

Il lavoro di gruppo è fondato sui comportamenti dei suoi componenti ed il rispetto reciproco è un fattore ineludibile.

La separazione fisica tra piloti e controllori del traffico non costituisce segregazione dei rispettivi ruoli e deve essere superata da una comunicazione efficace. La comunicazione stabilisce una identità funzionale tra gli operatori di front line a condizione di essere scevra da atteggiamenti di contrapposizione ed il più possibile rispettosa delle esigenze reciproche come se si stesse lavorando fianco a fianco. Tale atteggiamento di disponibilità può a volte evitare un grave incidente.

RESPECT

Websters' Dictionary defines "RESPECT", in part, as "to Consider worthy of high regard".

At some locations on our system and in the enroute environment, this word is meaningless to our crew members and ATC controllers. They have no respect for each other. As a result, things are said over the air by both parties which are completely unnecessary, use extra air time, and eventually lead to a complete breakdown of cooperation.

In the main, pilots and controllers do a good job; however both are human and can make mistakes.

Somewhere back in the pilot/student days, the word got around that what a controller said was law and we'd better obey or else!

What the "or else" meant could be anything from losing a student permit to getting fined by the FAA for breaking the rules. Unfortunately, a lot of pilots still have that same feeling long after all that string of ratings that come when the student pilot is eventually occupying the left seat of a scheduled carrier flying all the way from a DC 9 to a B 747. That thinking it, all wrong. There are times when a pilot is justified in saying "No" to ATC and saying it loud and clear.

ATC does not stand for Air Traffic "Cop" - it stands for Air Traffic Control.

ATC is a nice way of saying that a controllers' responsibility is to keep aeroplanes from running into other aeroplanes.

The controllers' Handbook states that a controllers primary job is to separate IFR traffic from other IFR traffic under his control. Everything else he does is on a "workload permitting" basis.

In pre-radar days, controllers relied on pilot reports over specified points to keep aircraft separated - Now, with radar vectoring to the final approach fix and other clearances, many pilots just accept clearances as a matter of course. That can be dangerous. Why? Because as stated earlier, controllers are human beings, and like pilots, they can make mistakes. It doesn't happen very often, but once is enough if you happen to be the pilot of the unlucky flight.

All remember November 20th 1975, when an American DC 10 and a TWA L1011 almost locked horns at FL 350 over Michigan. Thanks to the swift intervention of a second controller, who came to relieve the first man, a disaster was averted.

Does this mean that controllers are not dedicated men? got at all. Most of them work just as hard and under just as much pressure as a pilot flying in solid clouds through an area embedded with thunderstorms. Furthermore, many thousands of pilots owe their lives to help that came from controllers.

Remember, a controller must also train. The training is "on-the-job", working a scope under the surveillance of an old-timer. You could, therefore, be talking to a

beginner whose phraseology may not be up to par. To put it succinctly, it's not smart to turn off your brains when you bear "radar contact", and you shouldn't hesitate to question or refuse a clearance when it's necessary.

What kind of situation justifies refusing a controllers clearances? You're cleared for a visual approach at night, into an airport that is surrounded by many lights. It is difficult to pick up moving lights or other aircraft. Just because the controller cleared the aircraft for a "visual" doesn't mean the pilot must accept. Politely advise that you would prefer to continue the approach under the controllers' surveillance. Another example -many clearances given today require the aircraft to cross a certain fix at a certain altitude, either departing or arriving at a station or enroute. Please, do not wait until you are two or three miles from the fix to decide you cannot make it. Stay ahead of the aeroplane. Give the controller time to work out an alternate clearance when you cannot make the altitude. If there is any doubt, tell him as soon as you detect there's a possibility you can't make it.

This treatise could go on and on with many war and sea stories. However, the point is to respect each other and each others job. It takes cooperation to make a complex thing like our ATC system work. The controllers have a perfect right to expect full cooperation from the man in the cockpit, but only as long as it doesn't place the aircraft and its occupants in jeopardy.

Legally, of course, a pilot can refuse any clearance that appears to be hazardous. But once a pilot accepts a clearance to climb, descend or fly a particular heading, he needs a good reason to change his mind. Saying "No" at the wrong time is liable to get the pilot an audience with a very unfriendly FAA man who's apt to demand some very hard answers. Don't let this worry you to the point where you fail to exercise good judgement. All that's required is for a pilot to have a reason to believe that compliance with a controller's request would place his aircraft in jeopardy.

The manner in which a pilot refuses a clearance, or says, "No", can either start a confrontation or end in a very pleasant felling by both parties concerned. In most cases, a "No" or refusal can be said just as nicely as any other way. The "Deep South" really knows how to do such things well. Down in Georgia one night, a controller cleared an aircraft to "descend and maintain 2000". After a moment of silence, a deep, sleepy-sounding voice slowly drawled... "Why, we thank ya all kindly Sir, but seein' as how there's a big ole tower down there stickin' up about 2500ft, we reckon we'd better just stay up here for the time bein'. Shorely do appreciate it though." Now that's class. It's also a prime example of showing respect and saying "No" or refusing a clearance in a nice sort of way.

Remember that controllers are as interested as you are in expediting the movement of traffic. Vectors or speed restrictions are issued to provide separation. To discuss their reasons on the air is distracting to controllers and to other pilots.

Last, but not least, if a pilot has a gripe about the way a controller has dispensed ATC services, don't air it on the radio; use 'Ma Bell ' (telephone! Ed) to call when on the ground. Chipping at each other on the radio only serves to further irritate both parties.