Bronagh McAtasney, January 1978. Her teenage diary highlights the everydayness of living through military conflict during the Troubles. Photo ©: Bronagh McAtasney.

British Journal for Military History

Volume 5, Issue 1, July 2019

Cover photo: Bronagh McAtasney, January 1978. Her teenage diary highlights the everydayness of living through military conflict during the Troubles, and is the subject of the article in this issue by Dr Laura Aguiar and Dr Oonagh Murphy. Photo ©: Bronagh McAtasney.

BRITISH JOURNAL FOR MILITARY HISTORY EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

The Editorial Team gratefully acknowledges the support of the British Journal for Military History's Editorial Advisory Board the membership of which is as follows:

Prof Heather Jones (University College London, UK)
Lt Gen (Ret) Sir John Kiszely (Changing Character of War Centre, Pembroke College, University of Oxford, UK)
Dr Sylvie Kleinman (Trinity College Dublin, Ireland)
Dr Halik Kochanski (Independent Scholar & Member, BCMH, UK)
Dr Ariel Mae Lambe (University of Connecticut, USA)
Dr Elisabeth Leake (University of Leeds, UK)
Dr Elli Lemonidou (University of Patras, Greece)
Dr Peter Lieb (Centre for Military History and Social Sciences of the Bundeswehr, Germany)
Prof Charlotte MacDonald (Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand)
Dr Jenny Macleod (University of Hull, UK)
Dr Jessica Meyer (University of Leeds, UK)
Dr Alisa Miller (King's College London, UK)
Prof Rana Mitter (University of Oxford, UK)
Dr Michelle R. Moyd (Indiana University Bloomington, USA)
Dr Richard R. Muller (US Air Force School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, USA)
Dr Oonagh Murphy (Goldsmiths, University of London, UK)
Prof Michael S. Neiberg (US Army War College, USA)
Dr Emma Newlands (University of Strathclyde, UK)
Prof Helen Nicholson (Cardiff University, UK)
Prof Jane Ohlmeyer (Trinity College Dublin, Ireland)
Dr Eleanor O'Keeffe (Historic Royal Palaces, UK)
Dr Declan O'Reilly (University of East Anglia, UK)
Prof Douglas Peers (University of Waterloo, Canada)
Prof William Philpott (King's College London; President, BCMH, UK)
Stephen Prince (Naval Historical Branch, UK)
Prof Andrew Roberts (King's College London, UK)
Prof Guy Rowlands (University of St Andrews, UK; Member, BCMH, UK)
Dr Laury Sarti (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany)
Dr Lynsey Shaw Cobden (Air Historical Branch, UK)
Prof Gary Sheffield (University of Wolverhampton, UK)
Dr Claudia Siebrecht (University of Sussex, UK)
Dr Andy Simpson (Member, BCMH, UK)
Prof Natalia Sobrevilla Perea (University of Kent, UK)
Dr Beth C. Spacey (University of Queensland, Australia)
Prof Sir Hew Strachan (University of St Andrews, UK)
Dr Andrekos Varnava (Flinders University, Australia)
Dr Jennifer Wellington (University College Dublin, Ireland)

BRITISH JOURNAL FOR MILITARY HISTORY

Founding Editor (2014-18): Dr Matthew Ford, University of Sussex, UK

Volume 5, Issue 1 July 2019

EDITORIAL TEAM

THE BCMH LOGO: The BCMH logo is based on the combination of **Mars & Clio**, the Roman God of War and the Greek Muse of History. It depicts Mars with his spear whilst Clio stands before him reading from a book.

CONTACT US

Find us online at: www.bjmh.org.uk

Letters and communications to the Co-editors should be sent to:

editor@bjmh.org.uk

or

Prof Richard S. Grayson
Department of History
Goldsmiths, University of London
London
SE14 6NW
UK

Follow the British Commission for Military History and the British Journal for Military History on:

Twitter [@Mars_Clio and @BritJnlMilHist]
Online [www.bcmh.org.uk and www.bjmh.org.uk]

British Journal for Military History – ISSN: 2057-0422
DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1

CONTENTS

Submission Guidelines

EDITORIAL*

We are very pleased to have taken over as co-editors of the *British Journal for Military History* at an exciting time for the journal and the field of military history, broadly defined. We are delighted to be basing the new team at Goldsmiths, University of London, an institution which has a reputation for taking a new and creative angle on established subjects. The support of Goldsmiths involves not just our time, but also sees the institution hosting the journal on its website.

At a time when pressure is (rightly) on academics to ensure that they engage the wider public with their research, the *BJMH* has pioneered making research available completely free of charge and online. In addition, military history is a field in which many non-academics are among the leaders in the field, especially those with a relevant professional background of one kind or another. That means that the online open access approach, where one does not need an institutional subscription to access content is highly pertinent.

The journal was founded through the initiative of Dr Matthew Ford working with the British Commission for Military History. Matthew's efforts in this were enormous, and the quality of his work was extremely high. We are very pleased that he has joined our Editorial Advisory Board and we are also pleased to recognise him in this publication as 'Founding Editor'. We welcome the continued support of the Commission and look forward to working with it and its members in the years to come. We would like to thank two people specifically: Andy Grainger, the Secretary-General of the BCMH, who has worked tirelessly to manage the transition between editorial teams, and Prof Gary Sheffield, who has played a similarly valuable role in the transition.

While building on past work, we are also taking new initiatives and pushing in new directions. We have already announced a massively expanded Editorial Advisory Board (EAB) which points to the way we want to the journal to develop. The previous EAB consisted of twenty-six members, all based in the UK and predominantly (though far from exclusively) specialists in nineteenth and twentieth century history. Those involved were all very significant figures, carrying out exciting work in the field and we are delighted that so many of them have agreed to continue on the new EAB.

However, we wanted to broaden the chronological scope of the Board and the types of subjects covered, and we wanted to internationalise the Board. We also noted that only five of the twenty-six EAB members (19%) were women. We were concerned about that as we felt it did not reflect the balance of those involved in military history

* DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.835

research today, especially in newer and/or more broadly defined aspects of the discipline. There is a risk that the *BJMH* would miss an opportunity to create new networks in the discipline. At worst, such an imbalance risks perpetuating views of military history among non-specialists which are inaccurate and do not serve the discipline well in wider academia.

Consequently, we have massively expanded our Board so that it now includes 78 people, all significant figures in a broad definition of military history and the subject areas with which it should interact. We now have experts based beyond the UK in Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Greece, India, Ireland, Israel, New Zealand, and the USA. Our chronological scope now has much broader coverage of medieval and early modern history, and the geographic spread of expertise is broader, especially as regards non-European countries. The subjects covered are much wider, with the addition of experts working on, for example, cultural aspects of military history and areas such as commemoration, gender, colonialism and race. We are pleased to have made further direct connections with those who work directly with militaries on studying military history. This was already strongly established for the UK, but we have now made links with the US Army War College, US Air Force School for Advanced Air and Space Studies, the Bundeswehr's Centre for Military History and Social Sciences, and the United Service Institution of India. Many new EAB members would not define themselves primarily (or in some cases at all) as military historians, but work in adjacent fields often on themes of conflict, politics and society with which military history can and should engage closely. Note also that slightly more than half of the EAB members now are women.

In time, we hope that this new EAB will have a significant influence on the work of the BJMH and the wider Commission, and we look forward to seeing a range of exciting new subjects come before us for peer review. For now, we are pleased to have a wide range of subjects covered in our first issue which we commend to our readers, established and new.

RICHARD S. GRAYSON & ERICA WALD
Goldsmiths, University of London, UK

'He would not meddle against Newark…' Cromwell's strategic vision 1643-1644

MARTYN BENNETT*
Nottingham Trent University, UK,
Email: martyn.bennett@ntu.ac.uk

ABSTRACT
Cromwell with some justification is identified with East Anglia and this is often true of his early military career. However, his earliest campaigns were often focused on the area west of the Eastern Association counties and in particular they centred on the royalist garrison at Newark. This heavily defended town dominated several important communications arteries which Cromwell saw capturing the town as crucial to winning the war, at least in the region. Cromwell's ruthless pursuit of his goal led him to criticize and even attack his superiors who did not see things his way. This article explores Cromwell's developing strategic sense in the initial two years of the first civil war.

Introduction

The royalist garrison at Newark was not only one of the most substantial and successful garrisons in England during the civil wars: its steadfast loyalty had a devastating effect on the military careers of several parliamentarian generals and colonels. Between 1643 and 1645 Newark was responsible for, or played a role in, the severe mauling and even the termination of the careers of no less than five parliamentarian generals. The careers of two major generals in command of local forces, Sir Thomas Ballard and Sir John Meldrum, and three regional commanders, Thomas, Lord Grey of Groby, commander of the Midlands Association, Francis, Lord Willoughby of Parham, Lord Lieutenant of Lincolnshire and Edward Montague, Earl of Manchester, commander of the Eastern Association, all suffered because of it. Furthermore, Newark dented the ambitions, if not the careers, of two parliamentarian governor-colonels: the Derby governor Sir John Gell and the Nottingham governor John Hutchinson. It is also true that being governor of Newark did little for the careers of three royalist officers who served in the role: Sir John Henderson (1642-1643), Richard Byron (1643-1644) and Sir John Willys (1644-1645). More significantly from the perspective of this article, in the cases of three of the aristocrat or *magnate*

* Prof Martyn Bennett is Professor of Early Modern History in the School of Arts & Humanities at Nottingham Trent University, UK

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.821

generals, Lord Grey of Groby, Lord Willoughby and the Earl of Manchester, it was Oliver Cromwell that played an equally decisive role, alongside the midland garrison town, in terminating their field commissions. This article argues that whilst the actions, or rather, the often alleged inactions of the three aristocrats in relation to Newark, may have done the aristocracy, or at least aristocratic military appointments, no favours in Cromwell's eyes, it was his perceptive vision of the importance of Newark which was most remarkable. In the early stages of his military career Cromwell demonstrated his ability to conceptualise strategy, during a period of his life he might have been expected to have been paying attention solely to developing of his talents as a regimental and later a field officer in a growing horse regiment.

Newark upon Trent

Often referred to as a 'gateway to the north' there were several strategic angles to the importance of Newark involving the roads and river upon which the town stood and which its inhabitants used to make their living. Of the two, the river should have been more important during the war than it seems to have been in practice. The River Trent was a major waterway in the seventeenth century, made so by the shipping of goods from the Baltic and near Continent and the transport of coal and grain into and out of the county. Thus, there was the potential both to supply, and to deny supply, to the towns and villages which housed soldiers, garrisons and outlying billets for the armies raised and quartered in this region during the war. Newark of course was not alone, Nottingham too could be seen in this light. Holding the county town and its castle would enable a garrison to prevent goods being shipped either north and eastwards towards Newark or the port at Kingston upon Hull or westwards into south Derbyshire and Staffordshire. Yet little of the fighting in the area seems to have related specifically to the control of the river trade as it is rarely referred to in the literature. In February 1643 *Certain Informations* reported that the *Newarkers* had stopped barges heading towards Nottingham, but this is an unusual reference to the shipment of waterborne goods.[1] It may be that the early seizure of Hull (April 1642) by parliamentary forces had rendered the river less usable and the almost simultaneous royalist seizure of Nottingham, Trent Bridge and Newark later in the same year prevented the free movement of river traffic. This was underscored by their occupation of the inland port of Gainsborough in 1643. The use of a pinnace to carry the royalist Earl of Kingston away as a prisoner following his surrender of Gainsborough in July 1643 and his subsequent death on the boat, serves to underline the absence of other references.[2] Nevertheless, we must not neglect the importance of the river as a source of power for the mills in the town which had to produce an increased amount of flour for the garrison and the surrounding area, a point not lost

[1] British Library, Thomason Tracts, *Certain Informations* (London, 1643), No 4, 6-13 February, np.

[2] Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, *The Life of William Cavendish*, (London: George Routledge, 1906), (henceforward Newcastle, *Life)*, p. 80.

on the *Third Leaguer* surrounding Newark from 1645 to 1646. The river was also important because of the road-crossing points: at Newark itself, Muskham Bridge, Trent Bridge, and the ferries in south Derbyshire, Cavendish Bridge south of Swarkstone and the bridge at Burton on Trent which were all the focus of actions aimed at their control as crossing points rather than as trade centres or as inland ports. Their importance was such that the same issue of *Certain Informations* which highlighted the stopping of river traffic referred to Sir John Gell's intention to break the bridges at Swarkstone and Burton on Trent to hamper troop and materiel movement. The role of bridges serves further to underline the importance of the major roads, the Great North Road and the Fosse Way, that made Newark the conjunction of east-west and north-south travel and made the town a gem for the royalists who based themselves there. The royalist commander of the north and East Anglia, the Earl of Newcastle, could send or receive men and supplies into the southern reaches of his command via this route. Naturally, the control of these roads confirmed Newark as a target for the parliamentarian Eastern Association who wished both to interrupt the royalist hold on the Midlands and to establish communications with the parliamentarian garrisons at Derby and Nottingham, and from the Association to the parliamentarian stronghold at Hull as well as to the north in general. It was for these latter reasons that Newark became important to Colonel Oliver Cromwell and his Regiment of Horse as early as Spring 1643. Quite simply Newark was the gateway to the east, the west, the south and to the Midlands just as much as it was the gateway to the north, it simply depended on the strategic viewpoint of the observer.

Newark had been garrisoned by the royalist Nottinghamshire County High Sheriff, Sir John Digby, and by a Scottish veteran of the war in Europe, Sir John Henderson, under the orders of the Earl of Newcastle who had assumed command of the north and east of England at the tail end of 1642.[3] This occupation offset the parliamentary seizure of Nottingham by John Hutchison and Sir John Gell who had also seized Sheffield Castle and Derby and had begun to establish control of Derbyshire. At the same time, the region as a whole was being organised by the royalist Henry Hastings, who had been appointed colonel-general of the north midland counties in February. A parliamentarian attempt to crush Hastings's developing central garrison at Ashby de la Zouch was the cause of much acrimony within parliamentarian circles in late January.[4] Hastings's parliamentarian counterpart, the young Lord Grey of Groby along with Gell had attacked Ashby de la Zouch and its castle, but when Grey heard that Prince Rupert was on his way north to the garrison's rescue he had drawn off and moved into south

[3] Gell, J. 'A True Relation of What Service Hath been Done by Colonel John Gell', unpublished tract, in Glover, S., *The History, Directory and Gazetteer of Derbyshire,* (Derby, 1829), (Henceforth Gell, 'True relation), p. 62.

[4] British Library, Thomason Tracts, E86/1 *Special Passages no.24 January 17th – 24th, np,* Gell, J, 'True Relation', p. 63.

Leicestershire to block the prince's march.[5] Gell was furious at what he saw as a precipitous end to the parliamentarian siege, as the Ashby based royalist forces were a serious barrier to Gell's ambition to dominate the region.[6] Newark and its garrison was located within the region over which Hastings had command, but, because the garrison had been established on the direct orders of the Earl of Newcastle, it remained independent of Hastings to a great extent; nevertheless he would still be expected to support the garrison when necessary. At the end of February, it was the Newark garrison's turn to suffer a siege, albeit a fairly half-hearted affair led jointly by the parliamentarian Lord Lieutenant of Lincolnshire, Lord Willoughby of Parham and Sir Thomas Ballard the recently appointed major general of Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire.[7] This assault lasted just two-days, the 27 and 28 February and involved an attempted storm. Despite the fact that Newark's defensive works were not yet completed the attack was poorly coordinated and ended in failure. Failure led to acrimony as Sir John Gell and the Nottingham Governor John Hutchinson both claimed that they had been let down by the other despite them both holding Ballard chiefly responsible for their defeat.[8] As a result of this attack the royalist garrison began the re-development of Newark's defences.[9] Thus in early 1643 the two parliamentarian commanders in the east Midlands, Grey of Groby and Willoughby, who along with Ballard, had failed to prevent the growth of the royalist hold on the region had both incurred the wrath of Sir John Gell and were now both firmly on the back foot and would shortly come into contact with Cromwell.

Simply put, Newark acted as a serious brake on the activities of, and interfered with, several parliamentarian organisational structures: the Association of Eastern Counties and communications between that Association and London and, through Lincolnshire, to the north; Lord Willoughby's charge, Lincolnshire, part of Lord Fairfax's Northern Association; the town itself was located within Lord Grey of Groby's Midland Association; and the garrison's activities in South Lincolnshire threatened the territory

[5] British Library, Thomason Tracts, *Mercurius Aulicus,* 3rd week, np.

[6] British Library, Thomason Tracts, E86/1 *Special Passages no.24 January 17th – 24th, np,* Gell, J, 'True Relation', p. 63.

[7] British Library, Thomason Tracts, *England's memorable Accidents,* 9-16 January 1643. Northamptonshire Record Office, Finch Hatton Mss 133, under Lincolnshire; Lord Willoughby was appointed Lord Lieutenant on 5 March 1641(2) originally for Lindsey: the Earl of Lincoln was initially in command of Kesteven and Holland.

[8] Hutchinson, L., *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, (London: Longman, Orme and Rees, 1806) (Henceforth Hutchinson, *Memoirs*), pp. 121-123; BL Thomason Tracts, E92/3 *Certain Informations*, February 20th to March 6th, E86/41, *Mercurius Aulicus*, 9th week 1642(3); Lord Journal, Vol. 4, 5 March 1642, pp. 624-629.

[9] Hutchinson,, *Memoirs*, pp74-76; British Library, Thomason Tracts, E92/3, *Certain Informations*, , 20 February-6 March, 1642-3, British Library Thomason Tracts E86/41, 9th week, 1643.

of Lord Grey of Warke's Eastern Association. With Newark's royalist garrison growing in strength it was realised by them all that another parliamentarian attempt to capture the town would need to be made, and made soon.

Royalist troops of horse from Newark could conduct logistical expeditions – what parliamentarian newspapers of the time would refer to as raids – to establish taxation collection as far eastwards as the North Sea coast and as far north as the Humber Estuary. The royalists attempted to do the same in counties south of Lincolnshire from outposts such as Stamford and it was through this latter activity that the Midlands royalists first began to impress themselves upon the counties of the Eastern Association in early 1643.

The parliamentarian command structure into which Cromwell fitted was anything but clear cut: his civil line of command was divided between the two Lords Grey, the commanders of the Midlands Association and the Eastern Association. This came about because Cromwell served on two of the County Committees established by Parliament over the winter to manage the resources of each county under, or soon to be under, its control. Cromwell sat on the Cambridgeshire Committee which was in the Eastern Association and on that for Huntingdonshire which was initially in the Midlands Association.[10] Furthermore his regiment was raised in both areas. For the most part, Cromwell acted as part of the Eastern Association forces which had been placed under the command of Major General William, Lord Grey of Warke in late 1642, but for much of the time during the early part of the war Cromwell was involved in affairs in Lincolnshire, Lord Willoughby of Parham's command. Willoughby tended to keep his distance from Fairfax and the Northern Association and also may have resented the interference, if not the material support, from the Eastern Association. Cooperation between the Eastern Association and the Midlands Association under Thomas, Lord Grey of Groby was stilted by the 21-year old lord's inexperience and caution. It is clear that this hazy and conflicted command structure was responsible for a range of problems.

Much of the immediate funding of the Eastern Association tended to come from within, including the Isle of Ely and Cambridgeshire, and the borderland between the Association and disputed territory to the north. Protection of resources was at the forefront of Cromwell's financial as well as military strategy for much of 1643.[11] Troops serving in the Isle of Ely and Cambridgeshire also depended upon receiving

[10] Northamptonshire Record Office, Finch-Hatton Ms 133, np, under Cambridgeshire, dated 5 March 1641(2). And Huntingdonshire dated 1 March 1642(3) He was also appointed again on 3 December and to the Sequestration Committee the following March.

[11] Cromwell and others' letter to the Inhabitants of Fen Drayton, 8 March 1643. Abbott, I, p. 217.

money from across the region, including far-away Colchester from where Cromwell received men in March 1643.[12] The presence of such troops enabled not just a defensive posture to be maintained in Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire, it also made possible offensive action in southern Lincolnshire – the Holland division - during April.[13] On 7 April 1643 Lord Grey of Warke left his Association to join the Earl of Essex's field army within which his troops became a brigade. In his absence, Cromwell focussed firstly on the garrison which had been established by royalists from Newark at Crowland, on the River Welland about half way between Stamford and Wisbech, and which blocked communications with Willoughby's Lincolnshire. Willoughby's parliamentarian forces were defeated at the Battle of Ancaster Heath on 11 April and as a result Grantham and Stamford on the Great North Road were garrisoned by royalist forces. Stamford and Crowland now held the line of the Welland west of the fens. Peterborough had also been occupied giving the royalists a toe hold in the Eastern Association itself. This string of setbacks prompted Cromwell to go on the offensive.[14] Peterborough was only held briefly by the royalists before Cromwell retook it and turned on Crowland on 25 April. With Grey of Warke serving with Essex's field army and the Association forces depleted, Cromwell could not act alone so he needed to cooperate with Willoughby to his north and Grey of Groby to his west if he wanted to achieve further security.[15] He took his growing Regiment of Horse and was joined by foot from Norfolk and Willoughby's Lincolnshire troops. The aim was to enable a general parliamentarian advance northward from the centre and the eastern flank of the Eastern Association via Crowland and King's Lynn to Boston and towards beleaguered Lincoln. Cromwell and Miles Hobart seized Crowland on 29 April.[16] It was however, according to Clive Holmes, a three-day bombardment which persuaded the garrison to surrender rather than the actions of Cromwell and Hobart's regiments on that last day. Nevertheless, the attack on Crowland was an early example of Cromwell coordinating a combined arms offensive.

Cromwell was not satisfied with the level of cooperation he was receiving and five days after the seizure of Crowland, he complained about the contribution made by the neighbouring Association under Grey of Groby. Cromwell pulled no punches in his letter to the Committee at Lincoln on 3 May 1643, writing:

---

[12] Wilbur Cortez Abbott. *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1937-1947). Henceforth Abbott, *Writings*, Vol. I, pp. 220-21

[13] Abbott, *Writings,* Vol. 1, p. 224.

[14] British Library Thomason Tracts, *Certain Informations*, 17 April 1643, np

[15] Clive Holmes, *Seventeenth-century Lincolnshire,* (Lincoln: History of Lincoln Committee, 1980), pp. 70-72.

[16] *A True Relation of a Great Victory*, (London: Benjamin Allen, 27 May, 1643). p. 4; Holmes, *Lincolnshire,* p. 166.

> My Lord Grey hath now again failed me of the rendezvous at Stamford, notwithstanding that both he and I received Letters from His Excellency, commanding us both to meet, and, together with Sir John Gell and the Nottinghamshire forces to join with you.[17]

Cromwell was not backward at suggesting a strategic approach at this early stage in his career. Grey was very much concerned that in his absence royalist Colonel General Henry Hastings would go on the offensive in Leicestershire and be well-placed to attack his rear. Cromwell clearly believed and demonstrated that attacking Newark was more important:

> Believe it, it were better, in my poor opinion, Leicester were not, than that there should not be found an immediate taking of the field by our forces to accomplish our common ends.

This seems at first just to be a swipe at Grey's caution, but the logic is sound; he was suggesting dis-garrisoning Leicester and making use of the additional soldiers in a field army. The town was to play no significant role in Parliament's cause, and the garrison there was for the most part overawed by the royalist Hastings' larger regional army at Ashby. When Leicester was attacked by the king in May 1645 it was largely because the royalists judged it a quick win. However, Hastings had recently succeeded in recapturing Lichfield, which he and Prince Rupert had besieged for eleven days.[18] His next concern seems to have been the parliamentarians in Derbyshire and Cheshire and possibly a rendezvous with the Earl of Derby, rather than an attack on Grey of Groby.[19]

More broadly, Cromwell might have been making a case for developing field armies capable of besieging major strongholds rather than dispersing soldiers into a large number of garrisons. Clearly at that early point in his career he was not frightened of playing one noble general off against the other for he was clearly prioritising Grey of Wark or even Willoughby's strategy over Grey of Groby's. Cromwell had assured the Lincolnshire Association Committee that he would meet Grey of Groby the next day and remonstrate with him; if the committee could send someone to Cromwell on time he could then lend the weight of the Committee's opinion to it. Nevertheless, it is probable that Grey was involved in skirmishing around Loughborough on 4 May and not receiving an ear-bashing from Cromwell.

At the beginning of May the queen dispatched southwards a large convoy of ammunition from the cache she had brought into England from the Continent, under

[17] Abbott, Writings, Vol. 1, p. 228-229.
[18] William Salt Library, Burney's Newspapers, Vol. 1. *Mercurius Aulicus*, 16th week, p4.
[19] William Salt Library, SMS 550, no 4, Henry Hastings to Prince Rupert, 29 April 1643.

the command of Sir Charles Lucas. The convoy was joined at Newark by General Hastings who then enabled its journey to join King Charles at Oxford.[20] There was little in the way of an attempt to stop this convoy despite the royalist preparations in the belief that such an event was likely. Grey of Groby had again failed to leave his county, leaving Oliver Cromwell and Captain John Hotham at Sleaford in Lincolnshire without sufficient forces to make any move on Newark, and the ammunition was soon safely in Banbury.[21] Even so, this campaign was instrumental in Cromwell's development as a soldier. Despite failing to interrupt the convoy he and Hotham approached Newark and faced the garrison. The Newark royalists drove them off and chased them towards Grantham. Near there Cromwell turned to face them and defeated his pursuers.[22] It was a minor fight in many ways, the convoy had passed, the queen's ammunition train was by then in Oxford and the parliamentarians continued their retreat to Lincoln despite it but important lessons had been learned and had been put into practice. It is clear that Cromwell had not only developed his battlefield ability but a wider view of the war in the region that shows his developing strategic vision. [23]

By 24 May Cromwell and Hotham had joined Lord Grey of Groby at Hutchinson's base at Nottingham.[24] Grey may have felt safer there because whilst Hastings's headquarters was to his west and rear leaving his home territory vulnerable, should the royalists have made a move on Leicester, Ashby de la Zouch would in turn be exposed along with Hastings' own rear. Grey was certainly not averse to taking action, but his attack on the royalist outpost at Wiverton was driven off. Otherwise, there was little fighting. More serious than any disagreement about strategy was the fact that Captain John Hotham and his father, Sir John, were attempting to switch sides; something which would have gone a long way to handing the north to King Charles on a plate.[25] Moreover, there were already large numbers of royalist forces in the

[20] HMC *Hastings* Vol. 2, pp. 98-99, Sir Edward Nicholas to Hastings, 3 May 1643; Warburton, Vol. 2, pp. 189-190, Sir Edward Nicholas to Prince Rupert, 11 May 1643.
[21] Warburton, Memoirs Sir Edward Nicholas to Prince Rupert, p. 189.
[22] *A True Relation of Great Victory*, p4. John Vernon, *The Young Horfe-man, or the honeft plain-dealing Cavalier,* (London: Andrew Coe, 1644), p3.
[23] S.R Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War,* (Gloucestershire: Windrush Press, 1991 edition), Volume 1, p. 143. Charles Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England,* (Oxford: OUP, 1966 edition), p. 98; Ian Gentles, *Oliver Cromwell God's Warrior and the English Revolution,* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 27.
[24] R. Bell, ed., *Memorials of the Civil War Comprising the Correspondence of the Fairfax Family, with the Most Distinguished Personages Engaged in that Memorable Contest.,* (London: Richard Bentley, 1849), Vol. 1, Ulan Press edition , no date, (henceforth *Fairfax*) p45: John Hotham to Lord Fairfax, 24 May 1643.
[25] Martyn Bennett, 'The royalist war effort in the north Midlands, (Unpublished PhD thesis, Loughborough University, 1987), p. 191.

vicinity of Newark and according to Hotham 'we could not come to them without great disadvantage'.[26] The queen left York on 4 June with 4,500 men, having asked Hastings to join her for the journey beyond Newark.[27] It took two weeks for her army to reach Newark which she achieved without interference and joined Hastings there.[28] The assembled parliamentarians claimed that they had prepared to fight the royalists, but they then made no substantial attempt to stop the queen's army.[29] Despite initial reports to the contrary, they remained together at Nottingham where they were attacked by the queen and Hastings a few days later. The parliamentarians were paralysed, Hastings and the queen took over the town trapping the parliamentarians in the seemingly impregnable castle, before moving on to attack and capture the parliamentarian garrison at Burton on Trent.[30] By the time that Cromwell and Grey left Nottingham, the latter's reputation was damaged, and Hotham had been exposed as a would-be turncoat. Essex ordered Hotham's arrest and he was detained at Nottingham before escaping and asserting that his accusers were men without honour or status. Cromwell he claimed, associated with religious radicals and both he and the Nottingham Colonel of Horse Charles White were iconoclasts.[31] Hotham made his way to Hull, where he and his father were arrested by the mayor and sent to London.

Cromwell's war-effort was still in the hands of commanders like the two Lords Grey and Lord Willoughby and he could exercise little initiative off the battlefield, yet he was showing a keen interest in strategic matters, trying to ensure that his home territory was protected against the queen's army even though he himself was serving out of the region. In any case by mid-July one of the Greys was out of his hair, for Grey of Warke, who in any case was still in the south Midlands was relieved of command and at least temporarily imprisoned for refusing to join a commission being sent to Edinburgh to treat with the Scots.[32]

Despite Newark being secure and seemingly untouchable Willoughby scored a major parliamentarian success when he managed to capture Gainsborough. With a ferry crossing and its standing as an inland port, Gainsborough, whilst not as important as

---

[26] *Fairfax*. Vol One, p. 46, Hotham, Cromwell, Miles Hobart and Lord Grey to Lord Fairfax, 2 June 1643.
[27] Letter, Queen Henrietta Maria to Hastings, 1 June 1643, Historical Manuscripts Commission *Report on the Papers of Reginald Rawdon Hastings*, London, HMSO, 1930, Volume 2, pp. 102-103.
[28] British Library, Thomason Tracts, *Perfect Diurnal*, 26 June – 3 July, 1643, np.
[29] Abbott, *Writings,* Vol 1. pp. 234-235.
[30] Luke, Sir Samuel, *Diary of Sir Samuel Luke*, (Oxford: Oxford Record Society, 1950), Vol. 31, pp104-105, 117. Luke had heard that Lord Fairfax had captured 2000 of the queen's forces and that Grey had attacked her near Newark.
[31] Abbott, *Writings*, Vol 1. p. 237.
[32] Abbott, *Writings*, Vol 1, p. 236; House of Lords Journal, 25 July 1643, pp. 147-150.

Newark, gave Willoughby a route to the rest of the Northern Association and by extension he had given the Eastern Association a route to the north and to the parliamentarian garrison at Hull, also cutting communications between Lincoln and the northern royalists.

The captured royalist governor, the Earl of Kingston, commander of Lincolnshire, Norfolk, Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire and Rutland, was killed by friendly fire as he was being shipped northwards along the Trent to Hull, sliced in two by a cannon ball in a grisly enactment of the prophesy he had made about being divided in his loyalties.[33] With the town in his hands, Willoughby set up base in Gainsborough. This could have been his most important contribution to parliament's war-effort in the region, and potentially offsetting his defeat at Ancaster Heath; he could now disrupt Newark's control of eastern Nottinghamshire and curtail royalist expansion into Lincolnshire. However, almost immediately, he in turn was besieged by Lieutenant General Sir Charles Cavendish and Newark royalists. Willoughby of Parham's success in taking the town from Kingston's royalist forces had to be challenged and the Newark royalist garrison had responded quickly.

Cavendish's quick response prompted a counter move by the Eastern Association. In the absence of Lord Grey of Wark who was with the Earl of Essex in the south midlands, Sir John Meldrum assembled forces from Grey of Wark's Association and from Lord Grey of Groby's Midlands Association on 27 July at North Scarle west of Lincoln. He had about 300 horse and Cromwell brought in another six or seven troops of horse and dragoons. These forces marched on Gainsborough from North Scarle via Lea and pushed back a royalist *forlorn hope* of dragoons once they were close to the town. The ensuing battle of Gainsborough saw Cromwell and Meldrum win a convincing victory and rout Cavendish's horse. The royalist commander was killed having been trapped in a bog between the Lea road and the River Trent during the latter stages of the battle. However, whilst it appeared that Gainsborough was relieved and Willoughby rescued, the day was not over. As Cromwell, Meldrum and Willoughby met in the town news reached them that suggested that the royalists had rallied to the north of the town so Cromwell was sent out to reconnoitre and chase them off. The initial units of royalists were pushed from Windmill Hill near Morton, but then a great shock hit the parliamentarians when those first units were joined by another, and

[33] Hutchinson *Memoirs* p. 127; Newcastle, *Memoirs*, pp. 27-28; British Library, Thomason Tracts, *Mercurius Aulicus,* Week 24, 1643, np.

> after that another and another and another and as some counted about fifty colours of foot, with a great body of horse, which was indeed my Lord Newcastle's army.[34]

Newcastle chased the startled parliamentarians, but Cromwell managed to bring his troops off in an orderly manner and the garrison troops also returned to the town. Gainsborough was quickly made ready for a new siege whilst Cromwell and Meldrum hurriedly retreated to Lincoln pursued by part of Newcastle's Northern Horse. Although the horse and dragoons of Meldrum's relief forces got away without loss, within days, the garrison had been forced to surrender the town and Willoughby and his troops were allowed to march to Lincoln and the royalists reoccupied Gainsborough on the 30th.[35] Willoughby made it to Lincoln but was soon driven out by Newcastle who had pursued him closely. Of this stage of the war, the Member of Parliament and diarist Bulstrode Whitlocke later noted that Willoughby was thanked by Parliament for having 'done very considerable service' even though he then recounted the loss of Gainsborough; somewhat ironically noting of Cromwell that this campaign was the point which was 'the beginning of his great fortunes and now he began to appear to the world'.[36] On 5 August, in a plea for help addressed to Cromwell, Willoughby claimed abjectly that his men were demoralised: 'deaded' as he put it and many had run away, and asked Cromwell to join him at Boston in order to try and hold the town and thus keep Newcastle out of East Anglia. The following day, Cromwell enclosed Willoughby's letter with his own to the Association Committee at Cambridge, thus revealing Willoughby's military position and psychological state to its members. Furthermore he asked them to pass both letters to the County Committees of Suffolk, Norfolk and Essex, thus spreading far and wide news of Willoughby's failure to hold Lincolnshire.[37] To hammer home the message about Willoughby's unsuitability, during September Cromwell complained of Willoughby's men 'who did run away and gave no alarum to any of the rest of his forces'.[38] Within three weeks, Parliament allocated Lincolnshire to the Eastern Association, theoretically at least dealing with Willoughby's incompetence. Although it was the beginning of the end of Willoughby's career as the Lord Lieutenant of Lincolnshire, he was still involved in the next month's campaign in the county, although the Earl of

---

[34] Abbott, *Writings* Vol I, pp. 239, 241, Cromwell's account refers to 50 colours, the equivalent of five full regiments of foot, but the joint account suggests that there were 19 in Newcastle's regiment alone which would have made that almost a double-regiment, which was the second one in the line of march. West, J., *Oliver Cromwell and the battle of Gainsborough*, (Boston: Richard Key, 1992), p. 12.

[35] Luke, Diary, p127.

[36] Whitelock, Bulstrode, *Memorials of the English Affairs*, (Oxford: OUP, 1853), Vol 1, 209.

[37] Abbott, *Writings,* Vol 1. pp. 250-251.

[38] Abbott, *Writings,* Vol 1. p. 260.

Manchester had replaced Grey of Wark and was firmly in charge. The earl had established a new regiment in Lincolnshire and appointed Edward King its colonel.[39] The appointment is usually discussed in relation to King's Presbyterianism and the potential ructions this had caused amongst Cromwell's men. But King's appointment as a counterpoint to Willoughby's command in his own county is more important. Cromwell appreciated King's superior military ability compared to Willoughby and put that and the need for unity of purpose ahead of any religious differences and any qualms he may have felt.[40]

Although Manchester was given command of Lincolnshire with the same powers as he had in the other six counties, Willoughby, with support in Parliament, hung on to his command. In early 1644 Cromwell made a very personal attack on Willoughby in Parliament, detailing not just his military failings, but suggested moral impropriety as well and he was not alone in that condemnation.[41] There were a series of attacks on Willoughby's continuing authority, but he had a number of defenders too and there were even scuffles in a London pub between his supporters and detractors. Indeed, the view within the Commons was mixed; Bulstrode Whitelock's perspective was that the matter was less controversial than it appeared from Cromwell's perspective and commented that 'all was well reconciled'.[42] Even so Cromwell's attack had damaged Willoughby and he did himself no favours when it was discovered just over a week later, that he had challenged Manchester to a duel. Willoughby was then initially, as Cromwell had suggested, simply retained in Westminster on business. The Commons then ordered Willoughby's regiments of horse to remain in Lincolnshire and placed them under Manchester's command. However, within weeks Willoughby had managed to return to the county and, playing the role of regimental commander, had joined Sir John Meldrum's attack on Newark at the end of February 1644. This, the second siege of Newark, ended in disaster when Prince Rupert and Lord Loughborough defeated and received the surrender of Meldrum's entire army on 21 March.

Whilst he was not involved in the second siege of Newark, Cromwell had participated in seriously damaging the military reputations of two aristocratic generals: Willoughby was now finally removed and out of the way; Grey of Groby was still in post, but his reputation was severely damaged and would be out of the way before the end of the year.

---

[39] Leicestershire Archive Office, DE216, the Earl of Newcastle to Henry Hastings of 18 September which asks him to support Henderson who is under pressure from 'Lord Willoughby, Cromwell and their adherents'.

[40] Holmes, *Lincolnshire,* p. 200.

[41] House of Lords Journal, Vol 6, pp384-387. House of Commons' Journal, Vol 3, p. 372. Clive Holmes, 'Colonel King and Lincolnshire Politics'. *The Historical Journal,* 16/3 (1973), pp. 458-460.

[42] Bulstrode Whitelock, *Memorials,* Vol One, pp. 238-239.

It was as Grey of Groby's first military career sputtered to its end that Cromwell embarked on the course which would bring about the demise of the Earl of Manchester's career in the field. This followed the lack lustre performance of parliament's combined forces during and in the aftermath of the Second Battle of Newbury. Parliament's failure to defeat the king decisively in what seemed to be propitious circumstances at Newbury had many causes and not one of the generals involved, Essex, Cromwell, Manchester or Waller comes out of an analysis of the battle unblemished. However, unlike that of Manchester's other detractors, Cromwell's attack on Manchester in November 1644 brought Newark to the fore again. Originally a quarrel between Manchester and Cromwell it would embrace the Earl of Essex and drag into it Sir William Waller and Major General Lawrence Crawford and embroil the Scots in a proposal to indict Cromwell as an incendiary.[43] 'Lieutenant General Cromwell's Narrative' is perhaps the best known of the accounts of the case Cromwell made against Manchester and it reiterated something of the spoken attack on him that Cromwell had made in the House of Commons on 25 November.[44] However, it may not have been a single-author piece: the style of the writing suggests that the soldiers Sir William Waller and Sir Arthur Hesilrige and the politician Sir Harry Vane may also have had a hand in its composition. The latter part of the 'narrative' is far better known as it is there that it focusses on the charges made against Manchester's behaviour at the Second Battle of Newbury and because of the inclusion in the narrative of the debate when Waller, Cromwell and others were witness to Manchester's lugubrious statement:

> If we beat the King 99 times he would be King still, and his posterity, and we subjects still; but if he beat us but once we should all be hanged, and our posterity undone.[45]

This rightly famous passage highlights the lack of commitment shown at the parliamentarian high command level to the gaining of an outright victory over the king when in a position of strength.[46] On the other hand, the earlier part of the narrative centres upon the weeks following the conclusion of the earl's participation in the northern campaign and the days after he left York following its surrender. Cromwell claimed that it took some time for him to understand what was going on, and that

[43] Journal of the House of Lords, Vol., 7, 22 November, 1644, p76; Indeed, Whitelock believed that Cromwell attacked officers from Essex's army more than any other. Whitelock, vol. 1. pp. 338 & pp. 343-347. The attempt to charge Cromwell with being an incendiary involved the Scots' English Presbyterian allies, including the commander of the regiment Cromwell's initial troop had been assigned to, Sir Phillip Stapleton.
[44] Journal of the House of Commons. Vol 7, pp. 703-705.
[45] Abbott, *Writings,* Vol 1, p. 310.
[46] Abbott, *Writings,* Vol 1, p. 302.

only later in the year did he realise that Manchester's actions were predicated on the earl's desire that the war should be ended through negotiation rather than by gaining a dominant position through an outright victory. The earl, he argued, was:

> most at fault for most of those miscarriages and the ill-consequences of them. And because I had a great deal of reason to think that his Lordship's miscarriages in these particulars was neither accidents (which could not be helped) nor through his improvidence only but through his backwardness to all action.[46]

Cromwell explained that he had at first hand observed that the earl's 'continued backwardness' was 'contrary to advice given him' and 'contrary to commands received'. In other words, the earl was not only failing to act in the collegiate way expected of a commander in the seventeenth century, he was also disobeying orders. It was pointed out that in the six weeks or so between leaving York on 15 July and 3 September when the earl moved south from Lincoln, he had held just one Council of War.

After a successful campaign in the middle of 1644 which saw the defeat of Prince Rupert and the capture of York, the earl, Cromwell claimed, had frequently thrown away chances. These chances, he argued, mainly focussed on Newark. Cromwell asserted that the earl had plenty of time and opportunity to attack Newark and its satellite garrisons before being ordered south to after the summer's defeat of Sir William Waller at Cropredy Bridge and the destruction of the Earl of Essex's veteran army at Lostwithiel. However, according to Malcolm Wanklyn Manchester was well aware of the importance of Newark and on 22 July proposed attacking the garrison himself. This would not be surprising, Manchester's successes in Lincolnshire in late 1643 had largely been negated by the Newark forces, especially after the second siege in March 1644. It may also be the case that Manchester was becoming annoyed by Cromwell's various urgings, firstly Newark and then perhaps for a vigorous march to the west: in any case he was caught in the middle for the Committee of Both Kingdoms had ordered the earl to remain where he was as it feared that Prince Rupert was rebuilding his army.[47]

Newark and indeed the north Midlands royalist cause as a whole was vulnerable in the late summer of 1644. It moved swiftly from being a communications hub between north and south, east and west to being the front line following the collapse of the royalist north. Most importantly a good deal of the region's man-power and materiel had been invested in Prince Rupert's York venture and in the north in general. From January 1644 when Sir Charles Lucas took contingents of Hastings's army northwards

[47] Wanklyn, M., 'A General Much Maligned: the Earl of Manchester as army commander in the second Newbury campaign: July to November 1644', *War in History* 14, 2 (2007), p. 137.

to combat the invading army of the Solemn League and Covenant, onwards Newcastle had called upon the resources of his lieutenant general. Shortly after the relief of Newark in late March, the Newark Horse under Major General George Porter had been called north to support the Yorkshire royalists hold down territory in the wake of challenges from Hull, and he had taken part of the Belvoir garrison with him. Later whilst the Earl of Newcastle had become bottled up in York following the defeat of Sir John Belasyse at the Battle of Selby on 10 April, Lord Goring and the Northern Horse had been sent to camp on Newark's lush but already hard-pressed meadows. Not only had these extra brigades eaten into the resources of the region, but Loughborough was asked to reinforce Goring when he returned north.

When Prince Rupert began organising his relief force for the march to York. Lord Loughborough and Newark's governor, Sir Richard Byron committed yet more of their forces to the war in the north. Derbyshire and Staffordshire regiments under Sir Thomas Milward, Sir Rowland Eyre, Sir John Freschville and Sir Thomas Leveson had been involved in the Battle of Marston Moor as had horse regiments, like Sir Anthony Eyre's from Newark. Somewhat over a thousand men from the region had been on the field of Marston Moor on 2 July 1644. Leveson's horse had been scattered during the defeat of the royalist right, whilst the others, after their initial success under Goring's leadership on the royalist left wing were swept up in the final rout. The subsequently dispersed regiments would make their way back home over time, but as Manchester bore down on the midlands, they were still a long way north.

Loughborough and Byron had first heard that the Battle of Marston Moor had been a victory and later that it had been 'an Edgehill battle' of unclear outcome, and were preparing yet more reinforcements for Rupert to be sent to join him at Doncaster.[48] It would be the 8 July when real doubts began to set in and Byron suggested to Loughborough that they stay put: but even then Manchester was still outside York and would be for another week.[49] It would be a further eleven days before the truth emerged and the scale of the defeat in battle and the subsequent loss of York reached Lord Loughborough, by which time Manchester was on his way.[50] Cromwell and other officers in the Eastern Association army realised Newark was vulnerable and urged Manchester to attack the town quickly, and about this time Manchester indeed had suggested to the Committee of Both kingdoms that he should do so. Instead the earl stayed lingered further north around Doncaster for over a week before moving towards Lincoln, where he would then stay for a month.

[48] HMC, *Hastings*, Vol II, pp. 129-130. Loughborough to Byron and Byron to Rupert, both dated 6 July 1644.
[49] HMC *Hastings*, Vol II, p. 131, Byron to Hastings, 8 July 1644.
[50] HMC, *Hastings*, Vol II, pp. 131-132, Byron to Loughborough, 19 July 1644.

Cromwell and others suggested that garrisons close to Doncaster, such as Sheffield, Tickhill, Bolsover and Welbeck were also ripe for the picking. Indeed the royalist governor Major Monkton surrendered Tickhill Castle on 26 July as soon as John Lilburne and Eastern Association army dragoons quartered in the town an action to which Manchester reacted with anger directed at Lilburne. Welbeck surrendered on 2 August and Sheffield followed on 11 August, surrendering to Major General Crawford and Colonel Pickering. As the earl made Lincoln his base, Crawford marched into Derbyshire to support Sir John Gell and John Hutchinson in their siege of [South] Wingfield, which had begun back on 17 July.[51] Wingfield fell on 21 August.[52] Bolsover also fell and thus the Eastern Association army had bagged five north Midland and south Yorkshire garrisons.[53] Essentially the new royalist front line had ceased to exist in less than a month.[54] Cromwell believed that more could be done, identifying Newark and its satellites, Shelford and Wiverton and the fortress on the edge of the vale, Belvoir Castle as preliminary targets. Manchester, perhaps angrily listened to the advice Cromwell claimed he had offered, and had already tried to get the Committee of Both Kingdoms to authorise an attack. Had they agreed he would have swept away the eastern flank of the royalist midlands as well as its northern front. Instead Manchester was ordered to stay put for the time being and in the eyes of his detractors, he began to prevaricate, claiming to be waiting for the advice of the absent Lawrence Crawford, and would take no action until the major general returned.

When he did return, Crawford supported the idea of an attack on Newark. Manchester now called a council of war which, according to Cromwell's narrative, decided upon action against Newark. Faced with a decision promoted by his two subordinate generals Manchester reluctantly agreed and plans were made for a campaign. However, soon afterwards Manchester possibly feeling under pressure from London let the plans.

However, Manchester was then ordered by the Committee of Both Kingdoms to march westwards to support Sir William Brereton who had found himself beset by Prince Rupert, in a move which seemingly confirmed parliament's and the committee's fears about the prince's resurgent forces. Manchester had little inclination for a march

[51] William Salt Library, Burney's Newspapers, Vol. 1. *Perfect Diurnal*, no 53, 29 July – 5 August, 1644, p. 23. Refers to 500 of Manchester's horse preventing Hastings's attempted relief of the siege.
[52] William Salt Library, Burney's Newspapers, Vol 1. *Diary or Exact Journal* 21-28 August 1644, p. 25.
[53] Cavendish, *Newcastle*, pp. 22, 87-88; *Diary or Exact Journal,* (London, 1640) no. 14, 21-28 August, np. British library, Thomason Tracts, *Perfect Occurrences,* no. 3, 23-30 August, 1644, np.
[54] Gell, 'True Relation', pp67, 69; Abbott, *Writings,* Vol I, pp303-304; Newcastle, *Memorials*, pp. 87-92.

westwards and told the committee that he intended to attack Newark, using the arguments advanced by Cromwell that Newark represented too great a threat to the Eastern Association, Lincolnshire in particular for him to leave the area. As a temporary measure Manchester firstly agreed to send Brereton a detachment of horse, but then reneged on even this token gesture.[55] Cromwell was to go on to complain that Manchester had billeted his army on areas of Lincolnshire already controlled by parliamentarians whilst leaving the rest of Lincolnshire open to 'raids' from Newark.[56]

The earl continued to dissemble in the face of both orders from London and his officers by appearing to suggest targeting Belvoir and the Newark satellite garrisons, Wiverton and Shelford to close in on Newark. His officers, possibly making the best of a bad job encouraged the proposal to attack satellite garrisons 'in case he would not meddle against Newark', in other words they feared that he would never tackle the main garrison and at least capturing the smaller ones would damage Newark's potential. However, Manchester spent an inordinately long time deciding which garrison to attack first as a means of attacking none of them.[57] The earl's commanders were not alone in feeling frustrated with the lack of decisive action in the midlands. The newspaper *Parliamentary Scout*, declared that none of the region's smaller garrisons would have taken Manchester much time to capture: 'they being apprehended a work of no great difficulty' which would have leave Manchester able to tackle Newark. On the other hand just a week later the paper had some backhanded praise for Manchester a week later pointing out that Leicestershire and Derbyshire parliamentarians owed much to him as their own forces 'appear little outside their own counties'. Rather prophetically it suggested that it would now be left to the Earl of Leven to come south and capture Ashby de la Zouch and Newark: this would partly come true, but not for over year and a half.[58] *Parliamentary Scout's* criticism of the midlands forces was one of the last nails in the coffin of Lord Grey of Groby's first civil war military career, the royalist newspaper, *Mercurius Aulicus* had already somewhat sarcastically noted a month earlier that Grey had surrendered his commission as it meant nothing by this point.[59]

---

[55] Abbott, Vol I, p. 304.

[56] Whitelock, *Memorials*, Vol. 1. p. 339: some of these raids were effective and in November a part of the Lincolnshire County Committee was captured.

[57] Abbott, *Writings,* Vol I, p. 304.

[58] British Library, Thomason Tracts, *Parliamentary Scout*, no 64, 5-13 September, 1644, np; *Parliamentary Scout*, no. 65, 12-19 September, 1644, np.

[59] British Library, Thomason Tracts, *Mercurius Aulicus*, 33rd week, 1644, np. Ironically Grey's career would continue to have links to Cromwell's. He helped Colonel Thomas Pride identify Presbyterian MPs during the Purge of the Commons on 7 December 1648 and in 1651 he would play a not unimportant role in Cromwell's greatest victory at Worcester.

Cromwell was perhaps less aware of the catastrophe down south. The Committee of Both Kingdoms and Parliament had been focussed on the Earl of Essex's increasingly precarious campaign in the south west during August. However, shortly after Crawford had re-joined the Eastern Association Army the Earl of Essex was defeated at Lostwithiel, although he had managed to pass his horse through the royalist cordon trapping him on the Fowey Peninsula, the foot had been taken prisoner and disarmed before being sent on a long march towards Plymouth. Parliament had invested its hopes for rescuing the earl or at least distracting the attention of the king's forces pursuing him into Cornwall, Waller's army was simply not up to the task following its defeat in the summer. Parliament and the committee were forced to turn to Manchester. On 7 September they gave him his orders:

> We are commanded, by the Houses of Parliament, to desire you with all possible Speed to march towards *Dorchester*, in *Dorsettshire*, with all the Forces you can of Horse and Foot; the great Importance whereof, upon the sad Accident in the West (of which your Lordship hath received Intelligence from the Committee of Both Kingdoms), requireth your best Care and Diligence, and will admit of no Delay.[60]

Essex was informed that both Manchester and Waller had bene ordered to march with 'all possible speed' and that plans were afoot to rearm his forces, something which Manchester confirmed the following day from Huntingdon in a letter to his predecessor, Lord Grey of Wark, now the speaker of the House of Lords.

> I have received your Lordship's Letter; and shall obey the Command of the House of Peers, to make all possible Speed I can to march towards *Dorchester*. I am very sorry to hear of the sad Accident in the West. I trust, God will make up this great Loss.[61]

With matters in hand regarding rescuing Essex and restoring the balance of power in the south, parliament took time to thank its servants: Cromwell in particular was singled out in terms which matched the press accounts of the Battle of Marston Moor; and gave thanks to

> Lieutenant General *Cromwell*, for his Fidelity in the Cause in hand; and in particular for the faithful Service performed by him in the late Battle near *York*,

[60] Journal of the House of Lords, Vol 6, 7 Sept. 1644, p498; this and all subsequent entries for this Journal are accessed through the British History Online website.
[61] Journal of the House of Lords, Vol 6, 9 September, 1644, p490.

> where God made him a special Instrument in obtaining that great Victory over Prince *Rupert*'s and the Marquis of *Newcastle*'s Armies there.[62]

About a fortnight later, Parliament resolved that Manchester and Waller join forces as soon as they could and remain together to cooperate as the Committee of Both Kingdoms saw fit.[63] Three weeks later, by 12 October, Manchester had based himself at Reading and sent them a report on all of his recent movements.[64]

Cromwell as we know of course did not limit his attack on Manchester to his actions in the East Midlands, but he linked his accusations about the earl's dilatoriness there to the campaign in the south, realising that even late in 1644, parliament still prioritised the defeat of the king's Oxford field army rather than maintaining the local associations. He would also be familiar with the parlous state of Waller's army since the Battle of Cropredy Bridge back in June and the devastation wrought on Essex's army at Lostwithiel in early September, in any case at least by the time he was denouncing Manchester in parliament even if the battle itself had coincided with the start of Manchester's sluggardly march Therefore, Cromwell made explicit the important point that Manchester's perceived failings in the midlands had limited his contribution to the campaign in the south because he had to leave far more of his army behind in the region because of the threat from Newark, whereas if it had been captured, local forces would or should be sufficient to hold the territory, an argument similar to that advanced by *Parliament's Scout* issue 65.[65] At this point Cromwell's narrative turned to the earl's slow march towards the south and onto the better known sections on the Newbury campaign itself.[66] The narrative was in its turn supported by the testimony of Waller and Hesilrige and somewhat more damningly several of the colonels from Manchester's own army, some of whom would have been smarting from Manchester's threat in mid-September to have them hanged for suggesting that he move southwards more quickly. This outburst is perhaps suggestive of Manchester's patience wearing thin. It may be possible that he resented his juniors, including Cromwell pressing their strategic views upon him. But if he did only hold one council of war, then this may be symptomatic of him failing to share information with them about his orders from London that prevented him from attacking Newark when he and his officers were actually in agreement on the importance of the garrison. Even though Major General Crawford was, like the earl himself, a Presbyterian, and no friend to Cromwell, he supported the gist of the attack on the earl's performance: Manchester may have isolated himself from his own commanders in September 1644.

---

[62] House of Commons Journal , Vol 3, 13 Sept 1644, pp626-627 this and all subsequent entries for this Journal are accessed through the British History Online website.
[63] Journal of the House of Lords, Vol 6, 21 September 1644. p711.
[64] House of Commons Journal, Vol 13, 14 October 1644, p662.
[65] Ibid, np; Abbott, *Writings,* Vol I, pp304-305.
[66] Abbott, *Writings,* Vol. I, pp. 305-311. Wanklyn, 2007, pp137-8.

Even though he had the support in parliament to enable him to attack Cromwell's lacklustre performance in the Newbury campaign failing to nurture his juniors' support proved costly.[67] The aftermath of the assault on the earl is well known: following Cromwell's decision not to continue his attack on the Earl of Manchester, parliament introduced a self-denying ordinance which made it mandatory for members of the Commons and the Lords to hand in their commissions and left it up to parliament to reappoint a select few on exceptional bases. At the same time a new, remodelled army was established from the remnants of the three armies of Essex, Manchester and Waller. This decision left three chief armies in the north and south west untouched, and for a time sections of Waller's and the Earl of Manchester's armies operated together in the west under the command of Waller and Cromwell who were granted temporary commissions as the new army was modelled.

Conclusion

Thus Newark had become a stick with which Cromwell beat down the careers of aristocratic generals during the war. It is unlikely that Whitelock was correct when he claimed that he was told that the whole point of the attack on Manchester and Essex in late 1644 was a plot to bring about a levelling process which would remove the aristocracy or at least the two earls from the traditional role in army command. [68] It is far more likely that Cromwell was concerned to remove what he saw as half-hearted warriors from command. It would be a consistent policy of his during 1643 and 1644. Cromwell's commitment to prosecuting the war vigorously was demonstrated in other ways too, including the willingness to support people like Colonel King, with very different religious conviction to his own, if he believed they could 'do the job'.

Cromwell's view of Newark was sound at every stage. In the early part of 1643, Newark was able exert control over much of Lincolnshire, breaking links between parliamentarians in the north and the Eastern Association. Even when the Eastern Association periodically occupied central Lincolnshire and the county town from late summer onwards, the Newark garrison continued to interfere in parliamentarian attempts to control the county fully. This state of affairs continued throughout the following year and into 1645, as Cromwell predicted in his complaints about Manchester's war record. Even when Newark was neutralised from November 1645 onwards, it took two armies to keep it in check and surrender six months later was ordered by the king as part of the politics of his surrender deal rather than for military reasons. Cromwell thereby had proved, even as an early career soldier, to have a clear strategic vision. Moreover, it was a vison which he felt should be shared by his aristocratic commanders, Willoughby and Manchester and his associate Lord Grey of Groby. Whilst all three were to lose their field commands in 1644, ironically Lord Grey was to work with Cromwell again in 1651 during the Worcester campaign with

[67] Whitelock, *Memorials*, Vol. 1, p. 341, 343
[68] Ibid, p. 349.

greater success. There is little surprise that certain parliamentarian aristocrats saw Cromwell as a challenge and that Whitelock thought that in terms of military command Cromwell was a 'leveller'; three coronets was a high tally even if at least half the credit belonged to the Newarkers. Cromwell's concern was military but whilst Newark remained a major concern throughout the war, in the wake of the Battle of Naseby Cromwell showed clearly that it was not simply an obsession and demonstrated that he could identify a different strategic purpose. On 15 June 1645, the North Midlands lay wide open. The king was retreating north westwards with the remains of his army, Lord Loughborough and the Newark garrison had invested heavily in the king's advance through the midlands in May and June and they were, like they had been a year earlier, vulnerable to concerted attack: Loughborough surrendered Leicester within days. Yet it seems that Fairfax and Cromwell had decided to prioritise the destruction of the chief remaining royalist field army, that in the south west led by Lord Goring. Destroying that army would in essence make holding on to increasingly isolated pockets of territory less and less strategically valuable. However, Cromwell had been right to identify Newark as a major strategic priority in 1643 and 1644; reduction of the garrison either before or after Marston Moor would have probably hastened the end of the war dramatically; it was to parliament's cost that it appointed a series of commanders who did not share Cromwell's strategic vision, nor his aggressive determination.

'All Pretty Well Fed Up and Worn Out'? Morale, Combat Motivation, and the 'Marshall Effect' in VIII Corps at Gallipoli

GARY SHEFFIELD[*]
University of Wolverhampton, UK
Email: G.Sheffield@wlv.ac.uk

ABSTRACT
This article explores the morale of the troops of British VIII Corps on Gallipoli in 1915-16, using Anthony King's recent work on combat motivation in infantry platoons as a tool of analysis. King, partially rehabilitating the controversial work of S.L.A. Marshall, argues that left to themselves, the citizen armies of the early twentieth century tended to passivity. Officers resorted to a range of strategies to overcome this 'Marshall Effect', including appeals to patriotism and masculinity, mass tactics, and heroic leadership. It is contended that King's model works well when applied to this case study – such methods were indeed employed by officers of VIII Corps - but the jury is out on its wider applicability, pending detailed case studies of other campaigns. As this article demonstrates, the morale of the troops of VIII Corps was severely tested throughout the Gallipoli campaign, as a rash of short-lived 'panics' demonstrated. There was a distinct downturn in August 1915, which was marked by an increase in rates of sickness and self-inflicted wounds, and a 'strike', when a sub-unit simply refused to carry out an attack. Despite this, there was no general and permanent breakdown of morale, in the sense of unwillingness to obey the orders of higher command. VIII Corps' morale was characterised by stoicism and resilience in the face of adverse conditions.

Introduction

> The boys in our lot who were in Egypt and have been here since May are all pretty well fed up and worn out, which is only natural as they have been through it and do need a long rest.[1]

---

[*] Prof Gary Sheffield is Professor of War Studies in the School of Social, Historical and Political Studies at the University of Wolverhampton, UK

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.822

[1] Lee to mother, 4 Sept. 1915, in Robert Lee, *Letters from Gallipoli* (Kibworth Beauchamp: Matador, 2015), p. 45.

So wrote Private Bert Lee on 4 September 1915. Lee had arrived on Gallipoli as a reinforcement for 1/7 Manchesters, a Territorial battalion of 42nd (East Lancashire) Division. The Division had landed at Cape Helles in early May, after training in Egypt, and since then had been engaged in trench warfare, under small arms and shell fire, whether holding positions, or attacking, virtually without respite. This, plus a monotonous diet and endemic sickness, had reduced the 1/7 Manchesters to the state that Lee described. Similarly, a member of the 42nd Division Royal Engineers contrasted the appearance of yeomanry troops who arrived at Gallipoli in October 1915 'in the pink of condition', with 'our war-worn men, sick from every ailment imaginable'.[2]

This article explores the state of morale among troops of British VIII Corps at Gallipoli.[3] It makes use of Anthony King's recent work on combat motivation in infantry platoons.[4] King builds upon earlier attempts to explain combat performance. Seminal works privileged the primary group as the mainspring of combat motivation.[5] Essentially, it was argued that men fought because they did not want to let down other group members, and feared being seen as 'unmanly'. Indeed, interpersonal masculine bonds were seen as the centre of cohesion, and hence combat motivation. Alternatively, the role of ideology and punishment in combat performance has also been stressed; moreover, the goal of the cohesive group could be to avoid combat and thus enhance its chance of survival.[6]

In recent years, scholars have moved away from being concerned with what soldiers *feel* to what they collectively *do.* Hew Strachan has persuasively argued that 'when exhaustion makes rational thought impossible, or when fear has taken over' properly-trained 'individuals react without thinking'. It could even be argued that interpersonal relations are immaterial, providing that combat teams 'have trained together

[2] 'Compiled by members of the Corps', *A History of the East Lancashire Royal Engineers* (Uckfield: Naval and Military Press, nd [1920]), p. 109.
[3] For the order of battle of VIII Corps, see Appendix.
[4] Anthony King, *The Combat Soldier,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 17-19, 38.
[5] King, *Combat Soldier,* pp. 13-15, 98-99; Edward A. Shils and Morris Janowitz, **'**Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II**',** *The Public Opinion Quarterly (*12, 2, 1948), pp. 280-315; S.A. Stouffer *et al, The American Soldier,* Vol. II, *Combat and its Aftermath* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1949); Roger Little, 'Buddy Relations and Combat Performance', in Morris Janowitz, *The New Military: Changing Patterns of Organization* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 1969 [1964] pp. 195-223.
[6] Charles Moskos, *The American Enlisted Man: The Rank and File in Today's Military* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970); Richard Holmes, *Firing Line* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1985) pp. 31, 317-18; Omer Bartov, *Hitler's Army* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

sufficiently'.[7] Sweeping explanations of combat motivation, such as the primary group or ideology, are now less favoured than 'the specific social dynamics on the battlefield or within military units'. King is influenced by the sociologist Randall Collins, who argues that to commit violence is hard, not easy; to paraphrase him, habitual violence is a 'learned microtechnique'.[8] While not rejecting the significance of the primary group, appeals to masculinity, or ideology, King's work stresses the social dynamics of the platoon in creating cohesion.

Central to King's thesis is his rehabilitation of the work of S.L.A. Marshall. The latter's thesis, based on his study of US troops in Second World War, was that on the twentieth century 'empty battlefield' only around 1-in-4 of infantrymen fired their weapons. By contrast, crew-served weapons enjoyed the benefits of visible team work and could keep up high rates of fire.[9] Marshall's thesis and methodology have been attacked.[10] King partially accepts these criticisms but offers some evidence that supports Marshall's ideas, contending that in general, the mass armies of non-professional soldiers of 1914-18 and 1939-45 were too large to be trained effectively. Thus 'low levels' of combat effectiveness 'were… the norm in the citizen platoon' in Western armies of the period. Left to themselves, soldiers tended to passivity.[11] King, in part revisiting earlier theories of motivation, argues that this 'Marshall Effect' could be overcome in a variety of ways: appeals to masculinity and patriotism; ideological indoctrination; mass tactics, especially the bayonet charge; training soldiers for 'extreme aggression'; and relying on heroic, often self-sacrificing, individual leaders to motivate the rest.[12]

---

[7] Hew Strachan, 'Training, Morale, and Modern War', *Journal of Contemporary History* (41, 2, 2006), p. 217; Anthony King, 'On Cohesion', in Anthony King (ed.), *Frontline: Combat and Cohesion in the Twenty-First Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 11.

[8] Randall Collins, 'The micro-sociology of violence', *British Journal of Sociology* (60, 3, 2009), p. 575. See also *idem, Violence: A Micro-sociological Theory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008).

[9] S.L.A. Marshall, *Men Against Fire: The Problem of Battle Command in Future War* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1978 [1947]), pp. 41-42, 44, 50; King, *Combat Soldier,* pp. 42-61.

[10] Roger J. Spiller, 'S.L.A. Marshall and the Ratio of Fire', *Journal of the Royal United Services Institute*, 133, Dec. 1988, pp. 63-71; John Whiteclay Chambers II, 'S.L.A. Marshall's *Men Against Fire:* new evidence regarding fire ratios', *Parameters* 33 (Autumn 1993), pp. 113-21; Robert Engen, *Canadians Under Fire: Infantry Effectiveness in the Second World War* (Montreal and Kington: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009), 19-22, 146-9.

[11] King, *Combat Soldier,* pp. 51-8, 60 (quote from p. 51). King's thesis is twenty-first century professional forces have largely overcome the problem through training.

[12] King, *Combat Soldier, passim.*

VIII Corps at Gallipoli represents a good 'laboratory' in which to test King's ideas. This formation served in a discrete and geographically limited area (the Helles front at Gallipoli) from April 1915 to January 1916.[13] Most of its constituent units and formations were poorly-trained citizen soldiers without previous combat experience, led by inexperienced officers. The main exception was 29th Division, which consisted almost entirely of Regular battalions. However, heavy casualties soon reduced the quality of these units, and the replacements that reached Gallipoli were often wartime volunteers. The conditions at Helles severely tested soldiers' morale. The historical study of military morale and combat motivation is a dynamic field, to which scholars such as Jonathan Fennell, Jonathan Boff, Alexander Watson and Tarak Barkawi have recently made sophisticated and intellectually exciting contributions.[14] This article employs a simple but robust working definition of 'morale': it is a state of mind that determines the attitude of soldiers, individually and collectively, towards their situation, especially their willingness to obey orders and endure. 'Combat motivation' refers to a subset of more general morale, that is, willingness to engage in offensive action.[15] Clausewitz differentiated between 'mood' and 'spirit'. The former is transient and dependent on factors such as the weather; the latter concerns essential willingness to endure and to fight.[16] This article argues that for the most part, the spirit of British soldiers at Helles was, from the perspective of higher command, sound, although mood fluctuated according to circumstances.

[13] Technically, VIII Corps was formed in June 1915 from formations that had landed at Helles from 25 April 1915 onwards.

[14] Jonathan Fennell, 'Re-evaluating Combat Cohesion: The British Second Army in The Northwest Europe Campaign of the Second World War', in Anthony King (ed.), *Frontline: Combat and Cohesion In The Twenty-First Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 134-66; Jonathan Boff, *Winning and Losing on the Western Front: The British Third Army and the Defeat of Germany in 1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), Alexander Watson, *Enduring the Great War: Combat, Morale and Collapse in the German and British Armies, 1914-1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), Tarak Barkawi, *Soldiers of Empire: Indian and British Armies in World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

[15] These definitions represent a development of the arguments first made in G.D. Sheffield, *Leadership in the Trenches: Officer-Man Relations, Morale and Discipline in the British Army in the Era of the First World War* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000) pp. 180-1. Fennell's definition of morale is similar: Jonathan Fennell, *Fighting the People's War: The British and Commonwealth Armies and the Second World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), p. 708.

[16] Carl von Clausewitz (edited and translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret), *On War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), p. 189.

The basic factors that influenced British soldiers' morale in the Great War have been examined by the author elsewhere.[17] These factors, such as the importance of mail from home,[18] held true for Gallipoli, but a soldier's reminiscence of 'Those parched days when… we would have willingly given a week's pay for a cooling draught of "Bass" [beer]' hints at the particularly extreme conditions endured by men there.[19] Sleep was an unusually precious commodity, and given the medical effects of sleep deprivation, this would have made soldiers' morale especially fragile.[20] Moreover, there were also some very specific factors. Thus, in May 1915, the withdrawal of battleships from close support depressed soldiers' morale.[21]

For more than 50 years prior to the First World War, the Volunteer (from 1908, Territorial) drill hall had taken its place alongside the pub, chapel and sports team as a mainstay of local loyalties. The two Territorial Force (TF) divisions that served at Helles, 42nd (East Lancashire) and 52nd (Lowland), came from this tradition. Not all the men who went overseas with TF units had pre-war Territorial service, or were even local men.[22] However, there was substantial continuity between the peacetime TF units and those serving at Helles. Such connections undoubtedly enhanced unit cohesion, but the effect of heavy casualties on such close-knit units could be damaging to both military and civilian morale. Mike Horgan, who arrived on Gallipoli in August 1915 as a reinforcement for 1/7 Manchesters, found that 'a lot of my pals that I was looking for were already dead'.[23] In Galasheils, the news of the appalling losses suffered

---

[17] Gary Sheffield, *Command and Morale: The British Army on the Western Front 1914-1918* (Barnsley: Praetorian Press, 2014) pp. 153-71.

[18] A.H. Mure, *This Bloody Place: With the Incomparable 29th* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2015 [1919]), pp. 40-1.

[19] Border Regiment Archives, Cumbria's Museum of Military Life (BRA/CMML), 'S.W.E', 'Do You Remember? Some Recollections of Gallipoli, 1915', *Borders News Sheet,* I, (1 Apr. 1929), n.p. See also Gary Sheffield, 'Shaping British and Anzac Soldiers' Experience of Gallipoli: Environmental and Medical Factors, and the Development of Trench Warfare', in *British Journal of Military History* (*BJMH*) (4, 1, 2017).

[20] See below, and June J. Pilcher and Allen I. Huffcutt, 'Effects of Sleep Deprivation on Performance: A Meta-Analysis', in *Sleep,* (19, 4, Jun 1996)

[21] Diary, 24 May 1915, in John Gilliam, *Gallipoli Diary* (Stevenage: Strong Oak/Donovan, 1989 [1918]), p. 100.

[22] K.W. Mitchinson, *The Territorial Force at War, 1914-16* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2014), pp. 6, 62. For the context of army recruitment in 1914-15, see Peter Simkins, *Kitchener's Armies: The Raising of the New Armies, 1914-16* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988) and Catriona Pennell, *A Kingdom United: Popular Responses to the Outbreak of the First World War in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014 [2012]).

[23] Transcript of interview, in Sue Richardson (ed.), *The recollections of three Manchesters in the Great War* (privately published, 2006), pp. 32-33.

by 1/4 King's Own Scottish Borderers (KOSB) on 12 July 1915 led to women 'openly weeping… "It is just like Flodden over again"'.[24] In modern memory, 1 July 1916, the First Day on the Somme, was the first occasion in which locally-raised battalions and their parent communities suffered huge losses. In reality, in the previous summer towns in Scotland and Lancashire were grieving over mass casualties.

Casualties

Casualties at Gallipoli were extremely heavy. Losses in 86 Brigade during the landing were such that 1/Royal Dublin Fusiliers and 1/Royal Munster Fusiliers had to be temporarily amalgamated as the 'Dubsters'.[25] Costly offensives followed, but losses during periods of trench-holding were also high, as were sickness rates. 1/5 Manchesters first went into the trenches on 11 May. In three months, of the 832 men who landed on Gallipoli in May (including 35 officers) 582, about 70 per cent, had become battle casualties or were sick.[26] Loss rates were exacerbated by problems in sending reinforcements to Gallipoli, meaning that units were invariably understrength, sometimes severely so.[27] Moreover, the quality of some drafts caused concern: Major-General Paris (General Officer Commanding [GOC] Royal Naval Division [RND]) complained of being sent "'War Babies'".[28] Inevitably, heavy losses had an impact on combat effectiveness. After the fighting on 28 April Brigadier-General William Marshall (temporarily commanding 29th Division) signalled that 'both regiments and brigades are much mixed and thoroughly done'. The combination of strong Ottoman resistance, the breakdown of the advance, and doubtless the cumulative effect of the heavy losses incurred since 25 April meant that 29th Division was temporarily combat ineffective. Even in early June, the new GOC of 29th Division found it weak and in disarray.[29] Similarly, on 7 June Major-General Paris signalled that, after intense combat

[24] Quoted in Gavin Richardson, *For King, Country and the Scottish Borderers* (privately published, 1987), p. 58; see also Ian S. Wood, '"Be Strong and of a Good Courage": The Royal Scots' Territorial Battalions from 1908 to Gallipoli', in C.M.M. Macdonald and E.W. McFarland, (eds.), *Scotland and the Great War* (Edinburgh: Tuckwell, 1999), pp. 115-16.

[25] Public Records Office of Northern Ireland, Hume papers, Ms account of 86 Infantry Brigade, 30 April 1915.

[26] Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives, King's College London [LHCMA/KCL], Darlington papers, 3 September 1915.

[27] The UK National Archives (TNA), CAB 19/33, Lieutenant-General Sir Henry Sclater, evidence to Dardanelles Commission, 1917.

[28] Imperial War Museum [IWM], DS/Misc/57 reel 1, Paris Papers, Paris to Christine, 25 August 1915. See also Brigadier-General D. Mercer diary, (in private hands), 20, 24 August 1915.

[29] TNA, WO 95/4304, War Diary [WD], 29th Division General Staff [GS], 28 Apr. 1915; LHCMA/KCL, Lieutenant-General Sir Beauvoir de Lisle papers, 'My narrative of the Great German War', p. 75.

three days earlier, 'The [RND's] 1st Brigade are very exhausted. The 2nd Brigade is not for the moment effective'.[30] Even successes were expensive. 42nd Division did well in its attack of 4 June, but on the 26th Lieutenant-General Sir Alymer Hunter-Weston (GOC VIII Corps) reported that '42nd Division with the exception of the 127th Manchester Brigade (now very weak) are not at present of any great fighting value'.[31]

The Marshall Effect

There is some evidence from Helles that supports the notion of the Marshall Effect, in the sense of passivity of troops. In mid-May, a 'Special Order' was issued to 29th Division:

> It must be a point of honour for all that each day there is some advance to record, some Turks killed, or some important point in their line captured, or rendered so dangerous that they will cease to make use of it.[32]

Clearly, higher command feared inaction, the context being the heavy casualties suffered since 25 April. Generals continued to be worried by passivity throughout the campaign.[33] Moreover, in September 1915, Hunter-Weston's successor, Lieutenant-General Sir F.J. 'Joey' Davies, wanted to reduce the number of men holding trenches, in line with Western Front practice. The commanders of 42nd and 52nd Territorial divisions opposed the plan, arguing that their ranks contained many 'young soldiers and that numbers were necessary to give them confidence'.[34] Clearly, these generals understood the **'**empty battlefield' phenomenon.

Evidence of troops failing to fire their weapons is scarce, but one incident is suggestive. Brigadier-General D.G. Prendergast, (126 Brigade, 42nd Division) found two men in the trenches who did not 'know how to load their rifles. This is an extreme case no doubt, but [he found] men and officers I consider mere recruits, unfit for the firing line'.[35] Against this must be set evidence of 'funk fire', when raw, jumpy soldiers

---

[30] TNA, WO 95/4290, WD, Royal Naval Division GS, Paris to HQ VIII Corps, 7 June 1915.

[31] C. F. Aspinall-Oglander, *Military Operations: Gallipoli,* Vol. II (London: Heinemann, 1932), p. 51; TNA, CAB 19/29, Lieutenant-Colonel A.E.F. Fawcus, evidence to Dardanelles Commission, 1917; TNA, WO 95/4273, GS VIII Corps, Hunter-Weston to Braithwaite, 26/6/15.

[32] TNA, WO 95/4304, WD, 29th Division GS, 15 May 1915.

[33] See e.g. TNA, WO 95/4273, WD, VIII Corps General Staff [GS], Minutes of Corps Commander's Conference 30 September 1915.

[34] TNA, WO 95/4273, VIII Corps General Staff [GS], Minutes of Corps Commander's Conference. 14 September 1915.

[35] TNA, CAB 19/30, Brigadier-General D.G. Prendergast, evidence to Dardanelles Commission, 1916.

continually fired their rifles, especially at night. Here the problem was stopping men from wasting ammunition by blazing away at shadows. Experienced soldiers learned not to do this.[36]

One aspect of the Marshall Effect that certainly applied at Gallipoli was the role of individual leaders in overcoming passivity among troops. This is perhaps reflected in the high number of officer casualties relative to those of Other Ranks. Lieutenant-Colonel H.C. Darlington, commanding officer (CO) of 1/5 Manchesters, wrote in early June that 'Authorities' had ordered that COs were not allowed to lead their men into battle. COs 'should be in the rear of their commands where they can watch and influence events and keep in touch with their commands and with Brigade'. This managerial approach clashed with the instincts of many COs, including Darlington's. COs were often officers of a lower rank than lieutenant-colonel, temporarily holding the post because the original commander had become a casualty, and such men may have had difficulty restraining their desire to lead from the front.[37] *Pace* the stereotype of the chateau general, senior officers on occasion exercised battlefield leadership. Brigadier-General William Scott-Moncrieff, GOC 156 Brigade (52nd Division) was killed on 28 June in the 'front line where he had no business to be' while 'pushing forward' a 'sticky' battalion (1/7 Cameronians).[38] During First Krithia (28 April) the conduct of Brigadier-General Marshall, was described as 'magnificent[,] walking about the whole day under a heavy fire *pushing men on*'.[39]

However, regimental officers shouldered the main burden of battlefield leadership. An almost textbook example of the Marshall Effect occurred during Third Krithia (4 June 1915). The RND suffered appalling losses during their advance, with many officers being killed or wounded. Eventually, the 'whole line [was]... forced back to its original position with very heavy loss'.[40] Sub-Lieutenant F.S. Kelly (Hood Battalion), commanding a force in the British front line, was unaware of what had happened to the assaulting waves until 'there was rather an alarming rush back to our trench of

[36] H. Maldwyn Davies, *A Flintshire Territorial at War 1914-18* (Worthenbury: Bridge Books, 2016) p. 47; KCL, Darlington Papers 18 July 1915; Royal Marines archives, 1975/b, John Allen, diary, 23 July 1915.
[37] LHCMA/KCL, Darlington Papers, letter, 18 July 1915.
[38] TNA, CAB45/249, Major-General G.G. Egerton diary, 28 June 1915; Frank Davies and Graham Maddocks, *Bloody Red Tabs: General Officer Casualties of the Great War* (London: Leo Cooper, 1995) p. 103; but see also R.R. Thompson, *The Fifty-Second (Lowland) Division 1914-1918* (Glasgow: Maclehose, Jackson & Co, 1923), pp. 60-61.
[39] Lucas to Mother, 29 Apr 1915, http://gallipolifirstandlast.blogspot.co.uk/?view=timeslide (emphasis added), viewed 19 June 2019.
[40] TNA, WO 95/4290, WD, Royal Naval Division GS, Paris to HQ VIII Corps, 6 June 1915.

panic-stricken Collingwood and Anson men'. He went out into No Man's Land to attempt to halt the rout: 'I turned a few of them about, but there were too many of them for me to cope with'. Kelly then spent 45 minutes 'going up and down the trench pushing them out again', ordering them to 'report themselves to any officer they found in front of the line'. About 30 men went 'over the parapet', but Kelly discovered that most of them were 'merely lying down a few yards from the trench. Kelly then led the men towards Ottoman trenches. Once he had 'got them moving', Kelly returned to his own men, but he was wounded. Later he heard that casualties among the officers of the assaulting battalions had been heavy, so that 'the men were leaderless and didn't know what to do'.[41]

This incident reveals a number of facets of the Marshall Effect. The initial attack broke down because of the intensity of enemy fire, which resulted in the loss of leaders. The brigade commander, Commodore Oliver Backhouse, subsequently reported that four key officers were killed 'early in the advance', and their loss seems to have had a disproportionate effect on the cohesion of the assaulting troops.[42] Deprived of leaders, panic set in amongst poorly-trained troops that lacked initiative, but the rout subsided once the men had reached the RND's trench. Eventually, Kelly's heroic and charismatic leadership did succeed in leading some men back towards the battle. This was not the only time when individual leadership compensated for lack of training, discipline and combat motivation.[43]

At the heart of King's work is the distinctive problem of combat performance and the citizen force. This was reflected in a comment by a wartime volunteer, Joe Murray (Hood Battalion, RND), on the Regular 2/Hampshires: 'Their advance under such terrible fire was an object lesson to we 'civilian' soldiers and the value of training was brought home to us during those glorious minutes'.[44] Such admiration of the professionalism of the Regulars among citizen-soldiers was not uncommon. A middle-class Territorial, Corporal Cyril Barnes (1/5 Manchesters), commented that 'The average soldier might be a rather coarse & vulgar chap, but when it comes to doing

[41] Kelly, diary, 4 Jun 1915, in Jon Cooksey and Graham McKechnie (eds.), *The Lost Olympian of the Somme* (London: Blink, 2016 [2015]), p. 106. For context, see TNA, WO 95/4290, WD, RND GS, 4 June 1915.

[42] TNA, WO 95/4290, WD, RND GS, 'Report on the Operations of 2nd Brigade', 5 June 1915; Douglas Jerrold, *The Royal Naval Division* (London: Hutchinson, 1927), p. 135.

[43] For an example, see Kelly, diary, 4 Jun 1915, in Cooksey and McKechnie, *Lost Olympian,* p. 121; Lister to Ribblesdale, 22 Jul. 1915, in Lord Ribblesdale, *Charles Lister* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1917), p. 211.

[44] Joseph Murray, diary, 2 May 1915, in *Gallipoli 1915* (London: New English Library, 1977 [1965]), p. 66.

his duty he is a perfect 'brick'.[45] However, the discipline and training of even inexperienced citizen-volunteers could be effective. Coming under fire for the first time at Suvla Bay on 6 August 1915, a soldier noted that 'the discipline stood to us (sic) marvellously; we seemed to do the right thing at the right time mechanically, for you must remember that we were more or less stupefied'.[46]

Mass tactics, in the form of bayonet charges, were certainly used to overcome inertia. On 28 April Captain Ellis of 1/Borders (29th Division) led his exhausted men in an advance until they were held up by Ottoman fire. They were faced with:

> an open bit [of ground] of nearly 200 [yards] literally swept by lead and the only way I could devise of bringing the men up to scratch was to fix bayonets and take them across at the charge.

For these bone-weary men, the crowd morale of a bayonet charge overcame their hesitation.[47] Use of the bayonet charge was allied to the cultivation of extreme aggression in the men, something discouraged by modern professional armies. Such bloodlust could lead to situations such as when 1/5 Manchesters avenged 'the ill-treatment of our men by shooting or bayonetting everyone, & only taking prisoners when the officer was there'.[48]

Panics

Short-lived 'panic[s]' among troops in the front line, wrote Major-General G.G. Egerton, GOC 52nd (Lowland) Division, 'are common in every way'.[49] Hunter-Weston concurred. [50] As far as the Gallipoli campaign was concerned, Egerton was right. His comments were prompted by the events of 13 July 1915. 52nd Division had attacked and taken Ottoman trenches on the previous day, sustaining severe casualties in the process. The right flank of the one of the battalions holding the newly captured trench, 1/7 Highland Light Infantry [HLI], was enfiladed by sniping, bombing and machine gun fire. The paucity of men available, and the particularly ghastly conditions in the trench,

[45] Manchester Regiment Archives, Tameside Local Studies and Archives Centre (MRA/TLSAC), MR3/16/56, Barnes to Flo, 16 May 1915.
[46] Royal Dublin Fusiliers Archive, Dublin City Library, RDFA/018/018/1/3, TS Diary of Cecil and Douglas Gunning, 3 Jan 1916.
[47] BRA/CMML, 'Peninsular Press & Ellis' file, Ellis to wife (ts), 5 May 1915.
[48] MRA/TLSAC, MR3/16/56, Barnes to Jessie, 13 June 1915. For the importance of the bayonet, see Paddy Griffith, *Forward into Battle: Fighting Tactics from Waterloo to Vietnam,* (Chichester: Bird, 1981), *passim.*
[49] TNA, CAB45/249, Egerton papers, comment on draft of Gallipoli Official History, nd **,** c. June 1929, p. 3.
[50] British Library, BL Add MS48364, Lieutenant-General Sir Alymer Hunter-Weston Papers, Hunter-Weston to Wigram, 8 June 1915.

especially the stench of corpses, which caused men to vomit, meant that 'only a very primitive consolidation could be made during the night'.[51]

In the early hours of the following day, 'a small trickle of troops, which rapidly became a torrent, poured out from the trenches held by the right of the 157th Brigade and rushed back to the old British line'. A handful of officers succeeded in rallying the men and stabilising the situation, leading them back to the captured Ottoman trenches. While the proximate cause of the rout was an order to reduce to 'draw in the exposed right flank', which was misunderstood as an instruction to retire, the Official Historian concisely summarised the underlying reason for the rout began by 1/7 HLI: 'Many of the men, parched with thirst and utterly fatigued by their first day of active operations, were nearing the end of their tether'.[52] 157 Brigade HQ reported that at dusk 'a number of men left the firing line saying that they had been sent back for water etc.'[53] Thus even before the panic set in, soldiers were finding excuses to leave the front line. The rout drew in nearby troops. Men of 1/5 HLI 'were caught up in the rush of men' from their right flank and 'some confusion ensued'. Some of 157 Brigade stood their ground, however, while an officer of 1/5 HLI led a reserve company forward to the abandoned trench. On their own initiative, a machine gun team consisting of six privates of 1/7 Royal Scots brought their weapon into the front line to support 1/7 HLI. RND officers also intervened to rally men of the Lowland Division.[54]

After the war, Egerton admitted that the incident was an 'undoubted panic', but it was sorted out 'within the hour'. Other sources also indicate that the problem was of short duration - the Divisional history stated that the first group of rallied men were back in the trenches 'within five minutes of the retirement', the crisis being effectively over within 30 minutes. The panic had operational, not merely local, significance: a garbled and exaggerated report reached Hunter-Weston at VIII Corps, leading him to order a fresh attack.[55] It also undoubtedly reinforced suspicion in the minds of higher command about the reliability of Territorial soldiers and units.[56]

---

[51] TNA, WO 95 /4331, WD, 1/7 HLI, 13 Jul 1915; Thompson, *Fifty-Second Division,* p. 118; Christopher Page, *Command in the Royal Naval Division* (Staplehurst: Spellmount, 1999), p. 53.

[52] Aspinall-Oglander, *Gallipoli,* II, pp. 107-8; Thompson, *Fifty-Second Division*, p. 118; TNA, WO 95/4317, WD 52nd Division GS, 12 July 1915.

[53] TNA, WO 95/4321, WD, 157 Bde, 12 July1915;

[54] TNA, WO 95/4321, WD, 157 Bde, 12 July 1915; TNA, WO 95 /4321, WD, 1/5 HLI, 13 July 1915; Thompson, *Fifty-Second Division,* p. 118-20; TNA, WO 95/4291, WD of HQ Royal Marine Bde., 13 July 1915.

[55] TNA, CAB 45/249, Egerton papers, comment on draft Gallipoli Official History, nd**,** c. June 1929, p. 3**;** Aspinall-Oglander, *Gallipoli,* II, pp. 108.

[56] TNA, WO 95/4317, WD 52nd Division GS, Braithwaite to Egerton, 17 July 1915.

In terms of the Marshall Effect, this incident demonstrates the problem of sending into the attack untried and poorly-trained soldiers, commanded by officers and NCOs, most of whom were no better off, and the importance of individual leadership in rallying the men. It shows that high commanders' distrust of Territorials was not entirely unreasonable; these raw 'Terriers' simply lacked the resilience of veterans.[57] However, this panic also suggests that while the morale of these Territorials may have been brittle, it was fundamentally sound. Most men did not rout beyond their own front line. They were halted and quickly brought back into action, and they subsequently held the line until relieved. An eye-witness stated that he saw 'no sign of panic… They came back at a jog-trot as if they were carrying out a retiral (sic) on a field-day'. The Divisional historian stated that officers, NCOs and even some privates rallied the routing troops 'without difficulty… the moment they were told to do so'. The exception was 'always in such cases' - suggesting that the situation was not uncommon - the 'few nerve-shattered men who were stopped with difficulty'. In Clausewitzian terms, it was an example of how the mood of soldiers could change rapidly. However, this incident triggered another, and potentially more serious crisis. The WD of 1/5 Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders recorded that 'This retiral spread to the rear of the Bde (sic) and almost became a panic. Fugitives began to stream… past our HQ and there was some difficulty in stopping the rush and getting them to return to their units'.[58]

Another account of a panic also testified to its short-lived nature. In the early hours of 29 May the appearance of some Gurkhas in No Man's Land triggered panic among some men of 1/Royal Munster Fusiliers, who mistaking them for enemy troops, rushed back from the frontline trench. Second Lieutenant Laidlaw by his own account briefly panicked but recovered his nerve, and 'pricking' a few men with a bayonet he shouted for them to rally:

> [but] as quickly as it had started, the panic died down and the men returned and jumped back into the trench. They were thoroughly ashamed of themselves and nothing would have moved them after that. Although most of them had only gone a few yards'.[59]

This basic pattern occurred in a number of examples of panics. Soldiers' nerves broke; they ran back, but were quickly rallied by leaders, who sometimes threatened to shoot panicking soldiers.[60] Major A.H. Mure (1/5 Royal Scots) was one such leader. The

[57] IWM, 86/31/1, Backhouse diary, 11 May 1915.
[58] Thompson, *Fifty-Second Division*, p. 119; TNA, WO 95/4321, WD 1/5 Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders, 13 July 1915.
[59] Leeds University, Liddle Collection, GALL 53/1, R.F.E. Laidlaw, ts memoir, p. 28.
[60] See e.g. BRA/CMML, 'Peninsular Press & Ellis' file, Ellis to wife (ts), 5 May 1915 (1/Borders, 28 April 1915); Mercer diary 19 May 1915 (Hawke Battalion); Maj. C.S.

language he used to describe the incident in May 1915 was suggestive, combined masculinity and patriotic ideology: the men were 'unmanned but for a moment… [then] went over the top again like true Britons'.[61] On 6 June, 19-year-old Second Lieutenant G.D.R. Moor of 2/Hampshires actually shot British soldiers to stem a rout, then leading men in a counterattack which retook a lost position. This action earned Moor the Victoria Cross.[62] All this is evidence that while the mood of soldiers of VIII Corps was volatile, their spirit – their essential willingness to endure and engage in combat – remained fundamentally sound.

The August Morale Crisis

A 42nd Division sapper argued that until the failure of the August offensive, 'all believed that we were winning, and it was just a matter of time until Achi Baba fell'.[63] Likewise, an officer of 1/7 Manchesters thought the failure of the August offensive dashed hopes, 'and the whole aspect of the men… changed. They were sick in mind and in body, and fatigue was incessant'. In reality, sickness was endemic in VIII Corps long before then as were other factors that mentioned as undermining morale: constant enemy fire, the heat, the flies, and the appalling stench. The brutal ending of any hope that the campaign could be brought won severely damaged the morale of the men, undermining their willingness to tolerate hardships for the sake of eventual military success.[64] 42nd Division's heavy losses in diversionary actions in support of the August offensive were not irrelevant. [65] An RND officer made much the same case, arguing that in September and October, sickness rates - always a good indicator of the state of morale - were such that 'the war-weary divisions at Cape Helles melted like snow in the noon-day

---

Worthington, diary, 4 June 1915, in Robert Bonner (ed.), *Great Gable to Gallipoli* (Knutsford: Fleur de Lys, 2004), p. 22 (1/5 and 1/8 Manchesters); MRA/TLSAC, MR. 4/3/2/43, J. Harrison, ts account (1/7 Manchesters, 8 August 1915).

[61] Mure, *Bloody Place,* pp. 119-20.

[62] C.T. Atkinson, *The Royal Hampshire Regiment*, Vol. II, *1914-1918* (Glasgow: Robert Maclehose, 1952), p. 87**.** Moor's extreme action was of a piece with his personality. de Lisle said he was one of the bravest men he met, and that later, on the Western Front, when off-duty (!) Moor would carry out minor operations in the trenches: LHCMA/KCL, Beauvoir de Lisle papers, 'My narrative', pp. 76-7.

[63] *East Lancashire Royal Engineers*, p. 26.

[64] TNA, CAB 19/29, Lieutenant-Colonel A.E.F. Fawcus, evidence to Dardanelles Commission, 1917; TNA, WO 95/4273, WD, GS VIII Corps, 'Minutes of Corps Commander's conference', 7 September 1915. Historians make similar points about morale at Anzac after the August Offensive: Bill Gammage, *The Broken Years* (Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1975), pp. 75-76; Christopher Pugsley, *Gallipoli: The New Zealand Story* (Auckland: Read, 1998 [1984]) p. 329.

[65] Worthington diary, 7 August 1915, in Bonner, *Great Gable,* p. 29.

sun'.[66] The figures for 52nd Division support his assertion, and show that the problem actually grew worse in November, peaking in mid-December.[67] At the end of the year, the numbers of sick and wounded were more than twice as great as at the beginning of September.

Week ending	Officers	Other Ranks	Total
6 September 1915	66	1493	1559
26 September 1915	82	2037	2119
17 October 1915	103	2726	2865
31 October 1915	105	3108	3212
14 November 1915	104	3219	3323
28 November 1915	126	3261	3387
19 December 1915	126	3248	3374
26 December 1915	107	3056	3163

Source: Thompson, *Fifty-Second Division,* pp. 146, 176.

Table 1. *Sick and wounded in hospital and remaining on strength of 52nd (Lowland) Division. An unknown additional number were evacuated to UK and are not included in these totals.*

In mid-September, the VIII Corps Deputy Director of Medical Services (DDMS) stated that 'There is throughout the troops a general feeling of lassitude and depression which lowers the power of resistance [to disease]'. However he stated that this phenomenon had been worse previously, which suggests that it had peaked, and he expected the measures intended to boost morale that the new Corps commander was introducing (see below) to make a positive difference.[68]

This shift in attitudes was well understood by senior officers. In mid-September, Egerton visited 52nd Division's trenches to find the men 'looked very haggard and worn and tired… I told them we were all pretty well fed-up, but we had got to stick it'.[69] The cohesion of some RND units was under stress even before the failure of the August offensive. The amalgamation of battalions in June, brought about because of heavy losses, caused 'grave discontent'.[70] On 2 August some Royal Naval Volunteer

[66] Douglas Jerrold, *The Royal Naval Division* (London: Hutchinson, 1927), pp. 153-4. For the importance of sickness rates as a measure of morale, see Fennell, *Fighting the People's War,* pp. 704-06.
[67] The blizzard of 26 November 1915 boosted numbers of sick.
[68] TNA, WO 95/4273, WD GS VIII Corps, September 1915, Appx I, 'Minutes of Corps Commander's conference', 14 September 1915.
[69] TNA, CAB45/249, Egerton diary, 12 September 1915.
[70] Imperial War Museum (IWM), DS/Misc/67 Reel 1, A. Paris papers, Paris to Christine, 29 June 1915.

Reserve men of Hood Battalion, including eight Petty Officers, issued a petition demanding to be sent to sea, as 140 stokers had been previously. These men were only too willing to leave the Battalion, and thus Gallipoli. This challenged the beliefs of some officers about the cohesiveness of their unit. By early September, Hood officers were 'depressed' and angry with high command, not least because of the burdens placed on 'the rank and file'.[71]

Discipline is a useful another useful litmus test of morale.[72] At the end of May, the Deputy Judge Advocate General (DJAG) reported that 'considering the inevitable confusion and difficulties attaching to this month's work, crimes were remarkably few'. A month later, he noted there was still relatively little crime on the peninsula, with 'few serious cases'. In July, there were fewer Field General Courts Martial (77) than there had been in June (91), although the force was, at least notionally, larger.[73] Various factors help to explain this including the unattractiveness of deserting to the enemy, and the paucity of places for absentees to hide behind the British lines (although a few reached the beaches). There is little evidence of exceptional levels of minor misdemeanours dealt with at unit level, although this would repay further research.

The strain on the soldiery of the peculiarly testing conditions at Gallipoli prompted a degree of leniency by high command. By the end of May, General Sir Ian Hamilton (GOC Mediterranean Expeditionary Force [MEF]) had commuted all eight death sentences awarded for 'cowardice', 'taking into his consideration the hardships that the men had undergone'. On 21 May brigadiers were empowered to remit suspended sentences.[74] At the end of July, the DJAG reported that the 'policy of suspending sentences whenever possible' had produced 'excellent results'. Of 72 cases, only a handful of offenders 'seriously misused the leniency shown', although one was executed as a consequence. Moreover, from 25 July, Field Punishment No.1, the notorious 'crucifixion' whereby offenders were tied to a fixed object for set amounts of time, was forbidden on Gallipoli. Corps commanders had agreed that because of the fact that it exposed the men to undue punishment, there being practically no situation on the Peninsula secure from shell fire, it was held that such a punishment

[71] Kelly, diary, 2, 4 August, 2 September 1915, in Cooksey and McKechnie, *Lost Olympian,* pp. 125-6; Page, *Command,* p. 54. Stokers had a 'trade unionist approach' to their employment: James Goldrick, *Before Jutland: The Naval War in Northern European Waters, August 1914-February 1915* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2015), p. 27.
[72] Fennell, *Fighting the People's War,* pp. 704-06.
[73] TNA, WO 154/116, WD, Deputy Judge Advocate [DJAG], Reports by Capt. C. Hodgson, 31 May, 30 June, 31 July 1915.
[74] TNA, WO 154/116, WD, DJAG, Report by Captain C. Hodgson, 31 May, 1915; see also Hamilton's special order of 9 May 1915, in which he praised 'the devoted gallantry… bravery and endurance' (ok) of the troops, quoted in Henry W. Nevinson, *The Dardanelles Campaign* (London: Nisbet, 1918), p. 15.

was too severe, as well as being unfair to the men'.[75] That such a decision was taken speaks volumes about the extreme nature of everyday life on Gallipoli.

When 'Joey' Davies took command of VIII Corps on 5 August he judged that the morale of the TF formations and RND 'was indifferent. The men were worn out by fighting, by the heat and by the constant fatigues.' Having recently commanded on the Western Front, Davies was unhappy with the laxer approach to discipline he found at Helles; there was little saluting, for example, but there was a recognition that it was impractical to make Field Punishment more severe for Territorials 'under present conditions'. His twin-track approach was to tighten discipline and order 'minor operations' to 'encourage the spirit of keen offensive in the men', while taking measures to improve morale.[76]

From almost the beginning of the campaign, '[o]wing to the difficulties of obtaining rest and sleep' men falling asleep on duty had posed a disciplinary problem for the MEF. In July 'frequent' cases of 'men sleeping on post' were in 'nearly every case… directly due to exhaustion of the men'.[77] A major factor was the weakness of units, ravaged by battle casualties and sickness. 1/4 KOSB, nominally about 1,000 strong, on 13 September consisted of only 230 men, many of whom were sick, of which approximately 150 were holding the trenches – a task that included 'daily digging fatigues'. The rest were used for the exhausting task of carrying food and water to the front line. Such shortage of manpower increased the burden on the men in the trenches; sentries 'fell asleep… on the fire-step once relieved'.[78] The unwelcome attention of flies made it difficult to sleep during the daytime.[79] Cooler weather in early winter led to a diminution in the number of flies, and soldiers' health improved accordingly.[80]

The problem of exhaustion grew worse from August onwards. A battalion commander of 42nd Division believed that in September 1915 courts martial, which were 'very

[75] TNA, WO 154/116, WD, DJAG, Report by Captain C. Hodgson, 31 July. The role of punishment and coercion at Gallipoli deserves further examination. For the broader context, see Anthony King. 'Discipline and Punish: Encouraging Combat Performance in the Citizen and Professional Army' in King, *Frontline,* pp. 93-117.
[76] TNA, WO 95/4273, WD, HQ VIII Corps GS, 'Notes of Corps Commander's conferences', 2 and 14 September 1915; TNA, CAB 19/29, Lieutenant-General Sir F.J. Davies, evidence to Dardanelles Commission, 1917.
[77] TNA, WO 154/116, WD, DJAG, Reports by Captain C. Hodgson, 31 May, 31 July 1915.
[78] Thompson, *Fifty-Second Division*, p. 141.
[79] Australian War Memorial, 3DRL 3741, Delpratt papers, B.B. Delpratt to Nell, nd but c. July 1915.
[80] Peter Hart, *Gallipoli* (London: Profile, 2011), p. 402.

frequent at Helles', were 'almost exclusively for sleeping on sentry duty'. Officers had to try to keep their men awake in the front line at night. In 'practically in every case' the problem was of 'sheer physical exhaustion'. 42nd Division was 'physically incapable of carrying out effective military operations'.[81] Captain Percy, who became DJAG in September 1915, noted the 'very large proportion' of cases of 'sleeping on post'. This was the consequence of 'excessive periods of duty' and 'the want of frequent reliefs', and Percy believed that failures of organisation at regimental level was partly responsible.[82]

Even more striking evidence of morale problems was the rise in the incidence of self-inflicted wounds (SIW). Egerton noted this in 52nd Division in September ('men shooting themselves in finger or foot'). Percy also noted the significant increase in SIW, and that most men evacuated from Gallipoli never returned. 'The temptation is therefore greater in this force than in France [where men recovered from wounds often returned], and the benefits to be gained… more easily achieved'.[83] Percy's concerns were reflected in a GHQ memorandum of early November that ordered that all ranks were to be informed that no one suspected or convicted of 'self maiming' would be evacuated from Gallipoli, except 'extreme' cases, who would be sent to Mudros.[84]

Lieutenant-General Davies had a very practical approach to improving morale. He sought to improve leisure facilities, for instance by providing refreshments, raising bands from personnel of each division, and by staging sports matches. Greek labourers were brought into relieve soldiers of some 'heavy' fatigues. Clothes were to be regularly disinfected.[85] Further work is needed to assess how far Davies's plans were realised, but some certainly were. Two snapshots of his efforts are of Hood and Anson teams playing football in the RND final of the 'Dardanelles Cup', and the 52nd Divisional Band's rendition of *The Mikado* 'interrupted' by shelling.[86] Davies believed that such

[81] TNA, CAB 19/30, Lieutenant-Colonel Lord Rochdale, evidence to Dardanelles Commission, 1917.
[82] TNA, WO 154/116, WD, DJAG, Reports by Captain W. Percy, 30 September and 31 October 1915.
[83] TNA, CAB45/249, Egerton diary, 12 September 1915; TNA, WO 154/116, WD, DJAG, Report by Captain W. Percy, 31 October 1915.
[84] TNA, WO 95/4275, WD, VIII Corps A&Q, Colonel A. Cavendish to VIII Corps, 1 November 1915. For an example of collusion in a comrade's SIW, see Murray, diary, 5 Jun e1915, in Murray, *Gallipoli,* pp. 105-7.
[85] TNA, WO95/4275, WD VIII Corps A&Q, 23 September 1915.
[86] WO95/4275, WD AA&QMG VIII Corps, Routine Orders, 12 December 1915; Richardson, *King and Country,* pp. 66-7. Thompson, *Fifty-Second Division,* p. 154, stressed the morale-enhancing effect of the Divisional band.

measures ensured that '*moral* improved and eventually became good'.[87] The latter view is possibly too sanguine, but morale does seem to have improved from the nadir of mid-August.

Combat Refusal[88]

Perhaps the most striking occurrence of the Marshall Effect at Helles, and how under certain circumstances soldiers could have significant influence on their own fate, occurred in the early hours of hours of 16 August 1915 when a group of men carried out what amounted to a strike located in a military context; 'collective bargaining in khaki', in Julian Putkowski's felicitous phrase.[89] It is possibly significant that these particular strikers were citizen soldiers who had been civilians only months before, at least some of which would have been drawn from an industrial society in which trade unions played an important role.[90]

1/6 Highland Light Infantry (52nd Division) began an attempt to capture trenches in the Vineyard sector.[91] The plan was to use three waves of 30 men, with the waves being some 25 yards apart. At 0230 Lieutenant Wyllie climbed out of the frontline trench and 'walked in a crawling position for about 25 yards without looking behind me'. A voice close by him then said "'Mr. Wylie, the men are not following you'". Wyllie shouted, "Come on 6th" but reached the Ottoman trench he was 'alone as far as I could see'. Second Lieutenant Glendenning similarly advanced 10 yards into No Man's Land before realising that he was alone. A large majority of the men failed to follow

[87] TNA, WO95/4275, WD VIII Corps A&Q, 23 September 1915; TNA, CAB 19/29, Lieutenant-General Sir F.J. Davies, evidence to the Dardanelles Commission, 1917. See Christopher S. Forrest, 'The 52nd (Lowland) Division in the Great War, 1914-18' (Ph. D, University of Salford, 2009) pp. 114-15, 117, for the impact on morale of Egerton's replacement with Major-General H.A. Lawrence.

[88] Leonard V . Smith defends the use of this term rather that of 'mutiny' in the context of the disturbance in the French army in spring 1917 as it 'reflects the fluid nature of the events themselves' (*Between Mutiny and Obedience: The Case of the French Fifth Infantry Division during World War I* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 183. The same applies to the incident discussed below.

[89] J. Putkowski to the *Guardian,* 26 September 1986.

[90] For strikes in the British army during the First World War, see Sheffield, *Leadership in the Trenches,* pp. 151-54. See also Leonard V. Smith, 'Mutiny', in Jay Winter (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the First World War,* Volume II, *The State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 196, 201-02; Watson, *Enduring the Great War*, pp. 207-12.

[91] Unless otherwise stated, all information and quotations in the following six paragraphs is from TNA, WO 95/4273, WD, VIII Corps WD, 'Court of Enquiry…', 21 August 1915. See also Robin Prior, *Gallipoli: The End of the Myth* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010 [2009]) and Forrest, '52nd Division', pp. 90-101.

their officers; either declining to leave the trenches, or going only a short distance once they had gone over the top: Corporal Martin, who went 10-12 yards forward of the British position, saw 'men moving back on their hands and knees'. Although some men did attack and engaged in some stiff fighting, at 0305 the battalion CO, Colonel Millar, was informed that the assault was a complete failure.

Some witnesses to the subsequent Court of Enquiry speculated that the rum ration may not have been diluted. The system in the battalion was for a mess tin of rum to be sent along the line, with men placed on their honour not to have more than a mouthful. It is possible that some men, lacking the supervision more usual in the army during the distribution of rum, drank excessively and were emboldened by alcohol to defy orders. Whatever the case, the men of 1/6 HLI used a number of strategies to avoid making the attack. Some feigned wounds or sickness; and in the dark it would have been difficult to discover whether or not they were shamming. Some simply 'sneaked away' in the darkness before the attack (one wave was reduced from a nominal 30 to only 24 men by various means). Several rankers claimed to have heard an order to retire. It is unclear whether this was an outright fabrication, or whether someone did indeed pass along this unauthorised instruction. Outright defiance was avoided in favour of evasion and malingering, and there seems to have been some coordination to thwart the attack. Colonel Millar blamed NCOs as well as the private soldiers for the failure of the assault, although at least some NCOs did attempt to carry put orders.

These assault parties demonstrated a great deal of cohesion. Rather than this leading to positive combat motivation, this was an occasion when achieving the goals specified by military leadership was regarded as less important by the group than keeping that group intact.[92] One of the major responsibilities of leaders is to ensure that group goals are congruent with those of higher command.[93] 1/6 HLI's officers failed in this task. This failure began at the top. As recently as 2 August, Egerton had been doubtful about the Division's combat effectiveness following its losses in mid-July, but twelve days later he evidently thought that 1/6 HLI at least had recovered sufficiently, so he chose it, his 'best battalion', for the operation. Although in 1914 Egerton had selected Millar for command, after the operation he described Millar as 'greatly lacking in interest, energy, and initiative, throughout the whole affair'.[94] Millar had failed to visit the front line that night, instead remaining in contact by telephone. He had also issued verbal rather than written orders and this led to confusion about when the advance was to commence. Egerton's view was that Brigade's orders were 'not at fault', but the operation was 'ill-prepared regimentally'. Egerton criticised the 'negative role' of Captain C. Macfie, the Adjutant, but recognised that as Regular officer, Millar might

[92] King, *Combat Soldier*, p. 31.
[93] Sheffield, *Leadership,* p. 43.
[94] TNA, WO 95/4273 Egerton's report, 21 August 1915.

not have paid much attention to his Territorial subordinate; Macfie's evidence hints at discord between the two men.[95]

There were strong indications that all was not well with the men well before the attack was launched. Macfie testified that two soldiers 'fainted when the order to attack was given, and that he saw three men in the barricades sobbing'. Glendenning realised that his platoon 'did not seem very lively and [he] tried to cheer them up, telling them "we must see it through" and things of that sort'. Captain Daly, Officer Commanding C Company, 'did not consider they [the men] were fit for the first attack as they were tired out'. The officers did not act upon these warnings. It would have been asking a great deal of junior officers to call off their part of an attack, but very occasionally a battalion commander would do so. The buck stopped with Millar.

In retrospect, the malady was obvious. The battalion had not properly recovered from the heavy losses sustained in the fighting for Achi Baba Nullah on 12 July. The soldiers and most of the officers had been civilians just a few months before, and they were not members of an anonymous war-raised unit. On the contrary, 1/6 HLI was a community with deep roots in civil society of Scotland. Men were frightened and in mourning because of the recent catastrophic losses. As Egerton belated realised, these Territorials lacked the discipline and staying power of Regulars; or, one might add, veteran citizen troops.[96] A clearer example of the contingent nature of military obedience would be difficult to find. Inter-rank relations in the British army in the First World War were based on the exchange of deference in return for paternalistic leadership. If Other Ranks believed that their officers were in breach of the unwritten contract, they were perfectly capable of making their feelings known and taking action, up to and including large-scale mutiny.[97] The men of the HLI's behaviour in August 1915 was technically an act of mutiny, but in reality it was a way of conveying to their officers that they were unwilling to obey orders that they considered unreasonable. It is important to note that there was no violence against the officers, nor did the discipline of the unit collapse on a permanent basis. Rather, it was a stark reminder to its commanders that the unit's willingness to engage in combat could not be taken for granted.

Davies condemned this combat refusal in an order that shamed their identity as Scots, and, implicitly, their masculinity.[98] Egerton issued a memorandum to his officers criticising the tendency towards a live-and-let-live approach to the enemy, bluntly

[95] TNA, CAB45/249, Egerton diary, 2, 16 August 1915. For the instructions from Brigade, see WO 95/4321, WD, 1/6 HLI August 1915, Appx 7, 15 August 1915.
[96] TNA, CAB45/249 Egerton diary, 16 August 1915.
[97] Sheffield, *Leadership,* pp. 70-71, 150-52.
[98] WO 95/4273, WD, VIII Corps, Davies to Egerton, 18 August 1915.

ordering aggressive action.[99] This may have been a response to being warned by his three brigade commanders that while they believed their men would 'repel' an assault, they 'would not like to make an attack'. Egerton was conflicted. He was sleeping badly, had nightmares, and was haunted by his Division's losses. He did not mince words in speaking to his superiors, which probably contributed to him being sacked in mid-September.[100] By that time Egerton had come to share the doubts of his brigadiers as to whether his troops could be trusted on the offensive.[101] 52nd Division was not completely spared from being sent into battle, but in the short term it may have made higher commanders more cautious about using it.

Concluding thoughts

This article has demonstrated that Anthony King's 'Marshall Effect' thesis, defined broadly, is a useful analytical tool when applied to VIII Corps at Helles. Although the men of 29th Division, at least in the early stages of the campaign, were a partial exception, the troops of the Corps were inexperienced, poorly trained and too often indifferently led. They were spooked by the empty battlefield and showed, from the perspective of higher command, worrying traits of inertia. King argues that officers attempted to overcome passivity by using mass assaults, appealing to ideology and masculinity, encouraging high levels of aggression, and providing heroic leadership by charismatic individuals. These were precisely the means employed by officers at Helles. In fact, VIII Corps on Gallipoli was an extreme example of the type of citizen army discussed by King. The Dardanelles campaign occurred at the very beginning of the British army's learning process; for example, VIII Corps grew more proficient at trench warfare even while the campaign was in progress.[102] However, the jury is out on the question of whether King's Marshall Effect theory is more widely applicable. Further research is needed to see whether the theory is valid when applied to the much more sophisticated, better-trained, better-equipped and better-led citizen armies of the British Empire in the latter years of the Great War.

The morale of the troops of VIII Corps was severely tested from the beginning of the Gallipoli campaign. However, as the rash of short-lived panics demonstrated, to use Clausewitz's terminology, while soldiers' 'mood' was undoubted fragile, their 'spirit' remained essentially sound. For the most part, soldiers were willing, albeit at times reluctantly, to engage in combat. August 1915 marked a downturn in morale, with optimism about the eventual outcome of the campaign being replaced by pessimism,

[99] For the Western Front, see Tony Ashworth. *Trench Warfare, 1914-1918: The Live and Let Live System* (London: Macmillan, 1980).
[100] Robert Rhodes James, *Gallipoli* (London, Papermac, 1989 [1965)], p. 231; Elaine MacFarland, *'A Slashing Man of Action': The Life of Lieutenant-General Sir Aylmer Hunter-Weston MP* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2014), pp. 206-7.
[101] TNA, CAB45/249, Egerton diary, 28, 30 August, 1, 12 September 1915.
[102] Sheffield, 'Shaping… Soldiers' Experience', pp. 35-40.

but even then, morale was a long way from collapsing. The agency that soldiers exercised at various times, not least by the men of 1/6 HLI on 16 August, illustrates what could have happened if there had been a general and permanent breakdown of morale, in the sense of willingness to obey the orders of higher command.[103]
This article began with Private Bert Lee's description of men being 'all pretty well fed up and worn out'. For one of Lee's officers in 1/7 Manchesters, the endurance of his men was a matter of pride, resonating with contemporary notions of masculinity:

> The average soldier on Gallipoli broke down after a month or two. Comparatively few endured more than three months…The memory that dominates all recollections of Gallipoli is that of the grandeur of the British soldier [of 42nd Division] … their gallantry in the early assaults and their inflexible fortitude in the trenches – pestered by flies, enfeebled by dysentery, stinted of water, and worn out by hardships - are a lasting title to honour.[104]

At Cape Helles, as on the Western Front, British military morale was generally characterised by stoicism and resilience in the face of adverse conditions.

Acknowledgments
I am grateful to Stephen Badsey, John Bourne, Anthony King, Robin Prior, Peter Simkins, Andrekos Varnava and an anonymous reviewer for their comments on an earlier draft of this article. I would like to thank Jack Mercer for allowing me access to Brigadier-General David Mercer's diary for 1915.

Quotations from material in the Darlington papers appear by kind permission of The Trustees of the Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives.

[103] It is beyond the scope of this article to carry out extensive comparisons, but for suggestive parallels with the morale of other in Great War British Empire troops on extra-European fronts, see Andrekos Varnava, *Serving the empire in the Great War: The Cypriot Mule Corps, imperial loyalty and silenced memory* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2017); *idem,* 'The vagaries and value of the army transport mule in the British army during the First World War', *Historical Research,* vol. 90, no. 248 (May 2017); Charles Townshend, *When God Made Hell: The British invasion of Mesopotamia and the Creation of Iraq 1914-1922* (London, Faber and Faber, 2010), pp. 144-45, 239-246; James E. Kitchen, *The British Imperial Army in the Middle East: Morale and Military Identity in the Sinai and Palestine Campaigns, 1916-18* (London, Bloomsbury Academic, 2015).
[104] Gerald B. Hurst, *With the Manchesters in the East,* (London: Longmans, 1918), pp. 67, 75.

Quotations from the Gunning papers in the Royal Dublin Fusiliers Archive appear by kind permission of Dr Mary Clarke, Dublin City Archivist, on behalf of Dublin City Council.

Quotations from the Lucas Papers appear by kind permission of Mr. Steve Warburton.

Quotations from material in the Border Regiment Archives held in Cumbria's Museum of Military Life appear by kind permission of Mr. Stuart Eastwood.

Quotations from material in the Manchester Regiment Archives appear by kind permission of Tameside Local Studies and Archives Centre.

Every effort has been made to trace copyright holders of the Archibald Paris papers, and the author and the Imperial War Museum would be grateful for any information which might help to identify their names and addresses.

It did not prove possible to trace the owner of copyright in the Laidlaw Papers held at the University of Leeds. Any information on this matter would be gratefully received.

Appendix: Order of Battle of VIII Corps, August 1915 (infantry units and formations only)[105]

29th Division
86 Brigade:
2/Royal Fusiliers
1/Lancashire Fusiliers
1/Royal Munster Fusiliers
1/Royal Dublin Fusiliers

87 Brigade:
2/South Wales Borderers
1/King's Own Scottish Borderers
1/Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers
1/Border Regiment

[105] C.E. Callwell, The Dardanelles (London: Constable, 1924), pp. 350-5.

88 Brigade:
4/Worcestershire Regiment
2/Hampshire Regiment
1/Essex Regiment
1/5 Royal Scots (Territorial Force.)

42nd (East Lancashire) Division (Territorial Force)
125 Brigade:
1/5 Lancashire Fusiliers
1/6 Lancashire Fusiliers
1/7 Lancashire Fusiliers
1/8 Lancashire Fusiliers

126 Brigade:
1/4 East Lancashire Regiment
1/5 East Lancashire Regiment
1/9 Manchester Regiment
1/10 Manchester Regiment

127 Brigade:
1/5 Manchester Regiment
1/6 Manchester Regiment
1/7 Manchester Regiment
1/8 Manchester Regiment

52nd (Lowland) Division (Territorial Force)
155 Brigade:
1/4 Royal Scots Fusiliers
1/5 Royal Scots Fusiliers
1/4 King's Own Scottish Borderers
1/5 King's Own Scottish Borderers

156 Brigade:
1/4 Royal Scots
1/7 Royal Scots
1/7 Scottish Rifles
1/8 Scottish Rifles

157 Brigade:
1/5 Highland Light Infantry
1/6 Highland Light Infantry
1/7 Highland Light Infantry
1/5 Argyll and Southerland Highlanders

Royal Naval Division
1 Brigade:
Drake Battalion
Nelson Battalion
Hawke Battalion
Hood Battalion

2 Brigade:
No.1 Battalion, Royal Marine Light Infantry
No.2 Battalion, Royal Marine Light Infantry
Howe Battalion
Anson Battalion

When a 1981 Diary Meets Twitter: Reclaiming a teenage girl's ordinary experience of the Northern Irish Troubles

OONAGH MURPHY & LAURA AGUIAR*
Goldsmiths, University of London, UK, & Public Record Office of Northern Ireland / Nerve Centre, UK
Emails: o.murphy@gold.ac.uk & laura.aguiar@communities-ni.gov.uk

ABSTRACT
The Northern Irish Troubles (1969-1998) have been the focus of many cross-disciplinary literature and official and unofficial storytelling projects. When reviewing the accounts produced by these studies and initiatives it is visible that less focus has been paid to the everyday experiences of the Troubles, particularly to a young girl's perspective of them.

Introduction

In this paper we take an unusual object of study: a Twitter account set up by Bronagh McAtasney who recently rediscovered her 1981 teenage diary and has been tweeting entries from it since. By carrying out a textual analysis of her tweets and complementing it with an analysis of the original diary and one structured interview with McAtasney, our aim is twofold: firstly, we seek to re-claim an often marginalised experience of the conflict, that of a teenage girl; secondly, we explore and suggest the different roles personal forms of writing can play in Northern Ireland's current transition to peace.

The findings show that the very banality of her experiences can function as a counter-narrative to the overheard (male) heroic accounts of the conflict, adding a female and young perspective. Furthermore, despite its reliance on memory, the diary/tweets offer a welcome addition to historical accounts of the conflict, which have lacked plurality. As a result, the diary plays the important role of archival material and

* Dr Oonagh Murphy is Lecturer in Arts Management in the Institute for Creative and Cultural Entrepreneurship at Goldsmiths, University of London, UK. Dr Laura Aguiar is Community Engagement Officer and Creative Producer at the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland / Nerve Centre, UK.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.823

contributes to past and current official and unofficial storytelling initiatives. This potential can be maximised through the use of popular digital tools, such as Twitter, which provide a new framework from which recollection and memory can be channelled.

> Five years ago, my sister gave me my 1981 diary, found at the back of a drawer. We read it together and laughed at the old memories and the preciousness of 13-year-old me but I realised there was more to it than family stories. In between entries about riding my bike around Newry, or proclaiming my love for Suggs [from the band Madness] there were mentions of death, tragedy and hunger strikers. Just passing thoughts most of the time – five soldiers killed here, a Catholic shot there. In early summer, though, it became more pervading as one after another hunger strikers died.
> And yet, the drama of my own life was far more important to me really. I recorded these events because they were all around me but at the time I was really far more concerned about whether or not I would get a Valentine's card, or if the boys would be hanging about outside Woolworths. No matter what was going on around us, we were teenagers first and foremost, as tormented by the nuances of teenage life as any 13-year-old in Glasgow, Manchester or indeed anywhere else in the western world.[1]

When Bronagh McAtasney recently rediscovered her teenage diary, written during a significant period of contemporary Irish history, she also unearthed a powerful and under told narrative – that of a 13 year-old girl, living in rural Northern Ireland, struggling to become a woman, fanatical about pop music, but also mindful of the uncertainty that existed around her.

The diary was written at the height of the conflict euphemistically called the 'Troubles' (1968-1998)[2], and more precisely in 1981, the year of the famous Republican hunger strike that would not only lead to the death of 10 prisoners but also change the course

[1] Oonagh Murphy, 'Hunger Strikes and Teenage Angst – the World of @NrnIrnGirl1981', The Irish Times, 29 February 2016, https://www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/hunger-strikes-and-teenage-angst-the-world-of-nrnirngirl1981-1.2552470. Accessed 1 Jan 2019.

[2] The conflict can be categorised by 'systematic and sustained abuses of human rights by the British State, and a systematic blurring, by all protagonists of violence, of the categories of armed combatants and unarmed civilians'. Graham Dawson, *Making Peace with the Past? Memory Trauma and the Irish Troubles* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007). P. 9. It had a death toll of nearly 4,000 and left over 40,000 injured. David McKittrick and David McVea, *Making Sense of the Troubles: The Story of the Conflict in Northern Ireland* (New Amsterdam Books, 2002).

of the conflict.[3] Written as a private memoir, it reflects the internal monologue of a teenage girl becoming a woman, in parallel to the growing civil unrest and political uncertainty happening around her.

As interesting as the uncovering of the diary is in its own right, it is the corresponding series of contemporary but chronological tweets which were written in response to this discovery that this paper focuses on, revealing an important example of how digital technologies can provide a platform for marginalised voices to be heard and also become an invaluable educational tool to learn about war in post-conflict societies.

Since January 2013, McAtasney has tweeted daily snippets of her teenage diary through the account @NrnIrnGirl1981. The Twitter biography describes the account as 'Teenage angst, boys and hunger strikes. The life of a 13-year-old in Northern Ireland. My 1981 diary entries tweeted daily'. She originally choose to start tweeting her diary 'as a bit of fun' unaware of the wider attention it would attract beyond her immediate group of friends and some curious onlookers'. McAtasney was not a writer nor an artist when she began tweeting her diary; she worked as an administrator, was a mum and she didn't tweet for literary acclaim, but because she thought her diary was funny, embarrassing, and nostalgic. It was a reason to reach out to old friends. Twitter was a platform that McAtasney already had a personal account on, and she knew how it worked, there was no great academic or literary analysis of appropriate platforms, instead she simply opened an account and started tweeting.[4] When the Arts Council of Northern Ireland contacted her in 2015 to discuss supporting the development of her work, and explained its literary significance, she began to think about it within the context of wider academic concepts such as public memory. In 2016 an article on the diary, Twitter account and experience of McAtasney was published in the *Irish Times*.[5] In 2017 BBC Northern Ireland commissioned a series of articles and videos based on the diary which sought to link the experience of an individual to their wider archive [6]. As of October 2018, her Twitter account has over 4,500 followers and over 2,560 tweets. These outcomes, and this article were not in McAtasney's initial plans of a personal project from the comfort of her own sofa.

---

[3] For more on this area see Chris Ryder, *Inside the Maze: The Untold Story of the Northern Ireland Prison Service* (New York: Methuen, 2000); Nell McCafferty, *The Armagh Women* (Dublin: Co-Op Books, 1981); Raymond Murray, *Hard Time: Armagh Gaol, 1971-1986* (Cork: Mercier Press, 1998); Mary Corcoran, *Out of Order: The Political Imprisonment of Women in Northern Ireland, 1972-1999* (Devon: Willan Publishing, 2006).

[4] Interview with author.

[5] Murphy, 'Hunger Strikes and Teenage Angst – the World of @NrnIrnGirl1981'

[6] BBC - What Was Your Ma Doing When She Was Your Age?' http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/articles/5dw8lGXwpqB19VFd6rZqZ3m/what-was-your-ma-doing-when-she-was-your-age. Accessed 1 January 2019.

With followers ranging from politicians to teachers and approaches being made from TV producers and playwrights, it is visible that there is appetite for this neglected story – one that places politics, human interest and popular culture on an equal footing in the mind of a teenage girl in 1981. This appetite has been further confirmed with the success of the Channel 4 series *Derry Girls* in 2017. Written by Northern Irish author Lisa McGee, this comedy focuses on the life of four teenagers set in Derry/Londonderry at the tail end of the Troubles in the 1990s. The series drew an average audience of 2.5 million an episode and became Channel 4's highest-rated comedy launch since Ricky Gervais's *Derek*, five years ago.[7]

Based on a textual analysis of the tweets and complemented by an analysis her diary entries and one structured interview via email with McAtasney, this article seeks to broaden our existing understanding of the conflict through 'other stuff', i.e. personal writings during the hunger strike period by a frequently marginalised voice, that of an ordinary, teenage girl. This article also situates McAtasney's practice of diary-writing, and later tweeting entries from it, within academic debates about its role in not only uncovering hidden memories of conflicts but also in furthering peace processes. We argue that while her diary acts as a powerful historical archival document revealing a marginalised voice, her retelling through tweets provides a new framework from which recollection and memory can be channelled to a large audience. We hope to highlight the power of personal stories found in a diary in recovering the plurality of everyday experiences of conflict.

We begin by reviewing cross-disciplinary scholarly work and official and unofficial storytelling initiatives to provide an overview of how the Troubles have been studied, analysed and represented. We then move to a discussion about the role of memory in reclaiming marginalised voices in historical accounts. We finish with an analysis of her tweets to show the many roles and lessons that can be learnt from ordinary stories of conflict and from personal written sources such as diaries and Twitter. We would encourage readers to read this article whilst simultaneously engaging with the live and publicly available @NrnIrnGirl1981 Twitter account. This presents the reader with the rare opportunity to engage with the academic analysis contained in this article alongside the raw data which serves as our site of research.

Studying and Representing the Troubles

The Irish Troubles is a period of history that has been studied extensively. Roger MacGinty et al. state that Northern Ireland was a somewhat perfect conflict for

[7] Shilpa Ganatra, 'How Derry Girls Became an Instant Sitcom Classic', *The Guardian*, 13 February 2018 https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2018/feb/13/derry-girls-instant-sitcom-classic-schoolgirls-northern-ireland. Accessed 1 January 2019.

researchers who chose Northern Ireland over other more difficult and indeed dangerous civil conflicts such as Darfur, Chechnya or Burma. They describe the Northern Ireland conflict as being comparatively safe and accessible for Western journalists to cover.[8]

It is not surprising then to see the many different paths taken by scholars within a wide range of academic disciplines. To cite a few examples, there is growing scholarship within Film Studies examining how different aspects of the Troubles have been represented in films.[9] Oral History and History scholars have shown how the conflict affected communities and individuals in different ways.[10] Women Studies and Feminist Studies have focused on uncovering women's marginalised experiences and have highlighted their active roles inside and outside their homes as combatants, activists and breadwinners.[11] Scholars within Museum Studies and Archaeology have looked at issues regarding the preservation, collection and display of contested narratives of the past and the contentious role of heritage sites.[12]

---

[8] Roger Mac Ginty, Orla T. Muldoon, and Neil Ferguson, 'No War, No Peace: Northern Ireland after the Agreement' in *Political Psychology, Vol.* 28, no. 1 (2007) pp. 1–11.

[9] Megan Sullivan, *Irish Women and Cinema: 1980-1990* (Florida: NOVA Southeastern University, 2001); Brian McIlroy, *Shooting to Kill: Filmmaking and the" Troubles" in Northern Ireland* (Wiltshire: Flicks Books, 1998); John Hill, *Cinema and Northern Ireland: Film, Culture and Politics* (London: BFI, 2006); Laura Aguiar, '"We Were There": The Women of the Maze and Long Kesh Prison: Collaborative Filmmaking in Transitional Northern Ireland.' (PhD, Queen's University Belfast, 2015).

[10] Sharon Macdonald, Pat Holden, and Shirley Ardener, eds., *Images of Women in Peace and War: Cross-Cultural and Historical Perspectives* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988); Mary Corcoran, *Out of Order: The Political Imprisonment of Women in Northern Ireland, 1972-1999* (London: Routledge, 2006); Rachel Ward, *Women, Unionism and Loyalism in Northern Ireland: From 'tea-Makers' to Political Actors* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2006).

[11] Sharon Macdonald, Pat Holden, and Shirley Ardener, eds., *Images of Women in Peace and War: Cross-Cultural and Historical Perspectives* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988); Mary Corcoran, *Out of Order: The Political Imprisonment of Women in Northern Ireland, 1972-1999* (London: Routledge, 2006); Rachel Ward, *Women, Unionism and Loyalism in Northern Ireland: From 'tea-Makers' to Political Actors* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2006).

[12] Elizabeth Crooke, 'Museums and Community", in *A Companion to Museum Studies*, ed. Sharon MacDonald (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), pp. 170–85; Laura McAtackney 'The Negotiation of Identity at Shared Sites: Long Kesh/Maze Prison Site, Northern Ireland' in *Cultural Landscapes in the 21st Century* (UNESCO University and Heritage 10th International Seminar, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2005); Brian Graham and Sara

The Troubles have also been a key feature in many official and unofficial storytelling initiatives in Northern Ireland. The mid-1990s witnessed not only the peace process finally getting underway, but also a proliferation of projects dealing with the conflict.

Official initiatives include, quite early in the peace process, the report *We Will Remember Them* (1998) which looked at 'possible ways to recognise the pain and suffering felt by victims of violence arising from the troubles'[13]. There have also been legally based initiatives, with the most notorious, lengthy, and costly being the *Saville Inquiry,* which examined the infamous Bloody Sunday.[14] The inquiry established that the British army had shot and killed unarmed innocent civilians and led to an official apology by the British Prime Minister David Cameron.

When it comes to collecting and exhibiting 'The Troubles', for instance, a number of approaches have been taken not only by museums, such as The Ulster Museum, the Police Museum, and the Irish Republican History Museum, but also by grassroots, cross-community projects. These initiatives have challenged official narratives through photography, oral history, exhibition, theatre and film and have focused on personal testimonies (oral and written). To name a few to exemplify this point: *An Crann 'The Tree'* (1994-2001) used drama, textiles, creative writing and photography to engage participants to talk about the past. The Playhouse Theatre's *Theatre of Witness Programme* produced plays where people performed their own stories of trauma. These were filmed and turned into documentary films. Personal testimonies have been produced by a number of projects such as *The Ardoyne Commemoration Project (2002)*, the *Duchas Oral History Archive* (2000), *Epilogues (2005),* and *The Prisons Memory Archive* (2006), and the travelling exhibition *Everyday Objects Transformed by the Conflict* (2012-2014).

Film production in Northern Ireland has also had a strong focus on depicting the Troubles to the point that John Hill notes that the conflict has been 'the distinctive feature' of fiction and non-fiction films, making it difficult to set a film 'that does not

---

McDowell, 'Meaning in the Maze: The Heritage of Long Kesh', *Cultural Geographies,* Vol. 14, no. 3 (July 2007) pp. 343–68.

[13] Kenneth Bloomfield, 'We Will Remember Them' (Northern Ireland Victims Commissioner, 1998).

[14] This is when a peaceful civil rights march turned into bloodshed when British soldiers opened fire against unarmed protesters in the Bogside area of Derry/Londonderry. Thirteen civilians were killed on the day (one person died a month after the event, and as such the death toll commonly attributed to Bloody Sunday is fourteen civilians), fourteen more were injured and paramilitary activity escalated. Douglas Murray, *Bloody Sunday: Truth, Lies and the Saville Inquiry* (Biteback Publishing, 2011). p. 3.

deal with the impact of the conflict in some way or other'.[15] From as early as *The Violent Enemy* to the more recently *Maze*, the Troubles continue to trigger interest from independent filmmakers and mainstream film production companies.[16]

Situating McAtasney's Personal Testimony

What all of these scholarly works and grassroots storytelling initiatives have in common is that they have uncovered and given voice to plural accounts of conflict which were rarely heard during the many years of conflict. They contrast with mainstream media practices which manipulated public perceptions and marginalized the conflict in the minds of British public through vetoes, censorship of certain voices and careful choice of words.[17]

However, they also share another feature: the focus on gathering and disseminating stories from (and about) combatants and victims. Very little has been heard about the everyday lived experiences of those on the periphery of this conflict, particularly children and adolescents with the exception of Bill Rolston's 2011 book *Children of the Revolution.*[18] One reason for this absence, suggested by Ed Gains, is due to ethical concerns around the researcher finding out too much information. For example, a child could end up disclosing parents' involvement in a paramilitary group or knowledge of participation in research could lead to physical threat.[19] In identifying a gap in research on children and conflict in Northern Ireland, Orla Muldoon identifies researcher bias as a key concern– researchers research what is of interest to them, as such we can see how the peripheral experience of conflict is easily overlooked.[20]

In popular culture, there have not been many representations of the 'Children of the Troubles' or indeed the children born after the ceasefire, what McKee terms the 'Ceasefire Babies' a group of young people growing up in a complex and unique environment.[21] The rare exceptions to this being the contemporary (post 1998) films *After '68*, *Mickybo and Me* and *Good Vibrations* and more recently *Derry Girls.* Therefore, in the bloody and multifaceted story of Northern Ireland paramilitaries, politicians and

[15] Hill, *Cinema and Northern Ireland*, p. 242.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Stephen Burke, *Maze* (Lionsgate Home Entertainment, 2017); Wilfred Eades and Don Sharp, *The Violent Enemy* (Group W Productions, 1969).
[17] Bill Rolston and David Miller, eds., *War and Words: The Northern Ireland Media Reader* (Belfast: Beyond the Pale Publications, 1996).
[18] Bill Rolston, *Children of the Revolution: The Lives of Sons and Daughters of Activists in Northern Ireland*, (Derry/Londonderry: Guildhall Press, 2011).
[19] Macdonald, Holden, and Ardener, *Images of Women in Peace and War*, p. 15.
[20] Orla T. Muldoon, 'Children of the Troubles: The Impact of Political Violence in Northern Ireland', *Journal of Social Issues,* Vol. 60, no. 3 (September 2004) pp. 453–68.
[21] Muldoon, 'Children of the Troubles'.

political activists from Bobby Sands to Ian Paisley remain situated as the lead protagonists while those existing on the periphery of this conflict, such as Bronagh McAtasney, often do not even make the footnotes. Therefore, we hope that by uncovering and analyzing her experiences – conveyed to us through her tweets – this paper can contribute in an important way to this growing body of work and will hopefully open up to more academic and artistic interest in ordinary experiences of the conflict.

This task is even more timely given the fact that, despite (great) efforts by many researchers and grassroots storytellers and the success of Derry Girls, available material on the Troubles remains strongly focused on male paramilitarism. However, this is not Northern Ireland's fault; one does not have to dig too far into war history or war cinema to find evidence that 'personalized symbols of pain and suffering have tended to become embodied in women, while institutional repressive mechanisms have been for the most part connected to men'.[22] As a result, women's diverse experiences before, during and after warfare have often been relegated to absence, silence and marginality in both historical and filmic discourse.[23]

Therefore, it is the weaving of the banal experiences of teenage and female life with the political that makes McAtasney's personal testimony unique when it comes to historical accounts of the Troubles. As a male-centred history, particularly focused on paramilitarism, activism and politics, her writings as a teenage woman broaden our existing understanding of this country which has been the object of interest by many academic and storytellers for so many years – and will probably continue to be so for more years to come.

The Research

From January 2014 to January 2016 we analysed over 1,000 Tweets posted by McAtasney's pseudonym @NrnIrnGirl1981. We also analysed her original diary entries, consisting of 365 pages. As Uwe Flick notes, 'sampling decision always fluctuate between the aims of covering as wide a field as possible and of doing analyses which are deep as possible',[24] therefore, our sample was not defined in advance, but chosen gradually according to its relevance to the case we are making for McAtasney's diary to answer the following questions:

[22] Elizabeth Jelin, *State Repression and the Labors of Memory* (U of Minnesota Press, 2003) p. 76.

[23] Macdonald, Holden, and Ardener, *Images of Women in Peace and War*; Jelin, *State Repression and the Labors of Memory*; Ward, *Women, Unionism and Loyalism in Northern Ireland: From 'tea-Makers' to Political Actors*; Alison, Miranda, *Women and Political Violence: Female Combatants in Ethno-National Conflict* (London: Routledge, 2009).

[24] Uwe Flick, *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (London: Sage, 2009) p. 123.

1. Production: From Diary to Twitter:
   - Who has produced these Tweets, for which purpose and for whom?
   - How does the author choose which diary entries will be tweeted and which will be left out? Are there are any reasons behind the dates on which the author tweets?
   - Why did the author choose to turn her diary into tweets and not into more traditional formats, such as books or films?

2. Content: Analysis and Impact
   - What can the tweets reveal about people's everyday experiences of war?
   - To what extent can her tweets offer a counter-narrative to official and unofficial accounts of the Troubles?
   - How can these types of ordinary narratives contribute to the transitional period from violence to peace in Northern Ireland?

To answer these questions, we first conducted a textual analysis to map and understand how certain discourses were structured and how they produce certain knowledge. Narratives can provide 'a framework in which experiences may be located, presented and evaluated.[25] The type of textual analysis we employed here focused more on the content of the tweets, its subject matter (McAtasney) and its social rather than linguistic organisation. We include here quotes from her diaries, her tweets and from the interview we conducted with her.

However, Flick warns that 'as a stand-alone method, analysing documents gives you a very specific and sometimes limited approach to experiences and processes'.[26] Therefore, we complemented our textual analysis with one structured email interview with McAtasney to help us better interpret her tweets. We have deliberately left out an analysis of followers' responses to her tweets and opted to focus solely on the meanings and lessons that can be drawn from the content of the tweets. Hence, as this research answers questions concerning the production stage, it opens up to research on the reception stage. So, what lessons can be drawn from McAtasney's Tweets?

From Diary to Tweets

Personal testimonies, gathered mostly via oral history and to a lesser extent via diary writing, have become popular as a way of trying to supplement 'gaps' in archival collections, or in knowledge of a particular area or field of study. For instance, in Clare O'Kane's research on rural women in Ireland, she notes that 'It is in local history, oral testimony, memoir and autobiography that the voices of women in rural Northern Ireland are rarely heard' (in McIntosh and Urquhart 2010, 87). Whilst official

[25] Ibid. *p.* 81.
[26] Ibid. *p.* 261.

documents and historical accounts can tell us what happened, personal testimonies can go further and also tell us what it felt like.

For the purpose of our analysis, it is important to distinguish between personal testimonies gathered via oral history (as the result of an interview) and the personal narrative found in a diary. Diaries are personal and private and offer the freedom to surface, express, explore and develop ideas without the restrictions, fears, and assessments of external observers. Former US president Barrack Obama stated in an interview that writing while he was in the White House 'was the way I sorted through a lot of crosscurrents in my life — race, class, family. And I genuinely believe that it was part of the way in which I was able to integrate all these pieces of myself into something relatively whole'.[27] As Maria Luddy notes, 'It is perhaps only in the personal diaries and letters of women that we find a true immediate reflection of women about themselves, their own feelings and lives'.[28] These reflections are selected and censored by the writer herself who writes in a personal space with little technology (generally a pen/pencil and the diary and more recently a computer) as an everyday activity or to capture experiences of a particular moment in time, though in some cases they can be written as reflections afterwards.

Oral history testimonies, on the other hand, can be captured in many different ways and more often than not are collected with the aim to be shared publicly. In most cases they are conducted by researchers, filmmakers, etc and they can be written, audio recorded or filmed. Oral history is centred around the idea of disrupting the hegemonised power dynamics between interviewers and interviewees in more traditional scholarly practices and making the interviewing process a more shared and ethical experience for interviewees.[29] Oral Historians, thus, have accomplished this by adopting various approaches, including family-tree interviewing, single-issue testimony, focus groups, individual life story interview, and so forth.[30]

Despite its ethical efforts, the influence of the interviewer on the personal testimony must be acknowledged. Unlike diary writing which is an individual, private and reflexive practice, oral history testimony often involves at least two people and many things can come into play: the interviewees' answers can be influenced by the questions asked,

[27] Gillian McIntosh and Diane Urquhart, eds., *Irish Women at War: The Twentieth Century* (Dublin, Irish Academic Press, 2010) p. 87.
[28] Michiko Kakutani, 'Transcript: President Obama on What Books Mean to Him - The New York Times', 16 January 2017,
[29] Maria Luddy, *Women in Ireland, 1800-1918: A Documentary History* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1995).
[30] Michael H. Frisch, *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History*, SUNY Series in Oral and Public History (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990).

the use of a camera or audio recorder can inhibit or distract interviewees, and interviewers must make sure to set aside preconceived structures and interpretations of their own.[31] Context can also influence the process as Robert Perks and Allistair Thomson rightly note: 'the methods taken for granted by oral historians in the "developed world" of the north can be wholly inappropriate for researchers in the South'.[32]

However, these differences do not mean that written testimony in the form of diaries inspires better reflexivity while audio or visual testimony, in the form of oral history interviews, does not. The above discussion highlights how the content of original sources such as diaries and oral testimony can be affected by the way it is collected. Indeed, one thing is capturing personal testimonies, another is making them accessible and available to the public and as in the collection process, there are also losses and gains.

Diaries and oral testimonies have been turned into exhibitions, books, films, virtual reality experiences and so forth. Turning memories of the past into tweets is a novel practice and this places McAtasney's tweets in a unique position for analysis. For instance, whilst in a filmed oral history interview we can get extra layers of meaning by looking at a person's body language, expression and tones, in an original diary we can learn a lot about a person's personality by examining the handwriting and choice of language. As McAatsney diary is available in the format of tweets, what is lost and what is gained in this transition?

One could argue that while the extra meanings particular to the physicality of the object, i.e. her handwriting, are lost, choosing a channel like Twitter has opened up not only new opportunities for self-representation, but also new collaborative prospects.

For Runa Benmayor, the digital world provides 'exciting new possibilities for representing, interpreting, archiving and teaching' and also is centred around key verbs such as 'enable, help, enhance, facilitate, promote'.[33] Hence, digital tools such as Twitter have potential for 'increasing understanding across generations, ethnicities and

[31] There is an increasing participatory practice within Oral History and this is allowing Interviewees to act as both historians and sources, such as, Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, eds., *The Oral History Reader*, Second edition (London; New York: Routledge, 2006).
[32] Perks and Thomson, *The Oral History Reader*. p. 116.
[33] Rinha Benmayor, 'Cyber-Teaching in the Oral History Classroom', in *The Oral History Reader*. p. 435.

other divides' and 'as a tool in activist organizing, education, professional reflection and corporate communication'.[34]

Therefore, McAtasney has an unprecedented opportunity to build and nurture a personal audience and can have a much more direct, instant connection to her personal audience, perhaps in a much more profound way than she would have had if she her diary was subject of a film or a book.

The Ordinary versus the (Hypermasculine) Heroic

Rather than being irrelevant, a narrative of the everyday provides us with a hook to support a non-partisan reading of lived experience during The Troubles. Stephen Johnstone talks about the art of the everyday sparking a 'distrust of the heroic and the spectacular' and argues that such work has dissident connotations because it provides an alternative to a constructed and bureaucratically controlled consumption of history and popular culture.[35]

If we look at the most internationally famous war-time diary, that of Anne Frank, we find another teenage girl recording her banal domestic experience amidst what were less than banal times. In our reading of her diary, we see her humanity rather than her religion: she is a child, a girl, and a teenager. The banality of her diary is what may make readers empathize and relate to her experience and, for much of the diary, the Holocaust is the background, not the foreground to her experience. Although referring to museums, Johnstone suggests that 'the everyday might be the common ground experience that allows' people 'to understand the effects of history on the private lives of those who were usually overlooked [36].

Everyday life is also captured in McAtasney's writing. It could be suggested that her work has 'a vaguely ethnographic aesthetic' in that it sits in parallel to, but also beyond, the constructed realms of art or history.[37] As a result, the focus on the everyday in her writing may help the contemporary reader to question what they know about the Troubles. It is perhaps timely to return to one of her more banal entries to consider the transformative potential of the everyday when understanding lived experience during civil conflict:

[34] Ibid. p. 435.
[35] Stephen Johnstone, *The Everyday: Documents of Contemporary Art* (*London, Whitechapel*, 2008) p. 12.
[36] Johnstone, *The Everyday,* p. 13
[37] Ibid.

> Wednesday June 24
> I got my hair cut in Phil's tonight. I think it's lovely. I can't wait to go in tomorrow. I love doing that. Most people say, "Did you get your hair cut?" I remember doing it in 2nd year. Great fun.[38]

And the banality of her experience of the Troubles was recognized by her when she was interviewed in 2016:

> However my diary entry from June 22nd 1983 shows that at that time my biggest priority was my new haircut, something that I'm sure the international news crews failed to take an interest in. Looking at everyone else's hair, trying and failing to copy hairdos from Top of the Pops. Hair disasters like the perm that went wrong or thinking I could bleach my hair by using actual bleach. Peer pressure was nothing as bad as nowadays, but it was still there and badly-flicked hair could make or break a reputation in the classroom.[39]

Whilst the international headlines at the time represented a single, simplistic account of Northern Ireland of men starving themselves to death, bombs, shootings, and terrorism, this passage reminds us that life goes on as it always does in times of war, even if people took the long way round a bomb scare to get to work, families were searched by the security forces before going shopping, and children stepped around soldiers as they went to school.

Crucially McAtasney's audience was herself and she was writing about childish things to cement her thinking, understand her emotions and develop self-confidence around her daily experiences. However, her writing is reflective when it comes to lived experience, but more observational when it comes to wider political issues and events. The entry on which she seems most aware of politics perhaps is made on Tuesday the 5th of May 1981:

> Tuesday May 5
> Bobby Sands died at 1.17am this morning. It's very sad and the whole day has been filled with trouble and news about it. The people of Belfast were on the streets the moment they heard & there was fighting. Many girls from S. Armagh didn't come to school today because the buses were off. The police barracks or somewhere near there has just had a fire but I think its out.
> I couldn't stay fallen out with Eileen so although we're not as friendly as were used to be we are friends. She doesn't know how disappointed & sad I was after Saturday. B.S. passed peacefully although I was told off once or twice my Cornish pasties turned out lovely. There may be trouble yet. I don't know.

[38] Twitter post.
[39] Interview with author.

> Many shop windows have been broken in Dublin. I feel sorry for the Sands family.[40]

In this entry, we see McAtasney situate the political within her immediate surroundings of school, friends and family. While this is an entry about a significant political occurrence, the death of Bobby Sands, the weaving of the political and lived experience in single entries is characteristic of the diary. This suggests how politics was internalized and interrupted by young people on the margins of the conflict, be that *geographically marginal* (McAtasney lived in Newry) or *politically marginal* (her family did not actively participate as either state actors, or combatants). It reminds us that civil conflict does not exist within a vacuum, and instead must be viewed within a wider social ecological perspective, context is key when it comes to validly analysing lived experience of conflict within the wider population.[41]

McAtasney reflects on the juxtaposition of omnipresent conflict and the everyday as being a particularly powerful element of her tweets. The May 5 extract drew attention on Twitter, not only because it mentions a key political event, but also because of the other components, as highlighted by McAtasney:

> This is one of the most commented on quotes. I think many people focus on the news of the day but now, it reads more like straightforward reporting to me. It is the idea of my Cornish pasties being so good and my pride in that that makes this entry important to me. I do remember all the news coverage but I was always really looking at that from a distance. In addition, friendships were a constant battle at that age and falling out and reconciling were my real obsession – at that age, you are so completely defined by your friends.[42]

The focus of the everyday within contemporary storytelling can represent 'the desire to bring these uneventful and overlooked aspects of lived experience into visibility'.[43] However, a storyteller's ability to focus on the everyday is perhaps more challenging when working within a country rife with political uncertainty and civil unrest – in short, these artists have something more pressing, exciting and compelling to focus on. As such, one could praise McAtasney for her private writing and its powerful mirroring to everyday lived experience of civil conflict.

Her narrative about ordinary life becomes even fresher and more welcoming when it is added to accounts of a specific period of the conflict, the 1981 republican hunger

[40] Original diary entry.
[41] Bronagh McAtasney, Contemporary Reflection, interview by Oonagh Murphy, 20 November 2016.
[42] Interview with author.
[43] Johnstone, 'The Everyday', p. 12.

strikes, which have focused strongly, almost exclusively, on male paramilitarism and politics.[44] As Lorraine Dowler notes, the Maze and Long Kesh prison has 'figured as a 'prominent site of resistance' and has become part of the 'façade of [republican] hypermasculinity'.[45] This is easily noticeable in most scholarly work as well as films about the prison,[46] with Bobby Sands' story featuring more prominently than the others. The over-focus on paramilitarism and masculinity has led to a double marginalisation of experiences like McAtasney's as both young and as a woman. Her diary and tweets bring them all back to life.

Challenging Homogenized Collective Memory

The analysis of McAtasney's personal testimony raises the well-established debate about the role of memory in the re-writing of history. As Elizabeth Crooke notes, historical and contemporary memory has been utilised to create narratives in democratic societies: 'the national memory is naturalised through a shared history represented in the grand narrative of the nation, and in turn depicted in museums, history books and by other forms of cultural symbolism, such as memorials'.[47] Babara Misztal furthers Crookes argument in stating that 'collective memory is the condition of justice and freedom of democratic order'.[48]

Storytelling has often been pointed as one of the main ways of dealing with the legacy of the past in transitional societies. While Governments may encourage collective amnesia by suppressing memorialization, other times they recycle past wars in different guises: 'victories restaged, defeats rendered palatable, historical grievances nurtured, new enemies substituted for old'[49]. Remembering may help communities stick together in certain ways and split in others and offer opportunities to engage with the contested past. Graham Dawson reminds us that 'war memory is first of all the possession of those individuals, military or civilian, who have experienced war and

[44] Johnstone, 'The Everyday'.

[45] Peter Shirlow and Lorraine Dowler, "'Wee Women No More": Female Partners of Republican Political Prisoners in Belfast', *Environment and Planning* Vol. 42, No. 2 (2010), pp. 384-399 (p. 387).

[46] Peter Shirlow and Kieran McEvoy, *Beyond the Wire: Former Prisoners and Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland* (London: Pluto, 2008); Ryder.

[47] Elizabeth Crooke, 'Dealing with the Past: Museums and Heritage in Northern Ireland and Cape Town, South Africa', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* Vol. 11, no. 2 (2005) p. 174.

[48] Barbara Misztal, 'The Banalization and the Contestation of Memory in Post Communist Poland' in *Heritage and Identity: Engagement and Demission in the Contemporary World*, ed. Marta Anico and Elsa Peralta, Museum Meanings Series (London: Routledge, 2009) p. 118.

[49] Susan Carruthers, *The Media at War: Communication and Conflict in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2000) p. 244.

lived to tell their story'.[50] Martin Conway frames memory in two ways that of 'official state memory' and 'folk memory' Official state memory being the narrative recorded in official accounts be that through the courts, archives or museums. While folk memory is a truth held as accurate by a community, it traditionally focuses on the heroes and villains of seminal tales, and ignores the private memoirs, and life writing of those on the periphery.[51]

Any debate on memory, whether state or folk, and history re-writing must take into account the fact that memory is selective and narratives are built upon what is remembered and forgotten. The concept of absence is particularly relevant here: Colin Graham discusses the concept of remembering to forget the conscious or subconscious creation of an absence.[52] The creation of absence is not deleting a history' instead it is creating a new history: it re-defines, individual, institutional or indeed societal approaches ultimately, the goal of the storyteller is the creation of an accepted, homogenised and normalised memory, the creation of not a single grand narrative, but a multiplicity of valid narratives, narratives that reflect the varied experiences of conflict in an environment 'where stories can be told, where the layers of memory can be uncovered in an ensemble of hope'.[53]

Memory is not only selective but it is also subject to contemporary interpretation and reflection. For instance, within the context of the District Six Museum in South Africa Elizabeth Crooke observes that 'What caused people shame now evokes pride; closed memories have now become open and shared; and a fragile people are becoming a stronger community'.[54] That way, memories are plural and more than recollections of our past and can potentially be 'the history we expect for the present'.[55]

The debates around what is remembered and what is forgotten are key to the analysis of McAtasney's personal testimony. As she puts her diary into the public domain via Twitter, self-censorship comes into play as diary entries have the possibility of being omitted or edited. However, when we look at the original written diary entries from 1981, alongside the tweeted diary posts, what we find is that McAtasney rather than self-censoring, recognises the value of the embarrassing, banal, immature, and innocence of her diary and as such translates this to her tweets. The diary has not

[50] Carruthers, *The Media at War. p.* 244.
[51] Dawson, *Making Peace with the Past?,* p. 89.
[52] Colin Graham, "'Every Passer-by a Culprit?" *Third Text* vol. 19, no. 5 (September 2005): pp. 567–80.
[53] Crooke, 'Museums and Community' p. 121.
[54] Crooke, 'Dealing with the Past: Museums and Heritage in Northern Ireland and Cape Town, South Africa' p. 175.
[55] Sarah Maltby, ed., *Communicating War: Memory, Media and Military* (Suffolk: Arima Publ, 2007) p. 19.

been published, however a full transcript was provided to the researchers, which served as a rich source of textual analysis, and cross tabulation against the publicly available Twitter entries. Furthermore, McAtasney did not choose what days to tweet, but instead tweeted each day, the content of the corresponding date of the original diary entry. For example, on the 12 February she tweeted an edited (for brevity) version of what was written in her diary on the 12 of February 1981.

If memory is 'a narrative rather than a replica of an experience that can be retrieved and relived' and if 'what we remember is highly selective', then how reliable can her testimony be?[56] To what extent can they challenge or complement history? Instead of asking if a certain memory is true, we should be asking what the story being told could reveal about how the past affects the present. Stories based on memories have a valuable place in history re-writing because 'the emotions they convey have social import, reflecting readings of the world that are embedded in collective history, and group experience'.[57]

Therefore, it could be argued that the potential of accounts dealing with personal memories, such as McAtasney's diary notes/tweets, in transitional societies lies in the way they challenge the public to acknowledge that memory depend on context and is continually an interpretation and affects directly the present and the future. The creation of a valid record of The Troubles requires the critical appraisal of the entire history, a history of people - and not just heroes and of individual stories and experiences. As she put it:

> We aren't the people who get commemorated in murals and songs but our stories are important. When everything was falling apart around us, we needed the family politics, the teenage angst, the homework rants, to help create a semblance of normality. We needed the ordinary to ensure the extraordinary did not become our accepted norm. Of course it wasn't normal, but it was normal to us. "Ordinary" life – whatever that is – does not stop at the dawn of war and the diary of a 13-year-old girl in 1981, my diary, helps to breathe life into the people in the background, it helps give our stories the attention they deserve.[58]

In this passage we see McAtasney yearning for acknowledgement within the grand narrative of a nation's history. And doing so can have a twofold effect: on a personal level, this acknowledgement can publicly validate the importance of a person's ordinary

[56] Marita Sturken, *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering* (Univ of California Press, 1997), p. 7.
[57] Aguiar, "'We Were There", p. 9.
[58] Interview with author.

life in extraordinary times and reinforce the sense of having been part of a historically relevant place/time.

On a society level, the addition of personal stories to national history has the potential to create cohesive communities. This is even more crucial in places such as Northern Ireland, where dealing with the past has been considerably problematic as one person's 'victim' may be another's 'perpetrator', a hierarchy of victims remains debatable, and there remains a 'meta-conflict' - a conflict on what the conflict is about and how to address it.[59] Therefore, storytelling based on plural experiences have the potential to build sustainable and multi-layered relationships and produce a new narrative that 'tell a story of respect, difference, and positive relationships in the present'[60]. And key to this creation is reinforcing what unites people – their human experiences of conflict – and not what separates them – religion, political affiliations and geographic locations. That we are all human despite our plurality of experiences is perhaps a simple but effective narrative framework from which to build upon the layers of memory that exist within Northern Ireland - a Northern Ireland that is now working towards a shared future.[61]

Personal Diary as an Archival source

McAtasney's diary notes and tweets also raise questions around the role of official and unofficial archival initiatives. Archives that relate to the Troubles exist all over Northern Ireland. However, most 'cultural artefacts of the conflict are squirreled away out of sight of the new Northern Ireland' as the material object has been deemed too raw and too sensitive to put on display.[62] While the international press viewed the conflict as a somewhat safe and accessible to cover, local museums and heritage institutions were more hesitant in their response. In 'Confessions of an Archivist' Gerry Slater, former Director of the Public Records Office Northern Ireland (PRONI), reflects upon his initial desire not to engage with the story of The Troubles:

> I was comfortable in the belief that 'The Troubles' would be documented in the 'official archives' even if it might not be open for 30, 50, 75 or even 100 years. Everything else was unreliable evidence tainted by emotion and

[59] Michelle Moloney, 'Reaching Out from the Archive: The Role of Community Oral History Archives in Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland.' p. 298.
[60] Ibid., 298.
[61] Graham, "Every Passer-by a Culprit?" p. 578.
[62] Gerry Slater, 'Confessions of an Archivist', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* vol.29, no. 2 (October 2008) p. 140.

> partisanship. I could hide behind the excuse that it was not time to be collecting memories amid the bloody reality of terrorist outrages.[63]

Slater is not alone in reflecting upon the role of the individual within official government funded, and or sanctioned institutions when it came to identifying, defining, collecting and constructing narrative accounts of The Troubles. Claire Hackett and Bill Rolston also provide a critical context from which to understand the politics of community and institutional engagement with the Northern Ireland Troubles; they discuss the impact of community-led storytelling and conversely its significance through 'official mechanisms', for example the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. They identify the often polar opposite approaches – Catholics vs Protestants or Republicans vs Loyalists - that are taken by community groups and institutions who engage with storytelling as a mechanism to create reconciliation.[64]

While their article focuses on 'official mechanisms', in terms of legal and or statutory mechanisms such as truth commissions and public inquiries as an alternative to community mechanisms, it provides valuable insights into the barriers museums as non-community organisations face when working with dissociated communities who may see them as 'official mechanisms' to record and exhibit the recent period of civil conflict.

One could argue that personal diaries, thus, can become an important tool for humanising the 'official mechanism' and perhaps help identify potential crossovers with 'unofficial mechanisms' when responding to The Troubles. As an unofficial archive, McAtasney's diary (and later tweets) is a personal account shaped by lived experience, which exists beyond the political motivations of state funded collecting institutions such as PRONI or museums. Her entries show the subtler side of lived experience during civil conflict, the shared experience of loss, inconvenience and an attempt to understand events that she lacks the emotional maturity to truly comprehend. In the below entry, there is a naivety in McAtasney's recording and interruption of the political; it is brief, and lacks emotion or empathy, which is in contrast to the emotion and empathy narrated when it comes to her appearance, music and friendships:

> Thursday May 28
> I went to Phils with Mummy. I may get my hair cut and permed, I don't know yet. I missed TOTP tonight. A policeman was shot dead last night @ Whitecross & two IRA men were shot by an SAS soldier in Derry. John gave

[63] Claire Hackett and Bill Rolston, 'The Burden of Memory: Victims, Storytelling and Resistance in Northern Ireland', *Memory Studies* vol.2, no.3 (September 2009): pp. 355–76.
[64] Hackett and Rolston, 'The Burden of Memory'. pp. 355–76.

> me a "Smash H Block" badge. Another hunger-striker is supposed to be taking over Brendan McLaughlin. Maggie Thatcher was in Belfast today visiting.[65]

Upon reflection of this passage, McAtasney observes that

> Again, the juxtaposition appears deliberate, but it is not. It reads more like a stream of consciousness. I had an urge to record everything, convinced I needed to do so out of fear of forgetting so I had to get as much detail in as possible. Missing Top of the Pops was huge – that was my show and to not see it was devastating. It's not as if we could go back and catch up on it.[66]

The naivety helps present a nonpartisan record of events, which differs from other state and popular culture references that focus primarily on the heroes, villains, and emotion of politics.

Validation and Acknowledgement

Dissemination of personal stories, particularly of a contested past such as Northern Ireland, can have a paradoxical outcome: whilst it can offer a sense of validation and acknowledgment for people whose life experiences have been left out of official and unofficial discourses, it can also offer risks such as re-traumatisation or misrepresentation. To collect and exhibit is to remember and to remember is to validate this memory and thus validate the community, its values and truths. Hence, a carefully thought-out dissemination strategy can potentially become not only a tool 'for expressing and shaping internalised narratives' but also 'instigate different dialogues, for example on dealing with the past and on other experiences'[67].

Contemporarily museum, archives and governments use of Twitter further validates the importance of everyday personal experiences in the re-telling of history. Jean Burgess et. al. argue that the 'mediatisation' of historical institutions, presents opportunities for the introduction of new voices and the opportunity to correct historical wrongs. However, they note that such actions often exist at the periphery of an institution rather than forming part of their core collection or interpretive narrative.[68] As such, the voice of the individual distinct from the institution has a unique and different cultural and historical value. McAtasney's diary does not seek to tell 'the truth', but instead seeks to share her truth and her experience, and in doing so adds

[65] Twitter post.
[66] Interview with author.
[67] Aguiar, 'We Were There', p. 112.
[68] Aguiar, 'We Were There'

to public memory.[69]

However, one still cannot assume that speaking out will always be positive and unproblematic. This is because there is no guarantee that storytelling will work according to plan, or produce, the intended effects because of the volatility of populations strained by violence and agony.[70] Also, any project dealing with sensitive stories must consider the possibilities of dissemination and the implications that it may bring to producers, participants, audiences, and institutions that host the stories. Bringing people's stories to the public may put people in life-threatening danger, subject them to moral criticism, criminal proceedings, or simply damage their reputations.

A recent, controversial case showed very clearly the risks of dissemination: the Boston College's *Belfast Oral History Project*, a U.S.-based project headed by Irish journalist Ed Moloney and former IRA member Anthony McIntyre. It contains dozens of audio-recorded interviews with former republican and loyalist paramilitaries. Initially, participants were assured that their recordings would not be made public until their deaths, but this was later undermined by a U.S. court ruling, after the *Police Service of Northern Ireland* (PSNI) sought access to some of the recordings as part of their probing the IRA 1972 killing of Jean McConville, one of the Troubles 'disappeared'.[71] The turning over of the interviews has not only put the researchers and participants of the project in real risk of physical harm, but it has also complicated future projects dealing with the Troubles, as people may become more reticent to share stories. This case draws attention to the need to discuss with participants potential consequences of having their stories made publicly available and how storytelling projects can have long-term effects in their lives.

As well as real life-threating risks, there is the risk of re-traumatisation which cannot be ignored. Graham Dawson asks whether 'the attempt to represent the traumatic past help a survivor to come to terms with it' or it is 'risking too much, ploughing up thing too painful or disturbing to remember'.[72] Furthermore, as noted by Shaun Henry'[t]here is a danger we could become involved in an intergenerational transfer of all our hang-ups about the Troubles to a younger generation, who are, in fact, much more open-minded to things' and he urges us 'to ensure that somehow our storytelling, and our remembrance of the past, are firmly embedded in the a notion of

[69] Jean Burgess, Helen Klaebe, and Kelly McWilliam, 'Mediatisation and Institutions of Public Memory: Digital Storytelling and the Apology', *Australian Historical Studies* vol.41, no.2 (June 2010) pp. 149–65.
[70] Bhaskar Sarkar and Janet Walker, *Documentary Testimonies: Global Archives of Suffering* (London: Routledge, 2009) p. 18.
[71] Sarkar and Walker, *Documentary Testimonies*.
[72] Dawson, *Making Peace with the Past?*, p. 70.

moving forward'[73].

Therefore, when telling stories of such sensitivity it is important to thoroughly consider dissemination strategies so that these can create dialogues that will potentially promote mutual understanding and not more division or re-traumatisation. McAtasney's diary/tweets carries a dual historical and contemporary significance. They stand in their own right as a historical document, full of naïve personal bias, prejudice and emphasis towards pop music and boys. The diary also holds contemporary significance in that, through its Twitter retelling, it is providing a new framework from which recollection and memory can be channelled through shared experience, rather than the divisive framework of politics. Whilst it is important to identify a representative narrative it is also important to acknowledge the extremes of Northern Ireland's recent civil conflict in order to provide a powerful example of why peace must be maintained.

Conclusion

The ability to represent the little narratives - the individual stories and multiple perspectives has methodologically never before been so easy. Digital technology provides the opportunity to capture and distribute a vast amount of 'memory' and narratives of lived experiences. As @NornIronGirl1981 shows, the voices and experiences of those on the periphery of conflict can add depth, validity, plurality and provide a framework from which to begin to examine collective memory in a more human-centred way.

Perhaps then a compromise in response to collecting and exhibiting the Northern Ireland Troubles is seeking not to close and prevent the collection of politically sensitive subjects, but to assess and recognise the limitations and sensitivities that surround it. Perhaps then we can identify that the key curatorial or authorial dilemma 'is the dilemma of choice and selection, of learning to live with some absences while filling others'.[74] What we need in Northern Ireland is not to create an accepted, homogenised and normalised single grand narrative, but a multiplicity of narratives that reflect the varied experiences of conflict and that are found when we look at the 'other stuff. In this article, we demonstrated how McAtasney's diary and tweets, and the many other personal diaries waiting to be discovered, have much to contribute to debates around teenage experiences of war as well as to Northern Ireland's ongoing peace process.

[73] Jolene Mairs, 'Audiovisual Storytelling in Post-Conflict Northern Ireland - Participant and Audience Responses to Filming, Editing and Exhibiting Memories of the Troubles via Two Practice-Led Collaborative Documentary Film Productions' (PhD, University of Ulster, 2013), p. 221.

[74] Crooke, 'Museums and Community', p. 27.

REVIEWS

Mollie M. Madden, *The Black Prince and the Grande Chevauchée of 1355*. Warfare in History. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2018. xi + 248 pp. Hardback. ISBN: 978-1-78327-356-0. Price £60.00.

In September 1355, Edward, the Black Prince (d.1376), landed at Gascony and for the next two and half months he led a devastating *chevauchée* (a destructive raid designed to undercut a region's economic productivity), from Bordeaux on the Atlantic coast, east to Narbonne on the shores of the Mediterranean. Recent years have witnessed a growing interest in the Hundred Years War and Jonathon Sumption's multi-volume history (to date, four of the five volumes have been published) has set the benchmark for detailed narratives of the conflict. On a more regional level and, incidentally, published in the same 'Warfare in History Series', Adam Chapman's *Welsh Soldiers in the Later Middle Ages, 1282-1422* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2015) has, for example, offered a re-assessment of the role played by Welsh soldiers in the conflict. Iain MacInnes' *Scotland's Second War of Independence, 1332-1357* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2016), by comparison, has explored the 'Scottish' origins of the conflict. In the last decade, a growing body of scholarship has also been completed on the role played by other fronts (such as Italy and the Iberian Peninsula) within this conflict. In spite of these advances in scholarship, little attention has been devoted to exploring the grande *chevauchée* of 1355 and its wider significance for the Anglo-French conflict. As the author of this volume demonstrates, this issue is particularly intriguing as the *chevauchée* of 1355 offers a rich case study in the logistics of warfare in both the Hundred Years War and, the history of warfare in medieval Europe more generally. In particular, Mollie Madden argues that the English victory over the French at Poitiers in September 1356 has distracted scholars from examining the Black Prince's earlier campaign in 1355. Madden emphasises that the grande *chevauchée* not only warrants closer attention as a significant campaign in its own right (one that played an important role in laying the groundwork for the subsequent victory at Poitiers), but also as a template for studying other English campaigns.

Broadly speaking, this book is divided into two main parts. The first two chapters delve into the organisational apparatus of the Plantagenet war machine; the remaining chapters focus on the campaign itself. One of the major advantages of this study is that Madden, in addition to drawing upon the large corpus of English material, also draws attention to the milieu of French material available to historians. Chapter One focuses on the origins of the 1355 expedition. Madden argues that preparations for the expedition were well underway by the late spring of 1355 and that Edward III's decision to appoint his son as commander had important symbolic resonance: his appointment

reflected the need to show strong leadership in the face of French encroachment. A detailed examination of the systems of purveyance and supply underpinning the expedition reveals that the English government were well placed to equip and mount such long-distance and costly military operations. Chapter Two examines the recruitment process. The limitations of surviving source material make it difficult to reconstruct the precise numbers of soldiers in the Black Prince's army. Madden however, draws upon the work of other scholars both to estimate the number of troops serving in the prince's army (about 2,000 English troops, 3,000-4,000 Gascons as well as another 3,000 non-combatants). The breakdown is helpfully summarised on table 2.3 (p. 61). Madden then moves on to explore the organisational structure of the princes' army, providing a valuable insight into the composition of English armies during the Hundred Years War (Appendix 2 offers a useful top-down breakdown of army's structure). Chapters Three and Four examine the logistics behind the campaign itself. The third chapter traces the Black Prince's march from Bordeaux to Narbonne. Madden argues that it is a measure of the organisational capabilities of the English administration in Gascony that the Black Prince's army was ready to begin its march two weeks after landfall. The author then goes on to explore the impressive supply structures underpinning the prince's expedition and details a day by day account of the army's eastward progress down to mid-October when the force divided into three large groups (or battles). Chapter Four explores the return march home to Bordeaux. The English force was numerically inferior to the nearby French army under Jean (d.1373), Count of Armagnac; however, there was little Armagnac could do to stop the Black Prince's pillaging of the French countryside. Indeed, Madden suggests that the level of violence inflicted upon the region was very possibly aimed at enticing Armagnac into an open confrontation. In any case, the prince failed to force a military encounter with Armagnac. Whether or not a pitched battle with French forces was the intended objective, the Black Prince, nevertheless, inflicted considerable damage upon the region's infrastructure during the *chevauchée*. The final chapter examines the post-*chevauchée* period, linking the prince's activities in southern France with the impending Poitiers campaign.

Overall, this is an impressive study which has done a great deal to situate the grande *chevauchée* of 1355 within the broader narrative of the Hundred Years War. The book offers an interesting insight into the English crown's capacity for fitting-out, launching, and continuously supplying such large scale military ventures. Naturally, the book will of be of significant interest to scholars of the Hundred Years War. It should also attract a readership for those working in the area of medieval English history more generally

(social historians will be interested in Madden's work on purveyance) as well as those studying warfare in Europe during the Middle Ages.

SIMON EGAN
University of Glasgow, UK

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.824

Arran Johnston, *On Gladsmuir Shall the Battle Be! The Battle of Prestonpans 1745*. Solihull: Helion & Company Ltd, 2017. Xviii+226pp. ISBN 978-1-911512-83-7 (hardback). Price £25.

The battle of Prestonpans is well enough known as the first major encounter of the Jacobite Rising of 1745. It is usually addressed - quite often in some detail - in histories of the Rising, but it is very much rarer for it to enjoy a book-length study, as it was only temporarily decisive and the scale of the victory it represented is diminished by the conclusion of the Rising of 1745 in the overwhelming and decisive defeat of Culloden, adopted by British historiography as a foundational battle in the history of the British Empire and the rise of the United Kingdom to global prominence.

How then does Arran Johnston justify a 250 page study of the fight at Prestonpans, where fewer than 5000 troops were involved on both sides? Shrewdly, he rests his case on the view that without a Jacobite victory at Prestonpans the significance of the '45 would be as a footnote in history, something analogous to Glenshiel in 1719. He points out also the sense - from which the early title 'Gladsmuir' derived - of the battle as a fulfillment of Scottish historical prophecy.

There is much to commend in this study. The welcome use of the title 'British Army' to describe Cope's forces is completely correct and overdue: British regulars are still exposed to being called 'Government' troops or even worse 'Hanoverian' ones in this one context alone. This detaches them from their role, and their link - especially later in the campaign - to George II's personal leadership at Dettingen, and to the Continental firefights of the War of the Austrian Succession in which many of them had been involved. The '45 was an existential threat to the British state, which defended itself using - not solely, but centrally - the British Army.

Johnston's historical geography - the approach to Prestonpans, the sense of its status as an industrial site even in 1745 and at 'the cutting edge of Scotland's agricultural and industrial revolutions' (p. 38) - is very detailed and draws the reader in to both the age

and the place powerfully. The family and military background of John Cope is explored in detail, as is that of Charles Edward. Familiar ground is trodden in reciting the journey to Scotland in 1745, the Seven Men of Moidart and so forth, and - because quite traditional historiographical paradigms about the 'Highland army' and the expedition are on show, there is a sense here of padding: do we really need a full narrative of the 'Forty-five every time one of its elements is studied? The basics are readily available online, often it is true in a misleading historiographical format, but then there is nothing new on show here. Frank McLynn's *France and the Jacobite Rising of 1745* (1981) remains unanswered in its demonstration of the extent and partial sincerity of the potential French commitment, but the book does not appear in the bibliography, nor does much else pertinent to the modern historiography of the Rising. The sources for this central section are a mixture of primary material, clan histories and elderly secondary texts. Key questions, such as the reason for the opening of the Netherbow Port in Edinburgh, are elided as a 'mystery'. The collusion of the Lord Provost - widely suspected, but never proved in law - is an interesting question, and one which would bear fuller revisiting if - as Johnston does - more than 80 pages is to be spent on the campaign prior to the battle. There are only seven or eight modern secondary studies relating to Jacobitism in the bibliography.

Johnston does give full weight to the presence of Jacobite firearms at the battle, though is perhaps rather ready to assume that Morier and the Penicuik sketches have no hint of propaganda or caricature about them. Prestonpans does appear to have been the last engagement at which Lochaber axes were used, and this is discussed. The geography of the field itself is laid out in painstaking and precise detail, and is some of the very best study of the battle available, while the stress on the 'day one' conflict on 20 September is also excellent.

The implications of the military nature of the engagement are detailed, but perhaps explored to a little less depth than the field itself. The narrow Jacobite column (p. 157) was in keeping with French deployment, while the premature deployment of the dragoons, repeated at Falkirk and based on assumptions about Jacobite vulnerability to cavalry, was a tactical mistake which Cumberland (or Bland) corrected at Culloden, to devastating effect. The account of the collapse of Cope's line and artillery is well done, though it is worth noting that the British Army firing system under the 1727 regulations could not cope with rapid advance in a narrow fronted column: it failed to cope at Falkirk, and was changed for Culloden and in the 1748 Regulations. Closer examination of weapons systems, tactics and drill in action might have given even greater depth to Johnston's account here.

Both the aftermath and memorialization of the battle are well covered. Arran Johnston has produced the fullest and most detailed study yet of Prestonpans, and for that

reason alone this book is worth having on the shelves of anyone interested in the Jacobite movement.

MURRAY PITTOCK
University of Glasgow, UK

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.831

Robert A. Geake with Lorin M. Spears, *From Slaves to Soldiers: the 1st Rhode Island Regiment in the American Revolution*. Yardley, PA: Westholme Publishing, 2016. 184pp. ISBN 97-8159-4162-688 (hardback). £19.99.

Books, articles, monuments, and oral testimonies about The First Rhode Island Regiment, reorganized deep into the long American Revolution as the so-called 'Black Regiment', have attracted attention since abolitionists in the 1850s touted the valour of free blacks and former slaves in fighting against the British. A century later, Lorenzo Greene and Benjamin Quarles began to thicken the story of the Black Regiment. Now, in the last two decades, spurred by the Rhode Island Black Heritage Society and also by the efforts of white military historians, a clutch of new books and essays have presented new accounts of the integrated and then segregated First Rhode Island Regiment. The book under review here is the latest entry into what has become a controversial chapter of American military history.

Episodic and sparsely footnoted, *From Slaves to Soldiers* leaves the reader unaware of much of the First Regiment's history. For example, in Chapter 2, while diverting the reader with descriptions of the Stono Rebellion in South Carolina in 1739, the authors provide only the sketchiest details in the status and backgrounds of the Narragansett and other indigenous people recruited for the First Rhode Island Regiment after the Rhode Island Assembly reconstituted it in January 1778 by offering compensation to masters willing to free their slaves. One learns only that they were drawn from 'remaining indigenous people [who] were enslaved, indentured, or displaced from their traditional villages' (pp. 42-43). Also ignored is the enlistment of free blacks and indigenous males in the two years *before* the formation of the Black Regiment. Far from 'just a few blacks being integrated into a handful of regiments' in Washington's Continental Army, some fifty to seventy-five men of colour were among about five hundred rank and file soldiers in Rhode Island First and Second regiments that fought from Bunker Hill to Red Bank to Monmouth Courthouse from 1775 to 1777,

constituting at least 10 percent of the enlistees when free blacks and Native Americans were less than half that percentage in the population at large.

Chapter 3 on the war experiences of the Black Regiment is limited to three combat actions: the Battle of Rhode Island on August 29, 1778, where the Black Regiment helped the Continental Army retreat from the swarming British and Hessians on Aquidneck Island; the disaster that befell one part of the regiment in April 1781, where its commander, Colonel Christopher Greene, was surprised at dawn and slaughtered with a number of black and white soldiers at their outpost on the Croton River in Connecticut; and the participation of part of the Black Regiment at Yorktown in October 1781. The gaps in this coverage - for 32 months from September 1778 to April 1781 the regiment spent much of this period guarding Rhode Island's coast and labouring in fascine production - are amply filled by the exhaustive accounts of Daniel G. Popek in his recent *They '. . . fought bravely, but were unfortunate;' The True Story of Rhode Island's 'Black Regiment' and the Failure of Segregation in Rhode Island's Continental Line, 1777-1783* (2016).

Of special significance is the question of racially integrated versus segregated Continental Army units. This book skids by the fact that enlisted free men of colour—African born, African American, mixed race, and indigenous--in Rhode Island's First and Second Regiments were integrated with white rank and file soldiers until January 1778; performed well in their integrated units at Fort Mercer and Fort Mifflin on the Delaware River; and in the winter of 1777-78 at Valley Forge deserted the Continental encampment in much smaller percentages than white soldiers. But when men of colour were transferred out of these integrated units and assigned in the early months of 1778 to the newly formed 'Black Regiment' (where all the officers and non-commissioned officers were white), their performance was less than glorious. In Geake and Spears's telling, they fought courageously in trying to repulse the advancing opponents at the Battle of Rhode Island. Other accounts have it differently, charging that they fled the field of battle in disarray. Though not mentioned in this abbreviated book, what is not in dispute is that the Black Regiment never mutinied, as did the white Second Regiment (three times in 1779 alone).

Also undisclosed in this book is that after Rhode Island's legislature mandated a new recruitment of six-month soldiers in June 1780, the rank and file of the Black Regiment, never numbering more than about 150, were assigned to two companies, the Sixth and Eighth, of the Rhode Island Continental Battalion. For Washington this marked the end of 'the name and appearance of a Black Corps.' But in fact, when the Rhode Islanders went sent south in the summer of 1781 as part of the Continental Army's showdown with the British at Yorktown, all but two or three men of colour fought in the all-coloured Sixth and Eighth. In this sense, the 'experiment in segregation', as one historian puts it, did not come to an end. What is agreed upon is that the black soldiers

acquitted themselves admirably in the climactic siege of Yorktown, where some of them were at the point of the spear in attacking a key British redoubt.

Though far from comprehensive, this book extends our understanding of the First Regiment by tracing the lives of some of the long-suffering veterans who survived the war. Three appendices list whites, blacks, and indigenous Rhode Islanders who fought in the war along with a list of slaves who fled to the British and survived to be evacuated by the British ships carrying them from New York to Halifax, Nova Scotia in1783.

GARY NASH
University of California, Los Angeles, USA

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.830

Geert van Uythoven, *The Secret Expedition: the Anglo–Russian Invasion of North Holland, 1799*. Warwick: Helion and Company, 2018. 448pp. ISBN 978-1-912390-20-5 (hardback). Price £29.99.

The British military campaigns of the French Revolutionary War (1793–1802) are notoriously under-studied, and the invasion of Holland in 1799 is particularly so. The assault was Britain's major contribution to the European theatre during the Second Coalition. While Austria and Russia challenged French incursions into Italy and Switzerland, a joint Anglo–Russian force composed of around 40,000 men landed at the Helder in North Holland and marched on Amsterdam. The immediate aim was to overthrow the French satellite state known as the 'Batavian Republic' and restore the hereditary Stadtholderate under Willem V. The invasion did not succeed: every retreat pushed the Franco–Dutch forces closer to their supply base in Amsterdam; the British and Russians rapidly fell out; and with the autumn rains approaching and no chance of a decisive battle, the Allies signed an armistice and evacuated. Anglo–Russian diplomatic relations were badly shaken by the debacle. Within months, Tsar Paul I pulled Russia out of the Second Coalition and founded an 'Armed Neutrality' of northern maritime powers in an attempt to undermine Britain's naval supremacy.

The campaign's failure helps explain why it has not been studied as much as it should have been, given its impact on British continental relations at a critical stage of the wars with France. A.B. Rodger's *The Second Coalition: a Strategic Commentary* (Oxford: University Press, 1964) and Piers Mackesy's *Statesmen at War: the Strategy of Overthrow* (London: Longmans, 1974) were for a long time the only major texts on the topic. A

new interpretation of the campaign that takes recent historiography into account has thus been long overdue. Philip Ball's *A Waste of Blood and Treasure: the Anglo–Russian Invasion of the Netherlands, 1799* (Barnsley: Pen and Sword Books, 2017) partially filled that niche from the British perspective. Geert van Uythoven's *The Secret Expedition* follows hard on the heels of Ball's monograph and aims to give 'a balanced, detailed, and complete account of the events taking place during the invasion … based on source material from all participating countries'.

In this it is reasonably successful, and its major strength lies in its international quality. Uythoven is no stranger to the campaign, having already published a Dutch monograph on the subject, *Voorwaarts, Bataven!* (Zaltbommel: Europese Bibliotheek, 1999). *The Secret Expedition* builds and expands on his original research to present the French and Dutch side of the campaign on an equal footing with the British and Russian perspective. Uythoven uses a number of German and French sources to round out his story, and some of the book's most interesting passages deal with the impact of the French occupation (and of the Anglo–Russian attempt to overturn it) on the existing conflict that had already been going on for decades between 'Patriots' and 'Orangists'. The chapter on the abortive attempt to provoke an Orangist rising to coincide with the British invasion is particularly fascinating, and covers an aspect rarely explored by existing English-language sources. The author is obviously very familiar with the terrain and has walked the ground. The battles are minutely described and matched with several useful maps, as well as modern photographs of important sites.

These are undeniable advantages that should recommend this book to any scholar of military operations during the wars with revolutionary France. Despite this, Uythoven's book is not perfect. He is over-fond of immensely long quotations from primary sources (some as much as two pages in length) and rarely interrogates them in much depth. When he does, the accompanying commentary does not always square with the contents of the quotation. One source (pp. 55–6) was cited as a description of 'the state the British military was in at this time' (1799), but turned out to be a retrospective written in 1836 describing the British army in peacetime. Uythoven also makes at least one serious misattribution: a quotation credited to Lord Cornwallis, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (p. 349), in fact came from the pen of a late 19th century local historian from Jersey. Finally, and slightly worryingly for a book on such a thinly-covered topic, the text is lacking in broader historiographical context. Of the items in the 11-page bibliography, fewer than 30 were published in the last 100 years, and only six appeared since the year 2000. There are some odd omissions – no Roger Knight on the British war effort; no Paul Schroeder on the international context; and A.B. Rodger's book on the Second Coalition is inexplicably absent. This does not detract from the quality of the book's analyses of the battles, but the result is nevertheless slightly claustrophobic.

Taken altogether, Uythoven has produced a solid contribution to the neglected field of French Revolutionary War history, and a much-needed corrective to an overly British view of the struggle. It is by no means the last word, but Uythoven's book will make it much more difficult for English-speaking historians to ignore the Dutch aspect of one of Britain's most significant continental campaigns during the 1790s.

JACQUELINE REITER
Independent scholar and author, UK

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.832

Charles J. Esdaile, *Napoleon, France and Waterloo: The Eagle Rejected*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2017. 257pp. ISBN 9781473870826 (hardback). £25.

Those who have any interest in history, from the novice to the professional historian, at some point inevitably ponder the alternative outcomes of a specific historical event. The first chapter of Professor Charles Esdaile's *Napoleon, France and Waterloo: The Eagle Rejected* is very much in this genre. Although Esdaile utilizes accounts from French and Anglo-Dutch participants to paint the picture of Napoleon's *victory* at Waterloo, his point of divergence with history comes when Wellington, rather than Uxbridge, was escorted from the field to have his leg amputated. In the aftermath of Wellington's departure, an overwhelmed Uxbridge issued orders for the Anglo-Dutch army to retreat. Napoleon had won. In this somewhat unorthodox book, Professor Esdaile tells us that while this alternative ending is purely 'fantasy', it was 'by no means implausible' (16). The question of what if Napoleon had won at Waterloo lingers throughout this relatively short book.

In accordance with what appears to be his life-long professional mission, if not obsession, Professor Esdaile seeks in this work to cast another harpoon into his white whale: the Napoleonic Legend and, by extension, Napoleon himself. The opening line of his Preface states: 'Two hundred years on from the fall of Napoleon, one thing is certain, and that is that the Napoleonic Legend is as strong today as it ever was' (viii). It may as well be 'to the last I grapple with thee; from hell's heart I stab at thee; for hate's sake I spit my last breath at thee', so seethed Herman Melville's Captain Ahab. Esdaile ever strives to deconstruct the Legend and to reject the notion that Napoleon stood for anything that may be interpreted as progressive or commendable. Many of the eyewitness accounts that Esdaile cites are British rather than French; the few French contemporaries that he does cite are well-known for their hatred of Napoleon; and most of the French historians he cites are likewise anti-Bonaparte. He chastises

numerous modern historians, including respected scholars such as Michael Broers, Alan Forrest, and Stephen Englund for finding in Napoleon a reformer 'who was genuinely committed to building a new social and political order that was in many respects admirable' (viii). He continues by expressing his disgust that 'Napoleon remains a figure who continues to be associated not just with such personal qualities as romance, heroism and adventure, nor even with military genius, but also with freedom, progress, democracy, and all the advances of the modern world' (viii). Esdaile seems genuinely bothered by the fact that the merchandise at the Waterloo gift shop gives the impression that Napoleon did indeed triumph at Waterloo. This of course is used to reinforce Esdaile's contention that Napoleon may have lost the war but he won the peace, thanks to the Legend.

The purpose of *Napoleon, France and Waterloo: The Eagle Rejected* is to put into words what anyone who has studied the matter even in brief already recognizes: that had Napoleon actually won the battle of Waterloo on 18 June 1815, the chances of him winning the war remained remote at best. Regardless, Esdaile seeks to answer the question of what might have happened had Napoleon won at Waterloo. This paradigm is Professor Esdaile's *Pequod*, upon which he sails the literary seas to reject 'the simplicities of such Bonapartist apologists as Henri Houssaye', whose four substantial volumes on 1814 and 1815 he sees as 'deeply misleading' due to Houssaye's contention that Napoleon had the support of the masses in 1814 and 1815. Although Esdaile successfully uses the first chapter to employ alternative history as a hook to draw the unsuspecting reader into the book, he firmly rejects the idea that *Napoleon, France and Waterloo* is an exercise in counterfactual history. Instead, he asserts that he has produced a 'scholarly examination of a series of concrete situations from which certain conclusions may be drawn as to the likelihood of what would have transpired had Napoleon triumphed at Waterloo' (xi). While this is the very definition of counterfactual history, Esdaile does devote a portion of the book to evaluating the situation in 1814, while the rest of the work serves to propose and examine possible scenarios of the aftermath of a French victory on 18 June 1815.

At times, Professor Esdaile asks too much of the 'concrete situations' from which he seeks to draw his conclusions, leaving the reader to think that evidence is used to fit the argument rather than to make an argument. Nevertheless, there is much in Professor Esdaile's book to commend. It is provocative and has much merit, and is certainly well worth reading, beneficial to both the novice and the scholar.

MICHAEL LEGGIERE
University of North Texas, USA

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.828

Frank Ledwidge, *Aerial Warfare: The Battle for the Skies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. 184pp. ISBN 978-0-19-881813-7 (hardback). Price £12.99.

At first glance one might assume there is little requirement for yet another general survey of the history of air power, particularly in a volume as slim as *Aerial Warfare: The Battle for the Skies*. On closer inspection however, one realises that general surveys of air power are actually few and far between and there are even fewer as concise and reliable as Dr Ledwidge's work.

Past histories of air power, both popular and academic, have tended to restrict themselves within self-imposed boundaries of one sort or another. There are surveys that examine various individual national approaches to air power and there are those that confine themselves to defined wars or campaigns. Then there are works that concentrate on technological development, or certain air power theorists and practitioners or individual strands of air power such as strategic bombing or support to the land battle. The strength of Dr Ledwidge's work is that it does all of these things.

Aerial Warfare takes the reader from the earliest appearance of air power in balloons at the end of the eighteenth century through reconnaissance, air-to-air combat, strategic bombing, nuclear warfare, counter insurgency and stealth right up to contemporary thoughts on space and cyber warfare with a score of other strands and topics in between. Dr Ledwidge has generally approached his subject chronologically but has woven in the doctrinal thinking of influential air power theorists throughout. Boelcke, Boyd, Douhet, Seversky, Warden and a dozen others all make frequent appearances, which are not restricted solely to their own era. *Aerial Warfare* also ranges far and wide to highlight relevant and important developments in air power and includes examples from the Sino-Japanese War, the Arab-Israeli and the Indo-Pakistan wars. South America is perhaps a blind spot but the shortcomings of the Argentinian air force during the 1982 Falklands War are ably dealt with.

A keen student of air power might point out that none of this is very different to the work in Professor Jeremy Black's excellent 2016 survey, *Air Power: A Global Review*. However, what Professor Black manages in 386 pages Dr Ledwidge has achieved in just 184. At first this brevity might appear to be a weakness, for instance developments during the First World War are dealt with in just sixteen pages but, in fact, *Aerial Warfare's* concision is its strength. Dr Ledwidge has successfully extracted and presented the key doctrines and developments associated with each era, technology and theorist, woven them together and supported them with an array of examples and statistics. The result is eminently readable and manageable in a single sitting. One criticism is the paucity of references and the absence of any links to the text, which is frustrating but, on the other hand, a mass of footnotes might slow the pace of this

particular approach. Nevertheless, this is a reliable and readable survey that should prove particularly useful to those beginning on a path through air power studies.

JOHN GREENACRE
University of Suffolk, UK

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.826

Nigel Atter, *In the Shadow of Bois Hugo: The 8th Lincolns at the Battle of Loos*. Helion & Co., 2017. 144pp. ISBN: 9781911512776 (paperback). Price £16.95.

In the Shadow of Bois Hugo is a short volume that deals with the experience of 8th (Service) Battalion, Lincolnshire Regiment, during the ill-fated Battle of Loos in September 1915. Atter, an independent scholar, has written an attractive and well-illustrated account that deals with one of the New Army battalions that went into action on the second day of the battle (26 September 1915). During the action the Lincolns suffered a terrible baptism of fire, sustaining heavy losses around a small copse known as Bois Hugo. Atter is at pains to argue that far from 'bolting' from the action without good cause (as has sometimes been claimed), the battalion fought with courage and determination and, as such, 'deserves much better from contemporary historians'.

Over the course of nine chapters, Atter discusses the formation of the battalion and then goes through the development of British offensive operations on the Western Front during 1915, which led up to the Battle of Loos. The text then moves on to the first and second days of the fighting, before looking at the lessons of the battle. Seven appendices then complete the volume, including a roll of honour, selections of letters, a list of those who became prisoners-of-war, and the known graves of those who fell. Indeed, there are so many chapters, sub-chapters, headings and sub-headings, that it sometimes feels more like a series of lists and gobbets than a work of considered historical analysis. For example in the chapter on the first day, Atter provides a cursory description of the events of 25 September, with short sections on the involvement of each division, most of which are only incidental to the fate of the Lincolns. Chapter 7 is entitled 'Analysis' and is followed by chapter 8, 'The Lessons of Loos' (composed of only three or four short paragraphs), before we get to the final conclusion. This surely would have been improved by combining them all together in a more considered concluding section. As a result, the book often feels broken up and fragmentary.

In the Shadow of Bois Hugo does well at examining a New Army battalion that has escaped previous attention from historians, albeit for perfectly understandable reasons

(it being one minor part of a battle that has, itself, been overlooked). Atter does, however, claim a greater significance for the volume than it perhaps warrants. He argues that the book challenges the historiography of the battle, which has been critical of the New Army divisions generally (including 8/Lincolns), claiming that they were routed or 'bolted' from the battlefield. Atter believes that this is incorrect and defends the battalion from such a calumny. While some historians have made broad comments to this effect, it must be stated that my work on Loos (*Loos 1915*, published in 2006), which examines the experience of the reserve divisions in detail, does not come to this conclusion. It defended the performance of these units and argued that the idea of a 'wild panic' from the battlefield was 'unlikely'. But Atter does not cite this, which is surprising.

In the Shadow of Bois Hugo is an interesting account, written by someone with a deep attachment to the subject, but ultimately it will be of interest only to specialists in the field or those with a specific connection to the Lincolns.

NICK LLOYD
King's College London
at the Joint Services Command and Staff College
Defence Academy of the United Kingdom

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.829

Peter Sikora, *The Polish 'Few': Polish Airmen in the Battle of Britain*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2018. xvii + pp. 574. ISBN: 978-1526-714855. Price £30.00.

Peter Sikora's study of the Polish 'few' begins not in 1940 but with a more contemporary story. He says that 'A few years ago' (it was actually 2009), a British political party (which Sikora did not name) had used a picture of a Spitfire on a leaflet which was critical of immigration. Sentiment in Britain against immigration was at that time focused on people coming from eastern Europe, perhaps especially Poland. The un-named political party (it was the British National Party) had not done their homework, for the Spitfire pictured was very obviously flown by a Polish pilot, displaying as it did the distinctive red and white checkerboard. The error was repeated by the right-wing group Britain First in 2014.

The ignorance shown by these groups can hardly be because the role of Poles in the Royal Air Force in 1939-45 has been completely 'forgotten' in the UK. There are visible signs on both the Battle of Britain memorial near Folkestone unveiled in 1993,

and the Polish War Memorial in Ruislip unveiled as long ago as 1948. Television and film representations of the war have for decades been replete with airmen wearing 'POLAND' on the shoulder of their RAF uniforms. The 2018 film *Hurricane* has more recently brought the story to a new audience. What has been lacking, however, is the sort of painstaking research carried out by Peter Sikora in this comprehensive volume. Nearly half of the book is an encyclopedia rather than a narrative, containing detailed biographies of the 145 Polish pilots in the Battle of Britain. These represent very thorough research: life stories of all the men, focusing on the wartime years but also containing information on, for example, the naming of streets in Poland after the pilots.

As for the narrative, there is some useful context-setting beyond the immediate circumstances of 1940, going back to the presence of Poles among Russian Tsarist airmen based at Northolt in 1917. The story of Poles fleeing first to France in 1939 and then on to Britain is well-told by Sikora who provides rich sources of material on how they adjusted to a new country. The book is full of insights into the practicalities of this, including British tea being strange to Polish tastes. However, as the title suggests, the book is primarily about the air war above Britain in 1940. Sikora skillfully reconstructs the minutiae of the conflict into an engaging narrative. Much of that is focused on the two Polish fighter squadrons, 302 and especially 303 which as a member of 11 Group was in the frontline for longer than was 302's 12 Group. Indeed, 303 Squadron famously became the highest-scoring RAF squadron during the Battle of Britain. In telling this story, Sikora has engaged with previous work on the subject and used his findings to tackle some problems with previous writing. For example, his research shows that a visit by King George VI to 303 Squadron at Northolt on 26 September 1940 did not, as often thought, involve the King leaving when the squadron was suddenly given the order to scramble. Instead, the King witnessed the squadron's action from the Operations Room, greeting the pilots as they returned. Beyond the story of 302 and 303 squadrons, Sikora's diligent research has led him to Poles serving in several other squadrons, so this is as complete a story of the contribution of Polish pilots to the Battle of Britain as it would be possible to tell.

There is always a limit to how much information can be included in a book which is already lengthy. However, it would have been interesting to know more about Group Captain Kwieciński, who was the Polish military and air attaché in Britain. The interest in him comes from the fact that he had served in the German air force in Palestine in the First World War and was held captive by the British. A little more on his story would have been fascinating. Footnotes would have been helpful in the biographies (which do not have any), including at least the key sources for the 145, as they might have been an aid to other researchers.

Of the 145 Polish pilots in the Battle of Britain, twenty-nine were killed during it. Another thirty-three were killed later in the war and three died in flying accidents

afterwards. Nearly three-quarters of the survivors did not return to Communist Poland, with a few of the 'few' remaining in the RAF. Others were not welcome in Britain and told they had to leave. By the time the book appeared, none of the Polish 'few' survived. Had they lived to see it, they would have had good reason to feel that the story of their involvement in the Battle of Britain had at last been set down in the detail it deserves.

RICHARD S. GRAYSON
Goldsmiths, University of London, UK

DOI https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.825

Mark Edele, *Stalin's Defectors: How Red Army Soldiers became Hitler's Collaborators, 1941-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. ISBN: 978-0198798156 (hardback). 224pp. Price £60.00.

In no other allied army during the Second World War was the problem of defection so severe as in the Red Army. Nowhere else did the phenomenon of defection generate such political controversy as in the post-war Soviet Union. Moreover, in modern-day Russia, where historical memory continues to be shaped by on-going political, economic, and military struggles, the study of Red Army defectors is shackled to a nationalist historiography (p. 163). For these reasons, Mark Edele's fascinating book is important and not only for its much-needed forensic examination of Red Army defectors. This study of Red Army defectors is a 'military history from below' (p. 8), encompassing social, cultural, and detailed statistical analyses. More broadly, the book presents convincing challenges to recent research on popular support for Stalinism. In this way, Edele's book will remain the definitive account of defection in the Red Army and it moves contested debates about the nature of Soviet society further forward.

Stalin's Defectors is structured into nine chapters that systematically examine the phenomenon of Red Army defections. By way of introduction, chapter one begins with the case of Major Ivan Kononov, a Soviet defector who gave himself up to the Germans along with his unit in August 1941. Kononov would later organise one of the first units to fight against the Soviets for the Nazis. Yet Kononov's motivation – that of deep political opposition to the Stalinist regime – was untypical. As Edele shows, the vast majority of defectors were not in fact ideologically motivated traitors; they were 'refugees from Stalinism' seeking escape from death, dictatorship, and total war. Survival was the primary motivating factor (p. 10).

Edele's research base is impressive, drawing upon archival documents from various Russian, German, Australian, and American archives; and also incorporating a multitude of personal accounts, memoirs, and interviews giving detailed insight into individual defections. Moreover, in his chapter on the numbers of defections, Edele puts his appeal for historians to make better use of statistics into practice. Despite difficult and fragmentary evidence for defections in 1941, Edele's analysis reveals that 117,000 Soviet soldiers at the very least crossed the front line during the war. He reveals other surprising trends. For instance, the share of defections among Soviet POWs actually increased as the war persisted. A string of Red Army victories and subsequent fighting on non-Soviet soil from 1942 actually increased the likelihood of voluntary surrender (p. 33).

In his chapter on the obstacles to defection, Edele covers the serious risks undertaken by crossing the front line, including the danger of being shot on sight and the use of violence and coercion within units. In sum, both German and Soviet actions worked together to create 'extremely strong incentives against surrender'. That so many Red Army soldiers still took the risk makes the decision to defect even more impressive (p. 57).

Over subsequent chapters, Edele discusses defection scenarios; profiles; motivations, and the substance of collaborations. What is clear from reading Edele's book is how defections cannot be adequately understood with clear-cut categories. The 'ideal' defector profile is very difficult to pin down. Moreover, defections themselves were similarly varied, spanning those with peaceful outcomes to cases involving far more violence. Motivations spanned from deep anti-Bolshevism to a basic fight for survival, with the majority of defectors expressing defeatism rather than a willingness to take up arms against the Stalinist regime (p. 119).

In the final chapters Edele discusses how Red Army defections have been presented inside and outside the Soviet Union. However, for historians of Soviet society, the chapter focused on the 'implications' of defections engages with on-going debates about popular support for Stalinism. Challenging a recent school of thought emphasising ideology and 'Stalinist subjectivity' as underpinning Stalinism (that ordinary citizens were ideologically committed and their worldviews shaped by official discourse), Edele instead convincingly argues for a mass sense of defeatism in Soviet society from the very start of the war. Rather than place too great emphasis on the power of ideology, to understand Soviet society at war – and with it Red Army defectors - we need to better understand how the state was able to motivate (or coerce), with varying success, the mass of the non-committed majority (p. 174).

PETER WHITEWOOD
York St John University, UK

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.833

Benjamin A. Cowan. *Securing Sex: Morality and Repression in the Making of Cold War Brazil*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016. 340pp. ISBN:978-1-4696-2750-2 (paperback). Price £36.95.

Benjamin Cowan's extensive research into the archives of right-wing ideologues, both non-military and civilian, fills an important lacuna in the history of Brazil's military dictatorship from 1964 to 1985. While often seen as less repressive than the dictatorship in Argentina where approximately 30,000 Argentines disappeared and never reappeared, in Brazil, by Cowan's admission, fewer than 500 died at the hands of the military, while hundreds disappeared. It is worth noting that Argentina had a population of about 33 million, while Brazil had about 92 million. For these reasons and others, the history of right-wing ideology in Brazil seemed less pressing. Cowan noted in his introduction that the 1930s dictatorship of Getúlio Vargas often sabotaged the efforts of conservatives. But, as Cowen states: 'Right-wing culture warriors were not all powerful…. They did, however, play a key ideological role.' (p. 11)

In the 1960s and 1970s, inspired by 1930s *integralista* fascists, conservative Catholicism, and unfashionable scientific and philosophical writers from all over the world, Brazilian culture warriors had new opportunities to define morality, especially among the young and the sexually liberated. Although Cowan does not mention this, Brazil at this time had a very large proportion of youths under 15 who were already, or about to reach puberty in 1966 just at the time that rock and roll, the pill, and anti-militarism and world youth movements became visible through movies and music.

As Cowen proceeds from topic to topic, it appears that the right was all powerful, placed in important governmental and military positions. By the 1960s they confronted demands for divorce, abortion, birth control and women's rights—all unacceptable. Sexual promiscuity, both heterosexual and homosexual were anathema while the rest of the world extolled sexual rights. No wonder that later military governments subsidized a uniquely Brazilian form of cinema soft porn called *pornochanchadas* to keep the public away from American and European movies. Military governments even considered allowing the sale of contraceptives.

No wonder the right was defeated not by youths, but by the same military governments that had once promised to enforce morality. By the 1980s many of the children so feared by the right, had become adults and shared the values of world youths. So, they sabotaged the efforts of the right to impose a moralism no longer popular among the majority of the population.

Furthermore, as Cowan noted, the Brazilian left, including the communists, were as socially and sexually conservative as parts of the right. Thus the right's fears of a sexually degenerate Cuba in Brazil, never became a reality, and the fact that most Brazilians lived in the interior, far from the reach of leftist politics reinforced this.

Even though the Brazilian alt-right culture warriors did not win the day, Cowan is to be congratulated for uncovering their extensive publications in a variety of sources. He does a thorough analysis of these diverse writings, and provides a frightening portrait of a possible 'modern' Brazil.

DONNA J GUY
Ohio State University, USA

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25602/GOLD.bjmh.v5i1.827

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES (July 2019)

Articles

The British Journal of Military History (the BJMH or Journal) welcomes the submission of articles on military history in the broadest sense, and without restriction as to period or region. The BJMH particularly welcomes articles on subjects that might not ordinarily receive much attention but which clearly show the topic has been properly researched.

Papers submitted to the BJMH must not have been published elsewhere.

The editors are happy to consider papers that are under consideration elsewhere on the condition that the author indicates to which other journals the article has been submitted.

Authors should submit their article manuscripts, including an abstract of no more than 100 words, as an MS Word or RTF file attached to an e-mail addressed to the BJMH Co-editors at editor@bjmh.org.uk.

Authors must provide appropriate contact details including your full mailing address.

The editors are keen to encourage article submissions from a variety of scholars and authors, regardless of their academic background. For those papers that demonstrate great promise and significant research but are offered by authors who have yet to publish, or who need further editorial support, the editors may be able to offer mentoring to ensure an article is successfully published within the Journal.

The BJMH is a 'double blind' peer-reviewed journal, that is, communication between reviewers and authors is anonymised and is managed by the Editorial Team. All papers that the editors consider appropriate for publication will be submitted to at least two suitably qualified reviewers, chosen by the editorial team, for comment. Subsequent publication is dependent on receiving satisfactory comments from reviewers. Authors will be sent copies of the peer reviewers' comments.

Following peer review and any necessary revision by the author, articles will be edited for publication in the Journal. The editors may propose further changes in the interest of clarity and economy of expression, although such changes will not be made without consultation with the author. The editors are the final arbiters of usage, grammar, and length.

Articles should be no more than 8000 words in length (including footnotes) and be set out according to the BJMH Style Guide which is based on the Chicago Manual of Style.

Authors should note that articles may be rejected if they do not conform to the Journal's Style Guide and/or they exceed the word count.

Also note that the Journal editors endorse the importance of thorough referencing in scholarly works. In cases where citations are incomplete or do not follow the format specified in the Style Guide throughout the submitted article, the paper **will** be returned to the author for correction **before** it is accepted for peer review.

Authors are encouraged to supply relevant artwork (maps, charts, line drawings, and photographs) with their essays. The author is responsible for citing the sources and obtaining permission to publish any copyrighted material.

The submission of an article, book review, or other communication is taken by the editors to indicate that the author willingly transfers the copyright to the BJMH and to the British Commission for Military History. However, the BJMH and the British Commission for Military History freely grant the author the right to reprint his or her piece, if published, in the author's own works. Upon the Journal's acceptance of an article the author will be sent a contract and an assignment of copyright.

The British Journal of Military History, acting on behalf of the British Commission for Military History, does not accept responsibility for statements, either of fact or opinion, made by contributors.

Book Reviews

The BJMH seeks to publish concise, accessible and well-informed reviews of books relevant to the topics covered by the Journal. Reviews are published as a service to the readership of the BJMH and should be of use to a potential reader in deciding whether or not to buy or read that book. The range of books reviewed by the BJMH reflects the field of military history, taken in the widest sense. Books published by academic publishers, general commercial publishers, and specialist military history imprints may all be considered for review in the Journal.

Reviews of other types of publication such as web resources may also be commissioned.

The Journal's Editorial Team is responsible for commissioning book reviews and for approaching reviewers. From time to time a list of available books for review may be issued, together with an open call for potential reviewers to contact the Journal Editors. The policy of the BJMH is for reviews always to be solicited by the editors rather than for book authors to propose reviewers themselves. In all cases, once a

reviewer has been matched with a book, the Editorial Team will arrange for them to be sent a review copy.

Book reviews should generally be of about 700 words and must not exceed 1000 words in length.

A review should summarise the main aims and arguments of the work, should evaluate its contribution and value to military history as broadly defined, and should identify to which readership(s) the work is most likely to appeal. The Journal does not encourage personal comment or attacks in the reviews it publishes, and the Editorial Team reserves the right to ask reviewers for revisions to their reviews. The final decision whether or not to publish a review remains with the Editorial Team.

The Editorial Team may seek the views of an author of a book that has been reviewed in the Journal. Any comment from the author may be published.

All submitted reviews should begin with the bibliographic information of the work under review, including the author(s) or editor(s), the title, the place and year of publication, the publisher, the number of pages, the ISBN for the format of the work that has been reviewed, and the price for this format if available. Prices should be given in the original currency, but if the book has been published in several territories including the UK then the price in pounds sterling should be supplied. The number of illustrations and maps should also be noted if present. An example of the heading of a review is as follows:

James Gow, *The Serbian Project and its Adversaries: a Strategy of War Crimes*. London: Hurst, 2003. xii + 322 pp. 1 map. ISBN 978-1850654995 (Paperback). Price £17.50.

The reviewer's name, and an institutional affiliation if relevant, should be appended at the bottom of the review, name in Capitals and Institution in lower case with both to be right aligned.

Reviews of a single work should not contain any footnotes, but if the text refers to any other works then their author, title and year should be apparent in order for readers to be able to identify them. The Editorial Team and Editorial Board may on occasion seek to commission longer Review Articles of a group of works, and these may contain footnotes with the same formatting and standards used for articles in the Journal.

BJMH STYLE GUIDE (July 2019)

The BJMH Style Guide has been designed to encourage you to submit your work. It is based on the Chicago Manual of Style and more about this style can be found at:

http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/home.html

Specific Points to Note

Use Gill Sans MT 10 Point for all article and book review submissions, including footnotes.

Text should be justified.

Paragraphs do not require indenting.

Line spacing should be single and a single carriage return applied between paragraphs.

Spellings should be anglicised: i.e. –ise endings where appropriate, colour etc., 'got' not 'gotten'.

Verb past participles: -ed endings rather than –t endings are preferred for past participles of verbs i.e. learned, spoiled, burned. While is preferred to whilst.

Contractions should not be used i.e. 'did not' rather than 'didn't'.

Upon first reference the full name and title of an individual should be used as it was as the time of reference i.e. On 31 July 1917 Field Marshal Sir Douglas Haig, Commander-in-Chief of the British Expeditionary Force (BEF), launched the Third Battle of Ypres.

All acronyms should be spelled out in full upon first reference with the acronym in brackets, as shown in the example above.

Dates should be written in the form 20 June 2019.

When referring to an historical figure, e.g. King Charles, use that form, when referring to the king later on in the text, use king in lower case.

Foreign words or phrases such as *weltanschauung* or *levée en masse* should be italicised.

Footnoting:

- All references should be footnotes not endnotes.

- Footnote numeral should come at the end of the sentence and after the full stop.
- Multiple references in a single sentence or paragraph should be covered by a single footnote with the citations divided by semi-colons.

Quotations:

- Short (less than three lines of continuous quotation): placed in single quotation marks unless referring to direct speech and contained within that paragraph. Standard footnote at end of sentence.
- Long (more than three lines of continuous quotation): No quotation marks of any kind. One carriage space top and bottom, indented, no change in font size, standard footnote at end of passage.
- Punctuation leading into quotations is only necessary if the punctuation itself would have been required were the quotation not there. i.e. : ; and , should only be present if they were required to begin with.
- Full stops are acceptable inside or outside of quotation marks depending upon whether the quoted sentence ended in a full stop in the original work.

Citations:

- For books: Author, *Title in Italics*, (place of publication: publisher, year of publication), p. # or pp. #-#.
- For journals: Author, 'Title in quotation marks', *Journal Title in Italics*, Vol. #, Iss. # (or No.#), (Season/Month, Year) pp. #-# (p. #).
- For edited volumes: Chapter Author, 'Chapter title' in Volume Author/s (ed. or eds), *Volume title in italics*, (place of publication: publisher, year), p. # or pp. #-#.
- Primary sources: Archive name (Archive acronym), Catalogue number of equivalent, *'source name or description' in italics* if publicly published, p. #/date or equivalent. Subsequent references to the same archive do not require the Archive name.
- Internet sources: Author, 'title', URL (with date accessed) The time accessed may also be included, but is not generally required, but, if used, then usage must be consistent throughout
- *Op cit.* should be shunned in favour of shortened citations.
- Shortened citations should include Author surname, shortened title, p.# for books. As long as a similar practice is used for journals etc., and is done consistently, it will be acceptable.
- Ibid., with a full stop before the comma, should be used for consecutive citations.

Examples of Citations:

- Michael Howard, *War in European History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 21.

- Michael Collins, 'A fear of flying: diagnosing traumatic neurosis among British aviators of the Great War', *First World War Studies*, 6, 2 (2015), pp. 187-202 (p. 190).
- Michael Howard, 'Men against Fire: The Doctrine of the Offensive in 1914', in Peter Paret (ed.), *Makers of Modern Strategy*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), pp. 510-526.
- The UK National Archives (TNA), CAB 19/33, Lieutenant-General Sir Henry Sclater, evidence to Dardanelles Commission, 1917.
- Shilpa Ganatra, 'How Derry Girls Became an Instant Sitcom Classic', *The Guardian*, 13 February 2018 https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2018/feb/13/derry-girls-instant-sitcom-classic-schoolgirls-northern-ireland. Accessed 1 January 2019.

Note: Articles not using the citation style shown above will be returned to the author for correction prior to peer review.