



Update ME

DW1120589-0-0

No. 8/2006

A brief update from the
Civil Aviation Authority
Central Medical Unit

18 August 2006

Replacement medical certificates: CAA only

From time to time medical certificates that have been issued to applicants are lost, badly damaged, stolen, or destroyed. When this happens a replacement medical certificate is often sought.

Replacement medical certificates are now provided only by the CAA, who have ready access to the applicant's complete medical file. MEs should not attempt to issue replacement medical certificates.

Rule 67.65 requires that, when seeking a replacement certificate, the applicant provide either the damaged certificate or a statutory declaration that the certificate has been lost, stolen, or destroyed.

The medical area of the CAA website contains a section titled "[Application for Replacement of a Medical certificate](#)" which provides a link to an application form (CAA form 24067-407) which includes the necessary declaration. A fee (NZ \$66.50) is charged by CAA for a replacement medical certificate.

Replacement medical certificate:

- CAA only;
- CAA application form (24067-407) incorporating a statutory declaration;
- NZ \$66.50 fee.

From the literature: Farnsworth lantern

A recent paper by Barry Cole¹ concludes that "The practice of passing applicants who make no errors on the first run [of a lantern colour vision test] should be abandoned since 10% of those who pass in this way make many errors when additional runs are given". The paper also concludes that a new version of the Farnsworth lantern, the Optec 900™, can be considered as being equivalent to its out-of-production predecessor.

¹ [Color vision assessment: fail rates of two versions of the Farnsworth lantern test](#). Cole BL, Lian K-Y, and Lakkis C. *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine* 2006; 77(6):624-630.

For arguments sake

It's been a while since we've looked at a fallacy in this newsletter, and even longer since it's had a Latin name. The *argumentum ad modum* and *sentimens superior* are both fallacies that rely on emotional appeal for their effect².

Dr Pirie observes that although reason and emotion have "separate spheres of influence" tricksters have long known ways of making emotions "invade the territory of reason". Further, he observes that "Once whipped up, the emotions can be set at such a gallop that they easily clear the gulf between their domain and that of reason".

Argumentum ad modum functions through an appeal to an audience's desire for gradualism, the fallacy being in the audience's thinking that something admitted in due measure is more likely to be correct. An *ad modum* argument is classically introduced with an appeal: "Let's be reasonable about this."

The *sentimens superior* fallacy makes a straight-out claim of sentiment being better than reason, and is described by Pirie as both a "clever fallacy" and an "idiotic claim".

From the literature: Does age matter?

A paper³ in last month's *blue journal* concludes "The prevalence and patterns of pilot error in air carrier accidents do not seem to change with pilot age. The lack of association between pilot age and error may be due to the "safe worker effect" resulting from the rigorous selection processes and certification standards for professional pilots." The study applied Chi-squared analysis to the relationship between pilot age and pilot errors in respect to 558 NTSB accident reports involving US Part 121 operations (1983 – 2002).

² Pirie, M. *Book of the Fallacy: A Training Manual for Intellectual Subversives*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Books Ltd (1985).

³ [Pilot error in air carrier accidents: does age matter?](#) Li G, Grabowski JG, Baker SP, and Rebok GW. *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine* 2006; 77(7): 737-741.

CAA Medical Help

Tel: +64-4-560 9466 Fax: +64-4-560 9470
Email: med@caa.govt.nz web site: www.caa.govt.nz