

The Forgotten War: Multiple Perspectives on the Korean War in
American History Textbooks

A Master's Research Project Presented to
The Faculty of the College of Education
Ohio University

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by

Andrea Dawn Horner

November, 2011

This Master's Research Project has been approved
for the Department of Teacher Education

Frans Doppen, Associate Professor, Social Studies Education

John Henning, Professor and Chair of the Department of
Teacher Education

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	1
Background	1
Statement of Problem.....	3
Research Questions	3
Purpose/Significance of Study	3
Limitations	4
Definition of Terms.....	4
Methodology	5
Organization of the Study	7
Chapter Two: Literature Review	8
Review of the Literature of Multiple Perspectives	8
Multiple Perspectives Research of the Korean War	12
The Twelve Themes.....	14
Summary	19
Chapter Three: Methodology	20
Data Collection and Analysis.....	22
Chapter Four: Findings	25
Background of the War.....	25
Review: Background of the War.....	27
Chinese Civil War.....	30
Review: Chinese Civil War	31
Chinese Intervention	32

Review: Chinese Intervention.....	32
North Korean Invasion.....	34
Review: North Korean Invasion	35
Soviet Boycott of the United Nations	37
Review Boycott of the United Nations	38
United States Fear of Losing China to Communism	38
Review: United States Fear of Losing China to Communism.....	38
The United Nations and Truman.....	39
Review: The United Nations and Truman	40
Contributing United Nations Member Countries.....	41
Review: Contributing United Nations Member Counties.....	41
Truman’s Failure to Secure Congressional Declaration of War.....	41
Review: Truman’s Failure to Secure Congressional Declaration of War....	42
MacArthur and Truman Controversy.....	42
Review: MacArthur and Truman Controversy	44
End of the War and its Impact	44
Review: End of the War and its Impact	45
Comparative Analysis.....	46
Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations	49
Recommendations.....	50
References.....	53
Appendix A.....	58
American History Textbooks Reviewed in Lin et al.’s (2009) An analysis of the Korean War in history textbooks from the United States, South Korea, Japan, and China	

Appendix B	59
American History Textbooks Reviewed in Fleming, D., & Kaufman, B. (1990). Korea: The Forgotten War	
Appendix C	60
Textbooks Reviewed in this Master Research Project's Study	

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

It isn't a coincidence that the Korean War, commonly known as "The Forgotten War", is also largely forgotten in American History textbooks (Fleming & Kaufman, 1990). The significance of WWII and the Vietnam War overshadow the Korean War both in our nation's collective memory and in our history books. The Korean War receives limited coverage in American History books, with an average of three pages dedicated (Fleming & Kaufman, 1990, p.36). The amount of coverage becomes less of an issue when one looks at how the coverage leaves the high school student with more questions than answers. Fleming and Kaufman (1990) in their article "The Forgotten War", state, "Questions such as who provoked the war, what the role of the U.S.S.R. was, why the war was ended, and even who suffered from the war often remain unanswered or unaddressed" (p. 35). It's almost as if the restoration of the 38th parallel, as per the armistice of 1953, deprived either side of decisive victory, thus giving the Korea War a second class seat in written history.

A look at the presentation of the Korean War in history textbooks on the international level has shown that only the perspective of its respective country is given in the United States, South Korea, Japan, and China (Lin, Zhao, Masato, Hoge, & Kim, 2009). Just as in American History textbooks, textbooks from other countries leave the reader with questions about the causes of the war unanswered.

The insufficient history of the Korean War in American History textbooks is part of the larger problem of a lack of multiple perspectives. Foster and Morris (1996) found that commonly used history textbooks in the United States fail to present multiple perspectives in their content. Multiple perspectives in Social Studies refer to the teaching and learning of history from several different viewpoints. This means looking at a historical event or issues from the perspective all who were involved. Differing narratives give students the opportunity to grapple with the complexity of historical interpretation. It is proven that multiple perspectives in social studies lead to the development of critical thinking skills. It also part of a multicultural education that fosters toleration and understanding between cultures (Banks, 2004).

Since the 1960's research in education has examined the lack of multiple perspectives in American History textbooks. Its findings have led to the improvement of multiple perspectives in history textbooks through the inclusion of minorities' experiences. However, it is generally acknowledged that history textbooks present history from a nationalistic perspective (Foner, 2002). Therefore, differing narratives only exist in American History textbooks when they contribute to the "central story" of America, or fulfill the textbooks' nationalistic ideological and patriotic purposes (Foster, 1999, p. 269).

In regards to the Korean War, a lack of multiple perspectives in American History textbooks means that high school students are not learning a complete history of the war, and missing out on several opportunities to reflect on significant issues, past and present. The lack of the North and South Korean, Chinese, and Soviet perspectives leaves high school students at a disadvantage when trying to understand the Cold War. In addition,

crucial lessons in American foreign policy and international relations that are relevant to understanding the current international political scene are forgone. This Master's Research Project will identify what perspectives of the Korean War are presented in American History Textbooks, where they are lacking, and what content changes and/or additions would improve high school students' understanding of the war's significance.

Statement of Problem

The lack of multiple perspectives in the presentation of the Korean War in American History textbooks leaves high school students at a disadvantage when learning about the historical significance of the war.

Research Questions

Based on the statement of the problem, this Master Research Project seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. In examining the presentation of the Korean War in American History textbooks, whose perspectives are included and excluded?
2. How should the content be changed so as to address the lack of multiple perspectives on the Korean War?
3. How will these content changes contribute to improving students' understanding of the significance of the Korean War, past and present?

Purpose and Significance of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine whether American History textbooks fail to present the Korean War from multiple perspectives. Based on these findings changes in content will be recommended for the improving students' learning. The significance of this study is to provide suggestions for improving history textbook content.

Limitations

1. Articles that offered anecdotal examples were included, not all were based on scientific research.
2. The search of the literature focused on secondary education.
3. Articles found in various electronic search engines were only used if they were available online, available through the Interlibrary Loan (ILL), or at the main branch of the Alden Library at Ohio University.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions were used in this study:

- Multiple perspectives: the presentation of an topic, event, or issue from multiple viewpoints
- Schema/schemata: mental representation for concepts and abstractions
- Content Analysis: research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content communication” (Habtai, 1984)
- Constant Comparative analysis: “the systematic comparison of texts, developing categories or themes, and the integration of categories/themes by the comparison of items assigned to a category to fully develop the theoretical properties of the category/theme (Zhang& Wildemuth, 2009)
- Metadiscourse: language use that describes the author’s thought and writing process
- Historical empathy: the ability to analyze and interpret historical evidence in order to understand and explain why people in the past acted as they did

based on the values, beliefs, and knowledge of the time period in which they lived (Foster, 1999b, p19)

- Historical agency: recognizing that historical events are caused or affected by human actions and responses

Methodology

The methodology used in this Master's Research Project consisted of a review of research literature and a qualitative content analysis of multiple perspectives in the presentation and coverage of the Korean War in American History textbooks.

The literature review was conducted by using the electronic resources provided at the Alden Library at Ohio University. The following electronic databases were used; Electronic Resources Information Center (ERIC). Three different searches were done in ERIC. The first search included the terms "content analysis," "social studies," and "textbooks". Abstracts were reviewed to select those articles that dealt with content analyses of American History textbooks. The first search was done to review how content analysis, in general, of American History textbooks has been conducted. The second search included the terms "social studies" and "textbooks", and "multiple perspectives" as key words or phrases within the articles. Abstracts were reviewed so as to select those articles that specifically addressed the analysis of multiple perspectives in American History textbooks. The third search included the term "Korean War" as a key word or phrase. Abstracts were reviewed so as to select those articles that dealt directly with an analysis of the presentation of the Korean War from multiple perspectives in American History textbooks. Other combinations of any of the above mentioned search terms or key words yielded no matches for articles. References within selected articles were

reviewed for relevant articles that were not otherwise found within the ERIC searches. Other sources used were reference books on the Korean War, and Internet websites on the current relationship between North and South Korea.

The content analysis used a sample of five American History textbooks:

- Appleby, J., Brinkley, A., Broussard, A. A., McPherson, J. M., Ritchie, D. A. (2008). *The American vision*. New York, N.Y.: McGraw Hill.
- Danzer, G. A., Klor de Alva, J. J., Drieger, L. S., Wilson, L. E., Woloch, N. (2008). *The Americans: Reconstruction to the 21st century*. Evanston, IL: McDougall Littell.
- Davidson, J. W., Stoff, M. B. (2007). *America: History of our nation*, Boston, M.A.: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hart, D. (2008). *History Alive: Pursuing American Ideals*. Palo Alto, C.A.: Teachers Curriculum Institute.
- Lapansky-Warner, E. J., Levy, P. B., Roberts, Randy, Taylor, Alan. (2008). *United States History*. Boston, M.A.: Pearson, Prentice Hall.

These textbooks were obtained through donations by their respective publishing companies. The companies were chosen based on the fact that they are major actors in the textbook industry. The textbooks were first reviewed for whether the Korean War was explained or mentioned. This study entailed a content analysis of the Korean War in American History textbooks based on the following questions:

1. How did the United States, South Korea, North Korea, the Soviet Union, and China become involved in the Korean War?
2. What roles did each country play in the war?

3. How did the Korean War end, and what impact did it have on the nations involved?

Organization of Study

Chapter One of this study presents the background information. The main problem and research questions are outlined. The limitations, definition of terms, and methodology of the study are also included.

Chapter Two presents a literature review which includes relevant research publications on the topic of multiple perspectives and multiple perspectives of the Korean War in American History textbooks. The significance of the findings and their implications for further studies is discussed.

Chapter Three presents the methodology used to conduct the content analysis of multiple perspectives on the Korean War in American History textbooks. Explanation of data collection and analysis are included.

Chapter Four presents a content analysis of multiple perspectives on the Korean War in American History textbooks.

Chapter Five summarizes the four previous chapters and offers conclusions and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Review of the Literature of Multiple Perspectives

Multiple perspectives became of significance in public education during the 1960's. Many working in curriculum development worked toward the inclusion of the stories of minorities and those that counter status quo perspectives. Banks and Ambrosio (n.d.) state, "In challenging the dominant paradigms and concepts taught in the schools and colleges, multicultural educators sought to transform the Eurocentric perspective and incorporate multiple perspectives into the curriculum" (History section, para. 5). The growing diversity of our country, then and now, requires that public education reflects the various backgrounds of the students that it serves (Banks, 1994, p. 4). With the "Cognitive Revolution" of the 1980's and 1990's understanding of how students create and understand historical significance changed the way educators think about presenting and teaching social studies (Dulberg, 2005; Epstein, 1997; Mosborg, 2002; Sexias, 1993, Sexias, 1994; Sexias, 1997; Torney-Purta, 1991; Wineburg, 2001). Schema theory research suggested that students would not assimilate new knowledge into pre-existing cognitive structures without being presented with information that they could relate or connect to. They also would not accommodate these structures without being presented with information that forces them to solve a problem (Brandhorst, 1989). In social studies, alternative perspectives create this problem for students to grapple with, and thus develop critical thinking skills, such as historical interpretation and perspective taking. Researchers have found that teaching from multiple perspectives lends itself to improved

schema formation and knowledge construction for all students in regards to historical interpretation and perspectives.

The formation of historical interpretation and perspectives requires the skill of historical empathy. Historical empathy is the ability to analyze and interpret historical evidence in order to understand and explain why people in the past acted as they did based on the values, beliefs, and knowledge of the time period in which they lived (Foster, 1999b, p19). By use of historical empathy students can not only come to an understanding of the decisions and actions of the participants, but navigate their way through the event's historical significance. Yeager, Foster, Maley, Anderson, and Morris III (1998), state that historical empathy requires "...an analysis of a variety of historical evidence and interpretations..." (Introduction, para. 1). Through a series of studies on the decision and dropping of the atomic bomb on Japan during World War II these researchers found that multiple perspectives in social studies improves student's historical understanding. Students in these studies, who were presented with multiple perspectives on Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb on Japan, were better able to articulate the complexity of the decision, the depth of its impact, and their own conclusions and/or interpretations of it. In a similar study, Doppen (2000) found that students who were presented with multiple perspectives of the dropping of the bomb were better able to explain whether they believed Truman's and the United States' decision was right or wrong. Ogawa's (2001) study came to the same conclusion through the use of student textbook comparative analysis and interpretation of oral histories. Singer's (2003) *Multiple Perspectives of the Holocaust?*, uses the approach of multiple perspectives to teach the controversial and sensitive topic of the Holocaust. He argues

that by looking at a world tragedy from different perspectives, students can improve their understanding of how something so horrific can come to pass, and how to prevent such an event from occurring in the future.

Despite the positive correlation between multiple perspectives and students' historical understanding, social studies textbooks continue to inadequately incorporate multiple perspectives into their text. Social studies textbooks create the curriculum for the majority of social studies courses in the public schools in our nation today (Wakefield, 2006). Therefore, the inclusion of multiple perspectives is pertinent and crucial. Unfortunately, many studies have found that social studies textbooks do not present multiple perspectives. Various content analyses of social studies textbooks on specific topics in history have documented a lack of multiple perspectives despite new scholarship that has brought forth new content material and recommendations for its instruction (Commeyras & Alvermann, 1994; Foster & Rosch, 1997). In an examination of the extent to which history textbooks encourage the development of 'historical analysis and interpretation' as required by the National Center for History in the Schools, National Curriculum Standards, 1994, Foster, Morris, and Davis Jr. (1996) found that history textbooks fail to present multiple perspectives (p.372). In a content analysis of two topics; "the emergence of the Aztec empire and its conquest by the Spanish" and "the origins of the Cold War," they found that the Eurocentric and American perspectives were predominant. They argued, "If students are to become familiar with and intelligently understand the interpretive nature of history, history textbooks must offer students alternative interpretations and conflicting perspectives" (p. 372). The revised standards of September 2010, *National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies: A Framework for*

Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, under the Standard of Time, Continuity, and Change, describe student reconstruction of the past as; “They learn to offer explanations for why views differ, and thus develop the ability to defend interpretations based on evidence from multiple sources... They develop a deeper understanding and appreciation for differences in perspectives on historical events and developments, recognizing that interpretations are influenced by individual experiences, sources selected, societal values, and cultural traditions. They are increasingly able to use multiple sources to build interpretations of past events and eras”.

The question as to why history textbooks lack multiple perspectives given the evidence of its learning benefits can be answered with an examination of the history textbook creation process. Apple (1991) states that school textbooks “...are at once the results of political, economic, and cultural activities, battles, and compromises” (p.1) Since state textbook-adoption committees by and large choose which textbooks end up in schools, textbook publishers have to spend all their time and energy catering to the traditional “powers-that-be”. Therefore, social studies textbooks are perpetuators of the status quo (Apple, 1991, pp.1-19). They tend to present history from a single perspective that fits nationalistic aims (Tunnel & Ammon, 1996; Foner, 2002; Foster & Nichols, 2005). Foster (1999b) argues that perspectives of ethnic minorities in the United States are only hinted at if those stories fit into the “central” American story of progress. This lends itself to bias in the form of omission and misrepresentation of certain facts. (Foster, 2005; Miller, 1998; Lestvik, 1997; Loewen, 1995; Romanowski, 1996). In addition, the choice of language determines the impressions students receive when learning history (Romanowski, 1996; Tunnel & Ammon, 1996). For example, in the coverage of World

War II, textbooks describe the Japanese as “aggressive, militaristic, kamikazes” civilians and soldiers. The use of these terms affects students’ impressions of the internment of the Japanese Americans in the U.S. during World War II (Romanowski, 1996, p.172).

James Banks’ (1994) depiction of the Montgomery bus boycott of the 1950’s Civil Rights Movement is a perfect example of how the manipulation of a small piece of a story or event can completely change a student’s perception of a historical event or issue. It also illustrates how written history can be misrepresented when the stories of marginalized groups are ignored, excluded, and/or manipulated. Banks explains how textbooks say the boycott began when an old, tired woman, Rosa Parks, would not give up her seat on the bus to a White man. However, if students were to read her own words they would learn that her actions were far more meaningful than what is generally portrayed. Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat to a White man not because she was physically tired, but because she was “...tired of giving in” (p.7). Banks states, “Viewing this event from different perspectives shows how historians construct interpretations, how central figures can be omitted from historical records, how history can be rewritten, and how students can create their own interpretations” (p. 6). Banks’ example illustrates the importance of multiple perspectives in history textbooks. In regard to the Korean War, the lack of coverage in American History textbooks makes presenting multiple perspectives on this significant historical event all the more important.

Multiple Perspectives research on the Korean War

Research on the content of the Korean War in American History textbooks is almost nonexistent. However, there are two content analyses of the Korean War in history textbooks that are pertinent for a multiple perspectives analysis:

- Fleming, D., & Kaufman, B. (1990). *Korea: The Forgotten War*
- Lin, L., Zhao, Y., Ogawa, M., Hoge, J. and Kim, B. (2009). *An analysis of the Korean War in history textbooks from the United States, South Korea, Japan, and China.*

Fleming and Kaufman reviewed the Korean War coverage in twelve American History textbooks used in the state of Virginia, while Lin et al. compared coverage in history textbooks of the Korean War from the countries referenced in their article's title.

Fleming and Kaufman's (1990) textbook content analysis was based on several predetermined categories:

... background of the conflict, who started the war and why, the role of the USSR, the relationship of the United States and the United Nations, the objectives of the war, the role of Congress, the expansion of the war to the north, the Truman-MacArthur controversy, the ending of the war and the role of Eisenhower, the public response to the war, and the outcome of the war. (p. 35)

Lin et al.'s (2009) content analysis was a constant comparative content analysis based on four questions: how do textbooks mention the causes of the Korean War, how do they portray reasons for the United States involvement, for Chinese involvement, and their description of how the war ended and who won (p. 225). For the purpose of an analysis of multiple perspectives of the Korean War in American History textbooks, only the findings in the American History textbooks analyzed in Lin et al.'s study are included in this literature review. Since Fleming and Kaufman's study included a more extensive basis of analysis, they have unique findings in comparison to Lin et al.'s study. This includes the assessments regarding internal implications in the United States due to the

war. In addition, Lin et al.'s study did not include the role of the Soviet Union as did Fleming and Kaufman's study.

Although these studies are not direct analyses of multiple perspectives of the Korean War in American History textbooks, they present the dominant themes in its coverage. Although twenty years have passed since Fleming and Kaufman's study, the recent findings of Lin et al.'s study parallel many of theirs. These themes are to be compared to those found in this Master Research Project.

Twelve textbook themes

An analysis of both studies suggests twelve themes. When listing the findings of both studies, and subsequently merging them while grouping like findings, the twelve themes emerge. They are: the background of the war, United States objectives, the "Defense Perimeter Speech", the United States' failure to declare war, United States/United Nations distinction, lack of attention to Korean country and culture, catalyst for the invasion of South Korea, North Korean/Soviet Union relationship, the Chinese intervention, the Soviet Union's United Nations boycott, McArthur's handling of the war, and the end of the war results.

The first theme is the background information the textbooks give on the war which includes the nature of the United States and Soviet Union's occupation of Korea and the nature of the governments they aided in creating in the north and south of the country. They state Japan held Korea as a colony until its defeat by the Allied Powers in 1945, and that the Soviet Union supported the north of the country, while the United States supported the south (Fleming & Kaufman 1990, p. 36; Lin et al., 2009, p. 225). The textbooks in Fleming and Kaufman's study note the failure of the United States and

the Soviet Union to reunify Korea from 1945 to 1950, but in the same breath fail to qualify the nature of Syngman Rhee's government in South Korea. Fleming and Kaufman (1990) state,

“Most texts pointed out that free elections were to be conducted in Korea after the war for unification. The Soviet Union was blamed for blocking these elections in North Korea. The texts differed in their portrayal of the government of South Korea. Usually, the version given was that elections were held in South Korea and that Syngman Rhee was chosen President. The reader could easily assume from this that South Korea was a democratic nation” (p. 36).

Only one of the twelve textbooks examined by Fleming and Kaufman expressed a clear stance on the governments of the North and South. *Land of Promise* described the leaders as ‘Communist boss, Kim Ill-Sung’ and ‘strongman Syngman Rhee whose army was useful primarily to eliminate domestic opposition’ (as cited in Fleming & Kaufman, p. 36), (Appendix B).

The second theme is the textbooks' explanation of the United States' involvement in aiding South Korea. Both studies' textbooks agree that the United States saw North Korea as an arm of the Soviet Union, being used as an attempt to spread communism (Fleming & Kaufman 1990, p. 36; Lin et al., 2009, p. 226). They also state the United States' objective in aiding South Korea was simply to halt the spread of communism as part of its “containment” policy (Fleming & Kaufman, 1990, p. 36; Lin et al., 2009, p. 225).

The third theme is the textbooks' listing of the “Defense Perimeter Speech” as a cause of the war. Secretary of State, Dean Acheson made this speech in which he stated

that Korea was outside the boundary that the United States had drawn encompassing the areas in the Pacific vital to its interest. *The Americans* stated, ‘He may have given the Communists a green light in Korea’ (as cited in Fleming & Kaufman, 1990, p. 36), (Appendix B).

The fourth theme is that the majority of the textbooks mention the fact that Congress did not officially declare war before Truman made the order to send troops to support South Korea (Fleming & Kaufman, 1990, p. 36).

The fifth theme is the textbooks’ failure to distinguish between the roles of the United States and the United Nations. Fleming and Kaufman state, “The relationship between the United States and the United Nations is not very clear, and texts often vacillate between Truman and the United Nations on making decisions” (p. 36). They also found that although other U.N. member countries also contributed troops, the textbooks fail to accurately accredit their numbers, let alone discuss their separate contributions (p. 36) Lin et al.’s textbooks did note that U.N. forces were made up mostly of American troops (p. 226).

The sixth theme is the textbooks’ failure to provide information about the country or people of Korea. Fleming and Kaufman (1990) found that only two out of twelve textbooks in Virginia gave information on Korea, such as resources and size. Discussion of Korean culture was non-existent. The texts only noted that “it had an ‘ancient’ culture” (p. 36).

The seventh theme is the textbooks’ failure to explain the catalyst for the North Korean invasion on June 25, 1950. Both studies’ textbooks agree that the war began with the North Korean invasion, but with no explanation as to why North Korea made the

decision to invade (Fleming & Kaufman, 1990; Lin et al., 2009). Fleming and Kaufman (1990) found only two textbooks that noted the North Korean attack was a reaction to the South Korean military buildup (p. 36).

The eighth theme is the textbooks' speculation as to whether North Korea was under the control of the Soviet Union. Fleming and Kaufman found that the textbooks' versions all varied (p. 36). One textbook *Land of Promise*, stated, 'Kim, aggressive and ambitious, saw a chance to conquer the South when Dean Acheson publicly stated that Korea was outside the American defense perimeter. For reasons of their own, the Russians encouraged Kim (p. 36). Although not a theme, it is significant to note that only two textbooks in Fleming and Kaufman's study even touched upon why the Soviet Union would want war in Korea. *People and Our Country* stated, 'In Stalin's view, a united Korea under Soviet domination would deflate Mao's prestige. It would also serve as a warning to Japan' (as cited in Fleming & Kaufman, 1990, p. 36), (Appendix B).

The ninth theme is the textbooks' mention of the Soviet Union's boycott of the United Nations based on the United Nations' refusal to admit the newly formed communist country of China as a member (Fleming & Kaufman, 1990, p.36).

The tenth theme is the textbooks' explanation for Chinese involvement in the war as a military intervention for reason of self defense. Lin et al.'s study found that the textbooks explained China's reasons for involvement in the war only briefly. *Creating America: A History of the United States* stated, 'Communist China saw the movement of UN forces into North Korea as a threat to China's security. Chinese leaders warned that a further advance would force them to enter the war' (as cited in Lin et al., 2009, p. 226),

(Appendix A). It is significant to note that the textbooks do not touch upon China's political relationship with the Soviet Union or North Korea.

The eleventh theme is the textbooks' inclusion of General MacArthur's handling of the war. Fleming & Kaufman (1990) argue the textbooks cover the debate on MacArthur's war goals such as whether, "should there be all-out war or a limited war; should MacArthur be given his way to use atomic bombs in China; should we unleash Chiang Kai-shek to invade from Taiwan; and should we bomb supply bases in Manchuria" (p. 37). The textbooks also note how MacArthur underestimated the Chinese Volunteer Army, and reported to Truman that the Chinese would not intervene in Korea. Fleming & Kaufman (1990) posited that, "Most [textbooks] state that MacArthur assured Truman that the Chinese would not intervene despite their warnings to the contrary" (p. 36).

The twelfth and final theme is the textbooks' lack of discussion on the end of the war and its results. Lin et al. (2009) found that the war's end and its impact aren't touched upon by half of the American History textbooks analyzed in their study (p. 227). Both studies' American History textbooks claim that the war gained nothing for either North or South Korea, but that the spread of communism was stopped (Fleming & Kaufman, 1990, p. 37; Lin et al., 2009, p. 227). Lin et al. (2009) argue that the textbooks "...overlook the casualties and damage the war inflicted on individual civilians and the nations as a whole." The majority of textbooks in both studies do not mention North Korean and Chinese casualties, while only a few mention South Korean casualties (Fleming & Kaufman, 1990, p. 37; Lin et al., 2009, p. 228). The textbooks do note that the prisoner-of-war negotiations beginning in late 1950, was "a bone of contention in

settling the war” and that the war caused “...a shift in foreign policy from one of limited war to one of massive retaliation” (Fleming & Kaufman, 1990, p.37).

Summary

Although these studies do not constitute direct analyses of multiple perspectives of the Korean War in American History textbooks, the themes they identify offer us a glimpse into the lack of multiple perspectives, and illustrate Fleming and Kaufman’s and Lin et al.’s argument that the content on the Korean War leaves the reader with unanswered questions. From looking at the themes found in these studies one can see the failure of the textbooks to give an explanation as to why there is no mention of Korea as a country or Korean culture, the catalyst for North Korea’s invasion of South Korea, why the Soviet Union might have desired war in Korea, a discussion of China’s political relationship with the Soviet Union and North Korea, and the number of casualties of Koreans and Chinese.

Scholarship in social studies argues that with the inclusion of multiple perspectives these questions can be answered for students. The themes discussed can be compared to those found in this Master Research Project’s current constant comparative study of the Korean War in American History textbooks, upon which an analysis of multiple perspectives can be conducted. Chapter Three will discuss methodology employed in this Master Research Project.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Chapter Two presented a literature review of the research on multiple perspectives in the social studies and multiple perspectives on the Korean War as presented in American History textbooks. Fleming and Kaufman's (1990) *Korea: The Forgotten War* and Lin et al.'s (2009) *Whose History? An Analysis of the Korean War in History Textbooks from the United States, South Korea, Japan, and China* were reviewed for their content analyses of perspectives on the Korean War as presented in American History textbooks.. These studies presented the predominant themes in the coverage of the Korean War in American History textbooks. However, Fleming and Kaufman's study reviewed American History textbooks from the 1980's, and did not include China's role in its analysis of the coverage of the Korean War. In addition, Lin et al.'s study did not include the Soviet Union's role in its analysis. Therefore this Master Research Project includes a constant comparative study of the Korean War in American History textbooks published in the last five years, to include all participating countries' roles in the Korean War.

This chapter explains the methodology used in this Master Research Project. A constant comparative analysis was conducted prior to the multiple perspectives analysis because before multiple perspectives can be assessed, the major themes within the coverage of the Korean War in American History textbooks must be identified. A constant comparative analysis was chosen as the research methodology for this Master

Research Project because it allows for a cross-curricular analysis. According to Zhang and Wildemuth (2009):

“When developing categories inductively from raw data, you are encouraged to use the constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), since it is not only able to stimulate original insights, but is also able to make differences between categories apparent” (p. 4).

The constant comparative and multiple perspectives analysis included the following five American History textbooks:

- Appleby, J., Brinkley, A., Broussard, A. A., McPherson, J. M., Ritchie, D. A. (2008). *The American vision*. New York, N.Y.: McGraw Hill.
- Danzer, G. A., Klor de Alva, J. J., Drieger, L. S., Wilson, L. E., Woloch, N. (2008). *The Americans: Reconstruction to the 21st century*. Evanston, IL: McDougall Littell.
- Davidson, J. W., & Stoff, M. B. (2007). *America: History of our nation*. Boston, M.A.: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hart, D. (2008). *History Alive: Pursuing American ideals*. Palo Alto, C.A.: Teachers Curriculum Institute.
- Lapansky-Warner, E. J., Levy, P. B., Roberts, Randy, & Taylor, A. (2008). *United States History*. Boston, M.A.: Pearson, Prentice Hall.

These textbooks were obtained through donation by their respective companies. The companies were chosen based on the fact that they are major publishers in the textbook industry.

Data Collection and Analysis

I first reviewed these textbooks for their presentation of the Korean War in terms of coverage and format. Secondly, I listed and analyzed all excerpts relating to the Korean War based on the following research questions:

1. How did the United States, South Korea, North Korea, the Soviet Union, and China become involved in the Korean War?
2. What roles did each country play in the war?
3. How did the Korean War end, and what impact did it have on the nations involved?

These questions were taken from Lin et al.'s (2009) *Whose History? An Analysis of the Korean War in History Textbooks from the United States, South Korea, Japan, and China*. Lin et al.'s (2009), content analysis was based on three questions:

1. How did the United States, South Korea, Japan, and China get involved in the Korean War?
2. What roles did each country play in the war?
3. How did the war end and what impact did have on the nations involved?

Their findings were organized based on four sub-questions (p. 225):

1. How do textbooks mention the causes of the Korean War?
2. How do they portray reasons for the United States involvement?
3. How do they portray reasons for China's involvement?
4. How do they describe how the war ended and who won?

The three research questions applied to this Master Research Project's constant comparative analysis were modified from Lin et al.'s research questions to account for the analysis of the role of the Soviet Union. These questions were chosen as those most effective to assess the textbooks' presentation of the crucial aspects of the Korean War, and thereby elicit the presentation of each participating country's role in the war.

First, using the constant comparative method, recurring themes were identified in the excerpts from each of the five textbooks in this study. All words in the excerpts were color coded to facilitate comparing similar statements. Likewise, pronouns were coded according to what each referenced. Similar statements were first grouped into categories, and each excerpt notated according to how it represented an emerging theme. Some excerpts were included in more than one category when their meaning pertained to more than one theme. As I compared each category to the next, I refined each category, and the final themes emerged. Inconsistencies and outliers were noted and analyzed for their significance. After determining the final themes, I compared the twelve themes identified by Fleming and Kaufman and Lin et al. as discussed in Chapter Two in an effort to uncover any significant differences. Finally, I completed the multiple perspectives analysis..

The process of conducting the multiple perspectives analysis included identifying themes through a constant comparative analysis, based on following research questions, to include "official" histories and recent scholarship on the Korean War.

4. In examining the presentation of the Korean War in American History textbooks, whose perspectives are included and excluded?

5. How should the content be changed to address the lack of multiple perspectives on the Korean War?
6. How will these content change(s) contribute to improving students' understanding of the significance of the Korean War, past and present?

Each theme was assessed for its ability to promote student understanding of the war in regard to the perspectives of the five major participating countries: the United States, the Soviet Union, China, North Korea, and South Korea. Next, a discussion follows of what content each theme should address to include multiple perspectives. Finally, the themes that emerged in this project were compared to those found in the studies of Fleming and Kaufman and Lin et al.'s, discussed in Chapter Two. Chapter Four will present the findings of this Master Research Project's constant comparative study and multiple perspectives analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

This chapter will present the findings and analysis of this Master Research Project's constant comparative study and multiple perspective analysis. Each theme found that emerged from the constant comparative approach is discussed first. Then, a review of that theme's ability to promote student understanding of the Korean War via its inclusion of multiple perspectives is given. The American History textbooks reviewed are found in Appendix C. Finally, these themes are compared to those found by Kaufman and Fleming and Lin et al., as discussed in Chapter Two.

Background of the War

The first theme is the textbooks' description of the background of the war. All five textbooks include in its background of the war that Japan ruled Korea until its defeat at the end of World War II. Only one text notes the nature of Japan's rule of its colony. *America: History of Our Nation* states (2007) "In 1910, Japan occupied the Korean Peninsula and ruled it harshly" (p. 850). Only one textbook directly states that the United States and the Soviet Union divided Korea and created the 38th parallel. *The American Vision* (2008) states, "At the end of World War II, American and Soviet forces entered Korea to disarm the Japanese troops stationed there. The Allies divided Korea at the 38th parallel of latitude" (p. 771). Also, all of the textbooks explain that the United States and the Soviet Union were involved in the creation of the governments in the south and north of Korea. However, they use various terms to describe how directly they were involved, and how they differed in their involvement. *United States History* (2008) states, "In

North Korea, the Soviets installed a communist government and equipped its armed forces. The United States provided smaller amounts of aid to noncommunist South Korea” (p. 855). *History Alive!* (2008) states, “In the north, the Soviet Union put a pro-Soviet communist government in power. In the south, U.S. officials supported the existing anticommunist government” (p. 508). *America: History of Our Nation* (2007) states, The Soviet Union backed a Communist government in North Korea. The United States backed a noncommunist government in South Korea” (p. 850). *The American Vision* (2008) also used the term “backed” to describe the involvement of the United States and the Soviet Union. (p. 771) The textbooks describe the Soviet Union as if it created and implemented the Communist government of the North, while the United States merely supported the already existing government that was created by the Korean people of the south. Only one text mentions the U.S. and Soviet Union trying to reunify Korea and subsequently failing. *The American Vision* (2008), states, “Soviet troops controlled the north, while American troops controlled the south. As the Cold War began, talks to reunify Korea broke down” (p. 771). Only one text *The Americans*, (2008) mention Syngman Rhee and Kim Il-Sung as the official heads of the governments created in South and North of Korea. However, it fails to qualify the nature of their governments. *The Americans* (2008) state, “In 1948, the Republic of Korea, usually called South Korea, was established in the zone that had been occupied by the United States. Its government, headed by Syngman Rhee, was based in Seoul, Korea’s traditional capital. Simultaneously, the Communists formed the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea in the north. Kim Il Sung led its government which was based in Pyongyang” (611). No description of the nature of their governments is given.

Review: Background of the War

The textbooks' inclusion of Japan's rule and the involvement of the United States and Soviet Union in the creation of South and North Korea's governments are crucial for student understanding of origins of the conflict. However, these aspects are not qualified or clarified, which is a necessity for student understanding. Only one text mentions that Japan "ruled it harshly." Japan ruled Korea as a colony, and its exploitation of Korean resources and the Korean people became the major source of resentment and tension between the South Korean peoples and the United States military during its occupation. Once the United States expelled the Japanese from the south, it left in place the Japanese structure of local government along with many of the Japanese officials themselves (Cumings, 2010, pp. 138-149). Not knowing the colonial experience of the South Korean people leaves students at a loss when pondering the failure of South Korean President Syngman Rhee's government after the U.S. occupation.

Secondly, only one text directly states that the 38th parallel was created by United States and the Soviet Union. Students need to be clear on the fact that it was the Potsdam Conference of 1945 that initially divided Korea into North and South. The Allies, being primarily the United States and the Soviet Union, unilaterally made the decision to divide the country "without Korean input or approval" (Catchpole, 2000, pp. 2-4). In addition, only one text mentions that fact that the United States and the Soviet Union failed to reunify the North and South. Each superpower wanted reunification with the creation of a Korean government that would be politically advantageous to their own interests.

Thirdly, the textbooks fail to clarify the involvement of the United States and the Soviet Union in the creation of the governments in the north and south of Korea. Students

need to be clear about the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union were the “puppet masters” in the creation of these governments. They approved and placed the leaders of the governments in their positions as bastions for their own political interests (Cumings, 2010). The United States and the Soviet Union are mostly, if not fully, responsible for creating the divisive conditions prior to the North’s invasion of the South. Without this piece of information students become lost as to what party or entity is in control and for what objective.

Lastly, none of the textbooks explain the nature of Syngman Rhee’s Republic of Korea or Kim Il Sung’s Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. Students need this information to have some idea as to where the governments of the north and south and its peoples stood within this conflict. They also need it to compare and contrast their objectives with those of the United States/United Nations and the Soviet Union. First, there should be some background on the leaders, so students can see how the events of their lives molded objectives. It should be explained that Rhee owed his rise to President of South Korea to the support and dealings of the United States. He was educated in the United States and brought back to Korea by the U.S. Office of Strategic Services on McArthur’s own personal plane. He was part of the anti-Japanese movement before he was arrested and exiled, and viewed by the United States as the perfect “Nationalist” counter to any communist remnants in South Korea (Cumings, 2010, p.106). He was elected in elections observed by the United Nations, based on the limited franchise as established by the Japanese (Cumings, 2010, pp. 112-113) Kim Il Sung’s family fled Korea when it came under Japanese rule. His father was a Nationalist fighter against the Japanese, and Kim was educated in Marxist-Leninist ideology in Manchuria and the

Soviet Union. Kim returned to Korea in 1932 as a guerilla fighter to lead many successful raids against the Japanese. The Soviets saw his potential and recruited him as a Soviet officer. He was chosen as a leader in the new Communist provisional government under Soviet auspices placed in North Korea (Koestler-Grack, 2003). Through an explanation of the background of the two leaders, the idea that The Republic of Korea was created independent of American influence and that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was created independent of the Soviet Union, isn't lost on students.

Secondly, the nature of Rhee's and Kim's governments should be qualified as to depict how the North and South Korean people saw their government. It is known that Kim Il Sung distributed former Japanese land to the working class, implemented an eight hour work-day, and "purged" his regime many times to eliminate swiftly those who opposed his wishes (Peter & Li, 2005, p. 6) Rhee was just as dictatorial as Kim Il-Sung. For example, with U.S. support, Rhee massacred tens of thousands on the island of Cheju for an insurgency that now is known had no outside communist push. The peasants were revolting against the remnants of Japanese colonialism that the United States left in place at the local level. Anyone who did not support Rhee and his Nationalist regime was eliminated (Cumings, p.121-140). The textbooks should include some of the individual stories of Koreans under Rhee's government who remember the joy they felt when they realized the communists were coming through to liberate them from the fascist despotism of Rhee and his secret police. However, when the North Koreans swept through and began executing all Koreans who were land proprietors or not of the working class, their views changed. Hastings (1987) claims that it is estimated that some 26,000 South

Korean civilians were massacred by North Koreans between June and September of 1950 (p. 90).

Chinese Civil War

The second theme is the textbooks' explanation of the Chinese Civil War as further information to the background of the war. Four out of five textbooks include a discussion of the Chinese Civil War. They explain that during World War II, two sides formed in China; the Nationalists led by Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists led by Mao Zedong. From the late 1920's until the Japan's invasion of the mainland; they battled one another for control of China. Both sides then worked together to defeat Japan during World War II, but then resumed the civil war afterwards. The United States backed the Nationalists and sent aid in the form of money and military short of troops. Three texts explain that US supported the Nationalists as a bulwark against communist China. *The Americans* (2008), states, "In spite of the problems in the Nationalist regime, American policy favored the Nationalists because they opposed communism" (p. 609). Only one textbook mentions the Soviet Union's support of Mao and the communists during the civil war. All five textbooks mention corruption on the part of Chang Kai-shek and the Nationalists, but only two mention his abusive practices toward the Chinese people. *The Americans* (2008), states,

"...the policies of Chiang's government undermined Nationalist support. For example, the Nationalist collected a grain tax from farmers even during the famine of 1944. When city dwellers demonstrated against a 10,000 percent increase in the price of rice, Chiang's secret police opened fire on them" (p. 610).

Two textbooks note that Mao and the communists had Chinese peasant support because they promised to feed and uplift them. One textbook states explicitly that Mao and the Communists increased food production and literacy among peasants. *The Americans* (2008), continue,

“In contrast, the Communists, led by Mao Zedong, gained strength throughout the country. In the areas they controlled, Communists worked to win peasant support. They encouraged peasants to learn to read, and they helped to improve food production. As a result, more and more recruits flocked to the Communists’ Red Army. By 1945 much of northern China was under communist control” (p. 610).

All the textbooks finish by stating that Mao and Communists defeated the Nationalists in 1949. Chiang fled to Taiwan, then called Formosa where kept a Nationalist holdout for twenty years, and Mao created the People’s Republic of China.

Review: Chinese Civil War

The inclusion of the Chinese Civil War is important for student understanding of the background of the relationship between the Soviet Union and Communist China and its leader Mao Zedong. Only one textbook in this study mentions this relationship. This relationship is necessary for student understanding of the communist bond between the Soviet Union and China. This relationship was of vital importance to the assistance of North Korea in its invasion of South Korea in 1950. Only two textbooks mention the abusive practices of Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese people. It’s important to qualify the nature of Chiang Kai-shek’s unpopularity among the Chinese people because it gives students insight into the Nationalist background of South Korean President Syngman Rhee and his similar dictatorial practices. Most importantly the textbooks do not offer an

explanation of the objectives of the Nationalists and Communists other than that both wanted control of China. If students had some understanding of the ideology of communism, they could envision what Mao wanted to accomplish. Despite this, the textbooks should include an explanation of what both sides envisioned for China so students can make their own judgment about the motives of Rhee and Kim.

Chinese Intervention

The third theme all five textbooks address is China's intervention in the Korean War beginning in the fall of 1950. They all state that on November 25, 1950, China began its offense against the United Nations troops that lay just south of the Yalu River, China's southeastern border. Three out of five textbooks note how China warned the United States that it would attack if U.N. troops entered North Korea. Two textbooks count the number of Chinese People's Volunteer Army soldiers at 300,000 and another textbook at 400,000. The other two textbooks use the terms "hundreds of thousands" and "masses". Only one text included an explanation for China's reasoning to enter the war besides the defense of its border. *The Americans* (2008), states, "The Chinese wanted North Korea as a Communist buffer state to protect their northeastern provinces that made up Manchuria" (p. 612).

Review: Chinese Intervention

The Chinese Winter Offensive was a pivotal event in the Korean War. This occasioned when the Chinese shocked the United States with its surprise attack at the Yalu River and the Chosin Reservoir. At this time, MacArthur made his stand to pursue the use of nuclear weapons in China which led to his subsequent dismissal. Students need to understand why the United States ignored the warnings of an impending Chinese

invasion, why and how the Chinese surprised the U.N. force, and what China's political motives were for entering the war. The textbooks should explain that China issued several warnings throughout late September and October of 1950 which was ignored by the United States. Washington D.C. was sure that China would not intervene, believing that the Soviet Union controlled China, not only because China would have to rely on Soviet military resources, but that the Soviet Union had no intention itself of provoking an invasion (Hastings, 1987, pp. 131, 134-135). MacArthur also ignored the warnings, believing that the Chinese could not defeat his troops, and assured Truman of the same (Cumings, 2010, pp. 26-27; Hastings, 1987, pp. 130-132). A short discussion of the interplay of communications during this time would encourage student understanding of the intelligence blunder and underestimation of the Chinese on the part of the United States and the United Nations.

Second, a short explanation of the battle at the Chosin Reservoir would clarify for students the United Nations forces' retreat back to the 38th parallel. Sources vary on the exact number of People's Volunteer Army (PVA) troops, but all are within this range. According to Mahoney in his *Formidable Enemies*, (2001) 300,000 PVA troops entered Korea in the fall of 1950 (p. 46). The first contact with U.N. troops occurred on October 25, 1950. After this initial contact the PVA retreated into the North Korean Mountains, which the U.N. Command took as a sign of weakness. In actuality, the Chinese were hiding to await an ambush on the U.N. troops all along the Korean Front, east and west on November 25th, sending the U.N. troops in retreat. On the east side of the Chosin Reservoir was the 31st Infantry of the U.N. forces, while on the west side was the X

Corps. There was no radio contact. Neither suspected the surprise attack that was going to come from the Chinese (Seelinger, n.d.).

Third, the textbooks should include a description of the Chinese soldier as an explanation for Chinese success during the Winter Offensive besides superiority of numbers. Hastings (1987) states,

“A Chinese soldier required just eight to ten pounds of supplies a day, against sixty for his UN counterpart. Thus, to sustain fifty divisions in combat, Peking needed to move only 2,500 tons of supplies a day south across the Yalu. This compared with 600 tons for a single U.S. Army division, 700 tons for the 1st Marine Division” (p. 138).

In addition, it should be included as a significant fact that it was Soviet pilots flying a wave of MIG-15s over the Yalu River during the Chinese Winter Offensive, as confirmed by Soviet archives (Peter & Li, 2005, pp. 27-28).

Last, only one textbook offers further reasons for China entering the war. *The Americans* (2008) states, “The Chinese wanted North Korea as a Communist buffer state to protect their northeastern provinces that made up Manchuria” (p. 612). China no doubt had concerns about its territory at the border of North Korea given the close proximity of the U.N. forces and MacArthur’s threat to use nuclear weapons. However, this doesn’t explain China’s political motives to enter the war. This would require a discussion of the political relationship between China and the communist governments of the Soviet Union and North Korea. This will be discussed in regards to the following theme: the North Korean invasion.

North Korean Invasion

The fourth theme is the agreement among all five textbooks that the war started when North Korea invaded South Korea on June 25, 1950, with the use of Soviet military resources short of troops. Two textbooks mention that the United States drawback of troops from Korea allowed for a military buildup within North Korea. Only two of the textbooks include that the invasion was seen by Truman as a test of U.S. “containment policy” or “American will”. One of these textbooks places the Soviet Union as the one in control of the North Korean military buildup, and explains its reason for doing so. *The Americans* (2008), states,

“However, soon after World War II, the United States had cut back its armed forces in South Korea. As a result, by June of 1949 there were only 500 American troops there. The Soviets concluded that the United States would not fight to defend South Korea. They prepared to back North Korea with tanks, airplanes, and money in an attempt to take over the entire peninsula” (p. 611).

It is quite clear here that it was the Soviet Union who desired to acquire Korea. One textbook provides an explanation of the North Korean objective behind the invasion. *History Alive!* (2008) states, “The war began when North Korean troops armed with Soviet weapons invaded South Korea. Its aim was to unite all of Korea under communist rule (p. 508). This suggests that it was North Korea that desired the unification of Korea and subsequent ruling.

Review: North Korean Invasion

It is crucial that students are aware that North Korea went into combat with the aid of Soviet Union military resources short of troops. This clearly indicates that Stalin had an interest in the North Korean invasion of South Korea, but without the appearance

of direct involvement by sending Soviet troops. However, only one textbook gives an explanation of Stalin's motives for equipping North Korea. It is clear to the student that in this text it is the Soviet Union's desire to take over the peninsula. Unfortunately, only one textbook made this clarification. Although not within the context of the North Korean invasion, it is pertinent to note another textbook that gives a blatant explanation of the objective of the Soviet Union. *United States History* (2008) states,

“Since the time of the Russian Revolution in 1917, the Soviets had hoped to spread communism to every corner of the world, training foreigners in Marxist theory and revolutionary strategy. The Soviets were confident that communism would reach worldwide influence. In 1949, events in China seemed to justify their confidence” (p. 854).

This text, although clear in its view of the motives of the Soviet Union, does nothing in the way of promoting student understanding of the Soviet Union's actions and decisions before and during the war. The interplay between North Korea, the Soviet Union, and China is crucial for students understanding of their motives. The banter between Kim Il Sung, Joseph Stalin, and Mao Zedong is a perfect lesson on historical agency. For the sake of clarification, the new scholarship on the relationship between the three should be discussed. Shen (2000) claims that newly opened documents from the Soviet Union and China give the impression that Kim Il Sung of North Korea did initiate the plan for the invasion of the South. He tried to convince Stalin that with Soviet resources he could take South Korea within days. Stalin had no problem with giving Kim Soviet military resources. However, he initially refused to support Kim, claiming that the guerilla movement and armed uprising development south of the parallel weren't sufficient to

make an invasion successful (pp. 49-52). Stalin saw Mao's newly communist government as a rival, and saw a chance to not only eliminate him, but gain control of the Korean peninsula at the same time. Stalin forced Mao to support a North Korean invasion by first approving Kim's plans, and then telling Kim to get Mao's approval. Mao needed Soviet resources to take Taiwan and Chiang Kai-shek's government. The only way he was going to get it was to support Kim's invasion first. Mao had no choice but to use his People's Liberation Army in service of North Korea (Peter & Li, 2005, pp. 10-11; Shen, 2000, pp. 63-68). Mao's commander in chief of the Chinese-North Korean Allied Forces described the motivation to aid North Korea as follows, "How could [we show our power and strength if we did not send our forces to aid and save Korea? Our forces ought to be dispatched also in order to encourage the peoples of colonial and semicolonial countries to carry on their nationalist and democratic revolutions against the imperialists and invasions" (Dehuai, 2001, p. 32).

Soviet Boycott of the United Nations

The fifth theme in all five textbooks is the Soviet Union's boycott of the United Nations in protest against its refusal to admit Mao's People's Republic of China as a member country. Since the Soviet Union was not present at the United Nations when it passed its resolution to aid South Korea, it could not veto the resolution. The United Nations continued to look upon Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist holdout in Taiwan (Formosa) as the legitimate government of China. *The American Vision* (2008) states, "It used its veto power in the UN Security Council to keep representatives of the new Communist People's Republic of China out of the UN, allowing the Nationalists to retain their seat" (p. 770).

Review: Soviet Boycott of the United Nations

This theme is straightforward as a piece of information that students need to know how the resolution was adopted without Soviet approval.

United States Fear of Losing China to Communism

The sixth theme is the United States' fear of China's fall to communism. Four out of five textbooks mention America's loss of China to communism. All five textbooks note how the American public blamed the Truman administration. Two textbooks explain that Truman was blamed for not giving enough aid to Chiang. Three textbooks quote Secretary of State Dean Acheson's remarks on his belief that China's fall to communism was beyond the control of the United States. *History Alive!* (2008) states,

...In public speeches and on the floor of Congress, they asked bitterly, 'Who lost China?' Some Republican leaders pointed accusing fingers at President Truman. U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson denied that the administration held responsibility for China's acceptance of communism. 'Nothing this country did or could have done within the reasonable limits of its capabilities,' "he said," 'could have changed the result.' Many China scholars agreed, noting Chiang's unpopularity and broad public support for Mao Zedong" (p. 507).

Two textbooks mention the belief by many American government officials of the existence of communist agents within the United States government. Two textbooks note American fears over the Soviets obtaining the bomb in late 1949.

Review: United States Fear of Losing China to Communism

The importance of student understanding of American fears over the "loss of China" to communism is that it hardened the United States' stance against communism.

Unfortunately, none of the textbooks included all aspects described to give a coherent explanation of the significance of the loss of China to communism to the United States. Many within the United States government blamed Truman and his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, claiming they did not support Chiang and the Nationalists “fully” to successfully defeat Mao Zedong. Acheson saw Chiang Kai-shek’s corrupt and abusive government as a lost cause, and that the loss of China to communism was beyond American control. Acheson took the heat for his “Defense Perimeter Speech” in January, 1950, in which he stated that South Korea was not within the defense boundary of the United States. This was interpreted to mean that the United States did not see South Korea as a concern, and when the invasion took place, it was claimed he gave the Communists “the green light”. The State Department was criticized for not having the foresight of a North Korean invasion despite the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance and the Soviet acquisition of the atomic bomb in early 1950. Even though the Communists were defeated in South Korea, those who criticized Acheson and Truman’s “containment policy,” renewed their anti-Communist vigor by looking for communist agents and sympathizers within the United States government (Hastings, 1987, p. 57; Cold Warriors-Dean Acheson, n.d.).

The United Nations and Truman

The seventh theme is the comparison of the United Nations and President Truman. Three out of the five textbooks differentiate the actions of Truman and the United Nations while the other two textbooks explain it differently. Three textbooks explain that Truman saw the invasion of South Korea as testing his “containment policy” or the “American will”. He first ordered U.S. troops stationed in Japan to be sent to aid

South Korea. Then, they state that either Truman urged the United Nations to follow his lead and give its support, or that the United Nations then voted on its own accord to follow suit. One textbook does describe the United States as a member of the United Nations enacting the vote for United Nations support. *United States History* (2008), states, "... the United States pushed a resolution through the UN, calling for a 'unified, independent, and democratic' Korea" (p. 857). This statement describes the U.N. Resolution as a completely American action.

One textbook claims that it was South Korea itself that requested aid from the United Nations. *The Americans* (2008), states, "South Korea called on the United Nations to stop the North Korean invasion. When the matter came to a vote in the UN Security Council..." (p. 611). This statement leads the reader to assume that it was South Korea that, completely independent of the United States, went to the United Nations.

Review: The United Nations and Truman

Even though the themes in this study differentiate between the United Nations and Truman's actions, only one textbook, *United States History* (2008), came close to explaining the relationship between the two parties. As the first "hot war" of the Cold War, the distinction, as to the weight of the United States' vote in the United Nations, isn't qualified. It should be made clear to students that the United States' vote, as one of the permanent, five countries on the Security Council and the weight of its military contribution, gave it almost complete control over United Nations' decisions on the war. The claim that it was South Korea itself that called upon the United Nations is historically incorrect. The passing of the Resolution was primarily an American action.

Contributing United Nations Member Countries

The eighth theme is the inclusion of other United Nations member countries' contributions to the Korean War. Three of the five textbooks mention the number of United Nations countries that sent troops, and that American troops accounted for most of the force. *America: History of Our Nation* (2007), and *The Americans* (2008), give the number of United Nations member countries that contributed troops as 16, while *History Alive!* (2008) gives the number as 15. One of the three textbooks included troop numbers. *The Americans* (2008) states, "In all, 16 nations sent some 520,000 troops to aid South Korea. Over 90 percent of these troops were American. South Korean troops numbered an additional 590,000" (p. 612).

Review: Contributing United Nations Member Countries

Textbooks should include the United Nations member countries who contributed troops. This was the first time troops were sent under the flag of the United Nations. Including the United States, there were 16 United Nations member countries that contributed troops. They were Britain, France, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Columbia, Ethiopia, Luxembourg, Philippines, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, Belgium, Greece, and the Netherlands. The United Nations member countries of Denmark, India, Norway, and Sweden contributed medical and humanitarian aid (Office of Defense and Armed Forces Attaché, n.d.).

Truman's Failure to Secure Congressional Declaration of War

The ninth theme is the inclusion in only one textbook of the Constitutional conflict surrounding Truman's failure to secure a Congressional declaration of war before he ordered troops into Korea. The textbook, *United States History* (2008) states, "Truman

did not ask Congress for a formal declaration of war, as required by the Constitution” (p. 857).

Review: Truman’s Failure to Secure Congressional Declaration of War

Another aspect of the relationship between the United States and the United Nations that is given limited to no attention is the constitutional debate over Truman’s decision to send troops into South Korea. Textbooks need to include a discussion of this event for student understanding as it paves the way for the War Power’s Resolution of 1973. The United States Congress did not declare war as is required by the United States Constitution. Under the United Nations Charter’s language it was called a “police action.” Fisher (1995) argues that the President’s power to use the military without Congressional approval under “policing powers” is still seen by some as unconstitutional citing the UN Participation Act itself, which requires Congressional approval prior to any use of military resources (p. 7). Truman’s use of troops in Korea set a precedent for future U.S. Presidents to claim “police action” in support of the use of American troops in conflicts such as Vietnam and Iraq.

MacArthur and Truman Controversy

The tenth theme is the textbooks’ conflict with Truman over war with China. All five textbooks present the perspective that it was MacArthur’s brilliance that made the landing at Inchon a success. All five also include his public push to bomb mainland China, and his public criticism of President’s Truman’s decision to keep the war “limited”. They also include Truman’s refusal to allow McArthur to use nuclear weapons, and his subsequent dismissal of McArthur. Only one textbook mentions the public outcry over MacArthur’s dismissal. They also explain Truman’s reasoning for rejecting

MacArthur's demands. Two textbooks present direct quotes from Truman to describe his rationale. *The American Vision* (2008) states,

‘... Our allies agree with us in the course we are following. They do not believe we should take the initiative to widen the conflict in the Far East. If the United States were to widen the conflict, we might well have to go it alone’ (p. 773)

United States History (2008) states,

‘We do not want to see the conflict in Korea extended. We are trying to prevent a world war – not to start one... Why can't we take other steps to punish the aggressor? Why don't we bomb Manchuria and China itself? Why don't we assist Chinese Nationalist troops to land on mainland China? If we were to do these things we would become entangled in a vast conflict on the continent of Asia...’ (p. 858).

Three textbooks offer direct quotes from MacArthur as a description of his rationale. *The Americans* (2008) states, “...MacArthur called for an extension of the war into China. Convinced that Korea was the place ‘where the Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest,’ “MacArthur called for the use of nuclear weapons against Chinese cities” (p. 614). In *The American Vision* (2008) MacArthur says, ‘There is no substitute for victory,’... “Keeping a war limited was, in his view, a form of appeasement, and appeasement he argued,” ‘begets new and bloodier war’ (p. 772).

United States History (2008) states,

‘I made it clear that if not permitted to destroy the enemy built-up bases north of the Yalu, if not permitted to utilize the friendly Chinese force of some 600,000

men on Formosa [Taiwan], if not permitted to blockade the China coast...the position of the command from the military standpoint forbade victory.’

Review: MacArthur and Truman Controversy

It’s important that students understand the rationales of those who advocated total war, and those who advocated limited war. This would force students to grapple with the pros and cons of each perspective. The quotes used by these textbooks are an effective way of doing so.

End of the War and its Impact

The eleventh and final theme, present in all five textbooks, is the stalemate in 1951 that lasted until 1953 with the signing of the armistice. According to *America: History of Our Nation* (2007) “well over 30,000” Americans died (p. 852). *The American Vision* (2008) claims that “more than 33,600 American soldiers died” (p. 773) while *United States History* (2008) puts “Americans killed” right at “37,000 (p. 859). *The Americans* (2008) states that “54,000” Americans died (p. 615). *History Alive!* (2008) states that “more than 54,000 American soldiers” were killed (p.509). *America: History of Our Nation* (2007) states that 2,000,000 Koreans died in the fighting, a majority of this figure civilians (p.852). *History Alive!* (2008) states, that 3,500,000 North Korean and South Korean soldiers were killed or injured, 2,000,000 of this figure being civilians (p. 509). Only one text, *America: History of Our Nation* (2007) mentions the “thousands” of non-American, U.N. troops who were killed in combat (p. 852). None of the textbooks note Chinese casualties. Otherwise, the textbooks’ discussion of the end of the war culminate in a wide range of aspects that includes: the destruction in Korea left by the war, the contentious peace talks about the exchange of the prisoners-of-war,

Eisenhower's threat to use the bomb when peace talks began to break down, how the war prompted a hardened stance against communism and a military buildup in the United States, the McCarthy era hunt for communist sympathizers in the United States, Truman's legacy of presidents sending troops into combat without Congressional approval, the continued division of Korea, the recent reunification talks between the North and South, and the creation of SEATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, Asia's counterpart of NATO.

Review: End of the War and its Impact

All five textbooks discuss the stalemate and the signing of the armistice three years later, that ended the war, which is necessary for students to understand how the fighting ended. However, only one textbook, *The Americans* (2008) notes the obstacle of the exchange of the prisoners-of-war. There should be further explanation of this considering that it kept the peace talks lingering for two years. The last two years of fighting only took place due to the inability of China and the United States to agree on prisoner-of-war negotiations. The initial meetings between China and the United States in Kaesong and Panmunjom in March 1951 began two years of non-productive negotiations. Neither side trusted the other to return all prisoners-of-war to their respective side. They could not come to an agreement on a "screening" process of prisoners-of-war that would guarantee each prisoner-of-war to be permitted to go to the communist or non-communist side of his choice. They finally agreed to let four neutral countries (Switzerland, Sweden, Poland, and Czechoslovakia) implement the screening and complete the prisoners-of-war exchange (Catchpole, 2000, pp. 223-226).

Only two textbooks, *America: History of Our Nation* (2007) and *History Alive!* (2008) included numbers of North and South Korean soldiers and civilian deaths. Not a single textbook noted the number of Chinese soldiers killed. Students need to be exposed to these numbers to have a more comprehensive view of the full loss of life this war caused. Scholarship on the Korean War puts American soldiers killed anywhere between 34,000 to 54,000, South Korean soldiers killed at about 400,000, North Korean soldiers killed between 200,000 to 500,000, and Chinese soldiers killed at 900,000 (Cumings, 2010; Hastings, 1987; Mahoney, 2001). The total number for Korean civilian deaths ranges from 1 million to 3 million (Death Toll, 2011). These numbers vary according to the type of casualties included. The textbooks reflect the scholarships' varying numbers for American and Korean military and civilian death numbers. Chinese casualties need to be included as well as the number for U.N. troop casualties that were non-American. Scholarship puts non-American, U.N. troops killed at a little more than 3,000 and total casualties (dead, wounded, and missing), at about 17,000 (Hastings, 1987; Participating Nations, n.d.).

Comparative Analysis

This Master Research Project's constant comparative study produced themes that paralleled the themes found in the combined themes of Fleming and Kaufman and Lin et al.'s studies. The themes found in Fleming and Kaufman and Lin et al.'s combined studies will be referred to as the Chapter Two themes, while the themes produced by this Master Research Project's constant comparative study will be referred to as the Chapter Four themes. Chapter Four themes numbered 11, while Chapter Two themes numbered 12. Between the two sets of themes every theme but five, found the same theme among

one of those in the other set. Those five themes that did not match a theme from the other chapter are as follows;

- The Chinese Civil War
- United States' Fears of Losing China to Communism
- Dean Acheson's "Defense Perimeter Speech"
- Background of the War
- The North Korean Invasion

The themes "The Chinese Civil War" and "United States' Fears of Losing China to Communism" are not included in the Chapter Two themes. This is either a result of the narrow focus of Fleming and Kaufman and Lin et al.'s research questions, or the complete lack of the themes in the textbook coverage of the Korean War.

Dean Acheson's "Defense Perimeter Speech", which placed South Korea outside of the United States' boundary of defense and believed to have given the communists a pretext to invade South Korea, was not found in any textbook reviewed for the Chapter Four themes.

The "Background of the War" among the Chapter Four themes did not name or qualify Syngman Rhee and Kim Il Sung's governments. Only one textbook mentioned the two leaders, but gave no description or explanation of their governments. Within the Chapter Two themes the leaders' governments are named and qualified.

The Chapter Four theme of "The North Korean Invasion" of South Korea includes the aspects of a North Korean military buildup as a result of the pullout of the majority of American troops in South Korea. The Chapter Two theme of the invasion focused on the military buildup of South Korea before the invasion. The interesting thing about this

difference is that the North Korean and South Korean buildup both can be interpreted as a result of the pullout of American troops in South Korea. One can conclude that the focus of this theme is determined by the interpretation of the individual who is doing the analysis.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The Korean War, often referred to as the Forgotten War, has also been forgotten in American History textbooks. Coverage of the Korean War in American History textbooks is limited and more importantly leaves students with more questions than answers (Fleming & Kaufman, 1990). These questions can be answered with the inclusion of multiple perspectives. Researchers have found that teaching from multiple perspectives lends itself to improved schema formation and knowledge construction for all students in regards to historical interpretation and perspectives. With the skill of historical empathy students can navigate their way through the actions and decisions of individuals and groups, within the time in which he/she or they lived. This act of analysis, known as historical empathy, can help students better grasp the significance of a historical event or time period.

Despite this scholarship, research shows that social studies textbooks do not include multiple perspectives. The process of creating social studies textbooks creates texts that fulfill nationalist aims that include bias in the form of omission, misrepresentation, and manipulated language used to determine students' impressions and understanding.

A review of multiple perspectives on the Korean War in American History textbooks generated themes from the combined studies of Fleming, D., & Kaufman, B. (1990). *Korea: The Forgotten War* and Lin, L., Zhao, Y., Ogawa, M., Hoge, J. and Kim,

B. (2010). *An analysis of the Korean War in history textbooks from the United States, South Korea, Japan, and China*. Although these two studies were not direct analyses of multiple perspectives of the Korean War in American History textbooks, they present the dominant themes in its coverage. Fleming and Kaufman's study reviewed American History textbooks from the 1980's but did not include China's role. In addition, Lin et al's study did not include the role of the Soviet Union. Therefore this Master Research Project included a constant comparative analysis of the Korean War in American History textbooks published during the last five years, to include all participating countries' roles in the Korean War. The identified themes were used to conduct a multiple perspectives analysis.

The multiple perspectives analysis of each of the identified themes shows that the perspectives of the Soviet Union, North Korea, South Korea, and China are excluded from the presentation of the Korean War in American History textbooks. The complete lack of any textbook coverage of the Korean people and their way of life is paramount. The omission of the Soviet, North Korean, and South Korean governments' motives in regard to their actions and decisions is evident as well. Finally, the complete lack of an explanation of the Chinese political motives for entering the war further add to the manipulation and mythologizing of historical knowledge. .

Recommendations

This study did not seek to evaluate the effectiveness of one American History textbook over another with regard to including multiple perspectives to promote student understanding. The sheer lack of inclusion or clarity of the perspectives of the Soviet Union, North Korea, South Korea, or China warrants this sentiment. However, since

social studies textbooks are a predominant part of the social studies curriculum and likely to stay for some time, it is unwarranted to envision their removal from the classroom. However, it would not be a vast undertaking to include in the coverage of the Korean War in American History textbooks several crucial facts such as the background of Rhee and Kim, the process through which they were chosen to lead, an explanation of the civilian experience under a “nationalist” or “communist” government, as well as a review of the relationship between the three communist powers: the Soviet Union, North Korea, and China.

New scholarship on the history of the Korean War has brought forth new perspectives in these areas. Sources such as, Richard Peters and Xiaobing Li’s (2005) *Voices from the Korean War* offer firsthand accounts by North Korean and Chinese soldiers. Max Hastings’ (1987) *The Korean War* includes accounts of South Korean civilians and soldiers under the government of Syngman Rhee. Thoughts and reflections of those in command of the People’s Liberation Army are translated in *Mao’s Generals Remember Korea*, by Xiaobing Li, Allan R. Millett, and Bin Yu (2001). This last new source not only offers insight into how Mao’s generals felt about the Chinese intervention, but their narratives also recount his relationship with Stalin and Kim. With the incorporation of short narratives in classroom instruction from sources such as these, coupled with the use of text “metadiscourse”, or language use that describes the author’s thoughts, the coverage and presentation of the Korean War in American social studies classrooms can be vastly improved.

As the research literature suggests, the contradiction of the varying perspectives within these sources would provoke students to question their understandings and seek

answers that aid them in developing their own personal perspectives. However, it is safe to assume that the process and influences in the development of social studies textbooks is not going to change in the near future. With this in mind, teachers should supplement their curriculum with primary document activities based on sources such as those listed in this chapter.

References

- Ambrosio, J., & Banks, J.A. (n.d.). History, the dimensions of multicultural education, evidence of the effectiveness of multicultural education. *Education Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/2252/Multicultural-Education.html>
- Apple, M., & L. Christian-Smith. (1991). *The politics of the textbook*. New York: Routledge.
- Ashby, R., Lee, P., & Dickinson, A. (1997). How children explain the “Why” of History: The Chata Research Project on teaching history. *Social Education*. 61(1). pp. 17-21.
- Banks, J.A. (2002). *An introduction to multicultural education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon
- Banks, J. A. & Banks, C. A. (2004). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Brandhorst, A. R. (1989). Critical thinking: Schemata vs. skills. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 17(3) pp. 196-209.
- Catchpole, B. (2000). *The Korean War*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, Inc.
- Cold Warriors - Dean Acheson. (n.d.). In *Encyclopedia of the New American Nation*. Retrieved from <http://www.americanforeignrelations.com/A-D/Cold-Warriors-Dean-acheson.html>
- Commeyras, M., & Alvermann, D. E. (1994). Messages that high school World History textbooks convey. Challenges for Multicultural Literacy. *Social Studies*, Issue 6. pp. 268-274.
- Content Analysis. (n.d.) In *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/content%2Banalysis>
- Crismore, A. (1984). The rhetoric of textbooks: Metadiscourse. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 16(3). Pp. 279-296.
- Cumings, B. (2010). *The Korean War: A history*. New York: The Modern Library.
- Death Tolls for the Major Wars and Atrocities of the Twentieth Century. (2011). Twentieth Century Atlas. Retrieved from <http://necrometrics.com/20c1m.htm#Ko>

- Dehuai, P. (2001). My story of the Korean War. (Li, X., Millett, A. R., and Yu, B. Trans.). Lawrence: University Press of Kansas. (Original work published in 1981).
- Devoogd, G. (2005). Critical comprehension of Social Studies Text. *RHI: Promoting Active Citizenship*. Retrieved from http://www.randomhouse.com/highschool/RHI_magazine/active_citizens/devoogd.html
- Doppen, F. H. (2000). Teaching and learning multiple perspectives: The atomic bomb. *The Social Studies*, 91(4) pp. 159-169.
- Dulberg, N. (2005). The theory behind how students learn: Applying developmental theory to research on children's historical thinking. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 33(4). pp. 508-531.
- Epstein, T.L. (1997). Sociological approaches to young people's historical understanding. *Social Education*, 61(1). pp. 28-31.
- Fleming, D., & B. Kaufman. 1990. The forgotten war: Korea. *Social Education*, 56(4). pp. 35-38.
- Fisher, L. (1995). The Korean War; On what legal basis did Truman act? *The American journal of international law*, 89(21). pp. 21-39.
- Foner, E. (2002). *Who owns history? Rethinking the past in a changing world*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Foster, S., & Nicholls, J. (2005). America in World War II: An analysis of history textbooks from England, Japan, Sweden, and the United States. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 20(3). Pp. 214-33.
- Foster, S.J., Morris, James W., & Davis JR, O.L. (1996). Prospects for teaching historical analysis and interpretation: National Curriculum Standards for history meet current history textbooks. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*,. Vol.11. pp. 367-85.
- Foster, S. J., & Rosch, R. (1997). Teaching World War I from multiple perspectives. *Social Education*, Issue 7. pp. 429-434.
- Foster, S. J. (1999). The struggle for American identity: Treatment of ethnic groups in United States history textbooks. *History of Education*, 28(3). pp. 251-278.
- Foster, S. J. (1999). Using historical empathy to excite students about the study of history: Can you empathize with Neville Chamberlain? *The Social Studies*, 90(1). pp. 18-24.

- Gordy, L. L., Hogan, J., & Pritchard, A. (2004). Assessing “Herstory” of WWII: Content analysis of High School History Textbooks. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, Vol. 37. pp. 80-91.
- Habtai, A. Towards a Systematic Pattern for Evaluating History Textbooks in Curriculum Programme of Nigeria Teacher Education Institution. Paper Presented at 3rd Annual Conference of C.O.N. at University of Nsukka. December 24-28, 1984.
- Hastings, Max. (1987). *The Korean War*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.
- Koestler-Grack, R. A. (2003). *Kim Il Sung and Kim Jong Il*. Simi Valley, C.A.: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Korea Institute of Military History. (1997). *The Korean War: Volume One*. University of Nebraska Press: London
- Levstik, L.S. (1997). “Any history is someone’s history”: Listening to multiple voices from the past. *Social Education*, 61(1). pp. 48-51.
- Li, X., Millett, A. R., & Yu, B. (Eds. & Trans.). (2001). *Mao’s generals remember Korea*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Lin, L., Zhao, Y., Ogawa, M., Hoge, J., & Kim, B. (2009). Whose History? An analysis of the Korean War in history textbooks from the United States, South Korea, Japan, and China. *The Social Studies*, 100(5). pp. 222-232.
- Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American History textbook got wrong*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Mahoney, K. (2001). *Formidable enemies: The North Korean and Chinese soldier in the Korean War*. Novato: Presidio Press, Inc.
- Miller, H. M. (1998). Teaching and learning about cultural diversity: Who owns history? *Reading Teacher*, 52(1). pp. 76-78
- Mosborg, S. (2002). Speaking of history: How adolescents use their knowledge of history in reading the daily news. *Cognition and Instruction*, 20(3). pp. 323-358.
- National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies: Chapter 2, The Themes of Social Studies. National Council for the Social Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.socialstudies.org/standards/strands>
- Offices of the Defense and Armed Forces Attache. (n. d.) Brief History of the United Nations Command (UNC) and the Philippine Liaison Group. Retrieved from <http://www.philembassy-seoul.com/dafa.asp>

- Ogawa, M. (2001). Building Multiple Historical Perspectives: An investigation of How Middle School Students Are Influenced by Different Perspectives. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA, April 10-14-2001.
- Participating Nations: Their contributions to the Korean War efforts. (n.d.). The Korean War Educator. Retrieved from http://www.koreanwar-educator.org/topics/united_nations/p_un_involve.htm
- Paxton, R. J. (1999). A deafening silence: History textbooks and the students who read them. *Review of Educational Research*, 69(3). pp. 315-339.
- Peters, R., & Li, X. (2005). *Voices from the Korean War*. Lexington: K.Y. University Press of Kentucky
- Romanowski, M. (1996). Problems of bias in history textbooks. *Social Education*, 60(3). Pp. 170-173.
- Seelinger, M. (n.d.). Nightmare at the Chosin Reservoir. Army History Center. Retrieved from <http://www.armyhistory.org/ahf2.aspx?pgID=877&id=40&exCompID=56>
- Sexias, P. (1993). Historical understanding among adolescents in a multicultural setting. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 23(3). 301-327.
- Sexias, P. (1994). Students' understanding of historical significance. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22(4). pp. 281-304.
- Sexias, P. (1997). Mapping the terrain of historical significance. *Social Education*, 61(1). pp. 22-27.
- Shen Z. (2000). Sino-Soviet relations and the origins of the Korean War: Stalin's strategic goals in the Far East. *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 2(2). pp. 44-68.
- Torney-Purta, J. (1991). Schema theory and cognitive psychology: Implications for Social Studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 19(2). Pp. 189-210.
- Tucker, S. (2000). Why study the Korean War? *Magazine of History*, 14(3). pp. 3-5.
- Tunnell, M., & Ammon, R. (1996). The story of ourselves: Fostering multiple historical perspectives. *Social Education*, 60(4). pp. 212-15.
- Wade, R. C. (1991). Content analysis of social studies textbooks: A review of ten years of research. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22(3). pp. 232-256.
- Wakefield, J. F. Textbook Usage in the United States: The Case of U.S. History.

Paper presented at the International Seminar on Textbooks, Santiago, Chile, April 19-21, 2006.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking: And other unnatural acts, charting the future of teaching the past*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Yeager, E.A., Foster, S. J., Maley, S. D., Anderson, T., & Morris, J. W. (1999). Why people in the past acted as they did: An exploratory study in historical empathy. *International Journal of Social Education* 13(1). pp. 8-24.

Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. In B. Wildemuth (Ed.), *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science* (pp.308-319). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Zhao, Y., & Hoge, J. (2006). Countering textbook distortion: War atrocities in Asia, 1937-1945. *Social Education*, 70 (7). pp. 424-430.

Appendix A

American History Textbooks Reviewed in Lin, L., Zhao, Y., Ogawa, M., Hoge, J. and Kim, B. (2009). An analysis of the Korean War in history textbooks from the United States, South Korea, Japan, and China.

Textbook Title	Publisher	Year
World History: The Human Experience	Glencoe/McGraw-Hill	1999
The Americans: Reconstruction to the 21 st Century	McDougal Littell	2005
Pathways to the Present: Modern American History	Pearson Prentice Hall	2005
The American Nation	Pearson Prentice Hall	2005
History of Our World	Pearson Prentice Hall	2005
Creating America: A History of the United States	McDougal Littell	2002
History Alive! The United States	Teachers' Curriculum Institute	2002
Creating America: A History of the United States	McDougal Littell	2005
The American Journey	Glencoe/McGraw Hill	2007
The American Journey Reconstruction to the Present	Glencoe/McGraw Hill	2005

Appendix B

American History Textbooks Reviewed in Fleming, D., & Kaufman, B. (1990). Korea:
The Forgotten War

Textbook Title	Publisher	Year
The American Pageant	Heath and Co.	1983
Land of Promise	Scott, Foresman and Co.	1983
A History of the United States	Ginn and Co.	1983
Our Land and Our Time	Coronado Publishers	1985
The United States: A History of the Republic	Prentice Hall	1984
The Unwanted Symbol: American Foreign Policy, the Cold War, and Korea	Kent State University Press	1981
American History	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich	1982
American: The Glorious Republic	Houghton Mifflin Co.	1985
The Americans	McDougal, Little and Co.	1985
People and Our Country	Holt, Rinehart, and Winston	1982
Heritage of Freedom	Macmillan Publishing Co.	1985
Life and Liberty	Scott, Foresman and Co.	1984
Rise of the American Nation	Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich	1982

Appendix C

American History Textbooks Reviewed in this Master Research Project's Study

Textbook Title	Publisher	Year
The American Vision	McGraw Hill	2008
The Americans: Reconstruction to the 21 st Century	McDougal Littell	2008
America: History of our Nation	Pearson Education, Inc.	2007
History Alive!	Teachers Curriculum Institute	2008
United States History	Pearson Prentice Hall	2008