

Nathan Schultz

Citino, Robert M. "Military Histories Old, and New: A Reintroduction" *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 4 (2007): 1070-090.

In Robert Citino's "Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction" (2007) he describes a discrepancy in the perception of military history during the time of writing this article. He decided to offer his own perspective to counter contemporary believed notions about military history. **Citino takes an offensive and expectation shattering approach to try to convince scholars and laymen how the field he studies is just as legitimate as any other.**

**Citino counters the notion that military history is just the study of battles and generals or how Citino puts it is a discussion on when generals "should have zigged when they should've zagged." (1079) Instead, he puts forth the idea that military history is a complex and varying field with numerous avenues of study, not just battles.** He does this by citing different works under the umbrella of military history. The examples he chooses are pertinent to the subject matter. The selection of articles and books are then followed by a proof of legitimacy, to convince the reader that they are scholarly sources. For example, he cites a series of related books and articles regarding African American soldiers in the American Civil War. Work like Donald R. Shaffer's "After the Glory: The Struggle of Black Civil War Veterans" (2004) he says the author cited thousands of pension reports that he had to dig through for the articles. By citing these articles Citino tries to offer a wider and more diverse picture of military history. (1073) .He structures the article in steps of depth into the field of military history. First starting with popular culture with movies like "300" and other public exposures to military history. Then going deeper into the scholarship that has been written about military history citing direct and various studies that counter the idea of military history being a monolithic study of battles. Fields like race, gender, and culture make their way into the second section. Lastly, he dives into historical methodology discussing the historical schools of thought like the history of

memory, one of the newest fields of study that military histories are at the forefront of. Also, the internal conflict of old and new military history all too grown the legitimacy of military history in the eyes of the reader. This style of layering allows his article to show the popular perception of military history and how it is farcical, but instead suggest people to look from the other side of the glass of scholarship and how that view is a more correct vision since it views for what military history it is, a diverse and engaging field.

**During the essay, the offensive stance of Citino is affected by his own personal background regarding history.** He takes special interest and examples on the German army citing three different works that address the subject. Though those points do not seem interjected without meaning, Citino himself is an operational historian of the German army during World War Two so he is more familiar with the subject. From his own definition of what people think about military historians, he is in that category of the people that from his perspective do not respect since he studies the operational tactics. He does counter that by raising the point of the multi-pronged aspects of military history and that operational history is only a small portion of a very diverse field. Even though Citino writes from the perspective of someone on the inside of scholarship he emphasizes repeatedly on the actual diversity of the field.

He argues the classic argument that all historians have dealt with, “it is more complicated” Citino offers, that scholars should look at the full picture of their discipline while looking at everyone as equals. **He ends with a call to action, for scholars and laymen alike to simply pick up a military history book and read it. That action is the best way to understand the field, by reading it.**