

23 May 2016
11402 CALLE NUBLADO
SAN DIEGO, CA 921290-3811

RE: [RM-11769](#)

SUBJ: Amending Part 97 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations to Redesignate Sub-Bands from Exclusively Morse Code to Narrowband Modes, including CW and for Other Purposes

COMMENT:

In regard to the filing [RM-11769](#) by James Edwin Whedbee proposing redesignation of certain frequencies from “exclusively Morse code”, I urge the Commission to reject the proposal for the following reasons:

1. The petitioner’s claim that “there remain legacy subbands with the Amateur Radio and Amateur Satellite [sic] Service frequencies which only permit Morse Code emissions” is false. The only such restriction is for holders of Novice and Technician class licenses; all others are permitted both CW and data in the bands discussed by the filing. Therefore there is no need for the Commission to remove such a restriction.
2. The petitioner’s claim that “Many digital emissions ... surpass Morse Code in efficiency and efficient use of the spectrum” is irrelevant. CW is more “efficient” than voice modes, but that is not a reason to restrict voice modes any more than they are.
3. Again the petitioner claims that “the state of the art no longer permits exclusive designation of certain radio sub-bands to Morse Code telegraphy”, which is wrong. Novice and Technician licensees are more restricted than other license classes, but the bands are not. Novice and Technician licensees are constrained from using voice modes in certain bands, too. This is not related to designations of the band, but of the license class. Perhaps the petitioner really wants to lift restrictions from Novice and Technician class holders, but that is not what the filing asks for. Furthermore, the petitioner uses “state of the art” when they really mean that they believe there should be a change. The “state of the art” neither gives nor withholds permission. This is a patent attempt to inject gravitas into a personal opinion.
4. The petitioner’s reference to “nostalgia” is unsupported and irrelevant. CW is a more popular form of communication than ever, and stands on its own merits. The petitioner offers no evidence that nostalgia is relevant or even present in the rationale for the status quo. The evidence is that Morse code telegraphy is a robust, active, and current interest of many hams, myself included.
5. The petitioner attempts to suggest that because people can use computers to read Morse code that “there are few, if any, meaningful reasons and bases to continue with the Novice/Technician privileges being limited to Morse Code telegraphy on the HF bands”. While it might be true that there are few such

reasons, the petitioner does not elucidate them, and the use of computers is not shown to be relevant.

6. Novice and Technician holders do have voice privileges on HF, in the 10-meter band.
7. It is not necessary to invade the CW/data bands to give Novices and Technicians voice privileges on HF. If that is what the petitioner really wants, they should petition for these license classes to have voice privileges **in the voice bands**. They provide no rationale why restricted licensees should not only get further privileges, but that the entire band plan should be scrapped to do so.
8. That Morse code is not restricted in newer LF and MF bands is irrelevant, contrary to the petitioner's statements. If Novice and Technician licensees cannot operate there anyway, why does the petitioner care? What is permitted in one band is not an argument for what should be permitted in another.
9. "... Continuing to have Morse Code telegraphy-only sub-bands ... is an excessive regulatory constraint" – except that it isn't. Because there is no such constraint today.
10. The proposal that "restrictions limiting any part of the amateur radio spectrum to the use of CW/Morse Code radiotelegraphy ... be eliminated entirely" is moot, because there are no such restrictions.
11. The petitioner's suggestion to "refer to the ultimate form of communication reproduced at the receiving end of the communication" doesn't make technical sense. They call it "simplified", but it is not even meaningful. Emissions designations as used today reveal technical information about bandwidth, spectrum occupancy, modulation form, and other technical details relevant to radio transmission. The petitioner's suggestion throws all such information away and replaces it with a vaguely-expressed notion of "symbolds" that is not relatable to such technical specifications. Far from avoiding "future confusion and need for clarification", petitioner's suggestion would be impossible to measure, enforce, or understand.
12. Petitioner's suggestion that voice mode be allowed in sub-bands now permitting only CW, RTTY and other data modes would be very harmful to the amateur radio service. Most bad behavior in the amateur spectrum is done in voice mode – jamming, cursing, playing music, and the like. Voice mode requires much more bandwidth than CW or data. Breaking the CW/data bands would effectively ruin CW and data communication, as voice modes invade the spectrum and leave no room for narrower-bandwidth communication. The current system is there to permit such narrowband activities without that danger, and should be preserved.
13. The petitioner uses the term "Symbol Communication" in a fashion that suggests they do not know what the term means, and all rationales based on reasoning around that term are thus tainted and should be disregarded.
14. "Redesignating 75 meters as 80 meters" is a phrase that makes no sense. These are not official designations but colloquial references that are well understood to refer to specific frequency ranges, and in fact "80 meters"

already is a common and accepted term for the sub-band also known as “75 meters”.

15. The petitioner essentially asks for a major overhaul of the entire amateur frequency allocation, but lays out only sketchy, unsupported, irrelevant, and technically-deficient suggestions for the requests. Many of the questions they purport to handle are much better addressed by other proposals before the Commission, with much better research and feedback from the amateur radio community. Almost none of the petitioner’s suggestions are validated by any evidence or reasoning, simply a set of idiosyncratic statements lacking understanding of the status quo, the issues involved, or the possible deleterious consequences of their extremely ill-considered requests.

In summary, I urge the Commission to summarily reject [RM-11769](#), and turn its attention to offerings that actually make both technical and policy sense.

Sincerely,

Lewis S. Bloch
KW2KW