

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

## Spin Recovery

Sir:

The article by R. H. Johnson, Epitaph to an Austria, is an absorbing and instructive one. Among many things it reveals that details of corrective procedures with respect to spins may vary significantly as applied by highly skilled pilots.

Derek Piggott, in his book, *Gliding*, emphasizes the sequence: full opposite rudder — pause — stick steadily forward. However, R. H. Johnson follows a tested spin-recovery technique of stick forward followed immediately by full antispin rudder. Undoubtedly each procedure is based on much experience. One wonders, however, if the many variable factors setting up the need for spin recovery, compounded by the numerous models of sailplanes, do not force a vital cross over in choice from one to the other or even another procedure. A discussion airing the matter in the pages of *Soaring* should be most valuable.

FRANK DACHILLE

State College, Penna.

## More Spin Recovery

Sir:

I read with interest the articles on the Austria spinning incident in *Soaring*, June edition. You may be interested to read the following quotation from *Flying Training in Gliders* by Ann and Lorne Welch.

*The standard method of recovery from all spins and incipient spins is, first to apply full opposite rudder, a slight pause, and then to move the stick steadily forward until the spinning stops.*

*On some types of aircraft if the stick is moved forward at the same time as the opposite rudder is applied, the rudder or elevator may be ineffective probably because one is shielded by the other. That is why the standard method is to apply rudder first.*

I trust you will find this of interest.

II. C. HAYES

Thirsk, Yorkshire, Eng.

## LK Correction

Sir:

Old LK's Never Die . . . (July *Soaring*, page 13), but I'm afraid the incidence of LK infant mortality back in 1943 would have been considerably higher had all of them been flown at 240 mph as stated. In searching out the remaining bones of many a long-departed LK I heard some wonderful stories. Some, such as the 240-mph incident (which I attributed erroneously to Bob Sparling) should probably rest as stories and not be confused with fact.

ALLAN MACNICOL

Boston, Mass.

### SUGARBUSH SOARING

New privately owned ski chalet for rent.  
4 miles from airport — plus tennis,  
swimming, golf etc.  
Rent to club or individuals by week or  
weekend. — J. Koch, Knollwood Rd.,  
Franklin Lakes, N. J.

## Ah, Youth!

Sir:

On December 29, 1965, I had the good fortune to meet Jeff Yund and family. On this day, both Jeff and I earned our altitude Diamonds. As we were both fourteen at the time we set up a very informal contest to see who can top the youngest Diamond-pilot record held by Jack Arkovich. Since Jeff and I have several years to complete our Diamonds I believe we stand a pretty good chance of beating the record of twenty years. Jeff and I would like to hear from other young soaring pilots interested in our contest.

PAUL KOLSTAD

Colorado Springs, Colo.

## Long Flights

Sir:

That was a wonderful two-page feature in the May *Soaring*, and obviously it took a lot of work. But articles like that are the basis of today's daydreams, tomorrow's achievements.

Someday, sometime, someone is going to catch the January Bishop Wave about 2:00 A.M., be over Salt Lake City's Wasatch Range about daybreak for more waves, and thunk down east of The River that afternoon.

But thanks for today's listing of achievements. Well done and very well displayed.

CHARLES CELINSKY

Boise, Idaho

## Greetings!

Sir:

Greetings from the land of big BOOMING thermals; many of them can even be heard. Gabe Ray and I have discussed starting a Saigon chapter of the SSA, but we can't seem to get many people interested. I can't understand why. The weather is great, all sorts of good tow planes, and every now and then someone lands a glider around here. (He didn't take off that way, but it is the quick way to learn the sport.) This would be the best place in the world to set goal-and-return records; you would have such a tremendous incentive to make it back.

BOB SCHEURER

Saigon, Viet-Nam

## Sailplane Standards

Sir:

In reading *The Turn of the Screw* in the April issue, then the Schweizer Aircraft Corp. Report for 1965 in the May issue, I get the implication that inspection standards and methods in Germany are inferior to those in the USA and that pending legislation there may bring them up to our level at a considerable cost to the German glider manufacturers. Having been involved with the aircraft industry and sailplanes in both countries I can offer some comments which may be in order.

To draw the conclusion that German inspection and acceptance standards for fully type-certificated aircraft are inferior would be most unfair. While I cannot present a detailed comparison, I would

judge the German standards in general equal to those in this country although more strict in terms of latitude for deviation. In the case of non-type-certificated aircraft there is no comparison because there are no inspection standards of manufacture for homebuilt category kits in this country and no such class in Germany.

In the case of Schempp-Hirth, and I presume in the factories of all licensed sailplane producers in Germany, there is first the approvals of the company inspector. Like our designees, he is an employee of the factory but is directly responsible to the Government and is licensed by the government. The finished sailplane is then subject to an inspection by the government inspector (for which the manufacturer pays about \$50). Following this a flight test is required and a report submitted. At present spin tests are not required for acceptance of each sailplane since these have been accomplished during type tests. All in all the German inspectors spend as much time with their little stamps as do their American counterparts.

My experience has been that the Germans are more particular with regard to material conformity than we are. German manufacturers must use approved materials such as required by the U. S. military Qualified Products List. All incoming material must be inspected at the plant with tests if required. A plank of wood, for example, has to go through inspection with tensile samples at the plant. Each subassembly must be inspected before going into the aircraft. Glue pull tests are run concurrently with assembly and gluing conditions are under constant check.

Quality control depends, of course, on much more than regulations and standards. On many occasions I have received aircraft off the line which have just passed company and government inspection that had dangerous discrepancies. Essentially no system is better than the people involved in insuring safety. Where workmen can take pride in their workmanship and where the working conditions beget care and thoroughness, quality assurance will be better. Europeans rely on the standards of the craftsman, much as we do in our professional people, and their whole system reflects this trust. Schempp-Hirth's Chief Inspector has been with the firm in the business of inspecting sailplanes for 30 years and relatively greater reliance is placed on his experience than would be the case in the USA where the function of the inspector is more one of insuring conformity to a drawing or specification. American drawings are more detailed in regards to quality as a result. In a sense our standards are better on drawings. On the other hand our labor turnover and practice of "bumping" on the basis of seniority or hiring on the basis of longevity on union rolls without reference to skill or ability would be intolerable under the German system. Unless the systems are compared in terms of their overall functioning, it is difficult to make fair comparisons.

I hope that this letter may serve to bring the subject into clearer focus for readers and to clear up any misgivings resulting from the referenced articles.

FRED MATTESON

Palo Alto, Calif.