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undisclosed and often underappreciated events that have shaped U.S.-Iranian relations. This masterfully researched historical account focuses on U.S.-Iranian relations since the fall of the shah of Iran and the beginning of the Iranian Revolution. The policy and strategy decisions of the past six U.S. presidents, covert CIA operations, Iranian actions and reactions, and the struggle to create the present-day U.S. Central Command are all detailed in this book.

David Crist works as a historian for the federal government and as a frequent adviser to senior government and military officials. He is also a colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve and a veteran of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. His research for this work included interviews and access to records of many of the principal decision makers on both sides. The Twilight War comes at a critical time in the relationship between the United States and Iran.

If plotted on a graph, the thirty-year chronology of events between the United States and Iran would look like two opposing synchronized sine waves: when one is up, the other is down, and never the two shall meet. Crist’s engaging account provides never-before-revealed insights into the near, and often missed, opportunities for reconciliation between both countries. In what could sometimes pass for a Sophoclean tragedy, if not for the very real consequences, these two opposing nations cannot seem to get in step long enough to find ways to resolve their standing grievances.

Some readers may criticize Crist’s lack of detail on the complex history of Iran during the reign of the American-supported shah. Crist explains his decision to pick up the story of U.S.-Iranian relations at the time of the Iranian Revolution on the grounds that these are the years of direct conflict and competition with Iran. It is clear that this decision allows for a more focused examination of the current regime, as well as the events that are currently shaping our world. Those interested in prerevolutionary U.S.-Iranian relations may wish to read Stephen Kinzer’s All the Shah’s Men (Wiley Press, 2008).

General James Mattis has made The Twilight War required reading for members of the U.S. Central Command staff. This insightful and intellectually provocative book should be required reading in fact for all military professionals who wish to gain a better understanding of what many in the profession of arms consider the most likely reason for military conflict in the next decade.

DANIEL DOLAN
Naval War College


When you mention Dwight David “Ike” Eisenhower, far too many people will hark back either to D-Day and the invasion of Normandy or to a mythical, almost lyrical presidency, when life was good, three martinis accompanied every lunch, and gas cost pennies a gallon. The truth, of course, is far different and far more interesting. In Eisenhower Jean Edward Smith has produced what may well be the best one-volume biography on this figure. The book moves fast and yet manages to leave nothing out.

In illuminating Dwight D. Eisenhower, Smith steps adroitly and rapidly through the years of his life, maintaining the
reader’s interest and never shortchanging his subject. It is a bravura performance. For example, Smith moves through Eisenhower’s childhood at a gallop, while fully describing a family that was centered on a domineering, distant, and hot-tempered father but made bearable by the love and efforts of his mother, Ida. Eisenhower’s rise in the Army also speeds by, but not without explanation of the critical importance of Fox Conner, Ike’s steadfast mentor and advocate; George Patton, who became a trusted friend and fellow missionary of armored warfare; and Douglas MacArthur, who both recognized and used Eisenhower’s talents in Washington, D.C., and in the Philippines. Ike’s rise to prominence in the late 1930s and early 1940s as an exceptional staff officer is well chronicled, as is his progressively improving ability to lead combined forces, once given major command in North Africa and Europe. Almost before the reader knows it, Eisenhower has invaded Europe, arranged for the liberation of Paris, been surprised by the Germans in the Battle of the Bulge, and terminated the war. He then becomes the first commander of NATO and the chancellor of Columbia University. Ike’s campaign and two terms in the White House flow by at an equally fast pace, leading to his retirement from office and a final move to the farm at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Ike’s transition from military leader to political candidate to president is as surely and speedily dealt with. Smith lays out the major issues of the day and in so doing reminds the reader that Eisenhower, far from pursuing a presidency of golf and leisure, dealt with major domestic and international issues throughout his term in office. Ike was less than kind to Richard Nixon, although readers may find it difficult to muster much sympathy for the vice president. The two men were of vastly different temperaments and capabilities, and Eisenhower made it clear he thought Nixon was not of presidential caliber. However, part of Eisenhower’s antipathy might have stemmed from the fact that Nixon, with the brilliant success of the Checkers speech, forced Eisenhower to report earnings he would rather have kept private.

Smith awards Eisenhower full points for the handling of the Suez crisis of 1956. He depicts a world leader in his prime, a president who is savvy, decisive, and powerful. The reader is reminded that his stand on Suez was as much about principle as it was about power.

If, however, there is one portion of the book that truly stands out as the best part of an exceptional work, it is the recounting of how Eisenhower handled Arkansas governor Orval Faubus’s refusal to desegregate public schools as directed by the Supreme Court’s decision in Brown v. Topeka. Eisenhower the man, while in no way a racist by the standards of his day, was not one to challenge southern apartheid or other racial inequities. However, Eisenhower the president was different. He had taken the oath of office, and the Supreme Court decision made clear where his duty lay. Faubus refused to fulfill his gubernatorial responsibility to provide order and safety, so Ike stepped in, federalizing the Arkansas National Guard and ordering elements of the 101st Infantry Division to Little Rock. Equally credible was the manner in which Eisenhower refused to accept delays in desegregating the military, something for which he is routinely given too little credit.

In this excellent biography Smith also takes a major, and unfortunately
deserved, swipe at the late Stephen Ambrose. Ambrose, long accepted as a leading scholar on Eisenhower, was found to be guilty of plagiarism in some of his later works; as Smith points out, Ambrose also fabricated accounts of meetings between himself and Eisenhower, meetings that simply did not occur. The failure of Ambrose stands as a stark reminder as to the fallibility of historians and the need to get the history right. This Smith does. His scholarship is meticulous, and his book is a worthy addition to any shelf.

RICHARD NORTON
Naval War College

Larry Berman has written a scintillating biography of the man who is credited with changing the U.S. Navy more, perhaps, than any other single individual in its history. Zumwalt was controversial in his day, and Berman found during his research that feelings about the admiral, both positive and negative, still run strongly nearly forty years after his tour as Chief of Naval Operations. His book, although clearly written from an advocate’s viewpoint, captures the essence of why Admiral Zumwalt was such a polemic figure during a time of great social and political turmoil, both inside and outside the Navy.

Berman crafts a comprehensive picture of a highly complex individual who was driven as much by his heart as by his keen intellect. Zumwalt’s strong social conscience enabled him to perceive what most did not—a navy that was fundamentally racist and sexist, a navy that inflicted innumerable injustices on its sailors under the assumption such practices were needed to ensure discipline among the rank and file. As Berman found, few of Zumwalt’s contemporaries were his intellectual equals, particularly when it came to understanding the magnitude of the Soviet naval threat that confronted the United States in the 1970s. Berman makes clear that Zumwalt’s reward for attempting both to change the Navy’s force structure and to eliminate its abusive personnel policies was pushback by many of its most senior officers, who felt he was pushing too hard and going too fast. While Zumwalt saw a lack of accountable leadership, his critics saw a man hell-bent to destroy many of the Navy’s most cherished traditions. To most junior officers and junior enlisted he was a godsend, who, unlike most senior enlisted and older officers, understood the difficult conditions under which they served. Berman paints a vivid picture of the social issues and grievances that were not simply demeaning to the young sailors who manned the Navy but also threatened the service’s ability to man its ships and squadrons once the all-volunteer force replaced the Vietnam-era draft.

Berman also provides his readers with a riveting account of Admiral Zumwalt’s troubled relationships with President Nixon and National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger. Nixon held Zumwalt personally responsible for the race riots that broke out in three ships, blaming him for allowing lax disciplinary standards that, in his view, had led to the problems. Kissinger is portrayed as a self-interested political scientist who was willing to put the nation’s security at grave risk in order to achieve an ill-advised arms-reduction treaty.