

CORRESPONDENCE

The Secretary, Royal Aeronautical Society,
7, Albemarle Street, Piccadilly, London, W.1.
17th February, 1930.

Dear Sir,—I should like to crave a little of your valuable space to correct the somewhat erroneous impression which may be created by some statements which appear in the printed version of Mr. Brigham's Lecture on R.100 in the Journal for February.

On page 189, Mr. Brigham is quoted as stating "the structure weight of R.100 is greatly superior to the structure weight of R.101." I do not wish to quibble in any way, but taking what is usually accepted as the structure weight, i.e., that of longitudinals, transverse frames, fins and flaps, shear wiring and gasbag wiring, it is an interesting fact that in spite of the complete dissimilarity of the designs of the two airships, the structure weights come out identically the same within a few hundred pounds.

I notice on page 187, a considerable exaggeration in the statement of the weight of the five power cars of R.101, which together weigh $16\frac{1}{2}$ tons, not 22, as given by Mr. Brigham.

On page 186, it is stated that "R.100 was the first ship built which incorporated the system of ventilators to relieve the internal pressure on the gasbags." As a matter of fact, the "Los Angeles," which was built for the American Navy Dept. by the Zeppelin Company, was fitted with gauze panels similar to those used in R.100, and also R.101 is fitted with a ventilation system, the nature of which will be clear from my description of the ship in the Journal for August, 1929.

On the same page I see it suggested that the entrance to R.101 from the mooring tower is quite open, and therefore likely to give passengers a feeling of insecurity. This is incorrect. The same effect as is produced by the canopy in R.100 is obtained by stout curtains in R.101 connecting the sides of the platform to the hull of the ship.—Yours faithfully,

V. C. RICHMOND.

The Secretary, Royal Aeronautical Society.
8th February, 1930.

Sir,—In the review of my book "The Strength of Shafts in Vibration" in the February issue of the Journal, the following occurs: "The fault of the book from the practical engineer's point of view is that it is purely mathematical in treatment, and *the examples chosen are more on the academic side than the practical.*" The italics are mine.

I would like to challenge your reviewer to advance any evidence, however remote, in support of the statement italicised.

The seven worked-out examples which I give are typical of definite practical cases on which I have been consulted.—Yours faithfully,

J. MORRIS.