

CF pps.

CIOBGT



DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL ARCHITECTURE & OCEAN ENGINEERING

John Elder Professor
DOUGLAS FAULKNER, F.Eng.
Tel: 041-330 4322

The University
Glasgow G12 8QQ
Telex: 777070 UNIGLA
Tel: 041-339 8855

DF/IPC 7/5

24th July, 1986.

Dear Mr. Wicks,

Short Fat vs Long-Thin Frigates

Thank you for your letter of 13th June 1986 on behalf of the Prime Minister on the above subject.

I enclose a copy of some further correspondence I have sent to the Sunday Times so that you are kept informed of my continued interest in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

D. Faulkner

D. Faulkner

N.L. Wicks, Esq.,
Principal Private Secretary,
Prime Minister's Office,
10 Downing Street,
LONDON.

Encl.



DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL ARCHITECTURE & OCEAN ENGINEERING

John Elder Professor
DOUGLAS FAULKNER, F.Eng.
Tel: 041-330 4322

The University
Glasgow G12 8QQ
Telex: 777070 UNIGLA
Tel: 041-339 8855

DF/IPC 7/5

23rd July, 1986.

Dear Sir,

I sincerely hope you will publish the enclosed letter in full. In case you too think that there is a wicked plot against Mr. Giles and that I am a part of it, let me indicate my sincerity by declaring unequivocally my hope that this controversy is resolved quickly one way or the other for once and for all. I have put my own experimental facilities at the disposal of the Cabinet Office inquiry.

As a measure of my own professional standing and ethics let me add, since my own beliefs are very evident, that I would happily resign from this the first and most famous Chair of Naval Architecture, if any independent and qualified inquiry were to find that Giles is right. I hope you will understand why I have been hard on the press and media.

Yours sincerely,

Douglas Faulkner

D Faulkner

The Editor,
Sunday Times,
Pennington Street,
The Highway,
Wapping,
LONDON,
E1 9XW.

Encl.



DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL ARCHITECTURE & OCEAN ENGINEERING

John Elder Professor
DOUGLAS FAULKNER, F.Eng.
Tel: 041-330 4322

The University
Glasgow G12 8QQ
Telex: 777070 UNIGLA
Tel: 041-339 8855

DF/IPC 7/5

23rd July, 1986.

The Editor,
Sunday Times,
Pennington Street,
The Highway,
Wapping,
LONDON, E1 9XW.

Dear Sir,

SHORT-FAT VS. LONG-THIN FRIGATES

It is sad to see a great paper like yours continuing to sensationalise this protracted and expensive, but quite silly controversy. Robin Morgan's emotional and biased 1983 article "Sinking of a Dream Warship" presented David Giles as the underdog versus the establishment when the long-thin Type 23 frigate was ordered instead of the Thornycroft, Giles and Associates S-90 short-fat design. Now we are treated to Askold Krushelnicky's "MOD Man Used False Name" article which smeared Captain Llardet and the MOD with such phrases as "dirty tricks", "intolerable interference", "long-held prejudices" and so on.

Why should Captain Llardet be pressed to "admit" that he has written under a nom de plume? Is this not, in any case, accepted practice for personal or policy reasons? It is certainly in keeping with the policy of reputable papers to protect sources at all costs. Why should Giles and his associates alone have the total freedom of the press and media, whilst those really in the know have to "defend themselves"? Where is the underdog now? - laughing up his sleeve, I suggest, whilst he basks in the protection of the press. We have seen the media and the press present a battle between the slick promoter and the Navy's professional engineers, and the latter have lost because their arguments are factual and unsensational. David Giles has appeared as the victim, but let me inform your readers that they as the tax-payers and the MOD are the victims of his skillful exploitation of our peculiar British weaknesses including the cult of the gifted amateur. Your readers may also wish to know there was not a single qualified engineer on the Hill-Norton committee nor is Giles himself an accredited naval architect.

Giles's vindictive attack on the MOD's Chief Naval Architect (an extremely able man with one of the most open minds in the business) led to his resignation, which is an injustice of the very gravest kind and a great loss to the Navy. The culminating insult now is that Professor John Caldwell has resigned from chairmanship of the proposed Government inquiry because Lord Hill-Norton and Mr. Giles contend that he could not be impartial. But Professor Caldwell's connections with any of the parties involved were in the past. If these two gentlemen had been intimately associated with modern naval architecture developments and with current professional activities, they would have known that Professor Caldwell is not only respected worldwide for his knowledge but also for his impeccable integrity and impartiality to his science/

science and to professional ethics and events. Not for nothing do you rise to being President of The Royal Institution of Naval Architects. If Giles and Hill-Norton were sincere in their wishes for this inquiry (and I am now beginning to doubt this) then they should have thanked their lucky stars that Professor Caldwell had been approached and was willing to give his valuable time to this quite thankless task.

Well the time has come for someone to speak a few home truths and explode one or two of the more ridiculous myths perpetrated by Giles. First, the design is not radical with its low length/beam ratio. The Navy over the years has used a wide range of forms which have values appreciably greater than the type 23 to some which are even lower than that proposed by Giles, so where are the "closed minds"? Secondly, the Hill-Norton inquiry in defending Giles's claim for lower resistance suggested the Navy were overlooking the hydrodynamic lift that a short-fat hull can provide. The Navy do not overlook such well known possibilities but to imply that any worthwhile lift could be achieved on a frigate size vessel with moderate power is a blatant exposure of one's ignorance. Giles's earlier claims for doubling the armament while costs are halved ("twice the bangs for half the bucks" being the 1983 catch-phrase) is another absurdity. The ultimate one was a drawing in a Sunday newspaper showing what purports to be the S-90 with six sea Harriers embarked in a hangar. Yet this is the man we are supposed to take seriously.

To give Giles some credit, if one lists the several attractions of the S-90 design they outweigh in number its disadvantages. I believe this may be the crux of the dilemma as politicians and laymen are easily beguiled by such paper arguments, particularly when the tax-payer's money appears to be at stake. The fact is that two of the disadvantages are overriding. These may be itemised as: higher total cost which must include lifetime fuel bills, lower fighting efficiency because of poorer ship motions and seakeeping (I am aware of the one-tenth scale so called comparative tests), and lower damage tolerance. These would seem to most people to be rather important disadvantages in a ship that may at times have to fight. Of course Britain badly needs the entrepreneurial spirit of men like Giles but only the highest technical skills will beat our competitors and win wars.

The Cabinet Office are now placed in a nearly impossible position and it would be their just desserts if Hill-Norton and Giles were told now that enough is enough. To avoid more dirty tricks charges, let me state openly that I am copying this letter to the Cabinet Office who have corresponded with me over the inquiry. It would be a disgrace to this great maritime nation if we are forced to consider a foreign based inquiry. You in the press and the media must take the major blame for allowing Giles to exploit you to this extent.

Yours sincerely,

Douglas Faulkner

Professor Douglas Faulkner
FEng. FRINA. FStructE. MSNAME

The Editor,
Sunday Times,
LONDON, E1 8XW.

FORWARDED BY MAIL
REGISTERED MAIL
BY AIR

LEWIS & CLARK COLLEGE, WASHINGTON
PROFESSOR DONALD L. LINDSAY

Dear Sir:

I have been thinking of writing you for some time but have been too busy to do so. I am sorry to hear that you are not well and hope you will soon be back to your normal state of health. I am sure you will be able to handle the work of the college in the meantime.

I have been thinking of writing you for some time but have been too busy to do so. I am sorry to hear that you are not well and hope you will soon be back to your normal state of health. I am sure you will be able to handle the work of the college in the meantime.

I have been thinking of writing you for some time but have been too busy to do so. I am sorry to hear that you are not well and hope you will soon be back to your normal state of health. I am sure you will be able to handle the work of the college in the meantime.

I have been thinking of writing you for some time but have been too busy to do so. I am sorry to hear that you are not well and hope you will soon be back to your normal state of health. I am sure you will be able to handle the work of the college in the meantime.

I have been thinking of writing you for some time but have been too busy to do so. I am sorry to hear that you are not well and hope you will soon be back to your normal state of health. I am sure you will be able to handle the work of the college in the meantime.

