

LETTERS...

The first alternative has led to the sort of situation where the HS.748, Herald and Friendship compete for the same market, with the result that not one of these aircraft has achieved the degree of success that would have been possible if the two countries involved had concentrated on building one type between them. As for providing for individual defence requirements—surely the lesson of TSR.2 does not have to be taught again?

Gp Capt Harrop recognises that we need access to the whole of the European market. Quite so, but it is a large market and the production capacity of our industry alone is not sufficient to provide for it without upsetting the impatient customers at the end of the queue. But by pooling production capacity to build a single design for each category of aircraft the demands can be met.

There is an unfortunate suggestion of arrogance in Gp Capt Harrop's article when he speaks of Europe "acquiring our technology on easy terms," and, later, "Europe needs our technology." We are all Europeans and Britain has much to learn from her partners, particularly with respect to efficiency and management and an enlightened national attitude towards technology.

Joan Rieck hit the nail on the head when she said in her article, "We never shall have greater political integration unless we learn to think as citizens of Europe."

European co-operation may be idealism, but it is also common sense and the only sure way for the survival of our own and the other national industries across the channel. The problems are fully appreciated (*Flight's* editorial for December 15 suggested otherwise) but Concorde is proving that they are not insurmountable.

Finally, Gp Capt Harrop advocates an Aerospace Planning and Advisory Bureau with neither authority nor responsibility. Surely nothing would be less calculated to command respect or attention, or to give responsible advice. With responsibility and authority invested in professionals working within a specified budget, as suggested in Mr Masefield's concept of an Aerospace Planning Authority, we believe that the right decisions would be taken, and the interests of all aspects of aviation co-ordinated.

London W3

ACTION COMMITTEE FOR
EUROPEAN AEROSPACE,

I. B. Hudspith

All-British Condor

SIR,—With reference to your article "Rolls-Royce's Lighter Side" (December 15), we have been manufacturing the Condor aircraft at Croydon since 1963, fitting a Rolls-Royce O-200-A engine, so it does qualify as being an "entirely British built" aeroplane.

Croydon, ROLLASON AIRCRAFT AND ENGINES LTD,
Surrey R. F. Thompson,

Director and General Manager

Rejuvenating BOAC's 707s

SIR,—I was very interested to read the extract from *BOAC News* of October 14, 1966, which was reprinted in Roger Bacon's column in *Flight* for December 22.

So BOAC's Boeing 707s are to receive a "VC10" facelift, are they? My sympathies go out to the engineers and maintenance men who will be required to move the tailplane to the top of the fin, and reposition the engines on the rear fuselage. (Thinks: I wonder if this is a Boeing-inspired trick to increase the passenger appeal of their product.)

However, we must take the news item with a pinch of salt, since I cannot believe that each of BOAC's Boeings has worked a 150hr day since delivery in 1960. The figure of 350,000 flying hours obviously refers to the total flying hours of their fleet of 22 (now 21) Boeing 707s.

Windsor, Berks

A. G. HEAPE

Story with a Twist

SIR,—My memory is not what it was, but occasionally it is awakened by a picture or paragraph in Roger Bacon's column.

In the issue for December 15 the picture of the DH.52 glider reminded me that two were designed and constructed at Stag Lane and both suffered the same fate, one flown by Captain Hearn and the other by Hubert Broad.

About the same time a horse called Tishy, running in the Derby, suddenly twisted its front legs round each other at Tattenham Corner, with the inevitable result. Those of us concerned with the building of these gliders re-named them the DH Tishy. There is a lot more to this story. . . .

Redhill, Surrey

R. E. HARDINGHAM



SIR,—I am afraid dear Roger missed the point concerning the break-up of the DH.52 glider (Straight and Level, December 15). What happened was this. The wing had been so lightly built, and was so poor in torsion, that the ailerons functioned only as servo tabs and produced reversed control. "D.H."—remembering wing-warping from ten years previously—decided that, if the glider preferred to wing-warp, why not let it? And so the ailerons were locked and wing-warping controls devised.

Hearn was the pilot. As soon as he had been catapulted off and the bungee had fallen away, the wing became self-warping, twisting from limit to limit until it broke (there was a wonderful swishing noise, working up to a crescendo—*swish, swish, swish, swish, crump!*). The fuselage and wing stubs returned to earth the right way up. Hearn climbed out, walked over to "D.H." and said quite seriously, "It's no use, we shall have to go back to ailerons." A quotation which would have made the perfect inscription for the photograph.

Worcester Park,
Surrey

JOHN YOXALL

[Mr Yoxall, chief photographer of *Flight* for nearly 20 years until his retirement in 1962, took this famous picture.—Ed]

IN BRIEF

Mr P. J. Birtles (21 Poplars Close, Hatfield, Herts) is compiling a detailed history of the de Havilland Hornet and Sea Hornet. He is having difficulty in obtaining details for the section dealing with particular aircraft serving with various units, the dates of this service, and codes used, and would welcome information from readers.

LETTERS for these columns should be addressed to the Editor, "Flight," Dorset House, Stamford Street, London SE1, and must bear the sender's name and address, though the address will not be printed in full unless the writer specially requests it. Use of a *nom de plume* is acceptable only in exceptional circumstances. Brief letters will stand a better chance of publication.

Diary this week: page 21