

THE THREE PERIOD JUDGING SYSTEM

An Idea for the Future?

Robert M. Bell, M.D., Ph.C.

The Three Period Judging system is a system that has recently been adopted by the FIP for International Exhibitions, and a number of countries around the world, for the Postal History Class of philatelic exhibiting. By grouping classical, intermediate, and modern exhibits separately, and judging rarity and importance within the period, there is a slightly greater chance for more modern exhibits to do better in the medal awards. The FIP Traditional Commission is currently deliberating on the regulations for Traditional exhibits.

Introduction

Recently, I became aware that the Traditional and Postal History Commissions of the Fédération Internationale de Philatélie (FIP) had experimented with the Three Period Judging System (TPJS), and had for both Traditional and Postal History Classes decided to move forward and recommend that the System be used in future International Stamp Shows. Further, many countries follow FIP recommendations (the USA is an exception) and these have already introduced, or are planning to introduce the System for just these two classes.

Initially, I understood little about this new System, and inquiries amongst a few philatelists did not provide a great deal of information. I decided to widen my search and attempt to discover as much as possible.

By e-mail I contacted 171 judges and exhibitors, around the world, asking for their opinions on various aspects of the TPJS. There were 67 persons replying (often more than once), giving an individual response rate of 40.4%

This was not a scientific survey/poll, and as I moved forward I changed the questions being asked to clarify certain points. Further, some respondents did not answer the questions as presented and just summarized their thoughts and opinions in a paragraph or two. The following is a compilation of facts elucidated from many sources, together with the selected opinions of respondents, which it is hoped provides a balanced picture of the various points of view.

Understanding something about this significant change in global exhibiting, whether or not exhibiting, or planning to exhibit internationally, and its impact on US exhibiting will, it is hoped, be of interest to readers.

The Basic Facts

The Mophila Class Dr. Soichi Ichida of Japan and member of the FIP Council (1969 – 1984) is credited with suggesting the TPJS in 1981 at an FIP Traditional Philately Commission meeting in

Vienna. At the Mophila 1985 FIP International Exhibition in Hamburg, Germany the Ichida idea was modified and an experiment was approved, for Traditional Exhibits that had a short period of modern material. The exhibits were to be judged and awarded medals separately from the main Exhibition.

The Mophila Class was used at Phillanippon in 1991, Israel 1998, and other Exhibitions/Shows. More local/regional Shows using the system were referred to as Mophila Salons. However, the trial was not successful and was dropped in the 1990s. Interestingly, a single frame (1997 – 2006) Mophila exhibit sub-class was used at Manpex 2008, Manchester, Connecticut, USA. So the idea persists.

It was these early ideas that probably led to the Swiss Two Period system adopted in 1995, and now the FIP Three Period Judging system recently approved. Obviously along the way there were many supporters and enthusiasts, and perhaps even detractors, to arrive at the point we now find ourselves.

The idea of the Three Period System is to give more modern material a better chance at higher medals and so encourage exhibitors with modern material to compete.

In 2004 John Burnett, in a past letter to the editor of the Philatelic Exhibitor, when mentioning the cost of material he could never afford, suggested a Six Period System, together with three classes based on exhibiting experience (1). So many, in years past, were suggesting and introducing changes.

Countries and Exhibitions Using Period Sub-Classifications

Switzerland For the Traditional and the Postal History Class TWO time periods have been used nationally since 1995, mainly before and after 1900. For it to have been in operation for 14 years at all levels of exhibiting in Switzerland (local, regional, and national) suggests that it is accepted and working well. It is also reported that it is encouraging modern exhibitors to exhibit.

Finland From one source we learn that the TPJS was introduced in 2007, and is working well.

There have been some traditional exhibits of the modern definitive series (1954, 1963), which have reached national large vermeil, but not any gold medal exhibits. However, the reporter was quite sure that the new system has helped the modern exhibits to rise up to large vermeil. When it comes to other results (gold and other medals), the system seems to have had no influence on the exhibit awards in the classical & middle periods.

Germany Plans are afoot to introduce the system, and new regulations adopting the Three Period System for Postal History have recently been issued.

Australia In Australia the Judging fraternity has accepted the FIP Traditional and Postal History Classes for Three Period Judging. In a report on notes taken about the 2C (the new FIP Historical, Social, and Special Studies Regulations) judging team at the Melbourne Show (2) it is stated that this Show was the first Exhibition in the world to Judge exhibits under the new FIP Postal History Class 2C Regulations. The idea of time frames was discussed and was generally viewed as a positive step forward.

However, there is nothing in the entry form for the Australia Canberra 2010 Show (3) indicating that Traditional or Postal History classes will be divided by time periods. This inconsistency may be due to the newness of the System and/or the practicalities of having too small numbers of exhibits in each sub-class.

New Zealand At the 60th Annual General Meeting of the New Zealand Philatelic Federation which was held November 29, 2008 and in line with the FIP decisions in Bucharest of 2008, the following was decided:

“Postal History. All Postal History Exhibits will be placed and judged in one of the three time periods irrespective of geographical area: (a) Up to 1875 (pre-UPU) , (b) 1875-1945, and (c) After 1945. Each exhibit fits into the time period where it starts or where its main content lies” (4).

However, the Palmplex 2010 (5) prospectus does not indicate that Traditional or Postal History classes will be divided by time periods. Geographic sub-categories ARE listed. Again, similar reasons for this inconsistency to the Australian situation might pertain.

There are probably other countries that follow FIP regulations introducing the TPJS.

Singapore 2004 At this FIP International a Three Period Judging System was successfully experimented with for the Traditional Class. Essentially, this meant that all exhibits were grouped into those before 1900, those between 1901 and 1940, and those after 1940.

At the FIP 2004 Singapore show for Traditional exhibits the following Gold medals were awarded (6):

<u>Class/Period</u>	<u>Golds awarded</u>
Class A) up to 1900	*
Class B) 1900-1940	1 Large Gold & 5 Golds
Class C) after 1940.	Four Golds

* Golds for Class A were not provided

Dubai 2006 At this [Inter-Asian Philatelic Federation (F.I.A.P.)] International Show the Traditional and Postal History exhibits were judged using Three Periods.

Israel 2008 Here Traditional exhibits were judged using both a Geographical and a Three Period classification (until 1900, 1900 to 1940, and around 1940s till the present time) [7].

FIP Information

London 2010 (FIP), Portugal 2010 (FIP), and Johannesburg 2010 (FIAP), Bangkok 2010 (FIAP) are not requiring Three Periods.

The Postal History Commission/Bureau met in Bucharest in 2008, and after eight years of preparation and work, not only introduced the 2 C Classification for Historical, Social, and Special Studies, the Congress accepted the TPJS that had been previously approved by the Traditional Commission (9). The Postal History Commission does not intend to propose further changes of the new SREV's or Guidelines before it has gained more practical experience.

There is very little information on the Traditional FIP website about the Three Period system (9). In contrast, there is considerable information on the Postal History website, and the Commission (6) has gone out of its way to communicate information. Some of the information on both websites is as follows:

FIP Postal History website

“Above all we try to maintain the popular collecting and exhibiting of Postal History in such a way that it will neither degenerate to an unpleasant ‘cheque book competition’ nor become a pure academic discipline. Our main aim should be to allow the collectors and exhibitors of Postal History to have more liberty and pleasure in creating their exhibit” (6).

The Special Regulations for the Evaluation of Postal History Exhibits says:

“Besides these categories all Postal History exhibits are classified and judged in three time periods. 1. Up to 1875 (pre GPU). 2. From 1875 – 1945. 3. After 1945. Each exhibit fits in to the period where it starts or where its main contents lies.” (6)

FIP Traditional website

The Special Regulations for the Evaluation of Traditional Exhibits says:

“The introduction of three time periods has solved some of the problems with the importance. For instance an excellent modern exhibit with outstanding material, knowledge and treatment is often more important than a weak classic exhibit. Also, the completeness of all important aspects of the chosen area increases the importance of an exhibit. Excluding some important aspects is lowering the importance even if that is mentioned in the introductory statement” (9).

“Under the Question, What is Traditional Philately this website says that, within the next year or so you will see Traditional Philately divided into Three Sections: The Classic Period; Nineteenth Century, The Middle Period; From 1900 to World War II, The Modern Period; After World War II (note these intervals are different from the Postal History ones)” [9].

Both the Traditional and Postal History Commissions favor these new groupings of exhibits and have confirmed this to the FIP Board, and to the Operating Committees of the forthcoming International Committees.

This is a significant change as most exhibits previously were grouped Geographically (e.g. For FIP Israel 2008 – Holy Land and Israel; Europe; Asia, Oceania, and Africa; Americas).

The FIP, and Postiljonen, & the Swedish Philatelic Federation sponsored a Joint Seminar on Postal History and Thematic Philately in Malmö, Sweden, 21 – 23 August, 2009 (10). A discussion on Postal History (PH) took place. The responses relating to the TPJS were as follows:

:

- *Time periods are in the new PH regulations to promote modern PH philately (i.e. post UPU and post 1945), and to give these exhibits a better chance of competing with “earlier” PH exhibits.*
- *The periods chosen are the same as in Traditional Philately regulations.*
- *One attendee mentioned that at a recent exhibition there were two judging groups for different*

time periods in the traditional class.

• An FIP representative felt that it is positive to have the same periods in PH as in traditional philately, but the third period (after 1945) could be discussed, as the peace after World War II did not enter until later in some countries.

• Another attendee felt that it was good with the new time periods, but the “best” will always be the first years of each period.

Respondents' General Comments

- I know little about the new Three Period concept,.... I look forward to reading your article/letter to the editor....
- I have heard nothing about these proposed new rules.
- Australia will certainly be following that direction and I know the Postal History Commission.... is keen to follow that path as well.
- ...I was told never to collect anything more recent than my own birthday.
- Here in Finland, in our national exhibitions, we have used the system of three periods in traditional philately and postal history from the very beginning. We have only good experiences!
- I am not familiar with the three period system.
- USA is a non-FIP country. The likelihood of this becoming part of the USA rules is slim and none for our lifetimes.”
- My answers would be wild guesses at best,.....”
- In a way, here in the US we already do this with special APS awards of excellence for pre-1900, 1900-1940, 1940-1980, and post-1980.
- They do not apply in the USA (at least not yet), and with the 6th edition of the Manual of Philatelic Judging saying that classic material is more important than non-classic material, I think it is likely the FIP made a step forward whereas APS has made a backwards step.
- The “Three Periods” concept is news to me.
- you will have to find someone else who pays attention to this rather obscure part of philately.
- If and when this Period concept is implemented, it will take a decade to really find out if it is working or not.
- The three period judging concept will be first used in FIP exhibitions in 2011.
- It suggests that the modern material cannot be competitive with the classic and is creating a rather silly way for that to happen.
- They prefer the freedom to collect what they like, arrange it how they like, etc. For them, I suspect, and certainly for me, the whole idea of “doing” any aspect of my hobby according to rules set down by someone else is anathema.
- I don't see a fence around these time periods only guidelines.
- What FIP does or does not do really has little or no relationship to reality in my mind.
- The system has not been used in our National Exhibitions and no requirements have been received so far from FIP (or accepted by FIAF as far as I know).
- I am not sure adding the three periods for U.S. national shows would be that helpful.
- An exhibit should get the medal it deserves regardless of the time period it covers.
-it is simply a matter of time before the bias against modern material is gradually eliminated and FIP regulations are revised.
- In my opinion the implementation in this geographical area would be difficult or at least

impractical, as the number of suitable collectors/potential exhibitors, is quite limited. Therefore it might be impossible to have enough participants for each time period (Sub-category?).

- I know nothing about this...what does the THREE PERIOD mean?
- For Postal History it has become a requirement starting in 2009, but not with Exhibitions approved before that date, i.e., London 2010, Lisbon 2010.
- I have always been aware that a good classic exhibit will likely rate higher than a good later exhibit -- as is easily apparent from looking at the winners of the C-of-C over the years. My bottom line is that I am not convinced that we need C-of-C winners for more modern material.
- Dealer overtones? It would be good to see more interest in post world war II material as increasingly that is what will be available to dealers when they are looking to buy.
- I can see where exhibitors who don't have classic material would like to get greater recognition, but this isn't a great argument for changes. After all, the Yankees win the most championships and the Cubs don't!
- So, modern exhibits will be slow in coming since the old guard is not going to accept the concept easily and therefore the exhibitors will be slow to develop a quality exhibit with modern materials.
- It is not a matter of being "for" or "against" -- what the FIP does or does not do has no effect on my exhibiting, nor (so far) has it affected my judging practice. So I don't care how many periods the FIP chooses to slice and dice postal history.
- I think the change will take some time, nothing changes in a very limited period of time. But the new direction is good and needed.

Other Classes Other than Traditional and Postal History that Might Adopt the System.

The Postal History Commission's Website (6) says:

"It appears the only other classes that might consider the Three Time Periods are Postal Stationery and Revenue. We do not know if these classes will look into adopting the three periods. For Postal Stationery the pre-GPU (pre 1875) period is very limited in material and for the Revenue class the Three Time Periods year ranges are not nearly as relevant as for the Postal History class or even the Traditional class."

Respondents' Comments:

- Thematics are already organized by categories.
- Another thing is that each of the smaller classes (Postal Stationery, Revenues, Maximaphily for example) usually has only none to four exhibits in our national exhibitions. I don't feel it necessary to divide so small classes.
- The system of periods is good only for the big classes: Traditional and Postal History.

Advantages of the TPJS

The FIP Postal History Commission's Website (6) has this to say:

“As the 2004 Singapore experiment has shown, exhibits after 1900 if really well done have a better chance to achieve Gold and Large Gold if they are not compared with the "heavy-weight" Classic exhibits.

Respondents' Comments:

- Good for the dealers and auction houses, higher prices.
- Different judges I have spoken to feel it is a logical step -- so also for postal history, but that the other disciplines - Thematic, Aero need the differentiation.
- Changes the rules for determining importance and rarity for Postal History.
- Advantages are, it's easier to evaluate in time periods because the expectations are different.
- It encourages people to collect also newer issues, not only classic philately. Also, the best exhibits of mid and modern period can achieve high awards when not always competing against the impressive classic exhibits.
- None that I see.

Disadvantages of the TPJS

The FIP Postal History Commission's Website (6) commented:

“The disadvantages of the Three Time Periods will be found once we have some experience in using the Three Time Periods.”

Respondents' Comments:

- Exhibitors might also need to go to 5 frames instead of 8 frames because of a lack of material.
- As with the present emphasis towards postal history and telling a story in FIP shows, the owners of "valuable" and important traditional collections are getting disillusioned to see low value and some would say unimportant story collections getting large gold and grand-prix awards. If high awards are given to cheaper modern exhibits, again it will debase the value of a large gold, further alienating the major collectors with valuable traditional exhibits.
- It is a change.
- I think there are none?!

Are Period Prizes of Any Value?

Currently the FIP does not require Period Prizes. The FIP Postal History Website says to the question, Will Period Prizes be used (6)?

“The answer to your question is No. But the PHB (Postal History Bureau) would be in favor of the best exhibit of each sub-class and each time period receiving a Special prize if there are at least ten exhibits in each sub-class and time period. However, this will only be possible if the exhibits are grouped accordingly and this can only happen if the exhibitors learn to send the application forms indicating clearly which sub-class and time period their exhibits belong to.”

Respondents' Comments:

- No, probably not, there are a lot of special awards already (in the US) and I can't see these would have much impact.

- FIP does not require period prizes. If an exhibition wants to have period prizes then they can do so. Just like WorldStamp Championship 2004 in Singapore had prizes for the best in each class. The UPU Prix appears to be an award being given at Portugal 2010. It is not at the same level as GPN and GPI. It is another special award.
- I see no need for Period Prizes myself.
- It is hard to see where a period prize for a post 1945 exhibit can be equated to a pre 1875 exhibit.
- I don't object to "Best of Period" prizes of some kind. But, are they really needed?
- More prizes are better. It does not matter if they are period prizes or not.
- The judges have enough to do without more prizes.
- I think not, my opinion is that they are not needed.
- Felicitations might be more appropriate.
- Having three Grands would be like kissing your sister. Unrewarding at best...
- Yes. It is tantamount to specializing.

APS Period Medals

The American Philatelic Society (APS) has five well sought after medals awarded at the World Series of Philately Shows. In addition to its Research Medal, there are Four Medals of Excellence for the following Periods:

Pre 1900, 1900-1940, 1940-1980, and Post 1980

Respondents' Comments:

- The criterion for the Medals of Excellence is that the bulk of the exhibit would be in the appropriate time period. Exhibits that overlap time periods probably suffer in consideration.
- The APS has awards for different time periods, and the effect is sometimes to give a weak exhibit an award it would not otherwise get because it is the best (or sometimes the only) exhibit in the time period.

Cross Period Exhibits – Will Exhibitors Structure their Exhibits to Conform with the Periods?

Respondents' Comments:

- I could also see an exhibitor padding an exhibit if he was required to stay within the time period. Lesser quality material might be included just to fill out the frames."
- I would think there will be confusion for any "overlapping" exhibits just as there is here in the U.S. when awarding, for example, the APS 1900-1940 award. For best results, I think all exhibits should be strongly organized to fit within one of the time frames."
- I am sure they will, but many exhibitors need to pay closer attention to the start and final dates of their exhibits to ensure the scope is logical. It is a frequently encountered problem.
- Nope. I do not see this happening. I do see some areas being more interesting for exhibiting purposes. I can see where certain subjects may have not been interesting in the past since they would not get high importance points and thus created an artificial ceiling for the subject. Now this could change.
- Herein lies the rub. Though most exhibits do not cross three time periods, where they do, the practice may force the jury to some hard decisions.

- Absolutely not.
- A huge problem. Would love to know the answer to it.
- The point break down does not indicate any penalty for exceeding the time period so I assume it is up to the judge on how strict he wants to be and how relevant the material is to the exhibit.

Will the System take Money out of Exhibiting?

The Post History Commission's Website responds to the following question (6): *Will it in time tend to take money out of exhibiting?*

"Certainly not. It is an established economic fact that whatever is popular becomes more expensive. Since Postal History has been introduced as an Exhibition Class it has become more popular than any other Class. We are convinced that with the new sub-classes and three time periods Postal History will attract even more collectors and exhibitors than currently"

Respondents' Comments:

- No, it makes it more expensive. More collectors will try to obtain material in their specific time period and ignore material outside. Thus competition will increase and so will the expenses.
- From the Postal History FIP Commission's website it seems as though the main thrust is to take the money factor out of exhibiting/judging. One of the reasons I've shied away from exhibiting is the money factor.
- I doubt it.
- Not at all.

Will the System Level the Playing Field?

Respondents' Comments:

- My own understanding of the rationale of the introduction of the Three Periods by FIP, was to provide a level playing field for all exhibitors, from those that collected "First Day Covers (21st. Century)" and those that collected "Guild Symbols of the 15th Century.
- By having a sub-division of, e.g., post WWII material, it may be that such material will receive more attention/higher awards in the future.
- The playing field will never be level. Not all exhibit subjects are created equal.
- Until the international playing field is leveled (as we are trying to do here, pretty successfully I think), I won't play the game! But that's another story...
- The playing field isn't level. A presentation of dandelions at a flower show can't and never will compete at the level of hybrid roses.

Will the Three Period System bring more Exhibitors to Exhibiting?

Respondents' Comments:

- Hopefully!
-the net answer to the question is that there will be FEWER exhibitors, with or without time lines.

- I cannot envision any reason to see that this will encourage the entry of new exhibitors. Why would one assume that it will?
- Most likely, but not due to this idea

Significance to Exhibitors in the USA

It has been said by one Judge that as far as the APS Period medals, mentioned above, are concerned that having a cross period exhibit probably suffers in medal consideration. If this is true then a similar problem may present itself with the Three Period FIP system. International Exhibitors might consider limiting their exhibits precisely to the three time periods or even extending to other periods (considering the in-period evaluation of rarity and importance) if it was considered there was a slight advantage for a higher medal award. Only time will tell how this will work out.

In any case, if US exhibitors are planning to exhibit internationally they might consider keeping abreast of the Three Period System developments when putting together a new exhibit for US shows. And then there is the challenge of getting a Vermeil medal with modern material in the US to even allow the exhibit to go International.

Rarity and Importance

The FIP Traditional Commission's Website says in the Rules for Judging Exhibits (Bucharest, June 28, 2008) [11]:

“The introduction of three time periods has solved some of the problems with the importance. For instance an excellent modern exhibit with outstanding material, knowledge and treatment is often more important than a weak classic exhibit.”

The Post History Commission's Website responds to the following question (6): *Will it in time tend to take money out of exhibiting?*

“..... As Mr xxxxxx correctly assumes the philatelic importance and rarity should be considered against the other exhibits of the same time period.”

Jury Teams

In Switzerland different Jury teams judge the two different periods.

The Postal History Commission comments on their website (6):

“.....the grouping in Time Periods only makes sense if judged by different Jury teams. From a practical point of view we do not have enough jurors for three time periods. Also, from a practical point of view, there are only few exhibits after 1945. With these practical limitations in mind the best solution is to let one Jury team judge the pre-UPU exhibits (pre - 1875) and another Jury team judge all the exhibits after UPU (post - 1875). It is easier for a juror to compare Inflation rate exhibits of Germany, Hungary, Poland, China (post - 1875) with each other than with German States or Austrian Empire exhibits (pre - 1875).”

Judging

A recent article in this Journal (12) it is suggested that Judges in the United States, do not adhere to the judging guidelines, otherwise there would be more Gold medals awarded to 20th century material, and there would be more 20th Century, Champion of Champion awards in the US. If this idea has any credence it would seem that there is an urgent need to confirm this and establish the truth.

The situation Internationally is not known, but one might expect it to be similar to judging in the US. How quickly the playing field is leveled overseas with the TPJS, will depend to a great extent on how the FIP and national judges view modern material and interpret the regulations, particularly with respect to importance and rarity being judged within the period.

Respondents' Comments:

- but I could envision that in the US if adopted there would be a training and introductory period for the judges as well as the exhibitors. As long as the "rules and criteria" were established and agreed upon there should be no problem with this classification any more than the current regulations.
- In my opinion judges too frequently let their own personal bias come into the picture.
- What might, I emphasize *might*, is that for older judges there has always been a suspicion that they do not like modern material.
- I expect the jury to fairly and consistently apply the guidelines.

Medal Allocation

Respondents' Comments:

- We distribute far too many gold medals now so that last thing we need is a scheme to award even more of them.
- The system of three periods didn't change the allocation of Gold medals in Finland. We didn't have any gold medal exhibits of modern issues (post 1945) before the system, and not even today despite the new system!

Should the TPJS be Introduced into the US?

Respondents' Comments:

- The US is the only exhibiting country in the world that has not adopted the FIP system in one way or the other
- Also, it really would not make much of a difference in the medal levels as more modern exhibits are pretty well received here (in the US) and compete for the top awards with no problem.
- I am one of those who wants to bring in the entire FIP system, including FIP points.
- A very strong case can be made that no such division of traditional or postal history exhibiting needs to be made in the US for its national philatelic exhibitions.
- ...the problems they help to correct on the international level are really not a problem at the national level, at least here in the USA.

Conclusions

The Period Judging systems seem to have been reasonably well tried – The Mophila Class for up to 10 + years, Switzerland for 14 years, Finland 2 years, and Internationally at, at least, three FIP/FIAP Shows between 2004 and 2008.

In the survey a few judges and exhibitors did not know about, or knew very little about, the TPJS. Further, there were widespread views with regard to the many issues in the questionnaire/survey. Many in the USA did not think the system had a place in the US, others felt that it might level the playing field and encourage more to join the philatelic exhibiting ranks.

Considering that the US judging regulations are different from FIP regulations and that we have the APS Medals of Excellence for defined periods, it is a reasonable question to ask whether the FIP TPJS should be introduced into the USA.

So far, with only a few International Shows having been judged using the system, there is not a lot of information that tells us where this movement is going. However, from Switzerland and Finland we learn that a few more of the higher medals are being awarded to modern exhibits. However, Vermeils and Gold medals and other major Show medals being awarded to Classical exhibits, from the very limited information available, do not appear to be affected.

US Exhibitors putting together new exhibits, that they would eventually like to take Internationally, would do well to keep abreast of the Three Period developments.

With change there are often strong points of view; my aim is to present the facts as best I can, to provide a cross section of opinion, and to stimulate discussion so that these FIP changes are better understood, with hopefully benefits to both National and International philatelic exhibiting.

A recent article in this magazine (12) has suggested that judging in the US needs to be improved and that there is infrequent and improper application of the standards set forth in the Manual of Philatelic Judging. If this thesis is upheld and, this situation also extends to International judging, then it will probably take many years for significant changes to be seen, and the TPJS to be well accepted in the International exhibiting community.

Indirectly, the TPJS attempts to roughly control for the cost of exhibits (classical being more expensive than post 1945 material), but it still places all three time periods together for the award of the big Exhibition Prizes. This seems to ask the question, as to whether the next step in the evolution of the system will be to judge the three periods separately and not let them compete together for the big prizes?

Exhibitors often go on to be judges, and then become influential in organized philately. The young, in particular, and philatelists in general, often look to us for leadership. Further, with exhibiting we also have the responsibility to bring the classical and modern gems, together with the latest philatelic research and discoveries, for all to see. Are we providing that leadership? Are we adequately countering the changes taking place in organized philately and affecting exhibiting? Are we doing enough to encourage more to the joys of exhibiting?

It is hoped that the TPJS is a significant idea for the future and that it will advance the pleasures of philatelic exhibiting. Only time will tell.

I welcome corrections, suggestions, and comments. E-mail: rmsbell200@yahoo.com

Appreciation My thanks to all the respondents who gave of their valuable time and provided helpful answers.

References

1. Burnett, J. Letter to the Editor, *Philatelic Exhibitor* 2004:18 (3);7
2. King, C *Postal History Class 2C – A Work in Progress*. *Asian Pacific Exhibitor* 22(3);186
3. <http://www.canberrastamps.org/cs2010prospectus.pdf>
4. <http://www.nzpf.org.nz/html/news/jan09.html#AGM2008%200109>
5. <http://www.stampsnz.co.nz/palmpex/Prospectus.pdf>
6. *Fédération Internationale de Philatélie (FIP) Postal History Commission website*
<http://www.fippostalhistory.com/>
7. <http://www.wscisrael2008.co.il/publications/Bulletin%203.pdf>
8. *Flash* 107; 29: 2009
9. *Fédération Internationale de Philatélie (FIP) Traditional Commission Website*
<http://www.traditionalphilately.com/>
10. *Fédération Internationale de Philatélie, Postiljonen, & Swedish Philatelic Federation. Joint Seminar, Postal history and Thematic Philately, Malmö, Sweden, 21 – 23 August, 2009 Seminar Report*
<http://www.fipthematicphilately.org/documents/2009/Official%20Report%20from%20Malmo%20Seminar.pdf>
11. *The FIP Commission for Traditional Philately, Rules for Judging Exhibits, Guidelines for judging Traditional Philately Exhibits.*
<http://www.traditionalphilately.com/Grev~Srev~guide.htm>
12. Kotanchik, J. *The Philatelic Exhibitor*, 2009; 23 (4):11