

# N M P R A

## NEWS RELEASE

# NATIONAL MINIATURE PYLON RACING ASSOCIATION

---

AMA AFFILIATED BUSINESS ADDRESS: P. O. BOX 356, MILPITAS, CALIF. 95035

---

OCTOBER, 1972

Edited by BOB STOCKWELL

From the President

All you hear and read about these days are the elections, so being a small but integral part of the greatest democracy in the world, NMPRA is going to follow suit and have some elections too.

Let your voice be heard: VOTE! Whether you're unhappy or pleased with the candidates running for office, fill out the ballot, put a stamp on your envelope, and mail it to NMPRA, BOX 356, MILPITAS, CA. 95035. The whole slate is printed on the last page of this issue. Due to some nominations coming in late, some of the candidates did not have time to prepare their "platforms" -- don't hold that against them.

I am very pleased that Ed Rankin has consented to run for President. He certainly has all the necessary attributes, and many which I wish I had!

It appears as of this writing that all but two VP's are again willing to put in a year of hard work. In the Northeast, Pappy deBolt is under doctor's orders to restrict some of his many efforts, and in Southern California Al Prather is in the same boat as I am: not enough hours in the day or night to do the kind of job necessary.

The responses are coming in better than anticipated on our opinion poll. Some very interesting comments were included on some of them. By next month all replies should be in, and I'll report then on the tabulations and notations.

The Tucson Radio Control Club has again graciously invited NMPRA to make its annual awards at their banquet during the Winter Nats. Unfortunately, in some districts the racing season extends beyond Saturday 25 November, so we can only announce the election results that night. Their invitation is always appreciated, and their annual prestigious event eagerly looked forward to.

In the Southern California district, after a short period of rest, the pace is picking up again. The Publicity Committee under Terry Prather met last week for further work on the Pylon book. At the end of this month there will be the second Formula I rookie race (October 21-22) followed by two regular Formula I races back to back (BIRDS at Los Alamitos, and SGVRC at Whittier Narrows; the final race of the So. Cal. season is at Tucson on Thanksgiving weekend, the Winter Nats). Florida and N. Carolina have also scheduled races this month.

A great way to start next season: plan to attend the Tangerine on New Years! Our hardworking and dedicated members and other modelers in Florida are again planning a gala affair.

Don't forget to VOTE!

See you next month,

Bror

CORRESPONDENCE. From Bob Violett. "Every year about this time, after the Nats, we always get some suggestions by well-meaning modelers on how we should run our racing even so that they may have a chance to win. Their pleas for drastic changes to slow things down have been echoed since the day somebody broke 2 minutes. That group of fliers who say they would join our ranks if things were 'slowed down' are probably standing on the outside spectating instead of competing for more personal reasons. As you know, racing takes an extreme dedication of time, energy and resources and as long as there are any rules to work by there are those who will put forth a little extra and consistently come out on top. The nature of racing itself is to select a winner and no bit of legislation will make a consistent 'also-ran' or 'spectator' into a consistent winner. I am referring of course to Steven Metzger's letter published recently in the News Release. Please, Steve, don't take this personally -- I regret that we have not met yet. All of the proposals as set forth in Steven's Phase I and Phase II programs will not slow things down one bit, as a matter of fact I can see ways of taking advantage of such rules and cutting a few more seconds off our times. The more rules we add, the more measurements we try to restrict, the more nightmares we create for the poor contest administrators who already have too much to do. Ask Glen Spickler who had to deal with me at the Nats (I owe you a drink for all that, Glen). It would take volumes to elaborate on how we could go faster with these so-called slow-down proposals. Perhaps a look at the FAI rules would be revealing. These too were composed by well-meaning, uninformed legislators who wished to create an everyman's racing event: it's impossible. The only way we can slow the airplanes down without a lot of nonsensical and unenforcible rules is to reduce engine displacement. I can hear the manufacturers scream all the way out here, and justly so: they've worked hard to make those 40's (that's .4000000) run. If we reduce engine size to, say, .29 cu. in., I think the speeds would drop off to 1:35-1:40 and the same people would win and the "also-rans" would still gripe. So where would we be then? I think we have a great event in Formula I and those who actively participate do so because they like pretty airplanes that go fast and the challenge of meeting their peers in a fly-off. The closest thing we have to an everyman's racing event is 1/4 Midget, but rule makers beware, for in a few years this too can become very specialized and professional. This also is the nature of racing. The formula I rules have evolved over the years towards simplicity. This is good. Let's not take any steps backwards....P.S. Just got another Newsletter. Wow! A lot of different ideas from different people. Again, I emphasize SIMPLICITY. I think ultimately we will arrive at two events, one very restricted, and the other very unlimited: this is too radical for people to accept now, but I predict it will eventually come....Sincerely, Bob."

MORE CORRESPONDENCE. From Jim Simpson, VP NCWest. "A couple of months ago I wrote an open letter to the NMPRA regarding our 'hopeless' situation. Now, not being content to just criticize, I offer the following suggestions. (1) To begin with, there is nothing wrong with the NMPRA or with racing or with tremendous speed if it is safe. But anyone who doesn't realize that there are (and have been for a long time) two distinct classes in Formula I is really blind! The solution is not to drag the 'fast' guys down. Instead simply recognize that there are two classes, and let's race. (a) The first class will be called UNLIMITED and the only engine rules that apply are maximum total nominal displacement .4030 cubic inches and positive fuel shutoff (that even works on the ground). (b) The other class will be called STANDARD and the only engine rule that applies to it besides those listed in (a) above is that if the owner is offered the advertised retail price of the engine he is using then he must either sell it or be ineligible for Standard Class awards (he will still be eligible in Unlimited). (c) No other changes need be made. Both classes can be mixed for racing (just as they really are now) and instead of buying 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place trophies, you buy one 1st for UNLIMITED and one

1st plus one runnerup trophy for STANDARD (after all no one remembers who was second anyway!). Note that this suggestion eliminates the need to have Lee, Aldrich, or the like on hand to run a race. (2) Now, because we are a racing fraternity, we MUST, absolutely MUST, develop a training program! So, get the 1/4 Midget together and keep it slow (and stock). That way we have a place for the new guy (1/4 midget), the middle guy (standard), and the hot shot (unlimited). And by the way it's no trouble to fly stock 1/4 midgets around a ten lap formula I course, so why not? If you really want to try this, get the Formula I guys together and run a race (on Formula I course with Formula I rules) for the 1/4 Midgets. Then, ask them to reciprocate in kind for you the following week. You'll be surprised! (3) You must realize, of course, that by making these proposals the monkey is off my back. I would be pleased if you will try these proposals instead of echoing the standard cry of the Northrup board -- which is, "No more changes." After all, if that were a good position to take we would still be living in caves with dinosaurs! If we NMPRA members decide to adopt these proposals, I believe we can adopt them immediately on a 'gentlemen's agreement' basis and use them within the framework of AMA until the AMA prints another rulebook because there is really no change insurance-wise. How about that, Northrup? Worth? Anyone?"

MORE CORRESPONDENCE; IN FACT, CONSIDERABLY MORE. I have this very strong feeling that any bona fide member of NMPRA should have his say, so I am publishing the following letter from Jim Maki in its entirety. I hope any further letters along these lines will be somewhat briefer, however. "Dear Bror: I had asked Jack Fehling, as the secretary of the FMPRA, to officially write to you about some of the specific disenchantments with the National House suffered by a good percentage of our membership here in Florida. Since Jack suggested that I write myself, the impact of these thoughts will have the collective force of one. Despite this singularity, I trust you will weigh the grumbling to follow as a general feeling. Bror, I simultaneously entered Formula I and joined both the FMPRA and NMPRA at the Tangerine meeting last January in Orlando. The first order of new business by the newly elected president, Jim Schweitzer, was consideration of mandatory NMPRA membership for FMPRA members. Two points were stressed. One, that the national newsletter was in financial ruins. The national house needed our support, both financially and by empowerment of numbers. The argument was: with more in number, our leverage as a national organization would be greatly increased. In short, NMPRA needed us. Point two: there is the United States and then there is Florida. The matriculation into the national house provided us with a good tie-in to what was happening around the rest of the country in the world of Form I via the newly proposed Newsletter and inter-competition.

"First, let me say that as an organization, the FMPRA has seemingly held up its part of this dual benefit arrangement. As far as I know, you have received all dues moneys as well as Jim Schweitzer's dictated description of all our events. Let's review your part of the bargain in two parts. Firstly the Newsletter. During my initiation to Form I in the early months of this year, my total experience in racing was an evenly balanced combination of no-starts and crashes. My accumulated total for the first two races was 4 points. The format of the new NMPRA newsletter, as relayed by Jim at the Tangerine meeting, was to be by and for racers only. We could expect results, standings, three-views, racing product reviews, articles on engine reworking, props, building techniques, etc. For someone brand new to the sport, this seemed like a godsend. So far the Newsletter is fine in itself, but it is not as advertised when the money was solicited. Let me give you an illustrative example of its specific value to me personally: First let me say that just about all the fellows in our local circuit will do anything they can to help anyone get going in Formula I. Jim Schweitzer built me a going Tigre at no charge,

Jack Fehling sold me the plane he flew at the Tagerine when I had crashed all mine, Walt Schoonard has been a big big help with engines, props, finishing, etc. etc. Adding all these competitors' efforts to many many others, plus some of my own thing, Jim Maki is now consistently grinding out ten laps in the 1:30's. My winning time in one heat at the Miami race September 10th was 1:35.75. Bror, that's going a long way in nine months. Here is the point: at no time down that aggravating, super-expensive, heartbreaking road of learning, did I ever benefit from any instructive or informative article in the NMPRA Newsletter. I would honestly pity any novice entering Formula I in an area where the willingness and quality of help were not as available as it was to me here in the Florida circuit. Solution? As I said before, the Newsletter as it stands is fine. Everyone likes to see his name in print. But I am currently getting almost the same word for word dialogue in Cliff Weirick's column, and ditto for Chuck Smith and Bob Stockwell, in other magazines. Let's either revise the Newsletter so it has realistic for the dollar value, or lower the dues and shorten or drop the publication. The content of the print does not cost a penny more whether it's meaningful dialogue or rehash. If the promises for instructive articles are turning out to be empty promises, get on the backs of the people who have something to offer. If that would not yield the desired result, I am for dropping the Newsletter, and lowering the dues.

"Point two: where is the collective leverage of our organization? Did you read Don Dewey's open letter in the October R/C Modeler to John Worth? Here is a publication offering to print the AMA news free on three very reasonable conditions. We are talking about dollars in five and six digits to the left of the decimal point! Look at us, already talking again about our losing battle with the cost of publishing and mailing out the Newsletter. I don't see any national leverage working for us there.

"The K & B Schnuerle engine, by now an old gripe for you, probably. If it was known by NMPRA, and I assume it was, the the minimum legal production run was being made to prove the deficiency in the ruling, why weren't provisions made to protect the balance of one hundred (actually less) members against the permanent damage that has occurred in the standings. If the pilot run of one hundred engines was a success, and it was, by definition the engines are winning. I will not argue the point of flying ability, props, fuel, etc., the engines are winning. This is not an analogy, I realize, but this is how I feel: for some time now I have been trying to drive home a point to the city of Fort Lauderdale. I need a traffic light at the intersection to my development. To prove a point, will Brodbeck and one hundred of his "friends" stand out in that intersection to be run over and thereby illustrate my point. I won't even be making money on the deal! To wind up the engine mess: if a company the size of K & B cannot test their engines in their own back yard, then they ought to go into the manufacture of chopsticks. I can provide a safe 40 million Chinese and Japanese built-in market for the product. My plane does not have to be in a race for me to tell whether or not I'm going. It's called a caller, a lap counter, three honest friends at the respective pylons, a stopwatch that works and someone who can read and operate it. With the experience that K & B has in the development of the Torpedo, it's just so much of the material that goes down the toilet to stand there and say that they needed our back yard to prove the product in the fashion that they chose. It is even more of the same material to say that this was their way to denounce the present AMA engine rule on quantity. Bror, you are my voice in these matters. Let's not go with the idea of helping the winners go faster and denying the new and/or slower fliers the same opportunity. I think it's suicide for the sport as we know it.

"I still have more. With the current speculation on rulings for bigger props, mufflers, etc., why not first concentrate on eliminating the present "cut throat,

on-the-edge-of-legality" tactics being used. I would say that when Formula I grows to the proportion of Pro Golf and Tennis with prize money in the six digit figures, then watch out for me because I will sell my mother, quit my job, argue every cut to death, and do whatever else it apparently takes to win. While it is still a sport, can we cut out the bowling ball starts, cutting #3 on the 10th lap, and the like? I can and have broken 1:30 this way, so this is not sour grapes from a poor sport who just can't make it without holding everyone else back. If the national point standings are to mean anything at all, it is up to you to see that we are all doing the same thing. Speaking of the point standings... While the new formula is better than the old, let's inspect the system as it works in my circuit. FMPRA has a total membership of approximately twenty-five fliers. Why is it that my national point standings or anyone else's in this circuit have to suffer (however little) because a hundred guys don't show up for our races? All right, then I am supposed to get off this typewriter and get more guys into Formula I. I'll be damned if I get one new flier into racing for the purpose of improving my standing. Don't get me wrong. I have already talked three guys into joining the ranks, but I am hating this feeling of enlisting people from the standpoint of putting simply more names after mine on the list. Solution? Well, it's only a suggestion, but why not (if we can ever standardize the methods of running a race) make a man accountable for his own destiny? If incentive is to be given for higher positions in the national standings for winning over a larger group of fliers, give the winners credit for something they have control over. If it takes a 1:27 to beat over a hundred fliers, then give credit for the 1:27. That way if someone else achieves this time, equal credit can be given. I race in one of the hottest, most humid parts of the country. I would still rather have the chance to get my engine to run underwater, if necessary, than be penalized because I won't get seventy-five guys to join the circuit by the next race.

"Let me say this in closing (this letter is becoming a book): Bror, I do not want to be taken as a member telling you how to do a difficult nonpaying, aggravating job. I am president of an R/C club of about 50 members. I could not keep everyone happy even if I resigned! I know the feeling of hard work and then the feeling of "For what?" Everyone tells me what to do and any time I tell someone to do something I have to stand around and discuss it for three weeks. Next year I want to go back to being a simple member again where I'll be in a position of authority again. I think most of my thoughts are valid, at least as they pertain to this circuit. I also think that it is within our means to govern those problems discussed above. If we are right, but afraid to act, then why hassle with all the organizing end of it? Put down the foot of authority, iron fist...the guys that throw up their hands and leave won't be missed, I promise you. What has happened is water under the bridge, but we have three months to get things in order for the coming year. If my line of thinking has a penny's merit to the organization, all that is needed is asking for it, and I'll send you everything I got on the subject. If things are going to continue on more or less the same lines, all I ask is tell me now so I can get out of this end of the hobby which I am forked-tonguing as a most enjoyable recreation. Many thanks for your time. Sincerely, Jim Maki, 22T."

EDITOR'S CORNER. I won't defend my editorial policies very strenuously, because I don't think I need to. But Jim Maki has made a few allegations above which cannot comfortably be left unanswered. (1) If the magazines rehash our contest reports, that is their fault, not ours: we invariably report results of races two to three months before the magazines do, the whole idea being to get the word out while it is still fairly fresh. (2) It was never our intention to publish

construction articles: that is much better done in the magazines, where they can print plans and construction photos. In fact, the magazines have done very well in this respect: you can find magnificent articles on the Shark, on the Rivets, on the Minnow, on the Ole Tiger, and various others in the standard magazines over the last few years. Furthermore, the best construction articles you will ever read are included in the standard kits: the Stafford instructions, for example, give you absolutely everything you need to know about building a Minnow; the instructions in the PB Products kits like the Miss DARA are absolutely exhaustive, and if you follow them carefully there is no way your finished plane can be significantly different from those of Bob Smith or Kent Nogy. (3) As for finishes, it doesn't really matter much what technique you use, so long as lots of elbow grease is the main component. It's true that resin over light fiberglass, with any nonshrinking paint over that (SuperPoxy, Hobby Poxy, or light and well-spaced coats of acrylic or dope with ample retarder in it) is probably the easiest and fastest finish; but there have been numbers of excellent articles in the magazines on the various finishing techniques, all of them good. (4) As for engines, there's no way this Newsletter could improve on the superb articles of Clarence Lee that have appeared in R/C Modeler Magazine and that have now been published as a separate, and delightfully readable and informative book. The NMPRA is publishing a book soon on pylon racing that will contain another fine article on engines by Clarence Lee, as well as an excellent one by Cliff Telford, and articles on wings, airfoils, finishes, lists of manufacturers and available products, etc. It's a great book: I hope you'll recommend it to guys getting started so they'll have less trouble than you had. (5) As for K & B, I objected to their policy before anyone else did, and louder than most: but I have come to admire their steadfast view that no engine manufacturer can afford to produce a good engine in large quantities unless there is some reasonable guarantee that they won't be wiped out in national competition by a small manufacturer producing super engines on a small but expensive scale. They have a right to protect their investment by knowing that there will be a significant degree of standardization in the rules which will serve to outlaw the expensive custom engine. Otherwise, they are better off to go one-up each year on the same small scale. But of course that policy will destroy the sport, and there is no one who would be less happy to see that happen than K & B. If Formula I becomes a truly unlimited event with respect to engines, like FAI, then K & B is likely to make the winning engines, but they will not be production engines, and they will not be cheap. We have to decide which way we want to go. My son Whit was one of those most badly hurt by failing to get a K & B until too late in the season, and I saw at first hand the damage that can be done by this kind of "favoritism" policy: I don't like it at all, but I can see that the only reasonable alternative is either a policy of "claiming" races, which will eliminate the nonstock engines, or a "production 500 or 1000" kind of rule, which will eliminate the small manufacturers. (6) Finally -- and this is the only personal comment I will allow myself -- what makes you think there is any way to get good at pylon racing but by trial and error? The year that Terry Prather won everything, he went through SEVEN airplanes and hundreds of hours testing engines and propellers. The year that Whit Stockwell won his grand championship, he went through EIGHT(eight)airplanes and once built a Minnow from scratch in four days virtually without sleep in order to compete -- and lost it in a midair with Cliff Weirick in the first heat. In the year that Bob Smith won five out of seven races, including the Nats; and this year, when he has won EVERY race he has entered except the Nats and one other where he was third, do you really believe it was because he had a magic factory behind him? Have you ever looked closely at one of his airplanes? You will cut your finger on the trailing edge of his wing, you will see a frustrated face (your own) reflected in the gloss of his finish, you will see a radio compartment in which everything is installed as though for display, with every imaginable precaution

taken to insure his radio against vibration; you check his alignment and you see why he has to carry no trim deflection whatever; you check his hinge lines and you see why others have more drag. Sure he has good engines: in 1970 you could buy one exactly like his for \$50.00 from Clarence Lee. In 1972 he had two Schnuerles, neither of them the best of the 102 (I've seen a dozen or so others that tacked as well or better). The implication that the top winners are winners because of cubic dollars or factory backing or the like is just so much c...r...a...p. The guys who win, win because they work harder, are more dedicated, are better fliers, learn faster from experience, and -- no question of it -- are lucky at the right times: racing is too complex for the element of luck ever to be zeroed out. And let me say finally, Jim, that the very best of luck is what I wish you: you have shown yourself to be a great competitor, and I don't think a lot of the stuff in your letter is worthy of you! (7) I goofed, and forgot to mention the suggestion of scoring on times: it won't work. But scoring all races equally won't work either: every time he races, Smith has to beat a bunch of guys who are capable of winning the Nats (and several of them have!). That's true of Florida racing, too, which is what makes it (in my judgment) the second most competitive district in the country. But do you think it's true everywhere? Do you really think that winning a race with 8 or 10 entries only one or two of whom can break 2 minutes should be scored equally with one in which 40 guys will break 1:40? The only answer, in my book, is to settle the National Championship with a TOURNAMENT OF CHAMPIONS. That's what Pete Reed wanted to do last year, but it fell through, for no fault of his. Have district champions the way we do now, and just admit that they are not directly comparable, so there can be no national championship based on points of any kind. And then let the top percentage from each district meet in a head-to-head high prestige highly advertised and flawlessly organized Tournament.

STILL MORE CORRESPONDENCE. From Robert L. Morse, Santa Clara, Calif. "Dear Bror: This past Sept. 23-24, the Pioneer R/C Club sponsored the 5th Annual Western States Pylon Championships at Tracy, Calif. We verged on a catastrophe in that in Formula I, 69% of the entries were on 72.24 and 72.40. The balance of frequencies entered were four short of the total of these two, forcing us to schedule three-plane heats with four two-plane heats. Total effect of this situation was to reduce the racing time of each contestant over 25% from the flying time he would have enjoyed if we had been able to fly full four-plane heats. I'm sure you are aware of several reasons the fliers put forth for being on these frequencies, and I won't pursue that line further. It does appear to me, though, that some action should be taken to remedy this worsening situation. Two apparent courses are open to us. One, contest organizers and/or CD's can require preregistration of entrants far enough in advance that frequency selection can be determined and entrants can be notified of required frequency assignment prior to the contest. The second option open would be a rather drastic course, and should not be implemented without the express approval of the NMPRA Executive Board. That is that CD's be permitted, when necessary, to draw 25% of the total entry from one frequency hat. I, as an active CD, request the NMPRA President for the 1973 racing season to adopt this second proposal prior to the start of the 1973 season. I believe that the CD's just having this sanction from the President will be enough to stop the jamming at the larger races....A note about the FAI event: over HALF the entrants were on one frequency, forcing two-plane races; 18 of the 24 FAI fliers were in Formula I so that 36 Formula I fliers had to sit around on their duffs so 6 FAI people only could fly in these dumb two-plane races.... Well, Bror, I've bent your ear for quite a spell now and am truly sorry that it's been nothing but a bunch of problems. I've read your letter to the members declining a nomination for the coming year; the new president is going to have a tough act to follow. Thank you for an excellent year in the NMPRA, you've given much more than we had any right to expect."



## ACTIVITIES AROUND THE COUNTRY.

WESTERN STATES PYLON CHAMPIONSHIPS, Tracy Airport, California, Sept 23-24. Reported by Ed Hotelling. "A new Formula I record of 1:24.6 was set by Bob Smith and equaled by Kent Nogy at Tracy. Both Smith and Nogy had brand new Miss DARA's weighing within a couple of ounces of 5 lbs. In Formula I the top four flew K & B-powered Miss DARA's made from PB Products kits. Final results after 5 rounds were:

## Formula I -- 57 entries

1. Bob Smith	15 pts.	1:24.6, 1:24.7	\$158.00 prize money
2. Kent Nogy	15	1:24.6, 1:26.1	99.00
3. Dan McCan	15	1:26.7	71.00
4. Chuck Smith	15	1:28.5	47.00
5. Ed Foster	15	1:40.4	19.00
			<u>\$394.00</u>

## FAI -- 24 entries

1. Garry Korpi	10	1:51.9	\$40.00
2. Jeff Bertken	10	1:56.0	25.00
3. Joe Foster	9	1:51.4	18.00
4. Terry Prather	9	1:55.5	12.00
5. Paul Benezra	9	1:57.2	5.00
			<u>\$100.00</u>

Garry Korpi flew an unusual FAI design similar to the Telford-Violett one, in which two fuselage-mounted wheels were faired into the bottom. Unfortunately, Garry lost his aircraft on a practice flight after the FAI competition was over....Glen Spickler, Jerry and Jean Christiansen did their usual fine job out at the starting line.... The entry fee was a high one: ten dollars for one event and fifteen for two events. Of the total \$710 collected, \$81 went to miscellaneous expenses, \$135 to payroll (flagmen and lap-counters), and \$494 to prize money. A lot of griping was heard about the high entry fees and prize money, but no one feels the payroll was too high. If you count the normal fourteen helpers, that comes to less than \$10 each, which isn't much for two days' work. As a matter of fact, many feel that the help should be paid more like \$20 each to attract more highly qualified help to make those decisions which may determine who gets the prize money. Of course, a \$5 or \$6 entry fee would be sufficient to pay the help \$20 each and cover expenses if no prize money were given. Someone suggested that painted bricks or rocks be given for prizes....Besides the money aspect of this contest, another bone of contention was the present system of Formula I starting positions as determined by handicap judging. Not to take anything away from the fine job of judging done by Phil Gerrard and Gil Horstman, but their job becomes much more difficult when their decision may affect hundreds of dollars in prize money. That one or two seconds handicap becomes more and more meaningful as the times go down and the prizes go up. The top handicap aircraft were deserving of their place, but many newcomers are discouraged by the prospect of starting out several seconds behind. How about the FAI method -- racehorse starts or draw lots for starting position?... Because of the problem of frequency crowding discussed by Bob Morse above, Formula I flying did not even start until after 2:00 P.M. Saturday afternoon. In order to try to get in 5 rounds for the weekend, flying was continued Saturday afternoon until the sun was perfectly aligned with the top of the #1 pylon. After Terry Prather lost sight of his Minnow and crashed after flying through the sun, flying was finally called for the day. Obviously, there must be a better way to get plenty



of flying in. Notice that the top five fliers in Formula I won all their heats, and their place was simply determined by best time. Remember what happened to the old pylon racing against the clock? We must restore the principle of racing pilot against pilot, and not against the clock, if we don't want Formula I to die. Also, sometimes that 50¢ per hour help may make a clocking error. For example, Larry Leonard flew 1:30.6, 1:28.9, and a 1:28.4. Then from the backup line I watched him fly a beautiful fast race in which he was given a time of 1:40.8, which must have been for eleven laps. Obviously, determining winners by the clock has its pitfalls....Why not run our races along the lines suggested by Ed Rankin for the Nationals? Use heat races on Saturday and Sunday morning to determine the top twenty pilots in points -- not time (and segregate Formula I from FAI at larger contests). Then pit these top twenty pilots against each other in a fly-off Sunday afternoon much like the Nationals -- five rounds of four heats each. Also, use the Nationals system of forcing the sixth pilot on a frequency either to switch frequencies for the finals, or to be replaced by the next pilot on a different frequency. This system would eliminate the finish based solely on time, because the top fliers would have to fly against 75% of the other top fliers in the finals. At Tracy, each flier flew against only about 18% of the other fliers....This proposal is not intended to knock the work of CD Bob Morse or the fine performance of the winners. Certainly, these winners would do well under the proposed system. However, racing under the proposed system with a fly-off, using either racehorse starts or drawing lots, and having well-qualified, more highly-paid workers, would all tend to attract more people to the pylon racing sport. Also, this system would encourage pilots to fly on frequencies other than the three popular 72 MHz ones, which would then allow four-plane heats. Most important, all entries would fly more and feel they had an equal opportunity to win."

CORRESPONDENCE, AGAIN; OR, "YOU SAY, I SAY, HE SAY, WE ALL SAY". The following blast is from Chuck Smith, candidate for So. Cal. VP, 8509 Lennox Ave, Panorama City, Calif. "There has been much criticism of Formula I during the '72 racing season and fliers such as Steve Metzger and Jim Simpson have proposed several changes in letter printed in this Newsletter. Everyone's #1 complaint is that "competitive engines are not available to everyone" this year, due to the fact that K & B produced only 100 of their Schnuerle .40's this season. This problem should be alleviated next year when K & B markets the production version of the engine in large quantities (1000 plus). It would be nice if the Formula I rules required 1000 production engines so that we couldn't have another year like the 1972 racing season. I'm surprised that pylon racing was not hurt more than it has been by the K & B Schnuerle. Most fliers who were not among "the chosen few" continued to compete this year, although in most cases they were outclassed in the horsepower race. I think this says a lot for their dedication, and when competitive engines become readily available next year, we should see record growth in our sport.... In his letter, Jim Simpson states that "the price of a competitive engine is rapidly approaching that of the radio itself". I have seen no facts to back this up. The K & B, HP, and ST engines all cost less than \$60.00. Customized versions run for less than \$85.00, some much less. This is expensive, but it is still less than some .60's used in Pattern, and comes nowhere near the cost of the radio equipment. Mr. Simpson also quotes the price of the total equipment used in racing. A \$250 price tag for a model which a flier had someone else build is accurate, but this does not give this flier any advantage over anyone else out on the course. He also quotes \$150 for a "twice-hopped growler". Anyone paying this much is only getting the royal shaft and should find a new customizer. Mr. Simpson sums up his statements by saying, "Formula I racing is now to the point where the guy with the most cubic money wins." Bull\_\_\_! If time were money, he might be right. It is the

dedicated modelers who are winning Formula I, not the ones with the most money. Not even a person of unlimited wealth can buy a new set of thumbs. It is the hackers who are always running dirt through their engines, crashing, setting their engines lean, nosing over on takeoff, and losing their spinner and prop in the air (remember Montana, Jim?) who are constantly spending their bucks on engines and always complaining the engines they get are never as good as the ones Bob Smith gets. In order to force the use of stock engines which anyone can buy, Mr. Simpson proposes that we use claiming races. The question I have is who will be the one that will decide which flier has the right to buy the engine of the Nats winner after a mob of 80 people try to claim it? When an engine is mass-produced, it is a fact of life that 10-20% of the engines will be superior to all the rest due to the random matching of tolerances. If stock engines were required, one would have to buy and test about 5 engines and select the best one in order to be competitive. This is many times more expensive than buying one engine and spending \$25 to have it customized. You know you have a competitive engine this way. Some will say that a claiming race will discourage a flier from taking the time and money to find a hot engine, but what do you want -- all this left up to luck? Mr. Simpson also proposes an idle with engine running for landing rule. The number of broken props this would cause would be great for Top Flite. I also fail to see how this could help encourage newcomers. One just has to look at the Control-Line Carrier event to see how complicated carburetion systems can get for idling speed engines. This will give the engine experts an even bigger advantage, which is contrary to what most people want. Any advantage that an idle rule would have for a beginner is psychological....A pit stop requirement is also suggested in Mr. Simpson's letter. This is the most ridiculous proposal I have ever heard. What purpose would it serve? Landings cause more damage to Formula I models than anything else. Considerations of safety rule this suggestion out completely.

In Steve Metzger's letter, there are several suggestions for slowing them down. I'll have to admit that if I had been flying a racer when I first entered Formula I that was as fast as my racer is now, I probably would never have learned how to fly the course. The major justification for slowing the aircraft down is to make the event easier for the novice to enter. But where do the present rules state that the aircraft must be set up to go as fast as possible. A beginner should not let his plane go faster than he is capable of handling. This can be accomplished by a flier voluntarily using milder fuel and stock props and engines. Of course, such a flier will not be competitive, but a beginner is supposed to be learning, not winning. Virtually every one of today's top pilots spent at least a year finishing out of the money at contests while they developed their skills. Instant success is very rare in Formula I. If instant success ever becomes common, it will mean that many of the skills required will have been eliminated, which I hope is not what most fliers want. Slowing the planes down will not make the newcomer more competitive, since they will slow down just as much as the top pilots, in proportion. I have flown FAI in the 1:50's and Formula I in the 1:20's on the same day, so I know what it's like to go slow and fast. A tight race in FAI has almost the same excitement as a tight Formula I race. Unfortunately, tight races in FAI are relatively rare. If I fly a heat alone or lap the field in FAI, I am left with the feeling of having accomplished nothing. When my Formula I aircraft leaves the ground, however, I am forced to use every bit of my concentration and skill to fly a tight course. I don't have to race anyone in Formula I in order to get great satisfaction, but when I do have a tight race, it can be intoxicating. Mr. Metzger complains that "most pilots who can compete in Formula I are above average to exceptional in flying ability". If a pilot cannot or does not want to develop the skills needed for Formula I, then maybe FAI or 1/4 Midget is his event. Just imagine if Class C was the only Pattern event. What would Ron Chidgey's reaction be if a group of fliers

wanted to change the pattern to something similar to Class A, so that "less proficient pilots can participate"? Fortunately, Pattern has separate classes. Pylon has 1/4 Midget and FAI in addition to Formula I, but I feel that now may be the time to form a Novice Formula I class, at least in California. Pilots could voluntarily divide themselves into the Novice and Expert classes, with both classes flying at the same contest in separate Novice and Expert heats. This would increase the paperwork involved, but I think would be worth it. Initiation of this system would be the most difficult aspect. A committee would have to be formed to reject any novice entries which they considered to be expert. The committee could also allow someone in Expert to move down to Novice after his first contest. After the system is started, any newcomer would enter Novice and any Novice who finished in the top three 3 times would become an expert. This system will allow almost a full rotation of the top fliers at contest (provided there is a reasonable frequency distribution), which we have unfortunately not come close to lately in So. Cal. It would also be a good incentive for the Novice pilots. Tight racing is what this sport is all about.

The suggestion that 11" props be used has been heard many times. The use of stock 11-5 props would definitely slow the planes down. I've already given my opinion of this. There seem to be some "old-timers" around who are going fast and are worried about their blood pressure, so they are pushing this proposal. I keep hearing about the "good old days" when just breaking two minutes was a big accomplishment. Those who feel that way should stick with FAI....Mr. Metzger suggests that we increase minimum wing area to 500, increase minimum wing thickness to 1 1/2" and require rotating barrel carbs. He may be interested in knowing that some of the fastest Formula I's already meet or come close to meeting these specifications. They do not slow planes down so there is really no need to require these changes. To make the racers handle better, he also suggests 2 3/4" wheels for better ground handling on grass fields, but a wheel 1/2" bigger makes little difference. We are racing scale aircraft and larger wheels would be out of proportion. His suggestion of awarding bonus handicap points for flaps is impractical since planes are no longer given points. Anyway, why do we need extra incentive if flaps improve landings with little, if any, degrading of top end performance. Using flaps seems like the smartest thing a pilot could do if he uses small fields. We don't need any change in rules to make flaps more common, just more common sense.

Several years ago, many fliers felt that any model capable of flying under 1:40 would be too dangerous. They were proved wrong. With aircraft now flying consistently in the 1:20's, I still don't think that the event is more dangerous than it was three years ago. However, if the times get much below 1:20, it may be time for some changes. Lengthening the course by 100 feet may be a good first step. This would reduce the reaction time needed to get lined up for the number one pylon, which is one of the most difficult aspects of high speed flying. If we find that the planes must be slowed down, I think that the best method would be to limit the carburetor intake diameter to maybe 1/4" to 3/16" and not allow free-porting of pistons. This is not a drastic change, but it should prevent aircraft from flying below 1:20 for at least several years; however, I still think we should wait and see how the '73 season goes before any drastic changes are made."

ACTIVITIES. FORT WORTH THUNDERBIRDS FORMULA I, September 17, 1972. Reported by Ed Rankin. "We can truly say that this meet was the best one this year. 17 pilots flew seven rounds which were perfectly conducted on a typical Ft. Worth day with 95° F and 65% humidity and 17 MPH wind. This was the 3rd race for Ft. Worth this year and the 8th contest in this district. One more race is scheduled at Okla. City on Oct. 8 which will make a total of nine district races this year. Did I hear someone say that racing is dying in the Southwest? Never! In fact, we are having a hard time to attend all of the meets....We tried something new this time to help

solve the tremendous manpower problem for conducting the races. We engaged the Explorer Troop of Ft. Worth to help run the meet which really turned into a tremendous success. We gave a presentation at their meeting to acquaint them with the Formula I racers and then held a training session a week before the meet. Would you believe we had 25 young people between the ages of 16-21 to show up for work at the race? They did a flawless job in timeing, lap counting, flagging, and coordinating the pylon cuts. We are really excited about this idea for which we can thank Chuck Smith who originated it. [RPS: Actually, I think it was Jack Fabbri's idea, and he coordinated the use of Boy Scouts at an early So. Cal. race this season. We discontinued it because of the risk to outsiders. Do you think this aspect of it is perhaps a serious problem?] We donated \$40 to their treasury for their tireless effort, which is not much but was all we could afford....Another idea which we are continuing from our last meet was to give an award for the best Novice flier. At our last meet Wayne Browning won a new K & B .40, and at this meet Dr. Charles Mannett from Okla. City won a large trophy for his performance. This idea has served to stimulate interest for our beginner race pilots and we plan to continue giving some sort of an award....Terry Rollins from Jenks, Okla., crashed two Ballerina airplanes which wiped him out of the meet. The real disheartening incident was when Gale Helms damaged his beautiful Miss DARA/HP on landing after his third heat and was unable to continue to race. Gale took top scale honors with his model which was colorfully painted with yellow K & B Superpoxy and striped in black....The equipment used by most of the pilots was dominated by Ballerinas and '71 K&B with the breakdown as follows:

8 Ballerina	1 Midget Mustang
4 Miss DARA	7 K&B '71
2 Minnow	4 ST .40
1 Little Mike	4 HP
1 El Bandido	2 K&B Schn.

The alarming thing about this race and practically all of the races in this area is that only 9 out of 17 contestants were NMPRA members. We need to encourage everyone to join NMPRA next year so that they can be a part of the organization which formulates the rules. [THERE ARE MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION BLANKS ON THE LAST PAGE OF THIS ISSUE. IF EVERYONE WHO RECEIVES THIS NEWSLETTER WILL SEND IN HIS OWN PROMPTLY, AND PASS THE OTHER BLANKS ON TO NONMEMBERS WITH PERSONAL ENCOURAGEMENT TO JOIN, WE'LL BE IN GREAT SHAPE.]

The results of this tremendous race after 7 rounds with trophies through 5th:

1. Ed Rankin	Ft. Worth	Miss DARA	K & B Schn.	20 Pts.	1:42.0
2. Maurice Woods	Okla. City	Minnow	K & B	19	1:46.3
3. Jim Bertoglio	Kansas	Ballerina	K & B Schn.	18	1:40.0
4. Gary Heithold	Arkansas	Little Mike	HP	18	1:48.0
5. Roymayne Sizemore	Okla. C.	Ballerina	HP	14	1:47.6
6. Deeds Bigelow	Okla. City	Ballerina	K & B	14	1:49

TULSA, Oklahoma, August 13 Race Results:

1. Loren Tregales, Wichita, Kansas
2. Roymayne Sizemore, Okla. City, Okla.
3. Ted White, Okla. City, Okla.

CORPUS CHRISTI, Texas, August 20 Race Results:

1. Don Downing, Hules, Texas.
2. Monty Moncrief, Ft. Worth, Texas.
3. Raymond Elias, Corpus Christi, Texas

POSITION STATEMENTS. The following statement is from ED RANKIN of Ft. Worth, candidate for election to the post of PRESIDENT of the NMPRA.

TO THE NMPRA MEMBERSHIP: I have accepted the request to be a candidate for President of the NMPRA with the full understanding that it is a hard and sometimes an unrewarding job. However, I think that we as modelers must stop at some point in time and contribute something to the hobby from which we have benefited so much. Therefore, if elected I will dedicate the necessary time and talent that is required to fulfil the obligations of President of this organization.

If elected to this office I will pledge to implement and carry out all of the goals and objectives of the NMPRA which represents the toil and trouble of many dedicated people over many years. Especially, the work that Bror Faber has done this past year which has been simply fabulous and has placed the NMPRA in the limelight. Especially will I continue with the timely Newsletter and national point system which has served to create interest for old and new members. The Newsletter is a very important must, for without it being published promptly, the membership would die for the lack of communication. Magazines cannot serve as a medium of communication because of the 4-6 months lag time. We must have prompt reports of contests, rules proposals, voting, and tabulation of our National point system. I will examine the national point system formula after its first year of operation to assure that it has determined a true national and event champion and has been fair to all members in each district.

I will increase the value of the district Vice Presidents' roles by placing more responsibility of the NMPRA decision-making on their shoulders. This approach will assure equal representation of all members in each district. Therefore, if elected, the membership should be very wise in their election of district Vice Presidents. Through the district VP and membership I will instigate the following program:

1. Active pursuance of examining AMA racing rules with the main objectives of safety and preserving the racing event.
2. Vigorous membership drive. (In some districts, more than half of the active racing pilots are not NMPRA members.)
3. Explore new and improved methods of creating interest in racing.
4. Examine the conduct of the racing event at the Nationals if held again to assure that we have equal time with other R.C. events, and that all contestants have a fair chance to compete.
5. Explore the possibility of a championship race.

If elected, I will not dictate but will lead the organization by making decisions based on the views of the entire membership. I will need help in doing so, and will lean heavily on past officers, Vice-Presidents, and special committees.

I have heard some cynical talk that racing is starting to die. This will never happen if everyone will pitch in and help make 1973 another banner year. Let's pattern our enthusiasm after such people as Bror Faber, Pappy deBolt, Al Prather, Bob Stockwell, Chuck and Bob Smith, and many others who have dedicated so much to make NMPRA a successful organization!

Personal Qualifications: Age 45, married, 3 sons ages 23 (married), 20, and 16.

Employment: Convair, General Dynamics, Ft. Worth (22 years); Aeronautical Engineer, Advanced Design, Research and Engineering.

Modeling: 25 years competition, 15 years control line speed, Chairman Control Line Contest Board (1960-61), 10 years R.C., 6 years Formula I.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Rankin

SEASON STANDINGS, OCTOBER 15

Formula I.

6	1.	D.C. May	11S	640.1	7 races
8	2.	H. Coleson	69T	634.1	7
12	3.	H. deBolt	1K	628.0	7
14	4.	J. DeMerritte	68S	594.6	7
1	5.	B. Smith	51C	553.6	5
18	6.	E. Weitock	67S	550.5	7
10	7.	E. Rankin	17H	532.9	6 <sup>632.8</sup>
2	8.	L. Leonard	50C	530.0	5
4	9.	K. Nogy	120C	529.0	6
9	10.	J. Vartanian	49B	477.0	6

Formula II/FAI

1.	H. deBolt	1K	622.7	7
2.	G. Korpi	69A	558.0	6
3.	J. Foster	4A	539.1	7
4.	D. Gierke	77C	538.3	7
5.	K. Landefeld	76L	518.7	7
6.	A. Sattler	41K	503.3	7
7.	M. Helsel	64N	384.4	6
8.	B. Root	26E	377.1	5
9.	P. Reed	34J	370.1	7
10.	B. Barkowski	51J	366.3	6

POSITION STATEMENTS. The following statement is from CHUCK SMITH, candidate for the office of Vice President, NMPRA Southern California and Arizona District.

As VP of the NMPRA Southern California and Arizona District, I will do all I can to represent and initiate action upon the opinions of pilots in my district. I will inform every pilot of his standings in the District Championships at least once a month during the '73 contest season. If I have the support of the membership, I will try to initiate a Novice Class for Formula I at every one of our contests. If at all possible, I will also try to organize a NMPRA National Championship in the Southern California area. More and better racing is my pledge.

Respectfully submitted,

Chuck Smith, 51V

EDITOR'S APOLOGY. Today is October 19. I must put this in the mail to Bob Francis and Gil Horstmann tomorrow. But I have in hand at least TEN more pages of material, from our good friends Jim Buckmann (report on the October 6 & 7 CPC Regionals), Ralph Leidner (a nice explanation of why big props do better in a high wind, a point raised by Pappy deBolt), Pappy deBolt (UPRC Rochester and Jamestown meets, and UPRC CHAMPIONSHIPS), Jim Simpson (reports on NCW District Championships at Salina, Kansas, Sept. 24, and the Council Bluffs Cobras meet on October 1; also his statement to all members in his District concerning his candidacy for reelection, which happily he mailed individually to all his members), Bernice Williams, and numbers of pictures from all over. Obviously it is not possible to put all of this into the present issue. So I will get to work on the November issue right away and BEGIN IT with the above items and lots of pictures if not too much other material floods me. Okay? NOW TO THE NEXT PAGE, WHERE YOU VOTE, AND RENEW!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!