

Olivia Price

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

The article "Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction" was published in 2007 in the *American Historical Review* journal. In this article, Robert Citino is writing to non-military historians about the depth and importance of military history, countering its reputation as a marginalized study. Military history is less respected by other historians because traditional, tactical studies are seen as requiring little scholarly thought or research. Citino's main argument is to show other non military historians that tactical military study uses the same skills as cultural history and is deserving of recognition. He also argues that in addition to traditional operational history, military history has developed into a "big tent" including "new military history" and the "emphasis on culture" or "history of memory" (1071).

Citino cites a wide range of influential and analytical monographs for each of the three schools of military history in order to advance his argument. When talking about new military history, the relationship of war and society, he uses books that discuss the impact of war on all aspects of life. Sources discussing the American Civil War in this respect portrayed it as a "revolution that overthrew the social order" (1072). New military history focuses on war in all spheres of life, making it a very multifaceted study. The more traditional approach to military history has been said by other scholars to require minimal intellect or creativity, but Citino's counter argument uses sources that apply tactical knowledge in analyzing an event as a whole.

Traditional military history includes not only the operational aspects of war, but also cultural and sociological influences and the idea of “chaos.” An example Citino uses is Dennis Showalter’s 1976 book that discusses fighting and military planning as the main functions of armies, and how these things led to the unification of Germany (1079). Citino writes in further detail about how the knowledge of specifics provides a better understanding of victories, losses, and power during wartime. Lastly, when he discusses the emphasis on culture of the time period and the shifting truths of history, he uses comparative analysis of both old and newer accounts to show how the theses of authors changed over time based on the contemporary outlook. These differing opinions of the same events show the dynamic nature of military history and its prevalence as a study. Citino uses Victor Davis Hanson’s book (2001) in which Hanson writes about a single cause for the dominance of Western power. Citino then asks questions he still has after reading, and uses John Lynn’s *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture* (2003) as an example of a direct retort to Hanson’s arguments. These two books show how the same historical event or idea can be shaped in many ways based on the year the book was written, and what trends of thinking were influencing the authors.

Citino’s use of sources aid him in achieving his purpose of gaining respect for military historians in the eyes of other historians. He is proving to these other historians that extensive research and analytical skills are used in the study of military history, and it is an expansive and detailed field that affects the discourse of many other parts of history. To address historiographical questions in the article, Citino takes already existing military historical works from each of the three groups and connects them, showing how they are interrelated, dependant on each other, and in depth like other forms of history. Citino’s arguments lead to the conclusion

that non military historian scholars should take the time to read and appreciate military history and what it has to offer to the field.

Pledge: I declare upon my word of honor that I have not given nor received unauthorized help on this work.

Olivia Price