

Far Beyond Jack Tar: Maritime Historians and the Problem of Audience¹

Joshua M. Smith

Maritime history has undergone a remarkable transformation in the last few decades. In 1989, the Council of American Maritime Museums reported a general lack of awareness of the field within the academic community. In 1993 Danny Vickers wrote in an important article entitled “Beyond Jack Tar” that academic historians “pay maritime subjects little heed.”² As recently as 1999 one scholar declared maritime history a dead field. It should be obvious that the impending funeral for maritime history should be cancelled. Maritime histories abound, programs grow, conferences are plentiful, new approaches are invigorating the field and organizations such as the North American Society for Oceanic History (NASOH) flourish. Even the historian who declared maritime history dead has recently publicly recanted.³ Far from being dead, this field is generating some of the most dynamic new approaches to history; some even claim that global history grew out of maritime history.⁴ In other instances, maritime history exerts considerable influence on existing approaches, such as the *Atlantic World*. As John Hattendorf has noted, maritime history’s academic legitimacy lies in its breadth and range of interconnections that ask important questions about the relationship of humanity to large bodies of water, as well as the relationship of sea to land.⁵

The field is thus very broad and encompasses widely divergent approaches. For example, the essay collection *Maritime History as World History* attempts to establish the relevance of maritime history by proclaiming that maritime events are “tied more closely to events ashore than ever before,” while historians like Frank Broeze focus on historicizing the ocean as not merely a setting but the main dynamic agent.⁶ This has been taken even further by a group known as the “New Thalassologists” who accuse historians in general of suffering from “thalassophobia” and a land-based bias.⁷ Maritime history is clearly a big, vibrant intellectual community with a huge variety of views and approaches!

The question addressed in this essay is not “ubi sumus” (where are we?) or “quo vadimus” (where are we going?), nor even to call for renewed academic rigor, theoretical models, or new graduate programs.⁸ Rather I am asking how are we to understand the varying and different approaches to maritime history, and why do they communicate so poorly with one another. The answer in part has to do with audience, and in how we define maritime history.

Defining Maritime History

Playing with definitions is one of the ways in which Humanities scholars challenge commonly-held assumptions and attempt to impose their own vision on their field. Much to the consternation of undergraduates, those definitions constantly change. Less often considered is how academics misdefine concepts and alternative approaches in order to belittle them. For example, the New Thalassologists attempt to deny they are maritime historians at all and claim maritime history is too narrow and parochial by either misdefining it as a narrow study of ships,

navigation and sailors, or worse yet by simply ignoring the work of previous generations of scholars.⁹ But to many maritime historians the New Thalassologists are simply the latest iteration of the field, a mere ripple in the enormous ocean of maritime history. There will be others.

It should be noted and even emphasized that maritime history means different things to different historians, there is a general consensus on the definition of maritime history that traces its roots to the work of Frank Broeze. At its most basic level it was simply the history of human interaction with the sea.¹⁰ This is a very broad definition, largely accepted, and often accompanied with the assertions that maritime history is by nature international. The proponents of this view are scattered worldwide and represent a broad range of approaches. The Dutch-born Australian Broeze has written that maritime history “is intrinsically and necessarily international in nature.”¹¹ The British N.A.M. Rodger writes “There is no true naval or maritime history which is not an international history.” The Greek Gelina Harlaftis writes “Maritime history is primarily international and comparative, with a global perspective. It is the history of the people who sail on the sea and live round the sea, that is, of littoral societies, of maritime regions, of seas and oceans, of the effects on land of man’s interaction with the sea.”¹² And our literary friends, too, such as Hester Blum claim that sailors were “international by definition.”¹³ Implicit with this insistence is a criticism that other approaches are too narrow, and Skip Fischer, the influential editor of the *International Journal of Maritime History* makes this explicit when he complains that the greatest flaw in the maritime history literature is a continuing focus on local and national topics.¹⁴

Few have chosen to challenge that demand, which betrays the blue-water bias of most maritime history, a bias so strong that it is almost a defining feature, despite the valiant efforts of a few to call attention to shorter trade routes and inland waters.¹⁵ If it were true that maritime history must be international, then microhistories like John Stilgoe’s limnicole (quite literally muddy) *Alongshore* would be meaningless, yet his influential book pretty much occurs within a short row of his summer home in Massachusetts.¹⁶ So too, maritime populations were not necessarily international, such as the fishing communities studied by social historian Danny Vickers, who has demonstrated that seafaring communities could be deeply parochial and provincial, and who has warned that too strict an international focus overlooks the realities facing seafaring communities.¹⁷ So too, labor historians have considered the deep seated bigotry and racism of white seafarers.¹⁸ Carol Sheriff has written an award-winning book on the Erie Canal (often referred to as a “ditch”) that is an exceptionally well-crafted history that never really leaves western New York, let alone the United States, but it is a fine example of maritime history. Maritime history *can* be international and comparative, *but it does not have to be*, and local and national histories can be just as academically rigorous and important as those that are international in scope.¹⁹

So why is it that stones are tossed so frequently at nation-based or local histories? For the most part I think we can dismiss the majority of these calls as beating up on some pretty wispy straw men. Do we really need to beat up on Samuel Eliot Morison, who died in 1976—thirty five long years ago? Or the redoubtable CR Boxer, who surely suffered enough for his imperialism while incarcerated in a Japanese prisoner of war camp? Can we not appreciate that while we disagree with their narratives, they wrote beautifully and rank among the giants on

whose shoulders we stand, and that their writings have a remarkable endurance? At the same time that we appreciate these scholars, we can also recognize that our historical questions are fundamentally different from theirs, and that the focus and methodology has completely changed in that increasingly scholars are “historicizing” the ocean, moving the focus to the seas and other bodies of water as historical agents. Along with this historicization have come some overblown claims regarding the novelty of this approach that ultimately have more to do with the dynamics of tenure and status within academia, but give credit where it is due, there is much merit to the energy and questions of these new approaches, even if accompanied by far too much posturing regarding the narrowness of the national approach.

The problem is that in practice even the most stubborn internationalists have had difficulty transcending a national/imperial framework. A prime example is Frank Broeze, who edited a collection of essays on maritime history from around the world, but was flummoxed by the fact that he had to organize that volume by nation. Writing in 1995, he had to admit that most scholarship will continue within a national framework.²⁰ The same issue occurs in Jack Greene and Philip Morgan’s recent collection *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal*, in which they boldly proclaim that Atlantic history is “challenging the primacy of traditional national or imperial modes of organizing historical thinking.” But look at their table of contents for Part I, “New Atlantic Worlds” which reads as follows:

“The Spanish Atlantic System”

“The Portuguese Atlantic, 1415-1808”

“The British Atlantic”

“The French Atlantic”

“The Dutch Atlantic: From Provincialism to Globalism”

It is clear from this table of contents that “Atlantic” simply replaces the word “Empire.”²¹ Most Atlantic historians with important exceptions like Gilroy’s seminal work on a Black Atlantic and Rediker’s delightfully Marxist “Red Atlantic” have in fact failed to break from national/imperial framework of analysis.

Not only has a truly international perspective proved elusive, but those who propound it have been rather unpleasant to those who continue to utilize a national framework. In a maritime context, naval history has been especially singled out for academic disdain. Eminent scholars like Marcus Rediker have stooped rather low in calling naval history a simple chronicle of admirals, captains, and battles at sea.²² Naval historians, generally considered to be a sub-set of maritime historians rather than military historians, are frequently exposed to barbs like this, but they have long engaged in serious introspection and calls for increased academic rigor in collections with self-descriptive titles like *Doing Naval History: Essays Toward Improvement*.²³ Indeed, the theoretical Left has been quite vicious in denouncing eminent naval historians like N.A.M. Rodger because he dares to use a nationalist framework, he does not view history from the bottom up, and probably because he is widely read by both academics and the public.²⁴ British naval historian Andrew Lambert acknowledges that naval history is not popular in academic circles, and attributes that attitude to the conformist culture of university history departments—a stinging remark because it points out that scholars are seldom the iconoclasts they purport to be.²⁵ And who dares to recall that Alfred Thayer Mahan, a tremendously influential naval historian, was once president of the American Historical Association?

So where does that leave maritime history? Within an admittedly Anglophone community of scholars (with some exceptions), a pattern emerges of two divergent groups that I have labeled “Traditionalists” and “Utilitarians,” labels that members of both groups will probably be surprised (and perhaps dismayed) to find they belong to. Yet there is a great deal of common ground between the two even though members of each group may have dramatically different ideas about maritime history. This difference is not theory, or intellectual rigor, nor scope of study, but rather who they think the important audience is, and how they approach it. Traditionalists tend to value a smaller audience of scholars and focus on self-replication through graduate theses and programs. Utilitarians on the other hand tend to seek out a larger audience beyond the confines of the seminar room, with some actually seeking to influence policy makers. It should be emphasized that Traditionalists can be radicals who want to gain a popular audience, and Utilitarians can be theory-driven and highly analytical. The question is, what do scholars intend to do with their hard-earned knowledge, analysis, and publications?

The Traditionalists

As Bob Albion once said, the problem for maritime historians is to make it respectable in academic circles.²⁶ This is the driving concern of the Traditionalists, among whom we can name Frank Broeze, Skip Fischer and Danny Vickers, all of whom have publicly stated their concern about the lack of maritime historical arguments around which debate can be centered, a sort of intellectual Holy Grail that has proved evasive.²⁷ Most famously Vickers characterized maritime historians as sitting in a circle facing outward, not communicating among themselves and lacking a common agenda.²⁸ Traditionalists want intense internal discussions centered around a well-defined methodology; their Utilitarian counterparts want to share with a wider audience.

Because they perceive their audience to be other academics, Traditionalists are far more concerned with self-reproducing than the Utilitarians. They are much more likely to call for the creation of a formal graduate program in maritime history rather than relying on individual dissertation advisors scattered in various universities. A good example of this vision is Bob McCaughey, who worries that maritime history is conspicuous by its absence at the top fifty American research universities. Canadian scholar Fischer, too, believes that the future of maritime history depends on their ability to train a new generation of practitioners, as did Broeze in Australia.²⁹ Graduate students convey respectability somehow—an idea that may amuse many an impoverished grad student.

Deeply vested in scholarly respectability, Traditionalists are also more likely to utilize heavy academic jargon. A prime example is the term Thalassocratic, most famously used by Fernand Braudel in the mid-twentieth century, but resurrected as early as 1971 by arch-conservative historian Clark Reynolds, who found himself publicly mocked for his efforts by imperial historian Gerald S. Graham at the conference that foreshadowed the founding of the North American Society for Oceanic History (NASOH).³⁰ The term disappeared for a time, but unfortunately has re-emerged by fans of Braudel as the “New Thalassology,” and has been derided on the Internet as academic nonsense, “a fishy sort of codswallop.”³¹ The editors of the *International Journal of Maritime History* among others took umbrage at the assertions of the New Thalassologists and have taken to task the arriviste scholars who would divide this great intellectual commons into personal fiefdoms.³² Labor historian Leon Fink is only slightly more

gentle in skewering Traditionalists on their unrelenting use of jargon that guarantees that only the most scholarly reader will be able to penetrate their prose.³³

The use of jargon is related to the Traditionalists' self-perception as challenging conventional ideas, a prime example of which is the Atlantic World paradigm. But just as Atlantic World scholars have challenged the nation state, so world historians have challenged why Atlanticists privilege the Atlantic in their studies. A prominent maritime historian has also taken the Atlanticists to task because they really have not engaged very effectively with the ocean itself.³⁴ My point is not that Atlantic history is bad; actually it is very exciting and has opened new vistas for scholars and has produced vigorous debates about pirates, the slave trade, and other subjects. But is it new anymore—and hasn't it really become the mainstream view now, the new orthodoxy?³⁵

The claims of novelty should be especially troubling for the New Thalassologists, who by incorporating the term 'new' into their label run the same risk as the practitioners of the "new" military history did in the 1970s—when does it become old, when will there be a call for the new New Thalassology? But these scholars, however new their interpretations, should also realize that their audience is the same old group of academics. They write big ideas for very small audiences, and this sets them apart from the Utilitarians.

The Utilitarians

Naval historian Andrew Lambert writes that history is something societies and organizations "impose upon the past for their own purposes," an attitude that exemplifies the Utilitarian idea that the past is there to be used. He underscores this by noting that of the major audiences for naval history, academics form the smallest (and therefore presumably the least important).³⁶ It is also interesting to note that this is a slight variation and improvement on Sir Herbert Richmond's classification of who needs to know naval history: the public, statesmen, and sea officers.³⁷ For Utilitarians, maritime history is not merely a good debate among academics; it is meant to influence society's actions and attitudes toward maritime affairs, including policy.

Because maritime history can be seen as a tool to craft government policy, Utilitarians are much more willing to embrace national frameworks of understanding.³⁸ Naval historians often fall within the utilitarian, and indeed Traditionalist Broeze criticized them for this.³⁹ Another field that clearly attempts to influence policy is fisheries history. A prime example of this is the History of Marine Animal Populations (HMAP) project, which since 2001 has endeavored to understand how the abundance and diversity of marine life has changed over time.⁴⁰ Some scholars are uneasy with this approach; at least one fisheries historian has wondered aloud if historians do very well when they step outside of their discipline and attempt to engage with scientists and others, echoing William Cronon's caution on the uses of environmental history in current environmental policy debates, even as he acknowledged its genesis in the political movements of the 1960s. Nonetheless, Cronon found that non-academics were an important audience for environmental historians.⁴¹ The Utilitarians are thus in very good academic company when they attempt to influence matters beyond the university.

An important characteristic of the utilitarian approach to maritime history is that, perhaps more than any other approach to history, it emphasizes experiential learning, lending historians what literary scholar Hester Blum might call the “sea eye.”⁴² Many American maritime historians have some sort of personal connection to seafaring: Alfred Thayer Mahan, Samuel Eliot Morison, Arthur Donovan, John Hattendorf, Helen Rozwadowski, Ingo Heidbrink, Matthew McKenzie, Eric Roorda, Jeffrey Bolster, and almost the entire membership of the North American Society for Oceanic History could be included. The experience of seafaring, while not mandatory, certainly lends authenticity real or perceived to one’s writings. Harvard scholar Joyce Chaplin has written an interesting musing of her encounter with seafaring on a sail-training vessel and its relevance to her as a historian that encapsulates many of the North American attitudes, which seem to vaguely derive from the educational theorems of John Dewey.⁴³ Traditionalists, especially Europeans, often raise their hackles at this thought, sometimes with lengthy apologia regarding their tendency to seasickness.⁴⁴ The English scholar N.A.M. Rodger, is another who doubts the relevance of seafaring experience.⁴⁵ Nonetheless, American maritime historians have by and large accepted this premise, and programs such as the undergraduate programs at Williams-Mystic, Sea Education Association and others do their best to expose undergraduates to a seafaring experience, and even graduate programs like East Carolina University’s encourage a little time under sail. There is a certain irony to this in that the experiential emphasis has led Utilitarians to engage heavily with the specialized terminology of seafaring as a matter of technical literacy, making their prose potentially as impenetrable as that of the Traditionalists.⁴⁶

The emphasis on the experiential has also steered maritime historians away from the purely academic and toward public history venues such as museums, libraries, and historical societies. Many Traditionalists respond with unconcealed horror. Danny Vickers worried that the maritime history of early America was strong on public presentation, but weak on analytic content, although he remains silent on what the end goal of that analytic content is.⁴⁷ Robert McCaughey has bemoaned the state of American maritime history by pointing out the absence of academic engagement, and has found that American academic historians have “kept pretty much to their bunks” while independent scholars, writers, and government-employed or museum-based educators are up on deck doing all the work and providing its public visibility.⁴⁸ The Traditionalists have a point; striving to reach a broad audience does have its perils, among which are the gross inaccuracies that public historians sometimes perpetuate. An unfortunate example of this is the alleged portrait of an African American seaman dating to the American Revolution, sometimes purported to be an admiral. The painting however is a fraud, and was publicly exposed as such in 2006.⁴⁹ Nonetheless, important educational websites, even those produced by cultural juggernauts like PBS, continue to misrepresent this portrait as something it is not.⁵⁰ Another peril associated with museums is that they often fail to connect with the larger world. Independent scholar Lincoln Paine has pointed out the irony of maritime museums being deeply immersed in a parochial celebration of place—after all, isn’t the point that ports connected the peoples of the world?

Utilitarians however consider the connection with museums a strength. John Hattendorf has credited the Council of American Maritime Museums with revitalizing maritime history in the U.S. in the mid-1980s; N.A.M. Rodger has made similar assertions regarding the National Maritime Museum in Greenwich, and has even celebrated the fact that history is one of the few

disciplines where a non-academic can continue to make an impact, a fact that deeply disturbs Traditionalists.⁵¹

Commonalities

Having theorized on the divides within maritime history, it might be wise to consider how maritime historians are alike as well. Both Traditionalists and Utilitarians have called for stronger theoretical structures and connection to the historical mainstream.⁵² Both Traditionalists and Utilitarians have their concerns over the use of a nation-based approach, perhaps more stridently on the Traditionalist side, but even naval historians recognize that they need to proceed with caution when it comes to any overt or implied superiority of national character *à la* Alfred Thayer Mahan.⁵³

Another happy commonality is that both types of maritime historians evince a widespread acceptance of the importance of maritime literature, such as the study of voyage narratives, even though historian Lincoln Paine has expressed dismay over the homogenous English-language approach in maritime literature courses.⁵⁴ Some of the amity between those who study history and literature may be based on the experiential component discussed above; many literature scholars also claim personal experience with the sea, such as Herman Melville specialist Mary K. Bercaw Edwards or Shakespeare expert Steve Mentz. On an academic note, sometimes the writings of literary scholars have deeply influenced and even troubled maritime historians and Atlanticists, as when English professor Vincent Carretta challenged the idea that Olaudah Equiano's autobiography was a firsthand account of the Middle Passage. This has proved an extremely inconvenient truth for historians attempting to understand the Atlantic World from the bottom up.⁵⁵ The message here is that historians have to be inter-disciplinary and keep abreast of developments in other fields. The new historicism as it relates to maritime literature is something historians should be aware of in order to take advantage of important findings and interpretations.⁵⁶

Some would argue that maritime history is at its best when it is interdisciplinary, and both Traditionalists and Utilitarians tout interdisciplinary approaches. A fine example is the collection of essays in *Sea Changes: Historicizing the Ocean*, which features the work of literature scholars, anthropologists, cultural studies, and of course historians.⁵⁷ But there have been failures to cross disciplinary boundaries as well, the most notable of which is with maritime archaeology. In the 1990s it seemed like archaeology offered new perspectives, but it turns out that historians and archaeologists are the scholarly equivalent of oil and vinegar—they separate almost immediately given the opportunity. Historians bemoan the fact that the underwater archaeologists do not write enough, and that they emphasize process over analysis and publication.⁵⁸ The few who do write and interact with historians, such as Amy Mitchell Cook or Hans Van Tilburg, generally write as historians rather than as archaeologists. But in a sense this separation makes sense, as maritime archaeology has matured it has developed its own set of questions and methodologies, many of which lean toward anthropological models more than historical ones.

If this analysis has any value, it will lead maritime historians to question whether they follow a Traditional or a Utilitarian path. The answer lies in the questions that you seek to ask, your intended audience, and how you envision connecting to the historical profession, broadly

defined. To me, there are only good questions in maritime history, no matter whether posed by Traditionalists or Utilitarians. But there are sometimes bad attitudes, and I encourage all scholars to practice humility and good manners in the very big tent known as maritime history.

Joshua M. Smith is a maritime historian, associate professor and head of the Department of Humanities at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, as well as Interim Director of the American Merchant Marine Museum in Kings Point, NY and a vice president of NASOH. The views represented in this piece are solely those of the author, and in no way reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, the Maritime Administration, or the United States government.

NOTES

¹ I would like to thank the staffs of the Schuyler Otis Bland Library at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and that of the Blunt-White Library at Mystic Seaport for their assistance in helping me research this piece.

² Daniel Vickers, "Beyond Jack Tar," *William and Mary Quarterly* (3rd Series), 50:2 (April 1993), 418.

³ Eric Paul Roorda declared that "The most agonizing part" of being a diplomatic historian, "is that diplomatic history may go the way of maritime history. The pace of the times changes, and entire fields can become extinct." See Jeff Sharlett, "Why Diplomatic Historians May Be the Victims of American Triumphalism," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 24, 1999. Roorda recently retracted the statement; see Carla Carlton, "Sea Change: Interest In Maritime History Grows As Scholars Seek To Ensure Our Future," *Bellarmino Magazine* <http://www.bellarmino.edu/magazine/seachange.aspx> (last accessed May 23, 2011).

⁴ Dan Finamore, "(Maritime) History: Salting the Discourse" in Finamore, ed., *Maritime History as World History*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2004), 2.

⁵ John Hattendorf, "Ubi Sumus," in John Hattendorf (ed.), *Ubi Sumus? The State of Naval and Maritime History* (Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, 1994), 3.

⁶ Frank Broeze, "Notes on Paul Butel," Roundtable, *International Journal of Maritime History* (hereafter as *IJMH*) XII:2 (June 2000), 261-270.

⁷ Gelina Harlaftis, 'Maritime History or the History of *Thalassa*,' in Gelina Harlaftis, Nikos Karapidakis, Kostas Sbonias and Vaios Vaiopoulos (eds.), *The New Ways of History* (IB Tauris, London 2009), 212.

⁸ These questions are addressed in essays in John Hattendorf (ed.), *Ubi Sumus?* and John Hattendorf (ed.), *Doing Naval History*; Vickers, "Beyond Jack Tar," Robert McCaughey, "Freshening of American Maritime History," *New York Journal of American History* LXVII no. 1 (2008), 10-23.

⁹ Harlaftis, "Maritime History or the History of *thalassa*," 211-238.

¹⁰ Harlaftis, "Maritime History," 212; Finamore, "Salting the Discourse," 2. Broeze's definition was that maritime history was "the study of all aspects of the interaction between mankind and the sea." See Broeze, *Maritime History at the Crossroads: A Critical Review of Recent Historiography* (St. John's, Nfld: International Maritime Economic History Association, 1995), xix.

¹¹ Broeze, *Maritime History at the Crossroads*, 10.

¹² Harlaftis, "Maritime History," 211-238.

¹³ Hester Blum, *The View from the Masthead: Maritime Imagination and Antebellum American Sea Narratives* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 12.

¹⁴ Lewis R. Fischer, "Are We in Danger of Being Left with Our Journals and Not Much Else: The future of maritime history?" *Mariner's Mirror* 97:1 (February 2011), 370.

¹⁵ John Armstrong, "The Role of Short-Sea, Coastal and Riverine Traffic in Economic Development since 1750," in Finamore (ed.), *Maritime History as World History*, 115-116.

¹⁶ John R. Stilgoe, *Alongshore (Alongshore)*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).

¹⁷ Daniel Vickers and Vince Walsh. *Young Men and the Sea: Yankee Seafarers in the Age of Sail* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005); and Vickers, "Beyond Jack Tar," 421.

¹⁸ Leon Fink, *Sweatshops at Sea: Merchant Seamen in the World's First Globalized Industry, from 1812 to the Present* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2011), 131-132; 152-155

¹⁹ Carol Sheriff, *The Artificial River: The Erie Canal and the Paradox of Progress, 1817-1862* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996); A rare look at brown water navigation is John Armstrong, "The Role of Short-Sea, Coastal and Riverine Traffic in Economic Development since 1750," in Finamore (ed.), *Maritime History as World History*, 115-129.

²⁰ Frank Broeze, *Maritime History at the Crossroads*, xi-xii.

²¹ Jack P. Greene and Philip D. Morgan (eds.), *Atlantic History: A Critical Reappraisal* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), vii, 4.

²² Bernhard Klein and Gesa Mackenthun, "Introduction: The Sea is History," in Bernhard Klein and Gesa Mackenthun (eds.), *Sea Changes: Historicizing the Ocean* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 3-4.

²³ Rodger, "Considerations," 117;

²⁴ Alan James, "Raising the Profile of Naval History: An international perspective on early modern navies", *Mariners Mirror* 97:1 (February, 2011), 194.

²⁵ A.D. Lambert, "The Construction of Naval History 1815-1914," *Mariner's Mirror*

²⁶ Albion, "The Atlantic Ocean," in Reynolds and McAndrew (eds.) *1971 Seminar in Maritime and Regional Studies*, 18.

²⁷ Fischer, "Are We in Danger," 372.

²⁸ Vickers, "Beyond Jack Tar," 418-19.

²⁹ Fischer, "Are We in Danger?" 376; Broeze, *Crossroads*, xviii.

³⁰ Reynolds and McAndrew, *1971 Seminar in Maritime and Regional Studies*, 87.

³¹ Conrad H. Roth (probably a nom de plume), "Thalassology," on his blog *Varieties of Unreligious Experience*, <http://vunex.blogspot.com/2006/10/thalassology.html>, October 13, 2006, last accessed April 30, 2011, commenting on Peregrine Horden and Nicholas Purcell, "The Mediterranean and "the New Thalassology""", *American Historical Review*, 111.3.

³² Broeze, *Crossroads*, xix; "Editor's Note" *International Journal of Maritime History* XVIII no. 2 (December 2006), xiii-xiv; Harlaftis also roundly criticizes the New Thalassologists as "neophytes" in her essay "Maritime History, or the History of 'Thalassa.'" Scholars of the Indian Ocean, however, have been quite receptive. See Markus P.M. Vink "Indian Ocean Studies and the 'new thalassology'" *Journal of Global History*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (2007), 41-62. The Thalassologists claims for "historicizing" the ocean also seem overdrawn. Note for example that Helen Rozwadowski's *Fathoming the Ocean: The Discovery and Exploration of the Deep Sea* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005) strives to historicize the ocean without being part of the New Thalassology.

³³ Leon Fink, *Sweatshops at Sea: Merchant Seamen in the World's First Globalized Industry, from 1812 to the present* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 3-4, quoting Kathleen Wilson, *The Island Race: Englishness, Empire and Gender in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 173.

³⁴ Jeffrey W. Bolster, "Putting the Ocean in Atlantic History: Maritime Communities and Marine Ecology in the Northwest Atlantic, 1500-1800." *The American Historical Review* 113:1 (February 2008), pp. 19-47.

³⁵ See Paul Cohen, "Was There an Amerindian Atlantic? Reflections on the Limitations of a Historiographical Concept," *History of European Ideas* 34:4 (December 2008), 388-410.

³⁶ A.D. Lambert, "The Construction of Naval History 1815-1914," *Mariner's Mirror*, 207-224.

³⁷ Hattendorf, "Ubi Sumus?" 3-4.

³⁸ See for example N.A.M. Rodgers, *The Safeguard of the Sea: A Naval History of Britain* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998) xxv-xxvi.

³⁹ Broeze, *Crossroads*, xviii.

⁴⁰ Robb Robinson, "Hook, Line and Sinker: Fishing History—where we have been, where we are now and where are we going?" *Mariner's Mirror*, 97:1 (February 2011), 176-177.

⁴¹ Brian Payne, Review of *Oceans Past: Management Insights from the History of Marine Animal Populations*, David J. Starkey, Poul Holm, & Michaela Banard eds. *International Journal of Maritime History* 20, no. 2 (December 2009): 403-405; see also William Cronon, "The Uses of Environmental History," *Environmental History Review*, 17:3 (Autumn, 1993), 1-22.

⁴² Hester Blum, *The View from the Masthead: Maritime Imagination and Antebellum American Sea Narratives* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 3.

⁴³ Joyce E. Chaplin, "Overboard: A Historian's Life at Sea," *Common-Place* 6:2 (January 2006), <http://www.common-place.org/vol-06/no-02/chaplin/index.shtml>, last accessed September 30, 2011).

⁴⁴ For example, see Felipe Fernández-Arnesto, "Maritime History and World History," in Finamore (ed.), *Maritime History as World History*, 8.

⁴⁵ Rodgers, "Considerations," 118, 121-122.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 123.

⁴⁷ Vickers, "Beyond Jack Tar," 418.

⁴⁸ McCaughey, "Freshening of American Maritime History," 10.

⁴⁹ Erik Baard, "A Painting's Secret," *New Yorker*, May 15, 2006.

⁵⁰ PBS, "Portrait of a black Revolutionary War sailor, c.1780" *Africans in America*, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/aia/part2/2h81.html> (Last accessed April 30, 2011).

⁵¹ John Hattendorf, "*Ubi Sumus? What is the State of Naval and Maritime History Today?*" 1.

⁵² Vickers, "Beyond Jack Tar," 418-419; Fischer, "Are We in Danger?," 375; Rodgers, "Considerations," 117, 119; Hattendorf, "Ubi Sumus?," 5-7;

⁵³ Rodger, "Considerations," 118.

⁵⁴ Robert D. Foulke, "Odysseus's Oar: Archetypes of Voyaging," in Finamore (ed.), *Maritime History as World History*, 183; Lincoln Paine, "Beyond the Dead White Whales: Literature of the Sea and Maritime History," *IJMH* XXII no. 1 (June 2010), 205-208.

⁵⁵ Vincent Caretta, *Equiano, the African: Biography of a Self-Made Man* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2005). ; Jennifer Howard, "Unraveling the Narrative," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 9, 2005:

Ivi Bernhard Klein and Gesa Mackenthun, *Sea Changes: Historicizing the Ocean*, (New York: Routledge, 2004), 6.

⁵⁷ Klein and Mackenthun, *Sea Changes*, 5.

⁵⁸ See Jesse Ransley, "Boats Are for Boys: Queering Maritime Archaeology". *World Archaeology*. 37:4: (2005) 621-629, for a stinging critique of maritime archaeological methods and biases.