

By: Griffin Nameroff

Citino, Robert M. "Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction."

*American Historical Review*. Vol. 112 Issue 4, (October 2007): 1070-90.

Military History has been a favorite topic of history for the general public, however, when it came to historians, it was a different story. Most historians tended to view military history as nothing more than two armies trying to kill each other. In his article, "Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction" Robert Citino argued that military history was full of intriguing aspects to each topic within it. Citino also argued that if regular historians would just "read some military history" (1090), they would see his point.

Citino emphasized this central argument by explaining to his audience—regular historians—that military history could be broken down into three primary groups. These groups were "war and society scholars," the "traditional operational historians," and the "memory and culture" (1070-71) historians. Citino used different sources to show that each of the three groups had several different aspects to them. A good example of this is on page 1073 when he cited the authors Donald R. Shaffer and Steven J. Ramold when explaining the field of war and society. Citino discussed how these two authors tackled the issue of racism for African American combatants in the civil war, and how the experiences of army and naval officers were drastically different. This example shows Citino used two authors studying the same topic of military history, but they revealed different sides to it. This approach helped Citino show his audience that even a topic that has been studied extensively, like the civil war, can still have different aspects to each topic within it. Citino then followed this pattern of giving sources that show different angles of topics or between authors for the other two groups of study. Each of these

topics had aspects that could range from social, political, economic, technological, tactical, and more.

Another part of Citino's argument that is important to consider is his reasoning for writing this article. Citino states on the bottom of the first page that his article is dedicated to the members of the "Society for Military History." The last page of the article states that Citino is an operational military historian (1090), thus it would make sense that he would dedicate his article to this group of people. The knowledge that Citino is an operational historian also helped explain why he dedicated a good chunk of his essay to that field. It is because he is a member and specialist in that field, and the reason why most sources he used are for operational history. Finally, his affiliation with military history also helped his reasoning for making his argument. He was trying to show other historians how his field of study had several different angles to each topic in it, and each angle had other angles to them.

Citino's article "Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction" is an attempt by someone within a field arguing that field should receive more recognition. Citino's argument that military history is full of depth to be seen by others, is an attempt to have historians go out of their comfort zones. He attempted to show military history as an ever-evolving subject like other historical subjects. At the same time, however, Citino also argued that military historians also had to keep evolving and growing. According to him, military historians needed to move away from issues that still plague them such as overused aspects or ideas. Instead, Citino argued that military history must move on from these issues in order to win respect from fellow historians.

Honor code: I hereby declare upon my word of honor that I have neither given nor received unauthorized help on this work.

Signature: Griffin Nameroff