

Chuck Moo for example, and buy off his list? It may be the paper money and coins. I can go down the list of the items that I think Mr. Smith is likely missing. For example, the \$2 lemon yellow booklet, the 10-cent imperf, the \$10 on glazed paper, the missing colors and the double-color printing varieties. How many of these were in the exhibit?

The exhibit says "past and present," as well as "featuring the Machins." So the Machins were there and then more modern stuff was included to show the "present" part. Now I see what Wallace's critique was leading to. Mr. Smith admitted that if he was "to eliminate the pages in question would have taken away about 1/4 of the 'Prestige Booklet' portion which was an intricate part of the entire exhibit." So Mr. Smith used one booklet from the post office, tore out the pages (there were 3 souvenir sheets plus many pages of text) and stuck these on pages to make "an intricate part of the entire exhibit." Anyone reading this should see a problem.

What I can surmise is this is an exhibit with mint stamps only, pages cutout from booklets, with Scott numbers, plus some paper money and coins. Where is the story? The judges gave this a silver, which is much higher than what I would give, but I am sure that the judges rated "encouraging an exhibitor" a much higher priority at a local show. I wonder if this exhibit would even get accepted in a local show in Hong Kong.

Mr. Smith made the statement "I don't collect covers," as a defense for not including them. But he is therefore picking his own poison, without the use of covers in an exhibit, the exhibitor is generally forfeiting the chance of getting a higher medal. HK Machin covers are so cheap that most cannot even be sold as individuals on Ebay. You have to put 2 or 3 in a lot to get a \$5 starting bid. I am wondering to who Mr. Smith was referring to when he wrote, "I wonder when the last time was that he priced covers with stamps of QV." I can show Mr. Smith HK QV covers and cards I bought on Ebay that were all between \$25 and \$75.

Whether Mr. Smith leaves the hobby is his own business. It is perhaps more his loss than ours.

Sam Chiu  
Toronto, Ontario

#### Written Critiques

To The Editor,

A recent letter authored by Mr. James Burgess was reprinted from the May, 2000 American Philatelist in the July 2000 TPE. It described a handwritten, one page critique with 23 comments given to an exhibitor by a judge when circumstances prevented the agreed upon commentary at the frames. This judge went over and above what we normally expect. Mr. Burgess's letter goes on to describe five

points in support of written critiques.

After considerable thought, this incident leads me to ask: Can we fairly expect more from our judges? Do we have the right to written critiques? Perhaps, but we must also remember that judges provide direct feedback as a matter of courtesy. I know of no rule saying a judge is obligated to provide information outside the critique to anyone.

Written critiques sound like a nice idea, but they demand more time from jurors, especially one like that described above. So, how might we implement such a practice without undue pressure on jury members as they're already under time constraints. One possibility might be to list some typical criticisms on the evaluation sheet's reverse side which could give the exhibitor a general direction. It might even be an option reserved for medal levels of 'silver' and below.

Perhaps something akin to the following (a few used points as a quick example):

Class: Thematic

The Area: Presentation

Points for area: 10 points

Criteria: Description for area here

Sample Problems: Lettering is difficult to read (increase size)

Missing Philatelic text descriptions

Missing Thematic text descriptions

Handwriting illegible

Samples for other areas: Development of the theme can be deeper. Material condition could be better. Make philatelic knowledge more evident. Too much 'philatelically inspired' material. More personal research would help.

The presentation, philatelic and thematic element areas would each have general comments related to the area and a check box. A blank area on the form's face already provides an area for written commentary; most likely from the judges' notes should they deem it necessary to write a few lines.

The benefit - time to mark a box is minimal and can be done while making notes at the frames. The boxes may be used as reminders during jury discussions and perhaps the critique itself. A final evaluation sheet has consensus items marked. Checking boxes eliminates the need to write long notes on these points, minimizing time on basics and generalities and maximizing time for detailed review.

The drawback - this method may give the impression that only these general points were judged. In reality, many additional factors are considered which are not general in nature, but oriented to the specific subject of the exhibit. The subject related comments should comprise the meat of the critique unless there are some basic flaws which demand attention.

I often find it revealing to return to an exhibit several weeks after completing it. I

lay the exhibit aside and send a photocopy to a reviewer like the AAPE review committee. When the copy returns, I've not been immersed in the subject for some time, so I get a fresh view and usually a better appreciation for the comments provided by the reviewer. It's also a hard copy and I can review it at my leisure more than once and not forget any particular point.

How many times have we asked a judging panel, "Could you please comment on frames xxx?" without any idea of how we might use our single question to best advantage. If exhibitors view their sheets before the critique, grasp the fundamentals and ask a question aimed at a specific problem, additional notes can be made to expand their understanding of the comment box checked.

Mr. Burgess's letter goes on to indicate that juries should be held accountable even to the degree of filling written critiques and reviewing them at any later date. I don't believe that system would be beneficial and wouldn't be surprised to see a stampede of judges hanging up their credentials - telling the rest of us to look after our own critiques.

So, after the above, a few basic questions seem to be in order:

1) How much more complicated would check boxes make judging?

2) Would exhibitors appreciate 'basic criticism' on paper, getting specifics verbally?

3) If so, what comments would be most useful in which areas?

This is not an original idea. Europeans have used this type of sheet for many years - but it might save time with general feedback and give the exhibitor something to take home for review.

I've asked questions that can't be answered easily, but this solution is an interesting option that has been of assistance to exhibitors in other countries. We should also explore ways to implement a simple method to provide basic information an exhibitor can expand upon and retain.

Francis Adams  
San Diego, CA

(Editor's Note: People who want/need an extensive detailed critique are invited to utilize the AAPE Critique Service. See address to request forms and information on page 4).

Contact The TPE Editor  
To Inquire About The  
Advertising Manager's Position