

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

After careful review of Robert M. Citino's work, "Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction," many aspects of great importance are drawn from the work pertaining to the evolution of historical documentation. Throughout the article, this evolution of historiography is studied (the author explains how although military history is in a decline in popularity among scholars and historians, it continues to gain credibility with the general populous.)

Citino details how military history, as of 2007, is now meticulously divided into sub-disciplines focused on differing and various aspects that all share the Military commonality. The types are traditional military historians, "New" military historians, and cultural/social historians which study the mindset of the time to help further understand the reasoning and decisions that were made with impacts leading up to modern events and social structure. These different sub-disciplines frequently intersect and often have differing opinions of subjects, but similar conclusions. All of the various types, though more specifically the "New" military historians have brought forth the "human element" into military history, though truly Citino explains it best on page 1079 in his essay "Military Histories: Old and New"; "Once dominated by personalist modes of analysis that consisted almost exclusively of blaming General X for zigging when he should have zagged, or turning left when he should have turned right, it is now much more likely to emphasize systemic factors: the uncertainty of the battlefield (often metaphorized, per Carl Maria von Clausewitz, as the "fog of war"), the ever-present problems of information-gathering and -sharing, and the inherently asymmetric nature of war."

Throughout his work, Citino cites the works of such historians to prove the point that the subject has evolved to be much more. Certainly, this article reflects that as its intended audience, those who are in the process or have become new historians, should see the importance it places on military history.

Robert Citino's use of conflicting historical works from various historians based around events of historical precedence over a timescape of a fairly broad, yet somewhat limited scope of a topic is quite beneficial. This "debate among the pages" so to speak provides a complex and colorful view of not only what the tactics of the battlefield were, both domestic and abroad, but also the sentiment felt by the people of the time that drove them forth to do what they had done, the ideology held by hearts and minds that was sanctimoniously borne.

Mr. Citino, throughout his article, begs the question by stating the various points and purposes behind the reasoning he makes to define the purpose of his article's existence. Such points the author makes are how "modern historians were relative latecomers the new military history" , how social history intersects with military history frequently and that it truly paints the picture of, "a true military history of the powerless" and how the term "military revolution" can be misleading; among many other examples. Another major point that Mr. Citino seems to be trying to prove is that even though the scales seem to have tipped, as the common populous' demand for such works on the histories of military & warfare continue to grow, so must the field of researchers and scholars for that topic; this piece from his article perfectly embodies this sentiment: "The profession needs to ask itself, wouldn't it be preferable if that "someone" were a scholar

of Showalter's or Browning's stature, or one of the dozens of other fine operational scholars currently active, such as Megargee, Geoffrey Wawro, Adrian R. Lewis, or Michael V. Leggiere, rather than your friendly neighborhood re-enactor or war buff?".

This statement can be seen as both a "call to arms" for those interested in history to pursue it further and become scholarly in the history of tomorrow.

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

Jacob R. James