Fault lines of the Falklands

*Ralph Riddell-Carre has released the second part of his analysis of Falkland Island flaws - slightly modified in the light of Bruce Davies’s Lightning Conductor flaw discovery on a Gilbert & Ellice 1d, (announced in our Stop Press feature of April). Here is the report.*


As I said in part one of my research update the only sure way to identify when a plate is used in an individual printing is by that plate’s known constant flaws. Although the colours of most of the Falkland Islands (FI) printings differ the differences cannot always be easily distinguished both because after seventy five years the colour may not be quite what it was when the stamp was first issued and also because there is a degree of colour variation within individual printings. Malcolm Barton wrote an article in The Upland Goose (UG) Volume XVII No.7 at page 205 on the subject of the printings. In this article he described the colours of the printings that can be separately identified by colour. I have great difficulty identifying and describing colours so with Malcolm’s permission I have adopted his descriptions.

There are two printings of the 1d which are relatively easy to separate. The frame of the first is in what Malcolm describes as a
narrow range of scarlet while that of the second, much smaller printing, is in a carmine red shade. On my examples the Vignette (centre of the stamp) is a paler slate in the second printing. Care needs to be taken in identifying the second printing because the colour of some of the scarlet stamps in the first printing has darkened and could be confused with the carmine of the second printing.

The two printings of the 2½d cannot be distinguished apart by their colour.

There are three printings of the 4d. It is relatively easy to distinguish the first printing from the two later printings but the two later printings are very similar and cannot be distinguished apart by colour. Here it is the colour of the vignette that is different. The first printing is green while the two later printings are quite different being pale yellow-green.

There are four printings of the 1/- which can with difficulty be separated by the colour of the frame. That said the first and third printings and the second and fourth printings are catalogued together in the specialized stamp catalogue of the Falkland Islands and Dependencies published by Stefan Heijtz (Heijtz catalogue). Although to my untutored eye I would say the first and second printings both of which are shades of purple and the third and fourth printings which are redder and are shades of maroon would be a better pairings.

The first printing of the 1/- is purple. The second printing is darker, more of a blackish purple which Malcolm describes as closer to plum. The third printing when compared to the first printing is more of a reddish shade described by Malcolm as deep mauve. The final (fourth) printing is redder than the other printings and is described by Malcolm as deep magenta. This shade is a long way from the original purple of the first printing. An alternative guide to the colour of the third and fourth printings of the 1/- might be maroon and reddish maroon respectively.

Below is a detail of the vignette. I have identified different parts of Windsor Castle so that it is easier to describe where the flaws are located.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Windsor Castle landmarks on vignette plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Home Park Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Brunswick Tower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bradbury, Wilkinson & Co. Ltd. (BW) used six “plate sets” each made up of two panes of sixty impressions to print the vignettes. Each Colony had four frame plates, one for each denomination. The guillotined sixty impression plates are commonly identified by a numeric developed by John Cooper and others. Thus for example BW plate set 5 is known as Plates 1 and 3. Throughout the rest of this article I shall refer to plates by the numeric ascribed to them by John Cooper. I believe the vignette printing was colour specific rather than Colony specific. I say this both because it is a more efficient approach and also because it explains why there appear to be so few Plate 7/8 examples for the three higher values of the FI issue. BW would have printed a quantity of deep blue vignettes which, inter alia, were suitable for the Gilbert & Ellis Islands (GE) 1½d and the FI 1d. Once printed these vignettes would have been stored until it was time to add the frames. These would have been added after the double panes had been guillotined into sheets of sixty impressions. I am not sure whether the guillotining took place before the panes went into store or after they came out immediately before the frames were added. On balance I think it more likely that it was post storage which would mean wastage apart; there will be an equal number of each of the two plates making up the vignette printed double panes that have frames added.

Gilbert and Ellice Islands was the first Colony to be printed. The printing took place between 12 December and 19 December 1934. This was the only printing for this Colony. Falkland Islands was the second Colony to be printed. The printing took place between 19 December and 28 December 1934 so immediately after the GE printing was completed. Until recently it was thought that both the GE and the FI first printing were completed using Plates 5, 6, 7 and 8A. A recent discovery of a lightning conductor flaw on a GE 1d means that some part of the GE printing was completed using Plates 1 and 3. There is no evidence to show that plates other than Plates 5, 6, 7 and 8A were used to complete the FI first printing but it has to be remembered that all twelve plates were being used by BW at the time, that plates when they were first used were likely to be free of flaws and that the only way to identify a plate is by its known constant flaws.
Vignette flaws are specific to a plate whereas frame flaws are specific to a denomination. They each occur on the stamp in the same position on the relevant plate/denomination (constant flaws). Cooper’s research concludes that the flaws are scratches caused by debris on the plate scratching the plate during the process of removal of excess ink. He reports having seen a GE Plate 6 sheet without any vignette flaws which suggests that when the plates were first used they were flaw free. See also my comments in my earlier article (UG Vol. XXI1 No. 4) on Cooper’s research on when the extra flagstaff variety first appeared. This allows one to conclude that the flaws were created as part of the printing process and that any flaw that is known to exist on GE stamps is likely to also exist on the FI first printing as this followed immediately after the GE printing. It is possible, however, that the plate scratch causing a vignette flaw could become less obvious or disappear all together as printing progressed due to general wear and tear absorbing the scratch into the plate.

Below I discuss the flaws which I have classified as major being those that have achieved catalogue status; minor being those which I believe should be considered for inclusion in the next edition of the Heijtz catalogue and insignificant being flaws that are very small and/or difficult to see even when using a magnifying glass but are never the less constant flaws. The vignette flaws are plate specific but in some cases have not been reported as existing on all four denominations of the FI issue. As I have said above it is possible that general wear and tear could lead to the plate scratch being absorbed into the plate.

I have included illustrations of the flaws discussed in this article. Five of these are reproduced from Edmund Chamber’s detailed study of the Gibraltar Silver Jubilee issue - “Gibraltar - Collecting King George V 1935 Silver Jubilee Issue”. I am very much indebted to Edmund for permitting me to use copies of some of his illustrations in this article.

Before discussing each printing let me deal first with the one major frame flaw. This is described in the Heijtz catalogue as re-entry on value tablet and it occurs at position 43 (R8/1) on every sheet of the 2½d including on the specimen stamps. This is the most common of the major flaws with 1658 examples possibly existing. It is however rare on specimen stamps with only seven examples possibly existing.

Figure 1 illustrates a normal stamp which can be compared with Figure 2 which illustrates the re-entry.
The First Printing

This printing was dispatched to FI on 14 January 1935. It was the largest of the four FI printings. The stamps went into Treasury stock from Crown Agents on 28 March 1935 and initial issues were made to the South Georgia, Fox Bay and Stanley Post Offices on 28 March 1935, 17 April 1935 and 4 May 1935 respectively. Further issues were made from Treasury stock to the three Post Offices as required. The stamps went on sale on 7 May 1935 which is the official first day of issue. Some covers are known with 6 May 1935 cancellations including one addressed to His Majesty King George V (UG Vol. XXII No. 1). It had been the intention to issue the stamps on 6 May 1935, the date of King George V’s Silver Jubilee, but when Jubilee Day (6 May 1935) was declared a bank holiday FI, like the United Kingdom, issued the stamps on 7 May 1935.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Heijtz catalogue description</th>
<th>Number of sheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Deep Blue and Scarlet</td>
<td>2564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½d</td>
<td>Brown and Deep Blue</td>
<td>1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Green and Indigo</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First day covers from both Fox Bay and South Georgia are reasonably scarce because not many stamps were initially issued to them. Fox Bay were issued with 1240 1d stamps, 232 2½d stamps, 100 4d stamps and 360 1/- stamps. South Georgia were issued with 2000 1d stamps, 3968 2½d stamps, 500 4d stamps and 240 1/- stamps.

The only plates that have been identified as being used to produce the first printing are Plates 5, 6, 7 and 8A.

Plate 5 has one major flaw and no minor or insignificant flaws. The major flaw occurs on all values at position 37 (R7/1). It is described in the Heijtz catalogue as turret flagstaff. It is a vertical hairline arising from the left side of the Curfew Tower. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 3.

Plate 6 has one major, three minor and one insignificant flaw.

The major and two of the minor flaws occur on all values at positions 26 (R5/2), 20 (R4/2) and 14 (R3/2). The hairline that causes the flaw starts at the base of the flagstaff on the stamp at R5/2. On this stamp it is described as double flagstaff in the Heijtz catalogue. It is a vertical hairline above the Round Tower just to the left of the flagstaff which runs from the tower up through the “S” of ISLANDS and beyond. It is most visible running parallel to the flagstaff and in the sky between the tower and the word ISLANDS. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 4. It continues through the stamp immediately above, R4/2, where it is very clear in the water as illustrated in Figure 5 and also in the sky above the flagstaff as illustrated in Figure 6. On this stamp the hairline runs so close to the flagstaff as to not be separately identifiable. The double flagstaff hairline, R5/2, runs sufficiently to the left of the flagstaff to be clearly visible. From stamp R4/2 the hairline continues into the stamp at R3/2 where it terminates in the water below the castle as illustrated in Figure 7.
The third minor flaw occurs on all four values at position 2 (R1/2) where there is a re-entry on the flagstaff. This is not an easy flaw to identify. If you look at the flagstaff carefully you can see a second shadow flagstaff and flag to the left and also the turret the flag pole is set into appears less clearly defined so looks darker than the normal one. This part of the re-entry is sometimes easier to see than the doubling of the flagstaff. Figure 8 illustrates a normal stamp which can be compared with Figure 9 which illustrates the re-entry.

The insignificant flaw may exist at position 1 (R1/1). It is a vertical hairline arising from the right hand edge of Brunswick Tower. It is likely to be pretty faint so hard to identify.

I do not have an example of this flaw and I am not sure if it exists on the 2½d or 4d. According to the information published by The Silver Jubilee Study Circle the flaw has been reported on both the 1d and 1/-d. It is possible that the flaw is so faint as to be virtually invisible. I have been told by a collector who owns Plate 6 sheets of the 1d and 2½d that he can detect the flaw using a strong magnifying glass on the 1d but not on the 2½d. He describes the flaw as a vertical line spanning 3 horizontal lines. So unlike the Chambers illustrated example quite short and only visible under a strong magnifying glass. I have a top left Plate 6
corner block of the 2½d and cannot detect this flaw. I have recently examined a
top left hand block of the 1d, 2½d and 4d but was unable to detect the flaw on
any of these blocks. In summary my research to date suggests that the flaw may
be present on the 1d and the 1/- but probably does not exist on the 2½d or the 4d.
(See Chambers Figure 1).

There is one other flaw that may exist on FI stamps. This flaw occurs at position 60 (R10/6.). It is a diagonal hairline rising to
the right from the left spire of St. George’s Chapel. To date it has not been recorded on a FI stamp. It is known to exist on the
GE 1½d so it is possible that it exists on FI stamps particularly the 1d value which has the same vignette colour as the GE 1½d.
However, one collector, who owns Plate 6 sheets of the 1d and 2½d, was unable to see this flaw on either value. Illustration not
included.

Plate 7 has three insignificant flaws.

At position 49 (R9/1) there is a small cross between the Curfew Tower and St George’s Chapel. I have an example of this on the
1/-. This is illustrated in Figure 10. I have seen an example on the 4d in a half sheet that was sold at the March 2014 FIPSG
auction. It is also known to exist on the 1d but I have not seen an example. It should exist on the 2½d because Plate 7 should be
present wherever Plate 8A exists.

At positions 52 (R9/4) and 58 (R10/4) there is a vertical hairline arising from the left side of the Winchester Tower. This flaw is
illustrated in Figure 11. The flaw is known to exist on the 1d but to date has not been reported on the other three values. It
should exist on the other three values.

Plate 8 exists in two states commonly described as Plate 8A and Plate 8B. Plate 8A has one minor flaw which is present in rows
one to nine of column 5 and two insignificant flaws. The flaws in column 5 are found on the earlier printings including FI, the Plate 8A printings. The flaws are quite easy to identify and as a result were noticed and rectified so do not exist on the stamps of the later, Plate 8B printings. The two insignificant flaws are common to both states of Plate 8.

The minor flaw in column five is a vertical hairline stretching from the left edge of the Brunswick Tower for the first four rows and then from the right edge of the Brunswick Tower for rows 5 through 9. I believe that, on the 1d, it is the most common flaw of all the Silver Jubilee flaws. Since I started looking at this issue I have seen examples for sale with a number of dealers at Stampex, examples in lots at Grosvenor’s auctions, examples on EBay and a piece with this flaw for sale in the Falkland Islands Philatelic Study Group exchange packet. I have a strip of the final two columns of the 1d Plate 8A. Figures 13 to 21 illustrate the flaw starting at row 1 in figure 13. The flaw does not exist in row 10. You will see from these illustrations that the flaw is clearer on some stamps than others.

I have examples of the flaw on the other three values but my examples on the 4d and 1/- are on single stamps. I am aware of a right hand marginal block of four of the 1/-. To be absolutely certain of the existence of Plate 8A for the 4d I would like to see the flaw in a right hand marginal pair thereby confirming the position of the flawed stamp as being one from column five. I also have an example of this flaw, position 11 (R2/5), on a specimen copy of the 1/-. With the exception of the re-entry on the value tablet found on the 2½d this is the only flaw that has to date been identified on a specimen stamp.
The two insignificant flaws are small and so are difficult to identify.

First at position 6 (R1/6) two small marks within the borders of the spires and one just below the right spire of St. George’s Chapel. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 12 but as can be seen from this illustration the marks are pretty indistinct.

Second at position 49 (R9/1) two small marks within the borders of the spires of St George’s Chapel. (See Chambers Figure 2).

It is a pity that BW did not keep a record of how many sheets were printed using each plate. This was of course of no consequence to them but is of great interest to collectors trying to establish the relative rarity of individual flaws.

In my earlier article I gave no estimate of the number of sheets that might have been produced using Plates 5/6 and Plates 7/8A respectively. I think though that readers might find it useful if I summarize my thoughts on this.

As noted above the Plate 8A flaw is quite common on the 1d value and therefore I believe that a substantial proportion of the printing was completed using Plates 7 and 8A. Possibly as much as one half but my best guess would be at least one quarter even though very few Plate 7 flaws have been identified.

Based on a 75:25 division of Plates 5/6: Plates 7/8A for the printing of the 1d there will be a possible 961 Plate 5/6 flaws and a
possible 321 Plate 7/8A flaws. Remember that the minor Plate 8A flaw exists on nine stamps in column 5 giving 2889 possible examples of this flaw.

As far as the other three values are concerned there do not appear to be many Plate 8A flaws and I would be surprised if there were as many as 10%. Probably less perhaps considerably less for the 4d and 1/-.

If one adopts a 90:10 division of Plates 5/6: Plates 7/8A there would be 79, 44 and 24 Plate 7/8A flaws (which for Plate 8A grossed up by nine gives 708, 386 and 216) for the 2½d, 4d and 1/- respectively and 708, 386 and 216 Plate 5/6 flaws for the 2½d, 4d and 1/- respectively.

These figures may need to be revised as more information comes to hand from continuing research.

The Second Printing

This printing was dispatched to FI on 2 August 1935. The stamps went into Treasury stock from Crown Agents on 28 October 1935 and were issued to the Post Offices on 1 November 1935 and are likely to have gone on sale in Stanley immediately and as soon as they reached Fox Bay and South Georgia. The final issue of the first printing of the 1/- had been made from Treasury stock on 21 August 1935.

Looking at the shipping records the most likely ship to have taken this printing of the 1/- to South Georgia is the S.S.Lafonia. She left Stanley on 10 November and arrived in South Georgia on 15 November which would make this the earliest date that this 1/- might have been used in South Georgia. She then left South Georgia for Stanley on 19 November arriving back in Stanley on 23 November. She next left Stanley on 27 November bound for Montevideo calling on 28 November at Fox Bay on the way. She is likely to have carried these stamps to Fox Bay on that voyage. I think it likely that the S.S.Lafonia would have supplied South Georgia and Fox Bay with such additional copies of the other three values as they required to replenish their stock of Silver Jubilee stamps so that they would have sufficient to meet their needs through to 31 December 1935 when the Silver Jubilee stamps were to be withdrawn from sale.

The printing was completed using Plates 1 and 3 and was of the 1/- value only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Heijtz catalogue description</th>
<th>Number of sheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/-</td>
<td>Slate and purple*</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The colour of this printing of the 1/- is Slate and plum (blackish purple).
Plate 1 has one major, three minor and one insignificant flaw.

The major flaw occurs at position 49 (R9/1). It is described as extra flagstaff in the Heijtz catalogue. It is a short vertical hairline to the left of the Winchester Tower that looks like an extra flagstaff. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 22.

Of all the plate flaws this one has attracted forgers the most so care needs to be taken when buying an example of this quite expensive flaw. Purchasing a positional corner block of four is the best option as the stamps at position 50 and 56 both have minor flaws, see their description below.

The first minor flaw occurs at position 56 (R10/2). There are two parallel hairlines the: first is to the right of the Round Tower and extends up between the “A” and “N” of ISLANDS, the second, which is much fainter, is to the left of the Round Tower and extends up to the right edge of the “F” of FALKLAND. In addition there is a short hairline from the centre (apex) of St. George’s Chapel together with little bird like marks arising from the spires of St. George’s Chapel. These flaws are illustrated in Figure 23 (left hand side of stamp) and Figure 24 (right hand side of stamp).

The second minor flaw occurs in column 2 of rows one to nine. There are two parallel hairlines arising from the State Apartments just to the left of the Round Tower. These hairlines are clearer on some of the stamps, generally the lower rows and may not exist on the first two rows. Also the right hand hairline is clearer than the left hand one. The example of this flaw illustrated in Figure 25 is from the stamp at position 50 (R9/2).

The third minor flaw occurs at position 31 (R6/1) where there are two dots high in the sky between the “F” of FALKLAND and the frame border. (See Chambers Figure 3).

The insignificant flaw occurs at position 46 (R8/4). I have not seen this flaw but it is known to exist. Edmund Chambers describes this flaw as being a vertical hairline just to the right of the left hand frame. (See Chambers Figure 4).

There are four further flaws that may exist that I am still seeking information on. Three of them would be on what is probably the largest known Plate 1 block, being a block of twenty-four from the bottom left of the sheet. I do not know where this block is or even if it still exists but if its owner is reading this article I would like to hear from him.
Plate 3 has one major and two minor flaws.

The major flaw occurs at position 11 (R2/5). It is described as lightning conductor in the Heijtz catalogue. It is a vertical hairline resembling a lightning conductor on the centre (apex) of St. George’s Chapel to the left of the right spire. This is illustrated in Figure 26.

The first minor flaw occurs at position 8 (R2/2). It is two little marks, often described as swans, in the water just to the left of Jacob’s Island. (See Chambers Figure 5).

The second minor flaw occurs at position 50 (R9/2). It is two parallel vertical hairlines arising from either side of Curfew Tower. On my stamp the left hand hairline is quite faint and is only visible in the sky. It does not extend down to the roof of the building. The right hand hairline is clearer and extends up to the bottom of the frame. This is illustrated in Figure 27. As my example is on a single used stamp I have confirmed the existence of this flaw with a member of the Silver Jubilee Study Circle who owns a complete Plate 3 sheet.
The Third and Fourth Printings

The third printing was despatched on 11 November 1935. The stamps went into Treasury stock from Crown Agents on 11 December 1935 and initial issues were made to the Stanley Post Office on 15 December 1935 and are likely to have gone on sale immediately. On 15 December there was fifty sheets of the first printing of the 4d in Treasury stock but all the second printing of the 1/- had been withdrawn and issued to the Post Offices on 1 November 1935. There was a standing instruction that the stamps on hand in Treasury stock should be issued to the post office on a first in first out basis with a view to using up earlier printings first. These fifty sheets of the first printing of the 4d would have been issued together with the first issue from the third printing, which was the second printing of the 4d.

It is likely that this printing was not sent to either South Georgia or Fox Bay as the Silver Jubilee stamps were replaced for regular postal requirements by the Whale & Penguin equivalent stamps on 1 January 1936.

The printing was completed using Plates 2 and 4 and was of the 4d and 1/- values only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Heijtz catalogue description</th>
<th>Number of sheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Pale Yellow-green and Indigo</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/-</td>
<td>Slate and Purple*</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fourth printing was despatched on 24 December 1935. The stamps arrived on 23 January 1936 and went into Treasury stock on 29 January 1936. The 1d and 1/- were issued to the Post Office on the same day, the 2½d was issued to the Post Office on 21 February 1936 and the 4d was issued to the Post Office on 5 February 1936. I think it unlikely that any of the stamps from this printing would have been issued to the Fox Bay or South Georgia Post Offices.

I believe that this printing was produced to satisfy demand from dealers and collectors for the stamps. The issue had been intended to be in use from 6 May 1935 until 31 December 1935. During this period the corresponding denominations of the definitive issue in use (Whale and Penguins) were withdrawn from sale. On 1 January 1936 all residues had been intended to be destroyed. This did not happen in the FI because of the unsatisfied demand for Silver Jubilee stamps from dealers and collectors. Regular sales to satisfy postal requirements did however cease from 31 December 1935 and sales of the corresponding values of the Whale and Penguin issue resumed and replaced the Silver Jubilee issue. Commercially used examples of these two final printings are very scarce and even philatelic used examples of the second printing of the 1d are hard to find.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Heijtz catalogue description</th>
<th>Number of sheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Deep Blue and Carmine-red</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½d</td>
<td>Brown and Deep Blue</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Pale Yellow-green and Indigo</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/-</td>
<td>Slate and Purple*</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The colour of this printing of the 1/- is Slate and deep mauve (maroon).

Plate 2 has one major and three minor flaws.

The major flaw occurs at position 7 (R2/1). It is a short extra flagstaff just to the left of the flagstaff on the Round Tower. It is described as short extra flagstaff in the Heijtz catalogue and is illustrated in Figure 28.

The first minor flaw occurs at position 47 (R8/5). It is a diagonal hairline that extends up from the Round Tower at an angle of
about seventy degrees. On my 1/- it starts just to the right of the flagstaff buttress touches the right hand edge of the “A” in ISLANDS before running through the left hand side of the second “A” in FALKLAND and ending just into the margin above the frame. On my 4d the hairline is fainter and runs at a slightly steeper angle passing through the centre of the “A” in ISLANDS and to the right of the second “A” in FALKLAND. I do not have this flaw on the two lower values. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 29 (1/-).

The second minor flaw occurs at position 48 (R8/6). It is a vertical hairline arising from the State Apartments close to the left hand side of the Round Tower. On the 4d it ascends to the “I” of ISLANDS while on the 1/- its angle of ascent is slightly different as it ascends to the left edge of the “S” of ISLANDS. I do not have this flaw on the two lower values. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 30 (1/-).

The third minor flaw is a recent discovery by Ed Hughes. This flaw occurs at position 20 (R4/2). It is a short, near vertical, hairline extending from the centre of the gable on St. George’s Chapel. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 31.

Plate 4 has five minor and one insignificant flaw.

The first minor flaw occurs at position 21 (R4/3). It is a horizontal dash in the sky between the orb and the “F” of falkland. This
flaw is illustrated in Figure 32.

The second minor flaw occurs at position 56 (R10/2). It is short vertical hairline resembling a lightning conductor above the State Apartments on the low tower midway between the Brunswick Tower and the Round Tower. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 33.

The third minor flaw occurs at position 60 (R10/6). It is a vertical hairline arising from just to the right of the left spire of St. George’s Chapel. This is a little faint on my copy and is likely to be difficult to identify with certainty particularly on single stamps. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 34.

The fourth minor flaw occurs at position 49 (R9/1). It is a continuation of the vertical hairline arising from the right hand edge of Henry III Tower on stamp 55, see immediately below, that runs over the river to finish in the castle wall. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 35.

The fifth minor flaw occurs at position 55 (R10/1). Here there are two parallel hairlines. The left hand one rises from the left edge of the central buttress in the state apartments passing to the left of Falkland Islands and finishing in the margin between stamps 49 (R9/1) and 50 (R9/2). The right hand one rises from the right edge of Henry III Tower passing through the second “A” of FALKLAND and continuing through the frame into stamp 49 as described above. This flaw is illustrated in Figure 36.

The insignificant flaw occurs between positions 49 (R9/1) and 55 (R10/1). It is a short vertical hairline connecting the top right corner of the frame of the stamp at position 55 with the bottom right hand corner of the frame of the stamp at position 49. There is also a horizontal hairline running in the margin between these two stamps. This is illustrated at Figure 37.

These last three flaws are new discoveries. The flaws at positions 49 and 55 definitely exist on the final (December) printings of the 2½d and the 1/- but do not exist on any of the five Plate 4 sheets of the 4d that I and others have examined. This could be because the sheets are all from the November printing as I believe these two flaws developed some time during the December printing. On balance I believe that it is likely that at least one of the 4d sheets will be from the December printing. The December printing of FI stamps was the last BW Silver Jubilee printing. The penultimate printing was Seychelles. To date three of the four Seychelles values have been checked and they do not appear to have either of these two flaws. I am searching for examples of the bottom left hand corner of the 1d from Plate 4 to see if this flaw at position 55 is on this value. The 1d was the first of the four values to be printed in the December printing so it is quite likely that if this flaw does not exist on the 4d it also does not exist on the 1d. If I am correct and these two minor flaws did develop during the final printing the flaw on the 1/- can
only exist on a maximum of 125 stamps. This makes these flaws much scarcer than the other Plate 4 flaws on the 1/- which exist on both the third and fourth printings which means they can exist on a maximum of 308 stamps.

The insignificant flaw joining the stamps at positions 49 and 55 exists on the 4d sheets but on my sheet slightly further to the left. This suggests this flaw is present in the November printing as well as the December printing.

Some of these flaws are very expensive to purchase and are much prized by collectors. They are collected not only by Falkland Islands philatelists but also by those that collect the Silver Jubilee issue of King George V. I have set out a table below showing how the Heijtz catalogue prices, in pounds sterling, for mint examples of the major flaws have risen over the last twenty five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turret flagstaff - 1d</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2½d</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4d</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1/-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double flagstaff</td>
<td>-1d</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2½d</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4d</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1/</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra flagstaff</td>
<td>- 1/</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightning conductor</td>
<td>- 1/</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short extra flagstaff</td>
<td>- 1d</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2½d</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4d</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1/</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-entry on value tablet</td>
<td>- 2½d</td>
<td>not priced</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I hope this article encourages you all to examine your collection of Silver Jubilee stamps to see if you have any of the constant flaws. I have mentioned throughout the article where I have yet to see an example of some of the flaws. If anyone reading this article has an example of any of these flaws I would be most grateful if they would contact me at riddellcarre@sky.com.
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