



FAREWELL

The title is different from the previous seventeen issues. It is the last issue I am taking care of and I have decided to use it as a memento of a wonderful and challenging experience.

When trying to make a final balance of this long period I have mixed feeling. If I refer to the definition of the FIP Statutes, that present Philatelic Commissions as “technical committees of the FIP” I feel pretty happy with what has been performed. I believe that we have carried out correctly and effectively two main activities:

1. support the FIP as the “brain trust” for thematic philately
2. give guidance to the FIP members for the development of thematic philately.

Nevertheless in our class there has always been a side requirement to act more as an organisation than as a committee, in order to:

3. be the international reference of thematic philately in the world
4. ensure some coordination and support among thematic entities throughout the world.

In a number of countries it would be useful to receive direct support from a central organisation, providing educational material and counseling for collectors in addition to (or rather than) regulations for exhibitors. Several delegates are isolated and act on a personal basis, i.e. their environment is very different from those countries where an active National Thematic Commission and/or a National Thematic Commission is active.

Furthermore Thematic Groups are active mainly where thematic philately is more advanced and they have little contacts with the countries in which their basic (but also thematically specialized) valuable support to collectors will be very valuable. So synergy is very little, if any. Furthermore language is a non trivial barrier for those countries that needs more support.

These additional tasks require continuous and hard work, which is very difficult to be carried out by a commission, in the sense that it does not have adequate resources (manpower, equipment, money, statutes and organization) needed to perform regularly the said tasks.

Hence the many activities in this direction have been done on a goodwill basis. Furthermore all activities strongly depend upon the availability and the skills of the resources involved, namely the members of the Bureau and some “volunteer” delegates. Most of them, as in any other Commission, have a job, a family, other philatelic commitments in their national Federation (and sometimes also health or other problems personally or in the family) and often they cannot perform what they would like to do. And when somebody is available, there are others who at the same time cannot take care of their philatelic interests, as life sets other priorities.

IN THIS ISSUE:

Farewell	1
What we have done	3
FIP Thematic Commission	4
FIP Thematic Bureau	4
From “Qui Filatelia”	4

Even the “brain only” activities need synchronization and sometimes reports have been delayed because of the lack of input from just one or two parties involved, or the input reached me when I had no longer the time available.

TCNews with its irregular frequency of issue is a good example. I started last Autumn an e-mail information service for delegates and then I had to suspend it due to some personal problems of mine. Well, many were pleased with the initiative but very few answered my requests for input and none regretted about the interruption. In this situation I felt not (yet) feasible an Internet site of the Commission, as it needs to be dynamic and that means continuous input and cooperation.

It was not an easy task: in the overall period I moved house four times (twice abroad), I changed at least six major work locations, and for several years I had consulting engagements who kept me out of town (and sometimes abroad) for quite a lot... in addition I had key responsibilities for both *Genova 92* and *Italia 98*.

I am proud of what we have been able to achieve: a short summary is published in the next pages along with the names of all the Commission and Bureau members. I hope that omissions are very few, and I apologize for any error, but the compilation of the lists was not easy.

I have had the great fortune and pleasure of working with the great pioneers of thematic philately, like Frans De Troyer, Marc Dhotel, Jean-Louis Nagel, Ernst Schlunegger, Emilio Obregon, Vicente di Gaudio, Odd Grahm, Heinrich Walz, Endre Gal, Romano Caldeira Camara, Mary Ann Owens and many others. I cannot forget the friendly participation of Anatoli Katschinsky and Severin Zrubec, in spite of the difficulties of that period. I have received prompt cooperation by delegates of new FIP members, that took immediately a very active role: I remember the warm participation of Betty van Tenac every time she was involved to represent at first Australia and then Australasia. I had as vice presidents outstanding philatelists like Walter Lippens, Hans-Walter

Bosserhoff, Gunnar Dahlvig, and Manfred Bergman, who was in charge of Thematic Groups Coordination, provided a valuable support since the very beginning of my task.

I am also proud that we always acted as a team, having open Bureau meetings, and appointing joint members when it was necessary to ensure a world wide coverage in our discussions. We achieved all our main decisions through an intense and sometime “hot” exchange of opinions, on paper and live in the consolidation meetings.

I hope that in the future attention will be given to support to thematic philately in the “new” countries and that the new structure of the Bureau will help in this direction as long as it will be seen in terms of bi-directional coverage. I hope that information from the Bureau reaches all parties interested and does not remain in the **file** of the delegate. I hope that “major” thematic countries will play a more active role in this direction, even if at home they have already solved the problems that the Bureau is going to address.

I have had a constant attention for cooperating with National Thematic Associations and Thematic Groups, as they represent the collectors vis-a vis our efforts oriented mainly towards exhibitors, and I hope that it will be continued as much as possible. I thank them for their friendly contacts and I wish them the best success.

My Federation published recently an interview presenting a summary of my twenty seven years as president of the Commission, that I am copying in the last pages as it provides a wide picture of the development of thematic philately since I joined the Commission in 1968.

As I said, it has been a wonderful and enriching experience and I am grateful to each Commission delegate and Bureau member, each fellow Commission chairman, each FIP Board Director and President I have cooperated with. I wish also to thank Marie-Louise Heiri for her continuous support, as friendly as effective.

And I wish my successor the best of luck!

Giancarlo Morolli

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

1. Cooperation with the FIP Board

- We have performed several tasks, mainly in the preparation of statutes, general and special regulations for evaluation of exhibits with relevant guidelines, regulations for the philatelic commissions, up to the recent proposals for the One Frame Class.
- The role of some members of the Bureau for the development of the Open Class has been very important.
- We contributed to several other projects, from the fight against detrimental issues to the coding system for the WNS, from the FIP education data base to the Nation's Cup, from the cooperation to *FIP Flash* to the first design of the FIP computerized exhibition management system.
- A special task was the preparation of the FIP-FIPO agreement, on which Olympilex is based.
- We had the responsibility of coordinating the organisation of the FIP International exhibitions Portucale 77 and Brasiliana 79, the first FIP show in South America.
- As special assignments we supported the take off of the Commission for Maximaphily and the establishment of the Section for Astrophilately.

2. Elaboration

- For several years regulations and other major topics were discussed in Bureau meetings lasting a full week-end, with extended participation.
- Some meeting, like the Team Leader Seminars in Thun and in Bonn, helped focusing on the major aspects of evaluating competitive exhibits.

3. Education

- Articles and studies were circulated directly or published in TC News.
- Seminars and Walk-through were held regularly at FIP international events.
- Seminars for Team Leaders and Jurors were held international level.
- Seminars for jurors, exhibitors and collectors were held in a number of countries or at regional level.
- Most presentations prepared for the events were circulated and translated into several languages.

4. Communication

- Meetings normally were "open" to increase circulation of ideas.
- Information Newsletters were circulated before 1993.
- TC News (since 10.1993) has been published and a number of delegates have copied it their countries and supported the translation of major items.
- E Mail Info Update to delegates (2003-4).

5. Support

- Coordination of Thematic Groups, with publication of comprehensive lists.
- Support to specific initiatives (e.g. Prix Massari of Music Philately).
- Thematic Bibliography published by the ARRL
- Circulation of photocopies of exhibits to delegates needing this material.

THE DELEGATES TO THE COMMISSION 1997-2004

FEDERATION	DELEGATE	PREVIUOS DELEGATES
ALBANIA	Juli Daragjati (1993)	
ARGENTINA	Nestor Ferre' (1984)	Vicente A. Di Gaudio (1977), J. A. Romanelli (1980), Vicente A. Di Gaudio (1982)
ARMENIA	Souren Arakelov (1998)	Leon Roukhkian (1995)
AUSTRALIA	John Sinfield (1998)	Betty Van Tenac (1982)
AUSTRIA	Peter Riedl (1991)	Karl Luttemberger (1977), Karl Tancsos (1980)
BELGIUM	Marc Collage (1994)	Joseph Peeters (1977), Michel Hecq (1986), Joseph Peeters (1987), Jannick Delaey (1991)
BOLIVIA	Eugenio von Boeck (1984)	
BRAZIL	Ruben Reis Kley (1984)	Carlos Nery da Costa (1977), Heitor Fenicio (1979)
BULGARIA	Chirsto Nikoltchev (1981)	
CANADA	Frank Alusio (1991)	Betty Killingbeck (1977), Alan J. Hanks (1988)
CHILE	Ricardo G. Boizard (2000)	
CHINA	Liang Hong-Gui (1984)	
CHINESE TAIPEI	Shou-I Chu (1995)	
COLUMBIA	<i>No delegate since 2000</i>	Vytautas Stasiukynas (1977), Betariz Pantoja de Gil (1987)
COSTA RICA	Luis Fernando Diaz (1988)	Ricardo Alvarez Palleja (1977)
CROATIA	Ivan Libric (2003)	
CUBA	René Rodríguez Ríos (2004)	Mario Montero Ceballos (1977), Freddy Muguercia (1983), Fernando Fabregas Rodriguez (1988)
CYPRUS	Andreas Eliades (2000)	
CZECH REP.	Lumir Brendl (1995)	Vladimir Vicklicky (1993)
CZECHOSLOVAKIA REP.	-----	Severin Zrubec (1977), Vladimir Vicklicky (1986)
DENMARK	Frode Vesterby-Knudsen (1992)	Ingfred Bindel (1977), Henning Krøyer (1980), Tage Bøcker-Knudsen (1988)
EGYPT	Amhed Hamed (1983)	Abdel Habid Lofty (1977)
ESTONIA	Rein-Karl Loide (2000)	

FEDERATION	DELEGATE	PREVIUOS DELEGATES
FINLAND	Sejia-Riitta Laaks (2002)o	Pentti Anttila (1977),Sepo Laaksonen (1982), Heero Hellsten (1993)
FRANCE	Bernard Jimenez (1991)	Marc Dhotel (1977), Emile Bayle (1979), Robert Deroy (1989)
GERMANY	Damian Laege	Walter Lippens (1977), Hans-Walter Bosserhoff (1986)
GERMANY DDR	-----	Kurt Dunger (1977)
GREAT BRITAIN	Christine Earle (2001)	E.F. Hugen (1977), Alma Lee (1981), Francesca Rapkin (1988)
GREECE	Pandelis Leoussis (1999)	Mario Anghelopoulos (1977), Manos Anagnostou (1990)
HONG KONG	S. Chan (1997)	
HUNGARY	Peter Kallos (2001)	Endre Gal (1977), Ferenc Molnar (1980)
ICELAND	Gudni Fr. Arnason (2002)	Ernst Sigurdson (1981)
INDIA	Rameshwardas Binani (1990)	S.P.Chatterjea (1977)
INDONESIA	Sudirman AP (2004)	R.H.H. Newlan (1986), F.X. Kurnadi (1996)
IRAN	Joussef Babhoud (1986)	
IRELAND	Geoffrey McAuley (1987)	P. Casey (1982)
ISRAEL	Menachem Lador (1996)	Emmanuel Eilan (1977)
ITALY	Giancarlo Morolli (1977)	
JAPAN	Tsugumi Shirai (1996)	Takashi Tani (1971)
LUXEMBURG	Willy Serres (1977)	
LYBIA	Mohamed Ali Siala (1977)	
MALAYSIA	V. Senthinathan (2002)	C. Nagarajah (1983)
MALTA	Godwin Said (1978)	
MEXICO	<i>No delegate since 1980</i>	Emilio Obregon (1977)
NEPAL	Shyam Prasad Nucha Pradhan (1996)	
NETHERLANDS	Anton van Deutekom (2001)	M. Smit (1977), J. Ph. de Leeuw (1977), T.H. Siem (1985)
NEW ZEALAND	Jeff Long (2004)	Brian G. Vicent (1984), Doug Smith (1999)

FEDERATION	DELEGATE	PREVIUOS DELEGATES
NORWAY	Ingolf Kapelrud (1996)	Odd Grahm (1977), Eivind Evensen (1980)
PAKISTAN	Syed Imtiaz Hussain (2002)	
PARAGUAY	Teresa Pintos (2000)	Carlos Kron (1985)
PERU	Maria Luz Cerpa (2003)	Fernando Diaz (1997)
PHILIPPINES	Josefina Cura (2003)	Raymond V. See (1993), Larry A. Carino (1999h?),
POLAND	Antoni Kurczinsky (1982)	Maria Groer (1977)
PORTUGAL	Eduardo José Oliveira e Sousa (2003)	Romano Caldeira Camara (1977), Paulo de Oliveira Sa Machado (1979), Miguel Machado Teixeira (1981), Antonio Dionisio Silva Gama (199)
QATAR	Yacoub Jaber Sorour (2003)	
REP. OF KOREA	Sang-Woon Park (1986)	
ROMANIA	Dan Dobrescu (1998)	Apostol Turbatu (1977), Dan Angelescu (1991)
RUSSIA	Oleg V. Poljakov (2000)	Alexander Iljuschin
SAN MARINO	<i>No longer FIP member</i>	Denis Gemmani (1985-2000)
SAUDI ARABIA	Yousuf Ageel (2001)	
SINGAPORE	Tan Ngiap Chuan (2002)	Tay Peng Hian (1981), Chan Huei Lock (1987)
SLOVAKIA	Peter Osusky (1994)	
SLOVENIA	Peter Suhadolc (1998)	
SOUTHERN AFRICA	Moira Bleazard (2002)	Herman Steyn (1993), Martin East (199),
SPAIN	José Ramon Moreno (2001)	Luis Maria Fernandez Canteli (1977), Santiago Jimenez-Rebato (1978?), José-Antonio Hernan Sejas (1982), Mario Bueno (1988), José-Antonio Hernan Sejas (1991)
SWEDEN	Bengt Bengtsson (2004)	Gunnar Dahlvig (1977)
SWITZERLAND	Ursula Küenzi (2001)	Ernst Schlunegger (1977), Fredy Scherb (1980), Manfred Bergman (1988), René Berberat (1991)
THAILAND	Phairot Jiraprasertkul (2001)	Kawee Kehasuckharoen (1992)
TURKEY	Saadettin Guzhan (2003)	Tarik Güner (1977), Aziz Versan (1978), Erol Tugcu (1993)
U.S.A.	Ann M. Triggles (1996)	Mary Ann Owens (1977), Barbara de Violini (1977). Mary Ann Owens (1982)

FEDERATION	DELEGATE	PREVIUOS DELEGATES
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	Omer Malik Ahmed (2001)	
URSS	-----	Anatoli Katchinski (1977), Victor V.Sinegubov (1986), Alexander Iljuschin (1994)
URUGUAY	<i>Appointment in progress</i>	Angel B. Sanguinetti Filippini (1978), Herman Kruse (1994)
VENEZUELA	Ignacio Martinello S. (1989)	Tomas Dandreamatteo (1977)

THE BUREAU OF THE COMMISSION 1975-2004

Year of Election	Bureau Members
1975	F. De Troyer (P), G. Morolli (VP, <i>then P in 1977</i>), I. Bindel, F. Crestana, T. Dandreamatteo, M. Dhotel, E. F. Hugen, A. Katchinski, W. Serres, S. Zrubec, A. Scherb (<i>Thematic Groups</i>) <i>then M. Bergman ex officio (from 1977)</i>
1978	G. Morolli (P), W. Lippens (VP), A. Katchinski, W. Serres, S. Zrubec, <i>M. Bergman ex officio</i>
1980	G. Morolli (P), W. Lippens, E. Bayle, A. Katchinski, W. Serres, S. Zrubec, <i>M. Bergman ex officio</i>
1984	G. Morolli (P), W.Lippens (VP), <i>then H.W. Bosserhoff (VP since 1986)</i> , E. Bayle, G. Dahlvig, E. Eylan, N. Ferré, W. Serres, <i>M. Bergman ex officio</i>
1988	G. Morolli (P), G. Dahlvig (VP), M. Bergman, S.P. Chatterjea, N. Ferré, T.H. Siem, V. Viclicky
1992	G. Morolli (P), H.W. Bosserhoff (VP), B. Jimenez (S), G. Dahlvig, N. Ferré, J.A. Hernan Sejas, F. Rapkin, <i>M. Bergman ex officio</i>
1996	G. Morolli (P), G. Dahlvig (VP), B. Jimenez (S), H. W. Bosserhoff <i>then D. Laege</i> , N. Ferré, J.A. Hernan Sejas, F. Rapkin, <i>M. Bergman ex officio</i>
2000	G. Morolli (C), D. Laege (VC), B. Jimenez (S), J.A. Hernan Sejas <i>then J.R. Moreno</i> , , I. Kapelrud, J. Sinfield, A. Triggle

Giancarlo Morolli, leading World Thematic Philately from 1977 to 2004

On 2 September, at the 68th FIP Congress held in Singapore, Giancarlo Morolli will complete his seventh term as chairman of the FIP Thematic Commission. This Commission started working in the October 1964 with the Belgian Rombaut van der Auwera as president, after more than a decade of growing FIP interest into thematic philately that resulted in an agreement with FIPCO, the international organization grouping thematic collectors. Two years later the FIP Congress in Munich approved the first regulations for this competitive class.

You started as delegate to the Commission in 1968. How was the situation of thematic philately at that time?

I started with the conference in Prague that elected Heinrich Walz, German delegate, as president. Unfortunately he could not carry out his work due a very serious illness. His successor, Odd Grahm of Norway, led the Commission just for one year. The program he presented at the FIP Congress in 1970 was turned down and abbè Frans de Troyer of Belgium took over the presidency. The conflict stemmed from the reactions to the thematic regulations and the way of implementing them. In Italy we were not satisfied and the leading groups, namely those of collectors of Sport and Olympics, International Organizations and Scouts, felt that their exhibits were penalized because the philatelic content of their exhibits was not recognized adequately. The new president was well known as an outstanding exhibitor and after his election he demonstrated it by obtaining the Thematic Grand Prix at "Roma 70" with the "History of the Church". The CIFT had fostered international relationships by inviting a number of leading foreign thematic experts at the exhibitions in Salsomaggiore, Montecatini

Terme, Stresa and Mogliano Veneto; many of them were actively involved, at home, in the development of new proposals that were also reflected in the document I presented to de Troyer. I joined the Bureau of the Commission and I was fully engaged in the preparation of the new regulations that took into account several of our ideas. After the approval of the FIP Congress in Brussels, in 1972, Michele Picardi and I were asked to present the new regulations in the frame of the thematic seminar prepared by the Commission's president. His major target was now to reach the parity with the other philatelic classes, while medals awarded to our exhibits were still marked with a "T". But he wanted no discounts. The objective should have been achieved by demonstrating the actual philatelic dignity of thematic exhibits and to achieve it, he convinced the Belgian Post to organize the first FIP specialized exhibition, just for our class, and Themabelga 75 was a real success.

At the Congress in Amsterdam, in May 1977, you were elected president of the Commission. Which was your action plan?

During Themabelga I was elected vice-president of the Commission and for the next two years I had a close cooperation with Frans de Troyer, made easier by my frequent business trips to Brussels. He was active on three main projects: consolidate the Commission's structure, broaden the consensus on our definitions as well as the geographic coverage in parallel with the growth of FIP, and support exhibitors to give their exhibits that dignity that was his challenge. A serious illness did not allow him to be in the jury of Italia '76 and few months later he asked me to take over the Commission, as he was supposed to go into hospital again. He also asked the president of his Federation, Jacques Stibbe, to present my nomination at the following Congress. Hence, in my speech

after the election I just committed to follow his action plan.

How did you implement that plan?

The consolidation of the Commission's structure was addressed by including in the Bureau a greater number of key experts and also by inviting as guests some others to provide their advice. Later on FIP established special regulations for its philatelic Commissions and we complied with them, with some changes due to the peculiarity of our Commission, for instance appointing a coordinator for thematic groups that was a heritage of the FIP-FIPCO agreement. The broadening of the consensus had already begun by involving the key leaders of South American thematic philately, that also were pioneers of our hobby, as they were involved in the first international thematic exhibition, Temex 61 in Buenos Aires. I served as FIP coordinator for Portucale 77 in Porto, where a bridge was thrown towards Rio de Janeiro and Brazil, for the first FIP exhibition in South America, Brasiliana 79, again a thematic one, with myself as coordinator. The following exhibition in Buenos Aires at the end of 1980 enabled to achieve a full understanding.

In 1981 Bud Hennig, in charge of FIP relationships for the American Philatelic Society "recognized that American collectors would benefit from additional advice on preparation of thematic exhibits" and so I was invited to present the Commission's point of view on exhibiting and judging at Topex 81 in Chicago. I had very constructive talks with the officers of ATA, the largest thematic association of the world. That helped the efforts of the US delegate in the Commission in order to establish a cooperation between the two Associations and after few years ATA became an active member of the APS. Special recognition was given to me by the president of APS, Bud Sellers, in an article on The American Philatelists 8/86 highlighting the success of the American exhibits at Ameripex 86. It was also recognized through the "Distinguished Topical Award", the first given by the ATA to a non-American.

Concerning the collectors, within the Bureau we analyzed the experiences made at the three world thematic exhibitions in order to define the appropriate messages to bring them, especially in the seminars held at FIP world exhibitions or at other philatelic events to which we were invited.

Today the Commission consists of 68 members, and that shows that the geographical coverage has been accomplished. How did you achieve it?

In 1980 it was opened the "Asian way" at India 80 in New Delhi, followed by Philatoko 81 Bangkok 83 and Philakorea 84, with the appendices of Ausipex 84 in Melbourne and New Zealand 90 in Auckland. It was a great effort to support the education of jurors and exhibitors in the area, considered as the main prerequisite for the growth of the level of exhibits. Now this area has about one third of the delegates. We also acquired a number of new delegates in Europe after the recent political changes, but in almost all cases their philatelists were already represented in the Commission.

During your presidency thematic regulations were changed twice. Why?

After the election of Ladislav Dvoracek as FIP president, in 1980, it was decided to create uniform regulations for all philatelic classes. We had already a proven one, and that was the case of Aerophilately, Maximaphily and Youth Philately; in the other classes only national regulations were available, often different from country to country. Our experience was taken as an asset and I was asked first to contribute to the project in a small working group composed of the FIP President, the FIP secretary, at the time Paolo Vollmeier, and Raife Wellstead, president of the Postal History Commission. We defined a prototype that was then extended and modified with the intervention of the presidents of all other philatelic Commissions. The outcome (GREV and SREVs) was approved at the FIP in Rome, in 1985, leaving the Thematic Commission a certain degree of freedom to adapt its SREV over time so that our exhibits would have not been penalized by the changes. Some

differences were streamlined in 1992 and finally we reached the convergence with the text approved in Madrid in 2000. Anyway I wish to point out that our regulations have been built along the concepts demonstrated by the leading exhibits; I am strongly convinced that it would be detrimental if they would not reflect the indication coming from the most advanced research of the exhibitors. This is the real “state-of-the-art” and must be transferred in the regulations, as they are the guidance for all exhibitors.

This approach could give the impression that you have been a manager-bureaucrat. How have you approached collectors?

From the very beginning I held seminars at international and national exhibitions where I served as juror and a number of national thematic associations and federations asked me to run seminars for both jurors and exhibitors. On this subject I like to quote the AFPT and the French Federation, the Thematic Commission and the Spanish Federation, for which I held a number of seminars. In Asia I held these events in New Delhi, Singapore, Taipei, Tokyo, Seoul, Bangkok; I was also in Beijing, Xiamen, Guilin, after an invitation of the Chinese Federation for educating its exhibitors. AFPT elected me as honorary member, awarded me the “Mérite thématique 1988” and recently included my name among those “who made the AFPT”. The “Australian Stamp Monthly” 11/84 defined my seminars in Melbourne as “a side show” for the “appropriateness, flow and structure” of my comments, the practical common sense and the courage in expressing my thoughts. At Philakorea 2002 it was a great pleasure to be greeted by visitors who attended my seminar eighteen years before and wanted to thank me for that advice.

In several international exhibitions I led a walk-through for exhibitors, discussing with

them the assessment of the relevant exhibit. As Les Winick reported in Linn’s Stamp News (August 1, 1988) “Giancarlo Morolli spent hours with exhibitors at their displays. Everyone learned from the experience. Comments from the exhibitors were gratifying”. At CAPEX 87 a picture of mine was sent to the editor of Topical Time with the comment “Giancarlo Morolli doing what it does best”. From these events, that often involved other Bureau members like Manfred Bergman, Gunnar Dahlvig and Bernard Jimenez, we derived the model of seminar that then was used for training FIP jurors. Starting at Pacific 97 we arranged a feedback seminar for exhibitors followed by an individual talk with each one in front of the exhibit.

These seminars have compelled me to build or update presentations that have been always made available not only to the attendees but also to delegates. They have been translated in several languages, as many articles published on FIP Flash, TCNews or written on request.

How will change the Commission’s management?

I am very happy to leave the Commission in the hands of Damian Läge, delegate of Germany and professor of psychology at the Zurich University, who has served as vice-president in the last four years. Damian has his exhibit in the Championship Class and this confirms, once again, the achievement of the parity. With him I have run two of the best seminars of the whole period. He shall work with Bureau members who have already been in this post before. The only one who is certainly leaving is Bernard Jimenez, secretary of the Commission, a longstanding friend to whom I wish to express my thanks and best wishes for his new task as first Vice president of the French Federation.

TCNews is published by the **FIP Thematic Commission**

Chairman: Dr. Ing. Giancarlo Morolli

C.P. 83 - Seconda Strada 12, I 20090 Segrate (MI) Italy;

Vice Chairman: Dr. Damian Laege;

Secretary: Bernard Jimenez

TCNews is distributed thanks to the

Fédération Française des Associations Philatéliques