

# INTRODUCTION TO THE CHECKLIST

## (AFRICA)

### PURPOSE OF CHECKLIST

At one time, many years ago, I was a coin collector. I started out as a child by trying to fill up the holes in one of the old blue Whitman folders for Lincoln cents, and went on from there. As my interest expanded, I collected all of the U.S., then all of the Americas, and finally, Africa and Australasia. Along with the coins I also collected trade tokens, when I could find any offered for sale. When I started to collect, trade tokens, especially foreign trade tokens, were handled by most dealers as "junk box" items, mixed in with unsorted material and offered at a nominal price. Because they brought low prices, not many tokens offered for sale. It was not until well into the 1960's that tokens became an important part of my collecting. So while I have collected trade tokens since the 1950's, it was only around 1980 that the size of my personal collection, and the quantity of published reference material known to me in this area, became large enough to require some sort of organization. I found myself frequently frustrated by finding a token, or a description of a token, that I was absolutely sure that I had seen listed somewhere, sometime, but just could not remember when and where. Beyond that, the few catalogs that did exist then were all incomplete. Much of the information known to me concerning trade tokens was simply unpublished in any source. Much of it still is. Starting in December 1980 with a checklist for tokens of Panama, I began to assemble a descriptive listing of Latin American and West Indian tokens that would allow me to locate and identify any token that I had seen, or had seen described, from any source.

I did not start the African checklist until November of 1986 with the first version of my checklist for South Africa. The delay was partly a matter of interest. I began collecting Latin America several years before I expanded my collecting to Africa, and my African token collection is less than a tenth the size of my Latin American collection. It was also due to availability. The number of African tokens known to exist is less than a fourth of the number known to exist for Latin America and the West Indies. The quantity of literature is similarly reduced. However, due to the efforts of European authors, the percentage of tokens described in print is much larger for Africa than it is for Latin America outside of the West Indies. The existing catalogs therefore, at least for the European colonies and South Africa, are more useful than the catalogs for Latin America where my personal collection and checklist include hundreds of issues not described in anybody's catalog.

The intent of this checklist is to gather all available information on African commercial tokens from nearly a hundred publications, and several times that number of price lists and auction catalogs, and to put it all in the same place with cross references where they might apply. This list is intended to include all commercial and official tokens having an exchange value, but lacking legal tender status, and many store cards issued for commercial advertising. An effort has been made to exclude commemorative medals and medalets, although a few of these have been copied from earlier works for identification purposes. All materials but paper are included; the various metals, hard rubber (vulcanite), various plastics, wood, trade mirrors, encased postage, and even leather and cardboard where they are cut into shapes and sizes that resemble tokens. Obsolete coins are frequently recycled as tokens. It saves the cost of making new planchets. These are included too *if* they are defaced in some way with counterstamps, grooves, holes, etc. (There have been many occasions where obsolete coins, no longer used as money, continued to circulate as machine tokens. These items are not included in this list *unless* they have been physically modified in some way.) Paper money, even fractional values issued by the same merchants that issued tokens, is not within the scope of this checklist.

To accomplish the goals listed above, I have included all information available to me as of the date at the top of each page; and have made guesses about some of the information that I do not have. To fulfill the purpose stated at the beginning, I have set my priorities as being first: completeness, second: organization, and third: accuracy. All references to African tokens that I have seen, no matter how dubious, are included in this checklist. The information given on the "Info:" and "Ref:" lines, and the illustrations, where available, will allow a judgment to be made as to the accuracy of any given listing. Even with its limitations, this checklist is still useful for locating what information is available on any given token and the format I am using will allow me to make additions and corrections, page by page, as new information becomes available.

### ERRORS AND INACCURACIES

A great many errors and inaccuracies result from the fact that I am not able to personally verify much of the information included in the checklist. Where I have seen the token myself, or taken descriptions from listings made by the increasing number of authors who try to make detailed descriptions, (where *they* have seen the token), or by other collectors describing their own collections, the descriptions are fairly accurate. But only I have actually seen a minority of the tokens described. Space is always a problem, and descriptions taken from many publications, especially the earlier ones, and almost all auction catalogs and price lists are usually inaccurate or incomplete. Even where an effort has been made to provide a complete description, many token issues are known only through a single specimen with legends that are partly illegible because of poor striking or advanced wear. When only an incomplete description is available, the actual arrangement of the wording on the token is mostly guesswork; although the key words are usually correct and allow positive identification. Many of the problems are of my own creation. I have constructed a format into which I fit all of the descriptions I find. Other catalogers, not unexpectedly, have other ideas, sometimes very different. Throughout this checklist, hundreds of other authors' 'square peg' descriptions have been hammered into my 'round hole' descriptive format; not necessarily with the result intended by the original author. Errors of this nature are my fault, not theirs. Again, where I have a good description of one token in a series, I have assumed that higher and lower values are similar. This is normally true, but not always. Accordingly, where the 'Info:' line notes 'description only', the token descriptions should be viewed with suspicion. In most cases, when I acquire a new token for which I have had a 'description only' entry, I find that I have to make some changes to the description of the token.

Another area of inaccuracies in the list is the attributions. In some cases I have seen 'maverick' tokens (without the town and country on the token) identified by this source or that as being from as many as three or four different countries. It is unlikely that all these attributions are correct. It is possible that none of them are. This is less of a problem for Africa than for Latin America. Partly this is because there are fewer tokens to start with, but also because the European catalogers have put more effort into attributions. The attributions in this checklist reflect the state of knowledge currently available to me on African tokens. Much of the information on the colonial issues is very good, some is not so good, and for many issues, especially the independent post-colonial tokens, there is no information at all. When information is lacking, too many tokens are attributed by the "whim" method, because the unknown token "looks like" another token for which one does have an attribution. A similarity of style may mean no more than that the tokens were struck by the same manufacturer in far off Europe. All too often the whim method of attribution turns out not to be correct, leaving behind a trail of conflicting and confusing mis-attributions. In such cases the token is listed and described with each country for which an attribution has been seen. On the 'Info:' line are listed all of the other countries for purposes of cross-reference, and, if known, the true original place of issue. When an attribution error is finally corrected, the token is not eliminated, but moved to the back of that country list under the heading "NA" (= not applicable to the country in question).

An example where my priorities conflict is in those cases where tokens are given incomplete descriptions in the original sources. Sometimes, two different sources, and in a few instances the same source, will give two very different descriptions of the same token. So I have combined the two descriptions in my own checklist. Where I found it possible, other descriptions have been combined too. Even so, there are going to be occasions where I have made two listings, and only one token actually exists.

Just as often, there will be times when I have combined two different listings, and should not have done so. This side of the identification problem is only aggravated by the fact that dealers, who don't really have adequate reference works to begin with, rarely distinguish among varieties in their price lists and auction catalogs. My goal is to describe intentional die changes and outright errors caused by using different punches to make the token die, but not the unintended differences such as a minor difference in the spacing of letters or numbers.

Perhaps the most common source of error is human error. An entry being copied is misunderstood, or misread, or incorrectly copied, or numbers get transposed, or the wrong key is hit on the keyboard and on and on. All catalogs have such problems. Although this type of error, if and when caught, is less ambiguous and therefore easier to correct, the results of uncorrected errors can be just as misleading to the collector as the results of any other type of error. Of course I do this too, with the same misleading results.

In the end, there will always be errors and inaccuracies. In a listing of this size there are going to be a lot of them. This is how editors and proofreaders make a living. Except that they make errors too. I can hope that feedback from other collectors and catalogers will enable me to correct my errors. But even as old errors are caught and corrected, new errors will be added to an ever-expanding checklist.

## REFERENCES USED

As stated elsewhere, only a minority of the tokens listed here were actually seen by myself. Most of the descriptions have been copied from my predecessors, to whom credit is given in the 'Info:' and 'Ref:' sections of each descriptive entry. My own work covers an entire geographical area, and both the quality and quantity of material available to me varies widely from country to country.

Unlike Latin America, there does not seem to have ever been a previous attempt to catalog the continent as a whole. All of the European authors catalog *their* colonies. The French have done good work on the tokens of their African colonies, especially in recent years. I know of only a handful of pieces not described in the latest editions. The British have done good work too, but except for Southern Africa the standard works are now beginning to be outdated. I understand that the Portuguese have done well also, but I have had a very difficult time getting Portuguese books, (except Brazil), here in the United States. The Germans have good catalogs, but the best catalogs I have seen on German colonies were published in the United States by Jerry F. Schimmel and in South Africa by Brian Hern. The only good work on Italian colonies was published in the United States by Dennis Gill. The only work I have seen that is actually from Italy is a general discussion of all Italian tokens with only a brief mention of the African Colonies. Even so, this work contains a small amount of information not included in the Gill catalog. Tokens do exist for Spanish African colonies, I have seen several offered for sale, but to my knowledge no written work exists. Many Arab language tokens exist from North Africa, but apart from a couple of brief mentions in magazine articles, I don't know of any published material that describes them. I don't know that any Dutch or Danish African tokens exist from the period when those countries possessed African colonies. There are also excellent catalogs and articles that describe the United States "colonial" issues. (Here I refer to the many military token issues of the cold war period and the early tokens of Liberia.) The South Africans catalog *their* end of the continent, and do it very well. The biggest "hole" in the African token catalogs is with the independent countries. Principally this meant Egypt and maybe Liberia, but now includes the post-colonial issues from the rest of the continent too. Only the South Africans seem to be showing any interest in this material. I don't know of anyone else who has tried to describe the tokens of independent African territories except for the topical specialists for transportation, communication, gaming, etc.

## COUNTERFEITS AND FANTASIES

There *is* a difference of course. I use the term 'counterfeit' to describe a contemporary copy intended to be placed in circulation and deceive the user for the amount of its face value. There are not a great many of these. Given the small quantities and restricted circulation of most issues, it was more than difficult to introduce a counterfeit into a community where all of the token users knew all the other token users. Still, there are currency tokens issued in a few of the larger towns for which counterfeit issues are known. All of these early counterfeits are rare, sometimes more so than the genuine tokens they attempted to displace.

I do not include in the above, the many instances where otherwise worthless counterfeit coins were modified with counterstamps to be recycled as tokens. The planchets may have been counterfeit coins, but as tokens they are perfectly genuine. I don't know of any such pieces from Africa, but they could exist.

I also do not include in the above the many varieties of jewelry tokens. Coin jewelry has always been widely popular, nowhere more so than in North Africa. For those too poor (or too prudent) to wear genuine coins in public, enterprising manufactures produced a variety of tokens with the appearance of coins, deliberately blundered to avoid hostile notice by the police and suitably silvered or gilded. There are many varieties known to exist, several of which are in my collection. I view jewelry tokens as an interesting topical area and I have described those I know in the checklist.

Then there are the 'fantasies', both old and new, that are intended to deceive the collector for the value of their numismatic premium. These are less benign. There have been several such issues over the years, and like fantasies issued in this country, they usually try to attract collector dollars by claiming scarce locations and issuers, early dates (most tokens being undated), unusual values, etc., etc. Some of this material has been identified and published for the education of collectors. An article in the March 1974 issue of the old "World Coins" magazine noted that modern copies of Borel Lavelly Co. (sic) Suez Canal tokens were being offered to collectors at that time. With respect to Africa however, this has been more of a problem for the coin collector than for the token collector ... so far.

Finally there are the fantasies by mis-attribution. There are tokens, belonging to one country, that have been wishfully assigned to another country in an attempt to create a collection for a scarce and/or popular location. This happens. I have in my collection a token from the Casino de Sinaia in Romania that was sold to me as a piece from the "Sinai" in Egypt. Again, I was sold a 1943 Egyptian dog license under the label "military bus pass". Most of these mis-attributions were perfectly honest errors. Given the unavailability of literature on the subject ... who knew? Because of the scholarship of European catalogers, this is less of a problem with the African series than it is with the Latin American series. With respect to the independent countries such as Egypt, generally ignored by the "colonial era" catalogers, this can still be a problem.

## PRICES

This is an area of intense interest for all collectors trying to assemble a collection of tokens. The nature of the market in African tokens makes it exceedingly difficult to establish a standard value for most pieces. Given the rarity of most African tokens, and the limited market that exists here in the United States, much of the pricing seen is best described as whimsical. Still, some general comments can be made. Because there are fewer collectors of tokens, prices of tokens have always been more modest than for coins of equal rarity. Due to recently published catalogs and articles, the collecting of African tokens has become more popular, especially in Europe, causing prices to rise substantially in recent years. This has actually been to the benefit of token collectors. Having collected tokens for many years, I can remember the good old days when tokens could be found in dealers junk boxes for 5, 10 or 25 cents. I can also remember the bad old days when I was lucky to add a dozen tokens a year to my collection. It is not by chance that the "good old days" and the "bad old days" coincided. The higher prices of recent years has brought many new tokens out of drawers, closets and attics to be offered for sale for the benefit of interested collectors.

## MATERIALS

Tokens have been made of many different materials, all of which are included in the description if I possess the information. Unfortunately, the information I have is not always accurate. In regard to the 'metal' designations in my checklists, I can say that the phrase 'white metal' (unless copied), usually refers to an unidentified nickel alloy. I only describe tokens as 'nickel' if I know they are, i.e. they must be attracted by a magnet. (I routinely try to check 'white metal' tokens that pass through my hands with a magnet.) Otherwise I will use the terms 'copper-nickel', since of all the Latin American tokens that I have checked, not one has been magnetic, unless it was made of iron. There are, however, a fair number of nickel *plated* tokens. A token is described as 'german-silver', a copper-nickel-zinc alloy, only if I have a reference that indicates the person using such a description actually has some knowledge of the alloy that was used by the manufacturer. The term 'white metal' is *not* used for iron (magnetic), aluminum, or zinc unless my entry was copied from another source that was incorrect to start with. Neither is it used to describe the tin / pewter / lead group of metals. These can be confused, but only within that group. They are not 'white metal' either. I suppose that I could get around to doing specific gravity tests that might separate the various alloys, but I haven't done so yet. Plated tokens are always described as such, and not as 'white metal', when and if I can make reasonably positive identifications. Copper alloys are another problem. These all look dark when toned, and many tokens described as 'copper', have later proven to be made of brass. This is not helped by the fact that a good many issues actually *do* exist in both metals. At least one early European manufacturer appears to have had a policy of issuing 'specimen' strikes in pure copper, often found in AU-Unc condition, and pieces struck for circulation in a brass alloy. Copper and bronze are technically different, with bronze having a lighter color ... when new. Once the pieces are toned, the distinction is almost impossible to make. I generally describe dark/red, tokens as 'copper' and light/yellow tokens as 'brass' where I have seen the tokens. When I use the term 'bronze' it is usually copied from some other source.

So called 'plastic' tokens present their own difficulties. These light, cheap, organic compounds, dyed in a wide variety of colors, have been a popular material for making tokens since they first appeared in the mid-nineteenth century. There are many varieties, not always correctly identified. Early issues, through the World War I period, that appear to be plastic, are usually not. They are rather made of 'celluloid', generally glossy in appearance and frequently translucent, or 'vulcanite', not much used in Africa, a processed rubber material that is hard, brittle, opaque, and relatively dull in appearance. The first real plastic, used through the World War II period, was 'bakelite', a hard plastic even duller in appearance than vulcanite. I identify bakelite tokens where possible, as it helps to date the piece. All of these early issues have molded letters and devices. Although a few of the vulcanite tokens are known to be user modified with paint and lacquer, I don't recall any of the early pieces that are overprinted with colored inks. The generic term 'plastic' usually refers to some variety of hard, brittle and brightly colored material of recent provenance. These modern issues will usually have a flat surface, with the legends and designs being overprinted in a contrasting color of ink. The relatively few modern issues made of a soft, flexible plastic, once again with molded letters and

devices, are so identified when I have seen them. The pressed fiber or 'clay' tokens have a very dull, almost rough appearance. These pieces are first molded, then usually overprinted in a variety of colors. Except for the period around World War II, they are almost exclusively issued by gambling establishments for use as gaming chips.

## PUBLISHING

The first versions of text for my own checklist were produced on an old Sears® portable typewriter. Typescript looks good, and many book manuscripts have been, and a few still are produced by this method. Unfortunately, the frequent revisions required for a work of this type meant that I soon found myself spending most of my time just re-typing the old material that I had already typed two or three times before, never mind the difficulty of correcting any typing errors. It was only the modern personal computer that made a work of this nature and size, even remotely possible. I purchased my first computer, an IBM PC®, in 1983. By 1985 I was producing all of my material with a high end word processor, Microsoft Word, an updated version of which I still use, and a 'letter-quality' printing program called Lettrix, written by Hammerlab Corporation® of New Haven, Connecticut and Riverdale, New York, with revisable typefaces. Once written, the files were printed on an Epson® FX+ dot matrix printer. The use of a computer operated word processor, meant that descriptive errors, once corrected, tended to stay corrected, since the entire work did not have to be re-typed every time new changes and additions were made. The word processor made revision easy enough, that it almost took more time to print a new master copy and revise the index, than it did to change the text of the basic checklist. I could begin to expect that revisions would be issued, country by country, almost as fast as sufficient new material came in to make a revision worth while.

My initial system was very good for its time, but as the years passed, the equipment became increasingly obsolescent, even with updated software. It didn't help that the printing program became an 'orphan', no longer supported by the issuing company. When my nine year old computer crashed in mid-1992, I found myself having to acquire an entirely new system. I first purchased an IBM 'compatible' 386 computer, originally assembled by Micro Express of Santa Ana, California, and later upgraded with a system board built around an IBM 486SLC2/50 processor. This system used what were then the latest versions of MS-DOS, Windows 3.1, and Microsoft Word for Windows®. Files were printed on a 300 dpi Panasonic® KX-P4430 laser printer. I have upgraded my computer system, printer, and operating software two and three times since and now use a Hewlett-Packard® desktop system and ink-jet printer running Microsoft Windows 2000®.

There is a substantial difference between the "dot-matrix" fonts used pre-1992 and the "True-Type" fonts used since that caused 100% of my special characters to become unprintable, never mind the other differences in formatting a document for printing. The new equipment and software made it necessary to edit every line of the older manuscript for printing. This has *still* not been accomplished for every checklist. This means that for those countries, while I still have the electronic files, the files cannot be printed. When the editing is however, the text quality will be all that anyone could wish.

For illustrations, however, it was still totally inadequate. Neither the printer resolution, nor the memory for storing the graphics images within the document file were within my price range at that time. Pictures of the tokens *still* had to be hand pasted on the printed manuscript, and the resulting 'paste-up' photocopied to obtain a finished checklist. I would hate to tell you how much of my editing time is spent picking up little pictures of tokens from one piece of paper and putting them down on another piece of paper. There is hope, however, that even this bottleneck may be removed in time. In the years since I purchased my first system, both the computer speed and the printer resolution available for the money have multiplied many times. I can anticipate that eventually, I might be able to afford the quality of equipment needed to make 'desktop publishing' of a book a real solution. More recently, a 600 dpi resolution ink-jet printer does make it possible to print a good quality picture of a token from a scanned image. This is of course after I *have* a scanned graphic image of the token in question which is at this time mostly not the case. The printed picture of a token is often of better quality than the photocopied pictures that I have been using, especially for the darker tokens. I still have to paste each picture into the printed text before I can photocopy or scan the completed page of the checklist.

My most recent computer equipment has made it possible to distribute my checklist as graphic images copied onto a compact disk. One problem with this checklist has always been the size and cost. I have estimated that I am out of pocket around 7¢ for each page of the checklist as photocopied. Printing costs even more. Then there is the cost of mailing the boxes of checklists around which is also not cheap. This would make commercial publication of the checklist almost impossibly expensive. By contrast, CD-ROM that holds thousands of graphic images can be produced

for a cost that is almost trivial. I am now in the process of scanning every token in my collection and every page of my checklist into computer memory. It will be a nice archive if I ever finish. When completed, copies of the checklist can finally be distributed for a reasonable cost. The scans do take time, a lot of time, during which time I am producing little in the way of new revisions. As of this date I am at most half done.

## CREDITS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Of course there have to be a lot of these. My own collection formed a base from which to start making the checklist. But as this is written, only a small percentage of the tokens described are actually in my own collection. Everything else is copied. This percentage is a number that has been slowly, but steadily dropping, ever since I started the project. I can only expect the number to drop further as I continue. The great majority of token descriptions in this checklist are copied from the numerous publications that I have listed in the sections titled 'References' and 'Sources'. I owe much to the numismatists, both researchers and dealers, who have given their time and knowledge to organize and publish this body of work. Without their efforts over the years, no project such as this could even be contemplated.

Perhaps the most important credit has to go to the collectors who have given me assistance on an individual basis. Although the quantity of material from these sources makes up only a minor portion of the total checklist, the value of these contributions goes far beyond the actual quantity because almost all of the material received from such sources has never been published. These numismatists have provided descriptions and attributions for many of the rare and interesting tokens included in this checklist which would otherwise be missing, because the information is not available from any other source. Special credit is due here to Bob Lyall (England) who provided me with tokens, information and rubbings of pieces in his own collection., to Allyn Jacobs (South Africa) who has provided me with sample tokens and South African journals that I had not previously not known to exist. I also want to thank Roland Elie for his letter commenting on some of my earlier checklists. These advanced specialists have devoted substantial time and effort to locating tokens and investigating their background. Without their efforts, this information would not only have been unavailable to me, but wouldn't have been preserved at all, for anyone.

I would finally like to thank Paul Bosco, FORMAT of Birmingham Ltd., Rich Hartzog and Jerry F. Schimmel for giving me permission to reproduce illustrations from some of their published catalogs and price lists.

## CITATIONS

When citing this checklist I suggest using the following format: Henkle(C3)AAL#1/6. This being the number I use for the 1916 Chamber of Commerce 5 centimes token. in aluminum. Broken down, the citation would start with the catalog name of any recognizable abbreviation. Then would be the change or revision number, "(C3)". This is most important. For most countries there are several versions of the checklist. Since the tokens are being renumbered with each Change, it would in many cases be impossible for a third party to identify the token in question without knowing which change is being referenced. Then comes my three-letter code for the country. If only one country is being discussed, this might be left out. Finally is the number of the token consisting of the page number where the token is to be found and the number of the token. The page number is needed because the larger country checklists are being broken down by region: state, province, department, etc. where possible, so that there might be several token #1's in a given country.

I did experiment with numbering the tokens continuously within a country, but didn't like the result. Since the checklist as a whole currently describes more than 18,000 different tokens, and this number can be expected to grow substantially as local interest excites local research, numbering the tokens continuously within the entire checklist was never considered.

FORMAT OF ENTRIES

The format used for individual descriptions is the same as that used in my Latin American checklist. I am using the common North American practice of cataloging tokens by country, province or state, and town of issue; then alphabetically within a town by the name of the business, the name of the owner, or any other inscription or device that allows a piece to be classified. I have included background information on a given token only when it seems useful for purposes of classification. Given the size, just of the descriptive material, I don't have either time or space for anything more. If you want historical background, you will need to look elsewhere. Many of the books and articles in the REFERENCES list contain such material. I have also made a distinction between 'References' and 'Sources'. The former is published numismatic material, and doesn't necessarily mean the author has, or has even *seen* the token in question, any more than I have when I copy a description into this checklist. The latter, whether from a numismatic collection, or from a dealers stock, indicates that the piece actually existed at the stated time and place.

Month/Year - Change# Page Number

COUNTRY (at top of page) PROVINCE or STATE (if used)

NOTE 1: \* is under Token# on line 2 if I own, otherwise left blank.

NOTE 2: (?) precedes line 1 if *country* of attribution is uncertain, otherwise blank.

1: (-) (TOWN) (PROVINCE or STATE) (estimated number of tokens referenced)

NOTE 3: no parenthesis used if name is on token / "?" after name if attribution to a locality is uncertain.

2: Obv: **INSCRIPTION** and (device)

3: Rev: **INSCRIPTION** / **INSCRIPTION** and (device), / separates different lines.

4: shape (if not round), diameter, material, edge (if not plain), thickness and/or weight (if significant)

5: Info: location of published illustrations, classification, period, etc., translations (if not obvious), disputed attributions

6: Ref: catalog references (if any), other collections (if any), #1SOURCE/date/cost and condition of own specimen, #2(and up) SOURCE/date/cost and condition of other specimens seen offered for sale. ('e' after the price figure indicates an auction catalog estimate...the actual sale price is not known to me.)

NOTE 4: line 6, see list of REFERENCES for complete description of publications.

NOTE 5: line 6, see list of SOURCES for complete names and addresses.

Entered at Mishawaka, Indiana, 21 March, 2007

David E. Henkle

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I have combined under this heading not only the usual topic and page number, but also some statistical information that fits well into a table format. Found here will be the number of the most recent revision for each section, the date of the most recent revision, the number of token descriptions, and the total number of pages within each section. The first column lists the introductory sections, countries, and their subdivisions, followed by a column of revision dates. The next column lists the number of token descriptions within each section, the totals for each country being boldfaced and underlined. These totals include the duplicate entries for disputed attributions which, as I have stated earlier, are reproduced for each country to which the token as been attributed. The next column has the number of *known* mis-attributions for each country, the country totals again being boldfaced. This number can always be subtracted from the total number of pieces known for each country. It would be nice if the number of known mis-attributions equaled the number of disputed attributions, but this will probably never happen. The last two columns are the total number of pages within each section, and the page number on which each section or sub-section starts. The number of pages in each section is expressed in the form (pages of token descriptions) + (pages of introduction and country index). A prefix is assigned to the page numbers for each country/section because each section is intended to be usable as an individual country checklist, so that the page numbering is started over with '1' under each section. The difference in numbering for the "country index" is due to the change of format that resulted from the new (1992) computer equipment. Checklists dated 1992 and before are in the old format. Those dated 1993 and later are in the new format. The existence of two different formats will be as temporary as I can make it.

INTRODUCTION	3/07			7		i
REFERENCES	3/07			10		R - 1
SOURCES	3/07			4		S - 1
GENERAL INDEX	3/07			19		I - 1
ALGERIA w/C3	9/98	<b><u>324</u></b>	(-3)	53	+ 3	
Alger		95				AAL- 1
Constantine		125				AAL- 17
Oran		76				AAL- 37
Locality Unknown		28	(-3)			AAL- 49
Country Index for Algeria						I (AAL) -1
ANGOLA w/C1	8/91	<b><u>5</u></b>		1		AAN- 1
AZORES w/C1	10/98	<b><u>12</u></b>		2		AAZ- 1
BOTSWANA w/C2	3/07	<b><u>12</u></b>		2		ABO- 1
CAMEROUN w/C2	3/92	<b><u>8</u></b>	(-2)	2		ACA- 1
COMORO ISLANDS w/C2	7/97	<b><u>17</u></b>		3		ACM- 1
CONGO w/C1	3/92	<b><u>10</u></b>		2		ACO- 1
DJIBOUTI w/C1	3/92	<b><u>10</u></b>		2		ADJ- 1
EGYPT w/C3	8/96	<b><u>163</u></b>	(-2)	27	+ 2	
Al-Iskandariyan		40				AEG- 1
Al-Qahirah		66				AEG- 7
Bur Sa'id		16				AEG- 17
Military		10				AEG- 21
Locality Unknown		31	(-2)			AEG- 23
Country Index for Egypt						I (AEG) -1
ETHIOPIA w/C1	3/92	<b><u>19</u></b>		6		
Begemdir and Simen (province)		2				AET- 1
Eritrea (province)		5				AET- 2
Harer (province)		2				AET- 3
Shewa (province)		9				AET- 4
Locality Unknown		1				AET- 6
GABON w/C3	7/01	<b><u>52</u></b>	(-6)	9		AGB- 1
GHANA w/C2	9/97	<b><u>7</u></b>		2		AGH- 1
GUINEA	10/89	<b><u>3</u></b>		1		AGN- 1
IVORY COAST w/C1	10/06	<b><u>3</u></b>		1		AIV- 1

KENYA w/C3	10/06	<u>12</u>		3		AKE-	1
LESOTHO w/C1	1/03	<u>3</u>		1		ALE-	1
LIBERIA w/C2	12/03	<u>5</u>		1		ALI-	1
LIBYA w/C4	12/03	<u>32</u>		5		ALY-	1
MADAGASCAR w/C1	8/03	<u>38</u>		6		AMS-	1
MADEIRA w/C2	3/97	<u>303</u>		45	+ 2	AMD-	1
Country Index for Madeira						I (AMD)	-1
MALAWI w/C3	7/96	<u>12</u>		2		ANY-	1
MAURITIUS w/C4	1/03	<u>12</u>		2		AMU-	1
MOROCCO w/C1	6/91	<u>70</u>		11	+ 1	AMC-	1
Country Index for Morocco						P-	1
MOZAMBIQUE	8/89	<u>36</u>		6		AMZ-	1
NAMIBIA w/C2	10/06	<u>70</u>	(-1)	12	+ 1	ASW-	1
Country Index for Namibia						I (ASW)	-1
NIGERIA w/C3	11/06	<u>14</u>		3		ANG-	1
REUNION w/C1	5/97	<u>5</u>		1		ARE-	1
SAINT HELENA w/C1	6/96	<u>3</u>		1		ASH-	1
S. TOMÉ E PRINCIPE w/C1	11/89	<u>5</u>		1		AST-	1
SENEGAL w/C2	7/96	<u>34</u>		6		ASE-	1
SIERRA LEONE w/C2	8/96	<u>10</u>		3		ASL-	1
SOMALIA w/C1	3/92	<u>2</u>		2		ASM-	1
SOUTH AFRICA w/C2	3/02	<u>1000</u>	(-1)	159	+ 6		
Cape Province		426				ASA-	1
Natal		136				ASA-	72
Orange Free State		112				ASA-	93
Transvaal		179				ASA-	111
Locality Unknown		147	(-1)			ASA-	138
Country Index for South Africa						I (ASA)	-1
SUDAN	6/96	<u>3</u>		1		ASU-	1
SWAZILAND w/C3	5/01	<u>5</u>		1		ASZ-	1
TANZANIA w/C2	4/91	<u>28</u>		5		ATZ-	1
TCHAD w/C1	10/06	<u>6</u>	(-6)	1		ACD-	1
TUNISIA w/C3	11/94	<u>84</u>		13	+ 2	ATU-	1
Country Index for Tunisia						I (ATU)	-1
UGANDA w/C2	6/91	<u>6</u>		1		AUG-	1
ZAIRE w/C3	12/03	<u>34</u>		6		AZR-	1
ZAMBIA w/C1	12/06	<u>12</u>		2		AZB-	1
ZIMBABWE w/C2	11/06	<u>59</u>		9	+ 1	AZM-	1
Country Index for Zimbabwe						I (AZM)	-1