

# Letters

With this issue we must call a stop to lengthy letters intended for publication in this column. In the future, only letters limited to the equivalent of one sheet of double-spaced typing will be considered for reproduction. Many members wish to be heard but space is limited so try to make your point in a concise manner. —Ed.

## Dislikes Standard Class

Dear Lloyd:

The naming of two World Champions in the proposed rules for the 1960 World Soaring Championships is extremely disappointing.

Continuing the trend towards emphasizing the Standard Class will only weaken the development of higher performance sailplanes. Dividing the total body into minor competing groups will further weaken the movement.

Instead of breaking the competition up into two separate groups who are flying different tasks and determining separate champions, all ships should be flying the same tasks and be scored under the same point system. At the conclusion of the meet the Standard Class pilot with the highest number of points would be declared the Standard Class Winner; the open class pilot with the highest number of points would be declared the Open Class Winner; and the pilot with the greatest number of points would then be declared World Soaring Champion whether he flew a standard or open class ship.

There actually is not much difference in total performance between ships of the two classes during a 10 day meet because the open class ships though being a little better on strong days, suffer on weak days. In the interest of preserving the soaring movement, it would be far wiser to keep both groups together.

Further emphasis in favor of the Standard Class and its design freezing restrictions can only discourage future experimentation and development of better sailplanes.

If these suggestions are heeded, organizers of National and World Championships will be spared the additional cost and manpower requirements of conducting two separate contests simultaneously.

R. E. SCHREDER

1150 Nebraska Av., Toledo, Ohio.

## Wants Standard Class

Dear Lloyd:

I have been given various reasons, insufficiently based on fact, for the elimination of the Standard Class Category in the 1960 U.S. National Championships.

I can't help feeling I must express myself to other SSA Members on this subject. I hope SOARING can be used to do just this.

The wishy-washy way in which the rules for our contests have been warped around to suit a few has gone far enough.

Since the adoption of so-called "Standard Class" for our Nationals in 1958, there has been no definitive requirements for the ships to be used, until it was too late for the majority of interested persons to do anything about it.

The Schweizer Bros. have undoubtedly burned much midnight oil and spent considerable of their hard-earned profits on the 1-29 and 1-23H in an attempt to develop a Standard Class sailplane for U.S. consumption.

Others of us have used our spare time in planning ships along this line.

Suddenly our democratic SSA system, without warning, decides it doesn't want to promote the sport of soaring and eliminates the Standard Class Category from our U.S. Nationals.

The reasons for having "Standard Class" worldwide have been very clearly demonstrated in previous publications repetitively.

The performance of this particular critter is amazing when you look at the results of the last World Championship. Remember now, the scoring system used is the same for both classes. Also, these inferior(?) types don't get to take off till *all* the superior(?) breed are in the air.

The requirements laid down by OSTIV are simplicity, low cost, ease of handling, and *safety plus*.

To those members who have procured Standard Class sailplanes I say - speak now or forever hold the peace. It's your Soaring Society and you can control it.

IRVING PRUE

Box 6, Pearblossom, Calif.

## Invitation From FAA

Dear Dr. Selvidge:

The Bureau of Research and Development of the Federal Aviation Agency is pleased to announce that the second annual "Fly-In" to the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center, Atlantic City, New Jersey, will be October 1, 1960.

You and the members of your organization are cordially invited to participate.

Mr. Quesada, in his address to the 1959 "Fly-In" participants, promised that participants in the 1960 "Fly-In" would find a full-fledged experimental facility in operation. Where last year our laboratories were virtually empty, they are now well equipped and busily engaged in modernizing the Nation's air traffic control and air navigation facilities. We now have a fully instrumented measurement range; we have a Doppler VOR station on the air; our simulation laboratories are active. We are actively engaged in experimentation and evaluation in airport lighting, aircraft arresting devices, visual glideslopes, blind landing systems, communications systems, airborne navigation devices, and a full-scale automatic air traffic control environment, to indicate some of our projects under way.

We feel you will be favorably impressed with the way in which the center has become of age and welcome the opportunity to apprise you — the general aviation users — of our programs and plans.

We will advise you at a later date as to the details of the program and arrangements for accommodating our guests and their aircraft.

JAMES L. ANAST, *Director*

Bureau of Research and Development,  
FAA, Washington 25, D.C.

## Carmichael's Defense

Dear Sweet Reasonable Rage:

I have read with interest your commentary in the Letters column of the January issue of SOARING. The first five paragraphs are completely devoted to a criticism of Dr. Raspet's paper but in paragraph 6 I find myself under criticism without a very

clear picture of just how I became involved in this particular discussion. Perhaps you feel that I have in past papers done some unjustified extrapolating. If so, (and provided any past efforts on my part are judged worthy of your intellect and wit), I should be most happy to attempt to defend them on their individual merit.

I have just received a carbon copy of Dr. Raspet's reply to your letter and find that I have been further involved in this discussion through my work on low drag suction boundary layer control systems. The reports Dr. Raspet mentions are primarily concerned with demonstrating laminar flow to the trailing edge of the upper surface of a two dimensional airfoil and the suction distributions required to do this.

The overall feasibility of a suction b.l.c. laminarized sailplane is the point that I think we should all be concerned with since it constitutes one unexploited but known and fairly well researched method of possibly exceeding our present "apparent" performance limits. It is interesting to note that one gentleman outside the group involved in this exchange (Dr. Werner Pfenninger) feels that significant gains could be made with such a system if one cared to go to considerable trouble and expense. The problems and possible gains are a fit subject for a comprehensive study. The final performance will be appreciably inferior to that predicted by the laminar friction curve but the actual degree is the point of interest. The power source must of course be legitimate (direct sunlight, windmill, etc.) and proper account must be taken of flow metering losses through the skin, duct losses, and windmill and suction pump efficiencies. I suggest that we *each* present a paper on this subject for future publication in SOARING.

Trusting that you will continue this interesting discussion, I remain, yours for a long and vitriolic correspondence.

BRUCE H. CARMICHAEL

34795 Camino Capistrano,  
Capistrano Beach, Calif.

## Greenbaum Gets Specific

Dear Lloyd:

I received a carbon of Bruce Carmichael's reply sent to you and A. Raspet. The following is my further answer to Bruce:

Dear Bruce:

I would invite, as you suggest, a continued friendly vitriolic correspondence. You compliment the lunge of intellect and wit with parry and riposte.

You were surprised to be included in my impulsive rejoinder to the amorphous Raspet Ramblings. Your most recent "paper" was a model of this type of regurgitation, rigorous enough to prevent anyone taking issue with the data or conclusions, or ever hanging you with your own petard at a later date - more on this later - however, I vented your name for an earlier effort (?): "What Price Performance," SOARING, May, 1954. Probably you were then influenced by the company of the August.

You end this article with a dubious extrapolation not supported by the data: "It would appear that spans of the order of 50 to 60 feet might be optimum . . ." etc. Deleting opinions of ground crews and applying the data might have resulted in an exercise in concision, e.g., "What price performance? Expensive. Why? Because

(To be concluded next month)