fLIGHT International, I February 1962 161

AI R CO M M E RC E

THE EASTERN-AMERICA N MERGE R

MOST airline mergers current today are either between one strong
airline and an ailing one, such as United and Capital, or they are
between two carriers who, because their route networks compete
to some extent, feel that a degree of rationalization will lead to improved finances, or less costly re-equipment programmes. What is unusual—although the National-Continental merger provides a precedent—-is the amalgamation of two strong airlines whose routes do not overlap to any significant extent.
The proposed American-Eastern merger is in this category; and if this and the proposed TWA-Northeast merger both go through, then all three of the US transcontinental carriers (American, TWA and United) will have extended their route networks down into the rich Florida markets. And the award to National last summer of new routes from Miami to San Francisco and Los Angeles via Houston and New Orleans (similar routes were awarded to Delta) will enable National-Continental to draw off traffic from the New York - Los Angeles and San Francisco routes.
Ironically enough, there will still be three carriers on the plum New York - Miami route if the above mergers go through: National-Continental, American-Eastern and TWA-Northeast. This serves to indicate that merger may beget mergers without necessarily reducing competition; a merger between American and Continental or between Eastern and National might have served this end better. The American-Eastern merger is subject to CAB approval and also to that of the airlines' shareholders; if approved, the new company will be the largest US domestic carrier, a position now-held by United as a result of its merger with Capital. The latter may well have inspired a sort of rationalization rat-race between American, Eastern, TWA and Northeast.
The American-Eastern alliance may save an estimated S50m a year, although American's route network is essentially transconti-nental, and Eastern's essentially north-south. Major points com-mon to both networks are Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Balti-more, Washington, Detroit and Chicago.

Powerplant of the 2086 is two Pratt & Whitney JTF10A-2 turbofans of 10,0001b thrust and a specific fuel consumption of 0.82—or, like the BAC One-Eleven, two Rolls-Royce Speys of 10,4001b static thrust and an s.f.c. of 0.78. According to Aviation Week, bare engine weight of the JTF10 is 1001b more than that of the Spey's 2,2001b.
Maximum seating capacity is broadly similar; the Douglas aero-plane can seat 56 four-abreast or 77 in the all-economy six-abreast version at 34in pitch. The BAC One-Eleven all-economy layout accommodates 69 at 36in pitch.
The maximum weight of 69,0001b of the 2086 compares with 68,2501b for the initial BAC One-Eleven and 73,5001b for the longer-range One-Eleven, which is now the standard aeroplane. Maximum zero-fuel weight is 58,0001b for both aircraft.
Payload : range performance quoted for the Douglas aeroplane suggests that, like the BAC One-Eleven, it is essentially capable of carrying its capacity payload of 14,000-16,0001b over ranges of 0-600/700 statute miles. The now-standard higher weight (73,5001b) BAC One-Eleven can carry its capacity payload of 14,0001b beyond 1,100 miles, and a 10,0001b payload beyond 1,700 miles; in this respect it is not rivalled by the Douglas project.
Cruising speeds are closely similar, with the 2086 having a slight edge over the One-Eleven; the Douglas cruises at 552 m.p.h. at 25,000ft compared with 540 m.p.h. at the same height (M0.8 com-pared with M0.78). Take-off performance is of the order of 5.000ft for both aircraft on a standard day at full weight. Like the One-Eleven the 2086 has no leading-edge treatment, and the general design (e.g., manual controls) is along the same uncluttered and simple lines.
Insufficient information is available on the 2086 to compile a useful comparative tabulation of data. No delivery dates or price are quoted, and the aircraft and the civil JTF10 are still on paper while the One-Eleven (for which firm delivery dates and a fixed basic price of £835,000 are being quoted) is in the early production stages with firm orders from British United (ten) and Braniff (six). No doubt it was the decision of a US airline—Braniff—to import
a foreign aircraft of this class which concentrated Douglas interest on the obvious big home market that is available. As already reported in these pages, Eastern Air Lines has issued a specification for a short-haul jet, of which it will require a large fleet.

DOUGLAS MODEL 2086

JUST as Boeing cast their medium-range jet 727 in the same mould as Britain's D.H. Trident, so Douglas are flattering with imitating the British Aircraft Corporation's BAC One-Eleven. The Douglas Model 2086 project, though not yet officially announced, is the subject of an article in Aviation Week, in which enough details are disclosed for tentative comparisons to be drawn. The 2086 was
first mentioned in Flight, November 16 and 23, 1961.
The most striking similarity, as evident from the illustrations on
this page, is to be found in general layout, size and appearance.
Broadly speaking, overall dimensions are the same within 2ft or 3ft.
The 2086 has slightly more sweepback, 24° compared with 20°.

Here for comparison are the Douglas Model 2086 and the BAC One-Eleven, with fuselage sections above (Douglas on the left in each case). Both drawings are to the same scale. A note about the new Douglas short-haul jet appears on this page