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SUMMARY

In order to determine its static longitudinal and lateral-directional stability and control characteristics at transonic speeds, a 0.0667-scale force model of configuration 3 of the North American X-15 research airplane has been tested in the Langley 8-foot transonic pressure tunnel. The test range included Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.18, angles of attack from -20° to 20°, and angles of sideslip of -5.1° and 0°. The results of the investigation including a summary of some of the important stability and control parameters are presented without analysis.

INTRODUCTION

As part of the wind-tunnel program required for the development of the North American X-15 research airplane, a 0.0667-scale force model of the final version of the X-15 (configuration 3) has been tested in the Langley 8-foot transonic pressure tunnel in order to determine its static stability and control characteristics at transonic speeds. Tests of this model at Mach numbers from 2.29 to 4.65 are reported in reference 1. The results of pressure-distribution tests of a model of a configuration nearly identical to that of configuration 3 at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 4.65 are presented in references 2 and 3. Other tests of force models approximating configuration 3 are reported in references 4 to 7. Tests of a force model of an earlier version of the X-15 (configuration 1) in the Langley 8-foot transonic pressure tunnel are reported in reference 8.

The model was tested at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.18, at angles of attack from -20° to 20°, and at angles of sideslip of -5.1° and 0°. Drag, static longitudinal stability, and static lateral-directional stability were determined; the effectiveness of the horizontal tail as a pitch and roll control and the vertical tails as a yaw control was measured; and the effects of opening the speed brakes on drag and static stability were obtained. The results of this
investigation including a summary of some of the important stability and control parameters are presented herein without analysis.

**SYMBOLS**

Longitudinal data are presented about the stability axes and lateral-directional data are presented about the body axes for a center-of-gravity location of 20 percent of the wing mean aerodynamic chord.

- $b$: wing span, in.
- $C_D$: drag coefficient, $D/qS$
- $C_{D,0}$: drag coefficient at zero lift
- $C_L$: lift coefficient, $L/qS$
- $C_L(L/D)_{max}$: lift coefficient for maximum lift-drag ratio
- $C_{L,t}$: trim lift coefficient
- $\frac{\partial C_{L,t}}{\partial \delta_e}$: trim lift effectiveness parameter, per deg
- $C_{L\alpha}$: lift-curve slope, per deg
- $C_l$: rolling-moment coefficient, $M_x/qSb$
- $C_l\beta$: effective dihedral parameter, $\frac{\partial C_l}{\partial \beta}$, per deg
- $C_{l\delta_a}$: rolling moment due to differential deflection of horizontal tail, $\frac{\partial C_l}{\partial \delta_a}$, per deg
- $C_{l\delta_V}$: rolling moment due to vertical-tail deflection, $\frac{\partial C_l}{\partial \delta_V}$, per deg
- $C_m$: pitching-moment coefficient, $M_y/qS\bar{c}$
- $C_{mCL}$: static longitudinal stability parameter, $\frac{\partial C_m}{\partial C_L}$
\( C_{m_{o}e} \): pitch effectiveness parameter at constant lift coefficient, \( \frac{\partial C_m}{\partial \delta_e} \), per deg

\( C_n \): yawing-moment coefficient, \( M_z/qSb \)

\( C_{n_{\beta}} \): static directional stability parameter, \( \frac{\partial C_n}{\partial \beta} \), per deg

\( C_{n_{\delta_a}} \): yawing moment due to differential deflection of horizontal tail, \( \frac{\partial C_n}{\partial \delta_a} \), per deg

\( C_{n_{\delta_v}} \): yawing moment due to vertical-tail deflection, \( \frac{\partial C_n}{\partial \delta_v} \), per deg

\( C_{p,b} \): base pressure coefficient, \( \frac{P_b - P}{q} \)

\( C_Y \): lateral-force coefficient, \( Y/qS \)

\( \bar{c} \): wing mean aerodynamic chord, in.

\( D \): force along \( X_g \)-axis, positive rearward, lb

\( F_Y \): lateral force, lb

\( L \): lift, lb

\( (L/D)_{\text{max}} \): maximum lift-drag ratio

\( M \): free-stream Mach number

\( M_X \): moment about \( X \)-axis, in-lb

\( M_Y \): moment about \( Y \)-axis, in-lb

\( M_Z \): moment about \( Z \)-axis, in-lb

\( P_b \): static pressure at model base, lb/sq ft

\( p \): free-stream static pressure, lb/sq ft

\( q \): free-stream dynamic pressure, lb/sq ft
Reynolds number

total wing area, sq ft

body axes

stability axes

angle of attack of fuselage center line, deg

angle of sideslip, deg

differential deflection of horizontal tail when used as roll control, positive when left-hand surface has more positive deflection, (trailing edge down), deg

deflection of horizontal tail when used as pitch control (taken as average of left- and right-hand surface deflections and positive when trailing edge is down), deg

deflection of upper and lower vertical-tail surfaces, positive when trailing edge is to left, deg

APPARATUS AND TESTS

Model

The X-15 is a rocket-powered research airplane designed for hypersonic speeds at very high altitudes. It employs a 5-percent-thick low-aspect-ratio trapezoidal wing mounted in the midposition on a fuselage consisting of a body of revolution with large side fairings. The horizontal tail which has 45° sweep-back of the quarter-chord line is all movable for pitch control and is deflected differentially for roll control. The outboard panels of the upper and lower vertical-tail surfaces are deflected for directional control; the inboard panels are fixed and contain the speed brakes.

The 0.0667-scale force model of the North American X-15 research airplane used in this investigation was supplied by the contractor and was of stainless-steel construction. Photographs of the model are presented in figure 1, and dimensional details are shown in figure 2 and table I.

The model represented configuration 3 of the X-15. Features that distinguish this configuration from configuration 1 (ref. 8) include an increased fuselage diameter, shortened fuselage side fairings, increased leading-edge radii on wing and horizontal tail, wing shifted forward 3.6 inches (full scale), horizontal tail shifted rearward 5.4 inches (full scale), a larger vertical tail having 10° full-wedge airfoil sections with the total exposed area distributed...
about 55 percent above the fuselage and 45 percent below, and reduced speed-brake area. The contractor's code designation for the model tested was $B_4 W_2 X_{14} H_9 V_{1/2} U_2 V_L V_{L'} L_2$.

The movable portions of the upper and lower vertical tails and both horizontal-tail panels could be actuated remotely while the wind tunnel was in operation. The speed brakes were maintained in the closed position or were opened $35^\circ$ relative to the closed position as indicated in figure 2. The speed-brake hinge lines were located at the speed-brake leading edges and had $0^\circ$ sweepback.

**Tunnel and Model Support**

The tests were conducted in the Langley 8-foot transonic pressure tunnel which is a single-return rectangular slotted-throat wind tunnel having controls that allowed for the independent variation of Mach number, stagnation pressure, temperature, and humidity.

The model was attached to a sting support by an electrical strain-gage balance located inside the fuselage. The sting support was cylindrical for 2.4 base diameters downstream of the model base and had a diameter of 0.55 base diameter. At its downstream end, the sting was attached to an arc-shaped support strut which spanned the tunnel vertically. This support strut was rotated to obtain changes in angle of attack; the center of rotation of the system was near the model in order to minimize overall vertical motion of the model. Variations in angle of sideslip were obtained by insertion of properly angled couplings in the model support system.

**Measurements and Accuracy**

Model forces and moments were measured by a six-component internal strain-gage balance. They were converted by automatic electrical computing equipment to lift, drag, and pitching moment about the stability axes and to lateral force, yawing moment, and rolling moment about the body axes. (See fig. 3.) The center of gravity was located at 20 percent of the mean aerodynamic chord based on the total wing area. (See fig. 2.) At a Mach number of 1.0 and a dynamic pressure of 784 pounds per square foot, accuracies of the coefficients are estimated to be:

- $C_L$ .................................................. ±0.01
- $C_D$ .................................................. ±0.002
- $C_m$ .................................................. ±0.002
- $C_l$ .................................................. ±0.0005
- $C_n$ .................................................. ±0.0005
- $C_Y$ .................................................. ±0.005
The angle of attack was set to within ±0.10 by means of a pendulum-type attitude indicator located in the nose of the model. The angles of sideslip were determined to within ±0.20 by means of a calibration of sting and balance deflection with respect to model lateral force and yawing moment. Horizontal- and vertical-tail deflections were measured remotely by means of differential transformers attached to the control-surface linkages and are estimated to be accurate within ±0.20. Speed-brake deflections are estimated to be accurate within ±0.10.

The Mach number was determined within ±0.003 from a calibration with respect to the pressure in the chamber surrounding the slotted test section. Base pressure coefficients were determined from an average of measurements taken on the upper and lower portions of the base and are estimated to be accurate within ±0.005.

Tests

The complete model was tested with horizontal-tail deflections for pitch and roll control, with vertical-tail deflections for yaw control, and with the speed brakes open and closed. The model was also tested with the horizontal tail removed, with the lower vertical tail removed, and with both vertical tails removed. The detailed test program is indicated in table II.

The test range included Mach numbers from 0.60 to 1.18, angles of attack from -20° to 20°, and angles of sideslip of -5.1° and 0°. The tests were conducted at a tunnel stagnation pressure of approximately 1 atmosphere. The average test Reynolds number based on the wing mean aerodynamic chord varied from approximately \(2.2 \times 10^6\) to \(2.8 \times 10^6\) over the Mach number range. (See fig. 4.) For all tests, 0.1-inch.-wide boundary-layer transition strips consisting of No. 120 carborundum grains were installed along the 10-percent-chord lines of the wing and tail surfaces and at 10 percent of the fuselage length.

Corrections

Tunnel-boundary interference at subsonic speeds is minimized by the slotted test section, and no corrections for this interference have been applied. No corrections are necessary for the effects of supersonic boundary-reflected disturbances since they are negligible for Mach numbers up to approximately 1.03 (ref. 9), and the reflected disturbances pass well downstream of the base of the model at a Mach number of 1.18.

With the use of the measured base pressure coefficients (shown for three configurations in fig. 5), the data presented have been adjusted to an assumed condition of free-stream static pressure acting over the base of the fuselage. No sting-interference corrections have been applied. However, as indicated from the results of reference 10, errors in the drag data due to the presence of the sting are estimated to be small and errors in the other coefficients are probably negligible.
RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of an investigation of the stability and control characteristics of a 0.0667-scale model of the final version of the X-15 research airplane are presented in the following figures:

Basic longitudinal data as functions of $C_L$ ................................................. 6 to 15  
Basic lateral-directional data as functions of $\alpha$ ........................................ 16 to 24  
Longitudinal stability and control parameters ............................................... 25 to 27  
Drag and maximum lift-drag-ratio parameters .............................................. 28  
Lateral-directional stability and control parameters ..................................... 29 to 33  

A more detailed index of the results presented is shown in table II.

The data indicate that the configuration investigated has generally satisfactory static stability and control characteristics at the Mach numbers and angles of attack tested. Notable exceptions, however, include a region of neutral longitudinal stability at low negative angles of attack at Mach numbers from 0.60 to 0.95 and excessive positive dihedral at high angles of attack at Mach numbers above 0.60.

Langley Research Center,  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration,  
Langley Station, Hampton, Va., November 8, 1962.
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TABLE I.- DIMENSIONS OF 0.0667-SCALE MODEL OF CONFIGURATION 3 OF
NORTH AMERICAN X-15 RESEARCH AIRPLANE

Wing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airfoil section</td>
<td>Modified NACA 66-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total area, sq in.</td>
<td>127.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed area, sq in.</td>
<td>66.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total span, in.</td>
<td>17.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed span, in.</td>
<td>11.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total aspect ratio</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed aspect ratio</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading-edge sweepback, deg</td>
<td>36.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-chord-line sweepback, deg</td>
<td>25.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailing-edge sweepforward, deg</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root chord at center line, in.</td>
<td>11.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed root chord, in.</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip chord, in.</td>
<td>2.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total taper ratio</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed taper ratio</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean aerodynamic chord based on total area, in.</td>
<td>8.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal distance from fuselage nose to total wing 0.20c, in.</td>
<td>22.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence, deg</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Horizontal tail (in plane of surface):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airfoil section</td>
<td>Modified NACA 66-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total area, sq in.</td>
<td>73.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed area, sq in.</td>
<td>32.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total span, in.</td>
<td>14.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed span, in.</td>
<td>9.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed aspect ratio</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading-edge sweepback, deg</td>
<td>50.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-chord-line sweepback, deg</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailing-edge sweepback, deg</td>
<td>19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root chord at center line, in.</td>
<td>8.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed root chord, in.</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip chord, in.</td>
<td>1.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed taper ratio</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean aerodynamic chord based on exposed area, in.</td>
<td>3.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinge line, percent exposed s</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal distance from total wing 0.20c to exposed tail 0.25s, in.</td>
<td>12.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dihedral, deg</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upper vertical tail (exposed panel):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airfoil section</td>
<td>100° wedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area, sq in.</td>
<td>26.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span, in.</td>
<td>3.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect ratio</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading-edge sweepback, deg</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailing-edge sweepback, deg</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I.- DIMENSIONS OF 0.0667-SCALE MODEL OF CONFIGURATION 3 OF
NORTH AMERICAN X-15 RESEARCH AIRPLANE - Concluded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root chord, in.</td>
<td>8.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip chord, in.</td>
<td>6.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taper ratio</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean aerodynamic chord, in.</td>
<td>7.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal distance from total wing 0.20c to exposed panel 0.25c, in.</td>
<td>10.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable portion - Area, sq in.</td>
<td>16.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span, in.</td>
<td>2.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root chord, in.</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip chord, in.</td>
<td>6.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinge line, percent exposed panel c</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed brake (one side) - Area, sq in.</td>
<td>3.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord, in.</td>
<td>2.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average span, in.</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower vertical tail (exposed panel):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfoil section</td>
<td>10° wedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area, sq in.</td>
<td>22.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span, in.</td>
<td>3.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect ratio</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading-edge sweepback, deg</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailing-edge sweepback, deg</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root chord, in.</td>
<td>8.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip chord, in.</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taper ratio</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean aerodynamic chord, in.</td>
<td>7.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal distance from total wing 0.20c to exposed panel 0.25c, in.</td>
<td>10.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable portion - Area, sq in.</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span, in.</td>
<td>1.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root chord, in.</td>
<td>7.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip chord, in.</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinge line, percent exposed panel c</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed brake (one side) - Area, sq in.</td>
<td>3.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord, in.</td>
<td>2.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average span, in.</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuselage:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length, in.</td>
<td>39.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum depth, in.</td>
<td>3.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum width with side fairings, in.</td>
<td>5.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum width without side fairings, in.</td>
<td>3.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineness ratio without side fairings</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base diameter, in.</td>
<td>3.197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II.- INDEX OF FIGURES PRESENTING RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Longitudinal characteristics of: Model with and without horizontal tail. $\beta = 0^\circ$; varying $\delta_e$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Model at negative angles of attack. $\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ and $10^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Model with and without vertical tails. $\beta = 0^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Model with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_e = 0^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Model with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_e = -10^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Model with varying $\delta_e$ and with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_a = 0^\circ$; $\delta_v = -7.5^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Model with varying $\delta_e$ and with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_a = 20^\circ$; $\delta_v = 0^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Complete model. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$; $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ and $-10^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Model with speed brakes open. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Complete model. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$; $\delta_v = -7.5^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lateral-directional characteristics of: Model with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_a = 0^\circ$; $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ and $-10^\circ$; $\delta_v = 0^\circ$ and $-7.5^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Model with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = -5.1^\circ$; $\delta_a = 0^\circ$; $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ and $-10^\circ$; $\delta_v = 0^\circ$ and $-7.5^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Complete model. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Model without lower vertical tail. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Model without upper and lower vertical tails. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Model with speed brakes open. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Model with lower speed brakes open. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23     | Model with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_a = 0^\circ$ and $20^\circ$; $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ and $-10^\circ$; $\delta_v = 0^\circ$.
| 24     | Complete model. $\beta = -5.1^\circ$; $\delta_a = 0^\circ$ and $20^\circ$; $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ and $-10^\circ$; $\delta_v = 0^\circ$. |
| 25     | Summary curves:
Variation of lift-curve slopes with Mach number. |
| 26     | Variation of static longitudinal stability parameter with Mach number. |
| 27     | Variation of longitudinal control parameters with Mach number. |
| 28     | Variation of drag and maximum lift-drag-ratio parameters with Mach number. |
| 29     | Variation of directional stability parameter with Mach number. |
| 30     | Variation of effective dihedral parameter with Mach number. |
| 31     | Variation of lateral control parameters with Mach number. |
| 32     | Variation with Mach number of yawing moment due to vertical-tail deflection. |
| 33     | Variation with Mach number of rolling moment due to vertical-tail deflection. |
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Figure 1.- Photographs of 0.0667-scale model of X-15 installed in Langley 8-foot transonic pressure tunnel.
Figure 2.- Drawing of 0.0667-scale model of X-15 with speed brakes open. All dimensions are in inches unless otherwise noted.
Figure 3.- System of axes. Arrows indicate positive directions.
Figure 4. - Variation with Mach number of test Reynolds number based on \( \delta = 8.207 \) inches.
Figure 5.- Base pressure coefficients for complete model and for model without vertical tails. Surfaces undeflected unless otherwise noted. $\beta = 0^\circ$. 

$\begin{array}{c}
\text{Angle of attack, } \alpha, \text{deg} \\
\text{Base pressure coefficient, } C_{p,b}
\end{array}$
Figure 6.- Longitudinal characteristics of model with various $\delta_e$ and of model without horizontal tail; other surfaces undeflected. $\beta = 0^\circ$. 

(a) $M = 0.60$. 
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Figure 6.- Longitudinal characteristics of model with various $\delta_e$ and of model without horizontal tail; other surfaces undeflected. $\beta = 0^\circ$. 

(a) $M = 0.60$.
Figure 6.- Continued.

LIFT COEFFICIENT $C_L$ FOR $C_D$

(b) $M = 0.90$. 

Figure 6.- Continued.
(c) $M = 0.95$.

Figure 6—Continued.
(d) $M = 1.03$.

Figure 6.- Continued.
(e) $M = 1.18$.

Figure 6.- Continued.
Figure 6.- Concluded.
Figure 7.- Longitudinal characteristics of model at negative angles of attack. $\beta = 0^\circ; \delta_0 = 0^\circ$ and $10^\circ$; other surfaces undeflected.
(b) \( M = 0.90 \).

Figure 7. - Continued.
Figure 7 - Continued.

(c) $M = 0.95$. 

Drag coefficient, $C_D$

Pitching moment coefficient, $C_m$

Angle of attack, $\alpha$, deg
Figure 7.- Continued.

(d) $M = 1.03$. 
The diagram shows the relationship between lift coefficient ($C_L$) and pitching moment coefficient ($C_m$) for different angles of attack ($\alpha$, deg) and flap deflection ($\delta_\alpha$, deg) at $M = 1.18$.

Figure 7.- Concluded.
Figure 8.- Longitudinal characteristics of model and of model without vertical tails, surfaces undeflected. $\beta = 0\degree$. 

(a) $M = 0.60$. 

Figure 8. - Longitudinal characteristics of model and of model without vertical tails, surfaces undeflected. $\beta = 0\degree$. 

29
Figure 8.-- Continued.

(b) $M = 0.90$. 

Figure 8.-- Continued.
Figure 8.- Continued.

(c) $M = 0.95$. 

Figure 8.- Continued.
Figure 8.- Continued.

(d) $M = 1.03$. 

Lift coefficient, $C_L$

Drop coefficient, $C_D$

Pitching moment coefficient, $C_m$

- Complete model
- Lower vertical tail off
- Both vertical tails off
(e) $M = 1.18$.

Figure 8.—Concluded.
Figure 9.- Longitudinal characteristics of model with speed brakes open and closed; other surfaces undeflected. $eta = 0^\circ$. (a) $M = 0.60$. 
Figure 9.- Continued.

(b) $M = 0.90$.
Figure 9.- Continued.

(c) $M = 0.95$. 

(c) $M = 0.95$. 

Figure 9.- Continued.
(d) $M = 1.03$.

Figure 9—Continued.
Figure 9.- Concluded.
Figure 10.- Longitudinal characteristics of model with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_e = -10^\circ$; other surfaces undeflected.
(b) $M = 1.05$.

Figure 10.- Continued.
(c) \( M = 1.18 \).

Figure 10.- Concluded.
Figure 11.- Longitudinal characteristics of model with various $\delta_\theta$ and with speed brakes open and closed.

$\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_\theta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_\gamma = -7.5^\circ$.

(a) $M = 0.60$. 
Figure 11. Continued.

(b) $M = 0.90$. 

Figure 11.- Continued.
Figure 11.- Continued.

\( (c) M = 0.95 \).

\( \theta_0 \text{deg} \) Brakes

\( \circ \ 0 \) Closed

\( \square -10 \) Closed

\( \alpha \text{deg} \) Angle of attack

\( C_{m} \) Pitching-moment coefficient

\( C_{L} \) Lift coefficient

\( C_{D} \) Drag coefficient
(d) $M = 1.03$.

Figure 11.- Continued.
Figure 11.- Concluded.

(e) $M = 1.18$.
Figure 12.- Longitudinal characteristics of model with various $\delta_e$ and with speed brakes open and closed. 
$\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_a = 20^\circ$; $\delta_v = 0^\circ$. 

(a) $M = 0.60$. 

$\delta_e$ deg Brakes 
O 0 Closed 
-10 Closed
Figure 12.— Continued.

(b) $M = 0.90$. 

48
Figure 12.- Continued.

(c) $M = 0.95$. 

Figure 12.- Continued.
(d) \( M = 1.03 \).

Figure 12.- Continued.
(e) $M = 1.18$.

Figure 12.- Concluded.
Figure 13.- Longitudinal characteristics of complete model at $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$. $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ and $-10^\circ$; other surfaces undeflected.
Figure 15.- Continued.

(b) $M = 0.90.$

Figure 15.- Continued.
(c) $M = 0.95$.

Figure 13.- Continued.
Lift coefficient, $C_L$ for $C_m$ and $a$

Figure 13.- Continued.

(a) $M = 1.03$. 
Figure 13.— Concluded.

(e) $M = 1.18$. 

56
Figure 14.- Longitudinal characteristics of complete model with speed brakes open; other surfaces undeflected. \( \beta = 0^\circ \) and \(-5.1^\circ\).
Figure 14.— Continued.

(b) $M = 1.05$.
Figure 14.- Concluded.

(c) $M = 1.18$.

Figure 14.- Concluded.
Figure 15.- Longitudinal characteristics of complete model at $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$. $\delta_y = -7.5^\circ$; other surfaces undeflected.
Figure 15.- Continued.

(b) $M = 0.90$.

Figure 15.- Continued.
Figure 15.- Continued.

(c) $M = 0.95$. 

Figure 15.- Continued.
(d) $M = 1.03$.

Figure 15.- Continued.
Figure 15.- Concluded.

(e) \( M = 1.18 \).
Figure 16.- Lateral-directional characteristics of complete model with various $\delta_{e}$ and $\delta_{v}$ and with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_{a} = 0^\circ$.

(a) $M = 0.60$ and $0.90$. 

\[ \text{M} = 0.60 \]

\[ \text{M} = 0.90 \]
Figure 16.- Continued.

(b) $M = 0.95$ and $1.05$. 

Figure 16.- Continued.
(c) $M = 1.18$.

Figure 16.- Concluded.
Figure 17.- Lateral-directional characteristics of complete model with various $\delta_x$ and $\delta_y$ and with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = -5.1^\circ$; $\delta_n = 0^\circ$. 

(a) $M = 0.60$. 
(b) $M = 0.90$.

Figure 17.- Continued.
Figure 17.- Continued.

(c) $M = 0.95$. 

Figure 17.- Continued.
(d) $M = 1.03$.

Figure 17.- Continued.
Figure 17.- Concluded.

(e) $M = 1.18$. 
Figure 18.- Lateral-directional characteristics of complete model with surfaces undeflected.  
$\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$.
(b) \( M = 0.95 \) and 1.03.

Figure 18.- Continued.
Figure 18.- Concluded.

(c) $M = 1.18$.
Figure 19. Lateral-directional characteristics of model without lower vertical tail and with other surfaces undeflected. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$. 

(a) $M = 0.60$ and 0.90.
(b) $M = 0.95$ and 1.03.

Figure 19.—Continued.
Figure 19.- Concluded.

(c) $M = 1.18$.
Figure 20.- Lateral-directional characteristics of model without both vertical tails and with other surfaces undeflected. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$.
(b) $M = 0.95$ and 1.03.

Figure 20.- Continued.
(c) $M = 1.18$.

Figure 20.—Concluded.
(a) $M = 0.90$ and $1.03$.

Figure 21.- Lateral-directional characteristics of complete model with speed brakes open; other surfaces undeflected. $\beta = 0^\circ$ and $-5.1^\circ$. 
Figure 21.- Concluded.

(b) $M = 1.18$. 

Figure 21.- Concluded.
Figure 22.- Lateral-directional characteristics of complete model with lower speed brakes open; other surfaces undeflected. \( \beta = 0^\circ \) and \(-5.1^\circ\).
Figure 22.- Concluded.
Figure 23.- Lateral-directional characteristics of complete model with various $\delta_r$ and $\delta_e$, and with speed brakes open and closed. $\beta = 0^\circ$; $\delta_y = 0^\circ$. 

(a) $M = 0.60$ and $0.90$. 
(b) $M = 0.95$ and 1.03.

Figure 23.- Continued.
Figure 23. Concluded.

(c) $M = 1.18$. 

*Figure 23.* Concluded.
Figure 24.- Lateral-directional characteristics of complete model with various $\delta_a$ and $\delta_e$; other surfaces undeflected. $\beta = -5.1^\circ$. 

(a) $M = 0.60$. 
(b) $M = 0.90$.

Figure 24.- Continued.
Figure 24. - Continued.

(c) $M = 0.95$. 

Figure 24. - Continued.
Angle of attack, $\alpha$, deg

M=1.03

(d) $M = 1.03$. Figure 24.- Continued.
(e) $M = 1.18$.

Figure 24.-- Concluded.
Figure 25. Variation with Mach number of lift-curve slopes. Surfaces undeflected unless otherwise noted. $\beta = 0^\circ$. 
Figure 26.- Variation with Mach number of static longitudinal stability parameter. Surfaces undeflected unless otherwise noted. $\beta = 0^\circ$. 
Figure 27.- Variation with Mach number of longitudinal control parameters for complete model at $\beta = 0^\circ$. Surfaces other than horizontal tail undeflected.
Figure 28.- Variation with Mach number of drag and maximum lift-drag-ratio parameters for complete model at $\beta = 0^\circ$. Surfaces undeflected unless otherwise noted.
Figure 29.- Variation with Mach number of static directional stability parameter. Surfaces undeflected unless otherwise noted.
Figure 30.- Variation with Mach number of effective dihedral parameter. Surfaces undeflected unless otherwise noted.
Figure 31.- Variation with Mach number of lateral control parameters for complete model at $\beta = 0^\circ$. Surfaces undeflected except for horizontal tail as a roll control.
Figure 32.- Variation with Mach number of yawing moment due to vertical-tail deflection for complete model at $\beta = 0^\circ$. Horizontal surfaces undeflected.
Figure 33.- Variation with Mach number of rolling moment due to vertical-tail deflection for complete model at $\beta = 0^\circ$. Horizontal surfaces undeflected.