

STAMP DEFINITIVES

## QEII HIGH VALUE DEFINITIVES

### THE 'CASTLES' STAMPS

SEPTEMBER 1955

NOTE: THIS FEATURE IS NOT COMPLETE, THERE ARE GAPS IN THE TEXT AS HELD BY THE BPMA



Following the death of King George VI on 6 February 1952, the Director of Postal Services (DPS), R Locke, prepared a paper regarding stamps for the new reign, submitting it to the Post Office Advisory Council the following April. It was proposed to issue the full range of lower denominations before producing new line-engraved stamps in the high values of 2s 6d, 5s, 10s and £1, with the reminder that the current high-value set had been issued less than a year earlier, on 3 May 1951. On the question of pictorial designs, which the GPO was under constant pressure to adopt, the DPS pointed out that such had been introduced with the 2s 6d and 5s of the 1951 series: the designer Mary Adshead had respectively depicted HMS 'Victory' and the white cliffs of Dover. This departure had not passed without adverse comment from 'certain sections' of the philatelic press; however, with regard to the new high values 'it is here that the possibility of any extension of pictorial design seems most appropriate to be considered'.

A report by T J Griffiths and S W J Way of the Postal Services Department (PSD) dated 2 December recommended retaining the current allegorical designs for the 10s and £1 values, with the Queen's head substituted for that of King George VI and a change to the St Edward's crown, while for the 2s 6d and 5s values there should be a reversion to allegorical or heraldic designs in the style of the 10s and £1. While acknowledging the disappointment and criticism such would undoubtedly elicit from 'a fair amount of public opinion, mostly no doubt philatelic', they argued that:

As the head of the Sovereign does not fit in very well or artistically with the rest of a pictorial design and seems to leave the undesirable impression that the Monarch's effigy takes second place to the pictorial representation, reversion to the former policy seems desirable when new designs for these two high value stamps are obtained.

Despite such feelings, the DPS decided that the style should be left entirely to the artists involved, indicated by the 'Instructions to Artists' subsequently drawn up in liaison with the Council of Industrial Design (CoID): this was already under way before Christmas. On 23 December Mrs C G Tomrley of the CoID wrote to the DPS with a suggested list of artists - Leonard Beaumont, M C Farrar-Bell, John Brinkley, Edmund Dulac, Eric Fraser, Abram Games, Michael Goaman and Percy Metcalfe, plus the Royal College of Art and St Martin's School of Art. Later additions by PSD included Stephen Gooden, Enid Marx and Mary Adshead; Gooden, whose inclusion was enthusiastically welcomed by Sir Francis Meynell of the CoID, had refused all invitations to design stamps since disputes with the GPO over payment and copyright for work on the 1937 Coronation issue, but had indicated when approached informally that he would consider a fresh invitation. Sir Francis accepted the inclusion of Adshead and Marx somewhat grudgingly, doubting that either was 'a good investment from the point of view of a good engraved design'; the GPO had suggested both largely on the strength of their successes with low-value photogravure designs for the new reign. Sir Francis' suggestion in a letter of 27 January 1953 that David Kronig should be also added was accepted. A final name, added to the list at the last moment, was Harold W Bird, who submitted an unsolicited high-value design as early as 7 January. He had produced a large number of low-value and Coronation designs (also unsolicited) and advised that he was only too pleased to work for nothing for the value of the experience. Having sounded out the CoID's feelings on Bird, Griffiths of PSD recorded in a memorandum of 11 February: 'Mrs Tomrley ... doesn't think very much of his previous efforts', but her view was that anyone in the country was free to submit designs.

---

## INVITATIONS TO ARTISTS

Invitations and instructions were sent out to all the selected artists (except Harold Bird) and the four stamp printing firms on 19 February. The intention was to produce four line-engraved stamps in the current colours, each value to be in a different design; artists were

urged to produce either at least two distinct alternatives for any one value or a set of four related but different designs. These should either be 3.6 inches by 6.16 inches (vertical or horizontal) or 4.72 inches square - these measurements were four times stamp size excluding gutter and perforations. The denomination should appear once in figures only and lettering should be confined to 'Postage'. The choice of design was left to the artists, although PSD would advise on the suitability of content if required; artists were reminded that the detail would have to be copied by hand engraving at stamp size on a steel die, and Waterlow and Sons, the stamp printer and current holder of the high-value printing contract, would provide the fullest co-operation and technical advice. The initial deadline was 4 April for the submission of rough wash drawings, for which 20 guineas each up to a maximum of 80 guineas per artist or firm would be paid; a further 20 guineas would be paid for each finished design where the rough was considered to warrant completion, plus 160 guineas for any design finally used. This procedure was preferred by the CoID and had been used for the Coronation stamps, but not the low-value definitives. Harold Bird received similar guidelines to the above in a letter from PSD dated 23 February, but was told that the question of payment would only apply in the event of his being asked to complete any roughs submitted, since his work was volunteered in the first instance rather than commissioned; this fairly typified the warnings on payment given to senders of unsolicited material.

On 24 February Mary Adshead telephoned PSD for their reactions to her following suggestions for sets of related designs:

- (1) Four castles, one each representing England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland – a similar suggestion had in fact been made in February 1949 by Mr J E Yates, then DPS, for the 1951 high values
- (2) The four patron saints, one for each country
- (3) the four national emblems, one for each country
- (4) The Army, Navy and Air force, plus one for the Civil Defence, Merchant navy or similar civilian body
- (5) Rail, road, air and sea transport, especially featuring historic railway engines such as the Puffing Billy or rocket, or the first aircraft to fly the Atlantic
- (6) A single design for the four stamps showing a map of the world with special emphasis on the Commonwealth countries.

Mr Griffiths reported in a memorandum of the same date that he warned Miss Adshead of the possibility if (1), (2) or (3) were adopted that the public would assume each stamp only to be for use in the country whose symbol was depicted (this had been similarly envisaged shortly after the war when regional stamps were first considered).

The follow designs were duly received, some extension to the deadline being permitted because of the Easter weekend at the beginning of April; of those invited only Percy Metcalfe and the printers Bradbury Wilkinson had declined to take part. The numbering was as done subsequently for ease of reference by the stamp advisory panel; with the exceptions of nos. 7, 10, 14, 17-18, 39, 41, 43-44 and 47, it has not been possible to identify the numbers given to particular designs:

<b>Artist</b>	<b>Design Nos.</b>	<b>Date submitted</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Kronig	1,2	30/3	
Beaumont	3-6	1/4	
Waterlows'	7-9	"	See note (1) below
Marx	10-13	2/4	'Fleur de lys' background is No. 10
De La Rue	14-16	"	Square 'coat of arms' design is No. 14
Fraser	17, 18	1/4	Lion & unicorn No. 17; oak leaves No.18
Bird	19-25	2/4	See note (2) below
St Martin's	26-29	1/4	See note (3) below
Farrar-Bell	30-38	2/4	See note (4) below
Harrisons'	39-42	7/4	See note (5) below
Dulac	43,44	2/4	Seahorse No 43; lion & crown No. 44
Brinkley	45-47	"	Lion & unicorn is No. 47
Adshead	48-54	6/4	See note (6) below
RCA	55-58	3/4	See note (7) below
Games	59	"	
Goaman	60-65	Four 3/4, two 8/4	See note (8) below
Gooden	66,67	15/4	See note (9) below

### *Notes*

(1) Waterlow's staff artist Stanley D Scott has been identified as the designer of No. 7. The other square design bears the descriptive title "Island Queen" and a horizontal design depicts Buckingham Palace.

(2) Six designs were initially completed; at Waterlow's suggestion in a letter of 31 March Bird also produced a variant of one design with "Postage" in bolder lettering for greater legibility.

(3) According to a memorandum of 24 February, Mr Moore, Secretary of St Martin's School of Art, stated in a telephone conversation that only one senior student was sufficiently well qualified to enter designs; the four designs subsequently entered by the School were the

work of Miss Patricia Davey, who also submitted stamp size roughs of eight further designs at an unspecified later date.

(4) Farrar-Bell's letter accompanying his artwork stated that he was enclosing ten designs in all: one set of four plus an extra design in two variants in a horizontal format, and one set of four in a vertical format. However, only nine designs were numbered for the stamp advisory panel, and only four horizontal and three vertical designs are in the NPM albums. If the missing vertical design can be assumed to have matched the rest of its set it would have been in the 10/- denomination and included Scottish national emblems.

(5) As was increasingly their practice, Harrisons' designs were commissioned from an outside artist (not identified on this occasion) rather than produced by their own staff. No. 39 featured wild flowers, No 41 oak leaves and national floral emblems.

(6) Mary Adshead described her designs as follows: one set in horizontal format showing the Tower of London, Windsor Castle, the Houses of Parliament, and Edinburgh Castle (this series might be varied, I would have liked to include Caernarvon Castle but could not think of a suitable subject from Northern Ireland"); the royal coat of arms in vertical format; a design in square format showing symbols of the Arts in an ornamental frame around the Queen's head, which could be extended to form a set of four by similar treatments of Science, Industry and Agriculture; a horizontal design depicting Lord Nelson, which might similarly be extended to constitute a set of "national heroes" including Shakespeare, Isaac Newton and Florence Nightingale. The horizontal design depicting Edinburgh Castle is not in the NPM albums.

(7) Professor Richard Guyatt, of the School of Graphic Design at the Royal college of Art, arranged for the following students to submit designs representing the RCA: Carol E Jeffries (Nos. 55 and 56), E.C. Tatum (No. 57), and P J Moulding (No. 58).

(8) Michael Goaman initially supplied a set of four designs (Nos 60-63) explaining his intention as "to symbolise the country by our industries and occupations – as a series or singly", and two unrelated designs shortly after. Variants of the full set, minus the national floral emblems (Nos 60A – 63A) were also supplied; all of these are in the NPM albums in stamp size, but only one in full size.

(9) Stephen Gooden re-entered into his previous dispute with the GPO over their standard assertion of copyright over all designs submitted by invitation; after finally receiving a verbal assurance from the DPS on 15 April that this would be waived in his case in favour of an assumption of joint copyright, he submitted two stamp-size designs.

## REACTIONS TO FIRST DESIGNS

On 18 April the various members of the COID's stamp advisory panel were asked to examine and comment on the designs now to hand; it was not possible to arrange a full meeting of the panel before 17 June (the Coronation have rather interrupted events). However it was possible to lay on a preview on 8 May for Lady Cecilia Sempill, Sir Leigh Ashton, Mr Gordon Russell and Mrs C G Tomrley, while separate viewings were singly arranged for Sir George Bellew, Sir Francis Meynell and the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres. The only members of the panel who did not apparently see the designs until 17 June were Sir John Wilson and Sir Kenneth Clark, when Lord Crawford, Bellew and Russell were again unable to attend although their views were on record. Others present on the 17<sup>th</sup> were the Postmaster General [PMG] Earl de la Warr, the Deputy Director General [DDG] Sir Dudley Lumley, the DPS with Brigadier Holmes and Mr T J Griffiths of his department, Supplies Department representatives, and Mr Philip Waterlow on behalf of the printers.

The designs shortlisted by the panel on 8 May were Nos. 5, 10, 16-17, 34-35, 41, 44, 46, 52, 54 and 57-59; on 26 May Sir Francis Meynell had picked out Nos. 3 and 59 as the only designs worth selecting, but also chosen Nos. 13, 39, 46 and 52 as reserves. Lord Crawford's choices, made on 5 May, were as follows:

- 7: might be considered without the cupids (sic) should be (winged cherubs
- 10: might be considered without the inappropriate fleur-de-lys background
- 14: not a bad idea, but not a good design because of the position and shape of the harp in relation to the face and chin of the Queen's head
- 17: a competent design, but too detailed to be effective in reduction; it could be simplified by removing such items as the unicorn's chain plus decorative scrolls & draperies. The numbers should be improved and the lettering better spaced.
- 18: competent but lacked unity; the dove of peace was "temporarily suspect" because of its adoption as a propaganda symbol by the Communist movement.
- 36: needed revision to the slope of the surround to the head, and might be also simplified by the omission of the Queen's diadem.
- 39,41: very pretty naturalistic designs, but possibly not of sufficient dignity for high value stamps.

Sir George Bellew had made the following selections (apparently in order of merit) with accompanying comments on 7 May:

- 39: one of the best stamp designs he had ever seen; the daffodils however should be replaced by leeks. Legally Wales was part of England rather than a separate country and thus not entitled to a distinct floral emblem, but the leek was recognised as a courtesy emblem.

- 41: a good second but far behind No. 39; the design might be improved by replacing the floral emblems in the corners with acorns, etc.
- 44: the crown should more closely resemble st Edward's crown and E II R should be changed to E R to avoid offending Scottish feelings (since Elizabeth I of England had never been Queen of Scotland).
- 43: E II R should be changed to E R as above
- 47: leeks should replace daffodils as with No. 39.
- 17: as above
- 36: in the Scottish quarter of the royal arms, the frame should not be solid but reveal the background or "field". The placing of the fleurs-de-lys in relation to the frame should also be corrected.

The PMG, Lord de la Warr, began the meeting of 17 June by stating that he was disappointed with the general level of designs, a sentiment already voiced by both Lord Crawford and Sir George Bellew. He thought it would be hard to find four adequate designs and still harder to make up a related set as was desirable; in view of this lack of success with formal designs, he was now inclining towards a pictorial issue such as had been common overseas for many years and was already prefigured to a degree with the current issue 2/6d and 5/-. Of the designs now to hand he found Mary Adshead's "famous buildings" set very attractive, as was a similar series of five rough sketches prepared by Waterlows'; he would now like to hear the panel's views. (The Waterlows' sketches are not in the numbered list of submitted designs and do not appear to be preserved in the NPM.)

Sir Francis Meynell argued against pictorial stamps on the grounds that it was hard to achieve unity of design in a context where the Queen's head had necessarily to be kept separate from the other elements involved. Supported by Lady Sempill, he favoured Leonard Beaumont's designs Nos. 3-6 as an acceptable non-pictorial set; Sir Kenneth Clark blocked this however by stating his specific dislike of Beaumont's set and suggesting that a pictorial issue, if well done, would be very popular. In support of this Sir Leigh Ashton thought that a series on the lines of Waterlows' rough sketches would be very suitable for engravings. Sir John Wilson, the panel's philatelic expert as a former president of the Royal Philatelic Society and current Keeper of the Queen's stamp collection, gave his opinion that the matter was purely a policy decision for the GPO rather than a question of artistic value. When the PMG suggested that the pictorials might be printed in two colours, this was generally welcomed by the panel and Sir Francis Meynell said that provided the job was well executed his objections would be reduced (although not removed). It was therefore agreed to abandon the submitted designs and embark on a fresh competition.

---

## NEW 'CASTLES' DESIGNS SOUGHT

The resolve was that the new competition should be limited to five or six artists with special aptitude for small landscape drawings, and it was decided that these should be Mary Adshead, Sir Muirhead Bone, Stephen Gooden, Joan Hassall, Lynton Lamb and Reynolds Stone, plus Waterlows' on account of their experience in stamp design and engraving (but none of the other stamp printers). At this point it was intended that artists would be asked to include both a picture and a border for each design; in this way it would be possible if need be to consider matching up the best of both from different artists, although not without consultation; Waterlows' would in any case provide a selection of borders. The printers would also provide artists with colour samples suitable for two-colour treatments and produce stamp-size lithograph reductions of the wash drawings submitted. Subject to approval by the Queen, the subjects were to be the Tower of London, Windsor Castle, Edinburgh Castle, and Caernarvon Castle, drawn "from a well known angle" so as to be readily identifiable by the public (as will be noted, these suggestions were broadly those first made by Mary Adshead in February and since incorporated in her first designs, along with the similar batch of rough sketches by Waterlows'). The Home Secretary would also be consulted on the desirability of including a subject representing Northern Ireland, for which Stormont House or the Ulster Parliament building were tentatively proposed. It was hoped that the results of this second competition could be judged in the latter half of September.

In further discussions with the DDG and DPS the following day, Sir Francis Meynell proposed that each artist should be asked to confine themselves to one only of whichever four subjects were to constitute the series – faced with the most recent proof of the COID's reiterated argument that the selection process was in no way helped by permitting the over-proliferation of entries, the PMG readily concurred with this when put to him.

On 22 June the Queen "entirely approved" the proposed theme of the new high values, Lord de la Warr having pointed out that the subjects were not only famous in themselves but particularly associated with the Royal Family. The same day Sir Francis made a further suggestion to the DDG, Sir Dudley Lumley, that a fine "castle" subject for Northern Ireland would be Carrickfergus Castle (although, as he confessed his geography to be non-existent, he could not guarantee it was in the right part of Ireland. Fortunately it was.) Both Lumley and the PMG were reluctant to abandon the Tower of London as a subject but acknowledged that Carrickfergus would ideally round out a "castles" series, and this was largely the view taken in a letter of the 29<sup>th</sup> by the Home Secretary, Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe, who said its status as a part of the United Kingdom made it important that Northern Ireland should be represented. The DDG wrote to Sir Francis Meynell on 6 July confirming that Carrickfergus would now make up the series and thanking him for his suggestion. As early as 18 June, Sir Dudley had already remarked in an internal memorandum on his appreciation



for Sir Francis' continuing contribution, despite his known and deep-rooted objection to pictorial stamps.

Immediately the decision on the series was reached, local head postmasters and regional headquarters were contacted and asked to supply photographs of the best available views of the castles, "which, if reproduced, would invoke the spontaneous comment – "Edinburgh [or Windsor, Caernarvon, or Carrickfergus] Castle!" As the artists were to be asked to base their designs around these views, to avoid copyright problems they had to be taken either by GPO staff or as a special commission by commercial photographers. Samples of the best views were duly available by the end of July except for Windsor, a photograph showing the castle from the required angle finally being received on 6 August. The approved photograph of Carrickfergus was selected from a batch which the Belfast Telephone Manager, Mr R R Walker, took for the purpose himself. New draft instructions to artists were prepared during July, and another artist, B S. Biro, added to the list agreed on 17 June. On 9 July the DPS, Mr Locke, proposed that the 2/6d should depict Carrickfergus, the 5/- Caernarvon, the 10/- Edinburgh, and the £1 Windsor; as the current colour of the 2/6d was green, he recommended that this should be changed to brown in the new series to avoid either stimulating or exacerbating Irish feelings by showing Carrickfergus Castle in the green associated with the nationalist tradition. Meanwhile the new £1 could be issued in black instead of brown and would hopefully be reminiscent of the much-admired black PUC £1 specially issued in 1929.

This last point amounted in fact to special pleading, as there was no especial need for the view of Carrickfergus to be on the 2/6d in particular, although there was precedent for a brown 2/6d stamp in the reign of George V. The truth was that ever since it became apparent in May that a black 1d stamp was not a practical proposition for the new reign (all attempts at either cancellation or overprint having proved illegible) Lord de la Warr had been thinking in terms of a black £1, and already on 31 May the DDG had asked to see a sample of the 1929 PUC stamp. By 14 July the PMG had agreed Mr Locke's proposals both for the allocation of castles to value and for basic colours – the secondary colours as discussed on 17 June were to feature on the Queen's head and elsewhere outside the purely pictorial element of each design. The previous day Sir Kenneth Clark had written to the PMG: "[We] can now break out into something more adventurous. I shall be most interested to see what comes out of our invitation to artists to produce views of castles". On 31 July instructions and invitations for the new competition were sent out to the selected artists.

---

## ENGRAVING OF QUEEN'S HEAD

While all of the above was taking place Waterlows' had been working through the spring and summer of 1953 to produce an engraved head of the Queen for use on high values. PSD had

asked Supplies on 20 March to obtain an engraved die exactly reproducing the Queen's effigy from the recently issued 2½d Wilding definitive. A quote of £140 for this work was received from Waterlows' on 31 March and accepted on 17 April. By 26 June Waterlows' Chief Engraver, Mr H.J. Bard, had prepared a die from a print of the photogravured low values' effigy, the Dorothy Wilding ¾ face photograph as subsequently retouched, first by Edmund Dulac and later by M.C. Farrar-Bell. Four colour proofs were received by PSD on that date, Mr T.J. Griffiths noting that "the die seems an improvement on previous somewhat similar efforts", although no details of earlier results are recorded. The DPS and Brigadier Holmes of his department agreed that the new proofs failed to replicate precisely the Queen's expression as shown on the low values, which was attributed to accentuated shading on a line between the left nostril and left side of the mouth, and possibly also to the area between the lips and chin. The shading was least conspicuous on the proof pulled in green.

These remarks were passed on to Waterlows' and a fresh proof from the revised die was received on 9 July, with the firm's comment that if further alterations were still required, Mr Bard would like to see the original Dorothy Wilding photograph as it was extremely difficult to obtain all the detail required for the engraving from a photogravure print. While the new proof was agreed to be much nearer the desired effect, it was decided on the 13<sup>th</sup> to loan Waterlows' a copy of the original Wilding photograph (No. 015957-E) and discuss with Mr Bard how the remaining differences between the engraving and the 2½d effigy might be eradicated. Mr Bard duly attended a meeting with the DPS at GPO Headquarters on 21 July; after Mr Locke had explained the areas where the portrait on the die might be improved, the engraver concluded, after careful scrutiny, that the effect might be achieved by very slightly lengthening the left eyebrow and modifying the shading on the lip and chin and on the side of the face.

Mr Bard completed this by the 24<sup>th</sup> and brought fresh pulls in red, blue, green, brown and greyish-black to show the DPS the same day; Mr Locke now asked if these could be produced in an oval setting cutting off part of the shoulders, as the greater expanse of shoulder in the "square type" setting to hand seemed to create an illusion that the Queen's head was very slightly more upright than on the 2½d effigy, where it appeared to incline slightly backwards. Mr Bard agreed that this could be done without undue trouble; it was arranged that new colour proofs with the required amendment should be produced on special high-value stamp paper, and a card-mounted set of these was delivered on the 29<sup>th</sup>. Waterlows' now warned that any further alteration now made to the die might irretrievably ruin it; fortunately this latest version was approved as "excellent" by the DPS, the DDG and the Director General, Sir Alexander Little, on 31 July.

The new instructions to artists asked for finished monochrome-wash drawings to be submitted by 21 September; no limit was placed on the number of entries, for each of which a 40 guineas' fee would be payable, but the maximum fee for each artist was set at 80

guineas, exclusive of the 160 guineas payable as before for each successful design. The specified shapes and sizes were as before, except that the square design option had been withdrawn, and the question of whether designs should include borders was finally left to the artists. The major difference from the norm was in the very tight restrictions on subject matter and treatment – each artist was told which castle was to be depicted on which denomination, and invited to produce designs for that denomination only, while it was emphasised that the most recognisable view of the relevant castle must be represented, as exemplified on the photographs enclosed for “guidance”. Mary Adshead and Joan Hassall were each asked to design the 2/6d (Carrickfergus), B.S. Biro and Lynton Lamb the 5/- (Caernarvon), Sir Muirhead Bone and Reynolds Stone the 10/- (Edinburgh), while Stephen Gooden and Waterlows’ were asked to design the £1 depicting Windsor Castle. All artists were strongly urged to liaise with the printers on technical matters and in particular to seek their advice on two-colour printing.

---

### **GPO COPYRIGHT RELAXED**

A minor but significant change also made here was that, following advice from the Solicitor’s Department received on 20 April, the GPO formally qualified, for the first time and thereafter, its general policy that property and copyright in any designs submitted would “become the absolute property of the Postmaster General”. The following concessions were now made:

[The PMG] will not make any alteration in any drawing submitted by an artist without the artist’s permission. If any drawing submitted by an artist is rejected ... the artist shall not make use of the drawing or design contained therein without the consent in writing of the Postmaster General, but that consent shall not be unreasonably [with]held if the artist gives an undertaking, when making use of the drawing or design, not to say that it has been submitted as a design for a postage stamp.

This ensued from the substantially similar verbal arrangement entered into between the DPS and Stephen Gooden on 15 April, as already described; the absence of these concessions from the GPO’s standard assertion of absolute copyright had accounted for Gooden’s consistent refusal of repeated invitations from the GPO from 1937 to 1953. However the relevant clause had inadvertently been omitted from the invitations sent out in February, which was why Gooden had not followed his normal practice of declining to submit designs from the outset. When the omission of the clause was noticed and artists were warned at the beginning of March that it still applied, Gooden had protested: “This is just like those children’s games where the players invent the rules as they go along, and which in consequence always end in quarrels and tears”. In his somewhat belated reply of

30 August to the new invitation, Gooden thanked the DPS for altering “that offensive and dishonest clause”; however he also directed attention to a more aesthetic problem:

The connection between the portrait head and the landscape is a purely literary one ... As regards the visual arts there is no connection between the two, and the difference in scale between the head and the landscape makes it impossible to relate them formally, and particularly so when both ... are treated in a naturalistic manner ... Really I cannot undertake to design such a monstrosity.

Gooden’s criticism is worth recording as a lucid if forcible statement of the problem that would haunt stamp designers for years to come; however, he was the only artist in receipt of the 31 July invitation who declined to take part.

At a meeting with the DPS and representatives of PSD and the Supplies Department on 21 August, Mr Waterlow stated that only three artists (Lamb, Adshead and Biro) had so far approached the firm about two-colour printing and said that he would arrange for all the artists to be contacted and briefed on its capabilities and limitations and the proper use of the dominant and contrasting or secondary colours. A related question which Mr Waterlow raised at this time was that of using paper with a continuous watermark, rather than with a single registering watermark for each stamp as was the practice with the high values. The Inland Revenue had stated as long ago as 1911 that they would not object on security grounds to the use of continuous watermarks on high as well as low values; the Supplies Department had argued in 1926 that the small quantity of paper involved annually did not justify the trouble of changing from the single registering watermark, which was also “in keeping with the special character of the stamps in other respects”. Mr Waterlow now pointed out that two-colour printing as envisaged would necessitate the use of two machines, which would make it especially difficult to maintain one watermark per stamp, hence justifying a change to paper with the continuous watermark. PSD accepted this argument, although it has since been suggested that they were “blinded with science”, as printing one watermark per stamp was technically no greater feat than printing two colours in exact register. The Investigation Branch confirmed on the 25<sup>th</sup> that there was no objection to a continuous watermark from the security aspect.

---

## NEW DESIGNS RECEIVED

By 24 September the following designs had been received:

<i>Artist</i>	<i>Design Nos.</i>	<i>Castle</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Date submitted</i>
L D Fryer	1	Windsor	£1	17/9/53

(Waterlows)

Reynolds Stone	2,3	Edinburgh	10/-	15/9/53
Sir Muirhead Bone	4	“	“	17/9/53
B.S. Biro	5,6	Caernarvon	5/-	15/9/53
Lynton Lamb	7,8	“	“	18/9/53
Joan Hassall	9	Carrickfergus	2/6d	19/9/53
Mary Adshead	10-15	“	“	19/9/53

Full size drawings of all the above are in the NPM albums except for the horizontal design by Reynolds Stone and Sir Muirhead Bone's design featuring the collar and star of the Order of the Thistle. Biro, Lamb and Hassall also supplied stamp size roughs in colour of their designs, while full size colour drawings were submitted by Stone, and for two designs by Mary Adshead. In a letter accompanying her artwork Adshead gave here suggestions for two-colour treatment as either with the "view" in brown and the surround and Queen's head in black or green, or with both the view and head in brown and the surround only in black or green; to this end she supplied one vertical design with a brown view and the remainder in green, and a horizontal design with a brown view and the remainder in black. Sir Muirhead Bone indicated in a note accompanying his design, which he sent straight to Waterlows', that he was attaching a colour tracing showing his ideas for two-colour treatment, although neither this nor, as already noted, his full size drawing, are in the NPM albums. The firm's view was that the design was not adaptable to their "direct plate" printing method without considerably more work, which Sir Muirhead's doctors had just forbidden him to undertake (he was already in a nursing home when first invited and would in fact die there on 21 October 1953, only a month after completing his design. He was, coincidentally Mary Adshead's father-in-law.) "Direct plate" was Waterlows' own term for the conventional process more generally referred to by such names as line engraving, recess printing, or intaglio. All the designs except Lamb's used some variant of the oval frame for the Queen's effigy; Lamb later explained: "I do not think a formal or decorated frame, put round the portrait and superimposed on a naturalistically treated landscape, can ever be happy."

Mr Locke looked briefly at the 15 designs and accepted the recommendation by Brigadier Holmes of PSD that Waterlow's should now supply bromides and three sets of stamp-size litho prints – one set with the Queen's head and surround in the dominant colour and the pictorial and other features in the secondary, one set with the head and surround secondary and the rest dominant, and one set with all features of the design in the dominant colour on a white background without any secondary colour. Two sets of bromides were received on 17 and 23 October and the lithographed colour essays and original artwork were returned on 13 November. After seeing these the DDG referred in a memorandum of the 18<sup>th</sup> to "the somewhat disappointing character of many of the designs", but found the design for the £1 by L.D. Fryer, Waterlows' own artist, "very

attractive” – there is very little record in the files at this time or later of any deeper deliberations on the castles designs, and a distinct impression is given that PSD, with Sir Dudley Lumley’s approval, effectively rejected consideration of any designs other than Waterlows’. Following the DDG’s comments, Mr Waterlow agreed at a meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> with the new DPS, Mr S.D. Sargent to produce further designs for the other values and castles. The border, or “Waterlow frame” as it came to be described, could be amended as necessary. This work was in fact done by the 25<sup>th</sup> and three sets of “patched up photographs” of the four denominations with border adaptations by Fryer were delivered to Brigadier Holmes the same day. The adapted Waterlow frames bore the value in words as well as figures; “vignettes” of each castle copied from the original photographs had been patched into the revised frame and if need be trimmed to fit. There appear to have to have been slight variations between the sets in the number of curlicues on the oval surrounding the Queen’s head, the shape and number of the tabs containing the value in figures, and between white-on-black and black-on-white lettering for the value in words. Two examples with monochrome borders and vignettes in green are in the NPM.

Messrs Waterlow and Fryer subsequently called at GPO Headquarters on 11 December and were asked to produce finished stamp-size versions of the above with the value lettering white-on-black, the lower curlicues removed from the oval around the head, and the value figures in a single circular or oval tab. The vignettes were to be in black/grey and the border in the colour appropriate to the value – the £1 should be the same black as the 1929 PUC £1. Fryer duly executed these in watercolours and a card-mounted set of lithographed essays was to hand by 13 January 1954, when it was noted in a memorandum that the DDG intended to show it to Sir Alexander Little, the Director General. The final version of the “Waterlow frame” as seen on these essays included discreet captions between the vignette and lower border identifying each castle. The following day Waterlows’ were asked to provide 16 sets of bromides of the essays, and also to adjust their colours as closely as possible to the equivalents in GPO use, for which a colour chart was provided.

---

### **‘BROKEN GROTTO’ CHOSEN BY PMG**

A meeting took place on 21 January between Lord de la Warr, Sir Dudley Lumley, Mr Sargent and Sir Francis Meynell; there is no record of the PMG having previously seen any of the castles designs, by Waterlows’ or otherwise, although it seems that a set may have been present for viewing on this occasion. It was decided, largely at the PMG’s behest, to retain Waterlows’ vignettes but to use the Lynton Lamb border later known as the “broken grotto” for the remainder of the stamp; this framed the castles in a crumbling window embrasure with tufts of foliage and was designed to be reminiscent of old prints. It was decided to obtain bromides showing the four castles with the Lamb border, and also colour essays with the vignettes in monochrome as on Waterlows’ latest essays of their own designs and

the border in the appropriate colour, for which Lamb should be consulted as to the precise shade.

On the 25<sup>th</sup> the DPS held a further meeting at which Lamb, Waterlow and Fryer were present as well as Supplies and PSD representatives. In the course of discussion Mr Waterlow raised the point that Lamb's design was unsuitable for two-colour treatment in its present form as there was not enough room between the surround and the vignette to allow for the inevitable slight errors in registration, especially if space had to be found for the castles' names. Mr Sargent recalled that the PMG had himself suggested tentatively that the gap might be slightly increased. Lamb commented that he would not wish to alter the contours or proportions of the castles as drawn by Fryer, but "would prefer something after the style of his original drawing where the light and shade were intensified and the general effect somewhat simplified"; he also felt that the inclusion of the castles' names might not fit in appropriately with his design. A more cheerful shade of blue than that currently chosen for the 10/- might also have a less depressing effect in conjunction with the black of the vignette, although the colours of the other values were satisfactory. It was decided that a final decision on precise shades could be left to the proof stage, however.

At the close of the meeting Lamb agreed to produce overlays of the four castles (slightly reducing his original study of Caernarvon in size to meet Mr Waterlow's point about registration) and the value tabs for the four denominations, changing the "5s" on his design to "5/-" in accordance with the remaining values, "using the stroke and not the 's' 'd' form". Bromides would then be prepared for eventual consideration by the Stamp Advisory Panel; Lamb's other commitments meant that these were unlikely to be ready for another four weeks.

In the event he notified PSD on 16 February that he had completed his new drawings of the castles, with the remarks that "they will not only be more homogenous with my design; but owing to the particular and irregular nature of the opening through which they will be seen I now realise that they would have had to be redrawn in any case to fit comfortably within it". As well as simplifying general details and heightening the contrast in the shading as he had indicated on 25 January, he also omitted the cloud detail that Fryer had included in his drawings, explaining in a note to Mr Waterlow on the same date that he felt the masonry surrounding the views of the castles made this unnecessary; he had also taken the opportunity to strengthen the lettering of the word "postage" in his original design. As promised, he sent the printers four redrawn value panels on black paper, and four overlays of the castles drawn on one sheet of paper in slightly reduced size from Fryer's version. A final point he raised with both Mr Waterlow and PSD was that he was not averse to including the name of the castle in each design if it could be worked in along a curve in the foreground detail of the building itself, although he hoped Mr Waterlow and himself would agree on being equally happy to omit the names altogether. In a further letter to PSD on 2

March however, Lamb reported Waterlows' counter-suggestion that the name could appear printed close under or even across each castle in the same colour as the border, to which he had no objection provided the border was cleared.

Mr Waterlow called on Brigadier Holmes on 8 March with the bromides of Lamb's designs; Holmes was not altogether satisfied with the positioning of the castles, which appeared to float in the air, although Mr Waterlow explained that they had been placed according to the artist's specific instructions. Lamb was contacted on this and replied the following day that he was personally satisfied and thought the bromides might not be giving the full effect; otherwise the "floating" problem might be overcome by adding to the foreground detail of the vignettes. He was against lowering the whole within each framework as this would bring the bottom halves too close together and raise again the problems of registration.

---

## LAMB'S DESIGNS REVIEWED

On 23 April the DDG held a meeting to review Lamb's designs at which the artist, Sir Francis Meynell, the DPS and Brigadier Holmes were present; at Sir Francis's invitation, Mr R.B. Fishenden of the papermakers and stationery manufacturers Spicers Ltd also attended as an independent expert on the technical aspects of engraving. Lamb's new drawings, in reduced size as required to facilitate registration, did not have a happy effect; on the subject of colour registration however, Mr Fishenden drew attention to a Costa Rican 25 cent stamp reproduced in Waterlows' own booklet *A Century of Stamp Production*, in which there was no apparent gap between the parts of the design printed in different colours; he explained that "loose register" need not be exact and that a gap of only 2-3 millimetres would not be noticed. It was decided that, although there should be enough margin between the surround and the vignette of the castle to allow for "loose register" and facilitate two-colour printing, it was the responsibility of the printers to achieve accurate registration.

After discussion it was agreed that Lamb might prepare a new set of drawings reverting to the size and style of his original picture of Caernarvon. He was asked to take particular pains over Edinburgh Castle, felt to be the most difficult of the four subjects because of the rock in the foreground – either the castle should be lowered within the frame of masonry or the rock base continued down to the lower ledge of the embrasure, in either case removing the impression that the castle was floating in the air. If his revised version was satisfactory Waterlows' would reproduce it as it stood, ignoring for the time being any registration or other technical problems arising from two-colour printing. Lamb was also asked to consider the following general amendments to his basic design:



- (1) the value should be moved a little to the left, either preceding or following the word “postage” and in the same size, the full legend to occupy a central position on the base of the stamp.
- (2) the suggestion of a vertical black line in front of the Queen’s face should be corrected
- (3) the base of the design where “postage” and the value appeared should be in continuous black rather than broken up between light and shade
- (4) the awkward juxtaposition of the Queen’s head and right-hand part of the embrasure should be corrected either by moving the former a shade to the right or amending the latter (although the feeling of the meeting was less decided on this than the other points).

No firm decision was taken on colour; as before, the pictorial vignette was to remain in black and white and the colour of the borders decided another day. The work on the Queen’s head of Waterlows’ engraver H.J. Bard was much admired and it was decided to ask him in due course to complete the remainder of the stamps. Mr Fishenden placed his opinion on record that the quality of Waterlows’ engraving was very variable.

Lynton Lamb supplied his revised designs on 10 June; these included two new versions of the basic design, one with the distance between head and embrasure increased and one without. Both versions had the revised base which Lamb agreed was a great improvement. He also produced new vignettes of the castles extended (except for Edinburgh) to take in more of the surrounding landscapes; of these he remarked that the foreground of both Caernarvon and Carrickfergus was faded off to suggest the reflection of sky in water. For Edinburgh he had varied his approach by omitting a building on the extreme left in order to enlarge the detail of the main mass, which he thought should considerably help the engraver. The new drawing of Edinburgh was shown inset within the embrasure on the version of the revised surround with the placing of the Queen’s head unchanged.

By 30 June Sir Francis Meynell had seen the above and was on common ground with Mr Sargent, Sir Dudley Lumley, and the PMG that the version of the border with the revised head placing was certainly worthy of submission to the Queen, and that the latest drawing of Edinburgh Castle was “a much happier result” than had been seen hitherto. Although he thought that the remaining subjects could still be improved to the same degree, he felt that bromides could now be prepared for submission to the COID and, if approved submitted to the Queen, as “there will be much more difference between the engraving and the drawing than there will between the drawn inset version and new drawings of the subjects”. After some little discussion with Lamb, Waterlows’ finally produced two sets of bromides on 26 July with which both artist and printer were satisfied – it was agreed that any residual problems with overlapping areas of colour between border and vignette could largely be solved at the essaying stage by ensuring that the former were darker in shade than the latter.

## REDRAWN CASTLES REQUIRED

The DDG submitted the bromides for consideration by Sir Francis Meynell on 30 July; on 6 August, by which time Sir Kenneth Clark and the PMG had also seen them, it was felt further discussion was required, as both the latter felt that at least Edinburgh Castle and possibly all four needed redrawing to give them greater prominence compared with the surrounding border. Sir Francis Meynell had also complained on the 3<sup>rd</sup> that the view of Windsor was not “recognisably characteristic ... The detail when it is reduced is minute and is largely obscured by the foliage”, while the PMG had now decided that there was too much foreground rock in Lamb’s 10 June drawing of Edinburgh Castle. On the 10<sup>th</sup> Sir Kenneth Clark told the DPS that “the insets were purely photographic in nature and ... failed to bring out the distinctive features of the castles themselves, which indeed played almost an insignificant part ... It was essential that the artist should redraw on a completely new basis both Windsor and Edinburgh ... in what Sir Kenneth described as ‘in almost a poster style’”. Caernarvon and Carrickfergus were “very much less open to objection” but might later appear sufficiently “out of character” to need similar redrawing, although a decision on this could await results on Windsor and Edinburgh. Subsequently Mr Sargent spoke to the PMG; notwithstanding Sir Dudley Lumley’s view of the previous 27 May that efforts should be directed toward issuing the stamps by the end of 1954, Lord de la Warr thought it “preferable to take as much time as was necessary rather than to issue stamps which were less than first-class”, and if necessary he would answer an arranged question in the House of Lords to that effect. Later still that day he managed to contact Lamb, who was passing through London, and explained that the PMG now wished Edinburgh and Windsor to be redrawn as proposed by Sir Kenneth Clark, in a less “photographic” style and as a matter of urgency. Despite some initial dismay the artist agreed, with what the DPS described as “a good heart”. However, on the question of additionally redrawing Carrickfergus and Caernarvon if thought desirable, Lamb was sceptical of obtaining any better results than hitherto, whatever freedoms from photographic constraint were permitted; he also pointed out that even the most photographic drawing would look considerably less photographic once reproduced in stamp size by the engraving process.

After visiting Edinburgh and Windsor to execute new drawings on the spot, Lamb left two studies each of both castles with Brigadier Holmes of PSD on 14 September; in an explanatory note the next day, he described these as follows:

My general idea for the set had been a series of “picturesque views” somewhat similar to those in early nineteenth century albums; and for this line engraving is very suitable. It can render the texture of crumbling masonry, and thus establish an essential unity between the ruined window opening and the inset views ...

The picture will be so fine that ... recognition by silhouette is more important than the identification by masonry joints and brickwork ... To avoid as far as possible running the inset against or into the embrasure ... I have consequently used a dark silhouette against a light sky virtually eliminating cloud and leaving a white space between inset and frame ...

The embrasure frame ... can logically select a significant part of a building where the whole is too vast or rambling. I have done this in both cases.

After mentioning the great advantage of having finally made his own selection of viewpoints, Lamb now listed these:

*“Edinburgh 1”* – the castle proper, seen from Castle Hill at the top of the Royal Mile.

*“Edinburgh 2”* – the obvious view from Princes’ Street as known to tourists; very similar to the original photograph, “but by changing the scale I have given much more sense of distance, and have eliminated the awkward heavy tonal treatment of the rock that was so confusing with the edge of the embrasure.”

*“Windsor 1”* – from the NW, showing the Round Tower, Norman Gate and Winchester Tower. As the Royal Standard flew from the Round Tower the lower part of the flagpole running up to and behind the top of the embrasure would need to be put in.

*“Windsor 2”* – a simplified silhouette seen from Victoria Bridge to the NE.

Lamb made the final point that, “although the £1 stamp is in black throughout, it is nonetheless important to keep a shape of light tone between the dark of the embrasure and the shape of the castle”.

On the 18<sup>th</sup> the four drawings were seen by Sir Kenneth Clark and Lord de la Warr, who declared them highly satisfactory; it was agreed that the best pair were “Edinburgh 2” and “Windsor 2”, although the PMG noted of the former: “needs tying to the ground- looks like a floating battleship”. Waterlows’ were asked on the 21<sup>st</sup> to supply bromides of all four designs, and did so on the 30<sup>th</sup>. On 6 October Lamb visited the printers and decided to relieve the overall impression of Windsor Castle, which he agreed was a trifle too dark, by slightly lightening some of the details below the central tower – “I have also eliminated the white ‘river’ between the extreme right edge of the castle and the embrasure”. On Edinburgh Castle, Waterlows’ were insistent that some slight “vignetting”, ie, fading off around the margins of the drawing, was essential for satisfactory two-colour registration, which conflicted with the latest reported wishes of the PMG. Left it to PSD to resolve this dilemma in a letter to Brigadier Holmes the following day: “Should the Postmaster General or his advisers want less fading off at the base, I could easily add to the drawing by bringing the liens of the rock down to touch the embrasure? .. you, of course, will decide if you wish

the printers to undertake a higher degree of precision registration than they at present guarantee”.

In the event Lamb was asked to make this last change to the Edinburgh Castle drawing; Waterlows’ supplied fresh bromides on the 14<sup>th</sup>. These were first seen by the DPS and DDG on 16 October, when it was agreed that amendments to the basic design were not so striking as to necessitate redrawing fo the Carrickfergus and Caernarvon vignettes as had been feared earlier. Two days later Lamb visited GPO Headquarters to examine the bromides with Mr K. Hind of PSD, and Mr H.N. Pickering who had now replaced Brigadier Holmes in matters relating to new stamp issues. In discussion he gave his opinion that any slight lessening in the uniformity of style of the set which had now come about through the various changes would tend to be corrected in the process of engraving; he also considered that further vignetting of the Caernarvon drawing, which Waterlows’ now considered the sole outstanding technical requirement, was also best left for the engraver at the proof stage.

Sir Dudley Lumley met the PMG on 25 October, and it was agreed that the designs were now satisfactory and should be submitted to Sir Francis Meynell and the Stamp Advisory Panel for their views; the PMG thought that Edinburgh Castle “was still a little bit in the air”, but only to the degree that it should be reappraised at the essay stage. Less acceptable was Lamb’s suggestion (made on the 18<sup>th</sup>) that it would be aesthetically preferable for the vignettes to be in colour and the borders of the stamps in black or grey, rather than the reverse as proposed up to the present. The DDG disliked this because it might give the stamps a funeral air; Lord de La Warr was now inclining towards each of the stamps being in a single colour throughout, with variations in shade – the notion of the 5/- as “a symphony in red” was aired. However, any further decision on colour was postponed until essays should be prepared.

---

## APPROVAL BY COID

Sir Francis Meynell informed the DDG on 3 November that he personally approved of Lamb’s designs, and twelve sets of bromides were supplied for a meeting of the Stamp Advisory Panel on the 9<sup>th</sup> – this was as constituted some 18 months previously, except that the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres was no longer a member. Sir Francis reported that the meeting did not go smoothly, as it was generally felt that the panel should have the other submitted designs available for comparison with Lamb’s – Sir John Wilson in particular said that the Queen habitually asked his opinion in such matters in his capacity as keeper of the royal stamp collection, and that he could not give a favourable judgement if he were ignorant of any alternative. He also argued that the use of four variations on one basic theme rather than four quite separate designs might give the impression that the choice of design had

been reached “on the cheap”. In general discussion, the following points about Lamb’s designs were also raised:

- the question of naming the castles
- there were clouds in the sky in the Windsor design, but not in the others
- the hard vertical line on the left of the Queen’s effigy separating it from the “grotto”
- the possibility of lowering Carrickfergus Castle within the frame of its design
- the improvement of the stippled lines on the Queen’s head and the lightening of the lips.

Twelve sets of bromides of the other submitted designs were sent to Gordon Russell at the COID on 20 November, and it was agreed to arrange a meeting between the full panel and Lord de la Warr with other GPO representatives as soon as was convenient. Meanwhile as early as the 16<sup>th</sup>, it was the DDG’s strong contention that the question of colours should be settled in all aspects, and on the same date Sir Francis suggested that the effect of various colour combinations could best be demonstrated using half-tone blocks. Following this up Mr Sargent proposed to the DDG on 24 November that Waterlows’ should supply letterpress half-tone proofs of Lamb’s £1 design (Windsor Castle) in black only, and of the other values with (a) the selected colour throughout (b) the border in the selected colour, the castle in black (c) the castle in the selected colour and the border in black. It was then agreed with Gordon Russell that the meeting should wait until after these were to hand.

The half-tones were available for examination at a meeting on 13 December between Sir Dudley Lumley, the DPS, Mr Waterlow and Lynton Lamb; it was agreed that while the results were unimpressive in themselves, and not conclusive as a guide to the appearance of a finished stamp, the designs in two colours were not satisfactory and it would be far preferable to have one colour, in different shades, for each value. As a result two single-colour essays were obtained, of the £1 in black and the 10/- in blue; on the 20<sup>th</sup> Sir Dudley Lumley showed these to the PMG, who very much preferred the single-colour blue to the two-colour versions of the 10/-, and pronounced the black £1 to be a beautiful stamp. Meanwhile Lamb had prepared a selection of red and brown colour patches to help suggest how the 2/6d and 5/- might look when finished. Waterlows’ were able to match these up by 3 January 1955, and to produce five sets of colour pulls of the Queen’s head in red, green, brown, blue and black by 3 February.

By 21 January Sir Francis Meynell, despite his earlier advocacy of two-colour stamps, was ready to concur that the issue should now be printed in only one colour, with whatever gradations of shading were produced by the engraving process. It was eventually possible to convene a meeting of the Postmaster General’s Advisory Committee (as the panel was now more often referred to) on 15 February; Sir Kenneth Clark and Sir George Bellew were forced to be absent, although the latter saw a full selection of castle design bromides on

the 10<sup>th</sup>. As reported in a memorandum by Mr K. Hind of PSD, he considered Lamb's set the best, although he suggested that the Windsor, Edinburgh and Carrickfergus designs had "not enough castle and too much 'bus', 'rock' and 'beach' respectively ... The view of Windsor was not a very familiar one, and ... the left hand edge of the castle did not finish abruptly as shown but continued". The meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> was more concerned with whether designs other than Lamb's should be submitted to the Queen, although, pressed by the GPO representatives with Sir Francis Meynell's backing, there was general consensus that these were the best and most attractive set. Sir John Wilson did not reiterate his previous arguments for using a variety of designs, but still considered it philatelically advantageous to employ a variety of borders; however Sir Francis Meynell's feeling that the different castles and colours would provide sufficient variety was generally accepted. It was decided to submit Lamb's designs as the committee's unanimous choice, plus B.S. Biro's two designs showing Caernarvon and one of Reynolds Stone's Edinburgh designs, on a "best of the rejected" basis.

At this point Lynton Lamb joined the meeting, as any ensuing discussion was bound to involve his designs in part or whole. Once more Sir Francis Meynell and the GPO representatives joined in bearing upon the rest of the committee that Lamb should be permitted his own discretion as to any further changes; with the further support of Mr Montague Brown, who was present, representing Waterlows', the meeting was persuaded to abandon two-colour printing in favour of single colour by the technical difficulty of registration in two colours, and the detrimental effects upon finished quality that this implied. Lamb's earlier preference for omitting the castles' names was accepted, as was his view that the vertical line to the left of the Queen's head should not be softened; another point carried over from the 9 November meeting concerned the further introduction of clouds into the designs, and this too was left to Lamb's discretion. The artist agreed to lower the setting of Carrickfergus Castle. The committee also agreed the colours as recommended and welcomed the colour pulls of the Queen's head, in which the weaknesses of the bromides seen in November were no longer apparent.

Some further discussion took place on 17 February, when the artist was asked to consider a suggestion from the PMG "that the amount of foliage in the high value stamp designs might perhaps be reduced by a trifle, particularly where it overlapped the dark portions of the design". On the same day Lamb reported in a letter to PSD that he had already made slight reductions to the foreground foliage in the case of Windsor, and had also acknowledged Sir George Bellew's comments of a week earlier by amendments suggesting the leftwards continuation of the castle, while a memorandum from Sir Dudley Lumley to the PMG indicated the artists' feeling that any further adjustments to foliage on the Windsor and Edinburgh designs could be done at the engraving stage. Lamb was unwilling to amend Caernarvon and Carrickfergus further other than by placing the vignettes lower within the

framework of the borders; it was his intention to arrange this and other details at Waterlows' the following day.

---

## ACCEPTANCE BY HM THE QUEEN

Four card-mounted sets of bromides incorporating the changes as agreed and accompanied by pulls of the Queen's head in the appropriate colours from the approved die were formally ordered from the printers on 22 February (plus a similar number of sets of the three rejected designs by Stone and Biro which had been singled out on the 15<sup>th</sup>). These were received on the 25<sup>th</sup> and pronounced "excellent" by the DDG; the PMG being similarly satisfied, the designs were duly submitted to the Queen and approved in short order on 4 March.

The PMG now felt it essential that the stamps should be issued in the lifetime of the current parliamentary session, ie, by the last 3-4 days of July 1955; the DPS held a meeting with Supplies and PSD representatives, plus Lynton Lamb and the printers, to consider this on 8 March. On the basis of provisional timetables drawn up earlier it now seemed that mid- or late-August would be achievable after allowing time for die preparation, printing and distribution; however various measures were agreed which it was hoped might bring this forward to 29 July. Among these was the decision to produce the 2/6d die first (as this would be the value printed in largest numbers) and obtain pulls from it in the finished colours for all four values, so that these could be approved by the middle of May. Hopefully the 5/- would then be approved by 31 May and the 10/- and £1 dies by 10 June. Shortly after this meeting, on 8 April the office of PMG was taken over by Dr Charles Hill MP, possibly better known to posterity as the wartime BBC's "Radio Doctor".

At Waterlows, Bard, having produced the approved engraving of the Queen's head, now produced a master die for Lamb's basic design plus dies for each value. Although some problems were experienced at first because Waterlow was more used to engraving from photographs than drawings, Lamb, who had been keeping in close touch with the company, reported in a letter to Sargent on 30 April that he had seen colour proofs from the completed 2s 6d and 5s dies:

They have made a beautiful job of both ... I can now say I do not wish to [add cloud to the sky] in either case ... The engraver, from the beginning, works with the particular colour in mind for each denomination. He has adjusted his depth of line accordingly. ... In the completed 2/6d and 5/- the depth and sparkle of the landscape insets have the effect of somewhat depriving the [Queen's] portrait of its brilliance ... [but] this can be adjusted when all four denominations are completed ... [The 10/- and £1],

being printed in more intense colours than the 2/6d and 5/-, will probably need less or no strengthening to the portrait.

On 9 May Waterlow supplied PSD with three proofs of the 2s 6d die and two sets of colour essays from the 2s 6d die, printed in the colours of the 1951 high values; on 17 May were supplied three proofs each in brown, blue and black from the 2s 6d die and three each in two different shades of red from the 5s. At a meeting on 23 May of the DPS, Brown on behalf of the printers, and Hind and Carr respectively representing PSD and Supplies, it was agreed that the portrait on the 2s 6d should be printed in a more intense shade of the same brown and that the engraver would do as much as possible for the rest of the border to be similarly deepened in colour. The preferred shades of red for the 5s and black for the £1 were confirmed, and Brown promised to supply proofs from the 10s die when available in both the shade of blue already supplied and another contrasting shade. Sargent noted that the proofs were 'less glossy and less attractive' than anticipated; Carr of Supplies explained that the proofs were on the paper used for normal stamp production but unwatermarked, which gave a misleading impression of the final appearance, and Brown undertook to prepare the 10s proofs on more than one type of paper to aid comparison.

The meeting accepted that the issue date would have to be postponed until the end of August; as it was apparent that details of the engraving would have to be altered on each value to achieve the desired colour effect, it was thought better to submit finished versions of all four designs. Brown warned that this revised timetable would affect the schedule for producing the printing plates and would also be subject to the firm's holiday shutdown from 15 July to 2 August; on 27 May Mr Waterlow followed this up by suggesting that delivery of finished stamps might be delayed from 15 August as proposed to the first week in September.

Lynton Lamb wrote to the DPS on 25 May that he had seen the proofs of the 10s and £1, and was content also to leave the sky cloudless on these designs. The Queen's portrait was satisfactory in both values, and he was especially pleased overall with the £1 – 'it makes a very beautiful stamp'. Proofs were received from the printers on 1 June, hand-pulled on watermarked paper; both sets of the 10s proofs were also supplied on 'Samuel Jones Supreme' gummed plain paper. The 2s 6d had to be approved for revised colour only, the 5s and £1 for engraving only as their colours had already been approved, and the 10s for colour, engraving and paper (in fact the shade of blue used on the first proofs on 9 May was now adopted). The PMG declared on 8 June that he thought the new stamps 'magnificent'; sets of proofs were duly sent to the CoID. Although Sir John Wilson was abroad and Sir Leigh Ashton was unwell, Gordon Russell of the CoID collated replies from members including Sir Francis Meynell and Lady Sempill, and telephoned the outcome to Hind of PSD on 16 May. The proofs were found generally satisfactory apart from the yellowish tinge of the paper; Sir Francis thought the colour less solid than might be desired on the 2s 6d and 5s, with a



'lumpy' appearance to the background of the value figures on the former, while Lady Sempill was concerned that the colours of the 2s 6d and black £1 were similar enough to cause dangerous confusion in artificial light (the shade finally used on the 2s 6d is variously described as blackish-brown or dark sepia brown).

In a minute to the DDG on 21 June, Sargent recalled that both the 'yellow' paper and uneven colour had already been queried with Waterlow – 'we ascertained ... that the yellow effect was due to a scum of ink on the plate which could not be completely removed when proofs were being printed by hand, but which would be wiped clear in the ordinary machine-printing process'. The colour was as solid as Waterlow could make and not susceptible to further improvement within the engraving process. As to the similarity in colour between the 2s 6d and £1, the DPS in effect dismissed Lady Sempill's concerns with the rationalisation that 'we sell comparatively few of these, and counter clerks will, on that account, and because of the value of the individual stamps, probably pay close attention to which stamps they are selling'. These comments were passed to the PMG the following day; the colour proofs were submitted to the Queen on 27 June and approved on 29 June.

---

## FINAL ISSUE AND EARLIER DELAYS

Waterlow now promised to deliver initial supplies of the 10s and £1 values not before 15 August but no later than 25 August, and the remaining values by 9 September; it was agreed by 8 July that the company should concentrate initially on the two higher values. Sargent approved final essays of the stamps for colour and design at the beginning of August, although he drew the attention of the Supplies Department some smudging to the left of the Queen's face, most apparent on the 2s 6d and 10s, as a matter which needed to be resolved with the printers. The 'smudging' was actually deeper shading which gave the impression that the ink had run. Waterlow stated that it was confident of removing this blemish as a preliminary to final printing and Supplies found the stamps 'fully acceptable'; however, the HMSO's Assistant Controller of Printing, Mr Pickford, was asked to examine a specimen sheet of the £1 value with particular regard to the area of deep shading. Pickford's verdict reached after consultation with two of his technical experts is worth repeating:

All three of them were of the opinion that they were a very satisfactory commercial production. They did not think we could get anything better and, indeed, felt that we should be fortunate if there were not more variations in the depth of the shading ... Printers' ink was bound to vary slightly and with it the shading ... [and] there was nothing whatever wrong with the engraving itself. (Memorandum by K Hind of PSD, 5 August 1955.)

On 1 July 1955 the magazine 'Stamp Collecting' was critical of the GPO for not having yet issued the high values; in the reign of Edward VII, it had taken 1 year and 5 months from the

King's accession to complete the issue of new high values, in George V's reign 3 years and 2 months, and 2 years and 10 months after George VI's accession. The magazine pointed out that 3 years and 4 months of the present reign had elapsed, and recalled reports it had received as early as October 1953 of designs being ready. At the spring dinner of the Royal Philatelic Society London in 1954 Sir Dudley Lumley had referred to new high value designs which would be as popular with philatelists as had the recently completed issue of low values, and on 23 July that year 'Stamp Collecting' had accurately forecast that the subjects would include Windsor and Edinburgh Castles, plus 'monuments or historical buildings' associated with Wales and Northern Ireland. On 17 September it correctly named all four castles and even stated that the £1 would feature Windsor and probably be in black (by comparison, the 'Star' evening newspaper, reporting a month later, felt only able to guess at Windsor Castle and 'beauty spots and historic national monuments' representing the remaining parts of the United Kingdom, as the likely subjects). On 9 February 1955, answering a question in the House of Lords from Viscount Elibank, a persistent advocate of pictorial stamps, the PMG made the guarded admission that 'pictorial designs of historic buildings' were intended for use; next day most of the national press echoed the predictions of 'Stamp Collecting' of the previous September. Lord de la Warr also emphasised that 'it was because he did not wish to produce anything unworthy of the subject and of the traditions of British stamps that he was taking rather longer than he had expected to issue the new high-value stamps' ('The Times', 10 February 1955).

It was in the same statement to the Lords that the PMG remarked that 'my experience has shown ... how difficult it is to combine well the head of the Queen with good pictorial designs'. This observation caused some alarm, not least to the Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill, who formed the impression that plans were afoot to omit the Queen's head from the new stamps; he lost no time in asking Lord de la Warr that such was not contemplated without Cabinet authority. It was swiftly clarified that this had not been the PMG's meaning.

The 10s and £1 were issued on 1 September and the 2s 6d and 5s on 23 September; the printed area of each stamp was 39mm across by 22mm down and they were issued in sheets of 40. The complaints by 'Stamp Collecting' about the tardiness of the issue can be appreciated, as it had taken 3 years and 7 months from the accession; two of the artists involved at different stages (Edmund Dulac and Sir Muirhead Bone) had died in the meantime. There was comment that for the first time high value stamps were printed on the same cream paper as low values, but with the new St Edward's Crown watermark; at the Queen's request this was to replace the Tudor Crown watermark, and had already appeared on low values issued in some 2s 6d booklets during August, and on 1d stamps in coils from 23 August. The new watermark had been anticipated since the early part of the year, but philatelists were surprised that its first publicly announced appearance was on the new high values.

The issue was preceded by a lavish press conference on 31 August, at which not only photographs and colour essays of the new stamps were on show but displays of Victorian stamps, the low value 'Wildings', and the 1953 Coronation issue. The PMG, described by the 'Evening Standard' as 'the most indefatigable propagandist in the Government', presided; Sir Dudley Lumley, on his last day as DDG before retiring after 41 years in the civil service, referred to himself (quoted by 'Gibbons Stamp Monthly') as the 'unskilled foreman of the devoted band' whose labours had brought the 'Castles' stamps. The guest list included Enid Marx, M C Farrar-Bell, George Knipe, Mary Adshead, E G Fuller, Michael Goaman, Lynton Lamb, John Farleigh and Cecil Thomas (Farleigh had designed the 2d stamp printed in letterpress on the stamped postcards issued on 6 April 1955, and the 2½d on the letter card issued on 16 May; Thomas had designed the embossed 2½d and 8½d stamps which were respectively on the new ordinary and registered stamped envelopes issued 29 November 1954).

---

## OVERPRINTS AND OTHER VARIATIONS

Waterlow continued to hold the printing contract for the high values until 31 December 1957; De La Rue then held it until 31 December 1962, after which it was held by Bradbury Wilkinson. The De La Rue 2s 6d was reportedly 'a warmer, more chocolate shade' than the 'blackish-brown' of Waterlow; similarly the De La Rue 5s was described as 'scarlet-vermilion', a lighter shade of red than the Waterlow 'rose-carmine', the 10s as 'powder blue' rather than ultramarine, and the £1 a less intense black. Of the Bradbury Wilkinson printings the 5s was described as 'brownish red' and the 10s as 'bright ultramarine'; these printings also showed a more deeply engraved appearance than their predecessors, with more detail on the diadem and heavier lines on the Queen's face.

Overprinted stamps of the issue were on sale in the Bahrain, Kuwait and Tangier postal agencies from 23 September for all values except the £1; in the Persian Gulf territories covered by 'British Postal Agencies in Eastern Arabia' (BPAEA) the overprinted 2s 6d went on sale on 23 September and the overprinted 5s on 1 March 1957. All three values went on sale with the Qatar overprint from 1 April 1957. In Tangier the three values were available with the commemorative overprint '1857-1957 Tangier' from 1 April 1957 until the agency's closure at the end of the month. All of these were Waterlow printings; De La Rue printings of the 10s and 2s 6d values overprinted for Bahrain were sold from 13 May 1958 and 29 January 1960 respectively until withdrawn on 1 July 1960. De La Rue printings were also issued to the BPAEA: 5s overprints were sold from 27 January 1960 and 2s 6d overprints from the following June, while overprints of both values with the new Multiple Crowns watermark appeared from 8 April 1961. No Bradbury Wilkinson printings were overprinted.

A relatively high number of the 'Castles' high values were overprinted for use by British postal agencies overseas because of the growth of the oil industry in Arabia during this period. A converse effect of this was that the postal agencies were gradually replaced by the countries' own postal administrations, as shown below. The following totals are available for overprinted stamps issued - it should be stressed that these relate only to Waterlow printings and are themselves incomplete:

(copy missing)

During the life of the 'Castles' series the paper was first cream, then lighter cream, whiter and finally white; the Multiple Crowns watermark replaced St Edward's Crown, and was itself replaced by unwatermarked paper. These changes affected the appearance of the colours in which the stamps were printed, hence the varying descriptions of the shades. The chronology of the various changes subsequent to September 1955 may be summarised as follows (the dates cited are those of earliest issue to postmasters):

(copy missing)

The series was replaced by the Machin high values issued on 5 March 1969; in the twelve months preceding this, the following unsold stocks of Bradbury Wilkinson printings were withdrawn from sale by the Philatelic Bureau:

March 1968 – £1 on whiter paper

November 1968 – 2s 6d on chalky paper

November 1968 – 5s on whiter paper

January 1969 – 2s 6d on whiter paper

March 1970 – 10s on whiter paper.

The remaining stocks of 'Castles' stamps, on white unwatermarked paper, were withdrawn from sale by the Philatelic Bureau on 15 May 1970; all pre-decimal high values, except £1 values, were invalidated from 1 March 1972.

---

## **PAYMENTS, PRESENTATIONS, AND PRESS REACTIONS**

Payment of fees to the artists involved in the abandoned first competition was made on 15 July 1953 and consisted of 80 guineas (£84) each to Beaumont, Farrar-Bell, Goaman, Marx, Adshead, Harrison and Sons, St Martin's School of Art, and the RCA; 60 guineas (£63) to Waterlow, De La Rue, and Brinkley; 40 guineas (£42) to Kronig, Fraser, Gooden, and the executors of the late Edmund Dulac; 20 guineas (£21) to Abram Games. At the same time, Dulac's widow, Helen de Vere Beauclerk, was also paid the final 100 guineas owing for his full profile and three-quarter face drawings of the Queen's head; it had been agreed that

Dulac should receive 100 guineas for the former and 200 guineas for the latter, and previous instalments of 100 guineas had been paid on 8 August and 10 December 1952. The artists involved in the second competition were paid on 25 January 1954: Waterlow, Joan Hassall and the estate of the deceased Sir Muirhead Bone each received 40 guineas, while Reynolds Stone, Biro, Adshead and Lynton Lamb received 80 guineas each.

The above fees related purely to the submission of original designs; Lamb was also paid 70 guineas on 24 March for work on overlays of castles and value panels, and 100 guineas for his subsequent redrawing of Edinburgh and Windsor Castles. Finally he received 640 guineas on 18 August 1955 for his four successful designs at 160 guineas each; in total he received 890 guineas, or £934.50. Waterlow was paid a further £340 10s (£340.50) on 15 April 1954 - this was made up of £140 as agreed on 17 April 1953 for engraving the Queen's head, £123 for photolitho plates and proofs in various colours, and £77 10s for 'various sketches' and 'patch-ups of stamps and castles'. The final payments to Waterlow were £4 15s (£4.75) on 10 February 1956 for the final colour proofs of the engraved Queen's portrait supplied in February 1955, and £772 on 27 April 1956 for the subsequent engraving of original dies.

The PMG's customary distribution of gifts of the new stamps to distinguished people was on a more restrained basis than usual; souvenir sets of the stamps were sent but not first day covers. The Queen, Princess Margaret and the Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden, were sent sets on 1 September; on 23 September sets were sent to members of the stamp advisory panel and heads of postal administration in the self-governing Commonwealth. Sets also went to the former Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill, and the former PMG, Earl de la Warr.

The stamps were generally well received by the national and philatelic press, the October issue of 'Gibbons Stamp Monthly' described them as 'on the whole, quite pleasing and arresting - not to mention that overworked adjective, striking'. There were, however, both reservations and exceptions: 'Penny Blue' writing in 'Philatelic Exporter' for October 1955 called them 'a dull uninspired quartette [sic]', and objected 'to Windsor Castle being represented as one of those fabulous lost jungle temples'. In a similar vein 'Stamp Collectors' Fortnightly' for 1 October commented that the Queen seemed to be 'viewing the four castles through a hole in the wall of a bomb-damaged building, and the illusion is helped by the tufts of foliage which spring from the shattered brickwork'. 'Gibbons Stamp Monthly' was also fascinated by the foliage in the corners of the embrasure, finding the 'tufts' fussy and unnecessary; Lynton Lamb stated in interviews that the foliage consisted of 'common wildflowers of no particular symbolism or national association', and was furthermore the product of his own imagination.

The most intensive critique of the issue was by 'Stamp Collectors' Fortnightly' - in addition to its remarks on the designs, it was heavily critical of the choice and presentation of subject: Carrickfergus was by no means well known outside Northern Ireland, Caernarvon had been more attractively presented in photographs by the old Great Western Railway, Edinburgh was almost unrecognisable, since the artist had chosen to represent it from its least attractive aspect, and it was doubtful whether the depiction of Windsor as a large building with the grim walls of a prison fortress was 'the best representation of the home of our radiant young Queen'. The magazine also censured the lack of captions identifying the castles, the colours ('the 2/6d is so drab that it might be mistaken, even in daylight, for the £1 ... The latter is poor, more of a grey-black than the intense, impressive black used in 1840 and ... 1929'), the printers ('the workmanship does not bear comparison with some of the really beautiful pictorials for which [Waterlow] have been responsible in the past') and the GPO's choice of an artist with no experience of stamp design (Lamb had in fact previously worked on the Festival of Britain and 1949 UPU sets).

Some of the above points, especially on colour, were also made by 'The Daily Telegraph' columnist 'Peterborough'. 'Sanders' Philatelic Journal' of October 1955 reported Scottish criticisms of the 'unaccustomed' view of Edinburgh Castle, compared the set unfavourably with 'the superb quality of ... some Austrian pictorials of recent years', and commented adversely on the absence of descriptive captions. The 'Daily Mail' correspondent writing on 1 September found the view of Edinburgh disappointing - 'it ignores all the best features of the castle: no St Margaret's Chapel; no sign of the main building where James I, king of both Scotland and England, was born. The view is of the barrack buildings on the west end of the Castle Rock, built in the late 18th Century.' 'Stamp Collecting' made criticisms about the drabness of the 2s 6d and the lack of captions, and also printed the following comments from David H Jones of Edinburgh in its 16 September issue: 'Having spoken to dozens of people and the press, the general view on the 10/- is that it is with greatest difficulty that one can imagine that the castle is in fact Edinburgh Castle. It is regrettable that the accepted view was not used.' On 9 December, however, this was countered by a letter from Price Gaines Jr of Cincinnati, Ohio, who wrote: 'I cannot understand all the controversy over the view of Edinburgh Castle ... The view used is a more magnificent one by far than any other side ... I personally want to commend the selection made.'

---

## LAST WORDS

'Stamp Collecting' gave much coverage to the issue most generally favourable; the 23 September edition quoted an article in 'Architects' Journal', which conceded the 'Castles' to be an advance on the 1951 'travel-poster' subjects of HMS 'Victory' and the cliffs of Dover but then dismissed the new stamps as 'the kind of romanticism which is out of place' in the 'restrained and formal' British postage stamp tradition. 'Stamp Collecting' commented on

this somewhat elitist attitude: 'It seems that Britons have for so long been schooled into the never-any-pictorials line of thought that they cannot take the same pleasure in this break from tradition as do people on the Continent' – 'very favourable' comments had been received from Switzerland and Belgium praising the new series as 'really beautiful and masterpieces of English printing'.

'Stamp Collectors' Fortnightly' assumed they were 'intended as attractive souvenirs for visiting tourists'; 'Philatelic Magazine' of 9 September called them 'subtle tourist propaganda'. Another criticism made more than once was that the 2s 6d and £1 were confusingly similar in their dark colouring; on 26 September Alan Jacobs, General Secretary of the National Union of Sub-Postmasters, brought this point to the attention of PSD as having already caused serious alarm to some of his members. He warned that he would feel bound if necessary to recommend stocking extra 10s stamps to his membership and hoped that 'some greater distinction' would be made between the two stamps at an early opportunity. Nothing more was heard of this and by the following month Jacobs was complaining that the new high values were not being more efficiently distributed to his members.

In Lynton Lamb's own account of the stamps, published in the February 1956 'Stamp Magazine', he drew attention to the engraver's special problems ('the same engraved line would seem to have different weight when printed in red, or blue, or black') and singled out Waterlow engraver, H J Bard, for high praise: 'I developed a deep admiration for the patience with which he translated each detail of my watercolour drawing into intaglio engraving ... I consider it a great privilege to have been allowed to take part in the operation.' Writing in 1979 the Design Director to the Post Office, Stuart Rose, called the stamps 'a handsome set in every way and not wholly ruined by the romantic stone embrasure and carefully placed weeds', although he wrongly assumed that these details had been imposed on Lamb against his better judgement. Finally comments by W N A Thompson were published in 'The Philatelist' for October 1955: 'I most strongly dislike the practice of trying to reproduce a photographic portrait by line engraving - it just doesn't come off. The present definitive set to 1/6d is ... wholly admirable. Why could not the high values have carried on the sequence and been the crown and glory of an extremely fine issue?'

There were no official first day covers for the stamps in September 1955, but an illustrated commemorative envelope was available in Carrickfergus for the 2s 6d depicting the castle, to be cancelled with the local circular datestamp. On 21 December 1960 the £1, chosen from among nearly 5,900 other stamps, received the first Gold Medal awarded by the International Philatelic Art Society for the most beautiful stamp in the world.

In 1960 a presentation pack of the high values with Multiple Crowns watermark was issued: this was available in the UK, and also in the USA but with the price '\$6.50' printed on the outer envelope.

The unwatermarked Bradbury Wilkinson printing of the £1, issued on 4 December 1967 on white paper, is known on a GPO cover commemorating the 40th anniversary of the Post Office's underground railway, with a special handstamp for 6 December showing a train leaving a tunnel (other handstamps were also used: on 5 December showing a train entering a tunnel, and on 7 December showing a map of the system). In 1969, although the 'Castles' were effectively withdrawn from sale on 5 March with the issue of the Machin high values, the 5s value depicting Caernarvon Castle was retained on sale throughout Wales until 31 December. Letters bearing the stamp posted in the special philatelic box at Caernarvon head post office, or sent to the head postmaster for reposting, received the special handstamp 'The Royal Borough of Caernarvon - Investiture 1969 - Blwyddyn Yr Arwisglad 69'. The facility was suspended for one day, 1 July, when it was replaced for the first day of issue of the special stamps marking the Prince of Wales investiture. At the Philypia stamp exhibition of 1970, the National Postal Museum showed artwork and essays at various stages of the design and printing of the 'Castles'. When pictorial high values again appeared in 1988, the same four castles were chosen as subjects.

---

## BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

LYNTON LAMB, FSIA, FRSA, RDI, was born in India on 15 April 1907, and was educated at Kingswood School, Bath, and the LCC Central School of Arts and Crafts. From 1935 onwards he was active as a painter in oils and watercolours, a designer, and an illustrator of books in wood engraving, pen-and-ink, and lithography. He also executed architectural decorations in various media for ocean-going liners and was the author of many books, mainly on painting and drawing. He served during 1940-45 as a Camouflage Staff Officer in the Royal Engineers. At the time of working on the 'Castles' stamps, he was also President of the Society of Industrial Artists, a staff member of the Slade School of Fine Art, a lecturer at the Royal College of Art, production adviser to the Oxford University Press, and a member of both the Arts Council and the Council of Industrial Design. As well as much other work for the GPO between 1949 and 1966 he later designed the stamp for the 1957 airletter. His last major work was to design the Purcell Memorial at the Royal Festival Hall in 1959. He died on 4 September 1977.

GILES ALLEN  
31 March 1995

## REFERENCES