

LETTERS

Please address correspondence to:

Frank Ogden G4JST
Ham Radio Today,
145 Charing Cross Rd.
London WC2 0EE.

COMMENT - RSGB REPLIES

It appears to be one of the trends of publishing today that people seem perfectly happy to rush into print with half truths and misinformation. We regret three things: first that HAM RADIO TODAY appears to subscribe to this practice; secondly that a few minutes of time was not taken to check some of the facts with the RSGB headquarters; and thirdly, the right of reply offered by the writer of the article (with or without the editor's approval) was not made at the time that such a reply could be seen alongside the original comments.

The general charge is that it is the RSGB's policy to downgrade the status of Class B licence holders. This is simply not the case. The RSGB welcomed the introduction of this licence and especially the often very talented people who are attracted into amateur radio for whom an ability in morse was irrelevant and perhaps previously a barrier. The only distinction is a technical one, the capacity to use morse is, and always will be, a major advantage when transmitting under marginal conditions. In that sense, Class B licence holders may be considered to be in a disadvantageous position. Since one of the things that the RSGB must stand for is more effective communication, it also must be RSGB policy to encourage the use of morse.

As regards the use of morse by Class B licence holders, there seem to be three different cases that people present, its value in practising under so-called real conditions (debatable - one can do as well by other methods), its value in demonstrating the power of CW to get through when other modes fail, and therefore an incentive to master the technique (a credible argument) and its value as a permitted means of contact for any purpose, but subject to the call sign being given in speech at the beginning and end of each transmission and at a stated intermediate time (also a credible argument). The RSGB VHF Committee cannot of itself recommend anything to the Home Office. At present, the question of Class B licencing conditions is being discussed by all the relevant RSGB committees, namely the VHF, microwave and licencing advisory committees. The recommendations, which may differ from committee to committee, since factors such as band occupancy will also differ, will be passed to the RSGB Council who will have the responsibility of making any final policy decision. Anything 'leaked' from a committee can only reflect an intermediate stage of deliberation or the view of an individual. The final decision regarding changes to the Class B licence

would, of course, be made by the Home Office, not RSGB, although it is to be expected that RSGB's recommendations will carry great weight.

A similar argument applies to the 50 MHz experimental licences. The Society hopes that there will eventually be a permanent allocation in this most interesting part of the spectrum. The final decision about experimental licences again was made by the Home Office. In this case, RSGB recommendations clearly carried great weight.

In addressing this letter, I find it a little difficult to know who this reply actually is directed at. I feel that the editor of any magazine will always bear some responsibility for its editorial content. However, in the case of the above article, we have a problem, the writer is the editor, who in the letter claims that the opinions are his own and do not reflect those of the magazine he himself edits. It is called 'role conflict'.

DAVID A EVANS G3OUF
Secretary/General Manager, RSGB.

ASPECT OF DSB

Frank, A most interesting article about the low cost DSB/CW transceiver. I wonder if the two prototypes have been tried talking to one another on DSB. In theory some strange things might be expected to happen because the reference oscillator used to demodulate DSB must be in the correct phase. Under strong signal conditions the receiver VFO may lock on to the incoming signal through stray coupling. In the absence of locking, one would expect the audio output to be 100% modulated at the difference frequency between the far transmitter and receiver VFO's giving a flutter fading effect. Fortunately there are plenty of SSB and CW stations to work, so this effect is not really a drawback.

An intriguing property of DSB suppressed carrier (unlike SSB) is that the sidebands contain enough information to enable the RX injection oscillator to be locked in the correct phase, giving correct sounding audio without the need for careful adjustment (hence no "SSB sound"). Such a system has been described for broadcast reception, and a complete synchronous communication system using DSB was described in PROC.I.E.E. around 1960. However the need to conserve the frequency spectrum meant that SSB emerged as the universal voice modulation system for HF communications.

160m sounds a good place to try out a version of the DSB rig. There are usually plenty of empty channels even at night, particularly above 1.9MHz away from the Europeans and the DX.

JEREMY WHITFIELD G3IMW

I confess that I haven't actually tried the experiment that you suggest with DSB but I have noted an interesting "injection locking" phenomenon with an old fashioned TRF receiver of 1932 vintage. Naturally, this three valve set was designed for AM broadcast transmissions and, although sensitive, is lacking in selectivity when compared with a superhet design. However, if you wind up the regeneration until the set howls like a wounded dog and re-tune for a locked zero beat, adjacent, and seemingly co-channel interference vanishes while the demodulation bandwidth increases to almost Hi-Fi dimensions. Distortion induced by the grid leak detection system also disappears. I have a feeling that there is much mileage to be gained in re-visiting the early radio designs — Ed.

KW CORRECTION

Sir, This week I noticed your publication for the first time in our local WHS. I have found the one I have most interesting and wish you every success.

There is one item I wish to correct you upon and that is with reference to the HF RIG GUIDE, referring to the KW "ATLANTA" one of which I have been the proud owner since I purchased it new on 8th, May 1970. This model is very stable indeed, as are all of them, including the remote VFO. However the KW2000 series were very liable to drift and I only assume you have the two models confused. I think it only fair that you put a correction in an early issue.

Wishing you all the best for future issues.

FRANCIS MASON G4QU

Point noted. Instances of drift re. KW gear has always been associated solely with 500kHz versions of the KW2000. Atlanta models have never been implicated — Ed.

QRZ?

Sir, Who is this guy with the call sign QRZ whom I keep hearing other guys calling? If they would look up the Q-code they would find that QRZ means 'Who is calling me?' so it doesn't make much sense if guys come on an empty frequency and shout QRZ — or worse — if they come on an already occupied frequency and do the same thing, especially if the station which is already there has no interest in having a QSO with the QRZedder. So please — let's have a little less of the QRZ business and remember — we should only use it if we know that somebody is calling us.

SEAN SINEHAN E17CV

There is much room for improvement in operating etiquette on the HF bands and this is just one aspect. It is quite in order to call QRZ? de G4XYZ at END of a QSO but make