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An investigation has been made in the high Mach number test section of the Langley Unitary Plan wind tunnel on a variable-geometry high hypersonic performance spacecraft concept at Mach numbers from 2.30 to 4.63. The basic lifting body is designed for hypersonic lift-drag ratio near 3.0. The variable-geometry feature is a single-pivot two-position high wing which is deployed at subsonic speeds to improve vehicle landing characteristics. For the present investigation the wing was maintained in a stowed position, and the effects of horizontal stabilizer dihedral, elevon control effectiveness, and the addition of either a conventional single vertical tail or dorsal-fin-type vertical stabilizers on the longitudinal and lateral-directional stability and control characteristics were studied.
An investigation has been made in the high Mach number test section of the Langley Unitary Plan wind tunnel on a variable-geometry high hypersonic performance spacecraft concept at Mach numbers from 2.30 to 4.63. The basic lifting body is designed for hypersonic lift-drag ratio near 3.0. The variable-geometry feature is a single-pivot two-position high wing which is deployed at subsonic speeds to improve vehicle landing characteristics. For the present investigation the wing was maintained in a stowed position, and the effects of horizontal stabilizer dihedral, elevon control effectiveness, and the addition of either a conventional single vertical tail or dorsal-fin-type vertical stabilizers on the longitudinal and lateral-directional stability and control characteristics were studied.

A comparison of the untrimmed maximum lift-drag ratio for the configurations having horizontal-tail dihedral of 0° and either a center-line vertical tail or dorsal fins indicates slightly higher values for the dorsal-fin configuration at Mach numbers from 2.30 to 4.63, whereas comparison of trimmed maximum lift-drag ratio for these configurations indicates considerably higher values for the center-line vertical tail, especially at the lower Mach numbers.

Positive effective dihedral and directional stability were noted for each configuration near the angle of attack for maximum trimmed lift-drag ratio; large decreases in both parameters accompany increases in Mach number.

INTRODUCTION

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Department of Defense, and industry have studied numerous concepts relating to the development of manned orbital spacecraft suitable for supporting an orbiting near-earth laboratory, as well as independent missions in space. Criteria established for these advanced concepts are that lifting entry (that is, some cross-range capability) is desired along with the requirement for horizontal landing on conventional runways as the final mode of recovery. Although
primary interest was centered on fixed-wing body configurations, some studies of lifting entry vehicles (ref. 1) have also considered the inclusion of variable-geometry features in the form of conventional wings which are stowed or shielded during entry and deployed at some point along the return flight path to improve the overall aerodynamic behavior and performance for landing. In reference 1 a spectrum of variable-geometry vehicles was investigated, in-depth analysis being performed on six concepts. Two vehicles were studied in each of the three hypersonic lift-drag-ratio categories of near 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0. In addition, the dynamic flight characteristics and handling qualities of the most promising vehicle in each of the hypersonic lift-drag-ratio 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 categories, each having some form of variable-geometry feature, were studied. (See refs. 2 to 4.) Extensive wind-tunnel studies from low subsonic to hypersonic speeds were made for these selected concepts to provide a realistic data base for inclusion in the dynamic estimates. These vehicles were sized for small payloads but the associated aerodynamics determined for each of these diverse designs should prove beneficial to the design of larger payload advanced entry or hypersonic transport concepts.

The purpose of this paper is to present supersonic aerodynamic results on the lift-drag-ratio-3.0 class vehicle studied in the efforts previously described. A single-pivot two-position wing was employed as the variable-geometry feature for this vehicle. Transonic characteristics of this vehicle are presented in reference 5. The wing is stowed near the top of the body during entry and high-speed flight and deployed at subsonic speeds to improve the landing characteristics. The basic body is trapezoidal in cross section with an upper to lower surface ratio of 1 to 3, and has a longitudinal area distribution conforming to that required to minimize zero-lift hypersonic wave drag as determined under the geometric constraints of given length and volume. (See refs. 6 and 7.) Effective fineness ratio of the body is 6.0 with a ratio of volume to length cubed of 0.0110. Horizontal stabilizers and dorsal-type vertical fins are located in the aft part of the body to provide longitudinal and lateral-directional stability with longitudinal and roll control provided by elevons located on the horizontal stabilizers. A single center vertical tail was also tested with several horizontal stabilizer configurations. The present tests were made in the high Mach number test section of the Langley Unitary Plan wind tunnel at Mach numbers of 2.30, 2.96, 3.96, and 4.63. The supersonic aerodynamic characteristics associated with the basic body with wings stowed, and horizontal stabilizers at various dihedral positions with and without dorsal fins or a center vertical tail were studied. Horizontal stabilizer elevon control effectiveness was also studied at stabilizer dihedral angles of 0° and ±30°.
SYMBOLS

Longitudinal aerodynamic characteristics are referenced to the stability system of axes and lateral-directional characteristics are presented about the body axes. All coefficients are normalized with respect to the projected planform area, actual length, and span of the basic body. The moment reference point was located longitudinally at 62.8 percent of body length as measured from the body apex, with the vertical location of the moment reference point at 3.29 percent body length below the model reference plane. Values are given in both SI and U.S. Customary Units. The measurements and calculations were made in U.S. Customary Units.

\( a_1 \) lower surface semiwidth of body at station \( x \), \( m \) (ft)

\( a_2 \) upper surface semiwidth of body at station \( x \), \( m \) (ft)

\( b \) maximum span of body, 0.228 m (0.750 ft)

\( C_D \) drag coefficient, \( \frac{\text{Drag}}{\rho S} \)

\( C_L \) lift coefficient, \( \frac{\text{Lift}}{\rho S} \)

\( C_{L\alpha} \) lift-curve slope, \( \frac{\delta C_L}{\delta \alpha} \) at \( \alpha = 0^\circ \), per degree

\( C_l \) rolling-moment coefficient, \( \frac{\text{Rolling moment}}{\rho S b} \)

\( C_{l\beta} \) lateral stability parameter, \( \frac{\Delta C_l}{\Delta \beta} \) at \( \beta = 0^\circ \) and \( 5^\circ \), per degree

\( C_m \) pitching-moment coefficient, \( \frac{\text{Pitching moment}}{\rho S l} \)

\( C_n \) yawing-moment coefficient, \( \frac{\text{Yawing moment}}{\rho S b} \)

\( C_{n\beta} \) directional stability parameter, \( \frac{\Delta C_n}{\Delta \beta} \) at \( \beta = 0^\circ \) and \( 5^\circ \), per degree

\( C_{p,b} \) base pressure coefficient, \( \frac{p_b - p_\infty}{\rho_\infty} \)

\( C_Y \) side-force coefficient, \( \frac{\text{Side force}}{\rho S} \)
\( C_{Y\beta} \) side-force parameter, \( \frac{\Delta C_Y}{\Delta \beta} \) at \( \beta = 0^\circ \) and \( 5^\circ \), per degree

\( h \) body height at station \( x \), m (ft)

\( L/D \) lift-drag ratio

\( l \) length of body, 0.965 m (3.167 ft)

\( M \) Mach number

\( p_b \) base pressure, N/m\(^2\) (lb/ft\(^2\))

\( p_\infty \) free-stream static pressure, N/m\(^2\) (lb/ft\(^2\))

\( q_\infty \) free-stream dynamic pressure, N/m\(^2\) (lb/ft\(^2\))

\( S \) body projected planform area, 0.144 m\(^2\) (1.545 ft\(^2\))

\( x \) longitudinal coordinate of body, m (ft)

\( \alpha \) angle of attack, deg

\( \beta \) angle of sideslip, deg

\( \Gamma_t \) horizontal-tail dihedral angle (positive up), deg

\( \Gamma_V \) dorsal-fin dihedral angle (positive up) \( (\Gamma_V = 90^\circ \) designates single center-line tail and \( \Gamma_V = 45^\circ \) designates twin dorsal fins), deg

\( \delta_e \) horizontal-tail elevon deflection angle (positive with trailing edge down), deg

Subscripts:

\( \text{max} \) maximum condition

\( \text{min} \) minimum condition

\( \circ \) condition at \( \alpha = 0^\circ \)

\( \text{trim} \) trimmed condition
Configuration designations:

B  body
H  horizontal stabilizers
Vc  center-line vertical tail
Vt  dorsal fins

MODEL

A drawing of the complete model is shown in figure 1, and a photograph of the model is presented in figure 2. Table I presents body ordinates normalized with respect to body length.

The body is trapezoidal in cross section with a ratio of top to bottom of 1 to 3. Negative camber was incorporated in the body by placing 0.333 of the vertical height above and 0.667 of the vertical height below the model reference plane at all longitudinal stations. The large blunt base was retained (no boattailing) for efficient spacecraft-booster integration (tandem launch being assumed) or to provide the area required for rocket engine housing on shuttle type or advanced transport concepts.

The horizontal stabilizers were located along the lower body ridge line just ahead of the base region and were tested at dihedral angles of 30°, 0°, and -30°. The stabilizers for these tests had rounded leading edges with 2° (included angle) wedge airfoil sections, no incidence, and 65° leading-edge sweep. Elevon controls located on these stabilizers were tested at deflections of 0°, -10°, and -20° for pitch control and differentially for roll control about hinge lines located at the most aft body station. (See fig. 1.) Total exposed horizontal stabilizer area including the elevons was 18.74 percent of the body planform area. Dorsal fins were located on the sides of the body and were tested at a dihedral angle of 45° as measured from the horizontal reference plane. (See fig. 1.) Total exposed area for these dorsal fins was also 18.74 percent of the body planform area. A single center-line vertical tail was also tested with several horizontal stabilizer configurations; the tail had a flat-plate cross section with rounded leading edge and blunt base. For the present investigation the wing was considered to be stowed.

TEST AND CORRECTIONS

The investigation was made in the high Mach number test section of the Langley Unitary Plan wind tunnel. The tunnel is a variable-pressure return-flow type with a
test section approximately 1.22 m (4 ft) square and 2.13 m (7 ft) long. The nozzle leading to the test section has an asymmetric sliding block which permits variation of Mach number from 2.30 to 4.63.

The model was sting supported and forces and moments were measured by use of an internally mounted strain-gage balance. Static-pressure measurements were also taken at the base of the model.

The tests were made through an angle-of-attack range from about -5° to 21° at sideslip angles of 0° and 5° and at a constant Reynolds number of $8.7 \times 10^6$ (based on body length). All angles of attack and sideslip have been corrected for deflection of the balance and sting due to aerodynamic loads. The angle of attack was also corrected for tunnel-flow misalignment. Static-pressure measurements taken at the base of the model are presented in the form of pressure coefficients in figure 3. The drag results presented herein, however, represent gross drag in that the axial force is uncorrected for the base pressure.

The Mach numbers, stagnation pressures, and stagnation temperatures were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>Stagnation pressure</th>
<th>Stagnation temperature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kN/m$^2$</td>
<td>lb/ft$^2$ abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>100.60</td>
<td>2101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>142.30</td>
<td>2972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>253.48</td>
<td>5294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>345.98</td>
<td>7226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stagnation dewpoint was maintained sufficiently low (238 K or -30° F) to insure that no condensation effects would be encountered in the test section.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Longitudinal aerodynamic characteristics are presented in figures 4 to 8 and are summarized in figures 9 and 10. Summary lateral-directional stability characteristics are presented in figures 11 and 12. The following index is presented as an aid in locating a particular set of data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal characteristics of various vehicle components ............... 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Longitudinal control characteristics for –
  \[ \Gamma_t = 0°; \ \Gamma_v = 90° \] ........................................ 5 |
| \[ \Gamma_t = -30°; \ \Gamma_v = 90° \] ........................................ 6 |

6
Summary of untrimmed longitudinal aerodynamic characteristics .......................... 9
Summary of lateral-directional stability characteristics of various configurations .......... 10
Summary of lateral-directional stability characteristics as affected by horizontal-stabilizer dihedral ................................................................. 11
Summary of trimmed longitudinal and lateral-directional aerodynamic characteristics . 12

Longitudinal Characteristics

A summary of the untrimmed longitudinal characteristics for various configurations is presented in figure 9. The addition of the center-line vertical tail increased $C_{D_{min}}$ with attendant losses in $(L/D)_{max}$ as would be expected. It is interesting to note the favorable increase in positive $C_{m_0}$ resulting from addition of this tail. (See fig. 9(a).) Addition of the dorsal fins while increasing $C_{D_{min}}$ also increased $(L/D)_{max}$ as a result of the improved $C_{L_{\alpha}}$ characteristics. (See fig. 9(b).) These fins also increase positive $C_{m_0}$ but not as significantly as that associated with the center-line vertical tail.

The addition of the horizontal stabilizers at $\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$ to the configuration having center-line vertical tail resulted in increases in untrimmed $(L/D)_{max}$ at the lower Mach numbers, a reduction being noted above $M = 3.6$ (fig. 9(a)), whereas adding these stabilizers to the configuration with dorsal fins increased $(L/D)_{max}$ at all test Mach numbers. Large increases in the longitudinal stability parameter $\alpha C_{m}/\beta C_{L}$ were noted by addition of the stabilizer ($\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$) to the configuration having center-line vertical tail (fig. 9(a)). For the body-dorsal-fin configuration, however, only slight increases in $\alpha C_{m}/\beta C_{L}$ over that already provided by the addition of the dorsal fins resulted from addition of the horizontal stabilizer ($\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$; fig. 9(b)). A comparison of the untrimmed $(L/D)_{max}$ values for BVcH and BVtH configurations ($\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$) indicates slightly higher values for BVtH at all Mach numbers.

Summary of Lateral-Directional Stability Characteristics

The effects of the addition of various configuration components on the lateral-directional stability are presented in figure 10. Addition of the center-line vertical tail showed large increases in $C_{n_\beta}$ at the lower angles of attack, large decreases occurring with increasing $\alpha$. Considerable reduction in $C_{n_\beta}$, however, occurs as Mach number is increased even near $\alpha = 0^\circ$ (that is, from $C_{n_\beta} = 0.0052$ at $M = 2.30$ to 0.001 at
Addition of the dorsal fins indicates the largest increases in $C_{n\beta}$ to occur at the higher angles of attack at all Mach numbers. Again considerable reduction in $C_{n\beta}$ occurs as Mach number is increased (that is, at $\alpha = 18^\circ$ from $C_{n\beta} = 0.007$ at $M = 2.30$ to $C_{n\beta} = 0.0025$ at $M = 4.63$). The addition of either the center-line vertical or dorsal fin resulted in positive effective dihedral ($C_{\ell\beta}$) at all test angles of attack and Mach numbers.

The addition of the horizontal tail at $\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$ to either the center-line or dorsal-fin configurations showed only minor effects on $C_{n\beta}$. The horizontal tails, however, did have a destabilizing effect on $C_{\ell\beta}$ at angles of attack generally below $5^\circ$ at all test Mach numbers.

The effects of horizontal-tail dihedral on lateral-directional stability are presented in figure 11. Changing dihedral from $\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$ to $\Gamma_t = -30^\circ$ resulted in large increases in $C_{n\beta}$ at moderate $\alpha$ (that is, below $\alpha \approx 12^\circ$) at all Mach numbers. This favorable effect diminishes rapidly, however, with increasing $\alpha$. Regions of unfavorable effective dihedral parameter $C_{\ell\beta}$ were noted to occur for this configuration generally below $\alpha \approx 6^\circ$ at all Mach numbers. Increasing dihedral from $\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$ to $\Gamma_t = 30^\circ$ indicates a reduction in $C_{n\beta}$ near $\alpha = 0^\circ$ and a favorable increase in $C_{n\beta}$ at the higher angles of attack at all Mach numbers. No regions of unfavorable $C_{\ell\beta}$ were noted to occur for this configuration.

Summary of Trimmed Characteristics

A summary of the trimmed $(L/D)_{\text{max}}$ and $\alpha$ at trimmed $(L/D)_{\text{max}}$ for the various configurations is presented in figure 12. Higher values of trimmed $(L/D)_{\text{max}}$ were obtained on the configuration having a center-line vertical tail with $\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$ or $\Gamma_t = -30^\circ$ as compared with the dorsal-fin configuration having $\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$ at all Mach numbers (the largest increases being noted at the lowest Mach numbers). The BVcH ($\Gamma_t = 30^\circ$) configuration, although it indicated slightly higher values of trimmed $(L/D)_{\text{max}}$ at $M \leq 2.86$, was out of trim positively for the elevon settings tested at $M > 2.86$; thus, a down-elevon would be required for trim. This condition results from the higher $C_{m,0}$ values for the $\Gamma_t = 30^\circ$ configurations and the decreasing longitudinal stability variation with increasing angle of attack, especially at the higher test Mach numbers. (For example, see fig. 7.) All configurations were directionally stable and had positive effective dihedral in the region of trimmed $(L/D)_{\text{max}}$ at all Mach numbers. (See fig. 12.)

CONCLUDING REMARKS

An investigation has been made in the high Mach number test section of the Langley Unitary Plan wind tunnel on a variable-geometry high hypersonic performance spacecraft concept at Mach numbers from 2.30 to 4.63. The basic lifting body is designed for
hypersonic lift-drag ratio near 3.0. The variable-geometry feature is a single-pivot two-position high wing which is deployed at subsonic speeds to improve vehicle landing characteristics. For the present investigation the wing was maintained in a stowed position, and the effects of horizontal stabilizer dihedral, elevon control effectiveness, and the addition of either a conventional single vertical-tail or dorsal-fin-type vertical stabilizers on the longitudinal and lateral-directional stability and control characteristics were studied. Some observations of this study are presented:

A comparison of the untrimmed maximum lift-drag ratio for the configurations having horizontal-tail dihedral of 0° and either a center-line vertical tail or dorsal fins indicates slightly higher values for the dorsal-fin configuration at Mach numbers from 2.30 to 4.63, whereas a comparison of trimmed maximum lift-drag ratio for these configurations indicates considerably higher values for the center-line vertical tail, especially at the lower Mach numbers.

Positive effective dihedral and directional stability were noted for each configuration near the angle of attack for maximum trimmed lift-drag ratio; large decreases in both parameters accompany increases in Mach number.

Langley Research Center,
National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
Hampton, Va., December 7, 1972.
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**TABLE I.- DESIGN BODY COORDINATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$x/l$</th>
<th>$a_1/l$</th>
<th>$a_2/l$</th>
<th>$h/l$</th>
<th>$0.333h/l$</th>
<th>$0.667h/l$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.00503</td>
<td>.00168</td>
<td>.00591</td>
<td>.00197</td>
<td>.00394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.00794</td>
<td>.00265</td>
<td>.00936</td>
<td>.00312</td>
<td>.00624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.01090</td>
<td>.00363</td>
<td>.01287</td>
<td>.00429</td>
<td>.00858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.01349</td>
<td>.00450</td>
<td>.01590</td>
<td>.00530</td>
<td>.01060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.01592</td>
<td>.00531</td>
<td>.01876</td>
<td>.00625</td>
<td>.01251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.01826</td>
<td>.00609</td>
<td>.02151</td>
<td>.00717</td>
<td>.01434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.02050</td>
<td>.00683</td>
<td>.02415</td>
<td>.00805</td>
<td>.01610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.02270</td>
<td>.00757</td>
<td>.02675</td>
<td>.00892</td>
<td>.01784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.02476</td>
<td>.00825</td>
<td>.02919</td>
<td>.00973</td>
<td>.01946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.02775</td>
<td>.00925</td>
<td>.03271</td>
<td>.01090</td>
<td>.02180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.04475</td>
<td>.01492</td>
<td>.05274</td>
<td>.01758</td>
<td>.03516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>.05953</td>
<td>.01984</td>
<td>.07015</td>
<td>.02337</td>
<td>.04676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.07236</td>
<td>.02412</td>
<td>.08529</td>
<td>.02843</td>
<td>.05686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.08402</td>
<td>.02801</td>
<td>.09900</td>
<td>.03300</td>
<td>.06600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.09408</td>
<td>.03136</td>
<td>.01108</td>
<td>.03695</td>
<td>.07391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.10269</td>
<td>.03423</td>
<td>.12101</td>
<td>.04034</td>
<td>.08067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.11007</td>
<td>.03669</td>
<td>.12970</td>
<td>.04314</td>
<td>.08647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.11547</td>
<td>.03849</td>
<td>.13607</td>
<td>.04535</td>
<td>.09071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.11695</td>
<td>.03899</td>
<td>.13782</td>
<td>.04594</td>
<td>.09188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.11757</td>
<td>.03919</td>
<td>.13855</td>
<td>.04618</td>
<td>.09237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.11807</td>
<td>.03936</td>
<td>.13914</td>
<td>.04638</td>
<td>.09276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.11834</td>
<td>.03945</td>
<td>.13946</td>
<td>.04649</td>
<td>.09297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variable-geometry feature (Stowed for present results)

Body reference geometry
\[ S = 0.144 \text{ m}^2 (1.545 \text{ ft}^2) \]
\[ z = 0.965 \text{ m} (3.167 \text{ ft}) \]
\[ b = 0.228 \text{ m} (0.750 \text{ ft}) \]

(a) Basic body with horizontal stabilizers and dorsal fins.

Figure 1.- Drawings of model of present investigation. All dimensions are normalized with respect to maximum body length.
Vertical-tail geometry
Planform area 0.0185 m² (0.199 ft²)
Aspect ratio 1.206
Taper ratio 0.242

Horizontal-stabilizer geometry
Planform area 0.0285 m² (0.307 ft²)
Aspect ratio 1.330
Taper ratio 0.243

(b) Details of vertical tail and horizontal stabilizer and dorsal fin.

Figure 1.- Concluded.
Figure 3.- Variation of base-pressure coefficient with angle of attack and Mach number for various configurations.
Figure 4.- Longitudinal aerodynamic characteristics of the various configurations.

(a) $M = 2.30$. 
(b) \( M = 2.96 \).

Figure 4.- Continued.
Figure 4. - Continued.

(c) $M = 3.96$. 
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(d) $M = 4.63$.

Figure 4.- Concluded.
Figure 5.- Longitudinal control characteristics for the configuration BV_cH having $\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$ and $\Gamma_v = 90^\circ$. 

(a) $M = 2.30$. 
(b) $M = 2.96$.

Figure 5.- Continued.
(c) $M = 3.96$.

Figure 5.- Continued.
Figure 5.- Concluded.

(d) $M = 4.63$. 

Figure 5.- Concluded.
Figure 6.- Longitudinal control characteristics for the configuration BVcH having $\Gamma_t = -30^0$ and $\Gamma_V = 90^0$. 

(a) $M = 2.30$. 
Figure 6. - Continued.

(b) \( M = 2.96 \).

Figure 6.- Continued.
(c) $M = 3.96$.

Figure 6. - Continued.
(d) $M = 4.63$.

Figure 6.- Concluded.
(a) $M = 2.30$.

Figure 7. - Longitudinal control characteristics for the configuration BV$_{cH}$ having $\Gamma_t = 30^\circ$ and $\Gamma_v = 90^\circ$. 
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Figure 7.- Continued.

(b) \( M = 2.96 \).

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

(c) \( M = 3.96 \).

Figure 7.- Continued.
(d) $M = 4.63$.

Figure 7.- Concluded.
Figure 8. - Longitudinal control characteristics for the configuration BVtH having $\Gamma_t = 0^\circ$ and $\Gamma_v = 45^\circ$.
Figure 8.- Continued.

(b) $M = 2.96$. 

Figure 8.- Continued.
(c) $M = 3.96$.

Figure 8. - Continued.
(d) $M = 4.63$.

Figure 8. - Concluded.
(a) Center-line vertical tail.

Figure 9.- Summary of aerodynamic characteristics.
(b) Dorsal fins.

Figure 9.- Concluded.
Figure 10. - Summary of the lateral-directional stability characteristics for various configurations.

(a) $M = 2.30$. 
Configuration $T_1$, $\beta_e$, $\delta_e$.

- $B$: Off Off
- $B_{\delta_{f}}$: Off Off
- $B_{\delta_{f}}$: Off Off
- $B_{\delta_{f}}$: 0 0
- $B_{\delta_{f}}$: 0 0

(b) $M = 2.96$.

Figure 10.- Continued.
Figure 10.- Continued.

(c) $M = 3.96$. 
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(d) \( M = 4.63 \).

Figure 10.- Concluded.
Figure 11.- Lateral-directional stability characteristics associated with changes in horizontal-tail dihedral.

(a) \( M = 2.30 \).
(b) \( M = 2.96 \).

Figure 11. - Continued.
(c) \( M = 3.96 \).

Figure 11.- Continued.
(d) $M = 4.63$.

Figure 11.- Concluded.
Figure 12. - Summary of aerodynamic characteristics at trim \((L/D)_{max}\) for various configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>(\Gamma_t, \text{deg})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BVc H</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVc H</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVc H</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVt H</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \(a_{trim}\) vs. \(M\)
- \((C_{nB})_{trim}\) vs. \(M\)