

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED TO THE 9Fs

by ROGER BUTCHER

WRHTS



BR Class 9F 2-10-0 No. **92001** is pictured on a Bournemouth to Bradford passenger service at Oxford in July 1965. It would be nice to know where this locomotive was really scrapped. *Colour-Rail BRW61*

As it was my response in Link 91 to Raymond Harrison's letter in Link 89 about 92034 that first drew ESS members' attention to the 'What Really Happened To Steam' Project, it is appropriate that the very first published article reflecting what the HSBT team has discovered on a specific class relates to the 9Fs. Incidentally, Raymond, we now know 92034 was actually stored in Carlton Field sidings, a short distance from Colwick Shed which no doubt explains why you did not see it. For the record Terry Hayward and I saw 92187/88 stored awaiting disposal in the same sidings on April 25th, 1965. Fortunately for us we had been alerted to their presence by an enthusiast walking back to Colwick Shed from the sidings.

PERPETUATION OF ERRORS

In Link 91 I referred to the need to break the circle of a perpetuation of errors as most publishers, believing the 'What Happened To Steam' (WHTS) books to be reliable reference sources, continued to recycle the errors and fabrications contained in the books. I was fully aware that this would be a difficult task that needed to be handled very sensitively and in, as far as possible, a non-confrontational manner. Three years on I am delighted to say that of the major publishers who write or report on the storage and disposal of the steam locomotive fleet there is almost universal acceptance of our work and active cooperation with our aims. I will say more on this aspect in the forthcoming update on the overall project in the May issue of *The Railway Magazine*, but I would like to place on record my thanks, amongst others, to Ian Allan/OPC, Booklaw, Irwell Press and Lightmoor Press. Also to all the major railwayana auction houses who now either actively cooperate with the HSBT Project or no longer recycle fabricated storage and disposal information. If you have not seen the previous two articles in *The Railway Magazine* on this subject, they can both be found at www.whatreallyhappenedtosteam.co.uk

RCTS-GATE!

In the previous paragraph I used the phrase 'almost universal acceptance' when referring to the major publishers of information on the storage and disposal of the steam locomotive fleet. That implies at least one publisher has taken a different view on our work. So, whilst I anticipated that at least one would take the Flat Earth Society approach to what we were demonstrating, I did not for one moment anticipate that it would be the society I had been a member of for nearly four decades and had written a column for from 1976 to 1989 - the Railway Correspondence and Travel Society (RCTS)! As they say 'you couldn't make it up' or perhaps in the case of the RCTS you still can!

For those of you who haven't seen the RCTS book on the 9Fs - Volume 4 *A Detailed History of British Railways Standard Steam Locomotives* - it purports to include, amongst other data, the sale date of every 9F. It is the belief of the HSBT Project that these dates are - in the main - fabricated. I challenged the editor of the book, John Walford, to produce even one sale document to prove what he had published. He could not.

As regards the scrap merchant responsible for the disposal of each 9F I gave John Walford a list of

9Fs whose disposal we knew were fabricated in the WHTS books. John's 'advice' to me was not to use the terms 'falsification' and 'fabrication' as 'you never know who may eventually decide to reach for the telephone number of their solicitor.' Everyone will have their own thoughts about John's intentions in giving me that piece of 'advice.' Suffice to say here, the HSBT team is united in its determination to not only break the circle of a perpetuation of errors, but also to prevent any cover-up of the fact that railway history has been contaminated by fabricated material.

So, whilst every other relevant publisher accepted the irrefutable evidence presented in the October 2010 issue of *The Railway Magazine* (ie the comparison between official BR sale documentation and Zulu's letters in his own handwriting to Peter Hands) John Walford's view of the panel was "A block statement of this nature should always arouse scepticism in the mind of the historian". Yes, I know, it beggars belief! John Walford attempts to explain away the fabrications by talking (in his emails to me) of resales, sub-contracts, poor paperwork, mysterious deals, some doubt, etc - quite simply absolutely anything rather than simply accepting the truth that the 9F book includes the fabricated information that originated from Zulu.

So, whilst to his credit, the compiler of the WHTS books, Peter Hands, accepts he was duped by Zulu, referring to him as 'a rogue correspondent' in his 'right to reply' in Link 103, the editor responsible for the RCTS 9F book doesn't and is content to recycle the fabricated information. Whether that is because Zulu was himself a RCTS member, only John Walford can say.

THE LATE JOHN TRUE'S RECORDS

In simple terms, except for the additional information which was acquired from Trevor Ermel on 92066/77 and 92160/67 (Zulu fabrications sorted by Trevor who also contacted the HSBT Project) the 9F disposal list (locations and dates) is no more than an almost complete copy of the Hands 'information'

John Walford's response to me pointing out that fact was that 'John True wrote directly to the scrap dealers involved and was able to resolve outstanding issues. John reached his conclusions independently, ie without reference to the material in the WHTS series which was appearing at the time'

I challenge anyone to compare the WHTS list and the RCTS list and still believe that statement! As for the claim that the scrap dealers responded to letters from enthusiasts some 15 years after the end of steam, this is pure (or should that be impure?) fantasy. It is the same fantasy when Zulu claimed to both myself and *Steam World* that his records were based on detailed correspondence with some 80 scrap merchants. But, guess what, he doesn't let anyone see the correspondence. And, just for the record, I offered Zulu £20,000 to purchase that 'alleged' correspondence.

The reality is that the appearance of the first WHTS books in 1980 stimulated interest in the subject and the Project has been made aware of a number of enthusiasts who did then write to every scrap merchant they believed may have scrapped steam locomotives. The only two to respond positively were Hughes Bolckow, Blyth and Slag Reduction, Rotherham. Most of the companies involved were no longer in business of course! And so, quite obviously, would not be able 'to resolve outstanding issues.'

Just for the record the Steam Railway Research Society was bequeathed John True's non-GWR records and, of course, his 9F ledgers have as you would expect many gaps in them and no evidence whatsoever of any correspondence with scrap merchants. Also, one is entitled to query why, if John True had really carried out such extensive research on this complex subject, is his name not included in the extensive list of acknowledgements (for help) detailed in the 9F book?

THE END OF AN ERA

The final volume in the RCTS series on Standard Locomotives is (for me) aptly named 'The End of an Era', as it brings to an end (in my opinion) the time when RCTS books could always be trusted. It also

brings an end to my own membership of the RCTS as I have no wish to belong to a society that refuses to accept that it is recycling fabricated information. For the record I should mention that most of the HSBT team are members of the RCTS and fully support what I am stating in this article.

None of us can comprehend that despite providing a list of all the Standard locomotives whose disposals we knew to have been fabricated to John Walford he has chosen not to include them in the amendments listed in Volume 5 of this series. Instead, and it again beggars belief, the miserly list of amendments on disposals actually introduces further errors! As well as, in effect, perpetuating the falsified information by refusing to include the corrections we submitted.

The justification for ignoring us is (presumably) referred to in John Walford's email to me when, after having received the information I submitted, he states 'They could be included in Volume 5 after checking whether they conflict with any information in our files'. Well, of course they are going to conflict John - that is the whole point!

BR STANDARD CLASS 9F 2-10-0s WHOSE DISPOSALS WERE FALSIFIED			
NUMBER	DISPOSAL ACCORDING TO WHTS (2ND EDITION)	DISPOSAL ACCORDING TO RCTS	ACTUAL DISPOSAL
92001	COX & DANKS, WADSLEY BRIDGE	COX & DANKS, WADSLEY BRIDGE	NOT KNOWN
92016	McWILLIAM, SHETTLESTON	McWILLIAM, SHETTLESTON	MOTHERWELL MACHINERY & SCRAP, WISHAW
92033	WARD, KILLAMARSH	WARD, KILLAMARSH	WARD, BEIGHTON
92039	WARD, KILLAMARSH	WARD, KILLAMARSH - <i>THEN</i> ARNOTT YOUNG, PARKGATE	WARD, KILLAMARSH
92041	WARD, BEIGHTON	CASHMORE, GREAT BRIDGE - <i>THEN</i> WARD, BEIGHTON	WARD, BEIGHTON
92053	STATION STEEL, WATH	STATION STEEL, WATH - <i>THEN</i> CASHMORE, GREAT BRIDGE	STATION STEEL, WATH
92066	COHEN, CARGO FLEET	COHEN, CARGO FLEET <i>BUT CUT UP</i> ATELLIS METALS, SWALWELL	ELLIS METALS, SWALWELL
92077	CAMPBELL, AIRDRIE	CAMPBELL, AIRDRIE <i>BUT CUT UP AT</i> CLAYTON & DAVIE, GATESHEAD	CLAYTON & DAVIE, GATESHEAD
92110	ARNOTT YOUNG, PARKGATE	CAMPBELL, AIRDRIE <i>BUT COULD BE</i> ARNOTT YOUNG, PARKGATE	ARNOTT YOUNG, PARKGATE
92128	McWILLIAM, SHETTLESTON	McWILLIAM, SHETTLESTON	MOTHERWELL MACHINERY & SCRAP, WISHAW
92160	CAMPBELL, AIRDRIE	CAMPBELL, AIRDRIE <i>BUT CUT UP AT</i> CLAYTON & DAVIE, GATESHEAD	CLAYTON & DAVIE, GATESHEAD
92167	CAMPBELL, AIRDRIE	CAMPBELL, AIRDRIE <i>BUT CUT UP AT</i> CLAYTON & DAVIE, GATESHEAD	CLAYTON & DAVIE, GATESHEAD
92173	WARD, BEIGHTON	WARD, KILLAMARSH	STATION STEEL, WATH
92174	WARD, BEIGHTON	WARD, KILLAMARSH	STATION STEEL, WATH
92183	STATION STEEL, WATH	STATION STEEL, WATH	WARD, KILLAMARSH
92186	DRAPER, HULL	DRAPER, HULL	WARD, BEIGHTON
92192	WARD, BEIGHTON	WARD, BEIGHTON	ARNOTT YOUNG, PARKGATE
92194	ARNOTT YOUNG, PARKGATE	ARNOTT YOUNG, PARKGATE <i>BUT COULD BE</i> BAUER, CLEVELAND DOCKYARD	ARNOTT YOUNG, PARKGATE
92201	STATION STEEL, WATH	STATION STEEL, WATH	WARD, KILLAMARSH
92223	ARNOTT YOUNG, DINSDALE	ARNOTT YOUNG, DINSDALE	ARNOTT YOUNG, PARKGATE
92233	WARD, BEIGHTON	WARD, BEIGHTON	ARNOTT YOUNG, PARKGATE
92238	CASHMORE, NEWPORT	WARD, BRITON FERRY <i>BUT COULD BE</i> CASHMORE, NEWPORT	CASHMORE, NEWPORT

NOTES

- The tables above have been presented in a simplified and standardized format that also corrects any minor grammatical typos in the books referred to.
- Almost all the double-entries in the RCTS column reflect the inclusion of a Zulu fantasy inevitably contradicting a personal observation. They are not resales.
- The tables above only deal with the actual location where a 9F was scrapped. To attempt here to correct sales data and dates of scrapping we would need a supplement to Link!

Very many thanks to everyone who has contributed to the 'actual disposal' column, particularly ESS and HSBT members Tony Wakefield and Terry Hayward. Terry is the HSBT member with special responsibility for Standard locomotives and WDs.