Introduction by Michael S. Neiberg, U.S. Army War College

[illegible], 2007), [illegible] *L[illegible] B[illegible]: L[illegible] C[illegible]* (N[illegible]: P[illegible]-M[illegible], 2003), [illegible] *F[illegible] N[illegible] I[illegible]*

Review by Kathleen Burk, University College London

H-

> This relationship is not an end in itself but must be used as an instrument of achieving common objectives. We cannot afford to permit a deterioration in our relationship with the British."[2]]

[illegible]

[2] [illegible]

Review by David Clinton, Baylor University

Review by Daniel Gorman, University of Waterloo

[illegible] [1]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[2] [illegible]

[3] [illegible]

F

H K ’ (R), ( ) . [8] S OS J M E E R.D. L ,[9] A (137-138). M ’ O .[10] J ’ H E , I G A S E A ’ A .

H ’ OS ’ S . H

A A B G ’ A

1917

H 1916 (226). .006 A203 1916 .1 ( )-6-8.7 (.6 ( )-)-8.3 (



.S. B (.S.).

N H 1917 G -A I -A . F 1916 ,–(225) L N ? ’ A – H .

H I. H S. G B 1870-1914 ’ A , F P I , B .

H ’ H – A -A (20). B. 1917.

C . I ; .72 ( )2.9 0 ( )6 ( )12 20 04 .3 ( ) 3.3 ( )-4 0( )-4 83.6 (). ( )- 1.

Review by Srdjan Vucetic, University of Ottawa

0 6 -0 0 6 492.6 439 , 3 ( )-11.6 ( )-7)1.77.006 -39.37 66(,)-8.6M( ) -11 .3 0 3.3 (1) -11)-3 (1.5 1( )--5. ( )-

Response by David Haglund, Queen's University

I. E Q(.)6 3 (8.6)8 1.301 1 (. .)0.5 (1(.)6 ( )8 (E Q()8 1 1.8( )- 3 (009 ( ) 0.009

E) ’ ; ’
M
A -A – .

S .S. B (.S. F) – 1917, 1918.
A ; .S. ’
E . I (: 1949
NA O) S
. B. ?[9] O – (–) .
A ’ . B.

S .S. I . N
A ’ A 1917