

midable Hero while most RCAF vets didn't give it a thought. *Austin Airways* big in Ontario, less so elsewhere.

Other niche markets for CANAV include a small but loyal number of public libraries (of about 4000 English public library branches in Canada it's possible to find any given title in 300-400 of them by looking very hard over a 10-year period). There is almost no market for CANAV's books in Canadian school libraries. They have an aviation shelf invariably stocked with American titles. Except for a handful, Canadian schools simply won't order quality books such as CANAV's.

There are many other nuts that are hard to crack. Some booksellers wouldn't know quality, profit-making book if they peddled over it. One of CANAV's favorite stories is this one: a bookseller turned thumbs down on *Austin Airways*. "We don't carry war books," she explained. Airline (i.e., the Norseman bushplane on the dust jacket) equals oshima. Ergo no sale. It's a laugh some days!

CANAV's classic example of the amazing workings of the book market came with *And I Will Fly*. Lewie Leigh's by-now-famous autobiography eventually sold our 2000

copies. But get this—half went to Fort McMurray, Alberta (where Lewie flew in the early 1930s and where a street bears his name) and Grimsby, Ontario (where he lives, and where he happened to be "Citizen of the Year" when his book appeared). In Fort McMurray there's a drugstore flogging the book, while in Grimsby there was a keen stationer. Essentially, non-book trade retailers (bookagists, corner stores, etc.) who stock a odd book as a sideline invariably outpace the local bookstores.

Of course there's a much wider market for CANAV titles like *Sixty Years of Aviation in Canada* that contain something for everyone. Even so the aviation community is small in Canada and few titles reach "best seller" status (4000 copies for a debut). So far most of the 17 CANAV titles have passed 4000, so all is not lost (and do buy a book!)

story Down the Drain?

Government cutbacks are striking at the heart of Canadian culture. This summer bean counters in Ottawa slashed jobs and dollars at the Directorate of History. "Hist" is the main repository of Canadian military documents—operational records, archival photos, etc. Staff cut from about 30 to 10.

This may not be Cambodia or Somalia, but they burn their museums, archives and libraries in the process of self-destructing,

and the Ottawa penny pinchers may not be running around with machettes. Still, they are sure to undermine Canada with their rampaging. Does it cost so much to keep our nation's history in safe storage and to maintain adequate staff to care for it?

Somebody had better step in before irreparable damage is done to the nation's roots. Somebody? For starters, what do the Minister of National Defence, Chief of

Aviation Quarterly

In mid-September *Aviation Quarterly* appeared in mail boxes across Canada. It was six months late, so subscribers were beginning to despair. In the end, it was worth the wait. "AQ" is a clean, quality production jammed with hard core reading. It's a treat compared to

RANDY. I DECIDED TO SEND YOU THIS ANYWAY, SINCE I THINK THAT MY REBUTTAL CONTAINS SOME FACTS THAT MIGHT BE OF INTEREST. MY REBUTTAL WAS NEVER PUBLISHED, SINCE IT WAS A PERSONAL & PRIVATE NOTE TO FILE. PS. LARRY HAS NEVER SPOKEN TO ME SINCE THIS.

each. If Smith rejected a title, the publisher was loath to put it into print. No wonder mainline

Canadian publishers fear the chains getting any bigger. On the other hand, small

publishers, the exciting heart of Canadian publishing, don't lose much sleep over the chains, which steadfastly ignore their existence.

The Other Side of the Story

The Avro Arrow is one of the great aviation legends. No Canadian airplane has received such attention—several books, etc. Various interest groups ceaselessly discuss the Arrow and nostalgia buffs talk about building a full-scale replica (so long as the public will foot the bill).

Nobody can deny the importance of the Arrow in Canada's aviation heritage. It was a technological wonder of its day, but there is a problem with how the story is usually presented. It is generally treated from only one vantage point—losing the Arrow was a national tragedy.

People tend to deal with the Arrow on a purely emotional level. They rarely ask substantial questions that might deal with such matters as its cost (on a scale with the money spent on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway, or the Trans-Canada Pipeline, two megaprojects of the 1950s). Did the Arrow even have a mission? (What really was the threat from the Soviet Union?) What was so wrong with countering the Soviet threat, whether real, perceived or cooked-up, with alternate weapons such as the superb F-101 Voodoo? When the Arrow

was terminated, was it really a disaster for Canada's aviation industry? (Most of the 15,000 or so who lost their jobs at Avro were soon busy working elsewhere. Several ex-Avroites immediately joined Canadian Pratt & Whitney and before long had designed the PT6. Today the PT6 is aviation's most successful small turbine engine.) It is possible that the Arrow "disaster" is little more than a figment of people's imaginations.

One might also ask the sacrilegious question, "Was Avro capable of delivering a first-class weapons system in the first place?" Questions remain about the Arrow's airframe design, and its engine was still developmental. In early 1959, when it was scrapped, the Arrow was a big, beautiful experimental aircraft. Even its proposed weapons system was still on the drawing board. This did not prevent Avro from touting the Arrow as almost ready for service. Such aspects of the program are yet to be addressed. So far, the story is a fuzzy one, presented mostly by a pro-Avro faction. An objective view would be a treat. Maybe in the next book?

Mr. L Milberry,
CANAV Books,
51 Balsam Ave.,
Toronto, Ont. M4E 3B6

December 31st. 1994.

Dear Larry,

Your article on 'Arrowmania' in the current listing of CANAV books.

When I read the above piece I was going to write to you immediately, but, on reflection, I decided that I had better simmer down before doing that, since I didn't want to lose a friend, particularly one that I respect very much and who has done so much to present our aviation heritage to so many people. However, I did have to get my reaction to the item off my chest, so I decided to write down my feelings about what you had written in a 'memorandum to file', which would only be seen by myself. I thought that might help me to reduce the frustration that I felt on reading the piece, but it didn't,--- so I have now decided to send you my thoughts on the subject anyway.

The two main items that triggered off my 'dismay' were the use of the derogatory term 'pro-Arrow faction' and what that implies, and the fact that this plea for an 'objective view' of the project, was qualified by comments that questioned the capability of the Avro team to finish the job anyway! I was also surprised that this piece came from a source closely associated with the CAHS, from which we expect a truly unbiased approach to Canadian aviation history.

As I mention in the memo-to-file, the constant bombardment of the diatribes from the super-anti-Avro 'friends of Lucasiewicz' have resulted in a great deal of pain to the ex-Avro engineers and taken up far too much of my own time in trying to put the record straight. My main problem in that regard is my concern that the only voice that some of the students of these maverick history professors hear are the vitriolic ramblings of professors Bliss, Hodge, Morton and of course Lucasiewicz himself. So they are exposed to all of the bad, invented or otherwise, and none of the good on the subject.

Some of the students who phone or write to me are very confused about what really happened at Malton. I try to help by sending them recorded and documented facts about the Arrow and letting them make up their own minds and form their own opinions on the subject. These youngsters are not stupid and the attached correspondence with one of the students, which is typical of so many others, is a good example of their own thinking on the subject when presented with the facts, instead of the totally biased opinions that they receive from their tutors. Anyway, perhaps I should let the enclosed 'bits and pieces' tell their own story.

One comment in your piece that really bothered me Larry, was the statement, in making the point that many of the 15,000 people laid off on Black Friday found other jobs, which concludes:-- "It is possible that the Arrow disaster is little more than a figment of peoples imagination". -- Tell that to the thousands of employees who had to

move to other districts to get jobs and had to sell their homes in a saturated market of ex-Avro family homes at a fraction of the price that some of them had paid for them. Tell it to the families who lost a member in the number of recorded suicides. Tell that to my wife!---- I personally had no problem in landing an interesting job, but it happened to be 5000 miles away from our beloved Canada. We had to leave the cottage that we had built over a ten year period with our own hands, the house that we had just moved into and were going to live there for the rest of our lives. Tell it to our four sons who were dragged away from the home and the friends that they loved and the good schools that they were so happily attending, to go and live in new and unfamiliar surroundings. And we were the lucky ones! There were hundreds of families that were split up and were never the same again and one would have to be extremely callous to conclude that it was 'no big deal'.

Well Larry, now you know how I feel about the article and I can only hope for the day when the Arrow saga will be 'put to bed' and we can ignore the paranoid ramblings of the 'revisionists'. I don't want to start another debate on that oversubscribed subject, I am too old and weary of the subject, but I just wanted to leave these thoughts with you. I don't require or expect a response and anyway we are going to be away from Toronto until February 15th.

In the meantime I hope that you and the children will have a wonderful festive season and a healthy and prosperous 1995.

Sincerely,

Jim Floyd.

Memorandum to file

December 10th 1994

I was surprised and I have to confess dismayed on reading the article on page 2 of CANAV Books Newsletter and Booklist, received as a flyer in the Fall 94 issue of the CAHS Journal. Titled 'The other side of the story', it discusses the Avro Arrow saga and calls for a further book on the Arrow, to 'present an objective view' of the project, but, on reading between the lines, the article itself appears to be a poorly disguised derogation of the great team at Malton that for 13 extraordinary years put Canada ahead of the rest of the world in aviation and jet-engine technology.

One also has to question the 'facts' in the article. An example is the statement that:

'even its proposed weapon system was still on the drawing board' This reference was presumably to the Astra 1/ Sparrow system. The author must have known that this system--specified by the RCAF and certainly not Avro's choice, had already been cancelled in September 1958 and the Hughes MA 1/ Falcon system, around which the Arrow had originally been designed, had been reinstated and was the system which was being installed at the time of cancellation of the Arrow project. Far from being 'still on the drawing board', the Hughes MA 1- MX 1179 / Falcon GR 1 integrated fire control system concept had been designed and developed in the mid-fifties and was standard equipment on the Convair F 102 fighter well before even the first flight of the Arrow and approximately 10,000 Falcon missiles had already been delivered to the USAF at that time !!

Again, in the statement 'Did the Arrow even have a mission (what really was the threat from the Soviet Union)'. If that was meant to imply that the Operational Requirements Group in the RCAF wrote the wrong specification, then that accusation should be addressed to the RCAF, not Avro, who certainly didn't write the specification, it was simply the job of the company to produce an aircraft which would meet the specification laid down by the O.R. branch of the RCAF. Anyway, the whole question of defence strategy can be likened to any insurance policy. If one takes out a policy at what appears to be the lowest cost, without reading the 'fine print' to determine the adequacy of the coverage and the worst happens, it could mean being left very high and very dry. If the question of necessity is to be measured by hindsight, then any military aircraft that did not have to be used in conflict was unnecessary and there are certainly hundreds of those in the history books, some very good ones.

How also does the author reconcile his question of 'was Avro capable of delivering a first-class weapon system in the first place' with the fact that, after the cancellation, so many of the Avro and Orenda engineering teams went on to leading-edge-of-technology tasks all over the world, including helping the Americans put a man on the moon ?. In

that respect, it is appropriate to quote from the book titled--- Apollo: the race to the moon, published in 1969 by Simon and Shuster of New York and written by Charles Murray and Catherine Bly-Cox. They said this:

" As the Space Task Group's burden was threatening to overwhelm it, the Canadian government unintentionally gave the American Space program its luckiest break since Werner von Braun surrendered to the Americans ---- the Canadians never gained much public recognition for their contribution to the manned space program, but to the people within the program their contribution was incalculable"

The same book also quotes one of the original American Space Task Group engineers as saying, about the Canadians: " They had it all over us, in many areas ---just brilliant guys --- they were more mature and they were bright as hell and talented and professional, to a man"-- end of quotes!

So why does the author question the Avro and Orenda engineers capability to finish the job on the Arrow and the Iroquois engine ? Is it because they were Canadians and Canadians are not supposed to prove that they are second to none in so many things? Also, what about the fact that S/L Jack Woodman, the tough and no-nonsense RCAF evaluation pilot later reported that: " Approximately 95% of the flight envelope was investigated and from where I sat the Arrow was performing as predicted and meeting all guarantees" ----(yes, that is also on record). In a talk at the 25th. anniversary of the first flight of the Arrow, Woodman also had this to say : " 25 years ago, as a representative of the customer, I can tell you that it was a good airplane, a darned good airplane, well ahead of the pack. The decision to cancel the Arrow program I think denied Canada and the RCAF from being world leaders in high performance airplanes ".

One could go on 'ad nauseum' on the individual items in the article, but what I find most puzzling is the innuendo in remarks indicating that any offerings on the subject of the Arrow that have been presented to date are by a " pro-Avro faction " (the dictionary interpretation of the word 'faction' is as follows: A party combining to promote their own purposes at the expense of order and the public good). Oh those wicked Avroites !!!

The author apparently dismisses the efforts of other authors such as Paul Campagna, a young Canadian who has no axe to grind except a respect and admiration for his fellow Canadians (he was 3 yrs. old when the Arrow was rolled out). Campagna carried out an exceptional amount of research prior to putting pen to paper and turned out a book that many believe to be the most factual presentation on the Arrow since the excellent book on the subject by James Dow in 1979, titled 'The Arrow', published by Lorimer.

This statement that everything that has been written about the Arrow to date has been by a 'pro-Avro faction' is strange, to say the least, in view of the fact that so many derogatory articles and chapters in

I WOULD BE VERY SAD IF 'HALLERNE'
HAD TO BE INCLUDED IN THIS CLASS!

history books have been written by the self-styled 'revisionist historians', notably professors Morton, Bliss, Hodge and Lucasiewicz, To invite yet another book (which apparently has to be written by a 'revisionist' to be any good) indicates a sympathy between CANAV publishing and this 'gaggle' of professors of 'history' that try to revise recorded history in the style of the National Enquirer or other trashy tabloids. Incidentally, Morton even wrote a half page article in the Globe and Mail and a chapter in his book 'A Military History of Canada', which stated that the Arrow would have 'self-destructed' in flight, because of a certain item that was designed into it. Unfortunately, he had his aircraft mixed up and erroneously referred to a system that was not even used on the Arrow. When this was pointed out to him, he blamed a student of his who had carried out his 'research'. However, his false accusations are still in the libraries to be read by future generations as 'facts'.

So CANAV should find no problem in getting a totally derogatory presentation on the Arrow and Avro from these gentlemen if that is what is desired. I find it particularly disturbing that while the rest of the world considers that Canada was contributing so much to aviation technology in the 40s and 50s, the only dissenting voices come from within Canada and from sources that indicate an unhealthy bias against Canadian engineers and technicians. The real facts on the Arrow are well documented and these maverick professors who call themselves 'revisionists' should be informed that the truth needs no revising and stands on its own!

Finally, I have to confess that I was particularly sad that a well established and respected publishing house that has brought such a wealth of good aviation history to all of us, has used its position of privilege and courtesy within the CAHS, a society which I believe to be one of the finest sources of aviation history in Canada, to publish this piece, which puts in question the impartiality of all of the people involved. Perhaps we can agree on one thing, -- the debate on the Arrow has gone on long enough and most of us who have been bombarded by the 'for and against' arguments for decade after decade would rather see the subject 'put to bed' with the dignity and pride deserved by that great team that put Canada ahead of the rest of the world in aviation and jet-engine technology in those remarkable years. But not another book PLEASE. I seem to remember the caption in an earlier CANAV book listing of Campagna's excellent book which included the comment 'yet another book on the Arrow--whatever turns you on'!---- This time let it be -- 'whatever turns you off'!

I will probably now be tagged with the label 'a member of the pro-Avro faction'. Let the chips fall where they may. In fact, I make no apology for the fact that I am proud to have been associated with that wonderful team of fellow Canadians, who worked their hearts out to put Canada first in aviation and for a short time--succeeded. They deserve better than this.

Jim Fland

Dec. 94.