

SCORING SYSTEM

(Continued from Page 11)

tions would be different if reporting followed a more definite pattern and if winners and runners-up were always announced. There is also no doubt that a more accurate evaluation of our pilots' abilities would be possible if contests more nearly complied with certain standards. Note that I said "more nearly" as I do not think rigid standards are desirable for obvious reasons involving climatic and geographical conditions.

A more logical period however is five years. Standings of those having more than 1,500 points, as gleaned from SOARING, for that period follow:

Richard H. Johnson	7,750
Wm. H. Coverdale	4,100
Paul Bikle	3,850
Betsy Woodward	3,850
Wm. S. Ivans	3,650
Ray Parker	2,800
Kemps Trager	2,650
Wally Wiberg	2,450
Lyle Maxey	2,250
Larry Gehrlein	2,150
Paul McCready, Jr.	2,050
Bill Bueby	2,050
Gus Brigleb	1,800
Stan Smith	1,550

While most of the top hands are still at or near the top after dropping two years of points, most positions are changed and many have dropped out entirely, making room for new names. However I'm afraid reporting was not thorough enough to supply them. It is not possible from reports to determine the standings of promising young pilots such as Bob Smith, Dave McNay and others. Possibly others are entitled to recognition that the lack of a system does not provide. Prominent in their absence are pilots of the Middle and Northwest. A scoring system that would include these and pilots of other areas not now in the swim would certainly be an advantage.

This system, of course cannot be the perfect solution but something very similar may be. We welcome your suggestions to help make it so.

EDITOR'S NOTE

While our contributor's ideas for choosing an International Team appear to have been carefully thought out he misses a few important points which would drastically change the order in which he has placed our leading pilots.

For example, he penalizes individuals who, while the Nationals are being held, are competing for their country in foreign lands and who, were they to compete at home in the National Contest instead, could reasonably be expected to gain some of the top places. If this were not the expectation they wouldn't have been chosen for the International Team in the

(Continued on Page 29)



Spiraling

with E. J.

WHY DO THE LEADERS LEAD—WHY DO THE DOERS DO?

I probably don't rightly know. And sometimes it becomes a questionable in my mind if the leaders are leading or that the doers are doing. But it must be they are—albeit weak or strong—depending on who is looking at it how, otherwise things would come to a grinding halt.

You select your leaders by ballot. You have just gone through the process of selecting a slate of SSA Directors, these along with some others you had previously selected will run your Society. And if you should be wondering as to the future performance of your chosen leaders, let me track you. They will do for you and your Society just exactly what you inspire them to do—no more, no less.

There are just two ways to get people to do things for you; one is to pay them to do it, the other is to inspire them to do it. And it is a fact, no matter how silly it seems, that people will do more by reason of inspiration than they will for money.

Another singular fact about this peculiarity of man is that he will quit colder and quicker if you cut off his inspiration than he will if you saw his end of the payroll off.

Now your situation of leadership for your Society is further complicated by the fact that yours is one of those kind of organizations that can be made to go, not by paid workers but only, repeat only, by the kind who work from, for and by inspiration. No matter how much money you might have to spend—and you don't—you simply can't make up an SSA payroll by writing checks. Now that does make it hard because the other thing is often harder to come by than just simple money.

There's an awful lot of money around, just look in the Wall Street Journal. But blamed if'n this other commodity ain't scarce. Now I am going to recognize the fact that you SSA people could generate a pile of money. The thing that bothers me is not if you *can* but if you *will* generate enough and the right kind of enthusiasm and appreciation for your leaders to make your payroll every month.

Now you may be saying about here, like the monkey that fell out of the tree and exclaimed, "Those are for the birds." But let me point—improper as it is. You are affiliated with other organizations that can't run on money alone. A church for instance—and I am sure all of you belong to one of some kind—you ought to if you don't. How do you suppose they would make out if everyone concerned did what he did because he was paid to do it—including attending the services. Well, there are many other similar things.

So here you are—you have hired some new, rehired some old and you have on hand some. You have selected your leaders, you have hired the hands for the job. You are considerably obligated. Your work is cut out for you. You are going to have to get with it if you make the project succeed and meet your payroll regularly. It ain't easy.

Now, before I quit this little dissertation and start writing music to go with the words, do let me get in this one other thought. A little actual cash is not necessarily an evil thing in the case of SSA. So let's let this small trickle of silver keep coming too. But as I dismiss you with a little organ music and singing; let's pass the plate among you and ask for a substantial contribution of enthusiasm and appreciation for your new and old Directors. That will keep you in business long after you have run clean out of money as such.

E. J.