



STAMP
STUDY
SOCIETY

P.O. BOX AD • SPARKS, NEVADA 89431

MEETINGS ARE HELD ON THE 2nd & 4th
SATURDAYS OF EACH MONTH IN THE PHYSICS
BUILDING, UNR, RENO AT 2:15 PM.

THESE MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO ANYONE WHO SHARES OUR LOVE
OF STAMPS, CARDS, COVERS ETC.

FEBRUARY - MARCH 1990

We are sad to report the death of member CHARLIE BARBER, last week. CHARLIE had only been a member a few months, but was a true lover of the hobby, and took great pride in his collection of PLATE BLOCK CORNERS. He had not been able to attend lately due to ill health, but he will be very missed by those who knew him. Some of you may have known him through his business in Sparks, as he and his wife operated the RECORD CORRAL for many many years. Our sympathy to his family & loved ones.

COMING ATTRACTIONS

Programs for the next three meetings are as follows:

March 10 - DOUG WILLICK - AMUSING & HUMEROUS POSTAL REGULATIONS

March 27 - LARRY SCOTT - PHILATELIC EXHIBITING

APRIL 14 - PHILATELIC AUCTION - The entire meeting will be given over to an Auction, all members are invited to put in up to eight lots of any philatelic material they may have that they wish to sell. All proceeds go to the individual owner, as NSSS no longer collects a commission on Auction sales. Start looking through your extras now, and mount them on auction sheets and turn them in to RUTHE DREILING. Blank auction sheets are available from RUTHE at the next meetings.....

Raffle winners at the February 10th meeting were DR. SANDE, LARRY SCOTT, VIVIAN SCOTT, CHARLES CLIPPER, PHIL CROSS, JESSIE ROGERS, GENE SMOOTS, RUTHE DREILING & THE CASH AWARD TO RENE ST. PIERRE. We had one of the best turnouts we have had for a good long time, with a lot of members attending that we had not seen in a very long time, DOUG & LOIS WILLICK, DR. SANDE, NAN BITTNER, JESSIE ROGERS, HUGO HAVET, RENE ST. PIERRE, PHYLLIS SMITH. Hope to see all of them again real soon and often. JACK BARRIAGE gave a very interesting program on his covers depicting the history of the USF Constitution.

Raffle winners at the February 24th meeting were CATHERINE COLE, LOIS WILLICK, VIVIAN SCOTT, DICK DREILING, GUS GEIGER, JESSIE ROGERS, WALT SOMMER, PHYLLIS SMITH AND THE CASH AWARD TO GUS GEIGER. GUS GEIGER gave a very interesting talk on the trials & tribulations of plating.

SORRY GANG - DIDN'T REALIZE UNTIL I WAS TAKING THIS OUT OF THE TYPEWRITER THAT I HAD NOT USED "POST BOY" PAPER - WASN'T ABOUT TO START ALL OVER, SO NEXT MONTH!!!! !

For the benefit of those who have not kept your membership rosters up, here is a review of the "UPDATES & CHANGES". Please make the corrections now

ADDRESS CORRECTIONS:

HUGO HAVET - - 225 Hillcrest Drive, Reno, Nv. 89509 Phone # 829-7131
VERN KELLER - 695 Brown Street, Reno, Nv. 89509 Phone # no change
RENE ST. PIERRE - P O Box 185, Meadow Valley, Ca. 95956 - Phone # 1-916-283-2817
RON SCHULTS - delete phone number
CHARLOTTE WEISENFELD - 13373 Plaza Del Rio Blvd. # 6615, Peoria, Az. 85345

DELETIONS: Non-payment of dues

MARGO DUCORNO
JULIE GIANOPULOS
JOSEPHINE GOLDJOHN SWANSON
BILL THOMAS
MICHAEL L. WHITE
CHARLOTTE WEISENFELD _ MOVED out of the area

NEW MEMBERS:

PHILIP J. CROSS - 1220 Hollyhock Court, Sparks, Nv. 89434 Phone 331-1668
collects GERMANY
ARNE HENRIKSON - 4608 Neil Road # 254, Reno, Nv. 89502 Phone # 827-2813
collects SWEDEN, MINING & NON ORGANIC MINERALS ON STAMPS
STEFAN E. BORADJIEV - 545 Sadler Way, # 4 Reno, Nv. 89512
collects BULGARIA & SAN MARINO
PHYLLIS SMITH - 7900 North Virginia # 119, Reno, Nv. 89506 Phone # 89506
collects WORLDWIDE
EUGENE "GENE" SMOOTS - 11145 Whitesage, Reno, Nv. 89506 Phone # 972-5903
collects U. S. USED

IF YOU DO NOT HAVE A MEMBERSHIP ROSTER &/OR A COPY OF THE NEVADA STAMP STUDY SOCIETY BY-LAWS CONTACT RUTHE DREILING & SHE WILL MAKE ARRANGEMENTS TO GET YOU EITHER THE ROSTER OR THE BY-LAWS. THEY ARE ISSUED TO ALL NEW MEMBERS, BUT I AM NOT SURE WHICH ONES I HAVE GIVEN THEM TO TO DATE. IF YOU ARE NOT A NEW MEMBER BUT HAVE LOST YOUR COPY OF EITHER ONE OR BOTH CONTACT RUTHE FOR A REPLACEMENT.

REMEMBER - MARK APRIL 10th ON YOUR CALENDAR & START GETTING YOUR AUCTION LOTS READY

FROM LARRY SCOTT, THANKS LARRY. As you know, there has been heated discussions about the major pricing changes in the recent Scott Catalogs. New catalog values are said to be more closely reflect actual market value, with the result that most of them have been reduced. Gold Medal Mail Sales of New York recently sent me the results of an "opinion Poll" on this subject. Listed below are tabulated results for the 1360 responses, including mine.

- (1) A Old } I prefer the _____ Scott system of pricing. (1) A 46%, B 54%
- B New }
- (2) A I will } Follow in Scott's guidelines and pay (2) A 25%, B 75%
- B I will not } approximately full catalogue value.
- (3) A I do } think we are in a basically (3) A 69%, B 31%
- B I do not } healthy stamp market.
- (4) A I do } plan to continue collecting (4) Only 3 people will stop.
- B I do not } stamps.
- (5) A I do } think that foreign markets should be taken (5) A 77%, B 23%
- B I do not } into account when determining catalogue prices.
- (6) A I would } prefer to see Gold Medal Mail Sales (6) A 63%, B 37%
- B I would not } use the current Scott Catalogue.
- (7) A I am a collector. (7) A 87%, B 13%
- B I am a dealer.
- (8) A I have } purchased or intend to purchase (8) A 60%, B 40%
- B I have not } a 1990 Scott catalogue.
- (9) If you answered "I have" to the above question was it: (9) A 17%, B 76%, C 7%
- A out of curiosity only.
- B Intended to use it and will.
- C Intended to use it, but won't.
- (10) A I do } think the controversy is worthwhile (10) A 66%, B 34%
- B I don't } considering, and will have an affect on the stamp market.
- (11) A I do } think the change in prices is just (11) A 31%, B 69%
- B I don't } a ploy by Scott to sell more catalogues.
- (12) A I do } think that Scott had the collectors' (12) A 57%, B 43%
- B I don't } interest at heart in this change.

Question #1 was very close. It is worth noting that those who chose the old system were much more adamant about it than the others. They also seemed to be collectors who had been collecting for a longer period of time. Of the small majority who chose the new catalogue there seemed to be more explanations as to why. Many expressed the opinion "What's done is done and we may as well live with it," as one respondent put it. Many of you felt it was fairer to the "New collector," and many, many of you demonstrated the great American Spirit that, to quote one respondent who quoted another famous American, "Frankly, my dear, I don't give a damn." I pay what I think I should."

As to question #2, the outcome was as we expected. Even though the new catalogue was favored, it was very evident that Scott's guidelines were not to be followed, and their intent that the 1990 version was to be used as a retail guide was rejected by 75% of those who responded.

For question #3, most of you, approximately 3 to 1, felt we were in a healthy market.

In response to #4, only 3 people out of the 1360 responses said they were quitting collecting stamps.

Question #5 showed that 77% of you strongly felt that foreign markets must be considered when determining prices. Of the 23% who answered no, very many noted that they collected U.S. only.

Not surprisingly, due to the response to question #6, 63% of you preferred that G.M.M.S. use the 1990 catalogue, and welcomed the lower catalogue values when bidding. A portion of those responding "A" to this question were very often those who had not purchased a 1990 catalogue, and in fact wouldn't have to if we used it, for just about every stamp is represented sooner or later.

In reference to question #7, 87% of our clientele are collectors.

For question #8, only 60% of you have purchased the new catalogue, 40% had not. Of those 40% who had not, we feel it is only fair to state that many who did not, use the catalogue of their local library or stamp club instead. Not all were disgruntled with Scott.

In reference to Question #9, which we admit was a bit loaded, of those who purchased a 1990 catalogue, 76% of you are going to use the catalogue and 24% are not.

In #10 two thirds of you were interested in this controversy.

In response to question #11, a full two-thirds of the responses felt the change in pricing was for legitimate reasons.

The response to question number 12, in retrospect a rather meaningless question, was almost evenly split.

There were also over 50 of the respondents who took us to task for bad grammar. The word "affect" in question 10 apparently should be "effect." Apparently a misspent youth collecting stamps and not paying attention to grammar affected this effect.