, which is:

George Grinnell only acquired two stamps from Shattuck which are now known as G80 & G81. The balance of his story of a great Hawaii Missionary Stamp Find was a pure fabrication carefully crafted as a cover story to explain how the Grinnell stamps came into his possession.

When Shattuck died, with him, went the true story of the fabled George Grinnell visit to his home, and any chance that Grinnell would be outed by Shattuck at some future date. On that day, surely, George Grinnell must have breathed a great sigh of relief.

Grinnell and his fellow conspirators used G80 & G81 as models to print the Grinnell counterfeit stamps.

Afterwards, to ensure that these two genuine Hawaii stamps would not be inadvertently disposed of, or misplaced, Grinnell glued them down onto the card of ten, noting on the back of the card words to the effect, keep these stamps, do not sell. In other words, these stamps were temporarily written off as a cost of doing business.

Grinnell knew that he could not have it both ways, that is, use G80 & G81 as counterfeit stamp models, and then take the chance of selling these two stamps on the open market, thereby greatly increasing his chance of discovery.

I challenge anyone to prove any part of my above stated theory wrong?

Adding to the above, it would be more likely than not that Grinnell and his fellow Conspirators applied a cancellation on G80 to use as a model cancellation to be applied to some of the Grinnell stamps?

As you are all aware, more work has to be done, in this area, before we can say anything definitively, one way or another on this point.

I believe, that, that part of the investigation, as is so often the case with classic forgeries, will be determined by scientific investigation of the components used in the ink that will establish a contemporary time line when the ink found on the stamps was first available.

It appears that the present hurdle that has to be overcome is that these stamps were contaminated and bear traces of more than one type of ink? Also it is possible over the years that from storage and other reasons different ink trace elements may have transferred from one stamp to another?

November 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Stephen T,

From the November 2006 London Philatelist, "The Investigation of the Grinnell Hawaiian Missionary Stamps" by Professor Robin J. H. Clark CNZM FRS:

"Page 68, figure, half way down: The figure does suggest that the ink of the black obliteration is a mixture, but many different places on the stamp would need to be probed to be sure of this comment. It would be easy on the stamp surface for the edges of minute particles of both Prussian blue and carbon black to be just in the probe laser beam."

November 06, 2006 **David Shumaker**

I'm thinking back to the discussion that supposed the Grinnells were a virgin find to postulate the odds that both of the two genuine Missionaries would appear on the Card of Ten. The thought was that the odds were low that these stamps were drawn from the 81 randomly. Now that we know one of those two "genuine" stamps was tampered with, is there any doubt that the person applying the fake cancel knew the status of the stamp he was applying it to?

Can anyone dream up a scenario where 81 stamps were found as detailed by Grinnell, and one of those stamps held secretly in his possession has an aniline ink cancel, whose application Grinnell had no part in?

November 05, 2006 **Roger Heath**

I just read your new comment re: paper film.

[See here](#). This seems to be a comprehensive history of photography.

Roger

November 05, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Steve T -

Here's a link to an [early use](#) of photolithography. "In 1857 John Pouncy's DORSETSHIRE PHOTOGRAPHICALLY ILLUSTRATED was the first book illustrated by photolithography."

From then on it was the invention of the power press that expanded the photolithographic industry during the second half of the 19th century and into the 20th century.

Roger

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Roger Heath,

If your process could have been done on paper film, then 1883, on treated plates then much earlier than 1883.

I base this on the following:

"Then I went to the light box and viewed the backlit negative to see what flaws if any resulted during the development of the negative".

I believe this process is dated. Please correct me if my facts are not correct.

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Roger Heath,

The process of manipulating film, your "photographic process", not ink, could have only been started with the advent of film. Hence the thirty year window. If you can take me back before 1898 I'm all ears.

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

I find it totally incompetent that the RPSL Expert Committee would place in its report graphs that are based on a sampling error and then as a separate issue post findings that are different from Dr. Hall without being mentioned. The report clearly states, "Analysis by Dr. Hall of the obliterations on the Grinnells showed that the black was a mixture of Prussian blue and carbon black."

I respectfully submit if someone from the RPSL expert committee would please comment about these discrepancies as reported by Ken Lawrence.

- 1) Dr. Hall has stated that carbon black was only found on the black obliterations.
- 2) Robin Clark, the RPSL scientist, says the difference (between the two graphs) was caused by the laser beam overlapping both the black cancel and the blue printing ink on the Grinnell, not by a real difference in black inks.

November 05, 2006 **John Forsyth**

If one steals a stamp, perhaps a cancel forever makes it not the "stolen stamp"

November 05, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Steve W -

There is a difference between "the card of ten was the forger's manufacturing worksheet" and "the card of ten was in fact the forger's "proof sheet".

One would have been an ongoing manufacturing worksheet showing progressive proofs, the other a sheet showing an example of each of the final or intermediate products at the end of the project. I believe many intermediate examples were thrown away and never left the print shop. These guys were in fact inventing a new process for reproducing stamps fake stamps. They happened upon a couple of old rare examples that just would make them some money if the experiment worked.

The uncanceled pairs could also be considered "proofs", there is no reason for them to be pasted onto the brown paper other than to see how they appear after being stuck down, see [side to side comparisons](#). The next step of the forging process would be to make and test a canceler that would be accepted as real. One was created and probably tested a number of times on blank paper, then tested on discarded fakes, and finally used on some of the "better examples", which were then damaged to indicate authenticity. [See G36](#).

My guess is that it took real courage to place the fake Grinnell cancel on the real stamp. [See G80](#). Of course it probably wasn't done until the "hoard" had been sold to Kleemann. I have always been concerned about the color tone in the center of G80 beneath the cancel, maybe that is the result of the removal of an original cancel, maybe a soft black cancel as suggested below.

Here is a good internet site describing the [history of inks](#).

"The discovery of induline, one of the modifications of aniline black, was made known in 1864.

Nigrosine, produced by the action of concentrated sulphuric acid on the insoluble indulines, was discovered in 1868.

The soluble indulines and nigrosines differentiate in appearance, the first a bronzy powder and the latter a black lustrous powder. When made into ink they possess about equal color values."

So an attempt to create a 30 year window is in fact not viable.

Additional reading [here](#), which places us within a few years of the forgery manufacture.

Roger

PS: Am I the only one who can visualize greediness to the extent of spoiling a \$1,000 stamp for the possibility of making \$50,000, or more? If I am, I apologize.

November 05, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

Those were the first questions I asked. There's only one black ink on G80 according to Gene Hall. There is nothing to be strengthened. And there's no similar substance on any Grinnell or any Missionary examined by Gene Hall or the RPSL's scientist. So we need a new hypothesis if Gene Hall is right.

Stephen T,

I have no idea what you are suggesting. Gene Hall's new tests showed the same thing as his old tests, except on G80, both on Grinnells and on NPM Missionaries, as his earlier tests on Grinnells and Taplings showed.

The two graphs are different. I believe Robin Clark, the RPSL scientist, says the difference was caused by the laser beam overlapping both the black cancel and the blue printing ink on the Grinnell, not by a real difference in black inks.

There is nothing new from Gene Hall about the red cancels. According to Raman spectroscopy and x-ray fluorescence they are all alike.

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Ken Lawrence,

Why all the double talk? If Gene Hall has examined the stamps previously and now the card of ten, then you know what his findings are. Why take me back to the

RPSL report? Why not just tell the board what he has said. A very simple request.

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Ken Lawrence,

The two graphs are different. But I have an easy fix.

Why not submit the stamps with black cancels back to Dr. Hall and have his findings made public. I think you already know what those results might be. Are you telling me he has not commented to you personally?

You did not answer my question, which you must already know. What is the result of red cancel?

November 05, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Stephen T,

You are quoting the RPSL Expert Committee, not Gene Hall. I asked David Beech to link the reports on which those statements are based; they are not Gene Hall's report. To date we have not read those reports.

Gene Hall has previously examined Grinnells owned by both Shattuck and Grinnell heirs at his laboratory, and Missionary stamps from the National Postal Museum collection, so he has data for comparison. He had not previously examined the stamps on the card of ten.

The report by Gene Hall, Tracey Chaplin, and Greg Smith of the July 3, 2001, London tests of Grinnell and Tapling Missionary stamps is listed in the RPSL references, but David Beech said that is not the basis of the analysis in the book. That report states, "MRS identified one of the two components (pigment) in each of the red and black inks of the postmarks/cancellations, and these compounds were consistently found in all stamps analyzed (GHMS and THMS) wherein such postmarks/cancellations were present."

November 05, 2006 **Steve W**

This news about the G80 cancel is troubling. I can see no reason whatsoever for the forger to cancel a genuine stamp - there was no need to cover his tracks because the card of ten was never going to come to light.

It has been suggested that the card of ten was in fact the forger's "proof sheet". This is plausible since some of the Grinnells on the card are, from their crude appearance, works-in-progress.

If we start from the premise that the card of ten was the forger's manufacturing worksheet, then we can look at G80 in a different light. As a stamp, it was clearly the model for the Grinnells, as others have shown conclusively. Its cancel is identical to some on the Grinnells (both Trepel and Celler agree on this point). In that context, it is possible that the cancel on G80 was strengthened so as to be a better manufacturing model for the Grinnell cancels. It was certainly common practice to lighten cancels on Missionaries - why not strengthen this one so as to make a better model for the fake cancels?

I think that this was what Scott was suggesting - perhaps the presence of "wrong" ink in the G80 cancel was due to some monkeying with the cancel.

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Ken Lawrence,

Thank you. So you don't have anything to add about the second cancel right now!

Dr. Hall is quoted in the RSPL booklet as saying that the black obliterations on the Missionaries are carbon black. The Grinnells are a mixture of carbon black and Prussian blue. These are not the same. Examine the two graphs in the above mentioned.

You said, "although all the other black cancels on both Missionaries and Grinnells are carbon". Only one stamp had a black cancel on the card of ten. So you must be referring back to the original study, which differs from your statement. Are you saying that Dr. Hall is now mistaken? I quote, "The inks used for the black obliterations on the Missionaries and the Grinnells are clearly different."

November 05, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

My actual quote was, "... everything is implausible with these Missionaries," meaning the two stamps fastened to the card of ten.

David S,

I believe it was the RPSL Expert Committee who claimed that Grinnell black cancel ink contained Prussian blue. Although I have not yet received my London Philatelist, I'm told that the RPSL's scientist Robin Clark is skeptical about that assertion and unhappy about the way it was reported. Prussian blue is the pigment in both Missionary and Grinnell printing ink, and could have contaminated the result of the scan.

November 05, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Stephen T,

As you know, I publish my articles in Scott Stamp Monthly. After the Amos Press exclusive rights expired, I sent them to Richard to be posted here. He created a PDF of my November articles, but not October. I have not yet written about the scientific results, because they are not yet complete.

Gene Hall examined G80 very carefully, and repeatedly. He was unable to find any carbon black, although all the other black cancels on both Missionaries and Grinnells are carbon.

Scott Trepel could make a liar of me I suppose, but I estimated that an unused 13¢ Hawaii Scott 3 with no damage or repairs (it is not creased as Bill Longley thought) would bring \$100,000 in a Siegel auction today. I was trying to convey the improbability that anyone would intentionally ruin such a stamp by obliterating it with a forged heavy black grid obliteration.

Not being a plater, I could never figure out whether Dick Celler's or Scott's analysis of the cancellation features is right, but even so, I was surprised by Gene Hall's result.

Nevertheless, I think aniline is a deduction, not yet proven. He knows for certain there is no carbon black in the cancel or on the stamp. So more tests are needed.

Scott,

The trouble with your original theory is that no Grinnell has ink with this chemical profile. The Grinnell black cancels are carbon black. So we need a new theory.

Every time I think I'm getting close to solving this mystery a new puzzle appears.

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Ken Lawrence

When will you or a memeber of your group post to board the results of the two stamps X-rayed by Dr. Hall. My interest is the second stamp, the ink cancel composition which remains in secret.

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

If Dr. Hall used x-ray technology on the genuine stamp then his results would have shown carbon black present. The process "sees" the elements present. I believe I will stick to my point that no carbon black was present.

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

David Shumaker

If the results of the study can't "see" carbon black present with analine ink then they are worthless. My guess is that if both were present they can be seen. We will have to read the report.

David, why would the forger paste down the copy he used on the card with forgeries along side? Does he not already have copies on the card? Was this card used for a second printing? I don't have a problem that the genuine stamps were used to make the forgeries, only that I now question how the card was used.

Scott Trepel

What did you mean when you said, "The genuine G80 stamp does not have a fake cancel" in your article? Do you believe there is a genuine cancel under the fake? I'm sorry but I don't follow what your last post implies when you use the G80 in your study.

November 05, 2006 **Richad Malmgren**

Two weeks ago Hall confirmed that authenticity of two "Missionary" stamps from the 1850s. Printed in Hawaii when the future state was still a monarchy, the stamps are among the rarest in the world.

But when Hall analyzed the cancellation marks on the two stamps, he made a startling discovery -- one of the marks was a forgery.

"Why would someone take a \$100,000 genuine stamp and deface it with a fake cancellation?" said stamp expert Ken Lawrence. "It just seems implausible, but everything is implausible when it comes to the Missionaries."

So-called because they were used by evangelists sending letters home to the States, Missionary stamps -- and in particular the 10 that were examined by Hall last month -- have an enduring fascination for philatelists.

The collection X-rayed by Hall comes from a group of stamps originally owned by Hannah Shattuck of New Hampshire, who corresponded with a childhood friend who had become a Protestant missionary in Hawaii in the mid-1800s.

Shattuck's son Charles found dozens of the stamps sometime around 1918 and sold them to George Grinnell, a collector living in Los Angeles. Not long after, Grinnell sold a few of the Missionaries to a New York dealer, who in turn sold them for \$75,000 to Alfred Caspary, a world-renowned collector and Missionary stamp expert.

Days later, Caspary came to doubt the stamps' authenticity and, before long, Grinnell was hauled into court. In 1922 a judge declared the stamps fake and Grinnell, who spent the rest of his life trying to prove they were real, was ordered to give a refund.

As recently as 2004, some of the "Grinnells," as they have come to be known, were again declared to be fake by the Royal Philatelic Society of London.

The 10 stamps examined by Hall came from a collection owned by Carol Arrigo, Grinnell's granddaughter, and were not part of the group deemed forgeries by the Royal Philatelic Society.

By analyzing the ink used to make the stamps and then comparing those results to X-ray analysis of confirmed genuine Missionaries, Hall concluded two of Arrigo's stamps were indeed real and eight were most likely fake.

The two authentic Missionaries both bore cancellations, but when Hall studied the black ink mark on one of them, he discovered a surprising bit of forgery.

"The ink should be carbon black, but it was aniline ink, first synthesized in the 1890s," Hall said. "So why would there be a late 1890s cancellation mark on an 1850s stamp?"

According to a 2002 stamp collector's guide used by Lawrence, a canceled Missionary is worth about \$17,500 and an uncanceled one \$22,000.

"It's very confusing," said Donald Sundman, president of Mystic Stamp Co. in New York, where the Arrigo Missionaries are stored. "I'm kind of stymied. I'm looking forward to more testing to understand how it can be."

As part of that process, Sundman has pulled from his company's inventory 10 European stamps from the same period as the Missionaries' to send to Hall for comparison of inks.

Despite the philatelic fog that continues to surround the Grinnell Missionaries, stamp expert Lawrence remains optimistic.

"We've made amazing discoveries, and each time we make a turn there's a new mystery," he said. "Nothing is disappointing. All I care about is the truth."

November 05, 2006 **D. Shu**

Article at:

<http://www.nj.com/news/ledger/jersey/index.ssf?base/news-5/1162705956122940.xml&coll=1>

November 05, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

The Sunday Ledger Post article is on the internet.

Its a little hard to find on their site, but I did manage to print it out. There was no mention of lamp black in the article.

November 05, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Robert R.

Did the article say whether or not lamp black was also present in the cancel with the aniline signature?

November 05, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Stephen T.,

Robert R's post only mentions the black cancel, and the article is not yet posted online.

Perhaps there is a lighter, genuine grid beneath this one, but was painted over in aniline to hide the fact that it WAS the model for the Grinnell grids. Since the cancel is not Grinnell cancel ink, we can rule out the forger attempting to put legs on the fish by linking the forgery with the genuine. Therefore, to have defaced a genuine stamp, he must have been... motivated, shall we say?. Plus, the aniline ink may only have darkened an existing cancel, introducing only a few modifications, leaving the cancel coverage essentially unchanged. That would not seriously affect the value until and unless the faking was caught. So, perhaps in the forger's mind he is not defacing it at all, just darkening the cancel a little to keep out of jail.

November 05, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

INKS

"The ink should be carbon black, but it was aniline ink, first synthesized in the 1890's."

There is an aniline-based black ink that uses Nigrosine, which was invented sometime in the 1860's and commercially available in the 1870's. It was useful in fountain pens.

I'm not sure if the Hall report specifically identifies the aniline component of the G80 grid ink because I have not seen the report.

However, from what I have read, it is unusual to have aniline present in black ink (it is found more often in colored inks). I think Nigrosine would be the component of an aniline black ink, but somewhat more knowledgeable than I about inks should comment.

Is it possible that the G80 grid was traced in a nigrosine-based ink in order to create an offset image on paper, from which the fake cancel could be made? In other words, are we sure there wasn't a genuine cancel on G80 that is now giving off an aniline trace?

If indeed the cancel on G80 is fake, then my original reaction -- that the forger applied his handiwork to a genuine Missionary -- was correct, and that G80 was not the model for the grid.

November 05, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I think it is obvious that the 100,000 dollar figure you referred to in the Ledger article was today's market price for a genuine Hawaii 13c Missionary stamp in superb unrepaid condition.

I have two straightforward questions regarding the cancellation in question:

I am unclear as to whether the cancellation is an outright fake cancellation or is a genuine Hawaii PO cancellation that was applied 30 years or later after the stamps were issued in 1851?

Would it be even possible for someone to use a genuine 1851 era cancellation device some thirty years or more later on this stamp?

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

David Shumaker

If we stick with the premise that the card of ten was not to be seen and it served as a model for the grid cancel and the stamps which surface in 1922, I don't see how it could have been applied later.

Aniline ink on any Missionary is death.

What were the results of the second cancel?

November 05, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Perhaps Ken meant \$100,000 in today's dollars. I've seen \$500 to \$1000 figures on this board for these stamps in the early years of the 20th Century. Median price for a home was less than \$5000 in 1927 (according to a b-day card I got for my dad).

November 05, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco** <nbstamp@sonic.net>

The timeline for when the Grinnell forgeries were made is narrowing. The "photographic process" that Roger Heath has described cannot have taken place early then 1889.

We now have an approximate 30 year window. I am doubtful that these forgeries were "created" in the early part of this window.

One question I would like answered is the value of the 5c Missionary in 1920. Forty-three Grinnells were sold to Klemann for \$65,000. Seems like \$100,000 figure is ridiculous.

November 05, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Here's another question - Why isn't defacing a genuine stamp worth a hundred G's with a big fat fake cancel not best described as the actions of a desperate man?

November 05, 2006 **David Shumaker**

So, someone painted legs on that fish. Most importantly, in 2000 Hall found the ink composition of the Grinnell cancells to be a mixture of carbon black and Prussian blue. That means G81 was not cancelled along with the Grinnells but at some other time and for some other reason - perhaps to hide something?

November 05, 2006 **Robert G. Rose** <rgrose@pitneyhardin.com>

In today's edition, Sunday, November 5, 2006, of The (Newark) Sunday Star-Ledger newspaper there is a second article that updates Professor Gene Hall's testing of the Grinnells at Rutgers with a startling finding. I quote in part: "The two authentic Missionaries both bore cancellations, but when Hall studied the black ink mark on one of them, he discovered a surprising bit of forgery. The ink should be carbon black, but it was aniline ink, first synthesized in the 1890's." In response to Hall's finding, Ken Lawrence is quoted "Why would someone take a \$100,000 genuine stamp and deface it with a fake cancellation."

November 05, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Lucky I live Hawaii.

I just received today my Linn's Stamp News dated October 15. While Judie and I were watching the Prairie Home Companion movie on DVD, I was also trying to sneak in a little reading. I see that Scott R. Trepel is scheduled to speak October 21 at the Smithsonian as the keynoter at the fifth annual Maynard Sundman lecture. I think I have missed the opportunity to attend.

More importantly, I am disappointed in reading that of the "...numerous works that are standard philatelic references..." and which have been authored by the esteemed Mr. Trepel, no mention was made of "Tiny Marks and Other Reasons Grinnells are Fake".

Linn's really has to get it together.

Roger Heath – you living on the Big Island and all will probably receive your issue in the next couple of weeks.

November 04, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Richard M -

There is one result from the discussions on this Board. We will certainly be able to identify any new Missionary finds that appear as to their being Grinnells, or not. These stamps are uniquely identifiable, and extensive physical tests would not be necessary to identify them as Grinnells. They will be either Type I or Type II, no matter which value.

Roger

November 04, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Incidentally, I would not pay \$20,000 for a plain old Grinnell counterfeit, although I do like the back of the 'envelope' with the multiple 2c Grinnells and one 5c Grinnell.

Of course, I remain curious to know whether or not the purchaser of the \$20,000 Grinnell from Stanley will be sharing with us the reason(s) he did such.

I also remain curious to know what the balance of the story is behind the 'fake' Grinnell that Twigg Smith and Ostheimer purchased many, many years ago; however, at this date such appears no more likely to determine than uncovering a contemporary letter linking the Southwest Museum gang to the manufacture of the Grinnells.

November 04, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I think that you could argue about these stamps around a round table of experts and pseudo-experts until you die of old age.

The examples you give are indeed shrouded with controversy, however in the end, unlike the Grinnell stamps, the One Cent Magenta, Treskilling Banco and 1 Cent Z Grill all have certificates that state they are genuine postage stamps.

Another factor to consider is that the One Cent Magenta and Treskilling Banco are as of today unique postage stamps, and the 1 Cent Z Grill may as well be unique, because as of today there are only two used copies, one of which is in the Miller Collection at the NYC Library.

However, in the case of the Grinnell Stamps, there are something like 78 counterfeit copies disclosed so far by the owners, but given the track record of Vince and Carol Arrigo, it is impossible to know how many Grinnell counterfeit stamps there actually are in existence?

So I would have to agree with you, in that, the value of the Grinnell Hawaii Missionary counterfeit stamps is in their story, and when you take that away they are in fact, 'just plain old counterfeits.'

November 04, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

I'm not at all certain what it is I stated so succinctly. I am not often accused of being succinct.

I would like the Card of 10 for what I consider as the most obvious of reasons. It has historical philatelic significance. The Card of 10 was not needed to show the Grinnells to be counterfeit. That had already been accomplished. The Card of 10 provided the key to how they were manufactured and, to boot, includes as part of the package the two Missionaries used as models.

Walter P is correct that 'just plain old counterfeits' have been elevated to celebrity status, starting with the Los Angeles trial (stamp collecting was much more popular in the 1920's) and picked up later by George Linn when he 'hyped' them in Linn's. Some philatelic writers today are still hyping the Grinnells. But they are still 'just plain old counterfeits'.

Unlike some, I enjoy collecting counterfeits. I especially like Jean de Sperati's Hawaii forgeries which I believe are a 'better' counterfeit than a Grinnell. If one is performing a comparison, then it is easy to learn the betraying signs in the Grinnells large central numeral that makes them detectable from a Missionary. I personally find it more difficult to detect a Sperati numeral, although I am told by some that it is simply my ignorance that makes my identifying a Sperati more difficult.

Assuming we are defining 'extraordinary' as either 'strange' or 'special', I would not use the phrase "...world's most extraordinary counterfeits." to describe the Grinnells. (I got the words strange and special from using Shift-F7 in Word. I really like using Shift F-7 due to my limited vocabulary.) What I would say instead is that the Grinnells are the most hyped counterfeit stamps of which I am aware.

A lot of us buy into hype. And with that, I think I'll try a glass of this Pinot Grigio that I recently read about and scored a 43.

November 04, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

Depends on your opinion of the One Cent Magenta, the Treskilling Banco, and the 1¢ Z grill. All three have been condemned by esteemed experts, though they have been certified by respected expert committees as genuine.

Like the Grinnells, the controversies surrounding those stamps have invested them with market value that other equally rare stamps cannot match. That's why I say that the value is in the story.

November 04, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Posted in wrong section. Meant for primary board. Sorry.
Bill

November 04, 2006 **Bill Longley** <bill@longleyauctions.com>

My next auction is online at www.longleyauctions.com.
Strong Canada, both stamps and covers as always but also includes nearly 200 worldwide lots including a large Germany collection broken down. There is a US #1 used from Canada, a Boer war cover signed by John McCrae (poet Flanders Fields), excellent Large Queen and Small Queens, two great collections of PEI and New Brunswick, and more.

If anyone would like a copy of the catalogue, you can email me above.

Bill

November 04, 2006 **Walter P**

Correction - that should be sold for US \$20,000 not over \$20,000.

November 04, 2006 **Walter P**

The Grinnell Missionary stamps are in fact 'just plain old counterfeits, which through the extensive efforts of some have been elevated to celebrity star 'status.'

The outstanding success of the extensive advertising campaign in Linns Stamp News, the printing of three Grinnell promotional booklets, and the two Scott Stamp Journal articles, have all contributed to the grand promotion of the idea, that the Grinnell Stamps may be Genuine?

The success of this venture, so far, is evidenced by a collector recently having paid over \$20,000 for a single copy of a Grinnell counterfeit Hawaii Missionary stamp.

So, are the Grinnell Stamps, just in fact, 'plain old counterfeits,' or are they something else?

I think the point being made was, 'a counterfeit stamp is a counterfeit stamp,' period, and no amount of advertising, or self serving shameless promotion of the Grinnell Stamps are going to change that?

As far as the card of ten goes, aside from the eight counterfeit Grinnell stamps mounted on the card, there are two very desirable genuine copies of the 13 cent Hawaii Missionary stamps mounted on the card, and for that reason alone, why would any serious Hawaii Missionary Stamp collector not want the card of ten for his or her collection?

I wonder what the record is the most ever paid for a single counterfeit stamp? Does anyone know?

November 04, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

Thank you. You have stated the opposing opinions succinctly. In my opinion, if the Grinnells are counterfeits, they are the world's most extraordinary counterfeits, which is why they have become part of our hobby's lore.

But do you honestly believe they are "just plain old counterfeits"? If you do, why do you covet the card of ten? Why have we all participated in creating this Internet resource. What other "plain old counterfeits" would stimulate a comparable intellectual effort?

November 04, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I think that your suggestion of a CD issued by the RPSL, which could be put in a sleeve, mounted on the inside back cover of the present RPSL book is an excellent idea.

I also agree with Steve W that such a CD would be premature at this time as we do not know for sure how this is all going to play out in the end.

I think that most people have come to the conclusion that the Grinnell Stamps are counterfeit and that the only thing left is to definitely agree on what method the forger used to print the stamps.

I would gladly pay for a CD that chronicles the Grinnell Stamp story, leaving off where the present RPSL book ends, and with of course, the required omissions and corrections from the first RPSL book.

Ken, it amazes me how you just keep coming up with such good ideas?

November 04, 2006 **Steve W**

Richard,

I agree that it is not time yet for the RPSL to issue a supplement because more work needs to be done.

However, the intent of a second edition of their report would not be to alter their fundamental opinion (and this is why they would not be inclined to do it), but rather to correct errors and omissions in a very useful Hawaiian Missionary reference book.

November 04, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

In response to the private e-mail query I just receive, "You can fool some of the people..." is intended to refer to the notable quotation I learned in Junior High School, namely "You can fool some of the people all of the time, all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time into believing that the Grinnells are something other than just plain old counterfeits."

November 04, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Steve W & Ken L

Even were they are inclined to do so, I suggest it is premature for the RPSL to issue a supplement.

Papers have been presented and are still being presented by posters showing that the Grinnells are counterfeits.

Nobody has even come close to showing that the RPSL's fundamental underlying conclusion (i.e., Grinnells are counterfeit) is incorrect, although there are some side issues that need correction. While I do not believe the Grinnells were printed directly from type as shown by recent research that is published on this Board, the argument of typeset versus photo-engraving, for example, would not change the underlying conclusion and make the Grinnells any less counterfeit. Neither would an analysis of the paper.

Purely as an aside, I sort of like the idea of a separate little publication handed out at next years StampShow that I can pilfer. Maybe it can be entitled "You can fool some of the people...". Were such to be the title, it could still let everyone pursue their own interests; after all, the people who are fooled are not us, but the other people on the other side of the issue.

Walter P.

I just got home from an American Cancer Fund raiser. I will check out the auction on the web.

November 03, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

As you are aware the 1851 Issue Hawaii Missionary Stamps are part of a select group of postage stamps known as 'the primitives.' This grouping of postage stamps are among the rarest and most valuable stamps in the world.

While looking at the David Feldman Auction web site this evening I noticed that the auction catalogue for their December sale of the Grand Prix International Collection of Classic Romania is now available for viewing.

Of particular interest are the first two issues of Romania, the 1858-59 Moldavia Bull issues, which are in some cases on par, in both value and rarity, with the 1851 Hawaii Missionary Issues.

Some items in this auction have not been on the market for decades and most have graced the collections of the greatest stamp collections ever formed, including the collections of Alfred Caspary and King Carl of Romania.

The collection has been extensively written up with additional pages of text providing a census of all recorded first and second Moldavia Bull Issues and pages listing the provenance of the stamps and short biography's of the collectors who owned the stamps over the years.

Anyone who takes the time to review this collection will not be disappointed, as you will be viewing and reading about some of the rarest classic postage stamps in the world. The Moldavia Bulls are even more crude than the Hawaii Missionary Stamps, but at the same, one can say that their appeal lies in their crude simplicity.

If you take a look at this sale, I would be very interested in hearing about what you think of the collection, and what if any, similarities you can find between the Hawaii Missionary Issue and the Moldavia Bull Issue. Aside, of course, from their both being world class rarities.

November 03, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

The RPSL could issue a CD with the material on Richard's reference page, plus the archived discussion, plus additional commentary by the Expert Committee. It could come with a brief printed booklet guide, and could include a pocket that would attach to the inside front or back of the book. I would offer my Scott articles, which add information about Missionaries and forgeries not included in the book.

November 03, 2006 **Steve W**

I realize that it is not the practice at the RPSL to correct errors and omissions in their opinions, except in the context of a re-consideration. Since that is not the case currently with the Grinnells, then their silence on some of the topics discussed on this Board is understandable.

However, it is also not the usual practice to produce a book about a particular opinion, and this is where a problem arises. The RPSL has, in my opinion, produced a great general reference on the Hawaiian Missionaries, that will be used by generations to come. In that context, I do think that there is an obligation in this case to address some of the issues around their sub-findings in the published report.

These include, notably, the nature of the printing process used for the Grinnells and the Missionaries, some of the disputed scientific findings, and an expanded consideration of some of the postal history aspects of the accepted Missionaries.

It would be great if the RPSL would consider updating the fine reference volume that they have produced.

November 03, 2006 **Steve W**

In the current issue of the London Philatelist, there are two articles with corrections to the RPSL report on the Grinnells. The more substantive one is by Professor Robin Clark, and corrects some errors in the scientific studies, but re-affirms the Committee's overall conclusion. The second is by Patrick Pearson, and corrects an illustration caption in the report.

November 03, 2006 **Richard M**

Last question posted to the wrong board.

November 03, 2006 **Richard Matta**

My last grading comment/question for awhile, I promise - just curious, in looking at photos of graded bi-color stamps, it appears that the only relevant factor in centering is the frame - as far as I can tell the centering of the vignette does not matter?

November 02, 2006 **prometheus**

Thanks Ken L
Wonder if my little one will be reading about them 55 years from now.

November 02, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Pro,

Yes, photos of the Grinnells that George Linn published in Linn's Weekly Stamp News. He offered a \$1,000 reward for anyone who could produce a genuine cover that had a Grinnell postmark, but no one ever reported such a discovery.

November 02, 2006 **prometheus**

Found this little article neat - December 1951- Mercury Stamp Journal

A campaign to rehabilitate forgeries of the famous "Hawaiian Missionaries" has been waged for months by a certain philatelic weekly. Yada Yada Yada In our opinion the cancellations on the items cannot be genuine and that alone makes it highly improbable that the items themselves are not forgeries.

He talks of looking at Photos in the article were these the Grinnells?

November 01, 2006 **Walter P**

Roger Heath-

I e-mailed both Bill and Richard oksy this morning. Bill sent me an e-mail this morning for Richard explaining what the problem may be and I sent it to Richard M.

Send me your e-mail address at wrp13@shaw.ca and I will copy the e-mail from Bill L to RM to you.

November 01, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Bill L -
Same response to my email for you . I googled and came up with this explanation of your problem:

"C) 554: service unavailable

If you get the error from an OIT machine "554: service unavailable", then that generally means the user is over his or her disk quota, and will not be allowed to receive email until he or she removes some files."

Looks like you need to read and clear out your email box.

Roger

November 01, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Bill Longley

I don't know if there is a problem at my end or your end.

I can e-mail from my house to my office. I just did so.

I cannot e-mail to you. I can not forward a message to you. I cannot even reply to the e-mail you sent me. They all get rejected and the Mail Delivery Subsystem gives me some gibberish about permanent fatal errors.

I am now off to work.

Richard

October 31, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

Having made my position perfectly clear, I see no purpose in continuing to flog a dead horse. Accordingly, I have placed myself in a self imposed 'just corking it' mode, where I will remain, until such time as I can come forward with some new comments that will not 'ruffle' any feathers or cause Richard to close the Board.

I can say that not knowing or understanding the photographic printing process places me at a disadvantage so hopefully Roger Heath's posts will provide me with the education I am sadly lacking at this time.

I do agree with you that the Grinnell counterfeit stamps were printed by some sort of photographic process.

After reviewing the method layed out by Roger in his post today, he appears to be on the right track, and I look forward to his upcoming 'details to follow' post.

October 31, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Bill Longley

I responded privately to a Roger Heath e-mail with a copy to you.

It got rejected.

I don't understand all of the pseudo-legal twaddle that the 'Mail Delivery Subsystem' provided me. I assume (never assume) that Scott T and Walter P are much more knowledgeable than I on the pseudo-legal twaddle subject. (Walter - that is not intended as any sort of encouragement.)

Assuming you want to buy into the side discussion, what is your new (?) e-mail?

October 31, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Who is knowledgeable enough to comment pro or con on Roger's posting and why?

Let's hear from the folks in the balcony who actually know what they are talking about and can add to the discussion.

October 31, 2006 **Roger Heath**

I'm awake. It's mid-morning here in Hawaii so first a couple of responses. Notes for first draft.

Richard M -
Photo stamp.

Make two enlargments same size,

Cut required areas out of first print and save,

Align and paste saved cutouts onto 2nd print,

Add cut out numeral from type sample book,(change size photographically if necessary)

Create correct value text from same type sample book or saved cutouts.

Touchout glue lines as well as possible with white "ink or paint",

Photograph paste-up on large negative (I used 4x5 inch negatives), Touch out unwanted white spots and "flaws" on negative, (some were apparently missed)

Place negative in enlarger,

Make print,

Repeat for Type II.
 Glue both prints side by side.
 Take to print shop where the paste-up of both photographs is turned over to the printer:
 "This photograph is then turned over to the photo-engraver who rephotos it, reducing it to the exact size of the genuine stamp, and the negative is then printed on a copper or zinc plate which has been previously coated with a sensitive emulsion..."

Details to come.

Roger

October 31, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard M.

"In fact, why not simply paint directly on an enlarged negative, you wouldn't need to rephotograph it?"

If the forger had all six varieties (two types of three denominations), then you would be right on. But remember, this forger only had the two Thirteen Cents, and needed an intermediate step from which to prepare the Two and Five.

"I'm a bit confused as to why a forger would blow up a photograph and then trace it?"

For whatever reason, the forger made a decision to move certain elements between "settings" (the wrong elements at that) and so decided to work from artistic tracings that could be partially redrawn.

The Grinnell filigree are obviously not exact photographic reproductions of the G80 and G81 filigree. This fact is one of the issues procluding some to accept photography in the process. But a photograph of a tracing would explain the obvious differences in detail between the genuine and the Grinnells, while creating the opportunity for the forger to render differences within the working models.

I think the intermediate model was a freehand tracing of the enlarged G80 and G81 that had several components left out. The working models likely began with photographs of the intermediate sketched models that then had denominations and numerals added and then underwent some additional touch-ups like those seen on the "ge" of the "postage" label and other details.

I want to see what Roger H. concludes about this. Roger, do you thing an intermediate model sans denomination was prepared first and duplicated as a base for each denomination?

October 31, 2006 **Walter P**

Steven Tedesco-

Okay, I can do that. I think Ken is now employed by the Arrigo's and if so that is his choice and his business.

I also think he is just playing everyone around, but again, that is his business.

Having said that, I will sit back and wait and see what happens. I do not want the Board shut down, as I think we are months, or even sooner, in getting some concrete answers in this case, as some Board members seem to be on the right track.

I find myself very interested in the phtographic hypothesis, but lack the understanding of how this process works. I hope Roger can expalin the process in a more simple way.

October 31, 2006 **Richard Matta**

In fact, why not simply paint directly on an enlarged negative, you wouldn't need to rephotograph it?

October 31, 2006 **Richard Matta**

I'm a bit confused as to why a forger would blow up a photograph and then trace it? Why not simply blow up the photograph and paint right over it to get a good contrast (and make any modification), then rephotograph it?

October 31, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Walter P.

Would you mind just corking it! The post was address to me and I personally find not one hint of offence. If you could stand back for a second and understand your opponent, you would realize how close we are by the mere fact that my post was even addressed and then with facts that are irrelevant.

I am interested in the forger's tools and wish the board to remain open.

October 30, 2006 **Roger Heath**

I have two days now to put my thoughts in order. I write how I would have proceeeded, then any of the technical aspects can be debated.

My original thought, once I realized each value had the same characteristics when thinking vertically (Type I - 2 cents, 5 cents 13 cents, then Type II - 2 cents, 5 cents, 13 cents) was the ease at which each of value was made. I'm certain one can see the same "flaws" on each value of each Type, the only difference being attributed to the photo exposure and the exposing of the plate. I'm convinced the "card" examples demonstrate the problems encountered during the process yet proves the forgers process and the stamp's provenance.

Roger

October 30, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Roger Heath

It occurs to me that I left out Steven T who is also interested.

October 30, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Roger Heath
David Shumaker

I believe photography was involved in the manufacturing of the Grinnells.

Roger, my suggestion is that you write up a draft of where you think you are going with this and e-mail it to whomever you choose (David Shumaker is a logical person and I would love to be involved from the viewpoint of a critiquer.)

Get a couple of e-mail exchanges under your belt before you turn the living room into a photo lab.

October 30, 2006 **D. Shu**

"modifications"

October 30, 2006 **David Shumaker** <shuzilla@hotmail.com>

Where Klemann's process falls short regarding the Grinnells is that the enlarged photo was not redrawn, it was traced. That is why the details are not exactly as on the genuine models. In fact, many are poorly executed. As stated earlier, I believe the translucent tracing paper obscured the fine details and edges of the enlarged photograph, which may have been a bit pale and fuzzy to start with, but the forger proceeded anyway (reference the resulting filigree mess when compared to the genuine in my analysis). However, tracing the photo gave the forger some flexibility he felt he needed to make certain modifications. Unfortunately, the modifications he felt should occur between settings, such as moving canes and growing "e" tails, were incorrect assumptions.

Personally, I feel a major tripping point in previous analyses of the Grinnells was the assumption of a Master Forger where none existed.

Roger Heath -

Please prepare your analysis. I would like to hold the continuation of my analysis of the printing until I see what you have come up with.

October 30, 2006 **David Shumaker**

"The opinion of the experts generally was that the stamps were counterfeit, made by a photo-engraving process... The stamp, genuine, of course, is placed before a camera and photographed, and if any attempt at retouching is contemplated, this photograph is much enlarged... This photo is then... entirely redrawn... in order to produce a clear sharp black replica of the original stamp. This photograph is then turned over to the photo-engraver who rephotos it, reducing it to the exact size of the genuine stamp, and the negative is then printed on a copper or zinc plate which has been previously coated with a sensitive emulsion... The... plate is then covered with ink, which attached itself only to the outlines of the stamp, the white background receiving no ink. The plate is then 'etched' or eaten out in a bath of nitric acid... or chloride of iron. This etching process is repeated a number of times until the entire white background has been eaten to a sufficient depth to produce a printing plate which is in relief just the same as type." - John Klemann from "Res Adjuicata" in 1924.

The above quote is how the Grinnell plates would have been made using a photo-engraving process current with the trial. As Scott Trepel noted, such a plate would bite differently from a typeset plate, because on a typeset plate individual type will show differences in elevation relative to the printing plane, and the proud type will bite deeper than surrounding type. Photo-engraving starts with an even surface and eats away at the non-printing areas, so all printing surfaces are on the same plane and will bite the paper the same depth. This aspect should be easy to verify.

October 30, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I guess a better way to say what I was thinking would be:

I know very little about the photographic process described in your post as would most of the other readers of this Board.

I asked Roger Heath if he could post an article in language we could all understand so that we could learn something of this photographic process and how it may relate to the printing of the Grinnell counterfeit stamps.

I was really looking forward to reading and studying Rogers 'hypothesis, in that format, and then you come along this morning and shoot Roger's 'photographic hypothesis' down before he even writes his article to post on this Board.

I agree that you can post anything you want, but in this instance, I find it disappointing that you did not extend the courtesy of letting Roger post his article, before you shot it down, albeit, you did concede his hypothesis was possible, though in your opinion, unlikely.

I would like the opportunity to make up my own mind on this and hope Roger will still post his article when he finds the time to do so.

October 30, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Ken, would it for once, be okay with you that someone can post their 'photographic hypothesis,' in an article format, without it being shot down, by yourself, before it was even posted?

I find your post disturbing in that, I really wanted to read Roger Heath's 'photographic hypothesis,' in a language and format, that people who do not profess to

have the knowledge you have on this subject, could understand, so that we could all make an informed decision.

I hope Roger will still see fit to proceed with his article, in spite of your negative post.

October 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Stephen T,

Techniques did not change much between the introduction of photoengraving and the end of manually stripped lithographic negatives. Roger's descriptions would be familiar to anyone in the trade from the turn to the end of the 20th century, except that neither Grinnells nor Missionaries were printed by lithography.

My previously posted critique of Roger's hypothesis of photographic reproduction and assembly consisted of two points:

First, that enlarging and retouching minute flyspeck detail to match a model is senseless if one is going to change the most prominent detail to diverge from the model.

Second, that high-gamma lithographic film during the time the Grinnells could have been forged was orthochromatic. Panchromatic lith film had not yet been invented; it is a product of color-separation process lithography. But orthochromatic film sees blue as white, not as black, so it would have been difficult to reproduce fine detail of G80 and G81 on such film.

I'm aware that one could have gone through a succession of stages to overcome that difficulty. One possibility was to photograph first on continuous-tone low-gamma ortho film through a yellow filter, print it on high-contrast paper, then re-shoot on lith film, with some loss of fine detail at each stage. But taking all that trouble is even less sensible if one changes the most prominent feature.

The other aspect that may be subject to doubt would be if internal elements move as the RPSL report stated. That analysis requires plating skills that I don't possess. But the evidence that the Grinnells were printed from relief type or plates is independent of whether the reliefs were fixed or movable.

October 30, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco** <nbstamp@sonic.net>

Roger Heath

I understand how busy you are but if have a moment could you please email me the following. I would like a list of all the equipment YOU used and then the film and chemicals. I know someone who will be able to take YOUR list and place it in a historical time frame, of let's say 1910. When you receive back this information from me, perhaps you may see the boundaries our little forger had to work with. What was possible and what wasn't. May turn out to be a dead end but at the very least we can put off the charade of how this process was not possible. Please don't feel rushed.

October 29, 2006 **Roger Heath**

OK!

I'll think if this is possible on the computer, and if not, I'll set up a desk and photograph the process the best I can replicate. This will take a while as I've started 45 hour work weeks commencing at 5am each morning. It was 87° in the check point today, which I can only describe as tiring. If you don't see something this week, I'll report the back where I stand.

Roger

October 29, 2006 **Walter P**

Roger H-

If you have the time, by condensing your thoughts to an article for this Board, it would really help people like myself, who lack the basic understanding of the thinking, in your 'photographic hypothesis.'

In this way, perhaps in the future, I can contribute some constructive thoughts on your 'photographic hypothesis,' and not be reduced to posting any 'pseudo-legal twaddle,' as noted by Scott Trepel, and risk having Richard shut down the Board, again?

Seriously, I for one would be very interested in reading your 'photographic hypothesis' in a simplified form, that myself, and others can easily understand.

October 29, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Roger H

Have you printed out or perhaps have kept 'copies' of the pro and con postings pertaining to your photographic hypothesis? If so, then could you e-mail or fax them to me? I can go back through the many board postings and print them out myself, but I'm just wondering if you are already set up to make it easier.

The point is that there are now multiple people (as many as two at the last count – namely Steve T and I) clamoring for you to organize your thoughts into a single resource.

Or perhaps better yet, can you simply rewrite your stuff in a single word document (and, for that matter, include one or more 'con' comments from any naysayer) and send me or someone else a copy? We can then critique it so that other people can read your final product with great reverence and admiration.

Actually, people like David Shumaker and Bill Longely are even better choices if they feel up to it.

You comment that "I'm not really sure what I could add other than to demonstrate cutting and pasting techniques I used and believe the forger used to create his forgeries" may very well be true, but some of us would look upon your 'mere' contribution as terrific reading material.

I actually read the entire transcript of the 1920's Los Angeles trial. As I recollect, it was a four glass Pinot Noir effort

Besides and like Steve T suggests, somebody will likely pick up on some part of what you write and in turn add even more to the Grinnell story.

And then Richard Frajola might once again decide to keep the Board open so that we have something to do with our time and keep us off the streets.

Roger – the fate of the Board is in your hands.

October 29, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Ken Lawrence has supplied one of the Scott's Monthly articles which I have uploaded [here](#) as a PDF file. Any punctuation mistakes and integration of figures mistakes are my fault.

October 29, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Roger Heath

Roger

I would like to encourage you to proceed with your analysis that demonstrates the cutting and pasting techniques used by our forger. When others see the clear steps that you will outline in this process, I believe something else might jump out and add even more damning evidence to this discussion.

I admire your fortitude in posting the "photographic hypothesis" so early in this debate.
Please find the time.

October 28, 2006 **John Forsyth**

I didn't answer all your question.

To some extent lack of commercial pigments in these times is self explanatory. Mercury, arsenic, etc are not nice chemicals to mankind.

Lead pigments have left in my generation (many of these were not too bad because they simply won't dissolve but they got thrown out with the others).

October 28, 2006 **John Forsyth**

Richard M

The blue pigment is still somewhat in use in our times.

Any "red" pigments known in 1850's would have been inorganic (mercury salts, iron salts, arsenic salts, lead salts etc.) They are not as readily available these days (maybe if one went through artist colors might have some luck). They would have been out of vogue but still around in 1910's. For example, cadmium red might have been chosen by a forger since it matches the shade of Vermillion, but cadmium red was not available in the 1850's whereas it would have been in the 1910's.

From observations I have read of the appearance of the cancels, I would suspect they did not match the pigment for the red cancels. This will show up dramatically on any spectro readings, while I suspect the blue pigment analysis will show different but similar. Perhaps the blue could be argued ink batch to ink batch consistency, while the red may be a death blow.

This is all off the top of my head from years in the industry. Maybe this stuff will inspire some research on my part to get some more definitive answers.

October 28, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

John Forsyth

Or are you 'merely' referring to the fact that the red ink color of the Grinnell cancels is slightly different than the red ink color of Missionary cancels?

October 28, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

John Forsyth

Dilbert must have been reading one of my postings.

With reference to your ink comments, could you elaborate for me your wondering "...if the red cancel ink didn't fail."?

I assume you are saying that by comparison it is easy to replicate today the blue ink with materials used during the early 1850's, but not the red ink.

I'm not an inkmaker and am basically ignorant of the technical ins and outs. Why is this true?

October 28, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Richard -

We'd better write only of stamps and leave bikes behind. I started riding here in Kona about 8 years ago though not with Ironman in my future. One Saturday morning, while all by myself, I was hit broadside by a car that didn't see me coming at an intersection (it had a stop sign). I remember lots of blue sky and a huddle of people looking down at me. No major injuries, but decided life is too short to combat cars while wearing shorts. I kept the bent crank and mounted it on a mahogany plaque as a reminder to not do anything foolhardy for the rest of my life. Postal history is a perfect solution! I think.

Roger

October 28, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Roger

I was going to run in the Ironman this year, but I decided not to, what with qualifying times and all.

Believe it or not back in 1982 (?) I was actually in training to do just that, but I got hit by a taxicab while riding my trusty 10-speed and that put an end to my Ironman competition. (Incidentally, I own Dick Evans' racing bike. I bought it after he was hit and killed many a year ago. Have not ridden it for who knows how long?)

October 28, 2006 **John Forsyth**

I didn't realize how crude the Grinnells were till I read David's piece and then re-examined the other articles.

As an inkmaker I am much interested in what the Rutgers guy comes up with. I could replicate the blue stamp ink pretty readily, but I wonder if the red cancel ink didn't fail.

October 28, 2006 **John Forsyth**

Dilbert finds the Grinnell board

[HERE](#)

October 28, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Richard -

I appreciate your confidence in my photographic hypothesis, but I could only contribute to how I think they were created, as opposed to creating another detailed analysis as written by David, Scott, and Bill.

It is interesting that the techniques I used at the hospital to create my medical prints and slides are now so outdated it could be difficult to bring together the equipment to replicate my old workroom. The process was in effect "grainless", whereas nearly all digital imagery results in pixels at larger magnifications. Here are a couple of my graphs from the 1970's. I think I tried to show them once before but my ISP was down for that week so no links worked.

[Graph 1](#) and

[Graph 2](#)

You can see that scanning these results in some lost lines. Keep in mind the originals were probably drawn on 14" x 17" vellum with Rapidograph and india ink. Going back into the these prints would be difficult for the exact same reason the forger had problems - the finest lines tend to disappear, and the thicker lines end more rounded. Pens can only be used down to a certain finess necessitating enlargement of the work surface. If you enlarge 3x, why not 5x? It will be easier to draw in lines. then the reduction back down to stamp size will keep everything in proportion. Keep in mind that when looking at these graphs on your computer screen, the dots cause loss of detail that in on the prints.

I'm not really sure what I could add other than to demonstrate cutting and pasteing techniques I used and believe the forger used to create his forgeries.

Roger

We're over the earthquake and this past week all 1700 Ironmen athletes and families were going home. Maybe next week I'll have time to consider something for this Board. Let's just say I'll be thinking about it.

October 27, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

David & Roger

If the two of you got together and actually wrote up Roger's ideas, then Roger could be part of the new pamphlet handout and go down in history with the rest of you.

October 27, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

David Shumaker

I just got home and don't have a lot of time because I have to type up a bunch of proposals in order to earn money to pay off auctioneers and dealers to whom I owe my soul; however, my congratulations that Mr. Beech thinks you are 'important'. (Sounds to me like confirmation that our British cousins have low standards when it comes to what is important.) In any event, I am sure that he also intended to include Scott T and Bill L. as well and why not Roger H?

If Bill L. would write up even some more of his stuff (I still like his '88' article because it was so simple that even I could understand it) and you would do Part 2, then the two of you in combination with Scott T could have your own little pamphlet just like the Mystic publications. It could be passed out at a big stamp show and I could hang around and pilfer multiple copies. I would even contribute \$12.27 to the publication costs (in which case I would not really be pilfering). I realize that Scott T has been published before, but this time he would be in the company of the best of the best.

I still suggest you get with Roger H and the two of you write up what I seem to recollect (is my memory correct?) his illuminating commentary regarding photography and the Grinnells. A while back I seem to recall him early on making photography inferences based upon his observations of the printed Grinnells. He took some shots from some, but his comments (O.K., they were a little more esoteric than the analysis of some others - after all, he was pretending to be an artistic photographer type of guy), appear to be correct. (It was so long ago I can't even remember what his comments even were, but they sounded good at the time.)

I have to go now to refill my wine glass and write proposals.

October 27, 2006 **prometheus**

Does this mean I have to find an extension card that reaches the TV. We have Not had one plugged in for Months.

October 27, 2006 **Walter P**

Mark Rodgers-

I thought I heard it was the Jerry Springer Show that was going to have a Hawaii Stamp segment tonight?

October 27, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

DAVID BEECH

I do not recall any comments from you on the article I wrote, describing the tiny flaws that indicate the Grinnells were printed from solid plates, not loose type, as the RPSL concluded in its report.

Based on your description of David S's work as "important", may we assume that the RPSL has changed its opinion about the printing method used to make the Grinnells? Do you now feel confident that the Grinnells were printed from a solid typographic plate, not loose type locked in a forme? In my article, I say that the RPSL's methodology was flawed. Do you agree?

I would say that any revision in the RPSL's opinion is also important and should become part of the permanent philatelic record. Otherwise, it will be overshadowed by the hardbound book that states, unequivocally, that the Grinnells were printed from loose type.

October 27, 2006 **Steve W**

It is interesting that Ken Zierer's "image 3" also contains an ad for a divorce lawyer...

One aspect of David's analysis which deserves highlighting is the comparison of the same filigrees from accepted Missionary numbers 1-3, Missionary number 4 and the Grinnells. Given the striking similarity between the filigrees on numbers 1-3 and #4, and the contrast with the filigrees on the Grinnells, it is unclear how any printing sequence favorable to the Grinnells can be established.

The degradation in the filigree on the Grinnells relative to #4 shows that if the Grinnells are genuine, then they must have been printed AFTER #4, or after March 1852. However, none of the Grinnell postmarks support that timing. This contradiction indicates that either the Grinnells, their postmarks, or both are forgeries.

October 27, 2006 **David Beech** <David.Beech@bl.uk>

Ken L

I will reply sometime next week when I have more time at my disposal.

David Shumaker's important article (and the second part) should be produced in print in a philatelic periodical of record, otherwise it will not survive for future generations!

October 27, 2006 **Mark Rogers**

I may be mistaken, but I'm pretty sure I heard a teaser last night that the show "Entertainment Tonight" was going to talk about "Hawaiian Stamps" tonight. I was in the other room - my wife was watching it.

October 27, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

David Shumaker

Excepting the usual suspect, it appears that there are those who actually think you contributed something. Just don't let it go to your head.

Where the heck is Part II?

As to concrete, most of Oahu came out O.K. But I do have a small job on the Big Island - epoxy injection of some cracked concrete in sludge tanks. I know, but somebody has to do it. Besides, I just pretend to be some sort of boss and direct somebody else who actually knows what they are doing to perform the real work.

Ken Lawrence

We drank the boxed wine the night before. After the big shake, I was going to keep the doors on the wine cooler closed to conserve the cold, but temptation overcame me. After all, what else were we suppose to do?

Roger Heath

I think you and David should be talking to one another. More than one of us (O.K., maybe just the three of us) believed in your photographic paste-up brainchild.

October 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Carl,

The questions you ask go directly to the steps taken to produce the plates. I wonder about some of the same things. My best guess is that a paste-up of twelve composites was made for each cliché: four borders, one each of the pairs O-1 and O-2 and of O-5 and O-6, one each in fours of C-4 - O-7 - O-8 - C-1 and of C-2 - O-3 - O-4 - C-3, the "Hawaiian Postage" label, the "Cents" label, the denomination and the central numeral.

A tracing was done of most of the enlarged G80 and G81 for each denomination but without the central numeral, the denomination, the "Cents" label and many of the cane features. The tracing was made up of several composites that move independently. The dots Scott Trepel found to be consistent would have been laid down at this step.

A photograph was taken to make the next model and some distortion occurred in the above elements. The central numeral and bottom label were added to the model and the canes that move were re-handled into place to present the illusion of independent type within multiple-filigree composites. Also, the bottom of the "g" and the hook of the "e" in "Postage" were touched up for the same reason - to create the illusion of change between "settings". Lastly, on the two vertical filigree composites where the forger needed the corner ornament to "move" in relation to the adjacent side filigree, further touch ups make their spacing seem to

vary even though the body of these filigree do not actually reposition themselves.

My findings are much further than what I have posted here, which is why I need to write the next part - sometime.

October 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

Applying your skepticism, there would be no such thing as a FAKE First Nesbitt, even if every suspect example came from the same trunk in LA. ;)

I have found an aspect of the Grinnells that is out of character with metal type. In fact, it does the impossible if explained within mid-19th-Century mechanics. I guess that makes them forgeries, unless there was some other way Whitney would have prepared a separate printing.

Were I to apply the same methodology to embossed envelopes, I would learn how the dies were made and how the envelopes were manufactured, then find some aspect of the item in question that would be impossible to have been a Nesbitt product. Perhaps the paper or ink would hold the key in such a case, not the actual impression.

We have different approaches to the Grinnells. You've demonstrated how unlikely they are genuine and how unlikely they are fakes. You find doubt in each direction that precludes a conclusion. I looked at both the possibility they are genuine and the possibility they are fakes. I logically eliminated the "genuine" possibility while finding everything I have learned about the Grinnells explained in the forgery hypothesis. I am pleased with that hypothesis because I know the forger is yanking my chain and I don't want to lend any more credit to his fabrications.

Show me two 19th-Century typeset impressions and demonstrate that the same pieces of type were used to print each. Then demonstrate that between them a portion of detail within a single piece of metal type moves about without accompanying drop-outs, nicks, dents and other signs of damage. Then, show me several such incidences among those two documents, and I'll consider that a challenge to my conclusion.

October 26, 2006 **Carl Roberts**

Here's another approach to interpreting your findings David, because I really do see what you are pointing out, that there is a lot of unusual repositioning of the "canes".

Suppose a forger is using photography and enlarged images/drawings to recreate the stamps, as you propose.

Okay, to maintain symmetry he would probably draw the main components of the ornaments first, to more easily judge the balance - much like you have done in your illustration where you have removed the "canes" for clarity, the same thing in reverse.

After drawing all the main components he might have photographed his partially completed work, much like we save work-in-progress on our computers. That way if he botched up the addition of the smaller details, he would have a backup image to work from.

So then maybe, when preparing the mockup for the next denomination, something actually did not work out well with the original artwork. So he used his backup photo, adding the missing details but not perfectly.

That would explain why many of the distinctive features - the stuff that looks like damage - repeats on each denomination. Otherwise, the damaged appearance you attribute to "artifacts and erosion from preparing the line block from photos, and printing anomalies" should go away or vary from one denomination to the next.

Not that I'm buying any of this for sure, but you have got me thinking, and Ken's remark about "understanding the secret" reinforced even more the curiosity about exactly how a forger might have gone about creating the Grinnells.

This all does kind of go full circle, back to when you first proposed that the Grinnells have a hand drawn look.

But then how does all this fit in with the theory that the Grinnells are printed from a plate with the mysterious constant dots in the normally empty field?

My head is starting to hurt. Did Elvis take that box of wine with him when he left the building?

-Carl

October 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

I was commenting on your analysis about damage to type and where and how you'd expect to see it that you posted below. You stated assumptions that are untrue for 1850s prints from set type.

Plating studies don't prove that the Grinnells are forgeries. They explain how they were probably printed if they are forgeries.

This is difficult to demonstrate on this board because a majority of readers are convinced, and therefore regard each new demonstration as additional proof. You and Bill and Scott may be right, but it ain't necessarily so. That's why I'm pursuing a different line of investigation, though all are worthy.

Every reasonable hypothesis needs to be tested, but it's difficult to imagine other possibilities when you're sure you have the answer. That's true for every one of us.

Applying your methodology, one could demonstrate that a lot of genuine First Nesbitt envelopes of 1853 to 1855 are forgeries. That's because certain anomalies are repeated from one denomination to the next, and from one listed die type to the next, while others are not, and differ in ways we expect different settings to appear. Unless you realize the secret of how the working dies were made, you'll be completely flummoxed by that demonstration, and the blowups of minute detail will provide all the proof you need.

October 26, 2006 **Jerry Shean**

David S. - Very good analysis. The enlarged photographs are essential to understanding and they make your point very well. Nice job!

October 26, 2006 **Ken Zierer (by RCF)**

Article images:

[image 1](#)

[image 2](#)

[image 3](#)

October 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Oops - I am comparing O-1 and O-2 from a Type I cliché to O-1 and O-2 in another Type I cliché.

October 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

I feel you have missed the point of my analysis. I am not comparing one filigree with another, except as background for the article. I am comparing O-1 and O-2 from a Type I cliché to O-1 and O-2 with another Type II cliché. All else is irrelevant.

Remove the canes and these filigree are identical over the four stamps in the illustration. Add the canes and the two Five Cent are different from the two Thirteen Cent by virtue of the re-positioning of the canes.

I was not deluded enough to think that by simply demonstrating that every piece of filigree is different, I could convince skeptics that cast metal type did not print the Grinnells. Proving that a single piece of metal type morphs between "settings" is, however, a TKO. Elvis has left the building.

October 26, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I was not going to post on the Grinnell Board anymore, however once again you have mis-quoted me, forcing me, yet once again, to set the record straight.

Unlike your assertion to the contrary in your last post, at no time have I ever suggested to you, or anyone else, that you, or anyone else, should submit their work to the RPSL for vetting and validation. That was 'not my question' put to you, and you know that very well, so why play these games?

As far as the question of whether or not you are now in the Arrigo's employment, considering your failure to respond to this question, or any of the other questions in my post, I leave the readers of this Board to draw their own conclusions?

Again, I am through with posting on this subject as your actions and lack of response speak for themselves.

In the end, Scott is right, nobody has to answer any questions they don't want to on this Board, so my point being made, I agree let's move on. The only thing I ask is for you to please stop mis-quoting me and play fair.

October 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

Welcome back. I hope you weren't reduced to drinking wine from a box during the recent outages.

October 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David Shumaker,

Cast type wasn't standardized until the 1870s. Before then, dimensions varied considerably and no common measure existed.

A skilled printer devoted a lot of time to shimming and filing the type and pulling proofs to get the pieces aligned. Even then, if you read newspapers from the 1850s you'll see that words are printed with letters missing though obviously set, others with letters cracked and cockeyed.

I'm not challenging your observations, which are interesting. But before you become enamored of your deductions you should examine 1850s prints to see how similar features fare.

If you compare ornamentation on the Missionaries with the very same slugs printed in the founders' sample books, you'll see that the differences are similar to those you observe between Missionaries and Grinnells. That's part of the reason I haven't abandoned the stereo explanation despite its implausibility in other respects.

October 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Hello, Richard M!

I suspect that you have been called to examine quite a bit of damaged concrete after last week's quake?

October 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

I would like to continue to exchange opinions and information, and to avoid divorce proceedings.

Walter's impatience is unfortunate, but there's a lot of creative study going on here and reported in due course, most recently David Shumaker's, yet no one has

suggested that he or other scholars who share similar opinions are in someone's pay, or has demanded that they submit their work to RPSL for vetting and validation. So let's pass over those diversions and back to fruitful inquiry.

Here are some points to consider:

The RPSL has not published some of the scientific data and reports on which it relied, so it is not possible for independent studies to replicate them. That is the underlying reason for my frustration in some recent posts on this board, and in my reply to Steve Walske.

The Beech et al. report submitted to the Expert Committee in 2001 may be similar to the Chaplin-Clark-Beech report of 2002 published in the Journal of Raman Spectroscopy, which is not included in Appendix Two the RPSL book. Perhaps the former was a draft of the latter. I'd like that point to be clarified. If it is different, it should be made available to us all, as should the Tracey Chaplin report submitted privately to the Expert Committee in 2004, and the two reports (2005 and 2006) by Peter A. Bower.

Perhaps David Beech could arrange for those reports to be linked on the Grinnell Reference Page.

David wrote in reply to my earlier questions: "Professor Hall's Paper, which I not sure that I have seen, does not reflect my views. Blue paper brightens were commonly added to paper in the nineteenth century, it follows that it is not reasonable to suggest that '...THMS [Tapling] and four of the GHMS [Grinnells] analyzed were printed from the same ream of Pelure paper...' thus to suggest that Grinnell and Tapling stamps '...came from a single manufacturing source' is a statement without foundation as no evidence exists to support this."

The report I quoted on this board is by Dr. Gene Hall, Dr. Tracey Chaplin, and Dr. Greg Smith, titled "The Examination and Comparison of Chemical Components of Hawaiian Missionary Stamps of 1851-53 at the British Library July 3, 2001." It is listed in Appendix Two of the RPSL book under scientific references.

Dr. Robin Clark the scientist named by David as his partner in examining British Library collections with Raman spectroscopy was present only briefly when the July 2001 tests were performed in London.

The RPSL book reproduced spectra and photographs from those tests, and summarized conclusions that are at odds with the Hall-Chaplin-Smith report. I'm told that Dr. Clark has criticized some of the Expert Committee's statements about the science. I assume those are the points that David has said will be clarified in The London Philatelist.

Is there a possibility that David could help expedite access to the London information? I'd surely appreciate it.

October 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Nick K., John F., Walter P., Roger H. - Thanks!

October 26, 2006 **David Shumaker** <shuzilla@hotmail.com>

Correction to my article: The filigree O-1 and O-2 are from Type I designs, not Type II as noted.

Carl R. - One cannot use the word "damage" without the assumption that metal type was used to print the stamps. I worked with that assumption until I found movement that cannot be explained away as being damaged type. There are limitations to how much one element can move from suffering a blow without moving adjacent elements.

That being said, what you perceive to be damage is a combination of poor artwork, artifacts and erosion from preparing the line block from photos, and printing anomalies.

Cleaning metal will not cause this movement to occur, no matter how soft the metal, though it could lodge lint into tight areas.

Note that all the canes move in Figure 10, not just those I highlighted. They also change with the Two Cents stamp. Therefore, both filigree O-1 and O-2 would have to be "damaged" between all three settings. Yet changing out denominations only required the removal of the bottom and a side frame, the bottom label, and the central numeral. O-1 and O-2 stayed in the forme, so how did they get "damaged"? I think they were the most protected filigree in the forme.

"Normal" damage to soft metal would occur on the edges. "Normal" wear would occur across the whole surface. These canes are moving around in the CENTER of the filigree pieces. To challenge my conclusions, I need an explanation as to what force could have been imparted to the center of a piece of metal type during the course of business that would have made the whole cane feature move while maintaining their curved shape and preserving their ability to print clearly.

The forger didn't preserve the freakish O-1, he drew it that way as a composite with O-2. That's why even though they differ in size and are both asymmetrical they manage to meet in the middle (re-arrange to an O-2 left O-1 right pair and see what I mean). He added new sets of canes to many filigree ornaments, not just these two, to create the illusion of independent type movement between settings. He also prepared "midget" O-1 and O-2 for the Type II stamps. That makes three different sizes of filigree, and counting. The forger knew things had to look different, but he didn't know exactly how or why so he guessed. He exercised poor judgement.

I can't decide if 1) the canes were erased and redrawn directly on the paste-up model or 2) a photo was made of a model containing tracings of the common elements only, then a second model was prepared adding the canes, bottom label and central numeral. I'm leaning towards #2 because of the difference in clarity of some of the elements and the retouching of the "e's" of the "Postage" labels.

October 26, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Hi folks!

By pure accident I just discovered that the Little Boy's Board is back in business, although Scott would like it to go away due to pseudo-legal twaddle. (pseudo-legal twaddle?)

For those who have not yet done so (and it appears that some have indeed done so), take a look at David Shumaker's article on the Grinnell Reference Page. Interesting!

October 26, 2006 **Walter P**

Scott Trepel-

Fine, Scott, I just won't post anymore. That will make Ken Lawrence and his supporters happy.

I know that you are nutral and I am only trying to get a few answers to some very basic questions from Ken. However, as usual, he is just either playing games or is in the employment of the Arrigo's.

In case you have not noticed, its okay for Ken to not answer questions on this Board or to give run around the issue answers. Why is that?

I guess I resorted to asking the questions in a more formal way, because I was frustrated at Ken Lawrence never really answering a question, except with another question?

I think I will just sit back and read the posts and not participate, so much for a free board. I thought my questions to Ken were fair questions and did not infringe on the parameters, he himself set on this Board. I guess I was wrong?

October 26, 2006 **Carl Roberts**

David S, thanks for posting your article.

The particular design elements you've chosen to discuss, O1 and O2, are particularly interesting, due in part to the unusual disproportionate sizes of the components.

As an aside, the tilted top of those ornaments and the placement in relation to the word "Postage" creates a tell-tale that makes it very easy to spot a Type II Grinnell as opposed to a known genuine Missionary. On the Type II Grinnell - of any denomination - the space between the letter "S" in Postage and the ornaments is about equal to the space between the letter "g" and the ornaments.

On a Genuine Type II the "s" is distant from the ornaments and the "g" almost touches. When the comparison is made, it is really very odd that nobody spotted the genuine Type II on the card of ten. But then that's hindsight!

Anyway, David I'm fascinated by the movement of the "cane" elements, but after looking more closely at the images, I wonder why you ruled out damage as the cause, because the scans do show obvious damage, some of it in critical areas.

For example, in your Figure 5 and other images it looks like a piece of the curved line of O1 next to the cane is not just missing, it is displaced and pushed up against the cane portion of the design.

If the changes occur between printings of different denominations, doesn't that suggest that some damage occurred during cleaning or typesetting?

And how could that line element be pushed up against the cane without moving it? They're touching.

And considering that the round ball portions of the design would be structurally stronger than a thin line, and therefore more resistant to being displaced, it just seems logical that nothing more sinister than normal damage, perhaps during cleaning, was the cause.

That, and the idea that a forger would preserve that freakish oversized O1 ornament and just redraw the insignificant cane portion of the design... I just don't see his purpose, why not cut and paste or change the entire ornament?

Oh, and thanks **Richard**, nice to see the board up again, even if it may be for only a short time.

-Carl

October 26, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

This is not a courtroom. It's a forum for exchanging opinions and information.

The tone of the last posts is what I would expect to hear at divorce settlement negotiations between Heather Mills' and Paul McCartney's attorneys.

Whatever transpired at Rutgers is their business, and they'll tell us what they want, when they want, if they want...and that's their privilege.

If I were Richard, I'd close down this board again. It didn't last a day before descending into pseudo-legal twaddle.

October 26, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I am going to revise the first paragraph of my last post to you to avoid the possibility of any confusion, or misinterpretation of my question.

Revised to read:

I don't see any posts from anyone, either yesterday or today, requesting you release the results of any test performed on the Grinnell stamps submitted for testing at Rutgers, so I am at a loss to understand what you are referring to in your post, in this regard?

Further to that, I don't see any posts from anyone asking you what tests are being performed on the Grinnell stamps submitted for testing at Rutgers?

Accordingly, having respected the wishes in your post, the questions I posed to you in my last post fall well outside of the parameters set by you this morning.

I look forward to hearing your answers to my questions that fall outside of your posted parameters.

October 26, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I'll try again.

I don't see any posts requesting any information on the results of any testing of the Grinnell stamps and the card of ten, reported in your posts yesterday, and today, so I am at a loss to know exactly what you are referring to in your posts?

So, with that in mind, I will ask my questions once again, and add a few:

How many Grinnell stamps are being tested?

How many of the Grinnell stamps presently mounted on the card of ten are being tested?

How many, if any, of the Grinnell stamps mounted on the card of ten are being removed from the card to be tested?

In order to lead credibility to the testing. What RPSL representative has been present at the testing of the aforementioned Grinnell stamps?

If a RPSL representative has attended the testing. Who is the representative?

If a RPSL representative has not attended the testing. Why has an invitation not been extended to the RPSL?

I'm somewhat confused, your not a scientist, so what exactly is your role and purpose in attending the tests of the Grinnell stamps submitted for testing?

Are you now Vince and Carol Arrigo's official Grinnell stamp testing spokesman?

Who, if anyone, is paying you financial compensation or otherwise to attend the testing of the Grinnell stamps?

Are Vince and Carol Arrigo paying your out of pocket expenses to attend the aforementioned testing of the Grinnell stamps?

If, in fact, as you have always maintained, you are an impartial philatelic researcher, interested only in solving and writing about the Grinnell stamp mystery. Than in order to maintain your credibility and impartiality, would you not agree with me that the questions above deserve straight forward answers and not your usual dance around the campfire?

October 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

The article in the Star-Ledger does not give the impression that all the Grinnells are genuine. The caption beneath the photograph of the card of ten states: "In the middle of his work, with four stamps examined, Rutgers chemistry professor Gene Hall finds the ones at the bottom of the center and right columns are genuine and the bottom two in the left column are not."

October 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

I'll try again. We are not going to discuss the scientific tests until they are completed and we have published the results.

On a separate subject, I carefully studied G80 again under magnification. There is no crease in the paper. The spur on the S is an artifact of the type, not an anomaly of the print.

I think there's confusion here about stereotype molds. They were made of wet spongy pliable cardboard, which caused impressions to degrade before and during the time that molten metal was poured into them.

Electrotype platemaking was a radical advance not only because electros lasted many times longer than stereotypes, but also because their images were true to the original settings.

October 26, 2006 **Nick Kirke** <agenturakirke@seznam.czChip G.>

David Shumaker,

David, may I add my voice to the congratulatory messages you have already received. You make your points clearly and concisely and the illustrations are fantastic!

The debate can now move on - ie the supporters of the Grinnells now have both your conclusions and Scott Trepel's which they now need to rebuff. They will have to provide equally compelling evidence. If they can this debate is far from over. If they can't they should start reaching for the towel...

Nick

October 26, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

Congratulations on a job well done. A most informative piece, well written, and easy to understand.

October 26, 2006 **John Forsyth**

Excellent piece, David S. !!

October 25, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I can understand and agree with you that it serves no purpose to release test results piecemeal and that the test results should be released all together after the tests are completed and conclusions formulated.

What I do not understand is why you just can't answer a very simple question, absent going around in circles, ending up, saying nothing, which is, once again:

Exactly, which Grinnell stamps, and how many, were taken in for testing?

Were the stamps on the card of ten included in this lot of stamps taken in for testing?

Is this some kind of secret or can you share this information with us?

Why was a representative from the RPSL not included in this investigation or was an invitation even extended to the RPSL to attend?

October 25, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Wilson Hulme and Don Sundman took a lot of stamps to Rutgers to test, which is part of an extensive program of tests that will be reported in due course. I will not report the tests or the results piecemeal.

The only stamps that the reporters cared much about were the ten stamps on the card, which were previously reported in the New York Times with observations by Don Sundman, Scott Trepel, and me, and stamps that Wilson Hulme brought from the National Postal Museum collection.

October 25, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

We did not go to Rutgers to tell reporters anything. Feel free to tell any reporter whatever you wish (even in the passive voice), but don't expect me to hand out someone else's propaganda. They had a plentiful supply of that before we arrived, and the RPSL book was there for all to study. None of my extensive writing on Grinnells and Missionaries was on hand, nor was Mystic's, nor Dick Celler's, nor the owners'.

Over the course of two distracting hours while reporters interfered with what we came for, we answered their questions cordially, corrected misconceptions to the extent they were expressed, and explained that we are not willing to speculate about what we may eventually discover.

The purpose of our study is to substitute proven scientific facts for speculation. It would be counterproductive to encourage such speculation.

Anyone who wishes can call a news conference and tell reporters whatever he or she chooses. Talk radio and weblogs are alternatives where people gather to cuss the press.

October 25, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Can you indulge me for a moment. Can you confirm that the 10 stamps taken in for testing are the same 10 stamps that are presently mounted on the card of ten, and that no Grinnell stamps that were originally submitted to the RPSL for an opinion are being examined?

If this is so, have any of the stamps mounted on the card of ten been removed from the card, or will be removed from the card of ten, for scientific examination?

Or, on the alternative, exactly which, and how many, Grinnell stamps, are presently being examined?

October 25, 2006 **George A**

I guess it was too much to suggest to a reporter a single sentence summary such as: "It has been suggested that the two genuine stamps owned by Grinnell, that only recently came to light and were not evaluated by the RPSL, were used as patterns to make other stamps that most consider to be forgeries."

October 25, 2006 **Roger Heath**

David S -

Thanks for putting into words what I was unable to do. I understand the necessity for a scholarly presentation, but I'm not experienced in writing at your level. I certainly saw everything you have written about and agree there are many more inconsistencies in the details of the Grinnells. I don't think there will or can be a scientific rebuttal to your analysis, even artists can understand logic when presented so clearly.

I feel I took a lot of heat for promoting photographic/paste-up possibilities during the 1910's, and now feel a lot better that I didn't cave-in to the "couldn't be done" pressure.

Roger

October 25, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Those of us who are doing research on Grinnell and Missionary stamps are not going to give our partial findings and unverified information to newspaper and television reporters. Nor is it our intention to have non-collectors making pronouncements as philatelic experts.

Wilson Hulme, Dick Celler, Don Sundman, and I traveled to Dr. Gene Hall's laboratory at Rutgers University yesterday to obtain forensic information on a lot of stamps. To our surprise and dismay, the Rutgers public relations office had invited reporters and photographers from newspapers and television stations to attend also, making our work difficult. We indulged their presence for more than two hours, answered their general questions, and politely declined their requests for specific test results.

All of the reporters were aware that the RPSL has declared the Grinnells to be counterfeit, and that a controversy continues to swirl with experts challenging many of the RPSL's conclusions from many perspectives.

As skilled practioners of Google journalism, each reporter had come armed with printouts of stale reports on the Grinnells that can be found at the Post Office in Paradise and other websites. You can tell from the Star-Ledger report that out-of-date Internet facts are friendlier than our attempts to correct and explain them.

Despite the ground rule that our test results will not be reported piecemeal in advance of careful evaluation and scholarly publication, the reporters were most interested in the information that had lured them to the lab: that two of the stamps on the card of ten are genuine. So they pressed Dr. Hall repeatedly for confirmation, and I think eventually he did agree that the G80 and G81 stamps matched the Smithsonian reference stamps that Wilson had brought.

As one who has dealt with daily news media for 35 years, I'd say this story is fairly typical of the way complex information is transmitted to readers, with a

normal proportion of accuracy and misunderstanding. Don't hastily blame the reporter for mistakes; they may have been provided by her editor.

Newspapers live for controversy and die by complacency, so I'm confident a feisty, opinionated letter that condemns the Grinnells will be welcomed enthusiastically in the editorial room.

October 25, 2006 **prometheus**

Here is the [Link-Star](#) if anyone wants to send a differing opinion
just look at the list of offices available to contact on this page even has a 800 number

October 25, 2006 **ken zierer** <kenzierer@yahoo.com>

With regard to the star ledger article, it is even worse than you could believe as this article was the lead story on the FRONT PAGE of the newspaper today! A large photo shows ken lawrence and don sundman observing the professor as he works over a computer. This article is so misleading that someone needs to write a rebuttal to the editor.

October 25, 2006 **David Benson**

Bill, it all depends on who gave the info to the reporter, I doubt it was the scientist,

David B.

October 25, 2006 **Bill Cummings** <wcummings@wol.rr.com>

Very strange. Why publish the article after two stamps are examined and the rest are going to be checked "that night?" Wouldn't it be a better article the next day (week?) after all ten stamps had been examined?

October 25, 2006 **David Shumaker** <shuzilla@hotmail.com>

Prometheus,

Thank you for the encouraging words.

October 25, 2006 **Nick Kirke** <agenturakirke@seznam.cz>

Delighted this forum has reopened. I'm not even so interested in the debate but my God I'd defend anyone's right to say just what they like.

Ken Lawrence - get back here and strut your stuff. You became the edge that got everybody stimulated. Without you I fear the discussion will wither.

One of your admirers,

Nick

October 25, 2006 **prometheus**

David Shumaker Excellent reading, concise and understandable even to a novice like me. Thanks for the effort.

October 25, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

David Shumaker has today provided a new article on the Grinnell's [here](#)

October 25, 2006 **Larry Bustillo**

Second page, second sentence from bottom. How True, How True

October 25, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

In the middle of sale day, I had to read the linked article on Grinnells.

After reading the article, one would believe all Grinnells are real, not just the two authenticated by the Rutgers scientist, which are, in fact, genuine Missionaries on the Card of 10.

If this inaccurate and misleading report represents American journalism in general, then I need to stop reading newspapers for information.

October 25, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Link to a [newspaper article](#) supplied by **Barry Elkins**. Presumably the two "genuine" are the models, not the Grinnell forgeries.

October 15, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I have decided to put this board into hibernation for an indeterminate amount of time. I will continue to add substantive document files to the reference page as they are offered.

Readers are directed to the reference index page linked above for articles and images relating to the Grinnells. It is hoped that more definitive articles can be added and such are hereby solicited.

10/16/06 David Beech [comments](#) regarding the "Examination by Raman Microscopy of Tapling and Grinnell stamps"

October 15, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,
Sorry, but I didn't take Jerry's post that way. Posts like his are extremely detrimental to any kind of open dialog. I'm sure that many fine philatelists have taken offense at his characterization of small-mindedness, and will now be less likely to add to the discussion.

As I remember from 11th grade chemistry, any pursuit of "truth" starts with a hypothesis (i.e. the Grinnells are forgeries), and looks to experimentally confirm that hypothesis. If contradictory data is received experimentally, then the hypothesis is modified or dropped. I believe that is the process being followed by all participants on this Board. Some just start from different hypotheses, and do not need to be denigrated for their particular starting point.

October 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Re: your last post to me regarding the RPSL decision.

I agree to a point, however the point in my original post was that there were problems with the RPSL report that I was not comfortable with, but the release of the card of ten by the Arrigo's, and its possible implications and impact on the RPSL decision, does warrant a re-evaluation of the RPSL decision and narrative report.

I also agree that this case like the Vinland Map case, may be definitively proven one way or another, through the introduction of modern scientific testing of the Grinnell stamps.

Needless to say, such testing would have to be performed with the RPSL present to have any validity.

October 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Re: Your last post to Steve W:

For once, I agree with your post. Once again, you have proven to be, the master of the pen.

However, I caution you to not let my post go to your head.

October 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

The deficiencies in the RPSL book that are the subject of commentary and frustration here did not depend on the card of ten. It's true that studies by Scott, Bill, and David were enabled by the card of ten, but none of them depend on evaluation of the scientific evidence, and all of them dispute the RPSL's evidence that the Grinnells were printed from loose type.

October 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

I think the actual distinction that Jerry was trying to make is between those whose intellect, critical thinking, and curiosity are directed toward confirming their deeply held conviction, and those of us who want to see what's under every rock. Personally I think both are needed. Skeptics are necessary because no matter how open a person's mind may be, he or she rarely questions his or her own beliefs. People with conviction compel the skeptic to abandon lines of inquiry that are frivolous or fruitless.

During most of the time this separate chat board has functioned, it has attracted more comments and a greater amount of original thinking than the main Frajola board, as robust as its discussions are. That's because, despite some participants' belief that they have the answer, there are still challenges to be met and new lines of inquiry to be explored.

October 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Steve W-

Well stated indeed. I for one would be willing to change my opinion that the Grinnell stamps are counterfeit, if someone on this planet or elsewhere, can prove to me that the Grinnell stamps are genuine Hawaii Missionary postage stamps.

If the above is an example of my being, close minded intellectually deficient and not a straight thinker than so be it.

October 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I agree with your last post, in as much as, the RPSL Decision and Narrative Report is compromised by the Arrigo's releasing the card of ten to the public and last but not least the discovery of G80 and G81 genuine Missionary stamps mounted on the card of ten.

I agree that this whole mess, including the card of ten, and any other Grinnell stamps the Arrigo's are most likely holding back, should be sent to the RPSL for a

comprehensive review.

I personally hold the view that this will change nothing, as far as the Grinnell stamps go, they will still be counterfeit stamps, however the value in this exercise will be that the pro-Grinnell camp will be set straight, and deprived of their principal argument that the RPSL decision was unfair and was founded on mis-information.

Having said this, I doubt very much if the Arrigo's would agree to this, as even they, they must now realize that, "the gig is up."

October 15, 2006 **Steve W**

Who are these terrible people who are not "continuing to pursue this with an open mind, using intellect, critical thinking, and curiosity to truly analyze the facts"?

If I happen to believe that the Grinnells are forgeries, does that make me one of "those people"?

What brings people to make statements like these?

October 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Jerry Shean-

There is a saying that, "Americans always cheer for the underdog,"

Applying this logic, I would hazard a guess that there is still hope for George Grinnell and his champion Ken Lawrence?

However as persuasive as your post is, I am still going to stay with my previously stated position on this Board, which once again is:

The Grinnell stamps are counterfeit, and George Grinnell obtained G80 and G81 from Shattuck, and used these two stamps, in concert with unknown co-conspirators, as a model to print the Grinnell stamps.

As far as hearsay evidence goes, it is in fact admissible in court, under hearsay rule exceptions, adapted by the Supreme Court of Canada. Before hearsay evidence can be excepted, a Voir Dire [trial within a trial] is conducted, in camera [without the jury present], where the presiding judge decides whether the hearsay rule exception applies.

In framing this post, I first reviewed my copy of, The Law of Evidence in Canada, Butterworths, by John Sopinka, Sidney N. Lederman and Alan W. Bryant.

Although Grinnell's trial was conducted in California, the principles of American Law are founded on British Common Law. I do not own a copy of a book on The Law of Evidence in the United States, as I reside in Canada. However, in both countries, the hearsay rule and hearsay exception rules, are not far apart from each other, because they were founded on the same principles and have the same built in protections to ensure that the defendant has a fair trial.

I will say that there are very good reasons why hearsay evidence is generally not allowed to be received as evidence in both countries, hence the hearsay exception rule.

October 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

George A,

Their minds are so open that the only thing they agree on is that the Grinnells are forgeries, and that the RPSL book is good because it says so, even though they disagree with most of the RPSL's specific findings. In ordinary intellectual discourse those are not hallmarks of open minds. Or rather, the scholarly view of an open mind means something quite different.

October 15, 2006 **George A**

Jerry - Are you joking? The people with an open mind figured out ages ago that the Grinnells are forgeries. Ken likes to play with the "tale" rather than the actual "stamps" so that there is some semblance of a debate still going on. I have yet to see his presentation that the Grinnells are anything other than forgeries or anything to refute ANYBODY who has opined that they are forgeries.

October 15, 2006 **Jerry Shean**

I was disappointed to see the statement by one poster that "any hope to show the Grinnells genuine has become a lost cause" or that the hill is "insurmountable". I came to this board as a neutral party with no knowledge of Hawaiian stamps or printing methods, but I have found myself cheering not necessarily for George Grinnell, but for Ken Lawrence, who appears to be the only contributor who is continuing to pursue this with an open mind, using intellect, critical thinking, and curiosity to truly analyze the facts. This is not to slight the research and analysis of Bill Longley and Scott Trepel, which is excellent, but I have the sense that Ken Lawrence is not pursuing facts to support his predetermined position. He is seeking the truth. I say to him, Bravo! Continue the pursuit for the most reasonable conclusion, wherever it may lead. For those that are intellectually curious, it is the pursuit of the truth, not the final answer that guides them and the concept of a "lost cause" has no meaning.

Another poster has suggested little weight be given to the "hearsay evidence" being offered by some other posters. I would suggest to that poster that he realize that in federal court and most state courts, evidence of past wrongful conduct is not admissible to prove the actor acted in conformity with that in the present case. The standard to convict George Grinnell, as that seems to be a popular goal, is more sophisticated than, "I don't trust the guy, he had some suspicious actions in the past, so he probably did it." May God help the defendant in whose trial you sit as a juror.

October 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

Repeating for emphasis: When I cited Klemann's letter originally, I quoted it in full. Richard Malmgren later excerpted it. I then added other excerpts that he omitted. Anyone who wishes to read the entire letter may either scroll back to my original post, or request a photo copy from APRL, or both.

To answer your question directly, No, I do not agree. I don't need to quote the entire Origin of Species text when I want to cite a passage from Darwin to support a point. It is your business to read the book if you suspect that my chosen excerpt is insufficient.

If I'm required to copy lengthy texts for your edification, I'll quit posting altogether. That's a discussion we had once before. If Richard Malmgren wants to select an excerpt, that's his privilege also. I merely use that example to illustrate your elastic standards.

Grinnell did not fabricate a story for Klemann. There were several witnesses to every conversation Grinnell had with Klemann: S.L. Wood and Bertram Poole, both of whom were in Klemann's employ, and the banker who held Grinnell's stamps in escrow until Klemann brought his final payment. None of the witnesses disputed Grinnell's account of the discussions and terms. That's why Klemann had such a difficult legal hurdle.

No aspect has been ignored. You may choose to disbelieve Patrick Culhane's archival research on the provenance of the Grinnells, and you may be right, but it is simply not correct to assert that there is no provenance. It is the same provenance as many great philatelic finds.

You should invert the question and ask yourself: If Grinnell's story is untrue, how did he stumble upon a pretext that was long afterward verifiable by archival research in Honolulu and in the Houghton Library collection of Hawaiian missionary correspondence? That's the opposite of the Vinland Map story.

October 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Correction - Should read in 2nd paragraph when Shattuk passed away, not Klemann.

October 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

The impression I got from viewing Fred Gregory's DVD, once again, last night, led me to wonder if George Grinnell knew Shattuck had passed away at the time he 'first' met John Klemann.

The significance of this, keeping in mind, that the meeting between Grinnell and Klemann had already been prearranged, and Kleeman was actually enroute to California, when Kleeman passed away, would be:

That this would afford George Grinnell the perfect opportunity to fabricate the story he related to John Klemann at their first meeting, in regard to how he acquired the Grinnell Missionary stamps. The beauty of this, for Grinnell anyway, would be that with Shattuck now deceased, there was no longer anyone alive who could challenge his story of how he acquired the stamps in question.

Would you not agree with me that this is in fact an important aspect of this investigation and one that cannot, just be ignored?

With respect, you are just as guilty as anyone else who posts on this Board, regarding posting excerpts of letters or documents that could leave other Board participants to absorb this information out of it's original context. Therefore, your pointing the finger at Richard Malmgren is uncalled for to make your point, is it not? Anyway, interestingly, and equally frustrating, you answered my question by asking me another question, thereby failing to address my original concern. So, in fairness, to me and the Board, can you please refer back to my post to review my original question?

I am not surprised you already knew about the Vinland Map, accomplished writer and researcher that you are, however, I must admit that I am somewhat surprised that you failed to see the similarities between the Vinland Map appearing out of nowhere, with no provedence, and George Grinnell also appearing out of nowhere, announcing that he discovered a hoard of Hawaii Missionary stamps, equally with no provedence?

It is also interesting that you failed to see the significance and similarities in the backgrounds of Enzo Ferrajoli and George Grinnell?

It was later documented that Enzo Ferrajoli had been sentenced to prison in Italy for fraud. Likewise, George Grinnell, although he never spent a day in prison, was in fact labelled a fraud artist in no uncertain terms, by the presiding Judge Wood, at the end of his California trial.

In closing, I sincerely hope that our fellow Board participant, Richard Malmgren has not suffered any damage to his home from the earthquake in Hawaii this morning, and that Richard and his family are in a safe location.

October 15, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

I agree with you. It would be useful for the RPSL to clarify this question about the scientific studies.

It isn't terribly significant to the Grinnell discussion but, as a postal historian, I was also disappointed in their conclusions about eku on cover for the accepted Missionaries. They relied only on datelines and dockets in their analysis, but if they had consulted with any of a number of American postal historians, their conclusions would have been different.

October 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

I can't know for sure, but it's improbable and irrelevant. Grinnell did not start to arrange the sale the very day that Shattuck passed away, so there's nothing strange about the coincidence unless you think someone murdered him. Did you think that Grinnell decided to sell the stamps one day in 1919 and Klemann flew to Los Angeles on the Concorde the next morning? Or that Grinnell prophesied Shattuck's death?

Grinnell first satisfied himself that S.L. Wood was trustworthy, by buying stamps from him over a period of time. Once satisfied, he offered the stamps for sale to Wood. Wood declined, but agreed he would try to sell them to Col. Edward Taylor, which led to negotiations. Taylor brought along Bertram Poole as his advisor, but those negotiations fell through. That took many weeks; all the while Shattuck was alive. Don't take my word for this; all witnesses agreed on these facts in their testimony.

Poole then telegraphed Klemann on November 20, 1919. After exchanging several messages, Klemann took the train to Los Angeles. While he was en route, Shattuck died on November 30. Klemann arrived December 1, but news of his death wasn't published immediately, and no one has alleged that Grinnell had remained closely in touch with Shattuck.

Inexplicably and without citing any reference, the RPSL book states that Shattuck died "in June 1918, about a fortnight after Grinnell's visit." If that were true, it might lend weight to your conspiracy theory, but it isn't true.

I posted the entire content of Klemann's letter to Ashbrook verbatim some months ago. Scroll back and look it up. It was Richard Malmgren who posted excerpts lately, which prompted me to reply by posting pertinent excerpts that he had omitted. You are addressing the wrong man about that.

You'll have to ask the RPSL why its experts performed as they did. It should be obvious to you that the RPSL report is unsatisfactory to nearly every expert on classic Hawaiian stamps and covers.

I am familiar with the Vinland Map, and have been since its original sensation in the 1950s. I met Walter McCrone when I was a teen-ager, and have applied his lessons ever since, including to this investigation as I write.

For ten years I have modeled forensic expertizing on studies of the Vinland Map and the Shroud of Turin, as well as techniques of criminal investigation. The points that intrigue you are superficial. Coincidences are common, and prove nothing for or against. Science is what determines the verdict, and it's pretty clear to me that reports of the scientific studies were botched in the Grinnell report. Leonard Piskiewicz, a chemist, debunked the RPSL's use of science in his U.S. Specialist editorial and in his presentation at Chicago.

October 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

How could you know for sure that George Grinnell did not know that Shattuck had passed away when he first met John Klemann?

Does it not seem even a little strange to you that Grinnell started to arrange the sale of his counterfeit Hawaii Missionary stamps to Klemann, the very day after Shattuck passed away?

Has it not dawned on you that the only person that stood in the way of Grinnell's account of where he discovered the Grinnell Stamp Hoard [Shattuck] was now deceased, and he was now free to fabricate any story he wanted?

Do you not see a similarity between when the fake 1440 Vinland Map just suddenly appeared for sale in 1957, with no provenance, and George Grinnell, likewise, appears out of the woodwork claiming to have discovered a horde of Hawaii Missionary stamps?

Would you not agree with me that by posting excerpts from letters, and not posting the entire letter, tends to allow readers to take the quoted excerpts out of context?

Would you not agree with me, that although this may not be your intention, in reality, the effect of only posting excerpts from letters, can at the very least, lean towards posting misleading information, whether intentional or not?

Would you not agree with me that by only posting excerpts of a letter you run the risk of appearing to try and fit the quoted portions of the letter into your own theory, when posting the entire letter may cause readers to think otherwise?

What purpose does it serve your quest, whatever that is, to suggest that the oldest surviving philatelic society in the world, the Royal Philatelic Society London, was somehow not operating above board, in the Grinnell counterfeit stamp case?

Have you had the time to look at the website, I directed you to, which explains the story of the Vinland Map, and how a series of scientific tests on the paper and ink composition proved the map to be fake?

Do you not see the similarities between the Vinland map suddenly appearing with no provenance and George Grinnell discovering the Grinnell stamps in a very similar way?

October 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

I have a hard time with this problem too. Not venal, but careless, I think. I've seen mistakes on RPSL certificates for United States stamps that no U.S. expert would make, but we all make mistakes. This a different problem.

I have the same feeling as you do about the apparent bias, although the previous discussion of the RPSL's adherence to its paper expert's opinion in opposition to the evidence of destructive testing was not reassuring. I hope there's a benign explanation, but not much has been forthcoming.

Reading the report I quoted yesterday was a shock to me. I hope David Beech or Patrick Pearson will explain this to us. David has said that a clarification will be published in the London Philatelist, but will it address this issue?

I also felt sheepish that I had failed to remember this material, which I must have read a couple of years before the RPSL book was published. What made it so stark this time (and me, incredulous) was reading it beside the open book and contrasting two descriptions of the same scientific results.

[If you or others want to read the report, I'll flag it for Ellen at APRL so she can retrieve it easily for the usual copying and mailing charge.]

Carelessness is a different matter. I think evidence of that is abundant. In Pat Culhane's talk at Washington, he gave a number of examples. Some are trivial in themselves (his relation to Charles Shattuck misstated; the wrong date of Shattuck's death), but again, not reassuring after four years in preparation.

Several experts here have disputed the RPSL's conclusion that the Grinnells were printed from loose type. If Scott, Bill, and David S are right, that's a serious blunder. I'm still waiting for Dick Celler's verdict.

I also recall the old discussion with Chris Ceremuga, who opined that the British Guiana 1856 One Cent Magenta had never been expertized by RPSL, which I disputed. Patrick Pearson energetically denied my report at first, but after I quoted the auction descriptions that included the RPSL certification, he eventually reappeared with a passive-voice admission.

This was scarcely trivial, because in 2000 Pearson's RPSL team of experts studied and condemned Peter Winter's fake (I chose the word carefully, because the

RPSL report concluded that it is an altered genuine Four Cents).

The RPSL's certification of the unique One Cent Magenta was a momentous event in philatelic history. Before the Ferrary sale, French experts (notably Gilbert) had doubted its authenticity. It was sold to Arthur Hind "as is" because of that. The RPSL certificate for the sale of Hind's estate was intended to put the dispute to rest, but Maurice Burrus vigorously challenged it in 1951.

In the ensuing debate, Sir John Wilson, the RPSL expert, stated that it was "quite impossible" to alter a Four Cents into a One Cent, which is exactly the alteration that Person's team attributed to Winter's fake. But Wilson was not hubristic: "Nobody of experience in judging stamps regards their own opinion as necessarily correct. The advance in the development of mechanical aids to the judging of faking of stamps is always progressive, and I have not examined this stamp with possibly the very latest of inventions, but I would readily accept today the opinion of any other qualified expert or Expert Committee, suitably equipped, on the possibilities of the alteration of the label on this stamp."

Isn't that analogous to the subject of this board's discussion?

To me, the celebrated expertization of "the world's rarest stamp" in 1935 by the RPSL is an event that ought to be a matter of the current expert committee chairman's knowledge, but it plainly wasn't.

Perhaps the RPSL expert committee has become complacent in its reputation as most respected. I personally believe that respect is earned by accountability, not simply by reputation of past glory.

October 15, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,
I have a hard time believing that the RPSL is as venal as you suggest. It is probably the most respected expert body in the world. If they are sloppy and biased, then our hobby is in real trouble.

October 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

John F,

Charles Shattuck died the day before John Klemann arrived in Los Angeles to negotiate the purchase of the stamps from George Grinnell, but his death was not immediately reported in the paper, so Grinnell would not have realized it when he was negotiating with Klemann.

The earliest disclosure I've seen of Shattuck as the source is the written narrative history of the acquisition and sale that Grinnell wrote for his lawyer to prepare his defense. It's possible that Klemann never heard Shattuck's name until Grinnell testified at the trial, after Klemann had testified. He certainly wasn't aware of Shattuck when he learned of the Carpenter collection.

October 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

Grinnell was no saint, and I have not written that he was. I don't have time now to go through the thick Ashbrook correspondence file to excavate the few letters that mention Klemann's crooked dealings, but there's at least one by Ezra Cole, and then there's Ward's comment about how the Grinnell affair drove him batty. When I have more time, I'll provide you with explicit references.

This board does not lack writers who take a sympathetic view of Klemann, but the truth is that I was the first person here to report Klemann's accusation that Grinnell was a thief. My purpose ("Merde!") was to dramatize that by Klemann's own account, when he saw a Grinnell stamp in a collector's album far removed from Los Angeles, rather than suggesting that the stamps might have been more widely dispersed than just Grinnell's hoard, he suspected only that it must have originated with Grinnell. You prefer Klemann's account despite the difficulty that no other supply of Grinnells has ever appeared. That's why I refer you to other portions of the same letter you excerpted to take note of Klemann's fabrications: allegations that Grinnell gave other counterfeits to Wood, Walsh, and Lawler. By Klemann's account, Grinnell was papering the known world with counterfeit Missionary stamps, none of which have ever been seen.

October 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

Patrick Culhane donated to APRL a set of three thick loose-leaf volumes of evidence that he had submitted to RPSL along with his family's stamps for expertization.

I had read them long ago, but had paid attention mostly to the parts that seemed wrong (motto wafers mailed by William in September 1851, before Missionary stamps were issued; speculation about cancelers being used at Waialua) or doubtful (comparisons of writing samples).

Last week I perused them for parts I had missed or neglected to study carefully. One holder contains three scientific reports. Two were commissioned by the owners. One is a January 7, 2001, report by Dr. Gene Hall of Rutgers that reports on his analysis of seven Arrigo stamps and cancels and one stampless cover. Another is a September 2001 report on his analysis of the Shattuck stamps.

The third is the one I quoted: "The Examination and Comparison of Chemical Components of Hawaiian Missionary Stamps of 1851-52 at the British Library July 3, 2001" by Gene S. Hall, Tracey Chaplin, and Greg Smith. It isn't clear who paid for the analysis, but the parties present included David Beech of the British Library; Tracey Chaplin, Greg Smith, and Robert Clark of Christopher Ingold Laboratories, the RPSL's scientific advisors; Patrick Culhane; Gene Hall of Rutgers; David Jacobs, the British Library's conservation officer; and Robert Schoolley-West, former head of philatelic collections at the British Library. I believe this was the examination that David Beech reported in his Sundman Lecture at the NPM. It is credited among "Principal References" in the RPSL appendix.

Reading the RPSL chapter on The Scientific Investigations after reading that report is puzzling and disappointing. It appears that the RPSL treated scientific results as a smorgasbord, choosing parts that seemed tasty, omitting parts that were less appealing and finding new cooks to provide alternative morsels, but failing to report the dishes that Patrick Pearson's team rejected.

I realize this isn't a problem for people who have all along regarded the Grinnells as counterfeit, but to any skeptic this makes a sham of scientific evidence, and thus fails to address the very audience who most need to be persuaded.

October 15, 2006 **John Forsyth**

We know Grinnell met Shattuck, but when did it become an official part of his story? I know he died before the trial but Grinnell could not have foreseen that. He did not disclose to Klemann the origin of the find. Might be a clue.

As for the Klemann letters, of course he was bitter. He lost the equivalent of half a million dollars in today's money to Grinnell (I believe Klemann was a bit the fool for not checking the merchandise out closer). But the letters Richard M quotes are just the obvious.....he had access to old paper and old records and printing, etc. So did other people, but to Klemann that was the obvious at the time.

Klemann had little chance once Caspary claimed the "stamps" were not real. He would have lost his best customer if he had sold them elsewhere as genuine, and I don't believe Caspary would have been reluctant to tell others he thought them frauds.

October 14, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken Lawrence

I got your e-mail regarding the draft of the November Scott Stamp Monthly article.

Thank you very much. I just got back from an afternoon gathering and Judie and I are going out tonight.

I will read it tomorrow. Again, thank you.

October 14, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken Lawrence

You posted that "...all the evidence I have seen, including opinions expressed by fellow members of his trade who knew him well, lead me to believe that Klemann was so overcome by his hatred of Grinnell that his statements cannot be trusted."

You further posted that "I also think that if Richard Malmgren reads the rest of the letters with that thought in mind, he will draw conclusions less favorable to Klemann."

Could you please reference for me the specific letters that I have presumably obtained from the APRL (who to who and the date if you would be so kind) so that I may read them with that thought in mind? At the moment I cannot draw the same conclusions as you because I am apparently reading the wrong letters.

October 14, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken Lawrence

The London tests you reference and which you say the RPSL experts participated, is the report available for the rest of us to read?

You and I do not always have the same take on things. For example, because you are convinced that Klemann is a liar about Grinnell you have not previously thought it necessary to mention portions of the Klemann letters that put Grinnell in a bad light. My reading of the letters leads me to a different conclusion.

I would appreciate the opportunity to read the report to see if I concur with you. Do I understand correctly that this was a test commissioned by the Grinnell owners? Is it available to the rest of us so that we may join in your conclusion or not as the case may be?

October 14, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Dick Cellers

I have missed your postings of late. I hope you are continuing your plating study on the Missionaries.

Question please with regards to the Grinnells.

Many of us have become convinced that the Grinnells were not printed directly from type. Based upon the recent studies by various people generated from the Card of 10, do you now share that opinion? With going into a formal treatise, could you briefly put your current take into words?

October 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Also, several of the illustrations from the report appear in the RPSL book, but without noting that the report on them drew the opposite conclusion.

October 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

That report I quoted was from the London tests in which the RPSL experts participated.

October 14, 2006 **Walter P**

To All-

Before someone else corrects me, I would point out that the Vinland Map, if authentic, no longer proves the Vikings landed in North America prior to Christopher Columbus.

Norwegian archaeologists Helge and Anne Stine Ingstad discovered the remains of a Viking settlement at L'Anse aux Meadows in Newfoundland in Canada. Carbon dating of artifacts prove that the Norse settlement was in place 500 years before Columbus ever landed in America. Photographs of reconstructed buildings

and information on the settlement is available on the Parks Canada website. Interestingly, no evidence, between around 1440 and 1957 was ever found that proved Vikings used or drew maps to navigate.

October 14, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Regarding the testing performed by the Grinnell owners, I echo Steve W in his last post.

Steve's concerns are valid and must be factored into the validity of conclusions drawn by the Grinnell owners.

Personally, I find the paper test result information released by the Grinnell owners to be vague, and lack substance.

October 14, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

In your post you direct a question at me, which is:

"In that light, why has no one commented about the scientist's report that the Grinnells were printed from the same ream of paper as the Tapling Missionaries?"

"If the Grinnells are self evident counterfeits, as you believe, how could someone armed with the most advanced forensic instrumentation draw such a conclusion?"

I am glad you asked that question, because I have a very good response fresh in my mind, on how this could happen. Last evening, I was watching the Knowledge Network and viewed a program about, the 'Vinland Map.'

"The Vinland Map: Real or Hoax?"

The thrust of the program was, Is the Vinland Map a unique historical document, worth millions of dollars, or is it a fake?

Some experts believe that the map was drawn in around 1440, and others claim that the map is a hoax, forged in modern times. At stake was if the Vinland Map was authentic than that would prove that the Vikings landed in North America prior to Christopher Columbus.

The Vinland Map is presently owned by Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut in the United States and is kept in the Beinecke Library there.

Yale acquired the Vinland Map in 1957 from manuscript dealer Laurence C. Witten III, who, in turn, had bought it from a, shall we say colorful Italian dealer, Enzo Ferrajoli.

For the last 30 years the controversy has continued with detractors wanting to know, with a lack of provenance, how the map could be authentic, when the map just suddenly appeared in modern times. Many scientific tests on the Vinland Map have been conducted both in England and the United States.

In 1995 the University of Arizona was allowed to cut a small sliver from the edge of the Vinland Map parchment for radiocarbon dating. The result was the paper was made during the period 1423-1445 about 50 years before Columbus arrived in America. Detractors claimed this proved nothing, because the map could have been drawn in the 20th Century using period 1440 parchment, sound familiar?

In the 1980s the University of California used a cyclotron to calculate how much of each element of the present ink can be found in ancient inks. The results opened up the possibility that the Vinland Map may be genuine.

However, yet another analysis of the ink, using yet another technique, swung the argument back into the sceptic's favour in 2002. Following tests at the University College London, it was announced that they found industrial anatase on the map. Professor Clarke stated, "It was deliberately placed as part of the ink. We can see no option but this must be a 20th Century forgery."

For a full scientific explanation of the testing and history of the Vinland Map please consult www.econ.ohio-state.edu/jhm/arch/vinland/vinland.htm or 'google' Vinland Map.

There are marked similarities between the Grinnell Missionary stamps and the Vinland Map. Both suddenly appeared in the 20th Century with no provenance. Both were discovered in suspicious circumstances. Both were subjected to modern scientific testing and in both cases, the detractors were not satisfied with the test results. In both cases the controversy continues to this day.

By providing this example I hope this also answers your questions posed above. I hope you take the time to read the detailed information on the Vinland Map on the website I provided for you in this post.

The answer to your question, in short, is, yes, scientific tests can be wrong or inconclusive, and further more modern testing can upset the results of a previous test. In the Grinnell case the scientific opinion was rendered using the test results they had at hand. As you can see in the Vinland Map case, these types of scientific opinions can change and are not cut in stone.

I would like to hear what you think of the similarities of the Grinnell case and the Vinland Map case, and how the Vinland Map case may impact the Grinnell case.

October 14, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

Speaking frankly, the skepticism over the scientists' report on the paper comes from the fact that it was commissioned by the owners without independent oversight. What instructions were given? What financial arrangements were made?

Against that, we have the independent RPSL report in contradiction to the owners' study, and that one inherently has more credibility.

Perhaps the owners could elaborate more on the paper study that they made to alleviate these concerns.

October 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

APRL is a lending library to APS members all over the world, and a public library to any person who walks through the door, so no one can monopolize its information. That's one of the biggest benefits of APS membership.

David S,

You're probably right about the need to start over. I certainly did after discovering that the card included a genuine Missionary with a genuine cancel, perhaps two of both.

However, all the evidence I have seen, including opinions expressed by fellow members of his trade who knew him well, lead me to believe that Klemann was so overcome by his hatred of Grinnell that his statements cannot be trusted.

I also think that if Richard Malmgren reads the rest of the letters with that thought in mind, he will draw conclusions less favorable to Klemann.

I would agree, before anyone says it, that just because Klemann lied about Grinnell doesn't mean Grinnell is innocent. But much of the evidence adduced in discussions on this board concerns character. Such evidence is useless unless character is judged by a single standard (and may be useless regardless).

What I tried to say to Walter is that I do not think the mystery will be solved until all the lies are exposed and discarded, and all the conflicting evidence is explained.

In that light, why has no one commented about the scientists' report that the Grinnells were printed from the same ream of paper as the Tapling Missionaries? If the Grinnells are self-evident counterfeits, as you believe, how could someone armed with the most advanced forensic instrumentation draw such a conclusion?

You may not care about such a question, but I do, because as long as such evidence remains unrefuted and unexplained, the case will never be closed. Extending your point, each point presented by any expert in this affair ought to be rechecked and re-evaluated in light of the stamps on the card of ten. That's what I've been trying to do.

October 14, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker- Ken Lawrence-

May I be so bold as to suggest that all of this he said, she said, being thrown around is all "hearsay evidence," and little weight should be attached to it.

I submit, that at best, hearsay evidence is extremely unreliable, and has little probative value in solving this particular case.

October 14, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

You said that Klemann told Fox he always thought the Grinnells were genuine. Then you stated that Klemann accused Grinnell of stealing the stamps from Mrs. Carpenter after Grinnell died and could not sue for defamation. That reinforces Klemann's belief in their authenticity as stated earlier. Phillips also must have thought them genuine to have insinuated another victim of the same crime. Those are all very good and important revelations. However, these folks, along with the RSPL, George Linn, Kieth Cordrey and others had NO CLUE that Grinnell was in possession of two genuine Hawaiian Missionaries representing each type that could have been used as models. Therefore, which opinions and positions taken prior to July of this year are still relevant to the present discussion? Wouldn't any and all of the above people second guess their beliefs, even start from scratch, if presented with G80 and G81? If competent researchers, they'd have no other choice but to put earlier conclusions behind and start fresh.

October 14, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

Sorry, Ken, in my excitement, I spelled your name wrong, once again.

October 14, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

You are correct in that it not my intention to defame anyone. I am just working, like everyone else, with what little information I have on hand, and from what I can glean off this Board.

In regard to the Grinnell Saga, I like most people, only know what is posted on this Board, what is in the Grinnell Board Archives, the Scott Montly Journals, the RPSL Bound Report, the Mystic Stamp Booklets, and recent Linns Stamp News.

Unfortunately, Fred Gregory has not chosen to post on this Board so I only have at hand what has been posted on this Board to date.

Aided with the postings of yourself, Bernard Bailes, Dick Celler, Bill Longley, Richard Fralola, Roger Heath, Richard Malmgren, Stanely Piller, David Shumaker, Don Sundman, Scott Trepel, Steve W. and we can't forget Veronica, and others, I have, like some others, pieced together the Grinnell Saga, the best I can.

As I have no knowledge of private exchanges between people off the Board, and with Fred Gregory, you will have to be tolerant of my ignorance on that point.

I still think my post reveals some good points and some points that you have consistently or rather conveniently avoided addressing, which of course, is your right to do so.

Overall, I thank you for the information you provided up to today, and information today that I was unaware of, mainly, that others besides yourself, now possess the same information you do.

What is most interesting to me, is whether others interpret this information the same way you do?

I think that you can understand that working in the dark can at times can be most frustrating? However, I will just continue to muddle around in the dark hoping for a scrap of new information posted on this Board.

October 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve Belasco,

Thank you. Denison's letter is not clear enough to tell whether Gambs was a dealer at the time of the sale, nor even why it occurred. It may have been a boy-to-boy transaction; he wrote that he bought the Missionaries from Gambs at age 18 or 19 even though he was not a stamp collector himself.

I agree it may not matter, because there is plenty of evidence that forgeries of that design were widely available in the 1860s.

October 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

With all due respect, and I know it is not your intention, you are defaming some very good people who work selflessly for the entire stamp hobby.

Fred Gregory and Richard Malmgren and many others have copies of every pertinent scrap of paper at APRL. Ellen recently copied the file again for Richard M at his request, to be sure he wasn't missing anything. The file and its contents are listed in the Smithsonian's bibliography, linked from Richard's Grinnell reference page, so every competent researcher is aware of it.

I transcribed the entire Klemann letter on this list long ago. It is not new information here.

APRL is not the only source of information for my study, so I have had to perform the same kind of research that any serious scholar does, assisted by librarians and other researchers throughout the country.

I have published 12,000 words on this subject, so my findings are available to one and all. I have invited everyone to reply, and to show me any mistakes I have made.

The reason the allegation is not included in the material Klemann deposited at the Philatelic Foundation is because Klemann waited until after he knew Grinnell was dead to charge him with theft from Mrs. Carpenter, and then did so at his first opportunity. Had he done so earlier, Grinnell probably would have sued him for defamation and won. That is the alleged crime we are discussing. H.B. Phillips had insinuated the same crime but a different victim in 1924, but did not publish Grinnell's name because he was still alive and well respected in the stamp community.

During his entire long life and participation in philately, no one ever charged Grinnell with violating the APS Code of Ethics, which, if proven by the low standard of preponderance of evidence, would have led to his expulsion from membership.

October 14, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

Firstly, I would like to thank you for taking your valuable time to translate the Klemann letter from handwriting to text. Having worked as a union representative for many years I received many handwritten photocopies of medical reports written by Doctor's that can best be described as "chicken scratches." Therefore, my point being, I know first hand, how hard it is to decipher such handwriting, even if you possess a basic understanding of what the person is writing about. From this experience I can say this is no small feat.

As for the content of the Kelemann letter, and as interesting and revealing as it is, I reserve the right to post comments on the letter, at another time.

I believe, after just reading Ken Lawrence's response to your post, regarding the Klemann letter, that the following comments and observations are in order:

What we have here, in the George Grinnell Saga, is basically one person conducting extensive research at the APS Library on this subject. The problem inherent in this, is that when you have one researcher performing this research, you are limited to what that researcher will disclose, and to what that researcher believes is relevant to this investigation.

That is to say, that because this researcher has limited his findings to a series of articles published in Scotts Stamp Journal, and piecemeal posts, that are usually in answer to another person's post.

The problem that arises with this, is that when one person is conducting research at the library in question, that person may interpret the information housed at the research library in a certain way, and base his published findings on that interpretation. In other words, what we have here, is one person deciding what is relevant and what is not relevant to the investigation. This type of research is, thereby cloaked with flaws, in that, if the person conducting the research has overlooked an important piece of information, or has failed to see the significance of that information, or had dismissed it outright.

Richard, considering the above, I agree with you that it is indeed bad that a group of people could not come together at the APS Research Library and collectively and methodically go through all of the Grinnell information housed in the library.

This of course, this would not be possible, because of the time it would take, and for the financial costs associated with such a venture. Thus, we have to work with what we have, what Ken feeds us now and then, and what others can contribute.

An example of the above, would be, Ken Lawrence's post this morning in regard to his interpretation of the Klemann letter. Not surprisingly, Ken's interpretation of the Klemann letter differs in important ways from your own interpretation of the same letter.

Another problem associated with one person conducting solo research at the APS Library, is that, if that person has any bias whatsoever, than their interpretation of their research may lean towards their bias. An example being, that Ken Lawrence has consistently posted on this Board, that in his view George Grinnell has been unfairly portrayed as a possible forgery conspirator, liar, thief, fabricator of philatelic covers, and all unsolved crimes in California, if I left anything out, I apologise.

Being mindful of the above, I would hope, that, somehow, Ken can set aside his bias, exhibited on this Board on many occasions, and fairly assess the information supplied by other researchers, as is the case at hand.

Ken Lawrence-

Thank you for taking the time to respond to Richard Malmgren's post on his translation of the Klemann letter in question.

I would also like to thank you for taking your valuable time and spending it at the APS Research Library.

I too, have some comments on your post to Richard M:

Your comment in your post, "Once again, piling false charges on Grinnell does nothing to solve the mystery."

This, in my view, is an absurd statement, it has everything to do with solving the mystery. The more we can discover about George Grinnell the closer we are to solving the mystery. I have always maintained this, and common sense dictates that the more you can show George Grinnell was involved in shady matters the more likely, and more importantly, the more believability his involvement in printing the Grinnell stamps, becomes. Contrary to what you appear to believe, I am not engaged in a character assassination of George Grinnell, but at the same time, I don't think we should be ignoring or brushing aside his extracurricular activities, as irrelevant to this investigation?

I challenge you to post what unsolved crime you think George Grinnell was accused of on this Board? Do you believe, George Grinnell was not a party to printing the Grinnells? If your answer is No, than what is there to defend about the man, he was what he was?

I will say, that my interpretation of the Klemann letter in question, is that, without speaking directly with Klemann, considering his health and mental state at the time he wrote the letter, his personal history with Grinnell, the letter in my view must be considered to have little probative value. There is just too much history and baggage between these two people to take the letter at its word.

I predict, that in time, you must come to the conclusion George Grinnell was party to printing the Grinnell stamps.

October 14, 2006 **Steve Belasco** <srbelasco@aol.com>

Ken,

Regarding your story about Frank Dension, E.F. Gambs of St. Louis didn't go into the stamp business until 1872. So Dension's dating is a bit off, but I'm not sure what difference it makes.

Steve

October 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

I sent you the text of my November draft articles as an attached file to a September 14 e-mail addressed also to Steve Walske, Scott Trepel, Fred Gregory, Richard Frajola, and Matthew Healey. Don't know how yours failed to deliver. I sent it to you again this morning.

I have seen more than a dozen covers self-addressed to George Grinnell, and at least as many documents signed by him. I now own the cover with the WAR STAMP that David Shumaker linked here previously, which illustrates my Scott article on Thompson. The writing on the cover with the fake cancel is not Grinnell's. Should you or Fred be interested, I can enumerate the differences. Others with technical skills can probably do overlays that would reveal others I haven't detected. Patrick Culhane wondered if it was manufactured to frame Grinnell.

There are many reasons to doubt John Klemann's accusations. He told different stories to different people, perhaps because age was taking its toll or perhaps because, as Philip Ward wrote, the Grinnell experience drove him batty. Klemann told Bill Fox that he always thought the Grinnells were genuine, but that he had to take the opposite stance after Caspary rejected them.

In the Ashbrook letter that accuses Grinnell of theft from Mrs. Carpenter, Klemann asserted that Grinnell had paid his lawyer Oscar Lawler with a pair of 2¢ forgeries, and Secret Service agent Walsh with unspecified counterfeit stamps. Those charges have to be fabrications. He wrote that S.L. Wood got a 5¢; the record shows Grinnell gave Wood a pair of 2¢. If any of these claims were true, the stamps would have surfaced by now.

As you'll see from my November article, Charles Sidney Thompson was a seashell expert; Grinnell was a botanist. It makes no sense that Hector Alliot would have dispatched a botanist to examine the seashell collection when he had a resident expert. Thompson was a major stamp dealer and ASDA member at the time; Grinnell wasn't a dealer until later, so the part about selling the Hawaiian stamps soaked off the rat-gnawed boxes, if true, more probably applied to Thompson. Grinnell would have kept them.

The biggest reason to doubt the theft accusation is because Ashbrook was predisposed to believe every anti-Grinnell claim, and he assiduously investigated all of them. Julius Loeb would have been easy to reach at the time of Ashbrook's investigation (he might have known him personally, because Loeb was a Pony Express mail collector and author). If Loeb had confirmed Klemann's charge, Ashbrook would have published it.

Klemann knew of Mrs. Carpenter's husband's collection before he bought Grinnell's stamps. He thought that had been the source of Grinnell's hoard. That's why he told a newspaper reporter that Grinnell said he had got them from the son of a missionary in Pasadena, and told a similar story in court, although Grinnell said he had refused to tell Klemann the source because he was still hoping Shattuck would find the two covers that he had promised to find.

Later, Klemann would have tried to verify the story he had guessed, and Mrs. Carpenter would have acknowledged a visit from Alliot's staff member. She might not have needed a prompt to name Grinnell after all the sensational press.

But as I wrote before, pointing a finger at Grinnell had become a sport by then. In 1924, Henry B. Phillips claimed that a San Francisco woman who had been a collector for many years owned a complete set of Hawaiian Missionary stamps, Scott 1 through 4, "taken from the family letters of the parents of the original collector." Upon inspection, these proved to be counterfeits, verified as such by Bruce Cartwright and John Luff. Phillips deduced that the collection "had been exposed to the depredations of a heartless substitutor . . . This episode happened at about the same time certain counterfeit Hawaiian 'Missionary' stamps were offered for sale in New York, and subsequently became the cause of a suit in the Superior Court of Los Angeles."

In an interesting twist, Frank C. Denison of the American Consular Service wrote a letter to Grinnell in 1921 that was returned undelivered. He had bought a set of Hawaiian Missionaries in 1868 or 1869 from E.F. Gambs of Saint Louis. But when he took them to Scott Stamp Company in New York, they were condemned as counterfeits. Denison was hoping Grinnell could help him, but the letter never reached Grinnell.

Eventually Robert Dalton Harris bought a collection that included Denison's undelivered letter to Grinnell and Denison's collection with counterfeit Missionaries. When Rob wrote the story, he doubted that Denison could have acquired them in the 1860s because the earliest publication of the images he could find was in an 1874 issue of The American Journal of Philately. But in reality, these were based on the image published by Arthur Maury in 1864, in Le Collectionneur de Timbre-Poste, so Denison's account is probably true.

The Denison story is evidence to me that no one needed to substitute counterfeits of Missionaries in old collections. They were there from the beginning. On the other hand, while these forgeries are well known and ubiquitous, Grinnells are limited to the single source, and have not been dispersed.

For the record, George Linn's final words on the Grinnells were these, in the October 1, 1962, Linn's Weekly Stamp News "My own opinion has always been that there is as yet no conclusive proof that the stamps are phony. I still have an open mind and there is much that an expert printer can see about the stamps that is well in their favor."

Once again, piling false charges on Grinnell does nothing to help solve the mystery. If he is guilty of participating in a conspiracy to forge and defraud, these spurious claims only make it more difficult to excavate the truth.

October 14, 2006 **Steve W**

Richard M

That is a very interesting developing theory, nicely involving your favorite non-profit, the Southwest Museum. You may be on to something significant.

Just one thought, though - G80 and G81 didn't necessarily have to come from the same source. One may have come from a gift to the museum, and the other from the seashell lady. It seems unlikely to me that one source would have two #3's.

October 14, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard,

I wonder what his source was for Grinnell "playing the game wide open?" Someone must have approached Klemann with such information after the trial?

Penmanship - one aspect of the Filigree on the Grinnells I am looking into is the possibility they are "handed," or having a slight tilt and/or a compositional flow across the stamp, like with cursive writing. When one mirrors handwriting, the tilt changes direction. Even a hand sketch made up of seemingly straight lines will look different, seem to shift, when viewed as a mirrored image. You can also see that the two filigree ornaments, O-1 and O-2 on the Type I, have a consistent slope downward from left to right, even across each ornament, as if drawn as one flowing composition. Re-arranging these pieces, or even mirroring them, produces something entirely different. Impressions from metal type should not be affected at all when reversed or mirrored.

October 14, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

David

As you continue to improve on your yet to be published article, don't forget that George Grinnell was said to be a '...pen man...' and taught 'Spenserian' writing.

October 14, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

David

I thought you might like that part.

I have just spent more time trying to decipher every word of the relevant paragraph in Klemann's Dec 29, 1954.

"He played the game wide open going about his duties in museum where he had old manuscripts, letters, cameras, chemicals, everything at hand & made the stamps by pen & ink drawings, photographing & electroplating much as in the matter of the way the stamps were produced by type setting printing (etc?) ...the islands."

The above is the best I can make out. I took the liberty of performing some minor corrections to spelling and punctuation. For example, he seems to spell 'museum' as 'meuseum'. He doesn't put commas everywhere.

October 14, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

So what I think we have here is John Klemann saying that George Grinnell made '...several visits...' to Mrs. Carpenter.

The main bunch of stamps that George Grinnell got, repaired and sold were from the boxes that contained the seashells and which were mailed from '...the islands.' There is no indication that these stamps were Hawaiian stamps. The mailing was presumably from the Territorial Period.

These stamps needed to be repaired because the boxes were rat gnawed.

As to the Hawaiian stamp collection that was in an album and of which there is no mention of rats gnawing, George Grinnell reportedly saw it and had access to it. It was during the '...several visits...' that John Klemann says that Mrs. Carpenter says that George Grinnell changed out the stamp.

Contrary to my earlier recollection, this correspondence may have provided either an alternative or an additional source for George Grinnell to have obtained G80 & G81. There is no mention of the date when Klemann and Loeb visited Mrs. Carpenter. However and if Klemann's writing is to be taken literally, then he says '...one Missionary...' He does not use the plural.

In posting this I realize some will say that John Klemann made up everything to defame George Grinnell, but remember that Klemann did not publish this information. It was written at the end of his life and after he had a heart attack.

October 14, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard M.

Referencing your point #11, it seems Klemann hit the nail on the head fifty years ago.

October 14, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Gentlemen and Ladies

For those who are interested or care, I have found Walter P's long ago suggestion that George Grinnell obtained G80 & G81 from Charles Shattuck (as opposed to the 81 or 9,068 or whatever number of Grinnells) to be intriguing. I think that this remains a viable theory.

I used to speculate about whether George Grinnell obtained them from a Mrs. Carpenter. I have previously posted to this effect, only to dismiss my own theory because to do so required George Grinnell to visit Mrs. Carpenter at least twice – once to pilfer the genuine Missionary stamps and a second time to replace them with the Grinnells.

Resultant to a recent posting by Ken Lawrence that C.S. Thompson was the one sent to Mrs. Carpenter (and who therefore would have presumably pilfered the Missionary stamp(s) from Mrs. Carpenter as opposed to George Grinnell), I went back and reread John Klemann's letters. It turns out that my original reading and subsequent postings was to address a point that under shadowed important other parts of the Klemann letters. My re-reading causes me to re-think what might have occurred.

Merde!

The letters I have are from the APRL holdings. What I have are (1) a basically, but not totally accurate 'translated' copy (presumably the 'translated' copy was by a staff member of the library since Klemann's writing is not the easiest in the world to read) of John Klemann's letter to Stanley Ashbrook dated Jan 7, 1955, (2) either John Klemann's separately written file copy of the original Jan 7, 1955 letter to Ashbrook or the original, and (3) another letter from John Klemann to 'Dear Friend' dated Dec 29, 1954 that contains some of the stuff above plus other stuff.

For those who are unaware, Mrs. Carpenter apparently had both a seashell and a Hawaiian stamp collection. The later was actually owned by her ex-husband. She asked the Southwest Museum of Pasadena, California to come look at the seashell collection, presumably for purposes of donation. Bearing in mind that all of this is from John Klemann correspondence, it now gets interesting, assuming you have a lot of patience and nothing else to do but read about Grinnells with a Pinot in one hand. Please remember that in addition to both being school teachers at the same school, George Grinnell and Charles Sydney Thompson were also both curators at the Southwest Museum.

1. John Klemann (does he need any introduction?) wrote that he and Mr. Loeb of Oakland went to the Keystone Hotel in Oakland to see Mrs. Carpenter about her Hawaiian stamp collection. I do not know how Klemann or Loeb was turned onto Mrs. Carpenter.
2. During their visit, Klemann specifically writes that neither he nor Loeb brought up the name of George Grinnell; however, when Klemann told Mrs. Carpenter that all of the stamps were genuine except the one Missionary pen and ink drawing, Mrs. Carpenter said there must have been an exchange by Mr. Grinnell (Grinnell, not Thompson). To quote: "...she says if it is counterfeit and she says if this stamp is counterfeit Mr. Grinnell exchanged it on me."
3. Contrary to an allegation by a frequent poster to the Board, there is nothing to suggest upon hearing this news that Klemann exclaimed 'Merde!'.
4. Klemann writes "When they gave up housekeeping in Pasadena she wrote the SW Museum LA if they would be interested in a large collection of shells stored in the hay loft of a barn on the place."
5. Now some of the following stuff is sort of important. Go get a second glass of Pinot.
6. "...Allito (who was the Southwest Museum honcho) send (sic) Grinnell (no mention of Thompson) to see if the museum should take the coll(ection).
7. Now in all honesty and were you to have Klemann's lousy handwriting in front of you, then like me I think you would have thought the above reference was to the shells. But whatever.
8. "The museum secured the collection & Grinnell soaked off the stamps, had them repaired & sold them. At this time after several visits he saw the collection & you have Mrs. C. answer. Mr. G exchanged it on me.
9. Klemann (who is 75 years old at this point) says that everything else but what he has written about in this letter is in the box of stuff he gave to the Philatelic Foundation.
10. Klemann in his 1954 letter writes that "Grinnell was expert pen man which he taught also commercial law." Incidentally and in a conversation with Fred Gregory, I was informed by Fred that he learned from a meeting with Mrs. Arrigo that George Grinnell also taught (I think I remember this correctly) 'Spenserian' handwriting. I have been shown a Grinnell signature in the 'Spenserian' style.
11. Klemann also writes "...going about his duties in museum where he had old manuscript letters ... (I can't read this)...everything at hand & made the stamps by pen & ink drawings photographing & electro plating much as in the matter of the way the stamps were produced by type (?) settings (?)..."
12. As an aside and by the way and if you unlike like me have not had too much Pinot, John Klemann's legibility is atrocious.
13. And then "Pro Allito SW Museum sent Grinnell to inspect coll & procure it for museum. He did so the stamps an the boxes(?) he had repaired & sold them.:

O.K. What do we have here? Beats the heck out of me.

October 13, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken L -

You wrote below:

"I personally do not believe that a skilled forger would have faithfully copied the most minute details of the filigree ornaments in the Missionaries, and then drastically altered their most prominent features."

We finally agree.

The Grinnells had to have been done photographically by a not so skilled forger!

Roger

October 13, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Truth, legal and other Recent evidence suggests that the proportion of innocent people on death row (and the system tends to shade in the direction away from the death penalty if there is a soupcon of doubt), at least until recently, was well over one per cent (ten seems too high -- I use three as an estimate). I won't if you add up all the problems with the Grinnells, they are much better odds than a hundred to one bogus. And heading in the wrong direction.

October 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

In regard to point 4 of your thoughtful post, I predict, like George Linn, Ken Lawrence will eventually come to the same conclusion, the Grinnell stamps are counterfeit.

In the meantime, short of a new revelation from the Arrigo's, Ken has articles to write, and further research to be completed, but in the end, the result will be the same.

October 13, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken Lawrence

I was never aware that every crime in California was added to George Grinnell's name. His only offenses of which I am aware pertain to philately.

1. As to the Eat Bananas cover with what you refer to as having writing that 'superficially resembles' Grinnell's, I believe the writer was George Grinnell addressing to himself. You may or may not be aware or care that Fred Gregory also believes the writer was George Grinnell addressing to himself. And this despite having the name D.E. Clercq written above the corner card in a hand that also 'superficially resembles' that of George Grinnell. And according to the Owner who is indeed a specialist in Hawaii town postmarks, the postmark is manufactured. Nonetheless, each to his own.
2. As to the illegal use of the registry cover with a bisect, also manufactured by George Grinnell, it is one to which I have previously referred; however, I do not believe I have ever suggested that it is a forgery – just a small instance that does not exhibit George Grinnell in the best light.
3. And as to the Book of Sermons, I have little doubt that a current day laboratory analysis would reveal interesting information – whether pro or con is naturally speculative, although some of us would place bets on the outcome. And I continue to suggest that with the analysis generated from the Card of 10 having gone against the legitimacy of the Grinnells, the Owner should give it a shot. And were they to do such, I believe it should be done under the auspice of the RPSL.
4. And as to Bill Longely and 'proof' that the Grinnells are counterfeit, I again assert that in combination with the analysis performed by Richard Frajola, Scott Trepel and others in combination with the RPSL findings, any hope to show the Grinnells genuine has become a lost cause. One can disagree about this part or about that part, but in total, I find the hill insurmountable. About all that is left is for one to simply take the position of "I don't care. I still believe they are genuine nobody how they were made, what the arguments are against them, and I'm sure there is a reason why all copies ended up in one lot." Incidentally and contrary to some earlier postings, I suggest it is not those who disbelieve the genuineness of the Grinnells who keep moving the goal posts.
5. As to George Linn, he at one time or the other came down on both sides of the issue. Frankly, his correspondence that I obtained from the APRL causes me to think that he was simply a publisher running with a story to promote the sale of stamp magazine. It doesn't make him evil, but it doesn't make him correct. And of course, he seems to have been all over the block on the Grinnell subject. In any event, his final conclusion was that they are counterfeit.
6. And as to the phrase 'Grinnell's enemies', I suggest that I am no ones enemy; however, it is George Grinnell own words that show him to be something less than trustworthy. Even Judge Wood agreed to that in the 1920's. To not believe George Grinnell, whether today or 50 or 75 years ago, does not make one an enemy of George Grinnell. It simply means that one has looked at the available information and finds George Grinnell wanting.
7. As to you November Stamp Monthly article, I am yet to receive a copy. I will be interested as to how you speculate about the Southwest Museum connection. Not incidentally, your statement that Dr. Alliot of the Museum undoubtedly sent Thompson and not Grinnell to Mrs. Carpenter's house to examine the seashells is completely unsupported unless you have found something new. To my knowledge, the only documentation pertaining to the entire subject is correspondence by John Klemann who wrote that he and Mr. Loeb went to see Mrs. Carpenter and looked at her ex-husband's stamp collection. When Klemann told her that the 'Missionary' in the collection was not genuine, it was Mrs. Carpenter who offered that it was Mr. Grinnell from the museum (who was originally sent to look at the seashell collection) who must have exchanged it. She did not say Thompson. She said Grinnell. Now you can choose to disbelieve Klemann's written correspondence if you like, especially if it supports your case that Thompson was the perpetrator and not Grinnell. But it is not what Klemann said. 'Undoubtedly' is a 100% entirely incorrect contention.

In writing the above, I have gone back to reread Klemann's letter. It contains information different from what I had recollected and which I will insert in a separate post.

October 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

Cal Hahn, our most syllogistic expert, would probably have condemned all the covers with wrong-dated SF markings as fakes. Fred Gregory's logic is similar, if consistently applied, not to mention the Occam's razor boys.

October 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Warren,

As I stated several times previously, I personally do not believe that a skilled forger would have faithfully copied the most minute details of the filigree ornaments in the Missionaries, and then drastically altered their most prominent features. That is my principal objection to Bill Longley's reasoning. I'm not disputing his observations, but they do not support his apocalyptic conclusions.

Richard Malmgren,

When Bill Longley asserted that his findings had changed opinions, if all he meant was that he had persuaded you and perhaps others that the Grinnells were printed from plates, that falls rather short of "proof" that the Grinnells are counterfeit.

October 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

Thanks for the correction. There are also wrong-dated San Francisco postmarks on stampless mail from Honolulu to the East Coast, but I have mislaid my notes on them and don't have time to page through auction catalogs again.

I stress that this is speculation, but it's beneficial speculation that it should spark a search for evidence. Whether verified or refuted, this research will be useful.

Why is the percentage of wrong-dated Honolulu covers so relatively high in 1852? Does any other eastbound mail from San Francisco display this discrepancy? Are the markings themselves from different markers?

There was tension between the Honolulu post office and the San Francisco post office about delays in transit at San Francisco. No doubt this was exacerbated

after Mitchell undercut the post office letter rate and promised faster transport via clipper and via Nicaragua. So Honolulu hired an agent in San Francisco to expedite its mail, first G.B. Post, then J.W. Gregory, then Post again.

What did the agent do to earn his money? No archival records survived the earthquake, but I speculate he actually moved the mail and delivered the waybill to the post office for proper credit, payment to the ship master, and so forth. Perhaps the SFPM and the forwarders defied the PMG's order, or perhaps not, but in either case it looks to me as though the agent postmarked the mail, on dates earlier than post office dates, before it was bagged and dispatched (whether via PMSC or Vanderbilt line).

If that was the arrangement, legal or not, at San Francisco, where U.S. law applied, it's even more likely to have occurred at Honolulu where the pressure was on for speedier dispatch and transit. Mitchell advertised the fastest dispatch, whether around Cape Horn, or via Nicaragua, or via Panama.

Explaining the stamps is obviously dicier, but the larger problem is that the absence of postal history evidence to support any theory, and fewer Gregory's Honolulu Express covers than Missionary covers.

In the article I proposed that maybe Mitchell got one batch of stamps for his out-of-town customers. There was no postal collection or delivery of mail outside Honolulu except by happenstance passage of coastal vessels, but that was Gregory's business. A Honolulu resident or transient seaman would have used the post office; a letter-writer and newspaper mailer from a small town would have employed Gregory's Express to bring his incoming mail and take his outgoing mail. It was a thriving business, but today we have no remnants of it.

With zero Missionary covers from this period except the ex-Chang cover, it's not possible to support or refute this speculation with evidence. The cancel on the genuine Missionary stamp on the card is March, later than nearly all of the Grinnell cancels.

Richard Frajola asked if I believe this. I'd say it's unlikely, but I've said that about every explanation anyone has suggested to explain the Grinnells, including the majority theory that they are counterfeit. So it's still necessary to explore every possibility no matter how implausible.

October 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I do join Steve W in thanking you for taking the time to respond to our posts. I must admit that I have missed your informative posts, and shall we say, at times, your unique insight onto this matter.

October 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Why does it not surprise me that you disagree with my characterization of there being a distinction between a fact and an opinion?

I am not going to get sucked into posting a long post explaining once again, the distinction between a fact and an opinion.

All I can say is, that when a right minded person is presented with an opinion, supported by uncontested evidence, that person may rightly draw an inference that the stated opinion is a fact.

This is usually reserved for judges and members of a jury. The legal thinking is that when a judge sitting alone, or a jury of 12, consisting of right minded jurors, are presented with evidence, that is often in the form of opinion evidence, given by expert witness's, than that judge or jury by virtue of our court system in Canada and the United States, can form a conclusion, and thereby come to a verdict on the matter placed before them.

In the Grinnell matter, at least on this Board, there is no judge or jury charged with separating truth from fiction, or more to the point, fact from opinion.

All we have are Board participants who post their views, myself included, with no one person or panel charged with deciding what constitutes a fact, as opposed to an opinion.

I submit, your references to William Faulkner, and literature and drama, have nothing to do with separating fact from opinion in the George Grinnell case, because this was a real life occurrence and not a fictional story.

I submit, that contrary to what you state in your post, there are no problems with facts, because opinion becomes fact when it is supported by evidence. If at some later time this evidence is proven to be unreliable, than the matter can be re-visited. That is generally known as an appeal of the original finding or verdict, whatever the case may be at hand.

If your looking for a perfect world than I suggest your not going to find it in the Grinnell case or on this Board. The problem is that this is basically a free for all discussion, because there is no longer one body empowered to look at the evidence in this case, and come to a decision. To do so would be outside the scope of this Board, as who is to say that one poster is right and another poster is wrong.

One thing that I can state is a fact, is that once again I got sucked into trying to explain this distinction, yet, once again.

October 13, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,
Thanks for your comments. We've missed you.
I have comments about two of your points.

First, if Gregory was the purveyor of the Grinnells, how did all of them, used and unused, end up in one set of hands? The John Emerson story was concocted to address this very curious (and suspicious) aspect of the Grinnell saga.

Second, with respect to San Francisco postmarks, census #135 has an error in the table. The SF date is FEB 18, not FEB 12, and 2/18/52 coincides with the sailing of the PMSC "Panama" from SF. You are correct that the other four dates do not coincide with PMSC sailing dates, and that is one of the puzzles that

needs to be explained with respect to accepted Missionaries. However, you should remember that the SF post office was obligated by exclusive contract to forward all P.O. mails by PMSC steamer. They tried to challenge this in mid-1850 (you may be familiar with the little straight-line "Per Steamer Isthmus" markings which the SF P.O. used to justify sending the mails on Law's Line rather than PMSC), but were instructed to send all the mails via PMSC toward the end of 1850 by the PMG.

The upshot of this is that all via Nicaragua mails do not have San Francisco postmarks, but typically show entries into the US mails at New York.

That, however, does not rule out your theory since it would have been possible for Gregory to take the mails to the SF post office after the trip from Honolulu.

October 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

I disagree with Walter Plomish's dichotomy between fact and opinion, partly because I value William Faulkner's distinction between truth and fact, which is the principal justification for literature and drama. Walter's view echoes the legal distinction between fact and law, but neither is exceptionally concerned with truth in the larger meaning.

Information consists of facts, estimates, and analyses, in varying admixtures. All three are subject to modification as new discoveries are made and interpretations change. (What is the current "fact" of how many planets inhabit the solar system?)

All the contributions here are valuable, and all have contributed to my understanding of Hawaiian Missionaries and Grinnells. My difference with (for example) Bill Longley is that his evidence, as interesting as it is, does not constitute "proof" that the Grinnells are counterfeit. If Bill's and Scott's and David's evidence shows that the Grinnells were printed from plates, that was also the opinion of George Linn, who believed the Grinnells were genuine.

But here's an example of the problem with facts:

On July 3, 2001, scientists examined Grinnells (GHMS) and Tapling Missionaries (THMS) at the British Library using Micro Raman Spectrometry (MRS). Their report states, "All of the chemical compounds identified in the ink, cancellations/postal marks, and pigments in the paper are consistent with those used in the 1850's. . . . The ultramarine blue pigment detected in the paper of four out of five GHMS is the same chemical compound that was detected in the paper of the five THMS analyzed. In addition, as stated above the particle size and the number of particles per unit area of stamp paper were consistent. This suggests that the THMS and four of the GHMS analyzed were printed from the same ream of pelure paper. . . . Based on this comparison and the combination of the above similar features, we conclude that it is likely that the Grinnell Hawaiian Missionary Stamps and the Hawaiian Missionary Stamps of the Tapling Collection come from a single manufacturing source."

Another report of the same tests reached the opposite conclusion, and that was the conclusion adopted by and reported by the RPSL. The RPSL bibliography cites the report I quoted, but nowhere mentions its conclusions. Why is that? Perhaps David Beech will explain. Meanwhile, which report is factual?

October 13, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Scan is [here](#).

October 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

Previously you made reference to the cover with the fake Honolulu cancel. I asked Fred what he knew of this, and he replied with scans of two covers addressed to George Grinnell owned by another collector. The one with a fake cancel on a 1¢ Washington stamp has writing that superficially resembles Grinnell's, but is not his. The sender's name is D.E. Clercq, written above the printed corner card of Territorial Marketing Division, and includes a green and yellow etiquette that says EAT BANANAS and pictures one.

If that is the cover you mean, it does not support your allegation. It's another example of how every crime in California was added to his name. If Grinnell was so bad, why must we add allegations like this?

I have sent a scan of it to Richard Frajola.

Perhaps the Eat Bananas cover goes with David's peanut butter Sandwich.

The second is a registered cover from Grinnell to his wife mailed at Los Angeles whose postage includes a bisected 2¢ Washington along with a single 1¢ and a 10¢ registry stamp, which is an illegal use, probably tolerated by a friendly postal clerk, but is not a forgery.

The analysis of the book of sermons was performed by a man who considered the Grinnells to be counterfeit, but his analysis was inconclusive. Perhaps tests on more modern forensic equipment might yield more useful results.

October 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Despite Bill Longley's belief, I have expressed strong differences with the pro-Grinnell side from the very beginning. One difference concerned the owners' belief that the "motto wafers" that William Emerson sent to his mother were stamps, a point that the RPSL disposed of on pages 37 and 38. A second concerned their handwriting experts' opinions, which are not persuasive. A third concerned Jeffrey Weiss's theory that William had taken obliterators and Honolulu postmarkers to Wailua, where he used them to cancel letters and wrappers franked with Grinnell Missionaries. I have disputed that several times on this board, and it is the subject of my article and addendum that Richard linked on the page of longer statements.

So it is not easy to explain how the Grinnells might be genuine. My November Scott Stamp Monthly article "Are the Grinnells Genuine?" speculates that a batch of stamps and the extra set of postmarkers might have been given to Isaac Mitchell, the mail forwarder who was helping Henry Whitney establish mail service to the United States and who operated the Honolulu office of Gregory's Express during 1851 and 1852.

At present there is no direct evidence to support my speculation; it is entirely inferential based on these facts: Whitney ordered the postmarkers and mail scales from Joseph Gregory, the owner of Gregory's Express, and promised to pay Mitchell, his Honolulu agent, for them. He did not order them through Jacob Moore, the San Francisco postmaster.

In 1852, Gregory was officially appointed as the San Francisco forwarder for the Hawaiian post office.

Mitchell had more experience than the boy Whitney in managing mail to and from the U.S. On July 1, 1851, Mitchell advertised: "Hereafter, the postage on half-ounce letters for San Francisco will be 5 cents only." That was half the cost of postage for a letter mailed at the post office. That may explain why Honolulu postmarks on mail seem to stop abruptly in late June of 1851, and don't reappear until early 1852. It might also have prompted Whitney to work out an arrangement with Mitchell for processing mail after he matched Mitchell's rate in September.

According to Randall E. Burt writing in the January 1989 Western Express, "At least three 1852 outgoing mail announcements added Gregory's Express bag as being made up 'at the same hour' or 'by the same conveyance' as the government mail bag." Clearly there was a close practical collaboration between the post office and Gregory's Express at both Honolulu and San Francisco.

Richard Frajola thinks I'm all wet on this, and I trust he will present his full argument. He may be right. But my article is based on documentation taken from four well-documented histories of Gregory's Express, including aspects of Hawaiian mail that diverge from U.S. mail practice.

A hint of this is contained in the Walske cover census. Note that census 135 from Kahului to Brookfield, Connecticut, is postmarked February 12 at San Francisco; census 15 to New York City, October 27; census 193 to Albany, New York, May 26; census 143 to Port Gibson, Mississippi, October 7; and census 74 to Lancaster, Pennsylvania, November 10. If they were being processed by the San Francisco post office and dispatched according to regulation, they should be marked San Francisco on the 1st or 15th/16th of the month only. But if they were being forwarded via Nicaragua "ahead of the mail" by Gregory's Express, while charged as post office letters, that might account for the discrepancies.

Is there any way that my speculation might be supported by hard evidence? I'm told that Fred knows the location of some Honolulu waybills for mail to San Francisco. If he would share images of those, perhaps we can see if any were made up by Isaac Mitchell.

October 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

I'll take a break from work on the Liberty Series book to answer several questions and comments. I'm sorry I can't be a better participant right now. I'll try to respond to everyone who has addressed me, but that may take time. In addition to Steve Walske's advice to be respectful and friendly, I would also ask for your patience. We are inching toward a unified solution to the Grinnell mystery. I have published about 12,000 words on the subject so far, and relatively little of that has been discussed here, yet some intemperate posters feel I owe them replies to every barb. I'll do my best in due course.

I have two articles in the November Scott Stamp Monthly. I wrote both before the discovery of the two genuine Missionaries was reported, so neither article benefited from subsequent information, and both are deficient in that respect. One is "Are the Grinnells Genuine?" The other is "Are the Grinnells Counterfeit?"

The second article tells everything I have been able to discover about the chief suspect, Charles Sidney Thompson, and the nexus of the Southwest Museum, Hector Alliot, George Grinnell, and the museum's printer who manufactured Thompson's WAR STAMP overprints of 1917. Judge John Perry Wood pointed the finger at Thompson as the probable forger in a 1923 conversation with Grinnell.

Besides all the information at APRL, I quoted correspondence between Thompson and Grinnell about Y. Souren's intrigues while Souren was expertizing the Grinnells in 1945 and declaring them genuine.

Besides what I wrote in the article, I would add these points pertinent to Richard Malmgren's interest:

Thompson was the Southwest Museum's seashell expert. Undoubtedly Alliot sent him to collect Mrs. Carpenter's rat-gnawed seashells. I think Klemann leapt to the conclusion that she had met Grinnell because of his obsession.

However, between 1917 and 1923, at least three geographically disperse collections of Hawaiian stamps with impeccable pedigrees were discovered to contain counterfeit Missionaries. Two included full sets of Scott 1-4 counterfeits, and either or both of those sets may have originated in the 1893 discovery at Honolulu. So it's possible that the reported discovery was a hoax to defraud collectors, or official reproductions manufactured for the same purpose. Either way, they lack a plausible connection to Grinnell, but his enemies tried to link him to two of them.

October 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence** <apsken@aol.com>

Bernard,

Please send me an e-mail message. I'll try to assist you.

October 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

Just eliminating possibilities.

In my opinion, which has not changed, George Grinnell obtained G80 & G81 from Shattuck and used these two stamps as a model to print the Grinnells.

October 13, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Walter P

Yes, it is the same Southwest Museum.

It is now part of Autry National Center.

October 13, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

In a heart beat! I'll repeat myself by saying that I view the Card of 10 as one of philately's great treasures. The legitimacy of the Grinnells has been argued for over ¾ of a century. It has remained one of philately's most interesting stories.

I doubt that the Southwest Museum ever owned the items. Even if they did, I would bet dollars to donuts that they never placed identifying marks on the reverse.

The Academy of Arts never marked the stamps in the Atherton Collection which was formed in large part from the Crocker holding and was subsequently merged into the Advertiser Collection.

The New York Public Library never marked the stamps in the Miller Collection.

I once saw an unmarked collection in a Paris Museum (which name I forget).

October 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

Adding to my last post- Would anyone want to buy the card of ten and take that chance? Perhaps, the card of ten, has now been reduced, to a souvenir for the Arrigo's?

After all, more likely than not, that was George Grinnell's intention, in regard to the card of ten, in the first place. Was it not?

October 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

Further to your post this morning:

If the Vince and Carol Arrigo ever sell the card of ten, and G80 & G81 were in some way marked for identification by Southwest Museum, and the new owner lifted the two stamps off the card and found identifying marks of the Southwest museum then ...

Either, the new owner would have to take the Arrigo's to court to retrieve their money, or the Southwest Museum would have to take court action to retrieve their rightful property.

Of course, once again, this is pure speculation. However, the irony of such a hypothetical situation would be that George Grinnell would end up in court, yet again, through his descendant.

Richard M, you once stated on this Board you would like to purchase the card of ten. Given the above, do you still want to now?

October 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Correction:

In my last post, I did not mean to imply that Grinnell glued G80 & G81 onto the card of ten with the knowledge of some of the Southwest Museum staff.

October 13, 2006 **Walter P**

J Salva & Richard Malmgren-

J Salva raises an interesting point in that if G80 & G81 were marked for identification in some way, by the Southwest Museum, true ownership of the stamps may be established by lifting the stamps for inspection.

I made a search on the internet this morning and I see that the Southwest Museum in California is still in operation. I wonder if this is the same museum as in the Grinnell Saga?

If this is so, how is this for a hypothetical situation:

The two stamps now known as, G80 & G81 were acquired [stolen] from the museum by George Grinnell, who later, in concert with others, and after using them as a model to print the Grinnell stamps, glued them down onto the card of ten as his personal souvenir of this event.

The Southwest Museum had marked the two donated stamps with accession numbers or some other form of ownership identification so Grinnell glued them onto his souvenir card to hide this from view. This also provides a plausible explanation for his action, which Bill Weiss rightly described, as "stupid" in his post yesterday.

Assuming the above, it would be possible, provided the stamps were marked at the Southwest Museum with some sort of identification, for the Southwest Museum, providing today's museum is the same museum, to start a court action to retrieve the two genuine Missionary stamps, as stolen property belonging to the museum.

This would be the same rationale applied to present art owners today, having to return masterpiece paintings that were stolen by the Nazi's in World War II, to their rightful owners.

It is interesting to note, that I read a newspaper article regarding the Vancouver, BC Maritime Museum where they state that they have so many donated items that consist of all types of items, all they can do is catalogue the items and place them in storage for years and years before anyone looks at them again.

I think this is the situation of all museum's, and it would be possible that G90 & G81 were donated to the Southwest Museum and were placed in storage forgotten, until they were acquired by Grinnell, possibly with the knowledge of some of the Southwest Museum staff members. Perhaps, Grinnell ran across the stamps on his own in the Museum and took them without anyone's knowledge at the museum?

In any event, these are just possibilities and as yet not even an opinion. Would this even be possible? Is the Southwest Museum in California today the same Museum as in the Grinnell Saga? If so, did the Southwest Museum keep records of items donated to the museum? Were donated items marked for identification and if so, are these records still in existence?

Richard Malmgren is more than correct in thinking the Arrigo's would not be highly motivated along such lines. What a story that would be for Ken Lawrence, if the Arrigo's were ever forced to return G80 & G81 to the Southwest Museum, as stolen property?

However, this is all pure speculation at this time and I wonder if this is even worth pursuing, as a viable theory? What do you think?

October 13, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

The Card of 10 is owned by M/M Arrigo. They can do anything they wish with the Card. Assuming their motivation remains selling their Grinnell holdings for presumably maximum profit, I do not think they would be highly motivated to along such lines.

October 13, 2006 **J Salva**

Is it possible the genuine stamps are glued down to hide some identifying (incriminating?) evidence on the reverse, such as an owners handstamp or museum accession number? Would that premise be justification for removal and inspection?

October 12, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Remember the lady with the shell collection and her ex-husbands Hawaiian stamps and a visit from the Southwest Museum?

Remember the alleged 'merede'!

Some time back I tried to think through how G80 & G81 was obtained from her. The problem is that it would have taken two visits - one to pilfer the Missionaries and the other to replace them with Grinnells after G80 & G81 were used as the models and the Grinnells were produced. I could never make the time lag work in my mind.

Also, I am unaware of enough documentation to support the notion.

October 12, 2006 **Walter P**

Steve W-

I would say that it is a distinct possibility that G80 and G81 once were the property of the Southwest Museum. That leads us to the question, if that was so, than how did George Grinnell obtain these two stamps from the South West museum?

Assuming for a moment that George Grinnell did obtain these two stamps from the South West Museum, it would mean that he either stole them from the Museum Archives, or in concert with either the museum curator and or some staff members, took the stamps and used them as a model to print the Grinnell stamps.

It is also possible that these stamps were stolen from the museum archives by Grinnell, knowing that the museum staff and curator were unaware of these stamps existence, in the archives. Grinnell than could have later approached the museum curator and or some staff and hatched a plot to print the Grinnell stamps using these two stamps as a model.

Interestingly, other stamps are known to have been printed at the South West Museum.

If you can suscribe to the above as being a possibility, you can than surmise that Grinnell eventually glued them down onto the card of ten as a security blanket, as he did not want to risk the original doner of these stamps to the South West Museum, coming forward, if he tried to sell these stamps on the open philatekic market. This would, as Steve suggested, ensure they would not come to light again.

If the above is true, than of course you would have to say that Grinnell's story that he obtained the stamps from Shattuck, was pure fiction.

Is this even conceivable, or am I just buzzed out from drinking too much coffee tonight?

October 12, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Not to get off the subject, but I think it would be horrid to cut up the Card of 10. Considering the longevity of the Grinnell controversy (over 3/4 of a century) and the interest it has generated, I consider the Card of 10 to be in the nature of a historical item.

October 12, 2006 **Roger Heath**

The Glue on the Card -

It sounds like everyone is assuming the stamps on the card are attached permanently. Once the owners conclude the Grinnells are definately forgeries, it would be an interesting exercise to cut out one of the Grinnells and soak it in water to see if the stamp floats away. If successful I see no reason why the two genuine stamps could not be removed in a similar manner by "experts" familiar with soaking stamps. I would be willing to volunteer my stamp desk as the test site.

Roger

October 12, 2006 **Steve W**

Is it possible that G80 and G81 belonged to the Southwest Museum (via some sort of gift), and George got them from there? If they never really belonged to him, he might want to keep them under wraps - gluing them down would ensure that they wouldn't come to light again.

October 12, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

Your four questions are intriging and the answers to these questions would pretty much solve the mystery.

The only question of importance left out, I think, would be, who applied the fake cancellations on some of the Grinnell stamps?

A better question would be, was the person, or persons, who applied the fake cancellations on some of the Grinnell stamps, the same entity that printed the Grinnell stamps?

It hurts my head to even consider that Grinnell may have obtained G80 & G81 from anyone else, but Shattuck. However, its a possibility that one cannot ignore.

October 12, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Given the analysis performed by multiple people, it has become harder and harder (impossible in my opinion) to convincingly argue that the Grinnells are other

than counterfeit.

From my viewpoint what we are left with are the following type of questions:

1. What was Shattuck's role - did either the Grinnells or the Missionaries even originate with Shattuck? Absent new evidence to the contrary, I continue to maintain that the question of provenance between Shattuck and the Grinnells is extremely weak, especially given the Card of 10 and the two Missionaries that were used as models. It is easier to argue that the two Missionaries originated with Shattuck, although there remains the original testimony of the Shattuck family to overcome.
2. What was Grinnell's role? It is difficult to argue that he was a mere dupe. He was simply involved in too many fabrications, although the question of opportunity vs. premeditation is a fair question if he indeed obtained the two Missionaries from Shattuck for the bargain price of \$5 (or from someone else).
3. Who else was involved and what was their role, if any, in the affair - e.g., C.S. Thompson and Hector Alliot? Is any one aware of anything that can better tie one or both of these gentlemen or somebody else into the alleged 'ring'?
4. How were the Grinnells manufactured - I think David Shumaker may soon be adding some additional light on the subject.

I've undoubtedly left something out. While we may all have varying opinions on whether or not the Card of 10 was a keepsake of sorts any why the two Missionaries were glued down, the above questions (plus whatever I left out) remain unanswered.

A problem with most of us is that we do not have direct access to the American Philatelic Research Library. It would be nice if we were all there for a week pooling our efforts and trying to dredge up everything they have on record (which Ken and the library staff may already have done). In any event, does anyone have documentation or additional thoughts on the above questions?

October 12, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

Walter P;

Thank you. I admit that ANY of the possibilities you offer are, just that, but I still don't think any collector would knowingly paste down two valuable stamps. There's no need to do that. It's just stupid. I also don't think he would have done it BEFORE selling the stamps successfully. That would REALLY be stupid.

October 12, 2006 **Walter P**

Bill Weiss-

Adding to my post below:

Perhaps, George Grinnell glued the two genuine Missionary stamps onto the card of ten just to make sure that he would not be tempted the sell the two stamps at a later date.

This would be of course, assuming that he thought the sale of the Grinnell counterfeit Missionary stamps would be successful.

Perhaps, Grinnell just did not want to risk tempting fate, and was playing it safe. After all, if the Klemann sale had gone as planned, he could have very well risked letting the cat out of the bag, had he later been tempted to try and sell the two genuine stamps used as a model to print the Grinnells.

Perhaps, Grinnell glueing the two genuine stamps onto the card of ten was his insurance policy, that this would never occur?

October 12, 2006 **Walter P**

Bill Weiss-

In my opinion, George Grinnell was not a stupid man, however he was a man that made some very poor decisions.

Trying to sell the counterfeit stamps to Klemann was a poor decision, and pasting the two genuine Missionary stamps onto the card of ten was another poor decision, or was it?

I would theorize, that once Grinnell allowed his two genuine Missionaries to be used as a model to print the Grinnell stamps, he knew that he could never sell them as that would raise to much suspicion, so he just glued them down onto the card of ten.

I would also theorize, that Grinnell glued the two genuine stamps onto the card of ten, just after the Grinnells were printed.

In my opinion, it is reasonable to assume that Grinnell really thought he was going to get away with selling the counterfeit Missionary stamps, which were worth alot more than the two genuine Missionary stamps, if he could sell them all.

In my opinion, after the sale fell through, Grinnell had already glued the two genuine stamps down onto the card of ten, and the damage done. Why try to lift the stamps off the card of ten anyway, Grinnell knew he could not sell the two genuine stamps as that would raise too much suspicion. I believe, as stated previously, that the card of ten was then reduced to being George Grinnell's personal souvenir.

I would guess, Grinnell's thinking at the time was, what's \$2,000.00 anyway, against a \$65,000.00 windfall, had the sale to Klemann been successful?

Remember, nobody tries to pull off a fraud believing that they are going to be caught, do they?

October 12, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

The following is an OPINION;

I am very suprised that no-one to date (that I recall) has thought it highly unlikely that George Grinnell would knowingly and voluntarily glue the two genuine missionary stamps down to the card of 10! Am I not correct when I say, that even at the time this took place (1918?), that they were worth, what, several thousand dollars each? Do I not recall Ken recording that in the late 1890s someone had paid like, \$500.+ for a missionary?

Doesn't them being pasted down along with the non-genuine stamps kind of make it seem like Grinnell didn't know what he was doing? Doesn't it seem that he didn't realize their value? That, to him, all ten were of equal stature? Would ANY collector in his right mind paste down valuable stamps?

While I am definitely in the Grinnells-are-counterfeit camp to date, I just find this quite astonishing and wonder what others think about this? Even if, as others

have suggested, he knew they were the stamps used as the models for the counterfeits, what's the point in pasting them down? Even if, again, as others have suggested, he never planned to sell them, why paste them down? There is no scenario that has been presented that, to me, justifies him pasting them down. It just seems plain stupid.

End of opinion.

October 12, 2006 **Veronica**

Not a good day, but let me quickly say that I don't mind being challenged. I've only ventured into topics I'm very familiar with and that I can support with more than a "hunch." That's why I haven't commented on a number of aspects, including the critical question of the printing date.

I expect Walter to be cantankerous and would probably be disappointed if he weren't. Reminds me of my father. However, it's disappointing that he didn't familiarize himself with the topic before jumping into it. Until that happens, any further academic discussion on the topic would be like dueling with an unarmed man.

Walter, if you'd like to expand on my post and have specific citations for my statements I'll be glad to provide them. In the interest of the others, kindly email me at my personal address. I'd also like to know more about the glue and it's impact on the stamps.

October 12, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Frajola-

An interesting turn of events, when you consider that Turkey was just thinking of prosecuting Orhan Pamuk, the jouranist who was just awarded the Noble Prize for literature.

October 12, 2006 **Walter P**

Steve W-

Steve, one of my character faults is that when most people first meet me they percieve me to be hard nosed and that I have little patience for others.

This is the farthest from the truth, which you would see after sitting down and speaking with me in person a few times. When I worked as a union representative for many years, I came across as having a pitt bull mentality. This served me well, because other people did not know what I was really thinking. On this Board this works against me.

In this forum, I tend to back off when someone posts I am being too aggressive in making my points, and stating my opinions. I guess I just get upset when people present opinions as facts, as it does not move us forward on this Board.

One of the hallmarks of being intelligent is being able to recongnize ones own faults. Thank you for the reminder. In 'fact,' if you ever meet me you will soon find that I am an attentive listener, and not, in fact, a combative speaker.

I just have a pet peeve over board participants potraying their opinions as facts. What I was saying, was, please post all the opinions on the Grinnells you want, but do not present them as facts, absent supporting evidence. This was all I was trying to state in my last few posts, nothing more.

Anyway, they say you get more with honey than you do with vinegar. Perhaps I should remember that more, but we are all on the same page here, are we not? We are all just trying to sort out what happended with George Grinnell and his stamps.

October 12, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Maybe it is time to declare history as fact, not opinion. Noticed this in the UK Timesonline today:

French MPs have today approved a Bill that makes it a criminal offence to deny that Turkish massacres of Armenians in 1915-17 constituted genocide, causing embarrassment to the French Government and outrage in Turkey.

October 12, 2006 **Steve W**

Walter,

Why have you become so combative? Please lighten up on the commentaries about other people and their opinions. This is a Board about Grinnells, not wrong-thinking philatelists.

October 12, 2006 **Walter P**

Bernard Biales-

Re: Your post, Card of Ten - I would tend to agree with your post, in that it would be more likely than not, the reason why Grinnell glued the stamps down onto the card.

Re: Your post, Kinds of Truth - You raise an interesting point by stating, kinds of truths. I agree that it serves little purpose to go into long legal arguments concerning which participants in the Grinnell Saga were being candid, and which were not.

However, there is one legal point that I think we should not ignore on this Board, when posting. Even though the subject, kinds of truth, has been covered extensively, I think it important to cover it, yet once again.

This is because, it is obvious that when some people post on this Board, they cannot or refuse to draw the distinction between an opinion and a fact.

Anyone, can state their opinion on this Board, but I believe that it serves no advancement of the Grinnell discussions, when some posters keep stating their opinions, and representing them, as facts. Do most posters even recognize the difference between an opinion and a fact, it appears not?

I think it is important that all Board participants post their theories and opinions so that they can be either proved wrong or accepted as being plausible.

In order for a fact to be recognized as a fact, it must be supported with evidence, not a personal belief or opinion.

In your view can be move forward without adopting the above?

October 12, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

I once heard a rather amusing lecture by the Semiologist who wrote the Name of the Rose (Novel) about the sort of thing being mentioned -- name artists signing fakes and such. The Chinese thought highly of copies of masterpieces by later masters. The focus on having the original hand does have a sort of animistic quality to it. Why do we want the cover instead of nice scans?

October 12, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Rats -- I picked up a free copy of your latest in New York. At a very quick glance, it looked interesting -- but when I got on the Fung Wa, it was gone. Maybe I can grub one up here. What was your address again? I owe you a sending.

October 12, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Card of Ten Remember that Grinnell tried to acquire another Hawaiian rarity. He was a collector. It is reasonable to Assume that he was very happy to own the two genuine stamps for that reason.

Of course, once the thing blew up, it Also would have been tricky to dispose of them, since buyers would have associated him with the troubled material.

Kinds of Truth The use of legal criteria for studying a topic can be of value, but they seem to me to diverge sometimes from the more -- I can't find the right word -- fundamental question of historical (including -- in both law and science -- the use of the harder science/technologies) approaches. And the status of material as collectibles falls into a third categories. These discussions wander among these different universes, for good and ill.

October 12, 2006 **Walter P**

John Forsyth-

John, I thought this was a free Board created for philatallists to exchange their views on the Grinnell subject and related matters.

My post, that you seem to object to, was directed at Veronica in response to her post directed at me. Veronica expressed her views and I responded, what is the matter with that?

Unless, of course Richard has appointed you the Board censor who decides who can post, and on what?

October 12, 2006 **Shu**

Are any of the Sandwich Isles known as the Peanut-butter-'n-nanner Isles? Perhaps some very southern ones? I think I'm on to something. Alright folks, Elvis is in the building, carrying a Grinnell and probably filming a sequel in Hawaii.

October 12, 2006 **Shu**

I know Picasso was only talking about signing his own work. I know he's deceased.

However, Elvis isn't and he may have picked up a hankerin' for the Sandwich Isles.

October 12, 2006 **Shu**

Must have been Picasso who bought Piller's Grinnell for \$20K! ;')

October 12, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Roger H.

>Picasso: "If the counterfeit were a good one, I should be delighted. I'd sit down straight away and sign it."

He was talking about signing a check, right?

October 12, 2006 **John Forsyth**

Walter,

Please give it a rest.

October 11, 2006 **Walter P**

Veronica-

In your post today, you state it is your opinion that the card of ten was not created by George Grinnell as a personal souvenir.

In the same post you state your opinion is based on your review of a FBI Crime Classification Manual.

In the same post you state that it is your opinion that George Grinnell did not create the card of ten as a souvenir, because the card would be a painful reminder of his failure, exactly the opposite of the reason criminals keep their souvenirs.

In your next post you state nothing is impossible.

In the same post you state that you believe it important to support your statements rather than simply presenting opinions as facts.

In the same post you state that you feel a need to differentiate between fact and opinion - no matter how long the post goes - and support them.

In the same post you draw the inference that your opinion that George Grinnell did not create the card of ten as a souvenir, and you present your opinion, as a fact.

I submit that just because you consult an FBI Crime Classification Manual, read the general description or psychological profile on why certain criminals keep souvenirs of their crimes, apply this profile to George Grinnell, and then opines George Grinnell does not fit the profile.

Further to the above, I fail to see how your stated opinion, which you present as a fact, has been supported.

Veronica, isn't it true that in your post, you have in fact stated your opinion and presented it as an unsupported fact?

I further submit that the opinion you gave from referencing the FBI Crime Classification Manual was just that, your opinion, and not a fact.

October 11, 2006 **Roger Heath**

I think there is some disbelief in the motives of forgers and potential forgers. Art history has a number of 20th century examples that should be studied, well at least given some consideration in the present discussion.

Intellectual "crimes" are usually designed not to cause physical harm, but they are usually a method of discrediting experts. This web site below has a number of examples which should be read. This link is to one of the most famous forgers of the 1930's, [Han van Meegeren](#)

Other interesting and relevant pages are [#18](#), [#19](#), and [#20](#). Page [#12](#) describes a technique appropriate to our discussion.

Picasso:

"If the counterfeit were a good one, I should be delighted. I'd sit down straight away and sign it."

Vasari on Michaelangelo:

"He also copied drawings of the old masters so perfectly that his copies could not be distinguished from the originals, since he smoked and tinted the paper to give it an appearance of age. He was often able to keep the originals and return the copies in their stead."

Ah, ha!

October 11, 2006 **Veronica**

Nothing is impossible. I cited my sources because I feel it's important to support my statements rather than simply presenting my opinions as facts. If you'd like to overlook 200+ years of American jurisprudence, have at it. But I would remind you that - at the end of the day - the allegations put forth by some members of this board are criminal. And if this case had gone to trial as a criminal case, the VERY knowledgeable philatelists who are actively involved here would be reduced to expert witnesses trying to explain nuances to non-philatelists with a much stricter burden of proof. As you've seen, there are brilliant people of integrity who can't agree on critical issues that go to the heart of this issue. The state would have called one side, the defense would have called the others...and with beyond reasonable doubt as the standard, Grinnell would walk. That very well might have been a miscarriage of justice.

One other note - one of the things that brought me out of the balcony was seeing people whose integrity I never questioned - dealers and philatelic authors - assert points without supporting them. A kind of "It is because I say it is." I've been surprised, disappointed, and painfully enlightened by the various responses. How many other collectors are watching this conversation unfold, and basing their future dealings on the posts?

In short, I feel the need to differentiate between fact and opinion - no matter how long the post goes - and support them. I could have made the same point about the card of 10 without looking it up in any source (turns out my memory was correct), but I thought it was important to not only be responsible in my "facts" but to cite them as well. If it takes a little dusting, I'll kick it up.

October 11, 2006 **Walter P**

Veronica-

Before you start dusting off any more FBI Manuals permit me to remind you of the following:

The information contained in these types of manuals is not cut in stone, and certainly are not the be all and end all of law enforcement investigation. These manuals are more like guidelines which point you in a direction that warrants further investigation.

You state in your post that, "souvenirs are generally associated with violent crimes and go to the underlying motive of the crime." I note that by using the word 'generally' you concede that it was not an impossible George Grinnell made up the souvenir card of ten to keep hidden away from public view to be kept only for himself.

Therefore, it is possible George Grinnell made up the card of ten as his own person souvenir card.

In case you forgot, the card of ten was made up by George Grinnell, more likely than not, before he tried to sell the Grinnell stamps to Klemann. I think George made up the card of ten just after the Grinnell Missionary stamps were printed. Grinnell probably did take the card out now and then to gloat over the counterfeit stamps and the two genuine Missionary stamps used as a model to print the Grinnell Stamps.

You may be right, that at a later date, the card of ten would prove to be a reminder of his failure to sell the Grinnell stamps. However, what was Georgie boy to do? He was not going to throw away or destroy the card of ten, with the two genuine stamps G80 & G81 still affixed to the card. Before he could throw away the

card of ten he would have had to try to at least lift the two genuine stamps that were glued the card. This action may have resulted in damaging the two genuine stamps glued to the card and Grinnell did not want to take that risk. What he did do, was keep the card as it remained hidden away until it was finally recently revealed to the public by the Aggiro's.

After everything fell apart George Grinnell probably just squirreled the card away in his belongings and rarely looked at it again.

With respect, I submit that you are incorrect in stating in your post, that my theory of George Grinnell making the Card of Ten his personal souvenir card, "fails in my opinion."

Your thoughts?

October 11, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Each to his own regarding the Card of 10 and its status as a souvenir. The original owner has long since passed away so we all have to form our own conclusions.

In any event, the instructions "Keep these for my own private collection. Sell or trade all of the others. Geo. H. Grinnell." makes it obvious that George Grinnell wanted to keep this particular Card of 10.

And two of the pieces of paper glued to the Card of 10 are Missionary stamps. And because the two Missionary stamps were used as models for the Grinnells is reasonable motivation not to disperse the Card of 10. And if you have no intention of dispersing the Card of 10 because you know the Missionary stamps were used as models, then why not glue everything down?

The instructions on the Card of 10 can be interpreted different ways, but one inference is that George Grinnell did not place as much value on the 'loose' Grinnells knowing them to be counterfeits.

October 11, 2006 **Shu**

That is, Grinnell got a lot of money from Klemann...

October 11, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Veronica,

Good question. The glue may be only gum from another stamp, or similarly non-destructive. I don't think it has been examined. Certainly not dipped in a pan of water, where all ten stamps may float right off the card.

However, as far as the failure angle goes - Grinnell didn't fail. He managed to get alot of money from Grinnell and hold it for three years. He only gave back about half of it. Plus, he fooled Wood, Taylor, Pool and Klemann. He crushed Klemann like a robin's egg under a Peterbuilt. All these men edifices of the hobby, and he only an inconsequential novice.

October 11, 2006 **David Shumaker**

One more reason why G80 and G81 were not purchased for use in a premeditated forgery scheme: 5) No Scott #4. If one began from scratch to imitate a hoard of Missionaries, one would have to plan on making the #4 and endeavor to secure a copy. However, obtaining by chance the two #3's from Shattuck, there was no opportunity to model a #4.

October 11, 2006 **Veronica**

After giving the theory of the card of 10 being some sort of souvenir a lot of thought, I respectfully suggest that we cross that off the list of possible reasons for its existence. I dusted of my FBI crime classification manual and base the statement on their rationale for crime souvenirs at large.

Souvenirs are generally associated with violent crimes and go to the underlying motive for the crime. The items taken serve to remind the criminal of the thrill he or she experienced while committing the act - the victim's fear, the violence, the sense of power. They may also serve as a physical embodiment of the victim, keeping that person "close" and giving the criminal some other thrill. This is most often seen in murder, rape, and occasionally arson, but very unusual in white collar crime where the motive is money or greed. In fact, taking souvenirs is a clue profilers use to determine the underlying motive for the attack (hit men or husbands in a fit of jealous rage don't take them, so look instead for a person with a different psychological profile).

In fact, when I tried to apply this concept to Grinnell keeping the card to remind him of his counterfeiting, it invalidated the theory for another reason. Every time he looked at the card he would be reminded of his failure - exactly the opposite of the reason criminals keep their souvenirs.

I'm sure there's plenty of other plausible explanations for the card, but this one fails in my opinion.

Quick question - am I making too much of the stamps being glued to the card? I assumed that glue would be somewhat destructive and take away from their value (even though they've been well preserved by comparison to others). Am I reading too much into it?

October 11, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

David

I do not know. It is not my cover. I will ask, however, it will be a few days before I see him.

October 11, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard, can you get an image of that Grinnell cover with the fake cancel posted on this board?

October 11, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

David

I suggest that we simply do not know enough to eliminate other possibilities.

What we have is an incomplete record, portions of which are incompatible, and much of which different people argue differently.

In my opinion, the most important development since the Los Angeles trial is the belated appearance of the Card of 10, presumably initiated by the decision of the Arrigos to dispense of their holdings sooner than later. One can speculate as one wishes on whether they did or did not know of the significance of the Card of 10 and why only now was it produced. Don Sundman of Mystic has said the Arrigos did not know the card contained two Missionary stamps and they were simply selling off everything they had. My recollection from the round table at StampShow is that Don Sundman also said that they previously held back the card because of Charles Shattuck's written instructions to do so and were simply honoring the request of Carol Arrigo's Grandfather.

In any event and once the two Missionary stamps were discovered on the card, it led to Scott Trepel's and Bill Longley's analysis as well as your own – none of which particularly support the idea that the Grinnells are genuine and/or printed directly from type. When taken in total and combined with Richard Frajola's examination of the postmarks, most everyone concludes the Grinnells are counterfeit.

As a somewhat aside, I have now seen three early 20th Century Grinnell contrived covers. How many more must have been made? Where are they? Certainly I have not been so fortunate to have been shown all of them. My guess (i.e., speculation) is that there were once scores of them. Assuming I am correct and if many remain in a large holding, then I doubt that they will be produced regardless of whether or not they might help answer questions.

The above are a lot of words to say that I don't think we have enough information to eliminate other possibilities that you pose. There may be or once was additional material that could lead to answering some of the things we are speculating about. If so, then it has not been disclosed. (If nothing else, then there was once the progressive material leading up to the actual printing of the Grinnells.) At this stage we will never know all of the facts. But then who would have thought the Card of 10 existed?

October 11, 2006 **D. Shumaker**

Oh, and I forgot the most important negative: 4) Where was the profit for Mr. X?

October 11, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard,

A fake Honolulu postmark on a cover by and to George Grinnell??? Is there "STUPID" backstamp?

Yes, I have thought for quite some time that G80 and G81 were acquired by Grinnell through Shattuck, reconciling the Hawaiian provenance that the families have researched. But, in the spirit of Walter's wanting to "eliminate other possibilities," I am looking for scenarios wherein the stamps did not have to be obtained through Shattuck - which requires another person and perhaps an unknowing Grinnell being led to a "find" by Perkins.

For example, a Mr X stumbles across a man selling some 19th Century Hawaiian stuff and thinks "Wouldn't it be nice if this guy had a bunch of the old Missionary stamps?" Then, Mr. X goes about collecting some genuine examples to model, creates fakes, plants them (which would involve Shattuck in this mess) and paid Perkins to send Grinnell over to find them.

This can be eliminated because 1) G80 and G81 are much better and more expensive examples than necessary to produce the "Grinnells" from, 2) Grinnell possessed G80 and G81 and now 3) he makes his own cancellation devices!

Speculation; yes, but to eliminate possibilities, not expand them.

October 10, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

David

Responding out loud.

Unfortunately, we are all speculating on this one.

Walter P's original suggestion that George Grinnell obtained two Missionary stamps (G80 & G81) from Charles Shattuck (as opposed to approximately 80 Grinnells) provides a simple and plausible explanation as to how two Missionary stamps came into the hands of a school teacher. (On the other hand, remember that trial testimony of Mrs. Shattuck and the two children was one of disbelief about any stamps.)

As an aside, a local Hawaii collector who specializes in postmarks of Hawaii's territorial period has an envelope from the 1900's addressed by and to George Grinnell with a fake Honolulu H.I. postmark on a U.S. stamp. This is a separate cover from any others I have mentioned.

By my definition George Grinnell was more than a mere philatelic prankster.

Anyway, it would not surprise me that there was a 'ring' and it would not surprise me that the 'ring' included one or more Southwest Museum people. It would not surprise me that fellow school teacher and museum curator C.S. Thompson was part of the 'ring'. Incidentally, do I recall correctly that it was the printer at the museum who printed up Thompson's phony War Tax Stamp?

As to your query about opportunity versus premeditation – who knows? The more information I learn about the matter, the less credible George Grinnell becomes to me.

How did Grinnell obtain the two Missionary stamps? I doubt that he bought them in the traditional sense.

October 10, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Thinking out loud,

If one set out to BUY models for making Missionary forgeries, one would only need three crappy ones - one for each denomination to get the central numeral, making sure both types were represented. Well, a crappy Two Cent is still expensive and impossible to locate, so you settle for a Five and a Thirteen of different

types and wing the numeral Two. Why, if one was to buy the genuine as models, would they be two of the same denomination and in apparently exceptional shape? How would the "ring" have discriminated between pieced-together and painted-in majority from the exceptional specimens actually secured?

If purchased from a dealer, then G80 and G81 would not have been purchased by Grinnell himself, else a dealer recognize the name in the papers as someone who he sold genuine missionaries. Besides, he likely hadn't the money. This means that a direct purchase with intent to produce counterfeits was probably masterminded by someone OTHER than Grinnell. Which set up Grinnell as the "face man." The mastermind may have passed away before the deal with Klemann.

The above being of slim chance, I favor Shattuck as the source for the two genuine stamps, and credit opportunity, not premeditation, for hatching the forgery-peddling scheme.

Does anybody feel that a direct purchase from a dealer expressly for a forgery scheme deserves any more consideration?

October 10, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

The Grinnells have been called the Grinnells for nearly ¾ of a century.

I suggest the inclusion of two Missionaries on the Card of 10 was hardly an unexplained quirk.

Analysis is showing the two Missionaries on the Card of 10 to be the models for the Grinnells. It seems logical to me for one to keep the models used to make the counterfeits under wraps.

October 10, 2006 **Veronica**

Oh - and I might be color blind. I meant white collar crime, not blue collar. (Although blue collar crime might be a little more defensible...and way more fun!)

October 10, 2006 **Veronica**

Richard - please reread my post. I never assigned responsibility to anyone for the label. Whether it was the family members, the company that one family has consigned their stamps to or collectors in general, this group of stamps has been labeled "Grinnells". By some quirk that remains to be explained, there were two accepted Missionary stamps in the group. If I had an explanation I would proclaim it - if I had a theory I would advance it. I don't, so I merely pointed it out.

Your comment is value-laden and doesn't reflect my opinion.

October 10, 2006 **Steve W**

Prometheus,

Many of the early forgers like Fournier and Spiro were making "facsimilies" that were intended to be used as lower-cost album fillers. It is thought by some that their intent was not to defraud, but that others used their work to defraud collectors.

October 10, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Walter P

I am a magnanimous and forgiving person. Incidentally, I never took your post as a personal criticism. (One of our local politicians once used the magnanimous line when asked if he could bury the hatchet after a bitter primary election. I have never forgotten it. "Yes, I can forgive my opponent; after all, I am magnanimous.")

Veronica's comment that Mystic told us they were Grinnells so we believed them is accurate. What is the point in verifying that they were all Grinnells? Now if they told us they were Missionaries, then a lot of people would undoubtedly have looked closer.

Prometheus

I suggest that Missionaries in the 1890's were more rare than today. Many were yet to be discovered, still hiding in a trunk or somebody's Book of Sermons.

Many, if not most, of the pictures of Hawaiian stamps in old albums are inaccurate representations. Some of them are even funny.

Different collectors of counterfeits have their favorites. Among others, I have always been partial to the 5c Kamehameha III with a pig like nose – a not uncommon counterfeit.

The 2c Missionary you referenced on e-Bay is, of course, a counterfeit.

Last night I briefly thumbed through a copy of Sales List No. 2 from C.R. Richards, an early dealer and author. I did not see a date, but my guess is late 1800's. He listed a used Scott 3 and a used Scott 4 (the two 13c stamps) with a price of \$500. I doubt very much that he had either of them for sale, but who knows? I suspect listing them with a price in his Sales List was to hopefully improve his status to the collecting public.

October 10, 2006 **prometheus**

This has /is been a great discussion of the Stamps real or not. I am too green to weigh in on either side.

My questions are as follows,

1. I have many old stamp albums , most have places for the Hawaiian stamps were they just printed because the stamps existed Or was it considered a possibility in 1890 to get them for your book?
2. What was the method used for printing the stamp picture/sample in the Olde albums.
3. As I also buy old Stamp Lists and Catalogues, I see some even in the 1890's were offering the Stamps for sale. Were these Real Missionary stamps Or early forgeries.?
4. Is this Ebay Item a Known forgery 280036161121 or just some other older/new fake?

THANKS **RF** for again providing such a great resource for Postal History information on the WWW.

(I am leaning a little to the Not side at this point)

October 10, 2006 **Walter P**

Veronica-

I believe, as suggested by others on this Board, that the card of ten was George Grinnell's personal sample sheet of counterfeit stamps, with the two genuine stamps G80 & G81 that were used as models to print the Grinnell stamps.

A sort of George Grinnell souvenir sheet so to speak.

I think that is why George Grinnell glued the stamps down onto the card and wrote his note on the reverse of the card. I believe that Grinnell wanted to keep this card, for reasons known only to himself, all to himself. Maybe Grinnell just wanted to pull the card out now and then and dream about what could have been?

We may never know any of this for sure, but this appears, to me anyway, a reasonable explanation of what occurred. As usual, I am open to other suggests, I just haven't heard one that quite fits yet.

October 10, 2006 **Walter P**

Veronica-

Our last posts crossed.

October 10, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

I think your explanation, in general, summerizes why nobody noticed the two genuine Missionary stamps mounted with the eight Grinnell stamps on the card of ten at Washington 2006.

I too, remember, the last time I attended an International Stamp Show. I attended the last two International Stamp Shows held in Toronto, Ontario. I stayed both times for 10 days. I agree with Richard M that at such a show you soon become overwhelmed and it is impossible to take in everything at the show.

I remember looking at fantastic exhibits, the creme of the philatelic crop, for hours at a time until everything became a blurr. Most people's mind cannot take in any three or four straight hours of looking at exhibits, before they shut down and need a serious break.

In my answer to Veronica, I forgot the above, until I was reminded of it, by your post today. I was certainly not critizing anyone in my post for failing to notice G80 & G81 on the card of ten at Washington 2006. I was just pointing out that sometimes you cannot see the forest for the trees. Nobody was expecting to see any genuine Missionary stamps on the card of ten, just Grinnell stamps.

Richard, can you find it in your heart to forgive such a transgression?

I agree with you, in that that there is a possibility that the Book of Sermons has already been tested at a lab, with less than favourable results. However, it is not possible to know this with any degree of certainty, unless of course the owner himself, sheds some light on this possibility?

October 10, 2006 **Veronica**

I agree with Richard and can add that humans are easily led - the sign said "Grinnells" and we bought it. Even Ken Lawrence, armed with years of experience and a faithful reproduction of the card, chanced across the discovery - and missed the second one sitting right next to it! I guess we can forgive ourselves for not seeing it amidst the jostling crowd at Washington.

As to Walter's questions that arose from my post, I spent quite a bit of time looking at the card of 10 and wishing I'd learned more about blue collar crime in my forensic psych classes. What does occur to me is fairly basic - I see Grinnell, for a purpose good or bad, viewing this as a set of 10. I base this on the fact that there is nothing to distinguish the two genuine stamps from the rest. Even the note on the back is generic to the set of 10. If he'd meant to segregate the two, I would think he would have put them on separate cards or at least arranged them slightly apart from the others, or made a notation specific to the two.

Seems every question leads to another, but let me see what others think - if you were in Grinnell's place, knew you had two genuine Missionarys, and your gig was either up or faltering, wouldn't you use the two genuine stamps to either persuade potential buyers or convince the judge that you were just a dummy that got duped? I'm stunned they were treated like the rest of the counterfeits and never announced until recently.

My recollection is that the Shattuck/Culhane contingent was as shocked as the rest of the philatelic world when they learned of the card of 10. I believe it was reported in Linn's shortly before the show in May.

Thanks for the many kind words of encouragement.

October 10, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Why were the two Missionary Stamps not observed on the Card of 10 at Washington 2006? This question comes up on the Board every now and then.

I was at Washington 2006. I did not notice that G80 & G81 were Missionary stamps (assuming such is indeed true) and not Grinnells. Nobody else did either. Speaking for myself, the answer is relatively simple.

Washington 2006 was one of the greatest shows at which I have exhibited as well as had the pleasure of attending. (I also attended and exhibited at Pacific 97 and PhilaFrance in Paris.) While no longer a teenager, I was like a kid in a candy store. The exhibits were phenomenal, the dealers plentiful, the seminars instructional, and the society meetings friendly. In addition, Judie and I went sightseeing in Washington DC (a city full of museums) and went to more than one first class restaurant.

There was a lot for everyone to do besides checking out G80 & G81.

As a Hawaii collector, I naturally stopped by the Mystic Stamp booth to look at the Grinnells. The Card of 10 was shown. I thought it interesting and wondered

'why only now is it being shown'? I wondered how many more copies there might be squirreled away that might or might not ever see the light of day. I wondered if the Shattuck descendents were ever aware of the Card of 10 (ignoring the prior couple of years when the Arrigos apparently told a couple of people). These questions were not and are not unique to me.

In addition to the Card of 10, there were numerous other Grinnells displayed and for which Mystic was asking approximately \$1.5 million lump sum on behalf of the Arrigos. (I assume they were negotiable.) I suspect that nobody is truly surprised that neither I nor anyone else checked out each and every one of the 'for sale' Grinnells to verify that they were, in fact, Grinnells and that no one had slipped in a genuine Missionary to trick us. Likewise, I suspect that nobody is truly surprised that neither I nor anyone else checked out the Card of 10 to see if anyone slipped in a genuine Missionary to trick us. (Actually, I have a foggy recollection of checking out the 2c Grinnells; however, that would have been for no other reason than the rarity of 2c Missionaries and my wanting to be sure that I could tell the difference in the tail of the '2') In any event, I just thought to myself that I wish I could acquire the piece with the four 2c and one 5c issues on the back.

The Book of Sermons was also displayed. When I was not sneaking into my bag multiple copies of the free Mystic publications on the Grinnells, the majority of my time at Mystic was pondering the Book of Sermons and wondering why hadn't a thorough laboratory testing or examination ever been performed on it to verify that the mint Grinnells were inserted between the pages as claimed. I also wondered if such examination might actually have been performed and the results were not reported because they were unfavorable. (O.K., I'm sometimes cynical.) In other words, it was the Book of Sermons that caught my attention and I spent a fair amount of time pondering about it.

As to the Card of 10, I did not spend any large amount of time looking at or pondering it - at least not at Washington 2006. Nearly three months later at StampShow I spent a lot of time looking at it.

What is my point? Namely that it is entirely improper to criticize anyone at Washington 2006 for not having noticed the two Missionaries on the Card of 10.

Were the Arrigos aware of it before hand? Either answer they provide can be arguable to some. Don Sundman, the hopeful seller of the Arrigo material, says they did not know. To the best of my knowledge, he is the only one who claims to have actually talked to the Arrigos about the matter. As far as I know, everyone else pegs their answer off of his.

Some Grinnell defenders attempt to make the point that not noticing the alleged genuineness of G-80 and G-81 is indicative of the quality of the material and an implication that they are real. In actuality, it takes some effort to verify the genuineness of G-80 due to the heavy cancel, assuming that one's reference is the middle bar of the '3'. From my viewpoint and given the venue, one could have only noticed that G-81 was genuine. But I and everyone else had other things to do with our time than check out each and every one of the Grinnells to determine whether or not somebody had slipped in a genuine Missionary.

October 09, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

Veronica;

Contrary to an earlier post, your comment about your personal problems was not overlooked, so please accept my sincere best wishes. I have an elderly aunt undergoing chemo at the moment, but amazingly, she's tolerating it quite well, all things considered. Hope you are too.

October 09, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

I agree that George Grinnell, being a school teacher, may not have himself, been much of a mark to prey on. However, more likely than not, Grinnell obtained G80 and G81 from Shattuck, and that gave him a valuable bargaining chip, and made him a player, if one was to plan and enter a conspiracy to print Hawaii Missionary counterfeit stamps.

Veronica-

The answer to your question, why glue the missionary's to the card, may be very simple. When you consider that a photographic enlargement of the card of ten was displayed at Washington 2006 for a week, and nobody noticed two of the missionary stamps on the card were genuine stamps? Why was that? Was it because you can't see the forest for the trees?

Perhaps, Grinnell himself did not want to risk having the two genuine stamps he obtained from Shattuck [G80 & G81] being mixed up with the Grinnell counterfeit stamps, so he glued them to the card.

Perhaps, as an extra precaution, Grinnell also penned the notation on the back of the card of ten?

There are a lot of 'perhaps' here, but since all of the players have either passed away, or are unknown to us, all we can do is theorize, through the process of elimination.

Your thoughts on the above?

October 09, 2006 **Walter P**

Veronica-

I will call you Veronica from now on. I went through this twice with family members so your references to your situation were not lost to me.

I do wish you the best and hope you have a full recovery.

October 09, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Of course, none of my previous post can explain how Grinnell got hold of two genuine Hawaiian Missionaries.

Rick A. - Hang in there. Been there slightly (rad only) but certainly no fun. My best wishes to you.

October 09, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard M. - Lewis Perkins, according to the RPSL book.

If Lewis was part of a plant, then the question asked on this board before is how were the conspirators to make any money? Is that what you meant by "getting complicated?"

Walter P. - A good plan would have been to get Grinnell to pay Shattuck several thousand dollars for the stamps by setting up a fake deal between Grinnell and a "buyer" for many thousands more should he obtain them. With a school teacher's pay Grinnell doesn't appear to be much of a "mark" to prey on. But - what if he actually did pay several thousand instead of five dollars, got stung, realized said sting, and then got caught attempting to "pass the buck" to Klemann? Perhaps an untold drama unfolded in the year between the find and his approaching S.L. Wood? That'd be a twist.

I've always been suspicious of the story that Dr. Alliot told/confirmed the significance of the find sometime late in 1918 but Grinnell chose to do "nothing for some time after Dr. Alliot's death," approaching Wood several months into 1919. I'd have hopped the first train to NYC once Alliot told me what I had. But that's me.

Perhaps Alliot really told Grinnell he had been taken? Perhaps after some time doubt for Alliot's opinion crept in, so he tried again with Wood and was told again they were likely fakes. Perhaps the \$5000 from Grinnell changed Woods perspective?

Oops, I'm talking ill of folks again. There's no reason whatever to suspect Wood's complicity in any of this.

October 09, 2006 **Steve W**

Rick,
Count on philatelists to overlook your reference to the effects of radiation and chemotherapy. I hope you are well on the way to full recovery.

October 09, 2006 **Rick**

Thanks for the clarification - it didn't seem plausible and I was quite surprised to see you mention it. Does highlight several questions that arise if one seeks to place Grinnell's hand alone on the printing press without the complicity of others. But no one has theorized about my earlier question - why glue two genuine Missionaries to the card? Why even make a note to keep them? Seems like that would be a given.

If Mr. Culhane is still willing to post, perhaps he can fill us in on the Shattuck family descendants memories of the occurrences since the stamps were found. Why the ongoing loyalty without a nickle being exchanged (or, apparently, sought)? I would think that this kind of conviction would be based on something.

For those that are consumed with trivial matters, kindly choose between my given name and the nickname my family gave me - the constant reference is insulting and needless since I adapt easily to either.

October 09, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

My position on George Grinnell, his complicity in this affair, and his association with the counterfeit Missionary stamps, is clearly stated in my post to Veronica aka Rick.

However, in order to validate a theory, one must eliminate all other possibilities.

As stated in my post, I do not subscribe to the theory Grinnell obtained counterfeit Missionary stamps from Shattuck. I am merely attempting to eliminate that possibility, and through your post you effectively demonstrate the implausibility of that possibility.

The only question left, is, why would Grinnell add the counterfeit cancellations to some of the Grinnell Missionary counterfeit stamps?

October 09, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Walter P Y Rick (Veronica)

I think (?) the two of you are exploring the idea that the Grinnells could have been counterfeited and placed with Shattuck without George Grinnell's knowledge and prior to his obtaining them from his visit to the Shattuck home.

Please remember that George Grinnell obtained an affidavit from Mr. (I forget the gentleman's name) who was a fellow Mason. According to the affidavit, Mr. (I forget the gentleman's name) was visiting Los Angeles, attended a Masonic meeting, met George Grinnell, discussed philately, and gave him Shattuck's name. George Grinnell then visited the Shattuck home and walked away with the Grinnells, graciously leaving \$5.

For your idea to work, then Mr. (I forget the gentleman's name) would logically and most probably (but not absolutely) be part of the setup.

It gets a little complicated if you wish to go down that route.

October 09, 2006 **Walter P**

Rick [Veronica]-

Re-read my post to Ken Lawrence. I never posted that George Grinnell applied fake cancellations to the Grinnell stamps.

I merely asked Ken Lawrence if he knew of anyone having explored this possibility?

My position right now, and has always been, since the card of ten was publically released, is as follows:

George Grinnell only obtained two stamps from Shattuck, G80 and G81. The aforementioned stamps are presently mounted on the card of ten. George Grinnell entered into a conspiracy with one or more persons using the above noted two stamps to print Hawaii Missionary counterfeit stamps, which he later claimed he had found in his great Hawaii Missionary stamp find.

One of the great unsolved mysteries in the Grinnell Saga is who applied the fake Hawaii cancellations onto some of the Grinnell stamps, and why?

Like everyone else, I don't know what really occurred, and I cannot prove my theory with any degree of certainty.

If you have a counter theory, I would be very interested in hearing what you have to say.

October 09, 2006 **Rick (Veronica)**

John Forsyth - thanks for the quasi-compliment. I hope you didn't read too much in my absence. While I do have an aversion to circular thinking, there are a number of very brilliant philatelists posting here also and my hat's off to them for pursuing their areas of expertise. Right now the affects of radiation and chemo are dictating my schedule - this is just a nice diversion that I occasionally think I have something to add to.

Walter - your latest post seems to address part of my efforts to encourage the reconciliation of some information we have. Please elaborate - if the stamps were counterfeit before Grinnell took possession, why do you theorize he would apply fake cancellations?

October 09, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Steve Walske just add another color cover image for the [census](#) (#195).

October 08, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

To your knowledge, has anyone explored the possibility, that when George Grinnell first obtained the Grinnell stamps they were counterfeit stamps.

Then, during the interlude, between after obtaining the Grinnell stamps in their present state, and the time he first publicaly announced their existance, the fake cancellations were added onto some of the Grinnell stamps?

October 08, 2006 **Walter P**

Roger Heath-

While reviewing your post, I could not help but think that for some of the owners of the Grinnell stamps, namely Carol and Vince Arrigo, their driving force is their belief, that somehow George Grinnell will be vindicated, notwithstanding their huge potential financial windfall should the Grinnell stamps be found to be genuine. The eventual result of the RPSL report must have been akin to a brick shattering a plate glass window?

History has proven that when you hold back critical evidence in any case, this can result in a conviction of an innocent person. However, in this case, by the Arrigo's holding back the card of ten, this in itself did not result in the conviction of George Grinnell in the court of public opinion. The irony in this case is that the Arrigo's eventual public release of the card of ten was the Grinnell stamp owners downfall.

I agree with you in that, it is indeed unbelievable that the card of ten was held back, and the Arrigo's just sat back and rolled the dice hoping that the RPSL outcome would be in their favour.

Another thing to consider, is that if the Arrigo's had submitted the card of ten to be examined by the RPSL, the stamps are glued to the card, and they may not have wanted the stamps removed from the card thus risking damage to the stamps?

However, I believe, the reason was, more likely than not, that the Arrigo's did not want to raise any undue suspicion, by having the writing by George Grinnell on the back of the card of ten, part of the offical RPSL examination of the Grinnell stamps?

Not being a mind reader, I don't know for sure what the Arrigo's motive was in failing to submit the card of ten with the rest of the Grinnell stamps to the RPSL for expertisation, on that point, I will let the readers draw their own conclusions.

Yes, it was unbelievable, but what peaks my curiosity, is what else have the Arrigo's held back from the RPSL. How many, if any, Grinnell stamps do they have that have not been disclosed to the RPSL, 10, 20, 100, I don't know? This is all about credibility is it not? The less credibility you exhibit, the less likely you are to be taken at your word.

The bottom line here, with respect to the Arrigo's anyway, is that you 'reap what you sow.'

I will add, however, before Ken Lawrence starts to post, that the Arrigo's did in fact make the RPSL aware of the existance of the card of ten. However, the Arrigo's did not want to include the card of ten with the Grinnell stamps that were submitted for expertization. Why was that?

The lack of response to the recent Grinnell stamp studies by Bill and Scott from the Arrigo's or any of their supporters is telling and points to the Grinnells being, as the RPSL found, counterfeit stamps. After all, the onus to prove the Grinnell stamps genuine, falls squarely on the shoulders of the Grinnell stamp owners, does it not?

Ken Lawrence posted that in time a response may be forthcoming? I also fail to see how Bill and Scott,s studies can be discredited on their technical points. I for one, eagerly await any credible rebuttal, are one forthcoming? Only time will answer that question.

October 07, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Walter -

I thought your spelling got locked in, but you've now proven to be a user of moveable type.

I'll add that for all the technical studies showing Grinnells to be fake, I have yet to see any response which discredited the studies based on their technical points, usually the criticism is generic and non specific.

I have enjoyed the work of Bill L and Scott T, who have taken on the challenge showing the Card of 10 to be the missing link. It is too bad the expertisers didn't have the card available to them. They spent two years studying th eGrinnells but hadn't been given the complete "picture". That is what I find unbelievable.

Roger

October 07, 2006 **Walter P**

Bill Longley:

In reference to Richard Malmgren's post yesterday regarding your "Back to Canada" comments.

Bill, please reconsider, as I think you have made a significant contribuion to the Grinnel Study Board. As in all things, there will be detractors and people that are jealous of another's work. This may be, because they lack the skills and knowledge of this subject to post an intelligent study on this Board.

Also, there are people who possess the skills and knowlegdge on this subject to post an intelligent study on this Board, but choose not to post. I belive, this is because they don't want to be critized or taken apart, so they just don't post. This is to bad, because we may loose some valuable insight and clues in solving the Grinnel stamp mystery, just because some people feel too intimidated to post on this Board.

There are also legions of potential posters sitting in the 'peanut gallery,' who never or only occasionally come out to post, and after recieving a rebuttal or argument against their post, they retreat back to being a 'lurker or balconeer.'

Richard Malmgren suggested you have at least two supports, well you can add me to the list, and I would venture to say that there are alot more supports out there, who would post, but fear getting jumped on by one of the Grinnell supporters.

I think the lack of any response to your study and Scott's Grinnell study speaks volumes, although I am led to believe, by Ken Lawrence, that in time some rebuttal from the pro Grinnell camp may be forthcoming.

I hope this post causes you to reconsider your decision to retreat back to the Land of the Maple Leaf, and post no more on this subject.

put a spell on you - Whoever you are, you will be gradified to see that I spelled Ken Lawrence correctly twice in this post. Thank you for letting me know I was spelling his name wrong all this time. Actually, there is a lesson in this, as if this mystery person had not posted, I would have keep on unknowingly spelling Ken's name wrong.

This is called sharing knowledge, what a clever person you are, now if you would disclose your name to us, you share some more of your wisdom with us all.

October 07, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Maybe they wouldn't have been.

October 07, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Scott - I was thinking in hypothetical terms. If the Grinnell's, in uncanceled state, had been widely dispersed in the 1920's, that they might have been considered to be reprints on the par with other Hawaii reprints.

October 07, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Richard F:

"If the Grinnell's were not cancelled, their status would be extremely hard to determine with confidence"

I think you are making this statement from a postal historian's perspective.

As someone who tackles the technical aspects of printing with more enthusiasm, I would be 100% confident in the Grinnells status as fakes, even if no cancelled examples existed.

I understand your point, but I want to make sure everyone understands mine: the Grinnells were printed from solid metal plates, and in that respect they differ from the genuine Missionaries in a fundamental way that cannot be explained by the stories created to justify all of the other factors weighing against the Grinnells.

I assume Dick Celler is continuing his research, which I think will be very useful in understanding the genuine Missionaries, but I doubt it will change anyone's opinion about the Grinnells. Certainly not mine.

October 07, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

John F - Genuine stamps that meet the criteria established for authenticity (that is the have same characteristics as accepted genuine examples found on cover) do not need any collateral evidence at all.

The problem is that by every account the Grinnell's do not meet that standard. To establish the authenticity of a non-conforming, new stamp issue, it is required that a plausible story of their appearance and printing history can be given.

When used stamps are involved, it normally requires examples found on cover, or at least examples that have postmarks and cancels that are identical to those found on the new items. If the Grinnell's were not cancelled, their status would be extremely hard to determine with confidence.

October 07, 2006 **John Forsyth**

It is a bit discouraging. We all knew when this started it was an intellectual exercise. Even if the Grinnells were 100 percent legit, they still would not be accepted because there is no collateral evidence.

Yet, the mystery of how they were printed, and where they came from could still interesting. Yet, egos and personalities get in the way of a sane discussion. For me, I surrender. I will retire to the balcony on this one.

Veronica tried to make some good points on getting things up a level for discussion, but that sort of thing is ignored.

Thanks to Richard for the reference pages. I believe that will be the lasting legacy of all of this.

October 07, 2006 **put a spell on you**

Walter P, Please, Ken Lawrence's name has only the two "e's", not another one before the "r" -- Ken is evidently much more patient of this than I am -- thank you

October 06, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Bill L

Your 'back to Canada' comment disheartens me.

Please do not keep your future studies to yourself. I appreciate them. My wife doesn't, but I do.

I will bet that there are many, many people in the balcony who are waiting for your next study. Look how Richard Warren came to your defense. O.K., so there was only one balconite who actually took the effort. Nonetheless, the thought of your having many, many supporters in the balcony is a nice thought even if delusional.

Please continue to share your studies. Don't disappoint your fans -- neither one of them. Your efforts are first rate. Please keep those studies coming. I truly believe them to be a philatelic contribution.

October 06, 2006 **Richard Warren**

Walter P - Your judgement on all this is your own, but I might just add that I didn't actually mean to question Ken L's good faith in this matter.

Now I'm really going back to the balcony.

October 05, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Warren-

Well stated indeed. However the problem with the Grinnell Board, is that when a participant like Bill Longley submits a valid study, some participants who hold an opposing view simply dismiss the study.

In my view, when this occurs, it actually validates the study, because no evidence to the contrary is submitted to the Board.

It is also my view, that off handed comments, and unsupported fragmented statements that are carefully crafted to downplay the validity of the study, like you reference in your post, is not evidence to the contrary. However, this is evidence that the writer is choosing to, for reasons only known to himself, brush the study under the table.

It's just a clever play with words that fool some, but no not fool, like yourself, most of the other Board participants.

October 05, 2006 **Richard Warren**

Ken L - excuse me for being stubborn, but I still don't see quite how the clear differences you cite invalidate the "selected similarities", to use your words, or, to put it more accurately, the details which Bill L interprets as being evidence of copying.

With respect, you've wrongly paraphrased his case. He has not set out to find similarities per se. He has identified details that can only be explained as evidence of both primary mechanical/photographic copying and of supplementary copying by eye and hand.

The first are non-constant specks that transfer mechanically into the Grinnells as constant, and the second are faulty details that are subtly altered when transferred by eye and hand into the Grinnells, suggesting misunderstanding or garbling on the part of the copyist.

Either side of these, on the spectrum of similarity / difference, we can identify details that are similar (good copying), and details that are different (bad copying). These do not outweigh evidentially, or invalidate, Bill L's findings. I do not see how they are evidence to the contrary.

Back to the balcony again ...

October 04, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken Lawrence

Please reference your last posting to Bill Longley and your last line comment of 'Whose opinion have you changed?'

Scott T and Bill L and what I hope will be shown by David S have all helped me formulate an opinion that I did not previously have.

Prior to the showing of the Card of ten, it is true that I believed that the Grinnells were counterfeits because of a number of reasons, the highlights of which include the following:

1. The Grinnells are obviously different than the Missionaries.
2. There are no examples from anywhere else.
3. There are no examples on cover.
4. In view of the above, I found the Shattuck story to be wanting.
5. In view of the above, I found the Arrigo/Culhane efforts to show the Grinnells genuine to be wanting.
6. The fact that the LA Court, Philatelic Foundation, and RPSL all agreed that they are counterfeit were naturally additional reasons.

Prior to the Card of ten, I did not have a strong opinion one way or the other whether the Grinnells were printed directly from type. I was open to argument. Long ago I had read the trial testimony. I knew that Fred Gregory and Scott Trepel had definite viewpoints before the publication of the Card of 10. Nonetheless, I was no opinion. I just did not know, especially when the Court said they were not printed directly from type and the RPSL said that they were.

I have now changed from no opinion to an opinion that they are not printed directly from type. My opinion has been resulted from the research of the above three people in combination with my own observation of the Card of 10 at StampShow. The research of the above mentioned people has been presented in a way that I can understand and that I find convincing. I have not been shown research that is convincing to the contrary. I have only read words to the contrary.

To restate, I for one have moved from a no opinion to a strong opinion that the Grinnells were not printed directly from type.

The Missionaries are typeset. Regardless of your contrary statements, I believe the Numerals too are printed directly from type. That I now am of the opinion that the Grinnells are not is even more convincing to me that they are counterfeit.

I have no idea whether they will be a contrary presentation similar to Scott T's and Bill L's. While waiting for what may or may not come, at least Steve W and I both concur that Dick Celler's analysis of multiple settings of the Missionaries is definitely something to look forward to.

I sincerely hope that Dick has the time and inclination to share his effort with us.

October 04, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard M.

I am still working on that article for posting on this board. The work has not been as steady as I had hoped.

October 04, 2006 **Steve W**

This Grinnell thing has become an endless do-loop.

I'd like to second Richard's request of Dick Celler to publish the results of his plating studies of genuine Missionaries. That would be interesting!

Can we turn the direction of this forum more towards assessment of accepted Missionaries?

October 04, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Ken L - I have only seen the draft versions of your Stamps Monthly articles. Was that first one hypothetical, or is that what you believe to be true?

If the later, and you give me some version of it (or a summary of key points) to link on the Grinnell reference page, I'll take the time and provide a rebuttal.

October 04, 2006 **Tim Knies** <[tknies\(at\)ameritech\(dot\)net](mailto:tknies(at)ameritech(dot)net)>

The November Scott Monthly has been spoken for.

October 04, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bill L,

I haven't diminished anything. I haven't attacked anything. I haven't refused anything, except to respond to taunts.

I consider every possibility, including your suggestions, but I'm not interested in pursuing arguments that persuade no one. If this is fun for you, by all means enjoy it, but it isn't fun for me. I'm pursuing different methods of investigation that might solve the mystery, which is my idea of fun. If your study heartens people who share your fervor, so much the better.

By your exact logic, all the 1851 Missionaries are counterfeit. The formes remained mostly set between printings, but some elements were replaced and others acquired damage, so they all (within types) have identical features across denominations, and many differences also, with no rhyme, reason, or consistency.

Some genuine 1851 Missionaries were canceled long after the 1852 Missionaries were issued, and at least one is on an 1856 cover that has a clear PF certificate.

Whose opinion have you changed? As far as I can tell, no one here has switched sides.

October 04, 2006 **Richard Warren**

Walter P - it's probably clear from the posts since, but "he" = Bill Longley, likewise the "he" in the quote from Ken L in my post.

Sorry for the confusion.

October 04, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Ken L. You are a master of the pen. I bow to your prowess. Your ability to diminish what others have said without disproving it is (or will be) legendary.

Since you (or should I say the Grinnell supporters) have put forward the notion that the stamps were printed with the formes intact and denominations changed. Please explain why these later printings (after all the genuine ones) have earlier period postmarks.

Please tell me how the repaired "88" flaw suddenly appears.

Please ask Mr. Sundman for a scan of the genuine missionary to disprove what appears to be a paper crease.

If the formes remain in place, then why are there 500+ differences in the design of the stamps. That awaits explaining.

Why won't you even consider the fact that the Grinnells were copied? It is a perfectly valid option as to the Grinnells origin, yet you refuse to consider it. Why?

If copying is a deduction from my preconception the Grinnells are counterfeit, then looking for evidence of copying is valid. Finding it warrants examination, no *lasse faire* dismissal. Please, go ahead, disprove it.

Everything that you seem willing to consider points to the Grinnells as being genuine. Everything else is attacked. Why is that?

As for your comment *"as far as I can discern he hasn't caused anyone else's opinion to change"*, I would respectfully disagree.

I'll keep my future studies to myself and share them at a more appropriate time, perhaps once some expert committee or buyer thinks they are real.

I'll leave the Grinnell debate for those who have a vested economic interest.

Back to Canada.

Bill

October 04, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard W,

Or else the selected similarities are in the eye of the beholder, which are blind to the differences, and the copying is imaginary.

Owners of the Grinnells who believe they are genuine have been noting similarities a lot longer than Bill has. You should study their writings.

In Pat Culhane's presentation to RPSL, he identified specific rules which, based on matching flyspeck traits common to both Missionary and Grinnell stamps, he interpreted as evidence that the same rule had been used to print both.

Bill simply inverted that logic. "Copying" is a deduction from his preconception that the Grinnells are counterfeit, not evidence to persuade skeptics.

October 04, 2006 **Tim Knies** <[tknies\(at\)ameritech\(dot\)net](mailto:tknies(at)ameritech(dot)net)>

I have an extra copy of the November Scott's Stamp Monthly, no charge, if anyone is interested.

It has the 2nd part of Ken Lawrence's story about the Grinnells.

E-mail address above.

October 04, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Warren-

In your post to Ken Lawrence you make a some valid points, but fail to mention who "he" is in your post.

Can you please share this with us, as I want to be able to understand and evaluate all of the posts on this Board?

October 04, 2006 **Richard Warren**

Ken Lawrence -

"For every gotcha similarity he thinks he sees from the Missionaries reflected in the Grinnells, one can show a greater number of differences."

Don't quite follow the logic there. It's not a matter of totalling up the similarities and differences and seeing which outweighs the other, surely? All he has to do is to demonstrate that there are sufficient similarities to indicate imitation or copying. The differences don't require any explanation.

October 04, 2006 **Walter P** <[Walter P](#)>

Ken Lawrence-

No flies on you? I see your leaving no stone unturned in your investigation.

I am just waiting for Chapters Book Store to get their November issues of Linns Stamp News. I am looking forward to reading what you have to say about the Southwest Museum Connection.

I am sure you won't disappoint us.

October 04, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

One of my articles in the November Scott Stamp Monthly is about the Southwest Museum connection.

October 04, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

You have this all wrong. I was just injecting some humour in a post to Richard Malmgren, but I guess you thought I was being impatient?

Not so, I, like you, would rather wait for a measured credible response to Bill and Scott's studies, than a halfhearted one, if in fact any credible response is

forthcoming at all. Time will tell Ken, time will tell, but at the same time I'm not holding my breath.

On the positive side, I found out that Chapters Book Store sells Scott Stamp Monthly issues, so I will be able to purchase read your latest Grinnell article and try to keep up to date.

I hope that you are going to find the time to look into the activities of the Southwest Museum staff and known associates in your investigation? Do you think this is a waste of time and effort or a loose end that has to be cleared up?

October 04, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

You were not so impatient when Scott asked our indulgence for several weeks while he prepared his report. I'm perfectly happy to wait an equal amount of time to see what his critics might find.

No one has published a rebuttal to my November Scott Stamp Monthly articles either, but I'm not tapping my toe restlessly for your answers to my theories pro and con. Scott has suggested that I should devote more attention to aspects intrinsic to the stamps, and that's what I'm doing next. When I reach firm conclusions, I'll report them.

Bill's findings, as has been noted several times, would equally apply if the Grinnells are genuine and printed in the way the owners believe, namely, sequentially from set type in which the frames and ornaments are unchanged but the denominations are reset. For every gotcha similarity he thinks he sees from the Missionaries reflected in the Grinnells, one can show a greater number of differences. As Bill wrote, he's having fun, which is fine, and he thinks his faith is verified, but as far as I can discern he hasn't caused anyone else's opinion to change.

Incidentally, for anyone who may care, I recently studied an image of the Advertiser sale "Grinnell" that wasn't. It appears to have been made the way Dave Churchman made the print that I included in my last paper, with the side ornaments being single pieces of type, four per side, rather than joined and paired. This fortifies the RPSL's belief that it is a modern forgery, made from recently cast type.

October 03, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren-

I feel like the Maytag Repair Man waiting for a call or in this case a rebuttal to Bill and Scott's posts housed in the Grinnell Board Archives.

October 02, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Steve W and Walter P

I'm hoping that the Owner is willing to submit the Book of Sermons to a laboratory analysis.

Steve W may be correct in an earlier posting that this has already been done and the results were either inconclusive or unfavorable. On the other hand, maybe it has not been done, in which case the results would be interesting no matter how they come down.

I am the first to say that a laboratory analysis of the Book of Sermons is a back door approach and can never by itself be conclusive that the Grinnells are genuine; nonetheless, I hope the Owner(s) will have such performed if it has not already been done.

Again I suggest that it should be done under the auspice of somebody like the RPSL so that the results – whether favorable or unfavorable – are less clouded with suspicion.

And what about the Southwest Museum Connection? I sure hope that Ken L has the time and inclination to further examine 'those' people.

October 02, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Dick C

While this has nothing to do directly with the Grinnells, I do hope you have the time and inclination to follow through with your analysis of the multiple printings of the genuine missionary printings.

Does this extend beyond the 13c issue?

To the best of my knowledge, you are the first to pick up on this and I am most certainly interested in how far you can go with it.

October 02, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

David Shumaker

I sincerely hope that you will find the time to finish your article for publication on this Board before the postings are reduced to 1 per week. Assuming your analysis is correct, I think you have done a great job. I'm looking forward to it and others should be as well.

My apology for this not being in a private e-mail, but I really do think you should get it out and I hope that you are working on it.

October 02, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Steve W and Walter P

As I believe you each know, I live in Hawaii.

Only in Hawaii would I receive a letter addressed to me as Robert Matsunaga.

October 02, 2006 **Steve W**

I kinda like Malmgren better - it has a distinctive ring to it once you learn how to pronounce it. I think Richard should consider a change...

October 02, 2006 **Walter P**

That's Richard Malmgren, sorry about spelling your name wrong.

October 02, 2006 **Walter P**

It appears that the pro Grinnell stamp camp has folded up their tent and left the discussion?

The way I figure it, is, that after Bill and Scott's posts on G80 & G81, and the card of ten, were placed in the Grinnell stamp archive, and no credible rebuttals were posted, or appear to be forthcoming, there is not much to post from the non believers camp?

After all, as correctly pointed out by Richard Malmgren, and others, in the non believer Grinnell camp, the onus to prove the Grinnell stamps genuine lays squarely on the shoulders of the Grinnell stamp owners, and their supporters.

We are all waiting with baited breath for a credible response, is one forthcoming or is this all over?

October 02, 2006 **Ken Stach** <kstach@houston.rr.com>

David H - Thanks for your input regarding the calculation. I think the reason we are off a factor of 2x is that I have tried (perhaps incorrectly) to account for the fact that when the first Missionary is being "drawn" there is a 2x10/81 chance, since there were two real Missionaries in the lot. Either way, it probably doesn't matter much, whether it is 1.4% or 2.8% probability...still very low.

September 30, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

David, it does seem likely that they chose their words carefully, which is why the phrasing is ambiguous about whether just the paper was bleached or if it was the paper and the ink. To me it makes more sense that it would be just the paper, although I can see interpretations of the events that would make sense of either interpretation.

September 30, 2006 **David H**

Correction: for *biases* in the last paragraph of my last posting, read *biases and motivations*. (I want to be inclusive.)

September 30, 2006 **David Handelman**

Ken Stach: I don't normally check this, the *Kinderboard*, but I was looking for an old posting, and came across your computation of 19-20 September. This concerned the likelihood of that a sample of size 10 out of 81 would contain both of two distinguished items. There is an error in your computation; the result is around one-half of what you obtained. (The error is counting things twice because of the two possible orders.)

The number of subsets of size 10 of an 81-element set is $C(81,10)$ ("81 choose 10"; binomial coefficient). The number of subsets of size 10 with the two distinguished elements is the same as the number of subsets of size 8 from a 79-element set with no distinguished elements, $C(79,8)$. Hence assuming the usual uniform distribution and independence, the likelihood of finding both of the distinguished elements (read "Missionaries") is $C(79,8)/C(81,10)$.

Most of the terms cancel, and we are left with

$1/72$

(for those who insist on converting perfectly understandable fractions to decimals, and then using too many digits to be meaningful, this is about 1.39%).

Of course, $1/72$ or $1/36$, it doesn't really matter, since interpretations or dismissals will be made depending on the readers' biases---which is why I don't come here very often.

September 29, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker & Richard Malmgren-

While musing about George Grinnell's trial in California, it made me think about a trip I once made by automobile between Los Angeles and San Francisco. I stopped and visited the Winchester Mansion at San Jose which, was open for tours at the time, around 1970.

During the course of the tour of Winchester Mansion, which was owned by the widow of the inventor of the Winchester Repeating Rifle, there was a room called the 'blue room,' where Mrs. Winchester held seances and tried to contact the dearly departed.

As George Grinnell was a Californian, perhaps it would be fitting to hold a seance in the 'blue room' of Winchester House, and try to ... na, maybe not.

September 29, 2006 **David Shumaker**

You caught me in a diplomatic mood. Yes, at this point it is the pro-Grinnell camp that has the burden to prove them genuine. But as you well know, thus far what we have seen is not so much proof of genuineness as the impeachment of old evidence used in the past to condemn the stamps. Which has in turn herded the hopeful to greener Grinnellian fields. If we simply left the decision to the Royal and it's several-year investigation, we wouldn't have anything to post. Like you said, what else would we do with our time? (Asked as I am working till midnight yet again this evening.)

Seriously, I've learned so much on these boards.

September 29, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

David Shumaker

Your recent posting included the wrap-up sentence "But that's only if the stamps are proven to be fakes."

I beg to differ with you. Please do not forget that the stamps are fakes.

The Los Angeles court has said so.

The Philatelic Foundation has said so each time a Grinnell was sent in for an opinion and issued Certificates to that effect.

The Royal Philatelic Society London has said so and has published a book to the effect.

Some people (many of whom, but hardly all, have not even familiarized themselves with the basic issues) have disagreed with the court and have also disagreed with the experts to whom the stamps were submitted for authentication. Because some people have disagreed (typically based upon one or more, but not all, of the points the court and/or expert group have published), is the burden upon the court or the expert groups to prove they are correct or is the burden upon the objectors to prove that they themselves are correct?

I suggest the burden is upon the objectors. Thus far they are not doing a good enough job. Until they are convincing, the stamps are fakes.

A laboratory analysis of the Book of Sermons is not good enough by itself, although it would allow some people to keep stirring the pot depending upon the results.

Of course, just plain arguing about it is interesting too. After all, what else do we have to do with our time?

September 29, 2006 **Rick**

I forgot to add that this is true in most states today. It may be different in California today, and/or in 1922.

September 29, 2006 **Rick**

It was never my intention to sidetrack this conversation into a big legal discussion but rather to point out that an understanding of it may help unravel the mystery. For those that are concerned, I began neutral and am now convinced that Grinnell was culpable in some way. However, as a person who both expects and gives respect, I feel we owe it to each other and to the families who have been cooperative to restrain our comments to those things we can reasonably prove.

To respond to earlier posts on civil and criminal law, only the defendant in a criminal case can ask for a bench trial. In a civil trial, both adversarial parties have to agree. I'm not sure what, if anything, this says about Klemann's suit. Usually the plaintiff will ask for a jury trial because the jury tends to be sympathetic to those who are wronged and award bigger judgements.

Criminal acts are considered to be crimes against the state and the state becomes the plaintiff. Therefore, the state decides whether or not to bring a case to trial using the evidence they have on hand. One of the things they have to look at is whether or not they can prove elements of the crime. Fraud isn't terribly difficult to prove and could have been as simple as knowingly selling counterfeit stamps as real. Conspiracy is remarkably difficult to prove.

Walter - I spent several summers on the Little Rideau near Perth. Beautiful country and warm, wonderful people and icy cold Canadian beer.

September 29, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Greg,

Right, and it didn't say who handled those particular stamps. Could have been bleached by someone to whom Grinnell let examine the stamps. Still, since the RPSL said they saw evidence of bleaching, I take it to mean evident in the ink as well. They concluded that he bleached the stamp, not just the paper, so I'm assuming they chose their words accurately.

When a mold colony makes a stain, that stain will be on the stamp and the surface of the adjacent paper. As far as the B of S investigation, stains between a stamp and the book page will be easier to match than the fuzzy, toned outlines to the stamp's edges. And a lot more conclusive. I think photography under certain lighting conditions can bring out the stains in the bleached stamp. I'm not saying such an investigation would prove anything one way or the other, but it may lead us to better understand the book's role, if any, in the saga.

Walter and Ken,

I was more or less commenting on the condemnation of Grinnell by certain posters being seen by certain other posters as unfair and unsubstantiated. Judgements of board participants by board participants have ensued. May I suggest that we give each other the intellectual freedom to assume Grinnell did some unscrupulous things, whether found guilty in a court of law or not, when we look at the scenarios by which the Grinnell Missionaries are fake. Condemnation naturally follows the assumption that if the stamps are fake then Grinnell is involved in the deception, given his story of the find and refusal to retract that story. But that's only if the stamps are proven to be fakes.

September 29, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

David quotes: Page 41 of the RPSL report says "there is evidence of bleaching of the unused copies to remove rust spots or stains."

RPSL doesn't say when the bleaching was done. Imagine you're a forger, with a supply of appropriate old paper (perhaps from somewhere in a museum's collection?). The only problem is that the paper is a bit moldy. So you bleach it nice and clean then print the forged stamps on it.

September 29, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Ken, I never posted George Grinnell should have been charged with fraud. I just pointed out the problems there would have been in gaining a fraud conviction.

I did post that I believed George Grinnell knew that it would be difficult to be charged with fraud when the sale to Klemann was an "as is" sale.

I also posted that I believe that George Grinnell, only bought two stamps from Klemann G80 & G81 and played some kind of hand in the printing of the Grinnell stamps. I believe George Grinnell knew the stamps were counterfeit stamps when he sold them to Klemann. Evidently, trial Judge Wood agreed with at least the last statement I make here, and ruled against Grinnell.

I think we should move away from all of these fraud posts as George Grinnell was not charged with fraud and what does this all prove anyway? We can each judge the man's character on what we know about him, and from the evidence he gave at his trial. When you consider the outcome of the trial and Judge Wood's ruling and reasons for his ruling I think you can safely find that George Grinnell does not come out of this with clean hands. In short, Judge Wood did not believe anything George Grinnell said in his testimony, so why should we?

This is my theory of what happened. If you can prove me wrong, I will change my view, but until then, this is my position.

September 29, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

That gap, and the earlier one (why no Honolulu postmarks after late June 1851?) were the questions that prompted my study of alternatives to the post office.

When I discovered that Isaac Mitchell (Gregory's Honolulu Express) had cut the cost of a letter to San Francisco effective July 1, 1851, to 5¢ -- half the post office rate -- that seemed to explain a lot.

Whitney made no attempt to compete until mid-September, when he slashed postal rates to equal those of Gregory's Express, and then two weeks later he issued stamps, another competitive move. But he was also working more closely with Mitchell and Gregory than with the San Francisco post office, so perhaps he was making these changes at their urging.

Maybe it took time for his belated reductions and conveniences to take effect, and in any event we have virtually no mail from that period to analyze.

I'm hoping that Fred will present a critique of this, because the effect of Gregory's Express competition hasn't been explored from this perspective by Hawaiian postal historians. Fred has the corresponding ship sailing data that I lack, and the complete cover census.

(But Gregory's Express was posting letters, newspapers, and parcels on the weekly China clippers, and was routing by whatever ship was available, including whalers, so comparison is risky for drawing firm conclusions.)

The scarcity of surviving mail is even more peculiar when you consider that California gold miners were sending their laundry to Hawaii and China to be washed, which was cheaper than having it done locally.

For the Scott 3 and 4 study, perhaps one could begin by paying closer attention to sequences of postmarks on off-cover stamps, and attempting to relate them to similar ones on cover.

September 29, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

That's a theory that could hold water. I wonder if we could ever find any supporting evidence?

Scott points to the earlier use of #3 (January 1852 on Chang fragment cover) than #4 (April 1852) as suggesting that #3 preceded #4.

However, the "Trepel Gap" relates strongly an equally interesting (to me!) question about the gap in known uses between October 1851 (date of issue) and January 1852. Have no Missionary covers from that period survived, or did these beautiful new stamps stay unused in a Post Office drawer for four months? Even the Grinnells can't be dated to that period.

September 29, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

In order to charge someone with a crime, I think the prosecutor would have needed a complaining witness. No one ever filed charges of fraud or conspiracy against anyone in the Grinnell case. Walter wants to charge him posthumously.

Also, George Grinnell's lawyer, Oscar Lawler, either was at the time or had recently been the Los Angeles district attorney.

John Klemann attempted to persuade the federal government to charge Grinnell either with counterfeiting or with possession and sale of counterfeits, and used that possibility as a pretext to freeze Grinnell's assets, but the Secret Service and the federal prosecutor declined to prosecute.

Klemann then sued for breach of contract, which was the sole issue before the court. It was a bench trial, with no jury to decide factual issues. The legal dilemma for Judge Wood was that he could not invalidate the "sold as-is" contract unless he found, as matters of fact, that Grinnell had failed to deliver "stamps" to Klemann and that Grinnell knew that the "bits of paper" he did deliver were not stamps.

September 29, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

From the perspective of the Honolulu postmaster, the 13¢ stamp was more important than the others, because that required credits to the United States. The other two values were conveniences, allowing customers to prepay postage without needing to make cash payments or run credit accounts, and avoiding the nuisance of changemaking in an economy where circulating money was often scarce.

(I think that consideration is what may have led to the speculation about the unused Grinnells being change for a dollar, but I doubt anyone ever stated it as a fact. It would be interesting to know whether 1850s stamps were ever used as fractional currency in Hawaii.)

So suppose Whitney made the 13¢ H.I.&U.S. first, with that concern in mind, then disassembled the setting and returned all the type and elements to the case.

Later he set the 5¢, next in importance, then the 2¢, hardly needed.

By this set of guesses, when Whitney decided he needed more 13¢ stamps, he simply reset the denomination in his Hawaiian Postage settings and continued printing. There's no evidence to support this, but it would fit Whitney's later recollection and the 19th century reports.

Changing the subject, I meant to mention earlier that the card of ten is really a folder, two pieces of cardboard hinged by tape, enclosing the stamps in a stiff protective sandwich, supporting your earlier point.

September 29, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

In answer to the last question of your post:

In my role as an advocate for a trade union, I learned along time ago, that you cannot guess how an arbitrator was going to rule in a quasi judicial hearing. The same can be said for juries of your peers, especially in a civil court case where they have much more latitude than they would have in a criminal court case.

The danger of such proceedings is when you find a jury that wants to solve the case instead of making a finding on the evidence placed before them.

Accordingly, I would not venture a guess, as to what verdict a jury would come up with, had the George Grinnell case gone to a jury instead of trial by judge.

September 29, 2006 **Walter P** <Walter P>

David Shumaker-

Cases tried in Civil Court are much easier to prove than the same case tried in a Criminal Court of Law, because the standard of proof is much higher in Criminal Court.

To put this in perspective, OJ Simpson was not convicted in a Criminal Court of Law, but was found responsible for the murder of his wife in Civil Court.

If, and thats a big if, a judge in a Criminal Court of Law, came to the same finding that Judge Wood in the George Grinnell Civil Court trial, than yes, George Grinnell would have been convicted of fraud, and dealt with accordingly.

However, when you read the original trial judge's statement, as articulated in your post, you cannot help but think that from that moment on, 'foxy' George Grinnell was on a downhill slide from which he never recovered.

I think the trial Judge Wood's comments are damning, as in effect what he was saying was, Grinnell was not candid in his testimony, and as such, no weight was placed on any of the evidence he gave under oath. The trial judge called it as he saw it, the man was just not to be believed.

Now, we have some posters on this Board trying to paint George Grinnell as some kind of a victim? I think George Grinnell was a victim of himself.

September 28, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter P.

Judge Wood found that "on December 1, 1919, and at all times thereafter and for sometime prior thereto the defendant knew that all of said pieces of paper were forgeries and imitations... Each of the statements and representations so made by (Grinnell) was untrue and known by the defendant to be untrue."

If a judge in a criminal trial found the same, wouldn't that have constituted fraud? Or would it be the jury who'd be hard to convince?

September 28, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

Fraud is a very difficult charge to prove in a criminal court, because in order to obtain a conviction, the prosecutor must prove that George Grinnell intended to sell the Grinnell stamp find Missionary stamps, knowing that they were counterfeit stamps.

The reason, George Grinnell was not charged was more likely than not, that he had insulated himself from prosecution by insisting that the sale of the Grinnell find stamps was an "as is" sale. This is the reason I tagged George Grinnell with the title 'foxy' George, the man did not have a shortage of grey matter.

However, many intelligent people committ crimes and this case was likely no exception to the rule.

A more likely charge would be conspiracy to committ fraud, but in order to charge someone with conspiracy there has to be one or more other people named in the charge. One person cannot be charged with conspiracy to committ fraud as you must conspire with one or more parties to committ such a crime.

It would go without saying, that if in fact, George Grinnell had fabricated his story of making the Grinnell stamp find in the manner that he had reported, than it would follow that he had intended to defraud John Klemann of \$65,000. As long as George Grinnell stuck to his story of obtaining the Grinnell stamps from Charles Shattuck, he was not likely to earn a criminal fraud charge for his efforts.

However, at his point in time, and considering all of the posts on this Board, and all of the recent articles written by Ken Lawrence and others, I think it extremely unlikely that George Grinnell did not play some part in the manufacturing of the Grinnell Missionary stamps. At the very least, it is more likely than not that George Grinnell must have been a co-conspirator in a criminal conspiracy to committ fraud. I believe George Grinnell was not charged with fraud or conspiracy to committ fraud, because he outfoxed everyone by seccessfully insulating himself from criminal prosecution.

September 28, 2006 **David Shumaker**

George Grinnell actually sold, not merely intended to sell, 43 Missionary stamps for \$65,000 to John Klemann that he said he bought from Charles Shattuck. If he new that the stamps were not actually bought from Shattuck, but were of a "recent vintage", then I think that would demonstrate intent to defraud Klemann. Even if his fingerprints were not on the press. Even if that would have been a weak argument in court.

Any assumption that the Grinnell Missionaries are fakes invariably implicates Grinnell because his story evaporates, fair or not. In looking at the good possibility that these stamps are fake (the RSPL, among others, feels they are fake), one must consider the roles that Grinnell and those around him potentially played. These roles come across as both criminal and conspiratorial.

The only two scenarios that I have read in which the stamps can be fake AND Grinnell's hands are clean are 1) the fakes were planted and Grinnell was guided to them and 2) he indeed found a hoard of genuine Missionaries that were in the hands of Shattuck, but someone he trusted printed exacting replicas and switched them with the genuine find. The problem with the first scenario is that the unknown forger would have seemed to get no benefit. The problems with the second include that Grinnell ended up with the two genuine stamps from which the fakes seem to have been "inspired," and that there are no Scott #4 even though they were used concurrently with #3 during the time the 7-bar cancel was used.

As I told Ken L. some time ago, I think the second scenario is much more reasonable than the Grinnells being a separate printing having several unique cancellations and all ending up in one trunk. Can anyone think of any other scenarios that would let Grinnell off the hook given the latest (RSPL) opinion?

Page 41 of the RPSL report says "there is evidence of bleaching of the unused copies to remove rust spots or stains." This is one of those non-sequitor observations that makes me scratch my head. A fake stamp would have had to be stained and/or have mold induced to then have those stains bleached. If this can be done, then perhaps the stains in the Book of Sermons are also produced by the forger to deceive. But if so, why bleach the stamp if you want to make the connection with the stains you just put in the book? Even so, the stains and/or rust spots should match the corresponding stamp image in the book perfectly, so that is where a scientific analysis of the book should begin.

September 28, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,
That is very interesting. If we presume for a moment that Whitney's 1870 recollection was correct, how can we account logically for a #4-#3 printing sequence?

September 28, 2006 **Walter P**

Rick "Veronica" -

The last partial line of my post was not intended to be part of my post, so please ignore same.

September 28, 2006 **Walter P**

Rick "Veronica"-

I am going to take the high road and advice of Richard Malmgren and not "fence with you" on this board

Everyone knows my position on George Grinnell and I am not about to repeat it here again. Until someone presents some clear evidence that my position is flawed, I am going to stand behind what I have said consistently stated on this Board.

If that upsets you, I am sorry for that, but both Canada and the United States are free countries and I am entitled to state my opinion, right or wrong, just like everyone else.

This is the last post you will receive from me on this matter.

Unless you have something to

September 28, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Rick & Walter P

May I respectfully suggest that if the two of you wish to exchange personal insults, then do so off-line?

Incidentally Rick, American is probably Walter's second language. I think he is Canadian, thus I would suspect English to be his first language.

Rick, you can disagree if you like, but I suggest that the tone of your latest posting ratched things up a notch. Since our host hasn't been a big fan of all of us squabbling like children anyway, why don't we all take him at his word that he might close up our playbox if we are not more civil to one another.

September 28, 2006 **Veronica "Rick" Wayland-Smith**

Walter -

Maybe English is your second language. You are one of the participants of this board who have "convicted" Grinnell of the criminal act of counterfeiting and fraud - others have accused him of it. It's true that the civil case brought by Klemann was civil - with the standard of proof being a preponderance of the evidence. Grinnell wasn't indicted of a criminal charge - bearing the standard of guilt being beyond a reasonable doubt - because the investigators at that time didn't feel they could support the charge. One thing they would have had to have proved was the element of intent. Without that - then or now - there's no criminal conviction.

I'm not setting any standards here, but the accusation is of the criminal acts of counterfeiting to commit a fraud (I've even seen murder suggested in a non-offensive "what-if" comment). You've lamented that the pro-Grinnell camp just doesn't get it - and I'd suggest that this is the standard they are and should be using. The forensic evidence may and probably will show that the stamps were printed later than 1856, blowing a huge hole in Grinnell's credibility. That together with the on-going debate of printing methods and dates may very well prove the stamps to be counterfeit. None of this puts Grinnell's hands on the press (camera, etc), which by default means you don't have intent.

You've lamented the fact that the pro-Grinnells just don't throw in the towel. I'm pointing out that these are some of the outstanding issues that have failed to convict Grinnell in their minds. Huffing, puffing, and insulting people of integrity who have a different view than your own stands in the way of good scholarship and has led to threats to close this board down. Read back through your posts - maybe the level of venom in some of your posts will make this point more efficiently.

September 28, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

Yes, I think this is one of the most interesting aspects of the Missionaries, and one that the Meyer-Harris generation completely missed. If Fred produces the promised update, I hope he'll give all these stories the treatment they deserve. The old book is deadly dull, but the subject matter is worthy of Mark Twain and James Michener.

It's interesting that Whitney told his 1870s visitor that the H.I.&U.S. stamps came first, which no one anymore believes but which many 19th century writers took as fact. The overlapping use in the spring of 1852 makes that story possible. (If so, it would be a first-in, last-out sequence, which was once suggested as a way the Grinnells could have been an original trial printing.)

The type and ornament differences between Scott 3 and 4 are the aspects that have fueled much of the pro-Grinnell hopes. Conversely, the continuing Grinnell saga has caused many of us (on both sides, and on neither side) to pursue leads that we otherwise would have missed, which enrich the story of classic Hawaii regardless of the final Grinnell judgment.

September 28, 2006 **Steve W**

That is a plausible scenario for the concurrent use of #3 and #4. I also like the theory that #3 was made as a natural follow-on from #'s 1 and 2, but that Whitney really intended for the 13c value to be #4 all along. Once he saw #3, he stopped printing it, and finished the job with a re-configured forme to make #4. However, with a limited postal budget, he went ahead and used the supply of #3.

There is definitely an interesting story in this #3 and #4 interplay, wouldn't you say (Ken?)?

September 28, 2006 **Richard Matta**

As to #3 versus #4, is it possible the PM in Hawaii decided to wait for approval from the PM in San Fran before using a stamp indicating US postage paid, so prepared #3 for use in the interim? (Then had leftovers so used both contemporaneously?)

September 27, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Steve W

While your post regarding A-2 was addressed to Scott, I assume your question is centered on whether it is possible to determine by the side ornament(s) if the stamp is Scott 3 or 4.

The A-2 image does not enlarge and my screen does not provide me enough resolution to allow me to make out what I am actually looking at.

Based upon where I think the stamp was placed, it looks to me like the small piece of remaining stamp might be from between O-3 & O-4.

Having said the above, I don't think I helped much.

September 27, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Patrick C.

Regarding laboratory examination of the Book of Sermons.

Assuming you do 'analyze' the Book of Sermons and assuming you wish the results to be accepted by as many as possible, I suggest that who does what is very important. You may wish to utilize the RSPL or PF to engage one or multiple (preferably multiple) laboratories for the analysis and have the results published under the auspices of either the RPSL or PF.

Your simply going privately to a laboratory would not, I suggest, provide the same assurance to the philatelic world.

I say the above recognizing that my personal belief is that the final results will not support the legitimacy of the Grinnells; however, if you hope to demonstrate otherwise to whomever, then doing so through a public forum (assuming we call the RSPL or PF a public forum) is, I believe, a better way to proceed than doing so privately.

Again and if you do decide to proceed, you might consider inquiring of this Board a list of questions/tests that should be asked/performed by the laboratory(s).

September 27, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Walter P

To the best of my knowledge, there is no full transcript of the trial. Portions are missing.

The APRL has a copy of much of the trial transcript. Years ago they made me a photocopy. I do not recollect the charge.

September 27, 2006 **Steve W**

Scott - Is it possible to tell which 13c stamp was on census #A2?

September 27, 2006 **Walter P**

Rick-

And by the way, as you are well aware, this is not a criminal case. The case was tried in civil court and no fraud charges were ever laid against George Grinnell.

So if in fact, you know criminal law as well as you say you do, you should also know that this case will be solved using the standard, on a balance of probabilities, and not on the standard, beyond a reasonable doubt.

September 27, 2006 **Walter P**

Rick-

I have posted many times on this Board, prior to when you started to post, that a fact not supported by evidence is not a fact.

I also previously posted that this case will not be decided on a standard of proof that applies in a criminal court proceeding, which is, beyond a reasonable doubt, but on a standard of proof that applies in civil court proceedings, which is, on a balance of probabilities.

While we are on the subject of legalise, people who post things that are attributable to one person having heard another person state something, that is called hearsay evidence, and should in my view, and particularly in this case, should be avoided as unreliable evidence.

I suggest to you Sir or Madam, whatever the case may be, that you practise what you preach, as most of the statements you have made on this very Board are exactly the same in nature of what you have accused me of making.

I also suggest to you that if you think that this case is going to be solved by presenting facts that are proven in evidence you are sadly mistaken. This case will be solved by solid detective work, which in the end, will form conclusions that are based on a balance of probabilities, and not on the standard of beyond a reasonable doubt. If that is what you are looking for than I think your going to be dissapointed. All of the main participants in the Grinnell Saga have passed away and with them the absolute truth of what occurred. All we can do now is to work with what we have, and there are some very competant researcher's doing just that, as I type this very post.

In the end, we may never be absolutely certain as to what ocured in this case, but we should be able to form a conclusion that will be as close to the truth as it is humanly possible to do so, with the original participants having all passed away.

I am glad to hear that you have some law degrees and diplomas on your wall, however that does not give you the right to say how this investigation must be conducted, and how it should be solved. I believe, this case will be solved by good solid detective work and forensic investigation of the still available evidence. I also believe that, yourself included, participants on this Board should be able to float any theory or idea they may have as this is a public Board of philatelists who all share the same goal of finding out what really happened. Some participants will be right, and most will be wrong, but I think history will bear this out, not you.

Thank you for sharing your views with me, but once again, please practise what you preach.

September 27, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Rick - may we have your full name please?

September 27, 2006 **Rick**

Walter -

I don't have a penny riding on the outcome of this debate, don't personally know the people involved and really don't care who "wins" or loses - it's been great fun and I'll almost be sorry when it ends.

While I'm hardly an expert on printing methods, I'm staring at two diplomas and a stack of student loan bills that say I know the law - criminal law in particular - and the rules of evidence that are associated with them. I would suggest that many of the "facts" that are posted here - many of them with Walter P attached to them - are merely hunches, guesses, well-intentioned "what-ifs" and the continued rantings of people who feel that they have to defend one side or another at the expense of any premise of objectivity. (Of course, the latter group has to accuse the other side of the same thing, often in tones reasonable people would find offensive.)

In short, merely stating something - even if it's repeated several times - doesn't make it fact.

My posts - and those of some others - have encouraged the group to look at the totality of the evidence to explain their individual theories. I fail to see how that's overlooking any evidence as your post suggests - I was merely reminding the board that there are elements to the story that need to be addressed. Right now each side has major holes in their theory that a first year law student could drive a truck through and leave enough reasonable doubt to convince a jury that we're just a bunch of school yard bullies picking on some old deceased guy.

Patrick - Of course. My fingers got ahead of my brain for a minute and I keyed the wrong name. Thanks for catching it.

Ken L - Great article. Lots of meaty info and well written.

September 27, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Are the transcripts of the George Grinnell trial available, and if so, is it possible to purchase the trial transcripts?

I would imagine the transscripts would be quite lengthy and would cost a fair amount of money to obtain? Perhaps there are photocopies available for sale somewhere?

Have you read the transcripts of the George Grinnell trial?

September 27, 2006 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

Steve W.,

I found the reference. It is "The Story of the Trial as Related by Eyewitnesses" by George B. Sloane, Collector's Club Philatelist July 1922 (p. 91). The paragraph involving the "even dollar's worth" also claims Grinnell testified that Shattuck's father had been a missionary in the Hawaiian Islands in the fifties. As an aside Grinnell, in a letter to Mekeel's dated August 12, 1922 stated this was the testimony of Klemann and his witnesses as to what they had been told by Grinnell, and not Grinnell's testimony at all. Yet it had been reported as his. There is no indication as to whether Sloane was in fact one of the eyewitnesses. It reads as if Sloane is recapping testimony as he heard about it - not quoting it at all.

Richard M.,

Interesting idea regarding the book. I'll look into it.

September 27, 2006 **Walter P**

Steve W -

(edited by RF)

The book should be sent to a lab where a scientific examination can be performed. Personally, I think the prayer book is of no or of very little significance.

I believe that one of the problems facing this Board is that the Grinnell stamp owners are ignoring studies and articles posted on this Board that do not support their position that the George Grinnell Hawaii Missionary stamps are genuine Hawaii postage stamps. They are hoping for a miracle and frankly if I were in their position would I be acting any different. They have everything to win and nothing to lose at this point in time.

The release of the card of ten by the Arrigo's was I believe a grave tactical error on their part as they unwittingly released to public scrutiny the greatest clue in solving this mystery. Their silence on the resulting studies of the stamps mounted on the card of ten is deafening.

As far as 'foxy' George Grinnell goes in your post. Regarding his trial testimony, the man was less than candid, and was likely tailoring his answers to the questions put to him in order to place himself in the best possible light. In all cases, this type of self serving testimony, always comes back to haunt you in the end. Such is the case of 'foxy' George, he outfoxed himself in that over time anything he said would not be taken as credible, especially in the Grinnell Board participants investigations regarding a the search for the truth.

The owners road to proving the Grinnell stamps genuine gets bleaker as each day passes.

September 27, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Steve W:

#3 and #4 may have been used concurrently, but I think we can agree that #3 was issued first with no overlap until April 1852.

September 27, 2006 **Steve W**

Patrick,

You are probably right. If you do find the attribution, please let us know.

Scott,

The image for #192 is taken from a 1909 French catalog and, other than the Life article, it hasn't been seen since. I am curious about the quality of the stamp impression - it almost seems like a double impression.

I noticed for the first time that the cover is endorsed "Noble" at the upper left, which firmly establishes the date of use as 1852. This is only important with respect to the RPSL book, which would not opine that census #'s 190 and 192 were 1852 uses (even though census #140, with an 1852 docket, has exactly the same Honolulu and SF postmarks). This, along with further work on dating the SF postmarks, does firmly set the #4 eku as April 23, 1852, and further reinforces the observation that #3 and #4 were in concurrent use.

September 27, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Steve W & Patrick C

As you know, my continued belief is that provenance is one of the weakest, not strongest arguments for the Grinnells. On the other hand, if one dismisses the Book of Sermons from the equation, then there is hardly reason to believe anything that George Grinnell ever said regarding the stamps.

Despite my status as a non-believer, I suggest to Patrick Culhane that the Book of Sermons be analyzed in a laboratory in an attempt to show that the stains and impressions are resultant to there being at one time both gummed and non-gummed Grinnells stored between the pages.

With the other studies that have been/are being done regarding the stamps themselves and how they were likely created, I suggest that providing more physical evidence to demonstrate the supposed role of the Book of Sermons (admittedly a back door approach) is more important to a Grinnell supporter than ever before.

September 27, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Cover #192 is in a collection in Europe. It was formed by a collector who has been deceased many years. Siegel and Weill used to talk about it with great reverence. It also includes what Weill described as the finest 5c Buff Scott 67 with o.g. that he had ever seen. The collector loved corner copies of classics and kept them in a stockbook next to his bed so that he could look at them before going to sleep.

The cover was pictured in the Life magazine spread on the world's greatest stamp rarities, courtesy of a European dealer.

September 27, 2006 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

David S.,

The stain illustrated is typical - there is one page where there are seven images, 4 "rows" of two with one missing in one of the rows. I'm not qualified to state they are consistent with pressing, but the distinct ones are similar to that shown in the RPSL book.

Steve W.,

There is no citation in the RPSL book regarding the source of the statement to which you refer, unfortunately. It is unclear whether this is excerpted from the testimony itself or repeated from other accounts. I would suspect the latter. Absent a clear reference as to the source of the quotation, I wouldn't rely on it.

September 27, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Thanks to further contributions from Steve W, I have added images to Missionary cover census [here](#). Most recent addition is cover #192.

September 27, 2006 **Steve W**

RPSL Grinnell book, page 40:

"At the trial, George Grinnell stated that the unused stamps were the remainder of a purchase of one dollar's worth of stamps, and the used stamps had been torn from letters...the stamps, 43in all, had been laid away in an old psalm book..."

This statement is problematic. First, we now know that there were more than 43 stamps. Second, there just is not a plausible scenario where the unused and used stamps would be gathered in the same place. Third, the illustration on page 39 in the RPSL book is not convincing support for the contention that the stamps had been stored there.

I think we should move off the William Emerson/Psalm book provenance story - as previous posts by Ken and others have indicated, that theory just doesn't stand up to scrutiny.

September 27, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Patrick,

Are the stains illustrated in the RSPL book typical of the location of the majority? I'd think that if a book were carrying stamps around they would migrate to the inner binding, not stay out in the page. The locations away from the binding and between sermons suggests the book was used to press damp pieces of paper, possibly stamps, after soaking. In fact, they appear to have stayed in the book for a while. Do the remainder of the stamp images look consistent with pressing?

September 26, 2006 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

Rick, Ken L., David Shumaker, Steve W.,

Forgive me for trying to cover several bases (and recent posts) in one – but they seem related and this is the most efficient way.

To Rick in particular: It was Hannah Shattuck who died in 1856. Ursula Emerson died in the 1888. Hannah was Ursula's childhood friend and adult correspondent. Hannah's son Charles moved from Pepperell, Massachusetts to California in 1865. The Shattucks have never offered any of the stamps for sale.

We believe the story of the find to be true, based on all the material in the record including the articles found (all of which together would fit in a small shoe box) after the trial. I have several of those articles to this day, and some are personal to Charles B. Shattuck and without question dated to the 1850s.

The Book of Sermons contains more than two stamp-shaped images as Rick points out. The book was shown to Patrick Pearson in London in 2002. It was exhibited at Washington 2006 and also at the 2003 Maynard Sundman Lecture at the National Postal Museum.

Eight pages contain discolorations that distinctively reflect the presence of stamps. Together they bear 22 images of the approximate size of the stamps. There are some other pages that could bear the images of stamps but the shapes are indistinct.

The distinct images are very much in keeping with the dimensions of the stamps.

None of the images appears in the middle of a sermon. All appear in the pages delimiting the sermons.

I am not aware of the source of the "even dollar's worth" story, though I believe it appeared in one of the period articles. If memory serves, it is not part of George Grinnell's account. With a bit of time to research hopefully I can confirm this.

September 26, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Rick -
from - <http://www.whatislithoprinting.com/history.html>

"Photolithography & The Litho Offset Press

Lithography got another boost when the French chemist, Alphonse Louis Poitevin invented Photolithography in 1855. Again however, because of the difficulty of creating lithographic plates, this printing technique lay dormant in waiting for some new miracle.

It was in 1875 that the lithographic offset press was invented. It was subsequently that offset lithography really took off and people paid due attention to this printing technique."

The proposed photolithography reproduction technique was not available to the Honolulu print shop, but it was available to Grinnell. You may have missed, but in answer to one of my questions here, Steve W posted a reference saying "Sperati first began making forgeries that could fool legitimate experts in 1911." He used photolithography.

Roger

September 26, 2006 **Walter P**

Rick-

As with all deceptions there are always elements of the truth that shine through which give the deception some validity. Thus is the case at Bar.

While reading your lengthy and thoughtful posts today I cannot help but find that you are taking the existing evidence and placing it a favourable light that fits your theory. Although, at it's best, your theory is interesting, on close examination it fails to address the 'host of outstanding questions' and in fact raises more questions than answers.

I have said this before, and I will say it again, the key to this mystery lies with George Grinnell, who I believe, in the end will not come out of this with clean hands.

A fraud by definition, is a planned deception for profit, and looking at the evidence so far, 'foxy' George is in this up to his ears.

September 26, 2006 **Rick**

The answer to this mystery is two-pronged. Simply solving the mystery of the method by which they were created won't explain who did it, or why. Nor can it explain the host of outstanding questions that can't be overlooked simply to make a particular theory work.

The prayer book was displayed at Washington 2006 and impressions similar to several stamps - many more than 2 - were evident. (For obvious reasons, I wasn't able to examine the entire book.) I'm not suggesting that this is proof of Grinnell's story, but rather that it fits into the totality of the story. Furthermore, my understanding is that the book remains in the hands of the Shattuck family's descendants rather than the Grinnell's, and the level of cooperation between the two may dictate whether or not comparisons can be done. Until then, we can only rely on what we've actually seen and not on gut instincts, otherwise responsible people defending a previous position at all costs, or the way the wind blows.

I'll apologize if I've missed a post or a prominent news article about the "change for a dollar" story, but how does that fit into Grinnell giving Shattuck \$5 for stamps that he didn't want anything for? Change from what?

In any event, Shattuck's death changed little. His widow and children's testimony continued - in fact, it tipped in Grinnell's favor. After testifying to the facts as they knew them in 1922, the discovery of items they thought had been destroyed in a fire prompted them to correct the record in Grinnell's favor - 3 people, at least 2 under oath. This occurred in 1924, three full years before they were given a portion of the Grinnell stamps. Even though that initially struck me as unusual, I can't think of how they've profited in any way in the eight decades that's followed. It's one thing to overlook an unfortunate event that tainted your family's name - it's quite another to pick up the banner of the person who allegedly brought this upon your family's name and carry it forward for a number of generations without profit.

If Grinnell knew that the gig was up and still had 2 genuine Missionaries, why not unload them and reap some sort of profit? Discredited or not, he still had something of great value that any stamp collector would have given his eye teeth for. Sell them, lick your wounds, get some cash and move on. There was no criminal case pending - the Secret Service was uncertain about that.

I can't answer the cancellation question, but I would suggest that it isn't inconsistent with the date of fraud being pushed back. My point is this: barring conclusive proof that the fraud occurred after 1856, we can all have our cake and eat it too. The stamps don't match the conventional description of Missionary stamps, Grinnell and his contemporaries were telling the story as they knew it to be true, and we can explain the totality of the evidence. What we don't know yet is who perpetrated the fraud. It all works if you're not hell-bent on making George Grinnell out to be the bad guy. (And if you are, move on - foregone conclusions absent of irrefutable proof make any real discoveries improbable.)

Printing methods make my eyes glaze over, so enlighten me - have we figured out yet whether or not the proposed methods of counterfeiting the Missionaries existed in 1856?

And explain this - the Grinnell and Shattuck descendants seem to be far apart for a number of reasons. Although neither has made a nickel (or at least only a few nickels) to date, why are they still insistent, independent of each other and several generations after the fact, that the story unfolded just as explained more than 80 years ago? I don't know about you guys, but I wouldn't work that hard without profit for a few slips of paper unless I had some sort of guarantee that I'd cash in at the end.

That dog don't hunt...

September 26, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken - If G80 and G81 were glued to card for 80 years, that would also tend to preserve them...

September 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

I don't recall now where the change-for-a-dollar story originated. That will have to keep until after my deadline unless Pat Culhane or someone else can cite the source. Grinnell said the canceled stamps were in an envelope, not in the prayer book.

He also said that Shattuck had told him of two full covers with Missionaries on them, which Shattuck had promised to give Grinnell if he could find them.

If the two genuine Missionaries were on covers when Grinnell got them, that could account for their splendid condition. But so might storage between pages of the prayer book.

September 26, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

Thanks. There was also that vague story about Grinnell stating that the unused stamps in the book were change from a dollar. That doesn't jive with the census of unused stamps, and I cannot see a scenario where both used and unused stamps were in the book. Is there such a scenario?

September 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

George Linn hired forensic photographer Raymond Kershner to study the prayer book images and seek matches with the stamps. The results were inconclusive.

But if the two genuine Missionaries had been available to them, perhaps Kershner could have matched them.

September 26, 2006 **Steve W**

Rick - Do you actually believe that the owners haven't already tried to match the Grinnells to the shadows in the prayer book? Methinks the glass slipper didn't fit...

September 26, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I am still waiting for somebody to tell me how all those fake cancels got on the Grinnells.

September 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Rick,

Considering everything you put forth in your second paragraph, what evidence or testimony exists to indicate that any more than the two genuine stamps, G80 and G81, were all that were passed from Hannah Shattuck through Charles to George Grinnell? I'm not trying to be argumentative, but you've said the same thing several times and I reply the same. I agree that there has to be a connection, but why can't those two stamps be it?

As far as concocting a story, once Shattuck was not available to corroborate, what physical evidence and whose testimony would have to change for Grinnell to claim several dozen missionary stamps were found instead of only two? Nothing factually need change for Grinnell to claim any number of stamps having been bought from Shattuck, being the only living soul involved in the transaction.

The only reason we can't eliminate the 1850's for printing the Grinnells is that we cannot rule out a stereo plate was made, though that is historically unlikely. Scott Trepel presents strong evidence that a fixed plate was used, meaning of later production. However, looking at WHEN these plates would have been made by Whitney and WHY he needed to have made them leads me to dead ends, so I'm just waiting to see what other's think.

September 26, 2006 **Rick**

Barring conclusive proof that the Grinnell's were printed after 1856 (the date Ursula Emerson died), I strongly disagree that the provenance is the weakest part of the story. In fact, I believe it's one of the more persuasive - regardless of who printed them or why. I also suggest that if this were an actual criminal case in front of learned legal professionals and an impartial jury, the circumstantial evidence would be convincing that Grinnell and others involved at the time believed their story to be accurate.

Think of what was put forth more than 80 years ago as fact, who said it, what they knew at the time, and what has been either supported or refuted for eight decades. Ursula and Hannah were childhood friends. Ursula went to Hawaii and sent letters home while her son worked with Whitney. The mutual acquaintance verified Grinnell's version of how he was put in touch with the Shattucks. The trunk existed, as Grinnell testified and the Shattuck children agreed. Shattuck's widow later admitted knowing about the transaction and being upset he gave away the stamps. And the testimony wasn't limited to details directly related to the stamps - Grinnell added info about Captain Cole and a letter from Lemuel Smith, two individuals who actually existed. The story didn't add anything to the stamp's authenticity, but rather had the potential to blow his story apart or provide strong circumstantial evidence that he'd seen the prayer book. These are the kind of details that trip up a lot of guilty people. If he were guilty, why invent that stuff when he was so busy concocting relevant details? The prayer book, with its impressions and (I've read) some sort of bleeding or ink transference may be more strong evidence once it's examined.

Anyone who believes that it would be easy to concoct the Grinnell and Shattuck story - giving details that address questions that won't be asked for years - should try to reconstruct the relationships today. Even with genealogical societies and the internet it's very difficult.

These are the questions that need to be addressed if we can't eliminate the 1850s as the time the Grinnells were produced. They're not irrelevant until someone can determine that the production date is later than 1856. Then it's a series of lucky responses by a very crafty group of conspirators.

As to the Card of 10 and Grinnell's forgeries, how many truly believe that a collector would knowingly glue 2 genuine Missionaries to a card? I think it's equally as likely that he'd just been told that they were worthless and believed it...but who knows? That goes to motive and trying to establish that is a very risky business and, frankly, not necessary in this case or any other.

Anyone know if the Shattuck family has ever tried to sell their stamps? If they haven't, does anyone have a theory as to why they changed their story to support Grinnell in 1924, accepted a gift of the stamps in 1927, and are still willing to hang their family's reputation on them? I haven't seen much on them and am curious.

Whiskey's nice tonight.

September 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

My November article explains why Charles Sidney Thompson was Judge Wood's suspect as the man who printed the Grinnells, an impression he got from Thompson's testimony at the trial.

September 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

I meant that when my interpretation differs from Dick's, his is usually right.

David S,

If Cordrey is correct that these clichés were locked in a forme, he's right about the logical procedure. But these compositions were so tiny in relation to any forme that would have been used on the Ramage press, it's possible or even probable that the settings were simply tied with twine as for proving, and untied for resetting.

September 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L and Roger H,

Some people at the Southwest Museum understood taking great pains to print a good product. You earlier quoted the following regarding printing of the "WAR STAMP":

"This was done in an exceedingly careful manner, many trial impressions being taken on paper in order to get an overprint that should be clear and brilliant. When it came to printing the stamps, the press was turned over by hand slowly, instead of using the motor, with the result that our home-made surcharge is executed much better than some produced in Government Offices."

C.S. Thompson, Curator of the Southwest Museum

Better than government work! It's just soooooo hard to look past those guys! ;')

September 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken,

The following passage from Cordrey's report, the one you quoted, has stuck in my head:

"To change the denomination it required the printing forms to be unlocked, the type form to be placed on a slant galley or worktop and then separated with additional spacing between the individual stamp forms. The bottom and one side rule were then removed, the bottom type line removed next, and the denomination numeral removed last. The new denomination numeral would then be inset in the center of the ornamental filigree border and new spacing material added, as each denomination numeral was of a different size. The bottom type line was changed to match the denomination numeral, the rule borders were replaced, the two stamp forms (which would produce two stamps of the same denomination) were assembled into one lockup form and tied with string awaiting lockup. This type of form change was common in the industry for generations."

My previous post had that procedure in mind. Assuming he was correct, I don't see why it was necessary to have ever re-arranged the forme at any time, unless he rebuilt it some time later for another printing. In which case the type would have been different as exemplified by Scott #4, no? Had he waited to re-assemble a typeset forme to produce stereo plates, he could just as well printed from the typset forme. Once the original printing form was retired and the type replaced into the case bins, there seems to be no reason after that to experiment with stereo plates. What are your thoughts?

September 26, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

You surprised me in your last post to David S in that you state that Dick Celler "is usually right."

Playing the Devil's Advocate for a moment, isn't the real question here, is Dick Celler right in this instance?

September 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

According to Dick Celler, the stamps with wide margins and adjacent fragments confirm the common belief about Type I and II positions. He's usually right. In any case, so many Missionaries are repaired and painted that it's difficult to know whether the appearance is original.

The Advertiser sale says 2¢ Type II M9 shows portions of adjacent stamps left and right, interpreted as the space between clichés at left and between impressions at right. But to my eye the adjacent fragment to the right of 5¢ Type I M18 is in the same position as the fragment to the right of the 2¢ Type II, so I'm still not positive.

Some of these interpretations may be simply fulfilling expectations, or perhaps we don't fully understand the layout, or perhaps there was more than one layout.

Regarding the 13¢, the record is clear that Whitney defended the Scott 3 text in the Polynesian, in reply to critics, before relenting and changing to the Scott 4 text. But he was forgetful afterward, and in the 1870s he told a British collector that Scott 4 came first.

September 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Carl,

I apologize for calling you Cary.

September 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.,

With your resources at hand, do you have enough images of the known genuine Five Cent to make a guess at their configuration? Any examples with wide enough margins to determine left or right side? Assuming, of course, that the RPSL is correct that the Five was printed first.

September 26, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Cary,

You bring up "apprentice error." One thought I had was that apprentice error is what brought about Scott #3 instead of #4 first. If I'm not mistaken, the "U.S. Postage Paid" datestamp was ordered in 1851 for use on U.S.-bound mail. If so, then knowing there was a 13 Cent "H.I. + U.S. Postage" stamp eventually issued,

isn't it reasonable to assume that Whitney always intended the 13 Cent value to be something like the Scott #4, mentioning the U.S.? Earlier discussions among Hawaiian experts on this board seemed to confirm that Scott #3 and #4 were used concurrently, though #3 is known used earlier. Also, there has been no conclusive reason offered for the change from #3 to #4.

Could Scott #3 simply be an apprentice error where the 13 cent forme was made after the Five and Two without knowing Whitney's intent to change the top label to include a U.S. reference? Upon discovering the problem, Whitney likely used the stamps instead of destroying them out of economy.

The sum total of the above is that if #3 was not Whitney's intention then he would not have repeated it in a stereo plate. Perhaps getting to the bottom of the reason for Scott #4 would answer alot about the possibility that Whitney could have produced contemporary stereo plates. Otherwise, thw two questions to ask about the possibility of making stereos are WHY and WHEN.

Ken - Yes, I carefully worded the statement "considered to have been." It is hart to make a rule with a single ocurrence, though the RPSL did mention wide margins on particular sides of some singles as further evidence of the configuration.

September 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger H,

You're still imagining lithography, not letterpress. Despite what Jim B wrote, it's difficult to reproduce fine lines on electrotpe plates intentionally, let alone by accident. Each printing base has characteristic limitations imposed by the printing method's "syntax," as William Ivins called their defining traits.

To appreciate this problem, first study a 3¢ Statue of Liberty stamp of 1954, printed by line-engraved intaglio, then compare fine details of the image to a 3¢ Statue of Liberty postal card of the same design, printed by letterpress from an electrotpe plate.

September 25, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Greg -

I'm not so sure I would consider them decent copies. If I was the maker and knew they weren't real I would have tried to sell by best renditions, and kept poorer copies to prove I did them. The colors on the card bohter me and I'd really like to see a scan where the color is not washed out.

NOIP - About the hair

Has anyone in this discussion laid out a Title for their exhibit, and later proofed it only to discover there was a misspelling? Sign makers make errors, graphic designers make errors, highway sign painters make errors, it is human nature to make errors occasionally, especially when one is very familiar with the subject matter and involved in layout detail rather than spelling. Then there are technical errors that occur during the different processes, and one of the problems with photographing graphic paste-ups is the film attracting airborne lint and dust. Photographers have link brushes, and nowadays compressed air canisters to clean off the glass and film to be used in the copying process.

I have taken a very close look at the scans from the Tapling Collection and it would be wonderful if there was any way we could get comparable scans of the other reference sources. In viewing the Tapling scans at full size I noticed lint on the images. I believe this occurred on the scanner glass as it is tiny. I use black arrows on these three examples pointing to the lint.

[Tapling 2 cent Y-2](#), [Tapling 5 cent Y-24](#), and [Tapling 13 cent Y-86](#).

Before anyone gets excited and writes they are not the same scale as the hair on the Grinnell, remember this is "hairy lint" which occurs in the air of every room, and these scans are enlarged, including the lint. When one photographs large art work and reduces it to the size of a stamp, and a normal size hair from one's head lands on the negative, or glass, the hair stays normal size. That's is why one uses a magnifier to touch up negatives and spot out flaws. A quick glance does not always catch flaws. So in the case of the Grinnell stamp the flaw was missed, a plate was made, and the [stamp printed](#). AAAAhhhhrrr! growls the forger as he looks at it under [15x magnification](#). He then goes back to the negative and determines it's too difficult to touch out the line, therefore, he just simply rephotographs the art work and makes a new negative, and plate. All that is lost is some time, one sheet of film, and one zinc. Or as Jim has pointed out, maybe he removed metal from the zinc. There would not be any other examples in existence, because it was obvious on looking at the first proof it wasn't right!

I really feel there is an attempt to make this photo reproduction process seem much more complicated than it really is. I believe the process would have been routine for any printer who was involved in reproducing graphic images such as those seen in museum displays and pamphlets during the period under discussion.

Roger

PS - [Normal size stamp](#) with hair across right side. Not visible.

[Magnified stamp](#) with hair now visible to show scale of hair on a stamp such as the hairy 2 cent Grinnell.

September 25, 2006 **Carl Roberts**

Thanks for your reply, **David**.

Sorry, I did confuse you a little bit with **Rick A**, but that's mostly because you both contribute such intelligent and thoughtful posts. Same to you, of course, **Ken**.

David, until Ken posted, I was pondering the possibility that an apprentice might've mistakenly started to break down the forme (sorry, I don't know the correct terminology) until the printer noticed what he was doing. If in doubt, blame the apprentice.

I know of a jet engine mechanic who came into work one morning and disassembled an engine, forgetting that it had just been repaired. Extra work does become necessary occasionally, in the work environment stuff happens.

But anyway, lets imagine Whitney did decide to make plates. If the 13c was the last denomination printed, the "2" and the "5" might've already been sorted into a type case and new type selected when making plates?

Thanks again gang, it's all very interesting!

-Carl

September 25, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Ken L &

Walter P...

Thanks for the clarification of George Grinnell's note on the back of the card of 10.

Jim

September 25, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

No one knows the Missionary cliché layout except for one setting of the 13¢. Everyone except me assumes that all the others were the same, but no one states why they should be. I have tried several times to explain that at least the original composition should have been in the reverse positions, as the Grinnells are. After that, if the clichés were removed from the chase to change the values, they could have been put back in either position.

September 25, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Carl R.,

Thanks for the comment on my posts, but I have to admit I am not impartial. I did not come into this discussion believing Grinnells are fake, but at this time every trail seems to lead down that path. And, it was Rick A. who suggested pushing the date back for their production, not me.

In considering the question of plates having been made by Whitney, you have to remember that the Grinnells are printed in Type I-Type II pairs, but the known genuine are considered to have been printed in a Type II-Type I order. That means Whitney had to have swapped the type between the two printings. This poses several problems. For the Grinnells to have been printed from stereotype plates, they first appear to be from an early printing since as a group they are known with the earliest dated cancels. That means that the stereo was made first, the Grinnells printed, the type put back into the cases, and later retrieved to make more satisfactory typeset impressions of the known genuine. However, as Bill Longley pointed out, the spurred "s" that occurs in G80, is repeated in all three Grinnell denominations of the same type. The odds of retrieving that defective "s" and other letters with defects consistent with those on the G80 and G81 from all the type available in a print shop AND putting them back in the same places they were on the G80 and G81 (even though the Types were switched) is staggering if not outright impossible.

The RPSL thinks that the Five Cent was printed first, then the Two Cent and lastly the Thirteen Cent, which incorporated a spurred "s". The Grinnells having that spurred "s" in all three denominations suggests that the Grinnells were prepared AFTER that "s" was incorporated into the 13 Cent forme, at the tail end of the typeset (known genuine) printing.

That would make more sense, because it means the stereo plates would have been a time-saving measure in the event supply ran low, but done after meeting the immediate need for stamps was fulfilled while the forme was still together. The plates for the three denominations would have been made in assembly-line order, simply by making a mould of the 13 cent that was already in the forme, replacing the central numeral and bottom label, making the next mould, and so on.

The problem is that for some unexplained reason, in making the stereo plates, Whitney took the forme apart and switched the Type I with the Type II AND then proceeded to use a different "2" and "5" then the ones he just got through printing with. Why? How is that any different from resetting the forme later if any more stamps were needed?

So, when you look at the scenario that the plates were made some time from the typeset printing, it fails because of the re-use of a few pieces of type out of hundreds available; and when you look at the scenario where the plates were made in conjunction with the typeset printing, that fails because of inexplicable and unnecessary changes that had to occur between the typeset and the stereo.

September 25, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

Bill, he kept the only two genuine copies he had -- conveniently, they were of different types. We know which ones he had on his want list! I have no idea why he glued them down. That's a good question. I wonder what the glue hides? And I'm sitting on the observation on the cancels for a bit, because I haven't convinced myself it holds much water. Let me think on it a bit longer before making myself look foolish in public.

September 25, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Greg I Blame me for the "worst copies" scenario. I was just flipping the idea of keeping the best on its head and seeing what it would be like.

If he chose for "select" copies, why did he keep the genuine BUT UGLY G80 with the grid cancel? He had many more to choose from.

If he was keeping them for his collection (and he was a collector and APS member) what sane person would GLUE them down? And then use hinges on the items he was selling?

Didn't you mention an observation about the cancels that you were going to bring up?

Bill

September 25, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

One other thing that strikes me as odd about the card of 10. Grinnell was a collector, and I believe that at some level he wanted these for his own collection. So he's kept the two genuines, plus at least one of each type of the other values. Except for the two 13 cent Grinnell, which are both the same type. Why would his collecting instinct not have kicked in and had him keep at least one of each type? He's only missing one stamp to complete the set. (I'm not buying the "these are the worst copies" theory -- many of them are quite decent copies.)

September 25, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

The back of the card says: "Keep these for my own private collection. Sell or trade all of the others. Geo. H. Grinnell."

September 25, 2006 **Walter P**

Jim Baughman-

George Grinnell penned his handwritten note on the back of the card of ten with words to the effect, do not sell, keep. I do not think there was any reference to destroying the card of ten.

The card of ten was kept secret by George Grinnell because the stamps G80 and G81 were mounted on the card and aside from being genuine Missionary stamps they were more likely than not used for a model to print the Grinnell counterfeit stamps.

If this is so, than why did he not destroy the evidence? For the same reason people do not destroy murder weapons, and instead hide them, often on their own property. It may defy logic, but it does happen and more than you would think. George Grinnell could not bear to part with, the more likely than not, incriminating card of ten, and I for one am glad that he did not destroy the card of ten, as we would be left with little to go on at this point of the Grinnell Saga investigation.

A word from the wise, battling with an insurance company can often be likened to entering a one legged ass kicking competition? Good Luck.

September 25, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Another point, whether useful or not, is that the "card of 10" seems to be material that Grinnell didn't want made public. Correct me if I'm wrong, but isn't there a note in his hand on the back saying that the stamps on the card should not be sold, and should be destroyed? Even if he didn't intend to destroy the stamps on the card of 10, why were they kept secret and separate from the rest of the accumulation?

If in fact the first "proof" printing of the 2-with-hair revealed the presence of the flaw, is it possible that Grinnell, knowing the stamp would be unsaleable as a bona fide Missionary with that errant hair, used it for a practice run of the red cancel?

I do agree with **Richard F** and **Bill L** that one must be careful in interpreting non-repeating flaws. I think however that this does not prevent certain explanations from being called into serious question.

Bill D: If the hair flaw was on the negative and discovered after one trial proof was pulled, it could have been easily eliminated, either by modifying the plate (which could be done in seconds with a small metal punch) or by opaueing the offending line on the negative and making another plate, as **Roger** suggests. I prefer the first alternative because it is easiest and fastest. It's certainly the one I would use if I were the printer, and I would definitely *not* simply ignore it.

Off to battle with my insurance company. I will drop in later and see how this discussion develops.

Jim

September 25, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

The scan of G1 is pretty low resolution. When I tried to blow it up it pixellated and lost all detail.

September 25, 2006 **Walter P**

Greg Ioannou-

Re: Longley 'hair curl' - First, I thought I saw part of the curl in your partial scan of G1. Than I went and looked at the G1 & G2 Arrigo pair scan and could not see any remmnants of the curl on the G1 stamp. Than I went back to your partial scan of G1 and this time I could not see the curl remmnant? I too thought am I hallucinating?

I than went and did something for a five minutes and came back and looked at your partial scan of GI and saw the curl remmnants again in the same place where it was on Bill Longley's original scan of the 2c Grinnell from the card of ten.

Perhaps, what we need here is a larger blow-up of the affected area of GI. I do not know how to do this but it may be useful as this appears to be something worth investigating further?

I find that when dealing with scans and blow-ups of the Grinnell stamps youe r eyes can start playing tricks on you, but without access to the Grinnell stamps we have to make do with the best we have to work with.

September 25, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

Am I hallucinating, or are some traces of the while line from the curly hair in the large 2 also visible in [Grinnell G1](#)?

September 25, 2006 **Bill Duffney**

As others have written, if that fiber was on a negative, it would have repeated. The stamps were printed just as Scott explained. Photography could still have been used to prepare the plates, but this foreign fiber does not strengthen that theory in any way.

September 25, 2006 **Bill Longley**

When I pointed out the 2¢ "hair flaw" and asked for comments, it was playing with the theory that Grinnell didn't keep the best examples, rather the worst. I have no idea if the 2¢ hair flaw was caused by a hair or not.

I agree with what Richard wrote that this flaw is not repeated and one must be careful about how it is interpreted. The other flaws that I wrote about WERE repeated. This non-repeating 2¢ "hair flaw" was curious to me, that is why I posted and asked about it.

In this regard, I am an interested bystander with nothing to add. I'm curious to see how this discussion will play out based on the input of other experts.

If photography had a role to play in preparing the Grinnells (not necessarily for printing the), could this hair flaw be indicative of photography as several people have posted here?

September 25, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

My training, such as it was, in stamps has taught me to be very careful trying to classify printing flaws. Until I see a flaw that repeats in similar examples from same position, I consider it to be a "non-constant" flaw. There are many different types of these.

September 25, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Hello -
Concerning the "hair". There is no doubt that hair was on the photo negative. I agree with Jim. Hairs are almost impossible to avoid as static electricity caused this tiny lint size hair to stick to the negative when the film is placed in the film holder. I believe I mentioned once before that touching up a negative is necessary on every job.

I believe the quality of the Grinnells on the card is so poor when compared to others that he kept these examples to show the process. If had the hair show on my plate, I could do as Jim says (I'm not a printer), but another very easy option would be to retouch the negative and remake the zinc. The hair is a flaw that was very easy to fix and redo. The curves and size in proportion to the stamp is consistent with the hair being on the negative prior to making the plate.

Roger

September 25, 2006 **Carl Roberts**

The impression of a short curly hair indicates that the stamp was printed in Hawaii or a similar climate, as the printer was obviously working in the nude.

I'm just saying...

Actually as a spectator to the discussion, I'm impressed with some of the theories and proofs that have been raised.

Scott T, your report on the tiny repeated dots makes a compelling case that plates were used. I'm not completely sold on the idea that the seven bar cancel was copied, the rounded corners on other parts of the postmarks suggest that the cork was simply deteriorating. Some of my old fishing rods have cork grips and chunks do break off - cork has that odd structure that allows pieces to crumble off. And one of my favorite cork handles has grooves worn in it from each finger, another indication of its tendency to wear.

David Shumaker everything you post seems clearly thought out and impartial, which gives added weight to your ideas. Since you suggest pushing the date back for the creation of the Grinnells, do you think they may have been printed in Hawaii? If the seven bar cancels (mentioned above) are genuine, they seem to tie in with that possibility.

I have no idea if the Grinnells are real, but can't help cheering for the underdog, feeling that they got a bad rap in 1922.

However, they don't seem to fit the timeline suggested by their dated postmarks.

Is it remotely possible that Whitney experimented, printing with loose type, then setting aside the forme, then making plates (to save time, while the forme was still set up)? He might have realized that his original print run was too small, might have been having problems with gum (especially on such delicate paper), might have wanted to preserve his precious type, and might have wanted to explore the practical side of printing stamps from plates.

-Carl

September 25, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Scott and Richard...

I disagree in the strongest possible terms. I have seen this effect a thousand times in my career—you simply can not get a uniform impression of any errant fiber that has fallen onto a letterpress. The physics do not allow for it. In photomechanical reproduction this happens as often as sunshine, in fact it is virtually unavoidable. That's why *opaqueing pens* were invented, an indispensable tool for doctoring such glitches in negatives.

To me, it offers incontrovertible evidence of a photographic process lying at the heart of the production of the Grinnells.

Jim

September 25, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Jim B:

No, a fiber will leave an impression, even if it is not backed up by anything solid (but as long as it is adhering to some part of the plate or type).

The greasy ink causes the fiber to stay firm. I assure you of this.

September 25, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Jim,

The most likely explanation is that it is a piece of hair, or fiber, that got on the plate (of whatever composition) and was inked in the printing process. A non-constant flaw of no real significance to anything.

September 25, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Ken L...

My last post was also meant for you, didn't mean to leave you out.

Jim

September 25, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Greg Ioannou...

Once the curlicue had been discovered, it was very easy to carve it away from the plate. (These plates are usually made of zinc or zinc alloys, very soft.) So it looks as if a "proof" was pulled, the errant line discovered, and subsequently removed from the plate.

Scott... I have to disagree that my observation undermines anything. Although I would not mean to assail or fault your scholarship, I'm not sure you know how a letterpress "plate" works—it consists of raised area which pick up ink and then these areas deposit the ink on paper when force is applied by a press. A rude cross section of a line plate would look like [this](#). Only those places indicated by black arrows would pick up ink and subsequently deposit it on paper. The hollow blue arrows indicate how each portion of the plate would look when printed. If an errant fiber were to fall on the plate, it might fall across the printing areas but in the blank areas it would sink to the subsurface, and thus never appear as a solid line on a print. See [this](#) illustration.

The fiber had to have been incorporated in the process when it was a two-dimensional image, thus the negative from which the line plates were made is the prime suspect. I repeat, such a fiber falling onto a letterpress cliché, forme, line plate or set type would never be reproduced in its entire length.

Jim

September 25, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

JIM B:

"The fiber was on the small negative made via copy camera from the large mock-up. It is very fine, and would not have been noticed either on the negative or on the plate until a "stamp" was printed from it. It is another damning piece of evidence that the Grinnells were created using photo processes. It is utterly impossible to create such an effect using a letterpress."

--as you know, I'm definitely not a proponent of Grinnells, but your statement is incorrect, and I'm afraid it will undermine the work that's been done.

A fiber impression on one or a few stamps is not a repetitive mark indicative of a solid plate. It is simply a piece of fiber that fell onto the plate and picked up ink. So, in this case, it means nothing. It could happen with loose type or a solid plate.

The marks in the white areas identified in my report appear on all impressions of the particular denomination/type, with the exception of the one damaged stamp cited by Richard Celler. Those are indicative of solid-plate printing.

September 25, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

Jim, if that was how it happened, why is it only on one stamp?

September 25, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

That fiber does not appear on any other Grinnell print that I can find, so even if printed from a plate, that feature is not in the plate.

September 25, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

Clockwise from the upper left, corner ornaments are ULO, URO, LRO, and LLO. Interior ornaments go clockwise from the top left, O-1 to O-8, as you wrote.

September 24, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Bill Longley & Greg Ioannou...

The errant curlicue on the "2" of the Grinnell you linked to is probably a fiber that got in the way when the negative was created from which the final line plate was made.

An aside is called for here, to illustrate the sequence I believed was followed—

- Photos taken of the original stamp
- Large photo print made
- Modifications, additions and adjustments made to image using paste-up
- Using copy camera a small (stamp-sized) negative was made
- Line plate made from stamp-sized negative, and this plate used to print the "stamps"

The fiber was on the small negative made via copy camera from the large mock-up. It is very fine, and would not have been noticed either on the negative or on the plate until a "stamp" was printed from it. It is another damning piece of evidence that the Grinnells were created using photo processes. It is utterly impossible to create such an effect using a letterpress.

Jim

September 24, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Can someone remind me what was Cordrey's listing method for the perimeter ornaments? Did not the four corners have their own designation like C-1, C-2, C-3 & C-4 starting with the upper left?. Did not the interior ornaments start with O-1 (upper left) and continue to O-8 (left upper)?

September 24, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

John F,

The narrative doesn't have that big a hole. Grinnell approached S.L. Wood a few months after Alliot died, first as a customer to test Wood's integrity, then to offer the stamps for sale. Wood tried to sell the stamps to Taylor. Taylor brought Poole along as his advisor. Bargaining ensued, but no deal was consummated. After that fell through, Poole telegraphed Klemann.

Nevertheless, if the Grinnells are counterfeits copied from stamps he got from Shattuck, there was ample time before he offered them to Wood.

September 24, 2006 **John Forsyth**

One troubling thing to me in the Grinnell saga is the fact he acquired the "stamps" in June 1918, yet he didn't seem to approach dealers till well over a year later. ?? Seems odd.

September 23, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

Don Sundman is traveling out of the country.

September 23, 2006 **David Shumaker** <shuzilla@hotmail.com>

I'm looking for a volunteer to kindly review an article I am preparing to submit to this board. It is the body only. I need feedback before proceeding any further. I've never written such an article so I'm a bit green. Thank you for your help and/or morbid curiosity.

September 23, 2006 **Walter P**

Donald Sundman -

I would be very interested in, as I am sure are most of the other readers of the Grinnell Board, your opinion regarding the content of the most recent posts from Scott Trepel and Bill Longley which have now been placed in the Grinnell Stamp Summary Archive.

Your posts are always interesting and if you have the time I would value your opinion on the content of these posts. Do these posts do anything to alter your view on whether the Grinnell stamps are in fact counterfeit or genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps?

September 22, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott,

It's Michael Schreiber's report on your analysis, with your photoshop comparisons of the cancels on the front page and tiny marks on the jump. He describes Bill Longley's similar finding. He says no convincing rebuttal has appeared.

September 22, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Ken L:

Thanks. I just received my Sep. 25 issue with the 2c Grinnell on the front page. I suppose the next issue will arrive next week.

Is there a rebuttal or counterpoint, or just my comments?

September 22, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott Trepel's analysis of the G80 cancel and Grinnell printing is the headline story in Linn's. Congratulations, Scott.

September 22, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

Bill, it is a hair or thread on the plate, no?

September 22, 2006 **Bill Longley**

[This](#) scan shows the 2¢ on the Grinnell Card of 10. The arrows point to a most unusual printing flaw that appears to be a wavy line originating from the right edge of the left curl of the "2". I could find no other similar flaw (long stringy ink line) on any genuine missionary.

Is there a printing process that this might be characteristic of and possibly point towards the method employed to print the Grinnells?

September 21, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

RICK;

This is the year 2006, no-one would have a heart attack if you were a boy and had a boyfriend!

If I understand the Grinnell story correctly, much of what is claimed as the actual events of the discovery came almost entirely from Mr. Grinnell, some later confirmed, and some not. The "story" of the original find IS one of the weakest parts IMO.

As far as Klemann settling with Grinnell even though he had "won" at trial, if he had a good Attorney, that Attorney MAY have advised him that, on appeal (or otherwise) courts and juries tend to side with collectors versus dealers, so to ward off that possibility, settle first. Makes sense to me.

September 21, 2006 **Rick** <armlin59@yahoo.com>

Dave -

Check the RPSL book for the info on Shattuck's widow's statement, Mystic's booklet for much of the rest, along with Grinnell and Klemann's articles in (I think - away from my desk and halfway out the door) Mekeel's.

The cover's important because the counterfeits were on them. The genuine stamps were on the card. To tie a counterfeit to the cover meant that Grinnell had to secure it, have it match a life-long friend of Mrs. Shattuck, and have several other people back his story. Doesn't matter if it's real or not.

Good night - my ice is melting and watering down my nectar.

September 21, 2006 **Rick** <armlin59@yahoo.com>

Oops - before anyone has a heart attack, Rick is short for Veronica!

September 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

"Even Shattuck's widow later stated that she testified at trial that there weren't any stamps in the trunk because she was peeved that her husband had given them away."

She first said the stamps could not have been in the trunk. She then said yes, they could have been, by virtue of the sampler found therein. She never said she ever saw the stamps, did she? Can you direct me to testimony that indicates she knew the stamps were there all the time?

"Back to reconciling - those who think Grinnell perpetrated the fraud need to do a lot of homework. Even if Grinnell slapped a fake stamp on a genuine cover, how did he get a cover with Ursula Emerson's handwriting on it? How did he get a cover addressed to Captain Cole by a Lemuel Smith? Is Lemuel Smith the same person born in Dighton, MA to Rev. John Smith in 1788 and operated a (get this) stationary store in NYC as listed in a city directory dated 1847-48? How would Grinnell know this?"

Why does any of the above have any bearing on whether there were two Missionary stamps or 81 stamps in the trunk? As stated before, if only two stamps were there, and those were used as models to create the rest, wouldn't that reconcile the history with the find?

"Why did Klemann take a \$20,000 hit on his victory in court? He won and yet agreed to pay court costs plus \$3,000 to Grinnell."

As Ken Lawrence responded earlier, "The issue that Klemann feared to appeal was Grinnell's evidence, agreed by Klemann, that Grinnell had refused to guarantee the stamps and sold them 'as is.' The judge himself thought his decision was weak on that issue, and anticipated an appeal." Klemann simply made the best out of a bad deal.

"How did Grinnell know about the prayer book if he didn't see it? And why do the impressions - which are very distinct and situated just as he described them - also fit the same general shape and size as stamps? How would he know this?"

I don't know why there has not been a comparison of Grinnells to the impressions, but since none of the impressions betray whether they were from Missionary stamps or United States stamps or anything else, we have to put that piece of evidence into a "holding pattern." Also, I was not aware Grinnell said he didn't see the book. I thought he claimed the remainder of a dollar's worth of postage, unused, came from the book. Can anyone help us with this?

Rick, for my money, if Grinnell didn't find the stamps exactly in the manner he claimed, then the story of the find is just that: a story. The question is: how much of that story is documented and how much of it was free to be made up to fit the circumstances because those in the know had passed away? As Richard Malmgren said, that story is perhaps the weakest link in the drama because so much relies on believing George Grinnell.

Of course, there's still that Book of Sermons with the stained outlines...

September 21, 2006 **Rick** <armlin59@yahoo.com>

Walter,

I thought I'd do something really crazy and stick to original sources rather than gossip and undisputed facts rather than conjecture. Call me crazy, but don't worry about answering the questions. I'll do my own digging and support my statements.

Good luck with your lady friend. I might throw back a couple of cheap but tasty whiskies myself with my favorite guy.

September 21, 2006 **Walter P**

Rick-

Bye the way, many of your questions can be simply answered by going back and reading the past posts that are archived on this Board.

September 21, 2006 **Walter P**

There are a lot of maybe's being thrown around on this Board, my own included.

Perhaps, this is good thing in that the more that is eliminated, as implausable, the closer we get to ferreting out the truth.

Personally, for today, at least, I am all 'Grinnelled' out, so I am going to meet a lady friend and have a few late afternoon vodka martini's followed by a good seafood dinner and accompanied by one or maybe even two good bottles of wine. A welcome distraction to say the least.

See you all tomorrow, when I rejoin the battle after reading the latest posts, which I am sure I will not be disappointed with, knowing the participants on this Board. And bye the way, that is a good thing.

September 21, 2006 **Rick** <armlin59@yahoo.com>

Steve W -

Couldn't have killed Shattuck. He was scoping out the Grassy Knoll that day.

September 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter,

I think his passing would have been to Grinnell's great relief, regardless if he bought two or eighty-one stamps. Without a receipt Charles Shattuck could have laid claim on the stamps at any time by denying a sale ever took place and citing the paucity sum as evidence. I think the five dollar sale would break down to a he-said-she-said claim and counter-claim in court. And I don't think a judge would have sided with Grinnell in a fight for ownership with Shattuck without Shattuck having received a substantial percentage of the stamp's true value; but I'm no lawyer.

My point is that the need to legitimize the transaction may have become acute only when Grinnell felt the publicity might precipitate the heirs' desire to get the stamps back, entitled or not. That precipitated the five dollar claim. It could have been one dollar or a quarter, and it could be for stamps other than the Missionaries. If there were only two, perhaps Grinnell never allowed Shattuck to see them within the pile of his purchase; who knows? Charles Shattuck never told anyone what he sold George, what he didn't intend to sell, or where those stamps and covers came from. People knew of Grinnell's visit, nothing more, so almost any story would fit.

I do not think a mere five dollars would have indicated a legit sale in court whereas perhaps five thousand dollars for an as-is lot would. As long as Charles was alive, he could have moved to regain possession had he learned of the stamp's true value. If not for himself, then for his wife and family.

When you do a friend a favor by paying five bucks for a hundred grand worth of stuff, I'd say you might be dragged into court at some time by that friend and be forced to explain to a judge WHY it was more likely than not that your friend was satisfied with 0.005% of the actual value in a legitimate transaction.

Whether Grinnell was thinking along these lines or not, I couldn't guess. Like you said, I wasn't there either. But he should have been!

September 21, 2006 **Rick** <armlin59@yahoo.com>

If you can legally acquire a house in 2006 for a \$1, why would Grinnell leave \$5? Why not a dollar?

As to the post that we only had Grinnell's word on many "fact," that ignores several statements - many given under oath - that has supported his version. Even Shattuck's widow later stated that she testified at trial that there weren't any stamps in the trunk because she was peeved that her husband had given them away. (Guess she didn't get her cut!)

Lewis Perkins, the man who put Grinnell in touch with Shattuck, backed the story. Prompted by the discovery of an old sampler after the trial took place, each of Shattuck children recalled seeing the letters along with a detailed inventory of the rest of the things in the trunk.

Back to reconciling - those who think Grinnell perpetrated the fraud need to do a lot of homework. Even if Grinnell slapped a fake stamp on a genuine cover, how did he get a cover with Ursula Emerson's handwriting on it? How did he get a cover addressed to Captain Cole by a Lemuel Smith? Is Lemuel Smith the same person born in Dighton, MA to Rev. John Smith in 1788 and operated a (get this) stationary store in NYC as listed in a city directory dated 1847-48? How would Grinnell know this?

Why did Klemann take a \$20,000 hit on his victory in court? He won and yet agreed to pay court costs plus \$3,000 to Grinnell. The total equates to more than \$880,000 in today's wages - certainly not enough in my mind to avoid a retrial or appeal, not to mention the indignity of paying the guy that just ripped you off.

How did Grinnell know about the prayer book if he didn't see it? And why do the impressions - which are very distinct and situated just as he described them - also fit the same general shape and size as stamps? How would he know this?

This is just the tip of the iceberg of what needs to be addressed if one assumes Grinnell was nasty, but if you MOVE THE DATE BACK - whether you think the Grinnells are counterfeit or not - and this pile of coincidences reconciles with the new findings.

September 21, 2006 **Steve W**

Maybe nefarious Grinnell had a hand in poor Shattuck's death...

September 21, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

I believe that George Grinnell offered some money for the two Hawaii Missionary stamps, but Charles Shattuck turned the money down, and indicated George

Grinnell could have them as a gift.

Knowing that this could cause a problem later, 'foxy' George [Grinnell] left \$5.00 on the table, and left with the stamps. Perhaps, he thought in this way he could later claim that he had paid for the stamps, if Shattuck ever requested he return the stamps or thought if Shattuck did not return the \$5.00 to him, than there was in fact a sale, because he kept the money? I just don't know for sure, I wasn't there?

George Grinnell could not press Charles Shattuck for a receipt for the \$5.00, because Shattuck did not want any payment for the stamps in the first place. It's like when you do a friend a favour and he or she insists that they pay you in return of the favour. When you refuse their offer of a payment for your services, than the only thing they can do is leave some money on your table when your not looking and leave.

Charles Shattuck passed away one month before the George Grinnell trial started. George Grinnell stated that his greatest regret was not getting a written statement from Shattuck before he died.

The question then arises, was George Grinnell upset or relieved at Shattuck's death? With Charles Shattuck having passed away the two stamps G80 and G81 were forever his, as evidenced by the card of ten where he later mounted the two stamps. George Grinnell even left a handwritten note on the rear of the card of ten, with words to the effect, do not dispose of, or sell.

My question is, was this George Grinnell's greatest regret or his greatest relief?

Your views on the above senerio please.

September 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter P.

The need for compensation to complete a legal transaction seems a very reasonable theory. If he was thinking this at the time of the transaction, though, he should have gotten a receipt from Shattuck. After all, what good is saying you paid five bucks if the other guy wants his stamps back, claiming you stole them because you would never sell \$1000 worth of stamps for a quick fiver?

Perhaps after Shattucks death the claim of forcing the five dollar bill on Shattuck was made to solidify his ownership of the stamps, no matter how many there really were. Absent a receipt, I don't think one can demonstrate that Grinnell was thinking about an iron-clad legal transaction occurring on the day of the sale.

When was the first time George Grinnell recalled paying five dollars to Shattuck? Was it before or after the death of Charles Shattuck?

September 21, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker & Bill Longley-

I believe [and I posted this before] that it was more likely than not George Grinnell only purchased two Hawaii Missionary stamps from Charles Shattuck, which were G80 and G81.

George Grinnell was many things but he was not a complete fool. Knowing or strongly suspecting that the two stamps purchased may be genuine, Grinnell insisted on paying Shattuck \$5.00 instead of excepting the stamps as a gift. Grinnell knew that if he paid \$5.00 for the stamps than that constituted a legal transaction and as such Shattuck had no legal recourse should he later decide to request Grinnell return the two stamps had he later changed his mind.

This is the same reason, why people who buy a house scheduled for demoliton for \$1.00 and than move the house to another lot. This nominal payment constitutes a legal sale of the house. In order for this to be a legaly binding sale some money has to change hands, hence the \$1.00 payment for the house, or as in this case a \$5.00 bill for the two stamps.

I think George Grinnell knew this and that is why he insisted on leaving \$5.00 as payment for the two Missionary stamps.

Its as simple as that. Anyone disagree?

September 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Bill L.

I've just presumed that they were the only two stamps found by Grinnell in the posession of Charles Shattuck, which he may or may not have left five dollars for. Others feel the same, so that's not exclusively my idea.

One nagging question has been that if the stamps are fake, then how come the Shattuck-Emerson connection keeps looking beter and better the more it has been followed up? In concocting his story, how could Grinnell know things about that connection that were not known until after the trial? I think that was part of the reconciliation Rick A. was seeking. A good answer was that not only should genuine Missionaries be found in Shattucks' mothers correspondence, two in fact were.

Does that make any sense to you?

September 21, 2006 **Bill Longley**

David S. That's right he didn't claim to have bought them, perhaps his records contain an invoice for two genuine missionaries. Absent such an invoice that would exonerate him, we have to look at other sources. Where did two very expensive stamps come from?

September 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Bill L.

Since Grinnell never claimed to have bought two "genuine" stamps, I don't know where that thinking will go. Without proof that he bought them after the trial, there's no argument to be made regarding what he did or did not do with them. If he really found the (insert number here) stamps as he said, then the two genuine ones were probably in with the rest, absent any claim otherwise. Supporters would say they add weight to the hoards integrity because the find didn't consist

solely of the Grinnell stamps.

I guess you are trying to reconcile how, against thin odds, the two genuine stamps happened to appear on the card of stamps not to be sold. But then, what are the odds that every example known as the Grinnells were found in one trunk in LA?

September 21, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Has anyone asked if Mr. Grinnell was a high school teacher specializing in art, drafting or printing?

It seems trivial but I don't recall his specialty. A career in one of these fields would not necessarily condemn him but it would lead to more suspicion.

September 21, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Grinnell's Genuine Stamps Here's a thought that needs RECONCILING -- A thought along the lines of how and where he got them.

Grinnell's efforts after the trial to prove the stamps were genuine are well documented. He did research in the Los Angeles Public Library, tracked down the minister in Hawaii to establish a family link etc.

Maybe he bought the two genuine Missionaries to use as research to support his claim? If so, why didn't he mention them in his Linn's article reprinted in "The Grinnell Missionaries Genuine or Forgeries" (Mystic Stamp Company, 2003) or in any other correspondence or conversation with any expert between 1922 and 1949 (the year of his death).

If he had bought two stamps, why does he mention his other research tracking down family members and not mention his two stamps? Surely he could find some similarity to point to in order to support his claim? Why else would someone spend so much money on two stamps to prove they are similar to the "Grinnells" if the attempt is not undertaken? Why then did he hide them away never to show them, even upon his death bed? And why were they hidden for 60 years after his death?

If family records and bibles are kept after 150 years, perhaps the Grinnell family records between 1920 and 1949 can produce a receipt of purchase that would exonerate the claim that he found them in the Shattuck's bible and used them as models. This would be an important vindication for Mr. Grinnell, if possible.

September 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott T,

I have a box of zinc electros of stamp designs that Jim Kloetzel gave away several years ago when the Scott catalog went digital.

David S,

No, Grinnell's testimony is all. As you know, the Shattuck heirs later changed their testimony, but they were not present during Grinnell's visit to Charles Shattuck.

Steve W,

No trouble making extremely high quality lithographed forgeries manually, one at a time. I had an old friend who spent time as a guest of the government because his lithographs of Andrew Jackson were not as good as he thought, but they did pass at several Chicago banks. The main difficulty I'm describing is caused by the blue ink of the Missionaries. It's not impossible to imagine, but the Numerals were much less of a challenge.

Thank you all, and keep stimulating thoughts flowing. This moth needs to take leave from the flame to work on his book.

September 21, 2006 **Richard Malmgen**

As to some recent posts:

Despite sometime claims to the contrary, there are actually very few things that are 'proven' about the Grinnell finding. While there is no dispute that Ursula Emerson grew up with Hannah Shattuck (wife of Jesse Shattuck and mother of Charles Shattuck) and corresponded with her from Hawaii or that young William Emerson went to work in November 1850 for a short time in the Government Printing Office with H.M. Whitney, much of everything else in the 'official' version of the Grinnells (i.e., Culhane and Arrigo attempts to provide an explanation for their existence) is disputable.

There is certainly dispute about how the Grinnells were found. The provenance of the Grinnells is one of the weakest links in the pro-Grinnell argument, not one of the strongest links. First time sworn testimony from all but George Grinnell was that there were no stamps in the Book of Sermons.

If there was something in the Book of Sermons – despite the first time testimony from others, then why not G80 & G81? (Is it Roger Heath who has been suggesting this for some time?) Interesting, but it is speculation.

Of course, George Grinnell had to acquire the items somewhere. I have never read that he had a trust fund. He was a school teacher and a museum employee. He could have saved his lunch money like I did in order to buy stamps. (Yes, mom. Lunch at school was especially good today, but I'm still hungry.) But then I could never save enough quarters in either Elementary or Junior High School to buy a Missionary.

September 21, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Richard Matta - I learned long ago that it is pointless to try to get into the mind of a forger. Some of the best cover fakes I have seen were most likely made to deceive "friends" the maker wanted to trick. Although many forgeries were made for profit, some were made to show that the expert groups were fallible, and others probably made simply to see if they could be. Others were made to supply a demand that couldn't otherwise be met.

September 21, 2006 **Richard Matta**

The one big question that still nags at me is if the "forgers" went to so much trouble to replicate all three values, two types of each, multiple cancels, "aging" and tearing the stamps, putting them on piece, etc., why were they so sloppy/lazy as to try to sell them in a single transaction? Particularly knowing that the only likely end purchasers were the experts who had access to known Missionaries for comparison? I would have at least slipped a few into the marketplace

beforehand. Lots of ways to do that anonymously. And why not go the whole nine yards and stick some on envelopes to make the story more convincing - the lack of postal history to me isn't so much damning as curious.

September 21, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken Lawrence, >I defer to your extensive knowledge of the history of the Grinnell find. Given everything you know, is there any evidence or any testimony other than George Grinnell's that can determine whether there were zero, two or eighty-two Missionary stamps bought from Charles Shattuck that day?

Also, consider the possibility that the Southwest Museum had legitimate reproductions made by a reputable printer, paper provided by the museum, with the story that they would be sold as souveneers? I don't think the job would have been declined because the stamps were not American and the museum folks were (mostly) reputable. I'm not throwing this idea out as yet another wild theory (I don't really believe it), but rather to point out that merely printing the labels was just a start. They may have been prepared and printed by someone who had no ill intent and didn't suspect any. To make artifacts for a scam, one needs to trim each stamp, apply varying cancells with varying dates and colors, stain them, bleach them and tear them to make a convincing find. Then, you have to build up the story... can't forget the story.

September 21, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Richard M - The Longley "G88" piece added to reference page.

September 21, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

We're selling Henry Tolman's Beer Stamps today and I have four catalogues in production, but like a moth to a flame, I'll reiterate...

A zinc electro is just the type of printing plate that would be made from a matrix of a Missionary stamp, assembled from various elements cut and pasted. The Grinnell artist mixed a combination of photo-reproduced elements (some touched up) and facsimile elements.

When zinc plates are made, they will pick up spots on the matrix, which then transfer as marks on the printed impression in white background areas. That's the point of my article.

Zinc plates are hard metal and will leave bite in the paper, although the bite differs from typeset stamps in that loose type elements, such as a rule or one letter, might be slightly higher than the rest and leave a strong bite until the printer hammers down the type by placing a woodblock over the type and gently tapping the type back into flush position. (Run on sentence, sorry).

Ken, if you're feeling ambitious, locate a printer who makes zinc electros and have him make you a plate.

September 21, 2006 **Steve W**

Sperati first began making forgeries that could fool legitimate experts in 1911. He turned to full-time "stamp business" in the early 1930's, which he continued until he sold his stock to the BPA in 1953. His process was photolithography, which reproduces genuine stamps in the finest details.

He seemed to have the equipment and expertise to make very high quality lithographic "plates" from photography in the early 1900's. (reference: C. Walske & R. Lowe, Sperati II).

September 21, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

The "flaky" appearance of the ink on the Grinnell's may be consistent with printing from zinc electros (according to a remark made by a friend who owned a small shop and used to print business cards).

September 21, 2006 **Bill Longley**

[here](#). Sorry, the second link had an extra colon (!!!).

September 21, 2006 **Bill Longley**

A few images for your consideration [here](#) and [here](#).

September 21, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Ken L - Stanley Piller and others may originally have thought the cancel on #G80 was fake but have since changed their opinion.

There is nobody I know seriously contending that the Grinnells were manufactured by a photographic process. Just that the electros were produced using a photographic process. The electros would have been used for actual printing.

The use of electros was widespread by 1920. And, it was not only used by large printing houses. Printers of checks and stationery used them routinely.

But, I am not a printing guy

September 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

As I have written before, if Scott is right about the grid cancel, that would be a fine outcome -- two genuine 13¢ Missionaries with genuine cancels are plenty to celebrate, and we can all toast to that. But Stan Piller opined that the PF would condemn the grid as counterfeit, so we still need confirmation or refutation of Scott's analysis.

As for Scott's hypothesis about a plate, if he's right, it would surely have been a line electrotype. No other kind makes sense. That suggestion poses the question of who made the electro. When Brewster Kenyon in Long Beach ordered a line electro to print his fake Hawaiian provisional overprints in the 1890s, Walter Sellschopp in San Francisco knew about it immediately, and promptly exposed Kenyon.

If Alliot, Thompson, and Grinnell acquired electro plates of Hawaiian Missionaries, did they make them at the museum? Electros were typically made by large printing firms and newspapers, not by small print shops. If someone made plates to order, he must have been a participant in the conspiracy. Otherwise the risk of exposure would have been too great.

These are the aspects that strike me as improbable and difficult to explain, not the deceptions of conjurers and confidence men.

September 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

The verdict that the Grinnells are relief prints, not planographic prints, is unanimous. The "bite" of the reliefs is obvious. Master printer Keith Cordrey agreed, the RPSL agreed, and I examined them again myself about two weeks ago. I also compared them to a certified Sperati Hawaiian Numeral forgery, and to genuine Hawaiian Numerals.

Orthochromatic film sees blue/cyan as white, not black. That's why editors and compositors use blue pencils; they disappear on lith negatives. With panchromatic film, blue and cyan can be rendered black through a red filter. Ortho film can't see red light. That's why darkroom light filters were red. So one uses yellow and hopes for the best, but the reproduction quality is not good. The alternative is underexposure on continuous-tone film, which yield the result that you see in the Grinnell trial photos.

Ken

On the main Frajola board Roger Heath wrote:

Ken -

I'm at your mercy. I don't know the date of the first photolithographic forgeries created by Jean Sperati, but I find it interesting that he used the technique to forge Hawaiian Numerals. During the period of the 1910's, photolithography had been a viable process for over 30 years and I haven't seen any source that implies it was not possible to produce the stamps under discussion using orthographic film and photolithographic plates.

A quote from Fred Gregory's Post Office in Paradise:

"Sperati was a prolific forger of postage stamps in the first half of the Twentieth Century. Because his production technique began with a photograph of a genuine stamp, his fakes match the stamp type for a genuine stamp. Anyone who plates Numerals strictly by typography will be fooled. However, because his fakes were made by lithography, no type "bites" will be found on them."

How many collectors (people) in the US have had the opportunity to see the front and back of a Grinnell, and handle one? Is there consensus among those who have that type "bites" are present?

Roger

September 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Hannah, not Ursula.

September 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

No, Shattuck died the day before Klemann arrived in L.A., and there's no doubt that Grinnell visited Shattuck. Pat Culhane has the proof of death, and the published death notice. No one knows why the RPSL claimed otherwise.

Shattuck's widow testified at the trial that Grinnell had come to visit her husband as he said. The Shattucks denied that a hoard of Ursula's estate was in the trunk. That's where testimony diverged.

The issue that Klemann feared to appeal was Grinnell's evidence, agreed by Klemann, that Grinnell had refused to guarantee the stamps and sold them "as is." The judge himself though his decision was weak on that issue, and anticipated an appeal.

September 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard F,

I meant the checkerboard serrated cork Grinnell obliterator, not the red round dater. The closest similar Missionary obliterator is very different.

If the red postmark is a forgery, the forger failed to duplicate the original maker's mistake. The reason why the genuine cancels are so easy to identify is because the U.S. Postage Paid inscription is in italic letters except for the capital S, which is roman, whereas on the Grinnell postmark, the entire inscription is italic.

Scott T,

Thanks for your answer.

My reply to you is the same that I made to the Grinnell owners when they submitted their stamps to the RPSL: No expert opinion is likely to sway anyone's opinion unless it persuasively explains the origin of the stamps. Absent such an explanation, the controversy will continue. It is the history of the stamps and the controversy that has made this into an enduring aspect of philatelic lore.

My investigation has not yet concluded. When it does -- shortly after my book deadline is past, I hope -- I'll publish my best answers to all the outstanding questions. I'm grateful for the assistance you have provided.

My articles in Scott Stamp Monthly have thanked by name all the people here whose insights have assisted me.

September 20, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Rick A.

I had some of the same concerns as you had before the Card of Ten was shown to have what look like two genuine 13 Cent Missionaries, one of each type. Were it those two stamps and only those that Grinnell got from Shattuck, they would reconcile a lot, wouldn't they? A find of two Missionaries establishes a link back to Hannah and Ursula that otherwise seems to be an enormous coincidence had Grinnell just selected Charles Shattucks name from a list of acquaintances to answer where he got the stamps.

However, I don't know when the story of Grinnell's meeting with Shattuck was first recorded, but according to the RPSL report Charles Shattuck died only a month or so after the alleged deal with Grinnell, and the only proof of the meeting was an affidavit sworn by a friend or lodge member testifying that he sent Grinnell to Shattuck because he might have something Grinnell would be interested in.

Also, there may or may not have been stamps in the Book of Sermons. I do not believe anyone has taken up the task to try to fit unused Grinnells with the silhouettes in the book. Even so, should silhouettes be considered in authenticating stamps that can be examined in person? What if there were genuine Missionaries found in the book, but someone Grinnell trusted made imitations to substitute for the real ones? Would you want the silhouettes to help authenticate replicas?

When you look at the possibility that the Grinnells are fake, you have to conclude early on that Grinnell made alot of stuff up. After all, if he sold several dozen stamps when he knew he found only two, he was chin deep in it. Given not much more than the testimony that he was directed towards Shattuck by an acquaintance, it is easy to see how much of the story of the find would have to be tossed out..p>As far as Klemann's settlement, it has been discussed on this board that the only legal course for recovering his money was because of fraud, not because Grinnell didn't know good from bad. The judge concluded that Grinnell knew the stamps were fake, but perhaps Klemann's lawyer felt that the same conclusion, fraud, would not be reached by a separate judge had Grinnell appealed the verdict.

September 20, 2006 **Rick** <armlin59@yahoo.com>

Ken-

Thanks. I thought I was the only one left who wasn't seeing Red Rats everywhere I looked.

I don't know if the Grinnell's are authentic government printings or not. But I'm confident that the theory of George Grinnell (or anyone else) counterfeiting stamps in the late 1910s can't be reconciled with other known (or unrefuted) facts that occurred decades before. It goes back to who knew what and when did they know it.

Advances regarding the differences between the accepted Missionaries and the Grinnells is still productive. As a group, we still need to keep each piece of this puzzle in perspective with the entire puzzle.

September 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

When I was growing up, Chicago was the printing capital of the world and the Lakeside Press was the world's largest printer. Printer's row had more antiquated printing equipment than anyplace else, and I operated a lot of it at one time or another, including a large Harris press of the same vintage as the ones that printed the World War I 1¢ and 3¢ Washington offset issues. So I'm familiar with the techniques.

You have passed over each of my statements that (orthochromatic) lith film technology and offset plates of that era did not have the capability of today's cameras, lenses, films, plates, and presses. Study the terrible quality of those 1918 to 1920 stamps, printed by the most skilled pressmen at the world's most important security printing establishment to understand why your hypotheses are unlikely. Judge Lybarger wrote the most scholarly study of the offset issues, explaining each step of the process as it was performed at the time, published by APS.

Second, as my second November article in Scott Stamp Monthly explains, the technique employed by the principal forgery suspect was hand typeset letterpress at the Southwest Museum. Here is how Charles Sidney Thompson described the method of printing his WAR STAMP overprints that the museum used on its mail until the POD forbade them:

"Therefore I bought a thousand 1c stamps, and after discussing the matter with our printer, who is an Englishman, we decided that we would overprint them in blocks of ten, 2 high and 5 wide. Owing to the fact that we possessed but little type of a font sufficiently striking to suit the purpose, it was necessary to use sans-serif type of three different sizes (but all the same style) to do the work.

"This was done in an exceedingly careful manner, many trial impressions being taken on paper in order to get an overprint that should be clear and brilliant. When it came to printing the stamps, the press was turned over by hand slowly, instead of using the motor, with the result that our home-made surcharge is executed much better than some produced in Government Offices."

September 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Rick,

If the Grinnells are counterfeit, I think a reconciliation that requires fewer inventions and unknowns would be:

Grinnell's masonic brother referred Grinnell to Shattuck. Shattuck had two stamps that Grinnell coveted in a prayer book, plus an 1850s seafarer's letter from Hawaii. Grinnell gratefully accepted the book, stamps, and letter, and left \$5 on the chair. Grinnell took the stamps to the museum and showed them to Alliot and Thompson. They wondered aloud if their printer who so skillfully overprinted the WAR STAMPS could match these prints in a similar way. Grinnell agreed to let them try. It worked. Alliot died. . . . [the sequence as well known] . . . Shattuck died. Klemann arrived in Los Angeles the day after Shattuck died. And so forth.

September 20, 2006 **Rick** <armlin59@yahoo.com>

While it's nice to see the testosterone level down to a healthy level, I'm disappointed that no one has thought to use the word RECONCILE - as in reconcile the theory that Grinnell counterfeited stamps in the late 1910s with facts (or at least generally accepted bits of information) that occurred decades before hand.

The research on production methods is eye opening. But the mystery isn't solved until someone can explain how these new facts RECONCILE with a list of

items. While I'm staying with family tonight and away from my resources, several questions come to mind that are at odds with a forger creating these stamps in the late 1910s - whether we prove that the Grinnells weren't printed in a manner consistent with the Missionaries or show that they're outright counterfeits. (Notice that I didn't say they were genuine - I'm just encouraging others to push the date back. It makes more sense.)

Otherwise, how do you explain the Grinnell-Shattuck meeting, the prayer book with its very distinct impressions, the testimony of the man who gave Grinnell Shattuck's name, Klemann's willingness to take a loss when he settled after a court had found in his favor, Ursula Emerson growing up with Mrs. Shattuck, or the rest of a list of 14 items I just listed from memory? That's either a ton of remarkable coincidences or a conspiracy theory that rivals JFK's assassination.

Move the date back, consider that the stamps found their way into Shattuck's and Grinnell's hands just the way they testified (without contradictions that withstood the test of time) and it places any duplicity back further in time. It also incorporates the discrepancies between the Grinnells and the genuine Missionaries.

Advances on the differences between the two sets of stamps and their production methods are encouraging and helpful, but they still don't answer the haunting question - who produced these stamps and why? Take the facts we have - and those that are emerging - and RECONCILE them. The answer we're all waiting for may be close at hand.

September 20, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Richard F.

On September 19, you posted to the effect that another article by Bill Longely is 'here'. The article was his '88' analysis and one that for whatever reason I found interesting. (I think because it was simple and even I could understand it.)

Perhaps you have simply had your hands full on other chores today, but will it eventually be added to the Grinnell Reference Page?

September 20, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Roger Heath

Each to his own, but I think it would be sacrilege to remove G-80 & G-81 from the Card of 10.

The Card of 10 should be kept intact and sold intact. If I had the funds at the moment, I would make an offer.

September 20, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Ken L:

Your questions in quotes, followed by my answers.

"for many of us the status of the Grinnells (genuine or counterfeit) is the least interesting aspect of the discussion"

--...yes, and a good conversation with Angelina Jolie is what interests me most about her.

"One question that keeps buzzing me is, if your analysis of the grid cancel is correct, why are some Grinnells canceled with a black obliterator that has no Missionary counterpart?"

--All of the Grinnells have a cancel that mimics the Honolulu killers. Some are poor replicas. The 7-bar grid is dead on. Why? Because the forger had one to work with. And he probably knew it would look pretty darn suspicious if all of the used Grinnells had the same exact killer.

"In other words, why make a fastidiously exact forgery of a cancel in one instance, and one that isn't found on any genuine stamps or covers, in another?"

--Circular grids, segmented cork, red datestamps...which Grinnell replicas are not "found on any genuine stamps or covers"? I think all of them imitate something that exists for real.

You may feel I'm dwelling on the least interesting aspect of this subject, but for everyone involved here, the verdict -- genuine or fake -- is the key issue.

In the Mystic booklet, Dick Celler states his opinion that the Grinnells are "very likely to be genuine." After all of the analysis presented here, does he still have that opinion? Do you?

If everything written and shown so far was presented to the P.F. Expert Committee with the stamps, I think we could reach a reliable verdict. Do the owners still feel they won't receive a fair hearing on American soil?

September 20, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Can you indulge me for a few moments of your time, by placing yourself in the forgers shoes, and think how you would go about manufacturing counterfeit Hawaii Missionary stamps. Please limit yourself to the technology and equipment that was readily available around the time George Grinnell made his find of a lifetime.

Indulging me futher, can you think about, if you were the forger, how you could seed some curves with the view of confusing any future instigator, like yourself, in their quest to answer the question, who printed the counterfeit stamps, and how they were printed.

If you were the forger, how would you go about accomplishing this task? In this, may lie the answer to your question posed to Scott?

September 20, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Ken L - You asked Scott about the red postmarks on some of the Grinnell's. The answer as I see it is that a forger had to use existing images from other sources

coupled with the part strike on genuine #G81. I think I mentioned in a post shortly after the #G81 scan was posted that the portion of "d" of "Paid" that is wrong in the fake cancels is the portion that doesn't show on the genuine strike. Oval versus round center.

September 20, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

The forger may have been, 'Crazy like a Fox.' Perhaps the forger threw in some twists just to get smart people like yourself, going down the wrong trail. No disrespect to you intended.

September 20, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

May I wear my forger wannabe hat?

I would see if I could duplicate the cork cancel accurately. If I determined it "looked good", I'd try a couple of other variations to make it appear that the stamps in this new find were mailed elsewhere than Honolulu. By the way, I made at least ten cork cancels before even getting close to the one I used on the stamps. I threw them all away as unsatisfactory.

Same with the stamps. You can't believe how many hours I spent trying to match those pictures in the book of rare stamps. I had trouble getting the paper right, and the red cancel color never really worked well! I'm keeping a few examples as part of my reference collection. What do I regret the most? Sticking the real ones on the card with my "art".

Roger

September 20, 2006 **Roger Heath**

I have just spent some time looking at the examples in the [Mystic pamphlet](#) and taking a closer look at the Tapling vs the Grinnells. An interesting feature of .pdf files is that one can enlarge them up to 1200%. Being curious I looked at the areas of interest enlarged to this magnification. An interesting side anomaly appeared. The red arrows have a flaw at the tip. It is a constant flaw showing the loss of a pixel at the point and an added pixel on the opposite side of the point. Pointing right the added pixel in on the bottom, with the arrow pointing left the added pixel is on top. Why do I bring this up, because until one magnifies over 600% these features don't show. The arrow on the Post Office in Paradise image was created in a different manner, on page 22 the stamps within the box have different arrows implying to me the image with its arrows were manipulated after the arrows were pasted to the image (I'm not saying or implying this is bad, just pointing out that until very high magnification is used, the arrows don't look different.)

I bring this up because I believe that the forger had the ability to magnify his work large enough to see fine details and work at a size that enabled him to manipulate and glue pieces of paper, and draw with an ink pen and a touch-up brush when he felt it necessary. I don't believe for a minute it was necessary for him to use a magnifying glass and single hair brushes to paint details.

The differing resolution of scans on this site leads to dead ends when magnifying the images. The Tapling scans are incredibly detailed and one can see in places albino sections of the fine inner frame line, the bleeding of the ink along the paper fibers, etc. None of this detail is visible on most of the other stamps, making comparisons impossible. I cannot duplicate the methods the forger may have used because scans and computers have square pixels denying one the ability to touch out smoothly. The grain in B&W film is many times finer than the pixels on my screen. I don't believe any of the Grinnells will show fine frame lines that slowly vanish and become albino, then restrengthen into a fully inked line. Nearly all fine lines on the Grinnells seems to end in a rounded manner indicative of film either resolving the finess of the line, or not. At any point during the photo process there is no way the fine line can reappear without being drawn in on the paste-up.

I look forward to seeing high resolution scans of the Grinnell card which would allow direct comparison with Tapling Missionaries. Just a single scan of each value would be satisfactory, along with G-80 and G-81. Another question to those who may have contact with the Arigos, will there any attempt to remove these two stamps from the card prior to them being offered for sale?

Roger

September 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard F,

Thank you. Even though I don't have time right now for thoughtful posts, I do check in to follow the discussion and pose questions that might clarify various points. The fact that this discussion attracts as much discussion as the main board, and sometimes more, is testimony to its value. I agree we are all on the same team, and our style should reflect it.

I'm trying to follow Reverend Steve's advice, and trust that others are as well.

Scott,

With all due respect, for many of us the status of the Grinnells (genuine or counterfeit) is the least interesting aspect of the discussion. Besides the mystery that attracts me, which I expect to solve (unless someone else beats me to it) but haven't yet, several participants have said they are learning more about stamp printing here than in any philatelic book.

I don't want to wait to comment until someone who knows as much as you about plating replies formally to your paper, though that's important, or your analysis should be accepted. One question that keeps buzzing me is, if your analysis of the grid cancel is correct, why are some Grinnells canceled with a black obliterator that has no Missionary counterpart? (This point is not original with me. It is the subject of Pat Culhane's Mystic booklet and his seminar at Washington.)

In other words, why make a fastidiously exact forgery of a cancel in one instance, and one that isn't found on any genuine stamps or covers, in another?

September 20, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Richard F:

I recommend closing down the posting section and leaving the reference page and articles.

Anyone who wants to learn about the Missionaries and Grinnells can access the info. The other banter is simply fueling the notion that the status of the Grinnells is controversial.

September 20, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I have decided, at least for the near term, to continue this board. I was swayed primarily in this decision by an email from a "lurker" who fits the profile of the type of collector I was hoping both boards would appeal to. Bottom line is that he said he could "filter the silliness."

Please, can we all try to remember that we are all on the same team and this intra-mural scrimmage is just part of a hobby that we all feel passionately about.

September 20, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Steve W.

And I thought I was the one with the dry humor.

September 20, 2006 **Steve W**

Richard M,
As I remember, the JUDGE was a very vertical thinker...

September 20, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Richard F

(I'm addressing this to Richard F. because I do not wish the Little Boys Board shut down, although it is in response to Steve W.)

Steve W posted "It has also been apparent for some time that no definitive resolution to the debate can be reached, so its continuation will only generate further personal hostility."

Depending upon what Steve means by definitive resolution to the debate, I disagree with his comment (ignoring the 'hostility' part for the moment).

I believe the setup of this Board has generated much to the resolution of the debate. Perhaps the information has not been definitive as to the single question of whether or not the stamps were manufactured by George Grinnell, but much information has and is being generated (some arguable at the moment) as to how they were produced. And it is only because you set up this Board that this information has been and is being generated.

As to the 'hostility' issue and 'respect and friendship', I think many posters have some egg on their face. Remember THE JUDGE? WE CERTAINLY WERE NOT VERY POLITE TO HIM. (TELL ME AGAIN WHERE IS THAT CAPS LOCK KEY.) AND THEN EVERYONE WENT ON A RANT AND STARTED A DISCUSSION ON WHO WAS THE MOST OBNOXIOUS FAMOUS PHILATELIST THAT THEY EVER KNEW AS IN A TRUE PHILATELIC GENIUS MUST BE OBNOXIOUS OR HE IS NOT A TRUE PHILATELIC GENIUS AND IF I AM OBNOXIOUS THEN IT IS PROOF THAT I AM A PHILATELIC GENIUS.

PERHAPS YOU SHOULD CONSIDER CLOSING DOWN THE BIG BOYS BOARD.

And the above is with the caveat of not intending to be disrespectful to anyone – just a recap of what I remember, perhaps incorrectly, during the brief participation of THE JUDGE.

OUST THE JUDGE!

O.K., some people who should act like adults instead act like children. But don't forget that we are doing this on a computer via e-mail and one of the very bad things about this means of communication is that we do not take the time to reflect about what we wrote before we press the 'send' key.

OUST THE JUDGE!

September 20, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Frajola-

I agree with Bill Weiss who has been around a long time and has been a wise and valuable contributor to this Board.

I have always posted, that in my view, if the Grinnell Saga is ever going to be resolved it will be on this Board. Therefore, I would request you not shut this Board down, but at the same time, we should consider the following if the Board is to move forward in its mandate to solve the Grinnell Saga.

Unlike myself, there are many very knowledgeable posters who understand the fine art of printing, photographic reproduction, postal history and the art of plating postage stamps. With a pool of talent such as the above, the answers to this mystery should flow forth, and yet they do not. Why is that?

Is it, because the information pool is tainted with so much disinformation that it is difficult to separate facts from unproven conclusions and presumptions, or is it that the bias and self interest of some posters override moving forward in a positive manner because it conflicts with their personal agenda.

One thing that I am sure of is that even though the tone of some posts are cutting, I believe that everyone that posts on this Board holds no disrespect for any other poster. I also believe that some posters are so entrenched in their positions that it can and will frustrate other posters who only want an answer to their questions or a convincing reason why their theory may be implausible.

Some posters have put forth some serious studies recently [Scott Trepel & Bill Longley], which you have posted on this Board that purport the Grinnell stamps are counterfeit stamps, and that the seven bar grid cancel is a genuine cancellation on a genuine 13c Missionary stamp that was used as a model to fake cancellations on some of the Grinnell stamps. However, to date no serious challenge has been posted that would prove these learned studies are not plausible and the Grinnell stamps are genuine postage stamps.

The onus is on the Pro-Grinnell side to issue a rebuttal to the above mentioned studies, and a lack of a rebuttal only frustrates the efforts of this Board in the search for the truth. In order to move forward in a positive manner I will join and second Bill Weiss in asking you to request Dick Celler and Ken Lawrence to provide a written rebuttal in the form of a presentation not unlike Scott or Bill's if either of them disagree with the contents and findings of these posts.

September 20, 2006 **Rick Armlin** <armlin59@yahoo.com>

Richard F,

The difference between a good deed and a bad deed isn't dependent upon the reception.

It would be a shame to quit when we've uncovered so much new information. Perhaps some of our more spirited friends can check their testosterone at the door when they come online.

A thought occurred as I sat in the balcony watching the wrestling match - a theory that may bring several otherwise conflicting facts into line if I can work it through. It relies partially on the old law enforcement test of who knew what and when did they know it? While some of our rowdier participants come down on my head, maybe the rest will help me flesh this out or (gently) show me why it can't work.

Even if we establish that the Grinnell's aren't genuine Missionaries, we still haven't eliminated Ursula Emerson as the source of the stamps or the Shattucks as the recipients. The fact that they sat in the prayer book for decades makes it a real stretch to think that either of them or George Grinnell were complicit in the scam. And if's been established that Grinnell indeed visited the Shattucks, how do we explain that if it wasn't related to the acquisition - just as he and the children testified. And new tests lean toward the paper and ink being appropriate for the era.

What if the Grinnells were printed on or around the same time as the genuine Missionaries but were bootlegged stamps? Ursula used them, Shattuck held on to them, Grinnell visited them and purchased the stamps, and they are indeed unauthorized (counterfeit) stamps. Trail goes back to Hawaii, several decades before George Grinnell, and that's where we pick it back up.

Anyone want to throw me a life preserver? Kick me back up to the balcony, maybe?

As to the 2 centavo stamp cover, I don't see that as any different than William Robey, a new father of modest means living in a one bedroom apartment - withdrawing the modern equivalent of more than \$1,200 from his savings account in the hopes that the Postal Department will screw up and produce inverted stamps. And he certainly made more on his quest than George Grinnell did by way of either the Grinnell stamps or his cover.

September 20, 2006 **Steve W**

Richard,

Your suggestion does have merit. One of philately's great attractions is the collegial exchange of information that it provides. I have enormous respect for Dick Celler as a philatelist and want to hear what he has to say, but I do not understand why he feels compelled to attack the integrity of those who do not agree with him.

This discussion is destroying the respect and friendship which is so central to our hobby. It has also been apparent for some time that no definitive resolution to the debate can be reached, so its continuation will only generate further personal hostility.

September 20, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Richard F

I think it would be a shame to shut down the Little Boys Board merely because some of us Little Boys are acting like toddlers.

I very much look forward to reading the Grinnell Board, primarily because my interest is Hawaii and, candidly, I don't really care as much as do others about the New York Foreign Cancels or grills. While each to his own, the Grinnell subject has undeniably generated a large amount of Board interest, even among those whose interest is not otherwise Hawaii.

Why curtail future Board postings to written articles? (Because you're tired of us squabbling toddlers, of course.) I suggest that the majority of the written articles you have thus far posted have only resulted because of the open Board. A closed Board would not have resulted in the articles.

I am not privy to the deleted posts, either in whole or in part. My impression is that most of the personal attacks are initiated by an extremely few individuals - i.e., three and perhaps just two (unless, of course, you consider my supposedly droll remarks to be in the category of personal attacks). Responders may number more than two, but most of the posters do not initiate personal attacks.

I am ignorant of the effort required by you to edit postings. I hope it is not too much effort, although any effort is too much. I do not know how much effect your personally contacting the abusers might have on their slant of their future postings. My guess is that you have already done so and have not experienced as much success as you wish.

Still, I find the ideas expressed about the greater subject of the Grinnells to be very stimulating (I have a low stimulation threshold). I would miss the Little Boys Board and I would miss the articles that would never be written. I will bet 50c that Bill Longely would never have written his articles absent the Board. Same for Scott Trepel. And obviously so for the postings of David Shumaker and Roger Heath.

I don't know why Dick Celler added his comment onto his recent posting. Not only unwise (witness the discussion that we are now having), it was the type of comment that hurts feelings. My hope is that he and all of us will think a little longer before clicking on the 'submit entry' symbol, which is not to say, of course, that some editing will still not be required on your part.

September 20, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

My initial reaction to your proposal is negative. My opinion is that, assuming you personally have the time and energy, that you keep the Grinnell board going despite needing to referee sometimes. I think it serves the greater good by allowing it to continue.

That being said, I also see no good reason why you can't arbitrate some of the ongoing dialog. By that I mean, for example, if you think someone has presented a compelling argument (like Scott Trepel's), why don't you ask the opposing side (in this case, either Dick Celler or Ken Lawrence) to address the issue BEFORE posting anything further? I see you as being a steadying influence in the ongoing discussion.

September 20, 2006 **Walter P**

Roger Heath, Bill Longley, David Shumaker, Steve W-

Your most recent posts crossed with mine because I took along time to write the post.

However, I agree with you all in that some posters appear to be bent on supporting their presumptions and refuse to seriously consider any alternate theory that is in conflict with their own.

September 20, 2006 **Richard Frajola** <covers@rfrajola.com>

I am beginning to regret having started the Grinnell board. My intent was that people could share information in a friendly atmosphere. Now, every day I have to edit or delete posts because of personal attacks, and many remain that probably should be deleted.

I am considering closing this board down (not allowing postings) and requesting that people contribute articles only. What say you? Email responses welcomed.

September 20, 2006 **Walter P**

Dick Celler-

You posted and shared with us the following words of wisdom in your post to David S this morning:

"We look at things differently. I look at evidence, and see what conclusions might be drawn. You start with the conclusion [forged stamps], and look for evidence to support that conclusion. So does most everyone else."

On its face this is an observation of a wise man, and a prudent course of action, if in fact one was to practice what they preach.

After carefully reading Bill Longley's post this morning, I cannot do anything but agree with Bill that you appear to want it both ways. With all due respect, I for one am starting to wonder if you know the difference between a fact and a presumption?

Statements, not supported by facts, are presumptions and as such, are not evidence.

In your post to David S this morning, you form the conclusion that a forger would not do this or would not do that, is this a statement of fact, or a presumption based on a former post by Scott Trepel?

Would you not agree with me that when you look at evidence, and form conclusions thereof, the conclusions must be based on facts proven by evidence and not on a presumption that your conclusions must be right?

I would like to see you address the points raised by Bill Longley in his post to you this morning. The points Bill raised are valid points, and if you take an opposing view, than I suggest you address these points, if you can, with supporting evidence and not with your own personal presumptions not supported by facts.

All in all, I find myself admiring your dedication to the cause and wish you luck in your search for the truth.

However, I watched a documentary television show yesterday, where the narrator proposed that when a mystery is so clouded with 'disinformation' and it takes on so many shades of grey that it eventually fades to black, it may be never be possible to find the truth.

This may be such a case.

September 20, 2006 **Steve W**

Dick C,
This comment is entirely unnecessary - why do you make it?

"We look at things differently. I look at evidence, and see what conclusions might be drawn. You start with the conclusion (forged stamps), and look for evidence to support that conclusion. So does most everyone else."

You are apparently guilty of your own accusation, except that you believe them to be genuine. Your 7-bar grid analysis is a prime example of this. Please respond to Scott's study on the cancels - your silence on this topic is most interesting.

September 20, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken L, and others -

"We keep the best and discard, trade, or sell the rest. That's what George Grinnell did."

George Grinnell kept two valuable stamps, real Missionaries. Why did he keep them with 8 stamps on the card, some mint never hinged, glued down for "safe keeping"? The card looks like a printers sample page!

My guess is that had Kleeman been successful in selling the stamps to rich collectors, who then had the stamps authenticated, G Grinnell would have eventually gleefully published an article in APS magazine proclaiming how he fooled the establishment, and his proof would have been the card!

All forgers keep back examples of their work so in the future they can take credit for having fooled the experts. This scenario has happened many times in the art

world. This trick is the forgers "fun", or payback, as the case may be.

Roger

September 20, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Dick C -

I think you have pointed out a location proving the use of photography.

Please compare the space on the left end of the lower ornaments.

The left gap is wider on G-73 than G-74, even though it appears the gaps are of equal width on the right.

Conclusion 2 cent:

There are two types of wide gap 2 cent stamps. Type I's are wide left gap (G73), Type II's are narrow left gap (G74).

Conclusion 5 cent:

Same relationship as 2 cent, same paste-up.

Conclusion 13 cent:

You call the right spacing "narrow". When I look at both left and right spacing I see the lower ornament as being centered with an equal space on the left end.

This was determined by the person who set the type on the original G-81. (I'll go along with the experts who appear to agree G-81 is a genuine Missionary.)

You are also comparing a "genuine" Missionary with G-79 which is one of those being questioned as being a forgery. I don't think it's valid to compare the two. I will agree G-80 appears to have narrow spacing at each end of the lower ornament., which of course is also being considered as genuine.

It's my contention that the forger started with the 13 cent stamps, solved the duplication problem, then made a number of printings until he made best "looking" fakes. He then took on the challenge of making the 5 cent stamps, then the 2 cent stamps. Each step led to a deterioration of line quality and distortions of letters. The 2 and 5 cent stamps presented him with copying and paste-up problems that you have pointed out. Lack of symmetry, misalignments, lost details, touch-up flaws are all typically encountered when photocopying and pasting up art layout for photographic reproduction.

Getting back to the "wide" space- "narrow space" dilemma. I believe the forger cut out the whole line of bottom ornaments and pasted the piece back into his layout. He probably reduced the size slightly to make it fit. When we look at the spaces today the horizontal measurements are much easier to determine than vertical. Why do the bottom ornaments show this asymmetry, because the 2 and 5 cent stamps were created by the forger as paste-ups rather than typeset in a Honolulu print shop.

You write - *"Now we are supposed to believe the forger was cutting up his model into numerous pieces, and retouching and reassembling them, to make it look like a typographed stamp?"*

In a graphic arts studio or print shop it is easy to photograph a stamp and make multiple prints, then cut up the parts and reconstruct a new stamp. This is relatively easy when compared to working on paste-ups of multiple color brochures, where each color layer must align. Think Exacto knives, glue, rephotograph and print at large size, proof "read", rephotograph with graphics camera to required size, make plate, choose color ink, use suitable paper, print! When in doubt consult master printer. This is the manner in which brochures were produced in the 1970's prior to the computer age. A single color item would have been quite straight forward printing job.

I defer to your expertise when making comparisons of Tapling stamps. I think your analysis makes the point, the Taplings are genuine. This has no bearing on the set of stamps known as Grinnells, other than to show the problems a forger runs into when making fake stamps.

Roger

September 20, 2006 **David Shumaker**

I am exactly and precisely correct when I stated that Cordrey never saw tiny pieces of design shift significantly within the same piece of type. That is impossible for a piece of metal type, and had he noticed such, don't you think he would have noted it?

I'll answer your obvious question - I guess I'm smarter, more observant and have better material to work from than those gentlemen. I've got large images, computers to compare and stack those images, and the knowledge that Grinnell had two genuine examples of the Missionaries from which to work. George Linn had none of that, for example, plus he was a crusader and as such had bias.

"We look at things differently. I look at evidence, and see what conclusions might be drawn. You start with the conclusion (forged stamps), and look for evidence to support that conclusion. So does most everyone else."

Your above statement is exactly the opposite of your actions. I write some points that I think can be independently verified. I avoid using illustrations, which can be manipulated to form a conclusion, leaving that to the reader. You take, what, ten minutes to conclude I'm full of it? You impugn my ability to take on such a study and then end your posting by stating that I can only come to the conclusion I have out of bias and not from the facts that you seem content to ignore.

I was only addressing your question on how photography could be used as a basis for forgeries.

You and Ken seem to reject any study that does not fit your ideas as biased, sophomoric and done by neophytes. We still await from you the reason why Scott's conclusion that stereotypes printed the Grinnells is not in step with his evidence. You see, I am not the only one thinking along those lines.

On a post yesterday, I described how proving the Grinnells are real and proving they are fakes are not simply a fork in the road: if real, the process would be one logically employed by Whitney, and if fake the forger would employ a counterintuitive process built around deception. When you and others continue to state that paste-up matrixes would be too much trouble to make, you seem oblivious to how much money \$65,000 was in 1918.

If a matrix was used as a basis for a model, and experts refuse to consider it, then they increase the forger's deception at the expense of true scholarship. Please stop asserting that as fact and prove it. I'm listening.

September 20, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Dick I wouldn't throw your whole article out, I was merely pointing out that sometimes EVERYONE's assumptions are based on wrong information and that isn't limited to the people you might have a friendly academic disagreement with. It can happen to you, too. I do respect your knowledge and dedication to the subject, even if an adversarial approach is taken. Sometimes having two sides strenuously arguing each side will bring more information out. And I assure you I am only in it for the entertainment value and the power of observation it has helped to impart on my own study of my other collection, plating Uruguay's Cifras issue.

Okay a new suggestion On the subject of picking 10 stamps, how about THIS suggestion...

The forger didn't keep 10 stamps (8 Grinnells and two genuine) randomly and he didn't pick the best ones. If he did pick on the basis of quality why did he retain the genuine example (G80) with the ugly cancel.

Maybe he kept the ones that were poor quality or had flaws. He couldn't dare offer the poor copies that could expose his handiwork, and some of them have serious design flaws.

[Here](#) is the card of 10 with arrows pointing at serious design flaws. These aren't all of them, just some examples.

Most have very mottled central numbers (2,5,13)and framelines, quite unlike the genuine missionaries.

Then there is the GC1 with the side dot and bottom dash as mentioned in Scott Trepel's article.

GC3 has an enormous thick wavy line through the central "2". What the hell is that?

What do you think? Keep the poor examples because you can't bring yourself to destroy them?

Bill

September 20, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Bill L

Your comparison of spacings was likewise flawed because in the Mystic booklet you employ G81 which turned out to be genuine. Right, you can dismiss the entire article.

Why was this card of 10 brought out nearly 50 years after his death? What purpose would it serve to bring it out now? Simple. The Arrigos decided to sell all their stamps now.

September 20, 2006 **Dick Celler**

David S

Cordrey's report concluded the Grinnells were typographed from movable type. You are not exactly correct when you say *Cordrey never saw this* - he had, and was studying, all three denominations of Grinnells. What **is** true is that he died before **writing** his report on the 5c and 13c denominations.

Cordrey, Linn, and the RPSL had dozens of Grinnells in front of them when they studied them. Each concluded they were printed from movable type. You say they weren't. I won't ask the obvious question.

You conclude pairs of ornaments *stick together*. If the non-printing spacing piece between them is left alone, they would slide together and their appearance would not change.

The photo reproduction theory is getting way too complicated. A few years ago Scott Trepel posted how forgers of identical-design stamps would make the various denominations by creating only one basic model first, then merely have to create new denomination sections, and "paste" them in for each new denomination desired. That saves a lot of work.

Now we are supposed to believe the forger was cutting up his model into numerous pieces, and retouching and reassembling them, to make it look like a typographed stamp?

We look at things differently. I look at evidence, and see what conclusions might be drawn. You start with the conclusion (forged stamps), and look for evidence to support that conclusion. So does most everyone else.

September 20, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Dick C Your comparison of spacings was likewise flawed because in the Mystic booklet you employ G81 which turned out to be genuine.

The forger's ability to reproduce some similar features of the stamp does not prove they are typographed? That's a leap of faith.

You now use variability in the print detail (flower bud heads and spacing) to suggest they are real, but we are not allowed to use them to prove they are fake.

Your dismissal of the photography/tracing suggested theory ties "us" to the fact that the forger only used these two stamps as models. Again that is an assumption on your part and does not dismiss the photography/tracing theory.

The forger would surely examine his quarry before copying them and just because he didn't have genuine examples of the 2c and 5c to use as a model, that does not eliminate his access to real stamps, photographs or philatelic writings. One must remember that Mr. Grinnell owned 2 Missionaries, was a stamp collector and APS member. So he, or any other person taking the time to produce these would study carefully. And what features would they be able to reproduce? Pronounced ones like dropped ones, narrow/wide spacing, etc. But the devil is in the detail where he couldn't copy well. Like the 88 flaw, and the heart flaw at left, which I am yet to hear any reasonable explanation as to why these flaws transferred to ALL of the Grinnells. Remarkable silence.

Further, there is no onus on those pointing out the differences to prove how they were made. You have 80 years worth of negative expert opinion plus current observations to overcome in your quest to prove they are real.

Picking 10 stamps I asked the question so I will chime in to say, that in fairness of applying the statistical question of 81 stamps and picking 10: Human nature of selecting nice samples aside, in fact there are less than 81 items, as several are pairs and one is a piece with 5 stamps on it, so the number 81 I quoted is incorrect if picking 10 items.

However, if choice or personal motives are entering into the equation of what to keep, how does that speak to the fact that he chose to keep the two real stamps? Something not attributable to random chance.

Steve W's question about glue is an interesting observation in that the Grinnells that were sold were hinged on. Perhaps in gluing down the evidence, nothing would come loose, get separated or mistakenly enter the market. Kinda like slabbing, this card with his note not to sell become an inseparable souvenir and

stashes away the evidence which is kept long after his death and only becomes available for study when the chips are down.

Why was this card of 10 brought out nearly 50 years after his death? What purpose would it serve to bring it out now? With 70, 80, 100??? Grinnells, what purpose would there be in bringing forward another 10 examples after 50 years? Unless somehow this card had something to offer that would suggest the stamps were real. And didn't that just happen? The card of 10 with 2 genuine stamps. Hey, we should compare cancels. Hey look they match. And wow, the G81 is real, so therefore so are all the rest. The missing link indeed!!!

September 20, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Dick C.,

Your question opens up a huge can of worms. When I found some differences in the top two center ornaments within the Type I stamps, as directed by Patric C., I first thought I found where these two ornaments (O-1 and O-2) moved in relation to each other. Using image overlays, I found two important things: first, that the corner ornaments move independently as the denominations change but the center pair moves as one piece; and secondly, the illusion of movement between O-1 and O-2 was caused by the relocation of the "canes" or "hearts" only, not the entire ornament "pieces", as the denominations changed.

Cordrey never saw this because he only studied the two cent value. Had he looked across all three denominations, he may have.

Referencing at the Type II illustrations on Page 21 of the Mystic publication, I see the same thing: The bottom pair of ornaments (O-5 and O-6) stick together instead of moving independently, even though significant movement occurs within the bottom row of ornaments. Despite this, the small pearl above the "e" of "Cents" on the Five Cent is smaller on the Thirteen Cent, and the pair of "canes" or the "heart" changes its location; both in an attempt to make the ornament O-5 look like it was replaced. Of course, to see this I referenced larger scans from this website as they are clearer and the red arrows are not covering the "heart."

My point is that the photoreproduction theory has always held that the overall design was a cut-and-paste job, unique in composition for each denomination but made up of the same pieces. These pieces were moved around to create a typeset look and to allow for a wider bottom label for the 13 Cent. The genuine group of ornaments consists of 12 pieces, but on the Grinnells it looks to be only 8 pieces. Additionally, the "Hawaiian Postage" label seems to have been one piece.

What the forger did that ultimately gives him away is that he doctored the pairs of ornaments to create the illusion that they were two separate pieces, and he doctored the "e"s of "Postage" to create the illusion of type being replaced even though that type never had to be removed between denominational changes.

September 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Ken S,

My point exactly. No one collects stamps randomly, and no one chooses stamps to keep randomly. Statistical analysis that assumes random selection of stamps by a collector is misleading.

We keep the best and discard, trade, or sell the rest. That's what George Grinnell did.

The RPSL book pictures all 71 previously recorded Grinnells, so everyone can easily compare them with the ten stamps on the card to verify this point. The only exceptions are the unsevered pairs.

September 20, 2006 **Kevin Preece**

Duh!

The gap is larger at the bottom because none of the numbers/letters go "below the line", such as "g".

September 20, 2006 **Ken Stach** <kstach@houston.rr.com>

Ken L - No. The only point in my analysis was to show the statistical probability in a random selection of two items amongst the population of 81 items.

If someone can tell me how many of the "better" items there are amongst the Grinnell hoard, from which we might have expected George Grinnell to choose, then perhaps we can determine the probability based on that population. However, when doing this analysis, the results are no longer fully objective, as we've introduced a subjective human element into the system (grading).

September 20, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Roger Heath

There is one basic problem with the photographic reproduction theory used to "prove" the Grinnells are forgeries. Perhaps you might address it regarding your 9 steps.

Take a look at pages 20 and 21 in the [Mystic article](#) and note the ornament spacing between the red arrows in the illustrations. How is it that these ornaments appear to have moved further apart on the 2c and 5c Grinnells than on the 13c? There are also other less obvious changes between stamps of the three denominations.

Now compare this spacing on the 3 Type I denominations of the Tapling stamps (eg M2, M21 [labelled New 10 by RF], M86). The space is wide on the 2c and narrow on the 5c, the kind of feature said to be typical of typographed stamps.

Evidence like this suggests the photographic reproduction theory is not the correct answer for how the Grinnells were made.

September 20, 2006 **Kevin Preece**

Ken (L&S)

GIGO is a new one to me. Suffice it to say that I know which ones I'd discard.

I didn't phrase my second observation very clearly. The larger gap at the bottom of the stamps between the print and the inner frame line, Grinnells & recognised genuine, seems to have been forced on the printer for some reason, otherwise there would have been no need to shave the side ornaments. I've no idea why.

September 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Kevin P,

The used to call that GIGO analysis. I don't know what they call it today.

September 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Ken Stach,

When you choose between stamps to keep and stamps to discard, do you choose randomly between damaged and perfect ones?

September 20, 2006 **Ken Stach** <kstach@houston.rr.com>

Sorry, I shorted old George a tenth of a percent. The answer is 2.8%.

September 20, 2006 **Ken Stach** <kstach@houston.rr.com>

Kevin P - I understand your point on the damaged Grinnells. However, if one begins to exclude pieces of data (i.e., damaged Grinnells), or only include other pieces of data (i.e., genuine Missionary stamps) in the analysis...then, it is no longer a random analysis.

The intent of my simple analysis was to show the potential for both genuine Missionary stamps to be on the "card of ten" in a random selection process. In other words, if George Grinnell had all 81 of the artifacts (the genuine Missionary stamps and the Grinnell "stamps") in front of him on a table, what would the odds be that the two genuine stamps would make it onto the "card of ten" in a random draw? The answer is 2.7%.

September 20, 2006 **Kevin Preece**

A couple of probably inconsequential observations from a non-combatant.

Firstly, the thing that intrigues me about the card of 10 is that there is no unused Type 1 13 cent stamp on the card.

Secondly, in connection with the shaved side ornaments on all the stamps, the top of the "H" of "Hawaiian" is much closer to the upper inner frame line than the bottom of the "2/5/13 Cents" is to the lower inner frame line. The lower side ornaments seem to have been shaved to achieve this, but why?

Finally, (yes I know I said a couple, but what the heck) shouldn't the damaged Grinnells be excluded from the count in Ken Stach's probability analysis, on the basis that they definitely wouldn't have been earmarked for preservation.

September 20, 2006 **John Forsyth**

I don't think glue has much to do with anything.

And I am not sure Ken is inclined to give you a measured response after your responses to him on eBay some time ago. (edited by RCF)

September 19, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

I know the next question coming to contest your conclusion.

Does the formulation of the glue used to stick the stamps to the card have 19th century characteristics, or is it made up from materials unavailable in the 19th century and available to G. Grinnell?

Roger

September 19, 2006 **Ken Stach** <kstach@houston.rr.com>

"Statistics, Permutations and Probabilities" I actually had a course by this name back in college. Yes, I've led a boring life. Bill Longley raised an interesting point the other day in one of his posts (which I am just now getting caught up on)....

What are the odds of the two genuine Missionaries being on the "card of ten"?

As I understand it, there were/are a total of 81 Grinnell 'stamps' (79 Grinnells and 2 genuine Missionary stamps). The calculation of the probability is as follows:

- 1.) The chances of EITHER of the two genuine Missionary stamps being on the card is 10 in 81. But, there are two Missionary stamps in the mix of 81 initially, so the odds are doubled for ONE of the two being on the card = $2 \times 10/81 = 24.7\%$ chance of ONE genuine Missionary being on the card.
- 2.) The chances of the SECOND of the two genuine Missionary stamps being on the card is 9 in 80 (each number is reduced by one, as the first genuine Missionary is assumed to already be on the card) = $9/80 = 11.3\%$.
- 3.) The chances of BOTH genuine Missionary stamps being on the "card of ten" is the product of the two individual probabilities = $(2 \times 10/81) \times (9/80)$

= 2.8%

I'd be interested to hear if Bernard Biales (a good MIT grad, like my oldest daughter) agrees with my analysis.

The conclusion, based on this analysis, is that it is highly un-likely that the two genuine Missionary stamps would 'randomly' be on the card of ten (i.e., George Grinnell knew what he was doing when he held back the two genuine Missionary stamps on the card of ten).

September 19, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Richard M -
Actually I jumped in with both feet.

I've read over and over that the RPSL concluded the Grinnells are not authentic Missionaries. So, why are we even having this discussion? Because those who think the stamps "may" be genuine Missionaries have required those of us, who agree they are fakes, to prove the stamps are fakes. I think proof has been presented by experts more knowledgeable than myself.

How many philatelic forgeries are determined by a misdrawn "star", or a slanted cross bar on a letter "H", for example. Bill and Scott have shown detailed analysis of flaws printed on the stamps which couldn't exist if the typesettings were broken down and reset for each different value. Even if the break down was to only change the center numeral and lower value tablet, there are flaws that would print differently when reset. As seen below there is no problem with inserting major parts, the problem the forger encountered was maintaining real looking details. A different exposure in ANY of the steps outlined below would result in a difference in the reproduction of the fine lines in the ornaments.

The following steps would be taken to create these forgeries photographically:

- 1.) Photograph and enlarge image. ([1 & 2](#))
- 2.) Touch out unwanted cancel.
- 3.) Insert correct value tablet, and make corrections to Hawaii Postage. Take letters from font sample book if necessary.
- 4.) [Insert Numeral](#)
- 5.) Rephotograph paste-up.
- 6.) Touch out anomalies from paste-up process.
- 7.) Create plate on graphics camera reducing image to exact size for printing.
- 8.) Choose color of ink
- 9.) [Print](#)

The forger could [paste in any numeral](#), make touchups and draw in any lines he felt necessary, etc., etc.. In this case he only had two real stamps as models, so he was limited in his ability to compare his final results with other genuine Missionaries. Those who had/have genuine Missionaries can make the comparison, and the Grinnells fall short.

As we'll read in Ken's book, there was an interesting story here, but it appears over. The smoke has dissipated, leaving us with a clear picture.

Roger

September 19, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter P.

That's a great analogy.

September 19, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker-

Your post this morning reminds me of a movie we have all probably seen at one time or another. The movie starring Robert Redford is 'The Sting' where a good portion of the movie relates to the 'material set-up' and the rest of the movie relates to setting up the 'mark' and convincing him to fall for the sting.

As you can see in this movie, the 'mark' goes for the sting because the perpetrators of the fraud set up a believable senerio that counted on human nature and 'greed' to be the catalyst for the mark to fall for the 'sting.'

The movie, as does the Grinnell Missionary stamp 'sting,' turns on the ability of the fraudster to turn the mark [John Klemann] and have him fall for the 'sting.'

I agree with you completely when you state in your post, "In my opinion, setting up that situation, controlling each players part, was the essence of the deception, not the printing method of the stamps."

September 19, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

Ken raises a valid point. I think that Scott and Bill have provided convincing evidence that the Grinnells are forgeries, copied in some way from the two genuine stamps on the sheet of 10. But the evidence has internal contradictions. The next step, the final nail in the coffin, is to figure out the process the forger used. Scott has given us some evidence on that question, but a lot of loose ends still remain. How do we get from the knowledge that some (but only some) of the details of the two genuine stamps were used as the basis of the forgeries to Scott's evidence that a stereotype was used? On the postmark front, we have solid evidence that the barred cancel was copied from #80. Where were the dated cancels copied from? We have a huge clue -- the absence of some numerals. But we still haven't found that smoking gun.

September 19, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard W.

Fine, but if you want to figure out the magician's trick, you can't do it from the seats because he controls what you are allowed to see from your chair. You have to go on stage and stand with the magician.

In other words, you can't simply look at the artifacts the forger produces because he has figured out how to mislead you in ways you would not consider you could be fooled. We don't like to think we can be so easily tricked or outsmarted; but in denying the possibility, we deepen the illusion. One must look at the intended audience and ask "how do I go about fooling them?" Even expert philatelists have human frailties to exploit.

It fascinates me that, whether genuine or fake, the Grinnells are so different from the accepted genuine and yet passed scrutiny of so many prior to Caspary's

rejection. The stamps were even compared to genuine Missionaries owned by Taylor, I think it was, and no problems found. By the time Klemann got involved, Poole and Taylor had already bought in, so that made the suspension of disbelief so much easier.

What better way to convince Klemann that something real is unfolding than with the story of a find of stamps in a missionary correspondence and a well-known dealer and collector each singing their praises? In my opinion, setting up that situation, controlling each player's part, was the essence of the deception, not the printing method of the stamps.

September 19, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

A further article from **Bill Longley** is [here](#).

September 19, 2006 **Richard Warren**

Bill Longley -

I had wanted to retire to the balcony, but in response to your comments, I'll just say - the smoke from the gun looks pretty smoky to me. I wasn't highlighting the anomalies by way of trying to undermine your case. I was simply trying to work out in my head how the forger set about his task.

David Shumaker says "The audience may rightly conclude that the person is not actually levitating even without understanding the magician's means of deception."

Agreed, but personally, I'm still curious to know how the magician did it!

September 19, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Steve W.

Interesting question.

Absent an ulterior motive, my initial thought is that nobody would knowingly glue down two genuine Missionaries on a card totaling 10 stamps (although some genuine Missionaries are individually backed, including my 2c).

As to an ulterior motive, gluing down the two genuine Missionaries makes sense if you knew they were used as models and did not intend to sell them in the future, either out of fear of discovery or wishing to keep the entire Card of 10 as an example of your work.

Multiple parties are presently producing analysis that G-80 & G-81 were models.

The handwritten note on the back of the Card of 10 confirms that they were not to be sold.

And were the Card of 10 forever kept in hiding, essentially the entire discussion on the Little Boys Board would never have occurred.

September 19, 2006 **Keith Bantz, M.D.** <Keithphilately@cs.com>

I received my Linn's yesterday and early for once! It's the September 25th issue and a front page story describes the sale of the "G10" Grinnell Missionary stamp for what is said to be \$20,000. In the story "Pillar said the purchaser bought the stamp knowing that it was a Grinnell and that it is considered to be a fake stamp." Am I missing something here or is this the craziest thing I have ever heard of in philately? What are people's thoughts on this?

September 19, 2006 **Steve W**

One curious detail is that the stamps on the card of 10 are glued down on the card. Why was that done?
My understanding is that all other Grinnells were hinged to cards.
Any thoughts?

September 19, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Actually 'guess' is not a strong enough word.

My 'belief' is that they are wrong.

September 19, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Roger

You stepped into this one.

One could argue that the 'proof' is that the RPSL said they were typeset.

Now maybe they are wrong and my guess is that they are wrong, but the 'proof' is that a recognized expertizing entity said they were typeset after their considered evaluation.

September 19, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Richard M -

I've thought for a while that Grinnell found the two stamps, G-80 and G-81, in the "Book", which makes sense if the stamps were originally on letters to New England. His story was real, his find was real, but only for two stamps, and I believe he tried to maximize his find and profits. Many collectors are treasure hunters, and happen to believe Grinnell went that step further, fully knowing the results could be spectacular. For the two stamps to be hidden for so long with an

apparently true, original note to not make their existence known, only adds to a murky tale.

If it is resolved that Grinnell and "friends" were the culprits of the attempted fraud, the story has a lot less interest, than if the stamps are proven to be real.

Ken L -

You ask:

"Why did the forger create a different font for the 13?"

If he photographed and made large size paste-ups, which were then reduced back to stamp size, he used a font found in a typesetter's sample book and just cut out the letters and stuck them on the photo paper. That is very easy to do. He didn't have to sweat over making a piece of type that was in scale with other pieces of type. The numerals closely resembled the font used to print the Missionaries, but the font is not the same. I find it hard to believe a printer in Honolulu would have had on hand two fonts so similar in style. Why would he order them? Wouldn't he spend his money on different fonts to offer his customers?

I understand you don't believe the photo process was used, but I ask you (when you have time), why is it that those of us who believe photography was involved in the creation of Grinnells have to prove the fact, when it seems to us it is obvious? Can you prove they were printed by a typesetting method, and what evidence is there to support that theory? In my mind every Grinnell I see looks like a work in progress compared to the consistent look of the Missionaries posted on this site. I'm sure there are variations, etc., on stamps not shown here, but the line breaks in Grinnells shown on the card don't look real when compared to the fading away and breaks of lines on authentic stamps.

Roger

September 18, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Scott T's posting makes me wonder how George Grinnell acquired two genuine Missionary Stamps (assuming they did not come from Charles Shattuck and the Book of Sermons).

Anyone have any thoughts?

There was the Los Angeles lady with the shell collection and her ex-husband's Hawaiian stamps who was visited by someone from the Southwest Museum. The problem with that connection is that there would have to be two visits - one to remove the real Missionaries (presumably G-80 & G-81) and another to insert Grinnells after their manufacture and having used the real Missionaries as the models. While imaginable, there is insufficient evidence to support the idea. One visit yes, but not two.

Anyone have any thoughts?

September 18, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

DOTS, DOTS, DOTS AND A CANCEL

While I think Bill L. is doing yeoman's work sorting out the reproductive trails of the Grinnells, the response from Ken L. demonstrates precisely why I chose another route...to identify something in the Grinnells that allows us a) to know how they were printed (from a solid plate, ignoring how the matrices were created, which is the thrust of Bill's work) and b) to show that the cancel on G80 was the source of strike-influenced features of the fake 7-bar grid used on some Grinnells, thereby tainting the entire group.

So far, no one has explained the repetitive dots in the white non-printing areas of Grinnells or shown evidence that the genesis of the Grinnell 7-bar grid was anything other than the strike on G80.

Steve W. awaits a response to my analysis, and so do I.

Ken's story is titillating, but I want someone, anyone, to tell me why I should think the Grinnells were not printed from solid plates and why I should think the Grinnell 7-bar grid was not copied directly from G80, a genuine Missionary owned by George himself.

September 18, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

If the forger had to reproduce the 2s and 5s because he only had a near perfect model of the numeral 13 to work with, then perhaps the forger also reproduced the 13s to make all the Grinnell numerals as consistent with each other as possible.

Is this a viable possibility or a Ken Lawrence impossibility? If so, can you please explain, why this would be so?

September 18, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Ken L When you are done your book, please go ahead, find a feature that exists on only one Grinnell that is repeated on EVERY genuine Missionary of every denomination. I look forward to your article.

September 18, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

I'm trying. That's why I answered. I don't think it's unreasonable to ask for explanations to be consistent. Scott's presentation is consistent, and if he's right, it's a strong argument, the kind that Varro Tyler savored. By contrast, Bill and David's arguments could be applied equally to all the Missionaries, making them all out to be forgeries. They are both my friends, but their vision is impaired by their conviction, in my opinion.

September 18, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

Thanks, that was helpful. I await with equal interest Dick's rebuttal of Scott's cancel analysis.

September 18, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bill L,

The Grinnell proponents don't seem to be responding, but maybe they will yet appear.

If your purpose is to preach to the choir and score its effusive accolades, you've done well. Overstatement is de rigueur in that case. If your purpose is to persuade skeptics that you might be right, you should adopt a different approach. Both can be fun, but the latter ought to be more satisfying.

The part I find distasteful is the sophistry, not the presentation. But I'd probably be less annoyed if I had time to engage your points directly, so maybe I'm overreacting.

Here's the point: You make an assertion. Someone offers a counter-example. You rearrange your calculation and reassert it. That's fudging. Maybe fun for you, but just annoying to a person who would be prepared to consider a serious challenge if you were prepared to acknowledge weakness when it's pointed out.

When you assert that the forger created 5s and 2s because he had no genuine sample, I ask, Why 13 too?, which would have a near perfect sample to reproduce if photographed, surely more perfectly detailed than the flyspecks you think set the forger to matching. For that you supply a different reason that contradicts the first, and I just don't have time now to adduce evidence to support my challenge, especially since the outcome of such a skirmish hasn't much to do with solving the Grinnell mystery, which is my interest in the study.

But only a true believer thinks that a forger tried to match microscopic details but ignored the most prominent ones or rendered them crudely, so that is not a credible step toward a solution.

The Liberty series book is scheduled to be published by APS, and everyone involved in it is working day and night to get it ready, so I can't carry any significant distraction for the next few weeks. I should have avoided this exchange, but having stepped in unwisely, I'll make one more stab at showing how to look at these details through your skeptic's eyes.

Every Hawaiian Missionary stamp has eight side frame ornaments (positions O-1 through O-8 clockwise from the top left). My recent paper on how the Missionaries were printed illustrates them. The bottom right and left (positions O-4 and O-7) are shaved at the bottom on all stamps (I'll award a prize to someone who explains that), but the other six are whole, giving twelve edges with the feature that interests you, on each of three denominations, two types of each, plus at least one additional setting of the 13¢.

That adds up to 78 different half-hearted curls on recognized Missionaries.

If you now study all 78 of those positions systematically, you'll discover that some are damaged in the precise way that you offered as proof of a forger's misunderstanding. Are those Missionaries therefore forgeries?

If you take another step (nightmarish to me, but maybe a plater's paradise), try cataloging each damaged frame element. It's not easy because so many Missionaries have been altered and painted, but quite a few repeat. Orient them alike so the differences can be catalogued and compared; some might be progressive. Now do the same for Grinnells. You'll discover that many damaged pieces are similar, possibly identical, but appear in different positions.

Is that evidence of authenticity? I doubt it. In that case, why should I think the reverse is evidence of forgery?

Now your earlier questions: Gang printing means having all the different subjects on press together, so that a single print contains them all. If stereotypes were used, that's the most efficient way to use them, whereas if you have just one forme and one batch of type, you must print them singly. It's actually the best reason to suspect that Missionaries might have been printed from stereotypes. If a stereo was made for one denomination, then another, then a third, with just enough unlocking to change the denomination elements and perhaps to change type elements that did not mold well, nearly everything else would be a close match. If a second stereo was made for a denomination that might be in greater demand, some movement of elements would occur just because the mold can't be perfectly removed from the type each time, even if the type itself wasn't unlocked.

Step-and-repeat printing would not ordinarily smear, because each print would be dried before the next one was pulled. The idea would be to position the paper against a stop or fence through the entire run, dry those prints, reset the stop, and run them all again at the second position.

Did you try loading my article as Richard suggested, right-click and send? That worked for me.

September 18, 2006 **Bill Longley**

To inject some humour into the conversation, I was thinking on the Grinnells while driving and the musical group "The Police" (Sting) came on with "Every Breath you Take", which I have paraphrased a la Weird Al Yankovic:

The Police "Every Breath you Take"

And every move you make (of ornaments)
Every bond you break (framelines), every step you take (forging)
I'll be watching you

How my poor heart aches (the central one, left side)
With every step you take (forging)
Every move you make (of ornaments)
Every vow(el) you break
Every smile you fake (on moons), every claim you stake (of genuineness)
I'll be watching you

September 18, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

It is a little frustrating that anytime someone like Bill is trying to demonstrate that Grinnells are forgeries, you dismiss the proposition as "refitting each argument to fudge an answer."

It would be more productive, it seems to me, if you would address the main points of presentations like Bill's and Scott's. If you truly see logical or factual flaws in their analyses, I for one would be interested to hear what you have to say. However, when you dismiss them as biased, self-serving mis-interpretations, it just inflames the dialog, and moves us no closer to resolution one way or another.

In the immortal words of Jack Nicholson in "Mars Attacks!", "why can't we all just get along?"

September 18, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Ken L. It is great fun. I don't thinking I am fudging anything, merely stating my observations and my opinion, like you. Which I am entitled to do without accusation of "fudging" correct?

When you get finished with the book I could give you a list of reasons, but thought a few examples in article form would have more lasting import, rather than just posts lost in the wind.

At the very least, my use of the "heart" analogies was not an attempt to confuse the standard position nomenclature, rather to assist in a visual aid to the reader. In fact, I don't think this can be used to detract from my article.

In fact, if you look closely they DO look like hearts between the two joined flower ornaments. I will keep calling them hearts.

When will the book (Liberty) be done and where will it be available? APS?

September 18, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bill L,

No that isn't my only question, but I'm working on the Liberty series book and don't have time to write on this subject now, even less to study minute details of all the photos I have.

There are many inconsistencies in your articles that are plain at a glance to to me, though plating is not my forte. Here I observed that you cited the 2 and 5 but not the 13 when all were changed in approximately the same measures. These numerals are standard type fonts that can be seen in other publications, not ad hoc inventions. Did your forger create those too?

I'm glad you're having fun, but refitting each argument to fudge an answer is not a good practice. Perhaps some of your observations will eventually support your conclusion, but some definitely do not.

At the very least you ought to describe the ornaments accurately and use the standard position nomenclature to identify them. Every Missionary stamp has four breaks between the paired ornaments, which are not hearts, one at the center of each side.

September 18, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Ken L. Something else I looked into based on your latest article posted in the reference page was the suggestion that the missionaries were printed in strips, and perhaps printed two at a time, the strip pulled along and then two more strikes.

I really thought that was a great idea and plausible so I checked the genuine missionaries for evidence of smears in an attempt to see which direction the stamps may have been pulled.

There did not seem to be any pattern to the smears in any of the stamps I examined.

Your latest article is not loading. Does it work on your machine? You mentioned "gang printed" or some such. Would this process show any directional smears? What features would one expect if it was "gan printed"?

Bill

September 18, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Ken L. Is that the only question you have relative to my articles? May I take it that you therefore accept all the other information in it?

The short answer to your question "Why did the forger creat a different font for the 13"?

Short answer, because he couldn't see what he was drawing or features were lost in the process. THAT in fact is the next article I am doing but since you asked, I WILL scoop myself.....

Look at the top of the "3" on G81. There is a small break that is there but the "L" crosses the top of the "3". When removing the "L" he mistakenly made the gap larger.

As for the "G80" the "13" is masked by the grid cancel, so once again we have the magical coincidence of an "new, invented" font.

There is a remarkable similarity between design features that are masked by the 7 bar cancellations and what magically appears is some new font or ornament on the Grinnells.

But you will just have to wait for that one.

In the meantime, please explain to me the mystery of the changing heart. Please do tell. Same ornament or new ornament, or altered ornament. It is rather difficult to argue against a moving target of no statement of claim as to how the proponents believe the Grinnells were manufactured. Tell us so we can examine your theory and prove it wrong.

It seems the onus is on the proponents to tell us why all past expert committee opinions should be overturned.

And with the "smoking gun" of two genuine stamps in Grinnell's possession, which is a new discovery and the importance of that finding is just beginning to be understood.

Here's a devil's advocate question "Why did Mr. Grinnell not produce the card of 10 at the court trial?" One may argue that being in possession of 2 genuine stamps while being accused of selling \$60,000 worth of forgeries would land him in jail.

Someone calculate the odds of 2 genuine stamps out of 81 total (79 plus 2 genuine) being set aside in a group of 10. Isn't that pretty remarkable in itself. Think about it.

In the meantime I will continue with my study. It is really an inexpensive distraction and most entertaining. Cheaper than a movie, in fact the \$10 I will have to spend to see the Grinnells on the big screen will exceed my research budget by about \$10. Great fun.

Bill

September 18, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken,

Have you been able to advance your stereotype theory any further? Is it still possible that stereotypes were used for printing some early Hawaiian stamps? Do you still suspect stereotypes were used for the Grinnells, either contemporaneously or as later reprints?

September 18, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Steve W

With regards to the 'lighten up' comment directed to Walter P, I agree to an extent; however, I also suggest that one should not simply dismiss out of hand that G.H. Grinnell appears to have been the creator of these items.

I agree that George Grinnell was likely having fun creating philatelic cover oddities that were not legitimate usages. It would appear that he tried his hand at manufacturing covers to see if he could deceive the Post Office. He was successful on at least two occasions and probably more. (I doubt that the two covers are the only ones in existence.)

In 1913 (the date on Nomad's cover), George Grinnell was approximately 38 years old (1875-1949). Most who might have attempted this or other similar type of things as a kid had grown into pseudo adults by the age 38. Admittedly, some of us are still striving for adulthood; however, the point is still valid.

I do not think the covers are the biggest deal in the world, but still.....

September 18, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bill L,

Why did the forger create a different font for the 13?

September 18, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Richard W.

No, the contradiction is not a problem. The genuine Missionaries were printed from loose type. An argument can be made that a stereo could have been employed, or at least the technology and material was available to construct a stereo plate in 1852 Hawaii.

If the Grinnells were not printed from moveable type, or a stereo cast from moveable type, then they are fake. Any photoreproductive process, whether an enlarged photograph, a touched-up photo or a tracing of a photo, would be a non-starter towards authenticity. It would be an historical contradiction.

When asking if the Grinnells could be genuine, the answer lies within the processes available at the time that a print shop might use to print them. These processes are rather limited and you can postulate several scenarios to find one that best arrives at the finished product. Most likely, the process that printed the Grinnells (if real) was the most expedient one.

However, in asking if they are fakes, one must understand that deception is central to the answer. You may never know exactly how an illusion is accomplished if done by a master. When a magician levitates a person on a table, he is creating the illusion of levitation. It is the illusion that he works to perfect, not actual levitation. When he is not honest about the trick being an illusion, he is deceiving his audience; typically, a magician is honest about his show and only invites the audience to suspend their disbelief and be entertained.

The audience may rightly conclude that the person is not actually levitating even without understanding the magician's means of deception. However, once you see light glimmering off a filament above the table, the illusion is immediately destroyed. It is that string that the illusionist tries to keep from view, and it is the string that the skeptic must search for.

Bill Longley found some strings, as have others.

David Copperfield made the Statue of Liberty disappear. Objectivity does not require that one assumes the statue actually disappeared unless proved otherwise.

September 18, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Richard Hi. There is no contradiction whatsoever. I believe the stamp was photographed and then touched up. So unique features (split s) were copied but then in areas of delicate design, the forger had to enhance the photograph. As they say "the devil is in the detail".

Regarding the counterargument to my "split s" that it was a flawed s that was re-inserted into the forme, there are four "s" that would appear in a two stamp set-up "Hawaiian Postage" and "Cents". **And the Grinnell proponents argue that the letters were removed and reset. And drawn from a tray of "s"s. How is it that the same "s" goes back into the same position? Why not in the other type or in the word postage? And presume as they suggest that there are a whole lot of "s"s. So the one broken one out of how many (20, 40) goes back in? What are the odds? Okay maybe there are more than 1 broken "s"s in the rack. So now what are the odds that only 1 broken s would be inserted in that one spot and not in any others. The chances are quite staggering depending on how many "s"s you think are in the tray.**

But this is just one feature. Compound that with many, many more features and the odds become very remote.

Now explain why the broken "e" ended up in the same place, the "short c", the short spur s in postage, the list is endless.

Numeral differences Why are the large numerals different? Because the forger didn't own a 2c or 5c with which to model, he drew it differently.

Why are differences in design being used as justification for the stamps when every other forgery is identified by differences. Is it the \$10 million at stake that causes common sense to be despatched? Come on, if the supposed owner of a huge batch of Missionary stamps (close but not quite the same) is found to own 2 genuine ones, and many studies have now shown similar features, how much more of a smoking gun do you want?

September 18, 2006 **Richard Warren**

Hold on a moment. (Hope no one here will mind an interjection from the balcony.)

Bill Longley's admirable first piece identifies the split "s" as a piece of "DNA transferred from the mother". How was it transferred? Implicit in the argument is that it was transferred by some photographic process.

Bill Longley's admirable second piece identifies the broken heart features as a second instance of such transference. But how were these transferred? Bill L says explicitly that they must have been drawn or traced, and this has to be so - it's hard to see what else would make sense here.

Is this contradiction a problem?

How do these conclusions fit with the anomaly that Ken Lawrence raised in the context of the first Bill L piece, for which no one has so far provided an explanation, namely that the precise transference of a tiny detail like the split "s" seems at odds with the use of quite different large numerals, that bear only a broad generic similarity to the originals? Which was a good question.

Can these three contradictory elements be reconciled by a scenario in which the forger reproduces the lettering by some photographic process, hand draws or traces the ornaments, and introduces new large numerals (cut and pasted??) from an entirely different source?

It's possible - but it doesn't seem to make much sense ..

September 18, 2006 **Walter P**

Steve W-

Perhaps your right. I'll take a wait and see attitude for now.

September 18, 2006 **Steve W**

Walter,

Lighten up a little - Grinnell was only having some fun, and I think the USPO probably didn't notice the lost 2 cents. Grinnell was just trying to make a curiosity to put in his collection, not defraud the US government of its postal revenue.

September 18, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren & nomad55-

Interesting posts. It appears that George Grinnell may have been a busier boy than some of us thought he was?

When you take the nomad55 & Richard M's covers for what they are:

Defrauding the United States Post Office of revenue that it was lawfully due for providing a service. This is no different than attempting to buy goods with counterfeit currency.

Circumstantial evidence is important to record, as one instance of fraud may not be condemning, however when you stack numerous instances and suspect behaviour of on top of each other, a pattern starts to form.

Absent a smoking gun, many people have been convicted purely on circumstantial evidence. It's the old story, in the eyes of the law, it doesn't matter if you defraud someone of 5c or 65,000.00, it's still fraud. Klemann learned that lesson the hard way.

So you see Ken Lawrence, as one sudo investigator to another, you may have to take a closer look at George Grinnell, the man, and his extracurricular activities in order to solve this case.

September 18, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Bill Longley just did an article which I linked up [here](#). I'll add to reference page.

September 18, 2006 **nomad55**

Richard M....thanks for your comments on my cover. So you think it had been addressed by Grinnell to himself? Interesting.....

Over the weekend, I was tearing apart my old Panama Pacific postmark exhibit, where this cover resided. Until then I had not paid any attention to the address, but with the current discussion on Grinnells, thought it might be something for this board to take a look at. My typed comment on the album page reads "an attempt to deceive or an honest mistake?" Well, I think that question has been answered.

I cannot remember where or when I bought the cover, but it was at least 15 years ago or more.

So George G. played philatelic games with the post office. Unlike Perry Nahl or Everett Erle, who also liked to "have fun" with the PO but always properly stamped their covers, it seems Grinnell pushed the limits somewhat.
Rhetorical question - what does this indicate about Grinnell's character?

(back to the other board, where I belong)

September 18, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Oooops.

There were not three 'steps' on the cover, there were three 'stamps' on the cover.

September 18, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

I have been on an outer island for a few days and just got back.

With regards to the Grinnell letter franked with the Chile two centavo stamp and mailed in the U.S., I suggest that the letter was written by George Grinnell to himself.

To my eye, the writing is comparable to other Grinnell signatures I have been provided.

Also and awhile back, I was provided with an image of a letter addressed to Mrs. G. H. Grinnell that was another example of philatelic tomfoolery. Of the three steps on the cover, one stamp was placed upside down (no big deal in itself) and another stamp was applied as a bisect. That writing appears identical to Nomads cover and it too appears comparable to the other Grinnell signatures I have seen.

I would not be surprised were there are a lot more of these type of covers in various shoeboxes addressed to Mr. or Mrs. G. H. Grinnell.

While you can simply refer to this sort of stuff as philatelic mischief as one board contributor has done in a private e-mail to me (and which I could buy into were such the only issue on the table), I suggest when taken in combination with the whole subject of the Grinnells, these two examples do not reflect well on the philatelic outlook of Mr. Grinnell.

In other words, I hardly think these covers are the biggest deal in the world, but neither are they the most admirable endeavors either.

September 17, 2006 **Walter P**

Scott-

That should be envelope not card and handwriting not handwriing.

Thats what happens when your in a hurray.

September 17, 2006 **Walter P**

Scot Trepel:

Sorry for not being clear in my previous post.

I was thinking of the possibility that George Grinnell may have mailed the card to himself, hence it would be his handwriing on the front of the envelope?

September 17, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Walter P:

The address is TO Grinnell, not FROM, thus I would not expect the handwriting to be the same as the Card of 10 (if we think that's Grinnell's writing).

September 17, 2006 **Walter P**

nomad55-

I wonder if the handwriting on this cover matches George Grinnell's handwriting on the back of the Card of 10?

September 17, 2006 **nomad55**

While looking through some old album pages, I found [this cover](#). While only peripheral to the Grinnell discussion, I thought it might be of interest to some of the players here.

Note the stamp - a two centavos from Chile, issue of 1901-1902. No return address or markings on the reverse.

September 16, 2006 **Walter P** <[Walter Plomish](#)>

Dick Celler-

I carefully read both yours and David's posts this morning fail to see where you are offering any real evidence to support your position, just speculation?

Last time I looked speculation was not considered evidence.

September 16, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker -

Im also speechless. But wait, doesn't it go something like this, if your a pro Grinnell supporter, you keep re-shuffling the deck until you find the cards that fit your hand. Think, smoke and mirrors.

By the way, being speechless, good thing we both have keyboards?

In my view this whole Grinnell argument is starting to go from the ridiculous to the sublime. While some people are providing some excellent research, equally, others are bent on discrediting this research, because it fails to support the Grinnell owners cause. Unfortunately, this is often accomplished through, a dog and pony show, or by smoke and mirror rebuttals.

David Beech is correct in that there has to be some order in how this massive amount of back and forth information, and off the wall theories are dealt with, because right now its a good old fashioned free for all.

September 16, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Dick,

I'm speechless. Someone else will have to explain. You may want to re-read what I posted.

The first theory that tried to resurrect the Grinnells had something to do with them being a first printing, thus the early and different cancellations AND the completely different ornament from the accepted genuine. I simply put the order of the Grinnell printing after the original; after the spurred "s" debuted in the 13 cent it carried through all the Type II Grinnells. That could have been months or decades later than the known genuine printing.

Either way, the forme was dismantled between the Grinnell printing and the printing of the known genuine. IMPOSSIBLE that the MAJOR and UNMISTAKEABLE variations in printing surfaces occurred while the form sat on a shelf. Unless it was made of chese and a mouse nibbled on it.

September 16, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Chris B

The spur on the "s" on #109 is in a slightly different place than on the others.

September 16, 2006 **Dick Celler**

David Shoemaker

You posted From what I've gathered from this board and the RPSL, the forme producing the known genuine missionary was dismantled and the type was put back into the case bins that were full of enough type to print a small newspaper, so the printing office could go about its work of printing a small newspaper.

You may have "gathered" this, but there is no evidence. The forme was not dismantled. It is speculated the letters and numerals may have been removed while the forme was sitting on the shelf, due to needing the type for other jobs. Print shops sometimes do this.

If they were dismantling and swapping out type all the time, of course we would see different type and different ornaments on the same stamp, and except for the 13c Type II, we don't. If you see such evidence, please point it out.

You also posted We are asked to believe that, upon a second printing with different ornament and worn type, the spurred "s" and the tailless "a" just happened to have been retrieved from among all that type and just happened to be used in the exact same places on the Type II Grinnells.

I don't get your point. What worn type? If there are a bunch of spurred "s" type pieces, what's so strange if one gets used?

September 16, 2006 **Chris B.**

I have [added 109 \(Tapling\)](#) "Cents" image to Roger H's Grinnell lineup - I think it is a better model than G80 (repeated below) for the "s with spur". My attempts to convert to B&W failed to give a good result. Forgive me if this has already been mentioned.

On different note, here are two pictures of the central post office in Algiers (built in 1913 a few years prior to the trial of interest here): [1](#) [2](#)

September 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

In your post today where you so graciously offer me some fatherly advice, and tutor me in the fine arts and theater:

You say, "I'd say you ought to read some good fiction and watch some good theater."

Gee Ken, I thought that was what I was doing when I read your articles and viewed your posts?

Is Richard Malmgren's dry wit starting to rub off on me, or what?

September 15, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Bill Longley,

In addition to the spurred "s" that carries through the Type II Grinnells that you discovered, take a look at the "a" of "Postage" in the Type II's. It misses a tail. The back just goes straight down. Just like the "genuine" 13-Cent Type II on the Card of Ten misses the tail of it's "a" of "Postage".

From what I've gathered from this board and the RPSL, the forme producing the known genuine missionary was dismantled and the type was put back into the case bins that were full of enough type to print a small newspaper, so the printing office could go about its work of printing a small newspaper. We are asked to believe that, upon a second printing with different ornament and worn type, the spurred "s" and the tailless "a" just happened to have been retrieved from among all that type and just happened to be used in the exact same places on the Type II Grinnells.

Really?

For a more reasonable direction, (1)take a look at the defects of the "a's" of "Hawaiian Postage" in the genuine Type II on the Card of Ten, then (2)see how those printing variations become exaggerated in the corresponding letters of the Type II Grinnells. These exaggerations occur at the expense of the overall form of the letters, which is a most important fact.

The four genuine "a's" stack up nicely, demonstrating their basic shapes are the same. They came from the same family of moulds, as one would expect. The printing and individual wear creates small variations in the thickness of the elements, making some horizontals dissappear and some central white/void areas overly large. However, the centerlines and overall design are still evident and agree with each other.

On the Grinnells, these four "a's" vary in overall width and height, so much that the RPSL thought that the third "a" in "Hawaiian" was a different size type. In fact, it is an exaggeration of the large white voids within the corresponding genuine "a" of the Type II Thirteen Cent. Thinking vertically, the Grinnell letters tend to have the same defects in printing surface and/or impression that the genuine stamps have, but these defects are exaggerated to the point that the letters no longer match the originals in size and shape. Neither do they match each other in size and shape, making it unlikely they slipped out of the same mould.

So, they are fake because they match the genuine, AND they are fake because of how they differ. What do you think?

September 15, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Grinnell Stamps Paper and Printing Flaw Arguments:

The problem with scientific data is that the data itself is subject to review by other scholars, and on that point alone different scholars may interpret the data in a much different way than originally presented.

In the end, or at least in courtrooms anyway, the evidence presented in expert testimony that has been challenged by another expert witness from the opposing side, often comes down to which expert witness has the most letters beside his name.

That is to say, that at some point in time, and to preserve everyone's sanity, some unbiased soul [a judge] has to hear the testimony, weight all of the evidence, and come to some kind of decision.

Seeing as there is no philatelic court where such weighty matters such as the George Grinnell case can be decided, we are all forced to muddle on hoping in vain to stumble onto the 'smoking gun' that will either for once and for all prove or disprove the Grinnell stamps are in fact genuine or counterfeit.

I know I suggested this before, but instead of engaging in a general free for all, with a few serious studies and discoveries thrown into the mix now and then, would it not be more prudent to set up an unbiased expert panel to take on a thorough and comprehensive review of the Grinnell stamps and the circumstances surrounding how they came into existence.

It is evident to me that to be fair to all parties some parts of the RPSL decision have to be re-visited in the interest of conducting a fair and impartial investigation of the Grinnell stamps. As far as the RPSL decision goes it would be up to the Grinnell owners to initiate any RPSL decision review, because they own and have possession of the Grinnell stamps.

However, as we all painfully know, this is a great idea in theory, but not in practise. The Grinnell case is like a famous murder trial where the case has already been tried by the press and as such it is not possible to find a pool of fair and unbiased jurors.

The last time I suggested a list of Hawaii stamp and stamp plating experts who may be qualified to undertake such an examination of the Grinnell's you launched into a tirade excluding every candidate, except yourself. So in the end such a panel of Hawaii stamps experts would be a non starter and we will continue to muddle on hoping for a breakthrough, and yes, yet another Ken Lawrence 'scoop.'

It was encouraging to see Scott and Bill's efforts come forward, and convincing as they are, it will take more than these findings to convince Dick Celler and Ken Lawrence that the Grinnell stamps are counterfeit stamps.

The best part of Scott and Bill's articles posted on this Board is that as far as I can see neither of these gentleman exhibit any self interest in whether the Grinnell stamps are genuine or counterfeit.

September 15, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Nick Kirke... I agree that Wallace got the short end of the stick. He was one of the world's most indefatigable researchers, spending decades, as I recall, in the wilds of New Guinea or Borneo, I forget which. Oddly his insight into the astonishing machinery of evolution led him to conclude that there had to be a Prime Mover (e.g. God) involved, while Darwin drifted the other way, becoming a convinced atheist by the end of his life, although Darwin's view was strongly influenced by the death of his dear daughter Annie, which made it impossible for him to believe that a beneficent Creator had anything to do with the workings of the Universe.

Jim

September 15, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Ken L... If you have examined the Grinnells in person and determined they are not planographic, then that is good enough for me. I'd still like to see them myself in the flesh, doubt that's going to happen though.



My reference to Wallace/Darwin was for **Nick Kirke** who suggested that Wallace and not Darwin had had the original idea.

John Forsyth... Pine oil is not a volatile. A liquid such as turpentine or lithotine is a mixture, and while the volatiles within these mixtures escape the residues do not. A residue of lithotine is pine oil, and it should not be found anywhere on prints produced on a letterpress, but should always be present, in varying amounts, on hand-pulled, small-edition lithographs.

Jim

September 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bill,

I don't know what will be published, but as David Beech wrote earlier, the entire record should be collected and archived in a scholarly way. That should not be done to support or condemn the Grinnells, but to reveal the truth whatever it might be.

In any case, I did not mean to imply disagreement with your point that all scientists need to be accountable and held to the highest standards. That should go without saying.

In this instance the results have been replicated by two laboratories working independently. But proving that the paper is consistent with 1850s manufacture does not prove that the Grinnells are genuine, whereas proof that the paper is of later manufacture would conclusively prove they are counterfeit.

Now that the scientific data appears to have disproved Bower's expert judgment, it's fair to propose the type of blind test I proposed, to determine whether his other forensic judgments are as unreliable. Would you trust him to expertize your classic Uruguay?

Bower is correct in saying that Grinnells exist on two types of paper, which are recorded as being with and without brighteners, just as is true of Missionaries. But that has no bearing on his assertion that the Grinnell paper consists of sulfated wood, for which no evidence has been found.

September 15, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Ken L Thanks for the clarification. I knew the data was reexamined by Peter Bower, but didn't know who had the destructive test data. I asked the question because I recall that there was some data regarding paper that wasn't published in the RPSL, and new research undertaken.

Do you think these follow-on studies will be published as part of the next phase of reporting that occurs to support the Grinnells? I mean in full, not summarized.

Bill

Bill

September 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bill,

No, read the book again. This judgment was not made by the RPSL scientist. In fact, it was not included in the original RPSL opinion. Earlier the RPSL had said that the Grinnell paper is "very similar to that used for the H.I.&U.S. issue." Sulfated wood pulp paper is not similar to that Missionary paper

The RPSL's scientific data shows that the Grinnell paper has the same constituents as the Missionaries and is consistent with 1850s manufacture, in the Beech et al. scientific study.

The RPSL source for the pseudoscience is described as "paper expert and historian, Peter Bower," not as a scientist. That's the problem.

The report on Bowers result says, "Under UV light the Grinnells had a slightly mottled pale yellow primary fluorescence indicative of an unbleached sulphate wood pulp."

Without exception, all the scientists consulted here state that no such conclusion is possible by non-destructive testing. Ted Liston confirmed that to me. So two laboratories were commissioned to do the destructive tests, one by Pat Culhane, another by the Arrigos. Both reported no evidence of wood. (RPSL, pages 74-75)

So the RPSL went back to Bower. "He agreed with the findings in the Meyer report but confirmed his original conclusion and pointed out he had identified two different sources for the paper used for the Grinnells."

He then fudged by restating differences in the papers that were never disputed by anyone, and by entirely different reasoning "gives a strong indication of later manufacture of paper used for the Grinnells."

So the destructive tests have been replicated and were consistent. The non-destructive tests were refuted, but the RPSL continued to assert them as evidence.

September 15, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Ken L. I can't comment on the paper discussion, but in fairness, the same identification test could be given to the scientist who performed the Grinnell's destructive testing too.

That is a bit of a malicious dig at the RPSL scientist as you are comparing apples and oranges.

The RPSL scientist didn't have the benefit of destructive testing, the Grinnell's scientist did, correct?

Please clarify.

Bill

September 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

Look at the photo on page 33 of the Mystic booklet. If Grinnells and Missionaries do not look alike, how did you and others fail to spot the two genuine Missionaries among the ten stamps?

Even after I told some experienced collectors that two of the stamps are genuine Missionaries, they could not be certain which ones are, and had to ask.

Bernard,

Back to you.

September 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

John F,

I agree. Also, the destructive tests performed on both Grinnell stamps and pieces of envelopes to which they are attached ruled out wood products as constituents of either. The RPSL elided that point, preferring not to retract its own expert's opinion based on unscientific study.

What the RPSL should have done, and still should do, is to prepare and label a couple dozen 19th century paper samples, ask the so-called expert to date them as he allegedly did the Grinnell paper, and see how accurate that expert's estimates are. I'd predict failure, and I'd love to conduct the test.

September 15, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Roger Heath That is the whole point that is sometimes lost. The Grinnells look too much like the Missionaries. They don't look anything like the Missionaries. I don't think anyone has come close to bridging this gap, except by taking the stamp as fraud. The story with the seven bar grid is alike, but in someways stronger, as TYPE WAS NOT CAST IN CORK.

September 15, 2006 **John Forsyth**

I don't believe lithotine, turpentine, whatever would have survived for long. It, being volatile, would have left the scene long ago.

September 15, 2006 **Nick Kirke** <aknotek@agenturakirke.cz>

Jim B,

Jim, I bow to your greater knowledge. My memories are from OU studies some years ago. I know I felt sad for Wallace. He got so little recognition compared to Darwin.

Nick

September 15, 2006 **Roger Heath**

It's obvious before any more discussion continues there must be better quality scans of the Grinnells on the card. The present scan is washed out and there is no paper texture to see. [Here](#) is a side by side comparison of the center card Grinnell between two Missionaries, all modified to even out color variations and the huge size difference in the scans. The quality of the Grinnell is not even close to the Missionaries. Why does the Grinnell appear so different? What went wrong with the Grinnell printing process?

Roger

September 15, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

No mention of pine oil. I have examined the Grinnells. They are relief prints, not planographic prints.

I have also examined a Sperati forgery of a Hawaiian Numeral stamp, which does not resemble the Grinnell prints.

Did you misunderstand my allusion to Darwin and Wallace? I was pointing out that I do not postpone publication of my findings, but publish them as quickly as possible.

September 14, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Also, **Ken**, it is not very hard to fake the effects of letterpress, especially on very thin paper. As I understand it the basis of the belief that the Grinnells were letterpress-printed is the conclusion of the RPSL to that effect. Since their pronouncements as to the constituents of the papers used to print the Grinnells have been contradicted by independent tests, I think it would advisable to subject all their conclusions to new testing rather than just accept them.

You didn't answer my question a while ago about whether *pine oil* was one of the chemicals identified on the surface of the Grinnells. Since you have access to the RPSL report, is pine oil (or turpentine or lithotine) mentioned at all?

Jim

September 14, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Not to stir the pot, but Wallace and Darwin arrived at the idea of evolution independently. The difference was that Darwin sat on his idea for almost twenty years, and it was only the realization that if he didn't publish Wallace would that forced him into print.

Similarly, Isaac Newton and G. W. Leibniz both arrived independently at the calculus, although Newton could never believe that Leibniz hadn't stolen the idea from him. Ironically it was Newton himself who admitted that if he had seen farther than anyone else it was because he stood on the shoulders (i.e. the accomplishments) of those who came before him. In other words, the calculus came about from all the mathematical work that had been done before. Newton just couldn't believe that anyone else, Leibniz for instance, could occupy that same privileged shoulder position.

Jim

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

I think you'll have to buy the November issue and read it. One can't reduce a 6,000-word explication to a multiple-choice quiz.

Also, if you read my earlier post, you know that I regard ALL people as contradictory in both Shakespearean and Hegelian meanings, so I would not accept such a constricted imagination in any case.

If your interest in this mystery is simply to repeat your disdain for George Grinnell, I'd say you ought to read some good fiction and watch some good theater. You gaze is fixed on the least interesting aspect of the story.

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

Because anyone can see they are letterpress prints.

September 14, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken L -

I await your future writings to read about all the equipment housed in the Southwestern Museum print shop, and the expertise of the British master printer. If he was a true master, we've found our man who accepted the challenge of copying and printing tiny pieces of paper for a friend.

Since many collectors in those days bought fakes from well known forgers to fill the holes in their albums, maybe Grinnell was testing this printer with the idea of going into the business of selling reproductions ala Fournier, Sperati, and the Spiro Brothers.

From Post Office in Paradise one reads, "Sperati's use of the photolithography process produced the most dangerous of the Boston Lithograph forgeries." If photolithography was good enough for Sperati during that same time period, why are you so opposed to photolithography being the process used by the maker of the Grinnells?

Roger

September 14, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

My apology, multiple choice selections should read:

- A. - Philatelic Fraudster
- B. - Choir Boy
- C. - Indiana Jones of Philately
- D. - Philatelic Dupe
- E. - None of the Above

September 14, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

Thank you for your critic on some of America's Favorite Authors.

I'm curious, utilizing your model, 'America's Grand Tradition of Lawlessness,' where do you think George Grinnell fits into the picture?

- A. - Philatelic Fraudster
- B. - Choir Boy
- C. - Philatelic Good Old Boy
- D. - None of the Above

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Digital subscribers to Scott Stamp Monthly received the November issue today. Mail subscription copies take longer, and newsrack copies appear after the month turns. My two articles are titled "Are the Grinnells Genuine?" and "Are the Grinnells Counterfeit?"

Unfortunately I won't be attending a show where Linn's and Scott will have a free giveaway table, so I won't be able to send free copies this time. However, if a member of this board can pick them up at the New York show, perhaps he or she could send them around.

September 14, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Dick C:

In your scenario, the Grinnells have to be printed from loose type.

How then do the repetitive flaws work their way into the blank areas of typeset forms?

September 14, 2006 **Dick Celler**

pring=print

September 14, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Bill Longley

It seems the narrowing pathway of the theory of the Grinnells has to become "ALL Type 2 Grinnells were printed with this "s". Is that really plausible when supposedly the letters were drawn from a rack of letters?

I think so. Think vertical again. Allow the possibility the Grinnells are genuine and printed from loose type.

Printer sets up the 5c form with a blue spur version of the s.

Print 5c stamps

Printer changes the 5c form to 2c, but retains the same piece of type for the "s" of Cents.

Pring 2c stamps

Printer changes the 2c form to 13c, but retains the same piece of type for the "s" of Cents.

Why does this seem implausible to you?

If all the Grinnells are printed during this sequence, and none at some later date, doesn't it produce what we see on the Grinnells?

September 14, 2006 **Nick Kirkeaa** <agenturakirke@seznam.cz>

Sorry, for Foundation read 'Origin'

September 14, 2006 **J. Krause** <jerome156@msn.com>

Ken Lawrence - kindly email so I can send you a scan. regards, J.

September 14, 2006 **Nick Kirke** <agenturakirke@seznam.cz>

Ken L,

Darwin and Wallace in the same bag? From what I remember poor Wallace did the ground breaking legwork providing the basis for Darwin's Foundation of the Species. Darwin hyjacked his work and became famous.

Poor Wallace ended up overseeing seances and faded into ignominious obscurity. A tragedy indeed.

September 14, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Bill Longley

I already answered your question *Why don't genuine Type 2 5c and 2c show the "s" spur?* in a posting I made to Steve W.

Think vertical.

2c Type II: normal s

5c Type II: normal s

13c Type II: normal s on the "level 13" version

Print lots of stamps.

Change the 13c setting. The new type includes the blue spur s.

Print some more stamps.

September 14, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Ken L Sorry, our last posts crossed. I hadn't refreshed. Perhaps when Don is back he could be asked?
Thanks

Bill

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bill,

Don has the stamps. He's gone for a few weeks.

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

A week or so ago I likened the Grinnell-Klemann story to an O. Henry plot. Did you miss that? Today I added B. Traven. Dwight Macdonald once wrote that the greatest hope for America is our grand tradition of lawlessness, which has been enshrined in our national literature ever since Huckleberry Finn. Perhaps Jesse James, Pretty Boy Floyd, and their kind don't play well north of the border, but here they occupy top billing.

September 14, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Ken L How about a 600 dpi of G80 from the front then? Surely that must be possible? Can you arrange it?

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott,

This is not Darwin and Wallace. I publish my findings as quickly and efficiently as I can get them into print, but not until I'm satisfied that I have assembled the best evidence that I can adduce.

Bill,

No one is withholding images from you. Don Sundman is traveling out of the country for a few weeks.

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bill,

No scans of the back. The ten stamps are glued fast to the card.

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

You're right. I need to avoid posting provocations myself.

I understand and sympathize with the frustration that Scott described in his article. I admire and appreciate all the original research and creative interpretation that's been presented here, including the parts that are probably wrong (maybe that includes mine). All of these are taking us closer to solving the Grinnell mystery.

My exasperation comes from reading my own words and opinions twisted into their opposite. I have never praised George Grinnell, and I observed that at least one of the owners of Grinnell stamps regards him as duplicitous. I do object to piling accusations against him for which there is not a shred of credible evidence. Yet you see how my position is chronically misrepresented, and the taunts that accompany those assertions recur each time a new, scholarly critique of the Grinnells is posted.

Scott is not responsible for that. The "Grinnellite" tag is perceived as offensive because others, not Scott, have used it to disparage those they disagree with. I will honor your sermon, and trust that henceforth others will too.

September 14, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Dick C Thank you for taking the time to scan those larger examples and note the area of repair. Presuming that is all of the repair and the "s" isn't near any repair.

What about cancel near the word cents on M-130? Can we be sure there is no cancel involved?

I have another aspect of the s spur that I am currently investigating and once I have something more definitive, I will share it.

As for the 3 genuine missionaries with a spur, just because there may be a spur on them doesn't eliminate my theory of the G80 being used for a model, and I am yet to hear an explanation or theory as to why the "s" spur occurs on all type 3s of the 13c, 5c, and 2c. It sure seems like DNA to me, especially since the genuine missionary in Grinnell's possession showed it too.

Why don't genuine Type 2 5c and 2c show the "s" spur?

It seems the narrowing pathway of the theory of the Grinnells has to become "ALL Type 2 Grinnells were printed with this "s". Is that really plausible when supposedly the letters were drawn from a rack of letters?

We need a 600 dpi scan of G80, front and back. Perhaps the supporters could examine it, and if it proves me wrong, so be it, post it. If it proves me right, then I guess we won't ever see it.

Bill

September 14, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Bill Longley

You commented:

The three stamps you linked to M-90, M111 and M-130 are all described in the Siegel census as being damaged and repaired. If you recall my observations on the frameline breaks and the consistent breaks on EVERY Grinnell from the possible models (G80 and G81) you said I couldn't trust genuine missionaries because they were damaged and repaired. All three genuine missionaries that you posted were damaged and repaired so is it fair to include them in discounting the s spur? I'm not trying to be nit-picky, but come on, you can't have it both ways can you? Do you have a good quality scan of the s spur on an undamaged 13c type 2 dropped 1 genuine missionary? If so please share it.

If we excluded damaged missionaries from study, there wouldn't be much to do - the majority are damaged, repaired, and/or painted. We have to use what there is. The key is to be able to identify restorations and paintings, and ignore those areas. Many paintings are not noted specifically in certificates or auction lot descriptions - "repaired" encompassess a multitude of things.

I have not found any painting on M-90. M-111 and M-130 are painted, but not at the bottom. That is why I used them. I drew red lines around the paintings on the scans below. I thank the PF for these scans.

[3-II-CAN-111 Painting](#)

[3-II-CAN-130 Painting](#)

The scans I posted earlier of the bottoms of these three stamps are the best I have. The G-80 scan on the board is better than any other scans I have of this variety. It would be nice to have more scans of the quality of the British Library Taplings, but we don't.

September 14, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I would like to revise my post, perhaps 'Sainthood' is going to far, 'Choir Boy' more fits the mould.

The point of my post was that George Grinnell's part in this mystery, was no small part, and as the owner of G80 & G81, he was instrumental in the purpretrating this fraud, and thereby, was not anyone's 'dupe,' as you would have us all believe.

Plain and Simple, John Kleeman was a victim of his own greed and mostly of George Grinnell.

September 14, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

I was so taken with your most eloquently worded post to me this morning, that I printed it out and mounted it on my office wall, to remind me of the position you have taken, in your role as an Independent Investigator and Philatelic Sleuth.

However, there you go again Ken, demonizing John Klemann and painting George Grinnell as a candidate for sainthood.

Have you ever stopped for a moment and thought about how George Grinnell likely conspired with others to print counterfiet Hawaii Missionary stamps with the intent to defraud people for financial gain?

It is obvious that George Grinnell did not engage in this enterprise on his own, but at the same time he was the one with G80 & G81 in his possession, and without George Grinnell's participation the Grinnell stamps would never have been printed.

It now appears that George Grinnell was involved in a criminal enterprise known as conspiracy with the intent to committ fraud, where the only thing John Kleemann was guilty of, was greed, which by the way, unlike fraud, is not a crime.

That is why the counterfiet Hawaii Missionary stamps in question are not called the 'Kleeman's' they are called the "Grinnells."

Philatelic Sleuth that you are, 'let's get our facts straight,' it was John Klemann that suffered a great financial loss, not George Grinnell.

Yes, it is true that George Grinnell lost his reputation, but that was not because of anything John Klemann did, that was accomplished all on his own.

September 14, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Steve W and Richard M:

Insensitive and Unfair? Moi?

If Ken does not want to state his opinion yet, that's his prerogative, and I respect it.

September 14, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Bill Longley

You have asked a lot of questions. I will provide answers as I get a chance.

You've discounted the existence of the preprinting crease indirectly. Can you confirm for me that there is NOT a preprinting crease as I described? Do you have a better resolution scan of G80 that you could share? This stamp really must be examined to see if there is a preprinting crease. Wouldn't you agree that examining the stamp is the best scientific means of confirming or denying this theory?

I don't know whether there is a preprinting crease or not. The G80 scan here is the best I have. The stamp should be examined, of course. What I discounted was not a possible preprinting crease, but that such a crease caused the blue spur.

September 14, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Meant to say "Bill found it on all Type II Grinnells."

September 14, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Steve W

Yes, Bill found it on all 2c Type II Grinnells. That may indicate the piece of type was retained for all three Grinnell denominations.

However, on the missionaries, I suggest the piece of type used for the "s" of cents was used for the 2c, the 5c, and the 13c "level 13" printings. The blue spur piece of type only occurs on the jumping 3 setting.

Thus we have an analagous situation to the Grinnells, only with a different piece of type. Something to take a look at, perhaps.

September 14, 2006 **Steve W**

Dick,
Thanks for the clarification. However, didn't Bill also find it on all 2c Type II and 5c Type II Grinnells?

September 14, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Scott Trepel

I sent you another email a short while ago, and your email system still seems to be having problems, as it was bounced.

September 14, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,
Just those who believe in the Grinnells might object to being called Grinnellites, I can tell you that those who don't believe in them will take offence at the description

"approving jeers from your amen corner"

Is it really necessary to cast aspersion?

September 14, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Steve W

I know you didn't ask me, but I want to answer the question you posed to Bill.

It doesn't invalidate it.
It shows it is on all Grinnell 13c Type II stamps.
It shows it is on all Missionary 13c Type II jumping 3 stamps.

Bill is to be congratulated for finding it.

September 14, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Scott T.

You are being insensitive to ask that people speculate at this point in time.

Unless the Grinnells are forgeries, there is no doubt that they are genuine. Of course, the Official Reproduction theory is interesting and could be true.

September 14, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Steve W I don't believe it necessarily does, although it does require additional thought. One that subject could you please email me at bill@longleyauctions.com, there is something you may be able to help me with.

Scott T Your question to Ken is unlikely to garner a reply and will be perceived as an unfair question because as Ken has said, he is paid for his writing and won't scoop himself here (something I understand, we'll just have to wait for future articles.)

Bill

September 14, 2006 **Steve W**

Bill Longley,
If this is a stupid question, please forgive me. Even if a similar spur were found on other Missionaries, how does that invalidate your finding that a definable sharaacteristic of G80 was EXACTLY reproduced on EVERY (vertical) Grinnell?

September 14, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Ken L:

"I took your interesting report as a mark of respect, but I also accurately anticipated the approving jeers from your amen corner, which was the cause of my

concern."

I'm not looking for Amens or Yes Mens.

It is neither correct nor respectful to everyone here to characterize the work I did or the response received as a sermon to the choir.

I didn't spend hours and hours of my time preparing a report on the dots and G80 grid cancel to satisfy my ego (it's already plenty satisfied) or receive applause from the Board.

I did it because I think the Grinnells are fake, and I think my evidence is substantive (and, so far, irrefuted).

Your tributes to the Grinnell story are enjoyable reading, but you have created a gray area with references to stereotypes used to print genuine Missionaries and official reprints etc.

In the interest of defining the Grinnells in the simplest terms, I am compelled to call them FAKE. They were made to deceive collectors. That has been and is my position, and my article focused on two significant points to support it. I could have written much more, but I wanted to distill everything down to the essential points.

What exactly is your opinion? Do you think they are a) genuine, b) forgeries or c) official reprints?

That's an A, B, C choice. Given all of the information presented, you should be able to choose.

And the answer is...

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott,

I took your interesting report as a mark of respect, but I also accurately anticipated the approving jeers from your amen corner, which was the cause of my concern.

Bernard,

That was my point. The irony is that steps taken out of dismay while cries of resentment filled the board have led to an eruption of creative new fact-finding and analysis that had not previously been possible.

To put all this into perspective: It isn't just that Varro thought no skilled forger had access to genuine Missionaries. George Linn, Herb Sterling, and Harry Weiss never had an opportunity to compare the Grinnells in front of them with certified genuine Missionaries. Fred Gregory, Scott Trepel, and Richard Malmgren never had an opportunity to compare their Missionaries with Grinnells until very recently.

Until the existence of this board, the David Beech lecture, and the publication of the RPSL book, all analyses of the Grinnells put forward during the past half-century were based on poor or incomplete evidence from one side or the other.

Even after symmetrical evaluations were possible, the best evidence remained hidden out of sight on the card.

September 14, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

PATRICK C:

You asked "I would like to understand how, under your description of the printing method as evidenced by the dots, this stamp would have the characteristics associated with the 2-cent Type II - in particular the dot between the left frame lines, the absence of a dot to the lower right of the "e", and the absence of the dot that should be between this and the Type I stamp"

It's puzzling. The missing marks may just be a matter of condition. The dot at left is enigmatic, but many Grinnells and genuine Missionaries have extraneous ink spots and smears that are not repetitive marks from a raise point on the plate. They are just smears. Maybe it's coincidence that a spot of blue ink hit the same spot.

One stamp (a damaged one at that) does not overcome the fact that every other Type II Grinnell (2c, 5c or 13c) has every repetitive mark, which would not occur on typeset-printed stamps.

Last night I spent time going thru ALL of my records of typeset-printed stamps (Boston and Charleston Carriers, Confederate Provisionals), looking for repetitive marks. Nothing.

Having studied typeset-printed stamps for 20 years, I can tell you that the marks on the Grinnells occur on impressions from solid plates (or lithographs), not stamps printed from loose type...the RPSL's and Ken Lawrence's opinions notwithstanding.

September 14, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

I think the cancel was analyzed even before the new board was created.

September 14, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Bill L I think one can say the images are not good enough, but Dick is probably right that the spur is not unique to G80 -- which was the major observation. Good images of several examples of the spur are necessary -- as you suggest, perhaps G80 and the Grinnells are especially close.

The issue of not seeing the other setting on the Grinnells is not relevant (it is so easy to think this way because so much about the Grinnells is ridiculous).

It is true that the Grinnells do not fit into any reasonable timeline, but that is a little bit of a different question. I do think that the sequence of the printing of the real stamps places the Grinnells After the genuine stamps. The cancel, which to be real would have to be a late use, is another example.

Ken L I think you mischaracterize the revelation of the new information. The movement of the material to a separate board was long overdue and this was a good time to do it. It immediately resulted in a creative response, including my analysis of the cancellation and its logic, Richard's beautiful review of the postal history and both of the new cancellations, etc. Others took off on slower and tedious tasks. And the proGrinnell people should have been given pause by the (further) overthrow of one of Varro Tyler's notions.

Dick C I think we almost agree. A tray full of spurred "s"s. Hmmm.

September 14, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Dick C I left out my note on the M-130. The grid cancel that comes down to the word cents, may in fact be a cancel, rather than a dot. Can you get a colour scan of this stamp? Also, this stamp is noted as being damaged and repaired in the Siegel census, so again, is it fair to use repaired stamps when doing plating, and discounting a theory? We don't know where the damage is, so like your comment regarding framelines being painted in etc, in fairness we shouldn't use M130 to discount the s spur theory, right?

Bill

September 14, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Dick C Thank you for your information. I will revise the article to address the two settings, acknowledge the census number confusion, correct the G15 (stamp torn) and G65 (really a 5c) and give credit for the finders of the genuine copies on the card of 10. And relay some new information. I also promise to address the points you made about the second "a" of Hawaiian, and other such items.

I apologize for the very long post but perhaps we could work through this and bring more information forward.

You've discounted the existence of the preprinting crease **indirectly**. Can you confirm for me that there is NOT a preprinting crease as I described? Do you have a better resolution scan of G80 that you could share? This stamp really must be examined to see if there is a preprinting crease. Wouldn't you agree that examining the stamp is the best scientific means of confirming or denying this theory?

I agree there is more than one setting of 13c type 2. So why is it that all the Grinnell 13c are all dropped 1? Why don't we see examples of the normal "13" setting? Is it because the forger only had one genuine example of 13c Type 2 "dropped 1" missionary? And he faithfully copied this feature, along with others? (yes some features match, some don't which like the argument they are genuine can also be used that they are fake). As Bill Weiss said, fakers copy as best they can, and make mistakes which is where they get caught. Unfortunately, the Grinnells moving target of "proving them wrong" is thwarted with the "it's a different printing" argument.

The three stamps you linked to M-90, M111 and M-130 are all described in the Siegel census as being damaged and repaired. If you recall my observations on the frameline breaks and the consistent breaks on EVERY Grinnell from the possible models (G80 and G81) you said I couldn't trust genuine missionaries because they were damaged and repaired. All three genuine missionaries that you posted were damaged and repaired so is it fair to include them in discounting the s spur? I'm not trying to be nit-picky, but come on, you can't have it both ways can you? Do you have a good quality scan of the s spur on an undamaged 13c type 2 dropped 1 genuine missionary? If so please share it.

Further I did note two genuine missionaries G87 and G109 that had similar smudges which I believe are the result of ink trapped between the central edge of the s and the bottom foot. Could you confirm this? Your poor quality black and white scans of M-90, M111, and M130, I agree show what looks like a similar "s spur". Please see notes below.

M-90 does not have the characteristic of the spur rather it seems to be a dot or smudge and is not pronounced like G80 and all of the Grinnells. So this may be close but no cigar. I'd like to see a better scan of M90.

M-111 Is this a dot or a spur? It also seems to have a dot or smudge at the top of the S and the far right central part of the s, two features that do not appear on the G80.

M-130

As for comparing apples and oranges. I agree. Smudge dots etc, which could be the M90, M111 and M130 do not necessarily rule out the existence of a preprinting crease that caused this spur which was copied by the forger. As everyone agreed, there are many differences between the genuine stamps and the Grinnells. But why is this spur repeated on EVERY Grinnell? If the letters were being changed out, and there is indeed variety, why is there consistency with this, on EVERY Grinnell?

Early vs Late printing. Ken L. mentioned some Grinnell supporters think they were printed early while most think they are later. Again difficult to argue against because it is a moving target.

If Grinnells are early then why the late use cork cancels and why the very worn designs?

If Grinnells are late, then why are the dated postmarks in the supposed early period?

I think 600dpi scans would help in better identifying tiny features on these stamps. The scan Pat C. sent this morning is fantastic. Could we get similar excellent scans of the front. It is hard to "plate" from the reverse. Thanks

Ken L As you pointed out, why did the forger not reproduce the large central 13 correctly? Why indeed. I believe I have cobbled together additional evidence that may explain this and much more. I am working on two new angles both of which show promise, one of which may confirm the G80 cancel is real. I agree that these two stamps are spectacular, and with such a long story behind them, will certainly bring a huge sum when sold.

And I apologize for taking so long replying. I'm not being paid to undertake any of this study, nor am I retired. So back to lotting for my next auction, which contains some nice Canada, and Germany too. No Missionaries, however. Though I'm starting to think I would like a real one.

Bill

September 14, 2006 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

G39

Richard F. – Thank you for posting the scan of the reverse.

I provided it in response to the questions and comments about condition of the stamp. The scan shows the hinge - the Walsh initials and date are on the part attached to the stamp and the number "39" is written on the inside of the flap portion.

Walter P.

You asked:

"Why would the description on the RPSL certificate, issued for G39, state 'Stamp torn at top,' when in your scan of the stamp, you can see that it appears that the stamp has a vertical tear on the right side of the stamp that extends from the top of the stamp down to a location alongside and below the numeral 13?"

Would that not encompass a vertical tear that extends from the top right side of the stamp down to almost three quarters of the entire stamp?

Does the RPSL certificate issued for G39 state any other defects or alterations on this stamp?

To answer – this is all the information on the cert dealing with defects or alteration. I provided it since I thought there was some concern raised that the tear extends all the way through. I am sure if the tear extended through the entire stamp the cert would have noted that. I hope the reverse side scan clarifies.

Scott T.

You are welcome to see all the stamps I have any time you are in the SF Bay Area and I am here to show them to you.

I hope questions of the integrity of G39 as an example of the 13-cent Type II are answered by the scan.

I would like to understand how, under your description of the printing method as evidenced by the dots, this stamp would have the characteristics associated with the 2-cent Type II – in particular the dot between the left frame lines, the absence of a dot to the lower right of the "e", and the absence of the dot that should be between this and the Type I stamp.

September 14, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Patrick C sent along a 600 dpi scan of the reverse of #G39 last night which is linked [here](#). Sorry for delay in uploading it -he was going to comment regarding it when posted.

September 14, 2006 **Steve W**

Carl,

One of the mysteries of the accepted Missionaries is that the #3 13 "Hawaiian Postage" and #4 13c "H.I. & U.S." were essentially in concurrent usage, so it is difficult to construct timelines from their usage patterns.

The other germane point is that it is difficult to draw conclusions from any one cancellation strike, because so much depends on how the cancel was applied. A blurry, over-inked strike might be the first draw from a cancel, and a clear pristine strike might be the last.

This is why it is so important to distinguish device characteristics from strike characteristics when expertising cancels.

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

Having troubled to do that, why did the forger create two different 3s, especially when he had a perfectly clear exemplar on G81 that he evidently failed to copy?

I think you're groping for evidence, no matter how far-fetched, to avoid the simpler answer that these were typeset, at least originally, even if Scott's theory is correct.

For what it's worth, if the Southwest Museum hosted a master forger, that's another strike against your suggestion, because its master printer (his name lost to history unless Ron Cipolla has discovered it in the archives but isn't telling) was a Brit who worked with cold type letterpress, not lithography.

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

I want to read it too, but I'm not the man to write it. I can limn the lyrics; someone else has to compose the score.

September 14, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

Reread my article more slowly. I'm not a partisan of any ending, and haven't ever been. You were here when I summarized the Rashomon scripts, which examine the story from every perspective.

The Grinnell story is the greatest morality tale that philately has yet written, but its final chapter hasn't yet been composed. The passions posted on this board prove that its force to arouse, inflame, educate, reflect, and entertain hasn't yet dissipated.

Characters in this drama are afflicted with the range of human traits from noblest to meanest. Like all real people, each individual embodies a contradictory blend of them (in the Hegelian meanian as well as the Shakespearean). John Klemann was driven as mad by his Grinnell experience as B. Traven's characters were in Treasure of the Sierra Madre, for much the same reason.

As I observed in my article, the Grinnell trial occurred when readers worldwide were transfixed by record realizations for rare postage stamps at the Ferrary estate sales. One year earlier, Maurice Burrus had bought Ferrary's 2¢ Missionary for more money than had ever before been spent on a stamp. Arthur Hind doubled that record just as testimony was about to begin, while Burrus proclaimed that the One Cent Magenta was a spurious fraud, on many of the same grounds (absence of a validating example, or archival evidence, or a plausible confirming cover, and by plating) that are adduced to condemn the Grinnells.

So the once and future history of stamp collecting, and all the ennobling and corrupting elements of our hobby, were playing at Los Angeles, but on a world stage. From that perspective Grinnell was a hapless bit player, driven by events but never their master.

September 14, 2006 **Roger Heath**

I'm getting caught up to date, the result of living many time zones different than others.

Ken L -

Let's accept I'm not going to change my "illusions" on the photographic process used in the creation of the Grinnells. Your comment needs further reply:

"Why would the forger have painstakingly reproduced the damaged s that Bill L identified, but not reproduced the large 3 at the center of the design?"

Because it didn't take painstaking work to reproduce the Longley Flaw. [Here](#) are the **Cents** from G-80, the 2 cent G-19, the 5 cent G-30, and the 13 cent G-50, as best as I can reproduce from the scans available. I touched out the identifying background tones being as careful as possible to leave all characteristics of the letters. They are in B&W to de-emphasize the identifiable color differences.

As we know the word "Cents" is completely clear on G-80 thus making it an ideal model to use on all Type II Grinnells. The "3" is unusable, therefore if the cancel is genuine, the forger had to find a suitable replacement numeral. He had the flyspecks figured out, but it was the big numerals that presented the major problems. Size of the flyspecks had no bearing on the numeral problem, it was unrelated, and as far as I'm concerned the forger didn't do a good job in making his two types of stamps.

All the flaws, variations, etc., of the Grinnells can be attributed to the copy and paste technique. He used what was usable from the two stamps available, but had to find substitute letters to replace those that were covered by the cancels, or became lost in the photocopying. I understand the films were different but it may not have been necessary for him to use high contrast film, just process the film towards high contrast. The second size reduction step could have used high contrast since the forger was working his paste--up in B&W.

Richard M -

Another B&W study showing [G-19](#) and [G-50](#). Seems the echo from G-50 is 99% of G-19's song, a few notes different but not enough to change the tune. Might be considered slack key!

Roger

September 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Steve W -

I carefully read your last post several times and find I must agree with your contention that Dick Celler fell prey to his own emotions by failing to take a global approach to his analysis.

Absent, a comprehensive high level rebuttal of Scott and Bill's findings, posted on this Board in the next few days, their findings should stand up to the test of time.

Are you unfairly categorizing Dick's analysis? No, not at all, because as you so ably pointed out, his analysis is incomplete and thereby his findings may be flawed.

In the end we are very fortunate to have people like Dick Celler freely contributing their time and expertise to this Board. I believe that if the Grinnell mystery is ever going to be solved it is going to be through the efforts of this Board's participants, some more than others, but in the end it will be through a group effort.

My only regret is that I lack the expertise and technical knowledge that has been freely shared by the more experienced members of this Board. Nonetheless, as a neophyte in the plating and cancellation assessment department, this Board through its postings has opened my eyes, piqued my interest, and has become a valuable learning tool.

To this end the Board is a resounding success and something Richard can be very proud of.

September 13, 2006 **Carl Roberts**

Still thinking about the time line and when the Grinnells might have received the 7-bar cancellation discussed by Scott Trepel...

I'm sure all of you serious students already know this, but for lurkers in the balcony, did you notice that, among Richard's large scans, there is the 13c "H. I. & U. S. Postage" number 171, a stamp that came later than the first 13c Missionaries, which carries a fresh, pristine copy of that 7-bar cancel?

That suggests of course that the less-than-pristine 7-bar on G80 and on the Grinnells, if real, were applied some time after #171 was used.

Weird.

-Carl

September 13, 2006 **D. Shumaker**

Grrrrr. 4. There are prominent breaks in the design that are distinctive and are common to each, especially atop the upper left loop and around the central intersection.

September 13, 2006 **David Shumaker**

BACK TO BASICS IT IS...

Scott Trepel has offered evidence that the Grinnells were not printed from moveable type. Bill Longley demonstrated that G80 was used as a model for the Type II Grinnells. Now, I will attempt to demonstrate that the Grinnells were not printed from actual pieces of type, neither moveable or stereo.

Attempt, because I can neither produce nor post images at this time. Contestants will have to play along at home... if you're up to the challenge ;')

Begin with the mint pairs of the Five Cent and Thirteen Cent denominations that Richard has posted. The big ones. Compare the leftmost of the upper two ornaments, which Courdrey called O-1, between these denominations. Just clip one and paste next to the other. You can also stack transparencies if you can get

the scales the same. When you examine the Five Cent ornament against the Thirteen Cent ornament O-1, here is how they compare:

1. The shading in the four pearls are essentially identical, which as a set are unique from any other position of ornament on either stamp,
2. The lower left pearl is larger than the lower right pearl on each,
3. The "left half" of the design, from the left edge to the intersection, is wider than the "right half" (not really halves due to the asymmetry about a vertical axis, which is not evident in the accepted genuines). There are prominent breaks in the design that are distinctive and are common to each, especially atop the upper left loop and around the central intersection.

In short: stacked one upon another in Photoshop, these ornaments are identical to one another within what one would reasonably expect from nuances arising from inking and paper surface.

At this point, it's clear that this piece of type, O-1, is the same piece on the Thirteen as on the Five. But wait... now concentrate on the canes at the bottom, which when paired form an inverted heart:

1. On the Five Cent, drawing a centerline through the heart leads between the upper left pearl and the central intersection.
2. On the Thirteen Cent, the centerline of the heart passes through the intersection.
3. The heart on the Thirteen Cent is higher than on the Five Cent.
4. Within each ornament, the heart varies in elevation with the canes on either side.

Now, I don't claim to be an expert on metal type, but I can reasonably assume that the movement shown in the canes (hearts) is too much for a single chunk of metal to produce. Damaged, perhaps? Not likely. Metal type is three dimensional, so a blow capable of moving these tiny canes in the x-y plane would surely have affected the z-axis and thus the printing surface, severely degrading its ability to print the little canes. But how could they get damaged, given these ornaments need not be removed when the central numeral was changed? Note the canes change position from the Five Cent to the Two Cent as well!

Looks to me like the faker made some adjustments to the design to create the illusion of change without understanding the nature of the plate the genuine was printed from. This would not be the first time such an error was made by a forger. This tweaking carries to the "e" of "Postage" in each Type where, for some unknown reason, this letter morphs anew from denomination to denomination even though there was no need to remove it from the forme while changing denominations.

Well, anyway, it is what it is.

September 13, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

I used the term "Grinnellite" to simplify references to the few well-respected philatelists who have argued that the Grinnells are or might be genuine. I read the term on this board and thought it was an appropriate way to identify the believers.

No insult was intended. Both Ken L. and Dick C. know I respect their philatelic knowledge and CV's. Off this board, we share information frequently and generously.

September 13, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Dick C I've spent some time composing my notes and reply and will reread it tomorrow and post. I think I have more to support this, and yes I intend to correct the article with both nomenclature, clarify the census vs Grinnell census #s and address the several settings of 13c (ie dropped 1). I've analyzed it further and have some thoughts on the printing of the two settings, both of which have serious arguments against Grinnells regardless of which of the two paths one takes. Unless the fork in the road is three-pronged rather than two.

I still think the G80 needs to be examined to confirm a preprinting crease.

I'll post more tomorrow.

Thanks.
Bill

September 13, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,
Echoing Scott's appeal, it would be interesting to get a high level rebuttal to Scott's and Bill's analyses. Like you, I am not proficient in plating, but the responses so far seem to consist of fairly detailed critiques of small elements of each analysis. I do not see how those critiques invalidate the overall conclusions reached by Scott and Bill. What am I missing here?

The response to Scott's 7-bar grid analysis has been essentially non-existent. I do not agree with you that Dick's analysis of the G80 7-bar grid is well-founded. It seems to me that he fell prey to what you have pointed out repeatedly with respect to others: using selective data to reinforce an existing opinion. Dick followed a plater's approach to cancel assessment, and did not account for the very significant difference between device characteristics and strike characteristics. He did a very nice job of mapping flaws in cancel scans between different stamps, but did not distinguish whether those flaws were derived from characteristics of the cancelling device or from the particular strike of that device. This was compounded by the fact that he did not rigorously compare G80 with accepted 7-bar cancels, as Scott did. Please correct me if I am unfairly characterizing Dick's analysis.

The logical sequence that Scott proved is that G80 falls in the class of accepted 7-bar grids by virtue of shared device characteristics. He then showed that the Grinnell type G4a (RPSL) cancels are all children of G80 in virtually full detail, with a number of replicated strike characteristics that would not appear in genuine usages.

The importance of this is that it clearly establishes the G4a cancels as fake, although it does not address the authenticity of the underlying stamps.

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

Your explication seemed to connote doubt as I read it, along the lines that Stan outlined. [Ha!] If that's wrong, I apologize.

September 13, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

One could always just call them the “adherents of the Grinnells”.

Walter—my point was that it doesn't matter what kind of person George Grinnell was. I have no reason to believe anyone's assessment of his personality, positive or negative, neither is there a useful purpose in it.

Jim

September 13, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Or is it a Wednesday?

September 13, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Ken L.

You posted: “I think most experts still regard it as a fake cancel, as Stan Piller stated and Richard Malmgren seemed to echo.”

Gee Ken, I didn't know I echoed that. I thought I was attempting to better educate myself about the ‘outline’ around the cork cancel.

Alan Campbell

And yes Alan Campbell, you were not being presumptuous in surmising that you were one of the two people I talked with at StampShow about the cork cancel. (The real question is whether or not you think you were the one I referenced who has a significant cancel collection in his area of expertise or do you think you were the other person?)

David Schumaker & Roger Heath

My unsolicited suggestion is that neither of you expend too much energy in responding to those who wish to argue with your efforts. Since you each like what it is you are expending your time upon, analyze the points of others and incorporate them or not depending on what you think is correct. Don't get too caught up as some of us do by simply responding to a posting because it is a Thursday and you do not remember hearing an echo.

Walter P

You beat me to the punch. I too was confused.

September 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Jim Baughman-

Re: You last post: I don't think anyone is performing a character assassination on George Grinnell. He did that all on his own.

However, I think that you would have to agree that George Grinnell's actions are very much a part of the Grinnell Saga and thereby we should let the chips fall where they may?

In simple terms, the man was either the Indiana Jones of philately as some would have us believe, or he was no more than a criminal whose intent was to defraud other people for financial gain.

You be the Judge.

September 13, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,
I look forward to reading your second article.

Richard,
I'd like to suggest that we discourage the use of the term "Grinnellite". It is most assuredly offensive to those who believe that the Grinnells might be genuine, and there is no need to alienate anyone in this debate.

September 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence-

Thank you for taking your valuable time to clear up that point, because, you see, I was confused when every time a Board participant made an adverse comment regarding George Grinnell, you jumped in right away and tried your best to rehabilitate his image.

What was I to think?

September 13, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

A few thoughts, probably unimportant—

I'm hoping there will be a in-depth chemical, spectrographic, electron-microscopic and all other possible analyses done on the entire “card of ten”. This should

provide some very useful information. Also, I disagree with the person who stated here that only a destructive test will reveal the presence of wood fibers in paper—not true if an electron micrograph is obtained. Not only would wood fibers stand out, all other anomalies would pop as well, such as pollen grains, microscopic mineral particles, etc.

I've been thinking about the Missionary hoard that Ken Lawrence mentioned having been seen in Hawaii in the 1890s. Regardless of whatever provenance the story, I think it should be dismissed out of hand as irrelevant. First, if such a trove of very valuable stamps ever existed, where are they now? Why has not even one survived anywhere? Also, why do we have only one "sighting" of the group in the flesh? Most importantly, they cannot have been the source of the Grinnells if one is to believe the story that came along with their discovery in 1922, namely that they were collected by one family from letters mailed from Hawaii in the 1850s. As evidence that this 1890s hoard demonstrates that there must have been other, unrecorded printings of the Missionaries, it is far to flimsy to form such a hypothesis around, or any other hypothesis for that matter.

I don't think it is possible to objectively reconstruct a character for George Grinnell either. We've seen evidence posted here that indicates everything from self-effacing altruist to venal shark, so lacking the ability to interview the man himself nothing can be gained from character analysis as a method of determining his possible motives or actions in the matter of the Grinnells.

Probably most heretical is my next suggestion, which is that the RPSL evaluation of the Grinnells should no longer be relied upon by any serious student as the final word as to the authenticity, or lack thereof, of the Grinnells. True, there is valuable information in their report, which can be retrieved to support new ideas, but so many things have happened and been discovered since the report was issued that it cannot even serve as a jumping-off point for any future analysis.

It's my opinion that the brilliant work done and exhibited here over the last few weeks, along with a detailed scientific analysis of the "card of ten", will once and for all put the Grinnells in their proper place.

Jim

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

I am not and never have been George Grinnell's supporter. I am a researcher and writer who has had to clear the air of calumny in order to pursue legitimate evidence. From the beginning, if you recall, I proposed that both Missionaries and Grinnells were printed from stereotypes. Scott hasn't refuted that. He has adduced evidence to support his theory that the Grinnells were printed from plates of some sort, but he has not shown that Missionaries were printed by a different method.

Please read my article below that Richard posted for me to understand the point.

September 13, 2006 **Ken L (by RCF)**

How were Hawaiian Missionaries Printed?

By Ken Lawrence

I think most theories of Missionary printing are presumptuous. Both the Mission Press and the Polynesian (government) press had Ramage presses, and Whitney used one when he founded the Honolulu Advertiser. That was the only practical equipment available to the frontier before the 1860s. One was later shipped from Hawaii to Oregon, where it served similar duty. They may also have had proof presses, but I have not read of any others. A working replica of the Advertiser's Ramage is [here](#)

To me it's evident that printing a tiny two-subject forme on such a large press would have been cumbersome to the point of absurdity. Also, if that press or one like it had been used, the normal way to print multiple pulls would be to print the corner of the sheet, rotate it 90 degrees, print the next corner, and so forth, in four pulls. But we know that Missionary stamps were printed in horizontal strips. One theory is that the forme may have been laid face up on the galley, inked, and the print pulled with a strike of a mallet, using no press at all, which would probably have been more efficient.

But I do not exclude the possibility that stereotypes were made of each setting, perhaps more than one stereo of the 5¢ and/or the 13¢, which might have been gang printed and then cut apart into strips. I realize that experts dispute this possibility, but it should not be excluded from consideration.

I asked Dave Churchman to assemble and print the central elements of a Missionary from good type on an antique press, using blue ink and very thin white paper. His result is [here](#). The type is not a perfect match. The side ornaments are single, not double. The bottom side ornaments are not shaved. The numeral is slightly different. Dave's Kelsey press wasn't invented until the 1870s. But it's a reasonable study sample. Observe that even though the Kelsey is a small press with finer controls, the corner elements break up. The gaps are not a result of damaged type, but of bear-off. Flyspeck analyses should take that into account.

Compared to that sample, a Missionary print [here](#) does not look to me like a first-generation pull, even from worn type, though all the experts believe it is, and maybe they are right.

The next conundrum is, why were the lower side ornaments shaved? The paper was tall enough to accommodate a full setting, and no forme was so small that it could not accommodate a full stamp height. I don't have a plausible answer, but until we do, we won't really understand these printings.

Thanks to Dave Churchman for prints, Scott Trepel, and Dick Celler for criticism, and Richard Frajola for technical assistance.

September 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

I don't understand why you are embarking on the path you are, when all of the points you are trying to make are rendered irrelevant, if you cannot disprove that G80 was not the matrix used to print the Grinnells.

Further to that, the same goes for Bill Longley's post which clearly evidences there is a nexus between G80 and all of the Grinnell type II stamps, which is, the 'Longley flaw.'

I agree with Scott Trepel in that if no 'Grinnellite' comes up with any credible evidence that Scott's investigation and findings in his post is in anyway flawed, then all of the other investigations currently underway on how the Grinnells were printed are somewhat meaningless, and are in my view, nothing more than a dog and pony show designed to divert attention away from Scott Trepel's and Bill Longley's findings.

As George Grinnell's chief supporter all eyes are on you Ken Lawrence. If you can, please demonstrate to us all that the above findings are flawed, and if you cannot, at least concede to the Board that Scott and Bill's findings establish that the Grinnell Missionary's cannot be anything more than counterfeit stamps.

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott T,

Between your analysis of the cancels and Dick's, I can't tell which is more persuasive, but that's not my expertise. Evidently Richard, Steve, and Bernard agree it's genuine.

As I told you and wrote here, I hope you're right that the G80 cancel is genuine, because if it is, both the G80 and G81 stamps are among the finest Missionaries in existence.

I think most experts still regard it as a fake cancel, as Stan Piller stated and Richard Malmgren seemed to echo.

September 13, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

David S;

I do not believe that an expert forger would necessarily reject an inferior product. Lots of US locals, for example, are poor counterfeits of originals, but that didn't stop the forgers. Their motivation was greed, not perfect work. If the maker thought he could deceive with his work, that would probably have been good enough.

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

I do understand that. I have written that in my sequel, which I wrote before my October article was published, and which will be published soon. That is one point that makes it implausible that the Grinnells may be genuine. But other aspects are implausible if they are forgeries, so we still need to examine all the possibilities. My November articles explore two of them.

September 13, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

BACK TO BASICS

It seems we are back to arguing about how the forger might have created the Grinnells (or how a printer in 1851 might have set the type, if you believe in the Grinnells).

The purpose of my article was to identify evidence that a) the stamps were printed from a solid plate, not loose type and b) the cancel on G80 is genuine, and some of the Grinnells have a fake grid made from the G80 strike.

To date, I have not heard any substantive rebuttal on those two points.

Trying to figure out exactly how the forger created his matrices is secondary to the basic question: Can the Grinnells possibly be genuine?

I'd like to see articles answering this question.

September 13, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

Regarding #4, and its parallels with the Grinnells, please remember that there are nine accepted covers known with #4 13c stamps. As Richard has said previously, the Grinnells are notable for their lack of known usages on cover.

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

In that case, Dick's previous reply to you is appropriate. Either the forger tried to match the genuine or he didn't. Why would the forger have painstakingly reproduced the damaged s that Bill L identified, but not reproduced the large 3 at the center of the design?

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

I don't know whether all the type was different on the Grinnells, or on Scott 4, but maybe it was. None of it is good type, and none of it is found on any known Hawaiian printed item anywhere close to 1851. Samples that resemble these fonts and ornaments are known from other periods in Mission Press literature, which was a different shop. So these may have all been bad discarded type pieces.

While you, Scott, Dick, Bill, Roger, and others are scrutinizing stamp scans and trying to figure out how they might have been printed, I'm working from the opposite end. I asked Dave Churchman to compose the central features of a Missionary and pull prints in blue ink on very thin white paper from a chase in an antique press. I have sent comparisons to Richard so I can show you my theories.

September 13, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken,

It's not fair to accuse Roger of having "illusions." You speak as if you are consulting the Grinnell answer book, when in fact you are still searching for answers like Roger.

If the Grinnells are indeed forgeries, then the catalyst for the deception were the two genuine Missionaries, not a search for matching type to recreate the original cliches. One would not need both; and if one is in the possession of a good picture of the genuine stamp to arrange metal type from, buying two exceptional genuine copies at considerable expense would be overkill. An expert forger may well have begun with securing matching type, which is why no expert forger ever attempted a good fake of this stamp. The process used by this forger yielded an inferior product, with mis-shapen fonts and irregular ornament, that an expert forger may have attempted but would have rejected as too poor to successfully peddle.

So in your search for truth, might it be premature to discount photoreproduction playing a part in the creation of forgeries? I think your use of the word "illusion" is another way of saying that either loose type or a stereo plate are the only possibilities that can be considered.

September 13, 2006 **Dick Celler**

David S

You asked *If the "s" in question is in fact a defect in the type, and was used only in a few of the last printings of the known genuine Missionaries (the 13 cent value with the raised "3"), would it not be reasonable to infer that the Grinnells, having the same "s" in every value of Type II, were printed AFTER the known genuine, after the defective "s" was incorporated into stamp production?*

1. Where does it say the defective "s" was used in the **last** printings of Scott #3? There are two settings, either could be first.
2. If there were defective pieces of the "s" in the type supply, any one of them could have been picked out and used at any time - for Grinnells or missionaries.

I don't see evidence of a timeline.

September 13, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken,

What you said would apply to either a piece of type or a copy of the impression of that piece of type, wouldn't it? All the type is different on the Grinnells when compared to the genuine. I have not read where anyone disputes this. The theory is the form was reconstructed to produce a new printing either from worn type or using type from across the street. If the defective "s" was a unique defect, how then does it happen to have been drawn from a case of dozens of good letters AND placed in the same position as before instead of into the Type I "Cents" or in either of the two "Postage" labels? And if the defect was in the mould and thus many defective letters were cast, why did only one find its way into the forme, and into the same position as on the Type II 13 cent instead of some or all of the other three "s"? Seems highly unlikely. I still think Bill L. is onto something.

Roger,

I agree with most of your post. My problem is that the variations in the ornaments are too much for a photograph to create alone, even with varied exposures and touch-ups. I think there was extensive drawing done to the model. If you have the software to do so, clip the two top ornaments from a Type I cliché and place them, transparently, over the top two ornaments of a Type II cliché. Not even close. If actual pieces of type, then there are two completely different sources for the ornament type (which happen to have been matched when paired together) on the Grinnells.

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

I realize that photographic reproduction is the mantra from which you won't be deterred, but you could spare yourself a few illusions by attempting to do as you suggest with orthochromatic lith film from light blue originals. Even with a yellow filter, you won't succeed, but those were the only such materials available to a photographic forger before 1918.

If the Grinnells are forgeries, that is not how they were made. No forger in his right mind would preserve flyspecks of the type Bill L. showed but then replace the large numerals of value with a different font.

A better theory still awaits us.

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

George A,

My financial interest is far less than many of the participants in this debate, and the final solution will not affect my interests whatever it may be (except that a final conclusion will make a better book than an open-ended one). I own no Missionaries or Grinnells, and I don't buy or sell them, so I'm not committed to the virtue of either.

September 13, 2006 **Roger Heath**

George Grinnell held back relevant information which would have ended this debate many, many years ago and saved our generation a whole lot of effort.

David S -

I think the problem of inconsistencies with specific letters has to do with the process of photocopying. Depending on the exposure, one can obtain acceptable fine line resolution, but this leaves the "dark" areas underexposed. If one exposes for the darker areas, one loses the fine lines. The forger had to balance the fine lines of the ornaments with the strong lines of the lettering. Creating a paste up from two or three different exposures would show "type movement", which in reality was a result of an inability of the forger to line up the letters in an exact manner on the paste-up. Keep in mind the photographic process required two photo steps. The first to create the enlarged elements for the paste-up, then a second reduction photo to make the "plate". These two steps create scale problems for the forger. I believe we see in the Grinnells the results of different attempts to "get it right". The best attempts were shown to the public, the not so good results were held back along with the models.

I have only seen Missionaries and Grinnells on this website, but those scanned at the highest magnification show the following characteristic. The Missionaries tend to have pointed corners on line ends, serifs, and ornaments, only softened by the bleeding of ink into the paper. They also show "hairy" frame lines where ink has bled along the paper fibers. Grinnells have the characteristic of having rounded line ends, rounded missing serifs, and breaks in the fine lines of the ornaments

all seem to have rounded ends with many tiny blobs. This is a characteristic of photocopying, lines lose the sharp corners of printed type, and broken lines should have sharp ends not rounded. For this reason when I worked at the hospital I used Rapidograph and india ink to draw my [graphs](#) resulting everything having rounded corners, except the presstype symbols and fine line fill. I had to expose solely for the fine line fill. If I lost those lines I had to rephotograph. Letraset press type worked well for matching fonts, but I always had to make sure I didn't lose the "sharpness" of the corners and points of the letters. The main reason for using the Rapidograph.

Roger

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

The defect could be in the type or in the mold, a point Dave Churchman makes whenever this question arises. (Consider the so-called blowhole defects in the balls of all the 5 digits. George Linn considered that to be evidence that all these were printed from stereotypes. But Dave disagreed, because hand-molded type typically has defects like that.)

Most of those who regard the Grinnells as genuine think that they were printed after the first three Missionaries and before the fourth. One or two believe the Grinnells came first.

Neither Bill L nor Scott T has addressed my article, nor caused any potential revision in it, except on the disputed point of the G80 cancel, on which Scott at first agreed with what I wrote (that it's a Grinnell) and only later changed his mind. Personally I hope Scott is right, but Dick's comparisons are persuasive to me, and Scott's do not demonstrate what his words say. But again, I'm not a flyspecker; he might be right and I hope he is. Meanwhile, Bill would not have made his mistakes if he had consulted Dick first, so your point is not limited to professional writing.

When the Pony book was in press, I asked Richard for information that he provided in confidence and with a promise of non-disclosure until the book was published. All authors of new information or interpretation embargo their writing.

September 13, 2006 **George A**

I, for one, did not look at anything except scans that were posted here and I am certainly glad Richard Frajola provided the scan reference material for all. I do think that the anger was largely caused by the lack of sharing of pertinent information. After all, most of us have no financial stake in this at all.

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

George A,

I guess you haven't read my article, because your statement is not true.

I did not identify the G81 Missionary from a scan, for the simple reason I did not have a scan. I was looking at an actual-size copy, from which I could not be certain of my hunch. I next realized that the enlarged photo in the Mystic booklet (page 33) is sufficiently detailed to make the identification. By then, Dick Celler had confirmed my discovery and made his discovery of G80. Why didn't you and others identify it from the Mystic booklet?

September 13, 2006 **Mike E**

Ken,

I have no disdain for professional writing. Guess I am just going through the growing pains of getting used to it in a hobby where open sharing of information is usually the rule of the day. I'm sorry to the readers for polluting the (what should be a fun and academic) board today with philosophical rants.. I'm done now.

September 13, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Bill W.

I think the problem some have with the "revelation" is that the articles Ken has written and will write are destined to become the most read and most generally accepted, owing to his research ability, resources and writing skills. Had the discovery of genuine stamps in the mix been revealed several months ago, the articles from Scott T and Bill L may have required Ken to be re-think his work to better fit these recent developments and/or otherwise change the course of evidence in the search for truth.

Ken and Dick,

If the "s" in question is in fact a defect in the type, and was used only in a few of the last printings of the known genuine Missionaries (the 13 cent value with the raised "3"), would it not be reasonable to infer that the Grinnells, having the same "s" in every value of Type II, were printed AFTER the known genuine, after the defective "s" was incorporated into stamp production?

September 13, 2006 **George A**

Ken L - Not to diminish your 15 minutes of fame but almost everybody reading this would have spotted G80 and G81 as genuine originals if they had seen the scans rather than looking at two stamps behind glass from 3 feet away.

September 13, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Bernard B

You asked *BUT do you really think the prints on the subtype of the thirteen cent type II and the Grinnells are from the same physical object?*

I'm not certain I understand the question. Bear in mind that I leave open the possibility the Grinnells were printed from loose type, and that they may be a genuine separate printing. If you ask if the "s" with the blue spur found on Grinnells and the one setting of missionaries is the same physical piece of metal, of course the

answer is no.

Do I think that there could have been many identical defective "s" pieces in the type rack? Sure.

September 13, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

With due respect to all parties concerned, I believe that anyone's credibility is undermined if the reader can not determine easily if information/opinion is being held back or undisclosed or in any way altered, due to ulterior motives.

For example, I have heard someone opine that they thought Dick Celler's views must be tainted as it appears he's beholden to the owners in some way. I personally do not believe that is true, as Dick's reputation is beyond reproach and furthermore, it appears he was invited into the fray not by the owners, but by the NPM. What's important however, is the PERCEPTION by the reader. In that regard, I understand Mike E's last post clearly, even though I think I know better.

Realistically, does anyone really expect Ken (or anyone else) to need to continually (daily?) state that they make a living writing, thus may not be able to reveal everything they know here? Would anyone expect Scott Trepel or I to reveal that we have a specific property on the line so that we can make a sequential point on this board? Do we expect the Attorney-members of this board to temper their messages? No, we don't.

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Mike E,

You're entitled to disdain professional writing, but few of my readers would agree with you that they did not benefit from reading my story the way I wrote it rather than the way you might have written it had you known the same information. No one would pay me to write if that were true.

On the other hand, as I've observed often in the past few weeks, it's odd that I was the only one who recognized the genuine stamp on the card, while all the Hawaii experts missed it.

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Mike E,

I repeatedly stated that I was withholding my discoveries and theories until after publication. I stated that before I began the Rashomon sequence; I wrote it again when I declined to explain Pat Culhane's conundrum, and again when discussion about the Southwest Museum connection arose, and on other occasions after that. I stated exactly why, and assured one and all that you will be able to read it as soon as I can get it into print. There was nothing at all misleading about it.

September 13, 2006 **corey long**

Ken L, agreed. And as you stated earlier, it is still just stamp collecting, not life and death. Happily, there is far more about the hobby that unites us and brings people together as friends than there is that divides.

September 13, 2006 **Mike Ellingson**

Ken,

With all due respect, the following paragraph from your last post is, at best, EXTREMELY misleading.

"That report caused one prominent Hawaii specialist to attack me energetically, and caused our host first to consider dismantling the Grinnell board, and then to segregate the thread, expressing his discontent. Scott Trepel was alone among Hawaii experts in welcoming our discoveries. "

Your discovery had nothing whatsoever to do with the discontent of those persons mentioned in your post. It was WITHHOLDING your discovery for several weeks that really ticked folks off, all the while trying to keep what folks thought was an open debate on the subject going. Let's face it, holding back the discovery served NO ONE BUT YOU, under the guise of a 'journalistic scoop'. No amount of wordsmithing (is that really a word) can hide that basic truth.

Perhaps you should add the following disclaimer to each of your posts on the subject:

"Disclaimer: I am in the business of philatelic writing. What I post here may or may not be the extent of my knowledge on the subject. If I may profit from holding back certain information because a publisher will recompense me, I reserve the right to do so."

PS Thanks for sending me the issue of Scott Stamp Monthly. I may even subscribe to get 'the rest of the story'... How ironic...

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

In different settings of type, one typically sees some that repeats and some that is different, as Dick has shown in the two 13¢ settings.

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Corey L,

Yes, I'm no saint, but poison penmanship ought not be a point of pride. Namecalling is nothing to celebrate. Long after the heat of the moment has dissipated, those parts of these otherwise intelligent reports will diminish their authors in the minds of readers.

What's most important in solving the Grinnell mystery is to arrive at a solution that (nearly) everyone can accept. Creating a permanent divide that serves as a barrier to the solution is not helpful to that project.

September 13, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Then, reasonably, the argument for the genuineness of the Grinnells cannot be both that different type were used for the Grinnells AND the same "s" was used for the Type II 13 cent Grinnell that was used on the known genuine Type II 13 cent. Either a different batch of type with thinner verticals was used because no better could be had, OR the same deformed "s" was used in the same location because Whitney drew from the same case of type. Can't have that both ways, either.

The model theory suggests, even requires, a base model of the top label, frames and fancy ornamentation to be prepared first. The later addition of the center numeral and bottom label would have come afterward. It would not be inconsistent that the "s" of "Cents" be a closer match to the "DNA" than the upper label fonts, the "Hawaiian Postage" label having already undergone some distortion in preparation of the base model. This was my thought a few days ago when the subject of my post was about the multiple steps required to make stamps from a paste-up model and their leading to differing amounts of distortion depending on what step an object was added to the composition.

September 13, 2006 **corey long**

Ken L,

I for one thought you had a right to protect your discovery for the purposes of your article, particularly since I didn't believe you ever used the information in any way unfairly against others on the board who lacked it. However, to be fair - the objections of others were not over the discovery but over the concealment of it. Water under the bridge now and you are to be commended for making the discovery that has lead to all this new analysis.

As far as name calling - come on, you can do it with the best of them!

September 13, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

All the articles and comments posted here are interesting. Not being a flyspecker, I'm not able to add anything that would give succor to partisans on either side.

It's ironic that none of these studies were possible until after I discovered the genuine G81 Missionary, followed by Dick Celler's discovery of the G80 Missionary, which I reported in the October Scott Stamp Monthly.

That report caused one prominent Hawaii specialist to attack me energetically, and caused our host first to consider dismantling the Grinnell board, and then to segregate the thread, expressing his discontent. Scott Trepel was alone among Hawaii experts in welcoming our discoveries.

Despite that dismal initial response, the report has inspired careful philatelic study of Grinnells and Missionaries to blossom, a fine result. And it has brought more sustained discussion to this sub-board than to the main Frajola board, another fine development.

What isn't praiseworthy is the hubris. The namecalling, intended to pressure less sophisticated readers to declare their allegiance, is nothing to applaud. (It reminds me how Trotskyists became Trotskyites became Trots as verbal venom flowed in the 1960s, and their retorts in kind, which eventually rendered intelligent political discourse impossible.)

As literature, however, the Grinnell story is enhanced, not diminished, by these human foibles, even though the partisans fail to hear the lyrics, and can't appreciate humor except when it's barbed with schadenfreude.

Once again, I won't scoop myself here, but the November issue of Scott Stamp Monthly contains my sequel, which I wrote before any of this discussion erupted. I hope it will deepen insights further as we all take new steps along the path to solving the mystery.

September 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Carl Roberts-

'Criminals', and yes, people who counterfeit stamps with the intent to defraud other people, are in fact Criminals can be a strange lot indeed.

I would think it reasonable to surmiss, that the reason George Grinnell failed to dispose of the stamps we know as, G80 & G81, which he mounted on a card with 8 Grinnell stamps, may be the very same reason, as was in the case of others with the same intent, was plain old fashioned,'Greed.'

'Greed" one of the seven original sins.

George Grinnell knew the value of these stamps and that is evidenced by his mounting them on the 'Card of Ten' with a notation of the back, with words to the effect, keep these do not sell. These stamps were held back in the sale to Kelmann and were not even known of until 2006 when the Arrigo's, brought them out of the closet and made them public.

One should also not forget that 'Criminals' do not committ their crimes thinking that they will be caught. George Grinnell's dowfall may be that he could not bring himself to destroy such incriminating evidence, so he squirled the 'Card of Ten' away, hoping that it would never be found in his lifetime.

In this task he almost succeeded. The irony in this, is that his very own decendants who were not aware of the two genuine stamps mounted on the 'Card of Ten' innocently revealed the stamps to public eye, thereby exposing George Grinnell's two genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps that were used to print the Grinnell stamps.

Sometimes, the truth has a strange way of exposing itself, and this case is no exception.

To support my conclusions, may I remind you all, there are many men and women who have been sentenced to prison or even condemned to death for crimes they may have gotton away with had they not destroyed the evidence that had convicted them. Simply put, some 'Criminals' just can't bear to destroy something that has value and that was their eventual downfall.

In closing, it is not surprising that we have not heard from George Grinnell's greatest supporter.

September 13, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Dick C Re you comment on David Shumaker's comment. Of course the significance of a given match or mismatch depends on its Specific nature. The matching

on the Grinnell details is aesthetically creepy, like Superman's Bizarro double (I exaggerate of course). And Bizarro was basically a nice guy.

September 13, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Dick C It is extremely annoying that the 13 cent was apparently the last of the three first issue stamps set, and the Grinnells appear to be based on the 13s and the later version at that! If anything else, it would be so much more obvious.

September 13, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Dick C Good riposte. BUT do you really think the prints on the subtype of the thirteen cent type II and the Grinnells are from the same physical object? And, vague as is our understanding of the printing of the Grinnells, I think they would have to be reworked stereotypes of stereotypes from one value to the next to have any chance of meeting the Trepel observations? Is that reasonable? Another interesting semiconstant mark is the linked top and middle of the a of postage which propagates from the thirteen II into the Grinnells.

September 13, 2006 **Dick Celler**

David Shumaker

The model theory can't have it both ways. "Things which match are evidence of forgery." "Things which do not match are evidence of forgery."

September 13, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Bill Longley

In your presentation, you examined genuine 13c Type II missionaries looking for the G80 "blue spur" and did not find any.

There are (at least) two settings of the 13c Type II genuine missionary stamp. One has the normal "13" in the bottom label, the other has the 1 much lower than the 3 (similar to the Grinnell 13c Type II). Each setting has **different type** used for the large central 13 and the entire bottom label. G80 is the the latter version, the 1 lower than the 3.

The stamps you used for comparison to search for the blue spur are the other setting, and thus the "s" is a different piece of type - this is like comparing apples and oranges. You need to compare with stamps of the same setting, and none are posted here.

I made the comparison using scans of missionary stamps of the same setting as G80. The three which showed the "s" clearly are [M-90](#), [M-111](#), and [M-130](#)

What this shows me is that these stamps **do have your blur spur**.

My conclusion is that this setting of the missionary 13c Type II has a deformed "s" piece of type. Thus the blue spur is not caused by a paper fold or a paper crease on G80 - it is a constant variety.

My research on the two settings is ongoing. Good scans can be hard to find. There are several stamps that do not fit either setting perfectly, and I'm working on figuring out why.

September 13, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Dick C.,

Please explain why the "mother of Grinnell DNA" theory must also explain the appearance of that particular "a" or any other "a" in "Hawaiian Postage". Why can't the "s" spur give evidence as a reproduction of the original in a way that is different from how the "Hawaiian Postage" is evidently a poor copy of the original?

September 13, 2006 **Larry Bustillo**

Bill Longley,

Great "fly spec" detective work. Congrats. Have you ever considered plating classic US 1c & 3c 1851-57 issues I think they would be a breeze for you.

September 13, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Carl R-

Why didn't George Grinnell throw away 80 & 81? He knew they were valuable, and that they would always be valuable. If they were made known at the time, I believe a discussion similar to the one here on this Board would have taken place. No trial would have occurred, etc, etc., because those involved in viewing the Grinnells would have seen 80 & 81 were the models for the forgeries.

This is not a situation where the "criminal" needed to get rid of all evidence. An analogy: A jeweler views a bag of old jewelry and buys from the owner. He recognized the maker as being a known master craftsman, and after studying the pieces decides to copy the settings. After some trial and error, he makes known his find, and a collector is contacted who is interested in buying the hoard. After a short time of study the collector returns the jewels claiming they are fakes. He requests a refund. Law suit follows, etc, etc.

Do you think the jeweler would have thrown away the original stones? No. He knew they were valuable in their own right. Eighty years later the original stones come to light, mixed in with a few more copies. This find allowed comparisons between the original master works and the copies made by the jeweler, thus completing the circle. The original works still had a market value.

Roger

September 13, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Bill Longley

I spent a little time reviewing your presentation. I presume it is the original version, as the split "s" nomenclature was a bit confusing. I will use "blue spur" and "white line" in my comments so there is no confusion.

I have scans of all the Grinnells. The blue spur does occur on every Type II stamp where that area is visible, all three denominations.

The white line is not on any of them, so I agree with your posting today.

A little housekeeping. The list of 13c Type II Grinnells you examined has G65. That is a 5c stamp. It also has G79, which I think is the same as your GC8. The list for the 2c includes G15. My scan of G15 shows the lower right part of the stamp is torn off and the "s" isn't there.

How does the "mother of the Grinnells DNA" theory explain the second "a" in "Hawaiian" on the 13c Type II? Do you think the missionary version and the Grinnell version look at all similar? I don't. The vertical stroke on the missionaries is about twice as thick as on the Grinnells.

September 13, 2006 **Walter P**

Dick Celler-

Even though G80 & G81 are not Grinnell stamps they are mounted on the card of ten owned by George Grinnell.

Even though they will eventually be assigned numbers when added to the Seigel census, for the purposes of investigation findings, discussions and postings on this Board I suggest these stamps remain being referred to as G80 and G81.

To refer to these stamps as anything else, at this point in time, would be very confusing for Board readers who do not, unlike ourselves, follow the Board daily.

As you are aware, several excellent articles have already been written that use the G80 & G81 reference numbers. Perhaps future writers could place a small figure 1 beside G80, G81 and write a footnote at the end of the page stating these stamps were discovered on the card of 10 and are not Grinnell stamps but Genuine Missionary stamps.

Can I be so bold as to presume you find no issue with the content of Bill Longley's research findings or do you require more time to study his post? I would be very interested in hearing your views his the paper fold discovery, or rather the 'Longley flaw,' as it has now been dubbed.

September 13, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

G80 - On my screen I can clearly see the pre-print paper wrinkle on #G80. It is not a crease (it is not a straight line like a crease).

September 13, 2006 **Carl Roberts**

Okay, let's look at G80 and the spur on the S from a different perspective.

Earlier, I mentioned to Scott Trepel that his images of the 7-bar cancel seemed to show a progression, beginning with crisp clear marks on the known genuine Missionaries, to the deteriorated image on G80, and to even further deteriorated strikes on the Grinnells.

Taking the Grinnellite view that what we see is genuine, even at best the sequence of printing becomes wrong, right? First the Missionaries, then the G80 becomes the Missing Link, then the Grinnells.

For now, the idea of a paper crease is only a theory (a great one of course), one that should be investigated further, and a question that indeed will probably be answered - even a preliminary examination of the stamp itself should give some indication of the facts, especially whether there is a paper crease.

Meanwhile, though, don't we have one more indication that G80 is indeed a link between the Missionaries and the Grinnells? Suppose, for a moment, that there is no paper crease.

So a likely alternate explanation becomes this... the S had become damaged by the time G80 was printed. Features like the misaligned 13 carried over to the Grinnells, it seems logical that the damaged S could also be present on stamps printed later.

Sorry I don't really have a firm grasp of the timeline, but that sequence of printings seems to shoot down the Grinnellites' theories, is that correct?

Pitldown Stamp, Grinnanderthal, whatever. I'm keeping an open mind but sure would like to see a logical explanation of the facts as we know them today.

One other unrelated thought - it was recently mentioned that George Grinnell had sorted his Grinnells into two categories, damaged and undamaged stamps, originally holding back the rougher stamps when he offered them for sale. It isn't much of a stretch to imagine that he carried that sorting one step further, also sorting out the best for himself, explaining the card of ten.

Don't most stamp collectors do the same thing?

The idea that George G kept two genuine Missionaries that were used as patterns together with the forged end product seems like a stretch. Think about it. The gun goes in the river, the bullets go into a dumpster, and the body parts are scattered over two counties. Why wouldn't he scatter the evidence, selling either the Grinnells or the valuable genuine Missionaries if he indeed knew they were fake/real?

Incidentally, as a balconeer, I have to ask. Has anyone already put together a clear timeline of the events that are provable, and has anyone compiled a description of those Missionaries that have been repaired, and a description (or images) of the repair work?

-Carl

September 13, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

This has been an interesting lesson in techniques of philatelic study. I've already started using some of Scott's methodology in studying some confusing postmarks

of Clare, South Australia. What is really striking for me is that we all had access to the same evidence that Scott and Bill used. It has been fascinating to see how they've been able to make use of that evidence to solve the puzzle. (Presumably an obvious next step is for someone to examine Mother 80 to confirm that it is creased in the way that Bill proposed.)

September 13, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Bill Longley

Missionary/Grinnell nomenclature

I'm looking at your article. There is an incorrect statement in the fourth paragraph you might want to fix. Here's the background.

The Grinnell "G" numbers assigned by Grinnell and published by George Linn go from 1 to 71 inclusive. Linn did not know about the Grinnell "Card of 10". He did not assign 72-81 (but mentioned there might be a #72 and had no info about it - I don't have the reference handy).

Genuine missionaries use the Siegel census numbers published in the Advertiser sale catalog of 1995, eg 3-II-CAN-90. The unique numbers (90 in this example) run from 1 to 197 inclusive. Sometime we abbreviate this as "census 90" or "M-90". Scott Trepel told me a couple of years ago that he had not been adding new numbers to the census since he published it in 1995.

When I first became aware of the Card of 10 in April 2006, I assigned the G-72 through G81 to them. It wasn't until July that I found out the last 2 on the card were genuine missionaries and not Grinnells.

Ideally, the "G-80" and "G-81" should have Siegel census numbers assigned to them. The temporary census numbers I arbitrarily assigned are 3-I-CAN-920 and 3-II-CAN-921 respectively (I also record and assigned numbers for 15 other missionaries not in the Siegel census). My "900 series" is for my use in keeping track of these unrecorded items; hopefully, someone will pick up with the Siegel census starting with number 198.

For reference purposes in the present discussion, we may be stuck with calling them G-80 and G-81 even they are not Grinnells. I'm open to suggestions.

September 13, 2006 **Bill Duffney**

BB,

It might well be offset as you suggest. There is so little detail there that the situation might be an imponderable. Thanks.

September 13, 2006 **Bob Lodge** <rc1wa@nwi.net>

I am also an amateur who has enjoyed peeking in at this fascinating discussion "from the balcony" as we say on the eBay board. It is truly exciting to see a significant philatelic event unfolding in real time. Congratulations Bill for the fruits of your research. I would also like to comment that I am truly saddened that Varro Tyler could not have been here to both observe and participate.

"Bob in WA" on the eBay board

September 12, 2006 **Walter P**

Bill Longley -

A well thought out piece of philatelic detective work from the Land of the Maple Leaf.

Congratulations are in order on a job well done.

I second Bernard on the idea of naming the flaw, the "Longley" flaw.

September 12, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

If G80 is mom, does that make G81 pop. And the "Longley" flaw. Imagine having a famous flaw named after you!

September 12, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Bill Duffney I see what you mean, but most likely offset or some other kind of stray ink.

September 12, 2006 **Steve W**

Bill Longley,

If you are going to update your posted article, you might want to add a small correction. When referring to genuine Missionaries by census number, the letter "G" is not used. Only the stamps from the Grinnell find are numbered with a "G" prefix.

September 12, 2006 **corey long**

effors = errors. spell check!

September 12, 2006 **corey long**

Scott, Bill, Roger - great, great work. This has been fun to follow -- taking nothing away from the efforts on the other side which have resulted in a lot of new information and correction of some previous efforts.

However, the irony in this is simply amazing -- I think of the quote from Don S. in the Times which went something like, this is a fish with legs connecting the

Grinnells to the genuine missionaries... Well, close but this fish seems to be walking a straight line back to the forger.

I eagerly await the response from the Grinnellites, which has been stranglely muted thus far, save for that short diatribe by Dick C against Scott. There is an old lawyer saying (I am not one so I'll probably get this wrong), "When the facts are against you, argue the law; when the law is against you, argue the facts; when both the facts and the law are against you, pound on the table."

I think we long ago settled that the law is against the Grinnells -- with the negative RPSL opinion and the need to discard established expertising norms to find these stamps genuine. Now it seems that the facts are even more overwhelmingly against. I guess there is still time for pounding the table!

September 12, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

My thanks to those who advised about Adobe Reader, which I have now downloaded, and to my amazement, my Dell hasn't exploded, imploded or otherwise acted up! Appreciate the advice.

I have now read Scott's and Bill's presentations and find both rather compelling. Will be interesting to see how pro-Grinnell camp reacts to both.

September 12, 2006 **Bill Duffney**

Well done Bill Longley and Scott Trepel!

I am still of the opinion that someone should study the black ink between P and O of POSTAGE on the Mother G-80. Rotated about 45 degrees counterclockwise, the errant ink appears to be a lower case letter "a". Could this be part of a weakly struck postmark?

September 12, 2006 **Bill Longley**

A nomenclature correction I had originally called the printing feature the "S spur". It was just another one of the many features that are repeated from the genuine (G80) to the Grinnells.

It wasn't until examining this feature more closely that I realized it was due to a printing crease.

That is when I renamed it the "split s". That feature of course is the one that appears on the genuine stamp. That is a white area AND the blue spur. So split "s" is on the genuine missionary.

The feature repeated on the Grinnells is the "s spur" alone and I didn't see and absolute proof that the white area was repeated as well.

So a small nomenclature correction is in order, with the feature reproduced on the Grinnells being the "s spur".

This typo occurred when I did a global search and replace of split "s" and "s" spur.

I am going to fix this plus a few typos and adjust the images so there aren't as many page breaks. I will send a corrected file to Richard for updating later.

Thank you all for your encouragement.

Bill

September 12, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Roger

You posted while I was composing.

Think Vertical!

September 12, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Steve W.

Correct.

My repeated 'Think Vertical' comments are intended to contrast what most (if not all) of us were doing pre-Card of 10, namely comparing horizontally. In other words, most of us would compare a genuine 2c Type I with a Grinnell 2c Type I, a genuine 5c Type II with a Grinnell 5c Type II. We would then point out differences.

I am duplicating the gist of some of my prior posts, but based upon an initial phone call from Bill Longely and then several hours at the Mystic Booth at StampShow looking at the blowups, I started noticing similarities between G80 (a presumed genuine 13c Type II) and all of the Grinnell Type II's regardless of denomination. Ditto for G81 (a presumed genuine 13c Type I) and all of the Grinnell Type I's regardless of denomination.

I lack the Photoshop skills of some of the other Little Board members or I would have jumped on this. As it is, others are doing the same thing either with or without Photoshop (Scott Trepel, Bill Longely, Roger Heath, David Shumaker, etc.). Besides, their names are easy to spell than mine.

Based upon my recollection of what I observed at StampShow, I do not believe the reports thus far are the end of the 'Think Vertical' analysis, unless folks just decide enough is enough and case is closed. Based upon my StampShow observations, I believe there to be other similarities.

I continue to believe that photography was involved in the process.

September 12, 2006 **Roger Heath**

I sure hope this is considered Vertical!

I would like to present what I'll call the "P" flaws of Type I Grinnells. I believe we can trace the sequence the Type I stamps were prepared by the forger.

1. Lower Serif Flaw

Taking the 13 cent Type I Grinnell #81 as the model, the "P" in postage has a lower right serif that is very faint within the "o" of Honolulu, but visible at the high magnification of scan G-81. The serif is faintly visible in the pair G30-31, and G-37. Next it became a solid dot as in G-29, G-34, G-66, and G-69. I conclude this 13 cent group was prepared is what could be called a "second attempt".

When looking at 5 cent Type I Grinnells, the "Lower Serif Flaw" only exists as a dot on both G-20 and on G-62, barely visible under the red cancel. A repeat of second attempt, no need to change "Postage".

Finally arriving at the 2 cent Type I Grinnells the forger realized that the dot had become too prominent and touched it out, as seen on G-10 and G-47. It didn't make any visual sense and no longer appeared to be part of the original serif. Third iteration of Type 1, very simply done on the negative prior to making the plate.

2. Top Serif Flaw

Paralleling the above changes from faint serif, to dot, to not dot, there is also evidence of retouching on the 2 cent "P" seen on the top left serif. Starting again with the original G-81.

There is little evidence of the top serif on the "P", but it's there. Also, there is a start of an indentation at the top of the vertical stroke. We can trace a logical sequence through the process where the fine serif became a squiggly angled line in G-31 and G-34, then it proceeds to be a finer squiggly distorted line on the 5 cent G-20 and G-62. Finally one arrives at the very distorted "serifs" of the 2 cent G-2, G-10, and G-47. The indent became progressively larger with each step.

I think the forger made a last ditch attempt in retouching this squiggle as shown on G-51. One can see that the whole top of the "P" has been strengthened and straightened. This does not appear on other stamps and may be the only example, the reason it's on the card.

If one was to forge these stamps, one would duplicate the best original, ie 13 cent Type I. Then secondly attempt the 13 cent Type II, which is what the forger had on hand. If the results were considered acceptable, the forger would move on the next denomination, finally to create the rarest stamp. By then the photocopy process would have become more familiar to him and the paste-up, retouch mechanisms fine tuned. I think the card shows some flawed attempts along with the originals. Can anyone explain the blue hair across the numeral "2" on the top right stamp of the card? It looks to me like a hair got on the negative during the process of making the plate and on printing became obvious, therefore, not shown to anyone. I don't know why it wasn't thrown away.

There is no weight to my observations, and I realize they can be shot full of holes. One method of learning is to put forth one's thoughts and await the critique!

Roger

September 12, 2006 **Steve W**

Richard M
Vertical with G80 and G81 at the top of the vertical stacks...

September 12, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Regarding my last post, I'm experimenting with a new spelling for my last name.

I think I will stick with Malmgren.

Nonetheless, Think Vertical!

September 12, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Gentlemen

Think Vertical!

September 12, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

Scott and Bill, congratulations. Between you, you've presented some of the most original and compelling philatelic research I've seen in years. Along with some of the other evidence that has surfaced during this discussion (such as the work on the numerals in the Grinnell postmarks), you've put together a completely damning case. The only major question remaining would seem to be "who was the forger" -- and I doubt we'll ever know the answer to that.

September 12, 2006 **Steve W**

Not my area of expertise, but the bottom right element on all Type I Grinnells seems to have been copied exactly from G81 (half an arc with a large point to the southeast).

Bill L - your significant finding is very well presented.

September 12, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Thanks. I found that hysterically funny as I tried out alternative scenarios -- mostly too cynical and probably wrong. Twenty years in Mississippi. Starting when? Before about 68, it must have been pretty fierce.

September 12, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Bernard B - Only lucky that the pattern genuine stamp had a pre-print wrinkle is what I meant.

September 12, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard F Lucky is a little unfair -- Bill went looking and made his own luck! But yeh, having the crease is probably better than he had any right to expect.

September 12, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Bill Longley My comments sent by email. Congratulations for a fascinating study. I think the structure of the fold was probably different from what you show, and would explain its effect on the inking better. The differences between the two flaws may say something important about how the Grinnells were made (e.g. photographically or with a hand done intermediate stage). Very cool. The new discovery seems to be playing out so beautifully. A good theory tends to gel, a bad theory drifts around.

September 12, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Bill -

I saw that flaw last week but was unable to scan and post here. There is another flaw, on the top right ornament next to the inner frame line, showing on some stamps as a solid dot, and others as a circle. There is no reason I can think of why that flaw would be on all Grinnell Type II stamps other than it was on G80 and copied. I still think the cancel is added, and many of the ornament flaws are all variations of the photographic process and multiple attempts to "get it right".

I don't recall reading here whether or not the Grinnells on the card are printed on the same type of paper, as for example G55 - 59. The scans are so different, making it impossible to compare.

Your presentation is excellent, and I'm glad I didn't attempt it myself.

Roger

September 12, 2006 **Jerry Shean** <jshean@internetcds.com>

I am a novice that has been following this discussion quite closely. Scott Trepel's work was impressive, but I was not fully convinced. However, Bill Longley's Mother of Invention is very straight forward and simple for the average reader to see. A copied crease flaw - how can that be disputed? Good job Bill.

September 12, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Bill L,

Nice work finding that printing flaw! Interesting that the "s" of "Cents" is constant among all denominations but the "e" of "Postage" is different for each denomination. Changing the denomination in a typeset forme (according to Cordrey) requires the "Cents" to be removed, not the "Postage." One would think the "e" of "Postage" would be constant and the "s" of "Cents" would have been replaced between printings in an attempt to fix it.

September 12, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Bill L:

Interesting and well-presented study.

The spur on the "s" of "Cents" on all Type 2 Grinnells would probably be rejected by the Grinnellites as evidence that the stamps are fake.

However, you have linked that type characteristic to the genuine 13c G80 (which was in Grinnell's possession) and correctly pointed out that it was created by a crease in G80 and is not in any other genuine Missionary.

This is yet another example of the Grinnell forger picking up a characteristic from the G80 stamp and incorporating it into the matrix. Only in this case they picked up something caused by a paper flaw.

Dick Celler: this is something to add to your To Do list when you compile your rebuttal article.

September 12, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Bill L - Congratulations! How lucky that the genuine "pattern" stamp had a unique flaw (and that you spotted it).

September 12, 2006 **Bill Longley**

G80- The Mother of Invention I've written an article for inclusion on the Grinnell reference page. Richard will soon provide a permanent link, but for those of you who are interested, it can be found [here](#).

Basically, the genuine #G80 (Type 2) has a preprinting crease or paper flaw that causes the "s" of "cents" to show a white area and a blue spur. This feature is unique to the genuine missionary in Grinnell's possession. It was a result of the paper variety and had nothing to do with different fonts, type, etc. It does not appear on any other genuine missionary.

But somehow this variety then appears on EVERY Type 2 missionary, 13¢, 2¢ and 5¢ that I could examine. I see #G80 as the mother, and the split "s" feature as the DNA proof that it was used as a model, with a unique feature copied to every other Type 2 Grinnell, thereby proving the Grinnells are forgeries.

I would be interested in your input and thoughts.

Sincerely,

Bill

September 12, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I just added a piece by Bill Longley [here](#)

September 12, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

G39

Rather than look at G39 alone, I would like to see all of the Grinnells if that can be arranged sometime in the future.

September 12, 2006 **Walter P**

Patrick Culhane -

Thank you for supplying a scan of G39 to Richard for posting on this Board.

With all due respect, I find myself confused with regard to your G39 post this morning:

Why would the description on the RPSL certificate, issued for G39, state 'Stamp torn at top,' when in your scan of the stamp, you can see that it appears that the stamp has a vertical tear on the right side of the stamp that extends from the top of the stamp down to a location alongside and below the numeral 13?

Would that not encompass a vertical tear that extends from the top right side of the stamp down to almost three quarters of the entire stamp?

Does the RPSL certificate issued for G39 state any other defects or alterations on this stamp?

Seeing as you are kind enough to allow Scott Trepel to examine G39 in person, this will, no doubt, in time, answer all of my questions.

However, if you could take the time to answer the questions stated above that would be very much appreciated.

September 12, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Jim -

I remember the word - kipe. Same meaning in Southern California mid to late 1950's.

Roger

September 12, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Alan Campbell...

Yes, I have seen those references to 'pounce' in all the dictionaries/references I consulted. Also, it refers to the inking device most similar to the one I am talking about—a pounce is used to deliver ink through a stencil.

In a steel mill the large funnel used to transfer the hot steel from the ladle into the molds is known as a *tundish*, however in the mill where I worked for four years everyone pronounced it the same as *tonnage*. (They did likewise at the US Steel and Bethlehem Steel mills that used to exist in the Los Angeles area.) Yet I have never found a dictionary that reflects that pronunciation.

Where I grew up in Arizona there was a slang word used the meant to steal something of little value quickly and without preplanning—kipe. You kiped a magazine from the store, you kiped your sister's radio, you kiped a pencil from someone else's desk at school. Not only is this word not universal across the United States, I have yet to find it in any dictionary. Webster's Collegiate, the only dictionary left with a direct pedigree to Noah Webster, is usually very good about including such words, even all the "four-letter" ones, sometimes with definitions so deadpan they are hilarious. Alas it is silent on "kipe".

Jim

September 12, 2006 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

G-39

It is one stamp with a tear - the RPSL description on the cert says "WPW(alsh) 12-24-19 on hinge on reverse. Stamp torn at top". You may be seeing some of the writing on the hinge show through the stamp since the paper is so thin.

I don't have a scan of the back and the earliest I could do the scan is tomorrow, since the stamp is in another location. I believe the material visible between the tear inside edges near the top is the hinge mentioned. The area right of the "e" where the intransient dot "should be" is clear of the tear.

This was one of the stamps sold to Klemann and the tear is visible in the historical photos - refer to p.4 of the RPSL book.

As far as I am aware there have been no repairs to this stamp, ever. Of course I would make it available for Scott T to examine, in answer to one of the questions.

September 12, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

I'm trying to resist being drawn back to this board until I'm caught up on writing and editing the Liberty Series book, but I don't want to leave you in limbo on that simple point. Klemann testified (trial transcript, page 15), "I then asked Grinnell whether the thirty-five stamps which were there on the table before us were all the stamps he had, and Grinnell said no, that he had eight more, but they were damaged stamps, that he had intended exhibiting them at the Southwest Museum, and because they were damaged had not intended to include them in any deal. I said if I was to do business with him I would have to have all the stamps in any find."

September 12, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Stephen Tedesco The unusual characteristics of the individual print (overinked with fill in of some features) strongly suggest this is one damaged stamp. Missing dots are found on both sides of the supposed repair.

The more interesting question is -- how did the damaged stamps arise? For plausibility? But I think Ken said they were not initially shown (how reliable the info on that though? Or maybe mentioned but not shown???)

September 12, 2006 **Greg Ioannou** <gregioannou@gmail.com>

G39 really looks to be extensively repaired. Apart from the things that have already been mentioned, the blueish smudges to the right of the 13 make me suspicious (perhaps parts of the design of another stamp underneath showing through). As well, there are two places that look to have knife cuts, and the postmark seems to be over the top of one of those cuts. On the one hand, the repairs make me not trust it as an example of anything -- it really could be two or even three stamps cobbled together to make what appears to be an intact stamps. On the other hand, why would a forger bother doing that kind of repairs to one of his forged stamps. If I were the forger I'd crumple that one up and start again. (Of course, the repairs might have been done by someone long after the putative forgeries were prepared -- perhaps someone under the illusion that the stamp was genuine?)

September 12, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Alan Campbell What do you mean by "the outlines"? What was the source, etc. Go back and compare, as recommended, Tapling 169 and G80. Note the bowed left margin of the middle bar on 169 and inside the ink squeeze of G80. How did this isomorphism come to pass in the generation of a real fake from available information and materials (Was the 169 photo available? I think it may have been? By why the odd mix of similarity and variation?) It is hard for me to visualize the sort of "channels" you suggest being generated in the process of carving a cork (have you tried it?). And I can't see why a faker would have behaved in that precise manner -- and that cancel is not transparent.

Again, look at the real markings with the chip on the bottom as a group and the fakes as a group and then G80.

September 12, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Walter P.

The stamp (G39) has some serious problems with the repair. Try to run parallel ruler lines on the top and side frame lines. This is not possible as the whole right side of the stamp cantors off. Why? There is a slanting crease that runs from the top right of the numeral three and proceeds outward to the 10 o'clock position reaching the outside frame line. The crease stops at the tear. Why? Both dots are missing and there seems to be enough room for the top right corner dot to be visible.

If I am mistaken then please have someone post a scan of the back of said stamp.

September 12, 2006 **Kim Brickman**

Grinnellers?
Grinnellinis(slightly 'ethnic')
Grinnellens(Scotch Whisky?)
Grinnellettes(junior participants)
Grinnellskis(very 'ethnic')
Grinnellites(otherworldly participants)
or....
Grinnellorama(this entire experience)

September 11, 2006 **Walter P**

Stephen Tedesco -

To be clear on this, I understand that what you meant in your post was that the stamp had been repaired, and a piece of another stamp added, which would have been from another value 2c or 5c that did not have the dot in the margin across from the e of postage.

However, I still cannot find any evidence in my color photo of G39 where the piece had been added?

September 11, 2006 **Jim Watson**

Hmmmmmm. I switched to MS IE and I could use the link. I still can't get it from my version of NS (v. 7.2). The link seems not to be of a variety that should be difficult for NS. Oh well, chalk up another point to the vagaries of software.

September 11, 2006 **Walter P**

Stephen Tedesco -

I printed out the color enlargement of G39 Richard posted today on glossy photo paper.

The photo enlargement clearly shows that the stamp is badly torn from the top of the stamp through the A of Hawaiian down through the e of Postage and continues down to just right of the numeral 13 and then down to the filigree design, where the tear appears to end.

It appears the tear has not been closed as the design of the stamp is mis-aligned in several places.

Unless you have a better photo that shows the direction of the tear clearer, it looks like the stamp is intact with a long vertical tear, as described above.

Where do you think the replaced portion you mention is located on the stamp, or otherwise, what portion of the stamp has been repaired with a piece of another stamp added on?

This would certainly explain why the dot across from the e of Postage is not there, unless of course the stamp is badly rubbed and the dot is gone.

There does appear to be a faint jagged line running from the tear, to the right of the tear, under and to the right of the Numeral 13, but I cannot be sure of that?

September 11, 2006 **Alan Campbell** <alanccamp@aol.com>

Jim Baughman:

In the early 1970's, I used a proprietary product called "Pounce" in drawing with ink on linen. Subsequently, in drawing with pencil on vellum, I used a product with the disgusting name "Scum-X", a fine powder dusted across the drawing to pick up excess graphite. Per the unabridged edition of the Oxford English Dictionary, the noun "pounce" connotes:

"A fine powder, as pulverized sandarac or cuttle-shell, used to prevent the ink from spreading in writing over an erasure or unsized paper, and also to prepare the surface of parchment to receive writing."

"A fine powder, as powdered sandarac, pipe-clay, or charcoal, dusted over a perforated pattern sheet to transfer the design to the object beneath."

Richard Malmgren:

I may be flattering myself, but I might be one of the people who looked at the cancellation on G80 with you and expressed my reservations. I am only familiar with cancelling inks of a later period (1873-1884), but in that era, genuine strikes with the appearance of outlining are so rare that I am automatically suspicious. My theory is that a fake cancelling device might have been prepared by meticulously carving the outlines with a sharp outline (Exacto knife?) and then gouging out between them. The device would then be inked, and struck several times off the stamp, so that only a fine film was left, which when then struck on the unused stamp, would yield the appearance of a lightly cancelled stamp. But if the edges had been carved deeper, they would still carry a full reservoir of ink, resulting in the outlined appearance. Painted fake cancellations, of which I think I've seen a few, look much different, very intense throughout. To my mind, meticulous fine outlining, with uniform wash infills, would require a preternaturally deft and steady hand.

September 11, 2006 **Jim Watson**

Am I the only one who cannot make use of the Grinnell Reference Page link above (<http://www.rfrajola.com/grinnells/grinnells.htm>)? All I get is a message that "the file /grinnells/grinnells.htm cannot be found. Please check the location and try again." The other links work OK.

Help!

September 11, 2006 **Stephen Tedesco**

Dick Celler,

It is obvious to me that the stamp is repaired, and thus the replaced portion that was used was not from a 13c stamp portion but one from another stamp type.

September 11, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Grinnelleans would be so much more mellifluous, though. It floweth, untripping, off the tongue.

September 11, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Scott Trepel I think G39 is speaking loudly, though I know not the tongue. 1)The dot you identify at upper right outside the outer frame line is absent. (The margin is wide enough if the cut is clean.) 2)The dot you identify near the e at upper right is absent. 3) A feature that appears in some (probably many) 13 cent Ty IIs, two dots vertically arrayed just outside the outer frameline near the top of the lower left corner ornament, is absent. Was the inking or impressing done slightly differently on this? The above observations are hard to square with the evidence of an overinked impression -- although, hmmm, mebbe -- yes the left outer frame line especially and the lower inner frameline are fragmented. This could be caused by flaking of of ink, which can happen with overinking (cf around Blackjack numerals sometimes). I don't know if this could explain all three anomalies.

September 11, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Bill S:

Regarding your observation:

The tear in G39 does go thru the "e" and down to the bottom label of the entire stamp, but the white area just to the right of the "e" seems clear, and that's where we would expect to see a dot.

Nonetheless, it is possible that the paper has been scuffed or affected in a way we cannot see in the scan.

From the enlarged color scan of G39 I also notice a blue dot between the thick and thin framelines at left, where it appears on the 2c Type II. Very interesting and not something I could see before Pat posted his image.

These anomalies in one stamp might have simple explanations, but they do nothing to change the other Type II Grinnells or undermine the premise of my article. The repetitive marks on the Type II Grinnells are hardly "transient", and it will take a lot more than one damaged stamp to explain why they appear on the Grinnells and not on the genuine Missionaries.

I look forward to Dick Celler's rebuttal article, assuming he plans to write one that addresses the repetitive marks and the 7-bar grid cancel.

September 11, 2006 **Walter P**

To All-

It just occurred to me, now that the George Grinnell supports have grown from being a sect, to being named the 'Grinnellites,' thereby attaining instant cult status.

I now find myself pondering who the 'Grinnellites' spokesman and or leader may be?

Can anyone help me out there?

September 11, 2006 **Bill Seymour** <billsey@comcast.net>

That scan of #G39 sure looks like the tear goes pretty much right through the center of the 'e' to me ... and continues down quite some distance from there.

September 11, 2006 **Ken Stach** <kstach@houston.rr.com>

I am just getting caught up on the "Grinnell Board" happenings. Wow! Scott T has certainly added a lot to the anti-Grinnellite argument...which, by the way, I have agreed with all along.

We all anxiously await the rebuttal from the "other Ken" (Ken L) to Scott T's scientific data.

September 11, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Bernard B:

At first I thought the G80 grid was just like the strikes on the Grinnells, but after working with the overlays and realizing that the Grinnell grids were replicas of the G80 strike, I decided it is genuine.

Reminds me of Blade Runner ("Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?")...replicants can be difficult to identify.

September 11, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Scott T The word "all" could be qualified without harm to the argument. The nature of the sample is always interesting.

September 11, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Scott T After all, your comment about the presence of a fake grid on a genuine stamp was what set me off to all those hours convincing myself that it wasn't fake and writing it up for the board! I did see that the statement was actually non committal, but I thought you were taking the G80 grid as fake.

September 11, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Scott T That is a very nice discussion and tremendously helpful, not just for the information, but also the simplicity and clarity of the discussion. I do think the point is a bit lost that even if G80 does not have a genuine cancellation, it is not help for the pro Grinnell argument. When one compares the genuine markings AS A GROUP with the Grinnells as a group, the Grinnells are clearly imitations of the genuine marking, whatever the story with G80, which is a special case. (My earlier comments dealt with some of the new detail questions. I would love to place 169 next G80 as there is a hint of a super fingerprint match.)

I would have loved to have seen a study of the full range of variation and evolution of the genuine marking, but this is unnecessary for the basic thesis.

A very nice study.

It also leaves open the question of information flow from the two genuine stamps into the designs of the Grinnells, which I hope someone will consider producing at the level of clarity of your article.

September 11, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Patrick Culhane sent me a scan of #G39 which is [here](#). I will attempt to link up to the reference page when time permits.

Dick C - Please put your comments into an article format and I will post without comment.

September 11, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Richard Frajola

You posted: *Please lightened up a little. It is rather unfair to accuse somebody of "taking liberties" because they omitted to discuss a stamp (#G39) for which there is no good scan on the reference page.*

I don't know what Scott Trepel has for pictures of Grinnells or Missionaries, I'm relying on what he has in his analysis. He wrote on page 3 *After carefully studying every Grinnell image and every genuine Missionary stamp, the writer is confident ...*

The captions for Figures 2, 3, and 4 unequivocally state (in bold type) **All 2c Type II Grinnell stamps have these marks, All 5c Type II Grinnell stamps have this mark, All 13c Type II Grinnell stamps have these marks.**

I didn't see any caveats that he had poor scans, was missing some scans, or decided to leave G39 out because it had a tear. Did I miss them? This led me to believe Scott has good data, and as he posted today that he knew G39 did not have the dot, I have no reason not to stand by my previous posts.

If correcting Scott's mistaken claims is too "heavy" for the board, I plead guilty. There will be more corrections as I have the chance to do the research.

September 11, 2006 **Walter P**

Scott Trepel -

To take the 'High Road' is always a wise decision.

In any event, your submission is posted on the Board and the onus to prove it flawed now rests with Dick Celler and the 'Grinnellits.'

September 11, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Walter P:

I appreciate the post.

If I do not acknowledge further posts, supportive or not, it is because I really want to let my article stand as is and do not want to get into a back-and-forth dialogue.

Nor do I want to appear to be working up a torch and pitchfork party to attack the Grinnellites.

I will re-enter the discussion when there is something substantive to discuss.

September 11, 2006 **Walter P**

Scott Trepel -

I think you must know that the Grinnell owners and Dick Celler are not going to accept any finding that does not point to the Grinnell stamps being genuine Hawaii postage stamps from a separate contemporary printing.

Even though this in itself is rather sad it does not diminish your excellent work and certainly does not prove your findings are flawed.

The stamp in question is poorly illustrated in the RPSL book and unless you have access to a large color scan, or in this case, because of the damage to the stamp, an opportunity to examine the actual stamp, you were most correct in omitting this stamp from your submission.

Perhaps, Patrick Culhane will allow you to examine this stamp in person, as there could have been a dot on the stamp, but it would be impossible to tell for sure, without examining the stamp in person? It is possible the dot was obscured because of the damage to the stamp?

(edited by RCF)

Dick Celler, you are the plating expert, why not prove to the Board readers, with real evidence, that Scott Trepel's submission is flawed.

September 11, 2006 **Nick Kirke** <agenturakirke@seznam.cz>

Scott T,

Why didn't you become a policeman? The boys in blue need someone like you

And don't be to Grundy - is that a word? - or else I can those NYFM estimates going thru the roof

September 11, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Please lighten up a little. It is rather unfair to accuse somebody of "taking liberties" because they omitted to discuss a stamp (#G39) for which there is no good scan on the reference page.

Dick C - If you wish to write a piece for inclusion on the reference page as to why you consider the stamps and postmarks genuine, I will certainly post it.

September 11, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Dick C:

Liberties?

Ah, let's see.

I broke into the Royal and drew dots on stamps that didn't have them.

I erased dots from genuine Missionaries I've handled.

I changed the cancels to make them look different.

And the dog is pregnant.

This is a good time to stop posting and get my Fall sale catalogues finished.

September 11, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Dick C:

Re 2c Type II with two dots, it is difficult to say how many do or do not, because some have that area covered by a cancel.

I went on the assumption that most or all of them have some evidence of the flaw, even if I cannot see it.

September 11, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Scott Trepel

Let me see if I have this straight. In your Figure 4, showing the "e dot", the caption says: *Two 13c Type II Grinnell stamps, both showing the dot to the right of "e" of "Postage" and another between stamps. All 13c Type II Grinnell stamps have these marks.*

You said this knowing G-39 had no dot? What other "liberties" did you take in your analysis so it fit your conclusions?

September 11, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Dick C:

You said "I think it is apparent that you choose to exclude G-39 because it does not fit your theory, not because it is torn."

I did not "choose" to "exclude" anything. The stamp is torn in that area (I have a clear B&W photo). Maybe there was a dot, maybe not, but with damage in the upper right area, I could not rely on that sole example.

You are a plater. Look at all of the 13c Type II's and decide for yourself. Do you really think that dot is a transient flaw?

Please do not take cheap shots by asserting that I selectively excluded items that do not fit with my theory. I think you'll be hard-pressed to find examples that do not show the flaws I described.

It is not necessarily my objective to convince you and the owners to accept my analysis. At this point, that's probably an unrealistic goal.

September 11, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Scott Trepel

Pat sent me a good scan of the G-39. There is no "e dot". The tear does not affect where the "e dot" should be. It isn't even close. Perhaps Pat might post a scan of the area in question.

I think it is apparent that you choose to exclude G-39 because it does not fit your theory, not because it is torn.

To answer your question to Pat, ALL the other Grinnell 13c Type II stamps show the "e dot" (the cancel on G-38 covers this area, so we don't know for sure if it has the "e dot" or not. The mystery is why G-39 does not have the dot.

How many missionary 2c Type II stamps have the "2 dots" in the LR corner you illustrate? How many do not? Which ones?

September 11, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Patrick C:

I also noticed that the "e" of Postage is deformed and there is a visible tear at top right. Therefore, I believe the stamp is damaged to a degree that makes it an unreliable source of visual evidence.

But keep looking! (How many did you find WITH the dot?)

September 11, 2006 **Nick Kirke** <agenturakirke@seznam.cz>

Scott Trepel,

That's the best and clearest summary I've read and now, for the very first time, I'm up to speed as they say. You have not involved personalities or cast aspersions just kept to the job in hand of producing hard evidence which I think is compelling.

Of course you have now provided something for the otherside to grind their axe upon. But at least the onus has clearly shifted to the Grinnell camp to disprove your findings.

In danger of swamping you with congratulations but well done.

September 10, 2006 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

Scott T:

Re: the dot you refer to in the Type II 13-cent Grinnell stamp next to the "e" of Postage.

It does not appear on G-39, which is heavily inked (RPSL book p.48, cert. 181741). The tear shown is well clear of the area lower right of the "e". It appears to be "transient" after all.

September 10, 2006 **Walter P**

Scott Trepel -

Congratulations on your latest Grinnell stamp effort. Your findings and conclusions drawn appear to be carefully thought out and founded on solid ground.

Not being an Hawaii stamp expert myself, it will be interesting to hear from those that are, vis-a-vis their comments on this Board.

Thanks to you, another leak as sprung on the good ship SS George Grinnell. The 'Grinnellites' may now not be able to bail fast enough to stop the ship from sinking.

Thank you for your valuable time and for sharing your findings with us all.

September 10, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Correction: grid known in early state staring from 9/1852

September 10, 2006 **Steve W**

Actually, Adobe gives Acrobat Reader away for free because their corporate strategy is to maintain PDF as a standard file type for images.

September 10, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Bill Weiss - Adobe gives away Acrobat Reader no strings attached because they sell for a hefty price the full version that allows you to write or manipulate pdfs. Much like inkjet printers are practically free because the manufacturers then sell the ink at incredible prices.

September 10, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Also, a Tapling #3 13c that I had omitted has now been added.

September 10, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I received some 13c Tapling stamp number corrections from Dick Celler which have been fixed. I also received several cover scans from Steve Walske which have been added to the cover census.

September 10, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Carl R:

I think my explanation is simpler and supported by the evidence, but in any case the Grinnellites will have a tough time claiming that the cancels are worn versions of a cancel known in its early state in 1853.

September 10, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Roger H:

There is a difference between the plate flaws in the actual lines, ornaments and type, and the floating background flaws in white areas I have identified. Please make sure you understand the difference.

Because of the significant differences between the Grinnells and genuine Missionaries, I do not believe the Grinnells were made entirely by photoreproduction. I think there was some artistry involved in creating the matrices for each of the 2c, 5c and 13c pairs of types.

September 10, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

RICHARD M:

Your Question:

"Regarding the 'outline' on a cork cancel and staying strictly with the 'outline' and not complicating it with other factors, do I interpret correctly that each of you believe the 'outline' is simply the result of an abundance of oily ink that is pushed out to the perimeters of the bars during the stamping or rolling on of the cancel? Importantly and to use a different choice of words, do you each disagree that evidence of an 'outline' is a potential red flag that requires further investigation into the legitimacy of a particular cork cancel?"

Answer:

Genuine cancellations vary widely in appearance, even for the same cancel. Fake cancellations vary widely in appearance, even for the same cancel. An "outline" has been a red flag in certain cases, especially for certain fake fancy cancels made in Europe since WWII, which have a mottled appearance and sometimes have an outline. Outlines and spotting are also characteristics of Fox fakes. However, outline does not equal fake.

September 10, 2006 **Carl Roberts**

Scott Trepel,

Thanks for sharing your studies and presenting them so clearly. Well done!

There is, though, one observation about the images on Page 7. Consider for a moment the possibility that all of the 7-bar grid cancels on the page are genuine... the known genuine example, then the G80 cancel, and finally the combined Grinnells G8/G60.

Viewing those and your extracted images of the cancels directly below them, it looks like the three images in a row show a very clear progression.

That is, the first cancel shown is clear and sharp, and the bars are narrow in comparison to the others, suggesting that it could represent early use of the cancel device.

Then G80 is rougher, and the bars are noticeably wider with less white space between, perhaps swelling from absorption of ink.

Finally the Grinnell cancels - the bars appear to have widened even more, and not just due to over inking, the ragged edge features on G80 are still evident but spread wider and the white spaces are even narrower.

Doesn't this suggest that they were created in that order, with the Grinnells cancelled last, after the cancel device had deteriorated? And doesn't that raise the possibility that by the time the cancel was used on G80, it had lost a chunk at the top right edge, explaining why it is missing on the Grinnells? And how or why

would a forger make a copy that suggests such a progression?

If I understand the Grinnellite theory of when the Grinnells were used, that sequence of uses seems wrong. My understanding is the Grinnells would've been the first Missionary stamps to be used, during that period when no other Missionaries are found.

So I'm not convinced (yet) that the cancel was forged, but if it's genuine I don't see how that ragged 7-bar on the Grinnells could possibly be an early use.

It does suggest to me though that the Grinnells were printed at a time when the cancel device was still available.

Carl

September 10, 2006 **Roger Heath**

I have a couple of questions based on the following assumptions.

All Type II Grinnells have the same "plate flaws".

All Type I Grinnells have nearly identical flaws in the ornaments and line breaks.

Are Type I Grinnells photocopies of G-81 after having the red cancel touched out?

And if G-81 was the Type I "model" for the forger, isn't it logical that G-80 was the model for the Type II Grinnells?

If these two assumptions are correct, it seems to me that the cork cancel on G-80 must have been added after the photographs were taken, as too much detail is obliterated by the cork cancel on G-80 to create a reasonable photo paste-up. When I brought this up previously it was mentioned there could have been a smaller original pen cancel with the cork added. This makes sense to me as the cork cancel is now being debated as to whether it was added to the stamp in Honolulu, or California.

Concerning the possible fake cork cancel defacing of G-80: The value of one real Missionary must be weighed against the potential price asked of the group, which was almost a successful deal.

If my assumption is not true, which stamp was used to create the Type II Grinnells?

BTW - I looked at my pre-1857 Swiss Strubels which have rhomboid grid cancels, a few show the outline effect similar to the cork cancel. They tend to look "wetter" than normal. My ISP has been down since Tuesday so I've not been able to provide links to any scans this week.

Roger

September 09, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Scott T

Bye the bye and while Stanley and I were discussing the latest contribution to the Grinnell Reference Page, the grape was indeed being consumed.

Scott T and Steve W

This following is no way argumentative.

At StampShow and while at the Mystic Booth looking at, among other things, G80, two contributors to the Big Boys Board (neither of them were Stanley) came up on separate occasions and spoke with me. One of them is very much into cancels in his collecting arena. Each of them was critical of the 7-bar cancel on G80 because of the 'outline'. The comment was that the 'outline' was possible evidence of a counterfeit cancel.

I agree that some of the 7-bars on genuine Missionaries have an observable 'outline'.

I collect cancels on Hawaiian stamps, but I have never given consideration to the possibility of an 'outline' test before.

Regarding the 'outline' on a cork cancel and staying strictly with the 'outline' and not complicating it with other factors, do I interpret correctly that each of you believe the 'outline' is simply the result of an abundance of oily ink that is pushed out to the perimeters of the bars during the stamping or rolling on of the cancel? Importantly and to use a different choice of words, do you each disagree that evidence of an 'outline' is a potential red flag that requires further investigation into the legitimacy of a particular cork cancel?

This is not intended to be a trick question. I simply do not know and had never thought about such before. My impression is that your answers have already been provided, but I want to be sure I fully understand and that there is not some other consideration about an 'outline' that I am missing.

September 09, 2006 **Steve W**

Richard M,

As Scott suggests, when grid cancels are heavily inked, the "outline" effect can arise. For examples, look at numbers 169 and 171 in the #4 census (your wonderful #3 - census #119 - shows the same effect at the upper edge of the cancel). The 5c census #70 does not show this effect because the device very clearly slid upwards on the cover when the cancel was being applied, so the edges became blurred.

I believe that the outline effect arises from a combination of a lot of ink, and a slight rocking of the cancel device as the marking is applied.

A word of caution is worthwhile; just as many of the Missionary stamps have been repaired, many of the cancels have been lightened to "improve their appearance". This would have the effect of diluting the edges of the original cancels.

September 09, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Richard M:

The "outline" is simply where a concentration of oily black ink has collected around the edges of the bar. When pressure is applied to the cork cancel, the ink

along the perimeter (sub-surface, along the sides) comes in contact with the paper. It is also possible for ink to spread to the perimeter. The effect is an outline of darker, more concentrated ink.

Some grid strikes are lightly inked and a soft semi-transparent gray. Others are heavily inked and jet black. Judging from the paper staining on G80, I would say that the ink mixture used was very oily.

Having studied fancy cancellations in depth, I am not alarmed by the appearance of the G80 strike. In fact, it's just how I would expect a genuine strike to appear. That doesn't mean it's absolutely, positively genuine, but considering the circumstances (on a 13c Missionary) and its fine details and overall configuration (as shown in my analysis), I would say it's genuine.

September 09, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

By the way, I made sort of a stupid comment. I do understand that ink is not applied to a cork cancel by either a roller or a pounce. When I said that I had an earlier posting by Jim Bauchman in my mind.

September 09, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Question for whomever:

Stanley Piller questions the genuineness or not of the 7-bar cancel on G80 in part because the cancel 'appears to be outlined'.

The G-80 cancel indeed appears outlined (although I do not subscribe to this being necessarily a separate, hand drawn outline). The outline on G80 is especially noticeable on the Mystic blowup at StampShow.

I recollect noticing an 'outline' on 7-bar cancels on both accepted genuine Missionaries as well as Grinnells. Admittedly, I have not seen enlargements of all that many Missionaries. My sense is that the 'outline' is most evident with the Grinnells – but I believe it is still noticeable on some accepted Missionaries.

Assuming the 'outline' is not prima fascia evidence of a fake, my question is how does this 'outline' develop when a cork cancel is struck on a stamp? It is not something I have given a lot of thought to before. The cancel gives the appearance of someone having first partially traced in black ink the outline of the bars on the stamp before applying the cancel to fit within the 'outline'. (I do not personally believe this is the case, but it does sort of look like such.) I suspect that the ink - whether applied by a roller or a pounce (and I am familiar with the application of each) must accumulate in some manner on the perimeter outline of the 'raised bars' of the cork cancel, but I am having trouble visualizing how this occurs.

Is it surface tension?

At StampShow, I talked to two people in front of the Mystic blowup of G80, each of whom thought the 'outline' or tracing around the 7-bar cancel was evidence of fakery. As noted above, I am not certain of that since I recollect seeing an 'outline' on accepted 7-bar cancels.

Still, how does it come about? Is this easily explained?

Perhaps Richard Frajola and/or Steve Walske and/or someone else can educate me?

September 09, 2006 **Bill Duffney**

Scott T —

Marvelous analysis. THE CARD OF TEN is the *Faker's Notepad*.

September 09, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Patrick C I was extremely upset when I finally saw the scans of the two genuine stamps. I had already reached the firm opinion that the cancels and postmarks on the Grinnells were produced using a photographic process and had spent considerable time trying to find the "original" pattern for the cancel.

I was looking for a cancel that was identical to the corresponding portions of the Grinnell. After the stamps were found, I felt that had good scans of the stamps been provided earlier, they would have immediately been identified as those missing patterns.

This can easily be confirmed by side by side comparison with other genuine. Also, when placed side-by-side with Grinnells, I think even a novice will be able to see the difference in ink composition. As I have said, the ink used to cancel the Grinnells looks different. I attribute this to less oil in the ink mixture and application on the Grinnells having been made from a less pourous device material than was used on originals.

September 09, 2006 **Steve W**

Patrick,

After Scott's analysis, I think that most people will come to the conclusion that the G80 cancel is genuine. It has been an unlikely theory that someone would put a fake cancel on a genuine Missionary in perfect condition.

As Scott says, there are two types of identifying characteristics on cancels. The first type are flaws that arise from the device itself, and the second are flaws that arise from the strike, such as ink not fully applied, the strike not completely orthogonal to the surface, the twisting of the device while being applied, etc. All these leave incomplete or twisted impressions, but do not occur on the preponderance of examples because they are specific to a particular strike.

If you look at Scott's scans, you will see a number of device flaws that are common to genuine 7-bar scans and the G80 scan. The shortened top bar and the little indentation at the top of the G80 cancel, however, are strike variations. Dick, with all of his skill in plating stamps, missed this important aspect of cancellation assessment.

The further fact that a number of the Grinnell 7-bar scans show those strike variations in great detail indicates that those Grinnell cancels are fakes. The six examples illustrated in the RPSL book carrying the G4a 7-bar cancel (like the one on G80) are also quite uniform in the replication of the flaws on G80. This, too, would not occur naturally, and shows clearly that they are derivatives of G80.

I am not competent to comment on the underlying stamps, but the cancels are bad.

September 08, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Bill W:

Some things really are free. Acrobat Reader is one of them. Go to their website and download it.

Jim B:

Thanks for clarifying "forme" vs. "form". Actually, one of my reviewers suggested the same thing, and I told him I thought forme with an e was the British version.

Patrick C:

I'm as sure as one can be about the G80 cancel being genuine. The configuration of the bars is a match for the genuine grid, and there are slight irregularities in the bars that conform to the genuine. The Grinnell replica is close but there are slight differences.

Stanley P:

There are much better things to talk about with Richard than my Grinnell article. Burgundy, Rhone, Bordeaux, Mai Tais.

September 08, 2006 **Stan Piller** <stmpdlr@aol.com>

Patrick Culhane

I think that before one conclusively calls the cancel on G80 genuine or fake, one has to examine it directly and not under glass. I suggest it be submitted to the Philatelic Foundation. I have my doubts it is genuine but that is based upon looking at enlarged photos of the stamp. I have not seen the backside of the stamp. Until then I have concerns as to it being genuine or fake but nothing I can definitely say. My reasons I think it is possibly bad among others is because the cancel appears to be outlined when the enlarged mystic blowups were viewed. But without viewing the stamp I can't really expertise it.

September 08, 2006 **Stan Piller** <stmpdlr@aol.com>

Scott

I just finished reading your annalysis. You did a great job and I agree with your conclusions. I'm in Honolulu this week and had a lunch meeting today with Richard Malmgren and others and your article was one of our topics of discussion. I wonder if Linn's has the guts to pick up your posting and run your conclusions.

Again you did a great job, and thanks again to Richard for providing this board.

September 08, 2006 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

Scott T.

I read your article and have the following question:

What is it about the cancel on G-80 that convinces you that it (the cancel) is genuine?

I ask because those who are sure the Grinnells are forgeries fall into two distinct camps: those who think the G-80 cancel is genuine and those who are certain it is not.

What convinces you it is genuine?

I am also interested in how others contributing to this board who are versed in such matters feel about the G-80 cancel: genuine, bogus, or don't know – and why.

September 08, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Maybe we can take another poll tomorrow on where everyone stands now on the genuineness of the Grinnells.

I have to say remarkable restraint has been exercised by certain individuals in recent posts to this board. The origin of the Grinnells is a very hot-button issue, and people have invested a lot of time, logic and expertise trying to arrive at the truth, occasionally staking their hard-earned reputations in the process. I have learned a great deal over the course of this discussion.

September 08, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Scott... I left out the most important part of my message to you--congratulations on the brilliant, masterful job of your Grinnell analysis. Yes, even the RPSL can interpret things incorrectly.

September 08, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Bill W... PDF files can only be read by Adobe software. If you want I can print a copy and mail it to you. Send me a note with your snail address to jfdire-at-sbcglobal-dot-net.

Scott... Just a tiny suggestion, but a printing form is also known as a *forme*, which helps to keep people from getting the term confused with other uses of the word form. Also, a mechanical press would use a roller to ink the plate, but a flat hand press would use what we always used to call a "pounce", a wad of padded leather that was struck into the ink then applied to the raised type in the forme before the paper was applied and the press cranked down. Because of the way the Missionaries were printed, they may have been done on a hand press. (Alas I have not been able to find dictionary validation of the word "pounce" for this use, so the point may be moot. But while woodblocks printed on a hand press are inked with a roller, handset type is inked with the device I have described.)

September 08, 2006 **Steve W**

Bill - Adobe Acrobat Reader is a free download from Adobe.

September 08, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

While I would love to read Scott's presentation, I find that I can't download a PDF file without subscribing to Abobe on my computer, and I don't want to get involved with subscribing to something just to read a random article. Any suggestions?

September 08, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

ST - Happy to play the muse ... the word does seem apt in many cases.

September 08, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Richard F:

Yes, but I thought of it as inspiration, not theft. I actually thought about putting attribution in the Endnotes, but I elected to acknowledge the Frajola Grinnell Board instead.

However, I now refer to it as the Grinola Board.

September 08, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Frajola -

I agree in fact the group is likely to grow as Don Sundman expands his efforts in promoting the idea that the Grinnell stamps may be genuine.

Rumour has it that Don is thinking about forming a group that is similar to the cult group that follows Star Trek television shows and movies, as you probably already know, their called "Trekies."

Trekies attend conventions that are very similar to stamp shows where they dress up as Star Trek characters and buy and sell Star Trek memorabilia.

Perhaps, Don will adopt the name, with Scott's permission, 'Grinnellites' and host the very first Grinnellite Convention in, where else, New York City.

Grinnellites could dress up and assume Grinnell Saga characters like George Grinnell, Postmaster Whitney, Ken Lawrence etc.

Seeing as Richard Malmgren has already posted on this Board that he wanted to pretend to be Scott Trepel, he could attend the convention disguised as Scott.

Don could also design and market "Grinnellite" action figures which he could sell at the shows.

If the Grinnell Saga ever gains 'Cult Status' and has enough followers, this may all come to pass. What a grim thought.

September 08, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Scott Trepel An excellent presentation!

Did you steal the word "Grinnellites" from me, or did somebody else use it first? After your article, I think for the sect to grow they are going to have to start reproducing, not just advertising and having conventions.

September 08, 2006 **Mike E**

PS Last one out shut off the lights...

September 08, 2006 **Mike E**

Scott T,
Yeah but....
;-)
Nice work.

September 08, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

A smaller file size version linked [here](#)

September 08, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Scott Trepel's analysis of the Grinnells has been added to the main reference page. It is a large (8.8meg PDF file). I recommend clicking on the [link](#) and downloading to your computer before opening.

September 08, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

The second last paragraph of your post this morning to Richard M is one of the best statements you have ever made regarding the Grinnell stamps.

Now, if you could only stop wasting your time defending George Grinnell, and stay on track, you will probaby end up with coming as close as it is humanly possible in solving the Grinnell stamp mystery.

I don't think you will have all the definitive answers, however I do think that after carefully sifting through all of the available information past and present, which it appears you are doing, you should be able to provide some answers, albeit the answers will for the most part be based on a balance of probabilities.

However, sadly, no matter where your investigation leads you and no matter what your findings end up being, the owners of the Grinnells will not accept any finding that does not support their belief that the Grinnell stamps are genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps.

Dare I hope, that the book you are presently working on is a book on the Grinnells?

September 08, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

Keith Cordrey completed only his study of the 2¢ Type II, no others.

Your study can't demonstrate anything significant except in relation to genuine Missionaries. If the same effects occur on them, your findings are more evidence of authenticity than of forgery.

So you need a different starting point if your findings are to be sound, trustworthy, and useful.

First examine the ornaments as originally cast and printed without wear and damage. The RPSL reproduced enlargements of the 1848 George Bruce & Co. catalog sample, Advertiser sale lot 31 from 1853, and Gill's later samples, all on page 56.

From that beginning, compare to ornaments on the Missionaries. You'll probably be surprised at the distortions, including improbably cockeyed and reshaped internal elements and altered outer portions. See how many of those you record, and how consistent they remain within a denomination and type, and then to another denomination.

After you have those data, compare them to your Grinnell findings to see if they demonstrate what you suspect. It's a tall challenge.

September 08, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

I did not take offense, but I'm blessed that I have never wanted to be anyone else, and I count my blessings daily.

As a job in a studio, photography oppressed me. During more than 20 years as a civil-rights activist in Mississippi, I took hundreds of pictures that were published all over, and some now appear in history books, but as far as I know, none were credited to me. All I have left of them is a plastic tub full of old black-and-white negatives. As a hobby for my senior years, photography of no social significance satisfies a calling that still glows within.

Back to the hobby we share on this board.

One problem with the historical record, riddled as it is with voids, is that each separate document and report may be true but the presumed links that connect them may not be. This is what makes mysteries in the first place, makes them challenging to contemplate, and makes them gratifying to solve.

If you have read Dick Graham's story about solving the 10¢ Knoxville provisional cover mystery, you can understand what I mean. He pursued it despite near universal sneers of derision from the Confederate philatelic expert consensus, but he was right in the end (along with his patron, the cover's owner Scott Gallagher), and the cover was finally certified as genuine. Admittedly Dick was less an interloper in those circles than I am perceived to be by the classic Hawaii philatelic establishment, but here we inhabit a generally hospitable community, and Richard Frajola is a tolerant host.

Ursula Emerson did correspond with Hannah Shattuck, and Charles Shattuck was her heir. George Grinnell did visit Charles Shattuck in 1918. Grinnell stated that he got some Hawaiian stamps from Shattuck, and Shattuck's heirs belatedly agreed. Maybe true, maybe not.

The heirs' research and hypotheses have pursued their deduction that the stamps originated in that old family correspondence, which is reasonable, but that is not the only possible way that Shattuck could have obtained the stamps if the Grinnell-Shattuck story is true, and is unlikely if the story is not true.

As for official reprints of postage stamps, the 1893 news reports, not confined to obscure foreign philatelic sources, robustly revive the possibility that some were Missionaries.

Charles Posner is correct that the coup perpetrators abetted by Thomas Thrum zealously flooded the United States philatelic market with Hawaiian postage stamps touted as rarities. So his suggestion that we should pay closer attention to those events is sound advice, whether or not they connect to Grinnell's stamps.

Immediately upon receiving reports of eight Missionaries being discovered in a Honolulu government office, one San Francisco collector hopped a ship to Honolulu with \$10,000 in his bag. The rich California lawyer who had merely written a letter offering \$500 for the Missionaries and any leftover Numerals lost out to the quicker and more aggressive buyer. But what did the man's \$10,000 buy?

Hawaiian presses ran overtime to satisfy a cleverly promoted demand for stamps, old and new. Maybe they copied the eight Missionaries, or maybe the eight Missionaries were officially manufactured copies, samples of more in store or more to come. What became of them?

In light of these reports that predated the French report by many months, my previous hypothesis that the stamps went to Ferrary is implausible. They went to California. Judging by the published correspondence, one man took the entire hoard. What might he have done with it? Sold it? Kept it until he died? Left it with his former spouse?

At present no one knows these answers, because until now it wasn't possible to pose the questions. They may have no connection whatever to Grinnell and his stamps, but how many troves of previously unrecorded Hawaiian Missionaries got to California in time for his discovery?

You are not the only one whose imagination composes narrative plots set at the Southwest Museum. Mrs. Carpenter is known to have resided in both Oakland and Pasadena, and to have possessed a collection of classic Hawaiian stamps. Maybe her ex-husband had collected them in 1893 and added them to his collection. Maybe when Hector Alliot dispatched curator Charles Sidney Thompson (not George Grinnell) to bring her seashell collection to the museum, one of the ratgnawed boxes contained a mariner's 1852 letter, a prayer book, and an envelope of stamps. From that your conspiracy theory still flows smoothly, except they

would be official reprints.

In the final analysis, the Grinnell stamps may be counterfeits. But the stamp community at large won't accept that verdict, or any verdict, until we have presented and examined all the evidence, all the possible interpretations, and have swept away the false testimony and misleading interpretations that have cluttered the record since 1922.

If I fail to respond speedily to posts here, it's because I'm hard at work on a book with a short deadline, not because I've tuned out.

September 07, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Patrick C.

Your stamps are frustrating but oh so fun!

I looked at the LR corner ornament in the Type II designs as you said, and you are correct. Thank you for pointing that out. The little circles changed diameter from the 13 cent to the 5 cent.

NEED CONFIRMATION ON THE FOLLOWING:

I then looked for some more differences on the Type II designs and found something pretty interesting on the 2 cent. The "candy canes" under ornament O-1 appear to be higher than in the adjacent O-2, but on the 5 cent these canes are more in line. Hmmmm... a good indication of individual type, right?

So, I made enlarged prints of the mint pairs of each denomination (as posted on this site) and marked the consistent traits in blue and the changing ones in red. Problem: the "candy canes" vary position among each denomination, but the shading lines in the pearls DO NOT. For example, in ornament O-1 the outer pearl on the left side has a shading line that runs roughly 9:00 to 12:00 and on O-2 the right outer pearl shading line runs from about 10:30 to 1:30 that arcs into the pearl. These qualities are consistent on the 2, 5 and 13 cent pairs (Type II or left-hand stamp in pair). I drew a blue line tangent to the two outermost inside pearls (around the numeral) and found no vertical variation on those pieces of "type" that would suggest whole type was moving vertically relative to each other.

I then drew a red line from the point of the upper left corner ornament to the point of the right one on each value, such that it went through the curls of the "candy canes." Eureka - the canes move, but not the body of piece of "type" they are attached to! On the 2 cent, the canes are higher on O-1 than O-2, then on the 5 cent they get more in line as the "heart" or cane pair drops down a bit, and finally on the 13 cent the center two canes (or heart) of O-1 are MUCH higher than the others.

Thinking of the unique shading lines inside the pearls as individual fingerprints, the gentlemen called O-1 and O-2 show up on every denominations but change canes as they move along. The amount of variation suggest touching up a model to create differences much more than it suggests damaged type, IMHO. Regardless of my opinion, an expert on typeset impressions could probably take that and run.

Did Cordrey notice this?

September 07, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken Lawrence

I returned to the office to review the Board and, among other things, I read my posting to the Ansel Adams wanna be.

It occurs to me that my salutation could be taken as belittling. Believe me that was not my intention. I may not buy into your Grinnell imaginations, but I have a high regard for you or anyone else's wanting to be an Ansel Adams wanna be.

September 07, 2006 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

Scott T:

I agree there could be paper shrinkage. I can't help with G50-51 in particular as they are not mine. Will take a look at the width correction you suggest on the ones I was studying. I also concur with your point on overlays, though the observation I cited to David S can be observed on multiple examples (all I've looked at) and thus I don't think paper distortion is at play on that one.

September 07, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Patrick C:

Working with the scans, I find that the width differences in a few of the Grinnells can be eliminated by applying a very slight percentage increase (1-1.5%) to the width of the narrower stamp.

I cannot find a difference in the gap between one specific part and another (for example, extra space between one letter and the next).

If, as you say, this is not a scanning issue (although I think it is in the case of G50-51), this indicates that there is a paper shrinkage issue. It's another reason why one must be careful about drawing conclusions from overlays. Some conclusions are valid, while others are questionable due to the distortions in paper.

September 07, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

To Mr. Ansel Adams Wanna Be

Judie and I just returned home from the Honolulu Academy of Arts for the opening night of Ansel Adams at Manzanar, an exhibition of Ansel Adams prints made independently and without payment by the famed landscape photographer about the World War II internment camp for Japanese Americans. Adams published his photographs in a book Born Free and Equal.

As a youth and while others were accumulating printers ink beneath their finger nails, I spent a fair amount of time hiking the High Sierras. Among other things, I hiked up Mount Whitney from the backside where there were no trails. The brochure for Adams' Manzanar exhibit has a quote on the back by one of the writers for the Manzanar Free Press (the Japanese American newspaper publication at Manzanar) to the effect that "After this is all over, when Manzanar is nothing but a

dim memory in the cycle of one's life, the High Sierras will be remembered with fond memories and not with cynicism or bitterness."

I love the Sierras. I love Ansel Adams photographs. Internment of Japanese Americans was a crime. The Grinnells are not real. The foregoing are truisms.

Of course, my mind remains open to convincing evidence. And no, I would not spend \$20,000 for a Grinnell unless it was the Card of 10.

September 06, 2006 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

David Shumaker

One example is the lower right corner ornament of the Type II, which varies between the 13-cent value and the others. The 2 and 5-cent lower right corner (Type II) ornaments may be different from each other as well – I have obtained one opinion saying they are the same and one saying they are different. The easiest way to differentiate the 13-cent version and the others is to align the "flower" via a transparency and see the difference in the tilt of the "w" shaped element on the north side of the ornament.

Scott Trepel

The variation in measurements is real – I have noticed it more notably in the 5-cent values where the variation in width can approach (roughly) the width of the larger rule (side to side across the stamp). It's not (in general) a scanner issue.

Richard Malmgren

Belated thank you for your kind comments posted after StampShow. No the towel has not been thrown in by any means. With regard to official reproductions I have no knowledge but just reiterate that the historic facts regarding the link of the Shattuck and Emerson families are what they are (as I tried to summarize succinctly in the introduction on Richard's page). Where those facts lead and how the stamps are involved I suppose are the open questions. How much one has to endure is related to one's ongoing interest in the topic and curiosity in knowing the full story.

Also a clarification regarding the exchange about the three stamps I withheld from the submission to the RPSL: all were among the earlier-documented 71 and since they were in the U.S. in 2003 (and not in London) they were exhibited at the National Postal Museum in conjunction with the Maynard Sundman lecture. Patrick Pearson had a chance to view them there. Tests involving them and photographs were supplied to the Expert Committee. I simply kept one of each denomination here only so that not all of ours would be at risk of loss in one location.

September 06, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren -

Sorry, should read the Official Reproduction Theory -

September 06, 2006 **Walter P** <[Walter P](#)>

Richard Malmgren -

The Office Reproduction theory is as believable as the Reverend Al Sharpton having held a meeting in the parking lot of the Mystic Stamp Company shouting out to Grinnell believer's, "Do you Believe" while holding up a copy of the Shattuck 'Book of Prayers.'

Wonder of Dick Celler and Ken Lawrence would be in the crowd shouting "Yes, I Believe, Yes, I Believe?"

Nay, Maybe Not?

September 06, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Reading some earlier postings, the Official Reproduction story keeps coming up now and then as a possible explanation for the production of the Grinnells.

I find it difficult how anyone could give consideration to the Grinnells being Official Reproductions and especially being Official Reproductions from sometime after the establishment of Hawaii's Provisional Government in 1893.

For one thing, the assertion of George Grinnell obtaining the stamps from Shattuck who purportedly placed the mint copies in the Book of Prayers and the used copies in an accompanying envelope after tearing the stamps off envelopes addressed to Samuel Emerson or Charles Shattuck's mother or whomever would be, from a practical viewpoint, completely voided. In the face of prior reporting by George Grinnell and Charles Shattuck's wife and children, I do not think anyone could endure a revised story written to account for such a drastically new sequence of events.

And, of course, there remains the perplexity of how all of the stamps (this time Official Reproductions) ended up in one hoard in Los Angeles.

September 06, 2006 **Richard Matta**

One thing I noted in my comparisons was that I matched up the inner frame lines, without knowing if they really were the same distance apart in the originals. Even if you have 2 600 dpi scans, they may not match perfectly and I have no idea if due to scanner variation or stamp variation.

September 06, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Ken L:

I think Cordrey's methodology is possibly unreliable. Enlarged scans (without distortion) are the way to go.

September 06, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Ken,

Some of the scans that are up are very hard to back figure to 100% of original precisely. Several were sent at low resolution, large size and I tried to equalize but the factors involved (like 33% instead of 1/3) mess up the resultant image.

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott T,

Cordrey was working with a ruler and magnifier, and matching the actual stamps side by side, so any distortion would be caused by shrinkage.

September 06, 2006 **Scott Trepel**

Ken L:

You said "Cordrey says the word Hawaiian is set differently on G50 and G1"

As I near completing my work, this caught my eye. If there was indeed a difference in the "Hawaiian Postage" label between G1 and G50 (both 2c Ty II), it would run counter to my conclusion that the Grinnells were printed from a solid plate, not moveable type.

I made an overlay and, indeed, there was a difference between G1 and G50, the G50 being narrower in width.

However, when I applied a 101.6% increase in the G50 width, the overlay matched perfectly. There may also be distortion in the height of the G50-51 scan.

In working with various scanned images, I have discovered that there is distortion in some of them; for example, the G50-51 pair and the other unused pairs. One has to be extremely careful in how these scans are used. If you attempt to make overlays using distorted scans, the results will be corrupted.

That's one of the things I'm working on now before releasing my report. I want to make sure I am aware of the scale and distortion factors in each scan. It doesn't matter for certain tests and demonstrations, but it does for others.

September 06, 2006 **David Benson**

Richard,

I think the debate will only be proven one way or the other when documentary evidence of production of a subsidiary printing is found or records of accountancy which proved the existence of a subsidiary printing. Until then there will always be two groups, with a small minority in the belief that the stamps paid postage, whilst the other group believes they are philatelic forgeries,

David B.

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

I should explain that Cordrey lived only long enough to complete his detailed analyses of 2¢ Type II Grinnells, though he wrote in summary fashion about similar observations on all three denominations, both types.

For element O-4, he recorded changes on G1 and G56; G55 has the default setting. This element was shaved at the bottom to fit the space, and although Cordrey thought it was changed by a new lockup of the same elements each time, I think the differences may reflect sequential states of the same piece distorted by pressure of the surrounding elements.

Cordrey says the word Hawaiian is set differently on G50 and G1.

Dick Celler can probably comment more intelligently than I on these aspects.

If I were to post a print from fresh type of the same designs, you would see that all the elements of all the Missionaries and Grinnells are severely worn and battered, and would never have been used by any printer who had access to new castings.

The faces on the lotus buds of Missionaries vary considerably, including smiles, straight lines, circles, crescents, leaves, perimeter breaks, flats, and solids. Compared to the so-called blowholes in the balls of the 5 digits, the Grinnell anomalies you mentioned are relatively minor. Even the mitered brass rules are old and faulty.

September 06, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken,

Can you quote from Cordrey a few incidences where he felt pieces of the Grinnell "type" were replaced? That would be a good step towards making an argument for either moveable type or stereo plate.

The ornament I referred to having a smiley face in the inside pearl is Type II, O-6 (right pearl). The one with the pearl looking like an acorn is Type I, O-6 (left pearl). On every Grinnell Richard has posted these are consistent characteristics across all denominations. More importantly, I selected these pieces of ornament because I consider them to be something that would not come out of a mold intended to produce multiple type; they appear to be "customized," let's say. The 12 ornaments taken together lacks the look of mechanical uniformity but of the human hand instead.

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard F,

Your sequence of questions is logical, but I don't have confident answers for myself yet, partly because the data are ambiguous.

If the scientific test results had shown constituents of ink or paper that were unknown in 1850, as Cal Hahn expected they would, the answers would be easy. But

they did not.

Visually the Grinnell red ink is strikingly different. We need a testable hypothesis to explain it. The RPSL's report on the alleged black ink differences is flawed for reasons I posted earlier, and which Len Piskiewicz elaborated at the Rosemont roundtable. I'm eager to read the clarification that David Beech has promised.

The postmark puzzle is compounded by the suggested dates of use, when there are no known covers postmarked at Honolulu for comparison. Having now read the actual text of the January 5, 1852, announcement in the Polynesian (the arrival of postal scales for resale), I think that circumstantially suggests that the postal implements Henry Whitney ordered from Joseph Gregory had arrived earlier, probably in November or December 1851. If that merits consideration, might one set of markers have been used from December to March, and if so, are those the markings on Grinnells?

If not, the cancels are probably counterfeit.

(I want to mention that Cal Hahn wrote, "There are no rate questions regarding the Grinnells, as the only piece fits a known 13¢ rate that ended April 1, 1855. However, there are no known covers paying this rate with other than a 13¢ stamp." That's true, but the magnificent 2¢ census M4 stamp at the NPM has the U.S. Postage Paid cancel, which must have been taken from a cover with at least a 13¢ total franking.)

September 06, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

Don't want to get overly sidetracked from the Grinnell discussion, but it's hardly fair for anyone to think badly of a public auction firm if something they sold on consignment, with strict fiduciary requirements, turns out years later to be other than as originally described. And if, as Ken L. points out below, that would cause the buyer to "not do business" with that seller again, I would say that buyer would be narrow-minded. Logically annoyed, but with ill-conceived ire at the auction house.

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

Probably not, but I doubt that either of us would do business with that seller again.

September 06, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Ken L. Okay, that would tend to eliminate that theory. Thanks.

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David Beech,

The raw exchanges and the reference pages could fairly easily be annotated to academic standards, I think, and an introductory overview added.

At a certain point this discussion will reach the point of diminishing returns, and that will be a good time to decide how to package it more permanently. Perhaps a booklet with a CD?

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S and Roger H,

I wish Keith Cordrey's report were available in a format that could be posted here, but unfortunately it's in a comb-bound book of about 75 pages. I don't agree with some of his conclusions, but his analytical method is useful.

Taking the filigreed frames as examples, they consist of 12 individual elements, four corners and eight side pieces. Clockwise from the upper left, Cordrey labels them ULO, O-1, O-2, URO, O-3, O-4, LRO, O-5, O-6, LLO, O-7, and O-8. Some of the elements are spaced, some are abutted, some are shaved and abutted, several have degrees of damage.

Using this breakdown, you can analyze stamps both across denominations (Scott 1, Type I; 2-I, 3-I; 1-II, 2-II, and 3-II) and by single stamp census -- horizontally and vertically, as it were.

If you choose one single element at a time and follow it through either or both sequences, you'll discover that both Missionaries and Grinnells vary, acquire damage, and occasionally are replaced. Similar analyses of other elements show that spacings between elements, and of elements to rules, and between rules, also vary.

If you simply observe the overall match of elements, or study just a handful of stamps, these variations are easy to miss, while the fact that each identifiable piece is in its same position relative to the others reinforces your impression of uniformity.

These variations, which Cordrey supplied with measurements to the nearest tenth millimeter, would not result from the process you described, unless a large number of photographic matrices were prepared for each stamp, and several plates manufactured from each. But if Cordrey is right about how the denominations were changed from one setting to the next, displacement occurred in that process, mostly in the vertical dimension, congruent with Richard Matta's overlays:

"To change the denomination it required the printing forms to be unlocked, the type form to be placed on a slant galley or worktop and then separated with additional spacing between the individual stamp forms. The bottom and one side rule were then removed, the bottom type line removed next, and the denomination numeral removed last. The new denomination numeral would then be inset in the center of the ornamental filigree border and new spacing material added, as each denomination numeral was of a different size. The bottom type line was changed to match the denomination numeral, the rule borders were replaced, the two stamp forms (which would produce two stamps of the same denomination) were assembled into one lockup form and tied with string awaiting lockup. This type of form change was common in the industry for generations." [Cordrey, Report Number One, page 6]

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bill L,

Wood, Taylor, Poole, and Klemann all examined the 35 stamps on offer and declared them all genuine after comparing them under magnification to the

Missionaries in Taylor's collection. Taylor wanted to buy them all. His top offer was \$60,000.

Wood, Poole, and Klemann all examined the additional eight damaged stamps and declared them genuine. The 43 stamps declared genuine, several of which were mounted on a card with Wood's signed authentication (torn off by Klemann) were deposited in escrow at a third-party bank until Klemann completed the payment to Grinnell. The bank then delivered them to Klemann.

Klemann took note of the bright red of the cancels, and attributed it to exceptional storage conditions.

Immediately after the sale, Grinnell gave an additional 2¢ pair to Wood, with instructions to exchange the pair with Taylor for stamps on his want list. That pair was confiscated by the Secret Service agent when he impounded Klemann's 43, bringing the total to 45. No long after the trial, Grinnell wrote in Mekeel's that he had a total of 71 stamps, which is the number in the Linn census that we have used to identify each stamp. The ten on the card were made public in March of this year.

September 06, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Bill L Kleman only got some number like 43. More came out over time, then stabilized for donkey's years. THEN the card of ten.

September 06, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I can archive the board posts in the format they are in now - will probably do so in another couple months. At some point, I may add the Grinnell related posts from regular board even though difficult to extract. A project for the future.

September 06, 2006 **David Beech, the British Library, Philatelic Collections** <David.Beech@bl.uk>

Richard Frajola

Are you taking any steps to archive this Grinnell Board and the Grinnell contributions to the general Board? While not produced in an accepted research format (lack of references would be just one example of this) the exchange of ideas are important. With all of these (mainly) useful exchanges it will at last have to be written up in some natural, independent form to an academic standard. Perhaps Ken Lawrence has this in mind?

September 06, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Can everybody here please take it down a notch. Bordering on personal attacks

Personally, I think the Grinnell saga has to be examined more logically. I would suggest:

1. Are cancels and postmarks genuine?
 -A. If yes, proceed to question 2
 -B. If not, proceed to question 2
2. Are the underlying stamps genuine?
 -A. If yes, proceed to question 4
 -B. If not, proceed to question 3
3. Who made the forgeries and why?
4. What do the postmarks and stamps represent and how were they used?

Extra credit: What motives etc were involved?

September 06, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

Did I write that wrong.

"My mind hasn't been changed since I first started reading this debate..."

Where's my editor when I need him?

I came into this experience with no knowledge of the Missionaries or Grinnells, so must be considered neutral at first. After looking at the design similarities and working with scans I came to my own conclusions. It has actually been interesting to discover there are others much more knowledgeable in this area who have the same opinion I formed for myself.

A couple of days ago I started playing with Grinnell scans where I cropped off the Hawaii Postage and the lower value tablet, then cut a square in the center removing the numeral. I then removed all color (currently the color difference of the Grinnell scans makes it too easy to identify them). In B&W it is almost impossible to tell the ornaments apart, no matter which denomination stamp is being viewed. There are minor variations, but my analogy is that when one goes to a Ford (Missionary) dealership and looks at cars a style is being viewed. If one Honda (Grinnell) is sneaked in eventually it is obvious to see. One then walks into the used car lot next door, and now Hondas are easy to pick out when compared to the Fords. Each individual car is different, but the pattern is recognizable. Then there are the Honda specialists who can tell you whether an individual car is an LX or DE from 50ft. I'm still attempting to determine which parts are domestic or foreign made. I stopped my project when I realized I may be breaking the copyright rules. This issue seems to be cleared up, but at this point there is no need for me to proceed with posting scans. I'll leave that to the experts.

To me the most interesting personal aspect of the original Kleeman transaction was Grinnell's requirement they all be sold as a large group.

Is there any reason given anywhere why Grinnell didn't sell a few here, a few there.

Do we know which stamps were in the small group offered to Caspary?

Does the record show anyone other than Grinnell was aware of the additional stamps being held back?

Is there any indication there are any more being held back?

Even "proofs"?

The light-blue Grinnell scans seem to be scans of color photos and look totally different, for example, from the Grinnells on piece. Does anyone know the reason for such a great variation in image color and quality?

Roger

September 06, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Does anyone have documented proof that the other dealers who examined the Grinnells examined ALL of them? Each and every one? For sure, and up close?

Here's another scenario (another devil's advocate position)... Grinnell showed the Grinnells to the local dealers but only allowed close examination of the two genuine ones, the ones used as a model. The rest were kept at arm's length. It was only when Caspary compared them to the real missionaries that the jig was up.

So these early dealers are not necessarily to blame.

And the REAL missionaries in Grinnell's possession were NOT included in the deal.

#1 He wouldn't want a side by side comparison of the Grinnells and the real stamp.

#2 He wouldn't want to give away a real stamp. Let the buyer have the fakes. He will keep the real one.

So why weren't the real missionaries included in the deal? 70+ stamps offered to Caspary and incredibly these two are not included. Oh, he could tell the difference all right.

September 06, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence & Steve W -

I think that when you purchase a stamp or cover that has a recent certificate from a recognized entity such as the RPSL or the Philatelic Foundation stating the item in question is genuine, then you would have a reasonable expectation that the item was genuine at the time of sale.

This of course would be based on the fact you paid a financial fee for recognised experts in their field of expertise to examine your stamps and issue a certificate on their findings.

Most such purchases [with a certificate], which are later found to be not genuine, may be recoverable in a court of law, however the cost of this process would in most cases be prohibitive.

I would think you may have a 50/50 shot at winning your case in court, so why bother?

When the purchase price of an expertized item raises above 10,000 dollars then your chances at recovery may be better as the seller who may be a name dealer may not want any adverse publicity.

In the George Grinnell case we are dealing with an ordinary collector, for whatever his true motivations were, had the foresight to insist on an 'as is' sale for a huge amount of money. That is what gives this story so much appeal, in the first place.

September 06, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken,

I have arrived at a conclusion based on the evidence - and best speculation - at hand. My only biases have been that I believe the Shattuck provenance plays a central role in the saga, and for there to be any chance of the Grinnells being genuine, they would have to have been found very nearly as Grinnell said they were.

I came to a hypothesis not from bias but by allowing myself to believe my own eyes. Like the Emperor's New Clothes, I accepted the typographed vs. stereograph arguments because of the expertise of the men arguing each side.

But with the discovery of the two genuine missionaries, I feel my hypothesis (or Roger's) becomes the baseline theory because it is the easiest process, far more so than a forger having to acquire all that old type and more so than Whitney fashioning separate plates of different type but in the same locations and with the same handwork (which the RPSL concluded was not likely).

The RPSL opinion chose between the two methods without considering a paste-up model, probably because they had no knowledge of accepted genuine Missionaries in Grinnell's possession and because they were looking for the fingerprints of a master forger, not an art student. If the Grinnells were produced from either loose type or a stereo plate, prove it. I'm still listening.

Walter - Thank you.

September 06, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

Your post outlining George Grinnell's attempts at selling the Grinnell stamps just leaves me with a nagging impression that he knew the stamps were counterfeit.

It may just be a 'gut feeling' but no matter how I try to rationalize George Grinnell's behaviour it just leaves me with the impression that he knew the stamps were counterfeit.

Your argument that many experts on Hawaii Missionary stamps had informed Grinnell that his stamps were genuine, actually works against your argument.

The question then becomes: If George Grinnell had all these experts telling him that his stamps were genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps, then why was he so insistent on selling his stamps, as is?

I think it was because, more likely than not, George Grinnell knew that his stamps were counterfeit.

September 06, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

That's a good point. I assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that if a good cert on one of my covers was overturned that I had a right to recovery. Probably not, huh?

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Ha! Grinlee! My best typo here so far.

Bernard,

APRL has Perry's letter, angry that CCP would not publish his exposé of Needham's fakes, including Bissell covers with great stamps that did not originate.

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Steve W,

That's one way of looking at it, and might be right. Another possibility is that Grinnlee regarded the dealers' opinions as today's collector might regard his stamp that has an expert certificate. None of the characters in this drama strike me as possessing exemplary ethics.

I'm not happy about it, but most terms of sale today refuse to accept returns on stamps that have recent expert certificates even if the opinions are wrong, or on lots with more than ten stamps even if they are forgeries.

September 06, 2006 **Walter P**

David Shumaker -

David, your points made on George Grinnell and for that matter anyone who finds himself in a similar situation are well founded.

Personally, I would never purchase anything for that amount of money without a written contract stating if the stamps were not genuine than they could be returned for a full refund of the purchase price.

I do not think anything was different in 1918 than it is today regarding good business practise.

However, at the time there was a 'greed factor' in play here, in that 'Klemann' could have walked away from the purchase of the 'Grinnells' with no written refund contract, should G. Grinnell's stamps, later be found to be counterfeit.

I would guess this just comes down to either George Grinnell knew the stamps were counterfeit and that is why he insisted on selling the stamps to Klemann 'as is' or that he had indeed made the great find of Grinnell stamps and he believed the stamps were genuine.

If the later was the case, than that leaves you with wondering why, if George Grinnell truly believed the stamps were genuine. than why did insist on selling the stamps to Klemann, as is?

Was it just simply that George Grinnell was a shrewd business man, no he was a school teacher with modest means?

It just comes down to George Grinnell almost pulled off a perfect fraud or that he was a victim of his own great find. After all, did these stamps in the end not ruin his life?

Again, as is so often in this case, more questions than answers?

September 06, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L The failure of experts to spot this Is very interesting. The question is -- how many items of similar quality got by in those days only to crash years later. Perry got sucked in by a fake collection (was it Needham's stuff). A more difficult case as I suppose he was buying from a supposed expert, if I am remember the story anyway near aright. Why couldn't he get his money back?

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

John Klemann's enlargements were reproduced by Calvet Hahn in the June 2002 United States Specialist. Cal's illustration is especially helpful because on page 249 he included Advertiser lot 31, the 1853 ephemera from Massachusetts that used the identical George Bruce & Sons No. 39 filigree border ornaments as appear on the Missionaries and Grinnells. This comparison shows how a proper print direct from type appeared at the time (but the Advertiser catalog picture is much better), in contrast to the uneven quality of both Missionary and Grinnell prints of the same ornaments. In those photos, some Grinnell ornaments have greater integrity than the Missionary counterparts, particularly the corner pieces.

So I think you are fooling yourself by finding effects that appear to confirm your belief instead of examining each item without bias. Maybe you and Roger are right about how the stamps were made, but these images contradict your analysis.

September 06, 2006 **Steve W**

Ken,

It is curious that, with all those experts attesting to the authenticity of the Grinnells, that Grinnell refused to provide a guaranty that we all provide routinely when selling our stamps.

Makes you wonder if he knew something...

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

Everyone Grinnell consulted -- Alliot, Wood, Poole, and Klemann, possibly also Thompson -- told him the stamps were without question genuine. Col. Taylor wanted to buy them for \$50,000 to add to his collection, after compaign Grinnell's stamps to his own at Wood's office. After that deal failed to fly because

Grinnell thought his stamps were worth more (Taylor agreed, but that was all the money he had, and Grinnell would not break up the lot), Poole sent his enthusiastic telegram about Grinnell's discovery to Klemann. Before the trial started, Charles Mekeel observed that many experts considered the Grinnells genuine, and those who did not had previously called them genuine.

So unless Grinnell was a conspirator, he had every reason to believe that his stamps were genuine. He was also bitter that Klemann and Caspary lied in their testimony, which convinced him that Klemann was demanding a refund only because Caspary did not want to buy them.

The strangest parts of the trial are Klemann's and Poole's attempts to explain how with all their experience in handling Hawaiian Missionary stamps they could have blundered so spectacularly.

In a similar way today, it's odd that experts who say they can spot a Grinnell forgery at twenty paces never noticed the two genuine stamps on the card.

September 06, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Roger, thanks. I remember drawing floor plans in ink on mylar with Rapid-O-graph pens. Blast from the past. Had to be two-sided mylar. We drew the walls in on the back, in reverse, so if we had to erase or wipe away mistakes on top, the walls below weren't affected.

Ken, I don't quite understand. What will I see in 1922 photographs that I cannot see in the wonderful images on this site? Klemann "got the eel" because he was too quick to acquire the "find of a lifetime" before other dealers had a chance to start the bidding war, but now you suggest I study his musings as he played expert in court where the trial centered on his role as victim (of his own ignorance/greed)? Don't make me board the gondola on the airship Klemann! I've got a family who needs me!

September 06, 2006 **Walter P**

Donald Sundman - In your September 5 post you raised 10 numbered points listing some of your personal observations regarding the 'Grinnell' stamps.

No. 10 - Reads in part, "I came into the story thinking they had a 10% chance of being genuine. Later I went to 50/50. Now with the Grinnells, I think the odds are higher than 50/50 but certainly not 100%.

Mr. Sundman, I fail to see how the discovery of two genuine missionary stamps mounted on the 'card of ten' which also has eight Grinnell counterfeit stamps on the card [owned by the Arrigo's] could somehow make anyone believe that the Grinnell stamps are genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps.

Mr. Sundman, can you please provide the Board readers with the rationale behind your statement made in point ten?

Exactly why do you believe this discovery would make the Grinnells genuine?

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bill Weiss,

Steve W is correct. At the sale, Klemann tore up S.L. Wood's signed authentication and demanded that Grinnell guarantee the stamps. Grinnell refused, pointing out that the other three men present -- Klemann, Poole, and Wood -- were experts and he was not, so he could not warrant them as genuine. Reluctantly, Klemann bought them "without recourse."

At trial, his attorney argued that the contract required Grinnell to deliver stamps, not "pieces of paper" that were not stamps. The court agreed, and ruled in Klemann's favor, but also stated that he expected Grinnell to appeal and thought a higher court might overrule him.

That was also Klemann's fear, which is why he settled with Grinnell afterward, allowing Grinnell to keep \$5,000 in exchange for agreeing not to appeal.

September 06, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter P., I'd like to take a shot at answering your question. You have to look at two scenarios: one, he found the stamps as he claimed; and the second, he knew all along they were fakes. The judge declared the second scenario to have been proven in court.

My limited understanding of the law is that a professional stamp dealer should know his business but a collector who is not a professional is not expected to have any expertise. So, if Klemann goes back to Grinnell for a refund, on what basis does he ask for it? Klemann had to prove that Grinnell cheated him out of the money, not just that Grinnell lacked the expertise to determine good from bad (I think Ken Lawrence said something to this effect some time ago). Therefore, to collect his money Klemann had to go to court and accuse Grinnell of fraud.

Suppose you found a rare early Canadian airmail cover in a family correspondence in a garage sale. A big-time dealer looks at it after several other dealers have called it genuine and he buys it. By bye, it's his problem. Now, he comes back to you several months later and wants his money back, CLAIMING it's a fake, having no proof other than his intended buyer didn't want it. Now, you think to yourself, I found it in what was attic junk, several dealers said it was genuine, and now this big-time dude wants the money back? "Am I getting reamed? Am I getting back exactly what I sold him in the first place, or was there a switch?" You offer him a bunny-white cheek to kiss. He calls you a fraud and a cheat and drags you into court. Makes sense to me.

September 06, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

Steve W. & Walter P;

Thanks. Wonder why an amateur collector would want an "as is" proviso when selling something to a dealer, unless he had some inclination that there may be trouble ahead? Actually, today's courts are much more favorable to the amateur vs the professional, and more than a few lawyers have told me over the years that courts will invariably side with the amateur, logically concluding that the professional is supposed to "know what he's buying". Even when the amateur is a crook.

September 06, 2006 **Steve W**

Bill and Walter

I believe that the story was that Grinnell sold them "as is", and provided a certificate of genuineness (I forget by whom), that was later detached from the cards which held the Grinnells.

September 06, 2006 **Walter P**

Bill Weiss -

I raised this very question in two of my recent posts [within the last week] on this Board. "Why did George Grinnell not issue a full refund to Klemann?"

Up to today nobody has responded.

I hope that Ken Lawrence can give us an answer to this question, because I thought it was a 'telling' point' and went to the very character of George Grinnell.

I bet the answer will from Ken will be something like, because George Grinnell thought Caspary was wrong and that his stamps were genuine.

September 06, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

Ken Lawrence;

A quick question about the human aspect of this story I haven't seen anywhere - why was it that Klemenn was forced to sue Grinnell to get his money back? Can we assume that, after Caspary declared the stamps to be counterfeit, Klemann sought a full refund? If so, why didn't Grinnell give it to him? Did Grinnell immediately take the position that the stamps were sold "as is" - which is one argument his Attorney later used?

September 06, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard F If someone has the Kleman article, could it be board?

September 06, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

Your statement "My mind hasn't been changed since I first started reading this debate. . ." reminds me of the satirical 1960s tee-shirt slogan, "My mind is made up. Don't confuse me with the facts."

In contrast to that, I've learned a great deal from this board, which has considerably shaped my understanding. Without challenging insights by Richard F and Scott T, I would not have scrutinized the images that led me to stumble on the genuine Missionary on the card. If all you do here is troll for images that confirm your preconceived beliefs, you're missing the richness of wonderful reference material.

I too spent many years making and retouching Kodalith negatives, positives, and overlays. I kept a Multilith press in my basement to print the results. In those days in Illinois, women could drink at age 18, men at 21. But one could make a lith negative of a draft card, touch out the typed details, print a copy, and type in a new identity with the desired date of birth to satisfy those requirements. A postal card was almost a perfect match for the paper of the draft card, so paper wasn't a problem.

Although it's been more than two thirds of a lifetime since I apprenticed in letterpress, and almost as long since the last time I ran an offset press, I have enough intuitive feel for those techniques to doubt that the methods you and David suggest were plausible in the 1911 to 1917 period. They were not impossible, but the RPSL's proposed method of forgery is more straightforward and sensible.

There was no such thing as panchromatic lith film, which means that blue images were difficult to reproduce in line photographs. If you study the 1922 trial photos and detail enlargements, you'll see that the details break up in ways that are not step-and-repeat consistent.

If David S studies the 1922 photos (for example, Klemann's filigree border comparisons at about 750 percent enlargement) he'll see that the details of the Grinnells are not incoherent, but are so similar to Missionaries that Klemann pointed to such subtleties as allegedly overlapping elements to support his analysis that they are counterfeit.

Thanks for the compliment. Very nice photos on your website.

September 06, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Scott - Happy to link up your files. Can you send in PDF format? If you link images that are already posted it would obviate any permission questions.

September 06, 2006 **Roger Heath**

David -

Well written! Today I pulled out a few remaining examples of B&W graphs I drew for medical research in the 1970's. My drafting table had a very large sheet of graph paper permanently taped to the wooden desk top. This was overlaid with clear mylar to protect the graph paper. I used a Rapidograph with india ink on a sheet of vellum that was usually 11"x 14" and taped to the clear mylar. The beauty of the vellum allowed one to correct inking errors by letting the ink dry then scraping it off with an Exacto knife, then redrawing. Obviously all the letter spacing is unique as it was done by hand a single letter at a time. (Think monk in a cell.) In combination with self adhesive graphic screens, or lines, or patterns, one then photographed the art work using a copy stand and 4"x5" camera using Kodalith film. The film was processed and then any resulting spots or flaws were touched out with a reddish opaque "paint". This negative was then used to print 5x7 B&W glossies for publication accompanying medical research papers, such as these [one](#) and [two](#). The negative was also copied with 35mm camera for B&W projection slides.

I eventually used a second 4x5 negative in the creation of an intermediate coloring step for creating 35mm slides. I used transparent water based colors and painted them onto the 4x5 negative. When the painting was finished I then placed the negative on a light box and photographed it with the 35mm camera. The slides really looked great (If I do say so myself.) because in a darkened auditorium the screen was black except for the colored lines and text, and each change of slide didn't have the typical white flash, the colored lines just changed, morphed, into the next slide. One was able to use color to maintain consistency between slides making them easier to follow during a technical presentation. I never saw any other medical slide shows done in this manner. It was interesting to view these slides on screens up to 16 feet wide, this allowed me to adjust my proportions occasionally. I don't have the ability to scan slides and share the couple of these that I've kept.

Ken L -

Congratulations on your photography winnings!

Seems we have more in common than just interesting philatelic debates. Here are some of my [current photographic efforts](#). Best viewed on 1024X768 resolution, or thereabouts.

Roger

September 05, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Roger,

Of course, whichever of our hypotheses are most likely, we believe the printing surface of the Grinnell plates are neither typeset nor stereotyped, meaning they are fakes.

Advocates have enjoyed the presumption of moveable type because of the RPSL conclusion arrived at through measurements across several stamps. Their conclusion does not ponder the strong possibility that the model for the Grinnells was an enlarged paste-up of moveable elements that would closely resemble the re-assembly of type in preparation of each denomination. By "strong" I mean that once the actual Missionaries are procured in both types, it is infinitely easier to paste-up a several identical stamps from a matrix of photographs or tracings than to attempt to locate similar, indeed almost the exact same ornament and other individual type that printed the originals sixty years after the fact.

September 05, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

The article is under review at the moment, but should be ready soon unless I hit an unforeseen obstacle.

Re copyright on images, may I have clearance from Arrigo, Culhane and British Library to reproduce images already posted here? It will save effort obtaining permission for each image.

Richard F: I'd like to post as a PDF file in the reference section (about 8-10 pages). OK?

September 05, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Roger H.,

I have to disagree with you on two points, but first let me thank you for responding to my lengthy post. First, tracing a photograph is much easier to do, from a technical standpoint, than to remove the cancel and otherwise touch up a photograph. Once you've traced, you're done, but the photographic process is trial and error to make sure the resulting image is free of artifacts and crisp enough to mask light from the plate when reduced to stamp size. I'm not saying that the process you describe couldn't have been tried in an earlier attempt. However, a simple tracing would be easier than the photographic process you mentioned, which I feel gives both the faker and his product too much credit. It may not have taken an expert forger or even an expert photographer to create the Grinnells, as far as the stamp itself.

Secondly, a B&W photograph of tiny, milky-blue lines, once enlarged ten times let's say, would be fuzzy to start with, which I think you'd agree. Now, all tracing paper I'm familiar with is translucent and is capable of obscuring fine details. Put the obscure tracing paper over the fuzzy gray photo, and surely you can see how things like curls not curling enough could easily happen in locations completely unobscured by cancelling ink?

My main point in the previous post was that the ornaments are no consistent enough nor competent enough to have been actual metal type. You and I agree that it isn't, but you see photograph-induced distortion as the culprit. I understand that, but such distorted images would still share common geometry and centerlines. To me, the product is not as accurate as a photographic process would produce, but that's only my opinion. The graphic elements in the Grinnells (except the straight frames) are too dissimilar in geometry, too crude in execution and too void of design intent to be either the product of a professionally-made type caster (ie, whose product had to be ordered from the mainland because it was not made in Hawaii) or a faithful copy of same. If you would look again at the examples I've cited, you will begin to see what I am speaking of.

How exactly does a photographic process cause those little pearl shading lines to float about? Or the "a"s to change size relative to each other? And if those and other differences are incidences where the photograph had to be touched up during the process you describe, then I humbly suggest that tracing the whole thing would have ended up the faster, though less sophisticated, method.

Anyway, I think the case for the Grinnells having been printed from either moveable type or a stereo should be made prior to determining which of those two scenarios is correct.

September 05, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Bill D -

You ask: *Has anyone taken a good scan of the various ornament 'quadrants' (for want of a better term) of the Gs, flipped the image (as is possible in a photographic process), and then tried to find matches for the flipped images among the known Ms?*

There is no need to do that as the ornaments of each Type I and Type II match the 13 cent examples on the bottom of the Grinnell card. It's my belief that two Missionaries survived within a book and by chance they were one of each Type, leading to various possibilities after the discovery.

David S -

I think you are giving much more credit to the forger than necessary. As we know photocopying leads to fine line omissions which may or may not be important to the overall design. The re-photographing of the touched-up art work leads to further deterioration of the finest elements. One of the most telling points as far as I'm concerned are the fine "hairy" ink lines on nearly all the Missionaries, but absent on the Grinnells. What reproduced on the Grinnells was an increase in line thickness at the locations where "hairiness" was greatest, and a loss of line where "hairiness" didn't exist. I don't think the "artist" had to trace anything, but I do agree to the possibility of reentry drawing to strengthen the finest elements that were lost during the first copy photo. I think the lettering was pasted onto the photocopy of the 13 cent examples, and more than one effort is shown within the Grinnell examples.

My mind hasn't been changed since I first started reading this debate, but has only become more firm that photographic techniques were used to reproduce this series of stamps based on the two examples that appear to be real Missionaries. I'm just a collector who became more interested in this debate as time passed, and on reading the .pdf articles on the Grinnell Reference Page, have come to the conclusion that nearly all the experts have been correct in claiming the Grinnells are fake. I realize my voice has no status, but I really can't see any expert committee coming to any other opinion than that of the Royal.

I started playing around with the scans, doing mirror images, deleting the central numerals and comparing the ornaments, but came to the conclusion that for all the effort it didn't matter. (I'm certain Scott will do a more expert job than I'm capable of accomplishing.) There doesn't seem to be agreement on the results of past scientific testing, therefore, it seems to be disregarded. This has ended up being a religious experience, one either believes or doesn't.

Roger

September 05, 2006 **Steve W**

Don S
Hope you have some links time scheduled in Monterey...

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

It's not what you think.

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Mike E Actually, I had major plot elements, which I can supply off the board.

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Thanks. Will send postage.

September 05, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

Mike E;

I somehow find a way to regularly lose with pocket Aces, or maybe it just seems that way! It's definitely not a guarantee to win the hand. And while A-K is by far the best drawing hand, it is more often a loser than not. Terrific game (hold-em) and it (poker) mimics life in many ways. Now, back to those lovable little pieces of paper.

September 05, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

Your magazine is in the mail. The sequel won't be published for a few more weeks.

September 05, 2006 **Mike E**

Bernard,
Interesting idea, and a super genre to use! B & W media, combined with my usual self-deprecating satirical style, backed up by a rural agrarian, contempt for all things authority background.... Gotta go, off to the 2nd hand store to find a few long trenchcoats for the leading roles...

OK, don't worry everyone, I am done polluting this board for the day.. ;-)

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L That is fine, but we know the markings in use well enough to say these ain't they. Also that would mean that G4a was old in January and young in September.

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Mike E I think you should be writing the on line equivalent of the old dime (?) novels, but about philately instead of Wyatt Earp. Try your hand at a few in the film noire style.

September 05, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

If they are genuine, December 1851 to March 1852. If they are official reproductions, 1893 after the coup. If they are counterfeit, 1911 to 1917.

September 05, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard F,

Setting preconditions that we know are unacceptable to the owners won't solve anything, in my opinion. And the issues we are discussing here have relatively little to do with expertizing of the PF vintage (they are different, therefore they are counterfeit).

Here we are discussing expertizing as Ernst Cohn advocated, where the explanation, understanding, and disclosure are the point, not the opinion on the certificate.

My suggestion of a gathering at the NPM is because that's where some of the finest reference material exists for comparison, because it's accessible and available to us, and because it enjoys the respect and support of all interested parties.

That will present your opportunity to examine the cancels (or any other aspect) and to set forth your understanding of them, which was the original point of my reply.

September 05, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Bill D., I think an even better question would be, has anyone tried to match any of the ornament "type," either the four corners or the eight side pieces, to another such type piece ON THE SAME STAMP? Odd that so much effort has been expended in comparing traits of corresponding elements between DIFFERENT stamps when the comparison of ornament and font within the SAME stamp yields no matches! Perhaps the fundamental assumption that the Grinnells are either typeset or stereotype prints, but not any other kind of print, is mistaken and leading students down the wrong paths.

After my foray through the four a's in a previous post, several board participants have also expressed their belief along with mine that the Grinnells began as enlarged photographs of the two genuine stamps found on the "card of ten," images which were later doctored to be used as models for the insertion of numerals and denomination labels to create the 2- and 5-cent stamps. It has been asserted by Jim B. that photographic reproduction could have led to the creation of a "line block" which would print from a raised surface just like a stereotype plate.

Now I have to retreat to a much simpler hypothesis (and simple is quite often better). Looking at the utter trash that comprises the Grinnell ornaments in the posted images, I am at a loss how anyone can declare those to be typeset or reproduction of type (stereotype). Not one is like the other, and none look informed as to what their design intent should be. For example, just look at the curved shading lines in the pearls surrounding the numeral - both the inner and outer pearls. Note that on the genuine stamps that is exactly what they are - curved shading lines. Now, look at the Grinnell pearls. The "shading line" is different in every pearl, and seemingly oblivious to its purpose, which is to be a shading line on a pearl. It's mostly just scribble.

Yet, those traits correspond between stamps of the same type (I and II), demonstrating that these differences are not random printing flukes. Just look at the "smiley face" in the inner pearl above the "v" in "Five" (on the five cent) and see how it appears on all Type II denominations. Likewise, look at the Type I Five cent and see that the shading line in the inner pearl above the letter "e" of "five" runs almost across the center of the pearl, so the pearl looks like an acorn with a cap. This "acorn" exists in the other Type II denominations.

This observation, along with my observation of the differences within the same stamp among the same letters, leads me to think that the enlarged photograph used as a model was only for tracing. The letters and ornament are tracings of a real image, but quickly badly done. The borders may have had the assistance of a straight edge. The person doing the tracing was oblivious to the overall design, and only concentrated on the tiny patch of area being traced at any given moment. Now, making a line block for a frehand illustration is nothing that would have been exceptional in the early 20th Century. Nor did tracing the photograph require any innate artistic ability. The only extraordinary requirement for such forgery would be the genuine stamp, which we all now know had been obtained. Having that, obtaining illustrations of what the two and five cent stamps should look like would not be an insurmountable obstacle.

Would somebody please explain why the crappy appearance of the letters and ornament commends their graduation from simple sketch to metal type that was cast in molds fashioned from master type? Or else, can we stop asserting that as fact before the possibility has even been established?

Again, just a thought for discussion.

September 05, 2006 **Ken Stach** <kstach@houston.rr.com>

Mike E - I like the story. As an aside, I've only played Texas Hold 'Em one time in Las Vegas. The only time in my life I ever held pocket aces...and I lost. Nothing is a sure thing.

September 05, 2006 **Mike E**

Bernard,
Come on, cut me some slack! Perhaps 'scientific' should be substituted for 'forensic'?

Minus a couple of pseudo-Freudian slips, it was mostly meant to be a facetious post.. :-)

Been thinking a little more about my ending to the story I started in item number 4. It goes something like this.. "After being positively certified by the Royal, PF, PSE, APEX, CIA, FBI, (and even Scott T and Richard F agreed on something), Steve W takes the 37 new pony covers and mounts them up. Much to his chagrin, he finds himself a couple covers short of his goal (a ten framer). He challenges George K to a two-out-of-three Texes holdem match to get the last couple covers he needs from George's "Across The Continent" exhibit. Pocket aces fill out his full house and the covers now belong to Steve. (which will ultimately provide the coup de grace to Mr Gross at the big show in 2016..)"

PS Game played in specially built ca 1861 Western cowboy saloon, with great-great grandson of the COCPP founder dealing..

Who says Ken is the only one that can tell a good story..? Just trying to have a little fun, after all, they are just stamps... (if they were covers, it would actually be important)
;-)

September 05, 2006 **Bill Duffney**

Has anyone taken a good scan of the various ornament 'quadrants' (for want of a better term) of the Gs, flipped the image (as is possible in a photographic process), and then tried to find matches for the flipped images among the known Ms? I have no clue whether this has already been done, but would suspect it has.

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

You can't get there from here At least as a Gedanken experiment, C14 dating would be an interesting approach to examination of the Grinnells. Unfortunately, Civilization's screwing with the atmosphere puts the kabosh on that. (Thanks to Christopher Ramsey at Oxford for the info.)

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Mike Ellingson Not sure what you mean by forensic. I think some of the evidence would be permitted in a court.

September 05, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Ken L - You ask if I might be available to travel to the NPM to "resolve these issues." I would be happy to travel to the Philatelic Foundation to examine the Grinnell stamps if submitted for expertisation and *if asked*. Honestly, anything short of submission to the PF will not resolve a thing.

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Donald S Have you collected postal history? I would recommend such -- preferably going back to the early 1800s. Doesn't have to be expensive. Great fun. Opens ones mind philatelically. You'll never see the world the same way again. (You can see why you are a master advertiser and I am not.)

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Donald S re your 4. That is why I raised the Alger Hiss analogy. One possibility is that Grinnell was knowingly involved in a scam and could not tolerate the damage to his reputation. Knowing that there was wrong testimony in the case would have encouraged his effort at self rehabilitation. I don't understand what George Linn was up to. The expertisation process is robust enough visa vie such speculations.

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Matta and Ken L Well, the titles correspond to what I was suggesting. But the fine fit of the frame lines and ornaments surprise me. Perhaps the single manufacturer factor comes in here. (Note the Grinnells go the other way -- the titles match and the ornaments move).

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Of course I was being flippant -- it seems like sometimes the quest for "proof" (Hasidic faith) whatever that is, may overwhelm the possibly fruitful analysis (Talmudic discussion).
I gather you appreciate that it is very hard to find a time slot for the Grinnells -- presumably early 52 or early 53. The Arrigos story puts them in early 52. They have to have the Hawaii circle at Waialua, which makes no sense, and the presumably early and degraded use of G4a too, which doesn't work. But early use at Honolulu doesn't work. Going to early 1853 -- presumably they would be flushing an initial test printing out of the system (I think that doesn't work) runs into the mismatch with period markings. Good theories may have loose ends, but gel. Bad theories keep going around in circles.

September 05, 2006 **Mike Ellingson**

With malice to none, and charity to all...

Don S.

- 1) Take a stand and defend it! Several other very prominent collectors/dealers have done so.
- 2) Which really means nothing or does nothing to prove they are genuine.
- 3) There are probably thousands of items (stamps and postal history) that have been declared 'not genuine' or 'no opinion' or whatever that have no forensic evidence that 'prove' them to be bad. They are 'bad' or 'good' because a few experts in from various expertising committees have given that opinion. That seems good enough for most folks, including you, usually. (see your number 6) Obviously, the Grinnells are being held to a different standard, perhaps due to financial consideration, or to write the last chapter of a book...
- 4) The story is interesting, no doubt. I just wish instead of debating the genuineness (sp?) of a few dozen stamps, that someone had found an old leather saddlebag at a flea market somewhere in Wyoming that had arrow holes in it, and still contained a few dozen pony express covers. The storyline would be something like: "Steve W badly wants them to be real (because he found them retracing the original route on a family vacation), Richard F is convinced that the ink is wrong, Scott T and Dick C actually agreed on the plating of the stamps, but Ken L is convinced that the way cover couldn't be real because first issue Nesbitt entires weren't available at the Fort Bridger post office...." Now that would be infinitely more interesting to me than a few stamps, but to each his own... :-)
- 5) No opinion, really. Guess one just keeps running tests until the desired outcome is reached..
- 6) Think I covered this in number 3..
- 7) yep.. but they get called experts because they are right FAR more than they are wrong..
- 8) With all due respect to Mr Trepel and his efforts, this reminds me of trying to convince my 5 year old that mashed potatoes taste the same as baked potatoes. No matter how much I try to convince her, she refuses to change her mind..(even after I show her how they are both made...)
- 9) and Scott T and Richard F and Steve W and Bernard B...(you know, the other side...)
- 10) see number 1
- 11) yep, but no matter how much good publicity it generates, my wife will always think I am a geek....

September 05, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Donald S Re your 5 -- the Royal book indicates consideration of the new data on the paper and confirmation of the 2004 opinion.
0. Expertisation depends on comparison with genuine material. The Grinnells fail key tests on this basis.

September 05, 2006 **Donald Sundman**

Look at how the Grinnell story resonates. I've just read this write-up from a stamp collecting auto-test driver. This is an authentic write up on Edmunds.com "As I sit here in my hotel room reading Mystic's Stamp Showcase, the leading publication for philatelists, I can't help but reflect on my 400 mile day in our long term Honda Accord Hybrid. Truth be told, I can't decide which is more thrilling, reading about the Grinnell Hawaiian Missionaries first appearance on the philatelic scene in 1920, or driving our beige on beige Accord from Los Angeles to the Monterey Peninsula. So it isn't a thrill a minute, but the Accord proved comfortable and competent for 400 nonstop miles. That's right, nonstop. The Accord made it on one tank of regular and you've got to respect that kind of range. This thing is a good road tripper. From its well shaped seats to its XM radio, the Honda is proving to be just

the right ride for our run to Laguna Seca for a weekend of vintage auto racing. “

September 05, 2006 **Donald Sundman**

1. I don't know if the Grinnells are genuine or counterfeit. I know the Royal said they are counterfeit. Some think they are genuine.
2. Most of the facts from the 1922 trial have been shown false.
3. There is no physical evidence the Grinnells are counterfeit. There is a lack of evidence proving they are genuine.
4. The story is improbable no matter how you look at it. Either someone made the philatelic find of the lifetime, was discredited, and died concealing owning the two 'genuine or accepted' Missionaries that might have shown the Grinnells genuine OR a collector and his accomplices perpetrated the longest running con in stamp history. The con generated very little profit and they died owning two valuable stamps.
5. I believe at the time the Royal made its decision on the Grinnells that the paper of at least two of the Grinnells and some of the wrapper or envelope behind a stamp contained wood sulfate. Wood sulfate was not in paper made around 1851. After hearing this news the families had destructive tests done on small pieces of two stamps and those tests did not show any organic material. The families gave the test results to the Royal. I think the Royal made its decision on the Grinnells believing at least some of the stamps contained wood fiber in the paper. I was not at the Royal and so am only saying what it looked like to me on the outside.
6. I respect the Royal and all major expertising services. We use most of them at Mystic. These are very knowledgeable people making difficult decisions.
7. I don't think I'm alone in buying stamps with good certificates that later get bad certificates. Everyone makes mistakes. Even experts.
8. I respect my friend Scott Trepel and look forward to his analysis showing why the Grinnells are bad. Scott has seen far more Missionaries than I have and is a real student.
9. I respect Ken Laurence and Dick Celler and am in awe of their discoveries.
10. I am not pounding the table that the Grinnells are genuine. I don't know if they are. There are unanswered questions that should be answered. I came into the story thinking they had a 10% chance of being genuine. Later I went to 50/50. Now with the discovery of the two 'genuine' Missionaries mixed in with the Grinnells, I think the odds are higher than 50/50 but certainly not 100%.
11. This is a great story no matter what the outcome is. If the Grinnell story and controversy exposes non-collectors to the fun of collecting then, I'm in favor of showcasing the story and this great hobby.

September 05, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard,

I'm trying to solve those problems now. The response to the discussion here on your board shows that these stamps and their mystery are of great interest, but that they continue to present more questions than answers, even to a person like yourself who doesn't much care who printed them. Might you be available to travel if the opportunity for study can be arranged? That is the essence of the proposal at the end of my article, hoping that all interested experts will convene at the National Postal Museum to resolve these issues.

The way I discovered the Missionary at the bottom of the card was first by noting the difference in the colors and textures between the red postmarks on the Missionary and adjacent Grinnell. This probably disposes of John Klemann's suggestion, when he thought the Grinnells were genuine, that their different appearance reflected more favorable conditions of storage. But the black cancels are not so easy to differentiate, at least not for me, so I judged G80 by the gross outline.

We need better science than the RPSL applied to the reported presence of Prussian blue in the ink. Perhaps David Beech's promised forthcoming clarification will help. If that is the only difference, it is probably a mirage, and in any event it does not explain the difference that you assert.

I think the owners of the Grinnells and Jeff Weiss explain the period of use by reference to their theory of William Emerson at Waialua, which I do not accept.

I have an article in press that will be published soon which presents a different possibility, more plausible to me. But the physical evidence still needs to be critically examined by experts with a variety of experience, talent, and perspective.

September 05, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Ken L - In response to your comment: "I'm hoping that Richard Frajola and Bernard Biales will prove me wrong about the grill cancel" - it is unfortunate that the cancels on the Grinnells can't be examined in the flesh by more people. They just don't look right. Something is wrong with the ink composition that was used and they all fail in direct comparison with genuine examples.

And, if genuine, how do the Grinnellites explain their use between January and March, 1852 when none are reported genuinely used on cover until September.

September 05, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

When I was a boy scout in Chicago, the educational television station WTTW began broadcasting from the Museum of Science and Industry (1893 Columbian Expo collectors take note), possibly the first such experiment in the country.

We kids of the neighborhood were frequently recruited to join live audiences for programs that needed laughs, applause, or ad-libbed reactions to performers, and some of us got hooked. Among the first group of serious WTTW courses was one taught by Ansel Adams, in which I enrolled at my mother's urging.

By the time I was 18, I was pushing an 8-by-10 Deardorff camera with a 20-inch lens around a studio, photographing tires, jewelry, and modeled lingerie for department store ads, which was not the career trajectory I had imagined from that inspiring start, so I quit being a still photographer before I was old enough to drink legally or vote.

After all these years I have finally lived down that experience sufficiently to take up recreational photography as a hobby, in a village that offers a variety of interesting visual images to stimulate my compositional intuition.

September 05, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Bernard - [Last one](#) that I likely will have time for, have to get back to real life for a few days. 153 overlayed on 86.

September 05, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

Not nihilism. Science can falsify, it usually can't true-ify, so for progress to occur on this project someone's interpretation has to be undone by proof. I was merely suggesting an orderly sequence of experiment. Like my comrade Richard Malmgren, I can live and prosper after being shown wrong, but also like him I'd prefer to be right.

If the grid on G80 is not a Grinnell cancel, that will be embarrassing, because in my initial suprise at seeing G81 as possibly genuine, I ignored G80 because of the Grinnell grid, leaving it for Dick to discover.

Richard Matta's latest demonstration raises Scott Trepel's challenge threshold, I think. Your proposal about Scott 4 has promise.

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Matta Although it requires a little imagination, I suspect Hawaii number 4, say the bottom part, since we don't have overlays between 3 and 4 (and I'm not even asking!), give some idea of what a genuine but quite separate printing of Missionaries might be like. Or even the whole thing, come to think of it.

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L. Since I have no information about your analysis of the G80 grid, I can't comment. You do have my analysis, including a presentation of problems with the Celler chart as presented in Linn's.

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Matta Ain't that Something! The real ones are arguably tighter than the Grinnells. I think it is a beautiful demonstration that they are screwy and contradicts Ken's nihilism. (He is turning from the Talmudic to the Hassidic, I fear.)
The distribution of match and mismatch between the Missioneries and the Grinnells does require explanation.
The internal variation does not negate but supports this.

September 04, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken L.

You may or may not opt to accept this as true, but I am not trying to prove anyone either correct or incorrect about anything.

It sounds a little corny, but my motivation is actually the truth. I will without difficulty get over any momentary blush for having my scathingly brilliant ideas proved incorrect. I prefer, of course, to be proven correct in order to inherit the mantle of philatelic sleuth - but if not, then not.

P.S. I never knew you were an Ansel Adams wanna be. I like his work.

September 04, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Bernard B - Here are [13c #81 TII overlayed by 5c #24](#) and [13c #81 overlayed by 2c #15](#). Similar result - frames of all three types and "Hawaiian Postage" more or less match just across values just as with the Grinnells. But they Grinnells and Missionaries don't match quite as well "horizontally."

September 04, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

One thing at a time. Right now I'm hoping that Richard Frajola and Bernard Biales will prove me wrong about the grill cancel. After that you can prove me wrong about the printing method.

September 04, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ooops!

In Item No. 2 of my prior and extremely informative post, please substitute Type II for Type I. In other words, Item No. 2 should reference Type II Missionary and Type II Grinnells.

I used the copy function in Microsoft word and forgot to change I to II.

September 04, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

I have not been posting or otherwise contributing to the computer analysis of the Grinnells because of my lack of knowledge in manipulating items in Photoshop. I have not wanted to butt in because the person(s) doing the actual work might think it similar to my asking Ken L. to do my research for me. (I believe I recall an earlier posting where he got a little prickly when he felt that someone had asked him to do something like that.)

After spending multiple hours looking at the Card of 10 and associated blowups at StampShow, my present take remains as follows:

1. The perimeter ornaments of the presumed genuine 13c Type I Missionary have remarkable similarities (dings, dents, breaks –whatever is the operable word), with the perimeter ornaments of each of the Type I Grinnells on the Card of 10. There are some differences, but there are remarkable similarities.
2. The perimeter ornaments of the presumed genuine 13c Type I Missionary have remarkable similarities (dings, dents, breaks –whatever is the operable word), with the perimeter ornaments of each of the Type I Grinnells on the Card of 10. There are some differences, but there are remarkable similarities.
3. A somewhat comparable argument can be made about the perimeter rules.
4. THINK VERTICAL.
5. These comparisons do not necessarily equate as well when compared on a value by value basis (e.g., comparing a Type I 2c genuine Missionary with a Type I 2c Grinnell, etc., etc.).
6. In other words, do not think horizontal.

It would be enlightening (I think) were someone (1) familiar with Photoshop as well as (b) having some spare time to do the similar visually informative sort of thing that Richard Matta has recently posted, but include the presumed genuine 13c Missionaries from the Card of 10 as the 'control' with the Grinnells on the Card of 10. The significant elements for comparison would be (I think) the perimeter ornaments and rules. (This is not to imply that I am in anyway suggesting that Richard Matta spend even more time on this comparison. Of course, his time is his to allot as he chooses.)

If my StampShow visual observations are correct (as well as the observations of multiple other people), then one would be hard pressed (I think) to argue that the perimeter ornaments and rules of the presumed genuine 13c Type I and Type II were other than models for the respective Type I and Type II Grinnells. If I am incorrect, then I am incorrect.

Mind you, I am not suggesting that 'Hawaiian Postage', the central numeral, and the applicable value tablet of the presumed genuine 13c Type I Missionary will match all of the Type I Grinnells (and likewise for Type II). I think these were probably cut and paste operations and while I am not an experienced faker, I still think that photography comes into play.

Incidentally, it never occurred to me until a prior posting that there may have been more than one attempt to try to copy the presumed genuine Missionaries and if such were indeed the case, then that could perhaps account for some differences.

Anyway, it would be presumptuous of me to ask someone to do this work even with having admitted my personal inability to do so.

(I sure hope I am right about this or you know who will really let me have it. On the other hand, if I am right about this, then you know who will include it in a block buster article, perhaps as block buster as that Southwest Museum Connection article that conspiracy theorists await. On the other hand, Dick Celler has likely already figured it out and is generating reams of backup information for whatever it is that he has already figured out.)

September 04, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Bernard B - I thought you were talking about comparing the Grinnells across values. Frames do kinda match, internal elements less so. I guess one could do the same for Missionaries.

September 04, 2006 **Steve W**

There is often too quick a rush to judgement in this discussion, present company included. I do not believe that Don Sundman, Ken Lawrence or Dick Celler have any ulterior motives in this affair. All are first class philatelists who happen to believe that the Grinnells may be genuine. We should respect that view, and hope that they respect opposing views.

It is particularly inappropriate to cast aspersions on Don. He is an excellent businessman who brings great credit to our hobby. His standing, financial or otherwise, will not be affected by how the Grinnells are judged.

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Matta Very informative, but are you going for a whole case? When I said unrepainted, I was trying to indicate genuine Missionaries. With what you have up, the Missionary comparables may show a rather different pattern of variation.

Jim B Are you saying the Grinnells match over the different values, except for the major changes. Not entirely.

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Kim B I would argue that Linn's was riding the Grinnells before Sundman's was involved.

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Alan M My impression is that they did not believe they would get a fair hearing in the US.

September 04, 2006 **Kim Brickman**

Walter P: since your post is here instead of being on the 'big boys board', my brief comments re: Linn's is similar to yours and Nick's. Granted, advertising helps in great measure to underwrite (no pun intended) the production costs of a periodical.

However, it does seem that many readers may correlate Linn's editorial stance on the Grinnell's as being 'friendly' towards Mystic based upon the ad space they are paying for. As I've stated here and elsewhere, 'perception is reality'. As such, subscribers to Linn's will only read part of this entire saga.

September 04, 2006 **Alan McLeod**

One of the queries in the back of my head is why did the owners send the stamps to the Royal London instead of one of the US expertising groups,

Alan Mc.

September 04, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Ken L.

I would have been happy to provide Mr. Galvez with at least two possibilities to account for in a stereotype or line block what he could only envision as a “shifting of elements” in set type.

1. Distortion of the paper.
2. Damage to the block, such as from something being dropped on it, or that block itself being dropped.

The testimony of any expert does not mean it is the whole truth. If not rebutted, it serves as “truth” only for the context in which it was uttered, namely the trial in question.

Richard M.

Your superimpositions are pretty damning, I'd say. Small discrepancies appear, such as positions of the corners, which paper deformation would easily account for.

Jim

September 04, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Grinnell Owners/Agents Would it be possible to get 1200 dpi scans of #G32, G33 and G67?

September 04, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

You really mean if the Grinnells are counterfeits, they amount to a few dozen stamps. If they are genuine, they are presumably the surviving remnant of one or more printings that may or may not have been printed from stereotypes of locked formes.

In the argot of the 1922 trial and the RPSL's rebuttal, your line cut (or, for that matter, a similar halftone cut) is a photoengraving. Galvez was not testifying about gravure prints. He meant a photographically composed and transferred printing relief.

If internal elements shift by a fraction of a millimeter in relation to others, that is a mountain of evidence that a unitary integral printing base wasn't used. Scott Trepel promises to show that your system printed the Grinnells. I eagerly await his evidence.

September 04, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I just added scans of a genuine set of four to the scans page (2c #7, 5c #60, 13c #103 and 13c #171).

September 04, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Bernard B - you asked for it. Here are comparisons of both types I and II. I started with a 13c for each type that generated a good contrast scan. I shifted the color to green to get better comparison. I then compared with the same type 5c and 2c (which I shifted toward purple). In each case, I made 2 images - the first with the 13c on the bottom and the 2nd shifting it to the top. Because all of the images were slightly different sizes, I matched them up by lining up the inner frame lines at the very center on each of 4 sides. Let's hope I get the html right the first time.

[13c G66 TII/5c G13 TII](#)
[5c G13 TII/13c G66 TII](#)
[13c G66 TII/2c G7 TII](#)
[5c G13 TII/13c G66 TII](#)
[13c G37 TI/5c G19 TI](#)
[5c G19 TI/13c G37 TI](#)
[13c G37 TI/2c G51 TI](#)
[2c G51 TI/13c G51 TI](#)

September 04, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Ken L...

The *Grinnells* amount to a few dozen stamps at most—why would I be talking about stereotypes being used for the true Missionaries? The subject of my point has been the printing of the Grinnells. I must not be making myself clear at all.

Further, “photoengraving” (do you mean *photogravure*?) has nothing to do with a [line block](#). A print from a line block would be utterly indistinguishable from a print obtained from set type or a stereotype, provided of course that the image was the same in each. The exact process—same press, same pressure, same paper, same ink, same surface on the type/stereotype/line block—is used in all three. You could not find even a molehill of evidence (let alone mountains) anywhere to demonstrate the opposite. ☺

Jim

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L As to your comments on my question on typography, you go off on the Missionaries and I can't follow you. The use of the word "equally" could mean a lot of things. My Smaller point Was, that if this means comparing the first three missionaries with the Grinnells in the way I was suggesting, "equality" should prove the Grinnells fake. (The larger point was the question about the nature of typography. I actually went back and did a little reading in Williams. Great book.)

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Re the 51-52 gap: But I was supplementing the analysis that specifically emphasized the role of stampless in this period. It compared to slightly earlier marking free periods, discussed the peculiar nature of such small study populations, and came to the conclusion that the number was on the low side, but not enough to get excited about. (We also don't know how the sample was gathered and it apparently has a few errors.) I love mystery too, but the tragedy is that the goal of analysis is to kill the mystery. One can only pray to find another one.

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Roger M My as well wait for Scott's presentation -- he will probably do this thing up in style.

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Roger H It is unlikely someone would put a fake cancel on a genuinely uncanceled stamp (the uncanceled stamps were probably generally used stamps). However, they might put a fake cancel on a genuine stamp with cancel removed (manuscript). The likelihood is that the marking in question is OK. Stan Piller says the Grinnell was sold as a fake and I take that as true.

September 04, 2006 **Walter P**

Poller -

The results of your pole are very interesting. I was surprised to see that only 2 percent of the people who voted thought the Grinnells were genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps.

But wait, when you take into consideration the pool of voters that believe the Grinnells are genuine, which I think may consist in part of most of the following:

Donald Sundman and the Staff at Mystic Stamp Company, The Editorial Staff at Linns Stamp News, Dick Celler, Patrick Culhane and last but not least Carol and Vince Arrigo and Family.

I will also try to post a list of possible non believers when I have about 20 free time hours with nothing else to do. Agh, maybe not.

I found Nick Kirke's observation on the 'big boys' Board this morning very interesting, when he stated that he felt his copy of the most recent Linns Stamp News that contained an editorial that gives the reader the impression that it is starting to look brighter that the Grinnells may be genuine.

Nick also notes that Linns Stamp News is starting to look like an ad package for Mystic Stamp Company. In fairness, Mystic can place as many advertisements as they want to in Linns, its a free country, but I can also sympathise with Linn's readers who for the most part do not want to spend their good money only to be forced to navigate through a jungle of advertisements from Mystic Stamp Company.

Nick's third point is thought provoking, in that it is no secret, or futile ground for a possible 'scoop' for Ken Lawrence, to come to the conclusion that Don Sundman and Mystic Stamp Company have a huge financial stake in the Grinnell owners quest to have the Grinnell stamps proven to be genuine Hawaii postage stamps. As Linns Stamp News premier advertiser, it leaves one to wonder, what, if any, influence Mystic Stamp Company has over the editorial staff at Linns Stamp News?

I wonder how many other Board readers and contributors share this uneasy feeling with Nick and Myself?

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard M Email you a beer? I didn't know that was possible. Ain't compooters grand.

September 04, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Matta Type IIs -- for some values, Richard has images with no cancel.

September 04, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Richard M-

Well done. You get a plate lunch and ahi poke when we have the opportunity to meet. This will be washed down with a Kona Brew Pub Longboard Lager. No wine here, sorry!

Roger

September 04, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

Yes, \$20,000 would be a bargain for a genuine Missionary in sound condition. But Stanley assured me that the buyer regards it as unquestionably counterfeit, and paid that amount for a counterfeit.

September 04, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

They were not a few dozen stamps. At least portions of about 200 Missionaries survive today, from what was once about two years worth of postage. In 1878 Thomas Thrum wrote in his history of Hawaiian stamps, quoted by Walter Giffard in 1893: "The numeral Stamps -- of this [1851 Missionary] and subsequent issues -- were struck off in the Government Printing Office in this city as they were required from time to time, and upon thin plain letter paper, such as was to be had at the time in the market, which accounts, in a measure, for the great variety of kinds."

If the Grinnells were printed in the 20th century, the most sensible cuts would have been photoengravings. I won't repeat here the mountain of evidence that refutes that hypothesis, but if you're curious it is not hard to find.

September 04, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

I'm not a plater. Am I even close?

13- 2
2-13
5- 2

September 03, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Richard M -

Bonus points if you can find a "shaka" sign in the ornaments.

To NOIP -

I keep reading that the printing traits of Grinnells showing type movement equal to that on Missionaries. I understand different Missionary printings had type movement, and I understand Grinnells show movement similar, but different than Missionaries (The implication being they were printed in a similar manner at a different time.). What I see are Grinnells that are so near to identical with each other that there could be only one or two varieties for the different denominations.

The more I think about the photographic process and how one would create a paste up, the more I think there are at least two attempts by the forger to make satisfactory copies of the 13 cent stamps discovered on the card, and to make believable examples of the other values. The forger photographed the "real" 13 cent stamp, then enlarged the image allowing him to paste in "Hawaiian Postage", the central numeral, and the appropriate value tablet using individual letters from a font book. The rephotographing reduced the image back to the size of the real Missionaries. Since we have no idea of the time period these experiments were tried, it is quite possible a number of "improvements" were made with practice. We have no idea how many attempts were made prior to them being discovered by the lucky person.

Another question raised asks why anyone would place a fake cork cancel on a possibly unused 13 cent stamp. I have no idea of the value in 1918 of a single unused 13 cent Missionary, but I don't think it was as much \$65,000 for a group of 43 from the new find!! And a collector was willing to pay \$75,000 for just 16 of them. The cork cancel just became a cost of doing business in the let's make a deal attitude of early 20th century stamp dealing!

Last night I constructed this [quiz](#) (course grain image).

How many different stamps are represented, and what are their denominations? They are not real pairs.

Roger

Re: paying \$20,000 for a Grinnell. There is a precedent for paying big bucks, i.e. Caspary. The problem is he returned his after studying them, maybe the recent buyer bought his on extension with the option to return, if it is not a genuine Missionary. Wouldn't \$20,000 be a good deal if it turns out to be real? Just asking.

September 03, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Yes, Ken, I agree with your outline of the importance and uses of stereotypes. However if the Grinnells were made in the 20th Century I don't see why anyone would use stereotypes to manufacture them. If they were made in the 19th Century, stereotypes are plausible, but still unlikely. Making a few dozen stamps would not obviate the use of stereotypes, for any reason.

Jim

September 03, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

Stereotype plates were made to avoid keeping scarce type, furniture, quoins, and chases out of use for prolonged periods, and in places where freshly cast type was difficult to replace, to reduce wear. By 1851 electrotypes had replaced stereotypes in metropolitan countries, but stereotypes were standard in remote and backward places, and in small shops.

September 03, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Someone can correct me if I'm wrong, but a *stereotype* is made from type locked up in a forme. It is essentially a mold, from which exact duplicates of the set page can be poured. Therefore any stereotype would have to have been made from a Missionary forme, whether an original or one made to replicate the originals. That begs the question—why go to the trouble to make a stereotype?

Of course I don't know what Scott will say in his report, but if it is his conjecture that the Grinnells are 20th Century artifacts then it is far more likely they were printed from one of [these](#), which are simplicity itself to make, rather than the laboriously made stereotype.

Jim

September 03, 2006 **Steve W**

\$10 is still my price, although if they're really on period paper maybe I'm being too cheap. Perhaps \$20 might shake one of those babies loose...

September 03, 2006 **Richard Matta** <rkm@groom.com>

Bernard - you can also email me.

September 03, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Bernard Biales - Haven't been north of NYC for awhile, sounds like a reason to schedule a trip to Boston. Anyway, maybe you can pick the specific stamps to compare - I can drop out the cancels but if they are very heavy some of the underlying design may disappear as well.

September 03, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren -

And the beat goes on ...

September 03, 2006 **Walter P**

Poller -

Not if the two that believe are Carol and Vince Arrigo?

September 03, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

Your post re: Someone paying \$20,000 for a counterfeit Grinnell stamp.

I suggest that this only proves one thing, that the old adage is true, "a fool and his money are soon parted."

September 03, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

I can reduce this mornings monologue that you posted on this Board, to the following:

All the participants in the Grinnell Saga, or should I say Grinnell Philatelic Soap Opera, could certainly be categorized as authors of their own misfortunes.

You are correct in that, what a tangled web they wove?

However, philatelic sleuth that you are, I have every confidence in your ability to untangle this web in your unbiased search for the truth.

So my friend, my advice to you is to stop playing the part of George Grinnell's 'Champion,' as in my view it is starting to wear thin and may come back to bite you.

What you need to do right now is to take a week off and clear the cobwebs from your brain so that you can approach this problem with a fresh mind instead of spending all of your valuable time defending George Grinnell.

Donald Sundman, Public Relations Guru Extroninaire that he is, has done a masterful job in keeping the Grinnell Posts going, and guess what, we are all falling for it?

I am looking forward to reading Scott Trepel's forthcoming information. Hopefully, this will be a refreshing change to all the recent posts that consist of re-hashing old irrelevant information that has largely either been proven false or at best mis-leading or taken out of context.

September 03, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Who needs an auction of believers when someone who is 100 percent convinced they are counterfeit pays \$20,000 for one?

September 03, 2006 **poller**

I guess the 2 who believe can make an auction of it if one appears at auction -

September 03, 2006 **poller**

poll ended. Results to question "Are the Grinnell's genuine?"

68% - no, 100% sure

10% - don't care

8% - no, less than 100% sure

8% - don't know

4% - yes, less than 100% sure

2% - yes, 100% sure

September 03, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott T,

George Grinnell and George Linn both published their opinions that Missionaries were printed from loose type and Grinnells from stereotypes but failed to persuade me. I'm eager to read your report, and I'll be happy to provide any references that may be useful.

Reputations when applied to stamps -- stamps!, not the fate of the republic or tomorrow's weather or Joe Paterno's varsity squad -- are pretty resilient. Yours

survived Klepp and Ashbrook's survived the Knapp shift. I'll retire from this fun when someone proposes to risk his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor. Until then, this is still stamp collecting.

September 03, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

The August issue of the United States Specialist contains Leonard Piskiewicz's editorial critical of the RPSL's use of scientific data regarding the papers. Len's academic degree is and career was in chemistry. He made a presentation on these points at the Rosemont Roundtable, which will probably be available eventually on Mystic's website.

The RPSL says all the stamps – Missionaries and Grinnells – were set from loose type and printed directly, not from plates. The book offers precise measurements of movement that the author believes is proof of this. In the past, each reported printing trait of the Grinnells that an author adduced as evidence of fraudulent production has been shown to occur equally on Missionaries. I'm thinking that will be the eventual result of your observation. Meanwhile, try the same test using 1852 Missionaries, which are set from completely different elements yet have many matched features.

Mutilating stamps at San Francisco can't be the reason for the absence of stampless covers for seven months (beginning three before stamps existed) at a time when about 1,000 letters per month were being dispatched from Honolulu.

Richard Malmgren,

William Sydney Porter has entertained generations of Americans with stories about swindlers who outwitted themselves. If the Grinnells are counterfeits, that is their literary heritage.

John Klemann distributed gratuities to cheat Grinnell out of his stamps for a small fraction of their presumed value. When the dust settled upon the courtroom he had won a legal victory and lost a fortune. The experience drove him over the edge of sanity. That's a script for the ages, and improves with good wine.

Why do you suppose someone paid \$20,000 for a stamp that Steve Walske calls a \$10 forgery? My opinion is, as usual, that the value is in the story, not the paper and ink.

September 03, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

Bernard B:

When I present all of the images and information, it will be very clear to you and your questions will be answered.

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Scott T Re my recent attempts to understand the letterpress issues: Physically, they could have made a printing from loose type and one by stereo. I'm not judging whether that would make any sense in the real world. What seems to me to be Occam's razor (it may need to be one of those old two edged jobbies) is if some characteristics of the Grinnells match the original and some do not and there is no way both these could happen in the stereotyping.

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Jim Baughman The wood question is not irrelevant -- if it is wood paper it is a nail in the coffin. But I agree that if it is not wood, it means pretty much nothing, and some Grinnell supporters or semi supporters don't seem to accept that. So either way, it is not a positive for the stamps. The handling of the new discoveries, whilst still in flux, has a bit of a similar flavor.

Have you looked at my questions, base on Richard Matta's image, about how the Grinnells could be such a close match in some aspects of arrangement, but otherwise so different? Wouldn't different type of the period result in much larger variations?

September 03, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I just received four scans of genuine stamps from "scott31" and will link up tomorrow.

September 03, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Scott T...

I look forward to your analysis.

Jim

September 03, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Gee, my simple point got missed completely. I will reiterate it in two sentences.

I would argue that analysis of the paper is irrelevant. It would not be difficult at any date after 1850 to obtain virtually any kind of blank paper from that era, which could be put to any use whatsoever.

(Ken L., point taken about Bible paper, although if the difference of opinion on the Grinnell paper is as disparate as wood-pulp vs. no-wood-pulp I would suggest that any Bible paper might just as easily pass muster. But that is a side discussion that leads nowhere! We might as well discuss how many angels can dance on a pinhead, a problem once considered important enough to preoccupy the greatest minds of the Dark Ages. IMO the truth about the origin of the Grinnells will never be arrived at via analysis of their paper.)

Jim

September 03, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

RE ANALYSIS OF GRINNELL FAKES AND GENUINE MISSIONARIES

I'm almost finished. I have decided to release this study when it is simplified and clearly articulated.

I am disregarding all circumstantial evidence and theories about who, what and where. I will simply show the clearest and most irrefutable evidence I can to prove that the Grinnell Fakes and the Missionaries were printed by different methods; that is, the Grinnell Fakes were printed from static stereotyped plates, and the Missionaries were printed from loose type assembled in forms.

Donald S. correctly states that the RPSL and others have declared that the Grinnell Fakes and Missionaries were both printed from loose type, but the evidence I intend to present will prove them to be wrong.

And with that I hope to end this "controversy" once and for all (but I doubt it).

A big promise, and I'm staking my reputation on it, but so have others in insisting that the Grinnell Fakes are "possibly genuine."

Stay tuned.

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Jan 52 -- I've got to put on my other pair of glasses. Or at least, that is my excuse.

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Some time back it showed that the data on the lack of records covers in the July 51 -- Jan 51 period didn't appear to be a big deal. I believe you mokusatsu'd this (as the Japanese did the Potsdam declaration) but undaunted, I add a datum I probably neglected. Richard has commented that the dearth of known covers with the Missionaries in the pre February period is likely due, at least in part, to the Hawaiian stamps being torn off at San Francisco.

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Jim Baughman It is not clear that anyone "determined" the Grinnells to be on wood paper. The wording seems to indicate a significant or high probability, but I see no evidence that the Committee rejected the data refuting that.

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Donald S I should say -- indicative of wood paper -- paper in 3. The wording is a bit vague. Has anyone come up with an explanation of the yellow fluorescence of the Grinnells?

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

What happened in 1918-22? Robert Graves wrote something he called oneiric history (sometimes -- I guess not in the case of Lawrence, who did dreaming enough). Lots of fun. Hard to know what to make of it.

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Matta I've been thinking about your be-yooteful picture. It would be awfully entertaining to see similar for (unrepainted) 13 ty I vs 13 ty II, 5 vs 13 ty II and 2 vs 13 ty II. A beer or an obscenely rich sundae at J.P.Licks the next time you're in Boston? Anyway, I'm going to ask Richard to put the one you made on the reference board.

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L You lost me. "The various elements shift similarly" --- do you mean things like the existence of the same types (I and II) in both groups and other such? Equally uniform -- is this between the groups or within each one? And if those details match (whichever), then my suggestion fails? Why?

September 03, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Walter P.

Well, there you have it. Insight eludes me, although it appears that you still have a chance for salvation.

I think my original point must have been correct. The name of today's game is "Let's see whose glass is most full of snake oil. Klemann's or Grinnell's." He with the most snake oil will be declared devil incarnate. He with the least snake oil will be declared the victim.

By the way, Grinnell allowing himself to be shook down by Edward Shattuck (if indeed that is the direction the shook shaked) does not count. You only get points if you were the shaker, not the shakee.

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

5) I left out -- other aspects of the papers that suggested later production. My impression is that these were not seen as decisive, but helpful.

September 03, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Donald S Your comments deserve a detailed answer. Based on the RPSL report

- 1) Nobody has narrowed the paper to the 1850s. Rather they have -- not quite definitely -- opened a window that includes the 50s.
- 2) The 2004 opinion, after their expert said this might be wood paper, but before the owner's commissioned reports, does not (p xiv) mention this. If they thought it was decisive, I would think it would have been incorporated in some manner.
- 3) The RPSL's expert said only that it might be wood paper. The newer opinions strongly suggest that it is not, although unidentified material is mentioned. It seems very likely that it is not wood paper.
- 4) The book states that the conclusion of the Expert Committee that the Grinnells are forgeries remains unchanged (after receiving the newer analyses). I would think this implies the members were given the new studies (although only abstracts in one case -- why?) and polled as to their Overall significance. It appears that they did consider the new data.
- 5) There were other aspects of the papers (several different papers are involved -- I gather two for the Grinnells and also paper for the envelope pieces. Doesn't the Emery story etc. suggest a very small printing. Why more than one paper?

Expert committees do make major blunders. I don't see that your comments lead to the conclusion that this happened the handling of the new paper data. (I think I have heard that there is a new article about the paper -- BIA journal? -- is that correct? I would appreciate the reference.

September 03, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

This repeats points made several times earlier. The exchange would be more efficient if you'd read what's already been posted and published before repeating challenges that were refuted long ago. All the points you raised are perfectly understood and do not apply.

Bibles were not printed on India paper until the 1870s, and thin Bible paper has identifiable constituents that were not available in the 1850s. See Dard Hunter's history of papermaking.

The RPSL's expert believed Grinnell paper contained sulfates based on nondestructive tests that cannot establish that chemistry, and based his 1880s surmise on that erroneous belief. Destructive tests refuted his opinion by proving that sulfates are not present.

Throughout this exercise, beginning with Kenyon's attempts in the 1890s, no one has been able to find examples of the paper on which Hawaiian Missionaries were printed.

The RPSL calls it potter's tissue and then says it was embossed with the British royal arms and papermaker's crest. Do you believe that?

In reality, paper of the latter description was used to print Hawaiian numerals, but only one Missionary stamp, unavailable for forensic testing, has ever been so described, and is anomalous.

September 03, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

One thing to bear in mind about paper—in 1880 there was all kinds of 1852 paper available.

Fakers of etchings struck from old plates (Rembrandt's and Goya's for example) were smart enough not to print on modern paper. All one has to do is find a book printed in the appropriate time period and rip out the front or back blank leaves, and print on them. An 1850s Bible could have supplied the proper paper for printing the Grinnells, and there were loads of them around, as there are even today. It doesn't make sense that someone would go to considerable pains to fake stamps then disregard the kind of paper they were printed on.

I would argue that analysis of the paper is irrelevant. We have one test (the RPSL one) which determined the paper to have a wood pulp content, others that apparently contradict that, so the issue can continue to be beaten endlessly, but like any dead horse no further mileage will be gotten from it.

Jim

September 03, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

Yes, I know typography; Dick knows plating. If the RPSL is correct that the various elements of both Missionaries and Grinnells shift similarly, you are wrong (and so am I). If I'm right, your speculation will fail the same test that Cal Hahn's did, namely, that once the aspects caused by alterations and repairs are excluded, the remaining details will prove to be equally uniform in both Missionaries and Grinnells. But until Dick or Scott or someone equally skilled in those techniques performs the study and sees it independently validated, we have no proof, just our opposing speculation.

September 03, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

No, you have not got it right. If you think The Merchant of Venice has the same meaning today as it did to Shakespeare, I have no way to communicate my meaning to you. But if you can understand that prominent stamp dealers who enjoyed sterling reputations for integrity routinely understated the quantities of rare stamps in their possession in their news releases and advertisements until ten years ago, and regarded their actions as sound and reasonable business practices above reproach, then you might take a more charitable view of George Grinnell's behavior.

Similarly, if you take a less charitable view of John Klemann's bribes that suborned Grinnell's agent directly (payment to S.L. Wood) and indirectly (payment to Bertram Poole to persuade Wood to favor Klemann over his client), you will gain an insight that eludes Richard Malmgren.

The unrecorded but substantial amounts of those bribes were what cost Klemann dearly, not the money he paid to and mostly recovered from Grinnell, but they did secure transparently false testimony from Poole at the trial. (Grinnell recorded that he was allowed in the settlement to keep about \$5,000. Klemann claimed that the affair had set him back \$20,000 plus legal costs.)

Finally, if you recognize that the stamps were declared genuine by Wood, Poole, and Klemann, and that Grinnell himself never attempted to involve Klemann, and that Klemann destroyed the signed authentication declaration that Grinnell had secured from Wood and agreed by Col. Taylor, you might regard weeping for Klemann to be misplaced sympathy.

Suppose the stamps are genuine, even though you doubt they are. Do you regard Klemann's behavior as ethical? I don't, though I certainly understand why he acted as he did. In that case, why should I judge Grinnell more harshly than Klemann?

As for the Shattucks' revised testimony, Grinnell's contemporary account says that Edward Shattuck shook him down, not vice versa. Shattuck told Grinnell that he had approached Grinnell's lawyer and asked for a cut of the money, but Oscar Lawler spurned him, so the family testified against Grinnell. Only afterward, and after demanding and getting a fifty-fifty cut did the Shattucks testify that Grinnell had told the truth.

I imagine the Shattucks have a different version of the same events, but I have not read it except for what's in their affidavits. Herbert Sterling wrote to Stanley Ashbrook, "The Shattucks would never be a party to messing in a deal that was dishonest." In the same letter he added, "If there was anything came out in print detrimental to any member of the Shattuck family – living or dead – he [David Shattuck, vice president of Technicolor Corp.] would bring suit against the magazine for damages that would stagger them."

My general point is that those who are unable to view the circumstances through eyes of others will never rise above their preconceptions to achieve more useful insights. In this saga, all the leading characters seem to have been motivated by greed, and to a degree, more some than others, they succumbed to its temptations. Even assuming that the Grinnells are counterfeit, singling out Grinnell for condemnation is not a recipe for solving the mystery, only for clouding it.

September 03, 2006 **Walter P**

Donald Sunman -

Donald, your posts are starting to sound desperate? You can't bring your cause back to life by applying CPR to a dead issue.

With all due respect, what you have here is a RPSL negative decision, and Narrative Report, that cannot be vacated unless the Grinnell owners dust off their old trunks, old prayer books and dusty corners and come up with some new credible evidence that would cause the RPSL to reconsider their decision.

If the owners have such evidence, than they should re-submit the Grinnell stamps to the RSPL with that evidence for re-consideration of the present negative decision.

Regarding your post this morning. Mr. Sundman, are you seriously suggesting that the RPSL Expert Committee would rewrite their report containing their negative decision on the Grinnell stamps, so that they would not have to deal with the paper reports later submitted by the Grinnell owners?

Have you thought this out, because what you are suggesting is that an institution [RSPL] that has a sterling reputation and that has been in existence for over 100 years, with a flawless reputation, would have members of its Expert Committee re-write their Grinnell stamp report, and issue a flawed report, just so that they would not have consider any new paper evidence that was later submitted by the Grinnell owners?

I am both surprised and appalled that a person of your stature in the philatelic community would ever make such a suggestion?

As far as your comments on the Grinnell owners own paper testing goes, have you considered that even if the Grinnell stamps were in fact printed on pre 1860 paper without sulfates, that in itself proves nothing. Because, as you are well aware, the Grinnell stamps, even if they were printed on paper without sulfates, could still have been printed in the 20th century using unused paper that was manufactured prior to 1860.

In essence, you are correct in stating the stamps could not be printed before the paper was manufactured, but the stamps could have been printed after the paper was manufactured, and that I submit was exactly what occurred, not in the 1850s, but in the 20th century.

It should also be noted, as you are also well aware, that the paper used to print the Grinnell stamps was only one of many written reasons the RPSL gave for issuing their negative decision.

Open question for your client, the Arrigo's, what are you waiting for? If you think you have new compelling evidence, than why do you not re-submit your Grinnell stamps with your paper evidence to the RPSL for a re-consideration of their prior decision?

September 03, 2006 **Donald Sundman**

Grinnell paper.

I think the Royal paper analysis is weak and should be discounted.

The Royal used a non-destructive test on the paper. Their preliminary report to the families stated the Grinnells were printed on paper that contained wood sulfates. This news stunned both families because it conflicted with what their own non-destructive testing had shown. This is a very important point. The Royal called the Grinnell stamps counterfeit thinking the paper was made in the 1880's and contained wood sulfates!

Most modern paper (after 1860 I think) was made with wood pulp and contains sulfates. The accepted Missionaries are printed on paper without sulfates. The fact the Grinnells are printed on paper without sulfates is a key element that connects both the stamp issues. But like almost all the scientific testing, a match doesn't prove the Grinnells genuine. That is one frustrating element for people seeking to show the Grinnells are genuine. Testing showing a variance could prove the Grinnells are counterfeit but testing showing the Grinnells the same or similar doesn't prove they are genuine.

After hearing this news from the Royal both families independently and without consultation with the other decided to sacrifice a portion of a stamp for a destructive test. Destructive testing is the gold standard or paper testing. Two stamps and a portion of an envelope were subjected to destructive tests.

The destructive testing on both stamps showed no evidence of sulfates. This is consistent with paper from 1850 and inconsistent with paper from the 1880's. I will repeat, the Royal called the Grinnells counterfeit thinking the paper was from the 1880's.

The families sent the test results to the experts at the Royal. The Royal was being criticized for the length of time they had taken to make a decision. I don't think they wanted to re-open the issue. So the Royal report was re-written to remove the reference to the modern paper.

This is another sad part of the Grinnell story. The destructive testing showing no wood sulfates in the Grinnell paper was done after the Royals non-destructive tests showing wood sulfates. This fits the pattern of false claims made about the Grinnells overturned by testing but the new information doesn't affect the expert opinion about the stamps status.

I don't blame the experts at the Royal for reaching the conclusion of counterfeit if they believed the paper was from the 1880's. Absent time travel the stamps could not have been printed before the paper was made. The next time experts are looking at the Grinnells they will have information the Royal learned only after forming their opinion.

September 03, 2006 **poller**

Maybe we can get the [Grinnell poll](#) to 100 participants and close it down.

September 02, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Donald S I believe you misspoke when you said the paper was from the 1850's. The RPSL thought the late 1800s was more plausible, but did not eliminate the 50s.

What Grinnell did or didn't do is interesting, but that doesn't mean it is necessary to come to a strong conclusion about his stamps. What happened at the trial, involving very large amounts of money and the status of philately eight decades ago doesn't bear on the correctness of the analysis of the RPSL or other substantially disinterested parties today. (Actually interested parties analyses are also worthy of consideration -- it is nice to have those interests clear. My interest is in the puzzle and annoyance at the way the fakes have been promoted. But I am a bit puritanical.) The core of the RPSL study was a comparison of the issued stamps and their use with the Grinnells. The Missionaries are in design detail very different from the Grinnells. The markings are different, but, most clearly in the case of the seven bar, derived from the genuine: i.e. fake. The CDS also shows clear evidence of fakery. Even moreso since one of the missing ones may have been found. Richard Frajola has added considerable clarity to the RPSL study of the postal history aspects of the material. This is a beautiful article, which I won't try to repeat -- but the Grinnells don't fit in with any reasonable pattern of normal use, the markings aren't a reasonable geometry, nor is usage from Waialua plausible. (The whole Emery theory goes nowhere)

The two new genuine Missionaries are dramatic. I think they are wonderful and look forward to seeing a full analysis of them. But so far, the stamps fit in the role as possible sources of the generation of the Grinnells as copies, not original printings. Richard and I have made comments on the markings, which point in the same direction. The main question mark is the grid on Grinnell's Missionary. Richard, with great experience in this area, believes it is not the Grinnell marking, but does fall with the Missionary marking. With less experience, I believe this is quite likely so. Further, the Celler chart, the only part of his analysis available to me, diverges from the data. Whatever it is, it is hard to see how it will provide evidence the Grinnells are genuine.

The sale of a Grinnell for \$20,000 is stunning, at least to me, but I understand it does not reflect any belief in the Grinnell's being genuine.

Expertization is a multifaceted process -- these don't match the real stamps, the markings are copies, the postal history is non sensical.

The reporters ran to Einstein, asking him about new data against the theory of relativity. He suggested that the data, if correct, would make of his theory non sense. Then he went off and wrote a paper explaining how the new data was in error. I will be fascinated to see the results of examination of G80, but I don't see it changing the status of the Grinnells. To put it more philosophically, when a data based theory is well put together, loose ends and apparent contradictions tend to wash away with time.

But that is just my take on what I read... except the the embrace of G80 by some is pretty clearly premature.

September 02, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Let me try to refine my question. I'm not suggesting that there is no wiggle room in the Missionaries. But since they had so many elements in common, changing a few might not change the entire set of positionings. Also I am guessing (based vaguely on a comment somewhere on the point system not yet existing), that the difference -- not just in the lettering itself, but in the position of the lettering on the type piece, and in the underlying shape and size of the type - among sets of type from different sources would prohibit the mil level precision we are seeing. (I addressed it to you because I was under the impression you had more experience with typography than Dick Celler.)

September 02, 2006 **Donald Sundman**

My thoughts on Grinnell as an collector who stumbled upon the find of a lifetime.

I raise the A/B/C scenarios because I came into this story only hearing and thinking about A and B possibilities. C is a viable possibility and makes a compelling story. I don't know what actually happened in 1918 anymore than others posting here.

The choices are; A. Grinnell was an expert stamp forger or knew someone who was and acted as his agent, or B a stooge for someone manipulating him, or C actually made the find of a lifetime.

However the only person I've spoken with who actually knew GG is Carole Arrigo. She describes a nice guy who loved stamps and collecting. Everyone else I've talked to about GG never met the man and most never spoke with anyone who met the man.

Looking at the story of a stamp collector making a great find that is discredited by untruths is worth considering. For example Grinnell meets Shattuck, receives the Missionary stamps, doesn't know what he has, shows the stamps to someone who says they are genuine but watch out for stamp dealers, they will cheat you. Months Klemann borrows money from Caspary, buys the stamps from GG and sells a portion to Caspary. GG holds stamps back afraid of being taken advantage of by east coast dealers. Caspary compares the Grinnell Missionaries to his and notices they are different. Caspary then makes several claims against the Grinnells we now know are wrong. Caspary said the paper was of recent manufacture. Recent destructive tests proves that false, the paper is from the 1850's. Caspary said the ink used to print the stamps contained modern materials. Recent tests show that is not true. Caspary said the red cancel ink was made of modern materials. Again recent tests show that to be not true. Manuel Galvez said the Grinnells are printed by photoengraving. The Royal and others now say Grinnells are printed with lose type like the accepted Missionaries. Every conclusion drawn at the 1922 trial has been proven to be false.

In the C version of events Grinnell returned the unspent money to Klemann and received the stamps. Grinnell promised not to appeal the verdict in exchange for not repaying all the money Klemann paid for the stamps. Grinnell was not a wealthy man and did not have the money to give to Klemann. He was confident the truth would come out, that he would find evidence to prove his stamps genuine. Grinnell set about gathering facts to show the trial conclusions were wrong and spent the rest of his life seeking that evidence.

Bill Fox recently told me he spoke with John Klemann in the early 1960's when Klemann was an old man and Klemann insisted the Grinnells were genuine and was bitter about the outcome of the stamps. Klemann told Fox he had to sue to recover the money he owed Caspary because Caspary would not buy the stamps. If Klemann actually believed this we have Klemann saying the stamps are bad because his major customer said they were bad. Stamp dealers are not going to tell their biggest clients the client is wrong. Once Caspary backed out of the purchase Klemann had no choice but to sue Grinnell for the return of the money. It was Caspary's money.

Think about this.

We now know the trial was wrong about the paper, stamp ink, canceling ink, and printing method. But the stamps still are not accepted by some in the expert community. A new threshold is demanded in that a Grinnell cancel needs to be found on an accepted stamp or an accepted cancel found on a Grinnell. The thinking is no one would put a fake cancel on an expensive stamp causing it to lose value. We now have an example of a Grinnell cancel on an accepted stamp. Suddenly the rules change again. Now the skeptics say we need the accepted stamp on a Grinnell, something very unlikely to be found.

I don't know if the Grinnells are genuine or counterfeit. There is no physical evidence the Grinnells are counterfeit. There is evidence the Grinnells are genuine. There is a lack of proof the stamps are genuine. Perhaps Grinnell printed the stamps or worked with someone who printed the stamps. Perhaps he was duped. George Linn wrote he was convinced GG believed the stamps genuine.

The price of a Grinnell stamp may reflect the markets perception of the probability the stamps are genuine. Several months ago I was offered a Grinnell for between 4 and 5 thousand dollars. Now I'm told one sold at the Chicago stamp show for \$20,000. If true someone is saying the probability the Grinnells are genuine is higher now than a few months ago.

I post my warm and fuzzy statements about Grinnell because I've read plenty of words that strongly imply Grinnell was a con-man. That version of events has gotten plenty of ink. How often have you read the story of an avid stamp collector who made the discovery of a lifetime only to have it and his reputation discredited? The C scenario.

I'm writing the A story that Grinnell was the evil genius behind the greatest stamp fraud of all time. I hope to post it in a day or two. Its fun to think through all the possibilities.

September 02, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren -

While sitting here sipping a glass of world class British Columbia Ice Wine, from the Okanagan, all I can say is that it must be hard being a philatelic sleuth.

Unless Ken Lawrence knows something that we don't, about Kleeman, and he is holding it back for some sort of a earth shattering, you haven't seen anything yet,'scoop,' I fail to see why Kleeman gets portrayed as a philatelic pariah, when as far as I can see, he was the one who was victimized in the fraudulent sale of the Grinnell Hawaii Missionary stamps, was he not?

Caspary got all his money back, it was Kleeman who was left holding the bag, and was forced to sue George Grinnell.

The fact Kleeman had to sue George Grinnell in court is evidence that Grinnell was not willing to return Kleemans money to him after Caspary returned the stamps to Kleeman, as counterfiet.

If there was a victim, it was certainly not, as Ken Lawrence alludes to, George Grinnell.

September 02, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

Addendum to my last post:

Ken, to be very clear what I meant when I stated that it is not the role of Ken Lawrence, Dick Celler and Don Sundman to prove the Grinnell Missionary stamps are genuine and to prove George Grinnell was innocent of any wrong doing.

History will prove that one way or another.

Ken, I believe, based on what you have posted on this Board, that your role as a writer and philatelic sleuth, is to search for the truth no matter where that path leads. Ideally, you can accomplish this task free from personal bias, and with an open mind. I for one have every confidence that you can accomplish this goal.

As far as Dick Celler and Donald Sundman they can speak for themselves.

However, I would think that they are not acting as advocates for the Grinnell owners and will also interpret the evidence as they see it, free from bias, no matter where the path leads.

I think that there is no doubt that the Grinnell Missionary stamps are counterfiet, the only other issue left is who printed the Grinnell stamps, and why?

September 02, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Walter P.

It is past 5 pm on a Saturday in Hawaii. I am still at the office trying to play catch up and earn money to buy all of those Grinnells for my reference collection. I foolishly brought up the Little Boy's Board after multiple days of abstention to just read the latest. It was my plan later in the evening to meet my wife for dinner at which time I will probably order a Burgundy or a Rhone rather than a Bordeaux to better emulate Scott Trepel - instead, I am writing this. Actually, I think I will meet her and order multiple Burgundies or Rhones.

I confuse easy and I have always been confused by Ken L's continued assertion that Klemann's glass had more snake oil in it than did Grinnell's. Somehow, I get the idea that one is trying to argue that the person holding the most snake oil is the sinful party which, I guess, is supposed to make the person with the lesser amount of snake oil in his glass the victimized party. With little substantiation that I recollect (of course, substantiation is in the eyes of the beholder), Ken has continually made Klemann out to be the devil incarnate.

Grinnell actually told fibs. A cynic might even suggest that he bribed people to provide revised testimony.

Are the worse things that Klemann did to incur Ken L's wrath was to have (1) "arranged to pay Wood a substantial commission to lubricate a deal with Grinnell" and (2) "sold just 16 of the 43 stamps to Caspary for \$75,000" after having purchased 43 of them for \$65,000?

I for one do not think that stamp dealers are fundamentally the scum of the earth. (I guess they might be, but then in fairness, would one also have to include all people in sales?) There are stamp dealers who even today buy low and sell high. I can think of more than one such dealer. Believe it or not, there have been auction sales of Hawaii material when I did not have the funds to buy at the time and the stamp dealer who purchased the material has actually offered it to me at a multiple of the purchase price.

So just what makes John Klemann the devil incarnate?

September 02, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Collector's Club was selling RPSL book at BALPEX this weekend - as far as they are concerned, debate is over, Grinnell's are proven forgeries beyond a shadow of a doubt, anyone who suggests otherwise is deluded (paraphrasing, but that is the essential message).

September 02, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

So what it appears you are saying is that because there were no APS conduct rules in place at the time George Grinnell sold his counterfeit Hawaii Missionary stamps this makes his conduct somehow excusable when clearly today this conduct would not be acceptable? Have I got this right?

If you read my post and any of my other posts regarding George Grinnell you will see that I have never stated that George Grinnell printed the Grinnell Hawaii Missionary stamps.

All that I have ever stated was that based on the evidence presented to date, and albiet it is clearly circumstantial evidence, it appears that George Grinnell played some part in the printing of the stamps we all know now as the 'Grinnells.'

We all reap what we sow, and are all responsible for our own actions. In fact, poor George Grinnell made some, to be kind here, errors in judgement that may have later sullied his reputation, than Grinnell like everyone else must suffer the consequences of his actions.

All I ever suggested, was that based on the evidence presented so far, it appears that on a balance of probabilities, George Grinnell was not the 'Indiana Jones of Philately' but more likely than not a co-conspirator in the printing and sale of the counterfeit Hawaii Missionary stamps known as the 'Grinnells.'

So in fact, you are incorrect when you state in your post that I have somehow portrayed George Grinnell as a philatelic villain. This is not so, George Grinnell by virtue of the path it appears he chose to follow, did that all by himself.

Also, you seem to forget that based on the RPSL decision, and RPSL narrative report, the onus has shifted over to the Arrigo's, and not Ken Lawrence, Dick Celler or Don Sundman to prove that the Grinnell Missionary stamps are genuine and that George Grinnell is innocent of any wrongdoing.

Personally, contrary to what you may choose to believe, I have no axe to grind, and I would not be unhappy to see George Grinnell cleared of any wrong doing in the printing of the Grinnell Missionary stamps.

I, unlike others, have no stake in this case one way or another, but like many others, I would like to know what really happened in this case and mostly who in fact did print the Grinnells.

Interestingly, neither the Arrigo's or their supporters have offered no convincing rebuttal evidence and as of today the RPSL decision stands.

September 02, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Walter P,

Some of George Grinnell's behavior would not be acceptable today, but I'm not sure about his own day, which is the only fair standard against which to measure him.

Just ten years ago, the APS incorporated into our Code of Ethics a proposal by John Hotchner and myself that forbids false or misleading claims of scarcity. When we adopted this, it was controversial. Some leading lights of the stamp trade, all widely respected as people of integrity, had to change their business practices to avoid APS discipline.

In Grinnell's day there was no such rule in effect, and even as recently as my first term on the APS Board of Directors in 1991, concealing a substantial portion of a major philatelic discovery was regarded in many stamp circles as intelligent business.

Judged by today's standards, John Klemann's conduct was worse than Grinnell's. Before meeting with Grinnell and Grinnell's agent S.L. Wood, he met privately with Wood and arranged to pay Wood a substantial commission to lubricate a deal with Grinnell. Wood then persuaded Grinnell to accept Klemann's offer of \$65,000 though he had previously agreed with Grinnell that \$95,000 was reasonable. Klemann then sold just 16 of the 43 stamps to Caspary for \$75,000. Even allowing for overhead and expenses, that's the very swindle that Grinnell anticipated and sought to thwart or overcome by concealing a portion of the stamps.

Applying your standard equally to Klemann, should you not suspect him of condemning the stamps despite his stated belief in their authenticity in order to extricate himself from looming bankruptcy after Caspary found the stamps unacceptable?

Perhaps you'll recall earlier arguments on Richard Frajola's board with a naif named Prometheus who boasted of his ability to obtain philatelic material at prices substantially below its market value by taking advantage of sellers. Not everyone here disagreed with his tactics, I regret to say, but I think even those who took him to task did not revile him in the way you disparage Grinnell.

September 02, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

I will mail your magazine when the post office reopens Tuesday.

If you, Jim B, and Richard M will be patient, I think you'll see that the same situation or mirage occurs on genuine Missionaries, even after substitutions such as the small n of Cents on the 5¢.

Dick Celler's study is difficult because so many details on so many stamps are shifted, added, replaced, or removed by repairs and painting, but once those effects are taken into account, it appears that the settings are different in minute details, but still sufficient to identify, while most of the rest continue to match.

I'm not a plater and even less a computer hand, so I have to rely on others' skills. So far, each time someone has observed a supposedly fatal trait in the Grinnells, careful study has discovered the same trait in Missionaries, going back to John Klemann's points illustrated at the trial, and more recently Calvet Hahn's claim that Grinnell ornaments overlapped.

I favor continuing study from every perspective, but I've witnessed so many announced checkmates which analysis proved to be stalemates that the Scottish verdict stands for the present.

September 02, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Bernard Biales - I suppose someone might test the theory that the central ornamentation (4 corners, 4 frame pieces with projections x 2 cliches) could be rearranged in a way that all of the pieces match. That might support the theory that the cliches were broken down and reassembled. But, you don't necessarily know what was repaired. Moreover, I suppose they could have had enough pieces to make more than 2 cliches, so even harder to compare.

September 02, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Matta and Ken Lawrence Although others have been making similar points, it seems to me your image can be used to slightly rephrase the question in a way that should satisfy Ken, who asked for an element in the Grinnell's not available in 1850s Hawaii. Now if you had classic ink on old paper with the circuit diagram for a transistor stereo, you would be entitled to believe it was made after WW II. Likewise if you had a purported pre WWII ball race, but found the balls had ten millions tolerances, you would know it was not what it seemed.

My question is, with the variations in type -- and the Grinnell type is all different from the Missioneries -- how could so many of those alignments be so perfect without special jigs, precision instruments, or photo aids. Note how different the Scott no. 4 is from the earlier stamps. It seems physically impossible for there to be so many matches. The presence of non matches shouldn't vitiate the argument -- maybe even contrariwise.

September 02, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Jim Baughman I see that my comment below is naive step along the lines of your analysis of August 25.

September 02, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

"deed"

September 02, 2006 **-Bernad Biales**

Ken L In the no good dead goes unpunished -- after Amos Press sent me a couple of news stand locations, I drove over to one today. They don't carry it. Maybe I'll take up your offer --- Bernard Biales, Box 301150, Jamaica Plain, 02130.
Wonder why they are keeping such bad records?

September 02, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Matta Partly since I am unfamiliar with the processes involved, my first thought was that your image, for which I am grateful, didn't say much. But I think it says a lot -- if I only knew what. The questions in my mind are based on matcha and mismatch. Some of the match -- the framing and the titles are mostly so well matched. The decoration less so. I can't imagine how the former would happen (these are made from different "type") unless there were some kind of photographic model to work from. Accuracies of the order of a part per thousand. On the other hand, the ornaments don't line up so well. Dunno why that would be. Didn't realize that the match of the lettering would be so close in this kind of image.
Thanks

September 02, 2006 **Walter P**

John Bowman -

Thank you for the thoughtful comments in your post this morning. I agree with you and Don Sundman that we have to be careful and refrain from making statements that amount to a character assassination of George Grinnell.

Was he a passionate life long collector who loved his stamps as Don Sundman would have us believe, yes probably so. Does this exclude George Grinnell from playing a part in the printing of the Grinnell Missionary stamps, no it does not.

On one hand, I think it is not fair, as Ken Lawrence most ably points out, to hang every California based forgery or philatelic fraud on George Grinnell.

On the other hand, if the evidence points to George Grinnell being involved in some California Tax Stamp irregularities, then we cannot ignore this and brush it under the carpet.

There is ample circumstantial evidence that points to George Grinnell not being the 'Indiana Jones of Philately.' This arises out of George Grinnell's claim that he 'discovered' the Hawaii Missionary stamps that we now know as the Grinnell stamps. If it also turns out that the California Tax Stamps also 'discovered' by George Grinnell have been faked, altered or control numbers added, then that would only tend to deepen our suspicions.

Yes, the case against George Grinnell not being the 'King of California Philatelic Finds' or as I prefer to suggest, the 'Indiana Jones of Philately' turns on circumstantial evidence. However, you must also consider that there have been many men and women sent to the 'gallows,' by juries of our peers, solely on a case of circumstantial evidence in 20th century Canada, Great Britain and the United States.

As it now stands, even without having the California tax stamps in question, from George Grinnell's second great find expertized, there is still enough circumstantial evidence, that, when presented to a right minded person, free of bias, or having a financial stake in the outcome of whether the Grinnell Missionary stamps are genuine, could only come to the conclusion that George Grinnell does not come out of this with 'clean hands.' Only the extent of his involvement is at present unknown.

The Philatelic Jury is still deliberating on this case.

September 02, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

John B,

Grinnell's own report that Don cited makes clear that it was Grinnell's discovery in the sense you meant, not the dealer's nor the dealer's source, which was what Vanderhoof's report implied to me. Grinnell recognized the significance of the stamps; the dealer did not; his source did not. Vanderhoof confirmed Grinnell's belief.

September 02, 2006 **John D. Bowman** <johndbowman@charter.net>

Please ignore the "Mr Sundman" at the end of my posting. It is my posting and I forgot to finish the last sentence, which is inconsequential anyway.

John

September 02, 2006 **John D. Bowman** <johndbowman@charter.net>

Walter P and Don S,

I really do not have much to add to my earlier posting. Some of you know that my areas are US locals and their forgeries, and 19th century state revenues, so I cannot comment on the Hawaiian controversy. However, I recalled the WPG article was in my files and thought it might be of tangential interest to some.

But I wanted to correct any mistaken impressions my posting may have caused. I was merely raising questions concerning the CA revenue find, which Walter responded might make Grinnell an "Indiana Jones."

I certainly know nothing about Grinnell's character other than what I have heard here and might have read elsewhere, and did not know to what degree or what specific collecting interests he may have had. I agree with Mr Sundman that it is wise to focus on more than an examination of the stamps themselves, because GHG, as Mr Sundman says, has had his reputation besmirched over the years. I would not wish that on anyone, and did not intend my posting to further besmirch his reputation.

In a similar vein, S. Allan Taylor was widely reviled during his lifetime because of his many forgeries. He died penniless. Yet, he did publish the first philatelic publication in North America, he was contemporary with some of the earliest stamp collectors and dealers, as well as some of the local post proprietors. I have spent much time acquiring and studying his forgeries, and they are a favorite part of my collecting. Today, a "Taylor forgery" means a specific type of forgery and suggests nothing negative about Mr Taylor.

I can only identify one other person who may collect the CA stamps by controller's overprint, and only a very few people who seriously collect the CA stamps without regard to overprint. What I know about Vanderhoof suggests he was a lifelong lover of state revenue stamps, probably an expert on the early CA, and always collaborated with others. He seemed to have at least a high opinion of Grinnell's find, if not Grinnell himself.

Mr Sundman offered the citation for the 1940 Stamps article by Grinnell about the CA stamps, which I appreciate because I did not have that one. If I had been Grinnell, I would also have recognized this as a possibly exceptional find and would have taken it to Vanderhoof for confirmation, if not others as well. Grinnell did exactly what a good collector would do. Vanderhoof did not dispute their authenticity, and certainly would have examined them carefully before publishing his article. Perhaps I should not have raised the question about false overprints, but as I mentioned it was a very late find and an overprint seems easier to fake than a cancelled Hawaiian missionary. If someone did manufacture these, it is certainly plausible that Grinnell and Vanderhoof were completely unaware and in fact likely that they believed them to be genuine.

Whether or not the CA revenues with overprints are authentic remains to be seen, I suppose, yet I would not disagree with Mr Sundman's assessment of them, nor Vanderhoof's. All I meant to imply was that if they are authentic, Grinnell made a tremendous discovery. If not, it seems coincidental considering the long controversy over the Missionaries, but I could make no stronger association between the two issues than mere coincidence. My first posting stated "strong circumstantial evidence" but in retrospect I should have deleted the word "strong."

Ken L said I misrepresented the article by attributing the discovery to Grinnell. Yet, I have found items in dealer's stocks and auction lots that later, on inspection, revealed something previously unreported, such as a double transfer. I have never given the dealer or his unknown source credit for the discovery when I published my findings. It was in that frame that I made the statement that Grinnell discovered these.

Mr Sundman

September 02, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Bernard Biales - you asked about the capability of overlaying digital images. [Here](#) is something I did in a few minutes with Photoshop (I'm not an expert by any stretch of the imagination). Picked two images at random, changed the color a bit, and overlayed one (#80 in purple) over another (#G13 in dark green). "Pulled" the corners of the top image until the outer edges lined up. Not a great job (1) they may not have been perfectly aligned rotation-wise (i.e., if one is rotated a fraction of a degree to the left or right, it may affect the match) and (2) I can't guarantee that I didn't stretch more in one direction than another.

September 01, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Yes -- the G80 a grand image, but not quite as grand as the Tapling image (yeah, I'm too dumb to expand it even more and play with the contrast -- I think I may want a little less). Only recently did I get my printer running -- I've had the computer six years.

September 01, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Don S Re the Christmas seal: I wasn't questioning your characterization of the cover at all, but rather remarking ruefully on its social-historical aspect.

September 01, 2006 **Walter P**

Donald Sundman -

Firstly, I have not spoken to nor have I had any contact with John Bowman.

I took John Bowman's post regarding George Grinnell and his California Tax Stamp discovery at face value. Perhaps, in hindsight that was a mistake on my part, however I like to think that everyone on this Board posts information that is accurate and not designed to be misleading. I just invited John Bowman to post anything he could add to support his last post if he could do so.

After reading your post and Ken Lawrence's posts regarding the above, and more specifically the information reported in John Bowman's post, I now suspect that the information John posted on this Board may not have been completely accurate in all respects.

To be perfectly clear, so that you understand the intent of my last post directed at you, I was simply hoping that John Bowman would respond to your post if he had anything too add to this discussion so far?

I am not suggesting that your explanation was somehow misleading, inaccurate, or incomplete, I was just suggesting to John Bowman that if he disagreed with what you and Ken Lawrence posted on this matter, then now was the time to issue a rebuttal. Failure to do so would in my mind led me to believe that perhaps what was reported, for reasons known only to John Bowman, may not be an completely accurate assessment of the California Tax Stamp find accredited to George Grinnell.

After reading John Bowman's post, I was, and still am, left with the impression that George Grinnell's tax stamp find, and the circumstances surrounding the find, were somehow not completely above board.

Perhaps, John Bowman can support his post by providing us with the names of the stamp dealers he said the Arrigo's supposedly contacted to try and sell the tax stamps in question for a large inflated price, in relation to their true value?

If the Arrigo's did not try to sell these stamps to anyone prior to selling them to Mystic Stamp Company than Vince and Carol Arrigo should simply post this information first hand.

I realize that the Arrigo's are your clients, but I must say, that to my mind, your posts come off as you being some kind of champion for George Grinnell.

I do not want to see anyone's name or reputation besmirched, but I think that even you and Ken Lawrence must believe that in at least the printing of the Grinnell Missionary stamps, George Grinnell does not come out of this with 'clean hands'?

I also note in your post that you cite three possibilities A,B and C which give explanations regarding George Grinnell's involvement in the discovery and or printing of the Grinnell Missionary stamps.

Personally, I opt for the later part of 'A.' I think it safe to say that George Grinnell was not an expert stamp forger, but at the same time was part and parcel to the printing of the Grinnell stamps. George Grinnell may not have had blue printers ink on his fingers, but he most likely was not too far away from the printing press?

Mr. Sundman, you keep stating 'warm and fuzzy' statements in your posts, about George Grinnell, like, George Grinnell was a stamp collector who loved his stamps, so what, we all love our stamps and covers.

The real question we should be asking ourselves is, was George Grinnell the 'Indiana Jones of Philately' or was George Grinnell a collector who foolishly succumbed to temptation and allowed himself to become involved in the manufacturing of counterfeit Hawaii Missionary postage stamps, now known as the 'Grinnells'?

I feel sympathy for Carol Arrigo who desperately wants to see her fathers name cleared, but at the same time we all have to follow the evidence wherever it leads us. Right now, it appears to this writer anyway, that George Grinnell was involved in the printing of the Grinnell Missionary stamps.

What was the extent of his involvement? Well, all I can say is that if George Grinnell knew the stamps he sold to Klemman were counterfeit than George Grinnell was nothing more than a fraud artist that got caught and was lucky he did not go to prison for his part in this saga.

Let's not forget that there was a victim here. Klemman purchased the Grinnell Missionary stamps from George Grinnell for what would today be a great sum of money. Klemman was the real loser in all of this as he had to pay Caspary back and only received part of the money he paid George Grinnell back. There was also the question of his legal fees which he had to pay himself.

I hope this post addresses your concerns and you now have a better understanding of what I was stating in my earlier post regarding John Bowman.

September 01, 2006 **Donald Sundman**

Walter P.

I don't understand your post about John Bowman having more to say. Please expand or perhaps John will.

My guess is John was either posting what he heard from someone else or suggesting a connection that showed Grinnell was a serial faker.

I wanted John and the board to know facts I know.

Its great John shares what people are saying or his own thoughts. Addressing these issues will move us forward to knowing the entire story.

I posted to illuminate some of the facts I actually know about the Grinnell Missionaries and George Grinnell. I'm not certain we on this board think about him as a person, a stamp collector, someone who may have thought he made a fabulous discovery only to have it discredited and his reputation besmirched. Thinking of him as a collector who stumbled across a discovery we can only dream of, only to have it and his name discredited is an amazing story. I think the choices are; A. Grinnell was an expert stamp forger or knew someone who was and acted as his agent, or B a stooge for someone manipulating him, or C actually made the find of a lifetime. It's amazing to think about. What if this happened to you?

I know from what I've seen of George Grinnell's stamps that we purchased is that he loved stamps. This wasn't a passing fancy, but a lifelong pursuit.

September 01, 2006 **Donald Sundman**

Bernard,

I should have added the Grinnell cover to his granddaughter included a Christmas seal. I thought myself as an unpaid editor and was giving you what I thought the cream off the top of the milk. I'll try for full disclosure in the future. Sorry. Don

September 01, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I understand that Dick Celler's analysis, as shown in Linn's, is rather too small to be of much use.

What is the chance either you or Dick can supply that portion with better images for the reference page?

September 01, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

You should read the Stamps article that Don Sundman cited. Grinnell told the story of how he bought them from Edwin P. Seeborn. Grinnell's article doesn't say anything about them being found in an old desk, so Vanderhoof must have done his own interview with Seeborn and/or the person who sold to Seeborn to learn that detail.

September 01, 2006 **Walter P**

Don Sundman -

I think if John Bowman has anything further to say regarding Grinnell and the California Tax Revenue stamps, than now's the time to say it?

Bernard Biales -

Are you going to spend the long weekend checking out pumkin patches? Your post inspired me to look up Alger Hiss on the internet as the name sounded familiar but I could not place his story. The article I read, "The Pumkin Papers" is quite facinating to say the least.

I think its safe to say George Grinnell did not hide any his Grinnell Missionary stamps in a hollowed out pumpkin, wrapped in wax paper.

September 01, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

Click on G80 and it will fill your screen.

September 01, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

George Grinnell did not select December 7 1943 as the issue date for the Denmark Flag stamp. He just sent the cover to Washington for cancellation.

The series was supposed to end in November with Austria (protested by many as not overrun by Nazis but their welcome doormat), but stamp dealer A.E. Pade persuaded the POD to add a Denmark stamp to the list, extending the set into the Christmas rush.

September 01, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Jorge V Yeah -- or a drunk sitting up against a lamp post.

September 01, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Don Sundman I may be seeing things, but I think a scan of G80 comparable to those Richard has been putting up for the Taplings could be informative.

September 01, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Don Sundman It says something about everything -- not GG in particular --that a shy scholarly man would give his grand daughter an overrun nations cover postmarked on Pearl Harbor day as a Christmas present. Probably quite a normal thing for a collector to do.

September 01, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard,

It's a great reference, without precedent. Thanks to all who have contributed to it.

To an extent, the title plays down its importance for all students of early Hawaiian stamps and postal history, not limited to those who are interested in the Grinnell mystery.

September 01, 2006 **Donald Sundman**

California state revenues.

One great benefit of Richard providing this board is that we can sort out fact from fiction as it relates to Grinnell stamps. I appreciate John Bowman posting his story so I can respond with information he is missing.

To recap; John Bowman's posting theorized that Grinnell faked the handstamps on early California revenues and if he did so it shows evidence of intent to deceive. Someone faking handstamps on these stamps might have faked early Hawaiian stamps. I can see the point and if true it could show a pattern.

John didn't know I own the tax stamps in question or that some of these California revenues have handstamps and others are without handstamps. The stamps and handstamps look genuine to me. The look similar to lot #345 in the May 10th 2006 Cherrystone auction . The stamps I have appear to be the same stamps Grinnell wrote of in the 1940 Stamps magazine article. If they are the same then Grinnell kept the stamps and gave them to his granddaughter and her husband. More than fifty years later they sold the stamps to Mystic. Certainly no indication of unethical behavior.

Grinnell was a lifelong stamp collector. He loved stamps and stamp collecting. I'm told he was a gentle and shy man. A high-school teacher who became a school principal. A member of the Masons and active member of his church. He introduced stamps and collecting to his granddaughter Carol. I'm looking at an album of first day covers George Grinnell created and addressed to Carol. This album is full of covers from the 1940's including an oversized FDC postmarked December 7th 1943 with Overrun Country stamps inscribed Merry Christmas.

The Grinnell Missionary court case did not turn George away from collecting. He remained excited by stamps, continued to collect and look for discoveries. See page 79-80 in the October 19th 1940 Stamps Magazine for an article by George Grinnell about his purchase of 1857-1866 California revenue stamps. Grinnell mentions he also was collecting stamps for Tibet at the time. He wrote "I took them to show them to E.R. Vanderhoof of Long Beach, CA., who is one of the best authorities on California on California Revenues. He said the find is outstanding."

When Grinnell sold the Missionaries to Klemann the first thing he did was turn his stamp want list over to S.L. Wood and asked Wood to find stamps for

Grinnell's collection. He was a passionate collector in 1919 and up until his death in 1949.

There may be evidence somewhere that Grinnell altered stamps and intended to deceive collectors. The California state revenue story shows the opposite, a passionate collector sharing his hobby with his family and other stamp collectors.

September 01, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Grinnell project stats: over 100 megs for over 200 files.

September 01, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Also post side by side comparisons [here](#).

September 01, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I just added the 11 new images of genuine Tapling Missionary stamps. I have three new ones that I couldn't identify in Trepel census. I may have missed something so please advise any mistakes.

September 01, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I just uploaded links on Grinnell Reference page to PDF files of three Mystic Stamp Company publications.

September 01, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Thanks. I have no opinion about the tax story, but of course there is secondary interest to his other activities. Unique overprints sound interesting, if I followed that.

I think only a few elements of his involvement in the discovery are of some use to the analysis of the stamps -- mainly that they appeared from a single source. The date is useful. The two genuine stamps on the card are of some interest (and a blast to analyze). The Shattuck story etc. seems to me to fade into the background, upon study.

Of course, as a tale, that is something else. I think I have found a place that sells the Scott magazine and will probably pick one up today. Thanks for the welcome offer to send me one. I'm sure it will be worth the ticket.

September 01, 2006 **Jorge V**

Scott T

Re: Bernard's "stream of consciousness posts"

Wow! I doubt there's a better way to describe them! It's like listening to a medium who's submerged in a deep, dark trance during a seance...

September 01, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

George Grinnell was a serious collector of California revenue stamps before he became known for the stamps that bear his name. Vanderhoof was Gossip's state revenue columnist. When V learned of this wonderful find, G gave him details to write about it and an example to illustrate. He made no attempt to sell the stamps that anyone has reported, because he bought them for his collection and was proud of the acquisition. If other details are known, someone should set them forth. It's a straightforward story reported in the usual way, but because some writers to this board seek to rally the canaille against G, as Oklahoma did to Pretty Boy Floyd, florid interpretations embellish careless retellings to intensify the anti-G mood. This is exactly the wrong way to solve any mystery, elevating passions while obscuring facts to the detriment of careful impartial analysis.

August 31, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

Thanks for setting the record straight on the George Grinnell California Tax Stamp find story.

My questions were based on the John Bowman and Donald Sundman posts. I think it is best that I asked these questions, because some readers like myself, might be left with the apparently incorrect impression I was left with after reading John Bowman's post.

If we do not hear anything further from John Bowman on this matter, I would say George Grinnell clears this accusation with flying colors.

Perhaps a better title of a chapter in your George Grinnell epic might be, George Grinnell - Indiana Jones of Philately or Philatelic Whipping Boy.

I suppose that when you become famous, or infamous, whatever the case may be, you become everybody's favorite suspect. Just like today, when there is an unsolved crime mystery, people often say, Maybe O.J. did it?

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Not sure what to make of the quote about the origin of the revenues -- who was the dealer and how could the writer determine this was true? Sounds a bit neither here nor there.

With respect to the Grinnell Missionoidals, Alger Hiss comes to mind... in terms of a partially possibly relevant psychology -- not a comment on politics.

August 31, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Vince Arrigo states that he and Carol never offered the stamps for sale until they sold them to Don Sundman.

August 31, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

George Grinnell joined APS in July 1913, when the total membership of the society was 1,415 (that is, it comprised the philatelic elite). Grinnell was a specialist collector of United States postage and revenue stamps, state revenues, and official seals. He was a serious collector for the rest of his life, and held in high regard by fellow collectors.

John Bowman misreported the California revenue stamp story. The stamps were not discovered by Grinnell. "Mr. George Grinnell has lately taken title to a find of 123 stamps, all unused and mostly in strips of four. All bear the proper control and are unquestionably hall marked with genuineness. This lot of stamps turned up in an old desk in San Francisco, and were placed on sale by one of the dealers of that city from whom Mr. Grinnell obtained them."

But in deference to Walter Plomish, I shall title a chapter of the epic, "Every Crime in California was Added to His Name."

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Donald S What I would love to know is the reaction of the Arrigos when they found out they had two recognizable stamps. (I might add that her collecting relation with her grandfather adds a possible different dimension to the retention of the infamous card of 10).

August 31, 2006 **Walter P**

Donald Sundman -

Re: Your post regarding George Grinnell and his stamp collection purchased by Mystic Stamp Company from the Arrigo's last year:

In your post you state, "Your insinuation that Grinnell altered the tax stamps to sell them for more than they are worth is wrong and misrepresents Grinnell's intentions."

I'm confused by your statement above?

It appears to me that what you saying is George Grinnell did alter the California tax stamps in question, however it was not his intention to do so to make the tax stamps worth more?

If the answer to my question above is yes, George Grinnell did alter the tax stamps, then can you please explain to the board readers what his true intention was in altering the tax stamps?

In what way do you believe John Bowman mis-represented George Grinnell's true intentions?

How could you know for sure what George Grinnell's intentions were, you could not have asked him, as he has passed on along time ago.

Mr. Sundman, are you open minded to the possibility that George Grinnell was involved in the printing of the Grinnell Hawaii Missionary stamps?

Do you not think it the least bit suspicious that George Grinnell had also discovered a large find of California Revenue Tax stamps in addition to his claim of discovering the Grinnell stamps?

How do you know for sure that the Arrigo's did not attempt to sell the tax stamps in question prior to selling the stamps to the Mystic Stamp Company?

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Donald S It is interesting to have a collecting vignette away from the big contentious story. I bet everyone, over the years, had a lot more satisfaction from the four cartons the the small number of other stuff. The denouement of them having the benefit of the two good stamps (plus whatever from the others) is a real O'Henry ending.

August 31, 2006 **Donald Sundman** <dsundman@MysticStamp.com>

Bernard,

I haven't given much thought how to sell Grinnell's stamps, but it will be at retail. I believe he collected his entire life. He introduced stamps to his granddaughter Carol Arrigo to collecting. They made first day covers, other stamp souvenirs. I'll look up the date of the Stamps article and post on this site tomorrow in case someone wants to read it. Sometime I'll look at the stamps again and describe in a bit more detail. Fills four small cartons. Stamps were mostly Grinnell's but also included Carol Arrigo's stamps and covers.

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Oops Note to David H meant for big boys board.

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Don S Will the collection be mostly sold retail? It would be interesting to see what he had (irrespective of his true role in the Klemann sale, etc.) Do you have any notion of when he started collecting and whether he continued all his life.

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

David H Re Chinese super rate. 1) change stamps to stamp, p. 3.4. 2) Exactly what are commercial papers? If you make up such to the correct weight out of likely paper, is the fit good? 3) Might be nice to have a little table showing how your ultimate solution works out, just to give the reader a warm, cuddly feeling. The other thing is that you suggest that the chads link to the other stamps. Illustrating this would also be fun. Good stuff for puzzle solvers.

Modern Postal Historians When is the earliest use of a ball point pen on cover? (Remember when you felt you were on top of things with that Parker T Ball Jotter?)

August 31, 2006 **Donald Sundman** <dsundman@MysticStamp.com>

August 26 John Bowman wrote about the California revenue stamps George Grinnell collected. John writes... "I have heard that Grinnell's heirs own these stamps today and have attempted to sell them at prices too high for any collector or dealer to consider."

This statement is inaccurate.

Mystic purchased George Grinnell's stamps from Mr. and Mrs. Arrigo last year including the California revenue stamps. The stamps are sitting at Mystic in Camden NY waiting for us to process and offer them for sale. George Grinnell wrote a nice article about the tax stamps for Stamps Magazine in the early 1940's (I think). It's clear (to me) from looking at Grinnell's stamps that he was a real collector. He enjoyed his stamps and had an accumulation like the rest of us along with organized stamps. Recently Cherrystone auctioned California revenue stamps like those in the Grinnell accumulation and they brought a relatively high price. I have the information at work if you are interested.

Your insinuation that Grinnell altered the tax stamps to sell them for more than they are worth is wrong and misrepresents Grinnell's intentions. Grinnell was a stamp collector his entire life and, like the rest of us, enjoyed the hobby. He enjoyed it despite believing he was dreadfully wronged in the 1920's court case.

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

David S Southeast Museum. You can support the museum by selling fake Grinnell's at 10K a pop. If caught you could claim they are a previously unknown second printing that Grinnell made but never released. It would help to have a book with Grinnell's signature on the flyleaf, etc.

August 31, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Bernard B - very easy to do what you suggest on Photoshop, you can select out any particular color from the background and and turn it into a transparency, change color, lay it on top of another image, etc. But, I've been too busy to play around with it.

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Roger Heath What might be really interesting would be to blow up the corresponding ornaments (corner or otherwise) really big, change the colors on one, and then overlay them. It wouldn't prove anything, but I think it would really appeal to ones intuition of what these objects are like. (I have no idea how to do that, so I'm hoping someone will give it a shot -- a good thing for the reference page, too.)

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Scott T At least I get credit for consciousness.

August 31, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

BERNARD B:

I think I'm replying to one or more of your stream of consciousness posts. You make Ken Kesey look easy to read.

Assuming the Grinnell Fakes manufacturer wanted to build up matrices for each denomination and type pair, I think it makes sense that he would create basic components to be used in each set of pairs.

Some of these may have been reproduced accurately, perhaps with a photographic process. Others were either manipulated or approximated.

I'll get more into this when I finish my pro bono Grinnell Fake work. But I think the answer to your question is yes.

Do posts about wine belong here or the other board. I'm confused. I need a drink.

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Malmgren Did I see that Grinnell collected precancels? If so, does it go anywhere? One problem he had, notionally, is that if he was a maker or a conduit, after l'affaire, he would have had more trouble operating. Any idea what he taught?

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Poller Gee polls always scare me off because the questions aren't quite right, by my particular standards of course. Less than 100% is too broad, and 100%, especially for an outsider, to extreme. After all, this whole thing could be a febrile hallucination. (One could hope.) I would go for 99+ per cent no good. Soooo picky.

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Scott T By the way, Asimov, in yesterday's NYT had a funny article about an Australian winemaker who measured out his life in bottles of fine wine, lovemaking, etc. Said you should never waste you time on anything but the best. Gee, are we measuring out our lives in stamps and covers? I guess musing thus belongs on the other board or maybe hidden away entirely.

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Scott T So in terms of image flow, for want of a better phrase, you do feel the Gs started with type, or images of type, completely distinct (except stylistically) with the Missionaries? To that extent, are you and Ken on the same page? Makes sense to me.

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Malmgren I bet you are looking for a sleeper in one of those scruffy large lots. (I recently had a very painful experience along those lines -- I bid very high, but a certain auction house was putting in crazy bids -- they surely were way overbidding based on what they could have known.)

August 31, 2006 **David S.**

That was to Richard Malmgren.

August 31, 2006 **David Shumaker**

That's very decent of you to do that for "Twig." However, if the material is as bad as you say, wouldn't it be better that Scott T. convince the owner to donate the Hawaiian material to a museum, to keep them from turning up as misdescribed lots on Ebay? Assessed at full catalogue, there would be a sizeable tax write-off in it. And, it would spare you the drudgery of taking that long plane ride to the east coast of the Contiguous on auction day.

Now, it just so happens that I was cleaning out my garage here in Tennessee this week and, standing within the big empty, I thought, "This would be a good place for a museum." I'd call it the Southeast Museum. The TTS material would be a good draw. I could mount it across the back wall and still have room for tools on the left wall. The lawn mower, old photographic equipment and printing press could line up along the right wall without blocking the laundry room door.

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Scott T I have a few 95s and 96s (Burgundy) -- any suggestions which to do first. I imagine it is bout time, but I hardly ever drink the good stuff and I have a few 85s and 93s to get through. My first spectacular wine was a 71 Clos de Beze in about 75. I bought a case at \$14.99 a bottle. Rich overripe wine. I opened the next to last in 1986 with my wife to be. It was already transformed into that exotic old wine strangeness -- wonderful. I kept one and opened it recently for some occasion -- completely faded but some aroma -- a pleasant memory.

August 31, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

ROGER H:

You are well on your way to becoming a philatelic forger. I'm sure there will be plenty of work for you in Europe.

August 31, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Scott -

You're right.

All I did was take the scan of G81, convert to B&W, then touched out all the cancel. So it is really a Missionary!

The most fun was bringing it back to color, matching the color on the card, toning the background, and giving a soft blur to match the Grinnells on the card. This of course was all virtual, but I'm certain I could have done it in the 1970's using my old 4"x5" copy camera with Kodalith film and reducing back to correct size, going to a printer and finishing the job.

The inclusion of the numeral would have been easy. It could have been cut out of a font book and pasted into the design prior to the photo work. The rest of the lettering could have been done the same way, one letter at a time pasted into the layout. This would obviously give variety to the small lettering. Has anyone ever used Letraset in making layouts. That is just a modern version of cut and paste out of a book.

I do see evidence of different flaws in the three values indicating to me there were numerous attempts to get right, or to create a little variation as the case may be.

I don't believe the forger required a whole font of type, just a book with examples of all the letters and numerals, along with the letters he already had on his 13 cent Missionaries. Once you photograph a stamp it's possible to reprint the lettering as many times as necessary taking into account the "practice" mockups. Keep in mind we are thinking Vertical, as the ornaments and frames required little work, just the best exposure.

Everyone here should try their hand with this process. These are not difficult stamps to reproduce once one has a template (real example).

Roger

August 31, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Roger Heath Very enlightening. It is consistent with my naive comment -- the details are not shifting toward a Grinnell, but rather breaking up. Also, the type boundaries are losing smoothness, while the Grinnells have pretty smooth boundaries.

August 31, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Poller - link fixed.

August 31, 2006 **Poller**

Don't forget to vote in the Grinnell [poll](#). It only allows a single vote per computer so you can try to vote a second time to view results without affecting things.

Maybe just polling ignorance, but results seem rather lopsided.

August 31, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

ROGER H:

The problem with your effort is it is too good.

The Grinnell Fakes are not accurate reproductions of their counterpart genuine Missionaries. There are too many differences in the ornament shapes and lettering. Some of these differences may have been introduced during the process preparing the Grinnell "artwork" (or matrices), from which the plates were made, but there seems to be too many obvious differences.

I am working on a detailed analysis of the genuine Missionaries and a comparison of genuine Missionary "behavior" to Grinnell Fake "behavior", to show that the Grinnell Fakes were not printed from assembled type (although the Grinnell matrices were made from images printed from assembled type). This is where I disagree strongly with the Royal and various "experts" consulted by the Arrigos.

If the evidence continues to develop the way it's been going, then the pro-Grinnell people will have to assert that the Grinnells were not only printed at a different time from different settings, they were also printed using an entirely different process. That's when I'll stop answering.

RICHARD M:

I enjoy being your vino inspiration. In recent years it's been more about Burgundies and Rhones than Bordeaux. Next time you come to NYC, we'll open a bottle of Echezeaux or Hermitage and toast to George Grinnell, who has brought us all much closer.

Think vertical in wine, horizontal in...never mind.

August 31, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Thanks to great efforts on the part of **David Beech**, I have been granted a waiver of permission fees (some \$2,500 worth) by the British Library for use of the Tapling Collection scans on the Grinnell reference site.

I will probably be able to add the scans this weekend.

August 30, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Richard M -

While you were toasting your good luck in anticipation of filling some spaces, I was creating a second rate Missionary. [This](#) was only a half hour effort, but shows what can be done photographically. I know after just a single effort I would lower the contrast on the initial image. Of course this was done on a computer screen where my limitation was pixel size, high contrast graphics film has very fine grain and would be easier to retouch. The picture of the large copy camera brought back a few memories. When in Phoenix the print shop we took our work to had one that used negatives in the range of 48" x 36". We used to look on the ground glass to see how our details in our photographs held up prior to making the exposures. Four color printing requires four negatives identical to each other except each is shot through a different filter. One reason to proof before making the negatives and plates!

BTW - Now you have read this and your glass has been refilled, the question. Which stamp did I use as the basis of my forgery?

Roger

August 30, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

To all of you Hawaii Collectors

You may have read that TTS has engaged Siegel to auction off more Hawaii material.

I have seen Twig's material. It is not of the quality that you would want. Most of it is toned and ragged. Several pieces are torn. It is bad stuff. Much of it is misidentified. Many pieces are counterfeits. Do not even waste your time looking at the catalogue. Go to the beach or beat your dog or do something else productive, but do not waste your time with the catalogue.

I may show up at the auction merely to enter a few bids so that Twig doesn't feel bad. I think it may be the Hawaiian type of thing to do. As for the rest of you, don't waste your time.

August 30, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Bernard Biales

Ooops! Perhaps I erred.

I just read an earlier posting by Ken L. that it was Don Sundman who said at the great Grinnell Roundtable in Chicago that the RPSL was aware of the Card of 10.

Gee, so much to remember.

I consider myself fortunate that I can at least remember to THINK VERTICAL.

With that, I'm going to pour myself two glasses of Bordeaux and pretend that I'm Scott Trepel.

August 30, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Roger Heath You are indeed a font of knowledge. Excuse the spelling.

August 30, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Malmgren The book specifically says th three were retained (against loss, as I recall). A close reading shows those copies were Culhanes. Their census only lists 72 pre revelation items. Thus, it appears that knowledge of the card of ten was withheld. Further, "Extensive documentation was provided by the owners" -- hmmm.

Seven bar grid analysis In my analysis of the Celler chart, my not 5 reverses the allocation of the clipping of bar 7. The chart is misleading in either case, so the basic observation stands.

August 30, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Jim B -

No serpents here!

[Menehune](#) are the culprits, and they are in cahoots with FedEx and UPS. Here's logic for you. I can send to the mainland via ground service (air to Ontario, ground from there), but everything coming here must be 2nd day air or pay addiitonal for a premium service. Do not pay to have things shipped overnight express to Hawaii, it can't be done.

Richard M -

I've dug a little deeper and discovered the possible source of the font we are trying to identify. So far evidence is circumstantial the Grinnells were printed on [this machine](#). Another point that as you know is the fact that Menehunes only worked night shift making repetetive detail work extremely difficult to accomplish. I think we can rule them out. Another dead end.

Roger

August 30, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L The Scott Newsstand locator sends me into an error page -- probably the vile folk at AOL.

August 30, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Malmgren My apology -- Ralph is a long time member of the Philatelic Group of Boston.

David S Those curled ornaments and other features -- I would think they would be a lot of trouble to generate from nothing == the whole photography idea comes across as mushy to me. The Grinnells are weak, but also geometrically so different in detail I fear you would have to Draw in the Whole Thing in the end.

August 30, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Bernard Biales

You made an earlier posting:

"Re Mr. Culhane -- according to the RPSL study, he reserved three stamps and so informed them. The RPSL said they received all the others. Is there some confusion or were they misled by the Arrigos?"

I do not have my RPSL publication with me, but I do recollect (I hope I have this correct) that of the 72 'original' copies, 55 were submitted to the RPSL, 3 copies were kept by one of the owners and 14 had unknown whereabouts.

Out of ignorance, I cannot speak to the Card of 10 and whether it was or was not shown to the RPSL. My recollection (?) from the great Grinnell Roundtable at StampShow is that Ken L said the Royal was aware of the Card of 10 (perhaps had even seen it), but it was not submitted for expertizing and, therefore, was not examined closely (or even unclosely).

August 30, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Thanks **Ken L.** for that clarification and elaboration of detail.**Roger Heath**—

Regarding the difficulty of mail/parcel service to Hawaii, every Paradise has its serpent...

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

All authorities agree that the 1890s presented the first opportunity for skilled forgers to make counterfeit Missionaries that might deceive experts.

Fred Gregory suspects that Brewster Kenyon was the culprit who made the Grinnells (see his website for details). If Kenyon did, it would have been about 1895 to 1898.

Kenyon counterfeited other Hawaiian stamps; so did some of Charles Posner's suspects, but the latter were official reproductions. Except for evidence that Kenyon was trying to obtain paper similar to that of the Hawaiian Numerals stamps in 1893, both suggestions are based on circumstantial projection of character, experience, skill, opportunity, and motive. That's plenty more than a paranormal claim; it would be sufficient to support a criminal investigation.

Either theory begs your question, but Kenyon is the Hawaiian experts' principal suspect.

August 30, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Jim B.

As Letterman might say to Paul Schaefer, you have crystallized my thoughts exactly... and in much less verbage. I know only a tiny bit about photoreproduction, and hoped someone with some knowledge would come along eventually. That image of the "relief plate" is exactly the product I had in mind.

August 30, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Ken L.

When I look at Scott #4, I see fonts in the "H.I. & U.S. Postage" label that look like metal type having distinct and clear stylistic elements, not like reproductions of reproductions of type like on the Grinnells. Remember old xerox machines when you made a copy of a copy of a copy? Eventually text became illegible. Also, the central numeral on the #4's illustrated in the RSPL book are as clearly printed as the smaller type in the label (pages 24 and 25). When the impression is crisp, all size type is crisp; when blurry, all size type is blurry. Thus, no red flags. Not so with the Grinnells, where the "Hawaiian Postage" label is badly eroded and the central numeral is crisp. I'm sorry you feel that my observation is only my imagination and nothing more significant.

However, since #4 is known on cover and with accepted genuine cancellations, I can't understand how it remotely resembles the situation here where one source yields stamps of both different fonts and unknown cancellations. My imagination says that if Scott #4 was not known until 1918 and was found only with the Grinnells, having the same Grinnell cancels, it would not be listed in Scott today.

Bernard B.

Photoreproduction - That depends on how much of the design was redrawn, and how blurry and degraded the image was being traced. Perhaps all of it was traced; how long could that take? I know what you mean about the corner ornaments, and add to that the little curls in the side ornaments that are also too small and not curled enough, and the "V" that connects them wants to merge with the adjacent ornament.

August 30, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

The 1893 story Charles Posner retails does not come with any independent confirmation, does it? If not, then it is as reliable as the tales of those folks whose swear up and down they were taken aboard a flying saucer.

☺

If such a trove existed in 1893, where is it now? If they eventually morphed into the Grinnells, why is it nobody heard of them between 1893 and the time Grinnell got hold of them?

Jim

August 30, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

David Shumaker—

Black/white photographic film can be divided into two types, *line* and *continuous tone*. Line film will give you only black areas and white areas, and is used for photolithography, while continuous tone is the sort of film used in your 35 mm camera, such as Tri-X, Plus-X etc. It is designed to give you an entire range of tones from black through all the grays to white.

It is my belief that the Grinnells were constructed using photographs of the genuine stamps, from which large positive mockups were made of each denomination. While portions of these mockups were consistent, other elements were added and changed as needed (such as necessary to create both TYPE I and TYPE II) using a very simple procedure known as paste-up. Each mockup in turn was copied using a copy camera ([here](#)'s an ancient one) that reduced the images to the size of postage stamps, from which either litho plates or, more likely, line relief plates (such as [this](#)) were made.

If the Grinnells are forgeries, they weren't done by some clod with a rubber stamp. Rather, time and care was taken by someone who understood the processes involved in order to make the stamps resemble the genuine while also differing to an extent, just as the genuine do. (The fact that the resultant print was third generation from the original would achieve just such a variety effect.) I repeat however that the slavish consistency of certain aspects between the Grinnell types throughout the denominations argues persuasively that a photographic process was used in creating them.

Jim

August 30, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Bernard Biales

Your spell check is failing you.

Ralph is not spelled R-a-l-p-h. Ralph is spelled R-i-c-h-a-r-d.

Of course, I did once know a Ralph.

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Charles Posner has an intriguing conspiracy theory that he posted on Virtual Stamp Club. It would have involved Hawaii President Sanford B. Dole; Postmaster General and stationer Joseph M. Oat; and stamp dealer, chronicler, and publisher Thomas Thrum, cronies who capitalized on the stamp craze in 1893. In issuing and selling provisional stamps "They had the next best thing to printing money," wrote Charles.

"Now it is clear that Oat and his mates had access to presses." Lots of other detail.

To outline his plot, Charles cited "The Hawaiian Stamp Craze, A Situation that attracted the Attention of Philatelists the World Over," reprinted from the San Francisco Call in the November 1893 issue of the Metropolitan Philatelist. This article also speaks to Richard Malmgren:

"About two months ago the news was brought to this city that two complete sets of the first four stamps issued by Hawaii, viz., the 2 cent, 5 cent and 13 cent of 1851, and the 13 cent of 1852, all blue, were found in a safe in one of the Government buildings by the officials of the Provisional Government. . . ."

Recommended.

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jorge V,

Thank you. That was news to me.

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Alan McL,

The standard procedure for using any forgery manual, Madame Joseph or de Thuin or Zaresky or whichever, is to identify traits and to declare any example that matches them to be counterfeit. Whether that's legal I can't say, but it's philately.

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David S,

To exercise your imagination, try rewriting your composition substituting Scott 4, Types I and II, for Grinnells, Type I and II. You'll be surprised.

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

Send me your address. It's a 6,000-word article, with at least two more to follow, so perhaps more to stimulate critical thinking than you anticipate, but perhaps not. Amos Press has the exclusive rights to each article during the month the magazine is on sale. After that I can sell to anyone who wants to publish in any medium.

I think Dick has demonstrated his point, to choose the term you proposed. I have probably seen more of his analysis than what appeared in Linn's, but this is not my area of expertise, so I'm open to other interpretations.

I don't expect anyone to be driven to a conclusion by my articles, especially because I haven't achieved one myself. But I hope it will stimulate more creative and less reflexive responses than most of the dialogue here. Of the thousands of people who saw those stamps, many of whom swear they can spot a Grinnell at twenty paces, why did no one notice those two lovely Missionaries before I did? Why didn't I? Partly because we all thought we knew they were Grinnells. Cobwebs on our brains.

At the roundtable in Rosemont, Don Sundman said the RPSL was aware of the ten stamps on the card, but I don't know when their experts had that awareness, or whether they gave it any thought. The book implies that they were not aware during the evaluation.

August 30, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ralph Malmgren Epic or Opera Buffo? It is very nice in any case.

August 30, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Roger Heath You can't fool me -- I read Michener too.

August 30, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Photoreproduction I haven't followed the plating aspects of the stamps and the possible production methods. The fakes sure look different than the real ones, and one thing that impresses me is the sixteen little curls in the the corner ornaments. At high mag, they look very different between the two. How could that possibly arise from a photographic process? I don't think simply saying it was reworked is very plausible.

August 30, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard Malmgren Re Mr. Culhane -- according to the RPSL study, he reserved three stamps and so informed them. The RPSL said they received all the others. Is there some confusion or were they misled by the Arrigos?

Ken L I read your idea of proof as suggesting that most anyone can read a 2000 word article and come to a serious conclusion. Hmmm. I do think there are certain points that can be conveyed, but that doesn't make the reader more than a very tentative judge. Still, I think the basic story can be distilled down to a fairly simple and enlightening exposition.

Haven't found a store that carries Scott's -- tried Borders and B&N.

That comment about the moving goalposts is, near as I can tell is a glittering and probably wrong generalization. Seems to me a lot of skeptics or those confident the stamps are no good are enjoying the discovery of the genuine ones.

I gather you are taking it that Richard C has proven that the genuine Grinnell bears the Grinnell Grinnell seven bar and not the marking found on Census 169 etc.

August 30, 2006 **Walter P-**

Richard Malmgren -

You are 100 percent correct in your last post:

No matter how many times you re-shuffle the deck chairs on the Titanic ...

It's all over but the crying.

I hope Ken Lawrence writes a fitting end to the Grinnell Saga and what other better way than to chronicle the Southwest Museum Connection. It will be a sweet story for some and a bittersweet story for others, but as Crissim on CSI Los Vegas always says, "just follow the evidence."

August 30, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Richard M -

I guess the closest I get to being "one of those Hawaiian specialists" is that I can actually understand some da Big Island pidgen. BTW - Da Captain Cook rued his Day of Discovery in 1776, da kine go Kealakekua get banged good. Da bruddas kinda sad. OK, back to da kine,. Goalpost move, I find. OK??.

Roger

August 30, 2006 **D. Shumaker**

To clarify, the Grinnells are relief prints, prepared in a way similar to how a photo would be prepared to be printed in an old newspaper or magazine but without screen used for gray scales.

August 30, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Roger Heath

Do you notice that people who extol the Grinnells keep moving goalposts in order to uphold their position?

The ornaments and rules of the presumed genuine 13c Type I Missionary Stamp on the Card of 10 are amazingly similar to the ornaments and rules on all of the Type I Grinnell. Think VERTICAL.

The ornaments and rules of the presumed genuine 13c Type II Missionary Stamp on the Card of 10 are amazingly similar to the ornaments and rules on all of the Type II Grinnells. Think VERTICAL.

The end to the Grinnells came with Ken L's epic finding that the bottom 13c on the Card of 10 appears genuine and Dick C's subsequent monumental discovery that the right hand 13c on the Card of 10 also appears genuine. I commend both for the brilliant detective work. I didn't see it nor did others, but these two did and are owed congratulations.

And by the way Roger, are you suppose to be one of those Hawaiian specialists who are ruing the Day of Discovery? I have not heard any rues. I'm not ruing. (What does a rue sound like anyway?)

I'm celebrating. I'm hoping to someday be the curator of the bottom presumed genuine 13c Missionary Stamp on the Card of 10. It appears to be a great copy. It would look great in my exhibit and I would even add a note below it 'Lawrence Discovery Copy' and explain how it led to yet one more condemnation of the Grinnells following that of the Royal Philatelic Society London, Philatelic Foundation, and the Los Angeles California Court.

Actually, I admit to some greed and would really like the entire Card of 10. It is, I think, a great philatelic item.

I've never met either Mr. or Mrs. Arrigo, but I have met Pat Culhane and, frankly, he gave me cause to like him. In our three brief meetings, he has always presented himself as a gentleman – and an intelligent and sociable gentleman to boot. If for no other reason than the effort he has put forth, a part of me has hoped that this saga might have had a different ending, but the Day of Discovery put a stop to that. (I realize that Pat has not yet thrown in the towel, but I surely hope that not a lot of money will be expended on washing it.)

Of course Ken has at least one more (just one?) outstanding story in him about the Grinnells and I personally think it is going to be a magnificent story. It is about the Southwest Museum connection and, among others, includes C.S. Thompson – fellow school teacher, neighbor and curator of George Grinnell. The remarkable story will be a superb piece of detective work.

August 30, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Even though I am no expert, I would like to try my hand with the photographic reproduction theory. A lot of sensible things have been written and referenced on these boards and in the RSPL opinion regarding plating the Grinnells and the question of moveable type versus stereotype. I may have to stand alone with my belief that the fonts are not individual type nor are they collectively stereotyped.

There is an aspect of the Grinnells that has always bothered me, and I hope to get some of your thoughts. There are four "a"s in the "Hawaiian Postage" label. On Type I each letter "a" is distinctively different from the others within the label, but are identical to the "a"s of the same positions in all three denominations. On Type II, the second and fourth are close, but the others are very different; and likewise, they are the same in their corresponding positions on each denomination. Clearly, this has everything to do with the shape of the font and very little to do with printing anomalies.

On the "genuine" Missionaries, each "a" is clearly identifiable as the same style font, though there may be small printing differences between stamps. But the "a"s on the Grinnells, indeed every letter in the labels, are just UGLY. They are mis-shapen and eroded, and mostly thinner than the genuine (compare the space between the first "a" and "i" of "Hawaiian" to the thickness of those letter's verticals, on both the Genuine and the Grinnell). There is no artistry, no craftsmanship to those letters.

But then look at the central numerals on the Grinnells. In contrast, they are much better formed and almost as clean as the "genuine" numerals. The curved line going to the ball on the "2" and the tail are clear and shaped correctly. The curved top of the "5" and the point at the end are likewise clean. When you look at the label type and central numeral of the genuine examples, they match in clarity. The same compare poorly on the Grinnells. That difference in the crispness and clarity between the label fonts and the central numeral of the Grinnells require an explanation.

So here's my thought: the Grinnells were produced by a multi-step process that first produced border elements for a model and then the central numerals were PAINTED IN. The border and top label were distorted in this process prior to the addition of the numeral. I think an enlargement of each genuine stamp was used to prepare a working model, perhaps as big as an 8x10 photograph, large enough to remove cancels and to paint or insert a painting of the numeral (no need to find the original type, but also no 2 and 5 to copy, so they did their best). Then, the mock-up was photographed again, and a stamp-sized image was used to make the plate.

Of course, photographing the tiny stamp and blowing up the image causes several problems. First, the pale-blue lines would become gray and fuzzy on the enlargement, and the paper is not white enough without whitening it further. If you simply drew a numeral on an enlarged image, the drawn portion would be solid, black and crisp and stand in stark contrast to the pale and fuzzy photographed design. In some way, the border image had to be both overexposed and the design features crispened, which probably involved touching up the photo prior to inserting the numeral. The result would be mis-shapen elements as seen on the Grinnells.

You would also need to manipulate parts of the model to fit the varying text in the bottom label (again painted and inserted into the model in one piece), so the model was probably a jigsaw puzzle that could be manipulated, and would thus appear under scrutiny as moveable type, as the RPSL concluded.

In summary, the "Hawaiian Postage" label was eroded through photographic process and even touch-ups in early steps, then in a later step the numerals were photographed and the composite reduced to make the image required for the final step of preparing the plate. This explains the different conditions of the fonts and the poor shapes of the "Hawaiian Postage" label. If these stamps were typeset, the letters should match each other a whole lot closer on the same stamp than they do; and if distortion occurred during the creation of a stereo, the distortion in the label fonts should have carried to the central numerals as well.

Just a thought to stimulate conversation.

August 30, 2006 **Alan McLeod**

Ken,

that's sounds legal,

certified by 2, therefore it is,

Alan Mc.

August 30, 2006 **Jorge V**

Ken L

Posted on the OTHER board about Jorge Farinacci's death on Sat.

August 30, 2006 **Walter P**

Bill Weiss -

Re: George Grinnell

In short it goes to the character of the man. I believe the Grinnell Saga, in the end, 'turns on credibility' and in the end, George Grinnell does not have even a shred of credibility.

As for his heirs, I agree that their attempts to sell the Grinnells are different than George Grinnell's attempts to sell the stamps, in that the heirs and Don Sundman are attempting to market the Grinnells as being counterfeit with the caveat they may possibly be genuine, based on new information that has come to light since the RPSL issued its negative decision.

The question that begs to be answered is, if the Arrigo's truly believe this to be so, then why do they not re-submit the Grinnell stamps to the RPSL for re-examination with their new supporting evidence? I think we all know the answer to that question?

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

That was not the basis of the RPSL declaration that the Grinnells were printed from "loose type." The RPSL reported varying measurements that reflect movement of elements. I'm not persuaded, but that was the basis of the committee's verdict.

Also, if the traits you see are not illusory, they exist on many other 13¢ Missionaries, not just on these two, and on other denominations to the extent the elements were not substituted. That's what plating reveals.

Unfortunately, at least one prominent expert on classic Hawaii abandoned this discussion after the news of our discovery was reported, so that point seems to cut both ways.

Several APS members in Hawaii use APRL and seem gratified by the service they receive. But sure, if you choose not to participate, you realize the consequences.

Expert committees typically seek to evaluate all the evidence that they can adduce, not just evidence that points to a predetermined conclusion. In this instance, I think experts will be interested in similarities and differences, not just similarities, but as I noted above, these two stamps are not unique exemplars, so much of that analysis has already been performed.

The first task is to expertize the two genuine Missionary stamps.

As Don Sundman pointed out, people who condemn the Grinnells keep moving goalposts in order to uphold their position. In the past, the splendid condition of the Grinnells counted against them. For consistency's sake, the appearance of two Missionaries in similarly splendid condition ought to count in their favor rather than against them, showing that all these stamps were stored under similar good conditions while nearly all other known Missionaries were being mutilated.

Most perverse, in my opinion, is the general reaction here. Fewer than 200 genuine Missionaries have ever been found, so the discovery of two that were previously unknown ought to be a moment to celebrate, doubly so for two whose quality exceeds all the others. Instead, specialists here have rued the day.

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Alan McL,

I accept Dick Celler's analysis. You don't. That's my privilege, and yours. The RPSL declared a cancel type to be counterfeit, not just individual strikes of it.

August 30, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

"No expert since 1922 has believed the Grinnells were reproduced photographically, so that ship isn't yet afloat."

All previous experts had numerous Missionaries for reference and the Grinnell's didn't match any of them, therefore, with the available information they were correct in their opinions and assumptions. For the photographic process to be a viable method for a forger, there has to be something to copy. Earlier experts "knew" there were no Missionaries that Grinnell could have photographed. Historic opinions prior to July 2006 based on that premise are no longer valid. There are now two examples which by happen have identical detail design showing drop-out flaws that can happen during a photographic copy process. Notice there are only variation on the flaws which I interpret to mean the forger tried different exposures in an attempt to optimize his work.

We read all the time on Richard's Board that new research can be presented to expert committees when stamps or covers are sent for review. You have written specifically of your successes where your documentation has changed the opinion of expert committees. Don't you think that any expert committee would be interested in viewing the two new Missionaries and comparing them to the Grinnells.

The Titanic has hit an iceberg, and the radio operators are in emergency mode hoping for a rescue. History can't be changed, but I doubt very much whether this discussion would have continued this long if the two new stamps had not been shown.

Roger

August 30, 2006 **Alan McLeod**

Ken,

No, the Royal did not condemn the cancel as you state, they did not even see the cancel on the genuine Missionary. Your statement is incorrect and your comments on Virtual Stamp Chat are incorrect as the similar cancel on the Grinnells hasn't been proven to be exactly the same, only similar,

Alan Mc.

August 30, 2006 **Bill Weiss**

This afternoon I read Ken Larence's masterful article in Scott's Monthly. I feel, contrary to what others may want to think, that despite his contrarian interchanges here, that he reported the facts in this case in an accurate and interesting way. I see no bias in the article, one way or the other, which is pretty much how I felt about his article on the 1c "Z" grill years ago. No bias, just reporting the facts as his research allowed.

I am not competent to judge the technical aspects of the case, but it's pretty obvious that the Grinnells are different from accepted missionaries, but I do wish to make an observation on the human aspect of the case, and while it's been mentioned before here, I think it is really very telling.

There are those who have argued that because Grinnell tried for his entire life after the court trial to "sell" the Grinnells, that this tends to prove he either did not know they were fake, or did not believe they were fake. I feel the opposite. I think if any modern dealer or auction house, after an expert committee or court of law ruled against a stamp (or in this case many stamps) as being counterfeit, I think the LAST thing anyone honest would do is immediately try to sell them again, which is exactly what Grinnell did. (Please do not contrive this to compare in any way with the heirs trying to sell them now, as I see that as an entirely different set of circumstances, and that is perhaps a story for another discussion, but not this one).

Certainly, if he truly believed they were genuine, contrary to the court's opinion/verdict, he might have set about trying to "prove" their genuiness. It does not appear from the record that he did that. Instead, immediately after receiving them back after the trial, he tries to sell them again! He tries to strike up various deals to sell them, rather than try to prove they are genuine, which he might have done by seeking the aid of various experts or laboratories, to evaluate the physical evidence, etc. He didn't do that. He just tried to sell them. And kept trying.

Along the way, until his death, it appears based on Ken's timelines, that additional support for their genuiness took place, first from the Shattuck family (the chance encounter with Edward Shattuck appears only to be heresay), then later from stamp dealer Y. Souren, but initially, he quickly tried to sell them before doing anything to vindicate them. While this doesn't "prove" he knew or believed they were fake, I think it's very telling.

August 30, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

You can't make assumptions concerning delivery of products and goods to Hawaii. My first experience after moving here in 1994 was to order four special spark plugs from an auto parts supplier in Chicago. I asked for 1st class postage as the difference between 1st and parcel post was on 15 cents. After 10 days I telephoned them and of course the plugs had been sent parcel post. Six weeks after the order they arrived. At the same time Linn's and other weekly magazines took up to five weeks to arrive, so I canceled them all.

I asked the PO here about the problems and was told bulk mail, which includes parcel post, media mail, magazines, and bunk advertising stuff is loaded into containers and driven to Long Beach harbor where the wait for space and are finally loaded onto a container ship. The Honolulu PO (at that time) received 40 - 40ft containers a week for the state of Hawaii. These containers all had to be broken down for each island on a "time available basis" depending on staffing. The items were then reloaded into containers for the outer islands and shipped by barge, in my case to Hilo where the items are again sorted and trucked around the island to appropriate PO's. I was told 4 -6 weeks from Long Beach was not unusual.

I've also asked my local PO why I sometimes get items from Europe within three days of them being posted, and other times 2 weeks. Registered can take even longer. No acceptable answer is forthcoming. I have noticed in my collection many 19th century international covers that were delivered quicker within Europe than they are today.

I would like to read some of the material relevant to chat discussions, but would not get it in a timely manner. I, therefore, rely on the internet to provide up-to-date analysis and commentary of daily events that are of interest to me. I've adapted to the internet and believe Chat Boards such as this can be as productive as books, though more difficult to browse. I remember when you first came chatting on philatelic boards and apologized for not having internet skills. That was OK with us, and Richard posted scans for you so you could illustrate your posts. It's pretty easy once you know how. Please don't be critical of those who have evolved differently and traveled different paths. We all find this discussion interesting or wouldn't be adding our thoughts and opinions. Thanks.

Roger

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

It's not a standard of proof. I don't hold out an expectation that all parties will be in agreement on this or any other subject of intellectual weight and complexity. I'm searching for a solution that will satisfy the disinterested multitude (disinterested, not uninterested) who enjoy and appreciate classic Hawaiian stamps and covers but who have no personal stake in the outcome of this mystery.

I haven't yet studied Scott T's points about the Numerals, but vintage published sources are in agreement that stereo plates were used, that Whitney kept the plates locked up, and that he eventually destroyed them. Typographically stereotypes agree in every respect with set type from which they were molded. The incentive to use a stereo in Hawaii would have been to avoid keeping a chase and valuable type out of service, and to reduce wear of precious type.

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

No expert since 1922 has believed the Grinnells were reproduced photographically, so that ship isn't yet afloat. Again I urge you to read the RPSL book, which reviews all previous evaluations in addition to supplying its own.

August 30, 2006 **Poller**

How about a [poll](#)?

August 30, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Ken L—

How is a consistent double gap in the rule to the left of the “P” in “Postage” imaginary? How is it “flyspeck evidence”? Again, if photography were used in the copying of the originals, no attention whatsoever need be paid to the “flyspeck details”—the camera sees all, and dispassionately reproduces it.

I would suggest that the good ship *The Grinnells are Genuine* is sinking.

Jim

August 30, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L I think your standard of proof is not really a useful tool. (For example, the use of the word "persuasive" in your characterization of confession to my way of thinking suggests that other uses of "persuasive" might stand somewhere in the same room, at least -- you clearly grant the possibility of false confessions). It seems to say that if fundamental materials were available at the supposed time of the generation, it doesn't matter how historically illogical their assemblage, the object Could be genuine, by your standard. I don't think that would be very useful.

Would you be happier saying that we can "demonstrate" that the Grinnells are not genuine, rather than "prove" it?

Your comment on the timeline is interesting. It makes a kind of tight fit with the supposed early 1918 acquisition. Especially without preexisting expertise in Hawaiians and experience in generating objects d'art.

Amazing -- a soft steel intaglio plate was only good for around 20,000 impressions (more for black). Given that the entire production of the first three stamps was of the order of 2000, it seems to me a stereo wasn't necessary -- that doesn't mean it wasn't done. The other half of my question is how many prints per hour can you do on this sort of printing. The trade of is between materials usage, time to set up the stereotypes, and time to do the printing?

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger Heath,

If Christian missionaries in Hawaii could obtain goods from the United States beginning in the 1820s, surely you can do the same today. (edited RCF)

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

Not consistency, just greater consistency than difference. Each time someone imagines flyspeck evidence that condemns the Grinnells (Cal Hahn, Fred Gregory, Scott Trepel), Dick Celler shows that the alleged evidence is imaginary in the meaning that by looking for the same traits where one should not expect to find them, they do appear, or that some of the alleged evidence is painted, not printed. Scott turned this around when he showed that Dick used one of the genuine Missionaries in his analysis of Grinnell traits. So Richard Malmgren's eureka moment at Chicago does not bowl me over, to scramble a metaphor in several directions.

A fresh stereo plate was theoretically good for about 100,000 impressions on a properly primed press in the 1850s. Cast type, more than that, but nearly all the type in Hawaii had already printed millions of impressions. In the eastern United States, it would have been melted and recast by that time.

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

There is no void in the timeline. Grinnell spent the summer of 1918 trying to sell the stamps to Col. Taylor. He first developed confidence in S.L. Wood with Alliot's assistance, then Alliot died. Wood pitched them to Taylor. Taylor brought Poole to verify authenticity. Poole did. They dickered, but Taylor balked at more than \$60,000, and Grinnell would not break up the lot (of 35 stamps on offer). Poole then telegraphed Klemann. The rest you know.

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Bernard,

Yes to your interpretation of what I wrote. To falsify the Grinnells conclusively, one requires either a persuasive confession or forensic proof that some aspect or other of the ingredients did not exist in 1851. To prove them genuine persuasively, one requires either documentary evidence that appears not to have survived (stronger than Whitney's son's recollection of more than one Missionary printing) or some kind of persuasive postal history evidence of a stamp, postmark, or

cover that hasn't yet surfaced. Absent one or the other, the Scottish verdict remains, and true belief in either solution is based on theological principles. In other contexts, Scott and Steve lecture us about the evil of condemning a rare philatelic item without absolute proof.

The handwriting on the card is George Grinnell's. The interesting part is not the notation to keep these stamps and sell the rest, but his inventory of the ten stamps by denomination, type, and unused or used condition, without favor to any of them. This is consistent with later written evidence from Eddie Stern that Grinnell could not tell the difference between Missionaries and Grinnells, and regarded the trial evidence as a hoax that reified painting into plating. I hope the Arrigos will consent to letting Richard show the back of the card here, now that everyone at APS Stampshow got to read it.

August 30, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Alan McL,

I'm not claiming anything, just asserting facts. The RPSL condemned the cancel as counterfeit. It's on a genuine stamp. I find it difficult to believe, but not impossible, that anyone would ruin one of the finest existing 13c Missionaries with an obliteration similar to the one that the stamp doctors were being paid to lighten or remove from stamps of lesser quality. It's possible, but so unlikely that Scott T will need a more plausible explanation than his previous one to persuade me.

August 29, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Roger Heath Or a print shop at the school. Of course, he might want to be careful about people wondering -- at the time, or later -- what he (whoever he was) was up to. I wonder if Wood was brought in as a way of testing whether the things were good enough to sell, whilst still being able to pull the toe back out of the bath if it was too hot. Wood may have had no clue. (Or blinded himself.)

August 29, 2006 **Walter P**

Bernard Biales -

Our posts crossed.

In the first paragraph of your post it is interesting to note your comments regarding Shattuck and his untimely death. If my theory is correct and George Grinnell only bought the two 13c Missionary stamps from Shattuck it must have been like manna from heaven when he died a short time later for George Grinnell.

Interestingly, Shattuck's widow testified at George Grinnell's trial that she could not remember there being any stamps in the sea chest? Perhaps she did not notice the 2 Hawaii Missionary stamps, but if there were 60 plus Grinnell stamps they would have been hard to miss.

August 29, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

The Linn's Article The Linn's article is a pretty uneven appreciation of the issues at hand. On the seven bar grid, which has particularly interested me, it presents a "study" by Richard Celler. I doubt if this is more than a summary of some of his work, but taken at face value, it doesn't deal with a number of key issues. What follows repeats some of my earlier comments, but uses Celler's orientation (which makes more sense anyway.) Also some points given earlier are left implicit.

1)Generally, the problem is dealing with the inherent variability of a three dimensional flexible evolving surface with different ink distributions, ink, strike angles and pressures. The chart shown has no room to deal with this.

2)The resemblance of the two (or three -- conceptually, G80, the new genuine stamp could have a fake marking different from the eight Grinnell Grinnells) markings means they must the same device, or the Grinnell Grinnell is fake.

3)The Celler chart's differentiation of the left side of bar 4 on G80 and the Grinnell Grinnells seems a misapprehension. Some Genuine G4a show a bit of convexity and the curvature on G80 appears to be a mixed slight concave convex cork distortion and on top of that squeezed ink giving a convex distribution of ink. It may be that the apparent geometry was propagated into the Grinnell Grinnells if they are copies of G80.

4)The Celler chart shows bar 7 intact on G4a, but clipped on the Grinnell Grinnells (as is G80) but that feature is present in genuine strikes.

5)The Celler chart shows two notches in the small cap (bar 1)-- and none in the G4a. But the Tapling copy (4-169) does show one of these notches. That the other isn't present in any copy I have found is worthy of consideration, but not beyond reasonable variability for one marking. Interestingly, the Grinnells show variability in this area, also.

6)The Celler chart selects the narrowness at right of the second bar. This is another characteristic found in G80. However, 169 shows a tendency in this direction. This is adjacent to the region of the marking missing on G80. Those copies of the Grinnell Grinnell which show this region have peculiar appearance, which could be the product of an odd cork. It could also be the results of extrapolating from a variant and misleading partial strike.

7)The Celler chart does not include several points of interest, including the bottom notch of bar 7, the top irregularity of bar 7, the flaw at the left of bar 4.

A number of the stamps illustrated in the Advertiser sale (from old sources) would be interesting for further comparison. About the only way to save the Grinnell Grinnells is to claim them a late decayed form of G4a (compare COV-141) would suggest usage in late 1853. In fact, the claim that the Grinnell seven bar grid is genuine also has to trudge through the general postal historical problems raised by the Grinnells.

One of the key questions is ink -- The RPSL found different ink in the Grinnell Grinnells than the genuine black cancels. What is the ink of G80?

I haven't done the overlay work -- the RPSL drew the conclusion that the Grinnell Grinnells were fake based on such study.

August 29, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

I feel like the old postmaster, got to make do with what I've got in Hawaii.

Kleemann's study: Until these two stamps appeared on the bottom of the card, the Kleemann conclusion was valid. Now there are Grinnell elements matching Missionaries if the two on the card are genuine. Did he ever see the two on the card? The game has changed and previous conclusions must be modified because there is now a match of elements.

"I concede that an infinite number of theories can be concocted around the theme that the Grinnells are counterfeit, and none can be refuted by mere facts or logic, so we are stalemated." But I have the Royal on my side, so don't feel lonely and isolated in my views. I can put forth hypothetical possibilities, whereas the expertisers are limited in expressing their own opinions about the stamps in hand. Now I've had a chance to see some of the stamps in question, on my own screen, at my own pace, my opinion of the Grinnells just happens to match the Royal's.

I'm still interested in any identification of the fonts used on the Grinnells and the Missionaries. I'm obviously not in a good location to do real research, and I'm not asking you to do my research. There may be someone who has deeper interest and has good references available. But it would be interesting to discover if the

font used on the Grinnells was available to printers in 1851.

One of the wonders of the virtual age is having the ability to easily view stamps 8" inches high on a video screen, if the scan has sufficient resolution. I don't believe I would have been any different than any other of the hundreds of viewer in Washington who accepted seeing the Grinnells and wondering how certain opinions were determined. After Richard posted the large scans on the images page I started looking very closely, and it has become apparent after looking at images, 8" tall and next to each other, that the Grinnells are copied from the two Missionaries. If they hold up to be genuine we know the source of the design used for the Grinnells.

You asked once that this mystery would continue until the forger was identified. My guess is that we're 95% there. We just need to find a reference to a press in the basement of the Southwest Museum, and who had access to it! BTW - It was probably the mailroom clerk.

Roger

August 29, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

I read your last post to Roger with interest. Several of your points are well taken and this led me to start thinking about the Grinnell Saga and what standard should be used to judge these stamps as genuine or counterfeit?

By way of history, in nations such as the United States and Canada that have a democratic government and law courts where cases are tried by judge and jury or by a judge:

The standards of proof required to prove a case differ when you enter the Criminal Courts as opposes to the Civil Courts.

In criminal cases the standard of proof is that the case must be proven by the state or province 'beyond a reasonable doubt.' In civil cases the standard of proof is lower and the case must be proven 'on a balance of probabilities.'

The George Grinnell trial was conducted using the civil court burden of proof and I think that standard is sufficient when assessing the evidence in the present case for the Grinnells. After the RPSL issued its negative opinion and the reasons for its opinion, it became apparent after some new information came to light that there was room for further discussion and investigation. However, having said that, the burden of proof that would be required to prove the RPSL decision findings may be flawed lies squarely on the shoulders of the Grinnell stamp owners.

After you and Dick Cellar initiated your own investigations into the circumstances surrounding the Grinnell stamps it soon became apparent that the Grinnell stamps were printed more likely than not in the twentieth century and not in 1851-52 Hawaii.

I submit that on a balance of probabilities there is little or no evidence that the Grinnell stamps were printed in 1851-52 Hawaii and therefore based on this alone the stamps would more likely than not be counterfeit, as opposed to being a second printing of the Missionary stamps issued by the Hawaii post office.

On the other hand, the theory that George Grinnell did not find a cache of Grinnell stamps but instead found two genuine 13c Hawaii Missionary stamps which he then with the help of his co-conspirators used to transfer the printing detail from the genuine stamps onto the design used to print the Grinnell stamps.

Was this a perfect union, no, there were minute differences noted in the design of the finished product when placed beside the genuine Missionary stamps. However, these differences were hard to detect unless you were looking for them, as evidenced by the two genuine Missionaries [certification pending] not being detected that were mounted on the card of ten until recently.

George Grinnell knew there were minute differences between the stamps used for the design details to print the Grinnells and the Grinnells themselves, and fearing someone might notice he mounted the two 13c stamps and eight Grinnell stamps onto a card and held the card back from the sale to Kleeman. It should be noted that George Grinnell may not have known for sure whether the two 13c stamps he purchased were genuine, but he did know that if they were included in the lot they may be noticed and raise an alarm.

In the end this happened anyway as Caspary the eventual buyer of the Grinnell stamps had some genuine Missionary stamps in his collection and on close comparison saw the Grinnells were different and returned the stamps to Kleeman as counterfeits.

When the antics and track record of George Grinnell are looked at closely, and you recognise the Southwest Museum Connection for what it was, then coupled with the above, it would be more likely than not that George Grinnell and Associates printed the Grinnell stamps and tried to pull off a fraud by concocting the story of his great find that we are all too familiar with.

I believe that this is how this mystery is going to play out in the end and I will leave the 'how they did it' printing details to stamp experts Dick Cellar and Ken Lawrence to figure out, but in the end the Grinnells still are and always will be counterfeit stamps.

August 29, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

David S I am not sure that the scenario you suggest plays out quite right. I do think the recent discovery presents the Possibility of a more integrated Speculation. First -- it does seem quite likely, based on court testimony, that there was interaction with Shattuck, about the right time to initiate the sequence. Perhaps he got the good stamps (maybe even others, but it would have been tricky disposing of them later, after l'affaire became public). Then Shattuck died. Convenient (The fictional version, of course would have it has more than convenient. Dr. Alliot also appears on scene, then exits, stage right, into the waiting bosom of his Maker.) Then comes the attempted sale, apparently already in the works.) Did Grinnell have the summer of 1918 off? This is all delightful, but secondary to the examination of the material.

The presence of the thirteens on the cards suggests comparison with the Grinnells. One track that is being presented is the possibility of a general flow of details from the 13s to All the Grinnells. This is of interest, though perhaps not decisive.

The second looks at the question whether peculiarities of these two specific Hawaiians -- scarce, or preferably absent on other stamps, especially thirteens are propagated in the Grinnells. This is theoretically a decisive argument. The problem that may come up is this -- there may be a lot of tiny variations among the genuine stamps and the two key stamps may have some that appear in the Grinnells and some that don't (also consider possible variation in the Grinnells). The properties seen in the Grinnells in the areas blotted out on the genuine by their cancels (especially the seven bar) present an especial opportunity to get around the possible chaotic nature of the general comparison.

I do disagree with Ken Lawrence's use of the argument against some comparisons that, in effect, we must demand that they reflect consistency on the part of a notional faker. Fakers are human -- they have ignorance, varying capabilities of observation and execution, environmental and emotional distraction, impatience, etc. We are permitted to look for their weak points.

I have made preliminary comments on the seven bar. I find it attractive -- the genuine marking is a cork device. A second marking, showing plating type matches, is not going to be a post office phenomenon -- it is a demonstration of someone trying to replicate the marking for non postal purposes. Thus Q4a and the matching Grinnell are either productions of the same marking device, or the Grinnell is a non postal imitation and not a genuine usage.

Ken L You wouldn't have any idea how many impressions would be reasonable from typographic printing (or stereotypography) of the type being done in Hawaii

in the 1850s?

Richard Malmgren or Richard Cellar or Ken Lawrence Any idea of how certain it is that the card of ten is marked for sequestering and whether it appears to match any known Grinnell writing?

August 29, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L By the way, I think if one asks the questions a little differently -- can you prove the Grinnells are not genuine, and speak of proof in a practical sense, then it isn't such a problem. We've been executing people and sending up rapists with about 98 percent probabilities on the (positive) expertizations, I think the Grinnells are more knowable. So far the recent discovery does not really hurt the RPSL conclusions. Further analysis will be most interesting.

August 29, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Ken L Infinite number of theories? None can be refuted by facts or logic? I assume you mean infinite paranoid progressions, not plausible coherent thoughts.

August 29, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren -

I think that in your most recent post you are right on target regarding Ken Lawrence.

Philatelic Sleuth that he is, I think that Ken will keep on going the way he has been, exhausting all ends and examining every aspect of the Grinnell Saga under a microscope, and perhaps, that in itself is not a bad thing.

However, when this is all said and done, I agree that short of a revelation, or another earth shaking discovery by the Arrigo's, Ken Lawrence will in the end cross over from the dark side and entrench himself in the Grinnell's are Forgeries Camp.

If Ken wants to spend his valuable time searching for 'the smoking gun,' something that in my view does not exist in this case, or for irrevocable proof that the Grinnells are somehow genuine Hawaii postage stamps, than who are we to stand in his way.

In fact, I have every confidence that when the Grinnell merry-go-round finally grinds to a halt, it will do so at the entrance to the Grinnell's are Forgeries Camp, where quite possibly Dick Cellar and Ken Lawrence might very well be the last riders.

I think that both Dick and Ken have raised some very good points in the printing process used to print the Grinnells and in the identification of the printing characteristics between the genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps and the Grinnell stamps. However, as interesting as this all is, all this does is confirm that the Grinnells are different and are not the same as the Genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps and does not prove that the Grinnell stamps were printed and issued by the Hawaii Postal Authority to pre-pay Hawaii postal services.

I think it is now safe to say that the Grinnell stamps 1851-52 Hawaii Connection is dead, and the more you look at and investigate the Grinnell stamps Southwest Museum California Connection, the more it appears that the Grinnells were printed by George Grinnell and his compadres.

It's an inevitable end, and as each day passes we all draw closer to the day, when, short of the Grinnell owners, all participants in this discussion will all end up on the same page and in the same Camp.

August 29, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Walter P.

You addressed a post to me that included the following:

"I also supplied some posts on this Board stating that it is pretty obvious to anyone with open eyes that George Grinnell did not make a discovery of the Grinnells, in the manner he stated, and it is more likely than not George Grinnell only bought the two 13c Hawaii Missionary stamps that are now mounted on the bottom of the card of ten shown in Chicago [and this Board] and used the basic characteristics printed on these two 13c stamps to manufacture the stamps we all know now as the Grinnell Missionary Stamps."

My apology! It was never my intention to minimize the contributions of others. Upon my return from Chicago, I was overly anxious to report my dazzling observations of the Card of 10 and blowups displayed by Mystic at StampShow. I obviously did not take into consideration the prior postings of others.

So would you like to make a wager? I will bet \$10 at 2:1 that in the final analysis, Ken L. will stop all of his silly contrarian's postings and cross over from the dark side (this assumes, of course, that he does not have some sort of 10 year agreement to keep this squabble going). If you read carefully (and you do) and take note of his words (and I did at the Grinnell Roundtable), it seems as if his posts are simply to draw out information from the rest of us (and upsetting a few people along the way). Steve W., where are you?

August 29, 2006 **Alan McLeod**

Ken,

I notice that you are still stating on the Virtual Stamp Chat board that the Grinnell with the similar cork cancel as the genuine Missionary is also genuine,

" The August 28 Linn's includes Dick Celler's plating of the Grinnell cancel and the similar Missionary cancel, demonstrating that the cancel on that stamp is the Grinnell version that the RPSL condemned as counterfeit ".

Alan Mc.

August 29, 2006 **Ken Lawrence** <apsken@aol.com>

By the third day of APS Stampshow, the October issue of Scott Stamp Monthly was available. Everyone who wanted a copy got one, and I gave them out at the roundtable.

This is the issue that includes my article on the discovery of the two Missionaries on the card. I have some copies left, available on a first-come, first-served basis,

one per request. Postage would be appreciated.

August 29, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger,

Evidently only virtual information is real to you, so I'm stumped. I use old fashioned published sources, and Dave Churchman prints from solid cast type.

For the rest, I concede that an infinite number of theories can be concocted around the theme that the Grinnells are counterfeit, and none can be refuted by mere facts or logic, so we are stalemated.

As I've written so many times before, your deduction also demonstrates that Scott 4 H.I. & U.S. Postage 13¢ Missionaries are counterfeit also.

But if you won't read Klemann's article and study his drawings, which apply equally to the two Missionaries on the card, why should we continue this exchange?

In 1968, our hobby's leadership created APRL so that collectors desirous of doing serious research would have access to the world's philatelic literature. To borrow and read it, one must be an APS member in good standing and pay the required service charges and postage.

This discussion is fruitless if participants won't read existing references available to them, but prefer to spin theories contrary to firmly established facts.

August 29, 2006 **Roger Heath**

I spent much time composing this and I wish to share. It repeats a couple of points made by David Shumaker and Richard Malmgren, I had not read their posts prior to writing my response to Ken.

Ken -

"According to John Klemann, no element of any Grinnell matches any element of a Missionary. Fred Gregory reproduced Klemann's charts of all the differences."

I guess Mr Gregory and Mr Klemann never saw the two Grinnell Missionaries on the card, or are you suggesting the two at the bottom of the card may not be real either. If these two are eventually certified as real Missionaries, then the above opinions and charts must be modified to state: *"no element of any Grinnell matches any element of a Missionary, except the two Missionaries from the Grinnell hoard."*

I'm trying to interpret your third paragraph. *"Thorowgood numerals of value have been available to printers since the 1830s,..."* I have been online and was unable to find any font attributed to Thorowgood that has a flat base to the numeral "2". Your help would be appreciated. I think the Grinnell forger had similar problems finding a match, so did his best.

"And if this was done photographically from the genuine 13¢, why did the forger switch those numerals also to a different style?" To make the find look consistent. Wouldn't it be strange to a prospective buyer that two values had a new font and the 13 cent had the original font. No claim of separate printing could then be made, and the comparison of the frames would make one wonder why a Grinnell 2 cent and 5 cent stamp had exactly the same frame flaws as an original 13 cent Missionary!

The present situation (possible genuine Missionaries on the card) wasn't known to the original prospective buyers, nor the judge at the trial, but now we know these were real examples from which someone could have copied. By happenstance, the newly found stamps have flyspecking frame flaws identical to those originally presented for sale, and now presented for authentication.

I disagree with you that the numerals are the most important elements of these "stamps". Even you have made a point that no forger would spend time adding "flyspecking" to make them appear real, when the numerals so identifiably different. The only part the forger had was the details, not the large numerals. He was in the same situation as myself, couldn't identify the exact name of the font used in Honolulu in 1851.

How does this sound for provenance of all the Grinnells shown to us to date?

There was a book in which were found two Hawaiian stamps. These were shown to a stamp dealer who thought of maximizing his profit, since these two examples were not include in any census. He tells a couple of his friends, "too bad there are only two, if there were a whole bunch, we could all make a lot of money!" At the "special study circle" meeting it was decided to determine the feasibility of making additional copies. Over a period of time certain problems were overcome, the frames all looked good, the numerals were different (but this is a different printing, right), and they were found (well, two were) in a book with Hawaii connections.

An attempt was made to sell to the first dealer. He bit big time, as he had contact with a big time collector who would pay the moon to include all these Missionaries in his collection. Money changed hands. Happy faces in Pasadena. Some extra stamps and "originals" put aside for if these were discovered, cat's out of the album, so to speak.

Collector and his experts agree stamps not real. Wants money back, and goes to court to get it. After much debate during the trial, and the opinions of experts throughout the 20th century, part of the hoard is sent to Europe for expert examination. Results all negative!

After all this a 90 year old card of stamps is brought to light, and with it what appear to be two real Missionaries. The big surprise is the similarity of the design features, finally showing where the forger got his originals to copy.

I think the real story of these stamps is why after so much effort on the part of experts and observers for over 90 years, the family never showed their complete holdings to the experts. Not that it's any of my business, mind you.

BTW - I've only communicated with Richard to thank him for offering this forum to discuss the Grinnells. I am a cohort of one, thus the other nine must be acting independently.

Roger

August 29, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

I'm supposed to be working, but I just brought up the Little Boy's Board while eating lunch at my desk and I see that the postings keep coming.

Think VERTICAL.

Now that the Card of 10 has surfaced, it does not matter one whit that John Klemann did or did not say that no element of any Grinnell matches any element of a Missionary.

Think VERTICAL.

The perimeter ornamentation and rules of the 13c Type I presumed genuine Missionary have all kinds of matches with the perimeter ornamentation and rules of the other Grinnell Type II values. Think VERTICAL.

The perimeter ornamentation and rules of the 13c Type II presumed genuine Missionary have all kinds of matches with the perimeter ornamentation and rules of the other Grinnell Type II values. Think VERTICAL.

I do not want my post edited by Richard Frajola, so I will not suggest that Grinnell supporters are tailoring evidence to fit a theory nor will I suggest that this sounds to me like the Grinnell supporters are not properly weighing evidence. As to irony, the Card of 10 was only recently revealed. Had it been revealed in 1922, folks long since dead would have reached the conclusion that others are now concluding. And that would have been a terrible thing and left us with little to do but eat our lunch at our work table and try not to drip mustard on our pants.

(By the way, I wonder if I am being included as someone's cohort. I thought I was searching for light at the end of the tunnel and found it. I was not aware that I was trying to joint some sort of army. Incidentally, a shift-F7 reveals legion, army, gang, group and followers as synonyms for cohort.)

August 29, 2006 **David Shumaker**

Walter P.

Where I disagree with your theory is that Grinnell and/or his co-conspirators bought the two genuine Missionaries and lied about the find. Surely fakes as credible as these could have been made from damaged copies as well as (seemingly) perfect ones for much less money and less searching, and with all the publicity in and outside of philatelic circles pertaining to the find and the trial, surely someone would have come forth who recalled selling two fine copies of the Hawaiian Missionaries to a school teacher. Seems a highly risky endeavor to set out to fake an unprecedented find by purchasing the genuine article, doesn't it?

It has been suggested that the stamps were donated to the museum, which would point to someone therein likely hatching the scheme and enlisting Grinnell to market the product. If so, why would Grinnell continue to his dying day to defend himself when by the year of the trial the Southwest Museum co-conspirators were all dead, leaving him "holding the bag"?

Perhaps Grinnell did find the stamps, but was led to Shattuck where the fakes were seeded for him to find. Not an unrealistic scenario, since at a time without certificates and forensic study of paper and inks, the most important ingredients to legitimize a stamp is a reputable dealer and a good story - the one cent Mauritius, the yellow Swedish stamp, the Miller "Z" grill, all unique and all considered genuine by virtue of a good story.

Problem is, how was Shattuck determined to be the provenance for the "find" without the knowledge that has been dug up since the end of the trial - the links to the time and place of printing and mailing of the Hawaiian Missionaries? Someone needs to show how the information about Hanna Shattuck, William Emmerson, and the rest that has come to light since 1922 was known by the Southwest Museum ring. Otherwise, that's too much coincidence... for me to accept, anyway.

So, may I suggest that you consider there really was a find of two genuine stamps that were part of a Hawaiian correspondence, probably involving Hannah Shattuck, and it was the fact that these were unknown to the philatelic community that planted the seed of a scheme to print the Grinnells, including a perfectly legitimate story of the "find".

August 29, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger H,

According to John Klemann, no element of any Grinnell matches any element of a Missionary. Fred Gregory reproduced Klemann's charts of all the differences.

Now you and your cohorts are asserting the opposite, that everything matches except for the most important elements.

Just for the record, the large Thorowgood numerals of value have been available to printers since the 1830s, and are still available today. No one would have had any need to change them. And if this was done photographically from the genuine 13¢, why did the forger switch those numerals also to a different style?

This does not read to me like evidence is being weighed. Evidence is being tailored to fit a theory. The irony here is that the evidence now is interpreted exactly opposite the way Klemann interpreted it, but for the same foregone conclusion.

August 29, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

Why do you insist the forger "strove to match minute trivial details of filigree ornaments but then changed the type font on the large central numerals."

If you have examples of the details of Type I and Type II stamps, the only part necessary to complete the hoax is to find a type font similar to the originals. You wrote that foundry type books were available so the forger only needed to find a font identical to that used on the Missionaries. He came close, but no cigar.

You propose that the forger would have had problems "toiling" over the creation of the details, when in fact, all his creations have identical details, but the unreplicable parts, the numerals are different than an original.

The release of the two "originals" seems to confirm there was no example of the 2 cent or 5 cent stamps available by other than photographic images. This was the problem the forger faced, he had two examples of the frames, but no the value tablets or numerals. The only portions of the design that don't match original Missionaries.

Think Swiss postage dues of 1878-1908 and see how the post office used the same frames and just changed the value numeral. Simple straight forward substitution, though no photography used as the printers had the plates.

Roger

August 29, 2006 **Walter P**

Richard Malmgren -

Who cares if Ken Lawrence writes an article about the Southwest Museum Connection in the future, its a free country?

Everyone knows that you were the first to make the Southwest Museum Connection on this Board and I am sure Ken Lawrence will credit you with that.

I also supplied some posts on this Board stating that it is pretty obvious to anyone with open eyes that George Grinnell did not make a discovery of the Grinnells, in the manner he stated, and it is more likely than not George Grinnell only bought the two 13c Hawaii Missionary stamps that are now mounted on the bottom of the card of ten shown in Chicago [and this Board] and used the basic characteristics printed on these two 13c stamps to manufacture the stamps we all know now as the Grinnell Missionary Stamps.

Did George Grinnell print the 'Grinnell' stamps himself, of course not, that is where his croonies at the Southwest Museum come into play.

I do not think that anyone can argue that there is not a huge credibility gap associated with George Grinnell and some of the Grinnell family decendants regarding the possession of the Grinnell stamps and the family history starting with George Grinnell on where the Grinnell stamps came from. For instance, how many Grinnell stamps are there? The answer is, who knows for sure. With such a credibility gap, who can separate fact from fantasy? Given the past track record, who can believe anything George Grinnell and the Grinnell family decendants say?

Anything Ken writes in a future article on the Southwest Museum Connection will most likely be anti-climatic. You were the first on this Board to make the Southwest Museum Connection, and the more I thought about your posts, and the facts that relate to George Grinnells philatelic dark side, and my taking into account some of the people he was associating with, it is pretty obvious where the Grinnells were printed, and by whom.

In my view, the Southwest Museum Connection fills in more blanks on the issue of, by who, and where, the Grinnell stamps were printed than any other theory posted on this Board or elsewhere to date.

Does any reader disagree with this theory?

August 29, 2006 **David Shumaker**

If the two 13-cent values recently discovered as being genuine were the actual models for all values of the Grinnell Missionaries, then without the central numerals "2" and "5" to model from, poor matches to the genuine would not be improbable but rather most likely.

If the two 13-cent stamps were the models, it would be simple to prove for an experienced plater (which is not me). As has been mentioned here, if inconsistent inking and printing anomalies on the two genuine Missionaries become consistent plating points on the Grinnells of all denominations of the same type, you have your smoking gun.

I have been open to hypotheses that link the thoroughly researched provenance of the Shattuck family to the Grinnells as we have come to know them, regardless of the conclusion. I never liked theories that declared these stamps fake (though they certainly appear to be "unofficial reproductions") without explaining the unfolding 1850's Hawaiian connection as anything other than a bizzarre coincidence. I feel that the two genuine examples accomplish that link. If only the two good stamps passed from Shattuck to Grinnell, then I can accept that the Grinnells can be fake and still embrace the Arrigo and Culhane research (though not their informal PO theory).

Ken Lawrence, Clark Frasier and Richard Malmgren - thrilled to have met you in Chicago.

August 29, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Ken L.

The fancy border ornaments and the perimeter rules of the Type I 13c presumed genuine Missionary certainly have the appearance of serving as the model for all values of the Type I Grinnells. Ditto for Type II. The actual central numeric values themselves were, I assume, a cut and paste operation placed into the center of the model of the real fancy border ornament and perimeter rules. Again, I am not as an experienced faker as are some to better explain the operation. I would guess that photography fits into the equation somewhere.

As to the question why are there very slight differences in the large central numerals of the Grinnells from the original Missionaries? Well the answer appears to be because they are not perfect representation of the large central numerals of the real Missionary stamps. (Boy, that is certainly a profound statement.) Very close, but no cigar.

Since when was there a law that counterfeiters had to make their counterfeit stamps to be absolutely perfect representation of the real stamps that were being counterfeited? I thought that differences are one of the things that help us identify a counterfeit stamp? If they were absolutely perfect representations of the real stamp, then we would not be able to tell that they were counterfeit stamps. Do not the counterfeit stamps of other countries made by other counterfeiters have slight differences from the real stamps? Or do I have that wrong and the Grinnells are being held to a higher level such as - Oh, I just spotted a difference between the Grinnell and the real Missionary; therefore the Grinnell must be real after all.

And with that, I'm off to work after fun and games in Chicago. You and other posters as well as lurkers will all be overjoyed to know that I will likely not be posting for many days. Have to earn a living.

August 29, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I have every intention of keeping this board clear of personal attacks and posts that I consider to be "baiting" - too many good students have decided not to post here, or contribute to the reference pages, because they don't want to be exposed to abuse by those who hold differing views. That is most unfortunate as we all are thereby deprived of more meaningful, and balanced discourse.

August 29, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

I'm glad that Richard Malmgren came to our roundtable to make his points, because his comrade Stan Piller stayed away. Stan said the reason was because his

wife asked him not to go (edited by RCF).

If Richard M is right, as I told him at Chicago, it's odd that the forger strove to match minute trivial details of filigree ornaments but then changed the type font on the large central numerals, another improbable aspect that makes the Grinnells so interesting. His imagination stretches that far; mine doesn't.

Meanwhile, Stan sold the Grinnell he had on display. Word on the street from a usually reliable source says the price was \$20,000. Stan assured me that the buyer wanted a Grinnell, not a genuine Missionary. (edited by RCF).

August 28, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

And by phenomenally similar, I am referring, of course, to the border ornaments and the rules. Obviously a lot of the other stuff was changed out.

August 28, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

Over the objections of Judie who wants me to finish unpacking from the long trek back from Chicago, I looked at some, but only some, of the prior postings somewhat more closely. (I'm being very careful in my choice of words so that Ken L. does not rag out too strongly on me. And Ken, don't forget that I did not throw rotten eggs at your Grinnell Roundtable, although I thought you were most presuming to announce that you will be writing a future article on the Southwest Museum connection, undoubtedly inspired by my own superbly researched prior Frajola Board postings on the subject.)

Ken L's word of a prior day was 'flyspeck', as in Ken L's August 26 post about flyspecking.

My word of the day is 'bull pucky'.

Folks, look at the Card of 10 and the blowups. Actually look at them. Insist that Mystic recreate in your home their display at StampShow and each one of you stand in front of the Card of 10 and the blowups. Look at them. (O.K., use the computer if you want, but it is so obvious were you to stand at the Mystic booth at StampShow and actually look at them.)

The similarities between the presumed genuine 13c Type I Missionary and all of the Type I Grinnells of whatever value and the similarities between the presumed genuine 13c Type II Missionary and all of the Type II Grinnells of whatever value are phenomenal. By phenomenal I mean to imply extraordinary, exceptional, unusual, extra special and out of the ordinary (I did a shift-F7 in Microsoft Word and I came up with all of these synonyms—super huh? After all, you don't really think I have a vocabulary anywhere near approaching Ken's, do you?).

Think vertical. Think Scott Trepel. Think Bordeaux.

Yes, there are some differences. If I were a faker, then I could explain things better, unfortunately, that is not my forte (I did another shift-F7 to come up with forte).

August 28, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

Richard Matta

If you have access to J.F. Westberg's Plating

The Hawaiian Numerals, then you can get a reasonably good idea about the lock-up chase used on a job press.

August 28, 2006 **Richard Malmgren** <rcmstamps@hawaii.rr.com>

I just did return to Hawaii from StampShow. It is a long haul from Chicago, but someone must sacrifice to help support the tax base in Paradise.

I have only glanced at a very few of the prior Board postings. Apparently the Card of 10 arguments started in my absence. There appears to be little change in the makeup of the two teams – although Dick Celler appears to be more active. My posting may be repeating prior discussions, but repetition doesn't stop anyone else, so why me?

Over a week ago and before Judie and I left for Chicago, Bill Longely was kind enough to call and discuss his initial thoughts about the Card of 10 and whether or not the bottom two 13c presumed genuine Missionary Stamps served as models for the Grinnells and specifically for those Grinnells that were mounted on the same card. At StampShow, I spent several hours actually looking at the Card of 10 and the large blowups. My observations surprised me. (One observation was that a lot less people came to the Mystic booth to look at this stuff than I had expected, although Mystic's free pamphlets certainly disappeared – perhaps because they were free.)

In the past, I believe the majority of the Grinnell - Missionary comparison effort was expended in comparing a Type I 2c Grinnell with a Type I 2c Missionary; a Type II 2c Grinnell with a Type II 2c Missionary; a Type I 5c Grinnell with a Type I 5c Missionary; etc., etc. and on through the 13c values. In other words, the comparison has been horizontal, so to speak.

The Card of 10 is, of course, an invitation for a vertical comparison, something at which Scott Trepel excels, but usually with Bordeaux. My surprise was the results I observed when comparing the presumed genuine 13c Type I Missionary with all of the other Type I Grinnells on the Card of 10 and then comparing the presumed genuine 13c Type II Missionary with all of the other Type II Grinnells on the Card of 10. (Forget about horizontal comparisons, just stay with the vertical comparisons.)

There are a remarkable number of similarities in the breaks in the fancy border ornaments within each Type (e.g., a break in the corner ornament of the Type I genuine 13c Missionary is replicated in the same spot in all of the Type I Grinnells). There are many of these examples – and the source of these similarities is the presumed genuine Missionaries.

Many people are polite and do not accuse me of being a plater, but even I could easily see these similarities and so could anyone else if they stood there and looked. There are also similarities in the gaps of the perimeter rules – the same type of thing that assists in plating the Hawaiian Numerals.

Unfortunately for this discussion, I do not have a lot of experience as a faker, so I cannot comment as intelligently as some others on how all of this occurred, but when you actually stand in front of the Card of 10 and look at it and at the blowups, it is hard to argue other than I have done, unless, of course, you have moved to the dark side and joined Darth Vader.

Are there also differences among the Types? Yes, there are some. But the similarities are overwhelming when you look at them.

August 27, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

Dick C:

Thank you for the detailed explanation. I'll spend some time with this information and respond later.

August 27, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Scott Trepel

Different type in 13-cent Type II Missionary settings

You posted: *"If there are differences in the type, as you say, could you please describe them? I did not find anything specific in booklet."*

I doubt the 13c was dismantled and reset."

[Here](#) is a comparison of the "3" of "13" in the bottom label of Census 103 (level 13) and Census 111 (dropped 1). Note where the upper ball is attached to the stem of the 3. The upper ball is larger on the level 13 variety, and attaches to the stem further to the right than on the dropped 1 variety (see red arrows). In addition, note the shape of the colorless interior void. The bottom of this void has a leftward pointy end beneath the bottom ball. However, the top of the void lacks this leftward pointy end on the level 13 stamp shown at left, while it has the pointy end on the dropped 1 stamp shown at right.

There are other slight differences as well, evident not just on these two stamps, but on many other examples. One is the weak center bar of the 3 on the dropped 1 variety. Thus, this is not a painting, and not an inking irregularity on one stamp.

Highlights of the differences in the remaining type pieces of the bottom label are described below.

"1": fatter on level 13, right side slopes to right at bottom, LR serif prominent.

"3": discussed above

"&&" no obvious differences

"C": stronger bottom tail on level 13

"e": Level 13 is a wider piece of type, has a smaller interior void

"n": Level 13 is wider piece of type, has a smaller interior void

"t": Level 13 has a wider piece of type, usually shows the bottom tail

"s": Level 13 has a thicker center stroke

".": Level 13 period much larger, and not as far to the right as dropped 1 version (less space between "s" and period). Note also that the left edge of the period is directly below the left edge of the "propeller" of the lower right corner ornament. On the dropped 1, the left edge of the period lines up with the propeller differently.

If you can use your "blink-compare" skills on a bottom label of each setting, I think you will see these differences do exist. You might also do the same on the large central 13 of each setting - I haven't yet prepared an analysis, but they do look different. For one thing the lower ball of the "3" appears to attach to the stem further to the left on the dropped 1 stamps.

My present list of dropped 1 looks like this (it can change as better scans are located):

79 - bottom quarter added and painted
 90 - Advertiser sale lot 23
 93 - most of "13 C" added and painted
 95
 111
 116?
 122?
 130
 138 - middle stamp in Dawson strip, top and part of bottom added and painted
 144
 146?

August 27, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Scott Trepel

You raise several legitimate points in your posting to me two days ago. I will try to address them.

The article in the Mystic booklet is based on what I had learned up to the time I wrote it. I have done further research since then which demonstrates there are *at least* two settings of the Missionary 13 cent Type II.

There is more study to be done. This is a work in progress. I have refrained from publishing something definitive until I understand exactly what is going on. I hope this further research will provide the answers.

You stated: *"Census #146 is open bud, #81 is filled, both are normal "1". I think the filling in of the small ornament bud head, as you call it, is simply an inking/dirt issue. I do not think the ornament was changed."*

I have noted this open/filled bud on the "normal" as well. It is one reason further research is needed. I also tested the inking/dirt conclusion, which may indeed be the answer that the "normal" setting is found both ways. However, other traits of this ornament piece do not fit neatly with each example - this is one reason additional research is underway.

What I have found is all "dropped 1" stamps have an open bud, while some "level 13" stamps have a filled bud and some have an open bud.

One possible explanation goes like this:

(1) level 13, open bud stamps were printed

then

(2) level 13, dirt filled bud stamps were printed

then

(3) cliché was cleaned to remove the dirt, some type moved around in doing this cleanup, creating the "dropped 1" variety, and some more stamps were printed.

This scenario, however, does not explain why (on the dropped "1" variety) the large central 13 and the entire bottom label are composed of different type pieces than on the level 13 variety.

I will describe the differences to look for in a separate posting.

August 27, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Ken L—

I do not have access to the RPSL book, but if any test had turned up pine oil, or lithotine itself, then the matter would be decided beyond all doubt. After a litho image is etched and the gum surface of the plate/stone buffed down, the first step toward printing is to *wash out* the image with lithotine. Once that is done, the gum is washed off with water, and at this point traces of lithotine would be everywhere on the plate/stone, and it would also be in the water used for dampening the stone when it is rolled up. (Lithotine is the only solvent used just prior to *rubbing up*, which is done prior to the application of printing ink by a roller, and water is the only solvent used afterward. Water does not dissolve or dissociate lithotine.) I don't see how a litho print of the early 20th Century could be free of lithotine or its components, and I don't see how any print with traces of lithotine could be anything but a lithograph.

Since you have read the RPSL book, and perhaps even have a copy, do you recall any mention of "pine oil" or "lithotine"?

Jim

August 27, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

In your post you stated that Caspary lied in his sworn testimony [presumably when he testified at George Grinnell's trial?].

What lie[s] do you believe Caspary told when he gave his evidence at George Grinnell's court trial?

August 27, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Dick C - perhaps someone needs to illustrate how a cliché of loose type was built up and locked together

August 27, 2006 **Dick Celler**

The second paragraph of my last posting to you seems clear to me. Perhaps it is not - can someone help out and rephrase it to make it more understandable?

August 27, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

Please read the RPSL book, which condemned the Grinnells as counterfeit, before you declare what tests have not been performed. The discussion does not advance by trying to guess what is already known with certainty, including letterpress printing and loose type.

August 27, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

One test that I guarantee has not been done on the Grinnells is to look for any traces of pine oil, a vital component of lithotine, a solvent peculiar to lithography. Pine oil would never have been used in letterpress printing.

August 27, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Ken—the rules didn't have breaks, they had dings in them, or low spots. It is not credible to me that Henry Whitney, who published a newspaper, would allow the "H" of "Hawaiian" to be set so high that it would prevent the rule above it from printing properly. If the "H" were too high, the following "a" would have printed poorly too.

Also, I am not aware of any proof that photographic methods could not have been used to create the Grinnell stamps.

Labeling any evidence as trivial or imaginary does not refute it. For the Grinnells to be genuine they will have to withstand every test thrown at them. Science does not seek to *prove* anything; rather, a hypothesis, once arrived at, is subjected to test after test to discover if it can be disproved. This is known as the Scientific Method, and if you disagree, your quarrel is with Galileo, who formulated it, not me.

☺

Jim

August 27, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Walter P -

"Who do you think should decide?"

Rhetorical I presume! Anyway it's funny!

Roger

August 26, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

Who gets to decide what evidence is bogus and should be retired? Isn't that part of the problem of not moving forward here?

You may be moving forward in becoming a walking encyclopedia on the Grinnells, but at the same time it appears that in the end, you cannot prove and neither can anyone else, that the Grinnells are genuine Hawaii Missionary stamps?

For every theory posted on this Board there is a counter theory, for every technical printing point raised there is a counter point raised, the more people that jump on the merry-go-round the slower it begins to turn.

Who do you think should decide what evidence is real evidence and what evidence is bogus evidence?

August 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott T,

I am eagerly awaiting your evidence. If you can prove the Grinnells are counterfeit I will celebrate the solution just as much as I'll celebrate if Dick Celler can prove they are genuine, but I won't hold my breath for either. To me the more important point is to retire bogus evidence that has corrupted the analysis for generations.

Jim B,

People who exaggerate trivial and imaginary evidence while disdaining important well established evidence are properly labeled conspiracy theorists. People who selectively divert the debate with ad hominem attacks to bolster preconceived but unproven hypotheses need to be called to task. That's the only way this discussion can achieve integrity that might lead to an intelligent solution.

Stereotype plates date to the 1770s. It is quite possible that both Missionaries and Grinnells were printed from stereotypes. Photographic stereotypes were simply a 19th and 20th century adaptation of that technique. These are all letterpress (relief) prints, not lithographs (planographic prints).

To date, ALL evidence adduced to suggest that the Grinnells were produced by processes or materials not available in the 1850s and earlier have been refuted by forensic evidence. Please don't ask us to recite here the massive volumes of scientific reporting that is available to anyone who reads the published sources.

Roger H,

All the fonts used on Missionary and Grinnell stamps are in type foundry sample books of the 1840s. None of large numeral fonts are known on any other Hawaiian printed matter. Type similar to the smaller Missionary and Grinnell inscriptions were used by the Mission Press in the 1840s, but never by the Polynesian (government) press. Ornaments similar to the Missionary and Grinnell ornaments are known from Hawaii only on Catholic Mission Press prints of the later 1850s, and only in higher quality prints than on these stamps. So the origins of ALL the type elements of Missionaries and Grinnells is a mystery. No partisan of either side has discovered the source(s) despite vigorous searches by generations of researchers. You cannot prove that any type used to print Missionaries or Grinnells was available to Henry Whitney in 1851.

Walter P,

Why then did Caspary lie in his sworn testimony?

Bill L,

It is possible but unlikely that the rules had breaks. It's more likely that the letters H cast from the same mold stood higher in the chase than the other letters of the inscription and the rules, preventing the paper from pressing on that part of the inked rule. The point standard of type was not introduced until the 1870s. Before that time, inconsistencies from one slug to the next caused this kind of problem typically, particularly on rushed jobs or prints by unskilled workers who did not take time to perfect the makeready forme. Any H cast in the same mold and similarly positioned would cause the same void on the adjacent rule.

Why do you suppose Whitney used different type and ornaments on Scott 4 than on Scott 1, 2, and 3? Was he creating counterfeits, or simply setting up two new cliches, Type I and II? Why would the answer be any different if he also set and printed the Grinnells?

August 26, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Dick C I am perplexed. Let me understand this.

"the chase was unlocked but only the central numeral and bottom label replaced".

So where there is similarity in design one can claim the printer(whoever) used the original outer framelines to print the Grinnells, BUT if the design doesn't match, somehow mysteriously one can claim they used different ornaments and central numerals? Which is it?

This is almost like "If it walks like a duck, and quacks like a cow, it must be a duck".

Bill

August 26, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Bill Longley

You asked could someone please tell me why the genuine missionary in Grinnell's possession has a break over the H of Hawaiian, and so do ALL of the Grinnells, of EVERY denomination (TYPE 1s)?

I can comment on the second part of the question. The top inner rule on the Grinnell Type I cliché had a small break over the H. When the denomination was changed to print the other values, the chase was unlocked but only the central numeral and bottom label were replaced. The top part of the stamp tended to remain unchanged, and one would expect the break to be found on all three Type I denominations.

I looked at the Type I 13c missionary scans I have, and census numbers 86, 100, 117, 134, 136 and 145 seem to have the break above H as on G81. There does not seem to be a break on the majority. This is an observation, not an explanation.

These comments are subject to the fact that many of the scans are poor, and some of the stamps may have had a portion of the top inner rule painted that I am unaware of.

If one is going to say "aha - the Grinnell forger copied the break of the G81 stamp", one then needs to ask "how come the second i in Hawaii on all the Grinnell Type I stamps have the dot much higher than the G81?" (and consider the myriad other things he didn't copy).

August 26, 2006 **Walter P**

Bill Longley -

In your post you asked, "When will the 'Grinnell' families unveil any other hidden Grinnells?"

Perhaps, John D. Bowman has provided us with the answer to your question?

Perhaps, at the next big stamp show, Don Sundman will have printed up some glossy booklets revealing the details of George Grinnell's other great philatelic find?

Maybe, we will all be given the opportunity to purchase some early California Insurance Stamps, as described in John Bowman's post, that were discovered by, hold onto your hat, none other than George Grinnell himself?

August 26, 2006 **Walter P**

John D. Bowman -

I find your post to be most interesting and I think you are right in that perhaps the way of resolving the Grinnell mystery is to look deeply into the goings on of the man himself.

I was unaware that George Grinnell had made another fabulous philatelic find, which would now make him the "Indiana Jones" of philately.

I also find it very interesting that the Grinnell descendants have also unsuccessfully tried to sell some of the stamps from George Grinnell's other find.

Who knows what other rare philatelic gems reside in the vaults of the Grinnell descendants just waiting to be discovered.

Hang on to your hat Bill Longley there just may be other lost discoveries just waiting to be discovered in old prayer books or dusty trunks by the Grinnell descendants?

I think this is a most important piece of this puzzle that even the most die hard Grinnell supporter cannot ignore. This also reinforces my theory that George Grinnell may not have made the Grinnell stamp discovery and may very well be the one of the reasons these stamps exist today.

I can't wait to read a post from Ken Lawrence and Dick Cellar on what they think about George Grinnell's other philatelic find of the century?

I do not expect to hear anything from the Grinnell descendants on this disclosure. After all, what could they possibly say?

I have been beating the credibility drum on this Board for the last few weeks, but I never dreamed George Grinnell had made any other fabulous philatelic finds of a lifetime.

Congratulations on your finding this information John Bowman, this is really over the top.

August 26, 2006 **John D Bowman** <johndbowman@charter.net>

Varro Tyler apparently believed that Brewster C. Kenyon did not have the skills to make forgeries of the Hawaii missionaries.

Be that as it may, Kenyon did publish a hard-bound book in 1920 of documentary state revenue stamps. He notes in the preface that he had the good fortune to review the historical records concerning the early California state revenue stamps before the great fire in San Francisco destroyed them. The book is generously illustrated and seems to be a fine piece of research, although he gives no credit to J. Delano Bartlett who published a state revenue pamphlet in 1910.

Kenyon at the least was a capable researcher and writer of books. His fantasy Army Frank stamps are quite nicely made. What else did he forge, as accused by a contemporary dealer?

A story parallel to the Hawaii stamps concerning Grinnell may be of interest to some on this board. I have heard Grinnell may have been a dealer but little else about his philatelic activities.

In Weekly Philatelic Gossip of Feb. 1, 1941, state revenue collector E. R. Vanderhoof wrote a piece called "Classical Californias, A Startling Find." The find involved 123 early California Insurance stamps with controller's overprint, all in strips of four different as they were printed.

A large amount of these stamps without controller's overprints but in strips of four as issued were stolen from the state of CA and perhaps as a result of this theft, a new series of stamps of smaller diameter was rapidly issued. These stolen stamps did not seem to reach the philatelic market in quantity until around 1920, and

another group came to light around 1930.

Now, in 1941, Vanderhoof reports a find of the same kind of stamps in strips of four, but all with controller's overprint. Guess who found these stamps - none other than George H. Grinnell. Vanderhoof thought they were all genuine, and also noted that some had never been reported before, that is, there were five new discovery values in this group of 123. Vanderhoof described this find as "a spectacular find, probably the greatest ever made in these stamps."

I have heard that Grinnell's heirs own these stamps today and have attempted to sell them at prices too high for any collector or dealer to consider.

I wonder what will happen when these come to market. Will someone test the controller's overprint to see if it is the same ink and characteristics as those found on originals?

Somehow, to me at least, it seems awfully convenient in 1940 to find a group of stamps in strips of four that were basically unknown to the early collectors and that these were discovered a few years after the non-overprinted quantities came to market. These "Grinnell's" differ because they have the controller's overprint.

Initially, such stamps were not required to be cancelled, so to make a passable forgery would simply involve duplicating the controller's overprint. Because the stolen stamps in at least one find have been described as filling a steamer trunk, I have always been wary of any without a controller's overprint.

I am simply making the case that the means were available, probably inexpensively, in the first half of the last century, to obtain the strips of four of CA stamps without controller's overprint in perhaps substantial quantities. A forger might have found it a simple task to prepare duplicates of the controller's handstamped overprints. Could Kenyon have done something like this? Could Grinnell?

Both Grinnell and Kenyon lived in the same city in CA, did they not?

I suppose my point is that the Grinnell discussion has not really focused a lot on what Grinnell did beyond the big Missionary find, nor what Kenyon may have made in his time.

If, and only if, Grinnell's find of CA stamps around 1940 was a find hidden from all experts of the previous 80 years, and represents true controller's overprints, that could be circumstantial evidence that Grinnell's best skill was finding things that shook the foundations of philately.

On the other hand, if such stamps were ever examined and found to be fraudulent, I would think that would be strong circumstantial evidence against the Grinnell Missionaries.

August 26, 2006 **Bill Longley**

Let's try this one point at a time...

Without deflection or damnation, could someone please tell me why the genuine missionary in Grinnell's possession has a break over the H of Hawaiian, and so do ALL of the Grinnells, of EVERY denomination (TYPE 1s)?

Sincerely,
Bill Longley

August 26, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence - Scott Trepel

I would add to my post below, although Scott Trepel did not say the two 13c Hawaii Missionary stamps mounted on the card with eight Grinnell stamps were used as a model to print the Grinnells but more as a reference as to the paper and for matching inks, I still think that the general characteristics of the two 13c Missionary stamps were used in the printing of the Grinnells.

If you subscribe to this theory then Grinnell and his co-conspirators would have had to use some sort of model as a template to print the Grinnells and these appear to be the only Hawaii Missionary Stamps Grinnell would had access too?

August 26, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence, Scott Trepel -

Having read of all the Grinnell posts up to date, I am now leaning towards the following theory. which at this time cannot be proven but I believe is plausible:

George Grinnell's story is true up to the date he said he purchased the Grinnells. However, consider this, instead of purchasing the lot of Grinnells he only purchased the two 13c Hawaii Missionary Stamps that are now mounted on the card of ten stamps which are presently posted on this Board. As you know there is a notation on the rear of the card where George Grinnell wrote some words to the effect, do not sell or save the stamps mounted on this card.

With G. Grinnell now having the two 13c Missionary stamps [which now appear to be genuine pending expertization for a good cert] he used these two stamps with some co-conspirators to manufacture the stamps we now know as the Grinnells. I think Scott is right on the target when has suggested these stamps were used as a template to reproduce the dominant features of a genuine Hawaii Missionary stamp onto the stamps we now know as the Grinnells.

Although this theory cannot be proven it fits the mould in that I am now more inclined to believe that George Grinnell did not make the philatelic find of the century, but it appears that it is more plausible that he tried to pull off the philatelic scam of the century, almost succeeding had Caspary not come to his senses?

This senario seems to fit the mould but does not help us in finding out how the Grinnells were printed it just gives a plausible answer as to why they were printed and for what purpose.

One thing I am firmly convinced on is that George Grinnell does not come out of this story with "clean hands."

Gentleman, is my theory, in your view, plausible?

August 26, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -

You wrote - "It is ludicrous to propose that a skilled forger used completely different images for the largest features of each stamp, and then toiled to match

flyspeck details."

I agree it's ludicrous, but your point is not valid. The forger used what was available, the complex details of a Missionary, then he had solve the Numeral problem since no original type was available.

Lets' turn your thought around 180°.

The forger used a photographic process for all the flyspeck details and obtained them from the 13 cent Missionary, the real problem for him was to match the numerals. As you write, these numerals are "different fonts of type, cast by a different foundry," so don't you think this factor is the primary question to be answered by Grinnell supporters. What is the font? Which foundry produced it? Was it available to print shops in Hawaii in 1850?

You have repeated this numeral feature as being the primary difference between Grinnells and Misisonaries, yet I have not read of any research into discovering the source of the Grinnell numeral font. I certainly don't have this information available where I live, and it's unlikely to be available online, so I'm stymied. It's a valid project.

Please explain why on Grinnell's with the flush left "Hawaiian Postage" the second ball from the bottom on the left side is floating, 2 cent G56, 5 cent G58, 13 cent (center of card) and the left 13 cent with red cancel. I don't think the forger toiled to match flyspecks in these cases, he toiled to find a font that matched Missionaries, and failed!

Roger

August 26, 2006 **Bill Duffney**

~ Best Question/Theory of the Week ~

Bill Longley wrote:

If an artifact of the cancel was reproduced as part of the design in the Grinnells (especially of different denominations) would that be damning evidence? That is a red speck of the cancellation is reprinted in BLUE as part of the Grinnells.

Oh, yes! Can you show it?

August 26, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Ken Lawrence...

I would respectfully suggest that you are committing the very abuse you decry—using terms such as “ludicrous”, “conspiracy theorists” and “villains” would seem to indicate your thoughts are coming from a basis of emotion rather than logic, and as such can hardly contribute usefully to the discussion. If there’s a conspiracy afoot it was assembled without any input from me.

A photo-mechanical copying of an original Missionary does not involve the forger toiling to match “flyspeck details”. The details present themselves nicely as a result of the process. The classic forgers “toiled” because they made their stamps by hand. Negatives can be cut up and patched together by anyone with even a rudimentary understanding of photomechanical printing. One can even construct an equivalent of a typeset plate using photography. As late as the 1960s newspaper were printed on cylindrical presses whose plates were lead casts of pages originally set by linotype, and which included photo halftones, standard ads, even line drawings. Once composed (locked up the old fashioned way) a mold of it was made using a dense plasticized paper pulp that hardened into a form that could be curved and fitted into the machine in which the final plate was cast. This pulp-casting process was available in the late 1910s, when it has been suggested the Grinnells might have been manufactured. The resulting plate could have been used on a letterpress, and would then bear all the attributes of typeset printing. (My suggestion that the Grinnells were made lithographically should not be construed as meaning that was the only way they could have been printed. The relative lack of oil in the ink suggests lithography to me, but doesn’t insist upon it.)

In short, Richard Frajola’s August 9 article in this forum succinctly summarizes the evidence which most conclusively condemns the Grinnells, however that should not preclude others from pursuing other aspects of their provenance, production and possible sources. Everyone already knows who won the American Civil War, but that doesn’t prevent dozens of books from appearing every year on aspects of the conflict.

Jim

August 26, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

Ken L:

You make a valid point, but I'm not sure it's completely accurate with respect to the Grinnells.

When I originally suggested that the two genuine 13c stamps were "models" for the Grinnells, I was thinking more along the lines of matching inks and papers. My thought was that a philatelist owned two genuine stamps, then decided to build on that by manufacturing more, either himself or through an "artist."

Some people (Bill Longley in particular) have tried to prove a theory by matching breaks and certain features between the models and Grinnells. They have some convincing points. It is possible that the matrices for each of the 2c, 5c and 13c pairs of Type I and II were built up through a combination of photoreproduction, painting/enhancement and cut-and-paste.

I believe matrices were used because the stamps were not printed from a printer's chase of assembled type. I've been working on a presentation to make that point definitively, but I'm not satisfied with the results so far. I realise that whatever I say will be refuted by the pro-Grinnellians, so I'm being careful about what I put up for rebuttal.

In any case, I'm glad you concede that the cancel on the genuine 13c does not complete refute the postal history argument.

August 26, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Grinnells are not photographically reproduced from Missionaries, nor are they copied from Missionaries. Their most prominent details – the large central figures of value – are printed from similar but different fonts of type, cast by a different foundry. They are the easiest features to use in identifying Grinnells and Missionaries.

The serif on the tail of the 2 is rectangular with a flat top on the Missionary, and triangular with a sharp point on the Grinnell. The top flag of the 5 begins as a downward sloping line at the left, but curves sharply upward near the right end, on the Missionary; on the Grinnell it's a smooth curved arc. The center line of the 3 in 13 on the Missionary is almost horizontal; on the Grinnell it points diagonally upward to the left and ends closer to the upper ball serif.

It is ludicrous to propose that a skilled forger used completely different images for the largest features of each stamp, and then toiled to match flyspeck details.

The reason why the trial evidence focused heavily on flyspecks and played down obvious differences was to support the false testimony that persuaded the judge to think that the Grinnells are photoengraved using materials that did not exist in the 1850s. Grinnell and his team were unable to refute this evidence because they could not tell the difference between the two groups of type settings. John Klemann used this same misleading method to illustrate his article on the Grinnells, and the same approach is now being presented here.

This is the method of conspiracy theorists: Concoct an improbable theory. Rummage around for "evidence," no matter how obscure and eccentric, that appears to support the theory. Ignore more prominent and consistent evidence that refutes the conspiracy hypothesis. Bolster the argument by focusing on the dubious credibility of the alleged villain(s). Ignore evidence of the alleged victim's corrupt and malevolent character.

As I have observed before, conspiracy theorists, applying the same "plating" method used to condemn the Grinnells, could apply the same analytical approach to "prove" that the Type I and II settings of Scott 4 (13c H.I. & U.S. Postage) are counterfeits of Type I and II settings of Scott 3 (13c Hawaii Postage).

Experts in classic Hawaii stamps know all these things, which is the reason they focus on the postal history aspects (cancel differences and absence of entire covers franked with Grinnells) to advance their case. It's unfortunate that they provide tacit encouragement to conspiracy theorists and their contrived flyspeck evidence, which they personally know is invalid, to foment a climate of disdain for the Grinnells.

That is the principal importance of the recent discovery of a Grinnell cancel on a genuine Missionary. It weakens the postal history argument, though it does not refute it.

August 26, 2006 **Kevin Preece**

Dick Celler, thank you once again for your response.

August 25, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Richard M... 'Twas just a question, to see what what one of the regulars here thinks and how he arrived at his conclusions. Nothing more than that, no intent should be read into it.

August 25, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Bill -

I have another four examples but hadn't taken a chance on posting here, as I was focused on same denomination stamps. Your comments made me look closer and it certainly wasn't difficult to find this quartet of Type I's.

2 cent - [Grinnell G56](#),

5 cents - [Grinnell G58](#),

[13 cent from card](#),

and [13 cent Missionary from card](#).

All have the same frame flaws and ornament breaks. In particular see the corner alignments, the inner frame line breaks, and most telling to me is the break on the top of the large top left ornament directly below the space between "P" and "o".

The 2 cent and 5 cent happen to be on the same piece, which is very convenient. The 13 cent stamps are right next to each other on the card. I'll leave it to the person who was analysing the cork cancel to determine whether it is an original or a more recent addition to hide the details that appear to have been copied.

Roger

August 25, 2006 **Bill Longley**

I see Roger Heath is heading down the same path I had discovered last week. I have been working on putting together a presentation, package, whatever for inclusion on Richard's reference page for those to examine and will endeavour to complete it.

Based on Scott Trepel's suggestion that the two genuine "Grinnells" were used as a model for the forgeries, I thought one way to distinguish good from bad was to find a characteristic that was transferred from each type to the Grinnells in the forgery-making process.

I don't presume to be an expert in Hawaii but put forward these observations for others to comment on. I bounced them by some of the participants via telephone and email, and discussed them with some interested parties at the APS show this week.

TYPE I Break above H.

The real type 1 missionary on the card of 10 has a break in the inner frameline above the "H" of Hawaiian. This is repeated on ALL type 1 Grinnells of ALL denominations. Why is it that this feature which seems to be unique (there is another genuine 13c with a break above H but more to the right) on the Missionary in possession of Grinnell somehow appear on all 13c Type Is? And why does it appear on ALL 2c and 5c Type Is too?

Type 2 Breaks beside P of Postage

The real type 2 missionary on the card of 10 has two breaks beside the "P" of "Postage". Other real missionary stamps show this break but also two breaks at slightly different locations. Some missionaries do NOT show this break.

ALL Type 2 13c Grinnells show this feature as do ALL of the Type 2 2c and 5c values. Why?

There are other features which appear to be unique features of the REAL "Grinnell" on the card of 10, which appear to have been copied to the Grinnells and the Grinnells alone, which don't appear on other genuine missionaries. How could this occur.

Further, if the genuine missionaries were used as a model, what the forger lacked were the words "Two" and "Five".

Five Cent features

On the Grinnells, the top bar of F is misshapen, appears to have a break and bends down. The central bar seems to be a drawn line with a vertical addition, it does

not appear as on the "genuine" missionaries. Not having a "F" to use, is it possible that Grinnell (or the mystery forger) used the letter "P" as a model for the letter "F"?

The dot in the i is characteristic of dash, and does not resemble the real ones. The "e" seems to be floating above the imaginary baseline that genuine fives have.

The "w" may have been borrowed from the "Hawaiian postage and looks misshapen. The "o" has an overenlarged central space.

The "v" of Five may have been a trimmed "w" and the right serif of the "v" doesn't resemble the serif of real missionaries.

The type 1 genuine stamp, if used for a model had to have the desing painted in or otherwise reproduced where the cancel was in place, as suggested by someone else here (Scott T?). What if the forger photographed the stamp and used a filter to remove the red? I believe I can see a pattern of design weakness and inconsistencies in design, PARTICULARLY when examining the area where red cancel would have been. I am continuing to work on that.

A question --- If an artifact of the cancel was reproduced as part of the design in the Grinnells (especially of different denominations) would that be damning evidence? That is a red speck of the cancellation is reprinted in BLUE as part of the Grinnells.

APS Grinnel Display

The Grinnell display received only modest attention while I was at the show and the security guards on duty seemed quite bored. One little old lady just wandering by, questioned the fairness of the wording on the large panel displays. I think it was something along the lines of "Can you spot the genuine Grinnell?". Perhaps someone can take a picture (no flash photography, so flashes off please). She was a pretty sharp cookie as I didn't pay attention to the text, just the 2 foot high enlargements of the stamps.

I also found it interesting the the frame with Grinnells had a 2 stickers on it "No Flash Photography", while the National Postal Museum lacked any such notice. Which rarities need preservation from flash photography?

Devil's Advocate Questions

When will the "Grinnell" families unveil any other hidden "Grinnells"? Do they possess other genuine 2c and 5c that could have been used as models for the rest of the Grinnells? These have been hidden for 80 years. It may be a long time coming, especially if these genuine ones help prove the others are fakes.

While I have asked this question before, privately, is it possible that in the ensuing 80 years since an APS member and philatelist, in possession of two genuine missionaries hasn't sold or otherwise salted a fake Grinnell into a collection, so as to taint the pool of "real missionaries" for later generations to compare? All of the scans that I have seen of genuine missionaries does not support this thought. But is it possible? This is especially important since the true census number of Grinnells continued to change from the very beginning?

Bill

August 25, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

Dick C:

You state "While the uneven 13 has been used by some to claim movement of loose type, in actuality it is a different setting where the central large 13, the entire bottom label (13 Cents), and one side ornament are slightly different pieces of type, with the "1" in the bottom label set too low."

I'm going to dispute your findings. For example, in the Mystic pamphlet, page 22, you state that the filled bid head is found on normal Type II stamps and the open bid head is found on Type II dropped "1" stamps.

HOWEVER:

Census #146 is open bud, #81 is filled, both are normal "1". I think the filling in of the small ornament bud head, as you call it, is simply an inking/dirt issue. I do not think the ornament was changed.

If there are diferences in the type, as you say, could you please describe them? I did not find anything specific in booklet.

I doubt the 13c was dismantled and reset.

August 25, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Here is a question.

Why do the individual Missionaries of each Type, I and II, have indications of type shift and individual printing flaws (besides hand painting) that give them distinctive individual differences, when the Grinnells of each Type are identical?

Here is a typical constant plate flaw found with Grinnells. In this example all 5 cent Type II Grinnells shown in the scans have this characteristic.

Dot outside top left corner.

Break in top inner line above the left vertical stroke of the "H".

[Grinnell card center stamp.](#)

[Grinnell card right stamp.](#)

[Grinnell G20](#)

[Grinnell G62](#)

The dot is typical of high contrast photo reproduction. All photocopying on film makes flaws larger and more rounded than the original. The photo technician usually takes the negative, sits with a magnifier, and uses opaque touch-up to get rid of these pinhole flaws prior to printing. This was not done to a high standard on the Grinnells.

The line breaks are due to the line not being in the original or being finer than the film could replicate.

The examples on the Card have a more distinctive dot than G20 or G62, leading me to believe those on the card are second generation photocopies. Maybe the reason for the note accompanying the card was to prevent comparisons with the original model and these unacceptable copies.

I have a question to whomever sent Richard the scan of the new Grinnell card. Is this a scan of the actual stamps on card, or a scan of a color photograph of the card?

I would also like to ask those who have other 5cent Type II Grinnells to confirm my observation.

Roger

August 25, 2006 **Bill Duffney**

JB —

Thanks for your response. Yes, that is the area in question. Now I know that I am at least connected to the internet.

August 25, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Dick Celler...

OK, now I see your reasoning. You're holding out the possibility that there were later (or other) printings from the existing clichés. But if the same cliché was used to print the TYPE II 13 cent Grinnell, then the "3" of the central "13" was replaced before printing commenced, as well as (at least) the "g" in "Postage" and, I would argue, the doodads between the "13" and "Cents" at bottom.

A problem arises though by invoking a special, separate printing—how did all the stamps from this printing end up only in the hands of Grinnell? Why has none ever surfaced anywhere else? I think I've heard an argument to the effect that the Grinnells were possibly printed privately and used exclusively by one family, but that seems very odd, given that the reasoning above stipulates that the TYPE II cliché used for the "authorized" printing was also used by the "private" printing operation.

Maybe I'm missing something—

Jim

August 25, 2006 **Richard M**

Dick C beat me to a response, and put it more eloquently.

August 25, 2006 **Richard M**

Jim B - I'm confused by your question. I'm saying there are Type I and II "genuine" Missionaries (e.g., 137 and 139) and there were Type I and II Grinnells (G30 and G31). Same with the 2c and 5c. I agree they are close but not identical. I'm not saying anything about how that came about. Just that it is odd that a forger would go to such lengths to copy both types for each of the 3 values (for a total of 6), yet ignore the details. If I were only going for "good enough" to fool a casual observer or a novice, I'd probably only make one type of each, or perhaps even just use 1 type and simply change out the values.

So why do the Type I and II Grinnells come "close" to resembling their Missionary counterparts but are not identical? I don't know. Perhaps the forger had only poor copies to begin with, so that he had to guess as to some details (which seems to contradict Scott T's theory that the two genuine Missionaries on the card of 10 served as models). Or, maybe they really are Types III and IV (or, if you start with the proposition that they are the first ones printed, the Grinnells are Types I and II and the genuine Missionaries are Types III and IV). If that is the theory, arguably they could resemble each other if the first clichés were broken down after use, then later re-assembled some weeks or months later for another printing using some or all of the same pieces of type, but fitted together in a slightly different fashion. Or the originals were kept but adjustments were made - perhaps the type came loose and had to be tightened up, making everything move around just bit?

August 25, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Hav'n't been following the thread, but reread the RPSL book. I tend to look kindly upon it, even though there seems to be controversy about whether or not the Grinnells could have used photographic methods. However, just as some have noted that the example of G4a marking (I now use the RPS terminology) on Grinnells genuine stamp shows sign of being an optimal path to the similar marking found on Grinnells, I see that the RPSL summary of detail variations in the various values of both productions suggest a possible flow from 13 cent Missionary (rather than the 2 or 5) into the Grinnell.

August 25, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Jim Baughman

Your point 1: Agree. It is philately that in the 19th century assigned Types I and II to them based on the H/P orientation.

Point 2: Agree.

Point 3: The Grinnell 13c was assigned as Type II by philately because the H/P orientation fit Type II. Ditto for Type I. The minor differences you mention do not prevent philatelists from classifying it as Type II. You are right, those other differences are not printing vagaries, but are due to a slightly different design on the "plate" which printed the Grinnells.

It should be noted that there is more than one version of the Missionary 13c Type II. There are minor typographical differences, but this does not create a Type III (unless philatelists decide it does). Census #81 (NPM) is one version, and G80 (a genuine Missionary, not a "Grinnell") is a second version, the most obvious difference being the uneven "13" in the bottom label on G80.

While the uneven 13 has been used by some to claim movement of loose type, in actuality it is a **different** setting where the central large 13, the entire bottom label (13 Cents), and one side ornament are slightly **different** pieces of type, with the "1" in the bottom label set too low.

Point 4: The Grinnell could resemble the Missionary so closely because the Grinnells may be a separate printing made in the same print shop (perhaps by the same person) as the Missionary stamps, only at a different time. If the desire was to print more stamps in, say, 1851 or 1852, obviously the intention would be to make them similar to others already printed. The Missionary stamp cliché may not have been available for whatever reason. The process of assembling another cliché from loose type may create similar effects on the stamps just because of the process.

Point 5: There are many (such as the RPSL) who believe the Grinnells were printed from loose type, and not created using a photographic process.

As I noted in my post yesterday to Richard F, the Grinnell stamps show clear evidence they were **not** printed using the forger's standard copying method for stamps of mostly similar design.

Another point to consider is that the 2c and 5c Grinnells have major differences between them and the Missionaries, so it straight-forward to tell an M from a G. Both types of the 13c Grinnells, however, are **much** closer in design to the Missionary stamps. This explains why no one at the Washington show noticed the two Missionary stamps among the Grinnells on the card of 10.

The simplistic answer is the forger had these two models for the 13c stamps, and had to scramble for the other two values. I don't happen to buy it. There are too many other factors involved which need explaining.

August 25, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Richard Matta...

Then do you think there are at least three types of the 13 cent Missionary? Or do you think [this](#) Grinnell is TYPE I or TYPE II?

I'm trying to garner as much information and opinion as possible, and the reasoning behind it.

Jim

August 25, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Kevin Preece

I presume the Census #190 stamp was damaged before it was used, but I have only the auction catalog illustration to go by. There doesn't seem to be much incentive for a restorer to merely paint in a small section of missing postmark.

The Missionary stamps were printed on very fragile paper, and pieces being missing from the stamps is relatively common (although the majority of these have been repaired over the years). There are some scans of covers posted on this board with only fragments of stamps.

There are a few Missionary stamps with 1/3 to 2/3 of the stamp restored, so #190 is not an extreme case. See the A3 cover in the Missionary Cover Census, auctioned by David Feldman on December 2, 2005. I have an auction picture of the cover from a sale long ago, and only about a quarter of the original stamp is present.

August 25, 2006 **Richard Matta**

I have trouble buying the argument that a forger would go to such great lengths to duplicate paper, ink, postmarks, even and including two different types for each numeral and different frames for each of the 3 numerals, then rather than finish the job by fixing a few details he/she decides the work is "good enough" to fool someone who didn't look too closely (particularly if the idea was to sell them en masse to a big-time collector or dealer who would have access to genuine copies for comparison, rather than dribble them out to less knowledgeable collectors one at a time). If they are philatelic forgeries, the most logical explanation for that is that the forger didn't have good enough examples to work from and had to fudge some of the details just as the repairers did.

For the same reason, I have to wonder why that someone would work so hard to create forgeries, then try to sell them all at once rather than sneak a few at a time into the market.

August 25, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Bill Duffney...

If [this](#) is what you were referring to, I just see a smudge. The black in the smudge seems consistent with the black of the cancel.

Jim

August 25, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Dick Celler...

The point I was making yesterday was that I have been following the Grinnell discussion for quite some time with an open mind. As of yesterday morning there did not seem to be enough evidence to come down either way, until I looked very closely at the scans of the Grinnells and the two genuine Missionaries on that card Richard posted. After some study I came to certain conclusions, which formed the basis of my post.

At this point, I am of the opinion that the 13 cent Grinnell I linked to yesterday ([here](#)) was created by someone using photographic processes, and thus cannot be considered a genuine Missionary. While you may take issue correctly with what I have pointed out regarding the 8-shaped designs between the "13" and "Cents", there are other anomalies that cannot be so easily explained away.

These are the facts as I see them—

1. The 13 cent Missionaries were printed from 2 clichés, known as TYPE I and TYPE II.
2. The Grinnell 13 cent stamp in question resembles TYPE II to a remarkable degree, so much so that it cannot possibly be a TYPE I.
3. Yet the Grinnell 13 cent stamp *differs* from a TYPE II in ways that cannot be explained by printing processes, paper irregularities, ink problems, etc. which means that it cannot be a TYPE II either.
4. If the 13 cent Grinnell cannot be either a TYPE I or a TYPE II then it must be a third type, but if it is a third type, why does it resemble TYPE II so astonishingly closely? If the Grinnell 13 cent represented an authentic new TYPE III then the differences between it and the known, accepted types should be as glaring and obvious as the differences between TYPE I and TYPE II.
5. The conclusion I have tentatively reached is that the Grinnell 13 cent was made using a photographic process that copied a genuine 13 cent Missionary, then the resulting plate was modified in small ways before printing, which accounts for the details which diverge from the genuine 13 cent Missionaries.

David Benson has shown me how the consistency of ink on the Grinnells is really irrelevant to the discussion, because of the argument that the Grinnells were printed privately at another location on the Islands.

Jim

August 25, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Start of last post should have been:

Perhaps I misunderstand, but when you say *I was not operating from a position that the Grinnells were either genuine or fake* in one post, and say ...

August 25, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Jim Baughman

Perhaps I misunderstand, but when you say I was not operating from a position that the Grinnells were either genuine or fake in one post, and say *A comparison showing how one of the differences might have occurred between the 13-cent Grinnell and the 13-cent Missionary it seems to have been patterned after* [emphasis added] in another post the same day, you do appear to be working from the conclusion the Grinnells are fake.

The [comparison](#) you did showing the spacer ornament of a 13-cent missionary and a 13-cent Grinnell is similar but has differences (note also that each "8" is closer on the Grinnell than the Missionary). You then give an explanation of how they may have been copied.

Another (simpler) explanation is that a different piece of loose "spacer" type was used in setting the Grinnell cliché than the Missionary cliché.

If you make a similar comparison of this ornament, but using a Missionary Type I vs a Missionary Type II, you will find the type pieces are not identical. Is this surprising? I don't think it means one was copied from the other.

August 25, 2006 **Bill Duffney**

No one responded to my note of yesterday, so I will repeat it —

In the large image file posted by Richard of the newly discovered Missionary G-80, my monitor shows extraneous black ink marks between the P and O of POSTAGE, not apparently related to the grid cancel. The marks even suggest lettering to me.

Can anyone else see the same?

Is this not evidence that there might be another cancel under the grid cancel on G-80?

August 25, 2006 **Kevin Preece**

Richard, thanks for the close-up scan of the stamp in its original condition.

Dick Celler, thank you for the explanation. I hadn't realised that the "repairs" to these stamps could be quite so extensive.

The bottom of the postmark on the pre-repair scan appears to be complete. Does this mean that the stamp was already damaged when it was stuck on the cover, or had an earlier "restorer" already painted in missing parts of the postmark before it was sold at Harmer Rooke?

August 25, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I forwarded the scan of #190 from my Levi records along to Kevin.

August 25, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Kevin Preece

You asked:

Three #4 Type I's are illustrated on Richard's page, Numbers 153, 185 & 190. In both 153 & 185 (and in the Type I illustrated on Fred Gregory's site) the ornament between the "13" and the "Cents" is "dropped", yet in 190, this ornament is level.

Is this evidence of a separate printing from a different "plate of two"?

This is a very good question. The short answer is that part of 190 is repaired and painted, including the ornament you describe. There originally was a sizeable chunk of the stamp missing, including this ornament and the "3" to the left of it. The "restorer" mistakenly painted a Type II (level) ornament instead of a Type I (dropped) ornament.

The pre-repair version of the cover was sold as lot 78 in a Harmer Rooke auction October 4, 1954(?), with a picture. The repair of the stamp was done some time after this sale. I will provide a scan of the original stamp if Richard wants to post or link to it.

August 25, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

Yes.

August 24, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Thanks for the type I-II info. It's very clear now. So [this](#) illustration from Scott is type II, right?

August 24, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

That strip is the only item that gave the positions. All other Missionary types are deduced from that one item, although about one third of it is painted in, not original. It is (left to right) Type I, Type II, Type I. Printed step-and-repeat from a two-cliché forme.

August 24, 2006 **PAUL LANIOSZ**

JIM----TYPE 1,TYPE 2,TYPE 1

August 24, 2006 **PAUL L.**

To the fellow with the Hawaiian print shirt at the Grinnell exhibit -----here is the article i was discussing with you ,notice the last paragraph about the government printing office [.PAGE....paul](#)

August 24, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Can anyone identify the types on [this](#) block, carrying Richard F's ID #137-139 (NPM)? It seems to be continuous, i.e. unbroken, so an explanation of how these were printed from a plate would be helpful to me. How many types were there altogether of the 13 cent? This triplet seems to suggest 3 at least, or is there another explanation?

August 24, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Dick -

The point I am making is that known genuine Missionaries scanned and posted on this site don't seem to have any duplication enabling someone to study them along the line of traditional "plating". There are the two Types of genuine stamps identified by some basic alignments, but other than that, they are all different. The inking and fine line breaks are in different places on each stamp.

The Grinnells on the other hand, can be compared, using the pairs as a reference. Each Grinnell is either identical to the left stamp, or the right stamp of the pair. If you take the left stamp and select a single, then look at them both, every detail is exactly them same, except for line density which could be scan artifact.

Grinnell 2 cent:

Pair G 50-51 is identical to G1-2, all fine lines break in exactly the same location, so one must assume the pairs are exact copies, no variation. Take any single stamp and compare it to its respective type and it is identical. There is no variation in the details which one would expect in a hand operated press. The fine details of the stamps lend themselves to "flaws" from over or under inking. This is what I believe happened with the genuine Missionaries. There are none of these random variations in the printing of the Grinnells.

As I wrote below, I feel confident I can take the Grinnell pairs and when shown an unidentified "Missionary" tell whether it is a Grinnell, or not, based purely on the fine line breaks on each stamp.

The 13 cent stamp Jim detailed looks like a very strong candidate used to produce the 13 cent Grinnell, in my opinion. There is no doubt that the "original" has sharp edges characteristic of letterpress printing, while the Grinnell exhibits characteristics of a high contrast photocopy, i.e. the drop out of the finest lines and the rounding of sharp points. There are some limitations in the photographic copy process, and it shows when copies are magnified. These characteristics never make an image appear sharper, only softer.

Again, I want to say I'm asking questions that I don't see being answered in relation to the anomaly that the Grinnells are either Type 1 no detail variations, or Type 2 no detail variations. Whereas, genuine Missionaries are Type 1 or Type 2 and have many detailed variations making each one pretty much unique.

I think if genuine Missionaries were laid out on a table and mixed up, it would take a set of photos and in time each individual stamp could be identified. If the Grinnells were laid out on the table one would end up with piles where each stamp was identical and characteristics other than the printed image would be used to separate them. It would take a lot longer to sort the genuine stamps.

If I take one comment made by Jim below:

"Possibly the forger had to work with a cancelled stamp, and had to recreate those parts of the design which were covered with a cancel."

I would suggest after reading some discussion about the authenticity of the cork cancel on the 13 cent stamp that maybe the stamp was unused, or had a minimal original cancel. It was photocopied and to hide future comparisons the heavy fake cancel was added in an attempt to foil discovery of the process. Could be a reason these stamps were not shown to the potential buyers, who would have had time to compare all the stamps. None of those guys were stupid, it just seems to me a couple were trying to "put one over" on a famous collector.

I hope this makes sense.
Roger

August 24, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Ken L Comparing two genuine Missionaries of the same type is not relevant. Any two genuine Missionaries of the same type would not show the different alignment of the "n" in "Hawaiian" and the "e" in "Postage" found on the Grinnell which most closely approximates type II. The argument is simple—the Grinnell which remarkably resembles the type II is not the same stamp, because of the differences I have pointed out. Then why should it be so strikingly similar? If it were merely another type, one would expect to find all sorts of differences, such as between types I and II of the genuine.

Something else that may be helpful: A [comparison](#) showing how one of the differences might have occurred between the 13-cent Grinnell and the 13-cent Missionary it seems to have been patterned after.

Jim

August 24, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Jim B,

One is Type I, the other is Type II. Try comparing two of the same type.

August 24, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Dick Celler...

[Here](#) is a comparison of two genuine Missionaries. If you compare just the corners of each stamp, it is obvious how different they are, which is what one would expect from chance if the concern was not to make an exact copy

August 24, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Dick Celler...

First, I was not operating from a position that the Grinnells were either genuine or fake. But I noticed something I thought significant, and made a post about it.

I don't understand your comment about my avoiding the dissimilarities between the 13 cent Grinnell and Missionary—please see the bottom of the link I provided, for three distinct examples of how both stamps differ in ways that can't be explained by printing methods, pressure, "plate wear" etc. [Here](#) is another example. Compare the position of the middle line of the "3" with the top ball of the "3". Both cannot have been printed from the same setup.

If you compare any two genuine Missionaries of different type, you will see very obvious differences, in how the outer lines meet, the position of the letters, the spaces between them etc. The laws of chance were at work, since the printer was not concerned with making an *exact* copy of each, merely one close enough that a casual glance would suggest both were the same. On the Grinnell that I compared to the genuine Missionary, which are unquestionably two different stamps, the similarities are far more than one would expect through simple chance. For example, what are the odds that the thin secondary boundary line next to the "P" in "Postage" would have two breaks in it exactly where such breaks show up in the genuine? My best guess is that the Grinnell 13 cent stamp I linked to was created using a photographic process which was then tinkered with before the stamps were printed. Possibly the forger had to work with a cancelled stamp, and had to recreate those parts of the design which were covered with a cancel.

As to the ink, did RPSL publish a spectrographic comparison of all the Grinnells? It is my understanding that RPSL concluded that the ink components were consistent with what could have been used in the 1850s, which is a very different investigation from the one I am suggesting.

Lastly, the Missionaries were printed on a letterpress, which requires a different type of ink from a planographic press (lithography). It is considerably oilier, and while not all genuine Missionaries show oil seepage into the stamp paper some clearly do, such as [here](#). Letterpress printing can be temperamental, especially in reproducing small design elements such as on the Missionaries, and one quick fix, albeit frowned upon by professionals, is to load the ink up with oil to get everything to print. I confess to having done so myself more than once in art school.

☺

Jim

August 24, 2006 **Kevin Preece**

I, too, have been fascinated by the Grinnell debate - I've always enjoyed a good detective story, and eagerly await the next twist in the tale.

However, my query is about the genuine Scott 4 Missionaries, the 13c H.I. & U.S. Postage stamps.

Three Type 1s are illustrated on Richard's page, Numbers 153, 185 & 190. In both 153 & 185 (and in the Type 1 illustrated on Fred Gregory's site) the ornament between the "13" and the "Cents" is "dropped", yet in 190, this ornament is level.

Is this evidence of a separate printing from a different "plate of two"?

My apologies if I'm asking an "obvious" question with an "obvious" answer, but it's been bugging me ever since I noticed the difference, and I can't find any references to it on this or FG's site.

August 24, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Roger Heath

There is one important point to consider if you are using corners of Missionary stamps to make comparisons. A substantial number of them have repaired and repainted corners (not to mention much more extensive restorations on some). For this reason, the corners are a poor way to make comparisons, and one has to be very aware to watch out for "paintings".

As an example, the 5-cent Type I #41 has 3 corners added and painted (all but the top left), #61 has the bottom left corner added and painted. If you compare using these corners, you will come to some wrong conclusions. If you have other stamps where you see differences, point them out to me and I will look at them.

The Grinnells, however, have not been repaired and repainted. Thus all the corners are original and look similar.

August 24, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Jim Baughman

That's a nice comparison you did of the 13c Type II of the Grinnell vs the Missionary.

Yes, there are a lot of close similarities between the stamps (which you point out), as well as a lot of dissimilarities (which you seem to avoid).

No one is claiming the Grinnells and Missionaries were printed from the same "plate of two". For the Grinnells to be genuine, they would be from a different

"plate of two" printed at a different time.

You state: *The similarities **cannot** have happened by accident, rather there had to have been a deliberate attempt to reproduce an exact copy of a genuine Missionary.* Would you explain to us how you know they **can not**? We would like to know.

If one sets aside the preconceived notion the Grinnells are forgeries, it becomes apparent that if these were a separate printing from a different "plate", perhaps made in the same shop or by the same person a month or two earlier or later, one would expect the printer might use the same procedure, producing a similar (but not exact) product.

The argument that there are a bunch of design similarities, thus the forger carefully copied them, is two-pronged. It requires that after the forger did all this good work, he made a number of serious obvious errors where he failed to duplicate the genuine (ie the small "n" in "Cents" of the 5c Type II Missionary).

The former are explained as the designs are too similar, thus they are forgeries.
The latter are explained as the designs are different, thus they are forgeries.

The RPSL uses this "logic" in their Grinnell book. I don't think you can have it both ways.

You also state *I would also underscore the differences in ink between the Grinnells and the genuine.* I presume you have compared the ink of actual Missionary stamps with Grinnells, and are not relying on the inaccurate colors in the scans for this comment. Or perhaps you meant you "compared the color of the scans of this Missionary stamp and a Grinnell and found them different"?

If the Grinnells were a separate printing as described above, there is no reason to expect they would be exactly the same shade as the Missionary printing, is there?

Certainly the ink of the two versions of stamps needs to be given scientific analysis. It has already. The subject is covered in the RPSL book.

August 24, 2006 **Bill Duffney**

I wasn't going to post this, however...

In the large image posted by Richard of the newly discovered Missionary G-80 my monitor shows extraneous ink between the P and O of POSTAGE, not apparently related to the grid cancel. It even suggests lettering to me. Can anyone see the same?

Could this grid cancel on NDMG-80 been placed there to cover the staining? I understand that the stains might be from crude adhesive, or perhaps from something else.

August 24, 2006 **Jim Baughman**

Might as well add my opinion to the mix. It seems to me that at least one of the 13 cent Grinnells is a fake. See [here](#) for a detailed explanation.

While there are definite similarities between this 13 cent Grinnell and a genuine Missionary, there are obvious differences. The similarities cannot have happened by accident, rather there had to have been a deliberate attempt to reproduce an exact copy of a genuine Missionary, which proved impossible, as illustrated in the link.

I would also underscore the differences in ink between the Grinnells and the genuine. I think a detailed spectroscopic analysis would reveal that the Grinnell ink is consistent, but does not match that of the Missionaries. Further, the ink on the genuine seems to leach oil into the stamp paper, which is not true of the Grinnells.

Jim

August 24, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Dick -

For me it is much simpler to identify and match Grinnells by using the corners where the frame lines meet. There are a few other dots that go along with these frame misalignments to help me "plate" a Grinnell. This leads me to the conclusion there are only two types of each Grinnell value.

When I look at the Missionaries on the Grinnell Scans page I am unable to "match" any of them. Each has minor differences showing they are not printed from a fixed setting of two stamps. In a round-about way they are very similar to the Swiss Federal issues, which were hand drawn and printed from stones of 40 impressions, each distinctly different. This allows one to plate any Rayon, as it must be one of 40 versions. Forgers have had a field day since few collectors have suitable references to plate these stamps. With the Missionaries being printed only in pairs it becomes apparent there will be variations of the two types due to the more primitive printing techniques used in Hawaii, each pair theoretically being different. So how many different varieties are there of Missionaries (not Types), when compared to only two varieties of each Grinnell value?

I really appreciate the analysis of Missionaries into sub categories by the experts, this is what scholarly study is all about. But if I can certify a Grinnell based on only having three pairs of stamps (one pair of each value) for reference, this makes them completely different than any other Missionary, which in my limited experience says forgery.

About point 4. Maybe I should have written, I can't tell similarities well enough to match stamps, though with your help I can determine Types 1 and 2. But once knowing these two types, there are printing varieties (flaws) which makes it very difficult to determine if they were printed, for example, on the same day. The Grinnells can be matched to the tiniest flaws, not so the Missionaries.

Roger

August 24, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Richard Frajola

You just did "describe the Grinnell's as classicly produced forgeries". However, the Grinnell stamps themselves show they were NOT produced using this method.

The Grinnell stamps clearly have obvious differences between their 2c, 5c, and 13c values of each Type (aside from denomination) that could not exist had this method been used.

You need to read pages 20-21 of my article in the Mystic booklet, and see that the spacing of the ornament pieces above "Cents" clearly is different between the 13c and the other two values.

Perhaps you might post a scan of the article illustrations along with your classic forgery method description, and then explain the moving ornament? If you want me to email you the jpegs I used, just ask.

August 24, 2006 **Dick Celler** <dceller@garden.net>

Roger Heath

I think you are discussing the "Type I" and the "Type II" of the Missionary and Grinnell stamps. The obvious difference is that Type I has the P of Postage indented, while Type II has the P directly beneath the H. There are many other less obvious characteristics of each "Type".

Both Missionary and Grinnells were printed from a 2-stamp "plate", one stamp of each Type. Besides the H/P alignment, you will see many minor design differences between the Missionary and Grinnell version (2c, 5c, or 13c) of each Type.

In your point 4, if you would explain exactly what you mean about *no such repeating "plate flaws" enabling me to match stamps*, I may be able to point out examples.

One feature is the too-small "n" in "Cents" found on all copies of the Missionary 5-cent Type II stamp (see census 67 and 73), but this may not be what you have in mind.

August 24, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

The last post was an over-simplification but the nucleus is there. The Grinnells do not match any genuine examples and are clearly different.

To consider them genuine when they obviously do not match any other accepted genuine examples, is just not possible without a new definition of what constitutes a genuine Missionary.

August 24, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Roger H - Unfortunately, nobody has contributed a piece as to how the genuine Missionary stamps differ from the Grinnells.

Your observations are correct. For a forger to make 6 different stamps (3 denominations and 2 types of each) would be easy. Find genuine examples, or images, of one stamp of each type, say 13c, and genuine value and numeral for the 2c and 5c.

Then take an photo of the genuine 13c stamps (paint in area covered by cancel) and values. Then you are all set to make forgeries where all values have identical frames, etc and just different types and values.

Boy, did I just describe the Grinnell's as classically produced forgeries?

August 24, 2006 **Dick Celler**

Tony Kassel

Pages 28-31 of the Mystic 2006 booklet *The Case for the Grinnell Missionary Stamps* discusses the handwriting and illustrates all three handwriting samples. It also shows five examples of a typical capital "N" written by John Emerson.

Two handwriting experts certified that two of the three samples were written by John Emerson. The normal capital "N" from John Emerson's letters is a very different style. This is only one obvious instance of many obvious differences between the samples and contemporary letters written by John and Ursula Emerson. I believe this is the reason the RPSL "discounted the handwriting experts opinions".

My suggestion is to contact Mystic for a copy of the free booklet, and you can make your own determination.

August 23, 2006 **Roger Heath**

I have a general question since I don't remember all the details posted, and have none of the published reference material.

When I look at the pages of scans I observe the following:

- 1.) Each stamp in the Grinnell pairs has different characteristics.
- 2.) Once one "sees" a couple of these characteristics it is then possible to "plate" each of the single Grinnells to one or the other of the pair.
- 3.) There are only two types of Grinnells for each value.
- 4.) When looking at the expertized Missionaries I see no such repeating "plate flaws" enabling me to match stamps and say to myself, "those came from the same plate".
- 5.) I couldn't find characteristic flaws within the Missionary selection to match with any Grinnell.

Conclusion: I didn't see more than two variations of each Grinnell value. With the Grinnell pairs for reference, I feel confident I could take an unknown stamp and determine whether it is a Grinnell, or not. If not, it could be real or a fake from another forger. I don't have the experience to make that determination.

Did I miss this fact earlier? If I did, sorry. It is easy for me to match Grinnells and they don't match any of the scanned certified Missionaries. If the Missionaries are all so different, indicating different print runs through the press, why is there a belief the Grinnells are just additional print runs when there are two distinct versions? One would think even additional print runs would also produce difficult to match varieties, if they were printed in period on the same press.

Roger

August 23, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

The Bar 4 flaw on the 7 bar 20mm shows nicely on the Malmgren stamp. Also, the G80 image shows it there, well developed, but in cryptic form -- ink filling in and or heavy strike, etc.

August 23, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

A monster image is [here](#)

August 23, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I just added a nice scan of an genuine unused 5c Missionary to the reference page.

August 23, 2006 **Walter P**

Tony Kassel -

What are you suggesting in your post?

Are you suggesting that the RPSL Expert Committee should have taken into account more than they did, lay person's opinions and their versions of what had occurred in the past, that cannot now be verified, because the parties are no longer alive, over recent scientific testing of the Grinnell stamps?

Please remember that many of the characters involved in the Grinnell stamp discovery are now deceased and when they were alive, they changed their stories after the civil trial.

Everything George Grinnell himself stated is tainted by his subsequent suspicious actions following his civil trial and the people he was known to have associated with at the museum in California.

The provenance you refer to consists of statements that were made by George Grinnell and some of the present Grinnell owners family members which were later recanted after the civil trial. Such statements made under these circumstances are at best suspect and at worst simply not credible and cannot be taken at face value.

As far as the 1942 scientific report goes, I think you would agree with me that the testing methods used today by the RPSL would supercede the 1942 testing methods, and that the 1942 report findings would now be a moot point.

August 23, 2006 **Tony Kassel** <TonyKassel@aol.com>

I Just finished the RPSL Ltd. book on the Grinnell Hawaiian Missionary Stamps. I was suprised that they did not consider or consult the 1942 Philatelic Research Laboratories 1942 report. I understand that they found the grinnells to be authentic. Is that report available? Online maybe?

The other thing that seemed odd to me is that they have disounted two handwriting experts opinions and the opinion of one of the Boys that the writing was similar to that of his mothers.

It looked like the report was biased toward the scientific facts, but discounted the provenance.

Just thought I would share an Opinion.
TonyKassel APS 182002

August 23, 2006 **Roger Heath**

My non-expert impression of the stamps on the Grinnell Card -

2 Cents: Left and right identical type, flaws, and markings. Center stamp different.
5 Cents: Center and right identical identical type, flaws, and markings. Left stamp different.
13 cents: Left and center identical.
Right stamp different. Bottom stamp same font as right , but different frame details (flaws).

Roger

August 23, 2006 **David Beech, the British Library, Philatelic Collections** <David.Beech@bl.uk>

I have checked Collin, Henry, "Catalogue for Advanced Collectors..." in the Crawford Library (BL shelfmark: Crawford 1170) and find that the Missionaries illustrated in Volume 1 page 315, and the volume of Plates are or appear to be from the Tapling Collection. The volume of Plates appears to date from 1901? I see that some other items have been illustrated from the Tapling Collection.

August 23, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Don S "The voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

Then Isaac went ahead and issued the cert. And, barely, lived to regret it! The Royal has not, at least so far, expressed regret for theirs. Is the card of ten going to the Royal for certification, as they already have an experience base with the material?

August 23, 2006 **Richard Matta**

Seeing those 10 stamps side-by-side with the same background and same lighting, the two "genuine" Missionaries jump right out at you. I suppose people missed

them either because of display conditions or because they were told that they were also Grinnells. Even a novice like me can see the various more or less constant printing artifacts that just don't exactly look like something you would expect from loose type and the difference in inking suggesting different printing method or different ink. Supporters might say that all this proves is that they were from a different printing (which is obvious), perhaps some crude experiment with putting them on plates, but I've gone from neutral to skeptical.

August 22, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

As mentioned on the other board, left and right got switched in a few places, as my nomenclature for the orientation was originally opposite to the RPSL and now whenever I think about it I have to rotate the thing in my frazzled little brain.
For Tapling book, read RPSL book.

August 22, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

The new images from the card with the two genuine stamps are much better than the images in the Sundman booklet (those were not bad). Maybe when I get back from Madison I can give them a little more attention.

August 22, 2006 **Donald Sundman** <dsundman@MysticStamp.com>

Bernard, a quote from your namesake.

"All Great Truths Begin as Blasphemies"
George Bernard Shaw

August 22, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

my post of the 17th repeated here:

The "Good" Grinnell It shocks me that a lady of such distinction, full in years yet well preserved, and having so very much to teach, us would be so besmirched by men of breeding and distinction. I will gird up my loins and go jousting for m'lady's favour, knowing full well, my worth is small.

By way of introduction to some comments on the known seven bar grid in "H7" in comparison with the 20 mm Grinnell example on missionary "G7". I number the bars one to seven with the top one "1" being the broader.

Characteristics of 1 of H7 which may be relevant are a peripher notch. See the tapling (Scott 4) (Siegel 169) in the Tapling book. It is nipped at left (deemphasized by the left loading on the strike, I wot), also see the Tapling example. It also has a subtle step of the straight inner side (see Tapling) found on H7. Bar 4 has a variable irregularity about 1/6 in on H7 and on G7. Bar 7 is small compared to H7, but the Tapling is similar also shows the trailing off of bar 6 at the right.

On the other hand, for example, G7 shows a notch in the periphery of bar7 which is found in some Grinnells but perhaps not in H7 (169 may or may not have something similar).

So one possibility is that G7 is a genuine H7. If that is true, it would be nice to show that it is not only genuine, but also not the Grinnell marking (which has been called a fake, but it doesn't hurt to reexamine this -- we are leaving out the crucial ink issue). Some might argue that the marking was used at Waialua and also used at Honolulu. One point where H7 appears to differ from the accepted Grinnells (accepted Grinnells! -- now there's a switch) is that it has the step in the straight section of bar that I can't find in the Grinnell's (based on a limited sample).

There is another point. If G7 is genuine, it represents H7 in a distorted state -- under dynamic pressures. Therefore, the Grinnells would more or less start from this distorted state and undergo further distortion. (Note also they would have different gutter configurations in depth, also a factor). Looking at the populations as a whole, it appears that the underlying physical bars are thinner in H7 than the Grinnells -- consonant with the declaration that they are not the same marking. And, that the gutters on G7 are at the end and perhaps beyond the spectrum of Grinnell widths, consonant with G7 possibly being the mother marking.

August 22, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Bernard B - No I haven't but haven't looked at everything I have yet.

August 22, 2006 **Bill Duffney**

Thanks to the Arrigos and RF. That is just what we in the Balcony needed to make our own comparisons.

August 22, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Richard F One of the interesting points was the notch at the bottom on the G7 which was found on the Grinnell seven bars. Have you found any H7s with that notch?

August 22, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I just linked up the card of 10 stamps as well as the two "new" genuine 13c stamps (#G80, G81) on the Grinnell reference page and 13c scan page.

The cancel and postmarks are genuine in my opinion and the cancels on other Grinnell's appear to be derivatives of those genuine but suppose additional genuine postmark of "Hawaii" style was also available. The "D" in "Paid" on genuine postmark is ovoid while the Grinnell's have round center - the genuine "pattern" postmark is incomplete at foot and that ovoid characteristic is not visible. This could easily have been the cause for an incorrect drawing having been made.

Those stamps would certainly make nice "patterns" to photograph and make forgeries from.

August 22, 2006 **David Beech, the British Library, Philatelic Collections** <David.Beech@bl.uk>

Ken Lawrence

Patrick Pearson knows.

I will check Collin, Henry, "Catalogue for Advanced Collectors..." in the Crawford Library (BL shelfmark: Crawford 1170). I think I checked this many years

ago for much the same reason.

Tapling died on 11th April, 1891 but it was not until 21st May, 1892 that Bacon started work arranging the Collection (Tapling Collection Accounts). During the first accounting period to 21st November, 1892 he arranged, amongst others the Hawaii section. I am pretty sure that photographs would not have been taken by the British Museum (as the then holders of the Collection) during the early years to say 1904. In 1905 the Missionary page was illustrated in Melville's "The Tapling Collection of Stamps..." (BL shelfmark: 08247.f.7)

I am not sure that we know (off hand) where Tapling got his Missionaries (the Caillebotte Collection? which he purchased in part in 1887), so I would be most interested to know if you find any early photograph/illustration of his copies.

Do let me know if you find anything in the Crawford Library that is not in APRL that needs checking.

August 22, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Trying to catch up adding things to the Grinnell reference page today. Just linked up an 1886 article supplied by **Kim Brickman**.

August 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

David Beech,

If those were the only photos, you should notify Patrick Pearson to run a clarification, because his comment about them is misleading if they were not useful to forgers.

However, there may have been others at the time or very shortly afterward. I'm away from home en route to Chicago so I can't check, but I'm pretty sure that the Catalog for Advanced Collectors reproduced excellent photographic images of some Tapling Missionaries in 1892.

It's possible that Pierre Mahé sold Missionary photographs even earlier, though I don't know whose those would have been.

August 21, 2006 **David Beech, the British Library, Philatelic Collections** <David.Beech@bl.uk>

Photographs of the Tapling Collection Missioneries taken at the time of the "London Philatelic Exhibition, 1890"

We have a set of the photographs that were sold to the public, in the Crawford Library (BL shelfmark: Crawford 1524). These were of major or interesting items, two of which are items in Tapling's Collection (the other being his Mauritius 1847 1d on cover and 2d unused). The photograph of the Hawaii is about three inches high of an album page that was (Bacon remounted it in 1892) 12.5 inches high. It looks to have been taken through the glass and would be completely useless for the purpose of making any forgery or reproduction. The stamps have curled in what was an environment that was too dry.

The Missionaries were shown in a case (as were almost all exhibits) in Block E Frame No. 2. A photograph of the exhibition may be seen in:

Springbett, David J, The Grand Prix Club Book, Switzerland: David Feldman SA, 2001, page 24.

It is incorrectly described as a photograph of the 1897 exhibition.

August 21, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Traffic here may pick up after the mailed version of Linn's reaches subscribers. Michael Schreiber referred readers to this board.

I'm leaving on the slow drive to Chicago. Hope I'll see you all there.

August 21, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

19 postings on Aug 19 and 9 postings on Aug 20 (prior to and excluding this posting at 9pm Honolulu time).

Nope! The Little Boy's Board is just not going to cut it. And this despite the discovery that the Grinnells are real after all - or perhaps might be real - or perhaps not.

But then not everyone reads the Frajola Board and I'll bet attendance at the StampShow Sunday meeting will be large.

August 20, 2006 **Matthew Healey**

The Honolulu Advertiser's [Saturday front page](#) that Jeff P. mentioned.

August 20, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Richard posted while I was busily typing! Thanks for the excerpt.
Roger

August 20, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken L -
Thanks for a clarification of the VSC header. Seems presumptive of someone else to change the meaning of a post by placing it within a thread with a misleading title.

I would like you to rethink your premise concerning publishing in print vs webpage. When I moved to Hawaii I had been a long time subscriber to Linn's, but discovered my Linn's arrived in groups of 3 or 4 issues together about once a month. There was no fun in reading one after another in one sitting, when it was supposed to be a weekly event. It is wonderful that there are publications supporting print writers, but I've learned more on Richard's Board than I ever would have learned reading an article or two in a standard publication. So I won't be buying any paper publications, I'll just wait until the information gets sifted and

discussed here.

I do appreciate your research.

Roger

August 20, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

An excerpt from October 2006 *Scott Stamp Monthly* provided by Ken L:

In 1875, a Philadelphia stamp dealer named Giovanni Patroni was arrested and imprisoned for making and selling fraudulent imitations of foreign stamps. The Illustrated London News reported, "One of Patroni's counterfeits was that of the Sandwich Island stamp of 1852, which retailed at \$200." Few stamps of any country were worth \$200 in those days; that's an indication of how tempting Hawaiian Missionaries were to talented but unscrupulous forgers.

According to the RPSL book The Investigation of the Grinnell Hawaiian Missionaries by the Expert Committee of the Royal Philatelic Society London by Patrick Pearson, photographs of stamps in Tapling's exhibit at the London International Exhibition of 1890, including his Missionaries, were available at that time.

Other photographic reproductions of Hawaiian Missionary stamps, taken from stamps in the collection of F.W. Ayer of Bangor, Maine, were published by Brewster Cox Kenyon of Long Beach, California, in his 1895 book History of the Postal Issues of Hawaii. Kenyon pictured six Missionary stamps. Four of the same pictures also appeared in the October 24, 1895, issue of Mekeel's Weekly Stamp News.

Most experts therefore believe that the 1890s provided forgers' earliest opportunity to model truly deceptive reproductions that might have fooled experienced collectors and dealers. Kenyon himself, pictured in Figure 4, was a notorious stamp forger and creator of bogus issues. Probably his best known products were "Army Frank" patriotic labels for the Spanish-American War, shown in Figure 5.

San Francisco stamp dealer Walter Sellschopp exposed the true origin of Kenyon's military fantasy stamps; he also revealed that at the time Kenyon's book was in preparation, "there was a rumor that somebody or other in Los Angeles made attempts at different paper-houses to procure some old paper, the same or very similar to that old peculiar kind of writing paper on which the rare old Hawaiian numerals were printed," and that Kenyon had sold genuine Hawaiian stamps with counterfeit 1893 provisional surcharges.

California collector Fred Gregory, who hosts the Post Office in Paradise website about classic Hawaiian stamps and postal history, believes the Grinnell Missionaries are forgeries. He suspects that Kenyon is the culprit who created them. But Varro E. Tyler, the author of Philatelic Forgers: Their Lives and Works, believed that Kenyon had neither the means nor the skills to create counterfeits of this quality. Tyler, who died in 2001, believed they were genuine.

August 20, 2006 **Walter P**

Ken Lawrence -

Philatelic stickler for accuracy that you are, would it not be more correct to say that there was a discovery of two 13c Hawaii Missionary postage stamps mounted on a card that were mixed in with 8 Grinnell stamps that are thought to be forgeries?

Until the above mentioned two 13c Hawaii Missionary stamps have been formally expertised and have a clean certificate issued, would they not be better characterized as being two Hawaii 13c postage stamps that appear to be genuine Hawaii Missionary postage stamps in all respects?

Thanks for the tip today, for those of us who do not subscribe to Scott Monthly I do believe most public library's subscribe to this journal. The New Westminster public library used to subscribe and I will check to see if they still do?

Richard Frajola -

Thank you for setting up the separate Grinnell Board and the Grinnell and genuine Hawaii Missionary stamp enlargements. The work and your time involved in this project must be enormous and I just wanted to let you know it has not gone unappreciated.

As far as the enormous interest and appeal in the Grinnell stamps go, I think it has the same appeal for men and women as TV soap operas have. I think the appeal in soap opera serial style story lines with background sinister plots is the same appeal as for the continuing Grinnell stamp story line.

Most everyone wants to know how this will all turn out, will George Grinnell be vindicated, will his descendants receive a ten million dollar windfall or will they have to be satisfied with the two 13c Missionary stamps recently discovered mixed in with the Grinnells stamps. Will the two 13c Missionary stamps get a clean certificate or will the plot thicken further? I can feel my IQ dropping as I write this post. Stay tuned for the next episode and the next Dick Celler and Ken Lawrence discovery that will be sure to come out of the woodwork. Good work boys.

We have some very passionate Board posters and an interesting and esoteric line-up of Grinnell saga participants here, past and present, that range from the present Grinnell stamp owners to a most interesting line-up of characters, which follows in part:

Mr. Whitney, a printer and learn as you go Postmaster in 1851 Hawaii, crude Hawaii Missionary stamps designed and printed by Whitney, a sick schoolboy, the philatelic find of the century, George Grinnell philatelic hero or arch villain, the purported California museum midnight oil goings on, an old prayer book, a star struck stamp dealer with \$ signs in his eyes, an equally star struck very rich stamp collector, a great judge and jury trial, the RPSL negative opinion, Don Sundman pouring gasoline on the fire, the Arrigo's obsequy with vendication, Fred Gregory Hawaii postage stamp expert and wisely largely silent critic, and last but not least, Chief Inspector Ken Lawrence, author and philatelic sleuth. Have I left anyone out, if so, I apologise.

With such a diverse and esoteric line-up of characters, how could this not be a popular philatelic hit, which has gained such a level of philatelic frenzy, that it now rates its own Board and has worldwide attention?

Stay tuned you will not be disappointed. With this mystery ever be solved, probably not, but that's the appeal that keeps the Grinnell story going.

August 20, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Yesterday I linked **Matthew Healey's** article from the NY Times on the Grinnell Reference page.

August 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard F,

A better analogy would be someone asking you to give away free a cover from your store, which is your business.

Writers typically post summaries and samples of their work on the Internet in hopes people will buy the entire product; they don't sacrifice their royalties.

I think you've provided a fine service to the hobby here without compensation, and I think you should be proud of it. You've told us all along that the Grinnell story isn't a big interest of yours, and that you wish collectors were as interested in other stories. So do I, but I've been writing about stamps since 1983 and haven't ever before experienced such broad interest in a story.

Roger H,

What evidently occurred on VSC was that I posted my notice on the existing thread titled "Grinnell Hawaiian Missionary Stamps." Someone else started the new thread and moved my post to it.

August 20, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Ken L - Please don't project your payment formulas for writing onto me. It wasn't *my* pony book - it was a collaborative effort, as were the other recent books. I have no problem with the fact that you have an income from writing about philatelic subjects.

It has been suggested to me that I should be happy with all of the people visiting my site because of the Grinnell controversy. The truth is that my web site was never set up to be a profit center and it isn't. I have spent many hours doing the HTML work and research on the Missionaries because I thought that it was worth doing. That was probably a poor decision on my part.

August 20, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Roger H,

I did not title the thread "Proof The Grinnells are Real." My title was something like "Grinnell Hawaiian Missionaries in New York Times." I am not on the VSC staff, so I have no way to control or change the heading. Ask VSC who titled or retitled the thread.

If I post a 6,000-word article here without compensation, I essentially sacrifice my livelihood. I published it as quickly as I could, dropping everything to write it immediately after Dick and I had verification, dumping my regular column in the process and substituting this article after deadline by special arrangement with my editor so that everyone could read it as quickly as possible. Would you ask Richard to publish his entire Pony Express book on-line? You're supposed to buy the book.

I had thought that the United States annexed Hawaii a while back. Now you say it does not receive U.S. mail regularly. Odd. You could consider an on-line subscription, which you can read on your computer.

If people like you won't subscribe to a magazine you'd like to read, I won't have a job. But libraries do receive it, including APRL and many public libraries. Linn's also has a long, detailed article on the discovery, much longer and more analytical than what I wrote on that aspect, drawing conclusions that go beyond mine.

Besides reporting the discovery of the two genuine Missionaries, my article summarizes the history of Missionary forgeries, including information not provided by the RPSL or Fred Gregory, and includes a narrative history that has not appeared before in many details. I'm happy to have summaries on the web, and to discuss any aspect on the board, but rights to my writing are my principal asset, and I intentionally write for SSM because it gives enough space and color to tell and illustrate stories my way.

August 19, 2006 **Roger Heath**

Ken -
Could you explain why you titled your thread on VSC -
"Proof The Grinnells Are Real" ?

when the headline in the NY Times was much more conservative -
"Postmark Could Help Prove Rare Stamps Are Authentic"

I hope you are not interpreting other research in a similar manner.

I sure would like to read your article, but it is unlikely to reach Hawaii in its original form. Will you be able to post it here after a certain period, or will we have to contact the APRL for a copy?

Roger

August 19, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Greg I (re Confusing the real thing for the Grinnell). Or especially if you're not really looking, but only think you're looking. I don't know how further research has gone in the last forty years, but as I recall, there is an extensive innervation of the retina, which at least hinted that what you see at the retinal level is modulated from the brain.

August 19, 2006 **David Benson**

Scott,

do you have a photo or drawing of the so called embossing on the " watermarked " Missionary,

David B.

August 19, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

Ken L:

The Atlee article is wrong.

Having studied hundreds of Numeral stamps, I guarantee they were printed from loose type in a lock-up form, or chase.

Some show the thin rule and type cutting into the paper in a manner that indicates the piece rose up slightly from the locked form. Also, drop-out letters and elements did not occur on stereotypes.

Please don't waste your time following the stereotype concept for genuine Missionary and Numeral stamps. It just isn't so.

August 19, 2006 **Greg Ioannou** <[gregioannou@gmail.com](mailto:ggregioannou@gmail.com)>

On page 49, Westerberg describes a serif that "broke off at an early stage of the printing," which I would think suggests that actual type, not a stereotype, was being used. Other than hints like that, he says far less about the actual printing process than I remember him saying.

August 19, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Richard Malmgren,

The sources could be mistaken. I have no independent information, and I wasn't there in 1859, but it is possible the chase was kept intact and stereotypes made from it. Your junior high experience should verify the possibility. That appears to be Atlee's explanation:

Continuing the reference cited previously: "We therefore get of either value, ten types differing in minutiae, and these variations are fixed, so that the fourth stamp upon one sheet is exactly similar to the stamp in like position on another sheet. Had the stamps been printed direct from the type, it would have been almost impossible to have known them from the counterfeits, for variations would be constant through the tightening or loosening of the type within the 'form'."

I doubt Crocker would have reported that Whitney destroyed plates if he had merely returned type to the cases.

Regarding the Missionaries, Atlee wrote, "Each of the three stamps above described is of such extreme rarity, that it is impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion, as to the manner in which they were printed; but from appearances, we are led to believe that they were set up from the fount, and then stereotyped."

I'll be leaving for Chicago before long, so I can't make copies before I leave, but Ellen can send them to you when we return.

George Linn believed that the Missionaries were printed from stereotypes because of details like the lack of definition and the hollow serif ("blow hole") in the 5 digit, but Dave Churchman says that hand-poured castings also have similar flaws.

If the Grinnells are counterfeit, and if they were printed from plates as Scott and Fred believe, the plates were probably electros, not stereotypes.

August 19, 2006 **Richard Malmgren**

I'm confused again.

I am trying to get stuff done at work on a Saturday so I can get away for StampShow and still read the Little Boy's Board at the same time. (Not incidentally and unfortunately from my viewpoint, it seems that Richard Frajola has had enough of the ravings from rabid Grinnell posters and has chosen to preserve the Big Boy's Board for the real Postal Historians and relegate the Grinnell combatants to post on the Little Boy's Board.)

I believe that the first setting of the Hawaiian Numerals came out in 1859 and continued through 1866 or so (do I remember this correctly while I am allegedly trying to get real work accomplished in the office?) Did not Westerberg plate all of the subsequent printings through Setting 12 and show how through identifiable pieces of type/rules that this 'Type' got moved from this position to that position, etc? (Incidentally and confusingly so, capital 'T' Type is not the same as lower case 't' type, but you have to read Westerberg to get a better handle on that.) Was Westerberg not able to do this because of what I thought was the 'fact' that the chase was more or less and generally speaking kept intact and not dismantled due to the alleged making of a stereo?

How do the stereotypes come into play here? The chase was not dismantled as far as I know. (I mean dismantled in the sense of tossing all of the type being placed back into the type tray.) Is the assertion being made that each of the subsequent printings were also from stereo?

This is a real difficulty for me to comprehend. Ken, let's assume you are right. Help me out here or are you merely referencing a printed source that could be incorrect in the allegation of a stereo?

August 19, 2006 **Jeff Purser** <jpurser@snet.net>

Aloha from Hilo, HI!!! Missi and I are coming to the end of our vacation in Paradise. When we woke up this morning we saw stamps in the headlines on our way to breakfast.

The Grinnells are front page news in both the Honolulu Advertiser and the Tribune Herald today. Both papers cite Ken Lawrence's article in Scott Stamp Monthly.

I'm presently in a Borders Bookstore checking e-mail and folks at the next table are talking about the story!!

Gotta go. We're heading to a festival today and taking a hike to watch the lava flow tomorrow.

August 19, 2006 **Patrick Culhane** <patrickculhane@earthlink.net>

Bernard Biales

In the census I did mean 3 postmarks as stated – they comprise one a 2¢ stamp and 2 examples on the 13s. I hope that clarifies.

Matthew Healey

Jeffrey Weiss raised the possibility of contemporary postal forgery in his article but argued it to be out of character with what we know of William Emerson. As an aside -Ken's comment to me back in July was in response to a point I was trying to make to the effect that not every theory about William Emerson's involvement has come from me. To be clear: I have not suggested that the Grinnells comprised a special printing made for William Emerson's private use – by him or anyone else. I agree with Jeff's argument and am not aware of any evidence that would suggest postal forgery was at play – even though it may be consistent with more facts and circumstances than later philatelic forgery.

August 19, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Scott T,

"Ten stamps of each value, were set up in type, and then each ten were stereotyped to form a single plate." A Critical Analysis of the Stamps and Forgeries of the Hawaiian Islands By W. Dudlee Atlee, The Philatelic Journal, July 15, 1872, page 118.

Throughout Hawaiian Numerals, Crocker refers to plates, and quoting Charles Hustace on page 35, he wrote, "The plates he [Whitney] would put in his safe, where no one could get at them but himself, and he says he destroyed the plates himself."

This has no effect on plating. A stereo was commonly made from a setting. It's just soft metal poured into a mold made of wet spongy cardboard that is taken from the setting so the type will be preserved and the chase will be free for other work. When the stereo wore out, it was melted, a new setting made, and a new stereo molded from the new setting.

To the extent possible from screened reproductions, you can see in Gill's May 31, 1941, Stamps article, "The First Hawaiian Stamps -- the Missionaries," how good prints of the Missionary ornaments appeared when they were printed from careful makeready in 1857 and 1858. (Assuming Gill, Meyer-Harris, and Gregory are right that those were the same ornaments.) No Missionary stamp print has anything approaching that quality.

Is there a chance you can persuade Geoffrey Brewster to join our discussion? He was very helpful to Varro Tyler.

August 19, 2006 **Roger Heath**

This morning under "State News", the [Grinnell story](#) as report in West Hawaii Today. No attribution or byline. \$10 million is a lot to be riding on the outcome of mixed "expert opinion."

Roger

August 19, 2006 **Scott Trepel** <strepel@siegelauctions.com>

Ken L:

Where did you get the idea that the Numeral issues (starting in 1859) were printed from stereotypes?

They were printed from loose type in lock-up forms. I've never seen or read anything suggesting otherwise. Westerberg spent a lifetime plating the stamps and recreating the various "settings" as the loose type changed.

The genuine Missionaries were also printed from loose type.

Although some knowledgeable people dispute my statement that the Grinnells were printed from stereotype plates, I am confident in my judgment. The little thread-like projection on the bottom rule of one of the Grinnell 2c types, which I only noticed after seeing the actual stamps and hi-res photos, is the final piece of evidence I needed to be convinced the Grinnells were printed from stereotypes. There is no way that type of flaw would remain constant on stamps printed from loose type. On a stereotype, once it became part of the molded metal, it was there for good.

One name and opinion that has been conspicuously absent from all of our discussions is Geoffrey Brewster, who is probably the leading expert in Missionaries and Numerals.

August 19, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

Matthew H & Dick C Thank you for scans received. I will try to link up to the reference page when time permits (may be delayed somewhat).

August 19, 2006 **Matthew Healey**

Richard, a second email to you includes scans of the two 'new' Missionaries (though not the whole card).

Matthew

August 19, 2006 **Matthew Healey**

Richard F., I've emailed you the article and the pic of the prayerbook.

Many thanks,
Matthew

August 19, 2006 **Ken Lawrence**

Greg I,

That is the subject of Michael Schreiber's Open Album column in Linn's. At the Mystic display in Washington, I took pride in my ability to ace the quiz that challenged visitors to recognize which stamps on the screen were Missionaries or Grinnells, but even my private viewing of the card wasn't sufficient to catch

these.

Scott T made a similar point when he needled Dick Celler about using one of the two genuine stamps to illustrate a Grinnell trait in the Mystic book.

Now that Scott has made that point, I want to reiterate that I still think it's possible that all the Missionaries were printed from stereo plates, just as the Numerals were in 1859 and later. So I still want to see evidence that the composition elements moved. If they did, that rules out the stereo theory.

One aspect that supports the stereo theory is the overall poor printing quality. As I'm sure Richard Malmgren learned in junior high, makeready consists partly of leveling each type element, ornament, and rule so they all print evenly. That's achieved by locking the chase, pulling a proof, and then loosening the chase to shim the unprinted and weak elements with tissue underneath, then locking up and proving again until it's right.

Keith Cordrey, the Arrigos' master printer consultant, attributed the weak and unprinted areas to bearoff, which is accurate, but that means that the setting was poor to begin with. A stereo, on the other hand, does not offer the printer an opportunity to raise and level elements separately, which yields this kind of uneven print.

August 19, 2006 **Greg Ioannou**

One myth seems to have been put to rest by the stamps on that card: that it is easy to tell Grinnells from genuines "at a glance". How many supposed experts saw the 10 stamps and didn't spot the two genuines?

August 19, 2006 **Bernard Biales**

Bill W By the way, that admittedly tortured looking argument I made isn't so bad if you have the images from the Sundman booklet and the RPSL book. Of course the Advertiser sale has overall stuff. Reading it on the page is just a blur of words.

August 19, 2006 **Richard Frajola**

I would appreciate receiving 600 dpi scans of the new "card" of stamps that has been reported. I would have appreciated those scans last month, but receiving them now would give me more incentive to retain the Grinnell reference page.

[illegible]

[illegible]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100
 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200
 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300
 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400
 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500
 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600
 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700
 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800
 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900
 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000

(The following text contains extremely repetitive and nonsensical content, likely representing a corrupted or placeholder document. It consists of numerous rows of random characters and symbols.)

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]