

most often I found it to be either erroneous, naïve, extremely superficial, a violation of my Constitutional rights, or all of the above, so I usually ignored what he said. I do believe Hollingsworth, however, when he said that he stopped reading anything I sent him after my reply to his first warning notice (of course, that is proof of his bias per se) and when he admitted his insanity. You certainly do seem to be in denial about that!

29. State whether you ever volunteered to refrain from using the 3820 frequency. If so:

- a. describe specifically and in detail the circumstances by which you agreed not to use that that frequency;
- b. state when the agreement was made;
- c. identify each person with whom you agreed not to use the frequency;
- d. state whether the agreement was written and, if so:
 - i. state the title, if any, of the agreement;
 - ii. state when the written agreement was executed;
 - iii. identify each party to the written agreement;
- e. provide the date when you last broadcast over the 3820 frequency;
- f. state whether you continue to refrain from using the 3820 frequency.

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence herein. Subject to said objection, I informally agreed with Avery A. (“Allan”) Romine, KA4DXP, and Riley Hollingsworth that I would voluntarily leave the 3820.9 kc. roundtable QSO because Gordon Bennett, K7PED, violated §97.101(b) by refusing to share the frequency with me. Bennett never actually told me to go away; he would just refuse to talk to me, talk over me, claim he couldn't copy me when he

actually could [in violation of §97.113(a)(4) as a false and deceptive message that causes interference] and then turn around and claim I was interfering with him, even though just a moment before he had been falsely claiming that he couldn't copy me or didn't hear me at all. Rather than file a complaint against Bennett with Hollingsworth, I just agreed to leave the frequency under the Commission's long-established policy that amateurs are supposed to be “self-policing” and solve their own problems without asking the Commission for enforcement assistance. I did it merely in order to preserve the peace because I didn't want to disturb their long-standing roundtable. Romine said he was sorry to see me go, and said he wished it weren't necessary. I still occasionally stop by on 3820.9 kc. to say hello, and everyone gives me a very friendly greeting, although I've never again encountered K7PED when I did so. I think the last time I stopped in to say hello on 3920.9 kc. was a couple of months ago. I can't remember the date of the agreement with Romine and Hollingsworth, but I believe it was in 2000 and was memorialized by an email which I no longer have.

In other words, I am a *really* good operator, but Hollingsworth is proceeding against me for the foregoing under the theory that “no good deed shall remain unpunished”. The man is an *idiot!* I'm *never* going to let that happen! (Of course, all this will come out in the findings and conclusions herein.)

30. State whether you were ever instructed to not use the 3820 frequency. If so:

- a. describe specifically and in detail the circumstances by which you were instructed to refrain from using that frequency;
- b. state when the instruction was given;
- c. identify each person(s) who instructed you not to use the frequency;
- d. state whether that instruction was written and, if so, for each written

instruction:

- ii. provide the date(s) the instruction was written and sent;
- ii. provide the date the instruction was received; III. identify each person who signed the instruction.

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence herein. Subject to said objection, no, nobody ever instructed me to stop using 3820.9 kc. and nobody except the Commission had the *authority* to tell me to stop using it (see §97.27). I had the right to use it under my license grant. I agreed to stop using it *voluntarily*, because I wanted to be cooperative; to apply the self-policing policy in preference to calling on the Bureau for enforcement help; and did not wish to disturb the gentlemen's long-standing roundtable, even though K7PED was in the wrong, not I.

31. State whether you have ever referred to W. Riley Hollingsworth ("Hollingsworth") during an on-air transmission(s), on the hamjamming.com web page, in any internet blog, in correspondence, or otherwise as any or all of the following: "Princess," "Hollywood," "Mr. Hollywood," "Riley Hollywood," "Tsarina Hollywood," "Tsarina," and/or "Colonel Klink-Hollywood." If so, for each such name used:

- a. state the name;
- b. provide each date when such name was used;
- c. describe the type of communication containing each such name (i. e., letter, blog, etc.);
- d. describe the circumstances in which you used the name;
- e. explain specifically and in detail your reason for doing so.

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence herein. Subject to said objection, yes, I've called him all of those names, and I'm glad I did because it was a very effective way to call the attention of the amateur community and the Bureau to his abuses of discretion.

I called him "Princess" in my response to his first warning letter. If he can call me a jammer with no proof, I am privileged to call him "Princess". I was trying to embarrass him so much for his mistakes and poor judgment that he would either correct his mistakes and improve his judgment or resign from his position. I also called him "Princess" in order to ridicule him for apparently subscribing to the "Princess and the Pea" (i.e., the Hans Christian Anderson fairy tale) school of amateur enforcement: sending phony warning notices for non-existent, trivial or de minimus claimed violations to good amateurs who sign their callsigns because it makes him look good and it is easier than going after the real jammers. But once you decide to victimize good amateurs just because they sign their callsigns, you have to start making up miniscule, de minimus or non-existent "violations" to justify your warning notices, just like the Princess who was so sensitive that she felt a pea under 14 mattresses. It was also intended to suggest that Hollingsworth must be effeminate if he would get his knickers twisted just because I tried to enter a QSO. Again, I certainly do hope it was I who caused him to retire. I was entitled to do this as a good citizen, and in order to improve the functioning of my federal government.

I called him "Hollywood", "Riley Hollywood" and "Mr. Hollywood" to ridicule and satirize the fact that the *only* thing he has going for him are his phony, self-serving press releases, and that he has taken very little substantive enforcement action.

I called him "Tsarina" and "Tsarina Hollywood" both in order to ridicule him as being effeminate for endorsing "Princess and the pea"-type enforcement, as well as to suggest that his administrative style, insofar as its effect on free-speech was concerned, had a lot in common with a Russian dictator.

I called him "Colonel Klink-Hollywood" in order to ridicule and satirize him by suggesting his administrative style resembled that of a Nazi thug because he wants to use §97.1 to curtail hams' free-speech rights, but a thug who's a *schlemiel* like Colonel Klink on the television series "Hogan's Heroes", because he's "all press release, no real enforcement action" and the jammers have called his bluff.

My intention in calling him all of these names was to exercise my right of reply to his false allegations that I was a jammer and to embarrass him into either doing his job correctly or force him to resign his position in order to improve the administration of the Bureau and of the Commission.

32. State whether in a blog posting on or about August 31, 2004, on www.eHam.net regarding "All Hams Need a Secret Jamming Location" you stated, "If we all set up SJL's [secret jamming locations], it would have the added advantage of actually giving Riley [Hollingsworth] something to do besides sending out his form letter warning notices, permit him to save a lot of money on Vaseline [sic], and give his right hand a well-deserved rest."

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence herein; and also that the Bureau is estopped from claiming this is not non-FCC-related conduct because Hollingsworth told the amateur community to keep the disputatious and argumentative issues on the internet and off the air. Subject to said objection, yes, I believe I did so. Under the First Amendment, I have the right to make

the political comment that Hollingsworth's tenure as SCARE may well be compared, figuratively speaking, to 10 years of onanism. I did so because I was trying to influence public opinion so as to try to get rid of Hollingsworth due to his incessant and deliberate misinterpretations of Part 97, and because I wanted the Commission's administration of Part 97 to be improved so the public would have more confidence in the agency.

33. State whether in response to a blog posting by "Goodbuddy" on August 31, 2004 (stating: "Yeah most of us have heard old Billy Boy's behavior on 3840. A fine example of how to harass and interfere with on going [sic] QSO's. The echo effects were nice Billy.") you responded by stating, "but how did you like Bilitzniklick the Martian... and The Creature from the Black Slacks Lagoon... I thought they were even better than the reverb! Man that Behringer DSP-2024 digital audio processor is a fantastic unit." If so" describe specifically and in detail what you are referring to by "Bilitzniklick the Martian" and "The Creature from the Black Slacks Lagoon."

Yes, I believe I did so respond. I have a Behringer model 2024DSP digital audio processing unit that I will occasionally use to make my voice sound higher or lower in pitch, to distort it slightly or to impose reverb on it. I was just experimenting with my audio, as hams are supposed to do, in order to advance the radio art [§97.1(b)] and to improve my skills in the communications and technical phases thereof [§97.1(c)]. When I am experimenting with the high pitch effect, I sometimes jokingly claim to be Bilitzniklick the Martian; and sometimes when I am experimenting with the low pitch effect, I jokingly claim to be The Creature From The Black Slacks Lagoon. There is nothing whatsoever wrong with doing so because it is not prohibited by Part 97, I always properly identified my transmissions

and they were brief, so no communication was interfered with. Therefore none of the *indicia* of intentional interference appear. I defy you to show me where Part 97 prohibits such experimentation.

34. State whether in response to an internet website posting on www.eHam.net. you sent an email to rinehard@troyst.edu ("Rinehard") on August 31,2004 at 20: 18:56 (EDT). If so:

a. did you call Rinehard a "loser" or refer to his profession [professor of political science] as "bullshit artists," a "bunch of idiots" and/or other insulting terms in that email? If so, state each term used to describe Rinehard and his profession;

b. Explain specifically and in detail each reason for your email to Rinehard and the remarks made in it;

c. provide each email address used to send this email;

d. provide each email address copied on this email;

e. state whether you have ever corresponded or otherwise communicated with Rinehard. If so:

i. provide the date of each such communication;

ii. provide the method used for each such communication (i.e., email);

iii. provide the text of each such communication. If the text is not available, provide a detailed summary of the communication, including, but not limited to, each insulting word or phrase used therein;

iv. If the communication was via email, provide:

a. each email address used to send the email;

b. each email address used for Rinehard;

c. the email address of each person copied on your email to Rinehard

and an explanation regarding why you copied each individual on the email.

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence herein; and also that the Bureau is estopped from claiming this is not non-FCC-related conduct because Hollingsworth told the amateur community to keep the disputatious and argumentative issues on the internet and off the air. Subject to said objection, yes, I believe I did reply on eham.net in response to something really asinine that Rinehard had posted there. You have no business looking into this because it was perfectly legal, and why would Rinehard be such a pussy as to complain about it in the first place? Doesn't the fact that he's a pussy bear on his credibility? Yes, I did tell him I thought that he, and most political scientists, were a bunch of B.S. artists, and that, based on his statements on eham.net, Rinehard himself is a loser. I am qualified to say this because I got my A.B. degree in political science from the University of California, Berkeley in 1968 and in doing so I had to listen to a lot of pure and complete B.S. from the political science professors there. However, neither my ability to understand that the study of political science contains a lot of B.S., nor my ability to identify Rinehard as a loser, has anything whatsoever to do with my fitness to possess an amateur radio license.

35. State whether in response to a blog posting by N1VLQ on www.eHam.net regarding "All Hams Need a Secret Jamming Location" you, on September 4, 2004, stated: "[I]t's hard not to appear [like a know-it-all] by comparison to Tsarina Hollywood because she knows so little." If so, identify "Tsarina Hollywood."

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence here-

in; and also that the Bureau is estopped from claiming this is not non-FCC-related conduct because Hollingsworth told the amateur community to keep the disputatious and argumentative issues on the internet and off the air. Subject to said objection, yes, I did so state because it is true. "Tsarina Hollywood" is Riley Hollingsworth, and he knows very little about the proper interpretation and application of Part 97. Merely saying so is not ground for non-renewal because we don't live in a police state, and because I was trying to improve my federal government.

36. State whether in response to a blog internet website posting by KK6SM on www.eHam.net regarding "All Hams Need a Secret Jamming Location" you, on September 6, 2004, stated, "[J]amming is not wrong! My authority for saying so is none other than Riley Hollywood himself. . . , He has informed several stations, in writing, that it is OK to jam other stations whom they feel are violating Part 97." If so, explain specifically and in detail why you stated that "jamming is not wrong." Identify the writings you are referring to in your blog response.

At the ARRL Southwestern Convention FCC Forum in or about September, 2000, Riley Hollingsworth made the following statement:

"We use warning letters in cases where we don't have quite enough evidence or the situation isn't severe enough to start a forfeiture or revocation proceeding. In a lot of those cases, we found that amateurs were out there engaged in malicious interference because we weren't for 10 years. And let's face it: the Commission was missing in action for those 10 years. A lot of people out there are long-term licensees and they were going to save the amateur radio service if we weren't going to. They weren't going to let the jammers prevail, so we couldn't see moving in and making a broad sweep of revocation proceedings and taking a lot of licenses from people who, in their mind, were out there saving the band because we weren't."

Said statement was reported in WorldRadio Online Magazine for September 7, 2000, and a copy was attached as Exhibit B-1 to my Response to the Bureau's First Request for Production of Documents herein.

In the RAIN Report of the same date, Hollingsworth stated: "The sleeping giant has awakened now and we are coming in and I don't want to see a lot of good, qualified long-term operators get fines and revocations because they were jamming the jammers." A copy thereof was attached as Exhibit B-2 to my Response to the Bureau's First Request for Production of Documents herein.

On or about February 13, 2001, Riley Hollingsworth conspired with Orville Dalton, K6UEY, to illegally set Applicant for an intentional interference complaint by telling all other participants in the 3.830 MHZ roundtable QSO not to talk to Applicant, so that when he attempted to identify his station they could transmit at the same time (i.e., jam his attempts to identify) and then claim he was trying to jam *them* merely because he transmitted his call sign as required by Part 97. A copy of the email of said date from Orville Dalton to some of the other participants in the 3.830 MHZ roundtable, confirming said conspiracy with Hollingsworth, was attached as Exhibit B-3 to my Response to the Bureau's First Request for Production of Documents herein.

At the website <http://www.cq-amateur-radio.com/k4zdh.html>, entitled "CQ Magazine Interviews Riley Hollingsworth", a 2000 interview between the magazine and Hollingsworth is memorialized, in which Hollingsworth states:

"We could have come in right off the bat and designated 20 or 30 licenses for revocation in the amateur service. We didn't do it that way, we tried to take a more clinical approach because a lot of these people were out there operating the way they were or jamming because they saw the Commission as missing in action, and in their minds they weren't going to see the bands lost. Somebody who wasn't operating the way another operator thought they were supposed to be got jammed or they got on them about it. If somebody was jamming, they would jam the jammer and it got very crazy. Frankly, if we had been doing our job, a lot of these long-time operators wouldn't have felt

compelled to go do this.”

<http://www.eham.net/articles/9010>, which I posed on eham.net: "BE A VIGILANTE: JAM A JAMMER AND THAT'S NOT JAMMING": Riley Hollywood's words to the 2000 Convention of the ARRL Southwestern Division were as follows: 'In a lot of these [enforcement] cases, we found that amateurs were out there engaged in malicious interference and jamming because we [the Commission] weren't [doing any enforcement] for 10 years. And let's face it - the Commission was missing in action for those 10 years. A lot of people out there [i.e., the vigilante stations jamming to "enforce the Rules" in the Commission's absence] are long-time licensees and they were going to save the amateur radio service if we weren't going to. They weren't going to let the jammers prevail, SO WE COULDN'T SEE MOVING IN AND MAKING A BROAD SWEEP OF REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS AND TAKING A LOT OF LICENSES FROM PEOPLE WHO, IN THEIR MIND, WERE OUT THERE SAVING THE BAND BECAUSE WE WEREN'T.'" [emphasis supplied]

So if you're a "good" amateur (one of whom Mr. Hollywood approves) and if the Commission wasn't doing its job, it's OK to jam and he'll give you "Papal indulgences" for your past jamming, but if you're a "bad" amateur (one whom Mr. Hollywood happens to dislike) and if the Commission allegedly decides to start doing its job again, then the Commission is going to rip off your license even if you don't jam, and say you have bad character to boot if you object to the illegal procedure. Typical B.S. from this man. The full text of his extremely self-serving speech is available at <http://www.wr6wr.com/articles/features/longbeach.html>

Sometime in or about 2003, when questioned about what hams should do about unlicensed intruders into the 10-meter amateur band, Hollingsworth wrote to Jerry W. Oxindine, K4KWH, by email, saying substantially as follows: Licensed

amateurs should deliberately make one-way transmissions on top of the unlicensed intruders in order to run them off the band. The unlicensed stations have no rights and there is no obligation to recognize them in any way. They have no basis to complain because they have no legal standing, i.e., they don't exist. After it was pointed out to Hollingsworth that such transmissions by amateurs would violate §97.113(b) as one-way transmissions, he tried to back down from his statements and to deny that he ever made them. Applicant doesn't have a copy of the email because the Enforcement Bureau refuses to answer his Interrogatories.

Hollingsworth is the world's most sanctimonious hypocrite about the jamming problem (i.e., it's OK to jam if he likes you, but he'll call you a jammer even if you aren't and try to run you off the air illegally if he doesn't like you), and I'm going to prove to the ALJ how he dispensed his jamming indulgences.

37. State whether in a blog posting on or about September 9, 2004, on www.eHam.net regarding "Ford, you're right for once" you stated, "Yes, Ford, I do have an agenda and I freely admit to it. I want to get the Tsarina's ass canned." If so, identify "Tsarina."

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence herein. Subject to said objection, "Tsarina" is Hollingsworth; and, yes, I did try to get him fired by publicly exposing his corruption, laziness, constant junketing at taxpayer expense and deliberate misinterpretations of Part 97. I certainly hope I had something to do with his decision to retire, and if he were still working for the Commission I would still be trying to get him fired. My only regret is that I did not also call him "Pope Hollywood" for the way he dispensed jamming indulgences, but I just didn't think of it at the time.

38. State whether in a blog posting on or about April 16,2007, on www.eHam.net regarding "FCC Amateur Radio Enforcement Correspondence Posted" you stated, "I have made absolutely no changes in my operating habits or procedures as the result of the letters Mr. Hollingsworth has sent me, nor do I intend to make any such changes. Riley Hollingsworth is full of crap. I never listen to a thing he says. . . . 'F' you, Riley!"

Yes, that's right. Hollingsworth is so screwed up that he's NOT EVEN WRONG, and generally speaking I would view anything he said with a great deal of skepticism, and would not be likely to do what he said unless by mere coincidence, as as a matter of chance, or just due to the unlikelihood that one person can be wrong so consistently and forever, he happened to be correct on that occasion. Of course, unlike him, I would give good-faith consideration to whatever he told me before probably rejecting it because he is so stupid and incompetent that almost everything he says is illegal, incorrect, trivial, highly superficial or strictly subjective in nature. But even a stopped clock is right twice a day, and they say that if you put an infinite number of monkeys to work typing on an infinite number of typewriters, they would eventually type the Bible, and since it is possible that Hollingsworth could be right on such a basis, I would always be willing to give good-faith consideration to his statements.

39. State whether you have ever used equipment to mask, alter, or otherwise distort your voice during any transmission on any amateur radio frequency. If so, for each such transmission:

- a. describe specifically and in detail the nature and content of your transmission;

- b. state the frequency on which your transmission was made;
- c. state the date and time of your transmission;
- d. state the duration of your transmission;
- e. describe specifically the equipment used to mask, alter or distort your voice

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence herein. Subject to said objection, my answer to this interrogatory is the same as my answer to Interrogatory No. 33.

I wasn't trying to mask or disguise my voice because I had no reason to. Why would I want to disguise my voice? I'm a perfectly legal amateur operator, I wasn't violating Part 97 and I have nothing to hide. I was just experimenting with my audio, as hams are supposed to do, in order to advance the radio art [§97.1(b)] and to improve my skills in the communications and technical phases thereof [§97.1(c)]. I had no reason to want to mask my voice and wasn't trying to hide or disguise anything because I wasn't doing anything illegal. I properly identified and everybody knew it was me who was talking. I made such transmissions on 3830 and 3840 kc. and probably on other frequencies, and I always properly identified my signals. Part 97 does not prohibit changing the pitch of your voice on the air, and I defy you to tell me where it does. I can't remember the dates and times I made such transmissions, but they were few and brief, usually 30 seconds or less.

I used a Behringer model 2024-DSP digital audio processor to change the pitch of my voice, in connection with a Behringer model VX-2000 preamplifier and a Radio Shack model 33-3002 dynamic microphone. The line level output from the VX-2000 preamplifier was fed into the "phone patch in" jack on my Kenwood TS-820S transceiver, which sometimes drives my Heathkit SB-220 RF

amplifier.

40. State whether you transmitted music on any amateur radio frequency on the evening of November 23, 2005 or on the morning of November 24, 2005. If so, for each such transmission:

- a. state the date and time of the transmission;
- b. state the frequency on which such transmission was made;
- c. state the duration of the transmission;
- d. describe specifically and in detail the nature and content of such transmission;
- e. describe with specificity the equipment used for the transmission.

No, absolutely not. Art Bell concocted that recording from whole cloth, and I can prove it. He's not very proficient in his use of an audio editor! Apparently he never learned to use the "punch in" command, and incorrectly used the regular "paste" command instead, so there are quite audible clicks ("insertion noise") where he inserted audio snippets from the original conversation.

On one occasion I accidentally had music playing on my stereo too loud in the background until somebody told me so. I then immediately turned the stereo off. I forget the date. It was on 75 meters, but I forget the exact frequency. It was a complete accident; only about 2 such transmissions occurred, and they each lasted just a few seconds. This happened because I had just installed a new stereo in my hamshack and I didn't realize how sensitive my microphone and my transceiver's microphone preamplifier circuit were. Since I found out how sensitive they are, this has never happened again because I don't play the stereo while I am on the air anymore.

41. State whether you have ever transmitted music at any time on any amateur radio frequency. If so, for each such transmission:

- a. state the date and time of the transmission;
- b. state the frequency on which such transmission was made;
- c. state the duration of the transmission;
- d. describe with specificity the equipment used for the transmission;
- e. describe specifically and in detail the nature and content of such transmission.

Former ALJ Steinberg ruled in Par. 10 of Order No. FCC 08M-59 that I have already sufficiently answered Interrogatory No. 41.

42. State whether you have ever transmitted any recording other than music at any time on any amateur radio frequency. If so, for each such transmission:

- a. state the date and time of the transmission;
- b. state the frequency on which such transmission was made;
- c. state the duration of the transmission;
- d. describe with specificity the equipment used for the transmission;
- e. describe specifically and in detail the nature and content of such transmission.

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence herein. Subject to said objection, yes, I occasionally play brief recordings other than music. This is not prohibited by Part 97 as long as you properly identify your station, as I always do, and as long as it is not a one-way transmission, which mine were not. I defy you to point out where Part 97 prohibits such transmissions. I play

brief non-musical recordings only occasionally, as part of a two-way communication.

43. State whether you have ever transmitted over any amateur radio frequency profane or indecent language or otherwise cursed or swore at any time. If so, for each such occurrence:

- a. state the date and time of the transmission;
- b. state the frequency on which such transmission was made;
- c. state the duration of the transmission;
- d. describe with specificity the equipment used for the transmission;
- e. describe specifically and in detail the nature and content of such transmission.

In Par. 13 of Order No. FCC 08M-59, former ALJ Steinberg ruled that Interrogatory No. 43 was improper, and that I don't have to answer it, insofar as it inquires concerning any so-called "profane" language, but that I must answer it in all other respects.

Once or twice during my entire 50-year amateur career I have gotten mad and blurted out the word "fuck" before I realized it. That was accidental. Of course, other hams say "fuck" on the air all the time, every day, but Riley Hollingsworth never accuses *them* of using indecent language. On one or two occasions I've discussed whether or not the word "fuck" is indecent, and what forms of the word might or might not be indecent, but the context of those discussions was strictly intellectual and not prurient.

A few times I have called Art Bell's sycophants "fucktards" because they are. That's not indecent and if you think it is, you aren't considering the context correctly. If somebody is a fucktard, you are entitled to say so. The law does not

require us to pretend that others are not fucktards when they really are. It might be nice if you didn't call them fucktards, but they sometimes become very irritating and you need to remind them how stupid and retarded they are, so that hopefully they will either shut up or stop acting like a fucktard. It certainly is not a Part 97 violation or illegal in any way to do so.

I really don't know what you consider indecent. We will often discuss why we can't get a date and, for example, whether or not in this day and age a man has to be willing to perform cunnilingus on a woman in order to get her to date him; what happens to him socially and sexually if he refuses to perform cunnilingus; and whether it is medically, socially or psychologically advisable for a man to perform it if the woman makes it a condition of having sexual intercourse.

We also discuss our favorite sexual positions, why they are our favorites, which ones are womens' favorites and why, and which position(s) most stimulate female orgasm and delay male orgasm; and the propriety, advisability and desirability of engaging in mouth-on-anus sex, which is also sometimes referred to as "giving (or getting) a rim job" or "tossing someone's salad".

Sometimes we will discuss why some men become gay, the pros and cons of male homosexual sex and what medical maladies you can contract from engaging in anal sex. I only discuss these subjects as valid men's health issues, and if you think there is anything wrong with that, then you are not correctly considering the context of the statements. Men are *entitled* to discuss these subjects.

We also discuss all the hams who have gone to the Philippines in order to get a child bride, like Art Bell did; how perverted it is, and how, despite his phony protestations to the contrary, Bell was obviously communicating with his new child bride before he let his former wife die; how old coots like Bell are too old and ugly get a date with an American woman, so they marry filipina child brides instead; and how if they had sex with a child like that in the U.S. they would be

charged with statutory rape. Many of these filipina brides are age 14 or younger, and we discuss how the hams involved lie about their brides' ages in order to minimize the absolutely ridiculous age difference. For example, Art Bell's wife was a child and much younger than he claimed she was when he married her, while he was a crusty, wrinkled, chain-smoking 65-year-old coot at the time. We therefore discuss how sick and perverted it is for a disgusting old lecher like Bell to steal a young girl's virginity just because he has lots of money and she is poor and lives in a third-world country; how much, if any, Viagra an old codger like Bell requires to achieve and maintain an erection; and whether or not he artificially inseminated his filipina child bride and, if so, whether he used a turkey baster in order to do so. We discuss how it is not fair that hams who get filipina child brides don't have to perform cunnilingus before having sexual intercourse, while the rest of us must do so against our wishes because American women seem to demand it, and we discuss why women can't seem to have an orgasm these days unless they receive cunnilingus prior to intercourse. We also discuss how sometimes we don't want to perform cunnilingus because some vaginas don't smell very good.

We further discuss the problem of “pedophile Elmers”, or older hams who volunteer to help young boys become hams, only for the purpose of betraying them and their parents by “turning them out” into the homosexual lifestyle and then passing them around between themselves for meretricious homosexual sex, the severe emotional and psychological problems this causes to the young boys, how the ARRL and the amateur community hushes it up and pretends it's not happening, and about how so many parents have therefore said they wish they had never let their sons get into amateur radio.

We also discuss subjects such as the proper care and treatment of hemorrhoids, and whether it is really necessary for sanitary purposes, and/or for hemorrhoid management, to use toilet paper after a bowel movement if you are living on

a fixed income and can't afford it (because toilet paper is getting pretty expensive these days), or whether it is just as sanitary to use your bare hand instead, especially considering that most people scratch their anuses with their fingers anyway; about the popular belief in psychological circles that humans would be much more psychologically healthy if we got back to our evolutionary roots by scratching our anuses more or less continuously like monkeys do, rather than following the social prohibition against scratching them in public; how popular singer Sheryl Crow advocated using only one square of toilet tissue after each bowel movement, and whether or not this is really efficacious, or represents any actual improvement over just using your bare hand for the job.

Some of the older hams have trouble achieving or maintaining erections, so we often also discuss erectile dysfunction and its remedies, including what is the proper dose of Viagra and other E.D. drugs, and we document and discuss cases of E.D. drug overdose.

I don't think any of this is indecent, and I'm not going to let you judge the social value of my perfectly legal speech. After all, they talk about such subjects all the time on AM sex talk radio shows; the Commission has even given broadcasters a "safe harbor" period in which to discuss such subjects; and under the Red Lion and League of Womens' Voters decisions, you don't have the right to regulate our speech in the first place. Also, these are all valid men's health concerns, and if you think such speech is indecent then you are failing to place the discussion in the correct context. And as ALJ Sippel found in the Titus case, amateur radio is not particularly child-friendly, so we don't need to concern ourselves with whether or not a child would be offended by our said conversations. All such discussions occur after 10:00 P.M., the time for which the Bureau should have granted, but has wrongfully denied, amateurs a safe harbor to discuss said matters.

44. State whether you have ever intentionally caused interference during any transmission at any time on any amateur radio frequency. If so, for each such transmission:

- a. state the date and time of your transmission;
- b. state the frequency on which your transmission was made;
- c. state the duration of your transmission;
- d. describe with specificity the equipment used for the transmission;
- e. describe specifically and in detail the nature and content of such transmission.

Former ALJ Steinberg ruled in Par. 10 of Order No. FCC 08M-59 that I have already sufficiently answered Interrogatory No. 44.

45. State whether you have ever intentionally interrupted an ongoing radio transmission at any time on any amateur radio frequency. If so, for each such transmission:

- a. state the date and time of your transmission;
- b. state the frequency on which such transmission was made;
- c. state the duration of your transmission;
- d. describe with specificity the equipment used for your transmission;
- e. describe specifically and in detail the nature and content of such transmission.

Former ALJ Steinberg ruled in Par. 10 of Order No. FCC 08M-59 that I have already sufficiently answered Interrogatory No. 45.

46. State whether you have ever transmitted a one-way communication at

any time on any amateur radio frequency. If so, for each such transmission:

- a. state the date and time of your transmission;
- b. state the frequency on which your transmission was made;
- c. state the duration of your transmission;
- d. describe with specificity the equipment used for the transmission;
- e. describe specifically and in detail the nature and content of such

transmission.

Former ALJ Steinberg ruled in Par. 10 of Order No. FCC 08M-59 that I have already sufficiently answered Interrogatory No. 46.

47. State whether you have ever used the expression "fucktard," or any variation thereof, during any transmission at any time on any amateur radio frequency. If so, for each such transmission:

- a. state the date and time of the transmission;
- b. state the frequency on which such transmission was made;
- c. state the duration of the transmission;
- d. describe with specificity the equipment used for the transmission;
- e. describe specifically and in detail the nature and content of such transmission.

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence herein. Subject to said objection, yes, I have occasionally but rarely used the word "fucktard" on the 75-meter band. I can't remember the exact frequencies, but probably 3830, 3840 and 3847 kc. The transmissions were very brief; always under 15 seconds and usually less than 5 seconds, so it would have been impossible for my

said statements to have caused any real interference because nobody could have been prevented from saying anything they wanted to after I completed my brief transmission calling them a "fucktard". I did so only after they falsely called me a jammer and tried to illegally run me off the frequency, which is worse than calling someone a "fucktard" because jamming is illegal but being a fucktard is not. And if you think calling someone a "fucktard" is indecent, then you aren't properly considering said context. After all, none of this would have happened in the first place if Riley Hollingsworth had not taken his illegal and malicious actions against me, so don't blame *me* for what *you* caused.

The equipment I used consisted of a Kenwood MC-50 microphone, Kenwood TS-820S transceiver, and sometimes my Heathkit SB-220 RF power amplifier, feeding a 312-foot-long double-extended Zepp antenna that's about 100 feet up, through a Dentron "Super Tuner Plus" antenna tuner. The purpose of the transmissions was to tell Art Bell's sycophants that they were complete "screwups" (*i.e.*, "fucked up" in the head; hence "fuck") and mentally retarded ("tard") because they *were*, and I have a right to point it out when they start trouble by falsely accusing me of jamming. I only called them that when, at Art Bell's behest, they falsely accused me of jamming. There was nothing wrong with saying so when the context of the statements is properly considered, and I have a right under the First Amendment to call them "fucktards" in said context. As soon as they stopped falsely accusing me of jamming, I stopped calling them that. That shows my good faith in the matter. Last, §97.113(a)(4)'s prohibition against obscene or indecent words or language is not enforceable under the Red Lion and League of Womens' Voters decisions for the reasons set forth in my other filings herein.

48. State whether you have ever transmitted any previously recorded broadcast, commercial, and/or any copyrighted material during any transmission at any

time on any amateur radio frequency. If so, for each such transmission:

- a. state the date and time of the transmission;
- b. state the frequency on which such transmission was made;
- c. state the duration of the transmission;
- d. describe with specificity the equipment used for the transmission;
- e. describe specifically and in detail the nature and content of such

transmission.

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence herein. Subject to said objection, yes, I have occasionally done so, but only as part of a two-way communication, and I always properly identified my transmissions so everybody would know who was making them. There was no copyright violation because it was a fair use of the material in question and/or said materials were in the public domain. There is nothing illegal about making such transmissions, nor are they prohibited by Part 97; and I defy you to prove otherwise. This was done on the 75-meter band, and I can't remember the dates or specific frequencies, but probably on 3840, 3830 and 3847 kc.

The equipment used was a Fry's Electronics "Great Quality" personal computer running the Microsoft Windows XP operating system and the Adobe Audition audio editor, with the computer sound card feeding a Pyramid stereo preamplifier. The "tape out" jack on the Pyramid pre-amplifier is connected to the line-level or "phone patch in" jack on my Kenwood TS-820S transceiver, with which I sometimes drive my Heathkit SB-220 RF amplifier, which in turn feeds my 312-foot double-extended Zepp antenna which is about 100 feet up and is fed with ladder line having an impedance of 450 ohms. I use a Dentron "Super Tuner Plus" antenna tuner. All of this is legal, FCC type-certified, substantially unmodified amateur

equipment.

The only such recordings that I can remember is when I would play a short portion of Art Bell's Coast-to-Coast AM radio show and then we would discuss how idiotic it was, and how it was a disgrace that a man like Bell would thus victimize the American public with the Commission's cooperation and consent; or I would play a snippet of Phil Hendrie's parody of the Coast-to-Coast show and then we would discuss how funny it was, and what a fool Art Bell is. There is nothing illegal about this; in fact, it is good amateur practice, promotes experimentation and improves the radio art. Furthermore, we have the right to do so under the First Amendment.

49. State whether you have ever been informed by one or more amateur radio operators that you were or are not welcome to join a QSO. If so, for each such occurrence:

- a. state the date and time of the occurrence;
- b. state the frequency of the transmissions;
- c. identify the amateur radio operator(s) who were participating in the QSO
- at d. the time that you attempted to join it;
- e. identify the amateur radio operator(s) who told you that you were not welcome to participate in the QSO;
- f. state the reasons provided or otherwise known to you why the QSO participants did not want you to join the QSO;
- g. state your response(s) and action(s) after the participants in the QSO told you that you were not welcome to join the QSO.

Applicant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is irrelevant, immaterial and not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence here-

in. Subject to said objection, I had never been asked to leave any QSO in 40 years of amateur operation until Riley Hollingsworth began falsely, wrongfully and publicly calling me a jammer. Since then, I have had many stations tell me to go away, such as Orv Dalton trying to run me off of 3830 kc. and Art Bell and his sycophants trying to run me off of 3840, but Riley Hollingsworth wrongfully caused this to happen; it wasn't due to anything I did. The problem got worse after Scot Stone issued his phony Hearing Designation Order which, although it contains some facially-impressive allegations, was based on no admissible evidence whatsoever of Part 97 violations and as a matter of law failed to raise a character rule issue. This began to happen even more often after the FCC database began listing my callsign as expired. Now it happens so often that I can barely talk on the radio without having someone tell me to go away because they believe Riley Hollingsworth's and the Bureau's lies, or have them call me a bootlegger because they think my license has expired because the Commission's database is so screwed up. It happens so often now due to the wrongful, illegal and malicious actions of Hollingsworth and Stone that I can't even keep track of it because I just don't pay any attention to it. The reason is always because Riley Hollingsworth and Scot Stone called me a jammer for no reason and with no evidence, or told people not to talk to me, and not due to anything I've done. You're not going to be able to run me off the air *that* easily! I will *never* let you profit from your own wrong that way!

50. State whether you are aware of any occurrence in which your participation or attempted participation in a QSO was ever the cause of other amateur radio operators moving to other amateur radio frequencies to QSO. If so, for each such occurrence:

- a. state the date and time of the occurrence;
- b. state the frequency of the transmission;