


✓ PDMC New Class C paraglider

2001 **PG fatality**  soaring parachutist from Sweden

 **January 17, 2021** Porterville, **SOUTH AFRICA**

Turbulence → *Asymmetric collapse*. The man was flying at **40 to 70 meters** above the mountainside when he encountered thermal turbulence. Over half of the sail collapsed and he **quickly lost altitude**, struggling **to refill the canopy** without being high enough to throw his reserve. He fell to the ground, fatally impacting on his back. In its investigation released a month later, the Swedish paragliding association, while acknowledging that the man had been below effective reserve deployment altitude, nonetheless blamed him for **overcompensating** in his desperate attempts to regain control, suggesting he had **stalled** the paraglider. In doing so, he had increased the rate of descent and brought about his own demise.

Once again, a national paragliding association blames a doomed falling human for the murderous nature of the paraglider in turbulence.

Why is this so common?

Consider that most of these paragliding accident investigations are done at the behest of a national aviation authority - one that would rather not be bothered with crazies. Can you imagine them telling their overlord, "Oh, we have to fly within the Paraglider Dead Man's Curve on take off and landing, and also whenever we are below a hundred meters. It's a deadly deficiency compared to actual aircraft, but we don't mind if we fall out of the sky like a sack of potatoes. It's buckets of fun! Besides, it only happens to the other guy. We're just glad you have all those million-dollar helicopters for rescue and corpse recovery - and for and getting us out of the rathole or tree where we got drilled."

I don't think so.

Therefore, as far as these denialists are concerned, paragliding accidents are always due to pilot error, even when the so-called pilot is nothing but a helpless falling human often lacking the slightest effective control input.

Paragliderists calling it *pilot error* in a report for a bunch of real pilots has a nice ring to it, don't you think? After all, you can't have a pilot without an aircraft. So when the aircraft suddenly disappears in a hopeless fluttering mess, there will be *pilot error* should the "pilot" fail to make the aircraft re-appear like some kind of magic trick. It's his fault! Kind of turns logic on its head, doesn't it?

This would be laughable if it wasn't so universally sad.

 1065 Svenska Skärmflygforbundet