

Introduction

Quintin Colville and James Davey

The last few decades have witnessed a transformation in the way that naval history is researched and conceived. A generation ago, this was largely – though by no means entirely – a self-contained world. Its priorities and themes were understood and accepted, revolving broadly around issues of warfare, command and leadership, strategy and tactics, technology and weaponry. While these crucial subjects remain, historians working within the discipline, and others from outside it who have identified the navy as fertile ground for analysis, have between them opened up new perspectives on the subject. The range and variety of research concerning the navy is now remarkable, and continues to develop apace. Recent scholarship has examined issues of national identity and imperialism through naval affairs; the celebrity and legacy of Admiral Nelson; the social and cultural realities of life on board ship; the place of the navy within wider constructions of gender and class; and the myriad ways in which the relationship between the navy and British society has been mediated through art, music and popular culture. As a result, some of the assumptions of naval history have altered, and a variety of approaches now have a stake in defining it. Above all, there has been a distinct shift from a concern with the Royal Navy as a separate and separable institution, to an examination of the complex relationships between ship and shore, Britain and its empire, navy and nation.

Naturally, any discussion about the current state of naval history begs many questions about its earlier incarnations. As a discipline, it has not always had a strong sense of its past, for while there have been countless naval histories, there have been few works on the academic origins of the subject that have sought to explain how it has been conceived and understood. This unfamiliarity is beginning to change with the production of a number of ‘state of the field’ publications devoting attention to naval historiography, but for the most

part, this historiography remains overlooked and frequently disregarded.¹ Few would disagree that it is a subject of long standing, with most historians tracing its origins to the flood of publications produced in the late nineteenth century.² It is worth remembering, though, that the roots of naval history go back much further than that. Navies, admirals and sailors had been the subject of chronicles and historical narratives from the earliest recordings of civilizations in the Western world. Thucydides devoted vast portions of his history on the Peloponnesian War to the naval aspects of the conflict, as did Polybius's account of the Punic Wars, and countless other works were produced in the subsequent centuries that referred, if only in part, to the actions of navies and their commanders. Nonetheless, these remained partial naval histories, with events at sea but one part of a broader narrative.³

It was not until the early eighteenth century that naval history emerged as a clearly defined, coherent and separate subject. The early decades of the eighteenth century saw the publication of the first general naval histories in the English language: Josiah Burchett's *A Complete History of the most Remarkable Transactions at Sea*, published in 1720; Samuel Colliber's *Columna Rostrata: Or, A Critical History of the English Sea-Affairs*; and finally Thomas Lediard's *The Naval History of England*, fifteen years later.⁴ They were conscious that they were contributing something entirely novel, as Burchett made clear in his preface:

I began to reflect that, among the numerous Subjects which have been treated in the *English Tongue* ... no one hath hitherto undertaken to collect somewhat of a *Naval History*, or general Account of the Wars on the Sea; whereof both ancient and modern Times have been so productive, that I know of no subject which affords more ample Circumstance.⁵

These works did not just appear out of the blue, but instead emanated from a society increasingly wedded to ideas of naval power, and with a growing need to record and debate Britain's naval past. While newspapers, prints, pamphlets and parliament continuously stressed the importance of the navy, it was not at all surprising that literate Britons would seek to find out more about the institution's history. From the outset, then, naval history was written by individuals who had identified it as a marketable subject, and who produced works aimed at a broad popular audience.

If naval history was primarily a subject aimed at a burgeoning reading public, it was also strident in its patriotism, deliberately reflecting broader mentalities about national naval prowess. Burchett's work was remarkably international in its focus, giving considerable attention to other nations that had 'flourished at sea' (including the Egyptians, Phoenicians, Greeks, Romans, Venetians, Swedes and Danes), but the historians who followed focused only on the English, and later British, Navy. Colliber saw the roots of British naval power in the maritime efforts of the Saxons, while Lediard began his *Naval History of England* on the only date that mattered – 1066 – ridiculing the idea that studying foreign navies would offer any useful lessons whatsoever.⁶ Subsequent efforts wore their jingoism proudly: Charles Jenkins's *England's Triumph: or Spanish Cowardice Expos'd* can barely be described a history book, so blatant was its xenophobia, while John Campbell's 1759 work, *Lives of the Admirals and other Eminent British Seamen*, devoted its pages to highlighting fundamental characteristics intrinsic to the British naval admirals, including skilful navigation, virtue, heroism and success.⁷ Even William James's superlative histories of the wars of 1793–1815, which remain the most comprehensive operational accounts of the conflict, were prompted by a moment of nationalistic pride.⁸ Naval history would continue to be defined by its patriotic character into the modern era.

Most importantly, it had secured a robust and enduring popular audience. In the aftermath of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, countless narratives and biographies of leading naval figures were published, alongside autobiographical accounts written by both officers and seamen, which continued to be published into the second half of the century. What naval history had gained in popular audience, though, it missed in scholarly rigour, which became increasingly evident as the study of history became more entrenched into British universities in the second half of the nineteenth century. From the 1890s, historians such as Alfred Thayer Mahan, Julian Corbett, Herbert Richmond and John Knox Laughton, began to refocus the discipline towards a more meticulous approach based on close analyses of surviving documentary sources, and in the process brought coherence to a subject that had previously lacked definition.⁹ Institutions were set up that sought to further the reach of naval history: the Navy Records Society was established in 1893 to print original naval documents relating to the history of the Royal Navy, and it was followed in 1912 by *The Naval Review*, which published historical scholarship alongside papers on current professional concerns. Moreover, naval history was ensconced within the British university system for the first time: Laughton was a Professor of Modern History at King's College London throughout the 1890s and 1900s, while in 1911 the Vere Harmsworth Chair in Naval History was endowed at the University of Cambridge.¹⁰

What was truly distinctive about the naval history produced in the 1890–1914 period was how attuned it was to contemporary political and professional issues. Most writers were naval officers or civilians closely tied to the navy, whose work promised to offer critical insights for the present.¹¹ For some, naval history provided a means of uncovering principles of naval strategy and tactics that could educate serving naval personnel. Laughton used academic methodologies to deliver texts and courses for the purposes of naval education, while Julian Corbett taught naval history on the Naval War Course from 1904; his *Official*

History of the War: Naval Operations became the standard teaching resource of the inter-war navy.¹² For others, naval history offered an obvious opportunity to argue for the importance of naval power amid a back-drop of increasing imperial tensions and an escalating naval arms race. Herbert Richmond's operational histories demonstrated clear contemporary concerns – not least in *The Navy as an Instrument of Policy* – while in the United States, both Theodore Roosevelt and Alfred Thayer Mahan wrote to argue for a larger American navy. It seems likely that the Navy Records Society was also created with some degree of political intent: it was established at a time when Gladstone was attempting to reduce the naval budget.¹³

Naval history's reputation as a tool for naval education, and its obvious links to contemporary policy, gave it both resonance and relevance in the early years of the twentieth century. However, in the aftermath of the First World War – even as its influence on policy began to recede – it struggled to shake off its reputation as a narrow, specialized subject in thrall to the contemporary Royal Navy, and was all but excluded from the academic mainstream.¹⁴ It did not help that its leading proponents continued to prioritize public and political influence. Herbert Richmond wrote in 1939 that there were 'three classes of individuals to whom an acquaintance of naval history is needful: the general public, the statesman, and the sea officer', deliberately omitting academia.¹⁵ Certainly, in the decades after the Second World War, naval history had never been so popular with the British public: the National Maritime Museum saw its annual visitor figures double from 300,000 to 619,000 between 1954 and 1966, as visitors flocked to see its predominantly naval displays.¹⁶ But within academia, naval history's focus on great men, tactics and technical detail seemed decidedly unfashionable to scholarly historians suddenly struck by the possibilities of social and economic history. By the 1960s, naval history had become almost invisible in British universities: King's College London failed to find a replacement for Laughton, while the

Vere Harmsworth Chair in Naval History was converted to one in 'Imperial and Naval History' in 1932; since then it has been held only once by a naval historian.¹⁷

The second half of the twentieth century therefore saw naval history operating on the peripheries of academic discourse. It was in these shallows, however, that a 'new' naval history began to be forged that attempted to uncouple naval history from its patriotic, service-focused reputation. Inspired in part by broader historiographical trends, and encouraged by the remarkable body of source material available at the Public Record Office (now The National Archives) and the National Maritime Museum, scholars turned away from the strategic and operational histories favoured by Mahan and his peers (and which were still being taught in staff colleges). These historians looked anew at naval history, seeking to investigate the foundations of Britain's naval strength, rather than argue for its present utility, assessing navies in terms of politics, economics, administration, industry, material and manpower, finance and technological development, as well as taking account of non-institutional elements such as prize money and privateering.¹⁸ John Ehrman's *The Navy in the War of William III*, published in 1953, was very influential, and he in turn supervised the thesis of Daniel Baugh, published as *British Naval Administration in the Age of Walpole* in 1965. These publications placed the navy at the heart of British history, and as Roger Knight and Hamish Scott have both noted, established a 'new agenda' that would in due course save naval history from its academic isolation.¹⁹

For the first time, naval history began to intervene in and enlighten broader historiographical debates. Paul Kennedy's *The Rise and Fall of British Naval Mastery*, published in 1976, was a landmark book, the first academic work dealing with naval history to make an impact on contemporary scholarship.²⁰ This publication focused not on battles or tactics, but instead examined all the elements that contributed to a nation's exercise of naval power, including geopolitics, economics, logistics and statecraft, all through the lens of

Britain's national trajectory.²¹ In the years that followed, countless other historians – including Patricia Crimmin, David Syrett, Roger Morriss, Jonathan Coad, Roger Knight, Brian Lavery, Michael Duffy, Andrew Lambert and Richard Harding, Patrick K. O'Brien and Jan Glete – produced analyses that uncovered how resources, economics and government have shaped naval power, and were in turn shaped by its activities.²² By the 1990s, there was a corpus of work that allowed naval history to intercede on debates that dominated the historical discipline: the history of military professionalism, the 'military revolution', and, by the 1990s, the discussion surrounding the 'fiscal-military state'. This strain continued into the 2000s, with the study of navies at the centre of discussions about the 'contractor state'.²³

Furthermore, by the 1980s, naval history was being heavily influenced by broader trends in historical study. Inspired by the 'new social history' of the 1960s and 1970s, naval historians moved their focus away from elites to a wider investigation of 'ordinary' people and the experience of the individual.²⁴ Michael Lewis's *A Social History of the Navy* marked the first attempt to build on this interdisciplinarity, with N. A. M. Rodger's seminal *The Wooden World* replacing it as the definitive account of the social worlds of the Royal Navy twenty-five years later.²⁵ J. David Davies's *Gentlemen and Tarpaulins* did for the early modern era what Rodger's work had done for the eighteenth-century navy, offering a sophisticated and layered account of the Stuart navy's officer corps. Social histories have since become a crucial part of naval history's bibliography, with 'histories from below' sitting alongside a wave of scholarship on shipboard hierarchies, naval officers and their interactions with wider British society.²⁶ If naval history was quick to see the value of social history, it was more resistant to the 'cultural turn' that grew in prominence during the 1980s. However, in recent years a number of historians – Jan Rüger, Kathleen Wilson and Timothy Jenks to name but three – have identified the navy as an institution of significant cultural importance. It is unlikely that any of these scholars would define themselves as 'naval

historians', but in turning to the Royal Navy, and outlining its remarkable sociocultural impact, they have shown just how interdisciplinary and historically relevant the study of naval history can be.²⁷

The engagement with broader historiographies has also seen naval history benefit from the renaissance in maritime history. Numerous scholars, such as Glen O'Hara, Karen Widen and David Cannadine, pointed to the scholarly revival of this subject, highlighting its versatility and its increased relevance in the globalized world of the twenty-first century.²⁸ This popularity owes much to the prominence of Atlantic and global history, which have used oceanic regional focuses to reveal transnational networks and relationships, in the process challenging national and imperial histories.²⁹ Navies are, by their very definition, tied to the idea of the nation state and, at first glance, naval history's place in these avowedly transnational disciplines might seem limited. However, in recent years a number of studies have shown any such doubts to be premature. Scholars have revealed that navies were a crucial part of any oceanic system, creating networks of communication and cultural exchange, and acting as an instrument of globalization.³⁰ Just as importantly, while a naval ship was for many a visible and even daunting manifestation of the state, it was frequently peopled by an ethnically and internationally diverse crew. Works such as W. Jeffrey Bolster's book, *Black Jacks*, have shown that Royal Navy ships were made up of a surprisingly high number of non-Britons, revealing a very different social make-up than previously understood.³¹ The navy, it is clear, must not be excluded from the broader study of humankind's relationships with the sea.

Discussions over sailors, not least their social backgrounds and shipboard agency, have also prompted a gathering – and increasingly heated – discussion about naval and maritime manpower. What is more, it is a debate that has attracted scholars from a range of backgrounds, each of them bringing different methodologies and historical outlooks.

Jeremiah Dancy's rigorous quantitative study of naval impressment in the late eighteenth century has argued that the number of sailors who suffered at the hands of the press gang was far lower than previous calculations allowed, suggesting instead that volunteers made up the majority of seamen in the Royal Navy. Other scholars have offered markedly contrasting views of the same subject. Isaac Land – a historian of political culture and a pioneer of 'coastal history' – has critiqued Dancy's work, accusing him of neglecting published discourse and relying too heavily on state archives. Christopher Magra, a historian of revolutionary America, has also criticized any attempt to downplay the importance of impressment, arguing that anger over British impressment was at the heart of American discontent in the lead-up to the American War of Independence.³² The debate will continue to rage, but what is perhaps most notable about it is the variety of scholars who have turned to what ostensibly might be seen as a 'traditional' naval subject. The navy's search for sources of manpower is but one aspect of the debate, for these studies of naval impressment reveal just as much about the power of the state, radical politics and, in Magra's case, the origins of American independence.

In the early twenty-first century, we therefore find naval historical scholarship connected to the historical mainstream more firmly than ever before. This does not mean that its other audiences have receded. On the contrary, the subject has never been more popular with the general public than it is now, with countless books, television programmes and museum displays highlighting the crucial role of the navy in British history, while navies remain major consumers of naval history. Their concern with education and training will continue to shape scholarship; in the United States, almost all naval history teaching is in government educational facilities, especially the naval academy and naval war college.³³ However, it now finds itself deeply entrenched in British academia, with a growing range of naval history courses being taught across the country's universities. A new generation of

naval scholars will move the discipline in new directions, for as this discussion demonstrates, the parameters of naval history have been continuously shaped through a prolonged and intense process of definition and redefinition. There have been many 'new' naval histories over the past decades, and there will no doubt be more again. Nonetheless, the contributions to this volume reflect the current reality of a field occupied, incorporated or borrowed by numerous scholarly constituencies, and they serve as a useful route marker on a journey that promises to become more rather than less complex and unpredictable.

The book is arranged in two parts. The first five chapters are sociocultural analyses of naval communities from the later eighteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries. Evan Wilson's chapter begins this section by opening a window onto an important but under-researched grouping within the eighteenth-century Georgian navy: warrant officers. In this regard, he contributes to the much-needed social historical analysis of the Royal Navy from this period pioneered by Michael Lewis and N. A. M. Rodger, and extended by volumes such as John Cardwell's on naval surgeons, Samantha Cavell's on midshipmen, Ellen Gill's on naval families and Thomas Malcolmson's work on order.³⁴ Wilson flags the relative scholarly neglect of warrant officers in comparison with their commissioned officer peers whose role and identity within understandings of shipboard organization and status have been more readily grasped. Using a database drawn from the years 1775 to 1815, he examines the patterns of warrant officer careers, and assesses the opportunities for advancement and higher pay that emerged in the context of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. He challenges some assumptions by concluding that the social distance within the wardroom between warrant and

commissioned officers was generally small, with a large proportion of both constituencies drawn from professional backgrounds.

In an oft-quoted remark from his 2005 volume, *The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain, 1649–1815*, N. A. M. Rodger noted that ‘there has been virtually no research undertaken into what one might call the female half of the naval community ... [this represents] an enormous void of ignorance, and our knowledge of the social history of the navy will never be complete until someone fills it.’³⁵ The intervening years have begun to address this imbalance, in the process building on approaches to women’s history within the broader maritime setting by scholars such as Lisa Norling and Margaret Creighton.³⁶ The eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century context has been explored by Margarete Lincoln, Jennine Hurl-Eamon, Cindy McCreery, Louise Carter and Patricia Lin; while Melanie Holihead has provided important insights into female lives in nineteenth-century portside communities.³⁷ Elaine Chalus’s chapter in this volume reveals the intricate web of activities through which one naval wife, Betsey Fremantle, promoted the interests of her family and husband, the latter absent on active service for long periods between 1800 and 1815. Chalus exposes the concentric rings of Fremantle’s emotional, sociocultural and political involvement, from the immediate anxieties surrounding parenthood and wartime dangers to her energetic advancement of schemes for the education of their children, the cultivation of local notables and powerful patrons and the financial management of their estate. From this perspective, the boundary between ship and shore becomes less important than the joint determination of husband and wife to act in the best interests of their family – whether through naval service or the careful and strategic cultivation of opportunities at home.

Another area where recent scholarship has interrogated the conceptual and experiential commonalities between naval and civilian realms lies in the study of male homosexuality and homoeroticism. Seth Le Jacq’s work on the eighteenth-century Royal

Navy, for instance, has traced this exchange within literature, the periodical press and the law, contending that naval personnel were often active agents in constructing broader debates surrounding homoeroticism.³⁸ Mary Conley's chapter here extends this form of analysis into the Victorian and Edwardian period where, as she notes, the rich history of homosexuality has been less concerned with exploring same-sex relations within the navy itself. Through an examination of naval courts-martial boards between 1900 and 1913, Conley illuminates sharpened Admiralty concerns that homosexual practices not only undermined service discipline but threatened 'the normative heterosexual foundations of naval and imperial manhood'.³⁹ She traces a changing legal language of condemnation from earlier references to 'lewd' and 'nasty' acts to a more codified vision of 'sodomy', 'gross indecency' and 'indecent assault'. Beyond this, though, she demonstrates how the anxieties of naval authority were amplified with regard to boy ratings, through fears that 'vice' could be incubated within the process of training, and that boys were vulnerable to the 'corrupting' influence of older sailors. However, the 'policing [of] naval bodies' prompted by these apprehensions obliged the Admiralty to look beyond the institution to the pubs and music halls of portside communities.⁴⁰

Cindy McCreery's chapter expands our understanding of Royal Naval communities in the modern era from a different direction: the production and consumption of photographic images. In so doing, her work is part of a small but significant cluster of research focused on the social history of the navy during the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries by, among others, Mary Conley, Laura Rowe, Christopher McKee and Anthony Carew.⁴¹ McCreery's focus is on overseas naval stations, and principally Simon's Town in South Africa. Within this context, she traces the role of photographs in defining and consolidating the sociocultural groupings that coalesced in these locations. Photographs were distributed and collected in order to cement links among networks of officers who effectively formed substitute families

on foreign postings. Collected in albums, these assemblages were more enduring than the 'families' themselves, which naval life usually served to disperse and re-form. McCreery explores the functions of particular types of photograph, from the visual calling card of the *carte-de-visite* to group photographs taken on board ship or against landmarks ashore. She also identifies in these land-based images a rich resource for assessing both the leisure pursuits of naval personnel and their engagement with understandings of empire and race.

The latter categories of empire and race are also the subject for the final chapter in the first section of this book. Analyses of non-white experiences within naval and maritime life have also proliferated in recent years through the work of scholars such as Marcus Rediker, Peter Linebaugh, Charles Foy, Philip Morgan, Joshua Newton, Aaron Jaffer and Ray Costello.⁴² Daniel Spence's chapter uses case studies considering India, the Cayman Islands and the Straits Settlement of Singapore to reveal how British imperial notions of racial hierarchy shaped the configuration of colonial naval forces. In each case, the British presented particular ethnic groups as 'naturally' predisposed to naval service. These judgements responded not only to ethnographic preconceptions but to local, geopolitical, imperial and strategic factors. They allowed the Royal Navy both to exclude communities deemed problematic and to legitimize the position of white naval personnel at the pinnacle of an organizational (and imperial) structure defined in their own interests. At the same time, Spence concludes that far from being simply the passive recipients of these authorized imperial messages, 'colonial peoples exerted agency to shape their own identities and take advantage of the opportunities that being perceived as martial races opened up to them.'⁴³

The five chapters that comprise the second part of the book address the public presentation of naval subject matter through a variety of representational forms. Ranging from the 1760s to the 1930s, these contributions demonstrate the diversity and complexity of the material involved. They move from the crisp iconography of commemorative medals to

the curatorial ambitions of a naval gallery, and from the pages of popular periodicals to transient yet spectacular moments of public performance. The simple fact that these undertakings were planned and realized across such a broad chronology tells its own, albeit unsurprising story: that the roots of British culture are deeply set in naval narratives. However, the contributions here demonstrate, singly and collectively, the active and purposeful ways in which the navy has been fashioned for wider consumption. Though ostensibly ‘naval’, these cultural engagements typically had – and were meant to have – a resonance far beyond the navy itself, delineating for instance cherished national mythologies or idealized visions of male heroism. These agendas were also, of course, extremely mobile. They frequently promoted notions of national triumphalism but were equally the means, intentionally or otherwise, for exposing deep-seated national anxieties and evaluating troubling processes of historical change.⁴⁴ Disseminated through British society, these cultural beliefs about and expectations of the navy also became yardsticks against which the service might be judged in the present.

In her chapter, Katherine Parker uses both the eloquence and the muteness of a single object to explore the nature of eighteenth-century naval commemoration. In 1768, Thomas Anson commissioned the striking of a medal to celebrate the achievements of his late brother, Admiral Lord George Anson. Such medals had a long pedigree as acknowledgements of martial achievement. Parker shows, however, that both this commemorative tradition and the wider understanding of naval service to which it was attached lacked the flexibility to foreground the full scope of Admiral Anson’s contributions, which lay at least as much in exploration and administration as they did in the master category of contemporary medal making: victorious battle. Through this object, she points to a fissure between the increasingly bureaucratic and professionalized realities of everyday naval life – which owed significantly to Anson’s own work – and a parallel structure prioritizing social honour and

leadership in the heat of action. The latter was the currency of commemoration, buoyed by the enthusiastic public association of national prosperity with naval victory.⁴⁵ The former, upon which success often depended, did not translate so readily into the existing visual and cultural vocabularies.

Cicely Robinson extends this analysis of the nature and uses of naval heroism into the nineteenth century, through the prism of the naval gallery opened at the Royal Hospital, Greenwich, in 1824.⁴⁶ The purpose of its displays was straightforwardly celebratory, asserting the centrality of naval power within an evolving story of national greatness boundaried by the Spanish Armada at one end and the conclusion of the Napoleonic Wars at the other.⁴⁷ Here, too, the focus was rigidly fixed on climacterics and moments of glory, with the dual aim of securing public admiration and incentivizing new generations of naval recruits. One supreme hero stood out, and Robinson plots Admiral Lord Nelson's representation within the gallery through statuary, paintings and relics (including the undress coat that he was wearing when mortally wounded at the Battle of Trafalgar). As she points out, choosing the very location where Nelson's body lay in state in January 1806 supercharged the gallery's propagandist purposes, and placed Nelson still more firmly centre stage as the personification of an apparent national destiny.

General interest magazines from the period 1850 to 1880 provide Barbara Korte with material to demonstrate how this 'construction and reconstruction of heroic [naval] images' was both maintained and undermined in Victorian Britain. Her analysis involves titles such as *Chambers's Journal* and *The Leisure Hour* – sources considerably further removed from direct naval control than the Royal Hospital or the Anson legacy. While she notes the same teleological approach to naval and national history that informed the paintings hanging in Greenwich, cross-currents are also made evident. Above all, the readerships of these publications were presented with a picture of dramatic technological change in the navy that

could be interpreted as both empowering and disempowering. The conjunction of oak and valour that had supposedly won command of the seas was moving towards a new synthesis, and one whose physical and scientific properties seemed so awesome that they threatened to render human heroism redundant. In the absence of large-scale conflict to repopulate the pool of naval exemplars – and with a Victorian queasiness surrounding the personal motivations of distant but important figures such as Drake and Benbow – Korte presents an image of increasing public uncertainty. Not least, defining the navy through its battle honours, and the qualities of its commanders and crews through proximity to conflict, had drawbacks in an era dominated by the institution's deployment on policing and peacekeeping duties.

The indications of cultural nervousness that Korte reveals within constructions of naval heroism become urgent and profoundly destabilizing in Jonathan Rayner's examination of *War Illustrated* magazine's coverage of events at sea between 1914 and 1916. The British public had come to view naval confrontation with Germany as a performance rehearsed through Nelsonian precedent, with inevitable and decisive victory as its final act.⁴⁸ Rayner shows how *War Illustrated* interpreted the naval conflict for its readers when reality failed to conform to a charismatic cultural script. Positive naval stories were glossed with Nelsonian allusion, and British involvement with the new technologies of submarine warfare was presented as consistent with traditional heroic ideals. Nonetheless, and as Rayner demonstrates, the central problematic remained untreatable. The victory that the Royal Navy ultimately won through 'sea control' was not the annihilating fleet action that the nation had been promised, and which the public had savoured in advance. The sense, communicated by Anson's medal, that unglamorous administration and efficiency were undeserving of memorialization was paralleled and writ large for the twentieth-century consumers of *War Illustrated*. They struggled to locate the grinding, incremental work of naval blockade, power projection and trade protection within the narrow parameters of a fetishized heroism.

The Royal Navy's failure to deliver a new Trafalgar during the First World War cut deeply into the place it occupied within navalist, nationalist and imperialist opinion. During the interwar years, these premises of conservative Britishness were also perceived as menaced from other quarters, most notably by socialism, industrialization and their assumed challenge to the established order. Emma Hanna's chapter shows how – galvanized by these fresh anxieties and threats – the naval account of Britain's inexorable rise was relaunched, once again in Greenwich, in 1933.⁴⁹ Hanna explores the genesis of the great night pageant that was held there that June, with its familiar and mythologized retelling of British history weighted towards a rosily conceived Elizabethan and Georgian past (and drawing a veil over Cromwell and the Protectorate).⁵⁰ The pageant represented society as a changeless community processing harmoniously through time, and defined by consensus, tradition, hierarchy and monarchical authority. With the 'cult of the navy' as its organizing framework, the event was an enormous popular success. The naval and heroic narrative of British greatness was always most powerful as an imagined and idealized reality. The anticlimactic disappointment of Jutland, and the myriad interwar signs of Britain's declining global status, created a desire within some constituencies for a return to 'normality', and a void that cultural performance readily exploited.

Notwithstanding the richness and variety of these ten studies, it is necessary to conclude with a brief consideration of what this volume cannot achieve. Perhaps this should begin with an acknowledgement that the evolution of naval history – and the agency of academic fashion⁵¹ – have worked to obscure as well as to reveal. In spite of the title selected for this book, its editors are keenly aware that new approaches to naval history bring their own problems. Not

least, revisionism and novelty are always eager to have their freshness highlighted by the supposed staleness of what went before. In recent years and in broad terms, the ‘new’ has become synonymous with studies that connect ship with shore, and the institution of the navy with much wider historical realities.⁵² Earlier specialisms dealing with the idiosyncratic, internal workings of naval life have often suffered as a result, easily marginalized as works of enthusiastic but parochial traditionalism.⁵³ However, any resulting loss of fluency in the vocabularies of ship handling, command skills, weapons technologies, naval architecture or navigation comes at a cost. The significance of these subjects, and the ability of new research questions to reinvigorate apparently recondite material, are easily obscured.

Much vital work has been completed – though more needs to be done – to reveal the extent to which the Royal Navy is the expression of social, cultural, national and imperial agendas. At the same time, these essential insights need to be counterbalanced by a continuing curiosity regarding the specific human and professional alchemy of naval life from the port town to the deep sea.⁵⁴ More traditional naval history was vulnerable to the criticism that it ghettoized its subject, and artificially promoted its uniqueness. Newer approaches, and particularly from within cultural history, are vulnerable to the charge that they systematically erase naval exceptionalism, representing the institution through the media of popular culture rather than through fine-grained analyses of naval lived experience. The inherent hazard of this process is that naval history, however defined, forms a series of discrete strata deposited loosely one on top of the other, rather than fusing into something more solid and synthesized. The fact that a multitude of disciplinary approaches now interrogate naval material accelerates the accumulation of strata but does not necessarily provide the edifice itself with any greater stability or accumulated analytical power.

In a recent article, Isaac Land has considered what a more ‘holistic’ and ‘integrated’ naval history might look like.⁵⁵ He refers to Victor Davis Hanson’s work *Carnage and*

Culture: Landmark Battles in the Rise of Western Power, and quotes the author's contention that: 'Students of war must never be content to learn merely how men fight a battle, but must always ask why soldiers fight as they do, and what ultimately their battle is for.'⁵⁶ The value of this comment for naval history surely lies in its insistence that a complex field of study will become problematically compartmentalized or thought-provokingly interconnected in direct relation to the nature and quality of the questions historians ask.⁵⁷ As we have seen, the welcome status quo is that the questions being asked of the naval world are diverse and challenging; the issue lies in determining how, why and whether they intersect, and what their conjunction might permit us to reveal.

This, in turn, begs the fundamental question of what navies are actually for. The answer has most consistently and enduringly been identified in their development as instruments of conflict, a view closely connected to the nature of much naval history as an analysis of and preparation for war fighting.⁵⁸ There is, of course, an unarguable degree of common sense within this premise, and yet the instinct of historians to mistrust monocausal explanations is also well applied here. Without necessarily challenging the centrality of this battle-focused definition, the branches growing outwards from this 'trunk' have become so broad and luxuriant that they have long required other visible means of support. As we have seen, navies have, for instance, been assessed in terms of their active role within diplomacy, the functioning of the state, the operation of trade and commerce and the realm of industry and technology.⁵⁹ They have been illuminated as locations within which understandings of class, hierarchy, expertise, age, gender and sexuality have been communicated, entrenched and contested.⁶⁰ Their influence upon and involvement within a host of local, regional, national, imperial and global cultural forms and political agendas has been convincingly demonstrated.⁶¹ Moreover, it has become clear that at any point of the early modern and

modern periods addressed in this volume, pulling on one thread within this cat's cradle of function and identity usually sets a dozen others twitching.

Rather than a single tree, therefore, the naval world now appears more of a thicket, with a complex and often concealed labyrinth of roots and entanglements. War and the anticipation of war certainly prompted it to grow and change. Unlike a career in farming, the law or the priesthood, naval life *always* had a relationship to war, whether active or passive. However, this connection to conflict also associated the navy's personnel with a charismatic and culturally validated masculinity, and the institution with the most straightforward route to promoting its usefulness and significance, and defending its costliness. Under these circumstances, it is surely inevitable that the navy's myriad activities have been viewed and presented rather too consistently through the prism of combat readiness and warlike purpose. Few naval memoirs are written about desk-bound careers in the supply and secretariat branch. And yet, many of the levels on which the navy functioned owed as much or more to the undramatic realities of peacetime – from patronage networks to the patterns of sociability and recreation that defined and attracted particular groups within the institution.⁶² War was an ever-present *raison d'être*, but its arrival could be experienced as an aberration, menacing settled routines of ceremony, training, professional hierarchy and family life.

To put it crudely, the fact that the bulk of naval historical scholarship has been focused on periods of conflict can thus create a circularity when it comes to plotting the underlying priorities of the organization and its inhabitants. As has been noted for the nineteenth century, the failure of that period to deliver long periods of high-intensity sea warfare has, at times, even threatened to leave it without a naval history at all.⁶³ The aim of this book is not to replace one partiality with another, but instead to unsettle the notion that any single master category should enjoy necessary pre-eminence. The potential exists for the plurality of current approaches to naval history – defined as broadly as possible – to meet on

a more level playing field, where their interaction will provide new answers and new questions for all participants. This book can only provide a step in that direction. It does not ask to be viewed as the expression of a newly resolved and internally coherent approach to naval history itself, even if that was either desirable or achievable.⁶⁴ It does, however, hope to promote the interdisciplinary exchange and communication that holds out so much promise for future scholarly insight and public engagement.

It is fitting, too, that this volume developed from papers given at the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, in 2013. Greenwich, of course, has been implicated for centuries in the making and – as several chapters in this collection explore – the representing of naval history. These connections began with the Tudors and the royal dockyards at Deptford and Woolwich, and then flourished from the commissioning of the Royal Hospital for Seamen in the 1690s through to the operation of the Royal Naval College from 1873 to 1997. The National Maritime Museum itself occupies buildings once used for naval training by the Royal Hospital School, and is thus physically and conceptually the product of this legacy. The agendas that led to its opening in 1937 were the socioculturally conservative, navalist, nationalist and imperialist motivations that had energized the Navy League in the late nineteenth century.⁶⁵ By the 1930s, the writing was clearly on the wall for such triumphalist visions of naval mastery and British pre-eminence. However, amid imperial destabilization and international competition, ‘the supporters of the National Maritime Museum project could still believe that such an institution would help to turn the tide’.⁶⁶ Those founding aspirations are now only a ghostly presence within a site that – like naval history itself – has long charted a determinedly different course through British and global history.

Notes

¹ For an assertion about the weakness of naval historiography see Andrew Lambert, 'The Construction of Naval History, 1815–1914', *The Mariner's Mirror*, 97:1 (February 2011), 217, 223. For recent examples of 'naval gazing' see: John B. Hattendorf (ed.), *Ubi Sumus? The State of Naval and Maritime History* (Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, 1994); John B. Hattendorf (ed.), *Doing Naval History: Essays Toward Improvement* (Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, 1995); Richard Harding, *Modern Naval History: Debates and Prospects* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016). A few works have attempted to analyse naval historiography in focused periods: see Andrew Lambert, *The Foundations of Naval History: Sir John Knox Laughton, the Navy and the Historical Profession* (London: Chatham Publishing, 1998); Don Schurman, *The Education of a Navy: The Development of British Naval Strategic Thought, 1867–1914* (London: Cassell, 1965). The centenary issue of the *Mariner's Mirror* included a number of articles about the history of naval history: see *The Mariner's Mirror*, 97:1 (February 2011).

² See, for instance, N. A. M. Rodger, 'Britain' in Hattendorf, *Ubi Sumus?*, pp. 42–3; Lambert, *Foundations of Naval History*.

³ Harding, *Modern Naval History*, p. 4.

⁴ Josiah Burchett, *A Complete History of the most Remarkable Transactions at Sea, from the Earliest Accounts of Time to the Conclusion of the Last War with France. Wherein Is Given An Account of the most considerable Naval-Expeditions, Sea Fights, Stratagems, Discoveries And Other Maritime Occurrences that have happen'd among all Nations which have flourished at sea: And in more particular manner of Great Britain, from the time of the Revolution, in the years 1688, to the aforesaid Period. In Five books* (London, 1720); Samuel Colliber, *Columna Rostrata: Or, A Critical History of the English Sea-Affairs: Wherein all the Remarkable Actions of the English Nation at Sea are described, and the most considerable Events (especially in the Account of the three Dutch Wars) are proved, either from Original Pieces, or from the Testimonies of the Best Foreign Historians* (London: R. Robinson, 1727); Thomas Lediard, *The Naval History of England, In all its Branches; from the Norman Conquest in the Year 1066 to the Conclusion of 1734. Collected from the most Approved Historians, English and Foreign, Authentik Records and Manuscripts, Scarce Tracts, Original Journals, &c. With Manny Facts and Observations, never before made public.* (London: John Wilcox, 1735). See also James Davey, 'The Birth of Naval History: Audience and Objectivity in Eighteenth-Century Historical Writing' (forthcoming).

⁵ Burchett, *A Complete History*.

⁶ Burchett, *Complete History*, pp. 1–34; Lediard, *Naval History*, preface.

⁷ Capt. Charles Jenkins, *England's Triumph: Or Spanish Cowardice expos'd. Being a Compleat History of the Many Signal Victories Gained by the Royal Navy and Merchants Ships of Great Britain, for the Term of Four Hundred Years past, over the insulting and haughty Spaniards. Wherein is related a true and genuine Account of all the Expeditions, Voyages, Adventures &c. of all the British [English-British interchangeable] Admirals from Time above mention'd, whose Successes have already filled all Europe with Amazement.* (London, 1739); John Campbell, *Lives of the Admirals and other Eminent British Seamen* (London, 1742).

⁸ Dismayed to discover that American accounts of recent naval victories had failed to take into account the British inferiority in size and gunnery, William James wrote a book that sought to make overturn any misconceptions, so beginning a debate about frigate sizes that continues to this day. For an excellent overview of James's career see Andrew Lambert's introduction to William James, *Naval Occurrences of the War of 1812: A Full and Correct Account of the Naval War Between Great Britain and the United States of Americas, 1812–15* (London: Conway Maritime Press, 2004), pp. i–vii. See also William James, *The Naval History of Great Britain during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars*, 6 vols (Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2002).

⁹ Harding, *Modern Naval History*, p. 5. For each historian's defining works, see Alfred Thayer Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, 1660–1784* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1890); Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power Upon the French Revolution and Empire, 1789–1812* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1892); Mahan, *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, 2 vols (Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1905); Julian Corbett, *England in the Seven Years' War* (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1907); Julian Corbett, *The Campaign of Trafalgar* (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1910); Julian Corbett, *Some Principles of Maritime Strategy* (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1911); Herbert Richmond, *The Navy in the War of 1739–48* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920); Herbert Richmond, *National Policy and Naval Strength and Other Essays* (New York: Longman, Green and Company, 1928, 1934, 1993); Herbert Richmond, *The Navy as an Instrument of Policy, 1558–1727* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953).

¹⁰ Rodger, 'Britain', pp. 42–3, 45.

¹¹ Rodger, 'Britain', pp. 42–3; Harding, *Modern Naval History*, p. 5.

¹² Lambert, 'The Construction of Naval History'; Harding, *Modern Naval History*, p. 5.

¹³ Rodger, 'Britain', pp. 42–3.

¹⁴ Lambert, 'The Construction of Naval History', 217; Harding, *Modern Naval History*, p. 6.

¹⁵ H. W. Richmond, 'The Importance of the Study of Naval History', *The Naval Review*, 27 (May 1939), 201–18, quote from p. 201.

¹⁶ Kevin Littlewood and Beverley Butler, *Of Ships and Stars: Maritime Heritage and the Founding of the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich* (London: National Maritime Museum, 1998). Visitors in the 1950s would have seen galleries focusing on Anson, Vernon, Cook, Nelson, Trafalgar, the transition from sail to steam and the First and Second World Wars.

¹⁷ Rodger, 'Britain', p. 45.

¹⁸ Roger Knight, 'Changing the Agenda: the "New" Naval History of the British Sailing Navy', *The Mariner's Mirror*, 97:1 (February 2011), 225, 227–9.

¹⁹ H. M. Scott, 'The Second Hundred Years War', *The Historical Journal*, 35:2 (June 1992), 453.

²⁰ Lambert, 'The Construction of Naval History', 219.

²¹ See the new edition, Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of British Naval Mastery* (London: Allen Lane, 1976; published with new introduction, London: Penguin, 2017), p. xix.

²² There is not enough space to list the many works produced in this period so the most important will suffice (in order of publication): P. K. Crimmin, 'Admiralty Relations with the Treasury, 1783–1806: the Preparations of Navy Estimates and the Beginnings of Treasury Control', *Mariner's Mirror*, 53:1 (1969), 63–72; David Syrett, *Shipping and the American War, 1775–83: A Study of British Transport Organization* (London: Athlone Press, 1970); Roger Morriss, *The Royal Dockyards during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1983); Jonathan Coad, *The Royal Dockyards, 1690–1850: Architecture and Engineering Works of the Sailing Navy* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1989); R. J. B. Knight, 'The Royal Dockyards in England at the Time of the American War of Independence' (PhD thesis, University of London, 1972); Brian Lavery, *The Ship of the Line*, 2 vols (London, 1983–4); Michael Duffy, *Soldiers, Sugar and Seapower: The British Expeditions to the West Indies and the War against Revolutionary France* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987); Andrew Lambert, *The Last Sailing Battlefleet: Maintaining Naval Mastery, 1815–50* (London: Conway Maritime Press, 1991); Richard Harding, *Amphibious Warfare in the Eighteenth Century: The British Expedition to the West Indies, 1740–1742* (New York: Boydell and Brewer, 1991); Patrick Karl O'Brien, *Power with Profit: the State and the Economy, 1688–1815* (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1991); Jan Glete, *Navies and Nations: Warships, Navies and State Building in Europe and America, 1500–1860*, 2 vols (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1993).

²³ Roger Knight and Martin Wilcox, *Sustaining the Fleet, 1793–1815: War, the British Navy and the Contractor State* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010); H. V. Bowen and A. Gonzales Enciso (eds), *Mobilising Resources for War: Britain and Spain at Work during the Early Modern Period* (Pamplona: Eunsa, 2006); R. Torres Sanchez (ed.), *War, State and Development: Fiscal-Military States in the Eighteenth Century* (Pamplona: Eunsa, 2007); Gareth Cole, *Arming the Royal Navy, 1793–1815: The Office of Ordnance and the State* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012); James Davey, *The Transformation of British Naval Strategy: Seapower and Supply in Northern Europe, 1808–1812* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2012); Robert K. Sutcliffe, *British Expeditionary Warfare and the Defeat of Napoleon 1793–1815* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016).

²⁴ Harding, *Modern Naval History*, pp. 6–7.

²⁵ Michael Lewis, *A Social History of the Navy, 1793–1815* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1960); N. A. M. Rodger, *The Wooden World: An Anatomy of the Georgian Navy* (London, 1986).

²⁶ J. D. David, *Gentlemen and Tarpaulins: The Officers and Men of the Restoration Navy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991). For more recent examples of naval social history see Margarete Lincoln, *Naval Wives and Mistresses* (London: National Maritime Museum, 2007); S. A. Cavell, *Midshipmen and Quarterdeck Boys in the British Navy, 1771–1831* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2012); Evan Wilson, *A Social History of British Naval Officers 1775–1815* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016); Ellen Gill, *Naval Families, War and Duty in Britain 1740–1820* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2016).

²⁷ Jan Rüger, *The Great Naval Game: Britain and Germany in the Age of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Kathleen Wilson, ‘Empire, Trade and Popular Politics in mid-Hanoverian Britain: The Case of Admiral Vernon’, *Past and Present*, 121 (November 1988), 74–109; Timothy Jenks, *Naval Engagements: Patriotism, Cultural Politics, and the Royal Navy, 1793–1815* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

²⁸ Karen Wigen, ‘Oceans of History’, *American Historical Review*, cxi (2006), 717–21; Glen O’Hara, “‘The sea is swinging into view’: Modern British Maritime History in a Globalised World”, *English Historical Review*, cxxiv (2009), 510, 1109–34; David Cannadine (ed.), *Empire, the Sea and Global History: Britain’s Maritime World, c. 1763–c. 1840* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007).

²⁹ The literature on Atlantic history – and increasingly global history – is vast. For important ‘state of the field’ pieces see Bernard Bailyn, ‘The Idea of Atlantic History’, *Itinerario*, xx (1996), 19–41; Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concepts and Contours* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005); Richard Blakemore, ‘The

Changing Fortunes of Atlantic History’, *English Historical Review*, cxxxi:551 (2016), 851–68; Cannadine, *The Sea and Global History*.

³⁰ For a good example of this, see Christer Petley and John McAleer, *The Royal Navy and the British Atlantic World, c. 1750–1820* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

³¹ W. Jeffrey Bolster, *Black Jacks: African American Seamen in the Age of Sail* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); see also Charles R. Foy, ‘The Royal Navy’s Employment of Black Mariners and Maritime Workers, 1754–1783’, *International Journal of Maritime History*, 28:1 (2016) 6–35

³² J. Ross Dancy, *The Myth of the Press Gang: Volunteers, Impressment and the Naval Manpower Problem in the Late Eighteenth Century* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2015). For his critics, see Isaac Land, ‘New Scholarship on the Press Gang’, <http://porttowns.port.ac.uk/press-gang-1/> and <http://porttowns.port.ac.uk/press-gang2/> (accessed 18 December 2017); and Christopher P. Magra, *Poseidon’s Curse: Naval Impressment and Atlantic Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

³³ Lambert, ‘The Construction of Naval History’, 217–18; Kenneth J. Hagen and Mar R. Shulman, ‘Mahan Plus One Hundred: The Current State of American Naval History’ in Hattendorf, *Ubi Sumus?*, pp. 379–80.

³⁴ Lewis, *Social History*; Rodger, *Wooden World*; John Cardwell, ‘Royal Navy Surgeons, 1793–1815: A Collective Biography’, in David Boyd Haycock and Sally Archer (eds), *Health and Medicine at Sea, 1700–1900* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2009), 38–62; Gill, *Naval Families*; Cavell, *Midshipmen*; Thomas Malcolmson, *Order and Disorder in the British Navy, 1793–1815: Control, Resistance, Flogging and Hanging* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016). See also Isaac Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor, 1750–1850* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), for a particularly integrated social and cultural approach.

³⁵ N. A. M. Rodger, *The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain, 1649–1815* (London: Penguin, 2005), p. 407.

³⁶ M. S. Creighton and L. Norling (eds), *Iron Men, Wooden Women: Gender and Seafaring in the Atlantic world, 1700–1920* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996); Lisa Norling, *Captain Ahab had a Wife: New England Women and the Whalefishery, 1720–1870* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); L. Abrams, *Myth and Materiality in a Woman’s World: Shetland, 1800–2000* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005); V. Burton, ‘“Whoring, drinking sailors”: Reflections on Masculinity from the Labour History of Nineteenth-Century British Shipping’, in M. Walsh (ed.), *Working Out Gender: Perspectives from Labour History* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 84–101; M. S. Creighton, ‘“Women” and Men in American Whaling, 1830–1870’, *International Journal of Maritime History*, 4:1 (1992), 195–218; T.

Bergholm and K. Teräs, 'Female Dockers in Finland, c. 1900–1975: Gender and Change on the Finnish Waterfront', *International Journal of Maritime History*, 11:2 (1999), 107–20; Jo Stanley, 'With Cutlass and Compress: Women's Relations with the Sea', *Gender and History*, 12:1 (2000), 232–6; Hugh Murphy, "'From the Crinoline to the Boilersuit'", Women Workers in British Shipbuilding during the Second World War', *Contemporary British History*, 13:4 (1999), 82–104.

³⁷ Melanie Holihead, 'Cut Adrift or Towed Astern: Sailors' Wives in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Portsea Island Considered in Perspective', *Journal for Maritime Research*, 17:2 (2015), 155–68; Linda Colley, *The Ordeal of Elizabeth Marsh: How a Remarkable Woman Crossed Seas and Empires to Become Part of World History* (London: Harper Perennial, 2008); see also Quintin Colville, Elin Jones and Katherine Parker, 'Gendering the Maritime World', *Journal for Maritime Research*, 17:2 (2015), 97–101.

³⁸ Seth Stein Le Jacq, 'Buggery's Travels: Royal Navy Sodomy on Ship and Shore in the Long Eighteenth Century', *Journal for Maritime Research*, 17:2 (2015), 103–116. For a twentieth-century exploration of homosexuality and the maritime world see: Jo Stanley, "'They Thought They Were Normal – and Called Themselves Queens": Gay Seafarers on British Liners, 1945–85', in Duncan Redford (ed.), *Maritime History and Identity: the Sea and Culture in the Modern World* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2014), pp. 230–52. For an analysis that demonstrates the currency of naval homosexual identities within wider British culture see: Matt Houlbrook, *Queer London: Perils and Pleasures in the Sexual Metropolis, 1918–1957* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2005). See also B. R. Burg, *Boys at Sea: Sodomy, Indecency, and Courts Martial in Nelson's Navy* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007).

³⁹ Mary Conley, 'The Admiralty's Gaze: Disciplining Indecency and Sodomy in the Edwardian Fleet', in Quintin Colville and James Davey (eds), *A New Naval History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ Mary Conley, *From Jack Tar to Union Jack: Representing Naval Manhood in the British Empire, 1870–1918* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009); Laura Rowe, *Morale and Discipline in the Royal Navy during the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); Laura Rowe, 'Their Lordships Regret That ... Admiralty Perceptions of and Responses to Allegations of Lower Deck Disquiet', in J. D. Keene and M. S. Neiberg (eds), *Finding Common Ground* (Boston, MA: Brill, 2010); Christopher McKee, *Sober Men and True: Sailor Lives in the Royal Navy, 1900–45* (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press,

2002); Anthony Carew, *The Lower Deck of the Royal Navy, 1900–39: The Invergordon Mutiny in Perspective* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981).

⁴² Marcus Rediker, *The Slave Ship: A Human History* (London: John Murray, 2007); E. J. Christopher, *Slave Ship Sailors and their Captive Cargoes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (London: Verso, 2012); Charles R. Foy, 'The Royal Navy's Employment of Black Mariners and Maritime Workers, 1754–1783', *International Journal of Maritime History*, 28:1 (2016), 6-35; Philip Morgan, 'Black experience in Britain's maritime world, 1763–1833', in Cannadine, *The Sea and Global History*; Joshua Newton, 'Slavery, sea power and the state: the Royal Navy and the British West African settlements, 1748–1756', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 41:2 (2013), pp. 171–93; Aaron Jaffer, *Lascars and Indian Ocean Seafaring, 1780–1860: Shipboard Life, Unrest and Mutiny* (Martlesham: The Boydell Press, 2015); Ray Costello, *Black Salt: Seafarers of African Descent on British Ships* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012).

⁴³ Daniel Owen Spence, 'Salt water in the blood: race, indigenous naval recruitment and British colonialism, 1934–41', in Colville and Davey, *A New Naval History*.

⁴⁴ See Jan R uger, *The Great Naval Game: Britain & Germany in the Age of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

⁴⁵ See James Davey, 'The Naval Hero and British National Identity, 1707–50', in Duncan Redford (ed.), *Maritime History and Identity: The Sea and Culture in the Modern World* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2014), pp. 13–37; Nicholas Rogers, 'From Vernon to Wolfe: Empire and Identity in the British Atlantic World of the Mid-Eighteenth Century', in Frans de Bruyn and Shaun Regan (eds), *The Culture of the Seven Years' War: Empire, Identity, and the Arts in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), pp. 25–52; Kathleen Wilson, 'Admiral Nelson and the People: Masculinity, Patriotism and Body Politics', in David Cannadine (ed.), *Re-Discovering Nelson* (London: Palgrave, 2005), pp. 49–66.

⁴⁶ See also Geoffrey Quilley, 'The Battle of the Pictures: Painting the History of Trafalgar', in David Cannadine (ed.), *Trafalgar in History: A Battle and its Afterlife* (Basinstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 121–38.

⁴⁷ See R uger, *The Great Naval Game*: p. 3: 'the Royal Navy became one of the most important metaphors of Britishness in the nineteenth century'.

⁴⁸ See *ibid.*, especially pp. 1–4.

⁴⁹ For a useful counterpoint addressing an earlier moment of public naval display see: Huw W. G. Lewis-Jones,

‘Displaying Nelson: Navalism and “The Exhibition” of 1891’, *International Journal of Maritime History*, 17:1 (2005), 29–68.

⁵⁰ See Rüger, *The Great Naval Game*, for example, pp. 173–4, 269.

⁵¹ See Knight, ‘Changing the Agenda’, 236.

⁵² See, for instance, Land, *War, Nationalism, and the British Sailor*, p. 166.

⁵³ Lewis R. Fischer, ‘Are We in Danger of Being Left with Our Journals and not Much Else: The Future of Maritime History?’, *The Mariner’s Mirror*, 97:1 (2011), 366–81: ‘When I first entered the profession in the mid-1970s, maritime history was dismissed by many scholars in other sectors of the historical discipline as a haven for antiquarians who posed narrow questions of interest only to enthusiasts and no one else ... the late Frank Broeze, in my view the best maritime historian of his generation, referred to this narrow approach as “nautical history”,’ p. 366.

⁵⁴ From a naval perspective, see the following previously cited contributions: Lewis, *Social History*; Rodger, *The Wooden World*; Rowe, *Morale and Discipline*; McKee, *Sober Men and True*; Carew, *The Lower Deck of the Royal Navy*.

⁵⁵ Isaac Land, ‘Gender History: Inclusion versus Integration’, <http://www.britishnavalhistory.com/gender-history-inclusion-versus-integration/>, 2 March 2014 (accessed 18 December 2017).

⁵⁶ Victor Davis Hanson, *Carnage and Culture: Landmark Battles in the Rise of Western Power* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), p. 131.

⁵⁷ See Lambert, ‘The Construction of Naval History’, 224: ‘The issue is not what we know, but what questions we ask, and how our work engages with other scholars, and other audiences.’

⁵⁸ See Lambert, ‘The Construction of Naval History’, 208, 217.

⁵⁹ For work approaching the latter category of ‘technology’ from cultural perspectives see, for instance: Don Leggett and Richard Dunn (eds), *Re-Inventing the Ship: Science, Technology and the Maritime World, 1800–1918* (London: Ashgate, 2012); Don Leggett, *Shaping the Royal Navy: Technology, Authority and Naval Architecture, c. 1830–1906* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015); Crosbie Smith, ‘Dreadnought Science: The Cultural Construction of Efficiency and Effectiveness’, in Robert Blyth, Andrew Lambert and Jan Rüger (eds), *The Dreadnought and the Edwardian Age* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 135–64.

⁶⁰ See Quintin Colville, ‘Corporate Domesticity and Idealised Masculinity: Royal Naval Officers and their Shipboard Homes, 1918–39’, *Gender and History*, 21:3 (2009), 499–519; Quintin Colville, ‘Jack Tar and the

Gentleman Officer: The Role of Uniform in Shaping the Class- and Gender-Related Identities of British Naval Personnel, 1930–39’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6:13 (2003), 105–29.

⁶¹ See Margarette Lincoln, *Representing the Royal Navy: British Sea Power, 1750–1815* (London: Ashgate, 2002); Cannadine, *Trafalgar in History*; David Cannadine (ed.), *Admiral Lord Nelson: Context and Legacy* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005); Nicholas Rogers, *The Press Gang: Naval Impressment and its Opponents in Georgian Britain* (London: Continuum, 2007); Timothy Jenks, *Naval Engagements: Patriotism, Cultural Politics, and the Royal Navy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁶² See, for example, a recent thesis that explored the network and influence of naval patronage in the late eighteenth century: Catherine Beck, ‘Patronage and the Royal Navy, 1775–1815’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University College London).

⁶³ See Lambert, ‘The Construction of Naval History’, 207: ‘Edwardian naval history examined admirals and operations – ships and men, dismissing the nineteenth century as an unremarkable catalogue of gunboat diplomacy; tedious technology and dull books that separated Nelson from the next world conflict ... Never a headline area for research or teaching, the nineteenth century rarely achieved a critical mass of scholarship, and the main debates have been driven by twentieth century concerns.’

⁶⁴ See Knight, ‘Changing the Agenda’, 242: ‘Over-defined labels as to whether a historian is a “naval” or “maritime” historian are of little consequence and misleading to boot. The future is at least in part interdisciplinary. After all, economic, political, war studies and cultural histories of the navy are but dialects of a greater language.’

⁶⁵ See, for instance, John C. Mitcham, ‘Navalism and Greater Britain, 1897–1914’, in Duncan Redford (ed.), *Maritime History and Identity: The Sea and Culture in the Modern World* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2014), pp. 271–93; Neil C. Fleming, ‘The Imperial Maritime League: British Navalism, Conflict, and the Radical Right, c. 1907–1920’, *War in History*, 23:3 (2016), 296–322.

⁶⁶ Kevin Littlewood and Beverley Butler, *Of Ships and Stars*, p. xv.