

pieces and not actually talking on radio? Should a motorist spend his time stripping car engines then rebuilding? Should an angler first dig a pond? I could go on all day.

Some time ago I joined a camera club, but soon left – why? Well, the old-time boids would never accept that the 35mm camera was capable of decent picture-making. In every hobby there are at least two factions: those who know it as it was and the newcomers.

Back to radio; neither I nor any other licenced operator I know would advocate that everyone should transmit rather than build, so why should Frank Ogden rather than any other person complain about the actions of other people who are not interfering in any way with the way in which other stations conduct themselves.

Most of the new boys are ex-CBers – AM, SSB, FM, it makes no odds: most did not tinker with electrical bits before they found their new hobby gave them the knowledge, albeit pretty basic, to meddle and build bits like ATUs and aerials; few would contemplate building a transceiver and why should they if they can afford to buy one? The Russian amateurs build their own equipment because they do not have an alternative and every day their signals can be heard 'splattering' all over the place – is that what Mr Ogden wants? Or, better still, let's all go back to AM – would you believe that when single side-band transmitters first appeared, a lot of the "OMs" decried it?

Mr Ogden makes comments like "2 metres is un-naturally quiet". He obviously lives 50 miles from any reasonably large town or city. Within a 20 mile radius of Manchester there is queue for vacant frequencies. His comment refers to "killing the hobby" – surely this cannot be the case, there are more amateurs than ever, enough, in fact, to warrant the publication of *Ham Radio Today* – which is read by backward baboons.

Mr Ogden, could it be that you and a lot like you thought that you belonged to an exclusive club; the remnants of which can now be heard on 80 metres claiming to have exclusive use of a certain frequency for 30 years until these upstarts appeared? I note that your opinions were not expressed in the first issue – I wonder why?

To the new editor, I say welcome, let's hope that you are not as biased as your predecessor.

One last question for Mr Ogden: if, as you imply, home construction is virtually dead, why does HRT publish all those projects?

A Whittam, G4TOJ

Sir, As one of Frank Ogden's "backward baboons", I must reply to his final "Comment" in the October edition. In his vitriolic condemnation of new radio amateurs and their commitment to the hobby, he is missing a very important point.

Passing the RAE is only a beginning, it always was so, even in the halcyon

days of the written examination. Good amateurs are not so because they passed the old-style exam, and, of course, there is a lot wrong with the current one, but that is another subject. Amateurs become "good" by being taught and "shown the ropes" by more experienced operators.

Could the truth be that there is a school within the hobby that has chosen to ignore the new amateurs as ex-CBers and legalised pirates, which has produced the standards of which Frank complains? If so, one is entitled to ask just whose commitment to the hobby is in question?

Speaking personally, I have been most impressed by the example of personal enthusiasm of my tutor at the local college of further education whilst studying for the RAE last year. Also, the help offered and given by local amateurs in setting up a good station and advice on construction problems has been most helpful. Perhaps if those established amateurs actively helped their local "new boys" instead of belly-aching about them, then perhaps Frank would be somewhat more optimistic of the future.

A. David Whiteman, G1ADW

The above is typical of the majority of the many letters we have received on Frank's parting remarks. However, there is another point of view... .

Sir, May I say how much I enjoyed *Ham Radio Today* whilst Frank was at the helm. I especially enjoyed, as I'm sure others did, his *Technicalities* column – I personally devoured their contents with relish, even though sometimes the prose was reminiscent of that esoteric publication, *Wireless World*. His (G4JST) equipment reviews were seized upon with salivating interest none of this touching-the-forlock attitude that is all too prevalent in some other mags. Subservient bowing-down to advertising revenue – Ugh! (What's wrong with advertising revenue? – G4NXV)

I hope that the present editorial team at *Ham Radio Today* will continue to publish the above, with just a little of the previous editor's inimitable style. May I just say in ending how much I wholeheartedly agree with Frank's goodbye "Comment" in the October edition.

R J Howes, G40WY

Unless a reader writes to use with a viewpoint that is substantially different from those expressed above, we will not be publishing any further letters on this topic.

FT200 UP–DATE

Sir, Further to Gordon Crowhurst's letter in the October issue.

I have owned an FT200 for about four years and have had no trouble at all

with it (I do my own servicing). It makes a change to hear someone else asking for an up-date on this rig instead of the infamous FT101. I would eagerly look forward to such an article.

I have a regular order for your magazine every month and think it is very good value for money.

B. Tranter, G4FBT

Is there anyone out there who is interested in writing an FT200 update?

— Ed.

AMTOR UNIT

Sir, On reading the printout of my article "The AMT-1 reviewed" I see that unfortunately you have made a mistake in the captioning of a 'hard copy' QSO I sent you.

You will see on page 29 of the September issue that you have titled the copy of the QSO 'Typical AMTOR copy'. This is not so. The copy was of a CW QSO which I had with the Russian station, and which was mentioned as 'Figure 2' in the second half of the article which you did not publish.

I have had my attention drawn to this as first of all one *never* sends callsigns twice in AMTOR. There is no need as one gets 100 percent perfect copy, and so there would not be any errors in the text. Secondly, to my knowledge, no Russian station is in possession of AMTOR gear.

Can you please publish a correction of this at your convenience so as to remove any misconceptions about the efficiency of the note.

Ken Michaelson G3RDG

RAYNET

Sir, I have bought your magazine since its first issue (in Dec. 82) and must encourage you to keep up the good work.

However, like everyone, I have a complaint, though you will be pleased to hear it is not about HRT.

After reading an article in the April 83 issue of your magazine by Cyril Young (G8KHH) titled *This is Raynet*, I decided to make enquiries about joining, despite not yet being licensed. (I am in that long wait between RAE results and receiving my ticket.) I wrote to the RSGB, who, with their normal efficiency wrote back very quickly sending me an address to write to. I have since written to this address twice and, despite enclosing a stamped addressed envelope each time, have received no reply.

So, "This is Raynet", a service which lives could depend on. Do they want volunteers or not?

S M Richards

ANCIENT PHONETICA

Sir, Reading G4UBV's letter re Phonetics brought to mind my service