Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets

VOLUME 5 JANUARY 1968 NUMBER 1

On Diversity and Adversity

As R&D budgets for aerospace programs have dwindled, the industry has sought ways to diversify its activities, and AIAA meetings have included many sessions on the application of aerospace technology and systems engineering principles to the various problems of our people and our cities. This search for ways to apply systematic, scientific principles to the *definition* as well as the solution of such problems can be expected to lead, eventually, to magnificent accomplishments.

However, many of the resulting AIAA preprints and paper submissions in this area have been shallow from a technical standpoint. And, in this editor's opinion, our journals should continue to emphasize only those technical areas directly involved in flight, space exploration, and the related disciplines in hydronautics. Despite the current ebb in budgets, advances in these areas of primary interest to the AIAA surely will continue to play a leading role in the advance of our civilization. Therefore, papers dealing with the transfer of aerospace technology to the socio-economic field and to other fields of science or engineering should be published in our journals *only* when they demonstrate some *significant advance* in the development of, understanding of, or requirements for the *aerospace technology* itself. Peripheral papers that do not meet this criterion should not be submitted to the journals of the AIAA. The corollary is that authors who do submit papers to the journals should be sure that they are substantial in respect to the foregoing criterion.

On Survey Papers

The October issues of our journals carried an announcement that there will be an award of $750.00 to the author(s) of the best survey paper submitted to each of the four journals during the period July 1, 1967–September 30, 1968. The purpose of these awards is to stimulate interest in this valuable category of papers. The announcement stated that acceptable papers will be published in accordance with usual Journal procedures for review of survey papers. Our judgment criteria are a) thoroughness and balance in surveying and citing recent literature, b) timeliness in the sense of being up to date and covering a field of current and lasting interest to a sizable number of readers, and c) appropriateness with respect to our stated scope (see inside front cover).

A good survey paper has some depth relative to the specifics of significant advances and the emerging truths or trends in its subject area. The subject surveyed may be quite narrow, if it can still meet these criteria.

We could *not* publish seriously overlapping papers in rapid succession, and we will not normally expect to publish more than one survey paper per issue. If you are preparing or considering the preparation of a survey paper for submission to us (and we hope that qualified authors are!), please write or call Miss Susan Gritz at AIAA Headquarters, and she will put you in contact with me or an Associate Editor to discuss our requirements and possible scheduling.

A good survey paper can be invaluable to young engineers, to busy technical administrators, and to engineers just entering the subject field, as well as to those already in the field who find trouble keeping up with the literature. Are you ready to make your contribution?

On Engineering Notes

Whereas a regular contributed paper should represent a complete and substantial unit of work, and is subject to formal review procedures, an Engineering Note, in contrast, is a means for *rapid and economical publication of new and useful information of limited scope*, including significant progress items on a project yet to be completed.

The acceptance procedure for Engineering Notes in the *Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets* has gone through a cycle since 1964. In the beginning, this editor judged all Notes, and publication was indeed rapid, until the supply began to exceed our page capability in 1965. It was decided then to have all Notes formally reviewed under the direction of one Associate Editor, thus exercising more specific and critical judgment at the expense of speed. In 1967 it was decided that all journals of the AIAA should again strive for rapid publication of Notes, employing the intermediate process of distributing the notes according to subject matter to the various Associate Editors who would make their own judgments without outside reviews whenever possible. With this policy *and the cooperation of the authors*, we shall try to publish worthy Notes approximately four months from date of receipt. (This time compares to the 6 to 12 months normally incurred for full papers that are formally reviewed and generally require more extensive *technical* revision.) The decision of the editors on Notes is final; rebuttals by authors are *not* invited and will be considered only when it appears that the editors have made a genuine error in judgment on technical grounds.

The foregoing policy does not, for the *Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets*, prevent the editors from requesting that some papers submitted by the authors as full papers be cut to EN's that concisely present the few novel and significant points to be made. In these cases the criteria with respect to scope and completeness will be exercised, even though publication may not be as rapid as desired for the EN category as a whole.

The message to authors should be clear. If you have some new and significant results of limited scope or an original and important concept that has not yet been evaluated in depth, submit a concise Note, properly prepared, with good, compact illustrations. In follow-up respond promptly to any requests that we may make for revision, and we will do our best to publish the Note promptly. Allowable length will be judged in relation to content but normally will not exceed $\frac{1}{4}$ the length of a full paper.

On the Adversity of Editors

Sometimes we find it necessary to ask authors for re-revisions of their papers or notes for one or more of three main reasons: 1) they have not responded in either their revised text or their letter of transmittal to the technical comments of reviewers and/or editors; 2) they have not provided acceptable illustrations (most often, the lettering is too small; sometimes simple and similar figures have not been combined as requested); and 3) unnecessary verbosity. When this happens, authors may picture us as unreasonable adversaries and vow never again to send us a paper. However, we continue to be gratified by the kind acknowledgments of some who realize that their papers have indeed been improved by the final revisions. Our only aim is to put out a lean, accurate, and valued journal, publishing as many worthy papers as possible within our page budget. How happy we would be if *all* authors would take care of the three main faults during first revision!

Gordon L. Dugger
Editor-in-Chief

Reviewers for *Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets*, January 1–October 1, 1967*

WE take this annual opportunity to acknowledge, with great pleasure, the assistance received from reviewers. Conscientious review and constructive criticism of our papers is a vital part of our system, as indicated in our "Acceptance Procedure for Archive Journals of AIAA," which appeared in the first issue of each of our journals in 1965.

Thoughtful, detailed reviews are sincerely appreciated by both the authors and the editors. Every comment made by a reviewer is carefully considered. If the editors decide that a paper should be published (or rejected) against the advice of a reviewer, it is done only after all evidence from the other reviewer(s) and the author has been carefully weighed. Even in such cases, you probably will recognize that the quality of the accepted paper(s) has been improved as a result of your enlightened criticism.

For the help you gave us in 1967 and may give us in 1968 and in future years, we say a very warm "thank you."

H. Norman Abramson
Malcolm J. Abzug
A. J. Acosta
Vernon L. Alley Jr.
David Altman
A. Amos
D. K. Anand
John S. Archer
Carl Anderson
J. Robert Anderson
John S. Andrews
Carmon M. Auble
Fred Austin
David S. Baker
R. L. Barron
W. T. Barry
R. H. Battin
Helmut Bauer
Paul E. Bauer
S. J. Bauer
Herbert Becker
Warren Benjamin
Jerry T. Bevans
Kenneth W. Bills Jr.
Harold Black
J. B. Blackmon
Seymour M. Bogdonoff
Robert E. Bourdeau
John Braithwaite
Alan Brandt
R. D. Brooks
R. E. Brown
Robert G. Brown
Frank Bugg
Al Bulent
Edmund C. Burke
A. Bruce Burns
Marshall C. Burrows
Ali B. Cambel
Harry M. Cameron
M. F. Card
Huey D. Carden
A. G. Carlton
John R. Casani
C. C. Chang
Seville Chapman
Hsien K. Cheng
Harold Chestnut
J. T. Clapp
O. W. Clausen
Bruce E. Clingan
Gerald J. Cloutier
Arnold D. Cohen
Gerald A. Cohen
William Collier
Ruppert Collings
E. William Conrad
E. Copps Jr.
Kenneth Cox
L. L. Cronvich
Robert E. Danielson
E. H. Davison
Robert G. Deissler
Daniel W. Dembrow
W. F. Denham
Robert N. DeWitt
O. D. DiMaggio
Duane F. Dipprey
James I. Dodds
T. E. Dolan
Stephen H. Dole
Hugh Dougherty
Alfred C. Draper
Richard S. Dummer
T. N. Edelbaum
Krafft A. Ehricke
David G. Elliott
Gerard W. Elverum Jr.
Olen P. Ely
Robert English
Joseph Epstein
W. C. Erickson
Charles E. Feiler
Antonio Ferri
Philip C. Fisher
Philip D. Fisher
Robert Fitch
Robert J. Fitzgerald
A. Theodore Forrester
A. Fortini
David J. Foster
J. E. Francis
Henry E. Frankel
Donald Fraser
Cline Frasier
Malcolm Frazier
Terry N. Gardner
C. R. Gates
Ernst D. Geissler
R. W. Gillespie
Rafael Gluck
Frank W. Gobetz
J. E. Goldberg
Arnold Goldburg
Robert L. Goldman
Richard F. Gompertz
Charles C. Goodrich
Derck A. Gordon
Robert G. Gottlieb
M. C. Gourdine
Richard Gran
Jack Green
Allen Greene
Bill J. Griffith
K. Guderley
W. H. Guier
Gerald M. Hanley
Julius E. Harris
David T. Harrje
H. H. Hart
Pete N. Haurlan
Wallace D. Hayes
Marcus F. Heidmann
Robert E. Henderson
Robert M. Henry
M. Hersch
George G. Herzl
Maynard L. Hill
George A. Hoffman
L. G. Hofmann
John Holdsworth
Paul F. Holloway
Helmut J. Horn
Paul W. Huber
W. L. Hufferd
Gregory A. Hyver
Sam F. Iacobellis
Tak Ishimato
William C. Isley
Toru Iura
Leonard D. Jaffe
Joseph C. Jenks
R. E. Johnson
Robert J. Johnson
Allen S. Jones
I. R. Jones
John W. Jones
C. H. Karnes
Dean Karnopp
W. M. Kaula
Robert Keeler
Donald Keene
Joseph Kempner
D. J. Kerrisk
William Kerslake
R. B. Kieburtz
John W. Kiker
J. Kimmel
A. Kliore
J. S. Knaur
George Kocher
W. H. Krase
William E. Krauss
Tim J. Kreiter
Frank Kreith
Charles H. Kruger Jr.
Alfred Landau
Benjamin O. Lange
A. V. Larson
Melvin T. Lavik
John Lawson
Stanley Lehrer
George Leitmann
Lester C. Lemke Jr.
Robert W. Leonard
Henry C. Lessing
H. C. Lester
Norman N. Lewin
Donald H. Lewis
Jacob H. Lichtenstein
Seymour Lieblein
Charles A. Lindley
Horst Loeb
John H. Lundell
Paul S. Lykoudis
D. McAllister
Robert W. McCloy
John C. McFall Jr.
E. C. McKannan
Neil MacGregor
Charles M. MacKenzie
Artur Mager
John N. Majerus
E. T. Marley
Edwin O. Marriott
Anthony Martellucci
Fred H. Martin
C. W. Martz
Anthony Merz
Sidney Metzger
William R. Mickelsen
Aden Mienel
David Migdal
Daniel W. Moorman
Deane N. Morris
Raymond Morth
Heinz E. Mueller
James N. Mueller
M. Nagano
Robert L. Nelson
Harlan Neuville
James Nevins
G. C. Newton
John F. Newton Jr.
Robert R. Newton
Oran W. Nicks
John D. Nicolaides
F. W. Niedenfuhr
T. Nishimura
R. E. Oglevie
E. L. Olcott
Robert N. Olson
Charles Orlick
R. C. Orth
Simon Ostrach
Bernard Paiewonsky
Adrian Pallone
H. A. Panofsky
J. F. Parmer
William David Parsons
P. Parzen
John T. Patha
Robert G. Payne
Laurence E. Peterson
Michael Petrick
George W. Pfannebecker
P. Kenneth Pierpont
Benjamin Pinkel
Larry D. Pinson
Andrew E. Potter Jr.
Donald A. Price Jr.
Richard J. Priem
Ralph Pringle Jr.
W. L. Pritchard
R. V. Ragsac
R. W. Rainey
M. L. Ramey
Victor H. Ransom
Kenneth A. Ray
William T. Reid
Karl L. Remmler
Edward A. Richley
Arnold P. Ritter
Ralph Roberts
R. G. Rose
Daniel E. Rosner
Stanley Ross
Ray Rulis
Harry L. Runyan
Melvin Sadoff
Leo F. Salzberg
Carl A. Sandahl Jr.
Paul H. Savet
J. A. Schetz
Stephen E. Schloss
George Schmidt
George F. Schmitt Jr.
Wilson Schramm
David N. Schultz
Francis C. Schwarz
W. Seamore
Norman Sears
Paul Seide
Harvey N. Seiger
K. A. Sense
Norman W. Sheetz
Lawrence Sher
Irving Silver
S. Fred Singer
Lyle Six
Robert Slye
H. J. Smith
L. D. Smoot
B. A. Sodek
D. H. Sowle
Frank W. Spaid
Leslie G. St. Leger
Orestes N. Stavroudis
Ernst A. Steinhoff
Jesse Steinman
David G. Stephens
Leonard Sternfield
Brian Stewart
N. O. Stockman
James A. Stricklin
Ernst Stuhlinger
George S. Sutherland
R. T. Swann
Walter T. Teegarden
Wayne Templeman
J. Alex L. Thomson
William T. Thomson
Leo Tick
C. L. Tien
Leonard M. Tinnan
Thomas A. Toll
Raymond J. Tolosko
Ronald S. H. Toms
Milton Trageser
James H. Trainor
Robert E. Uhrig
James E. Vaeth
R. S. Valentine
Chris J. Van Der Maas
Edward R. Van Driest
J. J. Volkoff
A. Vranos
W. R. Wagner
Arnold A. Weiss
Jack D. Whitfield
C. H. Whitlock
William S. Widnall
J. A. Wiebelt
Max L. Williams
Willis G. Wing
Martin Wolf
Harry Wolff
G. S. Wong
William A. Wood
Paul B. Yang
Chia-ping Yu
F. J. Zeleznik
C. A. Zimmerman
M. A. Zipkin
Edward E. Zukoski
E. L. Zwiebach

* Because it is difficult to include the reviewers for October, November, and December in this issue of the Journal, they will be listed with the reviewers for 1968, in the January 1969 issue.