

# Special Regulations for the Evaluation of Philatelic Literature Exhibits at F.I.P. Exhibitions

## Article 1: Competitive Exhibits

In accordance with Article 1.4 of the General Regulations of the F.I.P. for the Evaluation of Competitive Exhibits at F.I.P. Exhibitions (GREV), these Special Regulations have been developed to supplement those principles with regard to the Philatelic Literature. Also refer to Guidelines to Philatelic Literature Regulations.

## Article 2: Competitive Exhibits

Philatelic literature includes all printed communications available to collectors related to postage stamps, postal history, and their collecting, and to any of the specialized fields connected therewith.

## Article 3: Principles of Exhibit Composition

Philatelic literature will be subdivided as follows:

### 1. Handbooks and Special Studies

- a. Handbooks
- b. Monographs
- c. Specialised research articles
- d. Bibliographies and similar special works
- e. Exhibition catalogues
- f. Specialised catalogues which besides philatelic issues of one or more countries treat varieties, cancellations or other specialized aspects.
- g. Transcripts of philatelic lectures presented to the public (including radio, television, film and slide show scripts).
- h. Similar special works.

### 2. General Catalogues

Worldwide, regional and single area catalogues whose depth of coverage does not qualify them as specialized catalogues.

### 3. Philatelic Periodicals

Philatelic journals and newspapers, society organs, house organs, yearbooks and similar publications.

### 4. Articles

Articles of a general nature, in philatelic or nonphilatelic publications.

## Article 4: Criteria for Evaluating Exhibits

4.1 Literature exhibits will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- Treatment of contents
- Originality, significance and depth of research
- Technical matters
- Presentation

4.2 The criterion "treatment of contents" requires an evaluation of the literary style, clarity, and skill in communication shown in the exhibit.

4.3 The criterion "originality, significance, and depth of research" requires an evaluation of the overall significance of the subject matter presented in the exhibit, as well as the degree to which the exhibit displays original discoveries, research, analysis or approaches to a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.

4.4 The criterion "technical matters" requires an evaluation of such aspects as title page and imprint, pagination, credits, bibliography, index, and use of illustrations.

4.5 The criterion "presentation" requires an evaluation of the effect of binding, typography, and similar production factor on the usability of the publication. To avoid the impact of purely commercial aspects, this criterion will only be evaluated to the degree that it represents a negative factor.

## Article 5: Judging of Exhibits

5.1 Literature exhibits will be judged by approved specialists in their respective field and in accordance with Section V (Article 31-46) of GREX (ref. GREV. Article 5.1)

5.2 For Literature exhibits, the following relative terms are presented to lead the Jury to a balanced

evaluation (ref. GREV. Article 5.2):	
Treatment of contents	40
Originality, significance and depth of research	40
Technical matters	15
Presentation	5
Total	100

## **Article 6: Concluding Provision**

6.1 In the event of any discrepancies in the text arising from translation, the English text shall prevail.

6.2 These Special Regulations for the Evaluation of Philatelic Literature Exhibits at F.I.P. Exhibitions have been approved by the 54th F.I.P. Congress on 5th November, 1985 in Rome. They came into force on 5th November, 1985 and apply to those exhibitions which are granted F.I.P. patronage, auspices or support at the 54th F.I.P. Congress and thereafter.

# **Supplementary Rules for the Philatelic Literature Class in F.I.P. Exhibitions**

## **Rule 1:**

These supplementary rules for the admission of Literature Exhibits have been developed under Article 3.3 of the General Regulations of the F.I.P. for Exhibitions (GREX) and will apply to all literature entries in General and Specialised Exhibitions of F.I.P. (GREX Article 2).

## **Rule 2:**

In amplification of Article 17.1 (GREX), entries may be exhibited by the author, compiler, editor, publisher, sponsoring organization or society, or any other individual holding proprietary rights.

## **Rule 3:**

A literature exhibit may be admitted provided the exhibitor, as defined under Rule 2 above, meets the qualification requirement of GREX Article 10.1. Recently published works which have not had the opportunity to be exhibited at a national exhibition may directly participate in a F.I.P. exhibition (GREX Article 10.3).

## **Rule 4:**

A separate form will be used for entries in the literature class. In addition to the other information needed by the Exhibition Management, this form should also include the publication date, publisher, number of pages, frequency of publication (for periodicals) and means of ordering the publication (address, price).

## **Rule 5:**

Two copies of each literature exhibit shall be provided by the exhibitor: one copy for judging and the other for a reading room as per Article 6.8 of GREX. Following the exhibition these copies shall be sent by the Exhibition Management to a library designated by the member federation hosting the exhibition, unless the exhibitor specifically asks for the return of these copies.

## **Rule 6:**

The entry fee for a literature exhibit shall be equivalent to the price of one frame in the general competition class of the same exhibition.

## **Rule 7:**

The Exhibition Management shall furnish the judges a list of literature entries at least three months prior to the exhibition.

## **Rule 8:**

Handbooks and special studies must have been published not earlier than 5 years prior to the exhibition year. For all other entries the publication date should be not earlier than 2 years prior to the exhibition year. For multivolume works, the date of publication of each volume shall govern. Revised editions will be considered as new publications. For periodicals, the most recent complete volume or year shall be exhibited. A selection of at least ten different newspaper articles is required for exhibition.

## **Rule 9:**

Medals in the literature class will bear the word "Literature" either abbreviated or in full. Literature entries are also eligible for special awards (Article 8.6, GREX).

#### **Rule 10:**

Literature judges must have a reading ability in at least two languages, one of which must be any of the four official F.I.P. languages (Article 29.3 of the Statutes).

#### **Rule 11:**

In the event of any discrepancies in the text arising from translation, the English text shall prevail.

#### **Rule 12:**

The Supplementary Rules for the Evaluation of Philatelic Literature Class in F.I.P. Exhibitions have been approved by the 54<sup>th</sup> F.I.P. Congress on 5<sup>th</sup> November, 1985 in Rome, and replace all previous special regulations for literature. They came into force on 5<sup>th</sup> November, 1985 and apply to those exhibitions which are granted F.I.P. patronage, auspices or support at the 54<sup>th</sup> F.I.P. Congress and thereafter.

**Note:** The cross-references to the Statutes and GREX have been updated to refer to the Statutes and GREX approved by the 69<sup>th</sup> F.I.P. Congress on October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006 at Málaga.

## **Guidelines for Judging Philatelic Literature**

### **Introduction**

These guidelines are intended as a checklist which is detailed enough to be of service for specialized literature exhibitions as well as for general philatelic exhibitions in which literature is only one of several classes.

### **General Principles**

While the majority of the principles in exhibiting philatelic literature is identical to those which apply to other philatelic classes as well, there are certain distinct differences.

In the first place, the significance and importance of a piece of literature cannot be seen from the outside. Literature must be judged by its content, and obviously the judges have to be familiar with that content before the start of the exhibition. While the three to five days available for judging will allow time for review and some reading, it in no way suffices for each judge to read each entry thoroughly.

Second, literature exhibits cannot be taken apart and improved from one show to the next. In many cases, the exhibit represents a lifetime of research and effort which will serve philately for years to come. For this reason, the exhibiting of philatelic literature must be looked at primarily as a means of encouraging and promoting such literary efforts, and only secondarily as a competition for various levels of awards.

Third, it follows that the public must be able to examine the literature. A glance at a row of books in a locked case gives little information, and is a disservice to the viewer and the exhibitor. It is the content that is of interest, not the covers.

The F.I.P. has developed a comprehensive set of regulations for evaluating philatelic exhibits, incorporating those F.I.P. principles common to all competitive classes. For philatelic literature, these principles are expressed in the Special Regulations for the Evaluation of Philatelic Literature Exhibits at F.I.P. Exhibitions. They are supplemented by provisions which recognize aspects of philatelic literature which are unique to this class, the Supplementary Rules for the Philatelic Literature Class in F.I.P. Exhibitions.

The two documents, taken as a whole, constitute the requirements for exhibiting and judging philatelic literature at F.I.P. exhibitions.

### **Use of the Evaluation System**

The use of a point system, together with appropriate "scoring sheets", can be helpful in reaching balanced and rational evaluations. However, it must be emphasized that such a system cannot be applied mechanically; the final point totals also must be looked at in terms of the overall quality of the exhibits.

It may be helpful at this point to give some concrete examples of the use of the scoring system. These examples are not taken from actual jury results; they are, however, representative of the evaluations reached during jury deliberations.

**1. The Postal History of the Forwarding Agents, by Ken Rowe, published 1984 by L. Hartmann:**

Treatment of contents (maximum 40)	38
<i>Very clear presentation of a difficult, worldwide subject; the book is easy to use, and reliable</i>	
Originality, significance and depth of research (maximum 40)	37
<i>Particularly high marks for originality; Rowe was the first to systematically treat this aspect of postal history (in 1966 and again in 1974), inspiring other scholars to do similar research. The subject matter is also of considerable significance. Quite thorough, considering the worldwide scope but Dromberg's recent work on Finnish forwarders lists many important agents not covered by Rowe.</i>	
Technical matters (maximum 15)	13
<i>A few problems with crossindexing, and with placing of notes.</i>	
Presentation (maximum 5)	4
Total:	92 (= Gold)

**2. Eesti Filatelist / The Estonian Philatelist / Der Estnische Philatelist, No. 30 (1984).**

Annual publication of the Society of Estonian Philatelists in Sweden and the Estonian Philatelic Society in New York. Edited by Elmar Ojaste. 288 pages.

Treatment of contents (maximum 40)	34
<i>Generally well written and edited, with good use of illustrations and tables. Most articles are in several languages, or at least have multilingual summaries. Not all articles are at the same level of clarity and technical soundness.</i>	
Originality, significance and depth of research (maximum 40)	32
<i>This journal is a critical source for Estonian philately, and contains much original material. This particular issue has several articles reprinted from other sources; also not all of the material is philatelic (some numismatics, some errinophil items). A single journal issue of course does not have the depth of the recent Handbook of Estonian Philately, although it must be remembered that much of the material in the handbook was originally developed within the pages of the journal.</i>	
Technical matters (maximum 15)	14
Presentation (maximum 5)	4
<i>Occasional weakness in offset reproduction, affecting the legibility of illustrated covers and documents.</i>	
Total:	84 (= Vermeil)

Please note that the comments above are meant to suggest the mental process used in reaching a "numerical" evaluation. Two aspects of that thought process are worth stressing.

First, judges should look first for the positive aspects of the exhibits, rather than merely looking to see "how many points can I take off".

Second, all evaluations have to be made on a comparative basis with respect to what else has been published on that subject, how well similar matters are handled in other publications, even such questions as how significant a given publication may be for one country or language group as compared with others. These comparative factors can all change from one year or one exhibition to another, and it's conceivable that such changes may affect the evaluation of an exhibit.