

wing cellule. Also the method of bracing with four struts should have a lower resistance than the conventional biplane bracing of struts and cables. This gain is, however, considerably offset by the excessive cutout at the junction of the wing with the fuselage which tends to reduce the lift and the lift/drag ratio. The low aspect ratio also develops a low light/drift ratio.

With the wing area increased to take care of the correct weight and recommended loading, the wing span approaches 42 ft. It would be very difficult if not impossible to construct a sufficiently strong wing of 42 ft. span stayed at one point in this manner.

General Comments: In general the 3-view drawing shows neat, compact and well coordinated fighter airplane design. The probable performance and other military qualities, while good, are not better than aircraft now in service. To produce a performance of marked superiority over present airplanes, requires a loading of less than 8 pounds per horsepower. It does not appear possible with present day construction to carry guns and necessary crew equipment for a two place fighter with less than 400 H.P., and still maintain this light power loading.

The above remarks are taken from R.D.M. No. 300, Aeronautic Research Department, Airplane Engineering Department, McCook Field, Dayton, Ohio, July 1918.

WHAT SIZE PHOTO DO YOU TAKE?

In the hopes of building up our sagging correspondence section the following is offered as food for thought. It represents the views of one of our members on the subject of film size for aircraft photos:

"For the last few years the 616 camera has been out of production. I searched the city here and finally found one that took fair pictures. They were OK until recently. However, the quality sure isn't what I was getting with my $2\frac{1}{4} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$ Speed Graphic.

What the story boils down to is this. Since I have had such a rough time with a 616 I have given it up and "regressed" (in the terms of most collectors) to the smaller size. I might add that this regression was caused by the loss of 8 beautiful negatives on a Boeing 307. Knowing that the 616 wasn't up to par I have been taking a few of the smaller shots of each rare plane so it was not a total loss. However, in the future, it seems to me that collectors will either have to become more broad-minded and accept the smaller negatives or limit their trading. This is not too good or even a desirable situation. The history can best be done by more people. We are limiting ourselves by accepting only the one size, for new blood cannot come in. The 616 is hard to find and youngsters just starting will find this obstacle hard to overcome. I'm not complaining, just voicing an opinion on what I think could become a serious situation. I like 616 negatives, but I take 120. In England they use 35mm film and this is even more serious."

This problem is one that involves many of our members. What do you think about it? What are your opinions? Let's hear from members like Ed Deigan and John Mitchell who have changed from 616 to 620. What about 4×5 ? $2\frac{1}{4} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$?