GUENTER NAMED LAUREATE OF FIAV

Dr. Scot Guenter, NAVA President 1991-1994 and Vice President 1989-1991, founder of RAVEN, was named a Laureate of the Federation on July 28, at Stockholm’s City Hall.

The award is the fifth Laureate in FIAV’s thirty-four-year history, following awards to Captain E.M.C. Barracough, Dr. Whitney Smith, Ottfried Neubecker, and Dr. William Crampton. It honors of Guenter’s original, outstanding contribution to the science of vexillology, The American Flag, 1777-1924: Cultural Shifts from Creation to Codification.

FIAV President Michel Lupant presented the Laureate plaque to Dr. Smith and asked that he and FIAV Secretary-General Kin Spain (both also former NAVA Presidents) present it to Scot at the 2003 NAVA meeting in Montréal.

Congratulations Scotty! It is a well-deserved recognition for your fantastic analysis of a peculiarly-American cultural phenomenon. All of NAVA is proud of you!

Two views of cross-flag displays at Truman Pope’s home in Muncie, Indiana. Tru, a former NAVA Officer, uses his four flag poles to regularly display “theme” sets of flags. With the exception of the second flag, these two displays show the same flags: (left to right) Norway, skipping the second pole, Iceland, and Finland. The second flag in the left photo is the proposed flag for Yorkshire, England. The right photo has the flag of Sweden in that position.

Mason Kaye (left) and his dad, Ted Kaye, display the award they co-received in Stockholm. Story on page 2.
The 20th International Congress of Vexillology

Delegates from flag groups from around the world—including NAVA—convened in Stockholm from 27 July to 1 August at the biennial meeting of the International Federation of Vexillological Associations (FIAV). Nordisk Flagselskab (our Scandinavian colleagues) hosted a full and rewarding XX ICV amid a record European heat wave.

Over 120 delegates and accompanying persons met at the Army Museum, the former arsenal for Stockholm and now full of excellent exhibits (including flags!). Representing over 25 countries, they heard scholarly papers, engaged in seminars and discussions, and enjoyed camaraderie at mealtimes and in special events at outstanding venues.

During the day, speakers shared the best in contemporary flag studies through 30 interesting lectures, grouped in topics such as Flags, Arts, and Museums, Civic Flags, Flags from History, Flags for the Future, and Flags in Art, Heraldry, and Vexillography. Several NAVA members delivered papers. Panel discussions covered Flags of Islam, Vexillological Congresses, Methods and Organization of Vexillology, and FOTW—The Flags of the World website.

In the evening, from the opening welcome at the House of Nobility, to the elegant reception at city hall (site of the annual Nobel Prize Banquet), to the farewell cruise on the steamer Stockholm, participants reveled in the hospitality of the hosts. On a scenic boat trip to historic Voxholm fortress, they spotted the Swedish flag or pennant flying from nearly every flagpole on the islands (some of the 24,000 in Stockholm’s archipelago) they passed.

The FIAV General Assembly (kept to one evening by the sound moderating of former NAVA president Kin Spain, now Secretary-General of FIAV) admitted three new members to the association, and chose the sites for the next two congresses: Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 2005 and Berlin, Germany, in 2007.

The opening ceremony began with the Dragoon Trumpeters of the Royal Life Guards playing marches including an original performance of Marcia Vexillum, composed by their music director and dedicated to FIAV. They had marched from the changing of the guard at the Royal Palace. They returned—on horseback—to play for the closing ceremony on the congress’s final day.

Representatives of the flag manufacturers attending continued their tradition of recognizing the best paper with a short ceremony and award. They declared a tie for the best presentation: between Mason Kaye’s Flags of the City of Portland, 1916-2002 and Ted Kaye’s Flags over Antarctica—the first father-son team to present at a congress.

It’s not too soon for NAVA members to begin planning to attend the next congress—in South America for the first time.
I, your humble delegate, bring my report from the illustrious 18th meeting of the General Assembly of FIAV.

As far as inducting new organizations, I voted “yea” for all but the Reunion Association. I voted against their induction because they showed no apparent connection with vexillology. Their mission statement was to preserve the culture of the island of Reunion, not to study flags. Several others shared my point of view, and voted accordingly, so that organization was not inducted into FIAV.

Despite Alfred Znamerowski’s vociferous protests, we voted to have the 21 ICV in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 2005. We also voted to have the 2007 ICV in Berlin, Germany, the 22nd meeting.

Everyone excitedly reelected the board, so Michel Lupant, Graham Bartram, and Kin Spain are still in office.

That’s all the excitement that happened at the GA in Stockholm.

I’m looking forward to seeing you in Montréal.

Cheers!

Mason Kaye

---

ORGANIZATIONS APPLYING FOR MEMBERSHIP IN FIAV AT THE 20 ICV

✔ Flag Heritage Foundation, Winchester MA, USA
✔ Association Réunionnaire de Vexillologie, Saint-Pierre Cedex, Réunion
✔ Russian Center of Vexillology and Heraldry, Russia
✔ Flag Data Centre, Prague, Czech Republic
✔ = Admitted to FIAV

---
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NAVA DELEGATE REPORT

Many NAVA members enjoy receiving periodicals from other flag-oriented groups, usually by joining each association. NAVA News will occasionally publish subscription/membership information on such groups to help NAVA members expand their flag libraries and personal networks. All of the groups listed here publish fine and rewarding newsletters, journals, or bulletins in English. More groups will be listed in later issues of NAVA News.

South African Vexillological Association

SAVA Newsletter
3 issues/year, 16-28 pages/issue
SAVA Journal
Annual, 88-198 pages/issue
Individual Member (elsewhere)
US$35
Send cash or check (in US$) to:
Bruce Berry, Secretary
P.O. Box 836
Pinegowie 2123
SOUTH AFRICA
bruce@dbsa.org
www.sa-va.org

Flag Research Center

The Flag Bulletin
6 issues/volume/year, approx. 70 pages/issue
The Vexillo-File (occasional newsletter)
Subscription: US$40/year
Send cash, check, or Visa/Mastercard info
(Name, Card No., & Exp. Date) to:
P.O. Box 580
Winchester, MA 01890
Whitney Smith, Executive Director
vexor@atthi.com

Flag Institute

Flagmaster
4 issues/year, 20 pages/issue
Membership:
Ordinary (adult) £25 (US$40/year)
Send payment to:
Membership Secretary
Mr. Doug Southern
15 Edenfield Close
Southport, PR8 6LL
UNITED KINGDOM
membership@flaginstitute.org

Canadian Flag Association

Flagscan
4 issues/year, 16-20 pages/issue
Membership:
Ordinary (adult) US$25/year
Other publications available
(e.g. FlagsAm) US$3/year
Send cash or check to:
Membership Secretary
Mr. Kevin Harrington
50 Heathfield Dr.
Toronto, ON M1M 3B1
CANADA
kevinhar@allstream.net

Flag Society of Australia

Crux Australis
4 issues/volume/year, 52 pages/issue
Membership:
Ordinary (individual) Approx. US$35/volume
Send cash or Visa/Mastercard info
(Name, Card No., & Exp. Date) to:
Ralph Kelly, Treasurer
P.O. Box 233
Milsons Point, N.S.W. 1565
AUSTRALIA
Or e-mail:
Ralph Bartlett, Secretary
flagsocaust@optusnet.com.au

VEXILLOLOGICAL ASSOCIATIONS AND JOURNALS
A FLAG FOR THE CATLIN GABEL SCHOOL

Mason Kaye

As the largest private school in Portland, Oregon, the Catlin Gabel School runs from pre-K through 12th grade. Its history stretches back to the 1850s. I have attended since kindergarten, and many other members of my family have as well.

The school's symbol is a pine tree. It was selected in 1912 by students who chose the pine to represent growing upward and outward into the greater community. The logo has evolved over the years, always placing the pine tree in a circle, oval, or rectangle. The school's colors are blue and white.

Two events inspired me to design a flag for my school. The first was a flag exchange with students from a sister school in Japan. They presented us with a beautiful maroon flag featuring a white flower and a stylized Japanese character. We presented them with a flag based on the school bumper sticker: a logo on a white background—an "SOB flag" in every way. I tested several designs, all using the school logo counterchanged on a blue and white background.

After four designs, I chose a flag. It uses the school logo—a pine tree inside a narrow vertical rectangle—centered and counterchanged on the flag. The background is divided diagonally from the upper hoist corner, through the logo, to the lower fly corner. The field is white over blue; the logo is blue over white.

While my original sketch was a flag in proportions of 2:3, when converting it to 3:5 for a production design, I found that the diagonal no longer intersected the logo cleanly. The slightly different slope of the diagonal meant that the logo had to be "tweaked" a bit to clean up those intersections. I checked with the school's development office and learned that the "official" shade of blue is PMS 286, and then created an electronic mock-up of my design.

I sent the design to the head of the school, with the proposal that it be adopted to represent the school officially and fly from the main flagpole in front of the administration building (along with the Stars and Stripes). She shared it with her administrative council, who approved it unanimously.

Peter Orenski then generously created factory-ready artwork on short notice and arranged for National Flags in South Africa to manufacture the first flags. It was a pretty exciting day when the package arrived at our house!

I recently presented the flag to the head of the school at an upper school assembly. It was soon unveiled with great excitement to the full school community at the 2003 graduation.

I feel that it was very important for me to design and present my school’s first official flag. To the best of my knowledge, I am the first vexillologist to attend the Catlin Gabel School, so who better to design its flag? Also, both of my parents went to Catlin Gabel, and each of them left their mark. My mother’s parents were also heavily involved with the school, and they, too, left their marks. Now I have left my mark on the school, one that should last for a long time.
FLYING THE FLAG ON A VEHICLE

Dave Martucci

Since 9/11/2001, the North American Vexillological Association (NAVA) has received several inquiries from transportation providers regarding the correct way to affix a flag decal to the different sides of a bus or train. Janis Yuen, Public Relations Officer of the San Francisco Municipal Railway asked the most detailed questions:

“I am in the process of purchasing several thousand decals of the United States flag to be affixed to a fleet of vehicles (buses, streetcars, cable cars) for the San Francisco Municipal Railway. According to page 4 of the American Legion’s Flag Education & Etiquette: Flag Code, ‘when displayed either horizontally or vertically against a wall, the union should be uppermost and to the flag’s own right, that is, to the observer’s left.

When displayed in a window, the flag should be displayed in the same way, with the union or blue field to the left of the observer in the street.’

My question is this:

If a decal of a flag is horizontally affixed to the passenger’s side of a vehicle (curb side), should the union be on the left or the right? A colleague of mine watched a Public Broadcasting Station (PBS) program featuring the President’s Air Force One, and saw that the flag had the union in the upper right hand side on the passenger side (curb side) of the plane.

Others have commented that members of the National Basketball Association (NBA) wear a patch of the U.S. flag with the stars in the upper right hand side on the left sleeve of their uniform.

It is our organization’s desire to display the United States flag proudly, and accurately. Do we go with the union in the upper left or right for these decals that will go on the passenger’s side of our vehicles? Please advise.”

The answer is not readily found in the flag code as that Resolution of Congress was passed at a time when flag decals were not usually available. In relation to display on vehicles, here’s the rule: “The flag should not be draped over the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle or of a railroad train or a boat. When the flag is displayed on a motorcar, the staff shall be fixed firmly to the chassis or clamped to the right fender.”

Naturally, changes in vehicle design and speed have far outpaced the U.S. Flag Code and the answer has to be sought elsewhere. In Ms. Yuan’s inquiry she mentions the flag patch on a NBA uniform and the decal on the President’s plane. As for a flag patch, the code says “No part of the flag should ever be used as a costume or athletic uniform. However, a flag patch may be affixed to the uniform of military personnel, firemen, policemen, and members of patriotic organizations.” So the NBA is violating the Code and that is no precedent.

In the Air Force, at least, when flag patches are worn, they are only worn on the left side so they meet the requirements of the Flag Code.

Air Force One, however, is marked according to military rules and, in the absence of clear language from the Flag Code, one has to consider that somewhat “official”. The policy here is that on moving vehicles, the flag should appear as if it were flying with the Union of stars towards the front of the vehicle and the stripes streaming towards the rear. This is how the flag has been displayed on vehicles of all types by the military since before World War I. (see Raven 7, “Evolution of the U.S. National Air Insignia” by John Gámez, 2000)

Because the Code is silent on the usage of decals on vehicles, NAVA recommends following the military usage. Suzanne Willcox, Procurement and Project Manager of the Tompkins Consolidated Area Transit in Ithaca, NY, another inquirer, kindly sent photos of the decals they affixed to their fleet in accordance with our recommendation.

Dave Martucci is the son of Larry Martucci who operated buses for many years in the Newark-West Orange NJ area. His brother, Jeff Martucci, is the current owner of the Martucci Bus Company and Eagle Rock Bus Company in N.J.
For the first twenty-four days of the existence of their government, the Confederate States of America had no officially approved flag. When Jefferson Davis was inaugurated President of the provisional government on February 18, 1861 the capitol building in Montgomery flew the flag of the State of Alabama, and the inaugural parade was lead by a company of infantry carrying the flag of Georgia.

The Provisional Congress had established a Committee on Flag and Seal, the chairman of which was William Porcher Miles of South Carolina. The Committee received hundreds of designs for flags which were submitted to it by citizens from all parts of the country. Even citizens of States still among the United States sent in proposals. An unwritten deadline for the adoption of a flag was March 4, 1861 because on that date Abraham Lincoln was to be inaugurated president of the now-foreign United States; and on that date the southern States were determined to fly a flag which expressed their own sovereignty.

As the deadline neared, the Committee continued to examine and debate designs without being able to reach a consensus. The patterns submitted could be divided generally into two categories: those which bore some resemblance to the flag of the United States and flags of intricate and complex design. The Committee, and especially Chairman Miles, discredited all those imitating the United States' flag as being too easily confused with the flag of the old union. A sentimental attachment to "the old flag" felt by the public at large, however, made it impossible to ignore the elements of its design. The category of intricate designs was ruled out as being too difficult and expensive to render into bunting flags. The Committee finally had to admit its inability to agree on a flag and chose four patterns to present to the full Congress for a final decision.

On the morning of March 4, large cambric models of the proposed flags were hung up on the walls of the Congressional chamber. The models of the three rejected patterns did not survive the War, but we are able to reconstruct them from a description given by Chairman Miles in an 1872 letter to General P.G.T. Beauregard.

The first of these three is now a familiar design: a blue saltire fimbriated in white on a red field, with white stars upon the saltire. This flag was designed by Chairman Miles, whose inspiration may have been the banner of the South Carolina Secession Convention. The convention flag had been red with a blue Saint George's cross which bore fifteen stars representing the slave-holding States. Its canton featured the crescent and palmetto of the state. The Congress rejected Miles' flag: one member even ridiculed it as resembling "a pair of suspenders." The difficulty of achieving a symmetrical arrangement of the seven stars (one for each of the seven Confederate States in March 1861) on the arms of the cross may have prejudiced Congress' consideration of this proposal.

Miles' flag would not die, however, and in various alterations went on to become the battle flag of the Confederate armies. Before the end of the war, Miles' "pair of suspenders" would be incorporated into the flag of the Confederate States and, as the canton of the ensign of the CSS Shenandoah, would circumnavigate the globe.

The other proposals rejected by the Confederate Congress were never to be seen again. One of these was closely patterned on the flag of the United States. Its blue union displayed a star for each of the Confederate States, but the stripes were changed from red and white to red and blue. Mr. Miles could not remember, in 1872, how many stripes were on the model. Probably there were seven to represent the original Confederate States in keeping with the precedent of thirteen stripes to represent the thirteen original United States.

The third flag rejected by Congress bore no resemblance to the
flag of the United States. It was described by Chairman Miles as "a red field with a blue ring or circle in the center." Presumably the ring represents the solidarity of the Southern States, but there is no statement of its symbolism in Miles’ 1872 letter to Beauregard.

The flag which received the blessing of Congress was described in the following language:

The flag of the Confederate States of America shall consist of a red field with a white space extending horizontally through the center, and equal in width to one-third the width of the flag. The red space above and below to be the same width as the white. The union blue extending down through the white space and stopping at the lower red space. In the center of the union a circle of white stars corresponding in number with the States in the Confederacy.

The text of this description was inserted into a report of the Committee on Flag and Seal which may have already been prepared save for the description of the flag. The report was then written into the journal of the Congress.

Arrangements had already been made for a flag-raising ceremony to be held on the afternoon of March 4; but a flag had just that day been decided upon. “Thanks to fair and nimble fingers,” however, to quote Chairman Miles from his 1872 letter again, a flag made of merino was completed within two hours of its adoption. This very first flag of the Confederate States of America was hoisted over the capitol building in Montgomery by Miss Letitia Christian Tyler, the granddaughter of President John Tyler.

In their hurry to adopt the flag and have it prepared for the ceremony to be held that afternoon, Congress neglected to formally enact a flag law. The journal of the Congress reflects the report of the Committee on Flag and Seal, but indicates nothing with regard to a vote. Nor do the statute books of the Confederate States contain a Flag Act of 1861.

Despite official use for over two years, the “Stars and Bars” was never established as the Confederate Flag by the laws of the land.

The use of this new flag not only spread rapidly across the Confederate States but also among Confederate sympathizers in States still in the old Union. Six weeks later, it was flying over Fort Sumter in Charleston harbor as a flag of a nation at war. With war came alterations in the flag because, by the third week in May, Virginia and Arkansas had been admitted to the Confederacy adding two more stars to the flag. The circle grew to eleven with the addition of North Carolina and Tennessee in July.

In their hurry to adopt the flag, both men claimed to have submitted "Stars and Bars." Mr. Marschall later became famous as the “Father of the Stars and Bars." Mr. Marschall also claimed to have submitted two other unsuccessful patterns.

The controversy between Marschall and Smith seems to have arisen about 1911, but it was not until 1915 that it was officially investigated.

At that time the Stars and Bars Committee of the United Confederate Veterans at their Richmond reunion held during June 1-3 of 1915 found in favor of Mr. Smith’s claim, as evidenced by the published report of the committee. The debate continued, however, and in 1931 the Alabama Department of Archives and History published the results of an investigation by the Alabama legislature, which determined that Mr. Marschall had in fact designed the flag.

Both sides produced convincing evidence as well as contradictions during these investigations. Contradictions should always be expected when attempting to reconstruct from memory events which have transpired more than fifty years earlier. However a recently discovered letter dated March 2, 1861 seems definitely to establish Marschall’s claim. Given the simplicity of the design and the early enthusiasm for the flag bearing some resemblance to that of the United States, it is possible that Mr. Smith also submitted a very similar proposal. The evidence presented to the United Confederate Veterans and the Alabama legislature may very well entitle both men to claim the honor of being “Father of the Stars and Bars.”

---7---
The Contest for a Confederate National Flag

The Winning Design

A flag should be simple, readily made, and capable of being made up in bunting; it should be different from the flag of any other country, place or people; it should be significant; it should be readily distinguishable at a distance; the colors should be well contrasted and durable; and lastly, and not the least important point, it should be effective and handsome.

— National Flag Committee of the Confederate States of America, 1861.

The Finalists

Some of the Other Proposals

Artwork by Deveraux Cannon and Dave M Artucci

©2003 NAVA
All Rights Reserved
**Qui Transtulit Sustinet.** This Latin motto, in use in Connecticut since at least the mid-17th-century, is often translated as: “He who brought us here will sustain us.” The reference is to both the grapevines in the state arms and to the people of Connecticut, the latter appealing to heaven to help them flourish in their new colony. I believe that the current flag, which in roughly the same form has been current for three and a half centuries, has got Connecticut this far, and now should be sustained, and not modified in any way.

However, others feel differently. Some months back, there was a movement started to add the word “CONNECTICUT” to the state flag, to make it more recognizable. This is scary enough, but then I found out that someone had proposed a complete redesign of the Connecticut flag, based on the principles in *Good Flag/Bad Flag*. Connecticut placed near the bottom in the NAVA state flag poll, as did Utah, so I knew the GFBFers would get around to it eventually. I also knew what the charges would be, again, the same as those leveled against Utah: badge-on-a-bedsheet, too complicated a design, not unique enough, and so on.

Perhaps these charges are valid. Still, given what happened in the recent spate of suggestions for a new Utah state flag, I wait with great trepidation for what will be suggested for Connecticut. (I have already seen one proposed design: Blue with a simple white triangle at the hoist and an array of thirteen blue stars. Simple, yes; easy to draw and make, yes; dignified and historic, no.)

The trouble here lies not in the state flag of Connecticut, but in the principles of *Good Flag/Bad Flag* itself. The more I looked at the GFBF website at nava.org, the more concerned I became. I believe that GFBF, a useful tool in most respects, has been taken to unfortunate extremes.

First, the name itself is problematic. Must all flags be either good or bad? I worry that this kind of thinking makes us seem arrogant. Surely, some flags are better than others, but it cannot be helpful to relegate all flags that do not meet our criteria to the category of “bad.” How this seemingly inflexible position must seem to the very people we say we are trying to help.

Second, there is a little blurb just under the NAVA title. It reads, “The Flag Experts of the United States and Canada.” Is this accurate? Are we really flag experts? I don’t remember any examination or verification of my expertise upon joining NAVA. The NAVA website says that “[a]ny individual or organization is eligible for membership in NAVA that: 1. is interested in vexillology; 2. agrees to
subscribe to NAVA’s bylaws; and 3. resides in Canada or the United States (except associate members).” Not a word about expertise in any field, let alone vexillology or design. Back in 1996, I designed a flag that the town of Sonoma, California, adopted as its city flag. I am often published in the editorial page of my local major newspaper when I write about flags. Does the former make me a flag expert, or a good designer of flags? Does the latter make me an authority? No, not in the least, on either count. I’m just an enthusiast, a word with which should never be confused with “expert.” I am not sure how we would go about verifying any expertise we might have, but it seems our current broad claim can be called into serious question. Such a claim might impress the locals, but it is to our discredit to make it without serious professional review.

Third, the first principle of GFBF appears to be the one most taken out of context. While GFBF says — not emphatically enough — that none of the five principles should be departed from without caution and purpose, it is the first one that seems departed from in just this manner. The first principle states that a flag should be so simple that a child can draw it from memory. However, if the suggestions for the Utah flag are any indicator, what we will get are flags that look as if they were designed by children: cartoonish graphics, garish colors, disconnected symbolism, ignored history, and so on. It looks like we have reduced flag design to what we can draw in our computer programs. More cut-and-paste than art; more advertising logo than honored symbolism.

I guess I fail to see why exactly a child must be able to draw a flag. Is any flag really inadequate purely because it is not simple? If it doesn’t make a good t-shirt? Why don’t we just train children to better artists? While we’re at it, why don’t we teach them more about history, and the role of symbols in it?

Speaking of symbols, the second principle of GFBF: “Use meaningful symbolism” seemed largely ignored in the numerous new Utah designs and the one Connecticut suggestion I saw. GFBF itself takes the Akita, Japan, flag to task for a symbol that is “distinctive but lacks universal meaning.” Given that, isn’t Dustin Eatchel’s winning design for a new Utah flag just as guilty? Those white mountains on blue could just as easily represent the mountains of Nepal, Peru, Colorado, Switzerland, or a dozen other mountainous locals. Ugly or not, only the current Utah flag really says “Utah.” (Perhaps a bit too much, in all fairness.) Moreover, the proposed Connecticut flag I saw, the blue with the triangle and star, in no way says “Connecticut” better than a flag designed and maintained by the people for hundreds of years, a flag consecrated on the field of battle, a flag the central design of which is carved into great buildings and appears on all official state documents.

The fourth principle, on avoiding lettering and seals, is at face value a good idea. Most flags can’t pull off lettering of any kind. However, even though GFBF rightly says flags must be seen at a distance, sometimes they must be seen up close as well. Not only must a flag look good high over a building, but often also up close in someone’s office. In Utah’s case the seal may indeed be a little complicated, but the Connecticut arms on that state flag are big and bold and historical, and bear a motto that reaches all the way back to the founding of the colony. Again, a triangle and thirteen stars will do a better job? Doubtful.

Finally, it is not that GFBF is necessarily a bad idea. We have needed something like this for a long time. However, I fear it will continue to be used as the tool whereby any flag enthusiast with a graphics program can pass himself off as an artist-expert. Given the acts committed, or about to be committed, in its name, perhaps Good Flag/Bad Flag needs to be reconfigured to look more like the scholarly, rational approach to flag design it was clearly intended to be. The handling of the proposed Utah and Connecticut re-designs suggest that this reconfiguration is desperately needed.


Revolutionary War Connecticut flags were also known similar to the State Flag pictured opposite, but with red fields instead of blue.
Mr. Kenneth R. Ray  
Salem, Oregon  
The cross in the blue vertical third at the hoist has obvious Christian connotation, but the seven white stars surrounding it hold a couple of meanings for me. Seven is a significant number in Christianity and Judaism. The seventh day Sabbath for example, and in the Book of Revelation, with Jesus standing among seven lamp stands (Rev. 1:12), holding seven stars in His right hand (1:16). Seven stars also has personal significance, as my first name, Kenneth, has seven letters and I was also born in the seventh month, July. Combining the interpretations suggests some interesting theological implications.

The green fly is symbolic of my love for nature. The proportion is simply what I found to be aesthetically pleasing, though it does lead me to imagine large areas of pure and undisturbed natural beauty. Dividing the two major colors is a white fimbriation with a red "ray" in the center. This is reference to my surname, and its vertical position also holds some spiritual meaning for me.

Vexman Consulting Services  
Mr. David B. Martucci  
Washington, Maine  
Based on the colors of his personal flag, the Vexman symbol was the emblem of his previous business, "The Screening Maineiac", a silk-screen printing company. The emblem is red at the hoist and green at the fly on a golden yellow field. Designed 1979, Proportions 3 x 5.

NAVA offers its members a registry of their personal flags (or organizational flags for organizational members) as a service. This registry can serve to protect your design from adoption by others and also lets the other members see your colors! Please send a line drawing, sketch or other illustration or a photograph for inclusion in the Registry, along with its meaning and symbolism. Contact us if you need help designing a flag or refer to Good Flag, Bad Flag at nava.org. Send your info to: NAVA Member Personal Flag Registry, PMB 225, 1977 N Olden Ave Ext, Trenton NJ 08618-2193 USA. Your flag may also be shown on NAVA's award winning web site at http://www.NAVA.org/

Graphics and photographs in GIF or JPG format may be emailed to navanews@nava.org.
To the Editor,

In response to your query in NAVA News, I am sending some photos of some of the “Service” flags here in Attleboro, Massachusetts. Except for some small National Service banners in local windows, these flags plus all the American Flags set up all over the downtown area are provided by the local Veterans of Foreign Wars Post (pictured above). As a matter of fact, at least once weekly a large group of folks come out and wave American Flags at the morning commuters. Very nice.

Please call or write if you have any questions.

Chris Sweet
csweet@therobbinsco.com
1-800-343-3970 x 354

To NAVA,

We are trying to identify a flag that we have in our school.

The design of the flag is 4 stripes. The top stripe one is the largest, on top, working down, is blue, white, red, and green, in the blue section is a white circle.

Thank you for any help you can give us.

Regards,
Christine M. Rozzi
Academic Dean and IB Coordinator
Leysin American School
CH-1854 Leysin
Switzerland
Tel-41.24.493.3705
crozzi@las.ch
The following illustrations were sent by Kari K. Lauria of the Collegium Heraldicum Fennicum RY in Finland in response to the article about swastika flags that appeared in NAVA News #177, January-March 2003. It was accompanied by a short note pointing to the illustration of the Finnish President's flag appearing in that issue that says “Our presidential flag never was like that.”

To the President,

An idea on fund-raising: hold a flag-a-thon. Get members like me (I have to be an idiot—I collect 4x6 inch flags!) to pledge a certain amount of money to go to NAVA if some flag collector (whether at NAVA or not) will sell a flag that the pledger would really like to get hold of. Start off at $5 to NAVA, but go up to $100.

Also, in addition to the pledge to NAVA, the pledger buys the flag from the seller/donee. This will get people to put up flags they may not put up for sale otherwise. Personally, I would be willing to pledge at least $50 apiece for two or three 4x6 inch flags I can’t seem to get my hands on otherwise, plus buy them from the flag owner.

Well that’s my idea, but you could change it or maybe it’ll make you think of a better one. I don’t mind buying the flags from a business that makes or sells flags, even if the flag merchant isn’t a NAVA member. I think if you emailed the non-NAVA flag sellers in North America about such a flag-a-thon, and tell them they don’t have to be a member to participate, NAVA might pick up one or two merchant members in the process.

You could run a kind of exchange over the net. Everybody who wants to can send in want lists and collectors can submit their want lists, and the merchants can contact NAVA and NAVA contacts the collector. This is how coin and stamp collectors do it. And NAVA could charge a very small fee to non-members—both merchants and collectors. Actually this is a second idea. Sorry, meant to burden you with no more than one.

Your friend
Hubert Frick
HCF66779@aol.com
To the Editor.

I found your article “when is a flag official” most interesting.

I received an e-mail from a party in the USA asking me to quote on the “official” flag of the coalition of countries of the willing re: Iraq.

My first query was “What makes the flag official?” to this party as I felt he may be setting me up and from what I gather I don’t know anybody else who has received this inquiry. The request was for 1,000 flags and I was to send samples.

In the first canton were the flags of: USA, UK, Spain, Portugal, Australia. The remainder were the stripes of the USA flag with white letters in the red of the other coalition countries.

In my opinion, it is dealer-beware because I have heard nothing more from him.

Best wishes
Ron Strachan
National Flags
Darwin City, NT Australia 0801
flagman@austarnet.com.au
http://www.nationalflags.com.au

The foremost Russian vexillologist, Vladislav Sokolov, is interested in exchanging information with NAVA members about national coats of arms. He can be contacted through his colleague, Victor Lomantsov, at vikloman@mail.esoo.ru, or by mail: Moscvorechje, 37, b.1., ap. 45 / Moscow 115409, RUSSIA.

John Ford, of Great Britain’s Flag Institute, is compiling worldwide information on local laws and ordinances regarding flagpoles and flag display. Please contact him at john@fordojas.f9.co.uk, or by mail: 146 Southridge Rise, Crowborough / East Sussex, TN6 1LL, UNITED KINGDOM.

... Is the creation of Michael Faul, Editor of Flagmaster, the distinguished journal of The Flag Institute in the United Kingdom. To a field not often blessed by humor’s grace, Mr Faul brings a delightfully light touch, deep vexillological roots, and sparkling whimsy.
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THE VEXILLONNAIRE AWARD

NAVA has established the Vexillonnaire Award to recognize a significant and successful act of activist vexillogy, involving flag design or usage, in North America. A single Award will be presented annually, with its recipient announced at NAVA's Annual Meeting.

The Award consists of a Medal (reading “Vexillonnaire”), along with a description on a certificate (and on the NAVA website and in NAVA News) of the Vexillonnaire’s accomplishment.

Five initial Awardees have been named by the NAVA Board in 2003, representing years leading up to the Award's establishment. From 2004 on, one Awardee will be recognized each year except in cases where more than one shares the Award for a specific accomplishment. No previous Awardee is eligible for a second Award, either singly or shared.

Starting next year, the Awardee will be proposed to the NAVA Board one month before the Annual Meeting by the Vexillonnaire Selection Committee. The Awardee need not be a NAVA member, nor must his accomplishment be realized in the year of the Award. The Committee will be named annually by the Board President from among previous Awardees who are NAVA members. It sets its own internal processes in any way that meets the overall criteria of significance and success set by the Board. The Committee may call for nominations for the Award in NAVA publications.

The Vexillonnaire Award honors the “engaged vexillologist” who goes beyond the limits of descriptive study to become personally involved in a specific event of
1) creating, changing, or improving flag design,
2) promoting good flag usage or altering it for the better, or
3) leading similar accomplishments in activist vexillogy in a distinctly public manner, with documented success, informed by sound vexillogical or vexillographic knowledge.

The award honors actions that change the way people interact with flags, as opposed to flag scholarship or boosterism. The difference between a vexillonnaire and a vexillologist is analogous to that between a politician and a political scientist, or a musician and a musicologist.

The Award will be presented at the Annual Meeting by the Executive Board. NAVA will announce the Award and promote recognition of the Awardee in local and national press.

INITIAL AWARDEES

Peter Orenski
For leading the public process of flag design and adoption for New Milford, Connecticut, and for publishing the results for others in A Flag for New Milford, the Practical Guide for Creating a Successful Civic Flag, 1995.

James Babcock
For spearheading a year-long drive across 16 cities in the Hampton Roads Region of Virginia to develop the first regional flag in the U.S. based on sound vexillographic principles; it saw widespread adoption throughout the area, 1998.

Ted Kaye
For the compilation and publication of Good Flag, Bad Flag—the NAVA guide to flag design, and for the conception, coordination, promotion, and documentation of the Great NAVA Flag Survey, 2001.

Douglas Lynch
For revisiting his 1969 design for the flag of Portland, Oregon, in a successful effort to simplify and improve it following sound flag design principles, through a campaign assisted by several NAVA members, 2002.

Ed Jackson
For his informed support for the Georgia General Assembly’s difficult and complex efforts to redesign the state flag, resulting in an improved design which honored state history, reflected the tenets of good flag design, and was adopted as the new Georgia state flag, 2003.