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ABSTRACT

This thesis is a case study of the relationship of the Dying Child's Wish complex, its related beliefs and associated practices, and "reality." The nucleus of this complex of narratives and beliefs concerns a little boy (variously named Mario, Craig, Jarrod, Blaine), who is dying from a terminal illness. His wish is to have his name recorded in The Guinness Book of Records for having collected the greatest number of get-well cards (or alternately postcards, Christmas cards, stamps, hats or other such items).

Since 1987 four real appeals for world records have been launched using the same means generally associated with contemporary legend—that is by word of mouth as well as by office technology and the media. As the parents soon found out however, once an appeal is launched, it became impossible to halt renegade appeals and the public's response was subsequently overwhelming and irrepressible. One effect of these renegade appeals was the generation of a quagmire of distorted and missing information, the consequences of which have led to speculation, and the invention and generation of numerous scenarios based both on both fact and fiction.

Using the Craig Shergold appeal as a focus, this study explores how textual variation and change in the presentation of information influences individual perceptions regarding both the real and legendary nature of Dying Child appeals. When a total of 204 texts were individually compared against an Enhanced Baseline Profile of the Shergold Appeal, results showed that all texts but one varied from the
reality of the appeal in some major or minor way in terms of both missing information and incorrect information. A consequence was the generation of numerous scenarios ranging from positive support for the appeal to views of debate and rejection. Examination of the rhetorical statements and textual changes in texts also showed that perceptions varied considerably from positive support for the Craig Shergold campaign to cynical views that the appeal was less than real. This in turn led to the creation of a body of "lore" surrounding real appeals and the resulting generation of the Dying Child's Wish complex.
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Chapter 1 - INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a case study of the relationship of the Dying Child’s Wish contemporary legend, its related beliefs and associated practices, and reality—in terms of actual Dying Child’s Wish appeals. The nucleus of this complex of narratives and beliefs concerns a little boy (variously named Mario, Craig, Jarrod, or Blaine), who is dying from a terminal illness. His wish is to have his name recorded in The Guinness Book of Records for having collected the greatest number of get-well cards (or alternately, postcards, Christmas cards, stamps, hats or other such items):

Craig Shergold of Surrey is seven years old and is dying from plural tumours of the brain and spine. He has one ambition to fulfil and that is to gain an entry in the Guinness Book of Records as the recipient of the greatest number of get-well cards. He will need 1,300,000 cards in order to achieve this. If Dorset schoolchildren would get involved with this simple but worthwhile cause, Craig would be well on the way to breaking the record. Any schools or organisations willing to participate or who would like to know more details please contact Jane Regan at the Dorset Science & Technology Centre tel: 0929 405063 (Dorset County Council Education Department Education Circular 18 Oct. 1989).

In response individuals send cards, gifts and money; they also offer words of encouragement and organize collection project to help the child. Persons are often so moved by the story that they also encourage others to respond to this appeal.

Folklorists have for some time now perceived that a relationship exists between legend and "reality." Studies by Grider (1984, 128-140), Ellis (1992, 274-277), and Dégh and Vázsonyi (1983, 5-24) illustrate that exchanges can and do take place between "actuality" and tradition. As Smith points out, "folklore mirrors reality and reality mirrors folklore" (1991, 148). The very nature of many legends
and beliefs is that they present realistic situations in a plausible manner but with some unusual twist. There is always something tangible about the scenarios described in the themes and plots of these narratives, and they can therefore never be totally detached from the framework of the everyday world, as is the case with the Dying Child’s Wish legendary complex.

Since at least the mid-1980s, folklorists have commonly treated the Dying Child’s Wish as a contemporary legend (Folklore Round Table 6 (1988), 15-16; Brunvand 1989, 227-232). There are also in circulation a number of stories, and responses to stories, which suggest that these appeals to help dying children are just rumours, nothing but legends, hoaxes, or a mixture of fact and fiction:

If you have received a tear-jerking fax message asking you to send a card to an address in Manchester, England, for the sake of a seven-year-old boy called Craig who has terminal cancer, throw it in the waste-paper basket...It is a cheap trick. The first appeal for cards for Craig surfaced in 1981 in England and reappeared again in San Francisco in March this year. Now it is Brisbane’s turn. There are some very weird people out there (Courier Mail 4 Dec. 1989).

Although folklorists tend to discuss the present-day Dying Child’s Wish appeals in terms of their association to the legendary postcard appeal for the non-existent Little Buddy which surfaced in Paisley Scotland in 1982, historical evidence shows similar narratives have been in existence since at least 1850 (Brunvand 1989, 227-232; London Illustrated News, 18 May 1850, 349). Evidence also shows that the Dying Child’s Wish legendary complex derives its existence as much from fact as from any legendary tradition.
Since 1987 at least four terminally ill children, Mario Morby, Craig Shergold, Jarrod Booth and Blaine Granger, have been engaged in efforts to acquire a Guinness record for variously receiving the greatest number of postcards, get-well cards, Christmas cards and hats. Three of these children, Mario Morby, Craig Shergold and Jarrod Booth, achieved their goal, and their accomplishments have been entered in The Guinness Book of Records (1988; 1991; 1992). Blaine Granger, the fourth child, continues to work on his project, which was initiated in 1990 (Field-notes, Grace Thompson, 13 Dec. 1992). All of these appeals have been extensively profiled in the media, and individuals have responded generously, often sending gifts and money in addition to the items requested in individual appeals.

One outstanding example, and the subject of this case study, is the case of terminally ill Craig Shergold of Carshalton, Surrey, England, who in September of 1989 launched an appeal to acquire a Guinness record for collecting the most get-well cards. In less than two months, Craig achieved his goal and, having received 1,266,000 get-well cards, broke Mario Morby's 1987 Guinness record of 1,265,000 million postcards. The Shergolds officially called off the campaign on November 16, 1989 and Guinness Publishing announced that Craig's record would be included in The Guinness Book of Records in 1990 (Croydon Post 22 Nov. 1989). The family soon found out, however, that it was impossible to stop the flow of cards generated by uncontrolled appeals. Craig was eventually listed in the 1991 Guinness record book for having received 16,250,692 cards and by 1991 he had established another world record for having received more than 33,000,000 cards from well-wishers.
throughout the world (The Guinness Book of Records 1991, 188; 1993, 552). Despite this universal achievement and numerous requests for people to stop sending cards, some five years later, appeals for Craig are still circulating and the cards continue to arrive at the Shergold home on a daily basis.

Within the framework of contemporary culture, any number of scenarios and influences can create the right milieu for the emergence, reinforcement, and perpetuation of legendary traditions. For example, many organizations conduct appeals to help sick children. Having said that, in the area of legend and belief studies, this is not an issue which is regularly addressed. As Allen observes of legend studies, writers have spent too much time "simply groping for historical, monogenetic beginnings" instead of "identifying the circumstances out of which the forms developed in order to account for the specific features or characteristics they display" (1982, 87). Fine similarly suggests that by "focusing on content and the immediate context of performance" American folk narrative research has tended not to relate traditions to much broader questions of social structure, status, gender, institutions, politics and economics (1988, 353).

Such has been the case with previous examinations of the Dying Child's Wish tradition. Writers have most often commented on the observable aspects of this legendary complex without looking at the underlying causes or influences which have influenced the development and perpetuation of the tradition. Moreover, folklorists have continually discussed this legend solely in terms of its relationship to the 1982 Little Buddy incident without seeking to identify any other possible linkages which
may help perpetuate either real or misguided appeals for dying children. In essence, little has been done to investigate the probable relationships between legendary accounts and the reality of actual appeals. Furthermore, despite the prominence of such appeals in newspapers and other media, folklorists have yet to assess the impact of modern communication technology (photocopiers, FAX machines and computers) in disseminating the tradition. Instead, folklorists have initially labelled the whole phenomena as being legendary, when in fact, this was only partially correct.

Perhaps what also misled them was the fact that these actual appeals were disseminated using the very mechanisms we would normally associate with contemporary legends, namely, that they are transmitted by word of mouth, the mass media, and through the formal and informal use of modern office communications technology (Burns 1969, 90-106; Bird 1976, 285-305; Klintberg 1981, 153-160; Bennett 1991b, 179-198). For example, in launching Craig’s campaign, the Shergolds used newspapers, radio, television, word of mouth, FAXes and chain letters to publicize the appeal over the greatest possible geographical area. The family subsequently attempted to halt the appeal using the very same means. Furthermore, well into 1993, misinformed appeals to help Craig continue to circulate using these same media. This situation may, in itself, have misled folklorists and caused them to assign the term legendary to such requests.

That is not to say that the folklorists were totally wrong. There are legendary Dying Child’s Wish appeals with no grounding in reality—some of which bear a close resemblance to the actual appeals. Overall, however, it was the casual identification
of these appeals which has led folklorists to speculate exactly as their subjects do, that is, to provide missing information based on conjecture and speculation. In this case both the infused missing and misinformation dealt with the status of the appeals.

While the Dying Child’s Wish legendary complex is relatively well known to both folklorists and the general public, it can be concluded that scholarly work on this material is negligible and, although folklorists have periodically cited the existence of earlier antecedents of this tradition, no research has been done to establish whether there were previous real events upon which the tradition is based, or even its relation to existing traditional activities.

The Craig Shergold campaign, launched in 1989, as perhaps one of the best publicised appeals, offers an excellent opportunity to explore the multi-dimensional relationship of this complex of real events and connected legends, and as such, is the central case study of this thesis.

The goals of this study are to:

(a) investigate the inter-relationship between the Dying Child’s Wish complex and “reality” as presented in the actual appeals which have taken place since 1987;

(b) document the history of the Dying Child’s Wish tradition;

(c) use the Craig Shergold appeal as a focus to examine the relationships which exist in this complex of legend, beliefs and reality;
(d) explore how textual variation and change in the presentation of information influence individual perceptions of the real and/or legendary nature of these narratives and beliefs.
Chapter 2 - RESEARCH APPROACH

Introduction

The first part of this chapter contains a summary of the approaches used for data collection in this study and consists of a description of the materials collected. Following this is a discussion of current theoretical approaches influencing present-day legend research and which have considerable bearing on this particular case study.

Data-Collection

The data-collection strategy employed in this study is based on a model developed by Galtung, who sets out the following nine approaches: (1) participant observation; (2) systematic observation; (3) experimental techniques; (4) conversations with informants; (5) open-ended interviews; (6) pre-coded interviews; (7) letters, articles and biographies; (8) open-ended questionnaires; (9) structured questionnaires (Galtung 1967, 110). Out of these nine strategies the following four approaches were used:

- Open-Ended Interviews
- Informal Participant Observation
- Systematic Observation
- Correspondence.
The main part of this study took place primarily between 1988 and 1993 and two types of materials, texts and contextual information, were collected from the following sources which included the public sector, as well as institutional, corporate and other office environments:

A. Mass Media - magazines, newspapers and newsletters, radio and television interviews and broadcasts;

B. Circulated Materials - photocopies, chain letters, and FAX transmissions;

C. Computer Services - correspondence obtained through computer news-groups and Electronic Mail.

Additional contextual and interpretive material was mostly derived from

D. Open-Ended Interviews - discussions with individuals having first hand experience with real appeals and with folklorists and others having knowledge of the Dying Child's Wish or a related tradition;

E. Scholarly and Special Interest Literature - articles and commentaries obtained from folklore journals and special interest publications.

Through the various methods of data-collection described here, I was able to collect over 400 texts pertaining to both actual appeals and legendary appeals for terminally ill children. The materials comprising the corpus of texts studied are contained in a two-part bibliography which contains (1) published sources such as
conventional books, periodicals, newspaper articles, newsletters and (2) unpublished sources which are listed under the following main headings: (A) mass media, (B) circulated materials, (C) computer networks and electronic mail, and (D) correspondence. Where such material is referred to in the main text, an attempt has been made throughout to signal the exact description of the item in order to facilitate the location of a particular reference.

Out of this data-base, a total of 204 texts pertaining to the Shergold appeal were used for the study of the Dying Child’s Wish complex and these are listed in appendix A (page 251). In addition, to alleviate cumbersome documentation of these specific texts used in the textual analysis in chapters six and seven, any specific reference to individual examples has been made with the use of an assigned number given to each item in this appendix. Thus, S-7 would indicate that this is listed as text seven, a newspaper listed in appendix A as follows: Singleton, Daniel. 1989. "Traders Join Craig’s Record Bid." Croydon News and Property News [Croydon, Surrey] 28 Sept., Thurs. ed.: 3.

Mass media sources

Many variants of the Dying Child’s Wish narrative were collected from the media including magazines, newspapers, newsletters, radio and television. Much of this information was usually conveyed within the context of local interest stories, or included as part of a national news or general interest program. A large part of this
material consists of appeals to help a Dying Child, coverage of children who have
initiated real appeals, interviews with individuals and organizations who have helped
with appeals, as well as exposés of misdirected efforts.

Since at least 1982, magazines such as the Peoples Weekly, Time Magazine
and Reader’s Digest, tabloid publications, such as The Enquirer and the Weekly
World News, and a variety of local and national newspapers have carried relevant
items. Between 1988 and 1992, information regarding Dying Child appeals was
regularly broadcast on both local and national radio stations world wide. In some
cases I was able to acquire either copies of interviews or news broadcasts directly
from various radio stations such as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (C.B.C.).
Other examples were simply taped while the interview was in progress.

In terms of television coverage, both the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
and Newfoundland Television have conducted interviews with individuals who had
participated in appeals. As well, they have provided news coverage of particular
appeals, generally within the context of a national news program. Regrettably, no
film or video documentation could be acquired, although detailed notes were taken.

Information about various appeals also turned up on cable television. For
example, in January of 1990, the local community cable network (channel nine) in
St. John’s, Newfoundland, transmitted in its typed Public Service Announcements,
a request to help Jarrod Booth. These notices are most often instigated by individuals
and organizations within the local community.
A year later, information about the Blaine Granger appeal appeared on the Cable Atlantic Scrolled News service on channels eight and ten in St. John’s (ca. April 1991). The source for this item was Broadcast News based in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

The media rely on their own news agencies such as Associated Press (AP) in the United States, Reuters in Europe, Southam News and Canadian Press (CP) in Canada for information. Canadian Press, for example, is a co-operative which includes 110 member newspapers from across the country. Both CP staff and member newspapers submit ready to print items to a central distribution point in Toronto, Ontario, via the computer. Member subscribers log-on to this service and select copy-ready items for incorporation in their own programmes. In Canada, Broadcast News, a branch of Canadian Press, offers a similar service to 400 radio and television stations across the country (Field-notes, Steve McCleod 16 Nov. 1993). The implication for this study is that a single source, via these agencies, can quickly disseminate information on a real or legendary appeal to millions of prospective participants overnight.

Circulated materials

A considerable number of texts relating specifically to the Shergold appeal are, and have been, circulating for some time in the form of photocopies, chain letters and FAX transmissions. However, these items are functionally distinct from the photocopy-lore and computer-lore texts as discussed by Preston (1974, 11-26),
Dundes and Pagter (1975; 1987; 1991), Smith (1987, 177-202), Bennett (1991, 179-198), Renard (1991, 3-26), and Smith (1991, 257-277). In the case of the Dying Child's Wish appeals, modern office communication technology has been used as an effective and efficient means to disseminate information about the appeal.

Wherever possible, such sources were methodically checked when an appeal was in circulation. For example, computer networks were regularly scanned and checked. Material was also contributed by others searching these sources either independently or on my behalf.

A large number of the texts in the collection were photocopied appeals to help a dying child. These were most often found on notice boards in staff offices or on more openly accessible bulletin boards around the Memorial University of Newfoundland campus (see appendix B-1, page 269). Examples include photocopy reproductions of (a) individually typed letters, (b) handwritten FAX transmissions, (c) typed or handwritten chain letters, and (d) published texts of appeals.

I also collected several internal memos which had been photocopied and then distributed by various organizations to staff members. Most of these examples are in the form of direct appeals encouraging workers to contribute to a request. In at least some instances, memos served as a means of advising staff that such appeals were hoaxes, or that while such requests were real, the Shergold family had asked well-wishers to stop sending cards. In these instances, supplementary information, such as photocopies of newspaper clippings, were often attached as supportive documentation.
Chain letters have also been widely used to disseminate information about Dying Child's Wish appeals. Customarily, chain letters consist of a single page text which is passed from one recipient to another. The recipient subsequently deletes the first name on the list, adds his or her own at the bottom of the list and passes it on to another recipient (Dundes 1965-68, 14-19; Duncan 1976, 47-58; Sann 1967, 97-104).

In the case of Dying Child's Wish chain letters, however, several variations of the traditional chain letter have emerged. For example, large lists of previous recipients are frequently retained as are examples of already circulated texts giving instructions to potential participants. The size of these chain letters can range substantially from single-page personalised appeals (appendix B-2, page 270) to chain letters of thirty or more pages in length, listing dozens of names of previous participants (appendix B-3, pages 271-301).

Many examples in the corpus appear to have originated within the context of business and corporate environments, a more professional format for the chain letters is frequently adopted. Individuals have, for example, added a covering letter. There is also much variation in the actual format of the letters used—ranging from personalized examples using first names to those which are simply addressed "To Whom It May Concern."

In some instances, individuals have made alterations to these chain letters for easier handling. In one example, the reduction feature on a photocopier was employed to accommodate the increasing number of names, letters and addresses,
while at the same time maintaining the original list in circulation. In this manner, three or four letters were incorporated onto a single sheet. Individual sheets were then copied for transmission to others and attached to a personalised letter. This method allowed individuals to maintain the original text of each request, while reducing the quantity of paper and time involved in each dissemination.

Much of this correspondence also reflects the global distribution of the Craig Shergold appeal through corporate business connections. For example, the address lists indicate that several of the letters originated in countries such as France, Britain, Portugal, Canada and the United States and have subsequently crossed national and international boundaries dozens of times through company branch offices and affiliated business networks.

Individuals in companies throughout the world have also employed the FAX machine to convey information about Dying Child’s Wish appeals. Examples in the collection show that some photocopied documents were subsequently FAXed and then re-photocopied and re-FAXed—the disseminators simply updating information, or adding their own comments as the process continued (appendix B-4, page 302).

Computer services

One of the most prolific sources of discussions about the Dying Child’s Wish proved to be the computer ANU-NEWS (ANews) and electronic mail (E-Mail) services. ANU-NEWS or, ANews, as it commonly known, is an extensive news data-base available to computer users at universities and businesses throughout the
world. ANEWS consists of both articles and items posted to over 1000 assigned news-groups and is directed to individuals with interests such as gardening, child care, recreation and politics, to specialized computer program discussion groups—including one on folklore. Individuals can access ANEWS from their personal or institutional computer terminals and then select the various news-group directories they wish to view and read or print items in which they have an interest (Field-notes, Randy Dodge, 23 Feb. 1992).

Individuals wishing to send their contributions to various ANEWS news-groups do so through electronic mail (E-Mail). In turn, each of the news-groups then makes this correspondence available for a period of up to thirty days to other computer users interested in that subject area. Messages and correspondence sent through E-Mail typically contain numerous errors in English. In terms of computer-aided communication, this is more the convention than the exception—reflecting the spontaneous and informal nature of E-Mail correspondence itself.

The Dying Child's Wish has been a constant topic of discussion on ANEWS. Between 1988 and 1993, I tracked information circulating in such news-groups as Kids. Misc. (an informal discussion group pertaining to children in general), Rec. Motorcycles (a recreational news-group dedicated to discussions on motorcycles), and Misc. Misc. (a news-group dedicated to discussions on miscellaneous topics). In 1989, I learned that an appeal to help a dying child by the name of Craig was being mailed to various news-groups on ANEWS, (appendix B-5, page 303) and I systematically searched this program for relevant information. Significantly, postings
had originated from a host of locations throughout North America, the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands and elsewhere in Europe.

By 1993, I had collected at least 200 examples of E-Mail correspondence pertaining to appeals for terminally ill children -- over 100 of which pertained specifically to the Shergold appeal. These texts are, in fact, a modest reflection of the overall number of E-Mail transmissions which were being sent out regarding both the actual appeals and related legendary manifestations. The distribution of such texts also serves as an excellent indicator of the global distribution of the Shergold appeal.

In addition through ANEWS I gained access to useful newspaper references, toll-free phone numbers, and addresses of organizations which had been involved in these appeals. For example this is how I was able to locate Mark Young, of the New York based agency, Facts On File, and Arthur Stein, Executive Director of the Children's Wish Foundation International, Atlanta, Georgia.

Only once, did I E-Mail a request for information about this tradition to the ANEWS network. In 1990 I sent the following request to the Folklore Discussion Group:

In reference to enquiries re: Little Buddy it seems that in Newfoundland as elsewhere the legendary tales of Little Buddy are as popular as ever. Since at least before Christmas there have been several fax machine-xeroxed flyers circulating on campus and within the city encouraging people to send out cards to help out Craig. For the past year I have been actively gathering material for a thesis on the Little Buddy story. This has consisted of interviews with individuals who have been involved with legitimate or fictitious campaigns to get into The Guinness Book of Records. While the focus of this work has concentrated on the 'Newfoundland' experience I have ended up with several large phone bills attempting to track down any leads I might uncover. In addition to several interviews I have been attempting to
gather examples of flyers, faxes, posters, newspaper articles, computer conversations or any other form of communication with respect to Little Buddy.

I have recently learned that another child by the name of Jarrod Booth from British Columbia is also attempting to get into The Guinness Book of Records by collecting the most Christmas cards. This is a legitimate campaign. However, as with the efforts of Craig Shergold and Mario Morby, this campaign is getting muddled by the legendary Little Buddy...I would be only too delighted to hear about and receive information with respect to any Guinness card collecting campaign efforts anywhere. If readers or fellow folklorists would like to exchange information with respect to the "Little Buddy" legend they may contact me through Bitnet... (Guigné 5 Feb. 1990).

Despite the popularity of this subject as a topic for discussion, I received no response to this enquiry. After much consideration, I decided not to re-issue my request preferring to maintain the role of observer. Discussions pertaining to these appeals were frequent, and sometimes quite heated. I felt therefore that if I began to participate in them I would be lured into the dialogue taking place, and this might somehow begin to affect or influence peoples' comments.

Open-ended interviews

Interviews, both in person and over the telephone, were conducted with individuals who had some personal knowledge of the Dying Child's Wish complex, as (a) families who had initiated actual appeals, (b) individuals who have been personally involved with appeals, (c) individuals who have been professionally involved with an appeal, and (d) individuals who had knowledge of the early appeals or with the tradition.
Within the body of this thesis, reference to taped interviews with informants is identified with the name, date and tape number. This information in turn corresponds to a master list of taped interviews and field-note interviews contained in appendix C (page 307). This list contains both names of informants and their occupations. References to conversations or field-notes with individuals is similarly cited by use of the person’s name and the date of the conversation.

The parents of three of the four known terminally ill children who initiated their own campaigns to gain a world record for collections were interviewed. These included Mrs. Anna Morby (mother of Mario Morby) living in Sutton Coldfield, England; Del and Bernie Granger (parents of Blaine Granger) residing in Winnipeg, Manitoba; Canada and Cindy and Eric Booth (parents of Jarrod Booth) of Salt Springs, British Columbia, Canada.

Interviews with Anna Morby, and with Cindy and Eric Booth were conducted over the phone, while the interview with Bernie and Del Granger was conducted in person at their family home in Winnipeg. These individuals provided much factual information about the relationship between real appeals and legendary accounts as well as many insights into the public’s response to these appeals. I was also able to explore how the families had acquired the idea to initiate an appeal and whether they had any knowledge of similar efforts elsewhere.

During the course of my research, I endeavoured to contact the parents of Craig Shergold. Each time I attempts to arrange an interview, unfortunately, the family were travelling outside of Britain as a result of Craig’s campaign. I was,
however, fortunate enough to obtain a copy of a radio interview with Marian Shergold (Radio interview, 5 July, 1990).

I conducted personal interviews with two persons in St. John’s, Newfoundland who have had personal experiences with the Dying Child’s Wish tradition. In both instances, these individuals discovered that their desires to provide aid to a dying child had somehow gone amiss. Gill Boyce, a teacher in Mount Pearl, had organized through his school, a mail campaign in response to an appeal to help David (supposedly living in Britain,) only to discover later that the British Post Office would not accept any more cards for this child because he did not appear to exist. Ken Ash, a radio announcer for Q-Radio in St. John’s, had responded to a different appeal for David (supposedly living in Florida). Ash broadcast the appeal on the local radio station only to later learn that the request was outdated by a full year and that David did not exist.

An interview was conducted with Derek Delouche, Executive Director of the Newfoundland provincial chapter of the Children’s Wish Foundation, who had been professionally involved with an appeal. Delouche’s organization has a mandate to respond to the wishes of sick children within Canada. Discussions with Derek, therefore, provided an insight into the role of institutions which formally respond to the needs of terminally ill children. Since 1991, Derek has been approached by numerous individuals and groups in Newfoundland to ascertain whether the Children’s Wish Foundation could assist with the Craig Shergold appeal. On several
occasions, he has had to advise the public of the facts surrounding the Craig Shergold campaign.

Telephone interviews were conducted with individuals who have had other types of experience with this tradition; for example, Mark Young, a public relations director with the New York based Facts on File, represents American interests in Guinness Publishing (the agency which is responsible for The Guinness Book of Records). As a result he has had to respond personally to numerous enquiries regarding the appeals. Similarly, Arthur Stein, Executive Director of the Children's Wish Foundation International located in Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A., has been personally involved with the Shergold appeal since 1989. Our discussions focused on the controversy surrounding the efforts of his organization to promote the Shergold campaign in the United States and its efforts later to halt the flow of cards to their offices.

I also attempted to locate individuals who had some knowledge of appeals prior to 1987. Discussions with Walter Loeb of Roanoke, Virginia, U.S.A. a stamp collector and contributor to the American Philatelist: The Journal of the American Philatelic Society, revealed that he had initiated a 1960s campaign which inspired millions to send Christmas cards to Little Doris of Roanoke, Virginia.

As part of this research I also documented examples of related traditions. In 1988 I interviewed Daphne Maunder, director of public relations for the Janeway Children's Hospital in St. John's, Newfoundland, regarding her efforts to debunk appeals which were then circulating for the collection of pull tabs from soft drink
cans to aid an ill child. In 1992, I obtained a copy of an interview with Mrs.
Maunder regarding another pull-tabs appeal which occurred at the same hospital
(Radio interview, 12 Feb.).

**Folkloristic and special interest literature.**

As part of this research, I attempted to ascertain if any information or
discussion pertaining to this tradition might be available in folklore journals and other
special interest publications.

Although I searched such mainstream publications as the *Journal of American*
Folklore, *Western Folklore*, *Indiana Folklore*, *New York Folklore*, *Canadian*
Folklore canadien, and *Fabula*, these efforts yielded nothing.

Much of the documentation of this tradition appears to be confined to more
ephemeral folklore publications such as *Dear Mr. Thoms: The Occasional Newsletter*
of the British Folk Studies Forum 1990 (14: 22-23); 1991 (29: 13-19); 1992 (25: 14-
19) *Folklore Frontiers* 1991 (14: 20-23); *Folklore Round Table* 1988 (6: 15-16); or
Fonfiaile News: The Newsletter of the International Society For Contemporary Legend
Research 1991 (21: 10; 22: 11); 1992 (26: 11); and *FLS News: The Newsletter of*
the *Folklore Society* 1990 (11: 7-8); 1993 (17: 13). This documentation is thus the
direct result of the collaborative efforts of a small group of British and American
folklorists over the past five years.

For example, since 1990 *Dear Mr. Thoms* has regularly included details of
appeals supplied by readers. The January 1990 issue, for instance, consists of a brief
article "Little Buddy Strikes Again," and presents four variants of the Little Buddy Appeal sent in by correspondents in England and Australia 1990 (14: 20-23). In 1991, Dear Mr. Thoms (20: 13-19; 23: 7) contained two updates on the Craig Shergold campaign with samples of articles from newspapers covering the appeal and descriptions of chain letters and newspaper clippings submitted by readers. A subsequent 1992 edition carried a six-page article entitled "Update: Craig Shergold" in which was contained a letter from folklorist Marilyn Jorgensen citing appeals collected in California (25: 14-16).

In 1989 and 1992 I placed requests for information in FLS News (8: 9) and Foafiale News (21:11; 22: 11). From these efforts I received many texts of Dying Child's Wish appeals and newspaper clippings from readers in Australia, France and the United States.

Significantly, some of the most detailed documentation of this tradition is to be found in folklore-related publications such as the Fortean Times: The Journal of Strange Phenomenon 1990 (56: 12); 1991 (59: 26-27). Of particular importance was Mike Dash's 1991 work "Buddy Can You Spare a Stamp?" which attempts to provide some explanation for the folkloric phenomenon primarily through a chronology of the events leading up to the Craig Shergold appeal which was initiated in 1989. This article included many excellent references (59: 26-27).

Other very useful information about the tradition has been acquired through relatively obscure special interest publications such as American Philatelist: The Journal of the American Philatelic Society. This was where I found Walter Loebl's
"The Doris Ridgeway Story" (Dec. 1982: 1075), an excellent source of background information. Loebl describes the 1960's appeal to send Christmas cards to "Little Doris" Ridgeway of Hardy, Virginia and the ensuing public response. As a result of this article, I was able to contact and speak to Mr. Loebl regarding his initiative to launch this appeal.

Mark Schumacher's "The 'Little Buddy' Story," also published in the American Philatelist, provided still more useful background information (Nov. 1988, 1104-5). The author reports on a worldwide hoax involving Little Buddy of Paisley, Scotland, and includes an excellent sampling of the thousands of cards received by the Post Office in Renfrewshire which he himself had purchased through an auction.

Relevant to these materials concerning the Dying Child's Wish is a complex of stories, beliefs and practices entrenched both in legend and reality and which is disseminated through word of mouth and by means of the media and office technology. Folklorists and others have regularly discussed all stories pertaining to the Dying Child's Wish in terms of their being contemporary legends, hoaxes, or rumours. However, they have yet to distinguish those aspects of this phenomenon which are based on actual appeals from those which have grown out of the popular imagination. Perhaps more to the point, as folklorists have failed in this respect, they, consequently, have also failed to identify and understand how this complex of beliefs, legends and related actions came about. At this juncture, the task must be one of unravelling this complex and attempting to distinguish these aspects which are based on folklore from those which are rooted within the realities of the everyday
world. This being the case, what is needed is a much broader framework that situates the relevance of such materials within the context of present-day society. With this in mind, there are certain theoretical issues pertaining to contemporary legend studies which have relevance to this investigation of the Dying Child's Wish.

**Theoretical Issues**

Like most folklorists, when I initially heard of Craig Shergold's 1989 appeal for a world record, I automatically assumed that this was a contemporary legend and in fact some of the material in this corpus is in this form. Therefore, I feel that it is appropriate to address certain issues pertinent to contemporary legend which have particular relevance to this case study. Within this context, it is not my intent to deliberate at great length on the history of contemporary legend scholarship. This itself has been addressed by Tangherlini and by Bennett and Smith (1990, 371-390; 1989, 13-26). Moreover, it is not my intention to enter into any discussion on approaches, definitions and classification of this genre, as other writers have regularly addressed these issues since the turn of the century—although they did not always find workable solutions to the issues they address (Grimm 1865; Van Gennep 1910; Von Der Leyden 1917; Granberg 1935; Peuckert 1938; Von Sydow 1949; Christiansen 1958; Honko 1964, 5-19; Pentikäinen 1973, 217-241; Hand 1965, 439-446; Deği 1965, 77-87; Bascombe 1965, 3-20; Dorson 1971, 157-172; Halpert 1971, 17-37; Luthi 1976; Williams 1984, 216-228; Nicolaisen 1985, 213-218; Wolf-Knuts 1987, 167-179; Smith 1989, 91-101; Bennett 1987, 15-30; Dégh 1991, 11-38). Rather, I
intend to examine those theories which have some bearing on the relationship between actual Dying Child’s Wish appeals and the Dying Child’s Wish complex of narratives, beliefs and related practices.

Contemporary legend and society

Folklorists generally agree that what distinguishes "contemporary legends" from legends per se is their current usage and correspondence, in terms of content, to the context of present every-day culture (Jones 1944, 284-92; Bennett 1984, 45-63; Nicolaisen 1985, 216; Ellis 1987, 31-60; Fine 1989, 169-177; Glazer 1984, 108-126; Bennett and Smith 1989, 18; Langlois 1991, 153-172; Green and Grider 1991, 5-9).

Since at least the early 1930s writers have observed and documented narratives situated within the context of contemporary society, and which exhibit "modern" features (Woolcott 1937; Beardsley and Hanky 1942, 303-35; 1943, 13-25; Bonaparte 1941, 105-20; Jones 1944, 284-92). Initially, it was perceived that "urban" or "modern" legends were distinct from other types of legend (for example saints’ legends, supernatural legends, personal and local legends) because of their supposedly more current content and focus. As Brunvand observed, these stories concerned "recent events (or alleged events) with an ironic or supernatural twist...told and believed by some of the most sophisticated ‘folk’ of modern society--young people, urbanites, and the well educated" (1981, xi). Studies illustrated that the content of these stories dealt with current subjects such as automobiles (Buchan 1984, 99-107), dormitories (Dégh 1969, 55-74), foreign matter in food (Domowitz

Typically, these "contemporary" narratives have been seen to reflect more ordinary events and happenings within present-day society. Thus stories of child abductions, strange things in food, faulty credit cards, lovers' revenge tales, and scary baby sitters, are easy to identify as contemporary legends because within the context of our present-day experiences, it is quite possible that such events could occur. In essence, it is the excessive familiarity of the subject matter of contemporary legends which sets this genre apart from other forms of legends.

Many contemporary legends are therefore credible. The plots may be unusual, outlandish, peculiar and absurd, but not so out of the ordinary as to be totally disregarded. Moreover, an irrefutable reality is always manifest within these narratives because of the existence of coinciding situations and events.

Certainly, one of the distinguishing features of these narratives is that they tend to be set in the very recent or, at least, near-past. Although in some instances historical roots or analogues may exist, the themes are often immediate and tend to reflect new societal trends and concerns, as is exemplified in the recent emergence of contemporary narratives about AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) (Brunvand 1989, 14; Smith 1990, 113-142; Goldstein 1992, 23-41; Langlois 1991, 153-172).

In certain instances, the genesis of at least some contemporary legends can be accredited to actual events and incidents. For example, such well-known stories as
those pertaining to alligators in the sewer may challenge our imagination and sense of order and reasoning, but they are to a certain degree plausible, and to some extent supported by factual occurrences (Brunvand 1981, 90-98).

As cultural representations and portraits of present-day society, contemporary legends minister to the fears, misgivings, anxieties and stresses of present-day society. We easily relate to these narratives because they often centre on everyday things, activities and events so common as to be quite ordinary. As Mullen notes, this is what makes them so plausible, "the informant gives the exact locale, mentions a local motel, and identifies the name of the road where the incident supposedly took place in order to give his tale 'immediate and tangible reality'" (1972, 98).

The versatility of the legend

Certainly since the late 1970s studies have shown that there can be many reasons for telling a story, including value as entertainment (Bennett 1988, 13); as news and gossip (Oring 1990, 163-177); as an attempt to explain the "exTRANORMAL" (Dégh and Vázsonyi 1973, 50); as a means to "gratify our desire to know about and to try to understand bizarre, frightening and potentially dangerous or embarrassing events that may have happened" (Brunvand 1981, 11-12); or "as explanations for strange behaviour...or warnings against involvement in particular types of situations" (Smith 1983, 11). A characteristic of all legends is that they adapt and change readily to the local conditions of a particular place.
However, recent studies illustrate that these contemporary narratives also share an affinity with other genres such as rumour (Mullen 1972, 95-109; Smith 1984, 197-215), practical joke (Bowman 1987, 171-175) and personal experience narratives (Smith 1981, 167-173).

Legend, belief and truth

This thesis, however, is not about contemporary legend but in fact about the inter-relationship of the parts which go to make up the whole; namely the existence of actual appeals for terminally ill children and the coinciding Dying Child’s Wish complex of beliefs and practices.

Considering one of the legend’s characteristics, "looseness of form," (Dégh 1965, 78) many studies of this genre have given prominence to the relationship of legend and belief; although over the years writers have expressed considerable disagreement with respect to the exactness of this relationship (Luthi 1964, 25; Schmidt 1968, 108; Nicolaisen 1988, 79-87; Dégh 1991, 23-25). While earlier definitions gave emphasis to belief in the material being communicated, today many studies instead emphasize the encompassing role of belief.

Nicolaisen, for example, maintains that what delineates the legend is that it fulfills "the criteria for believability" (1985, 218). Dégh, however, maintains that "belief is the cornerstone of the legend (1991, 24) and disputability its raison d’etre (1991, 32). On this point, Dégh and Vázsonyi stress that, while legends are transmitted by individuals, "subjective beliefs are not a necessary ingredient of the
legend" (1976, 118). They propose that legend formation is much more of a collective process. Therefore, in their view, it really doesn't matter what the individual thinks about the content as "doubt, unbelief, or direct opposition does not prevent the legend from coming into existence by the legend process and from being passed through the legend conduit" (1976, 117).

Georgina Smith, however, takes the stance that "belief in the material being communicated structures both the content of the narrative and the form in which it is performed" (1981, 168). Therefore, the attitude of the individual considerably influences narrative content and performance (Smith 1981, 168). Moreover, she comments, "it is the belief of narrators in the truth of their stories which structures and maintains their continued performance of legends" (1981, 173).

Paul Smith notes that contemporary legends are stories told as supposedly "truthful accounts of current situations and events" (1987, 194). Therefore belief in contemporary legends is often induced because of the plausible, rational explanations sustained in the content. Smith also observes that the precise relationship between belief and truth is difficult to establish; for example the "credence" and so, possibility for belief of a legend may grow out a real-life event, although the circumstances of that event must be plausible (1987, 194).

Others, such as Wineck, observe that legend definitions which employ belief by the narrator or listener are self-defeating—particularly when combined with other measurements such as a degree of falseness for "if the culture recognised the narrative as a legend by this definition, they would violate the primary criterion for
its being a legend in the first place" (1992, 3). Relevant to these observations Saler remarks that besides belief, there is also disbelief and unbelief; "Belief and disbelief differ in truth value...unbelief is denotive of uncertainty and doubt" (1968, 29-33). Saler suggests that belief is a proposition meaningful to an individual which he or she affirms to be true; thus it would be more appropriate to consider and examine the criteria individuals employ to establish the validity of a belief "We are not really interested in 'truth' as such; we are concerned, rather, with conviction and what structures it" (1968, 29-33).

In certain cases, reality itself induces and nurtures the growth of particular beliefs associated to legends. For example Smith suggests that definitions of legend should take into consideration the blending of several elements including the narrative content, the extent of belief, the method of presentation/ transmission, the context of performance, and the function of the narrative/ performance (1987, 182).

While legends themselves may be highly fluid in form, the individual sentiments and convictions expressed, during the transmission of such narratives from individual to individual, are presented in very specific ways and exhibit particular patterns. Individuals may or may not recognize something that is legendary, but they will communicate it to others if there is a personal or relevant reason. Individuals verbalize their thoughts all the time in a systematic manner and they use rhetorical devices to argue and express particular viewpoints, whether relating information about a hoax, marketing a product, or telling of an appeal for a terminally-ill child which they just read in a newspaper.
Considering the prominence of belief studies in the scholarship, it is surprising that few scholars have actually attempted to analyze the relationship between the narrative structure of legends and individual expressions of belief. Presumably folklorists have been rather disinclined to apply any form of structural approach to the analysis of legends simply because of the deep-rooted "all content no form" issue which has pervaded the discipline since at least the 1960s (Dégh 1991, 19; Nicholaisen 1988, 80-87; Barnes 1984, 67-78; Dégh and Vázsonyi 1976, 93-123; Schmidt 1963, 107-08).

**Legend and "reality"**

The existence of legends in the media and the fact that they are often disseminated through office technology highlights one of the predicaments of any contemporary legend research. These narratives cannot be too far distanced from reality itself and, both in terms of content and dissemination, they are particularly attached to the tangibility of the everyday world. Although the themes and plots of contemporary legends may be so amazing or fantastic as to be questionable, there is always something plausible about the reality they present. Therefore, separating legend from reality is not so easy or always possible.

Studies such as Fine’s examinations of mercantile legends and redemption rumours (1985, 63-84; 1986, 208-222), McConnell’s work on corporate legends (1989, 231-47), and Smith’s work on contemporary legend and the Coca-Cola company (1992, 123-153) all illustrate that the products of popular culture frequently
furnish new opportunities for legend production and regeneration and are indicative of the complex inter-relationship which exists between legend and "reality." The fact that an event or the existence of a product may underlie a legend or belief is only part of the picture. Several writers have observed that the telling of a legend can often involve much more than just narration. In these instances, repeatedly observable behaviours in terms of "ostension" or the physical enactment of beliefs and practices linked to the narrative, can also result (Ellis 1982-83, 61-73; Dégéh and Vázsonyi 1983, 5-34; Grider 1984, 128-140; Ellis 1989, 201-220; Glazer 1989, 165-177; Kapferer 1989, 467-481).

In a study of halloween traditions, Dégéh and Vázsonyi have observed that there are certain kinds of legends which involve not only narration but some additional overt manifestation of belief in the form of actions (1983, 7-8). In such instances, they observe, individuals use action itself to communicate and/or imitate themes, events, and behaviours encapsulated or indicated in a legend. Applications of this idea have also been pursued on other levels by Sylvia Grider (1984, 128-140, Bill Ellis (1989b, 201-220) and Gary Alan Fine (1991, 179-181). Such works collectively highlight the fact that the reality of the legend is often grounded within the context of the real world and closely linked to actual events and happenings within specific cultural settings.

This is exactly what is occurring in the case of the Dying Child's Wish legendary complex. However, unlike other forms of ostension, which primarily involve some form of copycat behaviour, this complex may invoke or even request
any of a combination of behaviours in addition to the narration of the story. These behaviours can include (a) the embodiment of the Dying Child's Wish through the initiation of world record appeals by ill children, (b) the communication of such appeals to others, (c) the co-ordination and organization of efforts to assist a Dying Child obtain a world record, and (d) the creation of practical jokes and parodies paralleling actual Dying Child's Wish appeals.

The complexity of contemporary legend texts

As somewhat of an aside to these issues, folklorists appear to continue to be boggled by the complexity of the materials generally accepted as falling under the rubric of legend. The 1980s, for example, saw the rise of a group of scholars who, through a series of highly controversial "Perspectives on Contemporary Legend" forums, attempted to tease out some of the subtle relationships between legend definition and classification, belief, performance, and function. In a recent review of one of the resulting publications, Monsters With Iron Teeth: Perspectives on Contemporary Legend Volume III, Jon Erickson criticised these attempts noting, "What strikes one about most of these papers, however, is their naivété and lack of any convincing non-trivial theoretical framework whether psychological, sociological, or even basic rhetoric" (1990, 239).

Bennett argues, however, in a rejoinder to this review, that what scholars such as Erickson are advocating is a "more schematic, theory-driven approach to the study of contemporary legend" (1991, 187). Part of the problem, Bennett notes, is that
what has evolved is a "sort of 'authorized version' of definitions and interpretations which are fast becoming unchallengeable because they seem to provide a 'natural' and 'obvious' scholarly frame-work" (1991, 187). Based on some of these existing definitions, Bennett suggests contemporary legends may not even be legends at all but something entirely different, especially considering the overall lack of "generic homogeneity." As she points out, "'contemporary legend' plots and motifs turn up in a wide variety of guises—dotes, rumours, personal experience stories, children's 'scary stories', folktales, jokes, photocopylore, among many other modes—and are told in a number of different contexts and performance modes" (1991, 189).

Furthermore, Bennett notes that most scholarly definitions of this genre appear to be bound by a "theoretical straight-jacket formed out of ideas drawn from Linda Dégh's 'The 'Belief Legend' in Modern Society,' Jan Brunvand's 'The Vanishing Hitchhiker' and its sequels, William Bascom's 'Four Functions of Folklore' and Alan Dundes 'The Psychology of Legend'" (1991, 190). This, Bennett argues, has constricted most scholarly explorations of present-day legend. Thus, she concludes, "if therefore 'disquieting questions' are now at last being raised, it is good news" (1991, 190).

Certainly, what Bennett and others in the Perspectives group have been attempting to address is that there are certain features of contemporary legends which are distinct to contemporary society. Smith suggests, for example, that what makes these narratives complex is that they are by nature so diverse in terms of "the social and physical contexts of their performance, in their range of presentational forms,
and in terms of the varieties of functions associated with both the narrative per se and with the presentational form" (Smith 1989, 96). All too often, however, studies simply fall short of the mark, focusing on descriptions of individual elements rather than grappling with the milieu which creates this diversity.

According to Fine, investigations of contemporary legend should actually be done through a more global model of interconnection which looks at such factors as the "social structure," "personal imperatives," "situated dynamics," and "narrative content" (1992, 5). Certainly, Fine's model provides an overall macro-framework in which to situate specific legend studies. However, any one examination could take into consideration hundreds of variables which have cause and effect relationships on the existence of any one narrative tradition.

Perhaps more importantly for this study, Smith suggests contemporary legends need to be explored as "parts of a cultural complex which includes both synchronic and diachronic perspective" (1991, 126). He proposes that one way to untangle the complex relations between contemporary legend and popular culture is to specifically document, trace and examine what kind of exchanges and transformations are taking place and the beliefs which affect such interactions (Smith 1991, 148) and this is the approach I have elected to adopt.
Summary

This study took place between 1988 and 1992 and includes both texts and contextual information collected from the public sector, institutional, blue collar and other office environments. Additional contextual information was derived from open-ended interviews and scholarly and special-interest publications.

Out of a data-base of 400 texts a total of 204 texts pertain specifically to the Craig Shergold appeal. This data itself is largely of accounts of the appeal disseminated through the media, and by way of circulated materials (FAXes, photocopies, chain letters) and computer network correspondence.

Folklorists have most often considered legendary materials from within the context of a pre-ordained framework, linking these narratives to an historical past. Recently, however, they have begun to investigate the relationship "contemporary" legends in terms of today's context. As such they have been led to investigate the impact of contemporary society, products, events and situations on legend formation, content, presentational form and dissemination. What has been gleaned out of these examinations is that contemporary legends tend to be situated in the recent or at least near-past. They tend to be credible and to encompass certain truths and, in certain circumstances, reality itself induces and nurtures the growth of particular beliefs associated with legends.

The existence of these legends in the media, and the fact that they are often disseminated through office technology, indicates that these narratives can never be too far removed from actual events or happenings, and that separating reality from
legend is not always possible. Moreover, contemporary legends are extremely complex in terms of the diversity of contexts for performance, presentational forms, and functions. Therefore, while the narrative content of contemporary legends can to a certain extent be examined on the global level of inter-relationships and connections to society, it is perhaps more advantageous to document the specific exchanges and transformations and interactions occurring between these narratives and present society itself. Within this context, the theoretical perspectives and approaches presented in this chapter provide the basis for the ensuing study of the Dying Child’s Wish complex of stories, beliefs and practices.
Chapter 3 - DYING CHILD'S WISH APPEALS AND RELATED PHENOMENA

Introduction

The Dying Child's Wish tradition consists of a series of real and legendary accounts of appeals by, and for, dying children seeking a world record for their personal collections of get-well cards, business-cards, postcards, hats, and other such items. As the stories concerning real efforts become entwined with legendary examples, an intricate network of narratives, beliefs and practices emerges—all connected to the Dying Child central theme.

While folklorists have most persistently treated and categorized this material as a contemporary legend, with antecedents traceable to the beginnings of the 1980s and possibly back into the nineteenth century, (London Illustrated News 18 May 1850; (Brunvand 1989b, 227-232), it is difficult to draw a clear line between any historical precursors and present-day appeals if for no other reason than the limitations of available documentation.

Regardless of the historical status of the Dying Child's Wish complex of narratives, beliefs and related practices, it is more likely the case that other factors situated within present-day society have provided the basis for the growth and continuation such appeals. Having said that, folklorists have done little to explore those factors which might possibly have acted as catalysts for the emergence of real appeals and the concurrent generation of legendary affiliates. For example, there are currently many formal organizations mandated to help terminally ill children and
many informal reinforcing activities which give credence and vitality to appeals from
dying children, real or legendary. There are also analogous fund-raising undertakings
sponsored by both the media and informal community efforts—the purpose of which
is to provide assistance to sick children and their families.

As this chapter will illustrate, the so-called Dying Child’s Wish contemporary
legend is based both in tradition and reality and is influenced by at least four primary
factors: (i) the existence since 1960, of real appeals for terminally ill children (ii) the
launching since 1987, of appeals for world records by the families of four terminally
ill children; (iii) historical antecedents in legend; and (iv) the existence of both
institutional efforts and spontaneous community endeavours which in turn provide
established cultural practices and role models.

Actual Appeals 1960-1990

The earliest available documentation of an actual appeal for a terminally ill
child dates back to 1960 when a request was launched for Doris Ridgeway. In this
instance, although the appeal was widely disseminated, it did not involve a world
record, just a request for cards.

Following this, between 1987 and 1990, four terminally ill children, Mario
Morby (1987), Craig Shergold (1989), Jarrod Booth (1989), and Blaine Granger
(1990), all launched appeals for world records. At least one of these appeals is active
today. The following is a brief chronological history of these appeals.
Little Doris

The earliest example of an actual appeal to help a despairing child occurred in 1960 when Walter Loebl, an avid stamp collector in Roanoke, Virginia, in the United States, heard of a girl, aged nine, by the name of Doris Ridgeway who was terminally ill with bone cancer and who liked to collect cards. The child was from a poor family, her father having deserted her mother. Loebl decided to help the child by publishing a request in a local newspaper, for people to send Christmas cards to the child (Interview, Walter Loebl 3 Apr. 1992).

According to Loebl, who later documented the event in American Philatelist: The Journal of the American Philatelic Society, the request instantly caught the interest of the community. Sometime in December 1960, Loebl’s appeal was broadcast on a radio station in West Virginia. This request was in turn picked up by Allegany Airlines and transmitted by teletype to other airlines throughout the world.

The teletype dispatch went as follows:

A small girl is dying of bone cancer. She has expressed her last wish that she receive Christmas cards, lots of them. Her name is Doris Ridgeway Route 1, Hardy, Va. Take five minutes of your time and send her a card. Please make her last Christmas a happy one (Loebl 1982, 1075).

This message was picked up and relayed to air force bases in the far east and was subsequently printed in the Pacific Stars and Stripes. The response was enormous and the child received over 600,000 Christmas cards from well-wishers throughout the world. The Post Office at Hardy, Virginia was overwhelmed with bags and bags
of mail for Little Doris:

Some organizations sent telegrams - thousands of telegrams - signed by the people who contributed the cost. Others sent dolls, and many wrote letters. The great majority sent Christmas cards: gay Christmas cards, cheerful cards, cards with snowy scenes, cards with holy scenes, cards with the infant Jesus. Others sent Christmas cards showing the area from which they came, or reindeer, but all of them had messages of love and good cheer for the little girl. Some were simply signed, "Your Little Friend." Some others were signed, "We Children," or poignantly, "Parents of a Little Boy No Longer with Us" (Loeb 1982, 1706).

According to Loeb, Little Doris did not die. Although she never fully recovered from her illness, as late as 1982 she was living in the Virginia area (1982, 1139).

The Doris Ridgeway case is the first documented account of a real appeal for a terminally ill child and one which involves requests similar to those most often associated with the current appeals for world records.

Mario Morby and David

In September 1987, the family of twelve-year-old Mario Morby, from Sutton Coldfield, England, who was terminally ill with leukaemia, initiated an appeal in an attempt to be listed in The Guinness Book of Records for having collected the most postcards in the world. According to Mrs. Morby, the idea came from someone at the children's hospital in Birmingham where Mario was receiving treatment:

Somebody rang him up and asked him if he would like to start collecting them [postcards] you know to get himself into The Guinness Book of Records... They said we only need 25,000. So we thought that's not too bad, so we thought--it's not 25,000, we've had three million (Anna Morby, 29 Nov. 1988-Tape 2).
The Mario Morby case received considerable media attention and the community response to Mario’s request was so intense that by 17 December 1987 he had collected 147,000 cards—enough to gain a place in *The Guinness Book of Records*. Delighted with their success, the Morbys attempted to call off the appeal, but to no avail. Mail continued to come from everywhere and two months later Mario had received over one million cards. As Mrs. Morby observed, the family was inundated:

Guinness met him [Mario] last December 17th...so that was fine, and he [Mario] said on the television we didn’t want any more postcards because he already reached the number. After a while it cooled off [and] with no cards we had peace. All of a sudden the sacks started arriving: 67, 70, 75! We had 347 sacks...after this January we’ve still had some more postcards coming, loads and loads of them. We had a million. So we got in touch with Guinness [Publishing] and they put one million two hundred thousand [on the certificate]. Oh God, it did take over our lives (Anna Morby, 29 Nov. 1988—Tape 2).

Early in 1988, Mario received his official certificate from Guinness Publishing, and he was subsequently listed in both the 1989 and the 1990 editions of *The Guinness Book of Records* for having collected 1,000,265 postcards (1989, 159; 1990, 191). Even this, however, did not stop the cards coming as unofficial requests for cards for Mario were still circulating. According to Donald McFarlane, editor of *The Guinness Book of Records*, despite repeated attempts to inform the public that Mario’s appeal was over, and that this particular Collections category was now closed, well into 1990, the Morby family continued to receive postcards from well-wishers (*Intelligencer Journal* 20 June 1990: A6; *The Guinness Book of Records* 1990, 191). Perhaps, not surprisingly, as outdated unofficial appeals were
disseminated, and as the information contained in them became more and more

distorted, new variants of the Mario appeal emerged:

There is a seven-year-old boy named David who lives in England. He is
dying. He would like to get into The Guinness Book of World
Records for being the person who has received the most postcards.
If any one of your readers would like to help make David's dream
come true, they can send him a postcard at the following address:
David, c/o Miss M. C. Williams, St. Martin DePorres Infantry School,
Pastoreways, Luton, Bedfordshire, England. One person can make a
difference—if enough people care! Another candle in St. John's

According to Mrs. Morby, this particular David variant (there are others) was
the result of a simple blunder in the use of names by Mrs. Williams, a school teacher
living in nearby Bedfordshire. When Mrs. Williams learned of Mario's request in
the local newspaper, she was so moved that she decided to help. However, in
sending out her request from the school, she somehow confused the child's name with
that of his father, David:

You see [Mrs. Williams] got their names mixed up. David is his
Dad's name and they got mixed up and the head mistress [Mrs.
Williams] she's got a brother lives up our end and he edited it from
the local paper and happened to mention it to her. So she probably
told the children at the school to collect cards for him you know--so
that’s, that’s how Mrs. Williams had to know about it. And then
somebody signed their signature saying the boy’s little David and he's
7 and he's got between one week to a month to live. [We placed] all
sorts of stories you know, in the papers, saying David is Mario and
Mario is not 7. He's 12. He isn't dead, he isn't dying; so it wasn't
really very pleasant to tell you the truth (Anna Morby, 29 Nov. 1988-
Tape 2).

By middle of 1988, the David version of the Morby appeal had migrated across the
Atlantic and caring individuals from across Canada and the United States began to
respond to the story.
By 15 December 1988, a full year after Mario had achieved his record, Canadians had started sending cards to another David appeal—this time he was supposed to be living in Florida. Donna-Lin Stringer of the Park City Daily News Bowling Green, Kentucky, reported that "News of a dying boy named David, whose last wish was a spot in the "Guinness Book of World Records" for receiving the most Christmas cards raced through Bowling Green...But apparently there is no 'David'" (Stringer 15 Dec. 1988: 1). Stringer also added that Frances Keefe, founder of the Child's Wish Come True organization, based in Spring Hill, Florida had decided to help Mario. Keefe claimed that she had changed Mario's name to David in response to the parents request for anonymity but, according to Stringer, this was denied by the parents (15 Dec. 1988: 1).

The Florida "David" version of the appeal quickly took on a life of its own. For example, on 26 November 1988, The Columbus Dispatch reported that residents of Harrison, Ohio, were participating in a drive to help David - no mention being made of Mario:

About 2500 students and workers in this southwestern Ohio's community school system showed a thanksgiving school spirit by sending postcards to a boy reported to be dying of leukaemia...His cause was publicized by Florida Child's Wish Come True, a Spring Hills Fla. organization that tries to arrange special favours for children suffering from catastrophic diseases" (26 Nov. 1988: 2B).

Throughout 1988 and 1989, both the Morby family and the British Post Office, via the media, continued to advise the public that the appeal had ended. Jeff Collins, producer of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation radio program Eye
Opener, when preparing to interview David Winters, press officer for the British Post Office, prefaced the interview by saying:

An urban legend from England has landed in Canada and is waiting to suck you in. In the latest edition of Grand and Toys Internal newsletter, there appears a note from the hospital chaplain at Toronto Grace Hospital. It asks employees of the company to send postcards to a little boy dying of cancer in England…We checked out the story and found out the truth. There is a boy, named Mario and two years ago he did ask for postcards and he was suffering from leukaemia. But now he is in remission, has more than enough postcards, and he and his parents don’t want any more. They have asked the Post Office in Britain to stop delivering them. The royal mail used to send trucks to this kids (sic) house…If you want to pursue it as an urban myth with this guest feel free, but don’t believe it the way it is written (24 Nov. 1988: item 1624).

The media also attempted to clarify the misinformation contained in these unofficial appeals—although this often led to further confusion. For example, reporter Linda Barnard with the Toronto Sunday Sun told readers that the David appeal in Great Britain was a hoax, while the appeal for David in Florida was for real:

Folks here are responding in a big way to the request for mail to a dying Florida boy named David…Unlike a similar case with a terminally ill boy in Great Britain who asked for postcards last year, David really does exist. The British boy was a phony (4 Dec. 1988: n.d.).

Notwithstanding, as misinformed unofficial appeals for David continued to filter through to the public, newer and newer variants of the Morby appeal were created, and whole communities sent cards and other items to non-existent addresses for non-existent children in Florida and England.
Significantly, the establishment of Mario's 1987 Guinness record created both a precedent for the record books and a model for at least three other terminally-ill children to launch appeals.

Craig Shergold

On 24 September 1989, the family of terminally-ill Craig Shergold of Carshalton, Surrey, England, age 10 and suffering from cancerous tumours on the brain and spine, initiated a campaign to collect get-well cards (Hazelton-Standard-Speaker 22 Nov. 1989: 10). In launching the appeal, the Shergolds aimed to have Craig break Mario Morby's 1987 record of 1,265,000 and which had been published in the 1989 edition of The Guinness Book of Records (Singleton 5 Oct. 1989: 5; The Guinness Book of Records 1989, 151).

The appeal was an overnight success and, soon after the campaign started, two local newspapers, the Croydon News and Property News and the Croydon Post, became official sponsors (Singleton 5 Oct. 1989: 5; Croydon Post 4 Oct. 1989: 10). By early October many businesses in the Carshalton and Croydon area had sent out Help Craig appeals—many of which were distributed to associates in other countries via FAX messages (South China Sunday Morning Post 19 Nov. 1989: 3).

As the drive gained momentum and popularity, the London office of the Children's Wish Foundation International, which funds wishes for terminally-ill children, also spread word of the appeal to its parent organization in the United States (People Weekly 10 June 1991: 63-66). Cards flooded in and Mrs. Shergold
commented to one reporter how grateful the family was for all the support, noting "the cards and messages we have been receiving are such an inspiration" (Croydon Post 4 Oct. 1989: 10).

Throughout October 1989 interest in Craig's appeal continued to soar and by 16 November 1989 it was reported that he had easily broken Mario's record. Guinness Publishing subsequently announced that Craig would be listed in their upcoming [1991] record book for having collected 1,266,000 cards (Croydon News and Property News 16 Nov. 1989: n.pg).

On 22 November 1989, family and friends jubilantly celebrated Craig's victory, Mrs. Shergold expressed her gratitude to all who had participated, and "appealed for well-wishers to now stop sending cards" (Croydon Post 22 Nov. 1989: np.). As was previously pointed out in the case of Mario Morby, the family quickly learned how difficult it is to stem the flow once an appeal has been started. As happened in the Morby case, misinformed appeals for Craig continued to stay in circulation long after the actual appeal had terminated. At the same time, the circulating information became increasingly distorted and varying from the facts of the appeal.

By the middle of 1990, as so many thousands of individuals had continued to respond to fresh appeals, Guinness Publishing was eventually compelled to list Craig in the 1991 record book for having received 16,250,692 get-well cards collected (1991, 188). This figure was later revised a second time for its 1993 book, as by the end of 1990 Craig had received 33,000,000 cards (The Guinness Book of Records
1991, 188 (1993: 552). Furthermore, by 1991, in addition to the millions of get-well cards Craig received, he had also begun to receive thousands of business-cards—all resulting from a renegade request which had rapidly circulated across the world via newspapers, Faxes and chain letters.

As late as March 1993 the total number of cards had skyrocketed to an unbelievable 100,000,000, and Craig’s father was extremely frustrated at not being able to halt the flow (Alford Croydon Advertiser 26 Mar. 1:93: 13). Well into 1993, totally unaware that Craig’s appeal terminated several years ago, hundreds of well-wishers continue to respond to this appeal (The Boston Globe 15 January 1993: 46). For an expanded overview of the Shergold appeal, see Chapter Four.

Jarrod Booth

On 8 November 1989, just as the Shergold appeal was gaining momentum, the family of terminally-ill eight-year-old Jarrod Booth of Salt Springs, British Columbia, Canada, who was suffering from cancerous brain tumours, started an appeal to collect the most Christmas cards—again aiming for a Collections world record. His parents contrived the idea with a friend who had copies of British newspaper articles on the Shergold campaign (Cindy Booth, 9 Jan. 1990 - Tape 4). Although Jarrod’s appeal received considerably less publicity than that of Craig Shergold, word of his request rapidly travelled across Canada via the media. For example, on 3 January 1990 the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation radio station in St. John’s, Newfoundland carried the following item on the eight A.M. news:
Officials with *The Guinness Book of Records* are interested in a British Columbia boy. Eight-year-old Jarrod Booth wants the record for receiving the most Christmas cards. Currently such a record does not exist. The Salt Spring Island boy has received about 200,000 cards including ones from Indonesia and Japan. He is suffering from a cancerous brain tumour (Field-notes, Bill Bowen 3 Jan. 1990).

As with the Morby and Shergold appeals described earlier, community response to Jarrod's request was instantaneous. According to Jarrod's mother, Cindy Booth, the local Driftwood Post Office offered to act as a clearing house for the project and set up a post-box for the boy. Soon thereafter cards started arriving at up to 50,000 a day (Cindy Booth, 9 Jan. 1990-Tape 4).

By late January, the Booths were already making travel plans so that Jarrod could go to England and present, in person, Guinness Publishing with his application for a world record:

Well, we're planning to go around the end of February. Right now we're just trying to get the money together to go. We want to all fly over there and present Guinness with the record or the application or whatever, in person...apparently English T.V. want to cover Jarrod and Craig on a talk show or something together (Cindy Booth, 9 Jan. 1990-Tape 4).

However, Guinness Publishing appeared to be somewhat hesitant about considering Jarrod's record:

Basically our only frustration right now is with Guinness. They don't really want to give Jarrod the record for whatever reason...we're just trying to get in contact with them now. We've written them to try and find out why they don't want to enter his category, because it is a valid category. We're just wondering why they don't want to use it. He hasn't beat any records because there isn't a record for this, he's setting a new record (Cindy Booth, 9 Jan. 1990-Tape 4).
Several British Columbia reporters who were following Jarrod’s story took it upon themselves to explore why Guinness Publishing was so reluctant. According to Jody Patterson of the Victoria Times Colonist, who had close links with the Booth family, Guinness didn’t want anything to do with the Jarrod appeal at all because the collections category for postcards in the record book was officially closed.

Guinness Publishing also seemed reluctant to talk to the press about the matter, partly because it had recently been criticized in the media as a result of its initial refusal to endorse the Shergold appeal. Guinness Publishing uncomfortably explained that it was still experiencing considerable difficulty halting ongoing postcard requests stemming from an earlier erroneous appeal—the 1982-1983 Little Buddy hoax. Guinness was also fearful from its experience with the Morby campaign that once such appeals were initiated they would be impossible to stop—the Booth appeal was viewed as yet another precedent for what now appeared to be a trend of card collecting by terminally-ill children (Field-notes, Jody Patterson, 4 Jan. 1990). The Booths maintained that Jarrod’s card collecting had nothing to do with previous records as he was collecting Christmas cards and, as no other record for this category existed, there would not be a conflict. As had happened in the Shergold case, the media rallied behind Jarrod and encouraged residents of British Columbia to apply pressure, through an onslaught of phone calls, to Guinness Publishing in an attempt to make them reconsider Jarrod’s record:

...they [Guinness Publishing] told Jarrod that they wouldn’t entertain his record and all of a sudden there was this media blitz. The fellow on the radio in Victoria we met once was asking listeners every 15 minutes to write to Guinness and protest their rejection of Jarrod’s
record...I thought that was just wild, we didn't even know [about it]. A reporter phoned me up and said "Oh, I hear that they're not going to take Jarrod's record," it's all over the airwaves. I didn't even know about it and I went "What"! The media just took it upon themselves to ask people to write Guinness. They said "hey, this isn't fair"--some of the media people have been just fabulous (Cindy Booth, 9 Jan. 1990-Tape 4).

On 19 February 1990, Eric and Cindy Booth calculated that Jarrod had reached his goal and attempted to officially stop the campaign (Cindy and Eric Booth, 12 Nov. 1990-Tape 8). Having recently acknowledged Craig Shergold's record, Guinness Publishing announced, reluctantly, that it would also accept Jarrod's record and later that month the Booths went over to England where Jarrod proudly received his official certificate (Windsor Star 28 Feb. 1990: D12).

Three days after the Booth family returned home from England, Jarrod went into hospital for major surgery and on 12 September 1990, seven months after obtaining his record, Jarrod passed away (Field-notes, Cindy and Eric Booth, 12 Nov. 1990). Jarrod Booth's record for having collected 205,120 Christmas cards appears in both the 1991 and 1992 editions of The Guinness Book of Records.

Blaine Granger

Sometime during 1990, as appeals for Mario, Craig and Jarrod were circulating around the world, ten-year-old leukaemia victim, Blaine Granger of Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, decided to initiate a campaign to obtain a Guinness record for having collected the most hats. His father had been collecting hats for some ten to eleven years. One winter, Bernie took his son Blaine to a hockey game,
and, as Blaine had lost most of his hair resulting from the radiation treatments he was receiving, his father bought him a Winnipeg Jets hat to cover his bald head. The hat collecting idea evolved from there—with Bernie giving Blaine his own collection of 300 or so hats to start with (Bernie and Del Granger, 2 July 1991-Tapes 9a&b).

During 1990, Blaine's father helped him increase the hat collection by contacting companies to see if they would make a contribution. Bernie ran into considerable difficulty with people who did not believe his son's story. However, at one point, a receptionist suggested that he write to Gordon Sinclair Jr. of the Winnipeg Free Press. Sinclair in turn published the following letter:

The reason I'm writing is I've had a cap collection now for about 10 years now (about 300 total). Blaine started collecting caps when he first got cancer. He now has about 350 caps. But I want more for him, and I really don't know what to do—other than keep trying to phone all the different companies. That takes a lot of time and people really don't know if we're kidding...When I phoned one company the receptionist said to write you and you might have some ideas on how to expand our collection (which is all going to be Blaine's some day) (Sinclair, 4 Dec. 1990: 3).

Sinclair, who had already attempted to quell continuing appeals to help Craig Shergold, quickly communicated to his readers that they should put their efforts into helping Blaine, instead of Craig, acquire a world record (Bernie and Del Granger, 2 July 1991-Tapes 9a&b):

Every week I get the same question from a different caller "Our company just got a FAX about a little boy in England who..." and before they can finish their query I give them both answers. Yes, Craig Shergold is a real little English boy who really has cancer. No he doesn't want anymore mail. So...DON'T send Craig Shergold any more mail. Don't FAX the chain letter you received appealing for your company to make 10 copies and pass them on. His stack of get-well wishes has already done what it was supposed to do: Land him
in the Guinness Book of World Records. And he doesn’t want any more. However...At the risk of starting something that could get even more out of hand, I’ve begun telling the company secretaries who phone about Craig Shergold that there is something that they can do for another little boy who lives right here in Winnipeg (Sinclair, 4 Dec. 1990: 3).

Sinclair’s appeal brought an instant response and over 700 hats were dropped off on the first day (Interview Del and Bernie Granger, 2 July 1991-Tape 9a).

Despite his father’s efforts, Blaine’s appeal was never formalized and he never requested to be considered for a world record. It appears that much of the community interest in the project was casually generated through media attention and as a result of the efforts of organizations such as the Children’s Wish Foundation.

For example, in 1990 when the Granger family went on a fishing trip sponsored by the Manitoba chapter of the Children’s Wish Foundation, someone learned that Blaine was interested in collecting hats and an appeal was sent out over a Thunder Bay radio station (Field-notes, Bernie and Del Granger 2 July, 1990). Similarly, the Children’s Wish Foundation newsletter Wishmaker, which carried an article on Blaine’s fishing trip, also made reference to his hat collection:

Blaine is a nine-year-old fishing enthusiast and a great admirer of Bob Izumi, from The Real Fishing Show. You can imagine his delight when he got invited to participate in one of the show segments in Thunder Bay...Meanwhile, Blaine continues to be enthusiastic about another activity; he has an ever growing collection of caps. While in Thunder Bay, many people contributed caps to Blaine. He is hoping to collect enough caps to be entered into the Guinness Book of World Records. Caps off to Blaine (Wishmaker Jan. 1991, 1).

By early 1991, contributions had arrived from every province in Canada, and from several locations in the United States, Europe and the Middle East, and the
Grangers proudly started displaying the collection in their basement. As more hats poured in, both the Cable News Network (C.N.N) and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (C.B.C.) television picked up the story. As a result of the coverage, by February 1991 Blaine’s collection had risen to 6,500 hats (Sinclair, 8 Feb. 1991: 3). From the ensuing publicity, Blaine also had an opportunity to meet the then President of the United States, George Bush (Field-notes, Bernie and Del Granger 2 July 1991).

During the summer of 1991 I visited the Grangers, by which time the collection had grown to 10,000 hats. Several times I broached the possibility of their son acquiring a world record but it did not seem to be of particular importance to them (Bernie and Del Granger, 2 July 1991-Tape 9a). For example, Bernie Granger indicated that the activity of collecting the hats had actually been time consuming, and that, if the appeal were to continue, they would need some help (Field-notes, Bernie and Del Granger 2 July 1991).

It was apparent during this visit that the hat collection and collecting hats have played an important role, in building up the hopes and morale of Blaine and his parents, and so, have helped the family a great deal. In fact, the process of working with the collection has been therapeutic for them and has provided a necessary diversion to the daily problem of coping with a sick child with a life-threatening illness. As Del and Bernie pointed to various hats Blaine had received, including several from United States squadrons involved in the 1991 Desert Storm operation,
and two worn during the 1990 Mohawk uprising in Quebec, Canada, they took

noticeable personal pleasure from the collection:

His [Blaine's] lungs are only working at about 50 percent. If it [collecting hats] keeps him smiling, keeps him feeling good, then, when something starts happening with the lungs, if he gets a cold - one of the first things comes to our mind is pneumonia. With his lungs so weak, he gets the hats and they make him smile, they make him feel good. He gets a cold, well, we know the hats are still coming in. So when the hats come in, even if he's in hospital, we'll take 'em off to the hospital. He'll open up [the packages] there and we'll read the letters or he'll read the letters, or whatever, and it keeps him wanting to go on you know. Like, he was at the point that mom and dad [Del and Bernie] cared if he lived and died, nobody else did... Now, with all these hats coming in from all over the world, it has proved to him that a lot of people don't want to see him die (Bernie and Del Granger 2 July 1991-Tape 9b).

As of December 1992, the Grangers and their son were still collecting hats (Field-notes, Grace Thomspn 3 Dec. 1992). Although the notion of a Guinness record continues to be discussed, the idea appears to be less important than the activity and benefits of collecting itself.

Antecedents In Legend: 1850-1987

In addition to the actual appeals undertaken by the Morbys, Shergolds, Booths and Grangers, there is considerable evidence to attest to an earlier tradition of collecting activities which are specifically for the purposes of helping a despairing individual. These have been referred to as legendary appeals, as it is unclear whether these individuals existed or if the appeals themselves were actually real.
One Million Postage Stamps

One of the earliest examples is to be found in the 18 May 1850 edition of the Illustrated London News:

EXTRAORDINARY POSTAGE STAMPS CONTRIBUTION
Some time since, there appeared in the public journals a statement to the effect that a certain young lady under age, was to be placed in a convent, by her father, if she did not procure, before the 30th of April last, one million of used postage stamps. This caused numerous persons to forward stamps for the purpose of procuring her liberty. In March last, a lady, a member of one of the first families in Derbyshire, residing not many miles from Derby, mentioned the conditions to her friends, and in a short time the lady began to receive packages by post and railway from every quarter, which poured in such numbers that, in ten days during last April, she received parcels containing millions of stamps. The walking postman who was in the habit of delivering a few letters daily at the mansion where the lady resides, became so loaded with letters and packages containing the Queen's heads, that it was necessary to employ another man to assist him. On one morning between ninety and one hundred letters and packages arrived by post, and on another between 120 and 130. These were in addition to multitudes which arrived on other days. Boxes, bales and packages also poured in by railway; and to such an extent that it became necessary to give public notice, by advertisements and printed circulars, that it was urgently desired no more stamps should be sent, as the young lady had procured the number she required (18 May: 349).

In this instance, an under-age child, doomed to a tragic fate, could only be saved by the procurement of one million postage stamps and public response was required to help the child reach this goal.

Alms for the poor

Another early example in which postage stamps were used to help individuals in need is cited in the British journal Notes and Queries:
Some thought the Post Office authorities would pay something for a million; others said that poor people, &c., could be got into hospitals, almshouses, &c. by collecting a certain number of used stamps (Sawyer 1883 Nov.3: 355).

Again, in this instance, it is suggested that individuals in desperate need had to acquire one million of postage stamps in order to obtain relief from their despairing situation.

Billy

In 1916 in Chicago, Illinois, a similar appeal, in the form of a chain letter, was used to raise money for a supposedly infirm elderly rail-road man by the name of Billy:

Dear Sir:

...This chain is started for the purpose of raising a fund to assist an old rail-road man, Mr. W.D. Westbury, who is down and out on account of a long siege of illness. He can never get-well and having only one arm, a widowed mother, and no means of support, we will assist him in this way, and if all will respond (under the circumstances they surely will) a sufficient fund will be raised to make "Billy" comfortable while he is with us.

Please make five copies of this letter, as I have done, only changing the date and put the next highest number and date of each letter the same sign your name and mail the five copies to your friends, whom you will do likewise...(Duncan 1975, 53)

Again public response was required to help a person in need.

Little Buddy

The Little Buddy Appeal came from Paisley, Scotland, and was current in the early 1980s. According to the British Post Office, mail addressed to Little Buddy started to arrive in Paisley sometime in 1982 (Folklore Round Table 6 (1988), 15-
16). The Sunday Post notes that sometime during this period a Paisley citizen-band (C.B.) radio enthusiast named Cameron Black picked up a call on the airwaves, from the Alloa, Scotland area, from a young boy with the code name Little Buddy, who wanted to collect more call-cards than any other C.B. operator in the world. Call cards are more commonly known among short-wave and citizen-band radio operators as Q.S.L. Verification Cards and are frequently exchanged and collected by individuals as a means of authenticating the number of countries they have contacted through particular radio frequencies (Field-notes, Art Rockwood, Dec. 27 1993).

Wanting to help the child, Black organized a campaign to have mail sent to Little Buddy, P.O. Box 76, Paisley, Renfrewshire. Black’s call for help spread quickly amongst C.B. operators around the world and cards started to arrive from as far away as South Africa, and New Zealand—probably one of the most surprising being from the then president of the United States, Ronald Reagan (Sunday Post 5 June 1983: 1).

Despite the numerous contributions to the campaign, no-one was ever able to locate Little Buddy and the police, Post Office, and eventually Mr. Black declared the whole thing was probably a great hoax. Consequently, in June 1983, the Post Office took action to close the appeal. Hoping to quell the onslaught of letters for the non-existent child, the British Post Office sent out a standard circular in response to all enquirers:

Dear:
Thank you for your letter of—regarding items of correspondence addressed to "Little Buddy" PO Box 76, Paisley, Renfrewshire. Some time ago such an appeal was made. The response exceeded the
organizers' expectations and the appeal was closed in June, 1983. The organizers, whilst expressing their appreciation to all respondents, made it very clear through the media that they were unable to accept further donations. Since that time correspondence coming to hand has received normal Returned Letter Branch treatment. To our knowledge it was never established that the original appeal was a hoax. However, I must emphasize that the appeal is now closed. I trust that this information will be of assistance.

Yours faithfully
{copy unsigned}
for Head Postmaster (Folklore Roundtable 1988 6: 15-16).

Although the Post Office had officially closed the appeal, cards for Little Buddy continued to come in from all parts of the world well into the late 1980s (Globe and Mail 4 July 1987: A8). In fact, as late as 1988, individuals and groups in North America were still responding to this appeal. For example, on 12 March 1987, the Hazelton-Standard-Speaker relayed the story of how residents of Lehigh Valley, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, had been drawn in by the hoax:

Jane Pulley of Bethlehem heard about the legendary "Little Buddy" from a Lehigh bank employee whose child, a pupil at William Penn school brought home a copy of the school newspaper which included an appeal for more postcards. Pulley offered to ship her postcard collection of more than 800 cards to the little boy.

She'd spent most of her life gathering the cards, but was willing to part with them to help Buddy reach his Guinness world record. The entire school had been collecting for a month to help "Little Buddy" and Jane Pulley herself offered her own personal collection of 800 cards to the cause (12 Mar.: 8).

According to the Hazelton Standard-Speaker, Bob Levy of the Washington Post, had initially carried the story in May--only to find out later that the story was a hoax (12 Mar. 1987. 8).

The Little Buddy story had also spread to Canada and on 4 July 1987 the Globe and Mail carried an item entitled "No Little Buddy Here So Please Don't
Write." The appeal came directly from the Postal Service in Glasgow and was an attempt to stem the flow of mail for Little Buddy coming from Canada (4 July 1988: A8).

Despite the British Post Office's efforts to silence the story, word was still circulating about the appeal, even in England, and in 1988 the Post Office's own publication the Stamp Bug News, was caught circulating the request:

An 8-year-old boy is dying of cancer and wants to be in the Guinness Book of Records for the most postcards. Please send him one everybody. Little Buddy, P.O. Box 76, Paisley, Renfrewshire (49:1).

In a subsequent 1988 issue of Stamp Bug News a brief retraction appeared, "There is no such person so please don't send any more stamps" (50:2).

Paul

While the Little Buddy appeal was going on, it appears that other supposed appeals were circulating elsewhere. A reporter from The Guardian noted "another non-existent boy. Paul, who wanted greeting cards, had a short lived flirtation with the kindness of the British Public" (Dear Mr. Thoms 1988 7:11).

The Yorkshire Evening Post attempted to link the Paul appeals incident to Little Buddy--suggesting that Paul was the name of the citizen-band radio fanatic who used the code sign of Little Buddy (12 Aug. 1983). However, as Sandy Hobbs has pointed out in the Folklore Round Table, the name Little Buddy is a popular term used in the West of Scotland to refer to any inhabitant of Paisley (1988 6:16).
Colin

In the months following the incident in Paisley, at least one other supposed appeal surfaced in England. On 12 August 1983, John Wellington of the Yorkshire Evening Post reported an appeal which was circulating in Yorkshire for a child by the name of Colin who was purported to be a victim of terminal cancer and who wanted to get into The Guinness Book of Records by receiving a record number of get-well cards (12 Aug. 1983: 9).

Wellington concluded that there was an affinity between this appeal and the Little Buddy case, noting "The great 'get-well' card hoax in Yorkshire--with thousands of cards sent to Colin, the boy cancer patient who did not exist--is likely to have been copied from a similar hoax in Scotland last year" (12 Aug. 1983).

The Yorkshire Evening Post later noted that, despite their inquiries to verify the story, no-one could prove that the child Colin existed:

Last week the Yorkshire Evening Post exclusively revealed that thousands of kind-hearted Yorkshire people had been taken in by a story that a seven-year-old boy called Colin, a victim of terminal cancer wanted to get into the Guinness Book of Records by receiving a record number of get-well cards. Our extensive enquiries showed that no-one knew if the boy existed and thousands of cards were passing down a long line of well-wishers (16 Aug. 1983: 2).

By associating the legendary appeals for the non-existent Colin with that of the non-existent Little Buddy, Wellington, in effect, signalled the existence of some form of tradition.
Formal and Informal Reinforcing Activities

Gary Alan Fine suggests that social structure itself is an important variable which should be considered in the analysis of contemporary legends on the international, national and regional levels (1992, 2). To this extent, examination of institutional appeals, organized media appeals and community-based requests for aid, along with formal and legendary redemption schemes, shows that a number of models exist in society today--this perhaps accounts for why appeals for terminally-ill children are made, perpetuated, and responded to. All of these models provide reinforcement for Dying Child appeals and, a mechanism to aid and respond to such requests, while simultaneously legitimatizing such actions.

Institutional appeals

The activities of many formal institutions within contemporary society are designed to generate public awareness and sensitivity to appeals for terminally-ill children. The likelihood of individuals having contact with this dimension of our social structure is surprisingly high. Consequently, it should not be surprising that people would respond to any Dying Child’s Wish appeal--exactly because these requests personify the institutionally-sanctioned concept of helping terminally-ill children.

Examination of those social institutions mandated to help sick children shows that many role models exist to support and nurture causes such as a terminally-ill child’s appeal to achieve a world record. Certainly one of the characteristics of these
real appeals instigated by the Morbys, Shergolds and the like, and their legendary cousins, is that they closely resemble the primary goals of formal organised institutions mandated to aid terminally-ill children. This is not so surprising when we consider the number of formal organizations in the United States, Canada and Great Britain which have a specific mandate to grant a child a wish. The efforts of such organizations receive local, national and occasionally international publicity through media, and through newsletters generated by the organizations themselves.

In the United States alone, a plethora of organizations exists to provide wishes and hope for terminally-ill or impoverished children. For example, under the National Organizations of the United States, the Encyclopedia of Associations lists no less than twelve organizations whose mandate is to grant wishes to terminally-ill children. These are: A Special Wish Foundation; A Wish With Wings; Children’s Wish Foundation International; Dream Factory; Famous Fone Friends; Friends of Karen; Give Kids The World; Mail For Tots; Make A Wish Foundation of America; Starlight Foundation; Sunshine Foundation; and Toys For Tots (1992 ed.).

Many of these organizations, founded in the late 1970s or early 1980s, provide ready access to information about their services through either a toll free number, regular mail-outs to subscribers, or publicity through the media. Several of these organizations have hundreds of sub-membership chapters across the United States and sister associations in Canada and Great Britain. For example, the Children’s Wish Foundation International, founded in 1978, has branches in the United Kingdom and Canada (The Children’s Wish Foundation of Canada).
stated goal of the Childrens Wish Foundation International is to "fulfil the favourite wish of a terminally-ill child" (*Children's Wish Foundation History Aims and Scope* circa 1986) and the Canadian foundation, established in 1985, has a similar mandate:

> Our goal is to provide the once in a lifetime joy of having a wish come true, for a child suffering from a terminal illness. When we undertake to fulfil a child's wish, we attempt to provide a brief escape from the harsh realities of being afflicted with a terminal illness. We offer a positive distraction for both the child and the family... a little happiness (*The Children's Wish Foundation of Canada* brochure, ca. 1985)

Such organizations often have extensive networks throughout an entire country. For example, the Children's Wish Foundation of Canada has ten provincial chapters, each with its own sub-chapters and over 1,000 volunteers are involved with the organization's daily operational activities across the country (Field-notes, Laura Cole, 19 Aug. 1993). There are, in addition, thousands of other volunteers which support the organizations in its many fund-raising projects-- particularly in communities where sub-chapters have been set up.

In Newfoundland alone, there are fifteen Children's Wish Foundation sub-chapters located throughout the province with a community support base of several hundred and considerable financial backing (Field-notes, Derek Delouche, 18-19 March 1993). Often such organizations draw on corporate sponsorship, media, and community support. In fact, the local corporate sponsor of the provincial division of the Children's Wish Foundation in Newfoundland is a province-wide radio station VOCM, with its own charitable foundation, VOCM CARES (Derek Delouche, 21 August 1991-Tape 10).
It is often at the local community level that such activities as community networking and fund raising have the greatest effect. Individuals work with their friends and colleagues for the good of an organization and they draw extensively on contacts from both work and at home. High profile individuals known within the community sit on national, provincial and sub-chapter boards, where personal connections can be exercised to involve others. It is also through these networks that such organizations achieve the greatest profile, simply because individuals associate the strengths of particular projects with faces which are familiar.

Between 1985 and 1993, a total of 2,900 wishes were granted to terminally-ill children in Canada through the Children’s Wish Foundation (Field-notes, Laura Cole, 19 Aug. 1993). As indicated earlier in this chapter, both the Children’s Wish Foundation International and its sister organization the Children’s Wish Foundation of Canada provided direct assistance to many of the families of children who sought Guinness world records—therein providing institutional reinforcement for such activities.

Organised media appeals

The media often works in liaison with organizations in communities to promote and enhance local, national, and international projects such as media-sponsored events to help sick children.

When community fund-raising events take place, the media frequently become involved by enticing public support from their listening and viewing audience. One
such example is the highly successful Children’s Miracle Network Telethon which annually enlists the co-operation of superstars and the national and local media as well as thousands of hospital volunteers throughout Canada and the United States for a 24 hour blitz to raise funds for needy children in 160 children’s hospitals. Since its foundation in 1983 the organization has raised more than half a billion dollars for hospitals serving children. In 1992 alone this event raised $116,890,378 in North America. Out of this figure $24,049,895 million dollars was directly raised in Canada (Field-notes, Lori Young, 19 Aug 1993).

Intensive promotional effo.; and media attention ensure that such organizations as The Children’s Miracle Network stay highly visible within society and the collaborative efforts of the media and formal institutions create a well established and accepted social pattern of reaching out to help terminally-ill children.

Organized media appeals are not limited to North America. In England, for example, since at least 1962 the widely acclaimed children’s television program Blue Peter has actively sponsored appeals and community projects in the British Isles, and occasionally International Relief programs (Baxter and Barnes 1989, 232-235). Many of Blue Peter’s community campaigns require their young viewers to send envelopes of old stamps, postcards, old rags, silver, paper and foil for resale or recycling. The profits are then donated to various community projects.

Such examples serve to illustrate the extent of the media involvement in educating and empowering the general public to be able to respond to the plight of
others. Moreover, the visibility of such formalised appeals demonstrates by example that small gestures can be turned into great things.

Community based appeals

Within local communities, individuals frequently are motivated to respond to the needs of children or adults, and initiate local campaigns to solicit help on their behalf. In one such instance, an employee of a night-club in a shopping mall canvassed the local population by posting handwritten and photocopied requests in various locations throughout her place of work:

Liver Transplant
Darlene Brophy

From HolyRood
Age: 21
(1) Feb to Halifax to have a liver transplant. If anyone would like to give a donation of any amount to this real worthwhile cause it would be very much appreciated. Thank you

Please contact the Bank of Commerce Avalon Mall
This would be very much appreciated by her aunt Marian Costigan at the Strand Lounge (Costigan, Marian; Posted in Trans Canada Drugs, Avalon Mall Shopping Centre, 7 Jan. 1989).

Local initiatives such as this, provide additional reinforcement and legitimization for both real and legendary appeals for terminally-ill children.

Media reporting of community-based appeals

Local community efforts to aid children are also well documented. For example, the St. John’s Evening Telegram reported on a local six-year-old child by
the name of Angie Scott who was in need of a bone marrow transplant (30 July 1990: 11). The reporter noted that Angie had gone to the Children’s Hospital of Eastern Ontario and that "hundreds of people have pooled their efforts in recent months to help pay travel and related expenses for the family" (30 July 1990: 11).

Similarly the British tabloid The Sun offered its official support to the Shergold appeal and provided its readers with regular updates on Craig’s progress (10 Apr. 1990; 9 Feb. 1991; 7 Mar. 1991). Such efforts are not unusual; this tabloid newspaper regularly gives exposure to the plight of terminally-ill children. In 1989, for example, the caption "Parents Race Against Time to Send Dying Brothers to Disneyland" drew readers’ attention to the plight of two small children, noting that the "doomed boys have only short lives ahead of them; but their parents, caring friends and relatives want to make the memories sweet by raising money for a special dream vacation-to Disneyland" (31 Jan. 1989: 29).

The American tabloid the Weekly World News has similarly provided coverage and support for both the Morby and Shergold appeals (8 Nov. 1988; 21 Nov. 1989). This same tabloid often provides its readers with stories about the plight of other sick children in its highly popular column, Cindy’s Letters For Sick Kids (8 Nov. 1988; 21 Nov. 1989). One issue devoted a story to Linda Bremner who founded the organization Love Letters. Linda, who lost her son Andy to cancer in 1984, along with a team of volunteers established Love Letters, an organization which sends letters of encouragement to some 465 sick children (22 Sept 1988: 22).
Official redemption schemes

Impetus to respond to the needs of terminally-ill children is also reinforced by the existence of a multitude of formal redemption programs which require that individuals send back to the manufacturer some form of proof of purchase in exchange for money. For example, in St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada, many community groups encourage their volunteers, friends and family to collect and save all grocery purchase tapes from Sobeys' Stores. Every $300 worth of tapes can be redeemed at the store's head office in Nova Scotia for a cash exchange value of one dollar; this money is subsequently donated to schools, churches and community sports programs. Fine notes that the existence of legitimate product redemption programs dates back to at least the 1850s when Benjamin Talbot Babbitt marketed laundry soap by offering a coloured lithograph in exchange for 25 soap wrappers (1986, 209).

Knowledge of formal redemption programs frequently appears even when such schemes are not locally in use. For example, the St. John's Evening Telegram carried a photograph of three children in a Southbridge Massachusetts school collecting labels for Campbell's Soup—although this redemption program is not currently functioning in Canada (Evening Telegram 14 Jan. 1989: 27). Similarly, on at least one occasion in 1988, the Janeway Children's Hospital Ladies auxiliary in St. John's was led to believe that labels for Heinz baby food could be redeemed in Canada for money when, in fact, the program only applied to the United States (Daphne Maunder, September 29, 1988-'tape 1).
Throughout the past decades, various businesses have organised or sponsored product redemption programs for medical facilities such as hospital beds and for the purchase of kidney machines. Such programs have encouraged brand loyalty and generated a tremendous amount of publicity. Fine notes, for example, that between 1948 and 1979 Vet Dog Food labels could be redeemed to help the Chicago-based, Pilot Guide Dog Foundation train seeing eye dogs (Fine 1986, 210). These programs are not restricted to the United States and Canada but are also to be found in Britain and in other countries. Regardless, all this activity goes to provide additional models and reinforcements for Dying Child's Wish appeals.

**Legendary redemption schemes**

In addition to the official redemption schemes, a number of legendary schemes have been noted. According to Brunvand, stories about these schemes are "recurrent and totally fictional traditions about saving a large quantity of useless things with the belief that one can redeem them with the manufacturer to provide a major medical benefit for a needy patient" (1986, 169).

Gary Alan Fine similarly defines such stories as a form of belief legend spread among consumers that claims individuals or communities will receive medical technology from a large corporation if they collect or redeem a large number of product packages (1986, 208). Fine notes that rumours about exchanging cigarette packages for medical technology date back to at least 1936 in the United States (1986, 211).
Collecting worthless or used items has certainly been a favourite pastime of children for many years. An 1891 edition of *Notes and Queries* notes, for example, the custom of children collecting post-marks from old envelopes and used railway tickets (Delevingne 26 Feb.: 165). The Opies note that children had collected not only bus tickets but match sticks, postage stamps, milk bottle tops, toffee papers and cigarette cards and in 1957, the *Yorkshire Post* observed that children were collecting tickets to obtain wheel chairs or guide dogs (1959, 307).

Redemption rumour stories frequently parallel legitimate redemption programs and, as with these programs, individuals and organizations become involved in massive campaigns to collect thousands of the prescribed item. Those participating in the tradition often spend many long hours or even years saving such worthless items as bar codes, tin foil, cigarette packages, tea bags, and pull tabs from aluminum cans—all in the belief that, in some way, their efforts will help someone acquire a wheel chair, perhaps save a life, or help a person to obtain a kidney dialysis machine. More often than not, they later discover that their efforts were in vain.

**Summary**

As has been shown, the present existence of the Dying Child’s Wish tradition is very much grounded in the realities of contemporary culture. Between 1960 and 1990, there have been five real appeals for terminally-ill children—four of which were specifically launched for the purpose of attaining world records and relying on the
influence of the media and modern technology to achieve their goals. As these four families all discovered, once the appeals were launched, it was impossible to stem the responses as people continued to respond to misguided requests.

In addition to these real appeals, there are a number of historical legendary antecedents dating back to the previous century. Within our society there are also a number of socially-based role models and institutions which share similar features with both real and legendary appeals for sick children; the collective existence of which serves reinforce and promote such activities.

In some instances these organizations have themselves become directly involved in real appeals. Likewise, media reporting of community-based activities and of both real and legendary appeals has additionally created further awareness and support for requests to help terminally-ill children.

Perhaps most importantly however, the Dying Child’s Wish complex of stories, beliefs and related activities has grown out of a morass of misinformation brought about by unofficial and misguided appeals which grew out of the requests initiated by the Morbys, Shergolds, Booths and Grangers and which continued to circulate after the campaigns were terminated. One of the consequences of the ongoing circulation of these unofficial appeals was the generation of information increasingly at variance with the reality of each of these appeals. This in turn has lead folklorist to the belief that we are dealing with folklore.

This being said, that is why at this point it is necessary to explore the variation in the texts pertaining to these appeals—because, by identifying how
information became distorted and the actual extent and impact of this variation on individual perceptions, it will then be possible to measure the subsequent growth and evolution of scenarios and misinformation pertaining to these real appeals. This then will lead us to a better understanding of the existence of the Dying Child's Wish complex of legends, beliefs and practices as we now know it.
Chapter 4 - CASE STUDY OF THE CRAIG SHERGOLD APPEAL

Introduction

The Craig Shergold appeal may be considered an exceptional case. The unusual events associated with the appeal, the volumes of get-well cards received, and the tremendous publicity, have resulted in ongoing media coverage and public interest since 1989. Numerous accounts of the appeal have, for example, been recapitulated in the media. Individuals still continue to disseminate information about Craig’s request through FAX messages, computer network electronic mail, personal letters, internal memos, photocopies, and chain letters. One outcome is that the actual number of texts associated with the Shergold appeal far outweighs the material available on the other three appeals combined. This makes it an outstanding case and a good example to study.

The goal of this chapter is to provide a chronological history of the Shergold appeal and to examine those predominant factors which have aided the dissemination of both the original actual appeal launched by the Shergolds and subsequent unofficial appeals out of which a legendary complex of narratives and beliefs emerged. This case study establishes the basis upon which to explore the inter-relationship between this real appeal and the subsequent growth of the legendary Dying Child’s Wish complex.
In December 1988, the Shergold family of Carshalton, Surrey, England, discovered that their ten-year-old son Craig had cancerous tumours on his brain and spine. Throughout 1989 doctors at London’s Great Ormond Street hospital attempted to remove the tumours through surgery but their efforts were only partially successful. During his stay at the hospital a surgeon treating Craig joked that the boy had apparently received so many cards from friends and companions, that he could break a world record (New York Times 29 July 1990).

Early in September 1989 Craig was transferred to the Princess Chula Ward of the Royal Marsden hospital for radiotherapy treatment (Croydon Post 4 Oct. 1989). Hearing of Craig’s plight, Diana, Princess of Wales, expressed an interest in meeting the child. Arrangements were made for him to visit with the Princess after a royal gala; however, when the time came, Craig was too ill and the visit was called off (People Weekly 10 June 1991).

On 24 September, in order to boost Craig’s spirits and to give him a goal to aim for after his massive brain surgery, the Shergold family decided to start a Get-Well card appeal (Croydon Post 11 Nov. 1989; Hazelton-Standard-Speaker 22 Nov. 1989). The family aimed to help Craig collect 1,266,000 get-well cards, thereby hoping to exceed a 1987 Guinness record for Collections of Manufactured Articles set by Mario Morby who had acquired 1,265,000 postcards and which was published in The Guinness Book of Records (Singleton 5 Oct. 1989, 159). According to Guinness Publishing, because of the limitless number of objects it is possible to
collect, only those records are considered that "improve upon previous records which are newly significant in having become the subject of widespread and preferably international interest over a significant period of time" (Maria Morgan, Letter to Author, 25 Sept. 1991).

From the onset information about the Shergold appeal spread quickly both by word of mouth and by such means as FAXed messages, chain letters, and electronic mail. Supporters and friends of Craig sent out appeals for Craig using both his home address as well as the address of the Royal Marsden Hospital where he was receiving treatment. Instantaneously the appeal took on momentum, having also received tremendous coverage through local and national newspapers, and radio and television networks. On 28 September, one of Britain’s major tabloid newspapers, The Sun, pledged its support and printed a special coupon for readers to mail to Craig and within two days thousands of ‘messages of hope’ had begun to pour into the Shergold home (Sayid 7 Mar. 1991). On the same day the local newspaper, the Croydon News and Property News reported that Craig had already received cards and wishes from the Chelsea Football Club, old age pensioners, as well as from children and adults as far away as Germany, Switzerland and Texas (Singleton 28 Sept. 1989).

On 4 October 1989, another local newspaper, the Croydon Post, covered the campaign and instructed its readers to send their cards and well wishes to Craig care of "The Croydon Post, Advertiser House, Brighton Road, South Croydon, on or before 11 October" (4 Oct. 1989: 10). Later, The Post extended this appeal to 18 October, telling its readers "We want to help make Craig’s dream come true, so why
not put pen to paper right now" (Stone 11 Oct. 1989). Likewise on 5 October the Croydon News and Property News followed suit publishing its own appeal and advising readers "Send your card to: Craig Shergold, 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey SM5 1LD."

All throughout October the local media drove home the message to help Craig, and published pictures of community and business organizations who had taken time to send cards to the boy (Croydon Post 25 Oct. 1989). As the get-well cards poured in, Craig’s mother commented to the media how beneficial the community’s response was to her child’s morale:

The cards and messages we have received have been such an inspiration...We must make sure that everyone knows we open and read every single card that comes. We can’t express how much it means to us...Craig is a bit low at the moment, because the treatment he is getting takes it out of you. The emotional boost we have got from these messages has been vital to Craig’s welfare (Croydon Post 4 Oct. 1989).

As the newspapers and local community groups campaigned on the boy’s behalf, hundreds of individuals, including school teachers, rock stars, members of parliament, bookstore owners, business proprietors, friends and neighbours received and redistributed appeals for Craig.

As the following chain letter appeal illustrates, business networks provided an appropriate and effective route for dispersing word of the appeal:

Dear Ron
We recently received information about a 7 year old boy Craig Shergold, who is terminally-ill, with tumours on the brain and spine. Craig’s dearest wish is to get into the "The Guinness Book of Records" and friends have suggested that he may achieve this by
receiving the greatest number of "Get-well Cards". I am sure you will
wish to help Craig in achieving his dream by sending a card to:

Craig Shergold
Princess Chula Ward
Royal Marsden Hospital
Fulham Road
London
SW3 6JJ

Perhaps you would also pass this request to colleagues and friends as soon
as possible, and let us hope that we will see Craig's name in "The Guinness
Book of Records" in the near future (Carter, J.L., "To Councillor R.
Blower." 10 Oct. 1989. Dear Mr. Thoms Occasional Newsletter of the
British Folk Studies Forum 14 (1990), 21; S-36).

Individuals also used office technology to spread the word—the most
commonly used being FAX machines and computer networks. For example, on 13
November the British firm, Dunard Computer Services, distributed a request which
asked recipients to FAX chain letter appeals to others:

Please, Please, Please help Craig to fulfil his ambition and send a card
to:
Craig Shergold,
56 Selby Road,
Carshalton Surrey.
Please help Craig more by sending this fax to at least another 10
companies. If you have a directory you can choose them at random.
Thank you very much (Dunard Computer Services, FAX Chain, 13
Nov. 1989; Appendix B-4, page 304).

This FAX had some seven transmission verifications stamped on the bottom of the
page, indicating that the appeal had passed through several other offices previously.

These FAXed messages instantly spread the appeal outside Great Britain. In
one instance a director of the giant British company, Imperial Chemical Industries
(ICI) initiated a chain FAX, sending word of Craig's appeal to all ICI offices
overseas (Wong 19 Nov. 1989). Several other corporations similarly adopted this
method and FAXed appeals for Craig to affiliated organizations in England and abroad. Within days similar requests to aid Craig appeared throughout Europe, North America and Asia, and had also begun to spread around the world through computer networks:

The appeal to people to send "Get-well" cards to Craig Shergold is certainly no hoax. My family sent one to him last month...people may still wish to send cards from the USA etc. The address to send to is:
Craig Shergold Appeal,
Central Trailer Rent Co.,
Lenton Lane Industrial Estate, Nottingham,
United Kingdom. The cards will be sent from there. (Rae, Simon Rae COM3@Clustr.Trent, AC.UK from BITNET, 23 Nov. 1989).

As the Shergolds soon found out, such methods were highly effective in disseminating information about the appeal over a wide geographical area and get-well cards began to stream into the Shergolds home by the hundreds.

During the early stages of the campaign, the London office of the Children's Wish International Foundation heard about Craig's appeal. Shortly thereafter the foundation offered its assistance and spread word to its parent organization in Atlanta, Georgia. This helped to spread the campaign to North America (Field-notes, Arthur Stein 9 Nov. 1992).

By mid-October 1989, just when the campaign was gaining momentum, Guinness Publishing announced it would not consider another collections record noting:

Long experience of similar situations tells us that such appeals have the potential to get out of control. In the long term they cause more distress than positive value (Croyden News and Property News 19 Oct. 1989).
Guinness Publishing was apparently addressing the specific concern of how to halt such appeals once they went into circulation, and so thwart the flow of cards. This concern was based on the fact that the current record holder, Mario Morby, was still receiving postcards, even though his appeal had ended two years previously (Croyden News and Property News 19 Oct. 1989). Immediately the British media reproached Guinness for its pomposity and the firm became the focus of intense public criticism (Croydon Post 18 Nov. 1989). Local papers observed that Craig’s mother, Marian Shergold, was obviously distressed:

It’s sickening, because we’re not doing this only for Craig. We’re doing it for all the children with cancer. We’ve put Princess Chula Ward and the Royal Marsden on the map...all the stamps are being collected for leukaemia research and the envelopes are being recycled. This Christmas I won’t buy a copy of the Guinness book for my older son Stephen as I have been doing for years (Croyden News and Property News 19 Oct. 1989).

Unfortunately for Guinness, its attempt to dissuade the Shergolds from continuing with the appeal had the effect of generating more enthusiasm for Craig’s campaign, and spread the word even further. Mike Barwell, editor of a new record book, The Alternate Book of Records, announced that if Craig accomplished his record they would gladly “make sure he goes down in history” (The Sun 13 Oct. 1989). The Sun again assisted by publishing Craig’s address, and urging readers to send cards (13 Oct. 1989). The local media also followed suit, commenting that “Even if the Guinness book won’t [acknowledge his record], we should all carry on supporting young Craig” (Croydon Post 18 Oct. 1989).
By the end of October 1989 Craig's campaign had noticeably picked up speed. One local newspaper showed a photograph of the boy reading some of the 531,000 cards he had received noting that he was 'well on the way' to breaking Mario's record (Croydon Post 25 Oct. 1989).

Three weeks later the media proclaimed that Craig Shergold had actually "DONE IT" with help from well-wishers in Australia, the United States and France (The Croydon News and Property News 16 Nov. 1989). Yielding to public pressure, Guinness Publishing announced that Craig would be included in the 1991 record book after all (Croydon Post 22 Nov. 1989).

In less than two months Craig Shergold had achieved his wish of acquiring a Guinness world record for having surpassed Morby's 1,265,000 cards collected. Mrs. Shergold thanked all who had helped and politely asked for well-wishers to now stop sending cards (Croydon Post 22 Nov. 1989). But such was not to be the case, and just as Guinness Publishing had warned, and as Mario Morby's family had discovered, it was much simpler to start an appeal than to halt the flow of cards.

The Shergold Appeal--Phase 2: 1989 to 1993

Initially the Shergold appeal was deemed a great success. However, as Craig and his fans in and around Carshalton revelled in the victorious achievement, people in other parts of the world were just only beginning to learn about Craig's appeal. Following the official termination of the appeal on 16 November 1989, and although
the Shergolds had requested "No More Cards Thank you," elsewhere things were just gearing up.

A major source of the problem was that the Shergolds simply could not stop the generation of new appeals on Craig’s behalf. This situation arose for two reasons. First, although the campaign was terminated, old requests continued to stay in circulation. Many of these appeals contained the correct information about the original appeal, as they were based on accurate details from the Shergolds and their supporters. Second, because thousands of well-wishers were unaware that the campaign had terminated, they continued to circulate new appeals on Craig’s behalf. Furthermore, as time went on, these obsolete unofficial appeals became more diverse in nature as there was no longer an authority (i.e. the Shergolds) presenting the party line.

The effects were catastrophic, in that this explosion of renegade appeals led to what later turned out to be millions of get-well cards for Craig, and an unforeseen morass of misinformation. Therein, as individuals continued to circulate misguided appeals and, as others tried to make sense of these events, a major consequence was the outgrowth of stories, beliefs and activities—all being based on missing facts and misinformation. The repercussions of all this led to the production of a body of folklore based on fact and fiction and all focused on the Dying Child’s Wish.

One week after the appeal was terminated, on 21 November 1989, the American tabloid the Weekly World News published its own request to help Craig, and readers throughout Canada and the United States were told "While response in
Britain has been heartwarming, its not nearly enough to set a new record (21 Nov. 1989). According to the Weekly World News, although Craig had received more than 200,000 cards, he was still 800,000 cards short of his goal and readers were encouraged to "pitch in" and help (21 Nov. 1989: 4). This information was totally incorrect. Had the tabloid newspaper checked its facts it would have learned that the appeal was successfully completed one week before with a total of 1,255,000 cards and more still not counted (Croydon Post 22 Nov. 1989). As a result of this misinformation, and much to the Shergolds alarm, by the end of December American well-wishers had begun to respond in full force by mailing Craig get-well cards in the thousands.

Similar scenarios were being acted out elsewhere. In early October 1989 the Children’s Wish Foundation in London, England, had requisitioned the use of its American facilities as a drop off centre for cards for a one month period. An official application was sent out from the London office to the international headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia to set the project in motion (Field-notes, Arthur Stein 3 Nov. 1992).

For some reason, the appeal was not discussed by the board of directors until late December. At this meeting, as per the mandate of the foundation, the Shergold appeal was officially adopted as a special project by the Mercedes-Benz corporation a member organization of the Children’s Wish Foundation. Again, had Mercedes-Benz or the Children’s Wish Foundation checked with the London Office they would have learned that the Shergold appeal had been terminated one month before. Instead Mercedes-Benz wrongly FAXed out appeals for Craig in the later part of December
1989 (Field-notes, Linda Doworitz, 1 Apr. 1993). Moreover, instead of using the Shergold’s address in England, Mercedez-Benz had used the Children’s Wish Foundation address in Atlanta, Georgia. As had occurred in the earlier Morby case, this effectively created an entirely new variant of the original request—situating Craig in North America, as opposed to England. All this generated more misinformation about the appeal.

By the spring of 1990, as updated variants of the original 1989 appeal continued to disseminate alongside newer appeals (many of which carried alternate addresses such as that of the Children’s Wish Foundation) the influx of get-well cards took on new momentum. It was apparent that things were completely out of control not only at the Shergold’s family home, but also at Children’s Wish Foundation in Atlanta, Georgia, and at the Royal Marsden hospital in London where Craig was continuing to receive treatment:

The Royal Marsden Hospital last night urged people to stop sending get-well cards because their post room cannot cope. Readers can send donations to the Royal Marsden Hospital Cancer Appeal. Downs road, Sutton, Surrey (The Sun 10 Apr. 1990: 5).

Despite such pleas, the cards just continued to pour in, often at a rate of 55,000 pieces a day (Adair The Patriot 14 June 1990: A5).

In May of 1990, as Craig’s card count continued to skyrocket, Guinness Publishing announced that Craig’s world record would be revised from 1,266,000 to an astonishing 16,250,692 and that this would be included in the 1991 edition (USA Today 21 April 1990: 2A; The Guinness Book of Records 1991, 188). Marian Shergold wearily told reporters two months later, "We don’t want any more cards
because it looks as though we’re taking cards for no reason.” At the same time Donald McFarlane, editor of The Guinness Book of Records, reminded everyone that he had tried to dissuade the Shergolds from the campaign in the first place noting that “Our experience is that once it goes international it’s unstoppable” (Intelligencer Journal 20 June 1990).

The family stringently reminded well-wishers that Craig was literally up to his neck in get-well cards and that if people really wanted to do something they could donate money instead to the cancer fund at the Royal Marsden hospital (National Examiner 14 Aug. 1990:43). Similarly, the local and national media once again reminded well-wishers the Craig wanted no more cards and that the appeal was over.

On many occasions even the media were responsible for presenting the wrong information. For example as late as April 1990, according to a Michigan University newspaper staff report, the Children’s Wish Foundation in Atlanta, Georgia, was still appealing for cards to help Craig beat a world record already set some months earlier on 16 November, 1989. The newspaper was apparently unaware that this record had also been realized by Craig himself:

According to Arthur Stein, a worker at the Children’s Wish Foundation in Atlanta, Shergold’s dream is to receive more get-well cards than anyone in the world. His wish is already a reality. "Shergold has already received over 5 million cards," Stein said. "We anticipate at least 6 million or 7 million." According to the MSU Library the world record for the most cards is 1,000,265, set in November of 1989...Those interested in sending cards to Shergold may write the Children’s Wish Foundation, 32 Perimeter Centre east, Atlanta, GA, 30346 (The State News 13 Apr., 1990).
These types of inaccuracies continued to play a role in keeping fresh appeals for Craig in circulation, and resulted in an ever-increasing accumulation of get-well cards at the Children's Wish Foundation.

Throughout the summer of 1990, as more and more uninformed individuals encountered the appeal and redistributed it around the world, the Shergolds, the Children's Wish Foundation, and the Royal Marsden struggled continuously to halt the spread of more appeals. By the end of 1990, as cards of all sorts continued to pour in, it was apparent that Craig was on his way to setting yet another new record and on October of 1990 The Sun reported that Craig's card count had risen to twenty-one million (Sayid 10 Oct. 1990).

By December 1990 the card count had spiralled ever-upward and, hoping to halt the flow of cards once and for all, Guinness announced that Craig would be entered in the 1993 record book for having received some 33,000,000 cards--Guinness also noted that no further claims would be entertained for this category (Time Magazine 13 Dec. 1990: 60; The Guinness Book of Records 1993, 552). Having gained a place in the 1991 edition of The Guinness Book of Records for receiving sixteen million cards and in the 1992 edition for receiving 33,000,000, Craig Shergold at age eleven had established the all time record for having received the most get-well cards or any cards ever.

At this point, his exasperated parents resolved to take a new approach to stemming the flow of cards. In late December 1990, in conjunction with London's Royal Marsden hospital, the Shergold family officially enlisted both Bill Wyman, a
musician with the Rolling Stones, and the media, to launch a campaign to raise funds for cancer research. It was anticipated that this effort would redirect peoples' energies away from sending Craig cards (Croydon Advertiser, 28 Dec. 1991). On 18 January 1991 the Shergolds informed well-wishers, through the media, that "Craig's only remaining record-breaking wish was to raise more money than anyone else for the pioneering Royal Marsden hospitals in Sutton and Fulham." The press advised readers, on the family's behalf, that donations could be sent to the Craig Shergold Cancer Fund, care of the Royal Marsden Cancer Appeal, 203 Fulham Road, London (Croydon Advertiser 18 Jan. 1990) The entire story received national media attention and ample photo coverage of Craig.

The family had another motive for launching the new fund raising appeal. In addition to their failed efforts to combat the flow of get-well cards, a completely new renegade business-card appeal with Craig's name and address had somehow come into circulation and was being transmitted with as much gusto as the original appeal (Croydon Advertiser 18 Jan. 1991). As with other renegade appeals, this request was being circulated by word of mouth and even more effectively, through FAX transmissions, electronic mail and chain letters.

In light of what had occurred with the original get-well card appeal, the family was desperate to halt this renegade request at all costs. On 29 January the Shergolds and Guinness Publishing issued a joint press release stating:

Craig similarly alerted the public in a personal letter written to The Sun, again asking that monetary donations be made to the cancer appeal:

Thank you for sending them but please ignore any chain letters saying I now want business-cards. I don't... please send a donation however to this address "Craig Shergold Appeal" Save the Humans, c/o Appeal Office Royal Marsden Hospital (9 Feb. 1991).

Requests such as this only served to confuse the public; besides the damage had already been done as the business-card appeal had rapidly made its way from England to Europe and North Atlantic. Moreover, as the Shergolds already knew too well, it was unlikely that this new appeal would be stopped.

As this runaway business-card variant converged with older get-well card appeals, the overall effect was again one of misinformation and altered facts—the consequence being that many individuals were totally perplexed. Some assumed that Craig was attempting yet another record. Others, who had seen continuing coverage of Craig in the media, unknowingly assumed he had always wanted business-cards. As the following computer network correspondence indicates, some individuals reasoned that requests for Craig were simply a resurgence of previous erroneous appeals:

Sorry if this is the wrong notes group—but where else to debunk an urban myth. I have often read that this is a hoax—the boy has already died or never existed. Does anyone know the true story? The reason I am asking is that I received a request to send a card to Craig from someone who received his request from his company's (fortune 100type) CEO to send on. I called him to tell him that this is a hoax, but he swears that it is true because it is in People's Magazine. I would like to set him straight if I can. Thanks for any help. (Clarke, Bob. 3 June 1991: Anews,Sci.Skeptic. Bruce Mason. E-mail to Author. 4 June 1991).
Many individuals simply didn’t have access to the facts pertaining to the Shergold appeal, consequently they created their own explanations of the events, based on the limits of the information they had available.

**Consequences of The Shergold Appeal**

Today, some five years from the onset of the September 1989 get-well card campaign, many unknowing individuals continue to transmit appeals to help terminally-ill, seven-year-old Craig Shergold achieve his last wish, be it for get-well cards or business-cards. As fresh appeals continue to circulate, individuals in many parts of the world are just hearing about Craig’s wish for the first time through chain letters, electronic mail, appeals posted to bulletin boards and FAXed messages. In 1992, following numerous enquiries regarding chain letters for Craig, Ann Landers advised her readers "please, please if you receive any of these pesky little things in the mail, particularly regarding Craig Shergold, tear them up into little pieces and feed them to the fish" (*The Boston Globe* 3 Aug. 1992).

Several months later similar advice was given to the American Repertory Company which itself had sent a chain letter to *The Boston Globe*:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your Jan. 6 letter informing us of the poignant wish of young Craig Shergold...Since our business is journalism, not drama, we decided to do some checking before acting upon your request and are delighted to inform you that the tragic story has a happy ending. First Craig Shergold is 13 years old. Second, he is no longer dying of a brain tumor. Third, he was listed in the 1991 edition of Guinness with 16 million cards and in 1992 with 33 million cards; in May 1991 his mother pleaded for no more...Thus we think it unwise to send Craig mere cards. We trust you will so inform the other august institutions that received your appeal...We suggest that
you can indeed help a dying child realize a wish by calling the Children’s Wish Foundation at (800) 323-9474 (15 Jan. 1993).

On 23 June, 1993 on the campus of Memorial University, St. John’s, Newfoundland, a brand new appeal for Craig was being circulated:

Here is a letter we hope will work.
Will you please send a business-card to:
Craig Shergold, c/o Children’s Wish Foundation
3200 Perimeter Centre E,#500
Atlanta, Georgia
USA 30346

Craig is seven years old with terminal cancer. He wishes to be named in the "Big Book" of World Records. This wish has been expressed by the Children’s Wish Foundation. Please send your card and if possible, solicit the cards of 10 of your colleagues. This will help Craig realize his dream. Thanks (O'Dwyer, B. "Craig Shergold’s Wish." Photocopy 23 June 1993).

According to the last report from the Shergolds, and, much to his parents’ annoyance, the total cards received to date had exceeded 100,000,000 (Alford 26 March 1993: 13). Undoubtedly Craig will receive hundreds of get-well cards and business-cards for months and probably years to come.

Apart from this, through the publicity generated by the get-well card appeal, John Kluge, an American millionaire, had heard of Craig’s plight and offered to fly the child to Virginia for an examination to see if anything more could be done (Croydon Advertiser 28 Dec. 1990). In November of 1990 Craig went to Atlanta, Georgia where, as a result of tests performed, he underwent another operation (People’s Weekly 10 June 1991). On 1 March 1991 the doctors at the Virginia Medical Centre were successful in removing ninety percent of the tumour in Craig’s head (People Weekly 10 June 1991). Today, at age fourteen, Craig has so far survived
cancer and, except for the continuing outpouring of cards, lives a relatively normal life.

The chronology of the Craig Shergold appeal establishes a basis for considering those factors which influenced the shaping of individual texts about the appeal, and the eventual growth of the Dying Child's Wish complex of narratives, beliefs and related activities. Scrutiny of the events surrounding the Craig Shergold campaign indicates that several factors resulted in the generation of confusion and ambiguity about the original get-well card appeal. These include (1) the family's inability to halt the circulation of appeals after the termination of the campaign and which in turn created a continuous flow of cards for Craig to the present date, (2) the emergence of renegade appeals which increasingly varied from the original appeal. An entanglement of misinformation arose out of this situation--the eventual backlash of which resulted in the outgrowth of the Dying Child's Wish complex.

Legends are most often examined in isolation of the probable causes of such stories--this is because seldom have folklorists had the opportunity to closely study the formation and growth of legendary material as it unfolds and develops. The case of the Shergold appeal however provides just this opportunity because, as illustrated in the history of this appeal, that is exactly what has been occurring. Examination of the texts in the Shergold corpus shows that some accounts are based in reality while others vary considerably from the facts of the appeal and that some explanations of the events are somewhere between these points.
Folklorists would agree that appeals such as the Shergold case are the substance of folklore, and certainly what they are observing follows traditional practices. However they, like others, have not been able to decipher what is actually transpiring in this instance and thus have imposed explanations that don’t necessarily fit the reality of the situation. As may be seen in the Shergold case, appeals for Craig still continue to circulate with considerable vigour as more people are tricked and deluded into assuming that he is still seeking a world record. Considering this the Shergold appeal provides an excellent laboratory for the exploration of ideas which cannot otherwise be explored. Herein lies a unique opportunity to examine closely the spread of variation and to explore the potential for missing or altered information to create distorted views and perceptions of real events—the major consequence being the emergence of scenarios, beliefs, and related practices inextricably linked to both legend and reality as embodied in the Dying Child’s Wish complex.
Chapter 5 - ANALYSIS OF THE CRAIG SHERGOLD APPEAL: THE NARRATIVES

Introduction

When information is missing or altered it is often difficult to grasp what is actually occurring. It is not surprising therefore that we often rely on folklore to deal with such situations. Such is the case with the Craig Shergold appeal in which many people have simply created such responses in order to fill in the gaps.

In this chapter I hope to unravel this complex of varying perceptions about the Dying Child’s Wish through an examination of 204 accounts which focus on the Shergold appeal and so to explore the dissemination of missing and altered information the consequences of which caused scenarios to be increasingly at variance with reality. Through this I intend to illustrate that the growth and development of these views and perceptions which, growing out of misconstrued and missing information pertaining to the Shergold appeal, ultimately translated into the Dying Child’s Wish complex.

Use of Motif Analysis To Examine the Dying Child’s Wish Complex

Often when legend and reality are so closely aligned, such factors as assigned importance, prior knowledge, and access to accurate information have great pertinence to the development and expression of individual views of the events being
described. It is within this context that much can be learned about the structure of legend and its presentation. Brunvand, for example, notes that as with any legend, contemporary narratives "gain credibility from specific details of time and place or from references to source authorities" (1981, 3). In short, we frame our conversations all the time in specific ways to disclose our experiences, and our perceptions about various topics. We constantly employ strategies to enable us to convey our ideas; therefore, one viable means of unlocking the relationship between real and legendary accounts of the Dying Child's Wish complex is through an examination of the structure of the narratives themselves in which details of people, actions, time, place and other specifics can be closely examined.

There is enough evidence to suggest that despite their notorious flexibility and fragmentary nature, legends are not totally formless. As early as the 1930s Von Sydow recognised that legends have to possess at least some structure and in fact classed 'Sagen' into both single and multi-episodic tales (1949, 86-87). Similarly, Labov observes in his examination of personal experience narratives that narratives in general possess at least six structural elements: abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, result and coda which fit together to answer such underlying questions as "what was this about", "who", "when", "what" "where", "then what happened", or "so, what finally happened" (1972, 370).

In recent years some folklorists have attempted to examine the structural basis of legends. Brunvand notes, for example, that while many contemporary legends may not employ numerous motifs in the traditional sense, frequently such narratives
are identifiable because they possess a certain number of stable recognisable parts (Brunvand 1981, 14). Bennett has demonstrated that Labov's narrative structural units are readily adaptable to Dundes' concept of the allomotif (1984, 45-63; Dundes 1965, 208) and both Bennett and Nicholaisen have separately applied the Labovian paradigm to examinations of the structure of legends (1984, 45-63; 1987, 61-76). More recently, Buchan has effectively employed tale role analysis to conduct a cross-cultural comparison and interpretation of The Pet Chow legend (1992, 89-103).

One of the difficulties in analyzing legendary materials is the actual diversity and volume of variants which may be linked to a particular narrative. Certainly in such cases as the Dying Child's Wish, where the narratives are embedded within the context of the real world, separating fact from fiction becomes the first step to establishing the basis for any events which may have led to the subsequent emergence of narratives and beliefs.

This approach offers a practical means of classifying a large corpus of material while allowing for a comparison of stories of real children's attempts at world records with the Dying Child's Wish complex of narratives and beliefs. This type of analysis also furnishes an appropriate mechanism to explore the small changes which have occurred in the individual texts such as a child's name, illness, address and intended goal.

Here I have used the circumstances of the Shergold appeal as a baseline against which to explore the degree of variance which developed in the resulting
accounts of the campaign, and in so doing I adopted the following strategy:

Stage A: Formulated an overall profile of the Dying Child’s Wish complex;
Stage B: Formulated a Baseline Profile of the Shergold appeal;
Stage C: Formulated an Enhanced Baseline Profile of the Shergold Appeal;
Stage D: Ranked the texts in the Shergold corpus;
Stage E: Analyzed the ranked data.

As will be shown, this examination provided a productive approach to understanding the practicabilities of the relationship between the actual appeals by dying children and the so-called connected legends.

A: Formulation of an Overall Profile of the Dying Child’s Wish Complex

In order to distinguish those elements in the over-all profile of the Dying Child’s Wish complex, some 400 texts in the form of newspaper articles, personal interviews, photocopies, computer correspondence and chain letters, dating between 1850 and 1992 and pertaining to both real and legendary accounts, were examined.
Based on this examination a total of eight consistently recurring descriptive elements were identified which, in one combination or another, were found in all the appeals. Each of these descriptive elements could be seen as being the equivalent of a motif—"the smallest element in a tale having the power to persist in tradition" and that "in order to have this power it must have something unusual or striking about it" (Thompson 1946, 415).

Collectively then, these eight motifs, listed in Table 1 (page 98), provide a descriptive profile of the Dying Child Wish complex, both real and legendary and describe the inherent structure of all such appeals.

| Table 1: Over-all Profile of Both Real and Legendary Dying Child's Wish Appeals. |
| A: Appeal By A Dying Child | - |
| B: Goal | - Enter Book of Records |
| C: Method | - Receiving Most.... |
| D: Action | - Send..., |
| E: Collector | - To..., |
| F: Identification | - [of the Dying Child] |
| G: Biography | - [of the Dying Child] |
| H: Illness | - [of the Dying Child] |

The motifs in this profile are arranged in the order A to H according to their over-all role and relevance to the entire tradition. While the following priorities were identified in the corpus of material, it must be acknowledged that the motifs are not
always presented in this sequence:

A: Appeal By A Dying Child;

This was viewed as having the greatest priority taking precedence over all other motifs because it serves as the nucleus of all the stories.

B: Goal;

This was ranked second because it establishes a primary goal, or mission statement, for the appeal. Examination of the database also indicated that this element was also most often coupled with Motif A.

C: Method;

This was ranked third because of its relationship to the two previous motifs; it establishes how the goal of the appeal must be successfully accomplished in order to achieve the overall objective of the appeal (i.e. Motif B).

D: Action;

This motif was ranked fourth as it indicates that the recipient must perform a necessary task to help the Dying Child achieve his goal as outlined in Motif C.

E: Collector;

This identifies where the donations should be sent to and so its related to, and follows from, Motif D.
F: Identification - [of the Dying Child];

The function of this motif is to link the Dying Child to an appeal by a specific individual. While this information is pertinent in identifying particular cases, it's relevance is circumstantial and is not necessary in order for someone to support or respond to an appeal.

G: Biography - [of the Dying Child];

This further describes the Dying Child - in terms of age and location. Again, as with Motif F, its function is to link a specific Dying Child to an appeal but, while this information is pertinent in identifying particular cases, it's relevance is circumstantial and it is not essential in order to support or respond to an appeal.

H: Illness;

Details of the nature of the illness of the individual children were viewed as serving a peripheral role in the narratives and beliefs. Its role is however supportive in that considering the commonness of cancer, the effects and treatments, information about such this illness often provokes the emotion necessary to give motivation to the action.

Out of the eight motifs identified, the first five are considered primary to the profile of the Dying Child’s Wish complex in that they invoke a call for action. Although the remaining secondary motifs may not be necessarily germane to the appeals scenario, the emotions they provoke may significantly influence a decision to act.
B: Formulation of a Baseline Profile of the Shergold Appeal

The resulting overall profile of the Dying Child's Wish provided the foundation on which to formulate a baseline profile of the Shergold appeal.

As discussed earlier in Chapter Four, the Craig Shergold get-well card appeal has mutated with the passage of time, and, in order to determine the degree of variance which has developed in the corpus of material, a baseline profile representing the reality of the initial appeal was developed. The baseline profile in this instance was created from information provided by the Shergolds themselves during radio interviews, and from interviews with representatives of Guinness Publishing, its affiliate, the New York based Facts on File, and The Children's Wish Foundation in Atlanta, Georgia, all of which were extensively involved with the campaign. Additional information was extracted from several British newspapers which also sponsored the appeal.

As may be seen by Table 2, the motifs used for this baseline profile are exactly the same as those for the overall profile of the Dying Child’s Wish. In each instance, however, only details specific to Craig's circumstances are included (Table 2, page 102).
Table 2: Baseline Profile Craig Shergold Appeal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: Appeal By A Dying Child</th>
<th>- [Craig Shergold]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: Goal</td>
<td>- Enter <em>The Guinness Book of Records</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Method</td>
<td>- Receiving Most Get-well Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Action</td>
<td>- Send A Get-well Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Collector</td>
<td>- Craig Shergold, 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey, England, SM5 1LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Identification</td>
<td>- Craig Shergold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Biography</td>
<td>- Age: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Address: 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey, England SM5 1LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Illness</td>
<td>- Cancerous Tumours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here Motifs E: Collector and G: Biography contain the same address because the family requested that cards for Craig be sent to their home.

C: Formulation of an Enhanced Baseline Profile of the Shergold Appeal

The 204 accounts of the appeal contained in the Shergold corpus were compared to the Baseline Profile in order to identify any variance. By so doing, it was determined that many of the individual texts differed from the baseline profile in a minor but significant way. In 1991, a renegade appeal urged individuals to send business-cards to Craig.

Dundes' concept of "specific alternate allomotifs" was used at this point in order to organize these variant forms within the motif structure already identified (Dundes 1965, 208). The results of this analysis are presented in Table 3 (page 103).
Table 3: Enhanced Baseline Profile of the Craig Shergold Appeal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIF</th>
<th>ALLOMOTIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Appeal By A Dying Child</td>
<td>A1. Dying Child [Craig Shergold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2. Child’s Wish [Craig Shergold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3. Ill Child [Craig Shergold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Goal - Enter Book of Records</td>
<td>B1. The Guinness Book of Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2. The Alternate Book of Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Method</td>
<td>C1. Receiving Most Get-well Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2. Receiving Most Alternate Cards(Business-Cards; Postcards, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Action</td>
<td>D1. Send Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Collector</td>
<td>E1. Craig Shergold 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey, England SM5 1LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E1. Craig Shergold 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey, England SM5 1LD To Be included in the Alternate Book of Records (S-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3. Craig Shergold, C/O Croydon Post, Advertiser House, Brighton Road, South Croydon, CR2 6UB To Be Delivered by Wednesday 18 Oct. 1989 (S-89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E5. Please Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E6. To an Intermediary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E7. Campaign Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E8. Stop Sending Get-well Cards We’ve Reached Our Goal (S-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E9. Stop Sending Get-well Cards We’ve Reached Our Goal; Instead Send Donations C/O Royal Marsden Cancer Appeal 303 Fulham Road London SW3 6JJ (S-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E10. Wrong Cards/Alternate Action (S-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E11. Stop/Ignore (S-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E12. Throw Away/ Tell Others (S-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Identification</td>
<td>F1. Craig Shergold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Biography</td>
<td>G1. Age: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2. Address: 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey, England, SM5 1LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Illness</td>
<td>H1. Cancerous Tumours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S* numbers pertain to references to Shergold Appeal which are contained in appendix A (page 251).
D: Ranking the Texts in the Shergold Corpus

The motif structure and the related allomotifs having been established, the corpus of 204 accounts was next examined to determine the extent to which details in individual texts matched those of the actual appeal. Accounts showing the least variation from the enhanced baseline profile were considered to most closely and accurately describe the campaign, while those showing considerable alteration or elimination of detail were viewed as less closely describing the appeal. The accounts were ranked on a continuum ranging from the best match to the worst match using the following four indicators:

1. Presence of information;
2. Absence of information;
3. Incorrect information;
4. Incomplete information.

The findings were collated and summarised in Table 4 (pages 105-119).

Examination of this table shows that texts which ranked highest in the main contain the five primary motifs (Motif A; Motif B; Motif C; Motif D; Motif E) in the prioritised sequence set out above. They also provide specific biographical details of Craig Shergold by the inclusion of the secondary motifs (Motif F; Motif G; Motif H). Texts which were ranked successively lower present decreasing amounts of information in terms of containing fewer motifs and re-ordered and broken sequences. Consequently, these accounts tend to be increasingly more fractured and further removed from the reality of the appeal.
Table 4: Ranking of 204 Texts Against an Enhanced Baseline Profile of the Craig Shergold Appeal.

Ranking Was Derived by Comparing 204 Texts Against an Enhanced Baseline Profile of the Craig Shergold appeal. Texts Were Scored for the Presence, and Absence of Information in Motifs, As Well As For Incorrect and/or Partial Information in Motifs. The Findings Were Then Arranged in Descending Order According to Accounts Best Matching The Profile.

code for scoring
presence of motifs - letters present
absence of motifs - letters absent
incorrect element in motifs [ ]
motif incomplete { }

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ai</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
<th>E10</th>
<th>E11</th>
<th>E12</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-90]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>[G2]</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-40]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>[G1]</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-53]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-54]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>[G1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-36]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>E8</td>
<td>E9</td>
<td>E10</td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>E12</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>S-41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>S-44; S-48; S-50; S-52; S-68; S-72; S-74; S-75; S-77; S-83; S-85; S-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>S-58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>S-57; S-57; S-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>S-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>S-89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>S-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>S-56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>S-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>[G1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>S-92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>|   | A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C1 | C2 | D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 23. | A3 | B1 | C1 |    | [E1] |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | E8 | F |    |    | H1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
<th>E10</th>
<th>E11</th>
<th>E12</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-98]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-28]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15) [S-1; S-2; S-6; S-30; S-7; S-15; S-20; S-32; S-33; S-34; S-35; S-37; S-38; S-39; S-16]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-128]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-5]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-95]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) [S-43; S-110; S-116]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) [S-95]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>E8</td>
<td>E9</td>
<td>E10</td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>E12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>[S-190; S-294]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-188]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-180]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-175]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>[C1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-125]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-134]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-147]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-184]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-185]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-133]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>E8</td>
<td>E9</td>
<td>E10</td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>E12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) S-136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) S-181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>[G1]</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) S-138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) S-179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>[G1]</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) S-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>[G1]</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) S-125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>[G2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) S-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) S-110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) S-145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) S-127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>E8</td>
<td>E9</td>
<td>E10</td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>E12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-205]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E8</td>
<td>[E8]</td>
<td>(G2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-125]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E8]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>(G2)</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-172]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-164]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>[S-22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-161]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-176]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>[S-155]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td>[C2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-173]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td>[C2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-107]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

113
<p>|   | A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C1 | C2 | D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
| 95. | A3 |   | C1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
| (1) [S-13] |   |   |   |   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) [S-153] |   |   |   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 97. | A3 | [C1] | [D] |   | [E4] | E6 | [E9] | E11 | F | G1 | H1 |
| (1) [S-200] |   |   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 98. | A3 | [C1] | [D] |   | [E4] | E6 | [E9] | E11 | F | G1 | H1 |
| (1) [S-196] |   |   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 99. | A3 | [C1] | [D] |   | E8 |   |   | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
| (1) [S-148] |   |   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100. | A3 | [C1] |   |   | E8 |   |   | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
| (1) [S-197] |   |   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) [S-199] |   |   |   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 102. | A3 | [C1] | C2 |   |   |   |   | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | |
| (1) [S-21] |   |   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 103. | A1 | C2 |   |   |   |   |   |   | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | |
| (1) [S-17; S-19] |   |   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 104. | A3 | C2 |   |   |   |   |   | E10 | E11 | F | G1 | |
| (1) [S-25] |   |   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|   | A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | F1 | C1 | C2 | D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| 106 | A2 | [B1] | C1 | C2 | [F] | [H1] |
| 107 | A2 | C2 | [E12] | F |
| 108 | A1 | C2 | F | H1 |
| 109 | A1 | C2 | F |
| 110 | A1 | C2 | [F] | [G2] |
| 111 | A2 | C2 | [F] |
| 112 | A2 | D | [E1] | [G2] |
| 113 | A1 | [D] | [E4] |
| 115 | A1 | [E1] | [E4] | [E9] | F |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>126.</th>
<th>127.</th>
<th>128.</th>
<th>129.</th>
<th>130.</th>
<th>131.</th>
<th>132.</th>
<th>133.</th>
<th>134.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-158]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>[S-153; S-164]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[C1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-150]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>[S-162; S-165]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-132]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-165]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[S-149]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>[S-154; S-193; S-201; S-167]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E: Analysis of the Ranked Data

Based on the ranking of the Shergold corpus a number of observations can be made:

A. Only one account out of 204 perfectly matched the circumstances of the Shergold profile.

Just one account (S-90) within the entire collection exhibited no variation or omission of information of the appeal, and it was subsequently ranked number one. This text was a request to help Craig Shergold published in the Croydon and Property News (5 October 1989)--just three weeks after Craig first launched his campaign. The newspaper, which is based in Craig’s home community, was an official sponsor of the appeal and so, had direct contact with the Shergold family. Not surprisingly, then, it reflected the reality of the original appeal.

B. A total of 125 texts contain the first three primary motifs in sequence.

When the 204 texts in the corpus were compared against the Enhanced Baseline Profile of the Craig Shergold appeal, 125 texts (61 percent) contain the first three primary motifs in sequence as they are identified in the Enhanced Baseline Profile (see Fig. 1, page 121). These texts were ranked 2 to 73, and were considered to best represent the reality of the appeal.
Figure 1: Showing the first three Motifs and/or Allomotifs in sequence as set out in the Enhanced Baseline Profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIFS</th>
<th>ALLOMOTIFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A:</strong> Appeal By A Dying Child</td>
<td>- A1. Dying Child [Craig Shergold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2. Child’s Wish [Craig Shergold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3. Ill Child [Craig Shergold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B:</strong> Goal - Enter Book of Records</td>
<td>- B1. The Guinness Book of Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2. The Alternate Book of Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C:</strong> Method</td>
<td>- C1. Receiving Most Get-well Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2. Receiving Most Alternate Cards (Business-Cards; Postcards etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 79 texts exhibit some form of minor variation in that either motifs were missing, or the sequence of motifs was interrupted.

These texts, ranked 74 to 142, were increasingly disjointed and containing less detail. As the following example taken from the computer networks illustrates, the absence of motifs sometimes resulted in descriptions which were inconclusive:

In article <1990 Mar29.160136.15859@tc.fluke.COM> inc@tc.fluke.COM (Gary Benson) writes: [re:dying boy wants postcards story]...
The tip off in many cases is the name - this is the 6th or 7th time I’ve heard about "Craig Shergold" in the past two years.
Besides the *two* separate postings here on Misc.Kids in the last couple of days, I just received E-mail from toby@computer science.manchester.ac.uk@nsfnet-relay.ac.uk, who sent me a copy of the story which is making the rounds locally there. The details are virtually identical, except that in this case Craig is now in Surrey, England (S-121, Ranked 110).
As noted earlier most of the E-Mail transmissions contain numerous inaccuracies in terms of English. In consideration of this and for purposes of clarification, E-mail texts used for illustration and discussion are presented as they were collected—no attempt has been made to insert corrections.

In this account the author attempts to establish that the Shergold appeal is a hoax. Noticeably absent, therefore, are references to Craig's goal and instructions as to the action required to help him obtain cards. References to any biographical information have also been left out (Motif B; Motif D; Motif E, Motif G). Considering the lack of sufficient detail in this account some readers were no doubt still totally perplexed with regards to the actual facts of the story.

Often when individuals attempted to explain the facts of the appeal, they only compounded this confusion further through the elimination of information:

Just to set the record straight: I present you with the facts, and nothing but the facts.
Yes: he exists (and is still alive and unwell and dying in London).
Yes: He has enough cards (4,000,000) is quoted.
Yes: He will be in the Guinness Book of Records for 1991.
No: Nobody else will be counted after this.
[source: Westminster Cable's View data service, today]
They follow this with a comment to the effect that he is dying from Cancer. Maybe the Royal Mail should send the profits made from these cards to the Imperial Cancer Fund. (S-129; Ranked 77).

In this instance, individuals who were aware of the details of the Shergold appeal could presume that this was what the author was alluding to because of references to "cards," "London" and The Guinness Book of Records. However, the text itself
varies considerably from reality in that nowhere is there any detail with respect to the child's proper name. The author has instead referred to Craig simply as "He"--thus establishing a major gap in information about the appeal.

In extreme cases this variation in information created a disarray of knowledge. In the following computer correspondence the author is responding to a previous correspondent looking for information to verify that the appeal has terminated. He, in turn commented that Craig didn't want any more cards. The author also suggested that the individual should also attempt to obtain an article written by Spaff debunking the story. Such efforts to re-confirm that the appeal had terminated only caused additional divergences because of the absence of basic information:

> Help!!! Craig Shergold wants postcards or so its being told here...Can somebody e-mail promptly some evidence...that will convince the powers that be that Craig's family doesn't want anymore postcards.
> Thanks! Connie

Holy Cripes!!!!
Two things.
One get a copy of the new users questions thing that Spaff does-debunked there (and spaff can't be wrong:)
Two: if any local worthy (mayor, sherrif, etc), or referring to a later posting) CEO of a company wants to call me, I'll vouch that Craig has asked people to stop. Do Not Send Cards To Craig Shergold (S-166, Ranked 138).

As the account lacks sufficient description of primary information about the appeal the only thing that can be deduced from this exchange of information is that some child by the name of Craig Shergold wanted postcards and now he doesn't.
D. Variation occurs in the accounts of the appeal, as a result of the complete omission of information.

Several accounts contained only minimal information about the appeal referring to it more generally as the Dying Child Appeal or the Child's Wish (Allomotif A1; Allomotif A2). In these cases the specific details of Craig Shergold's campaign have been omitted entirely. In the following electronic mail message the author makes only a cursory reference to the appeal by way of using the phrase "Dying Boy's Last Wish" as part of a subject entry title:

Subject: "UK vs US [Was: Sigh (Was Re: Dying Boy's Last Wish)]."

Oh heck. Someone must know someone in England who can try to meet this kid and report back to the rest of us (S-143, Rank 126).

In this instance the author makes a perfunctory reference to the appeal through the inclusion of "Dying Boy's Last Wish", "kid" and "England".

E. Variation occurs in the accounts of the appeal as a result of the partial omission information.

Many accounts in the corpus appear to be affected by the partial omission of information. Although these are generally minor discrepancies, over-all such differences cumulatively added to the evolving variation. This is particularly evident
in the details pertaining specifically to Motifs F, G, and H:

F: Identification  -  F1. Craig Shergold

G: Biography  -  G1. Age: 10
              G2. Address: 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey, England, SM5 1LD

H: Illness  -  H1. Cancerous Tumors

By way of example:

A former Croydon school teacher who is herself battling cancer has written a poem paying tribute to the bravery of young Craig Shergold...Angela, who has in the past had 175 poems published, has asked her friends to collect cards to help Craig's appeal...Meanwhile last week's news that Craig will not be included in the Guinness Book of records if he achieves his get-well target has not stopped THOUSANDS of Post readers adding to the bundles of cards in our offices. The Carshalton youngster is getting nearer the record which will be a moral victory even if it does not get in the actual book (S-4, Ranked 36).

In this instance The Croydon Post, one of two local newspapers to have officially sponsored the Shergold appeal, omitted Craig's address, making reference only to the Carshalton youngster. This is perhaps to be expected considering that the appeal was about to be terminated. However insufficient information such as this contributed to the emergence of mutant varying accounts. This is particularly so with respect to the numerous Get-Well card appeals which were circulated by letter and FAX machine. In many of these, part of the address was omitted--either causing individuals not to respond or to send cards to the wrong address. Subsequent reporting of the latter scenario fuelled discussion of this appeal as a hoax or legend
based on the model provided by the Little Buddy incident in Paisley, Scotland, in 1982.

F. Variation is to be found in accounts as a result of the substitution of information.

One example of such variation was the development of multiple addresses for the appeals by individuals and organizations creating their own appeals to help Craig. These included:

1. The Children's Wish Foundation;
2. Individuals who acted as an official contact;
3. Individuals who offered their own residence or workplace as a drop off centre;
4. Multiple combinations of the above.

Appeals ranked 15 to 20 use an address for a third party—namely the Children's Wish Foundation in Atlanta, Georgia (Allomotif E-4):

We're going to send him as many cards as possible. Those interested in sending cards to Shergold may write The Children's Wish Foundation, 32 Perimeter Centre East, Atlanta, Georgia 30346 (S-92, Ranked 15).

Similarly, appeals ranked 21 to 48 required the reader to either contact an individual for further information (Allomotif E-5) or send their cards to a third
party who will in turn forward them on to the Shergolds (Allomotif E6):

    Send your business-cards to The Editor, Weekly Bulletin, for despatch, 
or contact Collyn Ganced, ext 2792, for further information (S-94, 
Ranked 46).

Moreover, as the following description illustrates, some accounts identified 
multiple ways to contribute cards— but with no reference to Craig at all (Allomotif 
E4; Allomotif E5; Allomotif E6):

    The following just came across my screen. Sorry for the imposition, 
but why not? I'm sending this with some cross posting but I think it's 
worth it...

    Hi everybody, 
    David Comeau is collecting business-cards for a terminally-ill child in 
the "Make A Wish Foundation." This boy wants cards to get in the 
Guinness Book of Records for most business-cards. Please lets help 
him out. David is at ext. 6212 or cubbie 2N211 

    If you choose to include yourself in this effort, maybe you can collect 
as many business-cards you can in your area and package them and mail them to the following address. A special thanks to you from me 
for the child. I don't know him. But will deliver them to Eleanor. I'm 
also setting a delivery date of May 8th, though later ones will be 
delivered also. Again the above is all I know (S-180, Ranked 58).

As each of these examples illustrates, the substitution of information resulted in more 
mutant descriptions of the original appeal, more confusion, and so more chance that 
the appeal, although genuine, will be considered by folklorists and others to be closer 
to a hoax or a legend.
G. Variation in accounts of the appeal occurs as a result of the incorporation of incorrect information.

As the following newspaper account shows, some of the misinformed appeals contained requests indicating that Craig’s intended goal was to collect cards, postcards or business-cards instead of get-well cards:

I hear that seven-year-old Craig Shergold is trying to get into the Guinness Book of Records for having the most business-cards collected by one person. Craig of Carshalton, Surrey is determined to make his mark. Ian Beven-Mogg, of Chard Insurance Services, has decided to act as intermediary for Craig and anyone who wants their business-card to be included in the collection can drop it in to Ian’s Holyrood premises (S-71, Ranked 47).

Similarly, four texts contained some incorrect element in Craig’s address—either the number of the house or the postal code being wrong (S-45; S-46; S-47; S-57; S-84, Ranked 9).

Unknowingly, individuals disseminated erroneous information and passed it from appeal to appeal, with the consequence that they perpetuated the flow of misinformation. Such inconsistencies in detail were not, however, missed by others. As one E-mail correspondent pointed out:

Just for the record, here are some of the addresses that have been assigned to Craig. Seems this is a hoax won’t die” (S-124).

The author of the above statement had collected ten different addresses for Craig Shergold including the following three forms which he subsequently circulated to various computer networks users:
Such confusions again probably created the perception amongst the population at large that this was a hoax and among folklorists that this was a legend.

Summary

In this chapter an overall profile of the Dying Child's Wish appeal was first formulated and reflects both real and legendary accounts of appeals by dying children. A second baseline profile was then developed to reflect the Shergold appeal. An Enhanced Baseline Profile of the Shergold Appeal was then subsequently developed to account for minor but significant variations in individual accounts of the appeal. This enhanced baseline was then used to explore the degree of variance which developed in resulting accounts of the campaign.

Subsequent examination of the Shergold corpus showed that when the texts were compared against the Enhanced Baseline Profile of the Shergold Appeal, only
one out of 204 accounts matched the profile and that considerable variation was seen to occur because of partial information, and/or complete omission of information, as well as the incorporation of incorrect information. As might be expected, the cumulative effect of such influences could only be the generation of many variant texts which were less than accurate. It is no wonder, then, that while many individuals have responded to the appeal in a positive manner, others viewed the stories which they heard in other ways--folklorists viewed it as legend, sceptics viewed it as a hoax, and economic pragmatists viewed it as a waste of time. It is obvious that this proliferation of variant texts went towards changing people's perceptions as to the nature and value of the original appeal.
Chapter 6 - RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SHERGOLD APPEAL

Introduction

Folklorists have observed that a fundamental characteristic of the legend is its ability to provoke debate. Dégh, for example, notes that "disputability" is the "raison d'etre" of the legend and that it is the "core idea of the story" that has "fixity" (1991, 32; 19). Similarly, Oring notes that "at the core of the legend is an evaluation of its truth status" (1986, 125). Surprisingly little, however, has been done to explore the rhetorical frame in which individuals situate their personal beliefs about the truth of a legend's content--to the point of discarding it; "the subjective belief of the legend carriers is not a necessary ingredient of the legend and that moreover, it is unessential in the process of creation and transmission (Dégh and Vázsonyi 1976, 118). It is the assumption of this study that attitudes of the individual and the level of information he or she has available very much affects whether a text will be communicated as a true story, an unusual event, an incident that simply went wrong, a hoax, or something less than real.

The focus of this chapter is therefore, to explore the presence and nature of the rhetoric in the discourse about the Shergold appeal, so providing a practical means of examining the varying perspectives which have emerged. I intend to outline those methods employed by individuals to express these altering views. In order to
achieve this goal the subsequent strategy was adopted as follows:

A: Classified the rhetorical statements in the Shergold corpus;
B: Analyzed the prevalence of the rhetorical statements contained in the Shergold corpus;
C: Identified the relationship of the individual rhetorical statements to the content of the texts;
D: Tabulated Attested and Unattested texts.

For the purposes of this examination it was decided to exclude those accounts which originated in the media simply because it would be impossible to determine how accurately these texts reflect individual views. Such sources as newspapers and newsletters are often restricted by the amount of available text space. Moreover, in these accounts the content and perspective may have been shaped by predetermined editorial policy. This analysis, therefore, is based solely on circulated materials such as chain letters, FAXed messages, photocopies, internal memos and computer network electronic mail correspondence. It is these informally circulated materials which best inform, portray and encapsulate individual views, ideas and opinions about the Shergold appeal.

In all 147 accounts consisting of circulated materials such as photocopies, letters, FAXed chain letters, internal memos and computer network correspondence
Principle Themes Emerging From The Shergold Appeal

Examination of the Shergold corpus in Chapter Five showed that substantial variation existed in individual texts resulting from missing information or misinformation. An outgrowth of this variation was the generation of many different scenarios about the Shergold appeal. In general these various scenarios can be classified under the following four general themes:

A. Appeals to send cards to Craig Shergold;

B. Craig’s Campaign Is Complete-The Following Alternative Action Is Recommended;

C. Individuals Should Be Wary and/or Ignore Appeals For Craig Shergold;

D. Discussions Citing Craig Shergold But Not Focused on the Appeal Itself.

Theme A. Appeals to Send Cards to Craig Shergold.

All appeals for Craig approximate the following example:

Editor, Don Hipp of the Dallas Division Support Services Office is asking everyone to participate in his drive to help Craig Shergold, a 7 year-old boy with a brain tumour and a short time to live, to make his dream come true. Craig’s dream is to be remembered in the
Guinness Book of World Records as being the recipient of the most get-well cards. Please help Craig by sending your get-well cards to:
Craig Shergold Children's Wish Foundation 32 Perimeter Center E. Atlanta Georgia 30346-1202 (S-93).

Appeals are usually identified by the use of a combination of the following motifs and allomotifs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIF</th>
<th>ALLOMOTIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Appeal By A Dying Child</td>
<td>A1. Dying Child [Craig Shergold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2. Child's Wish [Craig Shergold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3. Ill Child [Craig Shergold]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Goal - Enter Book of Records</td>
<td>B1. The Guinness Book of Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2. The Alternate Book of Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Method</td>
<td>C1. Receiving Most Get-well Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2. Receiving Most Alternate Cards (Business-cards; Postcards, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Action</td>
<td>D1. Send Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Collector</td>
<td>E1. Craig Shergold 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey, England SM5 1LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E2. Craig Shergold 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey, England SM5 1LD To Be included in the Alternate Book of Records (S-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3. Craig Shergold, C/O Croydon Post, Advertiser House, Brighton Road, South Croydon, CR2 6UB To be Delivered by Wednesday 18 Oct. 1989 (S-89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E4. Craig Shergold, C/O Children's Wish Foundation, 32 Perimeter Centre East, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A. by 30th Nov. 1989. (Field Notes, Author Stein, 3 Nov. 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E5. Please Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E6. To an Intermediary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Identification</td>
<td>F1. Craig Shergold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Biography</td>
<td>G1. Age: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2. Address: 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey, England, SM5 1LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Illness</td>
<td>H1. Cancerous Tumours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme B. Craig’s Campaign Is Complete-The Following Alternative Action Is Recommended.

This second group of stories consists of examples which attempted to alert the public to the fact that the appeal had been terminated, that well-wishers should stop sending get-well cards and/or frequently advised potential contributors to take a more appropriate form of alternate action. These accounts may also be seen as an attempt to acquaint well-wishers with the circumstances surrounding the termination of the appeal:

Craig Shergold, 10 is loved by everyone except, possibly, his mailman. Since last September he’s received 16 million get-well cards and won a spot in The Guinness Book of World Records. The young Londoner who suffers from a rare form of brain cancer, still gets hundreds of cards every day. Now, after Craig’s desire to make it into the record book was chain faxed around the world, his harried mother has declared enough (S-32).

Texts in this group frequently employ some combination of the following motifs and allomotifs--in addition to the motifs and allomotifs contained in Theme A--Appeals to Send Cards to Craig Shergold:

E-7: Campaign Complete

E-8: Stop Sending Get-well Cards We’ve Reached Our Goal

E-9: Stop Sending Get-well Cards We’ve Reached Our Goal; Instead Send Donations To Craig Shergold C/O Royal Marsden Cancer Appeal, 303 Fulham Road, London SW3 6IJ.
Theme C. Individuals Should Be Wary and/or Ignore Appeals For Craig Shergold

Examples in this third type of scenario frequently employ some combination of the following allomotifs:

E-10: Wrong Cards/Alternate Action
E-11: Stop/Ignore
E-12: Throw Away/ Tell Others

In combination with motifs and allomotifs from Theme A and Theme B, Theme C attempts to inform the reader that (i) the wrong kind of cards were being requested (ii) the appeal is over or (iii) others should avoid/reject such appeals. As with the two previous groupings, these examples may be based on fact as well as, missing information and/or misinformation.

This third grouping of stories differs slightly from the previous two because these accounts often build on problems arising from missing information and misinformation. The intent here is largely to denounce the Shergold appeal as a hoax, a waste of time, or a waste of money. Individuals are therefore advised to ignore such requests and to tell others to do the same. As the following electronic mail message illustrates, authors may give detailed explanations, factual or otherwise, as to why such a course of action should be adopted:

> Hi everybody David Comeau is collecting
> business-cards for...
Without a name, address, and phone number for the child and/or the particular "Make A Wish Foundation," please be advised that this is
probably another repetition of one of the more enduring legends which keeps going around. If you pick up a copy of the current Guinness Book of World Records, you’ll see that the record for the most cards collected belongs to a Craig Shergold. Craig had what seemed to be terminal illness. This whole thing happened over five years ago. Craig got several hundred thousand greeting cards, Guinness recognised this achievement and everyone was asked to stop sending cards. Unfortunately every few months someone recirculates a version of the story (note the change to business-cards this time) which end up inundating his family, or some office of "Make-A-Wish". Other than the problem with the cards, Craig’s story ended up with a happy ending as someone who has seen all the publicity flew him to America where he had an operation and is now well into his teens and doing fine. Guinness has stated most emphatically they will not encourage any such collection attempts because of all the havoc this has caused. Considering the vagueness about who the kid is and where he is I suspect this particular request tracks back to the original story about Craig. If you can produce a name and address for the child in this version please contact me and I will apologize to them and mention the down side of this particular idea. While it seems like a nice way passing these stories around and around, Craig and his family are still getting ridiculous numbers of cards and its gotten to the point where it’s just not funny anymore. The good wishes are nice but please stop (S-188).

As this example shows, individuals may also offer advice about the Shergold campaign based on details which have been confused with previous appeals.

Theme D. Discussions Citing Craig Shergold But Not Focused on the Appeal Itself.

A fourth group of accounts also emerges from this analysis. These mention Craig simply to establish a discussion around another subject unrelated to the Shergold appeal. As the following correspondence collected from a computer network illustrates, the appeal may simply be a quick opportunity for an unrelated sarcastic or humorous remark:
In article <1990Apr.132134.12631@talos.pm.com>
kyles@cs.odu.edu writes:
> J R Evans writes:
> > Craig Shergold and his mother appeared on
> > national TV in the UK this morning, They
> > said that he has received and opened 7.5
> > million cards, and he has about 2 million
> > left to open. The Guinness Book of Records
> > will
> How do you open a postcard? (S-146).

Although occasionally drawing upon motifs and allomotifs from themes A, B and C, these texts do not advocate any action. Examples in this group most often draw upon some combination of the following motifs and allomotifs but add one or more totally unrelated items:

A1: Dying Child [Craig Shergold]
A2: Child's Wish [Craig Shergold]
A3: Ill Child [Craig Shergold]
B1: Goal - Enter The Guinness Book of Records
C1: Method - Receiving Most Get-well Cards
F: Identification - Craig Shergold
G2: Address 56 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey, England SM5 1LD

As earlier discussed in Chapter Five, a consequence of missing information and/or misinformation was the generation of scenarios about the appeal which were increasingly at variance. Through classification and analysis of the nature of the rhetoric present in individual texts, these four themes can further be refined to show
the varying degrees of belief, debate and disbelief pertaining to the appeal. Moreover, it can also be shown that these differing perspectives evolved out of the availability and quality of information pertaining to the appeal, and/or corroborative evidence.

A: Classification of the Rhetorical Statements in the Shergold Corpus

The 147 texts in the Shergold collection were examined to determine the variety of rhetorical forms which had been used and ten recurring themes were identified. In addition, it was observed that certain of the texts incorporated details of sources by way of providing substantiation of the information, while others did not. In order to discriminate between the two the term Attested was used to distinguish rhetorical statements wherein individuals had attempted to verify their views through the incorporation of references to some knowledgable source, such as the media or the family itself, and the term Unattested was used where individuals had not added such sources. Together then, this provides the possibility of ten
rhetorical statements—each being Attested or Unattested as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Appeals; Attested  
|   | Appeals; Unattested  
| 2. | Updates; Attested  
|   | Updates; Unattested  
| 3. | Exposés; Attested  
|   | Exposés; Unattested  
| 4. | Rejections; Attested  
|   | Rejections; Unattested  
| 5. | Inquiries; Attested  
|   | Inquiries; Unattested  
| 6. | Endorsements; Attested  
|   | Endorsements; Unattested  
| 7. | Alternative Actions; Attested  
|   | Alternative Actions; Unattested  
| 8. | Apologies; Attested  
|   | Apologies; Unattested  
| 9. | Cynical Reports; Attested  
|   | Cynical Reports; Unattested  
|10. | Reprimands; Attested  
|   | Reprimands; Unattested |

For purposes of illustration, description, discussion and examples of each of the ten rhetorical statement follows.

1. **Appeals (43 examples - 29%).**

   These are direct solicitations from either a named or unnamed source inviting others to help Craig win his bid for a world record. Appeals range in length from two or three lines to sometimes pages, and appear in a variety of public and private formats. But whatever the length, all have one common element, a child's wish is mentioned and an address to which individuals may respond is listed:
Dear Jim:

Walter Morrow, Director of Lincoln Laboratory, has called to my attention that Craig Sherhold, 7 years old, is suffering from terminal cancer. One of Craig’s wishes is to be included in the Guinness World Book of World Records as the individual having collected the largest number of business-cards ever. I would be most grateful, as would Craig, if you would be kind enough to send one of your business-cards to the address below and also send the enclosed pages, attaching one of your own, to ten other contacts.

Craig’s address:

Master Craig Sherhold
36 Shelby Road
Carshalton
London SM1 1LD

I hope this is not asking too much of you, but I am sure it would mean a great deal to this young man. Thanks

Constantine B. Simonides
Vice President (S-88).

Within the context of the analysis, all appeals were Unattested.

2. Updates (27 examples - 19%).

Updates primarily provide information about the progress of the appeal as the following Attested example shows:

Craig Shergold and his poor long-suffering mother were interviewed by Tim Mabey on BBC radio 4’s ‘Today’ programme at about 8:20 this morning. Craig does exist, and spoke briefly in a slurred, slow voice, the cancer of the spine formerly diagnosed has disappeared, though he still has a brain tumour. He is living at home. He mother did most of the talking...Apparently the Guinness Book of Records will include Craig. There was no mention of the story that they will accept no more record attempts at this category, but 16 Megacards will be hard to beat! (S-203).
In this account the author of this computer correspondence has referred to a British radio programme interview with Craig and his mother to validate the appeal and to inform others on the current outcome of events.

3. Exposés (15 examples - 10%).

These are accounts which pointed out that appeals to aid Craig are erroneous and/or inaccurate. In those Exposés which are Attested, individuals draw upon supposedly factual information to convince others to stop sending cards. For example, some argue that, based on the documentation provided, the appeal is legitimate but for reasons given in the documentation the facts have somehow become altered:

Recently as in the past, several chapters have been receiving inquiries about Craig Shergold, a child from England. As you know the Children's Wish Foundation of Canada has no connection to this wish. We are aware of it but have never had any successful contact with the family.

I have attached an article received by Lynda Murray some 18 months ago for your information. As you can see, this is a real wish but to the best of our knowledge, Craig does not need any more cards...Although we do not know which publication printed this article, the Associated Press is a well respected organization internally. I have forwarded this article to you as it is the only concrete piece of information that we have about Craig (S-11).

In this memo, which was circulated to all Children's Wish Foundation Directors across Canada in response to enquiries regarding the appeal, the author has attached a newspaper article as evidence to verify that this is an actual Child's Wish.
4. Rejections (14 examples - 9%).

These accounts, in the main, are attempts to repudiate the appeal—indicating that such requests should be dismissed on the basis of being immoral or inappropriate. As the following example illustrates, the individual often rejects the appeal because it is a waste of money and resources:

This story about Craig Shergold's postcard request has been recycled several times now and the whole thing has become totally insane. As far as I know, this request was fulfilled and Craig's carers HAVE REQUESTED THAT NO MORE CARDS BE SENT. In addition to being seriously insensitive to his relatives (I think he's dead now) it's a MASSIVE WASTE OF RESOURCES I also understand that the GUINNESS BOOK OF RECORDS no longer accepts RECORD ATTEMPTS OF THIS KIND, AND A BLOODY GOOD THING TOO (S-125).

5. Inquiries (8 examples - 5.5%).

Inquiries are requests from individuals for further information about the appeal. One such example is the following electronic mail correspondence:

About a year ago, the periodic request came across the net for cards to be sent to a dying child...I immediately thought "the scam is back" so I called information in Atlanta to verify the nonexistence of a Children's Wish Foundation...Surprise. There was a number for such a business, so I called it up. The man (who was by the way quite rude) said Craig had broken the record as of that morning...What gives? Anybody know why Guinness did an about-face on this record category? Or is it possible that this WAS a sham, and the people at the Children's Wish Foundation are telling anybody who asks that the record has already been broken, so they won't send cards (S-126).
6. Endorsements (4 examples - 3%).

Endorsements are directly supportive of Craig Shergold. Individuals usually indicate that, due to the reasons stated, they are going to respond to the appeal.

However, as the following computer correspondence indicates, authors do not directly request others to respond:

I also called the Foundation at the number listed above (they have a toll free number 1-800-323-9474) and told them that many people thought that it was a joke. The man at the Foundation said that this is what happened: ..."Mercedes-Benz approached us with the idea about 2 months ago. We weren't sure about it, because we had heard that there was a fake name and child used a couple of years ago. But Mercedes checked it out with the hospital and with the child *AND* with Guinness Book and it has been verified"...So I think I am going to send a card. After all its only $0.25 (at least until next year) to make a kid's dream come true (S-104).

7. Alternative Actions (7 examples - 5%).

In these examples the author of the text acknowledges that the Shergold appeal is officially terminated—therein suggesting some alternate form of action. Generally the text is Attested through the use of quotes from a spokesperson for the family, or an individual who has access to information about status of appeal:

> Hi everybody*****Is collecting business-cards
> for a terminally-ill child in the "Make A Wish
> Foundation". Please lets help him out...
> The Make A Wish Foundation *Does Not* want business-cards, or cards of any kind. There is no longer a Guinness category for this sort of nonsense. This is a variant of the well-known Craig Shergold Story. Will someone please set these bozos straight? Anyone have the Gene Spafford article handy for posting? (S-184).
In this case the author asks contributors to stop sending cards by making specific reference to an article by Gene Spafford which was circulating on the computer networks and which described in detail the circumstances pertaining to the Shergold appeal. At the time this account was in circulation, other computer users were lifting the Spafford article and mailing it to unknowing well-wishers, many of which had already had mailed appeals to news-groups through electronic mail (Spafford, Gene. 17 Feb. 1992: Article Six News. Announce. Important (moderated) spaf@cs. purdue. edu).

8. Apologies (3 examples - 2.5%).

These examples are usually a direct open repentance or a retraction of an original statement pertaining to the Shergold appeal. Individuals may offer an apology either because someone has proved to them that the record attempt is a waste of time or a hoax, or because it has been confirmed that the appeal is real:

I recently posted the information that I had received from this group on another group, which had also had the original posting placed on it. The information was that the boy had already died, that Guinness had nothing to do with him, etc. I received the following letter:
> From Karen Williams...I took your advice and phoned the
> Children's wish Foundation In Atlanta. I spoke with Mr. Arthur
> Stein who assured me that (1) Craig is alive; (2) He's close to
> breaking the Guinness record; (3) the Guinness researchers are
> monitoring the mail and counting it; (4) the mail is read by Craig
14.

> and his family....
next time, remind me to check things out myself. My apologies to
those involved (S-139).

In this instance the author has asked pardon for an earlier statement in which he had
indicated that Craig had already died. He has retracted this remark because of
information verifying the existence of Craig Shergold which he has obtained through
electronic mail from another computer contributor and which is also quoted in the
apology.

9. Cynical Reports (23 examples - 15.5%).

In accounts of this type the authors generally communicate disbelief, doubt
and/or mistrust of the appeals:

In article
< 1990 Apr. 13 175631.2110@msunfo.cl.msu.edu>, fengcr@cpsin3
uucp> (Steven V. Fenger) writes:
> From-The State News-May 13, 1990 [stuff deleted]
Oh, please. We’re supposed to believe this with a posted date a
Month from now for this ‘supposed’ article? (S-154).

This Attested cynical report makes reference to a newspaper article taken from The
State News 13 May 1990 and cited by Steven Fenger to validate the existence of
Craig Shergold (S-153). Here the author notes that Fenger had in fact mailed his
comments to the computer news-group misc.misc. on 13 April 1990. He points out
cynically that Fenger couldn’t possibly have acquired the article one month before it
was published.
10. Reprimands (3 examples - 2%).

These are all Unattested statements aiming to admonish or reproach others for their opinions or attitudes, either because of the sensitivity of the subject, or because the author agrees with other views expressed previously. There is no reference to any official source, simply an opinion:

> I'm not usually a very uncharitable person,
> but I really wish this kid would just DIE and
> Be DONE WITH IT

I can't believe anyone in his right mind would ever say such a thing! Perhaps the original poster of the call for cards was not justified, but to say that the kid should "just die and be done with it" is nothing short of pathological ... Your cynicism is neither funny nor warranted, even if this boy is an "urban myth" as proposed by another poster. I think you owe that boy and his family an apology (S-131).

In this instance the author is reproachful of a previous contributor who suggests that Craig Shergold should die (S-112).

B: Prevalence of Rhetorical Statements in the Shergold Corpus.

The above classification of rhetorical statements provided the basis on which to conduct an examination of the Shergold corpus. The corpus was compared with the above classification. The findings were then ranked on a continuum—from the most prevalent to the least prevalent of the ten rhetorical statements.
The resulting 147 statements were subsequently slotted into the ten categories and ranked in the following order according to predominance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Statements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appeals</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Updates</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cynical Reports</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exposés</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rejections</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inquiries</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Alternative Actions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Endorsements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reprimands</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Apologies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 147 (100%)

These results showed that the largest category of statements were 43 Appeals making up 29% of the total. The second highest category of rhetorical statements were 27 Updates of the appeals and made up 19% of the total. These two categories represent some 70 texts or 48% of the total. This indicates that many individuals presumed that the Shergold campaign was a real event.

Findings also showed, however, that a large portion of individuals viewed the actualities of the appeal quite differently. For example Cynical Reports, 15.5%, Exposés, 10%, and Rejections, 10%, ranked third, fourth, and fifth highest. This indicates that 52 of the reports or 35% viewed the appeal either negatively or with a degree of disbelief.
At least another six accounts or 4.5% made up of Reprimands and Apologies, indicated lack of concern with the outcome of the appeal. Another eight accounts, 5.5%, indicated a lack of knowledge to make any decision one way or another. The remaining categories, Endorsements and Alternative Actions, making up the remaining 8% of the total, implied that the appeal was real or what while the it was real, individuals had perhaps adopt a more suitable response.

C: Relationship of the Rhetorical Statements to the Content of Texts

The prominence of such negative statements as Cynical Reports, Rejections and Exposés appeared to suggest the existence of some form of conflict between the actual circumstances of the campaign and resulting perceptions based on misinformation or other influences. To ascertain the nature of this variance the corpus was examined to determine if there was any apparent relationship between the nature of the rhetorical statements and the contents of individual texts.

The 147 accounts in the corpus were arranged according to the rhetorical statements, motifs, and motif sequences they contained. As discussed earlier, texts containing the first three motifs in priority sequence were viewed to more closely reflect the reality of the Shergold appeal (Chapter Five, page 120). These three
primary motifs are considered to be the most significant because they encompass the overall story of all Dying Child's Wish appeals, whether real or legendary. In essence, texts which do not present this arrangement are seen to present increasingly modified and more fragmented accounts of the appeal. They may also be considered further removed from the actualities of the Shergold campaign.

When the 147 texts were ranked according to these principles, 76 texts which fitted the first set of criteria were ranked 1 to 73. Conversely, 71 texts contained less degrees of information and so were ranked 74 to 142. These statements are therefore supposedly at variance with the appeal. Table 5 (Appendix E, pages 324-338) shows the relationship of the 147 individual rhetorical statements to these texts as they ranked previously against the Enhanced Baseline Profile as illustrated in Table 4, Chapter Five (pages 105-119).
Based on this division two groups of statements emerged as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Statements</th>
<th>Texts Containing The Priority Motifs</th>
<th>Texts Not Containing Priority Motifs</th>
<th>The Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appeals</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Updates</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cynical reports</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exposés</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rejections</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inquiries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Alternative Actions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Endorsements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reprimands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Apologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this analysis, three separate trends can be identified. One group of fifty texts comprising Appeals (43) and Alternative Actions (7) present the most detailed information about the appeal and were so ranked highest. An additional group of six texts comprising Reprimands (3) and Apologies (3) present the least informed picture of the appeals and so were ranked lowest. A third group of 91
texts, clustered in the middle between these two extremes, comprises the following six categories of rhetorical statements:

- Updates 27
- Cynical Reports 23
- Exposés 15
- Rejections 14
- Endorsements 4
- Inquiries 8

Total 91

These three groups of rhetorical statements can be recapitulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Statements</th>
<th>Texts Containing Priority Motifs</th>
<th>Texts Not Containing Priority Motifs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Actions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynical Reports</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposés</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejections</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, group A rhetorical statements appeared to support most closely the realities of the Shergold appeal. Group B rhetorical statements project numerous
opposing views about the appeal and could, over-all be, perhaps, best described as
discussive. While some accounts were supportive Updates and Endorsements, other
statements such as Rejections or Cynical reports, were more negative. This signified
that some form of conflict and debate appeared to exist regarding the realities of the
appeal. Group C rhetorical statements signified views of disbelief or lack of interest.

Considering that information about the appeal disseminated through many
different routes and mediums, it is conceivable that discrepancies could exist in the
quality and the content of information being disseminated, thereby affecting an
individual’s knowledge of an appeal. It is also conceivable that such gaps in an
individual’s knowledge would, in all likelihood, be filled with the aid of popular
imagination and speculation.

Based on these observations, it was determined that consideration should be
given to whether individuals used Attested or Unattested sources to formulate these
rhetorical statements. In so doing, it was hoped that this would provide a clearer
insight into the relationship between the Dying Child’s Wish complex and the
variation which was presented in scenarios pertaining to the Craig Shergold appeal.
D: Tabulation of Attested and Unattested Texts

The three groups of rhetorical statements were therefore re-examined to ascertain what percentage of the 147 texts which were based on either Attested or Unattested sources. These results are presented as follows in Table 6 (page).

Table 6: Percentage of Rhetorical Statements In Groups A, B, and C Derived From Attested and Unattested Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Statements</th>
<th>Texts Attested</th>
<th>Texts Unattested</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>43 (29%)</td>
<td>43 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Actions</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>20 (14%)</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>27 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynical Reports</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
<td>21 (14%)</td>
<td>23 (15.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposés</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
<td>15 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejections</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>14 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiries</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
<td>8 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsements</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimands</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologies</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52 (35%)</td>
<td>95 (65%)</td>
<td>147 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results showed that 52 out of 147 texts, or 35% of the total, were based on Attested sources while 95 texts or, 65% of the total, were based on Unattested sources. It
is apparent that over-all, individuals appeared to rely primarily on personal opinion and speculation in expressing their views of the appeal than on any reference to knowledgeable sources. Moreover, considerable variation existed with respect to these perceptions.

The degree and nature of this variation is however best exemplified in the actual configuration of the groups themselves. As may be seen in Table 7, out of the total number of 147 texts, Group B contains 91 texts or 61% of the total. This, significantly, is also the group containing the largest percentages of both Attested and Unattested rhetorical statements.

Table 7: Total Number of Texts In Groups A, B, and C in relation to Attested and Unattested sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Statements</th>
<th>Attested Sources</th>
<th>Unattested Sources</th>
<th>Total Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>7 (4.5%)</td>
<td>43 (29%)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>44 (30%)</td>
<td>47 (32%)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52 (35%)</td>
<td>95 (65%)</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degrees and extent of variation in individual perceptions of the Shergold appeal can be additionally explored through scrutiny of the overall composition of the texts in relation to each of the three groups.
Examination of Group A shows that although 43 out of 50 rhetorical statements were Unattested, all accounts in this group were closest to the circumstances of the Shergold campaign. All 50 texts in this case present the first five motifs in priority sequence (Motif A; Motif B; Motif C; Motif D; Motif E) (Table 5, appendix E, page 324). These accounts contain in essence the most complete information about the appeal. Significantly, the rhetorical statements in this group were either Appeals or Alternative Actions and closely paralleled the circumstances of the campaign. This group comprises almost half of the Unattested texts. It could be inferred that, based on the detailed information individuals already had available about the appeal, there was no reason to doubt the validity of it. Individuals in this group supported the appeal without question and/or accepted that it was real and were aware that it had terminated.

Examination of Group C shows that five out of six texts were based on Unattested rhetorical statements. Texts in Group C actually contain the least amount of information about the appeal—the accounts being generally incomplete, and containing broken and fractured information. This group of statements ranked furthest from the circumstances of the Shergold appeal—texts in this case present incomplete combinations of the first three primary motifs in the Shergold profile (Motif A; Motif B; and/or Motif C).
It is suggested that individuals in Group C placed little importance on the appeal and therefore saw no need to substantiate their views. For them any information about the appeal was of superficial relevance to other concerns. These accounts best symbolize the so-called legendary Dying Child appeals in that details pertaining to the Craig Shergold appeal are almost non-existent. In this case neither belief in, nor debate about the appeal were at issue.

Examination of group B shows however shows a completely different picture. This is the largest group containing 91 texts and comprising 65% of the total number of rhetorical statements. Not surprisingly the overall trend presented here is one of conflicting views pertaining to the appeal. This is best evidenced by the presence of both large percentages of Updates (27 texts) and Cynical Reports (23 texts). This group best portrays the diversities of opinion about the appeal.

Significantly a total of 44 out of 91 texts or 30% of the overall total, are based on some form of Attested source—indicating that individuals appeared to rely on some official source to verify their opinions. The remaining 47 texts or 32% of the total, based their views on speculation, and personal opinion. It may be inferred that it is here between Attested and Unattested sources that some form conflict in the form of debate appears to have been forming about the real and/or legendary nature of the Shergold appeal. Much of this debate, reflected in the different scenarios
which arose about the appeal, appears to have evolved out of accounts containing more information and accounts containing less information.

Examination of the texts in this group shows that certain accounts present at least five motifs in priority sequence (Table 5, appendix E, page 324). Another percentage of the texts present the first four motifs in priority sequence. An additional number of accounts retain the first three motifs in priority sequence. As would be expected, these accounts which contain more information are closer to the reality of the Shergold Profile.

Conversely, the remainder of the accounts are increasingly fractured and suffered from loss of information. Eventually, accounts are reduced to one or two pieces of information and are far from the circumstances of the campaign. As evidenced by the breaks in motif sequences, accounts appear to be more disjointed, presenting only partial or re-ordered information and thus move further and further away from the reality of the appeal.

Group B is indicative of the extent to which conflicts arose in individual perceptions of the Shergold appeal based on the availability, or lack thereof, of information. The extent of this conflict is evidenced in the variety of rhetorical statements in this group including the presence of Updates, Cynical Reports, Exposés, Rejections, Inquiries, and Endorsements. On the one hand, some individuals in this group accepted the appeal as real because of the information they
had available. It can also be said that for many of the same reasons individuals rejected the appeal. Based on their experiences and knowledge, the appeal appeared to be a waste, a hoax, or an incident that had become distorted. As a consequence, individuals apparently found it necessary to provide some form of justification for these differing views and so frequently included references to knowledgeable sources. Growing out of these exchanges of information were multiple scenarios and conflicting arguments about the appeal, ultimately giving life to legend itself in the form of the Dying Child’s Wish complex.

Summary

Analysis of 147 texts pertaining to the Shergold appeal shows that perceptions of the appeal were not uniform and that considerable variation existed. Classification of the rhetorical statements shows that there were at least ten categories of statements present in the Shergold corpus. When these statements were examined for prevalence, results showed that at least 70 texts were appeals and updates and thus supportive of Craig’s bid for a record (48 % of the total). An additional 52 texts (35 % of the total) presented views exhibiting degrees of Cynicism, Scepticism and Rejection, while 25 accounts presented views recommending an alternate response, or reflected lack of knowledge, or concern.
When the texts were grouped according to presence of motifs and motif sequences three distinct groups of variation were identified. Group A, comprised of 50 texts, supported the appeal. Group C, comprised of 6 texts, represented views of rejection and disinterest in the appeal. Group B, the largest group and containing 91 texts or 65% of the total, presented conflicting views. In this group it was apparent that considerable debate existed between texts containing more information and detail and texts containing less information and detail. In part these alternate viewpoints grew out of gaps in information which occurred because of inadequate or flawed information.

Examination of the prevalence of Attested and Unattested sources shows that in many instances individuals appeared to fill in the gaps in their knowledge base by making assumptions about the appeal, and/or by supplying additional supportive information to substantiate these views.

It may be concluded from this analysis that perceptions of the Shergold appeal varied considerably from positive support to rejection and dismissal, and that in between, there were considerably mixed views. A consequence was the growth of many different scenarios and considerable debate about the appeal itself, ranging from support for it, to cynicism and scepticism. Some of this discourse dealt specifically with the circumstances of the campaign. Evidence also showed that individuals used
the Shergold appeal and events surrounding it as a way to draw others’ attention
towards other issues.

These results also concur with the findings of the Shergold profile analysis
which illustrated that missing, or incomplete information resulted in variation from
the realities of the campaign, and in the development of alternate scenarios arising
out of the popular imagination. In essence, where gaps began to occur in terms of
missing, altered and partial information, individuals increasingly arrived at
speculation, the development of erroneous and incomplete accounts, and differing
conclusions about the appeal. This in turn created varying scenarios about the reality
of the appeal and ultimately the growth of the Dying Child’s Wish complex.
Chapter 7 - VARIATION AND CHANGE IN THE SHERGOLD CORPUS

Introduction

The analysis in Chapter Five illustrated that the majority of accounts showed some variation from the realities of the Shergold appeal. Although a percentage of these accounts were closely related to the events of the appeal, others were considerably removed and bore little if any relationship to the Shergold campaign itself. The extent of the variation in the corpus was further illustrated through the rhetorical analysis in Chapter Six, which showed that perceptions of the appeal ranged from positive support to cynicism and rejection.

The focus of this chapter will be to examine these degrees of variation by exploring recurring changes present within the corpus. In so doing I hope to illustrate at least some of the strategies employed, consciously or unconsciously, by individuals when presenting their views about the Shergold appeal.

As in Chapter Six, this examination will focus strictly on the 147 texts in the Shergold corpus which consist of circulated materials such as chain letters, photocopies, FAXed messages, and internal memos, as well as electronic mail correspondence.
Classifications of Textual Changes

Tom Burns in his article "A Model For Textual Change and Variation In Folksong" notes that:

if we are to come to an understanding of why textual change takes place, we must focus on the individual and reckon with the forces which exist within him and impinge upon him to bring about change" (1970, 50).

Essentially Burns situates textual change and variation within the framework of the individual's own outlook; observing "whether conscious or unconscious, textual changes are affected by the individual and it is to this individual's limitations, idiosyncracies and socio-cultural experience that we must look for the cause of these changes" (1970, 51).

Through his own examination of folksongs, Burns identified sixteen ways in which variation may occur (page 164). Burns' model is a practical one because it emphasizes that textual change and variation should be seen from the perspective of the tradition bearer. As such, this approach may be readily adapted to other oral and written traditional materials including the types of texts found in the Dying Child's Wish corpus. Through scrutiny of patterns presented in the texts themselves, Burns' approach offers a systematic means of examining how differing perceptions of the appeal could have emerged (1970, 49-56).

Addition
1. sentimentalization
2. moralization
3. merger

Subtraction
4. expurgation
5. contraction
6. dramatization
7. lyrication
8. fragmentation
9. division

Subtraction plus Addition (Rearrangement)
10. localization
11. universalization
12. personification
13. bowdlerization
14. conventionalization
15. literalization
16. cross-over

Burns list does have at least one limitation. For example, an examination of the circulated materials in the Shergold corpus shows that Burns’ classification is not totally adequate to describe all of the textual changes identified in the Dying Child’s Wish—or even the Shergold corpuses. Perhaps this not surprising because Burns’ focus is folksong whereas, this analysis is concerned with accounts which were disseminated both by word of mouth and with the aid of office technology. In the latter case Burns’ model cannot adequately typify those textual changes which are the result of this technology. Overall, the principles inherent in Burns’ model have been
retained while adaptations and elaborations have been added in order to embrace this particular corpus.

A cursory examination of the 147 texts in the Shergold corpus illustrates that at least ten of Burns’ types of textual change and variation are present:

**Addition**
1. sentimentalization
2. moralization
3. merger

**Subtraction**
5. contraction
6. dramatization
8. fragmentation
9. division

**Subtraction plus Addition (Rearrangement)**
10. localization
11. universalization
16. cross-over

Scrutiny of the Shergold corpus also indicates that in addition to these textual changes there are at least three additional types of changes present, largely because of the nature of the material itself. These include:

1. authentication
2. simulation
3. standardization
These types of change can be integrated into the Burns’ model as follows:

Categories of Change Identified By Burns With Three New Additions

(1970, 49-56):

Addition
1. sentimentalization
2. moralization
3. merger
4. authentication *

Subtraction
5. expurgation
6. contraction
7. dramatization
8. lyrication
9. fragmentation
10. division

Subtraction plus Addition (Rearrangement)
11. localization
12. universalization
13. personification
14. bowdlerization
15. conventionalization
16. literalization
17. cross-over
18. simulation *

19. Standardisation *

(The author’s three new additions are indicated with an asterisk "*").

The category Standardisation was not integrated into Burns’ list of
classifications, but rather placed at the end. The reason for this is that this
classification does not involve any of the three basic changes identified by Burns.

What follows are examples of how individuals have reacted to the Shergold
appeal, based on an exploration of the modifications and alterations made to texts and
using the nineteen types of textual change identified above. While all of these
classifications will be discussed independently, in actual fact this is an interactive
process and, as such, many of these changes often occur concurrently. As Burns
points out, while all of these classifications fall under the three basic categories of
textual change, Addition, Subtraction, and Subtraction plus Addition
(Rearrangement,) a "specific type of textual alteration may involve any one or a
combination of these three basic changes" (1970, 51).

For the purposes of continuity, however, each of the thirteen categories of
change will be described separately and accompanied by specific examples.

1. Sentimentalization - The addition of material to a text wherein "The
added material is generally descriptive in nature and functions to heighten the
listener's feelings toward an act, scene or character" (Burns 1970, 53).

In the case of the Shergold appeal, Sentimentalization is intentionally used to
rouse a response from readers. It is therefore most commonly found in texts which are supportive of Craig’s world-record attempt:

Dear Mr. Warbinski:
We have received a request from People Count Inc. concerning the last wish of a ten year old boy, Craig Shergold. Craig has a brain tumour and has very little time to live. His wish, as expressed by the Children’s Wish Foundation, is to have an entry in the Guinness Book of Records for the greatest number of business-cards ever received by an individual.

Please take a moment and send a business-card to:
Craig Shergold c/o Children’s Wish Foundation
3200 Perimeter Centre East
Atlanta GA 30346.

Also please send the enclosed pages, with your information added, to ten other companies. This is not a request for money. We only ask that you spend a little time to make this boy’s wish come true.

Thank you for your help.
Sincerely

Bill
William Stillings
General Manager (S-96)

Sentimentalization typically attempts to persuade individuals to take action by stressing anxiety and concern for a dying child. Appeals, in particular, customarily attempt to evoke action by drawing upon such techniques as:

a. emphasizing the sentiment through the use of capital letters such as "If you want to take part in this NOBLE CAUSE" or "PLEASE READ";
b. the use of emotional catch phrases drawing readers' attention to the needs of the child with the addition of emotionally charged phrases such as "only moments to live," "suffering from a brain tumour," and "has a tumour in the brain and one on the spine, and has very little time to live."

c. the use of passionate pleas:

"Folks this is Passion Week, Passover Week and Whatever other observance I am not familiar with. PLEASE send this boy your support" (S-145).

In some instances, Sentimentalization may be more overt but still convey the need for individual participation, and stress the ability for an individual or community to make a difference--such as:

d. acknowledgment that others have participated elsewhere--implying "so why don't you?";

"Here in the Engineering School we are collecting many cards and tomorrow afternoon we are planning to FedEx them to Craig at the Wish Foundation" (S-145).

e. encouragement for others to take action;

"Please pitch in & send a get-well card, and by all means feel free to circulate this letter to local businesses/organizations, or other BBS's you may belong to. All your help and effort will certainly be appreciated" (S-145).

These insertions of sentimental passages into existing texts have the effect of creating new variants of existing texts.
2. Moralization - "the addition of material" [to a text] "which states explicitly the lesson supposedly to be learned" (Burns 1970, 53).

Much of the Moralization appears to have evolved out of a fundamental need to convey messages about conduct, ethics or principles. To this extent, the Shergold campaign regularly provided a vehicle for participants to lecture on an array of subjects. In some instances the Moralization was supportive of Craig's appeal and focused on:

a. The need to help a sick boy fulfill his wish;

"Today the Post is asking every reader to help a sick little boy realize his ambition...Below is Craig's story. After reading it we hope you will support him" (S-40).

b. The need to let a dying child know you care;

"Fulfilling a wish for a dying little boy is what matters the most to students living on the fourth floor of Case Hall...Katie Henninger says she wants Shergold to know people at MSU care about him" (S-92).

c. The difficulties of terminal illness;

"...to say that a kid should "just die and be done with it" is nothing short of pathological...Have you ever had a terminal illness in your family? Your cynicism is neither funny nor warranted, even if this boy is an "urban myth" as proposed by another poster. I think you owe that boy and his family an apology" (S-131).
d. Redirecting the efforts of well-meaning people;

"This appeal for Craig, as well as many urban legends, regularly appear on electronic bulletin boards around the world... It is both heartening and unfortunate that there are so many well-meaning people who continue to propagate these stories. It is too bad that so many people are unwilling to verify their information before passing such things along... If you would like to do something for a dying child, consider making a donation to a charity such as UNICEF or to the International Red Cross" (S-182).

However, the Moralization highlighted in other texts approached the campaign much more negatively, drawing individuals’ attention to:

e. Exposure of the appeal;

"All right if this postcard thing is ‘legitimate’ as several posters are saying, then how long has Craig Shergold been at it? I saw that exact same name in a similar posting over six months ago" (S-103).

f. The financial waste caused by the appeal;

"It troubles me to think of all that money wasted on postcards Craig Shergold will probably never look at. They’re going to be hard pressed to count 9 million postcards let alone give any attention to them... I think of all that postage and money spent on the cards that could be going toward medical research, and it all seems such a sickening waste" (S-40).

g. The character and conduct of such organizations as the Children’s Wish Foundation;

"The CWF [Children’s Wish Foundation] is being investigated... They’re promoting the Craig Shergold story, with him being an Atlanta resident, because many people send CASH to help pay for his ‘disease’ (last thing I heard he was recovering) and this whole shebang has been profitable for the CWF..." (S-168).
The inappropriate use of computer network resources;

"In an appropriate news-group for crying out loud! What, in the name of the Goddess, does this postcard garbage have to do with operating systems" (S-107).

The waste of peoples' time;

"Somebody has to say it: Who cares if any of these stories are true? Even if the kid wants postcards, is that a reason to waste everybody's time? These messages should not be posted even if true" (S-130).

The waste of office resources;

"I've seen the send-Craig-a card chain letters in business offices. They make me sick. They involve large amounts of photocopying of documents, old letters, lists of contributors, etc., and probably cost $2/postcard when you count labour" (S-173).

Taking advantage of children;

"Yesterday my two sons came home from school and told me they were making cards to send to a boy in England! I don't like having innocent children being used for this type of crap" (S-101).

The use of quotes, underlined passages, large text-type, parentheses, and exclamation marks are also used to add moral emphasis, particularly in those texts transmitted through computer networks:

This story about Craig Shergold's postcard request has been recycled several times now and the whole thing has become totally insane. As far as I know, this request was fulfilled and Craig's carers HAVE REQUESTED THAT NO MORE CARDS BE SENT.

In addition to being seriously insensitive to his relatives (I think he's dead now) it's a MASSIVE WASTE OF RESOURCES.

I also understand that the Guinness Book of Records NO LONGER ACCEPTS record statements of this kind, and a bloody good thing too.
So, people, PLEASE IGNORE ALL FUTURE REQUESTS OF THIS KIND. I apologize for shouting! (S-125)

The addition of material, for purposes of Moralization, frequently required that other material was dropped. In many instances, computer users lifted out whole blocks of information and comments pertaining to the Shergold appeal from other sources and appended these statements to their own. The character " > " is commonly employed by computer users to distinguish information extracted from sources elsewhere and added to a sender's own comments:

> Send a card to:
> Craig Shergold
> Children's Wish Foundation
> 32 Perimeter Center
> Atlanta, GA 30346
> Craig is 7 years old and has a brain tumour.
> He has a short time to live. But he has one wish: to break the
> Guinness World Book Record for card receiving: 1,000,265. He is
> trying to do this by 4/15/90.
One word: AAAAAAAAUUUUUUUUUU
RRRRRRRRGGGGGGGGGGGHHHHHHHHHHH!
I think everyone should no [sic] what I mean:-) Seriously folks this thing has been around for years and the kids address seems to keep changing. Now it has hit net-world. Please do not send any more cards (S-135).

As the above example illustrates, one consequence of the addition of moralization was the generation of a series of stories directed towards alternate issues. In this instance, only minimal information about the appeal is present. In
addition, the author has appended comments which have the effect of redirecting the readers’ attention to considering the legendary nature of such requests.

3. **Merger** - "the process whereby two [texts]... become one either through simple compounding or through fusion of their element...and is likely to occur only when the songs [texts] are close in content, mood and theme" (Burns 1970, 53).

Mergers have occurred primarily because individuals have mentally related the circulating appeals to earlier real or pseudo appeals. In several instances, after the Shergold appeal was launched, individuals regularly merged this request with Mario Morby’s 1987 record attempt. This was due in part to the ongoing publicity still surrounding the details of Mario’s successful achievement:

Craig doesn’t want more cards. In November, he received a certificate from Guinness after his mountain-sized collection of 1.5 million cards broke the record set in 1988 by Mario Morby, a 13-year-old cancer victim...These two boys really captured the public imagination (S-134).

In some instances, the availability of information about Mario’s appeal led individuals to assume that Craig was collecting postcards as had been the case with Morby’s campaign:

The greatest desire of Craig [sic] is to appear in the Guinness Record Book as the person who has received the greatest number of postcards in the world (S-79).
Stories such as these were inevitably picked up and commented on by readers, and then re-circulated; so creating variants and conflicting information about the appeal.

4. Authentication - A process of verification and documentation through the inclusion of names, places, dates, times, or sources that are used as proof of the existence of the appeal. This most often involves the addition of information to a text.

I have already alluded to this type of textual change in the rhetorical analysis where I observed that individuals frequently incorporated references to newspapers, radio and television programmes, or other knowledgable sources to verify the existence of the appeal (Chapter Six, page 139).

These particular additions were often for the purposes of substantiating the actuality of the Shergold appeal. They are found in all three rhetorical groups previously identified in Chapter Six. But, they were most often found in Group B where individuals regularly used the inclusion of such information to verify that the appeal was real. One such example is the following electronic-mail message by computer user Karen Williams, who employed the technique of authentication to prove that Craig's appeal was legitimate:

In response to the message many of us received on another network concerning a young boy named Craig Shergold...
I've spoken with Mr. Arthur Stein of the Children's Wish Foundation in Atlanta. He assures me that Craig is
1. Still Alive
2. Not in remission but doing well
3. Cards are welcome by the Foundation, Craig and his family
4. Craig's goal to be in the Guinness Book is so close Mr. Stein hopes that all the people who would like to send letter of encouragement WILL DO SO...Craig and his family READ EVERY PIECE OF MAIL.

There is no truth to other e-mail network messages that this is BOGUS...that Craig died...that there is no Craig...that Guinness won't print his story...
Here in the Engineering School we are collecting many cards and tomorrow afternoon we are planning to Fac"x them to Craig at the Wish Foundation.

If any of you doubt me, Mr. Stein will be more than happy to speak with you. His number (in Atlanta) is 404-393-9474.
Folks this is Passion Week, Passover Week and Whatever other observance I am not familiar with. PLEASE send this boy your support.

THIS IS EXCITING...PLEASE READ THIS
It's a follow-up on my earlier message, concerning a little boy named CRAIG SHERGOLD.

THE DAILY PRINCETON, Princeton's daily student newspaper, followed through with checking the story of Craig.
"Shergold beat 12-year-old-Mario Morby's 1990 world record of receiving 1,000,265 postcards, according to a spokesperson at the Guinness World Records museum Niagara Falls, Canada. An operator at the Wish Foundation said last night that she did not know how many postcards Shergold received."

THIS IS GREAT...Although I will say I received several lethal flames for repeating this story. I'm happy to say that the writer from the DAILY PRINCE took the time to verify it. As for the story about a sick child, trying to beat this record, being suffocated by 500,000 cards...well, I've put a call to the Research Departments of the PHILADELPHIA ENQUIRER and also the New York times...so far I haven't had verification that this particular story ever appeared on the wire services. Congratulations, Craig Shergold, not every person "gets their wish"!!! (S-145).
In this example Williams described a personal conversation with Mr. Arthur Stein of the Children's Wish Foundation and provided the phone number and quoted two other official sources; her university newspaper the Princetonian and the Guinness World-Records Museum in Niagara Falls, Canada.

One Authentication technique, associated specifically with chain letters about the appeal, involved the inclusion of the names of previous participants. At least one chain letter in the corpus had stayed in circulation for almost a year in this manner. It included over 290 names on 29 photographed pages, many with company letterhead and dating back to 25 September 1990 (S-61).

An examination of the chain letters in the corpus suggests that appeals regularly travelled through friendship and business networks and that these lists provided an effective means of swaying others to take action. The inclusion of names and lists was a persuasive means of obtaining a response from recipients. By implication these methods suggested that "the appeal must be on the level" because individuals could see for themselves "other people you know who have already responded."

Another Authentication strategy involves the substitution of Craig's address with an institutional one. For example, the inclusion of the Royal Marsden Hospital address provided an effective way of demonstrating, to potential participants, that Craig's appeal was authentic (see for example S-36; Chapter Four, page 79).
5. **Contraction** - "the most general of the terms for Subtraction, ‘contraction’ can refer to the loss of any type of material at any level. Usually however, it is implied that materials essential to the storyline remain, while peripheral material is shed" (Burns 1970, 53).

Contractions in texts, are often the result of individual efforts to emphasize a point. In these instances, certain details of the appeal are retained to underscore a particular idea or perspective, while extraneous information is consciously dropped.

Examples of Contraction are most often observable in texts disseminated through computer networks. In these situations, an individual borrows details about the appeal from another source and then appends his or her own comments for emphasis:

In article 23122@unix.cir.pitt.edu>, elsst@@unix.cis.pitt.edu (Edward L Shaffer) writes:
> Help a 7 year old boy make his wish come
> true!! Craig Shergold has a brain tumour and is
> not expected to live much longer...
I'm not usually a very uncharitable person, but I really wish this kid would just die and be DONE WITH IT (S-112).

This example contains a small segment of an appeal originally sent through electronic mail to the computer networks by Edward L Shaffer—appropriately tagged with " > ". The author has fused this information with his own comments to make a statement about his distaste for such activities.
Examination of texts in the Shergold corpus, shows that individuals repeatedly cited portions of Shaffer's appeal--utilizing, however, only those relevant passages which would support the new writer's particular view. A consequence of Contraction, in these cases, was that the quality of information pertaining to the appeal deteriorated considerably while, at the same time, the number of variant emerging texts increased.

6. Dramatization - This type of textual change emphasizes that a "single or climactic act becomes more and more the focus of attention due to the shedding of peripheral action and descriptive material...although this form of change is generally associated with Subtraction, there seems no reason that at the same time peripheral action and descriptive detail is lost, the focal action cannot be somewhat elaborated through the addition of dramatic material" (Burns 1970, 54).

Examples of Dramatization are numerous, particularly with respect to material disseminated by way of computer ANEWS news-group directories. Topics in individual ANEWS news-group directories are listed by "word-threads" (key words assigned by the sender). These "threads" in turn provide a reference point for readers browsing through the directory and are used to actually select items to be read. For example, key words such as Craig or Dying Boy's Last Wish were
regularly used as word threads to provide a link with previous conversations, or
discussions about an aspect of the Shergold appeal.

Occasionally contributors accentuated their views about aspects of the appeal
through the employment of key word-threads. In one instance, the word-thread
"Fuck Off Craig" was adopted by numerous contributors to open up debates and
discussions about the authenticity of the Shergold appeal. Such was the case with
Steven Fenger who used it as a dramatic way of registering his comments on the
appeal:

Subject: Re; Fuck Off Craig
From: fenger@cpsin3.uuep (Steve Fenger
Date: 13 Apr. 1990

In article <90102.185944mls129@psuvm.psu.edu>
MLS129@psuvm.psu.edu (Michael L. Sensor) writes:

> Good try for the CMU boys. They did the oldest email-chain-letter
> trick in the book. The "Dying boy who wants postcards" thing has
> been on the vax systems as well as ham radio BBSes for Years.
> Nice try though [...]  

From-The State News-May 13, 1990 "seven-year-old Craig Shergold,
of London, is dying from a brain tumour [...] According to
Arthur Stein, a worker at the Children's Wish Foundation in Atlanta,[...]  
Shergold has already received over 5 million postcards (S-153).
Shortly thereafter, Tim Roeder sent a rejoinder using the same word thread as a reference:

Subject: Fuck Off Craig
From: tar@naucse.UUCP
Date: 13 April 1990...
In article {1990 April 13.175631.211 @msuinfo. cl.mse.edu},
fenger@cpsin3.uuc[(Steven V. Fenger) writes:
> From-The State News-May 13, 1990

stuff deleted] Oh, please. We're supposed to believe this with a posted date a MONTH from now for this supposed article?
[more stuff deleted] (S-154).

Jeffrey Temple similarly circulated his comments to the network under the same word thread emphasizing, however, his support for such appeals:

Subject: Re; Fuck Off Craig Shergold
From: jeffry@utgard.uucp (Jeff Temple)
Date: 13 Apr. 1990
In article{90102.185944MLS129@psuvm.psu.edu}MLS129@psu.edu (Michael L. Sensor) writes:
> Good try for the CMU boys. They did the oldest e-mail-chain-letter
> trick in the book. The "Dying guy who wants postcards" thing has
> been on VAX systems as well as ham radio BBSes for YEARS.
> You fuck off asshole, it's legitimate.

+----------------------------------------------------------+
Jeffrey P. Temple mail:csusac!utgard!pygard!
jeffrey (S-156).

As these examples show, the focus of attention has obviously shifted away from presenting details of the appeal to a debate about the authenticity of the appeal.
7. **Fragmentation** - "an extreme state of contraction wherein the loss of material (either of action or mood) becomes so extensive that what remains...is no longer considered a complete piece" (Burns 1970, 54).

Several texts appear to have been affected by Fragmentation. In extreme examples only a single piece of information remained, resulting in a text that was somewhat nebulous:

> This is the variant of the well-known Craig Shergold story. It's only well known if you read the right newsgroups or magazines. The fact that it won't go away after years indicates that it's not all that well known generally.
> Will someone please set these bozos straight? Anyone have the Gene Spafford article handy for posting?
> I just posted it, but I don't think they're "bozos" for wanting to help the kid or for not reading a particular newsgroup. If we had more folks willing to pitch in and help sick kids without question or pause, this world would be a better place (S-187).

In this particular text the words "Craig Shergold" are all that remain of the original appeal.

8. **Division** - "a process ...which is characterized by a song [text] splitting into two or more" (Burns 1970, 54).

Examination of the Shergold corpus shows that the original get-well card request has been divided and split several times. One good example is a Division
which occurred as a result of the substitution of business-cards for get-well cards:

Dear Derek:
Re: Request for Business-Cards

Craig Shergold is seven years old and suffering from terminal cancer. It is one of his wishes to be included in the Guinness [sic] Book of Records with the largest number of business-cards ever collected by one person. I would be very grateful if you would send one of your business-cards ...

(S-65).

This renegade was simply reproduced and recirculated in the same manner as the original appeal. A major repercussion was that the Shergolds began receiving thousands of business-cards in addition to the millions of get-well cards.

Other Divisions were the result of the substitutions of specific instructions such as "consider making a donation to charity":

If you would like to do something for a dying child, consider making a donation to a charity such as UNICEF or to the International Red Cross (Red Crescent, Red Magen David). Many thousands of children are dying daily around the world from disease and starvation and countless millions more are suffering from the ravages of war, famine, disease and natural disaster. Think how many of them might be helped by the millions of dollars in postage spent on cards to Craig Shergold...Addresses (In US) Are:

UNICEF
1 UN Plaza
New York, Ny 10017... (T-205).

This specific textual change is comparable to Smith's concept of "Intervening Reformulation" (1988, 33). According to Smith, specific interventions and alterations to a tradition may occur as a result of either internal or external pressures on the tradition or the participants (1988:33). Attempts may be made to halt a tradition.
The reason may be that a new form of the tradition develops. This is in fact what had occurred in the case of the Shergold appeal. On 22 November 1989, the Shergold family specifically attempted to halt the flow of cards by appealing to well-wishers to stop sending cards, as the campaign had accomplished its goal (Croydon Post 22 Nov. 1989). These specific instructions subsequently were recorded in many accounts of the campaign following that date. These variants, overlapped with appeals which were already in circulation, created confusion and conflict.

Analysis of individual texts also indicates that numerous spin-off variants were created through the erroneous supplanting of alternate components. Examination of the texts shows vividly that individuals frequently added and/or altered information prior to reissuing it to potential recipients. Such is the case with three chain-FAX appeals collected in St. John's, Newfoundland, at roughly the same period (November-December 1989). At first glance each of these appeals appears to be the same request. All three examples of the appeal are typed and have the following text:

Craig is a 7 year old boy who is in the Royal Marsden Hospital in London. Craig has a tumour on the brain and one on the spine and has very little time to live. It is his ambition to have an entry in the Guinness Book of Records for the largest number of "Get-well Cards" ever received by an individual. Please send Craig a card now:
The author has in each case provided the same address for well-wishers to send cards to Craig, with the instructions to "Please fax this to at least ten (10) other companies" typed underneath.

However, comparison of the three appeals shows that ongoing variation resulted from repeated interruptions throughout the line of transmission. One significant difference is the propagation of new variants where each variant presents a different name, house number, postal code and road name:

- **Appeal 1.**
  
  To Craig Skerbold
  36 Elley Road
  Carshalton
  Surrey, England
  SW5 1LO
  (S-45);

- **Appeal 2.**
  
  To Craig Sherbold
  96 Selby Road, Carshalton, Surrey,
  England SW3 1LD
  (S-47);

- **Appeal 3.**
  
  To Craig Sherwood
  56, Salby Road
  Carshalton Surrey, England
  SW5 1LO
  (S-46).

Changes such as this were significant in generating misinformation about the appeal and in creating appeals that diverged continuously from the original appeal.
This type of textual change is comparable to another of Smith's concepts, where he observes that with each "Intervening transmission" change and variation occur because "the information required to reconstruct a tradition may pass through several individuals on its way from the 'parent' form to a prospective adopter who will finally put it into practice" (1988, 34). Fundamental to this type of situation is the notion that each performance or text will "unconsciously diverge from the 'parent' form" as a result of the transmission process (1988, 34).

9. Localization - "the process whereby details...particularly those of person, place and time, are replaced by local counterparts...the process of localization is considerably aided when local events attached to local names and places at least loosely parallel the events and characters... "(Burns 1970, 54).

Texts were altered in many different ways to demarcate between a localized request and a more general one. First names, personal greetings, official names, local addresses, phone numbers, postal codes, recognisable company stationery, and the inclusion of directed petitions for support, all assured that an appeal would be given due consideration. One such example is a personal chain letter appeal sent to Ron Day, Director, Planning and Research, Department of Social Services, with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador from George Courage, Director, Newfoundland and Labrador Statistics Agency, also with the Government of
Newfoundland (S-60, appendix B-??). This letter was later photocopied for Mr. Day and posted on a bulletin board in his offices.

Examples in the collection also illustrate that the demarcation of a text was not restricted to a specific geographical area. Chain letters, sent by mail and FAX, successfully used this technique to recruit participation from business networks connected across province, country, ocean, and continent. Individuals receiving such appeals frequently updated and reissued the requests to their own list of networks.

10. **Universalization** - "a process exactly counter to localization. Change in this instance involves the substitution of generalized categories (the three sisters) or common names (John) for specific designations (Emilou, Adelaide and Marge; Egbert). Whether the change that is brought about is one of Localization or Universalization, the result is much the same--to make identification with the contents of a ...[text] easier... (Burns 1970, 54).

The textual change of Universalizing has occurred regularly. Typical examples include:

(a) replacement of the more particular request for get-well cards with "cards" (S-133);

(b) replacement of the more particular name Craig Shergold with "Little Fellow" or "boy" (S-106);
replacement of the more specific address 56 Selby Road, Carshalton,
Surrey, England, with "somewhere in the UK" (S-106).

In these instances, the substitution of general information for detailed
information about the appeal ensured that the texts became more and more imprecise:

I am pretty sure the little fellow (who lives in Surrey, UK) got his
record number of cards some months ago, and there was some sort of
follow up request about not sending cards but something else (a
donation, perhaps) to some worthy cause. (S-106).

11. Cross-over - "a process whereby, because of similarities in content,
mood, theme or tune, material at any level passes from one [text]...to another"
(Burns 1970, 55).

The Shergold appeal resulted in the generation of least two distinct Cross-
overs. Both involved appeals for terminally-ill children, all of which, in terms of
context, theme, and mood bear remarkable resemblance to the Shergold campaign.

The parents of Jarrod Booth of British Columbia confirmed that their
terminally-ill child's appeal for the greatest number of Christmas cards was in fact
patterned on information derived from news clippings a friend had passed them on
Craig's appeal (Interview, Cindy Booth, 9 Jan. 1990-Tape 4).

The current campaign for Blaine Granger of Winnipeg, Manitoba, who is
attempting a record for the greatest number of hats, is directly linked to the Shergold
appeal. This specific appeal was given a public launch after a local Winnipeg
reporter inundated with Shergold requests suggested that his readers instead help
Blaine (Interview Bernie and Del Granger, 2 July 1991-Tapes 9 a&b). Blaine’s collection of hats now stands at 12,000 including one donated by then U.S. President George Bush.

12. **Simulation** - the autonomous creation of a text or situation which re-creates or resembles the mood and action of a parent text and is genetically related.

In March 1990, in Windsor, Ontario a worker in a metal plant played a practical joke on his co-worker Jim Lynn by FAXing out an appeal modelled on that of Craig Shergold:

```
Mar16’ 90 16:00 WINDSOR UTILITIES 12328477 
THIS CAME TO US FROM ONE OF OUR SUPPLIERS. PLEASE DO A GOOD DEED AND PASS IT ON. 
ATTENTION; 
Jim is a 3 year old boy who is in the Metropolitan Hospital in Windsor, Ontario. Jim has a tumour in his brain and one in his spine and he unfortunately has very little time to live. 
It is Jimmy’s ambition to have an entry in the Guinness Book of World Records for the largest number of "Get-well CARDS" ever received by an individual. 
Please send a card today to Jim at the following address: 
Jim Lynn 
207-101 Langois 
Windsor, Ontario 
Canada 
N9A 6Y2
```

Please fax this letter to at least 10 other companies as soon as possible and list your name here after you have sent your card... (Suppliers. Photocopy Appeal, 24 Apr. 1990).
Shortly thereafter, letters of goodwill started to arrive in the mail. Once the FAX went out, the appeal was irreversible, causing both the hospital and Jim Lynn to be flooded with letters.

One slightly different Simulation involved a cynical parody of the appeal. For example, much to the frustration of some computer users, well-wishers frequently sent requests for get-well cards to computer network directories through electronic mail:

Subject: Send your get-well cards
From : andre@tybalt.caltech.edu,(Andre T.Yew)
A friend of mine asked me to post this...(Feel free to distribute this article to wherever you feel appropriate.)
Found this on a BBS in Minneapolis, Minnesota...

We are asking all BBS Members and their family and friends in joining in to help make one extremely sick child's wish come true... This particular child's name is Craig Shergold, who is seven years old and has a very short time to live due to a brain tumour. Craig's wish is to have his name added to the list of "record holders" in the Guinness Book of World Records. The record he wishes to be accountable for is:
The person who has received the most get-well cards.

The record now stands at 1,000,265
This is such a small task for us to accomplish for a precious little seven year old to ask. Let's put a smile on Craig's little face with a get-well card and letting him know we all truly care by sending him a card as soon as possible. All cards must be received by no later than Sunday April 15, 1990 and can be mailed to him at the following location:
Craig Shergold
C/O Children's Wish Foundation
32 Perimeter Center E.
Atlanta Georgia 30346 (S-115).
In the following parody, only sufficient information essential to communicating the authors' intended viewpoint was retained:

Personally I've decided all these dying-child postcard stories are true. That's why I'm trying to get a new list started.

DEATHWISH -L
Moderator: CHOKING@DOBERMAN
Purpose: To generate Getwell cards for dying children to get into the Guinness Book of Records...
Note: Subscribers will probably be named David or Craig, so if there is more than one subscriber at your hospital site arrange with your fellow dying children with special wishes to assign numbers, e.g. David 1, David 2, Craig 1, Craig 2 (S-99).

In this example the author used references to the Shergold campaign and The Guinness Book of Records to simulate Dying Child appeals. By tactfully incorporating minimal information about the appeal, the author re-created the essence of such requests while making a cynical point. Other elements were then intentionally added to heighten the effect of the statement. The author cleverly lifted the moderator heading from Jan Brunvand's The Choking Doberman and Other "New" Urban Legends (1984); so adding emphasis to his parody of a computer network appeal.
13. Standardization - The reproduction of one or more duplicates of a text by the use of a communication system such as the FAX machine and photocopier.

Most often, change has been examined from the perspective of modifications made to individual texts, which result in a degree of alteration from the parent text. According to Smith, when traditions are disseminated orally the likelihood of an exact reconstruction of a parent tradition is remote. A tradition is more likely to show a steady "Evolutionary change," slightly diverging from the parent form over time as a result of "Constant evolution" brought about through performance or communication (Smith 1988, 31).

With oral tradition this is what one would expect to occur, but when texts are disseminated by the FAX machine and photocopier, reproduction can occur without modifying the text in any way. In these instances, the text may remain unchanged and static, producing a degree of Standardization. In such cases, the original text and all additional copied texts are patterned alike. One such example is a hand-written chain letter appeal which Kenneth Kavanah gave to Henry Crane. He in turn made a photocopy and passed it to an employee at All Clear Water Treatment, Avalon Mall Shopping Center, St. John's, Newfoundland (S-67, appendix B pages 304-306).

This individual simply made multiple copies of the original Dear Henry letter on the photocopier and passed them out to friends and contacts. One of the unaltered copies was hand delivered within the Mall to Louise Kearney of Kearney and
Daughter Watch Repair. She in turn made a photocopy of the appeal and presented it to the author (Field-notes, Louise Kearney 15 Nov. 1991).

In this instance, as Crane's response to the appeal was simply to photocopy multiple copies and circulate them to others in his network, the appeal was passed on to many people, unchanged, with the content of the appeal remaining exactly the same. As such this series of texts could be described as non-evolutionary. They were transferred to other individuals in their original state.

Significantly, this appeal contained a number of faults—the date of the appeal was out by several months, the request was for business-cards not get-well cards, and there were errors in Craig's address and age. These flaws continued to stay in circulation each time the appeal was reproduced and passed to another individual.

One twist to this pattern of non-variation is to be found in cases where a word processor has been used to generate a text which has been sent to individuals on a mailing list. The Spanish toy company, Juguetecnica, for example circulated a typed postcard appeal for "Graig" [sic] to ten museums in Britain, including the Bethnal Green Museum of Childhood, London; Bantock House Museum, West Midlands; Abbey House Museum, Leeds; and Cambridge and County Folk Museum, Cambridge (S-78; S-79; S-80; S-81). Each of these appeals is exactly the same with the exception that a different museum address had been inserted on the top of the letter. A feature of business letters is that they are designed to accommodate multiple
mailings. Today's word-processor technology facilitates such alterations while achieving standardization in the main body of the text.

The same might be said of many chain letters where the basic text can be reproduced by simply substituting the appropriate name and address of specific individuals. In these cases the style of the letter commonly includes the introductory greeting such as "Dear", followed by a customary form of closure such as "Yours Sincerely." These slots allow for the inclusion of particular information while retaining the uniformity of the letter's content and style.

Summary

Examination of the corpus illustrates how, Addition, Subtraction, Substitution and even Standardisation of textual material by individuals, has created numerous inconsistencies in terms of information about the Shergold appeal. The thirteen forms of textual variation and change found in these circulated materials (photocopies, chain letters, electronic mail correspondence, and FAXed messages) show how misinformation, missing and altered information affected individual perceptions.
The over-all result was that as material was added, subtracted and/or rearranged, individuals expressed these views in their own texts creating additional variation. The emphasis in texts shifted away from support for the Craig Shergold Appeal, (in the form of appeals and campaign updates,) to confusion, cynicism and rejection of that same appeal.
CONCLUSIONS

When this study commenced, I assumed, like many folklorists, that all the appeals for terminally ill children, real or otherwise, were inextricably linked to a legendary tradition evolving out of the 1982-83 Paisley, Scotland, Little Buddy hoax, with roots possibly dating back into the nineteenth century.

As this research progressed, however, and when it was discovered than no less than four children had initiated actual appeals for world records, I perceived that the Dying Child’s Last Wish narrative tradition was based in reality. Moreover, as the body of texts which I had documented were, for the most part, confined to accounts in the media and contained in circulated materials such as photocopies, FAX messages, electronic mail correspondence, and chain letters, I realised that no-one had yet considered whether these contemporary influences had any significance for this tradition. In the end it was the magnitude of the material itself, focusing on four campaigns for world records, all launched in the space of two years, which shifted the emphasis of this study from an examination of a legendary appeal to the identification of a complex of stories, beliefs, and behaviours rooted in both legend and reality.

The greatest challenge of this study was devising ways to explore the relationship between real and legendary accounts and to this extent, much time was spent organising the material into an examinable form. The subsequent development
of the Dying Child's Wish Profile and the formulation of the Enhanced Profile of the Shergold Appeal provided a means of scrutinizing the material—the final refinements being the result of much trial and error. Likewise, the development of a means of accounting for the conspicuous presence of rhetorical statements and textual changes in the data, created numerous frustrations. I was consequently forced to cross-check and re-examine many of my assumptions. This occurred, as I later realised, because my orientation was focused on legend, and I was trying to force the material to conform to pre-determined ideas and concepts.

As this in itself proved to be a constraint, I decided first to piece together the facts pertaining to the Shergold appeal and then to scrutinize the related data in light the circumstances surrounding this real request by a terminally ill child. Once the corpus of 204 texts were compared and ranked against the Enhanced Profile of the Craig Shergold Appeal, it was discovered that the rhetorical statements and the textual analyses served to highlight certain fine details in the accounts and so provide a clearer picture of the shaping of the Dying Child's Wish complex. Undertaking to examine the material in this form proved to be most rewarding, the results of which enabled the material to speak for itself.

The Dying Child's Wish complex is grounded within the reality of contemporary society and thus influenced by many factors including, antecedents in legend dating back to the 1850s, the existence of real appeals since 1960, both
institutional and spontaneous community efforts to support appeals and, most significantly, the launching of four real Dying Child’s Wish appeals since 1957.

Each of the four real Dying Child’s Wish appeals was disseminated using the same means generally associated with contemporary legend— that is, by word-of-mouth, office technology and the media. As the parents of the children involved soon found out however, once an appeal was launched, it became impossible to halt renegade appeals. The public’s response was subsequently overwhelming and irrepresible. One repercussion of these renegade requests, as evidenced in the case of the Craig Shergold appeal, was the generation of a quagmire of distorted and misinformation. The circumstances surrounding this real appeal led to speculation and the invention and the generation of numerous scenarios based on fact, garbled details, and fiction. This resulting situation additionally led folklorists to think that they were simply dealing with a contemporary legend.

Having recognised this, the use of the Enhanced Baseline Profile provided a practical means of unangling the layers of fact and fiction. First, it highlighted variation and change in a way that enabled me to explore the extent to which missing and incorrect information affected the growth of legendary appeals. Second, I was able to see that this variation and change generated scenarios further and further removed from the facts of Craig Shergold’s original get-well card request. When the 204 texts in the Shergold corpus were compared with the Enhanced Baseline Profile
and then ranked, the results showed that only one of the texts perfectly matched the circumstances of the appeal. Significantly, the remaining 203 texts all presented some form of variation, be it major or minor, from the reality of Craig's original Get-well card appeal.

In addition, having ranked the texts against the Enhanced Baseline, I found it possible to more readily characterize certain patterns affecting individual perceptions of the appeal. Both minor and major variation, were for example seen to occur in accounts of the appeal as a result of the omission and substitution of information, or because of the incorporation of incorrect information. Out of 204 texts, some 125 accounts (61%) reflected the realities of the appeal. Conversely, over 79 (39%) exhibited minor variation, in that they were disjointed and contained less detail. Overall then, some accounts reflected the reality of the appeal but many more were far removed from it, focusing on issues of little relevance to the appeal itself. The generation of these alternative scenarios also illustrated that individuals were discussing, or debating the reality of Shergold Appeal from various perspectives.

To determine how these views were formulated I therefore found it useful to reanalyse the data at the level of rhetorical function. This permitted me to explore the texts in terms of the weight of their individual content. When 147 texts of circulated materials were scrutinized, ten categories of rhetorical statements were distinguished. It was also evident from the corpus that persons validated their
opinions in one of two ways. Some statements incorporated references to perceived knowledgeable sources such as newspapers, television, the Shergold family, and other officials links to the appeal. In other instances individuals based their comments about the appeal simply on speculation and personal opinion.

Focusing on the Shergold corpus, when I tabulated the percentages of rhetorical statements in each of the ten categories, three distinct groups of rhetorical statements were identified. At one extreme, and echoing the reality of the appeal itself, were fifty accounts reflecting belief in, and positive support for such efforts. At the other extreme there were six accounts totally rejecting or dismissing the appeal as a hoax. The largest group of texts, situated in the middle, consisted of 91 accounts which presented conflicting views and discussions about the appeal.

A further common denominator amongst the group of 91 texts was the high percentage of validated rhetorical statements used--an obvious indicator that these individuals were over-all, uncertain about the status of the appeal. Some persons accepted the appeal as real and so expressed support, while others were sceptical or even cynical. As individuals, perhaps not surprisingly, base their opinions on the information available, in essence then, when gaps in available information occurred, in terms of missing, altered and partial information, it was no wonder that they began to draw differing conclusions about the appeal and to present these views in their own accounts.
An examination of the textual changes observable in the Shergold corpus of texts provided further opportunities to explore degrees of variation and patterns of change. It was determined that at least thirteen recurring forms of textual change were present in the 147 accounts. The implication of this is that individuals appeared largely to have expressed their personal views and opinions of the Shergold appeal through the addition, subtraction, and rearrangement of the texts. Such textual changes created numerous inconsistencies in the accounts and resulted in the formation of varied perceptions. The emphasis of texts thus shifted away, over time, from support for the Shergold appeal to expressions that the appeal was less than real, or even a hoax.

Rarely have Folklorists had the opportunity to observe and document, first hand, the formation of legends in present-day society, as often as not, because they have simply lacked the appropriate resources to trace the dissemination and growth of such narratives and beliefs. Upon reflection, had I not been able to reconstruct the events of the four real appeals, I, too, would have continued to label all such requests as legendary. But, having such a large number of texts from so many different sources allowed me to fit together pieces of an enormous puzzle and to begin to see the correlations between fact and fiction. This study therefore offers something new for consideration in terms of legend formation. First, by examining the dissemination of information by word-of-mouth as well as through the use of
modern communication technology, it has been possible to demonstrate how small changes to information, recurring throughout, have the effect of altering individual interpretations. Second, by using the events of a real appeal as a baseline against which to measure the documented accounts, it was possible to see the connections between fact and fiction as manifest in the texts. Finally, when combined with analysis of the rhetorical statements and texts, this study highlighted, with considerable clarity, the types of contemporary influences being brought to bear on individual perceptions of events.

This study illustrates that, in this case, a cause and effect relationships exists between reality and legend formation and it follows therefore, that all legends are subject to contemporary influences regardless of whether being disseminated by word-of-mouth, or through modern communications technology. Complexes such as the Dying Child's Wish Appeal are linked to particular sets of forces which, given the right conditions can, in turn, serve to nurture the formation of legendary stories and beliefs.

Legends and beliefs often emerge out of unremarkable, complicated events within the context of the every day world. Moreover, as folklorists have discovered, it is often difficult to cut through the layers of fact and fiction. As a consequence folklorists have sometimes concentrate on the role of belief as it affects legend formation, without examining the underlying elements affecting individual views. It
is evident from this study that, besides belief there are numerous other processes at work which may equally provide a basis for legend formation and generation. To this end the processes of legend formation are not randomly determined nor are legends the haphazard product of the collective imagination. Rather than occurring as single stories, such legends often comprise a complex of beliefs and narratives rooted in the realities of the every-day world and, connected to specific sets of conditions and incidents. It is the discernment of these complexes and their elements which must be our role as folklorists.

It is clear, from the results, that the approach used in this study is constructive, making it possible to find patterns and structure affecting belief or for that matter disbelief. In light of this, scholars must give closer consideration to the process of legend formation within the context of contemporary society and to assess in detail the connections in terms of those events and conditions likely to nurture and sustain complexes such as the Dying Child's Wish and its related narratives, beliefs and practices.

It may be concluded therefore, that examinations of contemporary legends and related belief complexes should best be viewed from within. In this case, by tracing the links and the inter-connections amongst the real appeals, it was possible to view a whole complex of narratives and beliefs pertaining to Dying Child's Wish appeals and to examine the composition of the sum of its parts.
Much of the "lore" surrounding these appeals by dying children was as the result of the circulation of misinformation about the campaigns. As long as Guinness' records exist for collections of postcards, get-well cards and Christmas cards, and as long as appeals for terminally ill children remain in circulation, the Dying Child's Wish complex will, in all likelihood, continue to be sustained and generated by a body of legendary stories, beliefs and practices, the essence of which is a mirror image of reality itself.
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Appendix A: Key to the 204 Craig Shergold Texts

This list serves as a key to the 204 texts used for the analysis of the Shergold appeal and which are cited in Chapters Five, Six, and Seven. Numbers containing an asterisk "**" signify that the texts contained two distinct accounts and were therefore treated as individual texts.
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Appendix B: Examples of Circulated Materials

1. Photocopy: page 269;

2. Single Page Chain letter: page 270;

3. Thirty Page Chain-Letter: pages 271-301;

4. Photocopy-Fax Appeal: page 302;

5. Computer Network Appeal: page 303;

6. Handwritten-Photocopy Chain letter: pages 304-306;
GRAIG IS A 7 YEAR OLD BOY WHO IS IN THE ROYAL MARSDEN HOSPITAL, IN LONDON. GRAIG HAS A TUMOUR IN THE BRAIN AND ONE ON THE SPINE, AND HAS VERY LITTLE TIME TO LIVE. IT IS HIS AMBITION TO HAVE AN ENTRY TO THE GUINNESS BOOK OF RECORD FOR THE LARGEST NUMBER OF GET WELL CARDS EVER RECEIVED BY AN INDIVIDUAL.

PLEASE SEND GRAIG A CARD NOW!!!

TO: Graig Sherwood
66, Selby Road
Carshalton
Surrey, England.
B6 1LD

PLEASE FAX THIS TO AT LEAST 10 OTHER COMPANIES, PLEASE.

From: Dept. of Health and Community Services
P.O. Box 27
Kedgwick, N.B.
E0K 1C0

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten note on the bottom left corner]
July 19, 1991

Ron Day
Director
Planning & Research
Department of Social Services
3rd Floor
Confederation Bldg., West Block

Dear Ron:

Craig Shargold is seven years old and suffering from terminal cancer. It is one of his wishes to be included in the Guinness World Book of Records with the largest number of business cards ever collected by one person.

It would be appreciated if you would send one of your business cards to the address below:

Craig Shargold
26 Shelby Road
Carshalton
Surrey, England
SRI LTD

and as well contact an additional 10 people to send theirs.

We can all help to make this child's wish come true.

Yours sincerely,

George Courage
Director
A little boy, Craig Shergold, is suffering from cancer and has only a limited time to live. He has his heart set on having his name included in the Guinness Book of Records.

His objective is to create a record by receiving the highest number of Business Cards ever sent to one person. If you decide to help, which I am sure you will, please send one of your business cards to:

CRAIG SHERGOLD
35 SHELBY ROAD
CHARLESTON
SURREY, U.K.
EH5 11G

As part of this ongoing round, Robin would you please send the enclosed pages of names, including your own, to ten other companies?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Archaeology</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Tuck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Engineering Technologists of NL</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Leggo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-Zone Engineering Ltd.</td>
<td>Winston</td>
<td>Pear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins &amp; Puddicombe Ltd.</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Puddicombe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Sales &amp; Services Ltd.</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>Petters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLFD. Hard-Rock Ltd.</td>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>McKay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLFD. &amp; Lab. AIDS Committee</td>
<td>Dr. Ian</td>
<td>Bonner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland Milk Marketing Board</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Harnond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoyles Insurance</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Stoyles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Realities Inc. Ltd.</td>
<td>Boyce</td>
<td>Mews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEN COMPANIES CHOSEN BY PIPER'S PLUS STORES

TERRA VISTA BROKERS LTD
ODDIA STRONG CAPL
PETE & SONS LTD
SUNBRITE SOFTICE AUTOMOTIVE
SOUTH RIVER HARDWARE
CANADIAN FIRST CORP
CHESTER BAYE LTD
STONES RICE SUPPLIES LTD
PETE & WALK CO LTD

SHANE KEENE
PETE SMITH
JULI STRIEZ
HARRY SPENCER
GERARD SHACK
MI DAVIS
MI REID
MI TURPIN
MI CROW
MI ORR

SPEL CANADA
SPEL CANADA
SPEL CANADA
SPEL CANADA
SPEL CANADA
SPEL CANADA
SPEL CANADA
SPEL CANADA
SPEL CANADA
SPEL CANADA
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Ten companies chosen by Charles R. Bell Limited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neilson/Cadbury Ltd</td>
<td>Peter Robertson</td>
<td>Nova Scotia, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley Canada Inc.</td>
<td>Rob White</td>
<td>New Brunswick, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Services</td>
<td>James Baird</td>
<td>Newfoundland, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipers Dept. Stores</td>
<td>Don Bonnott</td>
<td>Newfoundland, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Discount Stores</td>
<td>Nick Cantwell</td>
<td>Newfoundland, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Stop Mini Mart</td>
<td>Albert Barnes</td>
<td>Newfoundland, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. E. Bugden Whols.</td>
<td>Crazy Bugden</td>
<td>Newfoundland, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young's Wholesale Ltd.</td>
<td>Wayne Young</td>
<td>Newfoundland, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Derby Wholesale</td>
<td>John Connors</td>
<td>Newfoundland, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisporte Wholesalers</td>
<td>Bruce Cole</td>
<td>Newfoundland, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Oyler</td>
<td>Burns Fry Limited</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorrie Nicholson</td>
<td>Glengarry Inn</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Johnson</td>
<td>Pirelli Cables Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Hill</td>
<td>Northern Telecom</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Sullivan</td>
<td>Maritime Tel &amp; Tel Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Roberts</td>
<td>Northern Telecom</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fisher</td>
<td>Phillips Cables Ltd.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Parker</td>
<td>Corporate Communications</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Maclean</td>
<td>L.E. Shaw Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom O'Neill</td>
<td>O'Neill Fisheries</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE TEN COMPANIES BEST WESTERN GLENGARRY CHOSE:

RON EVANS                     BEST WESTERN CEO                  U.S.A.
PAT SKILLEN                   BEST WESTERN GOVERNOR               CANADA
ROY TEAL                      M.T & T                                   CANADA
LES SINGLE                    CROSSLEY                                CANADA
VINCE MACLEAN                 LIBERAL ASSOCIATION                       CANADA
NICK DURHAM                   BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA                        CANADA
JAMIE MUIR                    N.S. TEACHERS COLLEGE                     CANADA
BOB MACLELLAN                 BIRCHILL MADDOUGALL & GRUCHY                  CANADA
RICHARD PROVENCIER            TRURO DEVELOPMENT CORP                    CANADA
TOM STANFIELD                 STANFIELD'S LTD                             CANADA

*Best Western is the world's largest chain of independently owned and operated hotels, motor inns and resorts.*
TEN COMPANIES BURCHELL, MACDOUGALL & GRUCHY CHOSE:

ROY PUBLICOVER
NEIL MACULLIN
SAM BRUSHETT
RALPH FALLEY
WILLIAM J. HAY
J. ROBERT WINTERS
L. C. MCKENZIE, CA
MURRAY CAMPBELL, CA
JAMES CAMERON, CA
DOUGLAS POOLEY

RADIO ATLANTIC (CKCL) LTD.
ANnapolis Valley radio ltd.
DOMINION BIOLOGICALS LTD.
WILSON EQUIPMENT LTD.
GRINNERS FOOD SYSTEMS LTD.
HARRICK LTD.
PETE HARRICK THORNE, HALIFAX
DOANE RAYMOND, TRURO
COLLINS HARRICK, TRURO
ALTON DRUG CO. LTD.

CANADA
CANADA
CANADA
CANADA
CANADA
CANADA
CANADA
CANADA
CANADA
CANADA
COMPANIES CHOSEN BY NAPWICK LIMITED

Chris Rusted, Marquis Limited
Dave W. Young, Barney's (1975) Ltd.
J. T. Davies, Fast Foods (PEI) Ltd.
Murray E. Edwards, M. E. Edwards Take Out
W. E. Frank, Edwards Fine Food Ltd.
William Myatt, Chicken Chalet Ltd.
Barney Strassburger, Jr. Twins Drive-In Ltd.
George Mitges, Golden T Foods
Terry Donnelly, Donnelly & Daigreault
Ian Hyndman, Kentucky Fried Chicken-Canada
Noreen Byrne, Canadian KFC Franchisees Association

St. John's, Newfoundland
St. John's, Newfoundland
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
Kentville, Nova Scotia
Halifax, Nova Scotia
Sydney River, Nova Scotia
Waterloo, Ontario
Guelph, Ontario
Toronto, Ontario
Rexdale, Ontario
Halifax, Nova Scotia
Barney's (1975) Limited
P.O. Box 13162
St John's, Newfoundland A1B 4A4

TEN COMPANIES CHOSEN BY BARNEY'S (1975) LIMITED

Heidi Vandike, Delaval Stork
Carson Thistle, Sun Life
Bill Campbell, Complete Rent Alls
Blair Patrick, Browning & Harvey Ltd
Dr. Luc Doulay, Optometrist
Vern French, French Browne & Dodd
Rob Nixon, Mary Browns Fried Chicken
Jim Cavanaugh, Ernst & Young
Don Parsons, CIBC
Bob Reid, Coke Cula Bottling
Ten companies chosen by Red Circle Limited:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOSTESS-FRITO-LAY LTD</td>
<td>GARY HARRIS</td>
<td>NOVA SCOTIA, CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPSI</td>
<td>HARVEY GARRETT</td>
<td>NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMPTY, DUMPTY FOODS</td>
<td>WES DEAL</td>
<td>NEW DRUMSNICK, CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROOKFIELD ICE CREAM</td>
<td>DAVE SQUIRES</td>
<td>NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL DAIRIES</td>
<td>RON DURRY</td>
<td>NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIELSON-CADBURY</td>
<td>WAYNE DALEY</td>
<td>NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER-PAN SALES</td>
<td>DILL SPURRELL</td>
<td>NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE DAXION</td>
<td>VAUGHN UNDERHAY</td>
<td>NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRA NOVA BROKERS</td>
<td>STEVE WINTER</td>
<td>NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.J. WADDEN &amp; SONS LTD</td>
<td>TERRY EVANS</td>
<td>NEWFOUNDLAND, CANADA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coca-Cola Bottling

ST JOHN'S
30 Old Bay Avenue
P.O. Box 13037
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1B 3Y8
Telephone (709) 576-1270
Fax (709) 576-4160

GANNIFIELD
25 Holyoke Avenue
P.O. Box 240
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1A 2B2
Telephone (709) 457-1027
Fax (709) 457-1026

CORNER BROOK
B Loring Drive
P.O. Box 333
Corner Brook, Newfoundland
A2H 5C3
Telephone (709) 633-0011
Fax (709) 634-3018

TEN COMPANIES CHOSEN BY COCA-COLA BOTTLING

Tom Robertson, T & G Distributors

Gary Mahon, Gary Mahon Distributors

Gord Mills, Shargo Distributors

Sam Piercey, Spaniard's Bay Beverages

Doug Foley, Foley's Enterprises

Bob Giannou, Nfld. International

Grant Burke, Sobey's

Harold Shea, Amalco Foods

Wayne Puddester, Red Circle

Noel Parsley, Parsley's Shop Fast

Nfld., Canada

Nfld., Canada

Nfld., Canada

Nfld., Canada

Nfld., Canada

Nfld., Canada

Nfld., Canada

Nfld., Canada

Nfld., Canada
The 10 Companies M. S. Hansen UK Ltd, Manchester, chose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaw Whitmore Fyffe</td>
<td>Mr J. Whitmore</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheard Walshaw Partnership</td>
<td>Mr D. J. Walshaw</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Stephenson &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Mr D. Jiddon</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coope Ottley</td>
<td>Mr T. Holyneux</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies Hughes Kerrigan</td>
<td>Mr T. Hughes</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Brooks Marshall</td>
<td>Mr H. Wightman</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fenton Partnership</td>
<td>Mr S. Fenton</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. W. Goodyer</td>
<td>Mr H. J. Ecroyd</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Herring &amp; Co</td>
<td>Mr H. Herring</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanley &amp; Co</td>
<td>Mr J. Harris</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF PERSON</td>
<td>NAME OF COMPANY</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. HUTCHINSON ESQ</td>
<td>GEORGE HUTCHINSON ASSOC.</td>
<td>ENGLA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.R. SHARP ESQ</td>
<td>CO-OPERATIVE WHOLESALE SOCIETY LIMITED</td>
<td>ENGLA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.K. WILLIAMS ESQ</td>
<td>VERNON BUILDING SOCIETY</td>
<td>ENGLA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.P. THOMAS ESQ</td>
<td>BRISTOL &amp; WEST B. SOCIETY</td>
<td>ENGLA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLIN SHAW ESQ</td>
<td>CGS</td>
<td>ENGLA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. WRATHER ESQ</td>
<td>WRATHER &amp; CO.</td>
<td>ENGLA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE MATTIN ESQ</td>
<td>BOWER MATTIN</td>
<td>ENGLA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEITH BOLTON ESQ</td>
<td>AMEC PROPERTIES</td>
<td>ENGLA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN JACKSON ESQ</td>
<td>JOHN FALLows PARTNERSHIP AND INTERIORS</td>
<td>ENGLA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAN G. FITTON</td>
<td>FAIRHURSTS (ARCHITECT'S)</td>
<td>ENGLA:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2/11/90
The 10 Companies John Fallow's Partnership Chose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Name of Company</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Hamblin Esq</td>
<td>Hamblin Group of Companies</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gardner Esq</td>
<td>Tozer Gallagher &amp; Partners</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hardill Esq</td>
<td>Andy Thornton Architectural Antiques Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wood Esq</td>
<td>Clarity's Salons</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Brown Esq</td>
<td>Brown &amp; Parker (Shopfitters)</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Dixon Esq</td>
<td>Foremost Furniture Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Unwin Esq</td>
<td>Faircool Services Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pollard Esq</td>
<td>Dijkstra Office Systems Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Cleary Esq</td>
<td>Projects Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Cullen Esq</td>
<td>Townsford Lighting Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE COMPANIES PROJECTS LIMITED CLOSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Name of Company</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C Griswood Esq</td>
<td>Griswood and Diz Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Price Esq</td>
<td>Greyfriars Carpets</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Price Esq</td>
<td>Price and Son</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Price Esq</td>
<td>Greenberg Glass Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Price Esq</td>
<td>Ernest Axon Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Mowbray Esq</td>
<td>Locker Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Mowbray Esq</td>
<td>Neocrylic Signs</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Hay Esq</td>
<td>Sandford Cladding Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Willetts Esq</td>
<td>Lawrie Contractors</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Burroughs</td>
<td>Eschelborne Homes Limited</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Bradshaw Esq</td>
<td>Vehicle Purchase &amp; Lease Specialists</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Person</td>
<td>Name of Company</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Hulme</td>
<td>Roland Bardsley Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Walker</td>
<td>Richardson Projects Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Summersgill</td>
<td>Summersgill &amp; Pitt</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Atkins</td>
<td>C Atkins (Architects)</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Hawesley</td>
<td>Rawlings Bros (NV) Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Varney</td>
<td>Allen Building Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A Holt</td>
<td>Cruden Construction Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A Cunningham</td>
<td>T H Robinson Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr S Selby</td>
<td>Vincenton Distribution Services Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr H Alexander</td>
<td>Lewis Alexander &amp; Collins (Chartered Accountants)</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19th November 1990.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Name of Company</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Shaw</td>
<td>Shawton Engineering Ltd</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A Redmond</td>
<td>SA Draughting Services Ltd</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R Leach</td>
<td>R &amp; Leach Engineering Ltd</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J McVeena</td>
<td>James McVeena &amp; Co Ltd</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J McGarry</td>
<td>Ian McGarry Housing</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A Lodge</td>
<td>Preston Heating Co Ltd</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A Fitton</td>
<td>Alan Fitton Ltd</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Aspden</td>
<td>CPL Plumbing &amp; Heating Ltd</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Bennett</td>
<td>Robert Heyworth &amp; Co</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J O'Sullivan</td>
<td>Crown Scaffolding</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15th November 1990
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Name of Company</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Collinson</td>
<td>G. &amp; C. Supplies</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Dersham</td>
<td>A.T. Engineering</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. E. Bond</td>
<td>G. &amp; C. Engineering</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. E. Rogers</td>
<td>G.O.S. Heating &amp; Plumbing Services</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. E. Page</td>
<td>Burrells Scaffolding</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. D. Jackson</td>
<td>J. Jolly (Services) Ltd.</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Fairbuck</td>
<td>C. Jolly</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30th November, 1970

R.E. LEACH (Engineers) Ltd,
Cloughton Trading Estate,
Cloughton-on-Grave,
N.R. Preston, P.O. GBH.
Tel. 0305 1441, Fax. 40710

Printed: R.E. Leach, R.E. Leach
Registered in England No. 2555028.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Name of Company</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. G. Grey</td>
<td>Bridgewater Constructions Ltd.</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. L. Howa</td>
<td>L.J. Howa Ltd.</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. G. Gregson</td>
<td>Preston Electrical Services</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss C. Benedict Smith</td>
<td>Benedict Smith Associates</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. I. Cuthbertson</td>
<td>H Chatto &amp; Sons</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. I. Hebigley</td>
<td>Destination Travel</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. Thorpe</td>
<td>Brian D. Tichelli &amp; Partners</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. B. Grace</td>
<td>Berry Grace Associates</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Warthington</td>
<td>Footwell Graphics</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. T. Shalloe</td>
<td>North West Antiques Centre</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF PERSON</td>
<td>COMPANY</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. K. Cluett</td>
<td>L. F. Buildings (Decorators) Ltd.</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Birdley</td>
<td>Trusthouse Forte Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Smart</td>
<td>Singleton and Smart</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. Provan</td>
<td>Provan and Makio</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. S. Dodder</td>
<td>Dodder Saddler</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C. Tinker</td>
<td>Architects C T</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Aligh</td>
<td>Bernard Aligh and Partners</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. A. Lloyd</td>
<td>Trusthouse Forte Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. S. McAllum</td>
<td>Jarvis</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. T. Spencer</td>
<td>Jive Save and Tournee</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16th December 1970
### POST HOUSE HOTEL

**Leicester**

Address: Leicestershire LE1 2PF Telephone: 0533 605901
Telex: 24677 Fax: 0533 605760

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PERSON</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr D. Nott</td>
<td>The Belmont House Hotel</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr S. Humphries</td>
<td>Granby Hotel</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. Leyns</td>
<td>Leicester Mercury</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr H. Linsley</td>
<td>Print &amp; Print</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr T. Power</td>
<td>Photostatic Coopers</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A. Turner</td>
<td>Leicester Tigers</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P. Etchells</td>
<td>Etchells Signs</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Manager</td>
<td>The Ritz - Madrid</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Manager</td>
<td>The Viscount Hotel - Orlando</td>
<td>America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Manager</td>
<td>Hans Pacific Park Royal - Sydney</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3rd January 1991
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Heywood</td>
<td>Royal Mail, Leicester</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D K Smith</td>
<td>British Gas, Leicester</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Olverley</td>
<td>Leicestershire Health Authority</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Palmer</td>
<td>Central Television, Nottingham</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A Fuggle</td>
<td>Leicester Communications</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr K Rawlings</td>
<td>Texaco Ltd, London</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Brayley</td>
<td>Lewis's Ltd, Leicester</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr H Harvey</td>
<td>Leicestershire Co-operative Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Beck</td>
<td>Fenwicks Ltd, Leicester</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Robinson</td>
<td>Radio Leicester</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ten Companies Leicester Communications Ltd Chase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Alan Chaney</td>
<td>Community Communications Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Tom Hope</td>
<td>Sasktel International</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Alex MacLellan</td>
<td>Fundy Cable</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lew Branston</td>
<td>O. Studios</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ron-Campbell-Barnard</td>
<td>Alliance &amp; Leicester</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gregor Michie</td>
<td>Morgan Grenfell</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ron Coles</td>
<td>Radio Trent</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Roy Emerson</td>
<td>Coventry Cable Ltd</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Farrow</td>
<td>John Laing Plc</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Graham Blakeman</td>
<td>Lightstream</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ten companies chosen by GEOETIC SINGAPORE are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Kunert</td>
<td>Brunei Shell</td>
<td>Brunei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razali B. Ahmad</td>
<td>Sarawak Shell</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Price</td>
<td>Geodetic International</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Nackom</td>
<td>Geco</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Goold</td>
<td>Lomac</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Schulstad</td>
<td>Seismic Supply</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Chastan</td>
<td>Lochta</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Vonau</td>
<td>Cosa Liebermann</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Olney</td>
<td>Ferranti ORE</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Irvin</td>
<td>Petroconsultant</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Kuczynski</td>
<td>Northern Telecom</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bruce</td>
<td>SCN</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Talton</td>
<td>Unisource Systems</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris MacDonald</td>
<td>Nu-Net Comms. Ottawa</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Abood</td>
<td>Nu-Net Comms. Toronto</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Youngman</td>
<td>Morrison-Knudsen</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Yeo</td>
<td>Travel Directions</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Bradley</td>
<td>SaskTel</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moe Seguin</td>
<td>Douserv Inc.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Aitken</td>
<td>Deloitte &amp; Touche</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ten Companies Northern Telecom Chose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ballantyne</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Network Systems</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilles Belanger</td>
<td>Bell Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Bell</td>
<td>Royal Bank</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alain Chung</td>
<td>Wood Gundy</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Davies</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td>U.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Lavigne</td>
<td>National Optics Institute</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen McCreery</td>
<td>Bentel Goodman</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nevins</td>
<td>Corning Glass Works</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Roberts</td>
<td>SaskTel</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Scissons</td>
<td>Dr. E.H. Scissons &amp; Assoc.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# The Ten Companies SaskTel Chose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Young</td>
<td>Direct West</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Franklin</td>
<td>ML 1</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Fawcett</td>
<td>I - Levy</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Canam</td>
<td>Horachek Canam Jea</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Alexander</td>
<td>B.C.Tel</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Truett</td>
<td>Architel Systems Corporation</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Zukrowski</td>
<td>Federated Cooperatives Ltd.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lafontaine</td>
<td>Apple Canada Inc.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Walker</td>
<td>RBC Dominion Securities</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Sebstyen</td>
<td>Armadale Communications</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE TEN COMPANIES ARCHITEL CHOSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Caparello</td>
<td>NCR Canada Ltd.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Geldart</td>
<td>MT&amp;T</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid Drury</td>
<td>Helix Investments Limited</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Berend</td>
<td>Telxon Canada Corp., Inc.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gord M. Chambers</td>
<td>Bell Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C. Robert Lockhard</td>
<td>New Brunswick Telephone Co.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gevurtz</td>
<td>Itron</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard P. Carriello</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Mehisto</td>
<td>Bank of Montreal</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spence Noble</td>
<td>AGI</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firma</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Søren Kaj Møller Bank A/S</td>
<td>Danmark</td>
<td>Direktør Bruno Møller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poliliken A/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Markedspresident Jørgen Carsten Nielsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Håndværkskolen I København</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Niels Christensen Nielsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-ko KG A/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direktør Lars Nordgård</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Forenede Bryggerier A/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koncerndirektør Willy Poulsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlog A/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Koncerndirektør Torsten Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic Finans A/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direktør Alexander Schaumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Friisberg &amp; Partners A/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civilråd, partner Christen Dalum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dansk Management Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adm. direktør Erik Kofoed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloplast A/S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direktør Carsten Lannefield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 10 companies Sankt Annae Bank A/S chose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of person</th>
<th>Name of Company</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niel Orskov Christensen</td>
<td>Orskov Christensen Staalskibsværft A/S</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Christensen</td>
<td>LEX INVEST A/S</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Lawrence</td>
<td>Merrill Lynch Global Asset Management Ltd.</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karsten Petersen</td>
<td>Scandinavian Bank Group PLC</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Hansen</td>
<td>Jyske Bank A/S</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gösta Lenkert</td>
<td>Kalmar Drishus AB</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn Bergmann</td>
<td>Bikuben A/S</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnaud de Marcillé</td>
<td>MOET &amp; CHANDON</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Diaz Yanes</td>
<td>Serami s.a.</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Wolfram</td>
<td>INTERBANK Ltd.</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 16, 1990.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person</th>
<th>Name of Company</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Dan Petersen</td>
<td>Jumbo Transport A/S</td>
<td>Glostrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kristensen</td>
<td>Arthur Andersen &amp; Co</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gert Lund</td>
<td>Danish Trade Office</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Birne Bundgaard</td>
<td>Dagrosa Friskvare A/S</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Carsten Nielsen</td>
<td>Skandinavisk Computer Rekruttering</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Noel Butler</td>
<td>Giro Bank</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Per Geisler Hansen</td>
<td>BF - Credit</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Pernike Hergaard</td>
<td>Strand Shipping APS</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Loren: Jorgensen</td>
<td>The Adelphi</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25th September 1990
SPECIAL MESSAGE

ATTENTION

Craig is a 7 year old little boy who is in the Royal Marsden Hospital in London. Craig has a tumour on his brain and one on his spine . . . . Craig has very little time to live.

It is Craig's burning ambition to have an entry in the Guinness Book of Records for the largest amount of "Get Well" cards ever received by one person.

Please, Please, Please help Craig to fulfill his ambition and send a card to:

Craig Sharps
56 Dalby Road
Garthilton
DUNSFORTH

Please help Craig more by sending this fax to at least another 10 companies. If you have a directory you can choose than at random. Thank you very much.
A friend asked me to post this...
Feel free to distribute this article
to wherever you feel appropriate.

Found this on a BBS in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

WE ARE ASKING ALL BBS MEMBERS AND THEIR FAMILY AND FRIENDS IN
MINNEAPOLIS TO HELP MAKE OUR EXTREMELY SICK CHILD'S WISH COME
TRUE...

THIS PARTICULAR CHILD'S NAME IS CRAIG SHERGOLD, WHO IS SEVEN YEARS
OLD AND HAS A VERY SHORT TIME TO LIVE DUE TO A BRAIN TUMOR.

CRAIG'S WISH IS TO HAVE HIS NAME ADDED TO THE LIST OF "RECORD
HOLDERS" IN THE GUINNESS BOOK OF WORLD RECORDS. THE RECORD HE WISHES
TO BE ACCOUNTABLE FOR IS:

THE PERSON WHO HAS RECEIVED THE MOST GET WELL CARDS.

THE RECORD NOW STANDS AT 1,000.26.

THIS IS SUCH A SMALL TASK FOR US TO ACCOMPLISH FOR A PRECIOUS LITTLE
SEVEN YEAR OLD TO ASK.

LET'S PUT A SMILE ON CRAIG'S LITTLE FACE WITH A GET WELL CARD AND
LETTING HIM KNOW WE ALL TRULY CARE BY SENDING HIM A CARD AS SOON AS
POSSIBLE. ALL CARDS MUST BE RECEIVED BY CRAIG BY NO LATER THAN
SUNDAY, APRIL 15, 1990. AND CAN BE MAILED TO HIM AT THE FOLLOWING
LOCATION:

CRAIG SHERGOLD
670 CHILDREN'S WISH FOUNDATION
32 PERIMETER CENTER E.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30346

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THIS "SMALL" REQUEST.
PLEASE "PASS THE WORD" SO THAT WE CAN ALL HELP CRAIG'S WISH COME
TRUE.
Dear Henry;

I have been chosen by Sam Kean of the Newfoundland and Labrador Evidence Recovery Commission to help Craig Shergold, a seven-year-old boy in England, for whom diagnosed as being terminally ill with cancer.

It is his ambition to be included in the Guinness Book of Records for the largest number of business cards ever received by an individual.

To assist Craig in achieving this goal, would you please send a business card to the address below. Also, would you please send the enclosed pages along with your name, to another 10 individuals of your choice.

Thank you for helping to make a child's wish come true.

Craig Shergold
36 Shelby Road
Corkalton, Surrey
United Kingdom
SNB 1LD
The list below is of the names by Jo
Henry Crane to help Craig She
gold

1. John J. Jarrett
   - 15 Aurora Street
   - St. John's, N.F.

2. Margaret Skeats
   - Bell Island

3. C. F. Jones
   - Bell Island

4. Queen Dresser
   - Bell Island

5. N. C. Chadwick
   - Bell Island

6. Mr. Home House
   - Bell Island, N.F.
The Individuals Named by All For MealsIncluded

1) Air Atlantic
   P.O. Box 9040
   St. John's NL A1A 2X3

2) Wahl's Ship Supplies
   P.O. Box 150
   Bag Bulk NL A1D
   Nov. 100

3) Pro-Sign Painting
   42 Charlotte Ave
   St. John's NL A1B 5A3

4) Charles & Bell Ltd
   P.O. Box 8127
   St. John's NL A1D
   Nov. 9

5) Day & Ross
   Donovon Fresh Foods
   P.O. Box 8076 Stn A
   St. John's NL A1B
   Nov. 30

6) Martin & Hammond Co Ltd.
   South River, C.B.
   A1B
   Nov. 30

7) W.T. & E.J. Johnson
   474 Long Bay Rd.
   Box 3020
   St. John's NL A1E 5A3

8) Ottawa Cable
    50 Kinnear Rd
    P.O. Box 824
    St. John's NL A1B 3P2

9) G. McCall
    106 R.R.1
    Doyle NL A1D
    Nov. 15

10) G. Kennedy
    106 R.R.1
    Arichat NL A1H
Appendix C: Taped Interviews and Field-Note Interviews

Both field-notes and taped interviews cited in the text will be referred to by the individuals name and the date as well as the year in which the interview took place. Any taped field-notes will concur with one of the tape numbers provided below.

List of Taped Interviews

All of the taped interviews for this research are contained on 11 tapes which are numbered in this appendix in sequence by date and year. Where the same tape was used for several interviews, this is indicated by the use of the same number (see for example the citation for interview tape number 6).


List of Field-Note Interviews


Delouche, Derek. Executive Director, Children’s Wish Foundation, St. John’s Newfoundland, 18-19 Mar. 1993.

Dodge, Randy. Technical Support Manager, Computer Services Memorial University, St. John’s, Newfoundland, 23 Feb. 1992.

Dorowitz, Linda. Director, Children’s Wish Foundation, Atlanta, Georgia, 1 Apr. 1993.

Ellis, Bill. Associate Professor, English and American Studies, Pennsylvania State University, Hazleton, 18 May 1993.

Grundner, AL. Administrator, Windsor Hospital, Windsor, Ontario. 17 Apr. 1990.

Hare, Cecil, Radio Announcer, Q-Radio, St. John’s, Newfoundland, 16 Apr. 1990.


Maunder, Daphne. Director, Public Relations, Janeway Children’s Hospital, St. John’s, Newfoundland, 29 Sept. 1988.


Appendix D: Key to the 147 Circulated Texts Used in the Analyses in Chapters Six and Seven

This list is a key to those circulated texts used in the analyses presented in chapters Six and Seven. The "S" numbers in this key concur with the list provided in Appendix A.


77. S-134. Carlson, Christopher N. 1990. "Shergold not a hoax but..." 11 Apr.: News, Misc. Kids, item 8a8074i00uhw80xJod@andrew.cmu.edu.


82. S-139. Quitt, Kevin D. 1990. "Dying Boy's Last Wish." 11 Apr.: News, Misc. Kids, 3855, item 139@demott.COM.


86. S-143. Lode, Eric. 1990. "UK vs US [Was: Sigh (Was Re: Dying Boy's Last Wish)]." 12 Apr.: Anews, Misc.Kids, item 0930017@hpfcso.HP.COM.


90. S-147. Pimentel, John. 1990. "Please Do Not send Any cards!!! (Re: Children's Wish)." 13 Apr.: Anews, Misc.Wanted 4044, item 13857@frog.UUCP.


102. S-159. Pimentel, John. 1990. "Must Read This (Was Re: Get-well Cards)." 14 Apr.: Anews, Misc.Kids, item 13877@frog.UUCP.


Appendix E: Table 5 - Rhetorical Analysis of the Craig Shergold Appeal

Relationship of 147 Rhetorical Statements To Texts Ranked Against An Enhanced Baseline Profile of the Shergold Appeal.

|   | A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C1 | C2 | D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 |    | A3 | B1 | C1 | D  | E1 |    | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
| 2 |    | A3 | B1 | C1 | D  | E1 |    | F | G1 | (G2) | H1 |
| 3 | A1 | B1 | C1 | D  | E1 |    | F | [G1] | G2 | H1 |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 4 | A1 | B1 | C1 | D  | E1 |    | F | [G1] | G2 | H1 |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 5 | A1 | B1 | C1 | D  | E1 |    | F | [G1] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 6 | A1 | B1 | C1 | D  | (E1) | F | [G1] | (G2) | H1 |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 7 | A1 | B1 | C1 | D  | (E1) | F | [G1] | G2 | H1 |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 8 | A3 | B1 | C1 | D  | (E1) | F | [G1] | G2 | H1 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
<th>E10</th>
<th>E11</th>
<th>E12</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[E1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[F]</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[E1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[F]</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[E1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[E1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[E4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appeals-Unattested (4) [S-45; S-46; S-47; S-84]
Appeal-Unattested (1) [S-49]
Update-Unattested (1) [S-102]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
<th>E10</th>
<th>E11</th>
<th>E12</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiries-Attested (1) [S-126]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection - Attested (1) [S-100]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection - Unattested (1) [S-117]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal-Unattested (1) [S-115]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsements-Unattested (1) [S-58]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attested Updates (1) [S-39]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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|   | A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C1 | C2 | D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 29. | A1 | B1 | C1 |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    | E8 |    |    |    |    | F  | [G1] | (G2) | H1 |
|     | Updates-Attested (1) [S-128] |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 30. | A3 | B1 | C1 |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    | E8 |    |    |    |    | F  | G1  | (G2) | H1 |
| 31. | A3 | B1 | C1 |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 32. | A3 | B1 | C1 |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 33. | A1 | B1 | C1 |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 34. | A1 | B1 | C1 |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|     | Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-110] |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|     | Rejections-Attested (1) [S-116] |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 35. | A1 | B1 | C1 |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 36. | A3 | B1 | C1 |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 37. | A3 | B1 | C1 |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 38. | A3 | B1 | C1 |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
<th>E10</th>
<th>E11</th>
<th>E12</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposé-Unattested (1) [S-105]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E12</td>
<td>[G1</td>
<td>G2]</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E10]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[F</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>G2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates-Attested (1) [S-177]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>[E4]</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E10]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[F</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>G2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attested Rejection (1) [S-178]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Actions-Attested (2) [S-191; S-192]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>[E4]</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>[E9]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Actions-Attested (1) [S-183]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E7</td>
<td>[E9]</td>
<td>[E11]</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>[C1]</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>[G1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeal-Unattended (1-2)</td>
<td>S-55; S-63; S-68; S-87; S-51; S-60; S-56; S-67; S-82; S-97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>[C1]</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[E1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(G2)</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal-Unattended (3)</td>
<td>S-59; S-61; S-62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>[C1]</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[E1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(G1)</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal-Unattended (5)</td>
<td>S-78; S-79; S-80; S-81; S-88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Actions-Unattended (1)</td>
<td>S-182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal-Unattended (1)</td>
<td>S-95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates-Unattended (1)</td>
<td>S-144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>[C1]</td>
<td>[D]</td>
<td>[E4]</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>[E12]</td>
<td>[F]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynical Reports-Unattended (1)</td>
<td>S-202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposé-Unattended; (1)</td>
<td>S-150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates-Unattended; (1)</td>
<td>S-204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>[C1]</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>[E7]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[E11]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposé-Unattended (1)</td>
<td>T-208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal-Unattended (1)</td>
<td>S-188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C1 | C2 | D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 59. | A3 | B1 | [C1] | | | | | | | | | | | E7 | | | | | F | [G1] | (G2) | H1 |
| Updates-Unattended (1) [S-175] |
| 60. | A2 | B1 | [C1] | | | | | | | | | | | E3 | E11 | | | F | [G1] | (G2) | H1 |
| Rejections-Attested (1) [S-125] |
| 61. | A3 | B1 | [C1] | | | | | | | | | | | E3 | | | F | [G1] | (G2) | H1 |
| Updates-Attested (1) [S-134] |
| 62. | A2 | B1 | [C1] | | | | | | | | | | | E3 | | | F | [G1] | (G2) | H1 |
| Updates-Attested (1) [S-147] |
| Alternative Actions-Attested (1) [S-184] |
| Alternative Actions-Attested ; (1) [S-185] |
| 65. | A1 | B1 | C2 | D | | | | | [E4] | | | | | | | F | G1 | | | H1 |
| Appeal-Unattended (1) [S-133] |
| Exposed-Unattended (1) [S-136] |
| Alternative Actions-Attested (1) [S-181] |
| 68. | A1 | B1 | C2 | E1 | | | | | | | | | | F | | | | | | | G1 | H1 |
| Cyclical Reports-Unattended (1) [S-138] |
|   | A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C1 | C2 | D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 69 | A1 | B1 |    | C2 |    |    |    |   | [E4] | E5 | E6 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [F] |    |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Exposed-Unattested (I) [5-179] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 70 | A3 | B1 |    | C2 |    |    |    |   |    |    |    | [E4] | E8 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | F  |    | [G1] | (G2) | H1 |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Exposed-Unattested (I) [5-136] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Exposed-Unattested (I) [5-11] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 72 | A3 | B1 |    | C2 |    |    |    |   |    |    |    | [E4] |    | E7  | F  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | (G2) |    |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Exposed-Unattested (I) [5-119] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 73 | A1 | B1 |    | C2 |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    | [E4] |    |    | F  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Cyclically Unattested (I) [5-119] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 74 | A3 | B1 |    | D  |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | F  |    |    |    |    |    |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Endorsement-Unattested (I) [5-145] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 75 | A1 | B1 |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | F  |    |    |    |    |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Updates-Unattested (I) [5-127] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 76 | A3 | B1 |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | F  |    |    |    |    |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Account-Unattested (I) [5-99]  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 77 | A1 | B1 |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | E8 | [E9] |    |    | (G2) |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Rejection-Unattested (I) [5-129] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 78 | A1 | B1 |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | E8 | [E9] |    |    | (G2) |
|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Updates-Unattested; (I) [5-172] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
<th>E10</th>
<th>E11</th>
<th>E12</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Bi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates-Attested (1) [S-194]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apology-Unattested (1) [S-161]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[E8]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(G2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[C2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[E1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[C2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(G2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[E4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[E9]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[F]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(G2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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|   | A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C1 | C2 | D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|
| 89. | A3 |    |    | [B1] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | E11 | F |
|     | Cynical Reports Unattended (1) [S-195] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 90. | A3 |    |    | [B1] |    |    |    |    | [C1] | [E1] | | | [E4] | [E7] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [F] |
|     | Rejection Attested (1) [S-151] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 91. | A3 |    |    | [B1] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [D] | [E4] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [F] |
|     | Cynical Reports Unattended (1) [S-188] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 92. | A1 |    |    | [B1] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [C1] |
|     | Apology Unattended (1) [S-152] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|     | Updates Unattended (1) [S-109] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 94. | A3 |    |    | [B1] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [E7] |    | E11 | [F] |
|     | Unattended Account (1) [S-189] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 95. | A3 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [E3] |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 96. | A3 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [E9] |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|     | Updates Attested (1) [S-153] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 98. | A3 |    | [C1] | [D] | [E4] | E6 | [E9] |    | [E11] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|     | Updates Attested (1) [S-200] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   | A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C1 | C2 | D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 99|    |    | A3 | [C1]|    |    |    | D|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | E11| E12| F  |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 100|    |    | A3 | [C1]|    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | E8 |    | F  | [G1]| [G2]| H1 |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 102| A3 |    |    | [C1]| C2 |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | F  |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 103| A1 |    |    |    |    | C2 |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | E10| E11| F  | [G1]|    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 104|    |    | A3 |    |    |    | C2 |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | F  | [G1]|    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 105| A1 |    |    |    |    |    | C2 |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | F  | [G1]| [G2]| H1 |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 106|    | A2 |    | [B1]| C1 | C2 |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [F] |    |    | H1 |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 107| A2 |    |    |    |    |    | C2 |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [E12]| F  |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 108|    | A1 |    |    |    |    |    | C2 |  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | F  | H1 |    |    |    |

Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-196]
Updates-Attested (1) [S-148]
Exposé-Unattested [S-197]
Updates-Unattested (1) [S-199]
Exposé-Unattested (1) [S-103]
Inquiry-Attested (1) [S-174]
Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-160]
Reprimand-Unattested (1) [S-158]
<p>|   | A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C1 | C2 | D  | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 109. | A1 |    |    |    |    |    | C2 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | F |    |    |    |
|      | Exposé-Unattested (1) [S-121] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 110. | A1 |    |    |    |    |    | C2 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [F] |    | (G2) |
|      | Rejections-Unattested (1) [S-130] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 111. | A2 |    |    |    |    |    | C2 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [F] |    |    |
|      | Rejections-Unattested (1) [S-101] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 112. | A2 |    |    |    |    |    |    | D  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [E1] |    | (G2) |
|      | Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-120] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 113. | A1 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [D] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|      | Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-142] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 114. | A1 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [E1] | [E4] | [E9] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | (G2) |
|      | Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-141] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 115. | A1 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [E1] | [E4] | [E9] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|      | Exposé-Unattested (1) [S-124] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 116. | A2 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [E1] | [E4] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|      | Exposé-Unattested (1) [S-122] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 117. | A1 |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [E4] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | [F] | (G1) |
|      | Updates-Attested (1) [S-113] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|      | Updates-Attested (1) [S-168] |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| A1 | A2 | A3 | B1 | B2 | C1 | C2 | D | E1 | E2 | E3 | E4 | E5 | E6 | E7 | E8 | E9 | E10 | E11 | E12 | F | G1 | G2 | H1 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 119. | A3 | | | | | | | | | | [E4] | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-108] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 120. | A1 | | | | | | | | | | [E4] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Updates-Unattested (1) [S-106] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 121. | A2 | | E7 | [E9] | | | [F | G1] | (G2) | H1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-118] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 122. | A1 | | | | | | | | | | [E10] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Exposé-Unattested (1) [S-198] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 123. | A3 | | | | | | | | | | [E11] | | | | | | | | | | | F |
| | Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-112] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rejection-Unattested (1) [S-114] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Reprimand-Unattested (1) [S-137] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 125. | A1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | [F] | | | | |
| | Inquiries-Unattested (1) [S-143] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 126. | A1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (G2) |
| | Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-111] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Reprimand-Unattested (1) [S-131] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 127. | A1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-187] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 128. | A3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-99] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
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<th>E11</th>
<th>E12</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D</td>
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<td></td>
<td>[F]</td>
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<td></td>
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<td>H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endorsement - Unattested (1) [S-171]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(C2)</td>
<td>D</td>
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<td>[E4]</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E11]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates-Attested (1) [S-170]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposd-Attested; (1) [S-159]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td></td>
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<td>133.</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(G2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynical Reports-Unattested (1) [S-146]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td>134.</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[F]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Updates-Attested (1) [S-157]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[B1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[F]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rejections-Attested; (1) [S-158]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
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<th>F</th>
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<th>H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updates-Attested (1) [S-165]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attested Inquiries; (1) [S-149]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cynical Reports-Attested (1) [S-154]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cynical Reports-Unattested (2) [S-193; S-201]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiries-Unattested (1)[S-167]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

338