"That most useful body of men": the Operational Doctrine and Identity of the British Marine Corps, 1755-1802

Submitted by **Britt Zerbe** to the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in Maritime History**In **September 2010**

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material
has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature:

Abstract

The Corps of Marines 1755-1802 (after 1802, Royal Marines) was the smallest of the three military services of the late eighteenth century British Armed Nation. Because of this, their history has largely been marginalised - or if dealt with, only in broad three hundred year studies. However, their importance has been largely underestimated. With the rise in the late eighteenth century of a more coherent 'Blue-Water Strategy', classified later by some historians as a uniquely 'British Way in Warfare', there was a need to have an operational organisation from which to implement Britain's grand strategy. The two other contemporary military organizations (Army and Navy) were too large, had internal resistance to, or simply had one-dimensional geographic identification which prevented the full pure operational implementation of British amphibious power. With the dawn of the Seven Years War the government gave this operational priority to the Navy, which began in earnest with the formation of the British Marine Corps. The Navy, and Marines, were able to do this by constructing an operational doctrine and identity for its new Marine Corps. With the forty-seven year construction of its operational doctrine and identity, the Marines not only assisted in the implementation of British grand strategy, but also were pivotal in the protection of the empire.

This dissertation is separated into two distinct parts. The first part outlines the skeleton of the Marines; their past formations, administration and manpower construct. The second part outlines the trials and tribulations of construction and institutionalisation of the Marine Corps within the British nation of the late-eighteenth century. This part reveals the non-combat usage, operational development and imperial rapid reaction force aspects of the Marines. Marines were to carry out many protection and security related duties on land and at sea. Because of this they were given direct access to weapons which in the unfortunate event of mutiny might be used against the men. Naval and amphibious combat were the main justifications for why the Marine Corps existed to begin with. Marines were to develop their own special 'targeted' suppression fire and a reliance on the bayonet for both of these operations. Importantly Empire; its maintenance, expansion, and protection was an essential element of the Marines existence. Marines were to become an imperial rapid reaction force that could be sent anywhere a naval ship was and used to suppress disorders. Identity was the tool of three powers (Public, Admiralty and Marine Corps) in their construction of this body of men. Marines' identity allowed them to be relied upon for a multitude of duties, including the basic protection of order on ship. By understanding all of these areas not only will it expand historical scholarship on how the British state constructed and implemented its policy decisions, but also how an organisation creates and validates its own purpose of existence.

Table of Contents

Intr	roduction	p. 6
(a) V	p. 7	
(b) I	p. 10	
	Sources	p. 15
(d) Outline of the Thesis		p. 18
	PART I	
Cha	npter I: What Came Before	p. 22
1.1	1739 House of Commons Debates	p. 22
1.2	The Structure of Marine Regiments	p. 25
1.3	The Operational Use of Marine Regiments	p. 37
1.4	Summary	p. 40
Cha	npter II: Administration	p. 44
2.1	1755 Corps of Marines and Marine Department	p. 44
2.2	The Marine Pay Office	p. 49
2.3	Divisional Structure	p. 51
2.4	Marines Barracks	p. 58
2.5	Naval Sinecure or Marine Command?	p. 60
2.6	Summary	p. 67
Cha	npter III: Marine Corps Manpower	p. 71
3.1	Recruiting Service	p. 73
3.2	Demography and Social Background	p. 84
3.3	Pay and Subsistence	p. 96
3.4	Desertion and Retention of Marines	p. 99
	PART II	
Cha	pter IV: Policing Functions and Mutiny	p. 107
4.1	Policing Duties on Ship	p. 108
4.2	Policing Duties Ashore	p. 119
4.3	Mutinies at Sea	p. 125
4.4	Great Mutiny on Land?	p. 139
4.5	Summary	р. 146
	npter V: Operational Doctrine	p. 150
5.1	Marine Training and Tactics for Sea Combat	p. 152
5.2	Marine Training and Theory for Land Combat	p. 163
5.3	Amphibious Assault: Large and Small-scale	p. 169
5.4	Summary	p. 186
	npter VI: An Imperial Rapid Reaction Force	р. 188
6.1	Foreign Power Projection	p. 189
6.2	Imperial Power Projection	p. 199
6.3	Summary	p. 219

Conc The s	p. 222 p. 231			
Appe	endices			
1	p. 240			
2	p. 243			
3	3 'Blue' Colonel Establishment 1760			
4	p. 245			
5	5 Making 'Royal' 1802			
6	6 Command Tree			
Chart 1 Marine and Naval Manpower			p. 249	
Chart 2 Percentage of Marines to Voted Strength			p. 250	
Chart 3 Marine Enlistment Years		p. 251		
Chart 4 Marine Height & Year of Enlistment			p. 252	
Char	Chart 5 Age & Year of Enlistment			
Char	6 Marin	es Country of Birth	p. 254	
Bibliography			p. 255	
Tabl	es			
1	Total Population Percentages of Manpower		p. 87	
2	Marine Sentry Duties			
3	Marine Distribution in War-time Fleet			
4	Marine Establishment Numbers in Peace-time			
5	Marine Distribution in Peace-time Fleet			

Note on Terms and Acknowledgements

The Corps of Marines and Marine Corps were terms of contemporary usage for the British Marines of this period. I have therefore used these terms throughout my paper to refer to the British Marines exclusively; all other countries have their names before their service (i.e. US Marine Corps or Dutch Marines). As for capitalisation and lower case I have always capitalised Corps or Division unless it is directly inappropriate. Marines are to be capitalised when I am referring to them as the institution or the term of descriptive (i.e. the Marines or Marine officers). When the discussion changes to the marines themselves as men it shall be kept in a lower case. Finally, I have maintained the original authors' capitalisation practices when it comes to all direct quotes.

I would first like to thank the librarian of the Royal Marine Museum, Mr. Matt Little for all of his help with the museum's manuscripts. I also would like to pass on my thanks to two people who have laboriously gone over this paper in its many draft forms. Without their help most of the research for this paper would not have been possible. For any defects in the text I am the sole responsibility. Mike and Stacey, thank you from the bottom of my heart.