

Citino, Robert M. "Military Histories Old and New; A Reintroduction." *American Historical Review* 112, no. 4 (October 2007): 1070-1090.

Military historian Robert M. Citino's article, "Military Histories Old and New; A Reintroduction," published in the *American Historical Review* of October 2007, seeks to establish the relevance of military history in understanding both the past and present world. As a history professor specializing in operational military history, Citino has a particularly clear view of what direction military history is headed in in academia and how the existing rigidity within the field and the outside scorn towards it is affecting historical work. By analyzing and critiquing a wide range of works by military scholars, Citino attempts to prove to non-military historians that military history is not the unchanging, warfare-centered study that many believe it is. Rather, military history is constantly evolving to encompass new perspectives and is as relevant as any other method of historical study.

Citino uses works ranging from the early twentieth century to the early twenty-first century to provide evidence that military history has undergone many changes since its early days. He discusses the original school of operational military history as well as two newer schools of study in order to give clear examples of how much the field has progressed in just the past century. By comparing the works of early military historians to those of twenty-first century military historians, Citino contradicts accusations that military history has remained static; he argues that "scholarly military history has developed over the past few decades into the very epitome of the big tent" (1070). Citino is attempting to convince non-military historians and academics at large that military history is worth taking another look at because the modern innovations it has experienced are invaluable to understanding major historical events.

Citino chooses to use books written by military scholars as his evidence because, unlike articles or journals, academic books have the space Citino needs to prove how much thought and research military historians put into their areas of study. In order to support his argument that military history is inclusive of perspectives that range from social to political to race and gender, Citino reviewed the works of academics who have thoroughly researched military history from those various perspectives. The books Citino included in his article back up his thesis that, although traditional operational military history does account for some of the literature in the field, there has been a great deal of literature that falls under the newer schools of military history.

In organizing his article, Citino first discusses the war and society school of military history, then compares this school to the old operational military history and concludes his evidence by analyzing works of the newest school of military history. He does this so that he can immediately back up his assertion that military history has undergone an intensive transformation in the methods and perspectives that military historians use to study their subjects. Additionally, this organization allows Citino to separate the traditional military historians who are reluctant to accept change from the military historians who are actively working to provide military history with new lenses.

Though Citino's article is now slightly dated, his arguments and the length he goes to in order to back them up remain important insights into how military history and academia in general can benefit from embracing military history and shedding the view that this field remains stuck in the past.

I hereby pledge on my word of honor that I have neither given nor received unauthorized help on this work.        Nicole Ford

