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## SELECTED HIGHLIGHTS FROM SPINK AMERICA'S APRIL 9, 1998 NEW YORK PUBLIC AUCTION WHICH REALIZED IN EXCESS OF ONE MILLION DOLLARS



US no. 22, used, Scott $\$ 375$
realized $\$ 1,265$


US no. 96, o.g., l.h., Scott \$1,750 realized $\$ 4,025$


US no. 63b, o.g., l.h., Scott \$450 realized $\$ 1,840$


US no. 315
Schermack Private Vending
Machine Coil type II, o.g.,
Scott $\$ 3,500$, realized $\$ 10,350$


US no. 67, used, Scott $\$ 660$ realized $\$ 1,725$


US no F1, n.h, Scott $\$ 110$
realized $\$ 552$

## Other Realizations Include:

US no. 136 1.h. realized $\$ 1,150$, US no. 154 used realized $\$ 552$, US no. 211D ex. Lilly realized $\$ 13,800$, US no. 233a n.h. fine realized $\$ 15,525$, US no. 239 block of eight, dist. OG realized $\$ 2,415$, US no. 245 l.h. realized $\$ 5,175$, US no. 437 plate block l.h. realized $\$ 1,800$, US no. 480 plate block n.h. realized
$\$ 5,750$, US no. 20 on cover to Italy realized $\$ 978$
PLUS strong prices for additional US classic stamps and postal history, as
well as intact US and Worldwide collections and accumulations.

You have spent considerable financial resources building your collection. When you have decided to sell your holdings, please allow us to present your stamps and postal history in one of our magnificent and extremely attractive auction catalogues. We offer reasonable commissions and provide prompt settlement 35 days after the auction. For inquires, please call Brian Bleckwenn.
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# Looking for a professional who shares your passion for collecting? <br> <br> Glad to meet you. 

 <br> <br> Glad to meet you.}

Our clients sometimes wonder why we get so excited about a superb stamp, a rare cancellation, or an unusual cover.

The answer? We love stamps.

In fact, if we weren't America's premier stamp auctioneers, we would probably be America's premier stamp collectors.

Each auction is like our own collection. We hunt for the best material. We carefully present it in one of our awardwinning catalogues. And when it's done, we get to start again!

So, how can our passion benefit you?

Think about it. In any field, the best professionals have it in their blood.


Sports, music, medicine...stamps.

When you want the best, you want someone who loves
what they do, because their enthusiasm and experience will work for you.

Sure, there are stamp firms who can do the job by the book. But the philatelists at Siegel have something the other guys don't.

Passion.


AUCTION GALLERIES, INC.

For information about our auctions or to request a copy of the next sale catalogue and newsletter, please write to: Robert A. Siegel Auction Galleries, Inc. (Dept. CS) 65 East 55th Street, New York, NY 10022.
Telephone (212) 753-6421. Fax (212) 753-6429.

## Unusual 19th century U.S. Postal History Usages: Colonial to 1875



Minnesota Territory. 1857 usage with steam cancel and cameo for Fuller House

Specific areas of strength to include:

Colonial Mail
War of 1812
Ship Mail
Unusual Rates
Unusual Stampless
3ct. 1851-57 Usages

## Classic RR

Foreign Destinations
Steam Markings
BNA Cross Border Ad Covers
Other Unusual Usages

Searches for particular areas are gladly undertaken
Approvals are gladly sent to classic society members per a want list

Please send your requests to: Brad Sheff
P.O. Box 246

Northfield, VT 05663
(802) 485-8239
http://www.bradsheff.com


# DUE 6 CENTS <br> JAMES W. MILGRAM, M.D. 

Stamp collecting began as a hobby of studying and saving stamps, usually off cover. Over the last 60-70 years collectors have established a number of specific paths along which to develop their collections. The pure path is still to collect stamps, but this has branched into forming collections that show the creation of a stamp design with proofs and essays, and then unusual pieces such as multiples, shades and other varieties. More recently, such collections also show representative usages of the stamps both off and on cover. Foreign destinations of stamps on cover have become very popular.

This has paralleled a development of collecting specialized postal usages which has been labeled broadly as postal history. For instance, one can collect maritime postal markings with sub-categorization of different time periods, geographic locations, different countries, and specific wars. There also has been a tremendous growth in collecting items from a specific location such as one state, one county, or even one city or town.

However, although this type of collecting makes a lot of sense and defines the field of the individual collector to his or her financial means, it is just one way to collect. Although not popular with collectors of the classic period, topical collecting is attractive to certain persons. There is a fine collection of Benjamin Franklin material and several collections of Abraham Lincoln philately, but philatelic pigs, nudes and coal mining have also proven to be reasonable collecting interests. Illustrated envelopes have become a very popular sub-specialty.

This writer presented another way of categorizing postal markings (not an original idea) in an installment article that showed U.S. postmarks containing a county or postmaster's name over a long time span including all states, even Confederate States of America usages [The Chronicle of the Classic U.S. Postal Issues, Nos. 149-154, 1991-1992]. The present article is another subject that cuts across many time periods and different stamp issues. The idea is to take a specific postal marking, such as a rate marking, and show different usages in various time periods. When I first dreamed this up, I had no idea how interesting some of the usages could be. I picked the unpaid $6 \not \subset$ rate because there were many different usages over a long period of time.

## Unpaid 1792 Postage Rate Under 30 Miles

Although there are covers showing " 6 " numeral rates during the Colonial period, these rates are in pence, not cents. The rates of 1710 established a six pence rate for a distance of 60-100 miles. This rate was repeated in the 1765 laws. Postage can also be indicated as pennyweights (dwt) of silver. Albany, New York, had a straight line marking including the six pennyweight postal charge in 1789.

The Act of February 20, 1792, which became effective June 1, 1792, established the rate for a single sheet letter carried not over 30 miles to be $6 \phi$. While this rate could be paid by the sender, at that time in the Eighteenth Century the majority of letters was sent unpaid. Therefore, this is the first U.S. due $6 \not \subset$ rate. This rate was in effect until 1799 when the minimum postal rate was raised to $8 \not \subset$ for a single letter not over 40 miles.

The earliest possible usage for the $6 \not \subset$ rate would be a cover postmarked June 1, 1792. At that time most postal markings were handwritten (manuscript), although larger towns had handstamped straight line postmarks showing the town's name and sometimes the month and day dating (year dating was rare). No town had handstamped rating marks although "FREE" and "PAID" handstamps were used at certain locations.

At Figure 1 is a Colonial cover from New York to Philadelphia with an interesting


Figure 1. Stampless cover "NY dwt 6" to George Thomas, Governor [not Lieutenant Governor] of Colonial Pennsylvania


Figure 2. "Way 6" on 1794 river mail cover to Poughkeepsie, New York


Figure 3. "RICHMOND AUG. 6. 1798" fancy straight line with year date, rated "Wy 6" to ship captain at City Point, Virginia


Figure 4. Philadelphia " 6 " ship fee on letter from Savannah, Georgia in 1807
$c$


Figure 5. War rate of " 9 " indicated by inverted " 6 " in circle at Philadelphia; inset shows marking on reverse of cover "PAID WITHDRAWN SHIP LETTER LONDON 9 JY 9 1815" reflecting payment of ship letter fee at London


Figure 6. "Telegraph * $H^{*}$ Coffin *" red vessel-named marking for transatlantic ship usage, rated "6" at Philadelphia in 1817


Figure 7. The Boston ship marking, red "SHIP" in banner with " 6 " rating, 1826 usage


Figure 8. Red " 6 " in circle at New York on ship letter from New Orleans, May 26, 1831
address to the Colonial Governor of Pennsylvania (1738-1747). It is rated " 6 dwt" as due from "the Honorable George Thomas." Figure 2 shows a cover carried on the Hudson River from New York to Poughkeepsie where it was rated $6 \not \subset$ due. Because it was given to a mail carrier, it is also marked "Way," but there is no way fee charge to the addressee. Figure 3 shows a cover with "RICHMOND AUG 6 1798" straightline in fancy frame with manuscript "Wy 6 ," another very early way marking with no increased charges.

## 6¢ Ship Rate to Port of Entry

The Act of March 2, 1799 that changed the domestic postal rates also established a $6 \notin$ postal rate for a letter carried by a ship into a port city and delivered at that post office. This was a part of a rating structure that gave the ship's captain $2 \not \subset$ for each letter delivered to the post office at the port city. Letters addressed to other cities beyond the port were charged the ship fee, $2 \phi$, plus regular postage. The rates for these services under the Act of February 20, 1792, had been $4 \phi$ for a letter delivered at the port of entry and $4 \notin$ plus postage for a ship's letter going beyond the port. Thus the ship rate in 1799 was increased at the port city but lowered for other destinations.

Except for a little over a year in 1815-1816 when all rates were increased $50 \%$, this charge of $6 \phi$ remained intact until the Act of February 27, 1861 changed the rate to $5 \phi$. On June 30,1863 the ship fee was changed to double the regular postage rate, which would be $6 \notin$ to another city and $4 \notin$ to port of entry.

Philadelphia used a small elongated " 6 " within a circle that was applied in the distinctive reddish ink used in other Philadelphia postmarks. A cover from Havarnak, January 30, 1802 addressed to a merchant in Philadelphia, is an early example. At Figure 4 is a letter from Savannah to Philadelphia dated October 3, 1807. It bears a similar circular postmark with a larger " 6 ," the rate to a port of entry. During the war rate period, the earlier " 6 " postmark was struck upside down to show a " 9 " rate (Figure 5). This cover bears a black "PAID WITHDRAWN SHIP LETTER LONDON 9 JY 9 1815" with crown on its reverse (see inset) which is also indicated by manuscript " $81 / 2$ " (pence) in red on the front of the cover. In Figure 6 is a very spectacular 1817 usage of a Philadelphia " 6 " marking with a red straight line "Telegraph* $\mathrm{H}^{*}$ Coffin*," a marking applied by Captain Coffin of the sailing ship Telegraph, one of three varieties of handstamps used to advertise this vessel.

During a 33 -year period beginning in 1819, Boston used a very unusual "SHIP 6" in a banner (Figure 7). Also at this time some such covers also bear a straight line "QUARANTINE," which would have been a usage on certain ship letters from sites of infective diseases.

The most common " 6 " markings are actually in manuscript, and they are very plentiful. New York had various handstamps during different periods with markings in both red and black (Figures 8 and 9). A combination of a ship cover with $6 \not \subset$ port of entry marking with a magenta "G.P.OFFICE DEAD LETTER" (1819) is shown in Figure 10. This cover was apparently rerated to $8 \not \subset$ due since the address was to Brooklyn, and not New York, a ship fee of $2 \phi$ plus $6 \not \subset$ postage (to be discussed next). Philadelphia later used a blue " 6 " in an octagon. New Orleans used manuscript markings until 1845 when a large black " 6 " was used for the ship rate to the city (Figure 11). This was one of a number of large numerals used at the city at this time. In 1850 a red "SHIP 6 CENTS." was used at New Orleans (Figure 12), one of a small number of "ship 6 cents" markings that exist. By 1853 the marking is usually seen in black.

Certainly the most fancy marking of this type was the decorated "SHIP 6," commonly called a shell, used at San Francisco in the 1850s (Figure 13). Early usages are in red such as with a straightline marking "Honolulu, Hawaiian Is. March 1, 1851," but the black usage is more common (and legible). The later straightline SHIP handstamps with various numbers from San Francisco during the mid and late 1860s are for different ship fees and


Figure 9. Black " 6 " in circle at New York on ship letter from London, November 4, 1853


Figure 10. Red " 6 " in circle with New York postmark, rerated with "SHIP" and " 8 "; sent to Dead Letter Office with 1819 marking of that institution


Figure 11. 1848 letter from New York "pr Union" with separate black "SHIP" and " 6 " handstamps at New Orleans for ship rated letter


Figure 12. 1850 cover with red "NEW ORLEANS La. APR 23" and "SHIP 6 CENTS" for the ship letter fee


Figure 13. Red "HONOLULU HAWAIIAN ISLANDS FEB 24" postmark on private ship letter forwarded by G. B. Post \& Co. with their "STMR CITY OF NORFOLK", private vesselnamed marking, black "SAN FRANCISCO CAL. 19 MAR" and "SHIP 6" rating for letter addressed to San Francisco


Figure 14. Manuscript "Ship 6" on cover carried as private ship letter from Chicago into Mackinac on Lake Michigan


Figure 15. 1863 Confederate blockade run cover with two oval markings of Nassau forwarders, marked at Wilmington, North Carolina "SHIP" and " 6 ", the Confederate ship rate for port of entry letters


Figure 16. 6¢ rate on letter with negative red "FREDA DEL" with ms. date " 10 mo 1 " [1836], to Milford, Delaware
will be discussed subsequently.
On the Great Lakes the early vessels were private ships, so letters transmitted by them to the various ports were rated as ship letters, $6 \phi$ to port of entry and $2 \phi$ plus postage to other locations. In Figure 14 is an 1834 cover to Mackinac, Michigan Territory from Chicago. A few years later a handstamped "SHIP" was used at the same port. Although these markings are listed in catalogs as steamboat covers, these ships on the Great Lakes were not shallow draft steamboats, and thus such covers are more properly considered ship usages.

It has been mentioned that the ship rate to port of entry was changed in 1861. But that is only for the United States, not for those states within the Confederate States of America. Blockade covers from private ships running the Union blockade were rated under the old rates, $6 \notin$ to port of entry and $2 \notin$ plus postage for beyond. At Figure 15 is an 1863 cover with two forwarder's handstamps from Nassau in the Bahamas, addressed to Wilmington, North Carolina. The cover was rated " 6 " with a "SHIP" handstamp. A " 6 " handstamp that was used at Charleston on blockade covers was used at that city in red and then in black prior to the Civil War.

## 6¢ Postage Rate 1816-1845

The Act of April 9, 1816, effective May 1, 1816, reestablished a $6 \not \subset$ postage rate for a single letter carried for a distance of not over 30 miles. Between 1799 and 1816 the lowest rate was $8 \phi$, increased to $12 \phi$ for most of 1815 and three months of 1816 (the war rate period). This $6 \not \subset$ rate was one of five single letter postal rates based on the mileage the letter was carried. During this slightly less than 30 -year period, the usual practice was to indicate the postal rate in manuscript. Figure 16 shows the rate on a cover with a rare negative red town handstamp of Fredonia, Delaware in 1836. Figure 17 shows one of the most fancy postmarks, the York, Pennsylvania standing lady holding the town's name in a banner overhead.

Manuscript rate marks can also be found on covers showing some unusual postal usage. In Figure 18 is a rare "charged" notation written by the receiving postmaster at Hudson, New York. The cover was sent unpaid at the $6 \phi$ rate from Athens, New York. The postage was charged to the account of the address, a post office account. When the postage was paid by charging it to a box account at the time of mailing, the letter would be marked paid. Much more unusual is the charging of postage on an unpaid letter. Brooklyn, New York and Jackson, Mississippi (during the Confederacy) are the only towns known to have used "CHARGED" handstamps.

An 1842 cover from Albany, New York, was mailed at the $6 \varnothing$ rate which was marked as "PAID" with a handstamp. But then the cover was forwarded from Hudson, N.Y. to Austerlitz with the new $6 \notin$ postage unpaid or due. In Figure 19 is a cover from Burlington, Vermont which was originally rated $10 \notin$ due in 1840 . However, the cover was carried over the ice rather than by a longer land route during the winter, so it was rerated at the lower $6 \notin$ rate because of the shorter distance.

In addition to manuscript rating markings which were used by most towns, there were a few towns that had handstamps for the five single rates, $6 \phi, 10 \phi, 12^{1 / 2} \nmid, 18^{1 / 2 \phi}$ and 25¢. Among the best known of these markings are the red numbers from Schenectady, New York. One of these was a number " 6 " (Figure 20). Another more scarce example is a red Amherst, Massachusetts postmark in 1844 with a red " 6 " to Chicopee. Brooklyn, New York had some handstamped rates, but I have not seen a " 6 ." Another town with distinctive rating handstamps was Versailles, Kentucky (Figure 21). The markings from this town can be found in different hues of ink.

There is a second variety of handstamped rating markings. These are the attached rate markings that were used from many different small New England towns in the 1830s and 1840s (see Frank Mandel, "U.S. Rating Marks," 1985 American Philatelic Congress


Figure 17. "York Pa. OCT 18" in red fancy postmark with manuscript " 6 " rating to Columbia, Pennsylvania


Figure 18. "ATHENS N.Y. DEC 3" in red with "6" for due postage; marked "Charged" at Hudson, N.Y. with postage charged to the addressee's box account


Figure 19. "BURLINGTON VT MAR 1" [1840] mailed during the winter and rated "10" for land transit to Clintonville, N.Y.; however, the letter was carried over the frozen lake, a shorter distance and a lesser rate, and was thus rebated " 6 " due


Figure 20. Red "SCH'DY. N.Y." with ms. dating "Jan. 29 1834" and handstamped "6" to Mechanicsville, New York


Figure 21. Red "*VERSAILLES* KY." in double circle, no dating, and "6" in 1818 letter to Nicholasville, Kentucky


Figure 22. Black "NEWPORT N.H. JULY 20" with attached " 6 " on 1831 letter to Hanover, New Hampshire


Figure 23. "Mount Salus Miss May ard" and " $61 / 4$ " all in manuscript on 1826 letter to Jackson, Mississippi, correct rate would be six cents


Figure 24. "RICHMOND IND. Oct 28 " and "PAID" with ms. " $61 / 4$ " to Eaton, Ohio, an example of a prepaid " $61 / 4$ " rate

Book). These markings can exist with or without an attached "PAID." There are even "FREE" types. In Figure 22 is an 1831 example from Newport, New Hampshire with just a 6.

## 61/4c Rate

American coins were in short supply during the first 75 years of the country, and it was common practice to use coins of other countries. The British three pence coin traded at $6^{1 / 4 \phi}$. The Spanish medio real (half real) also traded for the same amount. The usage of the foreign coins was so widespread in certain places, that postal rates were sometimes written as " $61 / 4$ " even if they were actually " 6 " rates. I have already written an article on this (Chronicles No. 133 and 134, February and May 1987), so I will not repeat myself here. However, a number of readers sent me additional examples. The majority appear to be small towns with manuscript markings. In Figure 23 is an example from Mount Salus, Mississippi in 1826. Others are Yazor C.H., Mississippi, October 26, 1828; Madisonville, Mississippi, May 29, 1829; and Brandon, Mississippi, December 10, 1831. An unusual one is Habolichitto, Mississippi, May 6, 1824 rated $12^{1 / 2}$ to Jackson, but postmarked Monticello, Mississippi, June 1, 1824 with additional $61 / 4$ with marking "mast \& forward $18^{3} / 4$." But the most unusual cover is a manuscript "Pine Hill Miss April the 3d" [1835] with manuscript " $61 / 2$." I can only guess this was a mistake for " $61 / 4$." Then two other such covers bear handstamped postmarks of Richmond, Indiana. The first (Figure 24) shows "RICHMOND IND. OCT 28" [1835], "PAID" and ms. " $61 / 4$ " to Eaton, Ohio, a rare prepayment of the $61 / 4 \phi$. The other cover is even more unusual in that it is a double letter to the same address. It should have been rated " 12 " for double $6 \phi$ postage. But the postmarks are "RICHMOND IND. MAR 19" [1838] and ms. " $12 \frac{1}{2}$." indicating a charge based on coinage rather than the proper charge.


Figure 25. "FROM J.H. VANBENTHUSEN'S NEWS-OFFICE No 223 State Street. LANSINGBURGH. $6^{1 / 4^{\prime \prime}}$ in red from Lansingburgh, New York to New York City; there is also a red oval "BOYD'S CITY EXPRESS POST. JAN 17 1846" and "Collect $61 / 4$ " showing the same specie rate

The $61 / 4$ rate is seen on Texas ship covers addressed to Galveston, the port of entry. Although not a port of entry, the Republic of Texas charged the same fee for letters addressed to Houston.

During the 1840s a number of local express companies rated the postage on a single letter as $6 \frac{1}{4}$ rather than 6 due. Sometimes such ratings were even included in the handstamped markings. In Figure 25 is a very nice example with red "FROM J.H. VANBENTHUYSEN'S NEWS OFFICE No. 223 State Street. 61/4 LANSINGBURGH" [New York] addressed to New York City with additional red oval "BOYD'S CITY EXPRESS POST JAN 17 1846" and manuscript "Collect 61/4."
(to be continued)

## FROM THE EDITOR

## There's Always the Unexpected

With this issue of the Chronicle I'm into my seventh year as Editor-in-Chief. By now most editing tasks have been pretty well standardized. We've set up a reasonably firm schedule, which gives us the kind of flexibility needed in a hobby publication and yet generally insures that the journal will get into the mail during the last week of the month shown as the publication date. There are some months when it runs close, particularly nonLeap Year Februaries, but we almost always meet the schedule.

But there's always the unexpected. I intended to come back from the IBRA '99 exhibition and get right to work on the galley proofs which (as planned) were on my doorstep on April 5. But I hadn't counted on major surgery for a compressed spinal chord that would set me back by more than three weeks. It wasn't due to problems with the surgery, which went well, nor the recovery per se, which has been rapid and relatively uneventful. Except no one told me that certain basic movements such as bending my head to look down, or stretching my arms out in front of me, or trying to use scissors, or various other motions involved in proofing galleys and laying out dummy pages were going to be so perversely difficult. As a result, this issue will be roughly two weeks late, for which I apologize.

And quality control has also been a matter of concern and emphasis. We've got several iterations of proofreading, including one more review at galley proof and/or page proof time, at which point the entire journal is in digital form and theoretically immune from the gremlins that used to plague the hot-type printers.

But there's always the unexpected. Chronicle 181 included a stellar article by Scott Trepel on the "Used 15-Cent 1869 Inverts." Scott provided the entire article on disk, including all the images, laid out page by page. I reviewed it and the rest of the issue at least four times, right up to the go-to-press point.

And then the journal came out, and Figure 6 on p. 19 somehow showed a blow-up rather than the original miniature which had been furnished. Apparently someone needed to make one more check prior to printing, opened up the graphic, for reasons not clear enlarged the image, then when time came to close down inadvertently said "yes" to the prompt to "Save new image?" There's an insert with this issue showing the corrected page, which you can file with the original or cut and paste, however you may choose.

So we apologize for those slips. We'll continue to try to hold to our publishing and mailing deadlines, and keep to high standards of proofreading and quality control . . . but unfortunately, there's always the unexpected.

Charles J. Peterson $\square$

# Your Confidence is our Guiding Value! 

At Ivy \& Mader,<br>we take pride in our<br>integrity, reliability, and personal service.

But
all the principals can be summed up in one: your confidence that we are the right choice to handle the sale of your collection.

All of our efforts
are directed toward assuring you that your valuable stamps and covers are in the best of hands!

Call or write Walter Mader or Rex Bishop
to inquire further how
Ivy \& Mader, Inc.
can assist you in the sale or the building of your collection.
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# ADDITIONAL CANCELED POSTMARKS: PART I HUBERT C. SKINNER 

## Introduction

In an earlier two-part article (see Chronicle 179:185-191 and 180:264-268), this writer illustrated and described a number of obliterating devices designed and manufactured to cancel postmarks on letters between the United States and Canada during the period (16 November 1847-6 April 1851) when prepayment through to destination was prohibited. Such letters were required to be prepaid "to the Lines" but postage beyond the border could not be collected for the other country. Thus, "PAID" markings had to be marked out with pen or killer because a letter became unpaid to destination when it crossed the border between the two countries. Such obliterations did not correct an error or mistake but were a routine requirement for properly rating and carrying the "CrossBorder Mails."

We now turn our attention to other types of canceled postmarks. There is a wide variety of covers bearing postmarks which have been obliterated and corrected because a clerk misinterpreted a printed circular as a letter, a double letter as a single, misread the destination, or picked up and struck the wrong device on a cover in error. At times, a postal patron changed his mind about prepayment, or other reasons, such as remailing or forwarding letters, caused postmarks to be obliterated and replaced. All covers illustrated herein are from the 1850s.

## Altered Rate Markings

As stated above, many covers exhibit altered rates for a variety of reasons. Frequently, a double letter was first rated as a single one, then corrected. In Figure 1, an unpaid double letter from New Orleans to San Francisco in 1854 was first rated in error at $5 \notin$ due, requiring the numeral " 5 " to be obliterated (here with the enclosed seven-bar circular grid) and replaced with the numeral " 10 " representing double rate due. At this time, unpaid letters were charged at the penalty rate, adding $2 \phi$ to the $3 \phi$ single rate for prepaid letters and $4 \not \subset$ to the $6 \not \subset$ double rate for prepaid letters. In Figure 2, the New Orleans circular date stamp includes a " 5 " at bottom representing the penalty rate for a first-class intercity letter. However, this cover is a folded printed circular sent unsealed and prepaid at the circular rate. Thus, the encircled seven-bar grid was struck over the numeral " 5 " and the proper rate was indicated by the New Orleans "PAID/2" rate marking.

The cover in Figure 3 initially was postmarked and rated by the clerk at New Haven, Connecticut, using the unpaid penalty rate marking with " 5 " included. Then, apparently, the $3 \notin$ "dull red" adhesive [1853-1855] was placed on the letter as prepayment and canceled with the unpaid town marking. The prepayment made necessary the obliteration of the " 5 " in the original postmark by an encircled seven-bar grid as on the New Orleans cover (see Figure 2). Did the postal patron at New Haven decide to yield to the not-so-subtle pressure by the USPO to encourage prepayment by exacting a penalty rate for due letters? Or, did the clerk unintentionally use the wrong postmark and then use the grid killer to correct his mistake?

In Figure 4, the New York City postmark with " 5 Cts." at bottom representing the penalty rate due was struck on a cover to the Postmaster at Blairstown, New Jersey. As a postmaster could receive his "due" letters free, the clerk marked a manuscript " $f$ " over the " 5 " in the postmark to indicate the letter was rated "free" from postal charges.

In Figure 5, another prepaid letter is illustrated. Originating in Rochester, N.Y., it is


Figure 1. A folded letter from New Orleans, Louisiana, to San Francisco, California. The New Orleans CDS was struck in bright red on "MAY 19" [1854]; all other markings are in black. The " 5 " [single unpaid rate] was obliterated by an encircled seven-bar grid and replaced with a " 10 " representing the double unpaid rate.


Figure 2. A folded circular printed at New Orleans, Louisiana, and dated May 1, 1851. It was mailed on "AUG/1" [1851] and addressed to "Athens, Alaba." The New Orleans circular date stamp is struck in bright red; the " 5 " at bottom represents the unpaid single rate for inter-city letters. The " 5 " is obliterated with the seven-bar grid struck in dark red and this rate is replaced by "PAID/2" at the right, again in bright red.


Figure 3. A cover from "NEW HAVEN/CONN." to Hartford, Connecticut. The New Haven postmark with " 5 " at bottom representing the unpaid penalty rate for a single inter-city letter is struck at the right in black and again at left as the obliterator for a $3 ¢$ "dull red" stamp [circa 1853]. The " 5 " in the first struck marking is cancelled with a circular sevenbar grid, as the 3¢ stamp prepaid the postage. All handstruck markings are in black.


Figure 4. A cover from "NEW-YORK [CITY]" to the postmaster at Blairstown, New Jersey. The New York postmark [struck in black] indicates " 5 cts." due, but a manuscript " f " in blue crosses out the due rate indicating that the letter is free of postage. Postmasters were allowed to receive their incoming mail without postage charges.


Figure 5. A trans-Continental cover from "ROCHESTER/N.Y." to San Francisco, California. Originally, it was rated " 24 " [representing trans-Atlantic postage?], corrected by the obliterating black grid, and rerated " 6 " in manuscript for the postage for a single letter across the continent. All markings other than the gridiron are in red ink.


Figure 6. A very unusual cover bearing a circular "SHIP/6" marking in blue which is rerated with a crude " X " over the "SHIP" and a heavily struck " 5 " in blue over the " 6 " in the original origin/rating mark. It apparently is an ordinary inter-city letter which became mixed with the incoming ship mails by accident.
addressed to an attorney in San Francisco. Peculiarly, it appears that this letter was rated $24 \phi$ in error, representing the rate charged for trans-Atlantic mail. This is a strange mistake. Regardless of how it came about, the " 24 " is obliterated by a seven-bar circular grid and the correct rate for prepaid trans-Continental mail [ $6 \not \subset$ for a single letter to a destination more than 3,000 miles distant] was applied in manuscript together with a handstamped "PAID" and the circular date stamp for Rochester.

Figure 6 illustrates a very unusual cover. It appears to be an ordinary inter-city letter which became mixed with the incoming ship mails. It was first marked with a characteristic circular "SHIP/6" in blue representing a ship letter addressed to the port of arrival; quite apparently this was an error. Close examination shows that the "SHIP" portion of the original marking is "crossed-out" with a crude " X " design in matching blue possibly produced by the edge of a marker device or some makeshift cancelling implement. The " 6 " is heavily overstruck with a " 5 " which most likely is the unpaid penalty rate for an inter-city letter. It is probable that we will never determine exactly what happened in this case.

## Acknowledgments

This writer is deeply indebted to Edgar W. Jatho, Jr., of New Orleans, a computer specialist who produced the images for the illustrations used here. Ed utilized "state-of-the-art" scanning equipment to make these excellent figures. Also, appreciation is extended to other students and postal historians who have contributed in various ways to these studies.
(to be continued)
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## THE LITHOGRAPHED GENERAL ISSUES OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA: MISPLACED TRANSFERS, STONE 2 © 1999, LEONARD H. HARTMANN

The Misplaced Transfer varieties have a long but clouded place in Confederate Philately. Perhaps the name is partly to blame. I consider a Misplaced Transfer to be one position entered in place of another position on the printing stone and thus ultimately becoming an issued stamp, e.g., No. 2 in place of or over No. 10. Perhaps Replaced or Substituted Transfer is more descriptive, but considering the long usage of the original term I do not propose a change.

The words Misplaced Transfer could also be interpreted as describing a shift in a transfer unit of 50 when it was applied to the printing stone, $i, e$., the subject is not exactly where it should be for proper alignment. An especially desirable example of this shifted alignment can be found on the $5 \notin$ Blue Transfer Stone 2, Position 44, Printing Stone 1, Right Pane, Upper Setting. Such a variety exists from every impression from the plate and is thus of no special rarity. This more liberal interpretation has been taken by exhibitors and auction catalogs on a number of occasions to describe something of interest which however does not possess the special rarity and importance of a Misplaced Transfer. To the best of my knowledge, a true Misplaced Transfer of a Confederate General Issue Lithograph has never been sold at auction so described.

One could also produce a Misplaced Transfer in preparing the transfer stone: a position is entered and considered unacceptable, and another put in its place. Several positions suggest this possibility. However, as only the final form exists it is thus the normal variety or position; we have nothing to suggest that a position on a transfer stone was changed after the stone was used to prepare a printing stone, however it could have been done. Intriguing varieties are still being discovered.

The initial identification of a Misplaced Transfer requires both the plating of the stamps involved and a multiple or at least enough of an adjoining stamp to prove the relative position on the printing stone. Once the initial identification is made, future examples can be confirmed from the plating details.

In 1998, I purchased a lot from sale of the James P. Myerson collection, American Historical Auctions, lot No. 372. I bid on this lot based on the description: a $5 \phi$ Blue usage from Montgomery, Texas. I was delighted when the cover arrived, condition and description were at least what I expected (see Figure 1).

In plating the stamps I became puzzled-a pair of $5 \notin$ Blue Lithographs, Stone 2, the left stamp was immediately identified as Position 9 on Transfer Stone 2, thus the right stamp had to be Position 10. The right stamp of the pair was a problem; it didn't seem to be Position 10. The plating marks were strong and the impression clear with the stamp in excellent condition. I started to check all of my positions 10 and my notes for some error. Perhaps I mis-marked my $3 \times 5$ reference photographs of various positions. After all, there are four copies of Position 10 on a printing stone, and for Stone 2 in Blue there are at least two printing stones, thus eight possible constant minor varieties for the basic position.

Then the quandary became evident; the right stamp is not Position 10, but a perfectly normal Position 2 with a clear but slight portion of another stamp to the left, a new Misplaced Transfer! Both transfer positions 9 and 2 are the normal transfer stone stamps in all respects and there is no question as to the identification and that the stamps are a pair. The two stamps are further apart than they should be, the right hand one is moved to the right. There is enough of the sliver of the original position to the left of No. 2 showing


Figure 1. Misplaced Transfer, 5c Blue, Stone 2, Left Stamp Position No. 2 over No. 9, Right Stamp Position No. 10. On cover, Montgomery, Texas, August 23, probably 1862.


Figure 2. Misplaced Transfer, 5¢ Green, Stone 2, Position No. 1 over No. 10
to alert one to something different but not enough to plate it. However, the exact position of this sliver with respect to the adjacent Position 9 is in agreement with Position 10, thus I see no reason to question the original attribution. Another example would be nice; say the misplaced 2 with a Position 50 above or 20 below, or to the right and across the vertical gutter to Position 1.

The Misplaced Transfer first came to my attention in the mid 1960s with the rediscovery of a $5 \phi$ Green from Stone 2 in which Position 1 was entered in place of Position 10 (Figure 2). A most rare item: to date only two examples are known to the author, a used single and one unused example in a block of 40, Positions 1-40, Left Pane, Upper Setting, which proves the plating as to the printing stone location.

This Misplaced Transfer is of special importance as this variety is quite pronounced and should be evident to any collector of the stamp. It does not require a study of the plating to realize that there is something special which deserves serious attention. A good portion of another stamp shows to the left of the design!

The printing stone used for the $5 \notin$ Green Transfer Stone 2 stamps does not appear to be the one used for any of the Blue printings. One would assume that other copies would have surfaced for such an evident variety. This scarcity suggests numerous possibilities: perhaps this printing stone was quickly replaced, thus perhaps there was more than one for the Green printing; the defect was noticed quickly, considered unacceptable, and repaired; or the repair creating the variety was made near the end of the use of the stone.

For many years Scott has listed a "Misplaced Transfer" for the Green Printing of Stone 2 for a nominal monetary value both unused and used, and at one time also listed it for the Blue Printing. Perhaps I am to blame for the de-listing for the Blue stamps, as I have long contended that it only exists from the Green Printing as I only knew of the No. 1 over 10 Misplaced Transfer. If this is the case, the moderate catalog value is out of place considering both the unusual nature of the variety and the scarcity.

Our Green $5 \phi$ Stone 2 variety (Position No. 1 over No. 10) was reported and well illustrated by August Dietz in the October 1925 issue of The Southern Philatelist, Vol. 1, No. 12, pages 222-223. The identical illustration and text was repeated in his 1929 book, The Postal Service of The Confederate States of America, pages 105-106:

The Twin Scrolls.-This interesting Freak shows a repetition of the lower left side of the design, with no indications of a shift. There is but one explanation: Two transfers, one slightly overlapping the other, and sticking together, escaped detection in the group, and were transferred, jointly, on to the stone. Several sheets may have been printed before the Twins were discovered, when an erasure was made. A minor fillingin of lines appears in the letter "E" of "POSTAGE," due to "dry stone." Both oddities are of a temporary nature.
This description and the accompanying illustration are quite good as to the appearance of the item. However, as it was an integral portion of the printing stone and was repetitive for some time period the word "Freak" is not really applicable. As it was on the printing stone and did not originate with the transfer stone, Dietz's concept of two transfers sticking together is not possible. The significance of the filled in "E" was not realized, thus the remark "temporary nature" is again not applicable. This filled in "E" is a major characteristic for Stone 2, Green or Blue Printings from position No. 1, and exists on all examples.

The earliest reference known to the author of the phrase "Misplaced Transfer" with respect to the Confederate lithographs is an article by Curtis, Kappa and Pratt titled "Lithographs of the Confederate States of America," which appeared in the November 1929 issue of Scott's Monthly Journal.
... To show the real rarity of these, we would say, that during our studies covering the last ten years, we have found less than a score of these from Stone 2 (both colors).


## Stone 2, Position 1

The upper portion of the $E$ of POSTAGE, along with the adjacent area, is filled in with color resembling a smudge which is probably what it is; but it originated with the production of the Transfer Stone hence it is an integral portion of the design for this position. There is a large intense short dash of color just under the hair line and above Jefferson Davis's right temple. There is a dash of color just under the lower right hand spandrel. The lower left scroll shows a nice clipped transfer.

## Stone 2, Position 2

There is a small vertical line to the right of the upper right scroll. The deviation combined with a slightly deformed scroll gives it a distinctive characteristic among several similar varieties of Stone 2 such as position No. 9, 21 and 26 (and, somewhat, No.19). There is a pair of small horizontal lines, one being directly below and the other above the lower right scroll extension. As with Position 1, the lower left portion of the scroll shows a clipped transfer.


## Stone 2, Position 9

The lower left scroll is slightly clipped on the bottom and has two short intersecting lines to the left of the clipped area. The upper right scroll has a small claw-shaped dash of color extending to the right; this basic variety is common, and is also mentioned with Position No. 2. There is a dash of color about midway between Jefferson Davis's ear and eye with the normal dashes of shading being absent in its immediate vicinity.

## Stone 2, Position 10

When this unit was prepared for the Transfer Stone the subject was evidently torn or clipped and then rejoined. On finely printed examples a fine line of separation can be discerned extending from the center of the right side though to just beyond the inner colorless oval. The distortion of the inner colorless oval is even evident on poorly printed specimens. The top line of the lower right scroll extension is rather heavy with the right end being broken to give the appearance of an additional line. The lower left scroll also shows a slight clip. There are a number of these clips, all quite similar but also unique.

A short description of what a misplaced transfer is and how it may occur, is as follows:

Some position or group of positions show up badly when a printing has been tak-en-they have become damaged for some reason and do not print properly. The careful pressman notices this, and he erases that part of the stone, cleans off the space and makes a new transfer there (taking this new transfer either from the smaller Transfer Stone or from a perfect part of the big stone). Then the stone is ready to print from once more. But if he has taken his transfer from a different set of positions from the original ones, he has changed the arrangement of the varieties, and they do not run in the proper order, they are misplaced transfers.
It is unfortunate that the above description does not mention any specific plate positions, and to the best of my knowledge such has not appeared in print by these classic scholars. Perhaps some examples exist with their notations. Our Green Position 1 over 10 was certainly known as early as 1925 to Curtis, Knapp and Pratt and most certainly appreciated; as to the plate positions of the transfer stone, they may or may not have known the positions on the printing stone.

Other positions could also be applied to this basic definition, but they do not have the same level of significance. Stone 2 Position 15, among others, shows enough of a double scroll on the top to indicate there was a second design. However, as this exists on every copy of this position whether a Blue or Green print it evidently originated with the production of the transfer stone and is thus the normal condition of the position.

Starting with the 1927 edition of Scott's Specialized Catalogue of United States Postage Stamps, the "Bottom Scroll Doubled (re-entry Pos. 50)" of Stone 2 has been listed for the Green printing. The following year, 1928, "Misplaced Transfer (S 2)" was added for both the Green and the Blue printing but without further identification. The first edition of the Dietz Specialized Catalog of the Postage Stamps of the Confederate States of America appeared in 1931 and lists the "Twin Scroll Variety," but the designation "Misplaced Transfer" was not added until the 1945 edition. The 1945 edition does not define Misplaced Transfer though a note on page 129 implies it is the overlap on some Stone 2 units between the upper and lower transfer unit.

Over the years the Dietz and Scott catalogs have mentioned a misplaced transfer for Stone 2 Position 50. I have never seen anything from this position that resembles a misplaced transfer or any need for one, and have assumed it was an error for the Green Stone 2 Position 1 over 10. A 1966 letter from Charles Kilbourne also makes this remark and adds that he has never seen it except for the Green printing, never the Blue.

Perhaps the Position 50 Misplaced Transfer concept originated with the Bertram W. H. Poole articles in The Philatelic Gazette, 1915-1917. This Poole plating of Stone 2 is shifted by one horizontal row, thus he identified position 50 as position 10.

## Proposed Listing

The current catalog listing for CSA No. 1, $5 \notin$ green, shows "Misplaced Transfer" (not further described) under "Varieties," priced both mint and used. There is no corresponding entry for CSA No. $2,5 \notin$ Blue. Based on the information in this article, the entries should be:

CSA No. $1,5 \not \subset$ Green Lithograph, Misplaced Transfer, i.e., Twin Scrolls
Stone 2, plate position 1 entered over position 10 mint \& used
CSA No. 4, $5 \not \subset$ Blue Lithograph, Misplaced Transfer
Stone 2, plate position 2 entered over position 10 used
OK now, lets see some more Misplaced Transfers, either new varieties or more examples of the above- they most likely exist! There is a single stamp on cover that is a possibility! Write me at P.O. Box 36006 , Louisville, KY 40233, or e-mail at pbbooks@ibm.net.

## America's Great "User-Friendly" Philatelic Mail Sales present our Spring 1999 Calendar...

## March 1999:

- An outstanding British Commonwealth (including rare used 20th century) and Worldwide auction featuring the Jack Chapin collections of New Zealand and Cape of Good Hope. Also an outstanding Germany and Colonies collection with over 1,000 lots.


## April and May 1999:

- Puerto Rico: The renowned collections of D. Scott Gallagher and Seymour Rudman comprise the finest holding of Puerto Rican stamps and postal history ever to come on the market.
- Major Postal History featuring the international awardwinning collection of "To and From Palestine-Overland and By Air" formed by Dr. Arthur H. Groten.
- United States Civil War: Both Union and Confederate philately featuring one of the most outstanding collections of Union patriotic covers ever formed.


Affiliated with Andrew Levitt Philatelic Consultant

- The famous Charles L. Towle 19th and early 20th century United States Railroads postal history collection.
- The John R. Boker, Jr., specialized collection of New York Foreign Mail in the 1870s.
- United States General Sale: The full range of material ranging from an outstanding classic cancels collection to high quality unused and used singles and plate blocks.
- A Specialized Sale of France and Colonies with many varieties, postal stationery, revenues, booklets and other important material.
- Portugal and Colonies-and Italy and Colonies. A wonderful sale of specialized material in these two areas, plus our usual fine range of British Commonwealth and Worldwide.

> Our Nutmeg Mail Sales continually include a wide and deep selection of United States classic philately...from important stamps and varieties to quality 19th century postal history. Contact us now to receive the catalog for Nutmeg's next mail sale. Call, write, fax or e-mail us today and we'll send it to you right away.

Contact Us By E-Mail: levstamp@mags.net

Post Office Box 342
Danbury CT 06813
(203) 743-5291

Fax: (203) 730-8238

## When You Sell, Trust The Reliability Of The Firm That Has Handled Most of America's Greatest Classics.

So many of the world's great collections have always come to us.

Our 38 years of active buying are virtually unmatched in philately. They represent a record of integrity and comfort for the seller who always must trust, implicitly, the individual who buys his collection.

Andrew Levitt is the most competitive buyer in philately. We have handled properties as diverse as those of Grunin, Haas, Boker, Chapin and Jennings. When the serious U.S. classics philatelist thinks of selling his collection there is no doubt that he should come to Andrew Levitt first.

We have $\$ 5$ million ready to purchase your philatelic property....from the smallest collection to entire carloads of albums. Our letters of credit can be sent to you today. And for larger holdings we can come right to your home.


Long before America's rarest stamp-the One-Cent "Z" Grillwas sold at the Zoeliner sale, we handled it 3 times for important buyers. We did the same for the "Running Chicken" cover, one of the most important 19th century pieces of postal history known in our hobby.

Can Andrew Levitt pay you more for your stamps? We keep our finger on the pulse of the market and will pay you the most competitive market value for your stamps \& covers. And not tomorrow or in installments, but full payment right on the spot. This is always our guarantee.

## Give Us The Opportunity To Compete For Your Collection. Call, Write or E-Mail Us Today!



We are extremely vigorous buyers of all kinds of important specialized collections and exhibits. Over $\$ 5$ million is available now and, after looking at your material, payment from us is immediate. Find out why we are the most active philatelic buyer in America. Bank letters of credit available. Call or write us...or if you're a computer user, just e-mail us and tell us about what you have to sell.

Andrew Levitt

(203) 743-5291

Fax: (203) 730-8238
E-mail: levstamp@mags.net

## THE POST OFFICE SEAL REPRINTS WILLIAM E. MOOZ

There are a fair number of mysteries in this world, and many of them are philatelic in nature. One such vexing mystery resurfaced as a result of the Shreves sale of the Wampler collection on April 24 and 25, 1998, and my subsequent viewing of the magnificent 1998 APS STAMPSHOW exhibit of Post Office seals by Martin Richardson. Included in the Shreves sale as Lot 914 was a full sheet of 30 copies of OX2. The description of lot 914 in the Shreves catalog is instructive, and follows:


#### Abstract

\#OX2 var., Yellowish green Post Office Seal, special printing of 1875, the incomparable unique full sheet of thirty ( $\mathbf{5 X 6}$ ), which in this configuration can only be the special printing, as the regularly issued stamp was produced in sheets of 30 subjects (3X10) and cut into panes of 15 each, this being the special printing produced in 1875 on a harder white paper and less porous than the special printing of 1880 which was on soft porous paper, despite these two distinctively different special printings the Scott catalog lists only the 1880 special printing with a question mark, this astounding sheet, which was originally in the famous collection of Col. E. H. R. Green, has been lost to philately for many years, as it has been residing in collections misidentified and unrecognized as the special printing sheet configuration: the sheet, which has no gum (as it is believed to have been produced), has most of its sheet selvages intact (no plate markings were used), although a few bits are missing, plus there are small faults in the selvage as well, several separated perfs will be found, but the sheet is largely intact, along the top row of the sheet there is a strip of light aging which affects the top third of each stamp, centering typically ranges from fine to very fine; unquestionably the most important Post Office Seal item in existence; the special printing in Scott is valued at $\$ 600.00$ each and, of course, there is no valuation for any type of multiple, therefore the catalog value quoted is simply for 30 singles, and does not accurately reflect the extreme rarity of this unique sheet (photo)


The 1999 Scott specialized catalog identifies only the 1880 special printing of the OX1 Post Office Seal by the American Bank Note Company as OX2, on soft paper. The surfacing of this obscure sheet of 30 seals on hard paper brought to mind the fact that years ago I had purchased a copy of OX5, which was represented to be the special printing of OX4. For many years I had puzzled over OX2 and OX5, and had noted that the Scott catalog had dropped the listing of OX5 in the 1984 specialized catalog. The listing was replaced with a footnote which read, "A so-called 'special printing' exists in deep brown on hard white paper."

The question which has puzzled me over the years was, "Were OX2 and OX5 a part of the 1875 program which was designed to make copies of all previously issued stamps available to 'stamp gatherers'?" I was not alone in posing this question, and a number of researchers have debated this question over the years. Because of this past work, this article does not present any new findings, but rather addresses the question in the context of this series of articles, which deal specifically with the 1875 program of special printings. On the surface, the answer may seem simple. The 1875 program included not only regular issue stamps, such as the 1847 and 1869 issues, but also stamps which were not readily available to the public, such as the Newspaper and Periodical stamps and the Departmental stamps. This being the case, why not also the Post Office seals?

On the "pro" side, their inclusion could be thought to be logical to round out what
was available to these pesky "stamp gatherers," as the government called stamp collectors. This seems to be the only argument on that side. On the "con" side are a number of countervailing arguments.

First, there was apparently no intention of the government making these available to the public. The circular which announced this program, dated March 27, 1875, listed three types of "specimens of adhesive postage stamps." These three types were identified as "ORDINARY STAMPS FOR USE OF THE PUBLIC," "OFFICIAL STAMPS" and "NEWSPAPER AND PERIODICAL STAMPS." There was no mention of other types of stamps, such as revenue stamps, and no mention of postal items which were not stamps, such as these seals.

Second, these were not stamps, and they had no franking power. The 3rd Assistant Postmaster General specified that they should be classified as "supplies" and not as "stamps."

Third, since they had no face value, they could not be sold for money, which meant that the government would be in the business of purchasing them and giving them away. Rather unlikely.

Fourth, there is no record in the Bill Books which refers to a special printing of these seals, i.e., no payment record to either the Continental, National or American Bank Note Company during the period from 1875 through $1884 .{ }^{2}$

Fifth, a rigorous perusal of approximately 500 Press copies of the Invoices of the 3rd Assistant Postmaster General's Office reveals no written record that these seals were sold to anyone. ${ }^{3}$

All of this would imply that the special printings of the Post Office seals do not exist. But to the contrary, they seem to. In addition to the sheet which was auctioned by Shreve, a number of single copies of OX2 have been expertised by the Philatelic Foundation as genuine. And, not surprisingly, the Foundation has also expertised several copies of OX5. So they do exist, and the real question is "why?".

The blunt answer to this question is simply that we do not know. Previous students have done quite a bit of research, and offered various opinions. Regarding OX2, Perkal and Kazman state that they believe that two special printings of this stamp were made, one in 1875 , and the other in 1880 . The 1875 printing was said to closely resemble the special printings made by the Continental Bank Note Company. The 1880 printing was made by the American Bank Note Company and is on the soft paper that they used at the time. They also quote from Luff, as follows:

> The reprint was probably sent to the Post Office Department in company with the special printing of postage stamps of the $1870-9$ issue which was placed on sale July 16,1880 . It was made by the American Bank Note Company, and is on the soft porous paper which they always used for postage stamps. The gum is yellowish-white and rather streaked. The reprint has a very fresh appearance and may readily be distinguished by the whiteness of the paper and bluish tint of the ink. ${ }^{4}$

There are some problems with this logic. It is possible, of course, that the hard paper OX2 seal could have been printed in 1875 , along with the other stamps which were printed

[^0]by the Continental Bank Note Company. There may or may not have been a plausible reason for so doing, and this will be examined below. But, should this have been the case, there is no very convincing reason why the American Bank Note Company should have repeated this printing in 1880. At that time, the American Bank Note Company was making special printings of the same stamps that they were printing as contemporaneous regular issues, and they were also occasionally reprinting some items which the Office of the 3rd Ass't PM General had run out of. These were such items as the $1 \varnothing 1869$ issue, the $1 \varnothing$ Navy, the $1 \phi$ State, the $1 \phi$ Executive and the $18742 \phi$ Newspaper and Periodical. But since the OX1 Post Office seal was neither contemporaneous nor had any presumed supply of these (as OX2) at the Office of the 3rd Ass't PM General been exhausted, one must wonder why a printing was made, if indeed it was.

One may speculate about how these seals came into existence, and I offer one such idea. When the 1865 Newspaper and Periodical stamps were reprinted in 1875, there seem to have been a few problems. We know that these 1865 reprints were not delivered in time for the start of the program, and that 750 copies of the regular issue stamps were sent to the office of the 3rd Assistant Postmaster General, so that orders for these stamps could be filled. We also know that although the Continental Bank Note Company printed some of the various stamps in the first order placed by the 3rd A'sst. PM General, i.e., the issues of 1857-60 (Scott 40, et. seq.) and 1873 (Scott 167 et. seq.), plus the 1875 Newspaper and Periodical stamps (PR33 et. seq.) and the Official stamps (O1SD et. seq.), they did not print the 1865 Newspaper and Periodical stamps (Scott PR5, 6 and 7).

However, the Continental Bank Note Company prepared new plates for these 1865 Newspaper and Periodical stamps, as though they were going to receive the contract to print them, and both perforated and imperforate copies of reprints from these new plates are found in most serious collections today. There are no reference documents known which explain why Continental made these plates, or why National actually printed the stamps, although National had also reprinted the 1861-66 issue (Scott 102 et. seq.) and the 1869 issue (Scott 123 et. seq.).

Let's speculate a bit. Suppose that Continental was confident that they would receive the contract to print some or most of this first series of stamps, but were not sure that they could retrieve some of the plates from National, and were also not sure which stamps would be included in the order. If this were the case, then Continental might well have made new plates for the 1865 Newspaper and Periodical stamps, and they also might have made a new plate for the Post Office seal. This would be a gamble on their part, but would put them in a position to deliver these items in a short time. Of course, they would have printed some samples to show to the Post Office Department, and this could have been the origin of the 1865 Newspaper and Periodical stamps made from Continental's new plates as well as the reprints of the hard paper OX2 Post Office seals which are attributed to Continental.

A bit of a different situation could also have produced the same result. We know that National was awarded the contract for stamps other than those which Continental was to print. Next, we know that National had some difficulties which resulted in delays in printing these, such as the 1865 Newspaper and Periodical stamps. If Continental got wind of these problems, they might have rushed to produce plates, in the hopes of taking the business away from National. In their zeal to do this, they may have made plates for both the 1865 Newspaper and Periodicals, and also the Post Office seals, again because they may not have been sure whether these would be included in the contract.

But while this might shed some light on the 1875 reprints on hard white paper, what about the later 1880 soft paper reprinting of OX1? In this author's opinion, this reprinting may be easier to explain than the 1875 reprinting. By the time that the American Bank Note Company secured the printing contract for both regular issue stamps and the special printings of these, the special printing program had seemingly fallen into a lackadaisical
state. Sales of the stamps had never even vaguely approached initial expectations, and the clerks in the office of the 3rd Ass't PM General only filled a few small orders each week. (As an example, only 72 copies of the $90 \notin$ Treasury stamp were sold, out of 10,000 copies printed.) However, like many government programs, this one developed a life of its own, and simply continued, despite any apparent inherent reason to do so. Dutifully, and perhaps without any understanding of the reasons, each time that a new stamp was issued, the American Bank Note Company also made a "special printing" of the stamp, which was supplied to the 3rd Ass't PM General's office. One can understand that those at American might be confused about whether the "special printing" should be any different than the regular printing. The evidence is pretty conclusive that they could not convince themselves that these stamps should be much different, and the later stamps in the series, such as Scott 205C, 211D and the Postage Due stamps, vary from very difficult to identify to impossible to discriminate from the regularly issued stamps. In fact, the special printing of the 1883 $2 \notin$ Washington (Footnote to Scott 211B), of which only 55 copies were sold, has never been identified. There is a substantial body of evidence which leads to the conclusion that in several cases, of which this may be one, the regular issue stamp was supplied instead of a "special printing."

Perhaps because of the looseness or informality of this program in the early 1880s, American simply assumed that it should supply copies of each stamp to the 3rd Ass't PM General's office, and, without any confirmation or written instructions to do so, simply printed some of the Post Office seals. However, whatever the reason, American surely found out that the Post Office Department had no interest in the reprints of these seals, which may have been only printed as samples, and so, no more were printed. Those which had been printed somehow found their way into private hands, and therefore appear in collections today. Of course, this speculation still does not explain why American would have resurrected the plates for the then obsolete seal and reprinted them. It is still just a mystery.

Speculating about OX5 is even more difficult. In theory, this seal is printed on hard white paper, similar to that used by Continental in 1875. But OX4, the regular issue seal, was issued in 1879, and the Continental Bank Note Company no longer existed then. So OX5 must have been printed by the American Bank Note Company after 1879. If this is true, we are left to explain why the typical soft paper was not used.

There are several summarizing statements which can be made. The first is that neither the hard paper nor the soft paper reprint of the 1872 seal, OX1, appear to be officially a part of the 1875 special printing program. The program apparently did not intend to have these seals as part of it, there are no records of paying the bank note companies for printing them, and there are no records of invoices to customers showing that they were purchased or otherwise obtained from the Office of the 3rd Ass't PM General. The same remarks apply to the hard paper reprint of the 1879 seal, OX4.

The second point follows from the first. If these seals were not an official part of the program, then they may have been an inadvertent part of the program, i.e., some were printed without an official sanction, and these found their way into the stamp collecting community. A few possible reasons for this have been discussed above.

Finally, there seem to have been several varieties of these "special printing" seals, originating from apparently different plates. It is not the purpose of this article to treat these details. As stated above, the primary purpose was to explore the question of whether or not the reprints of these seals were part of the 1875 program. Those who wish to explore the details further should review the study by Perkal and Kazman.

# UNITED STATES MAILS TO THE MEXICAN EAST COAST POST CIVIL WAR TO MEXICAN UPU BY MICHAEL J. BROWN 

## Background

The advent of the American Civil War effectively stopped all direct mails moving between the eastern United States and the east coast of Mexico. During the war several temporary and indirect British mail routings were used by those wishing to correspond with eastern Mexico by sea. Interestingly, although the United States and the United Mexican States had no direct mails, a postal convention was negotiated between them in 1861. This came about amid the turmoil of our Civil War and the days of confusion leading up to the arrival of Maximilian, the short-lived emperor of Mexico. It was signed in Mexico City on December 11, 1861, proclaimed by President Lincoln on June 20, 1862, and officially placed into effect under the signature of First Assistant Postmaster-General John A. Kasson on July 4, 1862.' Charles J. Starnes concluded that the treaty rates were not used until July 1870 based on his analysis of the postage received for letters from Mexico which were reported in the annual Reports of the Postmaster General. ${ }^{2}$ Covers in the Lanman \& Kemp Archive of the United States Philatelic Classics Society Stamp \& Cover Repository \& Analysis Program (S.C.R.A.P.) reference collection, ${ }^{3}$ however, show examples of the treaty rates used as early as 12 February 1870.

For letters to Mexico, the convention called for a United States domestic rate of 3申 per half ounce plus a sea rate of $7 \phi$ per half ounce, for a total of $10 \notin$ per half ounce. This rate had to be prepaid. It paid for conveyance only to the Mexican port of entry. The cost of inland carriage within Mexico normally was additional and collected at destination. The convention rate to Mexico was, of course, very similar to the 1851 general $10 \notin$ per half ounce rate then in use for letters ". . . conveyed wholly or in part by sea, and to or from a foreign country . . ." by steamship for a distance under 2,500 miles. The latter rate was amended in 1864 to $10 \phi$ per half ounce regardless of the distance carried. Convention letters from Mexico to the United States will always show a postage due of $3 \phi$ since the American domestic postage could not be prepaid in Mexico. Letters brought in by steamships not carrying convention mails will show a postage due of $10 \phi$, the normal incoming steamship rate.

## New York Service

With the end of the Civil War, the United States government became interested in reestablishing direct mail contacts with Mexico. Charles Whitney obtained the initial government mail contract for a twice monthly conveyance of the mails from New York to Havana and the east coast of Mexico. After Lee's surrender in April 1865, an advertisement appeared in a New York newspaper the following month:

[^1]

Figure 1. Ports and routes used by United States mail steamers serving the Mexican east coast.


Figure 2. Veracruz folded letter sheet dispatched October 22, 1865 aboard Whitney-chartered packet Vera Cruz for New York. The missing stamp was probably a one-real Mexican adhesive of the period. STEAMSHIP/10 marking denotes 10¢ postage due. (USPCS S.C.R.A.P. Lanman \& Kemp Archive reference collection)

> STEAM TO VERA CRUZ VIA HAVANA. - THE AMERican and Mexican Mail Steamship Company will despatch their new and elegant sidewheel steamers from New York, commencing June 15, as follows:MANHATTAN, Captain Turner, on the 15th of each month.
> VERA CRUZ, Captain Gregory, on the 1st of each month. For particulars inquire of CHAS. A. WHITNEY, Agent, 26 Broadway. ${ }^{4}$

By July 9, 1865, Whitney was also advertising for an additional intermediate stop at Sisal ${ }^{5}$ on the Yucatan peninsula of Mexico (see Figure 1).

Because of mail service requirements, a number of other steamship companies were awarded contracts to carry foreign mail to Havana in addition to Whitney's American and Mexican Mail Steamship line. However, with but a single possible exception (the General Transatlantic Company discussed below), there was to be only one mail contract carrier at a time from New York to the Mexican east coast for the years leading up to Mexico's entry into the UPU on April 1, 1879. Throughout the 1865-79 period, the United States government never subsidized this Mexican mail route. All mail was carried "under act of June 14, 1858 , restricting the compensation to the postage on the mail transported." ${ }^{י 6}$ Thus, Whitney was paid only for the mail actually carried to Havana and Veracruz. Although the government did subsidize mail service to some destinations during this general period, such as to Brazil and China, Whitney's steamship line received no additional operating subsidies for establishing his mail-carrying service to Mexico.

The cover shown in Figure 2 was mailed and dispatched from Veracruz on October 22, 1865 aboard the American and Mexican Mail Steamship Company-chartered packet Vera Cruz and arrived at New York on November 1st. It is an early usage following the post-Civil War reestablishment of the Mexico-United States direct mails. It resides in the S.C.R.A.P. reference collection. The black 29 mm circular date stamp originally canceling the now cut-away stamp would have read FRANQUEADO/OCTBRE 22/VERACRUZ with the translation of franqueado meaning "paid." The missing stamp was probably a one-real adhesive of the period, possibly from the Coat of Arms or "Eagle" issue of 186466, which would have paid for domestic carriage from 1-16 leagues ${ }^{7}$ under the Mexican postal tariffs of 1864. The black circular STEAMSHIP/10 marking was applied upon arrival at New York and denotes the incoming steamship rate since the treaty rates were not yet in use. This marking's utilization period was reportedly between December 1851 and May $1867 .{ }^{8}$

Charles Whitney held the mail contract through March 1867. A listing of his American and Mexican Mail Steamship Company sailings is shown in Table 1. His company actually owned no steamships of its own, but relied exclusively on charters to fulfill its contractual obligations. In addition to mail for both the United States and Mexican governments, the steamers carried passengers, merchandise and raw materials. Whitney cut
${ }^{4}$ New York Herald, May 17, 1865, page 3, column 5.
${ }^{5}$ The small port of Sisal was a principal exporter of an important, durable white hemp of the same name which was used for manufacturing hard fiber cordage and twine.
${ }^{6} 47$ th Congress, 2nd Session, Senate, Executive Document No. 65, Letter from The Postmaster General, February 12, 1883, responding to Senate resolution of December 27, 1882 for certain information respecting the transportation of ocean mails.
${ }^{7}$ The length of a Spanish league used in Mexico as a distance measurement was approximately 2.6 statute miles.
${ }^{8}$ Theron Wierenga, United States Incoming Steamship Mail 1847-1875 (Muskegon, Michigan: Theron Wierenga, 1983), pp 170-171.
back to a single monthly sailing beginning July 1866, and there was no southbound sailing at all in February 1867.

Figure 3 shows a folded letter sheet carried on one of the last of Whitney's mail service steamers, also from the USPCS S.C.R.A.P. Lanman \& Kemp Archive. It was mailed and dispatched from Veracruz on February 12, 1867 aboard the American and Mexican Mail Steamship Company-chartered packet Alabama, arriving at New York on February 24th. As common with all such archive material, its single stamp has, unfortunately, been removed. Since the cover weighs less than one-half ounce, the missing franking was likely a 13 -centavos stamp of the Maximilian issue of 1866 , which under the Mexican postal tariff of 1864 would have paid for a letter conveyed domestically 1-16 leagues. The red double oval handstamp at lower left is the marking of H. D'OLEIRE Y CIA, a known Veracruz forwarding agent. The circular black STEAMSHIP/10 handstamp shows the $10 \phi$ postage due and was applied at New York. Again, the $10 \notin$ postage due indicated that the treaty rates were not in effect.

The United States Post Office Department may have tried to interest another company in beginning a monthly mail service to the Mexican east coast during the last half of 1866, perhaps because of displeasure with Whitney's service cutback in July. At various times the General Transatlantic Company (George McKenzie, Agent) advertised in the New York Herald for direct service to Veracruz with the steamers Tampico, Vera Cruz and Florida. Departures were scheduled from New York on September 8th, October 3rd, October 31st and November 28th. The Tampico and the Vera Cruz did depart New York bound for Veracruz on September 8th and October 2nd, but the other sailings apparently did not take place. The United States Mail and Post Office Assistant for September and October 1866 showed mail sailings for Mexico scheduled on September 5th and October 3rd. These were the original scheduled sailing dates for Tampico and Vera Cruz, so these steamers may have carried United States mails for Mexico.


Figure 3. February 1867 usage from Veracruz carried aboard steamer Alabama on one of the last American and Mexican Mail Steamship Company sailings. Removed stamp was probably a 13 -centavos adhesive of 1866 "Maximilian" issue. Postage due of 10c̣. (USPCS S.C.R.A.P. Lanman \& Kemp Archive reference collection)

In April 1867, E.W. Turner, the former captain of the steamer Manhattan, took over the mail contract from Whitney. Turner was agent-owner for the Mexican Mail Steamship Company. He operated the monthly service over the identical route as had Whitney, that is, New York to Havana to Sisal to Veracruz and return by the same ports. Outbound, the steamers carried United States foreign mails for Havana and Mexico. On their return, Turner's steamers carried Mexican foreign mails to Havana and New York. A listing of the Mexican Mail Steamship Company sailings is shown in Table 2. Like Whitney, Turner owned no steamships and chartered the vessels used in his service.

At the end of 1867, a significant change in the economics of the United StatesMexico mail steamer route took place. The firm of F. Alexandre \& Sons of New York obtained from the Mexican government an important subsidy contract, which was signed December 24, 1867. With this contract, the Mexican government promised to pay a mail subsidy of 2,200 pesos for each round trip voyage. Exemptions from various Mexican maritime dues amounted to another 6,768 pesos annually. For its part, the shipping company was committed to no fewer than 18 such voyages each year between Veracruz and New York via Sisal and Havana. The contract was to last for three years. ${ }^{9}$ This potential annual subsidy of 46,368 pesos was approximately equivalent to the same amount in U.S. dollars and represented a tremendous operational advantage for F. Alexandre \& Sons. The scale of this advantage can be seen by noting that the annual amounts paid by the Mexican government during the early years of the contract were about 25 times what the Unites States Post Office Department was paying during the same period for mails carried to Mexico. ${ }^{10}$

Earlier in October 1867, F. Alexandre \& Sons had inaugurated its new service with the following classified advertisement:

FOR SISAL AND VERA CRUZ - THE STEAMSHIP FAH-KEE, Captain Liesegang, will sail for above ports, from pier 28 East river, on Thursday, Oct. 3, at 3 P.M. For freight or passage apply to J.(sic) ALEXANDRE \& SONS, 44 Beaver street. ${ }^{1}$
From October through December 1867, F. Alexandre \& Sons competed head to head with Turner's Mexican Mail Steamship Company, although Alexandre's steamships apparently did not carry mail. However, by the end of December, Turner was out of business, and F. Alexandre \& Sons took over his government mail contract to provide service to Havana and Mexico. The folded letter sheet illustrated in Figure 4 was carried on one of F. Alexandre \& Sons' first mail carrying voyages (shown through the courtesy of Kenneth A. Pitt Postal History). The 10¢ Washington franking was from the 1861-68 issue. The letter was mailed at New York by the forwarding agent MOLLER \& THEBAUD. Their blue double oval handstamp can be see in the lower left. The stamp was canceled with a fancy 8 -diamond killer known to be used by the Foreign Division of the New York Post Office; however, there is no circular date stamp on either the front or reverse sides of the cover. The endorsement and internal dating indicates the letter was carried aboard the Alexandrechartered steamship Georgia which departed New York on February 4, 1868. The letter probably was put ashore at Sisal where it was sent on to Laguna de Terminos down the coast about 190 miles to the southwest, arriving about February 25th (per inner docketing). The large black 2 denotes the two reales (equal to about $25 \notin$ U.S.) to be collected upon delivery for the domestic portion of the postage.

[^2]

Figure 4. February 1868 folded letter sheet from the early post-Civil War period carried by the chartered steamer Georgia on one of the first mail carrying voyages of F. Alexandre \& Sons. (Pitt dealer stock)


Figure 5. Triple rate cover carried on the Alexandre-chartered steamer Cleopatra which departed New York February 2, 1870 and after a trouble-filled, interrupted voyage arrived Veracruz about February 27th. Large black 5 handstamp marks the five reals (63c) postage due, since the $\mathbf{3 0} 1869$ issue paid postage to port of entry only. (Forster collecion)
F. Alexandre \& Sons now had the advantage of earning mail revenues in both directions in addition to accruing income from passengers, merchandise and raw material cargoes. Its New York and Mexican Mail Steamship Company (later the New York, Havana and Mexican Mail Steamship Company), known also as the Alexandre Line, was to dominate the New York to Mexican east coast steamship service well into the 1880s before it was eventually sold to the New York and Cuba Steamship Company (the Ward Line).

For the first three years of the Alexandre Line, its Mexican route was New York to Veracruz via Havana and Sisal, with stops occasionally at other secondary Mexican ports. An example of a letter mailed during this period is shown in Figure 5. The cover, from the collection of Jeffrey M. Forster, was franked with the $30 \notin$ value of the 1869 issue. This paid a triple $10 \notin$ per half ounce rate for direct packet service to Mexico. The letter was carried on the Alexandre-chartered steamer Cleopatra which departed New York on February 2, 1870. The Cleopatra ran into a gale on February 4th off Cape Hatteras, lost her stern post and rudder, and limped back into New York on February 10th. After repairs it departed again on February 15th and finally arrived at Veracruz on or about February 27th. The large black 5 handstamp applied at Veracruz denotes the five reales required under the 1864 Mexican postal tariffs for internal postage for delivery to a destination of less than 16 leagues. Five reales was then equal to about $63 \notin$; Mexican domestic postage rates were very high during this period.

Unlike its predecessor companies, the Alexandre Line almost immediately began contracting for the building of its own steamships. Their first steamship, the City of Mexico, 1,500 tons, began construction in 1868 and made her inaugural run on February 20, 1869 to Havana and Veracruz and return. Initially, the company also used chartered vessels, but by April 1870 it had a sufficient number of company-owned vessels so that, with relatively few lapses, it was able to provide service almost entirely with it own steamers.

Beginning mid-1871, the route changed, possibly at the request of the Mexican government. It became New York to Veracruz via Havana, Progreso and Campeche. The latter two were secondary ports on the Yucatan peninsula and are shown on the map in Figure 1. This revised routing continued, with occasional minor exceptions for the convenience of the Mexican government, through September 1874. Sailings throughout this seven year period of the New York and Mexican Mail Steamship Company are listed in Table 3.

Figure 6 illustrates a usage from the latter part of this period. The franking was the $10 \notin$ Jefferson and $30 \notin$ Hamilton of the Continental Bank Note Company printing of 1873, which paid a quadruple $10 \notin$ per half ounce rate for American packet direct service. The letter was mailed by the New York forwarding agent MOLLER \& THEBAUD, whose blue double oval handstamp can be seen at upper left. It was carried in the mails aboard the Alexandre Line steamship City of Mexico which sailed from New York on November 8, 1873 and arrived Veracruz on or about November 21, 1873. The large 16 mm black 6 handstamp was applied by a Veracruz postal clerk. It represents the six reales (about 75ф) internal postage due to be collected upon delivery.

The Alexandre Line's contract with the Mexican government was renewed with little change for an additional two years in May 1870 and again for two more years in December 1871. In December 1873, the contract again was extended with an increase in the subsidy to a minimum of 45,000 pesos annually plus tax exemptions of another 7,200 pesos. ${ }^{12}$

## New Orleans Service

The Mexican government had long desired an efficient mail steamer route between Veracruz and New Orleans. France maintained an extensive mail steam packet system in
${ }^{12}$ Schimmer \& Heath, op. cit., pp. 191-192.


Figure 6. 10¢̧ and 30¢ 1873 Continental Bank Note issues pay quadruple rate from New York on November 8, 1873 on Alexandre steamer City of Mexico arriving Veracruz about November 21st. Postage due of 6 reales (75¢).
the West Indies during the 1860 s and throughout much of the last half of the nineteenth century. In September 1865 during the reign of the French-supported emperor of Mexico, Maximilian, the French established Ligne Annexe F (translated as Extension Line F) from Veracruz to Tampico and Matamoros and return. During the period April to December 1866 this route was extended on to New Orleans. ${ }^{13}$ On this monthly trip, the French mail packets may have carried mail to and from New Orleans; however, this could not be determined with certainty by the author. (During this period, the only announcement by the United States Post Office Department found by the author concerning French mails from New Orleans pertained to mail to be exchanged with the French postal agency at Havana, Cuba.) With the departure of French military forces from Mexico, the death of Maximilian, and the subsequent reduction of French interests and influence in the country, Ligne Annexe F ceased operations in January 1868.

In January 1867 the United States Mail and Post Office Assistant announced that the U.S. had arranged with the General Post Department of France "for the exchange of mails by means of the new line of French mail packets established between Havana and New Orleans, running in connection with the French line of packets conveying mails between St. Nazaire (France) and Veracruz., ${ }^{14}$ This routing description was certainly referring to Ligne Annexe M (New Orleans to Havana). ${ }^{15}$ Although it was possible to send mail from

[^3]New Orleans to Mexico via Havana by this arrangement, it appears not to have been a very favored route, even though the rate was $10 \phi$ per half ounce. Perhaps the reason can be seen in the particulars of this French line. Around the 13th of each month, mail leaving New Orleans via the French steam packet was taken to Havana to make a connection with the monthly French steamer traveling from Veracruz to St. Nazaire. To be carried in the French mails, such mail for Mexico would have to await the return of the packet from France before it could proceed to Veracruz. Therefore, the use and expense of a forwarding agent, either in New Orleans or Havana, was probably necessary by this route, in order to make a more timely delivery to Veracruz.

By 1873 the Mexican government was negotiating with F. Alexandre \& Sons to establish a second U.S.-Mexico mail route, this one a direct route between New Orleans and Veracruz. A contract was signed on March 26, 1873 providing for a subsidy of 1,800 pesos per round trip along with the same tax exemptions as provided for the New York to Veracruz route. ${ }^{16}$ However, delays in implementation resulted in the inaugural run not being made until October 1874.

Initially, the Alexandre Line serviced this new contract simply by expanding its New York to Veracruz route. Beginning with the sailing of the City of Mexico from New York on October 10, 1874, the Alexandre Line's Mexican route of New York-Havana-Progreso-Campeche-Veracruz was extended by adding a leg that included the secondary Mexican ports of Tuxpan and Tampico en route to New Orleans (see the map at Figure 1). The return trip was the reverse of this route, that is, New Orleans-Tampico-Tuxpan-Veracruz-Campeche-Progreso-Havana-New York. F. Alexandre \& Sons' agent in New Orleans was J.M. Witherspoon, who regularly advertised in the local New Orleans newspapers for this new Mexican service as shown in Figure 7.

Although the initiative of the Mexican government led to the establishment of the New Orleans-Veracruz route, the United States Post Office Department almost immediately made use of it to carry its foreign mails to Mexico. The effect was to provide service from New York about every three weeks, as well as service from New Orleans about every three weeks, or about 18 departures per year from each port. This routing picture remained unchanged for two years. An example of a cover with routing via New Orleans during this period is shown in Figure 8. Franked with two $10 \notin$ Jeffersons of the 1873 Continental Bank Note Company issue, this double rate letter was mailed at New York on February 15, 1875 by the forwarding agent FRED'K PROBST \& CO whose blue circular date stamp is at lower left. It was carried by rail to New Orleans where it was placed aboard the Alexandre Line steamship City of Merida which departed New Orleans on February 20, 1875 and arrived at Veracruz on February 26, 1875 (confirmed by circular date stamp on reverse). The small 8 mm black 25c. handstamp applied at Veracruz denotes 25 centavos internal postage due on delivery at Guadalajara under the 1874 Mexican domestic rates for a letter of less than one ounce carried more than 17 leagues.

The Alexandre Line began experimenting with a significant operational change in its Mexican service in November 1876. The change did not affect the postal service as Alexandre's steamship departures continued every three weeks from New York and New Orleans as before. The company simply changed how it accomplished the sailings. When the City of Mexico sailed from New York on November 4, 1876, it was not to return to its homeport until February 27, 1877. The Alexandre Line used the vessel to operate a New Orleans to Veracruz shuttle. During that almost 17 -week period before returning to New York, it made four additional round trips between New Orleans and Veracruz. Before the return of the City of Mexico, Alexandre dispatched the City of Merida to take over the shuttle.
${ }^{16}$ Schimmer \& Heath, op. cit., page 193.


Figure 7. Ad from the Wednesday, January 26, 1875 New Orleans Picayune.

Figure 9 illustrates a cover that was carried on the Alexandre Line steamship City of Mexico on the very first shuttle run made to Veracruz. It is franked with a pair of Continental $10 ¢$ Jeffersons and was mailed at New Orleans on December 2, 1876 by the New Orleans forwarding agent MANUEL PAYRO whose blue double oval handstamp can be seen in the lower left. The letter was in the mails placed aboard the City of Mexico departing that same day, and it arrived at Veracruz on or about December 8th. The small 7 mm black -35cs. handstamp refers to the 35 centavos due upon delivery for domestic Mexican postal charges for a letter of one to two ounces conveyed less than 17 leagues.

Although there was a short-lived interruption of the New Orleans to Veracruz shuttle in the summer of 1877 that was prolonged by the wreck of the City of Havana in August 1877, the Alexandre Line had again fairly well settled back into its shuttle by December 1877. Its steamers began staying away for longer periods on the shuttle before returning to New York. The City of Mexico was assigned to the shuttle for almost 26 weeks in the November 1877 to May 1878 time frame, and then again beginning June 1878 and lasting past Mexico's April 1, 1879 entry into the UPU. Table 4 provides the overall Mexican service picture for the Alexandre Line for the period October 1874 through March 1879. In addition, an extract listing showing only the New Orleans to Veracruz shuttle is provided by Table 5 .

The cover shown in Figure 10 illustrates a letter mailed shortly before Mexico joined the UPU. The letter was mailed on February 21, 1879 at New York by the forwarding agent FRED'K PROBST \& CO. It was franked with the $10 \notin$ Jefferson of the American Bank Note issue of 1879 and is an example of the earliest known use of this stamp.


Figure 8. Double rate letter from New York February 15, 1875 and sent by rail to New Orleans. There, it was dispatched aboard the Alexandre Line's City of Merida which departed February 20th and arrived Veracruz February 26th from whence it was sent overland to Guadalajara. Postage due of $\mathbf{2 5}$ centavos.


Figure 9. New Orleans, December 2, 1876 letter to Veracruz by the Alexandre Line's City of Mexico making the initial New Orleans-to-Veracruz shuttle run; arrived Veracruz about December 8th. Letter prepaid to port of entry by pair of $10 ¢$ Continental Jeffersons for direct service via American packet. Postage due of $\mathbf{3 5}$ centavos.


Figure 10. New York, February 21, 1879 letter to Guadalajara, dispatched the following day on Alexandre steamer City of New York, arrived Veracruz on March 6th. Franked with the earliest recorded usage of the 10¢ Jefferson of the American Bank Note issue of 1879.

Although the cover was postmarked February 21, the Alexandre Line steamer City of New York actually departed February 22nd and arrived Veracruz on March 6, 1879 (per backstamp). There it was marked with the small 8 mm black $\mathbf{2 5 c}$. requiring the collection of 25 centavos upon delivery at Guadalajara.

The Mexican government and F. Alexandre \& Sons signed a contract revision in January 1878. The revision merely confirmed what was already in effect by calling for some 38 to 40 trips annually between Veracruz, New Orleans and New York. ${ }^{17}$ By actual count for 1878 from the Mexican government's point of view, there were 21 Veracruz to New York sailings and 18 Veracruz to New Orleans sailings, or a total of 39 sailings. From the United States Post Office Department's view, the service had also improved. By the latter half of 1878 , the Alexandre Line was providing an average three and one-half departures each month to Mexico from New York and New Orleans combined. For the Post Office Department this compares quite favorably to the average one and one-half departures per month from New York alone seen in the first half of 1874, two years before the New Orleans shuttle began. Because the Mexican government paid the Alexandre Line substantial subsidies to provide this level of service, the Post Office Department got its more frequent service at little or no cost. Since the department only compensated Alexandre based upon the sea postage portion paid for the United States foreign mails, the government was the recipient of a service bargain courtesy of the Alexandre Line's Mexican government subsidies.

## Sailing and Steamship Data Tables

The principal sources for the listings of sailings found in Tables 1 through 5 are the microfilm records of the New York Maritime Register and the New York Herald located at the Mariners' Museum Research Library and Archives in Newport News, Virginia. The New York Maritime Register was particularly valuable for those sailings occurring after its inaugural publication in June 1869. It was published for the Merchants' Exchange and

News Association of New York and was an exhaustive digest and weekly compendium providing vessel type, name, captain, date and port departed from, port departed for and last reported port, as well as a wealth of other maritime information. Table 6 is an alphabetical listing of known steamships that carried mail between the eastern United States and the east coast of Mexico. The vessels listed are only those used on the United States to Mexican east coast route during the period covered. The Alexandre Line was also engaged separately on the New York to Havana route, competing on this route with several other lines during this period. Alexandre frequently shifted steamers between the two routes to meet requirements, and, of course, those on the New York to Veracruz run also carried mail to Havana. The Alexandre Line also owned the City of Washington, which was built in 1877, but it was used only on the New York to Havana route during this time. In addition, the Alexandre Line purchased some vessels after April 1879 that are not addressed here. These vessels included City of Alexandria, City of Puebla and City of Campeche. Information about the general particulars of the steamships used on the Mexican routes is found in Table 7. It was taken from various annual volumes of American Lloyd's Universal Register of Shipping from 1865-1879, also located in the Mariners' Museum Research Library and Archives. Abbreviations used in Tables 1 through 5 are: NY-New York; VCVeracruz; NO-New Orleans; Dep-departed; Arr-arrived; unk-unknown. Where brackets [ ] are used, the dates shown are estimates of expected arrival and departure dates.
${ }^{17}$ Schimmer \& Heath, op. cit., page 195.

## CANCELLATIONS AND KILLERS OF THE BANKNOTE ERA 1870-1894

by James M. Cole

Tracings of over 5,000 cancellations of the banknote era, approx. 150 halftone illustrations. With essay on cancel collecting, introductory chapter on postmarks and postmarking devices, bibliography, town index and Cole catalog index. 360 pages, $8^{1} / 2 \times 11$, cloth bound.
$\$ 49.50$ postpaid from:


USPCS, P.O. Box 455, Wheeling, IL 60090

TABLE 1
American \& Mexican Mail Steamship Company
(Charles A. Whitney, Agent)
Dep NY Arr VC STEAMSHIP Dep VC Arr NY

1865

| 15 Jun | [25 Jun] |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 Jul | [12 Jul] |
| 15 Jul | [25 Jul] |
| 1 Aug | [12 Aug] |
| 15 Aug | [25 Aug] |
| 8 Sep | [19 Sep] |
| 23 Sep | [3 Oct] |
| 9 Oct | [20 Oct] |
| 23 Oct | [3 Nov] |
| 8 Nov | [18 Nov] |
| 23 Nov | [3 Dec] |
| 8 Dec | [19 Dec] |
| 23 Dec | [3 Jan] |


| Manhattan | 28 Jun | 7 Jul |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vera Cruz | 14 Jul | 25 Jul |
| Manhattan | 28 Jul | 8 Aug |
| Vera Cruz | 14 Aug | 26 Aug |
| Manhattan | 28 Aug | 7 Sep |
| Vera Cruz | 21 Sep | 2 Oct |
| Manhattan | 5 Oct | 15 Oct |
| Vera Cruz | 22 Oct | 1 Nov |
| Manhattan | 7 Nov | 17 Nov |
| Vera Cruz | 22 Nov | 2 Dec |
| Manhattan | 6 Dec | 16 Dec |
| Vera Cruz | 24 Dec | 4 Jan |
| Manhattan | 7 Jan | 18 Jan |

1866

| 9 Jan | [19 Jan] | Vera Cruz | 23 Jan | 2 Feb |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 Jan | [4 Feb] | Manhattan | 8 Feb | 17 Feb |
| 8 Feb | [20 Feb] | Vera Cruz | 23 Feb | 7 Mar |
| 24 Feb | [6 Mar] | Manhattan | 9 Mar | 19 Mar |
| 10 Mar | [20 Mar] | Vera Cruz | 22 Mar | 2 Apr |
| 24 Mar | [4 Apr] | Manhattan | 8 Apr | 18 Apr |
| 10 Apr | [ ] | Vera Cruz | [ ] |  |
| 25 Apr | [5 May] | Manhattan | 8 May | 18 May |
| 10 May | [23 May] | Andrew Johnson | 26 May | 8 Jun |
| 25 May | [3 Jun] | Manhattan | 6 Jun | 15 Jun |
| 11 Jun | [22 Jun] | Daniel Webster | 26 Jun | 6 Jul |
| 25 Jun | [5 Jul] | Manhattan | 9 Jul | 18 Jul |
| 13 Jul | [25 Jul] | Daniel Webster | 31 Jul | 11 Aug |
| 10 Aug | [21 Aug] | Manhattan | [24 Aug] | 4 Sep |
| 10 Sep | [21 Sep] | Manhattan | 30 Sep | 10 Oct |
| 13 Oct | [23 Oct] | Manhattan | 26 Oct | 6 Nov |
| 12 Nov | [23 Nov] | Manhattan | 28 Nov | 8 Dec |
| 15 Dec | [26 Dec] | Manhattan | 29 Dec | 10 Jan |

1867

| 21 Jan | $[3 \mathrm{Feb}]$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 Mar | $[17 \mathrm{Mar}]$ |


| Alabama | 12 Feb | 24 Feb |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Alabama | 23 Mar | 4 Apr |

TABLE 2
Mexican Mail Steamship Company
(E.W. Turner, Agent)
Dep NY Arr VC STEAMSHIP Dep VC Arr NY

1867

| 15 Apr | [28 Apr] | Virginia | 4 May | 17 May |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 May | [4 Jun] | Virginia | 8 Jun | 23 Jun |
| 6 Jul | [20 Jul] | Virginia | [24 Jul] | 6 Aug |
| 14 Aug | [30 Aug] | Georgia | 8 Sep | $25 \mathrm{Sep}^{1}$ |
| 14 Sep | [1 Oct] | Virginia | 8 Oct | $25 \mathrm{Oct}^{2}$ |
| 5 Oct | [21 Oct] | Georgia | 31 Oct | 15 Nov |
| 25 Oct | [7 Nov] | Wilmington | 10 Nov | 24 Nov |
| 19 Nov | [2 Dec] | Georgia | 4 Dec | 19 Dec |
| 2 Dec | [17 Dec] | Virginia | 20 Dec | 4 Jan |

[^4]

Figure 11. City of Mexico, 1500 tons, built for the Alexandre Line in 1868 and placed in service on the New York to Mexico route in early 1869. (Courtesy of the Mariners' Museum of Newport News, Virginia)

TABLE 3
New York and Mexican Mail Steamship Company - 1867 TO 1874 (F. Alexandre \& Sons, Agent)

| Dep NY | Arr VC | STEAMSHIP | Dep VC | Arr NY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1867 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 Oct | [18 Oct] | Fah-Kee | 25 Oct | 8 Nov |
| 26 Oct ${ }^{1}$ |  | Thames |  |  |
| 9 Nov | [23 Nov] | Mt Vernon | 26 Nov | 18 Dec |
| 16 Nov | [1 Dec] | Fah-Kee | 4 Dec | 20 Dec |
| $24 \mathrm{Dec}^{2}$ |  | Mt Vernon |  |  |
| 28 Dec | [11 Jan] | Georgia | 16 Jan | 29 Jan |

1868

| 14 Jan | 26 Jan | Nightingale ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 Feb | [17 Feb] | Georgia | 20 Feb | 4 Mar |
| 10 Mar | [25 Mar] | Alabama | 2 Apr | 16 Apr |
| 4 Apr | [17 Apr] | Virgo | 22 Apr | 5 May |
| 24 Apr | [8 May] | Nevada | 11 May | 25 May |
| 14 May | [27 May] | Virgo | 31 May | 13 Jun |
| 3 Jun | [ ] | Nevada | [ ] |  |
| 23 Jun | [6 Jul] | Virgo | 10 Jul | 22 Jul |
| 12 Jul | [26 Jul] | Grenada | 30 Jul | 12 Aug |
| 1 Aug | [11 Aug] | San Francisco | 20 Aug | 30 Aug |
| 22 Aug | [5 Sep] | Grenada | 10 Sep | 4 Oct |
| 11 Sep | [22 Sep] | San Francisco | 1 Oct | 11 Oct |
| 1 Oct | [15 Oct] | Alabama | 19 Oct | 3 Nov |
| 21 Oct | [3 Nov] | San Francisco | 7 Nov | 20 Nov |
| 10 Nov | [25 Nov] | Grenada | 30 Nov | 14 Dec |
| 30 Nov | [13 Dec] | San Francisco | 18 Dec | 31 Dec |
| 19 Dec | [3 Jan] | Grenada | 7 Jan | 23 Jan |

1869

| 9 Jan | [22 Jan] | San Francisco | 28 Jan | 10 Feb |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29 Jan | $[11 \mathrm{Feb}]$ | Cleopatra | 15 Feb | 1 Mar |
| $20 \mathrm{Feb}^{4}$ | $[5 \mathrm{Mar}]$ | City of Mexico | 9 Mar | 23 Mar |
| 10 Mar | $[23 \mathrm{Mar}]$ | Cleopatra | 27 Mar | 8 Apr |
| 30 Mar | $[11 \mathrm{Apr}]$ | City of Mexico | 16 Apr | 27 Apr |

[^5]Dep NY Arr VC STEAMSHIP Dep VC Arr NY

1869 (Cont.)

| 19 Apr | [1 May] | Cleopatra | 6 May | 17 May |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 May | [21 May] | City of Mexico | 26 May | 7 Jun |
| 29 May | [11 Jun] | Cleopatra | 15 Jun | 26 Jun |
| 18 Jun | [1 Jul] | City of Mexico | 5 Jul | 21 Jul |
| 8 Jul | [21 Jul] | Cleopatra | 25 Jul | 6 Aug |
| 29 Jul | [11 Aug] | City of Mexico | 14 Aug | 26 Aug |
| 17 Aug | [ ] | Cleopatra | 10 Sep | 22 Sep |
| 6 Sep | [20 Sep] | City of Mexico | 23 Sep | 6 Oct |
| 30 Sep ${ }^{5}$ |  | Cleopatra |  |  |
| 11 Oct | [24 Oct] | Cleopatra | 28 Oct | 11 Nov |
| 16 Oct | [28 Oct] | City of Mexico | 3 Nov | 14 Nov |
| 16 Nov | [29 Nov] | Cleopatra | 4 Dec | 16 Dec |
| 4 Dec | [17 Dec] | City of Mexico | 21 Dec | 31 Dec |
| 25 Dec | [6 Jan] | Cleopatra | 11 Jan | 22 Jan |

1870

| 13 Jan | [26 Jan] | City of Mexico | 31 Jan | 12 Feb |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \mathrm{Feb}^{6}$ |  | Cleopatra |  |  |
| 15 Feb | [27 Feb] | Cleopatra | 1 Mar | 13 Mar |
| 22 Feb | [7 Mar] | City of Mexico | 12 Mar | 23 Mar |
| 19 Mar | [1 Apr] | Cleopatra | 6 Apr | $27 \mathrm{Apr}^{7}$ |
| 2 Apr | [15 Apr] | City of Mexico | 20 Apr | 2 May |
| 13 May | [26 May] | City of Mexico | 30 May | 12 Jun |
| $2 \mathrm{Jun}^{8}$ | [14 Jun] | City of Merida | 19 Jun | 30 Jun |
| 22 Jun | [4 Jul] | City of Mexico | 9 Jul | 20 Jul |
| 12 Jul | [24 Jul] | City of Merida | 30 Jul | 10 Aug |
| 1 Aug | [14 Aug] | City of Mexico | 18 Aug | 30 Aug |
| 20 Aug | [1 Sep] | City of Merida | 7 Sep | 18 Sep |
| 10 Sep | [23 Sep] | City of Mexico | 28 Sep | 11 Oct |
| 1 Oct | [15 Oct] | City of Merida | $\left[180 \mathrm{Oct}^{9}\right.$ | 2 Nov |
| 20 Oct | [2 Nov] | City of Mexico | 6 Nov | 19 Nov |
| 9 Nov | [22 Nov] | City of Merida | 26 Nov | 7 Dec |
| 29 Nov | [12 Dec] | City of Mexico | 16 Dec | 29 Dec |
| 19 Dec | [1 Jan] | City of Merida | 5 Jan | 16 Jan |

[^6]Dep N
1871

| 7 Jan | [20 Jan] | City of Mexico | 23 Jan | 6 Feb |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28 Jan | [9 Feb] | City of Merida | 14 Feb | 25 Feb |
| 17 Feb | [4 Mar] | City of Mexico | 7 Mar | 19 Mar |
| 9 Mar | [22 Mar] | City of Merida | 26 Mar | 5 Apr |
| 29 Mar | [11 Apr] | City of Mexico | 15 Apr | 27 Apr |
| 18 Apr | [3 May] | City of Merida | 7 May | 19 May |
| 9 May | [21 May] | City of Mexico | 25 May | 6 Jun |
| 31 May | [12 Jun] | City of Merida | 16 Jun | 26 Jun |
| 17 Jun | [1 Jul] | City of Mexico | 5 Jul | 15 Jul |
| 7 Jul | [20 Jul] | City of Merida | 24 Jul | 4 Aug |
| 27 Jul | [8 Aug] | City of Mexico | 13 Aug | 24 Aug |
| 16 Aug | [29 Aug] | City of Merida | 2 Sep | 13 Sep |
| 5 Sep | [21 Sep] | City of Mexico | 26 Sep | 9 Oct |
| 25 Sep | [7 Oct] | City of Merida | 12 Oct | 23 Oct |
| 17 Oct | [31 Oct] | City of Mexico | 5 Nov | 16 Nov |
| 4 Nov | [16 Nov] | City of Merida | 21 Nov | 3 Dec |
| 24 Nov | [8 Dec] | City of Mexico | 11 Dec | 23 Dec |
| 14 Dec | [27 Dec] | City of Merida | 30 Dec | 10 Jan |

1872

| 3 Jan | [17 Jan] |
| :---: | :---: |
| 23 Jan | [6 Feb] |
| 12 Feb | [26 Feb] |
| 2 Mar | [16 Mar] |
| 23 Mar | [7 Apr] |
| 12 Apr | [25 Apr] |
| 4 May | [16 May] |
| 22 May | [4 Jun] |
| 11 Jun | [25 Jun] |
| 1 Jul | [14 Jul] |
| $24 \mathrm{Jul}^{10}$ | [6 Aug] |
| 10 Aug | [23 Aug] |
| 30 Aug | [13 Sep] |
| 19 Sep | [2 Oct] |
| 9 Oct | [22 Oct] |
| 29 Oct | [11 Nov] |
| 18 Nov | [2 Dec] |
| 17 Dec | [29 Dec] |
| 28 Dec | [11 Jan] |


| City of Mexico | 20 Jan | 1 Feb |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| City of Merida | 9 Feb | 22 Feb |
| City of Mexico | 1 Mar | 14 Mar |
| City of Merida | 20 Mar | 1 Apr |
| City of Mexico | 10 Apr | 24 Apr |
| City of Merida | 30 Apr | 11 May |
| City of Mexico | 18 May | 29 May |
| City of Merida | 8 Jun | 19 Jun |
| City of Mexico | 30 Jun | 11 Jul |
| City of Merida | 18 Jul | 30 Jul |
| City of Havana | 7 Aug | 20 Aug |
| City of Merida | 27 Aug | 8 Sep |
| City of Mexico | 16 Sep | 29 Sep |
| City of Merida | 7 Oct | 19 Oct |
| City of Mexico | 26 Oct | 7 Nov |
| City of Merida | 16 Nov | 12 Dec |
| City of Mexico | 6 Dec | 18 Dec |
| City of Merida | 1 Jan | 13 Jan |
| City of Mexico | 15 Jan | 29 Jan |

[^7]Dep NY Arr VC STEAMSHIP Dep VC Arr NY

1873

| 18 Jan | [1 Feb] | City of Merida | 4 Feb | 17 Feb |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6 \mathrm{Feb}^{12}$ | [20 Feb] | City of Mexico | 22 Feb | 10 Mar |
| 28 Feb | [12 Mar] | City of Merida | 19 Mar | 30 Mar |
| 20 Mar | [3 Apr] | Cleopatra | 7 Apr | 21 Apr |
| 10 Apr | [24 Apr] | City of Mexico | 29 Apr | 11 May |
| 1 May | [ ] | Cleopatra | 23 May | 3 Jun |
| 22 May | [6 Jun] | City of Mexico | 9 Jun | 23 Jun |
| 14 Jun | [27 Jun] | Cuba | 1 Jul | 13 Jul |
| 3 Jul | [18 Jul] | City of Mexico | 22 Jul | 3 Aug |
| 26 Jul | [9 Aug] | Cuba | 13 Aug | 25 Aug |
| 16 Aug | [30 Aug] | City of Mexico | 2 Sep | 15 Sep |
| 6 Sep | [20 Sep] | Cuba | 24 Sep | 7 Oct |
| 27 Sep | [11 Oct] | City of Mexico | 15 Oct | 27 Oct |
| 18 Oct | [1 Nov] | Cleopatra | 5 Nov | 17 Nov |
| 8 Nov | [21 Nov] | City of Mexico | 29 Nov | 10 Dec |
| 29 Nov | [13 Dec] | Cleopatra | 17 Dec | 29 Dec |
| 20 Dec | [3 Jan] | City of Mexico | 7 Jan | 21 Jan |

1874

| 10 Jan | [24 Jan] | Cleopatra | 31 Jan | 12 Feb |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 31 Jan | [15 Feb] | City of Mexico | 19 Feb | 2 Mar |
| 21 Feb | [6 Mar] | Cleopatra | 11 Mar | 23 Mar |
| 14 Mar | [28 Mar] | City of Mexico | 31 Mar | 13 Apr |
| 4 Apr | [18 Apr] | Cuba | 22 Apr | 4 May |
| 26 Apr | [8 May] | City of Mexico | 13 May | 25 May |
| 16 May | [29 May] | Cuba | 3 Jun | 14 Jun |
| 7 Jun | [20 Jun] | City of Mexico | 24 Jun | 6 Jul |
| 27 Jun | [11 Jul] | Cuba | 15 Jul | 27 Jul |
| 18 Jul | [1 Aug] | City of Mexico | 4 Aug | 17 Aug |
| 8 Aug | [23 Aug] | Cuba | 26 Aug | 7 Sep |
| 29 Aug | 10 Sep | City of Mexico | 16 Sep | 28 Sep |
| 20 Sep | [3 Oct] | Cuba | 8 Oct | 21 Oct |

[^8]TABLE 4
New York, Havana and Mexican Mail Steamship Company - 1874 TO 1879
(F. Alexandre \& Sons, Agent)

Dep NY Arr VC STEAMSHIP Dep VC Arr NO Dep NO Arr VC Dep VC Arr NY
1874

| 10 Oct | $[23 \mathrm{Oct}]$ | City of Mexico | $[27 \mathrm{Oct}]$ | 2 Nov | 8 Nov | [14 Nov] | 17 Nov | 30 Nov |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 31 Oct | $[12 \mathrm{Nov}]$ | Cuba | $[16 \mathrm{Nov}]$ | 22 Nov | 20 Nov | $[5 \mathrm{Dec}]$ | 9 Dec | 22 Dec |
| 24 Nov | $[6 \mathrm{Dec}]$ | City of Merida | $[9 \mathrm{Dec}]$ | 15 Dec | 19 Dec | [25 Dec] | 29 Dec | 10 Jan |
| 15 Dec | $[27 \mathrm{Dec}]$ | City of Mexico | $[31 \mathrm{Dec}]$ | 6 Jan | 9 Jan | [15 Jan] | 19 Jan | 1 Feb |

1875

| 5 Jan | [18 Jan] | City of Havana | [21 Jan] | 27 Jan | 30 Jan | [ 5 Feb ] | 9 Feb | 22 Feb |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 Jan | [7 Feb] | City of Merida | [10 Feb] | 16 Feb | 20 Feb | 26 Feb | 2 Mar | 16 Mar |
| 16 Feb | [1 Mar] | City of Mexico | [4 Mar] | 10 Mar | 14 Mar | [20 Mar] | 23 Mar | 6 Apr |
| 9 Mar | [21 Mar] | City of Havana | [25 Mar] | 31 Mar | 4 Apr | [6 Apr] | 14 Apr | 27 Apr |
| 30 Mar | [12 Apr] | City of Merida | [16 Apr] | 22 Apr | 25 Apr | [1 May] | 4 May | 17 May |
| 20 Apr | 3 May | City of Mexico | [7 May] | 13 May | 17 May | [23 May] | 26 May | 8 Jun |
| 11 May | [23 May] | Cuba | [25 May] | 1 Jun | 6 Jun | [12 Jun] | 15 Jun | 28 Jun |
| 1 Jun | [14 Jun] | City of Merida | [18 Jun] | 24 Jun | 27 Jun | [3 Jul] | 6 Jul | 19 Jul |
| $22 \mathrm{Jun}{ }^{1}$ |  | City of Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 Jun | [10 Jul] | City of Mexico | [11 Jul] | 17 Jul | 21 Jul | [27 Jul] | 31 Jul | 12 Aug |
| 13 Jul | [26 Jul] | City of Havana | [29 Jul] | 4 Aug | 8 Aug | [14 Aug] | 17 Aug | 31 Aug |
| 3 Aug | 15 Aug | City of Merida | [18 Aug] | 24 Aug | 28 Aug | [3 Sep] | 7 Sep | 20 Sep |
| 24 Aug | [6 Sep] | City of Mexico | [9 Sep] | 15 Sep | 19 Sep | [25 Sep] | 28 Sep | 13 Oct |
| 14 Sep | [26 Sep] | City of Havana | [1 Oct] | 7 Oct | 8 Oct | [14 Oct] | 21 Oct | 2 Nov |
| 5 Oct | [17 Oct] | City of Merida | [20 Oct] | 26 Oct | 30 Oct | [5 Nov] | 11 Nov | 23 Nov |
| 26 Oct | [7 Nov] | City of Mexico | [11 Nov] | 17 Nov | 21 Nov | [27 Nov] | 1 Dec | 14 Dec |
| $17 \mathrm{Nov}^{2}$ | [7 Dec] | City of Havana | [8 Dec] | 14 Dec | 18 Dec | [24 Dec] | 25 Dec | 5 Jan |
| 7 Dec | [19 Dec] | City of Merida | [22 Dec] | 28 Dec | 2 Jan | [8 Jan] | 11 Jan | 24 Jan |
| 28 Dec | [10 Jan] | City of Mexico | [14 Jan] | 20 Jan | 23 Jan | [29 Jan] | 1 Feb | 14 Feb |

1876

| 18 Jan | $[30 \mathrm{Jan}]$ | City of Havana | $[4 \mathrm{Feb}]$ | 10 Feb | 13 Feb | $[20 \mathrm{Feb}]$ | 26 Feb | 8 Mar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 Feb | $[20 \mathrm{Feb}]$ | City of Merida | $[25 \mathrm{Feb}]$ | 2 Mar | 5 Mar | $[12 \mathrm{Mar}]$ | 17 Mar | 28 Mar |
| 29 Feb | $[12 \mathrm{Mar}]$ | City of Mexica | $[16 \mathrm{Mar}]$ | 22 Mar | 27 Mar | $[2 \mathrm{Apr}]$ | 4 Apr | 17 Apr |

[^9]1876 (Cont.)

| 21 Mar | [2 Apr] | City of Havana | [5 Apr] | 11 Apr | 16 Apr | [22 Apr] | 26 Apr | 8 May |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 Apr | [24 Apr] | City of Merida | [29 Apr] | 4 May | 7 May | [13 May] | 16 May | 29 May |
| 2 May | 14 May | City of Mexico | [18 May] | 24 May | 28 May | [3 Jun] | 7 Jun | 19 Jun |
| 23 May | [4 Jun] | City of Havana | [8 Jun] | 14 Jun | 19 Jun | [25 Jun] | 27 Jun | 11 Jul |
| 13 Jun | [25 Jun] | City of Merida | [29 Jun] | 5 Jul | 9 Jul | [15 Jul] | 19 Jul | 1 Aug |
| 6 Jul | [17 Jul] | City of Mexico | [20 Jul] | 26 Jul | 30 Jul | 4 Aug | 10 Aug | 22 Aug |
| 25 Jul | [6 Aug] | City of Havana | [9 Aug] | 15 Aug | 20 Aug | [26 Aug] | 30 Aug | 12 Sep |
| 15 Aug | [27 Aug] | City of Merida | [30 Aug] | 5 Sep | 10 Sep | [16 Sep] | 19 Sep | 3 Oct |
| 5 Sep | [18 Sep] | City of Mexico | [20 Sep] | 27 Sep | 1 Oct | [7 Oct] | 10 Oct | 26 Oct |
| 26 Sep | [8 Oct] | Cuba | [11 Oct] | 17 Oct | 22 Oct | [28 Oct] | 1 Nov | 13 Nov |
| 17 Oct | [29 Oct] | City of Merida | [1 Nov] | 7 Nov | 12 Nov | [18 Nov] | 22 Nov | 5 Dec |
| 4 Nov | [17 Nov] | City of Mexico | [22 Nov] | 29 Nov | $2 \mathrm{Dec}^{3}$ | [8 Dec] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [12 Dec] | 18 Dec | 22 Dec | [28 Dec] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [3 Jan] | 10 Jan | 13 Jan | [19 Jan] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [24 Jan] | 31 Jan | 4 Feb | [11 Feb] | 15 Feb | 27 Feb |
| 25 Nov | [8 Dec] | City of Havana |  |  |  |  | 17 Dec | 30 Dec |
| 16 Dec | [29 Dec] | City of Merida |  |  |  |  | 5 Jan | 15 Jan |

1877

| $\begin{aligned} & 6 \text { Jan } \\ & 27 \text { Jan } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { [18 Jan] } \\ & {[9 \mathrm{Feb}]} \end{aligned}$ | City of Havana City of Merida | $\begin{aligned} & \text { [14 Feb] } \\ & {[6 \mathrm{Mar}]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \mathrm{Feb} \\ & 12 \mathrm{Mar} \end{aligned}$ | 24 Feb <br> 17 Mar | $\begin{aligned} & \text { [2 Mar] } \\ & \text { [23 Mar] } \end{aligned}$ | 26 Jan | 6 Feb |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 Mar | 7 Apr |
| 17 Feb | [1 Mar] | City of Havana |  |  |  |  | 7 Mar | 20 Mar |
| 13 Mar | [25 Mar] | City of Mexico | [27 Mar] | 2 Apr | 8 Apr | [14 Apr] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [18 Apr] | 24 Apr | 28 Apr | [4 May] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [9 May] | [15 May] | 21 May | [27 May] | 30 May | 11 Jun |
| 31 Mar | [12 Apr] | City of Havana |  |  |  |  | 19 Apr | 29 Apr |
| 21 Apr | [3 May] | City of Merida |  |  |  |  | 9 May | 21 May |
| 12 May | [25 May] | City of Havana | 28 May | 4 Jun | 10 Jun | [16 Jun] | 19 Jun | 1 Jul |
| 2 Jun | [15 Jun] | City of Merida | [20 Jun] | 26 Jun | 1 Jul | [7 Jul] | 10 Jul | 23 Jul |
| 23 Jun | [5 Jul] | City of Mexico | [10 Jul] | 16 Jul | 22 Jul | [29 Jul] | 31 Jul | 12 Aug |
| 14 Jul | [26 Jul] | City of Havana | [31 Aug] | 6 Aug | $13 \mathrm{Aug}^{4}$ |  |  |  |
| 4 Aug | [16 Aug] | City of Merida |  |  |  |  | 22 Aug | 3 Sep |
| 25 Aug | [7 Sep] | City of Mexico |  |  |  |  | 14 Sep | 24 Sep |
| 15 Sep | 27 Sep | City of Merida |  |  |  |  | 2 Oct | 14 Oct |
| 6 Oct | [18 Oct] | City of Mexico |  |  |  |  | 25 Oct | 6 Nov |

[^10]Dep NY Arr VC STEAMSHIP Dep VC Arr NO Dep NO Arr VC Dep VC Arr NY

1877 (Cont.)

| 27 Oct | $\left.{ }^{9} 9 \mathrm{Nov}\right]$ | City of Merida | [13 Nov] | 19 Nov | 27 Nov | [3 Dec] | 8 Dec | 19 Dec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [11 Nov] | City of Vera Cruz |  |  |  |  | 13 Nov |  |
| 17 Nov | [ 30 Nov ] | City of Mexico | [12 Dec] | 18 Dec | 23 Dec | [29 Dec] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [4 Jan] | 10 Jan | 16 Jan | [21 Jan] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [22 Jan] | 28 Jan | 1 Feb | [7 Feb] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [8 Feb] | 14 Feb | 17 Feb | [23 Feb] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [28 Feb] | 5 Mar | 10 Mar | [16 Mar] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [21 Mar] | 27 Mar | 31 Mar | [6 Apr] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [10 Apr] | 16 Apr | 24 Apr | [30 Apr] | 5 May | 17 May |
| 9 Dec | [20 Dec] | City of New York |  |  |  |  | 26 Dec | 10 Jan |
| 29 Dec | [10 Jan] | City of Merida |  |  |  |  | 15 Jan | 28 Jan |

1878

| 19 Jan | [31 Jan] | City of New York |  |  |  |  | 6 Feb | 18 Feb |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 Feb | [21 Feb] | City of Merida |  |  |  |  | 26 Feb | 11 Mar |
| 2 Mar | [14 Mar] | City of New York |  |  |  |  | 19 Mar | 1 Apr |
| 23 Mar | [4 Apr] | City of Merida |  |  |  |  | 9 Apr | 22 Apr |
| 16 Apr | $28 \mathrm{Apr}]$ | City of New York | [5 May] | 11 May | 16 May | 22 May |  |  |
|  |  |  | [26 May] | 1 Jun | 9 Jun | [15 Jun] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [21 Jun] | 27 Jun | 30 Jun | [6 Jul] | 10 Jul | 20 Jul |
| 30 Apr | [12 May] | City of Merida |  |  |  |  | 18 May | 29 May |
| 14 May | [26 May] | City of Vera Cruz |  |  |  |  | 1 Jun | 12 Jun |
| 1 Jun | [15 Jun] | Carondolet |  |  |  | 20 Jun | 2 Jul |  |
| 17 Jun | [29 Jun] | City of Mexico | [2 Jul] | 8 Jul | 21 Jul | [27 Jul] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [31 Jul] | 6 Aug | 12 Aug | [18 Aug] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [21 Aug] | 27 Aug | 1 Sep | [7 Sep] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [14 Sep] | 20 Sep | 25 Sep | [1 Oct] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [5 Oct] | 12 Oct | 16 Oct | [23 Oct] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [28 Oct] | 4 Nov | 8 Nov | [14 Nov] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [16 Nov] | 22 Nov | 27 Nov | [3 Dec] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [7 Dec] | 13 Dec | 19 Dec | [25 Dec] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [29 Dec] | 4 Jan | 8 Jan | [14 Jan] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [18 Jan] | 24 Jan | 28 Jan | [3 Feb] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [ 7 Feb ] | $15 \mathrm{Feb}^{5}$ | 20 Feb | [26 Feb] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [1 Mar] | 7 Mar | 13 Mar | [19 Mar] |  |  |
|  |  |  | [22 Mar] | 28 Mar | 1 Apr | [7 Apr] |  |  |
| 29 Jun | [11 Jul] | City of Vera Cruz |  |  |  |  | 17 Jul | 28 Jul |
| 13 Jul | [25 Jul] | City of Merida |  |  |  |  | 31 Jul | 12 Aug |

[^11]Dep NY Arr VC STEAMSHIP $\quad$ Dep VC Arr NO Dep NO Arr VC Dep VC Arr NY

## 1878 (Cont.)

| 27 Jul | [8 Aug] | City of New York | 13 Aug | 26 Aug |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 Aug | [21 Aug] | City of Vera Cruz | 27 Aug | 8 Sep |
| 24 Aug | [5 Sep] | City of Merida | 11 Sep | 23 Sep |
| 7 Sep | [20 Sep] | City of New York | 25 Sep | 7 Oct |
| 21 Sep | [4 Oct] | City of Vera Cruz | 9 Oct | 21 Oct |
| 5 Oct | [17 Oct] | City of Merida | 24 Oct | 5 Nov |
| 19 Oct | [31 Oct] | City of New York | 6 Nov | 18 Nov |
| 2 Nov | [14 Nov] | City of Vera Cruz | 20 Nov | 1 Dec |
| 16 Nov | [28 Nov] | City of Merida | 4 Dec | 15 Dec |
| 30 Nov | [11 Dec] | City of New York | 17 Dec | 31 Dec |
| 14 Dec | [26 Dec] | City of Vera Cruz | 1 Jan | 12 Jan |
| 28 Dec | [9 Jan] | City of Merida | 15 Jan | 26 Jan |

1879

| 11 Jan | [23 Jan] | City of New York | 30 Jan | 11 Feb |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 Jan | $[7 \mathrm{Feb}]$ | City of Vera Cruz | 12 Feb | 24 Feb |
| 8 Feb | $[20 \mathrm{Feb}]$ | City of Merida | 26 Feb | $16 \mathrm{Mar}^{6}$ |
| 22 Feb | 6 Mar | City of New York | 13 Mar | 23 Mar |
| 8 Mar | $[20 \mathrm{Mar}]$ | City of Vera Cruz | 26 Mar | 6 Apr |
| 23 Mar | $[4 \mathrm{Apr}]$ | City of Merida | 9 Apr | 22 Apr |

[^12]

Figure 12. City of New York, 1,715 tons, built in 1873 and initially placed in service by the Alexandre Line on its New York to Havana run, transferred to Alexandre's Mexican route in late 1877. (Courtesy of the Mariners' Museum of Newport News, Virginia)

TABLE 5
New York, Havana and Mexican Mail Steamship Company
Extract of Sailings New Orleans - Veracruz, 1874-1879
STEAMSHIP Dep VC Arr NO Dep NO Arr VC

1874

| City of Mexico | $[27 \mathrm{Oct}]$ | 2 Nov | 8 Nov | $[14 \mathrm{Nov}]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cuba | $[16 \mathrm{Nov}]$ | 22 Nov | 28 Nov | $[5 \mathrm{Dec}]$ |
| City of Merida | [9 Dec] | 15 Dec | 19 Dec | [25 Dec] |
| City of Mexico | [31 Dec] | 6 Jan | 9 Jan | $[15 \mathrm{Dec}]$ |

1875

| City of Havana | [21 Jan] | 27 Jan | 30 Jan | [5 Feb] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Merida | [10 Feb] | 16 Feb | 20 Feb | 26 Feb |
| City of Mexico | [4 Mar] | 10 Mar | 14 Mar | [20 Mar] |
| City of Havana | [25 Mar] | 31 Mar | 4 Apr | [6 Apr] |
| City of Merida | [16 Apr] | 22 Apr | 25 Apr | [1 May] |
| City of Mexico | [7 May] | 13 May | 17 May | [23 May] |
| Cuba | [25 May] | 1 Jun | 6 Jun | [12 Jun] |
| City of Merida | [18 Jun] | 24 Jun | 27 Jun | [3 Jul] |
| City of Mexico | [11 Jul] | 17 Jul | 21 Jul | [27 Jul] |
| City of Havana | [29 Jul] | 4 Aug | 8 Aug | [14 Aug] |
| City of Merida | [18 Aug] | 24 Aug | 28 Aug | [3 Sep] |
| City of Mexico | [9 Sep] | 15 Sep | 19 Sep | [25 Sep] |
| City of Havana | [1 Oct] | 7 Oct | 8 Oct | [14 Oct] |
| City of Merida | [20 Oct] | 26 Oct | 30 Oct | [5 Nov] |
| City of Mexico | [11 Nov] | 17 Nov | 21 Nov | [27 Nov] |
| City of Havana | [8 Dec] | 14 Dec | 18 Dec | [24 Dec] |
| City of Merida | [22 Dec] | 28 Dec | 2 Jan | [8 Jan] |

1876

| City of Mexico | [14 Jan] | 20 Jan | 23 Jan | [29 Jan] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Havana | [4 Feb] | 10 Feb | 13 Feb | [20 Feb] |
| City of Merida | [25 Feb] | 2 Mar | 5 Mar | [12 Mar] |
| City of Mexico | [16 Mar] | 22 Mar | 27 Mar | [2 Apr] |
| City of Havana | [5 Apr] | 11 Apr | 16 Apr | [22 Apr] |
| City of Merida | [29 Apr] | 4 May | 7 May | [13 May] |
| City of Mexico | [18 May] | 24 May | 28 May | [3 Jun] |
| City of Havana | [8 Jun] | 14 Jun | 19 Jun | [25 Jun] |
| City of Merida | [29 Jun] | 5 Jul | 9 Jul | [15 Jul] |
| City of Mexico | [20 Jul] | 26 Jul | 30 Jul | 4 Aug |
| City of Havana | [9 Aug] | 15 Aug | 20 Aug | [26 Aug] |
| City of Merida | [30 Aug] | 5 Sep | 10 Sep | [16 Sep] |
| City of Mexico | [20 Sep] | 27 Sep | 1 Oct | [7 Oct] |
| Cuba | [11 Oct] | 17 Oct | 22 Oct | [28 Oct] |
| City of Merida | [1 Nov] | 7 Nov | 12 Nov | [18 Nov] |
| City of Mexico | [22 Nov] | 29 Nov | 2 Dec | [8 Dec] |
|  | [12 Dec] | 18 Dec | 22 Dec | [28 Dec] |


| City of Mexico | [3 Jan] | 10 Jan | 13 Jan | [19 Jan] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [24 Jan] | 31 Jan | 4 Feb | [11 Feb] |
| City of Merida | [14 Feb] | 20 Feb | 24 Feb | [2 Mar] |
|  | [6 Mar] | 12 Mar | 17 Mar | [23 Mar] |
| City of Mexico | [27 Mar] | 2 Apr | 8 Apr | [14 Apr] |
|  | [18 Apr] | 24 Apr | 28 Apr | [4 May] |
|  | [9 May] | [15 May] | 21 May | [27 May] |
| City of Havana | 28 May | 4 Jun | 10 Jun | [16 Jun] |
| City of Merida | [20 Jun] | 26 Jun | 1 Jul | [7 Jul] |
| City of Mexico | [10 Jul] | 16 Jul | 22 Jul | [29 Jul] |
| City of Havana | [31 Aug] | 6 Aug | 13 Aug ${ }^{1}$ |  |
| City of Merida | [13 Nov] | 19 Nov | 27 Nov | [3 Dec] |
| City of Mexico | [12 Dec] | 18 Dec | 23 Dec | [29 Dec] |

1878

| City of Mexico | [4 Jan] | 10 Jan | 16 Jan | [21 Jan] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [22 Jan] | 28 Jan | 1 Feb | [7 Feb] |
|  | [8 Feb] | 14 Feb | 17 Feb | [23 Feb] |
|  | [28 Feb] | 5 Mar | 10 Mar | [16 Mar] |
|  | [21 Mar] | 27 Mar | 31 Mar | [6 Apr] |
|  | [10 Apr] | 16 Apr | 24 Apr | [30 Apr] |
| City of New York | [5 May] | 11 May | 16 May | 22 May |
|  | [26 May] | 1 Jun | 9 Jun | [15 Jun] |
|  | [21 Jun] | 27 Jun | 30 Jun | [6 Jul] |
| City of Mexico | [2 Jul] | 8 Jul | 21 Jul | [27 Jul] |
|  | [31 Jul] | 6 Aug | 12 Aug | [18 Aug] |
|  | [21 Aug] | 27 Aug | 1 Sep | [7 Sep] |
|  | [14 Sep] | 20 Sep | 25 Sep | [1 Oct] |
|  | [5 Oct] | 12 Oct | 16 Oct | [23 Oct] |
|  | [28 Oct] | 4 Nov | 8 Nov | [14 Nov] |
|  | [16 Nov] | 22 Nov | 27 Nov | [3 Dec] |
|  | [7 Dec] | 13 Dec | 19 Dec | [25 Dec] |
|  | [29 Dec] | 4 Jan | 8 Jan | [14 Jan] |

1879

| City of Mexico | $[18 \mathrm{Jan}]$ | 24 Jan | 28 Jan | $[3 \mathrm{Feb}]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $[7 \mathrm{Feb}]$ | 15 Feb | 20 Feb | $[26 \mathrm{Feb}]$ |
|  | $[1 \mathrm{Mar}]$ | 7 Mar | 13 Mar | $[19 \mathrm{Mar}]$ |
|  | $[22 \mathrm{Mar}]$ | 28 Mar | 1 Apr | $[7 \mathrm{Apr}]$ |

[^13]TABLE 6
LISTING OF MAIL CARRYING STEAMSHIPS
Eastern United States to East Coast of Mexico Post American Civil War to Mexico UPU


TABLE 7
LISTING OF STEAMSHIP DATA

## Steamship

Tons/Type Year Built/Where
Owner/Agent
Dimensions

## AMERICAN \& MEXICAN MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY

Alabama
Andrew Johnson
Daniel Webster
Manhattan
Vera Cruz

| 1051/SW | 1850/New York |
| :--- | :--- |
| unk | unk |
| 776/SW | 1853/Greenpoint |
| 1338/SW | 1865/New York |
| 1433/SP | 1854/Liverpool |


| M O Roberts | $207 \times 35 \times 22$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| unk | unk |
| J H Sears | $220 \times 31 \times 10$ |
| G Quintard \& O | $219 \times 36 \times 20$ |
| Gen Trans Atl Co | $249 \times 34 \times 24$ |

GENERAL TRANSATLANTIC COMPANY
Tampico
Vera Cruz

1433/SP
1433/SP
1854/Liverpool
Gen Trans Atl Co Gen Trans Atl Co

249x34x24
$249 \times 34 \times 24$

## MEXICAN MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY

| Georgia | 671/SP |
| :--- | :--- |
| Virginia | 442/SP |
| Wilmington | $737 / \mathrm{SP}$ |

1863/Dumbarton
1860/Clyde
1865/Wilmington

| Williams \& Guion | $206 \times 27 \times 14$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pertz Bro | $175 \times 26 \times 13$ |
| Williams \& Guion | $185 \times 28 \times 17$ |

## ALEXANDRE LINE - CHARTERED

| Alabama | 1051/SW | 1850/New York | M O Roberts | 207 $\times 35 \times 22$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Carondolet | 1502/SP | 1873/Mystic | C H Mallory \& Co | $250 \times 36 \times 21$ |
| Cleopatra | 1045/SP | 1865/Fairhaven | Murray Ferris \& Co | $200 \times 35 \times 23$ |
| Cuba | 1075/SP | 1863/Fairhaven | Mordecai \& Co | $220 \times 34 \times 27$ |
| Fah-Kee | 601/SP | 1862/New York | Waydell \& Co | $176 \times 30 \times 18$ |
| Georgia | 671/SP | 1863/Dumbarton | Williams \& Guion | $206 \times 27 \times 14$ |
| Grenada | 764/SP | 1864/New York | Leary Bro | $181 \times 29 \times 29$ |
| Mount Vernon | 617/SP | 1863/Greenpoint | Bos N S B Co | $180 \times 28 \times 16$ |
| Nevada | 914/SP | 1864/Mystic | Wake Gook \& Dick | $160 \times 32$ |
| Nightingale | 849/SP | 1863/Mystic | C H Mallory \& Co | unk |
| San Francisco | 1137/SW | 1853/Philadelphia | M O Roberts | $219 \times 35 \times 21$ |
| Thames | 546/SP | 1862/Mystic | R Lowden | $150 \times 31 \times 17$ |
| Virgo | $1142 / \mathrm{SP}$ | 1862/Fairhaven | Murray Ferris \& Co | $192 \times 32$ |

## ALEXANDRE LINE - OWNED

| City of Havana ${ }^{1}$ | 1515/SP | 1872/Greenpoint | F Alexandre\&Sons | $245 \times 37 \times 26$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Merida ${ }^{2}$ | 1492/SP | 1870/Greenpoint | F Alexandre\&Sons | 236x36x18 |
| City of Mexico ${ }^{3}$ | 1500/SP | 1868/Greenpoint | F Alexandre\&Sons | 219x36x20 |
| City of New York ${ }^{4}$ | 1715/SP | 1873/Greenpoint | F Alexandre\&Sons | 339x40x28 |
| City of Vera Cruz | 1874/SP | 1874/Greenpoint | F Alexandre\&Sons | $286 \times 37 \times 26$ |

## LEGEND:

SW -- Side Wheel Paddle Steamer
SP - Screw Propeller Steamer
Dimensions -- length x beam x freeboard (in feet)

[^14]
## ANSWERS TO PROBLEM COVERS IN ISSUE 180

Two of the problem covers in the November Chronicle 180 received no comments from our Route Agents, so I'll provide an editor's opinions and perhaps awaken some responses.

First are the two 1868 covers, Figure 1, from Cincinnati to the same addressee on a U.S. ship in Panama. Why was the February cover paid $10 \phi$, and the April cover only $3 \phi$ ?

I believe it could be significant that the earlier cover paid the $10 \notin$ and the later cover the $3 \not \subset$. Perhaps Fleet Paymaster Looker advised his correspondents that he could receive mail, care of the U.S. Consul at Panama, at the domestic rate. Does anyone have other covers from the Looker correspondence that would corroborate this conjecture or provide a different reason?

Hold the press! A last minute message from Greg Sutherland provides a source of information that the U.S. Consuls at Colon and at Panama City each received mail in sealed bags for his office or to his care for other parties. The source is a letter to the U.S. House of Representatives from D.M. Key, Postmaster-General, forwarding a report of Mr. J.W. Fralick received on the 23d November 1878 (ten years after our problem covers). Mr. Fralick had been authorized to visit various South American states for the purpose of inquiring into the postal services of those states, and of promoting the interests of the commerce of the United States with South America. His report included appended reports of Consul Thorington at Aspinwall (Colon), Consul Long at Panama and "the valuable letter" of Hon. Francis W. Rice, Commissioner to the South American States at Panama. Pertinent excerpts are:

The condition of postal matters at this port (Colon), and on this isthmus . . . and mail-matter to Panama by the Panama Railroad . . .The United States furnishes mailmatter to this point through the New York post-office.

The mails are brought to the consulate in sealed bags addressed to the United States Consul. The Consul assorts the mail and retains all mail-matter addressed to himself and family; or to his care for naval or other officers of the United States Government:
If we can assume that a similar process existed in 1868 , mail could be sent to certain Panama addressees paying the $3 \not \subset$ domestic rate through the New York post office and delivered by the U.S. Consul. Can anyone document this with an official post office regulation? Also, was this a practice followed for other U.S. Consulates?

Next is the 1865 cover, Figure 2, from Vancouver, W.T. to Sacramento paid by "Chg box 61 / W.W.K." but with no amount of postage marked. Why?

A guess is that for a large mailing, such as to all Masonic Lodges in the northwest U.S., the Vancouver Postmaster didn't bother to mark the postage on each item (or inadvertently missed one in a stack), but charged the total postage to the sender's account at $3 \phi$ each. Presumably, the postage was prepaid. If the postage were not prepaid, $6 \notin$ each would have been charged upon delivery in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1863 which doubled postage on non-prepaid mail.

## ANSWERS TO PROBLEM COVERS IN ISSUE 181

Figure 3 shows an 1867 cover from Malaga, Spain via London to Philadelphia. This is a straightforward example of U.S.-Spain mail in the absence of a postal treaty between these countries. Combinations of the U.S.-British postal convention of 1848, effective 15 February 1849, and the British-French and Anglo-Spanish postal conventions were used prior to the GPU rates in 1875.


Figure 1. February and April 1868 covers to Panama - one paid 10¢, one paid 3¢


Figure 2. Vancouver, W.T. cover to Sacramento in 1865


Figure 3. 1867 cover from Malaga, Spain to Philadelphia

Greg Sutherland provided answers to the rates and routing of this cover as follows:
The two $20 ¢$ centimos ( 4 reals) stamps pay the correct $1 / 4$-ounce letter rate from Spain to England which covered Spanish internal, French transit and British transit and sea postage when carried by British packet to the U.S.' The black " 21 " indicates that this cover went by American packet and due $21 \phi, 16 \notin$ for the packet and $5 \phi$ for U.S. delivery.

There are two steamships under contract to carry U.S. mails from England which coincide with the dates on our cover: the Inman Line City of Baltimore departing Liverpool 6 November, Queenstown 7 November, arriving New York 17 November; and the North German Lloyd Bremen departing Southampton 5 November, arriving New York 17 November. ${ }^{2}$

The "P.O. PHILA / NOV / 17" CDS does not appear in Philadelphia Postal Markings except as a duplex marking used at the Germantown substation.


Figure 4. "STEAMBOAT" cover to Baltimore with "DUE 2 cts."
The "STEAMBOAT" cover to Baltimore with "DUE 2 cts.," Figure 4, brought a comprehensive response from Route Agent Don Evans. He writes:

The cover in question was probably brought into Baltimore by a coastal or Chesapeake Bay, non-mail-contract steamer. It was there deposited with the post office and entered into the mails. The postal rate for this type of service was five cents.

Assuming the date for mailing to be April 6, 1863, the following regulations would apply:

Section 164 of the Postal Regulations of 1859, under the heading of Ship and Steamboat Letters, defines these letters as follows:
"Sec. 164. The terms ship letters and packets, embrace the letters and packets brought into the United States from foreign countries, or carried from one port in the Untied States to another, in any private ship or vessel, before such letters have been mailed."

Section 171 of the same regulation authorizes the receiving postmaster to pay the master of the vessel the sum of two cents for his service in transporting the letter.

Section 175 states "Letters brought by steamboats should be marked 'Steamboat,' at the time of receiving them."

[^15]Under a Postal Act, Section 9, dated February 12, 1861, and effective May 1, 1861, the rate for ship letters (as defined above) was established to be five cents for letters to be delivered at the post office where the ship arrived. This is a change from the six cent rate that had previously been in effect. (Note: this includes steamers.)

The correct rates and charges concerning ship and steamboat mail for this period are difficult to extract. The regulations and postal bulletins frequently appear to be contradictory and overlapping. Steamboat mail on interior rivers and lakes seems to be handled at times in a way different than coastal steamboat mail. The difference between ship mail and steamboat mail, if any, is not well defined. Various interpretations of the laws and regulations have resulted in unusual rates seen on covers for the period, and the relative scarcity of marked steamboat mail covers after the beginning of the Civil War results in a limited number of examples to study.

My analysis of the cover would place its likely origin at a steamboat port in Chesapeake Bay where the sender handed a letter, paid with $3 \phi$ postage, to the purser or master of a steamboat that did not have a mail contract. The steamboat made port at Baltimore and deposited the letter at the post office, along with a request for reimbursement for his "way" service. The postmaster gave him his $2 \phi$, marked the cover "Steamboat" as required, and also "Due 2cts." to make up the correct rate of $5 \phi$ for an incoming ship letter.

## PROBLEM COVERS FOR ISSUE 182

Route Agent J.V. Woollam of England has submitted the large size cover in Figure 5 from Victoria to New York for explanation of the postage collected. He describes the markings on the front (shown) and the back (too dark to copy) as follows:

The cover is franked with 8 shillings in stamps, a very high rate, as the single letter rate to the USA was 6 pence. The stamps are canceled with a "MELBOURNE / 2 K / AU 28 / 68 " CDS. Endorsed "Via Panama"; it would have gone by the Panama, New Zealand and Australian Royal Mail Company, probably by the S.S. Matawa to Panama. There is an arrival company CDS "MAGUIRE COTHRAN \& CO. / OCT / 22 / 1868" on the front and an embossed oval "MAGUIRE \& Co / MELBOURNE" plus a manuscript "Aug 27 \& 28, 1868" on the back.

Rate markings - all in manuscript:
Front - " 80 " in ink - upper left
" 80 Cents Due" in pencil - right
"H (or is it " $\$$ "? 1.80 " in pencil - bottom left
Back - "Carrier is anxious (?) for the postage (?) / Collect $\mathrm{H}(\$ ?) 1.80$ "
Mr. Woollam asks, what was the postage to be collected, $\$ 1.80$ or 80 cents? If the " 80 " refers to a steamship charge, how does the total come to " 1.80 "? Did depreciated currency rating apply?

The cover in Figure 6 presents a challenge in deciphering the postage rates due and charged. A triple CDS strike indicates it originated in "DRESDEN / $14 \mathrm{JUN} / 57$." All cover markings are in black except for a " 6 " (crossed through) and an " 8 " on the back (not shown), and a smudged " 2 " on the front which are all in blue ink. It is endorsed in Old German Script at upper left "Nord Amerika / über Aachen," addressed to New Haven, Ct. and forwarded to Peacedale, R. Island.

The cover went via Prussian Closed Mail and received an "AACHEN / 16 / 6 / 10 cts." CDS, the " 10 cts." a debit for a double rate - over a half ounce, but not over an ounce. But the " 10 cts." is crossed through and replaced (?) by a large manuscript " 20 ," which is overstruck by a "NEW YORK / 60 / JUN / 30 / AM. PKT. A bold "Ford 69 " in manuscript completes the markings, apparently the " 60 " debit in the New York CDS plus 9 cents for forwarding.

Please explain the postal markings on this cover and point out any discrepancies.

$$
* * * * *
$$



Figure 5. 1868 cover from Melbourne, Victoria to New York via Panama


Figure 6. 1857 cover from Germany to New Haven and forwarded

Please send your answers to the problem covers for this issue, and any further discussion of previous answers to other problem covers, within two weeks of receiving your Chronicle. The "go to press" deadline for the August Cover Corner is July 10, 1999. I can receive mail at 9068 Fontainebleau Terrace, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45231-4808, and now have an E-Mail address: RWCarlin@aol.com.

New examples of problem covers are needed for The Cover Corner. We have successfully experimented with using copies of covers produced by high resolution copiers, either in black and white or in color, instead of requiring black and white photographs. This should make it easier to submit covers. Please send two copies of each cover, including the reverse if it has significant markings. It is also important to identify the color of markings on covers submitted in black and white. Thanks.

| Bibliopole <br> Since 1965 | PHILATELIC BIBLIOPOLE <br> http://pbbooks.com <br> Authoritative Philatelic Literature |
| :--- | :---: |

US, CSA, Maritime, Forgery, GB and the Empire, etc.


Purchaser of major and minor philatelic libraries, stocking new titles from over 100 publishers. 112 page Stock Catalog: $\$ 3$ to a US address, Foreign by air $\$ 5$.

PB Blank Pages, Mylar and Page Boxes
The state of the art for both archival preservation and appearance, our pages are $100 \%$ cotton rag, neutral pH and buffered; blank and quadrille. Custom steel engraved page heads and paneling available. Will run on most Laser Jet Printers. All made exclusively for us in the US. Page Sampler: $\$ 3$ to a US address. Foreign by air $\$ 7$.
P.O. Box 36006, Louisville, KY 40233

Leonard H. Hartmann
Phone (502) 451-0317, Fax (502) 459-8538
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## CLASSIFIED

WANTED: Carriage, wagon, harness, livery stable, blacksmith, all horse goods - advertising covers, trade cards, post cards, letterheads, catalogs, nameplates, medals, tokens, etc. All types of paper, celluloid or metal advertising items. Myron Huffman, 12409 Wayne Trace, Hoagland, IN 46745, 219-6393290. (183)

WANTED-AUCTION CATALOGS: Harmer Rooke, N.Y., 1940-49; H.R. Harmer, N.Y., 194149; Robert A. Siegel 1931-48; Daniel F. Kelleher, 1937-60; H.R. Harmer, London, 1925-69; Robson Lowe, London, 1936-76. Also any Colonel Green sales, 1942-46, any of Sylvester Colby's literature sales, and all sales of Fred Kessler. Dan Barber, P.O. Box 23055, Lansing, MI 48909. (184)

ESSAY-PROOF COLLECTORS ONLINE. The only website dedicated to the interests of collectors of Essays and Proofs of U.S. Postage and Revenue stamps. Please visit us at http//www. essayproof.net. (182)

ALASKA, HAWAII and Yukon postal history wanted to the present. Also buy 19th century Hawaiian town cancels off cover, and fancy cancels on U.S. Officials. APS Life Member. Steve Sims, 1769 Wickersham Drive, Anchorage AK 99507. (183)

UNWANTED NY STATE small town covers? Needed by dealer (especially manuscript postmarks). Unusual Rochester also. Contact: Douglas Penwell, P.O. Box 3525, Glendale AZ 85311. (185)

## YOUR AD HERE FOR 50¢ A LINE

Send payment to: Richard M. Wrona, P.O. Box 7631, McLean, VA 22106-7631. Next Deadline: July 5, 1999.

## Important news for the specialist in U.S.

 19th Century Classics and Philatelic Literature...
## WE ${ }^{\text {I }}$ RE YOUR KEY RESOURCE ON THE INTERNET...

We're Internet-driven, but with the kind of personal touch you've come to expect from us. Visit our website regularly to view and purchase from our large stock of 19th century stamps, fancy cancels, postal history, essays \& proofs, and philatelic literature.


## www.jameslee.com

## A visit to our Internet website

 is much more than just "click" and "buy".Unlike many websites, ours has become a major resource for the collector of America's classic philately and literature. For not only does our site offer countless examples of outstanding philatelic material and literature, you'll also find important information, articles and resources (including our quarterly newsletter-both the current issue and back issues).

For the astute philatelist, the Internet is no longer the "wave of the future." It is now one of the chief engines for the dissemination of philatelic knowledge and commerce. "Bookmark" our site and visit us often!

Get our newest philatelic literature catalog \#28! Only \$5 refundable with purchase. Call, write, fax or email us today! Attn: Dept CL.


E-Mail: philately2@earthlink.net
Website: www.jameslee.com


Great collections have one name in common.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Adam Perkal and Seymour Kazman, The Post Office Seals of the United States (Santa Monica, Calif.: George Alevizos, 1983), page 43, footnote 7.
    ${ }^{2}$ Records of the Post Office Department, Record Group 28, Bill Book \#3, GSA, National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D. C.
    ${ }^{3}$ Records of the Post Office Department, Record Group 28, Press copies of Invoices, GSA, National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D. C.
    ${ }^{4}$ John N. Luff, The Postage Stamps of the United States (New York: Scott Stamp \& Coin Co., Ltd., 1902).

[^1]:    'Report of the Postmaster General, 1862, Wierenga Reprint, pp. 159-163.
    ${ }^{2}$ Charles J. Starnes, "The U.S.-Mexican Postal Convention," Chronicle 108: 270-272.
    ${ }^{3}$ The Lanman \& Kemp archive in the USPCS S.C.R.A.P.collection has over 4,900 covers addressed to the United States from 55 different countries during the 1853-1880 time frame. All covers have had their stamps cut away, but most all of the markings are generally discernible. The archive provides excellent study material for postal history students and is available for loan through the USPCS S.C.R.A.P. Administrator.

[^2]:    ${ }^{9}$ Karl H. Schimmer \& John M. Heath, Mexican Maritime Mail (Limassol, Cyprus: James Bendon Ltd, 1997), pp. 190-196.
    ${ }^{10}$ This ratio was estimated based upon the 46,368 pesos annual Mexican subsidy and the $\$ 1,726$ to $\$ 1,971$ paid by the U.S. Post Office Department for the years 1868 to 1870 as reported by the Report(s) of the Postmaster General, 1868-1870, reprinted by Theron Wierenga, 1977 and 1978.
    ${ }^{11}$ New York Herald, September 27, 1867, page 12, column 4.

[^3]:    ${ }^{13}$ Raymond Salles, La Poste Maritime Française Historique et Catalogue, Tome IV, Les Paquebots de L'Atlantique Nord (Alencon, France: Imprimerie Alenconnaise, 1965), page 177.
    ${ }^{14}$ Reprint of United States Mail \& Post Office Assistant, January 1867 (Chicago, Illinois: Collectors Club of Chicago, 1975), page 302.
    ${ }^{15}$ Salles, op. cit., page 196, describes the routing and operation of Ligne Annexe $M$ between New Orleans and Havana. The first French steam packet sailing from New Orleans was on November 13, 1866 and arrived Havana on November 16, 1866. Service on Ligne Annexe M was discontinued in August 1869.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Georgia was towed from Charleston to New York by the steamship Manhattan due to a mechanical breakdown.
    ${ }^{2}$ Virginia had to lay to for 5 days between Veracruz and Sisal on the return voyage.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ This sailing of the Thames for F . Alexandre \& Sons is unconfirmed, as it was advertised in the newspaper but no actual departure or return was found.
    ${ }^{2}$ This sailing of the Mt Vernon is unconfirmed, as it was advertised in the newspaper but no actual departure or return was found.
    ${ }^{3}$ Nightingale was driven onto a reef during a storm while anchored at Veracruz on 1/27/1868.
    ${ }^{4}$ City of Mexico's maiden voyage.

[^6]:    ${ }^{5}$ Cleopatra put back into NY for unknown reasons 10/4/1869.
    ${ }^{6}$ Cleopatra put back into NY $2 / 10 / 1870$ due to a lost stern post and rudder from a gale on 2/4/1870 off Cape Hatteras.
    ${ }^{7}$ Cleopatra was towed into Hampton Roads 4/23/1870 by steamer Morro Castle after breaking a crank pin on her machinery off the Virginia Capes. Cleopatra was subsequently towed to New York by the steamer Saratoga.
    ${ }^{8}$ City of Merida's maiden voyage.
    ${ }^{9}$ City of Merida was detained for 5 days by weather off Sisal, Mexico, on her return voyage.

[^7]:    ${ }^{10}$ City of Havana's maiden voyage.
    ${ }^{11}$ City of Merida arrived Savannah 11/28/1872 with disabled machinery and sailed from Savannah 12/9/1872.

[^8]:    ${ }^{12}$ City of Mexico is believed to have stopped off at Key West en route.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ City of Mexico was damaged in a collision with Spanish bark Virgin de Montserrat on $6 / 22 / 1875$, put back into New York on 6/23/1875.
    ${ }^{2}$ City of Havana put into Tybee Island (off Savannah) disabled on 11/22/1875 and sailed on 11/30/1875 for Havana. A sister ship, City of New York, put into Tybee on 11/29/1875, presumably to bring repair parts to the City of Havana, and sailed on to Havana the same day.

[^10]:    ${ }^{3}$ With this voyage Alexandre Line began operating a New Orleans to Veracruz shuttle.
    ${ }^{4}$ City of Havana, Captain Phillips in command, ran aground on the Tuxpan reefs outside the Tuxpan harbor 8/15/1877. An attempt was made by the City of Merida to haul her off, but to no avail, and the City of Havana was eventually wrecked by the pounding of the sea.

[^11]:    ${ }^{\text {s }}$ City of Mexico made a stop at Galveston, Texas, $2 / 13 / 1879$ en route from Veracruz to New Orleans.

[^12]:    ${ }^{6}$ City of Merida put into Tybee Island (off Savannah) 3/9/1879 because of a broken crosshead on her engine and sailed on for New York 3/14/1879.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ City of Havana, wrecked on the reefs outside the Tuxpan harbor 8/15/1877.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ Wrecked off Tuxpan, Mexico, 8/15/1877.
    ${ }^{2}$ Destroyed by fire in Havana harbor, 9/4/1884.
    ${ }^{3}$ Foundered off Cape Hatteras, $3 / 21 / 1901$, as converted barge.
    ${ }^{4}$ Destroyed by fire in 1880 .

[^15]:    'Richard F. Winter. U.S.-Spain Mails via British Convention, 1849-1876, Supplement to Chronicle 147 (Vol. 42, No. 3)(August 1990).
    ${ }^{2}$ Walter Hubbard and Richard F. Winter, North Atlantic Mail Sailings, 1840-1875 (Canton, Ohio: U.S. Philatelic Classics Society, Inc., 1988).

