

MALTON - ONTARIO

TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT (Aircraft)

| AIRCRAFT: | ARROW 2 | SECRET | REPORT NO. 72/TACTICS/18 |
|-----------|---------|--------|--------------------------|
| FILE NO: | | * | NO. OF SHEETS |
| TITLE: | | | |

COMPARISON OF ARROW 2 AND BOMARC IN THE AIR DEFENSE OF EASTERN CANADA

| PREPARED BY _ | J boles | DATE | Sept.29/58 |
|---|----------|------|--------------------------|
| RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL APPROVED | And rame | DATE | Sept.29/58 Sept.29/58 |
| APPROVED | | DATE | 4 |



Condition for launch or

take-off

COMPARISON OF ARROW 2 AND BOMARC IN

THE AIR DEFENSE OF EASTERN CANADA

| | | | · Physical | |
|----|-----------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| | | ./ | ARROW 2 | BOMARC |
| 1. | PHYSICAL DATA | | | |
| | Length | | | 47 ft. |
| | Wing Span | | | 18 ft. |
| | Planform | | Delta | Cropped Delta |
| | A.U.W. | | 70,000 lb. | 15,000 lb. |
| | Power Plant | | 2 X Orenda Iroquois 2 | 2 X 25" Marquardt Ramjets + Rocket Boosters |
| | Armament | | 2 Genie Rockets | H.E. or nuclear warhead |
| | Radar Search Patte | a mm | | +150 in azimuth and elevation |
| | nauar Search raco | 8111 | | centred about expected bearing |
| | | | ing from ground control, to | |
| | | | wide angle search between | or target |
| | | | antenna limits | |
| | Antenna Traverse | Limits | ±700 Azimuth | +700 in azimuth and elevation |
| | | | +75° -45° Elevation | (?) |
| 2. | PERFORMANCE | | | |
| | Cruise altitude (| Subsonic | 35,000 ft. | _ |
| | (| Supersonic | 50,000 ft. | 65,000 ft. |
| | Combat speed and | | M = 2.0, 50,000 ft. | M = 2.5, 60,000 ft. |
| İ | Manoeuvrability a condition | t combat | 3.6 g | 7.0 g |
| | 1 | (Subsonic | 600 n.m. combat at M = 1.5 | _ |
| | | (Cruise | 500 n.m. combat at M = 2.0 | _ |
| 兹 | Radius of action | (| | |
| | | , - | | 280 n.m. at M = 2.5 |
| | | (Cruise | M = 2.0 | |
| | A.I. Radar Range | | 25 n.m. | 8 n.m. |
| * | In both cases the | limitation : | is aerodynamic and not thrus | |
| 並並 | | | the aircraft configuration where the city required to give these | nen carrying 2 Genies indicates radii is available. |
| 3. | GROUND ENVIRONMEN | Ţ | | |
| | SAGE | | Can be used: Not essential | Essential |
| | | ual operation | Can be used: Not essential | Marginally Adequate |
| | Broadcast control | | Adequate | Completely Inadequate |
| | Data Link | | Might be used. Not pre- | |
| | Voice Link | | ferred Adequate and preferred | Essential Completely Inadequate |
| | TOTCE BELLY | | vacdage and breserved | combiacata rusquedusca |

Any time a possible target

appears

Close control target track

established



SECRET

| | ARROW 2 | BOMARC |
|--|--|--|
| 3. GROUND ENVIRONMENT (Cont'd) | | |
| Quality of ground tracking data required | Moderate quality adequate (radar has full search capability) | High quality essential (Seeker is directed from the ground) |
| 4. EFFECTS OF ECM | | |
| Against ground radars | Interception can proceed with minimum of data | SAGE unworkable. Bomarc capability doubtful. |
| Against data/voice link | Sporadic information adequate | Disastrous if used in the closing phases of midcourse guidance |
| Against AI radar | Up to 30 secs. available for application of CCM. By alternate lock-on and home on jam, OBS/AI can concentrate on single tartarget. | CCM facilities must be applied in less than 10 secs. Programmed pattern jamming by multiple targets makes home or jam useless. |
| Against fuze | Time fuze-unaffected | Could result in premature detonation of proximity fuze. |

5. AREA DEFENSE COVERAGE

Fig. 1 - Area defended using present radar network

Fig. 2 - Area defended with close control radars at Mid Canada Line.

Target Speeds - M = 0.9 and 2.0 Target Heading- Due south.

The charts show that with the present radar cover the Arrow is able to intercept considerably farther north than Bomarc. For Bomarc to make full use of its range when operating from northerly bases, Mid Canada Lime must be brought within the close control network and SAGE extended to include these bases.



5. AREA DEFENSE COVERAGE (Cont'd)

| | ARROW 2 | BOMARC |
|--|--|--|
| Scramble or launch | 5 minutes after target leaves southern fringe of Dew Line (Allows 25-50 mins for scramble). | 2 minutes after target detection by Pinetree Line. |
| Loiter - with present radar network | 200 n.m. south of Mid Canada Line | - |
| with close control radars at Mid Canada Line | 100 n.m. south of Mid Canada Line | |
| Configuration | Full Internal Fuel | Full internal fuel plus rocket boosters |

6. STRATEGIC ADVANTAGES OF THE ARROW

a) Versatility

Capable of the following missions:-

High speed interception Long range interception

Patrol mission

Long range identification mission

Single or two-pass attacks

Tactical capabilities for limited warfare overseas Possible development for defense against ICBM

b) Operation

Requires a minimum of ground control.

Is not dependant on SAGE, which is highly vulnerable to ECM. Can attack targets at altitudes up to 70,000' and speeds up

to M = 2.0.

Having search radar, it does not need to be told precisely wher to look for target.

c) Aircrew Capability

With an aircrew of two:-

Human intelligence is brought to bear directly in the ECM situation.

The intrinsic human filtering capability can be used when noisy steering signals are displayed.

Component malfunctions can be detected and corrected or allowed for.

Stand-off bombs can be detected and attacked if dropped during an engagement.



SECRET

72/TACTICS/18

6. STRATEGIC ADVANTAGES OF THE ARROW (Cont'd)

d) Recoverability

In a doubtful situation, the cost of dispatching interceptors to investigate is negligible, whereas Bomarcs must be written off i launched.

e) Training Programs

The use of Arrows in training programs raises no problems, and such programs can be made realistic. However, the high cost of launching Bomarcs means that operational training must be done by simulation techniques only. The same is true of system evaluation.