



Smithsonian Institution

Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum Archives

Hattie Meyers Junkin Papers - Journal articles, 1930s

Extracted on Oct-22-2021 02:54:34

The Smithsonian Institution thanks all digital volunteers that transcribed and reviewed this material. Your work enriches Smithsonian collections, making them available to anyone with an interest in using them.

The Smithsonian Institution (the "Smithsonian") provides the content on this website (transcription.si.edu), other Smithsonian websites, and third-party sites on which it maintains a presence ("SI Websites") in support of its mission for the "increase and diffusion of knowledge." The Smithsonian invites visitors to use its online content for personal, educational and other non-commercial purposes. By using this website, you accept and agree to abide by the [following terms](#).

- If sharing the material in personal and educational contexts, please cite the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum Archives as source of the content and the project title as provided at the top of the document. Include the accession number or collection name; when possible, link to the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum Archives website.
- If you wish to use this material in a for-profit publication, exhibition, or online project, please contact Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum Archives or transcribe@si.edu

For more information on this project and related material, contact the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum Archives. [See this project](#) and other collections in the Smithsonian Transcription Center.

MPH which give it a wide speed range. An interesting comment made by one of the British team was that he thought there must be some witchcraft involved since the 2-25 consistently left him in a thermal, but he felt that he could stay on equal terms on the ridge. A more practical explanation would seem to be the inferior low speed characteristics of the laminar flow airfoils used on the other sailplane. At any rate a good thin airfoil with good characteristics at low Reynolds Numbers with normal reasonable smooth construction gives excellent low speed performance. NACA data of course, indicates that if such an airfoil is made with the accuracy of contour required of laminar flow conditions a very substantial improvement can be made in C_D. The wing is designed to operate at a relatively low spar stress to minimize skin deflection, but it does occur so that a measurable performance increase might be expected with more rigid wing skin construction, but it certainly would be more costly.

The fuselage is a simple rounded shape with small flats on the sides and maximum cross section area per sq. ft. of wing is slightly less than the 1-23 series. It can be considered a more fair shape than the 1-23 fuselages. This was made possible by the considerably greater length in relation to maximum height and width dimensions. The greater length was chosen to keep the control surfaces areas at a minimum. The Vertical Tail Surface volume was increased over previous practice as the long heavy wing would naturally require more powerful Vertical surfaces to get comparable response. The aspect ratio of both Vertical and Horizontal surface was increased over previous practice. No aerodynamic trim devices are used - only a spring bungee on the elevator control to set trim speeds. The trim speeds are satisfactory over a wide range of pilot weights and combinations without the use of ballast.

The ailerons are simple differential type with the hinge line at the top surface. All horns and balance weights are internal (as in the 1-23D). They do not extend all the way to the tip to give a cleaner tip.

The dive brakes are of the DFS type and as mentioned before were not sufficiently powerful to keep the speeds down to the desired level. They proved to be over-balanced also, requiring little or no force to operate. In future ships they would no doubt be redesigned, but for the prototype a modification has been made which seems very satisfactory. It consists of a spoiler added inboard of the dive brakes and connected to the dive brake control. This greatly increases the effectiveness and reduces the overbalance since the spoiler loads build up quite rapidly. No tests have been run as yet to determine actual sinking speeds with the dive brakes.

Performance - The performance indicated on the curves is calculated and based upon previous methods which have been substantiated by considerable testing and comparison flying of other models. Some sinking speed tests have been run on the 2-25 but there has not been sufficient time to gather enough data to get valid flight test performance curves. However, these tests and comparison flying indicated that the curves are not unduly optimistic and in line with previous experience. As in any new ship there are probably a lot of detailed improvements that can be made as to eliminating gaps and leakages and detail fairing. By doing this refinement for a contest ship it appears that the calculated performances can be improved upon.

Construction - The 2-25 structurally is very similar to the 1-23 series. It is all metal covered and the wing except the movable surfaces and the

MPH which give it a wide speed range. An interesting comment made by one of the British team was that he thought there must be some witchcraft involved since the 2-25 consistently left him in a thermal, but he felt that he could stay on equal terms on the ridge. A more practical explanation would seem to be the inferior low speed characteristics of the laminar flow airfoil used on the other sailplane. At any rate a good thin airfoil with good characteristics at low Reynolds Numbers with normal reasonable smooth construction gives excellent low speed performance. NACA data of course, indicates that if such an airfoil is made with the accuracy of contour required of laminar flow conditions a very substantial improvement can be made in C_D. The wing is designed to operate at a relatively low spar stress to minimize skin deflection, but it does occur so that a measurable performance increase might be expected with more rigid wing skin construction, but it certainly would be more costly.



The high aspect ratio and sleek appearance of the DFS are obvious in this shot of Paul Johnson leading P of Stevens.

The fuselage is a simple rounded shape with small flats on the sides and the maximum cross section area per sq. ft. of wing is slightly less than the 1-23 series. It can be considered a more fair shape than the 1-23 fuselages. This was made possible by the considerably greater length in relation to maximum height and width dimensions. The greater length was chosen to keep the control surfaces areas at a minimum. The Vertical Tail Surface volume was increased over previous practice as the long heavy wing would naturally require more powerful Vertical surfaces to get comparable response. The aspect ratio of both Vertical and Horizontal surface was increased over previous practice. No aerodynamic trim devices are used—only a spring bungee on the elevator control to set trim speeds. The trim speeds are satisfactory over a wide range of pilot weights and combinations without the use of ballast.

The ailerons are simple differential type with the hinge line at the top surface. All horns and balance weights are internal (as in the 1-23D). They do not extend all the way to the tip to give a cleaner tip.

The dive brakes are of the DFS type and as mentioned before were not sufficiently powerful to keep the speeds down to the desired level. They proved to be over-balanced also, requiring little or no force to operate. In future ships they would no doubt be redesigned, but for the prototype a modification has been made which seems very satisfactory. It consists of a spoiler added inboard of the dive brakes and connected to the dive brake control. This greatly increases the effectiveness and reduces the overbalance since the spoiler loads build up quite rapidly. No tests have been run as yet to determine actual sinking speeds with the dive brakes.

a modification has been made which seems very satisfactory. It consists of a spoiler added inboard of the dive brakes and connected to the dive brake control. This greatly increases the effectiveness and reduces the overbalance since the spoiler loads build up quite rapidly. No tests have been run as yet to determine actual sinking speeds with the dive brakes.

Performance—The performance indicated on the curves is calculated and based upon previous methods which have been substantiated by considerable testing and comparison flying of other models. Some sinking speed tests have been run on the 2-25 but there has not been sufficient time to gather enough data to get valid flight test performance curves. However, these tests and comparison flying indicated that the curves are not unduly optimistic and in line with previous experience. As in any new ship there are probably a lot of detailed improvements that can be made as to eliminating gaps and leakages and detail fairing. By doing this refinement for a contest ship it appears that the calculated performances can be improved upon.

Construction—The 2-25 structurally is very similar to the 1-23 series. It is all metal covered except the movable control surfaces and the wing ribs of the rear span which are fabric covered. It has a single wheel and skid, a small tail wheel, and no wing tip

skins are used. Assembly of the wings is also similar to the 1-23's except that the outboard main pin is outboard of the fuselage. This was done to remove the pin from the lower Cap area into a neutral area and give a greater area for the root attach angle. Also spacers and dive brakes are automatically converted up by a bungee tube. Access to the elevator rigging is from a removable deck held by piano hinges and pins.

The horizontal tail is removable by taking out 2 bolts and the elevator connecting bolt.

The canopy is similar to the 1-23, being a steel frame with aluminum edge skins to hold the rounded plastic. There are no external latches. Access for locking the canopy from the outside is by a built-in door on the side just below the hinges.

The cockpit is arranged in tandem fashion with the pilot sitting quite close, similar to the 2-32 or Piper Cub arrangement. The width of the fuselage is only 20 1/2" compared to the 21" of a 1-23, hence the cross section is not very large. There is plenty of room except at the rear pilot's feet where 2 becomes a little tight if heavy flying boots are used, but is adequate for normal flying clothes. All controls are dual. The dive brakes are operated by a push-pull tube on the left side with open

(Continued on Page 8)

wing aft of the rear spar which are fabric covered. It has a single wheel and skid, a small tail wheel, and no wing tip skids are used. Assembly of the wings is also similar to the 1-23's except that the outboard main pin is outboard of the fuselage. This was done to remove the pin from the lower Cap area into a neutral area and gives a greater arm for the root attach couple. Also spoilers and dive brakes are automatically connected up by a torque tube. Access to all the set-up rigging is thru a removable deck held by piano hinges and pins.

The horizontal tail is removable by taking out 2 bolts and the elevator connecting bolt.

The canopy is similar to the 1-23, being a steel frame with aluminum edge skins to hold the moulded plexiglas. There are no external latches. Access for locking the canopy from the outside is by a flush access door in the side just below the longeron.

The cockpit is arranged in tandem fashion with the pilots sitting quite close, similar to the 2-22 or Piper Cub arrangements. The width of the fuselage is only 28 1/2" compared to the 23" of a 1-23, hence the cross section is not very large.

There is plenty of room except at the rear pilot's feet where it becomes a little tight if heavy flying boots are used, but is adequate for normal flying clothes. All controls are dual. The dive brakes are operated by a push-pull tube on the left side with open
(Continued on Page 6)

[[image]]

Schweizer Photo

The high aspect ratio and sleek appearance of the 2-25 are obvious in this shot of Paul Schweizer landing it at Elmira.

MARCH-APRIL, 1955

[[Page Number]] 3

Hattie Meyers Junkin Papers - Journal articles, 1930s
Transcribed and Reviewed by Digital Volunteers
Extracted Oct-22-2021 02:54:34



Smithsonian Institution

Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum Archives

The mission of the Smithsonian is the increase and diffusion of knowledge - shaping the future by preserving our heritage, discovering new knowledge, and sharing our resources with the world. Founded in 1846, the Smithsonian is the world's largest museum and research complex, consisting of 19 museums and galleries, the National Zoological Park, and nine research facilities. Become an active part of our mission through the Transcription Center. Together, we are discovering secrets hidden deep inside our collections that illuminate our history and our world.

Join us!

The Transcription Center: <https://transcription.si.edu>

On Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/SmithsonianTranscriptionCenter>

On Twitter: [@TranscribeSI](https://twitter.com/TranscribeSI)

Connect with the Smithsonian

Smithsonian Institution: www.si.edu

On Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/Smithsonian>

On Twitter: [@smithsonian](https://twitter.com/smithsonian)