

THE SO-CALLED RE-ISSUES OR REPRINTS OF HAWAII, 5c AND 13c, 1853 TYPE.

By HENRY J. CROCKER, F. R. P. S.

Gibbons' Stamp Weekly, October 16th, printed my reply to the particular attention paid these stamps in a review of my work on "Hawaiian Numerals" by Major E. B. Evans in the June 26th issue. Commenting on this last article where I substantiated the claim that these stamps were regularly issued he says:

"There is one statement in the article which, if it can be shown to be correct would settle the matters at once and render all further argument superfluous." It is as follows: "Mr. Wm. G. Irwin saw Postmaster Brickwood deface the plates, and he states he was in the postoffice employ at the time. Mr. Irwin tells me he left the postoffice in the latter part of the year 1865, so we know from this the plates were destroyed in 1865."

As I am able to assure him that the statement is true, I will detail the matter later on in this article. It would seem as if catalogues would reinstate these from now on. The statement did not appear for the first time in the above article, but in "Hawaiian Numerals," and recognizing its importance I took care to have it approved. Major Evans is not clear on some other points, so I will endeavor to review them.

The early stamps of Hawaii have proven a prolific source of controversy for the past forty-five years. The contentions, doubts and theories advanced were caused by the absence of postal records. The 2c Missionary, now one of the rarest stamps known, was doubted; some of the Numerals were classed as reprints for years. The 2c engraved was said to have been issued in 1855, although it was not ordered until 1861. The 5c Numeral interisland, was not accepted as a regular issue for thirty years after it appeared, and the stamps under discussion "which" as J. N. Luff says, "Had long been accepted as having been prepared and issued for postal purposes" were in 1900 classed as reprints in an article written by L. Hanciau. A strong protest was at once entered by students of these stamps, although later, as Major Evans says, Mr. J. N. Luff became convinced as to his side of the question.

The additional information brought out at the time, however, was an aid to the final solution, and thus after ten years more of research, I feel rewarded with the result.

During this time I met and consulted with W. G. Irwin, the former postoffice clerk, and the author of the letters quoted by L. Hanciau; by him I was introduced to Alva K. Clark, Postmaster General from 1859 to 1863. I also met Wm. M. Giffard who wrote a book on the early stamps. With new information gathered, and with old data placed in order, I have succeeded in proving that the so-called reissues were regularly ordered for postoffice needs as was the case with all the issues prior to 1866, although we have no postal records of many of these stamps. (See Giffard page 3.)

I found a sequence of events in writing up the Numerals showing their relationship with the orders placed for stamps in the United States, and for the purpose of removing some other doubts expressed by Major Evans, I will relate the events as I gather them which took place in Hawaiian Postal affairs from the 19th day of September 1864

to the 1st day of June 1866, the end of my researches.

During this period of twenty months and twelve days, the following stamps were ordered:

The 5c 1853 Type (4th requisition).
The 13c 1853 Type (2nd requisition).
The 5c Hawaiian Postage Numeral (1st requisition).
The 2c engraved (2nd requisition).
The 5c engraved (1st requisition).
The 2c and 1c Hawaiian Numeral (plates XVIII & XVII).
The 5c Numerals "Interisland" error (1st requisition).
The 2c engraved (3rd requisition).
The 5c engraved (2nd requisition).

By comparing orders for stamps previous to and succeeding this period an extraordinary confusion of affairs is proven.

The plates for the 1853 type were ordered by H. M. Whitney at a time when he was running the postoffice at his own expense. His requisition for the 5c stamps lasted him three years (1853-1856).

He supplied the succeeding Postmaster Jackson with a new lot which lasted him four years (1857-1860 inclusive).

Postmaster Clark who succeeded Jackson consulted Whitney, and obtained a new lot which lasted four years (1861-1864 inclusive) at which time Kalakaua was in office and ran short of them. That he followed custom and consulted Whitney for a new lot, and included an order for 13c stamps, is shown by subsequent events.

On the date mentioned above, Sept. 19th, 1864, Postmaster Kalakaua wrote Postmaster Perkins, San Francisco, U. S. A. acknowledging his letter giving the new rates established by the United States as being 10 cents the single rate of ½ oz. or under. Kalakaua published this rate throughout the Islands and sent a copy to Perkins. That a grave error was committed is shown by the subsequent correspondence.

At this time Kalakaua was practically out of 5 cent stamps, and totally out of them a few months later. It has been conceded the 5c and 13c were printed at the same time and the above mentioned error could be the reason for ordering the latter. The old ones were still used, although they had become very scarce indeed and were practically obsolete.

Postmaster Perkins received the letter from Kalakaua and replied showing that a mistake had been made. The day the letter was received (Dec. 14, 1864) advertisements were at once placed in the daily paper and circulars were sent to each postoffice announcing the correct rate of three cents. This proved the order for the 13c was unnecessary. The order was evidently not cancelled as it would have taken at least two months for a letter to reach Boston, and the 5c were needed, it having become totally exhausted.

While awaiting this fresh supply from the United States, the postoffice was compelled to resort to the local plates formerly used for the 1c and 2c Numerals. It was fixed up for printing the 5 cent Numeral, copies of which Mr. Irwin sent to Moens in a letter describing his design of the 2c engraved stamp then in use, and which was to supercede the use of the Numerals. Moens had written for some of the old 5c stamps, but Irwin notified him they were out, but he was awaiting a fresh supply from the United States.

Kalakaua refers to his order in his letter of March 6, 1864 to Postmaster Coney at Hilo. He was awaiting a fresh supply from the United States. A careful study at this point of all the material gathered will convince the most skeptical that the only stamp referred to was the 1853 type, and not the 5c engraved which had not been ordered.

Twenty-four days afterward (March 31, 1864) Kalakaua was removed and Postmaster A. P. Brickwood was appointed by Kamehameha V.

It was under this new regime that the 5c engraved was ordered by Brickwood, April 26th, 1865. It was as follows:

The design was to be exactly the same as the 2c which had proved satisfactory. The features in the center, however, were to be those of the new King Kamehameha V, instead of Kamehameha IV, and "five" was to be inserted in place of "two" cents. This was all faithfully carried out.

Major Evans says:

"In regard to the date at which the 5c stamps with portrait of Kamehameha V first reached Hawaii, I would draw attention to the following facts. Mr. Giffard's book states distinctly that the first requisition for these was dated '26th April, 1865, and the delivery made August 31st, 1865.' If this is correct it is sufficient to prove, as I pointed out in the *Monthly Journal* for March 1901, that there must have been previous correspondence on the subject of the die and plate for this 5c stamp, and that it may well have been the stamp that was being looked forward to in February, 1865. I showed at the same time that in the case of the 2c, which was produced by the same engravers, correspondence commenced on November 4th, 1864, and the first requisition was dated January 23rd, 1864. A requisition for 5c stamps would not have been made before any design or die had been approved, and it is fair to assume that the plate of the 5c was known to be ready before the requisition of April 26th, 1865, was despatched.

"It is now suggested (contrary to Mr. Giffard's statements, supposed to have been founded upon official records) that the stamps delivered in August 1865, were not the 2c and 5c ordered in the previous April, but the 5c and 13c of the Boston type supposed to have been ordered nearly twelve months previously, by a requisition of which no one can find any trace, and which I still believe never existed."

The answer is:

Giffard now states that he evidently made an error in saying these stamps arrived in 1865 as he is convinced they did not arrive until 1866.

J. N. Luff never did accept this date as being of the arrival of the stamps at Honolulu, but suggests that is the date the stamps were turned over to the New York Agents.

L. Hanciau says they did not arrive until April or May 1866, and Major Evans calls attention that they were mentioned for the first time in *Le Timbre-Poste* June 15, 1866. My statement that they arrived in May or June 1866 was taken from what was accepted dates. I think they arrived at the Islands at the time mentioned by Hanciau and so stated. (See H. N. page 71.) However, Major Evans' assumption that the plates were ready before the order was placed could not be cor-

rect, as the order was not placed in the engravers' hands until June 22nd, 1865 with the above instructions which surely called for no proof under the circumstances.

It took Brickwood's letter fifty-six days to reach the engraver, and it was a physical impossibility for the stamps to be engraved, printed, perforated and shipped to reach the islands by August 31st—sixty-four days. Giffard was convinced he was wrong on this showing, and stated that it was not the habit to require proofs for stamps on account of the distance to be covered.

Major Evans also asks: "When were the stamps requisitioned in April 1865 delivered, if not in the following August?"

"They were delivered in 1866, and if they had been delivered sooner, Brickwood would not have had to resort to the numeral plate for 2 cent stamps to supply a shortage caused by the non-arrival of this April requisition.

He had the plates used by Kalakaua taken apart and set for 2 cent stamps, although Irwin had stated no more would ever be printed. A lot of 1c stamps were printed at the same time after necessary changes in the cliches were made. The non-arrival of the April requisition forced Brickwood to resort to the plates again to supply 5c stamps, for the ones ordered by Kalakaua had become exhausted. This was the error "Interisland." The printer forgot to take out the words "Interisland" which had been placed there when the 2c and 1c stamps were printed.

Major Evans says it is difficult to account for these orders of numerals, if Brickwood had received a stock of 5c stamps from Boston. There has been no claim made that Brickwood received the Kalakaua stamps prior to these orders being placed, but when he did receive the stamps ordered by Kalakaua through Whitney, soon after he complained about the cost of carriage as the plates came with them and that he defaced the plates at the time.

The whole question is boiled down by Major Evans as to the time when this happened and whether Brickwood ever ordered any stamps from these plates.

He would have had to order them at

this period for the stamps came with the plates, or he would have had to send the plates back to Boston to have reprints or reissues made.

We have the evidence of William M. Giffard, his son-in-law, that Brickwood had told him he never at any time ordered any stamps from these plates.

Giffard said if Brickwood had ordered any of these stamps the records would show, but as stated in his book they were regularly ordered prior to Brickwood's time, and he so classed them in his book. He mentions that when the plates were destroyed, the 5c and 13c original issue (see page 9) were laid away and a year or two later overprinted "specimen." He also refers to two original orders for 13c stamps. When comparing the color with the reprints see page 9, and he lists them on page 4 as

13c light red.

13c dark red.

That Whitney had to do with the order—that Brickwood had to pay for them, and that they were sold through the postoffice at face value both before and after being overprinted, are recognized facts; that they were not on sale during 1866 and 1867 is accounted for by a statement made in 1872 that they probably were laid away in bulk, and a statement made in 1893 coming direct from the Postmaster that they were laid away for several years.

Mr. Wm. G. Irwin made the statement referred to by Major Evans in the presence of three other persons beside myself

He had become much interested in my book on Hawaiian Numerals for I had written him and also asked him many questions regarding early postal affairs. While talking Numerals one day, I asked him about the letters he had written J. B. Moens in 1864-5. He had forgotten them, but asked to be shown copies of them to refresh his memory. I sent him L. Hanciau's article. Some weeks later he asked me to dine with him and bring my manuscript on numerals with me. During the evening he pictured to me his design of the 2 cent and the reason for it. I asked him about the 5c and 13c stamps and spoke of the destruction of the plates by Postmaster

Brickwood. "Yes," said he, "I remember that well," and suiting his actions to the remark by raising his hands in the act of striking. "I remember the old man defacing them with a hand axe."

I told him this statement was of utmost importance as evidence, and while my book was concerned with Numerals alone, this statement of his would confirm the idea of writing a special chapter on these stamps. (See footnote, page 73, H. N.) I asked him particularly if he was still in the postoffice when he saw this done, and he stated he was and that he had quit the office late in 1865.

When "Hawaiian Numerals" was published I took a copy to him and asked him if he would read it carefully with particular regard to the statements made as emanating from him. He took the book and said he would go over it carefully and let me know. He was shortly afterwards called to the Islands and it was nearly two months before he wrote the letter dated July 10th, 1909 from which I quote:

"I have had your book in my room and have carefully read it over, and I do not see any of your statements regarding the past postal affairs of the Hawaiian Islands to which I could take exception."

Mr. Irwin is one of the wealthiest men in the Islands. He is President of the Mercantile Trust Company of San Francisco. His word is unimpeachable.

Walter M. Giffard came to San Francisco in June. He had read my book. When I looked him up he was much interested and corroborated the statements I have made as far as he was concerned. He says that Wonderberg found the defaced plates many years later (1887) and sent them to New York, but they were too badly defaced so a new plate was made from which the reprints were issued in 1889, and Postmaster General Hill had them marked reprint in black.

The catalogues still list these stamps as issued in 1864 (see Kohl, Senf, Scott) but I think the words reissues, etc., should be eliminated and all catalogues should from now on list the early Hawaiians in their order of production as shown in Hawaiian Numerals, pages 78, 79 and 80.—*Gibbons Weekly*.