



VEE LINE

NUMBER 95

AUGUST 1972

DIRECTOR'S CORNER

I wouldn't want to make this a definite promise, but this Ninth Annual Formula Vee International Rules Thing is *probably* the last of the series. If this revised version of the rules is adopted, it shouldn't be necessary to reopen the subject again. If it is *not* adopted this time, we might as well forget the whole thing!

Looking back at the various ballots of the past, it's somewhat difficult to pick out any particular victory which we may have won, or any specific instance where our influence has made a big impact on the rules. On the other hand, however, taking the entire history of Formula Vee into account, it's pretty obvious that our influence, even if it didn't have any really flashy results, has made itself felt.

Formula Vee is still basically Formula Vee. It's the oldest unchanged class in amateur racing, in any part of the world. It is being challenged by Formula Ford (that copycat class!) for outright popularity, which is proof in itself that the Formula Vee concept was the biggest thing to happen to racing since racing circuits started replacing city streets as road courses.

No, we haven't changed the Formula Vee rules to any extent, up to now, but we have at least kept others from changing Formula Vee very much. Our votes for "No Change", then, have actually done more for the class than have the things we have voted *for*.

Formula Vee was *not* changed to conform to the European rules. It was *not* "updated" to accept "current" Volkswagen components. It was *not* transformed into Super Vee. It has *not* been allowed to deteriorate into a class for manufacturers and factory teams. It has remained, for nine years, an amateur class in which anyone who can afford to race at all can participate. Why has Formula Vee been so exceptional? Simply because "You asked for it", through the Eight Annual Formula Vee International Rules Ballots!

NEAL WILLIAMS RIDES AGAIN!

Remember Neal Williams — the guy who parlayed a \$2 reed valve for GoKart engines into one of the largest dynamometer firms, changed VW head porting from an art into a science, built his own Vee and within a year from his first race had worked himself up to a spot at the ARRC — and then decided to quit racing because he'd already found out what he was after when he started? He did take about a year off for movie making, but recently bought an old beat-up Zink, patched it up, rebuilt the engine to stock specs (except for the "Wild" flow-tested heads and manifold) and started out again to try to make it to Atlanta.

His "shakedown" race was a Conference event at Westwood, British Columbia, which he won. He won the National at Kent the following weekend, but was disqualified because his car, despite the addition of extra bracing, cockpit shrouding, steering gear reinforcement, etc., was found to be underweight. This increased the odds against his winning the National Championship somewhat, but when last seen in these parts, he was headed South, toward a National at Laguna Seca. (Just heard he got second place, there.) After all, he "only has to win four, or five, at most".

Anyhow, while he was in the Northwest
(Continued on page 2)

SOMETHING NEW

I've said several times that when I learn all about Formula Vee I'm going to write a book on it, but in the meantime, I'm still learning. This time it's about fuel pumps.

You'd probably believe that twice this summer Petunia has suddenly had a case of colic, right in the middle of a race — both times when she has having one of her better days, too! You wouldn't believe, though, that during that time the Ghia had a bout of the same illness, so I won't go into that.

Each time, it turned out to be the fuel pump, and each time it was from the same malfunction. In spite of an in-line filter, and plastic fuel lines (except for the pump fitting) a little — almost invisible — chunk of something got underneath the intake valve in the pump, preventing it from closing.

VW pumps are not all alike — even though they look alike from the outside. Some have two spring-loaded disc valves, and some have a disc valve for the discharge and a little reed valve for the in-

take. The reed is about the size of a child's fingernail, and it is fastened to the pump body by a screw at one end.

This reed is evidently very susceptible to dirt — particles small enough to pass through that fine filter screen in the pump. Each time we've had this problem, a little piece of something, almost too small to be seen, has been found under the "hinge" part of the valve where it bends when it opens. When it tries to close again, it can't.

If this happens again, we'll disconnect both lines from the pump and try blowing it out with compressed air. It might just push that little particle back farther under the hinge, but it might blow it on through the pump, too. If not, it's not all that much trouble to take the entire cap off, with the pump still in place, clean out the valve, and reassemble.

MEMBERS' SOAPBOX

"Dear Don — Every Vee driver should be deeply grateful to you for the immense amount of good you have done Formula Vee over the last eight years. That is a long time and a lot of work getting out the VeeLine which is always so interesting that I look forward to getting it each month with a great deal of pleasure and drop everything to read it just as soon as the postman brings it. I still have a copy of VeeLine No. 1.

I am particularly grateful to you because you have been especially good to me, so I am sorry that I cannot agree with you on all of your proposed new rules.

I hope that the position I take on some of them does not arise from selfishness, in that I am unconsciously trying to get some advantage for myself from some of the rules. But then, considering how old and decrepit I am getting to be, as Pogo would say, "I need all the advantage I can get" — so maybe I am just selfish.

I don't really think so — I believe I am trying to do the best thing for Formula Vee, just as you believe you are. So it troubles me when you divide Vee drivers into the three classes of "legal", "smart" and "cheating". You seem to be saying that "smart" is about half way between conforming to the rules and "cheating". It is hard to see how that is so. It is hard to see how the drivers you call "smart" have "bent" the rules, or why they should be compelled to "get back into line once a few of them have stepped out of it". Because they have not stepped out of line! Your "smart" drivers are simply taking
(Continued on Page 2)

The VEELINE of FORMULA VEE INTERNATIONAL

DON CHEESMAN, Director
1347 Fairmont Ave.

East Wenatchee, Wash. 98801

© 1972 Formula Vee International

NEAL WILLIAMS RIDES AGAIN!

(Continued from page 1)

he spent an evening (and a good part of the early morning) here at FVI headquarters, discussing the proposed rule changes. He'd be an outstanding "smart" engine builder, if his mind worked that way (among other things, he's an expert on the use and meanings of words, too) but he's a "say what they mean" man, so we spent most of the time dissecting the rules, trying them out for possible loopholes and double meanings, and then putting them back together again. If you compare this final version with the one originally presented on these pages, you'll find a number of such changes. He also suggested some more basic changes, some of which are included now, and some which are not.

Our purpose was to try to put together a set of rules which would get the best universal acceptance among *all* Vee people. After leaving here, he compiled his own version (the same as this one, with a few exceptions) and added a petition to SCCA. He is now circulating it among the "top competitors" he meets at the Nationals, recognizing a basic fact of life—the rules will have a much better chance of change and revision if those people, in particular, add their backing. How about getting some of those people in *your* crowd (who aren't FVI members) to get in on this act? We'll send extra postcards to anyone who wants them, or you can write up an informal petition and get several people to sign it, and send it directly to SCCA.

This is the year! Competitors have actually been *asked* to present their views on rule changes! So let's do it!

LAST MONTH'S BALLOT

WELL! If that punch card ballot proved anything, it has to be that there's no use trying to either change the rules or keep them the way they are, because too many of you won't be satisfied either way! If all of you who voted "NO" on something really meant it, there won't be a single favorable vote for the whole package.

Actually, it was very helpful in arriving at the final draft version. There were more "Yes" votes than "No's" on all the Vee-Line proposals. However, in several cases, there wasn't enough difference to justify making a change, especially if the "No" votes showed a definite pattern, too.

Mounting gas tanks inside the frame is a good example. While the vote "for" was greater than the "no" votes, there were enough "no's" to indicate that overall approval for the whole package would be greater if that item were omitted. Presumably you people who voted "yes" won't feel as strongly about it (since you probably have yours protected already) as those who voted "no" would feel about having to make a change.

The vote on the rear suspension showed

a 4 to 1 vote against "free" rear suspension and the "yes's" were almost evenly divided between the VeeLine version and the GCR version. However, there were more "No's" for the VeeLine version, so it has been changed in this final draft to include at least the Autodynamics type of "zero roll stiffness", while attempting to restrict "development" to what we have now.

The claiming price proposal got a clear majority vote, but not great enough to warrant inclusion. The loss of approval on the final version again would have killed the whole thing.

Air ducting through the firewall to the carburetor was included in the final draft, as a result of the ballot, but ducting to the cylinders was shot down decisively.

Weight with driver got overwhelming approval this time—70% in favor of it! And 75% of the "yes" votes were for 800 lbs. empty weight.

That last section ("Would you vote—IF—") was somewhat of a mess, wasn't it? I'm not sure whether it was the printer's fault, or mine. I was under the impression when I set it up that there were 42 spaces on the card, but noticed while the copy was at the printers that there were only 40. I had them delete two questions and renumber them, but I'm not sure I reworded that last one accordingly. Evidently most of you people were able to figure it out for yourselves, anyhow.

Since this was purely an advisory ballot, for my own information in trying to arrive at the most acceptable form for the final version, space won't be wasted here on a complete recount of the votes. You can pretty well tell by the few changes made since the original presentation.

THIS MONTH'S BALLOT

This is the one that counts! This is the one which goes to SCCA, as *your* opinion on these rule changes.

I've been accused, in the past, of influencing the vote on our ballots, which isn't very flattering considering the diversity of opinion they have shown on so many of the items. As I've mentioned to the members of the various boards and committees, if I had any influence on your votes, we'd have had an overwhelming majority for "weight with driver" years ago.

Anyhow, this time I *am* flat out trying to use any influence I may have. PLEASE VOTE A STRAIGHT TICKET — "YES" — ON THIS ONE!

There is a space on the card for "Comments" but I beg of you, PLEASE don't use it for negative requests—"except I hope you won't change the suspension rule", or "Please make weight with driver 1050 pounds instead of 1000". If you feel you simply CAN'T live with some section of this proposal, but like the rest of it, such a comment is better than a "No" vote, or no vote at all, but if you can pos-

sibly bring yourself to it, please vote for adoption of the entire package, just the way it is.

I have honestly tried to make it the closest thing possible to what *most* of you people have said that you want. Probably no one (as evidenced by this last ballot) will think it is perfect, but if *your* pet item were included—or omitted—it might have kept three other people from approving it. Please believe that it represents majority opinion, and go along with the majority! Otherwise it will get so hashed up in the various committees that we won't recognize the final results. Well, yes, we probably will—they'll probably be almost identical to last year's lash-up.

Normally, we don't ask for signatures on the ballots, but this time is different. Last year I was told quite bluntly that FVI members, as a group, don't carry a whole lot of weight,—"but if the ARRC drivers would approve, it would be different". Well, at least half the ARRC drivers, and alternates, and Divisional Champions, and Regional Champions and Hillclimb Champions, and car manufacturers, etc. are members of FVI. So this time, as well as your signature, please include a very brief biography—what kind of license you have, your present standing in your Division, how many times you've been to the ARRC (don't forget to tell them you won it last year, Garrett!)—anything which might impress the officials as to your right and ability to express an opinion on Formula Vee rules. Perhaps we can overcome the myth that FVI is composed solely of Novices and also-rans!

Another thing—if you want additional ballots (actually, they are more like individual petitions) ask for them. The Vee rules are for everyone, after all, and the more votes we can get, the better. (We might get some of that other half as members, too.) Ask for all you can use, but please use all you ask for—they're rather expensive.

MEMBERS' SOAPBOX

(Continued from page 1)

the wording of the rules in good faith, believing that they mean what they say as written, and acting accordingly. They are as legal as the drivers you call "legal". The only difference is that they do not believe, as you seem to do, that the rules somehow mean more than they say.

I am fearful that your somewhat angry (?) choice of expressions and your division of drivers into "legal" and "smart" is just going to cause dissatisfaction and hard feeling between drivers without doing any good. We are all in Vee racing together and we should work *together* in harmony to get and to keep rules that do mean just what they say and that can be depended on for several years, at least. And rules that are not so regressive as to stifle interest in the class.

Harvey Templeton, Winchester, Tenn." Thanks for the kind words, Harvey! If I've "been good to you" in the past, it was only because I called it as I saw it ("old and decrepit"—ba!). This puts us even, anyhow. Flattery will get you nowhere, however, toward converting me to your viewpoint of the rules, even though I believe I understand your position now, better than I did.

If I'm wrong (and I hope I am) I'll be glad to correct this, but as I see it, you want "rules which mean exactly what they say", but you DON'T want rules which SAY EXACTLY WHAT THEY MEAN. You don't want anyone interpreting the "intent" of the rules—you want to be free to decide for yourself "exactly what they say". Is that a fair statement?

Certainly you're being selfish! Who isn't, in regard to these rule proposals, specifically? No matter which "side" we're on, we're all looking at them from the standpoint of our own particular involvement in racing. I believe that most of us in Formula Vee want to concentrate on racing, and consider maintenance and our limited "development" as a necessary but secondary activity to that end. However, you certainly aren't alone in considering improvement, innovation, inventiveness, etc., as of primary importance.

You're right—I do consider "smart" to be halfway (or even more, in some cases) between "legal" and "cheating". And anyone who wants to place himself in either of the latter two categories is free to resent my opinion, of course.

I've probably beat that old generator rule nearly to death, but I'm going to revive it for one more whipping because it is such a perfect example of what this whole hassle is all about. The rule was simple—"Nothing must be done to interfere with the normal battery charging function of the generator." Period.

Ninety-nine Vee owners out of a hundred ran with generators which generated because that's what they thought the rule MEANT. However ONE out of a hundred said to himself, "The rule doesn't SAY that a generator has to be in operating condition. Obviously, it won't last forever—it will wear out brushes and burn out regulators and eventually quit generating. The rule doesn't SAY that anything has to be done to FIX it, so what the rule ACTUALLY SAYS is that it is OK to use a generator which DOESN'T operate. Putting in worn out brushes is just speeding up the process a little, and might possibly be just a teensy bit illegal, but once they're in, it's OK to use them." Talk about rule interpretation! I didn't invent the term, as you know, but that's what I call "smart" preparation. Which category would you put it in?

That's not all—Jim Patterson (then Director of Club Racing) as the perfect example of an official who condones "smart" preparation, successfully prevent-

ed any change in that rule for five years because, he said, "It's perfectly clear the way is now. It means exactly what it says".

"Does it mean that generators have to generate, Jim, or does it mean that you can run an inoperative generator as long as no one can prove that you actually DID anything to make it inoperative?"

"It means exactly what it says—no more, and no less. It's perfectly clear!"

There's not much point in all this, really—we have entirely divergent views on "what is good for the class", and I doubt that all this discussion is going to convert either of us to the other's viewpoint. I do agree with you that we should have rules which we can "depend on for several years", and that they should "mean exactly what they say". However, I also believe that they should SAY EXACTLY WHAT THEY MEAN!

"Dear Don—Keep the VeeLines coming! They are eagerly awaited and avidly read—and much of what is recommended in them is incorporated into the two Vees running from the Fredericton area.

Some comments you might want to pass on:

1. To Marc Robertson (VL#91) there was a reference to emulsion tube modification in VL#30. Also, relative to the proposed rules, could a modified emulsion tube be used?

I'd forgotten about that one—it was described as a cure for cut-out-itis. Under the proposed rules, "any emulsion tube" would include modified ones.

2. The General Racing Regulations of the Canadian Automobile Sports Club now require that a red 15-watt rearward facing light be mounted as high as possible on the centerline of the car. This is not a brake light, but just a running light and is to be turned on at the direction of the Clerk of the Course during wet or foggy weather. Should it be included in the FV rules?

We tried this on the 1970 ballot (it was for a brake light, however) and it was voted down 219 to 86. It's required on Formula cars in "Conference" now, too, and while a number of drivers profess to think it is "sissy", a lot of lights were turned on at Delia Park, recently, voluntarily, when it appeared that it might rain. I'd say this was a matter affecting not only Formula Vee, but all Formula cars, and should be so considered by SCCA. We'll include it on the ballot, though, for their information. (Later—it was voted down, by 60%).

3. A dandy solution to the throttle cable problem is to use the cable assembly from a Sunbeam Imp—cost about \$6.00. It can be purchased with a yoke termination on one end of the cable, and once it is assembled a sleeve made up from small bore steel tubing (such as from the distributor advance tubing on a Hillman) can be crimped and soldered to the other end to fit the VW throttle cable clamp. A

12-24 die cuts threads on the ferrule at the fan shroud end of the casing, permitting it to be clamped to the shroud with a lock nut inside and outside the shroud. Elongating the hole on the back side of the shroud would permit the cable to pass through with less bend, or the metal at the front side could be bent slightly to give the proper angle.

Tony Short, Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada."

Good idea! Hope it works smoother than the VW cable we started with. We found that due to springing, stretching, friction, etc., we had about four throttle positions, regardless of how smoothly the pedal was pushed.

"Dear Don—Why didn't Mr. Schultheis have discussions with some of the ordinary competitors, those drivers who seem to end up in the middle of the pack between the "leading competitors" and the drivers who also ran? It seems to me there are more of the middle packers than anyone else, which leads me to believe they are the ones who are running strictly legal Vees, and who champion the idea of winning in a legal Vee.

Why isn't he enthralled by the people who follow the GCR? And I totally disagree with his conclusion that the way the rules are currently written we have an unenforceable situation and that we should leave those situations alone.

I understand the rules in the GCR, and I don't see why other people can't. It's very simple, and as you have stated before, if it doesn't say you can, you can't. What could be simpler, or what rules could define it more precisely?

Philip Pierini, Jr., Memphis, Tenn."

You've raised a couple of good points, Phil. What is a top competitor—or, more to the point, what makes him one? Winning? Possibly, although championships have been won by people who never won a race, but racked up a lot of points by merely being in the front ranks at a lot of events. (Whit Tharin made it to the ARRC in six out of six, once, but usually those points include a lot of 2's and 3's and 4's, as well as 9's.) A fast car? You bet! There are a lot of good drivers in mediocre cars, but they don't get their names in the news! Boiled down, then, it would appear that a "top competitor" is a good driver who can afford to race a lot in the very best equipment. And that, for some reason, makes him an authority on any aspect of racing, whether or not he has ever seen the inside of his engine, or changed a tire.

I guess you know I agree with you, in theory, that the GCR is pretty precise, as it is. However, as long as two people can read a rule as simple as that old generator rule, and get two diametrically opposed meanings from it, it's not precise enough. These proposed rules may not be the very best, but the fact that some people think

(Continued on page 4)

MEMBERS' SOAPBOX

(Continued from page 3)

they are too restrictive is, in my opinion, an indication that we are on the right track. It has to mean that they haven't been able to find many loopholes.

"Dear Don — In reference to your article in the May VeeLine about "Conference", I feel that something else should be said. According to their race schedules, all open wheel cars practice together. Putting all Formula cars together is a very dangerous practice because of the tremendous differences in speed between an "A" car and a Vee. During my novice school (SCCA) I was hit from the rear by a Formula A. I can testify that it wasn't any fun.

I received a mailing from Wild Enterprises, and the address label had my membership number on it. Please answer the following questions: How did they get the Formula Vee International mailing plates, or make copies? How much did the company pay for the mailing list? (This is a common practice.) If they did not pay, why not? What happens to the money? Who authorized the transaction?

Jerome Thorpe, Tacoma, Wash."

You have a good point regarding Conference races — they do often have all open wheel cars practicing together. And in their Novice races, they also mix open and closed wheel cars, of all classes. It seems odd, doesn't it, that it's OK for novices to mix it up, but as soon as they become proficient enough to get their racing licenses, they have to be separated for their own safety. At driver's schools, as you pointed out, even SCCA allows all kinds of cars on the track together, but for experienced drivers, such a practice is considered dangerous!

Yes, I did furnish a mailing list to Wild Enterprises, but no money changed hands. Jim Wild "paid" for it by furnishing that article on head preparation. Having sold a couple of magazine articles myself, I'd

put a value on it of around \$200, which is a pretty fair price for a mailing list of 900-odd names. As to who authorized the deal, who would have received the money (if there had been any) and so on — read your copy of the Constitution and By-Laws. Previous requests for our mailing list have been turned down, as they will be in the future, unless someone comes up with something to trade which is of equal value to the general membership.

"Dear Don — I am writing in reference to the article "Asphalt Dyno" in the July issue. You said that a Mr. Greenwell sent you plans for an electronic accelerometer. Would it be possible to get a copy of these plans? I have access to a large quantity of electronic equipment, but do not have the money to tune my engine on a dyno.

I think the rules you have come up with are great! They are what the Class has needed for a long time.

George Dana, Orange Park, Fla."

There have been a couple of other requests for this information, but I have to confess that I didn't keep it. It was actually a reproduction of a couple of pages of a magazine, describing the building of the gadget from a kit. The name of the dealer selling the kit was given, as well as a list of the individual parts, and I would assume that anyone familiar with electronics could get the parts and build the thing from the information given in the article. All I can suggest is that you check with your local library for a copy of "Popular Electronics" (Sept. 1968) or look on your newsstand for a current issue and check with the publisher for back copies.

Glad you like the rule proposals — be sure to let SCCA know how you feel, too!

UNCLASSIFIED ADS

FOR SALE: Late '71 Crusader kit, with roll bar legal for 1972. Complete kit includes brake and clutch cylinders, tach, gauges, wiring, etc. Steal at only \$700. Jim Sullivan, 13441 Chase St., Arleta, Cal.

01332, (213) 768-5700 days, 785-2367 evenings.

FOR SALE: Invader Vee, race ready, with professionally prepared engine and trans. With spares and trailer, \$1100 or best offer. Car in Seattle (206) EA 5-2952, or contact George Bell, 2059 East Ave. 1, #70, Lancaster, Cal. 93534, (805) WH 2-0736. Delivery to Southern Cal. can be arranged.

FOR SALE: '70 Zink with latest suspension mods and exhaust. Only 12 races, total. Robert Morris, Rt. 13, Box 202, Muncie, Ind. 47302, (317) 289-8565.

FOR SALE: '70 King Vee, never bent. Hyd. clutch, adjustable Z-bar, Smith's instruments, lowered front end, Goodyears. New wheel bearings, brake cylinders, front suspension parts. Only 2 schools and 4 races since new. Without engine, \$1050, with stock 40 HP engine, \$1200, or best offer. Tony Spiridigliozzi, 138 Primrose Ave., Mt. Vernon, N.Y. 10552, (914) 664-1152.

FOR SALE: Fastest Zink in the West. Super engine with "Wild" heads and manifold, streamlined body, slicks. Fits 6'3" driver. With trailer, \$2500, firm. Neal Williams, 482 O'Connor, Menlo Park, Cal. 94025, (415) 322-5134.

FOR SALE: Crusader, new engine parts, balanced and cc'd; rebuilt trans, front end; metallic brake lining. 8 Goodyears, dries like new, wets brand new. Lightweight trailer. Car not run for 3 years — needs legal rollbar. Call Ralph Likins (Seattle) (206) 839-2665 or 3092.

FOR SALE: '71 Zimart Vee. Engine just rebuilt, "D" heads ported and cc'd, windage tray, gutted generator, sump extension, new clutch, all balanced. Adjustable Koni shocks all around, adjustable Z-bar, hydraulic clutch, new light wheels, low profile gumballs. VDO instruments, Formula I pedal assy., new starter and battery. 829 lbs. With tilt-bed trailer, \$1650. F. K. Zimmer, 60 Columbia Ave., #35, Dumont, N.J. 07628, (201) 387-0078.



**Formula Vee
International**

1347 FAIRMONT AVE.
EAST WENATCHEE
WASH. 98801