The RLC REVIEW

Submission Guide

Article Submission Guide Contents

1. Introduction

Like any other form of creating, few people find writing easy – including seasoned authors. The process can be daunting, torturous and seeped in self-doubt, not to mention time consuming. So, if you are finding submitting an article for the RLC *Review* challenging, you should remember that you are not alone. Writing is probably the most powerful form of learning – perhaps this is why it is so difficult. Writing however is a craft and crafts can be learnt, albeit that writing will remain a largely individual pursuit. Whilst the myriad of writing styles are focused on specific written products, the intent of this guide is to provide potential authors with some basic parameters to support a successful article submission to the RLC Connect annual *Review* magazine.

To be accepted for publication, it is important that authors recognise the *Review's* aim; *communicating relevant information to a broad logistic audience through competent and well informed articles*. The four broad categories which frame the content of the *Review* have been deliberately chosen to encourage potential authors to identify a suitable topic which supports the publication's aim. Whilst the *Review* has no pretence to be an academic publication, dependent on the type of article submitted, a degree of academic rigor is expected which conforms to a recognisable scholarly structure supported with accurate and consistent referencing. This adherence to academic rigor should also allow authors to recognise and observe copyright rules and appreciate the major pitfalls of plagiarism.

Everyone in the RLC has some form of anecdote, chronicle or piece of research to share. Every article submission will be formerly reviewed by a panel of independent military judges, and authors should appreciate that whilst judges expect a degree of literary competency, they are also looking for a fusion of imagination, experience (especially first-hand) and informed opinions based on a range of evidence. From a personal perspective, potential authors should recognise that there are long-term positives to writing for the *Review.* Apart from the fact that authors will be contributing to a repository of specialist information which could be utilised by future generations, preparing and submitting an article will develop and/or hone valuable writing skills. If you want to communicate convincingly on paper, writing demands that you must learn a variety of skills; a level of proficiency in researching, rehearsing arguments to create a well-balanced article and the penned brevity and clarity required to keep readers interested. Ultimately, an author has to acquire the skills to express arguments/experiences in a succinct and interesting manner. All of these attributes will contribute to developing a valuable life skill that can be called upon repeatedly across a number of professional and personal situations.

Finally, there are a number of initiatives that can help develop article writing. Reading other authors' submissions in past *Reviews* and articles in various journals and current affairs publications will provide ideas on topics, styles, layouts and standards. This submission guide also aims to help authors organise themselves, structure their work and ultimately increase the chance of writing an article that will be accepted for publication. The Corps has a

considerable repository of historic and contemporary written and lived experiences and authors are encouraged to utilise the expertise that exists within their unit and formation.

At the very least, authors should ensure that any article is proofread and cleared by their chain of-command before being submitted for consideration.

2. Getting Organised – *How to do it!*

a. **Source Material and Planning -** Perhaps one of the most challenging aspects of submitting an article is choosing the topic – getting an idea and transferring it to paper. Much will depend on the author's experiences, interests or opportunities to gather source material. RLC Connect encourages authors to write from across a broad range of article categories; essays, firsthand experiences, doctrinal/technical debates and historical analysis to name but a few. The writing style and format will vary depending on the article type and while an essay follows a recognisable format, a firsthand account will usually benefit in its telling from a more journalist style of storytelling. Whatever the chosen topic and article style, the format advice provided in this guide should help you plan and construct drafts. Every article, even a firsthand account, will require some research and identifying relevant information needs to be carefully planned.

The field of potential source material is vast, and authors can waste time and effort trawling through online sites, libraries, official documents, archives and the media if the topic field is not restricted. Plan your research time carefully (using the final submission date as your endstate). From the outset, think of a submission as a product of several drafts rather than a single piece of writing. When you have chosen your topic and narrowed down your sources from a preliminary sift, conduct an initial *skim read* of the material. Skim reading is a relatively easy skill to acquire but it must be undertaken with discipline. Skim read each introduction (or first paragraph) followed by the summary. The aim at this stage is to gain a general impression of the contents by only picking out key words, ideas, concepts i.e. getting an idea of the text rather than learning the material itself. If the source looks promising, mark it and put it to one side and move on. Once you have completed the first sift of your sources, you can go back and skim each individual source by reading the first and last line of each paragraph. If you believe it offers relevant material, then read it all. Record and/or mark whatever you think is useful. Highlight, underline, make separate notes, use sticky notes on the relevant pages or write manuscript comments in margins – how you mark your sources is up to you, but the aim is to help you quickly find the information you initially thought useful at a later date. The secret to reading for research purposes is to use more than one reading method in a methodical way.

If you have not already captured your initial idea(s), once you start the skimming process you can normally start to visualise what you need and how you want to write

the article (and what you can discard). At this stage, your ideas could be captured in scrap notes, mind-maps, lists (if you do make lists, remember to write why each item is on the list) etc. It does not matter how you start to transfer your idea(s) onto paper – as long as you do it. A particularly useful technique is to jot down initial thoughts and amend them as you sift source material. Give your potential article paragraphs some draft headings/explanations of what will be covered. Try to capture killer quotes and/or your arguments early, and slot them into the relevant draft paragraph. Make sure that once you identify a useful piece of information that you can find it again – start a form of referencing so that you can gather the source material at a later date without a lengthy search. If you find a useful quote, number or line of argument, capture the source in your rough concept notes (ideas) – remind yourself that organising ideas early will save time later. Your source material should provide a body of evidence that helps substantiate any claims you make in your article – referencing is offering this body of evidence for reader scrutiny – so make sure you know where it comes from!

Once you have your initial ideas down on paper, constructing a timeline which indicates how many drafts you will complete, the cutoff date for collecting source material and obtaining copyright permission(s) will help with completing the article within a prescribed timeline. Once you have a clear idea of timescale, an outline plan should be constructed which follows the format of the finished article (refer to the plan in the worked example for guidance).

b. **Submission Format -** Whilst RLC Connect encourages a broad range of article submissions, a general format and structure is expected. This includes:

- **Wordcount –** aim for a submission of **5000 words** (not including referencing and bibliography) with a 10% margin either side. Authors should recognise that Oxford Referencing does allow more context to be inserted without being counted against the wordcount but efforts should be made to keep footnotes to a minimum whilst ensuring any evidence/source is referenced correctly (refer to referencing conventions). A wordcount should be included at the bottom of submissions before the References/Bibliography.

- **Font Style Size** – submissions should be in Ariel, 11 size font and double spaced (to aid judges) with page numbers inserted at the bottom-centre.

- **Authors identification and organisation** – authors should place their name in the header of the submission with their organisation/unit.

RLC Connect will accept previously submitted articles/essays which meet the above format, but authors are expected to clear any permissions with the relevant organisation(s) which have published the article(s). Submitted essays (or selected elements from a thesis) must have the approval of the author's academic supervisor from the relevant university department which should be contained in the submission.

Author may contact RLC Connect if they wish to discuss a previously published article.

c. **Layout (Structure) -** The layout (structure) of a submission will, to a certain extent, depend on the type of article submitted. A personal experience of an operation for example may lead to recommendations or it may simply summarise an author's view based on firsthand knowledge – much like a piece of journalism there may be limited references. An essay on the other hand is expected to follow a more formal structure. Whatever the type of article, they should broadly exhibit a similar layout which includes a clearly signposted:

- Introduction
- Main body
- Summary/conclusion/recommendations

Following a structure should help with planning and drafting a submission, as thoughts can be organised, relevant research and references identified, and permissions gained for any copyright material. Remembering that writing is a craft however, how the article subject is selected, how the observations and/or arguments are presented and what supporting evidence is used is within the author's gift. Laying out initial thoughts into a plan should help organise evidence, develop the thread of an argument/analysis and make linking paragraphs easier. Apportionment of words to the introduction, main body and summary should also save time and perhaps the main advantage to planning is the opportunity to make the article flow, joining distinct points to create a clear and balanced argument/opinion. Try and avoid using long paragraphs – marking a natural break or change in your observations/argument will help to break up your work. Paragraphing is part of *signposting.*

d. **Signposting -** A separate note on *signposting* is worth mentioning before you start on any drafts. *Signposting* helps the reader follow the flow of your narrative and reminds them where they are. You should provide a series of pointers to where you are going and where you have come from – or the other way around if you are in the main body of text. The reader should know the *route* you are taking them on but not necessarily what detailed experiences they will have on the journey. If the reader cannot follow the flow of your work, then they have become lost on the *route.* To help signpost your work try words such as, *in short* or *as has been examined.*

e. **Titles -** Titles are important and you may wish to spend some time thinking about them. Make every word count as a title needs to achieve a number of things. It should introduce the reader to the article, give an impression of what to expect (a signpost) and it should attract attention, persuading the reader to move to the main text. Once you have decided on a title, use it to draw you back to the main gist of the article. Underlining the key words in a title will often make you think about the article's content.

f. **Introductions -** Invest some time in your introductions. Much like headings, you only get one chance to grab the reader's attention so set the scene very carefully. Brevity and clarity are key in an introduction. Tell the reader what you are going to do, and in what order (try laying out your argument/ideas/theories and how you intend to support them with evidence (primary, secondary or a mix of both)) and signal what your article's conclusion might be – all aspects of *signposting*. Whatever the word count, an introduction should normally not take more than 10% of the total – aim for between 5-10%.

g. **Main Body -** The main body is constructed of distinct paragraphs, each embodying a specific thought/argument/observation/key point. Whilst paragraphing is sometimes undertaken for cosmetic reasons i.e. to break up large amounts of text (consider what a large block of text looks like to a reader), they are normally self-contained – a discrete point of a single thought/argument. They are sometimes described as mini-essays. The first sentence can be treated as a mini-introduction (and signpost) followed by the main paragraph text which expands on the first sentence. Finally, a mini-summery with a signpost as to what is coming next guides the reader through the article. Paragraphs should link to each other in a sequential flow by using careful signposting. Authors can improve their paragraphs by re-reading them to ensure that they only contain one point of discussion supported with evidence. If authors are working to a prescribed word count, then paragraphs can be broken down in plans and drafts with estimated word limits – this helps negate significant cutting-out when revising drafts.

Authors should use a range of evidence (reference material) to support concepts and claims. For every key point you should have some form of evidence. Even if you chose to write an article from personal experience you need to support your opinions. Judges will find reading unsubstantiated statements very difficult and an article which undermines the confidence of the reader is unlikely to score highly.

h. **Summary/Conclusion -** Like your introduction, a summary should not be more than 10% of the overall wordcount – like introductions, aim for between 5-10%. You need to remind the reader what you have told them. Summaries/conclusions should give a broad overview of what you have argued/explained/analysed by highlighting the key points. Tell the reader (signpost) that they have reached the summary/conclusion. If you have constructed your main body paragraphs correctly, you can normally plan your summary/conclusion from the last sentence of each. If you set yourself a question in the title, make sure you have answered it. You do not have to be definitive in your answer – there may not be the evidence for a yes/no conclusion, but you could answer the question by stating that based on the evidence the finding is either inconclusive or leaning towards a particular school of thought. Whatever your conclusion, you should explain how you have reached it – it should not come as a surprise to the reader. A trick is to use some of the key words or

phrases from the title in your summary/conclusion. Avoid introducing any new evidence/argument into your summary that has not been covered in the main body.

i. **Drafts -** Drafts should be expanded from the initial outline plan. In your first draft you are still capturing and organising the source information in an effort to support your maturing ideas. Do not be too rigid in maintaining your initial planned structure. Try moving things around, perhaps a killer quote is better used in one particular area than another. Your first rough draft is just that – rough work which offers a framework to build on. Set yourself some review goals to keep to your desired timeline. A second draft often clarifies your thoughts, identifies that your source material works (if it does not – go back and find something that does) and allows some polishing of the signposting to make the article flow. Your final draft should be focused on making sure the article flows, the title is relevant, or any set question answered. Check for spelling/grammar and that any submission requirements have been met. At every stage, try and get someone to proofread your work but as a minimum, someone should read your work before you submit it.

3. Style, Punctuation, Spelling, Grammar, Abbreviations/Jargon and Writing Tips

Style - How you write is important – but individual style is sometimes difficult to explain. Even the most astonishing tale, groundbreaking report or fascinating first-hand account can be unwittingly dumbed down or come across as overly anodyne technobabble and send a reader into a state of torpidity. Try to avoid mistakes in punctuation, poor spelling, jargon and badly constructed sentences (see below). Authors have to find their own style and reading widely will help develop what is a challenging skill. Try to keep sentences short (which helps to keep the writing *tight)* – as a rule of thumb, try to aim for no more than twenty words per sentence. Write in an *active* voice rather than a *passive* – i.e. *Holmes shot Moriarty* rather than *Moriarty was shot by Holmes*. As sentences get longer however, so the *passive voice* will grow in importance. Re-read your submission, get someone else to read it (proofreading) and then re-read it again.

Punctuation – In its simplest form punctuation is just a collection of recognised signs, symbols and marks which mean something to a reader. They help to give meaning to the written words and make an author's narrative easier to understand. An example of the most basic punctuation is the use of a capital letter at the start of the sentence and a full stop at the end. Unfortunately, there is a difference between spoken and written words and a lack of understanding of this is often demonstrated by the use of parochial English combined with poor punctuation. Authors have two main resources to check their punctuation; a reputable English language writing guide and/or a competent person to check drafts and final articles. Whilst sound punctuation is no guarantee of a quality submission, poor punctuation is guaranteed to undermine any article when read by a judge.

Spelling – English is a difficult language to use well. Part of this difficulty is due to its origins where many languages have been adopted and placed into an accepted norm (and this accepted norm is constantly changing, so the rules of English spelling can be unreliable if you do not undertake constant checking!). Correct spelling falls under certain rules, unfortunately these rules have a myriad of exceptions. Poor spelling on its own is unlikely to debar an article from publication but it is highly likely that it will affect the impact of the work – and make it harder for any reader to follow. There are no shortcuts to ensuring articles are submitted with precise spelling. Use of a dictionary (hard copy and/or digital) is essential but make sure that if spellcheckers are used then 'English United Kingdom' is set as the computer default. If you are a chronically poor speller then over time select the most useful words that you find challenging and learn them. Finally, proof reading by a third party will normally significantly reduce errors in spelling.

Grammar – Basically an accepted set of rules for using written words. Grammar makes up the tools of the writing trade and ignorance of these rules will often result in the reader not understanding what the author is trying to convey. Again, a good English language guide will provide explanations with worked examples for authors to hone their written skills.

Abbreviations/Jargon – Authors should recognise that the *Review* is circulated to a wide audience within and outside Defence. The use of abbreviations and jargon needs to be carefully considered and no assumptions on their meaning should be made. The first time an abbreviation is used it should be written in full followed by the abbreviated form in brackets without full stops. Authors should ensure that readers are informed of what an abbreviation means as well as its constituent parts.

For example, 'Permanent Joint Headquarters (PJHQ) is the British tri-service headquarters from where all overseas military operations are planned and controlled.'

Writing Tips

- Invest in a dictionary, thesaurus and reputable basic English guidebook.
- Avoid clichés (they generally make for boring narrative)
- Avoid repeating words in the same sentence – unless used deliberately for effect
- Avoid informality and slang – unless you want your narrative to sound natural or when directly quoting
- Brevity and clarity (simplicity) are the keys to getting points across clearly (whilst avoiding boring the reader)
- Enlist a third party to proofread drafts
- Although painful, become accustomed to critiquing and checking your own drafts before submitting the final article.

4. Writing in your own words

It is important that you write in your own words. Using your own words will avoid the pitfalls of plagiarism whilst hopefully making your article unique (and by definition, interesting to read). The difference between quoting and paraphrasing needs to be understood if you are to incorporate someone else's ideas into your work while ensuring that they are properly acknowledged.

Quotes - This is where you accurately repeat what a speaker has said and clearly identify the spoken word in quotation marks. Quotes need to be referenced (refer to referencing conventions).

Paraphrasing - This is where you express someone else's idea/argument in your own words. You must still reference the original author's idea/argument.

5. Copyright and Plagiarism

Copyright. Authors will normally want to use some form of artifact photographs/maps/diagrams/tables etc referred thereafter as *work/image*) to enhance and explain aspects of their articles. Many of these artifacts are subject to some form of copyright regulation and **it remains an author's responsibility to ensure that the relevant copyright permission has been obtained before articles are submitted to RLC Connect.** The following is a broad outline guide only and is therefore not definitive. Authors should consider the time it will take to complete their copyright requirements when planning and preparing their submissions.

Copyright challenges will often revolve around what *a fair minded and honest person* should have done in gaining copyright permission. In a nutshell, copyright is an exclusive and legal right (e.g. Copyright Designs and Patent Act 1988) to control copying and various other uses of original protected works for a specific duration, with exceptions. Copyright laws are designed to give automatic protection to original work of an intellectual creation – i.e. there is no need to register it, the owner has 'exclusive' rights, but they are limited to a degree. This limitation differs from country-to-country, but copyright is subject to international agreement. Copyright lasts a long (but not unlimited) time. The 'general' time rule in the UK is for the lifetime of the author/creator, plus 70 years BUT it can be more.
What is protected – original works: literary works (including journals), artistic works (maps, photos, infographics), music, films, broadcasts/sound recordings, typographical arrangements of published editions.

Who can give permission? Unless a copyright exception applies, only the copyright owner can permit others to;

- Copy the work
- Issue copies
- Communicate the work to the public electronically
- Adapt the work to complete any of the above

Authors must identify the owner (not necessarily the creator) and attribute the work/image – even when an author has copyright exception. Even if a work does not have copyright, authors are morally obliged to attribute/give sufficient acknowledgement of the work/image. It could be construed that without attribution an author could be attempting to pass the work/image off as their own.

False assumptions/requirements – Availability of work online does not give an explicit right to use it. Some work/images are copyright protected but are made available free, although the product cannot be edited or used for personal gain. If a work/image is categorized as being in the *public domain* then copyright has normally expired. It is an author's responsibility to confirm the status of a work/image and ensure it is in the *public domain.* Where work has been made available under a license, authors are to ensure that they use the work/image under the restricted permissions provided, for example, restricted permission might be given for an image to be used in a not-for-profit magazine article, but the same image cannot necessarily be used in the same article for personal gain without further permission. Many authors may wish to use film stills to support their submission, for copyright purposes, under UK law, a single still is regarded as a substantial part of the film – so beware!

Creative Commons Licenses – Currently, there are six types with specific restrictions which the Rights Owner can apply to their work/images. Authors are strongly advised to identify they have obtained the permission to meet specific restrictions. As examples, these can range from editing restrictions to work/images or restrictions for non-commercial use only. Even with permission, authors must still apply appropriate attribution of the work/image and the license type and source.

Assistance – Archives may provide specific guidance on the use of the material they manage (they are not necessarily the copyright owner). The National Archive (Kew) and National Portrait Gallery London are just two organisations that provide assistance to authors wishing to use their extensive research sources and copyright permission is offered online for a broad range of works/images.

Plagiarism. Unless an author is working entirely with their own sources and ideas (a personal recollection of an operation perhaps where the author may be a (or even the only) reliable witness to events), the issue of plagiarism must be recognised - and avoided. In its simplest form, plagiarism is a form of literary theft where an author deliberately attempts to pass off someone else's ideas and/or views as their own. If authors need to write with other people's ideas (as supporting evidence for example), then an explanation of these thoughts

should be expressed in the author's own words supported by the ideas of others using quotation marks. Quotation marks are the recognised convention for acknowledging other author's work and all submissions must have original author's work clearly referenced (refer to referencing conventions). Whilst there is software that can be used to identify plagiarism, the best defence against it is for authors not to attempt to pass another person's work off as their own. As RLC Connect relies on a panel of experienced judges, it is highly likely that deliberate attempts of plagiarism will be detected. In short, authors should write ideas in their own words and ensure other author's work is clearly attributed - even if direct quotes are not used.

6. Referencing Conventions

Referencing is a recognised feature of academic work. It is important to attribute someone else's ideas/arguments and direct quotes to avoid being accused of plagiarism and also to allow readers to follow-up on further research and/or clarifications. Whilst referencing is time consuming, if authors do not cite their sources, the work could be considered as an attempt to deliberately pass off someone else's ideas/arguments. The reference should allow a reader to find the exact source that has been utilised. There are various formats for referencing and RLC Connect allows both the Oxford and Harvard Systems. There are numerous online guides which will provide information on both referencing systems. Whatever system is adopted, writers should be consistent and use the same system throughout.

Harvard Referencing System - This is a system which utilises bracketed references in the main text and an alphabetical list of authors with their titles in an end reference section or bibliography. The two component parts of this system are the in-text citations found within the body of the narrative and the corresponding full reference normally found at the end of the article.

- **In-text citations.** These appear within the body of the text in brackets and contain the author's name, year of publication and page(s) being used. For example:

> The longest campaign in WW2 was fought across the Atlantic where the Kriegsmarine under Doenitz entered into what he regarded as a *Tonnagekrieg* – a mathematical contest where Germany had to sink more tonnage than the Allies could sustain (Mawdsley, 2019, p.89).

If you have used the author's name in the text of the article, then the in-text citation only needs to include the date of publication and the page number. For example:

Hasting's summarised that they, 'remained technically primitive [with] innovation…not matched by reliability' (2011, p.274).

Newspaper and magazine titles are normally placed in italics within in-text citations. For example:

Ultimately, despite fears lamented in the popular press (*Picture post,* 1943, p.20), the evidence presented by Hastings reveals the scale of the Allied victory.

If multiple in-text citations are used to support a narrative, then they are referenced in reverse chronological order with the most recently published source listed first. For example:

(Mawdsley, 2019, p.89; Hastings, 2011, p.274)

Authors who may wish to use online references should follow the general Harvard Referencing principles as demonstrated in the worked example.

- **Full Reference.** Full references are listed at the end of the article under the headings of either *References OR Bibliography*. A bibliography normally contains articles/artifacts which are not necessarily referred to in the body of the article's text but which the author believes will be of interest to the reader – for the purposes of the RLC Connect RLC *Review*, judges will accept either an end *Reference section OR a Bibliography* i.e., there is no reason to submit both. All in-text citations should be annotated in the Full Reference in alphabetical order by author's name and full details of the title/source. If the source has a corporate authors name e.g. The HMSO then use the first word of the title, e.g. HMSO. Online full referencing should include the date the article was accessed (see below). In general terms a full reference should identify all the relevant information which allows the in-text citation to be identified for example;

- **Reference**

  Hastings, M. (2011) *All Hell Let Loose,* Harper Press, London.

  HMSO. (1946) *The Battle of the Atlantic: The Official Account of the fight against the U-boats 1939-1945,* London.

  Picture Post, *A Conference against the U-boat,* 27 February 1943 pp.20-25 [Online]. Available at https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/EL1800014925/PIPO?u=tou&xid+d64b6e29 (Accessed 8 January 2020).

  Journal articles, essays, thesis titles etc appear either in inverted commas or italicized with the journal title underlined and the relevant pages listed, for example:

  Drezner, D. (2021) *The United States of Sanctions: The Use and Abuse of Economic Coercion*, Foreign Affairs, Vol 100, Number 5, September/October 2021, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, pp.142-154.

  Or

Drezner, D. (2021) 'The United States of Sanctions: The Use and Abuse of Economic Coercion', Foreign Affairs, Vol 100, Number 5, September/October 2021, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, pp.142-154.

Oxford Referencing System - Sometimes referred to as a documentary note-style system, Oxford referencing normally consists of two elements; numbered footnote citations (superscripts (raised) numericals in the main body of the text and a corresponding numbers list at the end of the article.

- **Footnotes** are referenced by a superscript (raised) number, like this [4] (the note identifier) after the source together with a corresponding footnote citation at the bottom of the page that the superscript appears. The majority of word processing packages will automatically generate the superscript numbers in chronological order through the reference tab. The first time you use a source as an in-text citation the footnoted reference should include the author(s), title, publisher, date of publication and the page number(s).

An example of an in-text citation of a book source i.e. the referenced entry at the bottom of the page is:

[1].**Hastings, M. *All Hell Let Loose,* Harper Press, London, 2009, pp. 79-81.**

With the Oxford system, you can refer to new material from a source just mentioned in your text by entering the Latin term, ***ibid*** in the footnotes. For a reference to new material from a source that you have already used (but not immediately preceding the reference) you can use the Latin term, ***Op cit*** combined with the author(s) name, date of publication and page number(s).

- **The Reference List** is contained at the end of the article and should include the name(s) of the author(s) in alphabetical order, title, name of publisher, place of publication and publication date. You do not have to include page numbers in a Reference List except for journal articles. If you use the Oxford System then you do not have to include a separate bibliography for the RLC *Review magazine.*

An example of the corresponding in-text citation is in the Reference List is:

Hastings, M. *All Hell Let Loose,* Harper Press, London, 2009.

7. RLC Connect Review - Worked Example

This worked example is of an essay using the Harvard referencing system. It should be noted that submissions to RLC Connect are encouraged from a broad range of written article types. An example of an essay plan is also provided but initial workings and plans are subject to an individual's style of working and authors need to develop their own way of collecting/collating ideas and forming a structure to their articles. Reports from operations/exercises, historic debates and discussions of future technologies and functional structural changes will all demand different article structures. Authors must search for and often rehearse the best way of communicating their ideas to readers. What is not obvious with this plan is the first stage of garnering ideas for the essay's structure or how the references were allocated to paragraphs (in this case using sticky notes which corresponded to the documents being referred to).

Which was more important in determining the outcome of the Second World War in Europe – military tactics or technology? [1800 words – 10% over/under permitted]

Essay Plan

- ***Introduction* – up to 10% of total word count circa 180 words** o *Narrow subject down – introduce selected examples from 3 combat environments* o *Define tactical engagements* o *State that neither tactics nor technology on their own were the deciding factor in determining the outcome of WW2 but a complex mixt of the two.*
- ***Main Text Para 1 – Sea Environment* – Battle of the Atlantic** o *References; use Roberts (p.346), Padfield (p.376), Mawdsley (p.97), Hastings (p.274 and p.275), Hartcup (p.66), Picture Post article – get Churchill quote on threat of the U-boats and Doenitz on the withdrawal of the fleet.*
    - *The end state of the belligerents, Germany to starve Britain, Britain to maintain its Line of Communication to the New World*
    - *U-boats – what they could and could not do i.e. strengths and weaknesses over time. What did they achieve?*
        - *How did the British and then the US combat the threat?*
            - *ASDIC*
            - *Short wave radio*
            - *Forward firing weapons*
            - *Illumination*

- *Torpedoes*
- *Airborne Radar*
- *Closing the Atlantic gap* o *Balance technologies with organisation – development of Wolfpack but also German technologies e.g. snorkel combined with new tactics.*

- o *U-boats not defeated with single technology or tactic but a mix. State when the tide turned (Provide some quantitative evidence to demonstrate this – U-boats sunk and date that mission changed – 1942).*
- o ***Link sentence*** *– Temporary Germany ascendency in Atlantic similar to early victories on Eastern Front.*

- ***Main Text Para 2 – Land Environment*** o *References: Anderson (pp. 270-271 and p.281), Macksey (p.281), Chant (p.160), Overy (p.259), Beevor (p.482), Zabecki (p.32)* o *Germans/Russians on Eastern Front – tactics employed*
  - *Surprise*
  - *Concentration of armour*
  - *Germans developed armour without regard for the environment – weather etc*
  - *Russian simple tech versus German high-tech solutions*
  - *Only when Russians matched their technology to tactics did they achieve an advantage* o ***Link sentence*** *– similar situation where inferior tech forced Germans to adopt suicidal tactics in the air.*

- ***Main Text Para 3 – Air Environment*** o *References: Herman (p.105), Flypast (p.70), Terraine (p.620), Tooze (p.671)* o *P51 Mustang advantages in tech*
  - *mass production advantages*

- *merlin engine*
- *high altitude*
- *fuel drop tanks* o *Germans' obsolete aircraft* o *Development of air tactics to take advantage of tech* o *Use evidence of the 'Big Week' to illustrate point*

o *Para summary is that neither tech nor tactics on their own delivered a clear advantage but a combination of the two factors*

- ***Summary – circa 10% of total word count (180 words)*** o *Evidence from all 3 environments suggests that neither tactics nor technology on their own delivered success* o *Advantages from one factor alone were at best temporal in nature* o *Often tech was fielded incrementally – sea environment* o *Tech fielded with minimum regard to the operating environment undermined positive results – Germans on Eastern Front* o *Mass produced superior aeronautics combined with effective tactics produced positive outcomes for the Allies – air environment*

o *Final sentence: in isolation, neither factor successful – combined they were battle wining*

Word Count – Target 1800, maximum 1980.

Example – Plan and Final Essay

Which was more important in determining the outcome of the Second World War in Europe – military tactics or technology? [1800 words]

Strategy and operational art aside, it was the close combat mêlées – the million tactical actions, that provided the building blocks which determined the end-state of campaigns and ultimately the outcome of World War 2. Tactical engagements, i.e. the employment of firepower and manoeuvre by small units to achieve a local objective (Bowyer, 2002, p.212), fused with deployable technologies, allowed belligerents to contest outcomes on land, in the air and on/below the sea. This essay will analyse the significance of tactics and low-level

technological factors in determining the outcome of WW2 in Europe, by examining selected case studies from each of the combat environments. The efficacy of evolving fieldable technologies will be benchmarked against the adoption and adaption of tactics, and the complex relationship between each will be explored. Finally, an evaluation of the significance of each factor will conclude that technological advantages were so comprehensively fused and dependent on the effective employment of tactics, and vice versa, that they cannot be assessed in isolation. Evidence indicates that although each belligerent did experience a temporal combat advantage due to a specific technology or tactic, ultimately, these were rapidly countered, and any enduring success was as a consequence of a coalescing of factors.

Churchill succinctly described the Battle of the Atlantic and the relationship between technology and tactics where he believed it was, 'a war of science and seamanship' (cited in Roberts, 2009, p.346). Britain's survival throughout WW2 relied on supremacy at sea to guarantee its global supply lines. The longest campaign in WW2 was fought across the Atlantic where the Kriegsmarine under Doenitz entered into what he regarded as a, *Tonnagekrieg* – a mathematical contest where Germany had to sink more tonnage that the Allies could sustain (Mawdsley, 2019, p.89). The interplay between technological supremacy and superior tactics was accentuated in the Atlantic, where the belligerents experienced temporal dominance of a specific technology and/or tactic, only to find the advantage lost, sometimes overnight. To prosecute its aim, Germany relied on its U-boat fleet, supported to a lesser degree by the Luftwaffe. The Allies were compelled to find an antidote to the submarine/air threat but from the outset both sides were technologically weak. Germany's Uboats were understrength for the task with only thirty suitable vessels available in 1940, all of which bordered on obsolescence. Hastings summarised that they, 'remained technically primitive [with] innovation…not matched by reliability' (2011, p.274). During the course of

the war, combined U-boat/air successes accounted for 83% of total Allied shipping lost (Hastings, 2011, p. 275) – a misleading statistic from a technological perspective because the figures were swollen by British unpreparedness for anti-submarine warfare (Hartcup, 2003, p.67). From late 1941, Mawdsley reveals that German technology, 'over fifteen months – [only sunk] fifty-three out of 2,007 ships – a loss of 2.7%' (2019, p.85). Armed with unreliable torpedoes and restricted to downwind surface attacks because of their slow submersed speeds, U-boats relied on audacious hit-and-run tactics. With hindsight, Roberts noted that, 'we gave the

Uboats more credit than we should have done for efficiency' (cited in Williams, 2003, p.207).

Without effective and reliable technology, the initial British response was restricted to implementing line-abreast convoy tactics which proved less than successful with limited escort cover. Whilst various technologies such as ASDIC were known, there was virtually no fieldable systems available. The early stages of the Atlantic War could be summarised as daring German tactics triumphing over their British equivalent, with Kriegsmarine technology offering a slight advantage but with no decisive effect on the campaign. From June 1941 however, the Allies started to overmatch their opponents, firstly, through an organisational effort which Hartcup describes as, 'improv[ing] the application of science' (2003, p.66), and secondly, by the continuous synthesis of tactics.

Whilst the technological output from the belligerents was wide-ranging, with greater quantity and superior quality, the Allies wrestled the initiative from the

Germans. Complementary technologies were introduced incrementally, including, ASDIC, short-wave radar, forward-firing weapons i.e. hedgehog, improved depthcharges, illumination

devices and air-launched torpedoes. When the Kriegsmarine revised their doctrine to compensate for Allied technology by devising wolfpack tactics, they relied on frequent radio messages – a weakness exploited by Allied HF/DF locating which Mawdsley asserts, 'became a very important tactical tool [which] made night attacks by U-boats more difficult and dangerous' (2019, p.97). The last vestige of hope for the Germans was the 'Black Pit', a 600-mile mid-Atlantic air gap where Allied aircraft could not penetrate. Technology in the form of the Liberator armed with centimetric radar (Padfield, 1995, p.376), helped slam the gap shut in May 1942, stymieing the U-boat's brief tactical advantage and compelling Doenitz on 22 May to accept defeat and withdraw (Roskill, 1956, p.377). It would be wrong to assume however that technology alone was the campaign's cure-all. Bolitho recalled that an aerial approach on a target which erred by as little as 3º could fail because, 'the pilot must assess the course and speed of the U-boat, by mental arithmetic' (cited in Lyall, 2007, p. 219).

These margins represented the reality, and despite technology, the contest was always reduced to what Hartcup described as an, 'oscillating ascendency, [a] battle of techniques and wits. The submarine …was beaten not by a particular weapon [but] with the rational continuation of…tactics' (1970, p.56 and p.80).

Ultimately, despite fears lamented in the popular press (*Picture Post*, 1943, p.20), the evidence presented by Hastings reveals the scale of Allied victory, where, through evolutionary tactics and complementary technologies, '99% of all ships which sailed from North America to Britain during the war…arrived safely' (2011, p.274). The 'Kreigsmarine's 'Happy Times' were temporary and evidenced that on their own, neither tactics nor technology were the dominant factor. The relationship between the two in the mosaic of low-level engagements was so

entwined that any primacy of one over the other was obscured – only in unison did they determine the end-state of the Atlantic campaign and contribute to the outcome of the war. The official British account qualifies the relationship where, 'the seamanship, airmanship and science…all combined in wrestling the victory' (HMSO, 1946, p.10). In parallel with the temporary German ascendency in the Atlantic, the Wehrmacht's blitzkrieg into the Soviet Union in 1942 also displayed spectacular early success.

The German gains along the 1250-mile Eastern Front were achieved primarily through surprise and concentration of armour. These spearheads focused on selected enemy weak points – *schwerpunkt* tactics, where localised supremacy allowed pincer movements to develop and isolate Red Army pockets for subsequent annihilation. Close co-operation with infantry and armour, which the Soviets initially failed to recognise, resulted in a situation Anderson describes where, 'Although Red Army tanks were superior [they] fell victim to better German combat tactics' (2015, p.281). These superior tactics however, concealed major defects with German armour and whilst the opposing Soviet technologies were arguably superior, it was not until mid-1943 that these advantages were matched with complimentary tactics. Instead of penny-packeting tanks to defend over a wide area, the Soviets developed concentric defences to deplete German armour and allow superior Red Army tanks to strike. Simple welded tank hand-rails enabled infantry to offer intimate support (Overy, 2006, p.259) where armoured breaches could be further exploited. To counter, the Wehrmacht placed its confidence in relatively small numbers of technologically complex tanks like the Tiger. Compared to their Soviet T-34 counterparts, they proved inferior, with no close-in weapon systems, short tactical ranges of only 70 miles, restricted mobility due to weight, slow speeds and overcomplicated mechanics (Macksey, 1988, pp.121-122) which, combined with

the quagmire of the Russian spring/autumn *rasputitsa,* proved disastrous (Chant, 2002, p.160).

Revised tactics on their own could not save the situation against revolutionary Soviet armour and innovative tactics. Fast, mechanically sound, with sloped armour and low ground pressure through its wide tracks (Anderson, 2015, pp. 270-271), the T-34 had superior agility and according to Campbell, 'made obsolete the bulk of Germany's tank …arsenal at a stroke' (1988, p.281). The Soviets developed their tactics around the T-34's technology, whereby it would quickly close the range to nullify the German longer-range weapon advantage. Once amongst panzer units, Beevor describes the advantage of Soviet technology and close combat tactics where, 'All German superiority in communications, movement and gunnery was lost in the chaos' (2012, p.482). With inferior armour, the Wehrmacht relied on tactics to compete, but even when panzer commanders like General Balck who, according to Zabecki, 'Never considered tactical doctrine holy writ [and] deviated from it whenever…the situation required' (2008, p.32) revised their approach, Soviet technology and tactics proved superior. A similar situation developed in the air in 1944, where obsolete technology reduced the Luftwaffe to committing to near suicidal attacks on Allied long-range fighters.

Of the three operating environments, air combat leaves no margins for error in either technology or tactics. The aerial duels that developed over the Reich as the Allies prosecuted their day-and-night bombing strategy exposed the status of both factors. By the end of 1943, Herman asserts that the Allies fielded, 'the finest fighter plane of WW2, the P-51 Mustang' (2012, p.105). Powered by a British Merlin supercharged engine, when combined with 100octane fuel and drop tanks, it could fly to Berlin and back (Flypast, 2019, p.70) and whilst

protecting heavy bombers as they prosecuted their strategic aims, they denuded the Luftwaffe's fighter capabilities. According to Macksey, from the beginning of 1944 the Luftwaffe's, 'losses were irreplaceable and presented the Allies with an air supremacy never to be lost' (1996, p.195). From this evidence, it could be assumed that technology was more important than tactics in helping determine the outcome of WW2. The situation however, was complicated by the fact that to deliver a favourable operational end-state, pilots had to develop tactics to profit from the Mustang's technology. Once mastered, Allied pilots outperformed the Luftwaffe at high altitude where German aircraft, with inferior engines, lost power. Low-level tactical engagements produced similar outcomes where Kennedy claims the German fighters were driven, 'down to ground level, where the Mustang's astonishing aerodynamics would prevail' (2013, p.129).

The combination of superb aircraft design combined with sound aerial tactics resulted in heavy losses for the Luftwaffe in 1944 who, over February's 'Big Week', lost six-hundred interceptors against an Allied tally of thirty-eight. Goldberg maintains that this, 'was the foundation of practically all of the later Allied successes in both air and ground offensives' (cited in Terraine, 1985, p.620), providing a direct link between technology, tactical actions and strategic end-states in determining the war's outcome. Tooze goes further in qualifying the effect of the air campaign and asserts that as early as, 'July 1943, the war was obviously lost' (2007, p.671). This aerial case study provides evidence that neither technology nor tactics unilaterally can be accurately measured, and proffers caution to assuming that on their own, one factor obtained primacy over the other in determining outcomes.

In summary, the evidence from across the combat environments indicates that neither technology nor tactics can be reduced to a metric whereby they can be accurately measured.

The pattern that emerges is that in the Atlantic, the Allies eventually gained the upper hand by countering and bettering the early technical and subsequent temporal tactical advantages of the U-boat. This was achieved via a combination of incremental technological developments combined with innovative tactics. On land, German faith in technological excellence was undone by ignorance of the environment, whereas Soviet tactics were successfully grafted to their superior armour, which had been specifically designed to deal with the extreme battle conditions. Finally, German innovations in the air were crushed by a step-change in mass produced aeronautics, delivered in combination with robust aerial combat tactics. Whilst there are examples where a change in technology or tactics offered the belligerents a brief advantage, the end-state was ultimately decided by the side who could successfully fuse both factors to deliver an enduring effect. On their own, technology and tactics generally delivered sub-optimal results - employed together, they typically proved decisive in determining outcomes. [Word count = 1978]

References

Anderson, T. (2015) *The History of the Panzerwaffe: Volume 1: 1939-42,* Osprey Publishing, Oxford.

Beevor, A. (2012) *The Second World War,* Weidenfeld & Nicholson, London.

Bowyer, R. (2002) *Dictionary of Military Terms – Second Edition,* Peter Collin Publishing, London.

Campbell, C. (1988) *The World War II Fact Book 1939-1945,* Macdonald and Co Publishers Limited, London.

Chant, C. (2002) *World Encyclopedia of the Tank: An international history of the armoured fighting machine,* Second Edition, Sutton Publishing, Stroud, England.

Flypast, (2019), *Spotlight North American P-51D Mustang,* February, Key Publishing Limited, New Jersey.

Hartcup, G. (1970), *The Challenge of War: Scientific and Engineering Contributions to World War Two,* David and Charles (Publishers) Limited, Newton Abbot, Devon, England.

Hartcup, G. (2003) *The Effect of Science on the Second World War,* Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke, Hampshire.

Hastings, M. (2011) *All Hell Let Loose,* Harper Press, London.

Herman, A. (2012) *Freedom's Forge,* (2012) Random House, New York.

HMSO. (1946) *The Battle of the Atlantic: The Official Account of the fight against the U-boats 1939-1945,* London.

Kennedy, P. (2013) *Engineers of Victory: The Problem Solvers Who Turned the Tide in the Second World War,* Penguin Group, London.

Lyall, G. (Ed) (2007) *Freedom's Battle Volume 2: The War in the Air 1939-1945,* Vintage, London.

Macksey, K. (1988) *Tank verses Tank: The Illustrated Story of Armoured Battlefield Conflict in the Twentieth Century,* Guild Publishing, London.

Macksey, K. (1996) *Why the Germans Lose at War: The Myth of German Military Superiority,* Greenhill Books, London.

Mawdsley, E. (2019) *The War for the Seas,* Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Overy, R. (2006) *Why the Allies Won,* Pimlico, London.

Padfield, P. (1995) *War Beneath the Sea,* John Murray, London.

Picture Post, *A Conference against the U-boat,* 27 February 1943 pp.20-25 [Online]. Available at https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/EL1800014925/PIPO?u=tou&xid+d64b6e29 (Accessed 8 January 2020).

Roberts, A. (2009) *The Storm of War: A New History of the Second World War,* Allen Lane, Penguin Group, London.

Roskill, S, W. (1956) *The War at Sea 1939-1945: The Period of Balance,* Volume II, HMSO, London.

Terraine, J. (1985) *The Right of the Line: The Royal Airforce in the European War 1939-1945,* Hodder and Stoughton, London.

Tooze, A. (2007) *The Wages of Destruction: The Making and Breaking of the Nazi Economy,* Viking Penguin, New York.

Williams, A. (2003) *The Battle of the Atlantic,* BBC Worldwide Limited, London.

Zabecki, D, T. (2008) *The Greatest German General No One Ever Heard Of,* World War II, Volume 23, No.1, April/May, Weider History Group, Leesburg, Virginia.

Guidance Notes on the essay

The introduction deliberately narrows the answer down from what is a very broad subject. The reader is informed what to expect and signposts are given for each of the discussion areas (the three combat environments of sea, land and air) and the lines of argument and a definition of tactics offered. At the end of the introduction an answer to the title question is given.

The main body is broken down into discrete paragraphs with an introductory sentence, the argument (with evidence) and a link sentence (signposting) which leads the reader into the next point of discussion. Finally, the conclusion is clearly signposted, a summary of the main points reminds the reader of what has been discussed and an answer to the question is provided. At no point is new information introduced in the conclusion.

Double spacing makes it easier for a marker/judge to make notes. A 10%-word margin was allowed for this essay, hence, the word count meets the requirement.