

might be difficult as the Turks would no doubt insist on Istanbul, while the West Indies or the U.S. or Malta would probably attract the most visitors and the Kiel area of Germany would be historically the most suitable.

In this scheme, as also in the previous one, it is possible that enough official U.S. Government backing could be enlisted (e.g. through the Smithsonian) that one could obtain a discarded U.S. World War Two destroyer for example to exchange with the Turks for the GOEBEN, as they are NATO allies. This would, of course, reduce the initial costs to a very modest level, and one might even be able to obtain free towage by the U.S. Navy or the Royal Navy.

3. A Commercial venture on the lines of the QUEEN MARY at Long Beach and the QUEEN ELIZABETH might be much less attractive to the serious student, but it would at least ensure the ultimate survival of the GOEBEN, possibly for more serious preservation in the next century. The QUEEN MARY has already attracted a large increase in business to Long Beach and is expected to be a great money-maker. Gimmicks such as London Bridge at Lake Havasu seem to go down extremely well, and one could expect the GOEBEN moored (if it is possible to get her so far up the Hudson) off Pallisades Park or near Coney Island to attract very large numbers of extra tourists.
4. A very fine and appropriate fate for the GOEBEN, but one unlikely to come about, would be her adoption by NATO as a ceremonial flagship like HMS VICTORY is for the Royal Navy's principal Command (C-in-C Portsmouth). She could then be transferred within NATO, possibly by some discreet swapping of a current minor warship, and at the same time, she would entirely overcome German objections because of her International character. Located say at Antwerp (near Brussels) and if necessary re-named "Grand Alliance" or "Eisenhower", her future would be very secure. Such co-operation from NATO and from Admirals is perhaps too much to hope for.
5. The least likely and trickiest scheme would be to enlist the help of a film company interested in making some giant epic of the First World War at sea. There could be no more suitable epic story of that time than the true and thrilling tale of the GOEBEN (unless one used the GOEBEN to play the part of the little EMDEN). But this is highly speculative as there could be no guarantee that the ship, after use, would not be sold for scrap; although, like the BOUNTY, she could well be used as a vast Hollywood publicity gimmick in the region of San Francisco or elsewhere in California.

To sum up, unless something is done urgently to prevent it, an irreparable loss will occur in the world of maritime history. Regretting it later will be no comfort in view of the marvelous opportunity we have at the moment. There is nothing comparable to an actual object like the GOEBEN as far as understanding the history of its era and sensing the true atmosphere of the First World War as seen from and fought by a dreadnought, just as a visit to the Pyramids is worth more than reading numerous learned books: a small model or even an unbelievably costly full size reproduction is no substitute.

Time and time again enthusiastic devotion and determination have basically been infinitely more important than money in preservation efforts. Let us dig in our toes and refuse to allow the GOEBEN to be destroyed. I would be very grateful to hear from anyone interested in this scheme and in particular from a fanatic willing to join with me in an attempt to see this project through. Posterity will also be grateful if we succeed.

/s/ Aubrey Houston Bowden, Thame Park, THAME, Oxfordshire, England.

Re: Mystery Photo Number 16:

This bark-rigged German warship moored just off Havana's Prado is one of the BISMARCK-class steam korvettes. Judging by the two elevated platforms mounting searchlights - (one amidship just forward of her collapsable funnel and the other aft just forward of her mizzen) - and by the way in which the first tier of portholes above the waterline is arranged, the ship appears to be S.M.S. MOLTKE. Of the ships in that class, the above-mentioned features were unique to this ship.

/s/ Stephen W. Trott, photographic librarian, Von Moller Naval Library, San Francisco, California, USA.

Editor's note: See also W.I. Summer 1969 "Letters to the Editor" column for other identifications of this ship.

Re: ERIE Class Gunboats - See Spring 1969 W.I., pages 115-123:

Robert S. Egan states in his excellent article on the ERIE class gunboats that the vessels were equipped to carry "a small seaplane". While this may be a very minor quibble, the adjective "small" is rather misleading. The table of distribution of USN aircraft for 1937 shows that while serving with CL OMAHA in the Special Service Squadron the ERIE carried a Curtiss SOC-2 and the CHARLESTON a Curtiss SOC-1. These were the standard USN gunnery ship aircraft of the period, equipping battleships and cruisers. They could hardly be termed "small" in the sense that some other USN aircraft, such as those designed for stowage on submarines, were "small". Indeed, when the folding wings of an SOC were extended their 36-foot span would nearly rival the gunboats' beam.

/s/ R.D. Layman, Corte Madera, California, USA.

Re: H.M. Paddle Minesweepers of World War I - See Spring 1969 W.I., pages 124-132:

In his article on the ASCOT paddle minesweepers in the Spring Warship International, George Ransome is correct in his belief that these vessels (also known as the "Racecourse" class) did not operate aircraft. It had been planned that each should carry two Sopwith Baby or Sopwith Schneider seaplanes for anti-Zeppelin work, but although initial experiments with shipboard carriage of these planes were successful, it was apparent that the pitch and roll of the vessels would make launching and recovery of the aircraft impossible except under ideal conditions of sea and weather. Consequently, none of the ships ever