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STABILITY CHARACTERISTICS OF TWO MISSILES OF FINENESS RATIOS 12 AND 18 WITH SIX RECTANGULAR FINS OF VERY LOW ASPECT RATIO OVER A MACH NUMBER RANGE OF 1.4 TO 3.2*

By Allen B. Henning

SUMMARY

Two rocket-propelled missiles have been test flown by the Langley Pilotless Aircraft Research Division in order to study the stability characteristics of a body with six rectangular fins of very low aspect ratio. The fins, which had exposed aspect ratios of approximately 0.04 and 0.02 per fin, were mounted on bodies of fineness ratios of 12 and 18, respectively. Each body had a nose with a fineness ratio of 3.5 and a cylindrical afterbody. The body and the fin chord of the model having a fineness ratio of 12 were extended the length of 6 body diameters to produce the model with a fineness ratio of 18. The missiles were disturbed in flight by pulse rockets in order to obtain the stability data. The tests were performed over a Mach number range of 1.4 to 3.2 and a Reynolds number range of $2 \times 10^6$ to $21 \times 10^6$.

The results of these tests indicate that these configurations with the long rectangular fins of very low aspect ratio showed little induced roll, with the missile of highest fineness ratio and longest fin chord exhibiting the least amount. Extending the body and fin chord of the shorter missile six body diameters and thereby increasing the fin area approximately 115 percent increased the lift-curve slope based on body cross-sectional area approximately 40 to 55 percent, increased the dynamic stability by a substantial amount, and increased the drag from 14 to 33 percent throughout the comparable Mach number range. The center-of-pressure location of both missiles remained constant over the Mach number range.

*Title, Unclassified.
Wings of medium aspect ratio or stabilizing fins have been used to provide the necessary aerodynamic forces required for maneuvering flight for most of the guided missiles. In order to reduce the frontal packaging size and make a more compact missile, the use of fins of very low aspect ratio has been considered. Wind-tunnel studies have been conducted on wing-body combinations with wings of very low aspect ratio in reference 1, on combinations of bodies and wings of low aspect ratio in reference 2, and on missiles with low-span longitudinal strips placed along the body in reference 3. To investigate the presence and the degree of induced roll on winged configurations of low aspect ratio a study has been conducted by the Langley Pilotless Aircraft Research Division on rocket-propelled free-flight configurations having either highly swept wings, flared skirts, or rectangular wings.

An investigation of the stability characteristics of two configurations, each employing six rectangular fins of very low aspect ratio on a cylindrical afterbody, is reported herein. The two rocket-propelled free-flight missiles had body fineness ratios of 12 and 18, with exposed-fin aspect ratios of 0.04 and 0.02 per fin, respectively.

The two missiles were test flown in a Mach number range of 1.4 to 3.2 and a Reynolds number range of $2 \times 10^6$ to $21 \times 10^6$ at the Pilotless Aircraft Research Station at Wallops Island, Va.

**SYMBOLS**

All coefficients are based on the body cross-sectional area and the body diameter.

- $a_N$: normal acceleration, g units
- $a_T$: transverse acceleration, g units
- $A_F$: body cross-sectional or frontal area, 0.267 sq ft
- $b$: total fin span, ft
- $c$: fin chord, ft
- $C_N$: normal-force coefficient
- $C_Y$: side-force coefficient
resultant-force coefficient

longitudinal-force coefficient

pitching-moment coefficient

yawing-moment coefficient

normal-force-curve slope, \( \frac{\partial C_N}{\partial \alpha} \) or \( \frac{\partial C_N}{\partial \Delta \alpha} \), per deg

side-force-curve slope, \( \frac{\partial C_Y}{\partial \beta} \) or \( \frac{\partial C_Y}{\partial \Delta \beta} \), per deg

pitch-damping derivative, \( \frac{\partial C_m}{\partial \frac{\delta d}{2V}} \)

static stability derivative, \( \frac{\partial C_m}{\partial \alpha} \)

minimum drag coefficient

body diameter, 0.583 ft

acceleration due to gravity, ft/sec²

moment of inertia about Y- or Z-axis, slug-ft²

moment of inertia about X-axis, slug-ft²

body length, ft

Mach number

mass, slugs

rolling velocity, radians/sec

average period of oscillation, sec

dynamic pressure, lb/sq ft

nose-coordinate radius, in.
Reynolds number per foot

time, sec

velocity, ft/sec
distance along body measured from nose, in. or ft

body coordinate axis

angle of attack, deg

angle of sideslip, deg
time rate of change of angle of attack, radians/sec
time rate of change of angle of sideslip, radians/sec

angle of attack from integration of \( \dot{\alpha} \)

angle of sideslip from integration of \( \dot{\beta} \)
pitching velocity, radians/sec

yawing velocity, radians/sec

rolling velocity, radians/sec

pitching acceleration, radians/sec²

yawing acceleration, radians/sec²

basic oscillation frequency, radians/sec

nonrolling damping constant, l/sec
damping constant due to roll, l/sec
component of total pitch frequency resulting directly from roll, radians/sec

Subscript:
c.g. center of gravity

A dot over a symbol indicates the first derivative with respect to time. Two dots indicate the second derivative.
MODELS

Sketches of the two test missiles showing configuration characteristics and dimensions are presented in figure 1, and photographs of these missiles are shown in figure 2. Also presented in figure 1 are the geometric and mass characteristics for both missiles. The coordinates for the nose section are presented in table I.

The two missiles (referred to herein as model 1 and model 2) were constructed of aluminum alloy, and each had a nose with a fineness ratio of 3.5 and a straight cylindrical afterbody. Six rectangular, thin, aluminum-alloy fins of very low aspect ratio were welded to the cylindrical afterbody. Model 1 had a body length of 12 diameters, a fin chord of 5.14 body diameters, and a total fin span of 1.44 body diameters. Model 2 was similar, except that the body and fin chord lengths were increased 6 diameters to a fineness ratio of 10 and a fin chord of 11.14 body diameters.

The models were disturbed in flight by six pulse rockets that were placed around the body midway between each adjacent pair of fins and positioned to fire in such a direction as to place their lines of thrust through the center line of the model. The longitudinal location of the pulse rockets was near the rear of model 1 and approximately 5/6 the length of the body from the nose of model 2.

A scale model of model 1, shown in figure 3, was flown in conjunction with this investigation in order to obtain drag data for the preliminary calculations. This scale model was tested by the helium-gun technique described in detail in reference 4.

INSTRUMENTATION AND TESTS

The two models used in this investigation had the same instrumentation. Seven instruments, of which three were accelerometers, three were rate gyros, and one was a pressure cell, measured the normal acceleration, lateral acceleration, longitudinal acceleration, rate of pitch, rate of yaw, rate of roll, and total pressure. The flight data measured by the instruments were relayed from the model to the ground station by the standard NACA telemetering system.

Each model was propelled to flight-test velocity by a Nike booster rocket motor. A photograph of the model-booster combination mounted on the launcher prior to firing is presented in figure 4. After burnout of the booster, the model and the booster separated from each other because of the difference in the drag-to-weight ratios. Velocity and flight-path
data were obtained from CW Doppler radar and SCR 584 tracking radar, respectively. The maximum Mach number obtained by models 1 and 2 was 5.34 and 5.03, respectively. Atmospheric data were obtained from a rawinsonde sent aloft with a balloon immediately after each test flight. The Reynolds numbers and dynamic pressures obtained throughout these test flights are presented in Figure 5.

The six pulse rockets were programmed to fire in a timed sequence after the model-booster separation. The first two were fired in succession in the vertical plane the second two in a plane inclined 60° to the right of vertical, and the third two in a plane inclined 60° to the left of vertical when referenced from the rear of the model. The resulting programming gave six disturbances from the pulse rockets and one disturbance from the model-booster separation, or seven disturbances or pulses throughout the test Mach number range. Hereafter, these pulses are referred to as separation pulse, first pulse, second pulse, and so forth.

**ACCURACY**

The systematic errors of the measured quantities caused by the instrument inaccuracies are given in the following table in coefficient form for the forces involved and in radians per second for the rate measurements. The errors are given as incremental errors, and the tabulated coefficients are based on the body cross-sectional area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = 2.0</td>
<td>M = 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_N$</td>
<td>±0.144</td>
<td>±0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_Y$</td>
<td>±0.144</td>
<td>±0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_X$</td>
<td>±0.096</td>
<td>±0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\dot{\theta}$</td>
<td>±4</td>
<td>±4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\dot{\psi}$</td>
<td>±4</td>
<td>±4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\dot{\phi}$</td>
<td>±1.2</td>
<td>±1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The random errors are much smaller than these tabulated systematic errors and may be determined by the scatter of the data. In the calculation of $C_{N\Delta\alpha}$, $C_{Y\Delta\beta}$, $\frac{dC_m}{dC_N}$, and $\frac{dC_n}{dC_Y}$ the systematic, random, and other errors
introduced during the integration and differentiation processes are lessened and perhaps cancelled out when the slope is determined. The errors in Mach number and dynamic pressure are on the order of ±1 percent.

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The body axes coordinate system is used in analyzing the data obtained from the flight tests of the two models. This axes system is shown in figure 6. Also included in figure 6 is the sign convention showing the positive directions of the various quantities used herein.

The time histories of models 1 and 2 are shown in figures 7 and 8 for each pulse-rocket and booster-separation disturbance. The variation with time of the normal- and side-force coefficients; the pitch, yaw, and roll rate; and the Mach number, along with a cross plot of the normal- and the side-force coefficients are presented in these figures. The data plotted herein were continuously measured and recorded throughout the flight and read at intervals of 0.01 second, but in order to permit easier reading of the figures only the faired values of the measured quantities are shown.

In analyzing the data obtained from the instruments of the flight models, the following applications were used: (1) The normal-force- and side-force-curve slopes were determined from the pitch and yaw rates, (2) The pitching-moment and the yawing-moment coefficients were calculated from the pitch and yaw rates, and (3) The static and dynamic stability derivatives were computed from the cross plots of the normal-force and side-force coefficients (ref. 5).

The rates of pitch and yaw, along with the normal and transverse accelerations, were used to calculate the time rate of change of angle of attack and the time rate of change of angle of sideslip. These relationships were determined thusly;

\[
\dot{\alpha} = \dot{\theta} - \frac{a_{n_{c.g.}} g}{V} - \dot{\phi}\beta
\]

and

\[
\dot{\beta} = -\dot{\psi} + \frac{a_{n_{c.g.}} g}{V} + \dot{\phi}\alpha
\]
where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are approximated by $\frac{C_N}{C_{N\alpha}}$ and $\frac{C_Y}{C_{Y\beta}}$, respectively, by using theoretical calculations for $C_{N\alpha}$ and $C_{Y\beta}$. The $\dot{\alpha}$ and $\dot{\beta}$ curves were plotted against time and then integrated about arbitrary axes which, in this case, were their zero axes. Since these arbitrary axes are not necessarily the correct axes about which to integrate, an integration constant correction had to be made to give the integration results, $\Delta \alpha$ and $\Delta \beta$ curves, their correct slopes. It is assumed in the case of a symmetrical missile that at the time the normal-force coefficient $C_N$ is equal to zero the angle of attack $\alpha$ is also equal to zero. The $\Delta \alpha$ curve is then corrected for this assumption by integrating $\dot{\alpha}$ about the corrected axis. This assumption holds for the side-force coefficient $C_Y$ and the angle of sideslip $\beta$, in that $C_Y = 0$ when $\beta = 0$, and then the $\Delta \beta$ curve is corrected by integrating $\dot{\beta}$ about the corrected axis. The resulting $\Delta \alpha$ and $\Delta \beta$ curves are plotted, respectively, with $C_N$ and $C_Y$, and their slopes are the normal-force-curve slope $C_{N\alpha}$ and the side-force-curve slope $C_{Y\beta}$. An example of a typical variation of $C_N$ with $\Delta \alpha$ and $C_Y$ with $\Delta \beta$ for model 1 is shown in figure 9. Even though the integration does not give the exact numerical values of $\alpha$ and $\beta$, it provides a suitable value for the determination of the normal-force-curve slope $C_{N\alpha}$ and the side-force-curve slope $C_{Y\beta}$ (referred to as $C_{N\alpha}$ and $C_{Y\beta}$, respectively).

The pitching-moment coefficient $C_m$ and the yawing-moment coefficient $C_n$ were calculated by using the following relationships:

$$C_m = \left( \frac{I}{qAFd} \right) (\ddot{\theta} - \dot{\phi} \dot{\psi})$$

and

$$C_n = \left( \frac{I}{qAFd} \right) (\dot{\psi} + \dot{\phi} \dot{\theta})$$

where the pitch acceleration $\ddot{\theta}$ and the yaw acceleration $\dot{\psi}$ were obtained by differentiating the $\dot{\theta}$ and $\dot{\psi}$ curves with respect to time. The resultant quantities of $C_m$ and $C_n$ were then plotted against $C_N$ and $C_Y$. The average slopes of these curves were measured to obtain a
value of $\frac{dC_m}{dC_N}$ and $\frac{dC_n}{dC_Y}$. The center of pressure or aerodynamic-center location in percent of body length is calculated by using the equation:

$$c.p. = \left[ \frac{x_{c.g.}}{l} - \frac{dC_m}{dC_N} \right] \times 100$$

or

$$c.p. = \left[ \frac{x_{c.g.}}{l} - \frac{dC_n}{dC_Y} \right] \times 100$$

The method employed to extract the stability derivatives from the oscillations of these models is described in detail in reference 5. In this method it is assumed that the models are symmetrical, that they have a constant trim point, and that the rate of roll is constant. The cross plot of $C_N$ and $C_Y$ is utilized to determine the stability roots which are the basic oscillation frequency $\omega_0$, the nonrolling damping constant $\lambda_0$, the damping constant due to roll $\Delta \lambda$, and the component of the total pitch frequency resulting directly from roll $\Delta \omega$. In all cases $\Delta \omega$ was determined from the average roll rate for each pulse by using equation 16 of reference 5 where $\Delta \omega = \omega \left( 1 - \frac{I_x}{2I} \right)$. The stability roots were calculated for both model 1 and model 2 and are presented in table II. The method presented in reference 6 was also incorporated in the data reduction, and these results are also shown. By using the following equations, $C_{mq}$ and $C_{m\alpha}$ can be determined:

$$C_{mq} = \left[ \frac{2I}{(qApd)} \lambda_0 + \frac{57.3C_NaI}{mVd} \right] \left( \frac{2q}{d} \right)$$

and

$$C_{m\alpha} = -\left( \frac{I}{qApd} \right) \left[ \omega_0^2 + \lambda_0^2 - \Delta \lambda^2 - \frac{(Ix)^2}{2I} (\Delta \omega)^2 \right] - \frac{57.3C_NaC_{mq} qApd}{2mV^2}$$
Values measured for $C_{N\alpha}$ by the previous method may be compared with values determined by using the following equation which utilizes the stability roots computed from the cross plots of $C_N$ and $C_Y$

$$C_{N\alpha} = \left(\frac{1}{dC_m} \left[ \frac{I}{qA_p d(57.3)} \right] \left[ \omega_c^2 + \lambda_c^2 - \Delta \lambda^2 + \Delta \omega^2 \frac{I_x(1 - \frac{I_x}{2L})}{I} \left(1 - \frac{I_x}{4I} \right)^2 \right] \right)$$

In order to reduce the data by the method of reference 5, a constant trim point had to be selected for each pulse, and from this point the resultant coefficient $C_R$ was determined. The trim points for each pulse of model 1 were located at some small value of $+C_N$ and $+C_Y$ to indicate that the model had a trim level at some small resultant angle of attack. Similarly, for model 2, a constant trim point was selected for each pulse, but in this case the trim point was at a higher $+C_N$ and $+C_Y$ position and indicated that the model trimmed at a higher resultant angle of attack. This trim position remained in the same cross-plot quadrant throughout the flight, with the resultant angle-of-attack magnitude decreasing with decreasing Mach number, especially in the fifth and sixth pulses.

The data from the separation pulse and the first pulse of model 2 could not be completely determined. Observation of the telemeter record indicates that the booster rocket motor interfered with the model flight during separation up to the flight time of 3.9 seconds. The remaining portion of this separation disturbance was not long enough for good analysis, and because of the early firing of the second pulse rocket, the disturbance from the first pulse rocket was too short for any analysis; therefore, the stability roots could not be determined from these two model disturbances.

A comparison of the cross plots of figures 7 and 8 with similar cross plots of reference 5 shows that at no time during the test flight did the models approach a resonant condition, where $\frac{\Delta \omega}{\omega_c} = 1.0$. Throughout the flights of both models the roll rates were small, and the greatest value of $\frac{\Delta \omega}{\omega_c}$ was of the order of 0.2.

The results of the data analysis are presented in figures 10 to 16.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Induced Roll

When a symmetrical missile is at some angle of attack the asymmetrical flow about the missile can impart an induced roll to the configuration. In order to establish the amount of roll induced into the configuration, the rates of roll of the two test models were measured and the time histories of the roll rates are included in Figures 7 and 8. In the design of these models the pulse rockets were placed to fire normal to and through the center line of each model, but because of construction tolerances the pulse rockets could be slightly misaligned to produce a roll at the time of firing; therefore, at the beginning of each pulse the model had some roll, either positive or negative. Any increase in the roll rate after the pulse rocket had finished firing could be considered as being induced by configuration or flow asymmetries. When observing the roll-rate time histories of Figures 7 and 8 it is noted that there is no constant roll buildup in any one direction, which signifies that roll induced by the configuration asymmetries is small; therefore, it is assumed that the majority of the roll-rate increase with time, positive or negative, would be induced by the flow asymmetries. A decrease of the roll rate probably would be caused by the roll damping of the configuration, but an increase probably would signify aerodynamically induced roll. In all cases the roll rate is low and any change due to induced roll, that is, increasing roll magnitude either positive or negative, is small. In general, these configurations with the long rectangular fins of very low aspect ratio showed little induced roll, and the model of highest fineness ratio and longest fin chord exhibited the least amount.

Normal- and Side-Force-Curve Slopes

The variation with Mach number of the normal-force-curve slope and the side-force-curve slope for models 1 and 2 is presented in Figure 10(a) and 10(b), respectively. Also included in Figure 10 are some referenced test data for a model similar to model 1 and for body-alone tests for tangent-ogive-nose-cylinder afterbody models with overall fineness ratios of 12 and 18. Theoretical calculations from Reference 7 for similar configurations are also presented as a check on the validity of the test data.

The \( C_{N\Delta \alpha} \) and \( C_{Y\Delta \beta} \) points for each model show no appreciable difference, other than scatter, between the overall \( C_{N\alpha} \) and \( C_{Y\beta} \) levels and thus indicate that the symmetrical-model assumption is valid; therefore, under this assumption, \( C_{N\Delta \alpha} = C_{Y\Delta \beta} \) and one line is shown faired through
the scattered $CN_\alpha$ and $Cy_\beta$ points to represent the variation of the normal-force-curve slope with Mach number. The faired line of model 1 for $CN_\alpha$ compares favorably with the theoretical calculations, but that of model 2 has an unfavorable comparison in that the theoretical curve is 11 to 16 percent higher than the faired values of the calculated points. These data for model 2 could be expected to be of a higher value because cross plots of model 2 show that the model trimmed at high values of $CN$ and $Cy$ and, therefore, indicate the trim to be at some angle of attack other than zero, which according to the normal-force-curve characteristics of this type of configuration would increase the $CN_\alpha$ to the value corresponding to the trim angle of attack.

Another means of calculating $CN_\alpha$ explained in "Presentation of Data and Method of Analysis" utilizes the stability roots presented in table II. The results of this calculation are also tabulated in table II. By comparing these values with those of figure 10 it can be noted that the calculated values for model 1 are slightly lower but compare favorably with the plotted values, but for model 2 they vary considerably. These $CN_\alpha$ values are dependent on the $\frac{dCm}{dCN}$ values, that are presented in the "Center of Pressure" section, and any appreciable change in $\frac{dCm}{dCN}$ would change $CN_\alpha$. The $CN_\alpha$ values of figure 10 are the values referred to herein unless otherwise noted.

A $CN_\alpha$ test point from reference 8 for a model 14 body diameters long having 4 fins 5 diameters long and a total span of 1.5 diameters is used for comparison with model 1. This point is slightly lower in magnitude but presents a good comparison when it is considered that only 4 fins are involved. A visual comparison between data for similar models of references 8 and 9 with 4 and 6 fins was made, and it was noted that the model with 6 fins had an increase in $CN_\alpha$ of about 8 percent over the model with 4 fins; therefore, with a similar increase to the referenced point, the comparison shown in figure 10 would be even better.

The body-alone data of references 10 and 11 are presented herein as an aid in calculating the theoretical values of $CN_\alpha$ for both models and to show the increment of normal force contributed by the fins and the fin-body interference. By comparing the body-alone data with the test data it can be seen that a considerable increase in $CN_\alpha$ is
realized by adding these fins of very low aspect ratio to each of the bodies having fineness ratios of 12 and 18.

Finally, in comparing models 1 and 2 with each other it is shown that by increasing the length of the afterbody and fins of model 1 6 body diameters and thereby increasing the actual fin area approximately 115 percent increases the $C_{N_{\alpha}}$, based on body cross-sectional area, 40 to 55 percent over the comparable Mach number range.

Period and Damping of the Longitudinal Oscillation

The period of the longitudinal oscillation of models 1 and 2 throughout the test Mach number range is presented in figure 11. Each symboled point shown in the figure is the average period for each pulse and was obtained from the time-history oscillation of the resultant coefficient calculated from the cross plot of $C_N$ and $C_Y$ by the method of reference 5. The period curve of model 2 increases sharply at the low test Mach numbers, but it is not known whether model 1 shows this trend or not as no data were available at these Mach numbers. At comparable Mach numbers, the period of model 2 is approximately one-half that of model 1.

The exponential damping constant $\lambda_0$ for models 1 and 2 is presented in figure 12. The symboled points represent the data that were derived from the envelope of the resultant coefficient as explained in reference 5. Along with the data of model 1 are a few check points determined, whenever possible, by the method employed in reference 6. In comparing these two methods, a good agreement is in evidence for the few points checked. The damping data for model 2 above a Mach number of 2.6 were unobtainable because of the difficulties explained previously. The damping factor increases with an increase in Mach number, and model 2 shows a considerable increase over that of model 1.

The dynamic damping derivative $C_{mq}$ is a direct function of the damping factor, and its variation with Mach number is shown in figure 13. As can be seen by both figure 12 and figure 13 the damping of model 1 is low, but by adding 6 diameters of length to the body and fin chord and thereby approximately doubling the area of the fins, the damping is considerably increased throughout the test Mach number range.

Static Stability

The static stability derivative $C_{m_{\alpha}}$ is plotted against Mach number and presented in figure 14 for both models. These curves were derived by the equation shown in "Presentation of Data and Method of
Analysis" by using the stability roots given in table II. These plots show that the static stability of model 2 is much higher than that of model 1. The largest quantities in the calculation of $C_{m\alpha}$ are the oscillation frequency and the exponential damping factor, and, since for model 2 these quantities are quite high, the derived values of the static stability can become quite large also and thereby show a large increase in static stability for this model over that of model 1. This large increase can possibly be attributed to the increase in fin area, most of which is behind the center of gravity.

**Center of Pressure**

The $C_m$ and $C_n$ values were determined from calculations made by the method given in "Presentation of Data and Method of Analysis" and plotted against $C_N$ and $C_Y$, respectively. The resulting slopes $\frac{dC_m}{dC_N}$ and $\frac{dC_n}{dC_Y}$ represent the static margin of the missile or the distance from the center of pressure to the center of gravity, and these slopes are plotted against Mach number in figure 15(a) for models 1 and 2. Each symboled point represents either $\frac{dC_m}{dC_N}$ or $\frac{dC_n}{dC_Y}$ over the time of one pulse, and the dashed line represents the faired average of these points over the Mach number range. These average values were used to calculate, by the method discussed previously, the $C_{N\alpha}$ values that are given in table II. By utilizing the $C_{m\alpha}$ values from figure 14 and the $C_{N\alpha}$ values from figure 10 a comparison of $\frac{C_{m\alpha}}{C_{N\alpha}}$ is made with the data in figure 15(a). The $\frac{C_{m\alpha}}{C_{N\alpha}}$ of model 1 compares favorably with the $\frac{dC_m}{dC_N}$ and $\frac{dC_n}{dC_Y}$ values, but for model 2 the comparison is not as good.

The results of figure 15(a) are transformed into a ratio of center-of-pressure location to body length and presented in figure 15(b). Included in this figure is the center of pressure calculated from the theory of reference 7. The data of model 1 compare very well with the theory, but the data of model 2 show a center-of-pressure location somewhat forward of the predicted theory. The center of pressure of
Minimum Drag

The variation of the minimum-drag coefficient with Mach number is presented in figure 16 for both models. The test points shown were determined from the polars of the longitudinal-force coefficient $C_\text{x}$ and the resultant-force coefficient $C_R$, where $C_R = \sqrt{C_N^2 + C_Y^2}$. Since these models were assumed to be symmetrical, the minimum point was taken to be the point at which the resultant-force coefficient equaled zero. In some cases, particularly in the case of model 2, the polar curve had to be extrapolated to $C_R = 0$ because of the large minimum value of $C_R$; consequently, the accuracy of the drag curve for model 2, even though the polars were fairly flat, would not be as good as that of model 1. Included in the figure is the drag obtained from the helium-gun test of the scale model of model 1. A comparison of the drag of models 1 and 2 shows that model 2 had approximately 14 to 33 percent more drag than model 1 between the Mach numbers of 2 and 3. This increase in drag was mainly skin-friction drag due to the increased wetted area caused by elongating the body and increasing the fin area.

CONCLUSIONS

Two rocket-propelled missiles have been test flown in order to study the stability characteristics of a body with six rectangular fins of very low aspect ratio. The fins had aspect ratios of 0.04 and 0.02 and were mounted on bodies which had fineness ratios of 12 and 18, respectively. Each of the bodies had a nose with a fineness ratio of 3.5 and a cylindrical afterbody. The tests covered the Mach number range of 1.4 to 3.2.

From these tests the following conclusions have been made:

1. These configurations with the long rectangular fins of very low aspect ratio showed little induced roll, and the model of highest fineness ratio and longest fin chord exhibited the least amount.

2. Increasing the length of the afterbody and fins of the shorter model 6 body diameters and thereby increasing the actual fin area approximately 115 percent increases the $C_{N_\alpha}$ based on body cross-sectional area, 40 to 55 percent over the comparable Mach number range.
3. Lengthening the body and fins and thereby increasing the fin area increases the damping and, consequently, the dynamic stability by a substantial amount.

4. The center of pressure of each model is fairly constant throughout the test Mach number range.

5. Increasing the wetted area by elongating the body and fins increased the drag from 14 to 33 percent between Mach numbers of 2 and 3.

Langley Research Center,
National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
Langley Field, Va., October 1, 1958.
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TABLE I.- NOSE COORDINATES

x | r  
---|---
0  | 0.168  
.060 | 0.182  
.122 | 0.210  
.245 | 0.224  
.480 | 0.294  
.735 | 0.350  
1.225 | 0.462  
2.000 | 0.639  
2.450 | 0.735  
4.800 | 1.245  
7.350 | 1.721  
8.000 | 1.849  
9.800 | 2.155  
12.250 | 2.505  
13.125 | 2.608  
14.375 | 2.747  
14.700 | 2.785  
17.150 | 3.010  
19.600 | 3.220  
22.050 | 3.385  
24.500 | 3.500  
25.000 | 3.500
TABLE II.- VALUES OF STABILITY ROOTS AND $C_{N\alpha}$

[Determined by method of reference 5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pulse</th>
<th>$\omega_0$</th>
<th>$\lambda_0$</th>
<th>$\Delta\omega$</th>
<th>$\Delta\lambda$</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>$C_{N\alpha}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>18.59*</td>
<td>-2.39*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>-1.88*</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>-1.346</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>-0.385</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>-1.182</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>-1.12*</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>-0.910*</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>-0.716</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>-6.075</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>-3.620</td>
<td>-2.540</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>-2.887</td>
<td>-4.310</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>-1.570</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>-0.804</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values obtained by using method of reference 6.
Figure 1.- Dimensional drawing and mass characteristics of the low-aspect-ratio test missiles.
All linear dimensions are in inches.
Figure 3.- Drawing and photograph of scale model tested by helium-gun technique. All linear dimensions are in inches.
Figure 4. - Model 1 on launcher. L-57-845
Figure 5. - Variation of Reynolds number and dynamic pressure with Mach number.
Figure 6. Coordinate system and sign convention.
(a) Booster separation pulse.

Figure 7. Time histories of test flight of model 1.
(b) First rocket pulse.

Figure 7.—Continued.
Figure 7.- Continued.

(c) Second rocket pulse.
(d) Third rocket pulse.

Figure 7.- Continued.
(e) Fourth rocket pulse.

Figure 7.- Continued.
(f) Fifth rocket pulse.

Figure 7.- Continued.
(g) Sixth rocket pulse.

Figure 7.- Concluded.
(a) Booster separation pulse.

Figure 8.- Time histories of test flight of model 2.
(b) First rocket pulse.

Figure 8.- Continued.
(c) Second rocket pulse.

Figure 8.- Continued.
(d) Third rocket pulse.

Figure 8. - Continued.
(c) Fourth rocket pulse.

Figure 8.- Continued.
(f) Fifth rocket pulse.

Figure 8.- Continued.
(g) Sixth rocket pulse.

Figure 8.- Concluded.
Figure 9.- Typical variation of $C_N$ and $C_Y$ with $\Delta \alpha$ and $\Delta \beta$, respectively, for model 1.
Figure 10. - Variation of normal-force-curve slope and side-force-curve slope with Mach number. Reference data included from theory and body-alone tests.
Figure 11.- Variation of average period of oscillation with Mach number for models 1 and 2.
Figure 12. Variation of exponential damping constant with Mach number for models 1 and 2.
Figure 13. - Variation of damping derivative $C_{mq}$ with Mach number for models 1 and 2.
Figure 14.- Variation of static stability derivative with Mach number for models 1 and 2.
Figure 15.- Variation of center of pressure with Mach number for models 1 and 2.
Figure 16.- Variation of minimum drag coefficient of test models with Mach number.
1. Missiles - Components in Combination (1.7.2.1)
2. Stability, Static (1.8.1.1)
3. Stability, Dynamic (1.8.1.2)
4. Mass and Gyroscopic Problems (1.8.6)
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2. Stability, Static (1.8.1.1)
3. Stability, Dynamic (1.8.1.2)
4. Mass and Gyroscopic Problems (1.8.6)

The missiles were flight tested and were disturbed in flight by six pulse rockets over a Reynolds number range of $2 \times 10^6$ to $21 \times 10^6$. These free-flight missiles experienced little induced roll. Extending the body and fins of the shorter missile six diameters changed the fin aspect ratio from approximately 0.04 to approximately 0.02 and increased the value of the lift-curve slope, the dynamic stability, and the drag.

The missiles were flight tested and were disturbed in flight by six pulse rockets over a Reynolds number range of $2 \times 10^6$ to $21 \times 10^6$. These free-flight missiles experienced little induced roll. Extending the body and fins of the shorter missile six diameters changed the fin aspect ratio from approximately 0.04 to approximately 0.02 and increased the value of the lift-curve slope, the dynamic stability, and the drag.