

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D. C. 20554

In the Matter of:)
Rulemaking under Part 97 of)
The Communications Act of 1934,) RM-10807
as amended, to Revise License)
Examination Requirements Related)
to the Amateur Radio Service)
)

IN REPLY TO THE ABOVE CAPTION PROCEEDING

Submitted by :
William Houlne
2732 Grove Street
National City, CA 91950-7605
November 7, 2003

1 Two glaring issues need to be brought to the surface regarding this
2 petition. The first concerns the International Morse Code. The
3 second is the willful and deliberate misrepresentation of facts.

4 5 **CW AS A LANGUAGE**

6
7 Paragraph 3.3.2 of this petition boosts a glaring misconception that
8 seems to propagate itself throughout the Amateur community with
9 impunity. The relevant portion of this offending statement is in
10 paragraph "3.3.2" (emphasis added):

11
12 *[..... { CW is also an "International Language", by which, peoples of*
13 *the world who have differing spoken languages can communicate*
14 *efficiently. }.....]*

15
16 The International Morse Code, herein known as "CW," is not a language
17 in any manner of consideration. Specifically, it is a code or
18 characterization that represents the alphabet utilized by many Western
19 European languages. Specifically it does not refer to or provide any
20 relief with syllabic or ideographic based languages. Even with the
21 languages characterized by the common alphabet that "CW" represents,
22 if two radio operators are completely unfamiliar with each other's
23 language, then no effective communication is going to occur.

24
25 It constantly amazes me how people make the erroneous leap of faith
26 about something that should be so obvious. It is really embarrassing
27 that people in this country are so illiterate on such simple things
28 and unfortunately show it to the rest of the world.

1 **WILLFUL AND DELIBERATE MISREPRESENTATION**

2
3 It is also unfortunate that, not only the originator of the "CW"
4 study, but the petitioners as well, have failed miserably in their
5 scope of facts. This "CW" report is seriously flawed.

6
7 It is flawed in that the "data set" only considers one, and only one,
8 aspect of a "HAM's" operating habits. It also is flawed in that it
9 does not provide the element of "TIME" except in the aggregate.

10
11 Or more specifically, the time frame of the activity. Everyone does
12 not chase "DX" at every minute of a 24 hour day, 7 days a week, 52
13 weeks a year.

14
15 The data set, itself, is flawed because it does not include all
16 aspects of Amateur Radio operating practices as it relates to every
17 minute of every day, 52 weeks a year. In other words, not everyone
18 chases after "DX." There are many more that operate in another time
19 honored fashion called "RAG CHEWING" which does not involve chasing
20 "DX."

21
22 So if you were to consider only the "RAG CHEWING" crowd, the data set
23 would be heavily skewed toward SSB instead of CW. Likewise if you
24 only considered those that operate "CONTESTS" then obviously that
25 would be skewed as there are many more voice type contests as opposed
26 to CW.

27
28 It is also unfortunate that all the nice computer programs that allow

1 for nice charts, etc., do not also teach how to properly use
2 "STATISTICAL" information. Statistical information is a study in how
3 the variables affect the outcome of a process. This is not simple and
4 the conclusions are usually, themselves, skewed by the biases of the
5 individuals making the inferences from the data at hand. That is
6 exactly the conditions and the problem with this report.

7
8 To illustrate this very point lets consider just one aspect of this
9 report that is extremely flagrant in its assumptions of the presented
10 data. This concerns the following statement made of the 80 meter band
11 results (emphasis added):

12
13 { *"The DX spot activity for the 80 meter band is*
14 *shown in the graph. Note that the long term*
15 *trends clearly show a decline in the SSB*
16 *activity. In additon, except for 1997 and 1998,*
17 *there has been more CW activity than SSB*
18 *activity. The increase in CW activity from 1998*
19 *to 2001 is clearly offest by diminished SSB*
20 *activity, with the small amount of digital*
21 *activity also declining. The incomplete data for*
22 *2003 indicate that SSB activity is flat, and the*
23 *decline in CW activity is replaced by digital*
24 *activity. For this band the CW activity is*
25 *significantly higher than the 40% estimate from*
26 *other sources."* }

27
28 What is wrong with this conclusion based on just the presented data ?

1 It does not take into account the factors of propagation, noise, size
2 of antennas, etc. So there is another, and by all means not the only,
3 conclusion that can be drawn about this "DX" data. Most likely the
4 following conclusion would be closer to the true facts if one was to
5 "properly" conduct the necessary audit.

6
7 ANOTHER CONCLUSION :

8
9 { *"There is no argument that CW is a better weak*
10 *signal mode verses SSB. SSB, for intelligent*
11 *communication to occur, requires a better antenna*
12 *system and higher power levels if distant*
13 *stations ("DX") on the fringe are to be*
14 *contacted. There are far fewer people that have*
15 *the capability to erect multiple phased vertical*
16 *arrays or real beams needing 200 foot towers that*
17 *provide the foundation for consistent results*
18 *working SSB DX on 80 meters."* }

19
20 If one were to honestly review the real "MAJORITY" operating habits,
21 one would certainly see a different picture. For example, on the 80
22 meter band, the real **majority** operating practice is SSB in the "rag
23 chewing" mode. There is truly little CW or DIGITAL that occurs. If
24 one were to be truly honest about the issues that surround the 80
25 meter band, it would be to reduce the "CW" only segment. Thus
26 providing the room necessary to reduce all the squabble that occurs
27 due to overcrowding in the voice portion.

28

1 Additionally, the comparison to the so-called ARRL surveys is
2 misaligned as well, as those surveys suffer for the same reasons
3 outlined above. They are highly skewed because the "DATA" sets are
4 very small statistically. They are also highly skewed due to nature
5 of the questions asked. And finally, they are highly skewed as they
6 did not statistically include those that are not members of that
7 organization.

8

9 To attempt to justify this "**Rule Request**" based on faulty data and
10 some perceived correlation with other flawed reports is wholly
11 irresponsible and biased on its face. While the efforts to produce a
12 properly written "REQUEST" is laudable, it is disingenuous at best and
13 willfully irresponsible and dishonest to do so with fallible data and
14 deliberately incorrect assumptions. This is a discredit to the
15 Amateur community as a whole, and, sadly to say, demonstrates a total
16 lack of candor, not to mention totally self serving on behalf of the
17 authors.

18

19 Accordingly, I am opposed to this Rule Request.

20

21 Respectfully submitted,

22

23 William Houlne

24

25

26

27

28