In summary, the authors propose to make the written test more difficult, and to allow the applicant's code score to count as credit against the applicant's written exam score. The underlying assumption that "all skills are in some way equal" is political accomodation. This is not a bad proposal. However, as a volunteer examiner myself, I can hardly help but observe that this proposal replaces years of accumulated beaurocracy with an equally complex system. This (of course) makes the change-over period between the two systems very likely to suffer from problems caused by confusion. Had this system evolved naturally, it's something we could live with, but to invent it from scratch and to try to implement it on top of the current system is not the best solution. The logical flaw here is that it is OK for CW operators to be weak on theory, as they'll never need it [?] any more than phone operators will need CW skills. A band edge is a band edge and SWR is SWR. It just doesn't follow. As for the diagnosis of previous tests, applicants and the licensing process should focus on basic station issues common to all -- such as RF grounding and lightning protection -- and move away from questions of relevance only to a select few -- such as VFO diagrams (who builds these anymore?) and CW training. For example, I can drive using a manual transmission. No state requires that I prove this. We do not have to build our own cars, and most cars have automatic transmissions. Why have a licensing structure that mirrors a time of crystal controlled home-brew radios?