

**LIFE AND WAR IN KOREA:
PHOTOGRAPHIC PORTRAYALS OF THE KOREAN WAR
IN *LIFE* MAGAZINE, JULY 1950 - AUGUST 1953**

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri–Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
SUN-A KIM

Dr. C. Zoe Smith, Dissertation Supervisor

AUGUST 2008

© Copyright by Sun-A Kim 2008

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

LIFE AND WAR IN KOREA:
PHOTOGRAPHIC PORTRAYALS OF THE KOREAN WAR
IN *LIFE* MAGAZINE, JULY 1950 – AUGUST 1953

Presented by Sun-A Kim

A candidate for the degree for Doctor of Philosophy

And hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. C. Zoe Smith, Dissertation Supervisor

Dr. Wayne Wanta

Dr. Stephanie Craft

Dr. William Benoit

Dr. Carol E. Anderson

To Young Hwan Cha, with Love

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I have grown older, I have realized that life is a beautiful and elaborate fabric in which the relationships with the people surrounding me are woven together. The weave is done sometimes closely and sometimes loosely, but each relationship makes a unique design and pattern.

I have met many wonderful people while getting through all the steps of my life, and these encounters have made my life full of joy and happiness. I truly believe that these encounters have contributed to all that I have achieved. I could never have reached this amazing moment without their support and help.

First of all, it is with deep gratitude that I thank my advisor Dr. C. Zoe Smith for her understanding, her caring, and her intellectual guidance. She has been a valued mentor. I am very lucky to have met her and have her as my advisor. She led me to an academic life and gave me motivation to pursue my Ph. D. at the University of Missouri-Columbia. Her scholarship and knowledge have provided me with invaluable insights, which I really appreciate. She always supported and encouraged me.

Many thanks to my wonderful committee members for providing great advice. Dr. Wayne Wanta listened with patience to my problems, showing that one can be a great scholar and a nice person at the same time. Dr. Stephanie Craft helped me make clear the concepts that I was confused about. Dr. William Benoit made my research better with his precise eye. Dr. Carol E. Anderson energized me with her passion and genuine interest in my research.

Infinite thanks and love go to my husband Young Hwan Cha, who sacrificed three years of his life for me. He has never said no to me when I have pursued a dream. Although he was apart from me in Korea, he was always beside me, supporting and encouraging me in my hard times.

I cannot thank my parents enough for believing me and supporting me when I restarted my study late in my life. Their unconditional and unlimited love for me made what I am now. I also acknowledge here Dong Hee Kim, my mentor in Korea, who changed my life with her passion for photography. She has always guided me into a right path.

I thank Joan Koffler for her nurturing and caring personality. She is my mom in America. She has always been on my side, providing me with a shelter for peace of mind. I also would like to thank Malissa Peacock for her innumerable hours editing my several drafts of the study. I also appreciate the times spent with her family.

Finally, I thank God for letting me meet these wonderful people and giving me a wonderful gift for my time and effort spent for the last three years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Overview	
Purpose of the Study	
Importance of Study	
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	11
Theoretical Framework – Framing Theory	
Theoretical Framework – Cultural Studies	
Constructing Reality and Myths as News Frame	
Picturing Conflicts	
Picturing the Invasion of Iraq	
Picturing the Korean War	
Research Questions	
3. METHODOLOGY.....	34
Justification for selecting <i>Life</i> magazine	
Content Analysis	
Ideological Analysis	

4. CONTENT ANALYSIS RESULTS	55
Content Analysis	
Visual Framing of the Korean War	
Summary	
5. IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS.....	72
Ideological Analysis	
The Development of Themes	
Themes That Were Absent and Related Themes	
6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	175
Discussion	
Conclusion	
Limitations and Further Research	
FOOTNOTES	187
APPENDIX	
1. CODING LIST FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS	192
2. LIST OF THEMES FOR IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS	193
3. THEME(S) FOR EACH PHOTOGRAPHIC PACKAGE FOR IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS.....	194
4. LIST OF THE PHOTOGRAPHIC PACKAGES FOR IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS.....	199
5. PHOTOGRAPHIC PACKAGES FOR IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS	201
REFERENCES	204
VITA	220

* SPECIAL NOTE: The photographs analyzed for ideological analysis could not be included because of copyright issues. The list of the figures mentioned in the study and their corresponding pages from *Life* magazine is in Appendix 5.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequency and Percentages of Nations and Subjects	56

**LIFE AND WAR IN KOREA:
PHOTOGRAPHIC PORTRAYALS OF THE KOREAN WAR
IN *LIFE* MAGAZINE, JULY 1950 - AUGUST 1953**

Sun-A Kim

Dr. C. Zoe Smith, Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

This study examines the visual portrayal of the Korean War, as presented in *Life* magazine from July 1950 through August 1953, by adopting the theoretical framework of framing and cultural studies and by combining two methodologies: content analysis and ideological analysis. In light of recent international situations such as the end of the Cold War and the Iraq War, and the nuclear crisis of North Korea, it is this intention of this study to provide a new, balanced view of the Korean War. By recovering American history's "forgotten war," this study attempts an interpretative examination of the visual construction of news events and features.

Content analysis results show that *Life's* coverage was U.S.-centered and that the magazine published a reasonable number of combat photographs, but almost no photographs taken of Korean civilian casualties or of the country's destruction. Ideological analysis shows that *Life's* photographs followed several mythical themes: Victory in the air, Defeat on the ground, Unready/ Unpopular war, MacArthur as a hero, Good versus evil, Paternalism/Humanitarianism, and Tragedy of Korea.

Results and analysis suggest that although *Life* presented the Korean War as America's military tragedy and their disillusionment with war, Cold War politics still defined it as a just war, meant to save South Korea from the evils of Communism.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

The Korean War began on June 25, 1950 and ended with an armistice on July 27, 1953. On the national level, it was a civil war between North Korea (Democratic People's Republic of Korea, or DPRK) and South Korea (Republic of Korea, or ROK). Both countries existed as provisional governments competing for control after the division of Korea at the end of World War II. On the international level, the Korean War was also part of the Cold War between two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Korean War had already been conceived in 1945 in the international politics among the superpowers. At the close of World War II in 1945, Korea was liberated from 35 years of Japanese occupation, but divided into South and North at the 38th parallel by the United States and the Soviet Union, each of whom achieved Japan's surrender in South and North Korea. Although it was agreed that Korea would govern independently after four years of trusteeship under the US-Soviet Joint Commission, both the United States and the Soviet Union approved the Korean-led governments for their respective halves. These governments, of course, were favorable to the occupying power's political ideology.

In the first months after the liberation from Japan, the sectional and ideological differences between North and South Korea were already widening between the two sides: the revolutionaries in the North and the conservatives in the South. Conflict centered on fundamental issues such as land ownership, governing rules, and trusteeship

(Cumings, 1981). These discrepancies between the two sides were furthered and were distorted by the two superpowers in charge.

The United States, with a need for immediate stability in Korea, supported the conservatives, most of whose members were previous Japanese colonial administrators and collaborators. The United States had little trust in the Koreans. In addition to the feeling of mistrust, they had already experienced the red scare. Therefore, the United States refused to recognize the existing political organizations that had been established by the Korean people. The United States supported Syngman Rhee, who was anti-communist and US-educated. The Soviet Union supported revolutionists including Kim Il-Sung, who was a communist, and helped him to remove the nationalists from the northern part of Korea.

The South and the North, in August and in October, 1948, each built their own governments, backed respectively by the United States and the Soviet Union. In 1949, both Soviet and American forces in Korea withdrew.

Rhee and Kim competed to reunite the peninsula, with each of them conducting military attacks along the border throughout 1949 and early 1950. Kim Il-Sung tried to persuade Stalin to invade South Korea in mid-1949, but on January 12, 1950, United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson seemed to indicate that America might not be interested in fighting for South Korea, by leaving Korea out of his list of America's Pacific defense perimeter, which was made up of the Aleutians, Ryukyu, Japan, and the Philippines, but not Korea. Acheson (1969) said Korea's defense would be the responsibility of the United Nations.

On June 25, 1950, with Moscow's approval, the North Korean Army crossed the 38th parallel to attempt to reunite the Korean peninsula. They occupied Seoul, the capital of South Korea, within three days. The United Nations immediately reacted to the invasion and voted to extend aid to South Korea on June 27, 1950. On July 7, 1950, the United States, along with 15 other U.N. members, officially joined the operation to defend South Korea. The conflict was further expanded with Chinese involvement in support of North Korea in November 1950. A civil war in a small country in East Asia had become a proxy war of the Cold War among the world's two superpowers and their allies.

Despite the United States' prediction that the war would end by December, it continued for over three years, which made it one of the bloodiest wars in American history¹ as well as the first war on an international level in the post-World War II Cold War era. The United States suffered 33,237 men killed in action; 103,376 wounded; 5,131 captured; and 410 missing, for a total of 142,154 casualties (Dupuy & Dupuy, 1984, p.688). The other UN forces suffered 3,124 killed in action (Moeller, 1989, p. 444, Note 83). The South Korean Army suffered 58,127 dead, 175,743 wounded, and 80,000 missing in action or POW ("South Korean POWs," n.d.). Estimates of communist battle casualties varied widely, from 1.5 to 2 million, with an additional 400,000 non-battle casualties. In addition to the deaths in the two opposing camps, close to half a million South Korean civilians were killed, died, or disappeared as a result of the war (Moeller, 1989, p. 444, Note 83). Military historian S. L. A. Marshall referred to the Korean War as "the century's nastiest little war" (as cited in Halberstam, 2007, p. 1).

Despite the enormous cost of the Korean War, American history did not record it as a true war, but rather as a “police action” or the “Korean Conflict.”² Whereas the Vietnam War (1965-1972) remains controversial in the American collective memory, still creating emotional scars and raising issues about the justice of the war and the role of journalism and photojournalism especially, the Korean War is the “forgotten war” (Blair, 1987) of American history.

Purpose of Study

Every day the news media transmit information in verbal and visual forms, and this information shapes our understanding of the world and ourselves. Media accounts of events and issues are most often considered by readers to be factual, accurate, and impartial. However, media critics have long argued that selected news content provides an interpretative structure that sets particular events within a broader context (Gamson, 1991; Entman, 1991; Hall, 1973), referred to as the theories of framing and cultural studies. This structure or news frame is influenced by economic, political, social, and ideological constraints dominant in the society (Hall, 1982). The constraints might intensify during times of potential or actual international conflicts such as war. In particular, when a country is at war, it has been pointed out that many components of the news media have shown a patriotic bias and have failed to provide a place of debate on war. Instead, the media often provided an outlet for the U.S. government’s view of the war (Griffin, 2004b, 2004c; Lule, 2003).

Photographs, as a news medium, are often believed to be true portrayals of the events because of the camera’s mechanical accuracy. Julianne H. Newton (1998) said, however, “The twentieth century began by believing that what it saw a photograph of was

true and wound up by knowing, at least on a cognitive level, that many things that seemed to be visually true were not” (p. 4). Readers may think photographs are so accurate and neutral that they can transmit pure and unadulterated truth. Photographs often provide undeniable evidence of events by showing untouched slices of reality (Sontag, 1977). However, the neutrality of photographs can be compromised during the process of the photographers’ taking pictures and the editors’ selecting them within their organizational and institutional systems as well as within their cultural belief systems. The reality is mediated and constructed by the media’s visual framing within a specific context of the event and the ideological system of the society. Therefore, it is important to know whose reality is being portrayed in what context.

Keeping in mind the interpretative and subjective nature of visual framing, this study examines the visual coverage of the Korean War presented in *Life* magazine. The main questions explore how the popular American photography news and feature magazine, *Life*, portrayed the “police action” in Korea, and how this portrayal is related to the dominant ideologies of war in American society at that time and even now. In other words, first, this study explores how the U.S. media constructed a reality about the Korean War by using certain frames in their visual coverage to emphasize certain aspects of the conflict and to leave out others. Second, this study explores how such framing, consciously or unconsciously, reflected as well as reproduced the cultural values and shared beliefs about war in American society in the past. This study will also show how present reality in America is being treated in the same way. This study will show that many cultural values from the past can be found in the present, such as a just war against

Communism, the United States' humanitarian purpose, and the possibility of something called "a clean war" thanks to superior military technology.

In an attempt to investigate one example of visual coverage of the Korean War, this study relies upon the theoretical frameworks of news framing and cultural studies to combine several concepts of constructing reality and myths as a news frame (see Chapter 2). Methodologically, this study quantitatively content-analyzes a total of 399 sampled photographs of the Korean War published in *Life* magazine from July 1950 through August 1953. An ideological analysis of 17 photographic packages published in *Life* during the same period adds a qualitative dimension to this study as well (see Chapter 3). The result of the content analysis (see Chapter 4) and of the ideological analysis (see Chapter 5) are reported and discussed. The limitations are discussed and further studies are suggested as well (see Chapter 6).

Importance of Study

This study is important for three reasons: it fills the gap in American media research about the Korean War; it provides a newer or more balanced perspective on the Korean War representation in light of the current circumstances of international politics; and it attempts a more interpretative examination of visual construction of specific news events and features.

First, this study attempts to recover a part that has been "missing" part in the research of American media representation and collective memory about the Korean War. Although it was initially referred to as a "police action" or the "Korean conflict," the Korean War was "quite possibly the most important event since World War II" (Mueller, 1989, p. 118) and "a substitute for World War III" because "in its timing, its course, and

its outcome, it had a stabilizing effect on the Cold War” (Stueck , 1995, p. 3; Stueck, 2002, p. 1). Despite its importance in history, however, the Korean War has been “missing” in history as well as in the media history of the United States. David Halberstam (2007), a journalist and historian, pointed out America’s lack of attention and short memory of the Korean War (p. 3). Perhaps it is time to pay more proper attention to the Korean War and the media representation of the Korean War.

Second, in addition to filling the gap in American history and media representation, this study has additional importance because of the changes over the past few decades and the current issues in world politics: the end of the Cold War on one hand and the Iraq War and North Korean nuclear crisis on the other hand.

The historiography of the Korean War itself has been an arena of disagreements, contradictions, and controversies among history scholars over the past few decades. Orthodox historians of the 1950s and the 1960s were not free from the Cold War politics in their interpretation of the Korean War as an extension of Soviet expansionism. Their scholarship served the U.S. containment policy. The new release of the declassified documents from the National Archives and the British Public Records Office provided a revolutionary change in the characterization of the Korean War. Revisionist scholars of 1970s and the 1980s, such as Bruce Cumings (1981, 1990) and Jon Halliday, defined the Korean War as one of the United States’ imperialist attempts to install an anticommunist police state in Asia by unjustly intervening in a revolutionary civil war caused by colonialism, division, and the superpowers’ intervention. With new evidence from the Russian archives and Chinese sources at the end of the Cold War, a more balanced view of the war was suggested by post-revisionist scholars, such as Burton I. Kaufman, James

I. Matray, William Stueck (2002), who synthesized orthodox and revisionist perspectives (Chung, 2005, pp. 59-60). This development of research on the Korean War alongside the end of the Cold War has created a re-characterization of the Korean War. This new characterization of the Korean War therefore seems to require examining the American media representation of the Korean War with a fresh perspective.

This study is also important and timely due to the international circumstances surrounding the United States' war against Iraq as well as North Korea's nuclear crisis. Fifty-five years after the signing of the armistice in 1953 and 17 years after the end of the Cold War in 1991, the war in Korea has not ended yet and danger and tension still exist. North Korea has previously stated that it has produced nuclear weapons and finally on October 9, 2006, the North Korean government conducted its first nuclear test. After the September 11 attack, President George W. Bush, in his State of the Union Message to Congress in January 2002, called Iraq, Iran, and North Korea the "axis of evil" that threatens "the peace of the world" by supporting terrorists' activities and by producing weapons of mass destruction (Bush, 2002). When the United States went to war against Iraq in 2003, it was said that North Korea was next. After his reelection during the Iraq War, President Bush declared North Korea's nuclear crisis as one of the most important foreign policy issues.

Moreover, the relationship between South Korea and the United States is becoming more complicated due to the rise of anti-American sentiment among South Koreans and the United States' plan to draw down U.S. forces in South Korea. Some cautiously discuss the possibility of a second Korean War because of the similar current circumstances that surrounded the previous one (Lynch, 2003).

Third, this study has significance in attempting to examine the process of visual construction of news events by providing a more interpretative examination of visual elements. One might wonder what Americans actually saw in the visual representation of the Korean War in the early 1950s, and if today's American collective memory of the Korean War as constructed by the media at that time could have some influence on the United States' present consideration of going to war with North Korea again.

The possible influence of visual images on the public's perception on and attitude toward war has been pointed out by various scholars. Hallin and Gitlin (1993), in their study of the television coverage of the Gulf War, stated that the romantic image of the war, although it may not directly influence the decision about the next war, could easily generate enthusiasm about another war and suppress opposition the next time. We saw that this insightful prediction became real in the Iraq War 2003. We could say the same thing about the possibility of another Korean War.

Photojournalism has great powers in helping people make sense of events, and inspiring them to catalyze social changes for the better. Nick Ut's photograph of a naked Vietnamese girl fleeing the bombing of her village, for example, is considered to have changed the direction of the Vietnam War. As a famous war photographer, James Nachtwey said about the picture, "that picture, in and of itself, changed history" (as cited in Wright, 2004, p. 188). Can we also see these kinds of photographs from the Korean War, which caused enormous devastation and casualties as well? News photographs help to shape our interpretation of the experience in the world by framing it in some categories and by omitting or excluding other categories, and relating these frames to the cultural values resonating with the belief system of our society. Despite the significant impact of

news photographs on the public's perception and interpretation of events, there has been relatively little attention paid to the process in which photographic images are constructed into meanings.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework – Framing Theory

Framing is one of the research paradigms that has been studied rigorously across the social sciences and humanities. The concept of “framing” in academia is attributed to the work of Goffman (1974), a sociologist and a former photographer, who developed the idea of “schemata of interpretation,” which enables individuals “to locate, perceive, identify, and label” occurrences or information, thus rendering meaning, organizing experiences, and guiding actions. According to Goffman, phenomena in the real world are continuous, but people perceive them by arbitrarily cutting them into a “strip” (p. 10), which is a “frame.” The meaning can change according to the ways the strips are cut. Since the cutting is “arbitrary” (p. 10), the method in which people cut is not determined by the absolute rules internal in the phenomena, but is social and subjective.

Since Goffman, “framing” theory has acquired more concrete meanings by expanding into linguistics, cognitive psychology, and sociology. In communication, it has been used to support the concept of the “social construction of reality,” suggested by Berger and Luckmann (1966). That is, Goffman’s social-psychological perspective of frame—how people make sense of their everyday social experience—has evolved into a more sociological approach to the way issues are constructed, the way discourse is structured, and the way meanings are developed.

Framing also is a tool for journalists to make sense of the events in the world. Within the functional view, the concept of framing has been applied to media research

and frames are defined as journalistic devices that become institutionalized (Tuchman, 1978). Gitlin (1980) defines frames as devices that facilitate how journalists organize enormous amounts of information and package them effectively for their audiences. He saw frames as “persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, of selection, emphasis, and exclusion” (p. 7).

Entman (1993) further emphasizes “*salience*” and “*selection*” in the framing process. His definition of framing is to “select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described” (p. 52).

According to Entman (1993), one of the great aspects of framing is that the concept deals with all communication processes including communicators, texts, receivers, and culture. However, to him this also created confusion about framing as a coherent theory. According to him (1993), framing, despite its omnipresence in these areas of academia, remains a “fractured” (p. 51) paradigm without uniform conceptual definitions of key terms, which hinders it from becoming a “coherent theory” (p. 51).

D’Angelo (2002) opposed Entman’s (1993) call for the establishment of a paradigm of news framing research, and argued that news framing is a research program that consists of three inter-related paradigms: cognitive, critical, and constructionist (p. 875). D’Angelo’s description of the three paradigms is based on each paradigm having different research goals, different foci (on the locations in communication process), and, therefore, different images of the interactions between media (textual) frames and framing effects on individual-level or social-level reality. Journalists’ objectivity and

audience autonomy are more trusted, and media hegemony is weighed less in cognitive, constructionist, and critical paradigms in order.

On the basis of these concerns, the three paradigms are as follows: cognitive, critical, and constructionist (D'Angelo, 2002).

First, the cognitive paradigm defines framing as a negotiation between the media frame and an individual's prior knowledge. This paradigm relies on theories about how frames alter individuals' "trains of thought" (Price, Tewksbury, & Powers, 1997. p. 481) how they focus on the effects of media on the individual level, and how they use experiments on information processing as methodologies.

These media effects on individuals' cognition have been studied by several scholars. For example, Iyengar (1991) investigated the effects of episodic and thematic news frames in television news on individuals' attributions of responsibility for six social issues. Wanta (1988) examined agenda-setting effects of dominant photograph. Conducting an experiment, Wanta found that a dominant photograph generally influences the salience of an issue for a reader. His approach to the salience is related to Entman's (1991) argument that the physical size of news coverage is the first and most critical element in signaling an event's *importance*.

Second, the critical paradigm defines framing as a domination. Framing devices function as a process of media hegemony to support the status quo of the society by reflecting the perspective of economic and political elites. Framing focuses on production of media content through framing devices and media's hegemonic power on the social level, using a public opinion survey.

For example, Entman (1991) studied U.S. media coverage of the KAL and Iran Air incidents. He indicated that “by de-emphasizing the agency and the victims and by the choice of graphics and adjectives, the news stories about the United States’ downing of an Iranian plane framed it as a technical problem while the Soviet downing of a Korean jet was portrayed as a moral outrage.” He pointed out that these frames reflect the U.S. government’s view and the U.S. public’s familiar myth about the amoral Soviet Union. The political outcomes supported the influence of the dominant frame.

Fahmy (2007)’s study showed that media accounts could be influenced by nations’ governmental ideologies as well as media organizations’ inclinations. In her cross-national study on the photographs of the toppling of the Saddam Hussein statue, she examined the elements that might influence visual reporting in news production process. She found that country-level characteristics (governmental support for war, military involvement, press freedom, geographic distance from the United States and Iraq) and newspaper biases (political philosophy) predicted the number of photographs, but not the tone of photographs. She also found that U.S. newspapers overall ran more visuals depicting the victory /liberation frame than newspapers from coalition and non-coalition countries.

Third, the constructionist paradigm defines framing as a co-optation. Journalists, serving as information processors, create “interpretive packages” of the positions of politically invested “sponsors” (e.g., sources) in order to both reflect and add to the "issue culture" of the topic.

From the constructivist approach, Pan and Kosicki (1993) explain framing within the concept of news texts as “discourse,” integrating sociological and psychological

conceptions of frame. They define a theme or a frame as a central organizing idea that connects different semantic elements of a story into a coherent whole to convey a meaning. Thus, framing analysis is a constructivist approach used to examine news discourse through its framing devices (syntactical, script, thematic, and rhetorical structures), linking news texts, production, and the consumption process that operate in the shared beliefs of society. In short, the constructionist paradigm is interested in the construction of meaning into a media discourse and its effects on the social level such as public opinion and political socialization. Thus, it focuses on interpreting media texts through framing devices in the context of culture and examining the effects through focus groups.

By way of further explanation, Goffman (1979) examined women's images in advertisements of that time by looking at body expressions, relative sizes, and functions of the models in the images. He found that women are consistently subordinated to men in a variety of situations, relating to them not as equals but as children to parents. He concluded that commercial advertising both reflects and helps shape our concept of "masculine" and "feminine" behavior by standardization, exaggeration, and simplification.

In yet another example, Lee, Ryan, Wanta, and Chang (2004) examined the different photographic portrayals of politicians in U.S. and Taiwan in terms of the frequency and the tone of the images, and inferred that such differences might be explained by the societies' different values about democracy, individualism, equality, and journalists' objectivity.

This study adopts the critical and constructionist paradigms of framing with slightly more weight on the latter. With framing analysis, this study attempts to examine

the construction of the meaning of the Korean War into media discourse by interpreting media texts that operate in the shared values and beliefs of the culture. At this point, this study combines framing theory and cultural studies for the theoretical framework.

Theoretical Framework – Cultural Studies

The cultural studies approach to media attempts to explore the reproduction of dominant ideologies through the media by reading the mass communication processes as cultural texts (Graeme, 1990, pp. 81-82). In detail, the “Culturalist” perspective is influenced by the humanities such as literature, linguistics, and philosophy. By importing the semiotics of Barthes and Eco, it focuses on the construction of the “meaning” of texts. The culturalist perspective also, by importing Althusser’s concept of ideology in sociology, focuses on the mass media's role in the construction of social and political consensus (Graeme, 1990, p. 72).

Here, the concepts of “culture” and “text” are important in that they are associated with communication. According to the levels of definition by Chaffee (1991), “culture” is included in the level of meaning analysis while the definition of “text” is included in the level of the nominal definition (p. 24). Chaffee indicated that “A nominal definition is an arbitrary name that lacks linking statements.” He wrote,

These nominal levels are perfectly serviceable in everyday conversation, but when applied to the more abstract ideas of communication (e.g., information, understanding, reticence) they are helpful only to the extent that they are accompanied by mutually understood linkages between the label and the object. (p. 24)

In other words, in a language system there is no rule to associate an object with a specific name or label, but rather the nomination process is arbitrary. We do, however, construct linkages between the object and the label, which are mutually understood by the members

of the society and, therefore, communicate more sophisticated ideas and beliefs than the object would without linkages. It is the culture of the society that supplies the basis of the linkages and makes the linkages meaningful by linking the object and the label together into a code. By the same token, there is no rule to assign a text a specific meaning, but rather a text is rendered into a meaning in the context of culture. That is, there can be no meaning in vacuum.

The culturalist perspective on media is related to Carey's ritual view of communication that emphasizes culture. According to Carey (1989), there have been two views of communication in American culture since the 19th century: a transmission view of communication and a ritual view of communication. The transmission view of communication, which is dominant in the United States, perceives communication as "a process whereby messages are transmitted and distributed in space for the control of distance and people" (p. 15). This view focuses on effects and functions of media (p. 20). On the other hand, the ritual view of communication is directed "not toward the extension of messages in space but toward the maintenance of society in time; not the act of imparting information but the representation of shared beliefs" (p. 18). Defining communication as "a symbolic process whereby reality is produced, maintained, repaired, and transformed" (Carey, 1989, p. 23), this view focuses on the media's role of presentation and involvement in reality construction.

Suggesting a cultural approach as an alternative to the transmission view of communication, Carey focused on culture and reading texts in culture. He defined culture as a "process" (Carey, 1989, p. 33) or some "shared beliefs" (p. 18). He argued, "social life is more than power and trade . . . it also includes the sharing of aesthetic experience,

religious ideas, personal values and sentiments, and intellectual notions—a ritual order” (p. 34). Fiske (1989) also defined culture as “the constant process of producing meanings of and from our social experience” (p. 1). In cultural studies, “texts” refer to “symbolically encoded items, including commodities, clothes, language, and structured social practices, as well as the more conventional notion of all kinds of media products (television programs, books, songs, films, etc.)” (McQuail, 2000, p. 92).

Based on these concepts of text and culture, cultural studies attempts to “diagnose human meanings” (Carey, 1989, p. 56) by reading human action as a text that is “a sequence of symbols” containing interpretations (p. 56). Thus, the task of cultural studies is to “interpret the interpretations” (p. 60).

Since a text achieves a meaning in the context of culture and culture is not a fixed entity, there is no one single meaning of a text. Therefore, a variety of meanings compete with one another for dominance in a culture.

Here, the concepts of “ideology” and “hegemony” are suggested. Althusser (1971) defined ideology as a distorted definition of reality that represents “the imaginary relationships of individuals to their real conditions of existence” (p. 272). The concept of “hegemony,” borrowed from Gramsci (1971), means “a loosely interrelated set of ruling ideas permeating a society, but in such a way as to make the established order of power and values appear natural, taken-for-granted and commonsensical” (McQuail, 2000, p. 97). The ruling ideology is constantly reasserted as an unquestioned consensus by discourse rather than being imposed by political and economic power (Hall, 1982). Barthes (1957/1972) explained the idea by using the concept of “myth” that “naturalizes” bourgeois norms as taken-for-granted by “transforming history into nature” (p. 129). Hall

pointed out ideology's pervasiveness and cultural influence that serves to interpret experience of reality.

Hall wrote (1982):

That notion of dominance which meant the direct imposition of one framework, by overt force or ideological compulsion, on a subordinate class, was not supplicated enough to match the complexities of the case. One had also to see that dominance was accomplished at the unconscious as well as the conscious level: to see it as a property of the system of relations involved, rather than as the overt and intentional biases of individuals in the very activity of regulation and exclusion which functioned through language and discourse. (p. 95)

Critical cultural theory, especially the Birmingham school, shifts its concerns from the early attention of ideological domination toward the integration of oppositional elements in society. Hall (1980a) explained that the cultural studies approach:

stands opposed to the residual and merely reflective role assigned to the "cultural." In its different ways it conceptualizes culture as interwoven with all social practices; and those practices, in turn, as a common form of human activity . . . it is opposed to the base-superstructure way of formulating the relationship between ideal and material forces, especially where the base is defined by the determination by the "economic" in any simple sense . . . it defines "culture" as both the means and values which arise amongst distinctive social groups and classes, on the basis of their given historical conditions and relationship, through which they 'handle' and respond to the conditions of existence . . . (p. 63)

The social-cultural approach pays attention to both the message and the public and tries to explain the patterns of choice and response in relation to media. Hall (1980a) suggested a model of "encoding-decoding media discourse" which represents media text between its producers and the audience. Hall proposed three basic codes. The first code is one of dominant meanings associated with power. The second is a "negotiated" code, which is essentially the code of the media in their role as neutral and professional carriers of information. The third is an "oppositional" code, which is available to those who

choose to view reality differently in messages and can “read between the lines” of official versions of events. This theory came to empower audiences and lead to a broader view of the social and cultural influences that mediate the experience of the media, with regards especially to ethnicity, gender and “everyday life” (McQuail, 2000, pp. 98-99).

This study, relaying Hall’s concept of “encoding-decoding media discourse,” attempts an oppositional decoding of cultural texts to explore dominant meanings of a society. Hall (1997) defines culture as “shared meanings,” and language as “the privileged medium in which meaning is produced and exchanged” (p. 1). He introduced a constructionist’s view that languages use signs and symbols to stand for or represent objects, people and events in the so-called “real” world and also imaginary things and abstract ideas which are not in our material world.

Hall (1997) discounts the concept of language as a mirror that accurately reflects the real world. He argued that meaning is produced by the work of representation through “languages,” or various representational systems. He explains that it is possible through two such related systems of representation: first, the concepts formed in the mind operate as “a system of mental representation, which classifies and organizes the world into meaningful categories” when we use things in everyday life; second, we communicate meaning within a language, a second system of representation (Hall, 1997, p. 28).

Hall (1997) posited that language consists of signs that can convey meanings only when members of the society have the same codes to translate concepts into languages. In this constructionist view of language, words and things function as signs and symbols, which can be interpreted or decoded into meanings. In the same way, photography also is a representational system, using images to convey meaning about the world. Hall (1997)

also indicated that the cultural meanings are not only “in the head,” but they also “organize and regulate social practices, influence our conduct and consequently have real practical effects” by giving us a “sense of our own identity, of who we are and with whom we ‘belong’” (p. 3).

In summary, according to Hall’s cultural studies theory, culture is “shared meanings or values,” and these meanings and values are not in nature but produced by the work of representation through language. A language consists of signs and symbols—whether they are written words, images, sounds, gestures, clothes, or objects—to stand for or represent things and concepts to other people in the culture. The signs and symbols can be interpreted into meanings in the culture, while the cultural meanings organize and regulate social practices, as well as influence our conduct (Hall, 1997).

In this sense, this study examines how the act of representation produces cultural meanings through language, and how these cultural meanings are related to a ruling ideology in society. More specifically, this study serves to examine how *Life’s* photographic images, consciously or unconsciously, tried to produce shared meanings about the Korean War within the American culture at that time. Furthermore, this study suggests how these cultural meanings are related to U.S. government and U.S. military ideologies.

Constructing Reality and Myths as News Frame

Many scholars have examined the effect of the media on how people organize their experiences and their subjective involvement in social events (Goffman, 1974; Hall, 1982). The media’s effect on shaping our cognition of ourselves and the world has long been believed by the public and even by journalists to be factual, accurate, impartial, and

objective. According to cultural studies and ideological critique, however, news is not merely a collection of objective “facts” that reflect reality, but rather a cultural product that is influenced by the economic, political, and social ideologies dominant in society (Hall, 1982). Journalists and news organizations, also as cultural products, not only are influenced by the ideologies in the culture, but also participate in constructing the reality of society (Althusser, 1971; Hall, 1982).

One of the approaches that journalists adopt to create cultural products is to use narratives that are familiar to a society (Lule, 2001; Zelizer, 1993). When there are complicated events such as wars, as well as when there are commonplace events, the news media use well-known narrative themes from society to explain events more easily. To lead readers toward understanding more quickly, the media borrow familiar mythical themes to construct their stories.

Barthes (1957/1972), by paying attention to the communicative aspect of myth, defines myth as a “system of communication,” a “message,” and a “mode of signification” (p.109). He indicated that because myth is a “type of speech,” everything can be an object of myth when it is conveyed by discourse. Accordingly, every mode of representation including written discourse, photography, cinema, reporting, sport, shows, and publicity, not just modes confined to speech, can be the material of myth when endowed with meaning (pp. 109-110). Of course, as Barthes pointed out, all modes of representation do not use the same type of consciousness. For example, photographs, which are more direct than the written word, seem to be immediately perceived as meaningful, without analysis. However, like the written word, photographs also require a “*lexis*” as soon as they are meaningful (p. 100). Therefore, myth is defined neither by its

object nor by the material of its message, but by “the way in which it utters this message” (p. 109).

A message or a speech achieves its status as a myth only within a historical context. According to Barthes (1957/1972), every object in every mode of representation can pass from a “closed, silent existence” to a state of language uttered, “open to appropriation by society,” and in the process, the object achieves its “social usage” (p. 109). Then, it is “human history which converts reality into speech and decides the life and death of mythical language,” and myth is a “type of speech chosen by history” (p. 110).

Lule (2001) pointed out the similarities between archetypal myths and news stories in modern times. He insisted that journalists, consciously or unconsciously, use myth to make sense of the world. He even mentioned that daily news is the “primary vehicle for myth in our time” (pp. 18-19). By considering “myth” as an underlying structure for news, Lule indicated that myth does not refer to “unreality” or a “false belief” (p. 15), and that news-as-myth is rather a cultural story of human life, which offers “sacred, societal narratives with shared values and beliefs, with lessons and themes, and with exemplary models that instruct and inform” (p. 18). He mentioned, “Myth draws upon archetypal figures and forms to offer exemplary models that represent shared values, confirm our beliefs, deny other beliefs, and help people engage with, appreciate, and understand the complex joys and sorrows of human life” (p. 15).

These narrative structures of myth become formulaic when they are repeatedly performed and interpreted through time with common central agents and predictable results (Lule, 2001). As Barthes (1957/1972) explained, through these repetitive

interpretations, myth “naturalizes” the society’s dominant ideologies as taken-for-granted rather than as cultural products by depriving them of their original meaning as defined by historical, social, and economical circumstances (p. 129).

As commercial institutions competing in a consumer society, news organizations especially want immediate and high-impact photographs to support articles, which are already designed to be “easily and quickly read” and catch the reader’s eye (Griffin, 2004c; Rosenblum, 1978). Moreover, the photographs themselves are taken for granted as reflective of reality, making it more evident, making the meaning more transparent and attracting and having an immediate impact on the reader. Therefore, it could be said that the dominant ideologies of the society could be internalized more easily through photographs than through other pictorial or verbal coverage.

Some scholars have studied the mythic quality of photographs. Griffin and Lee (1995), in their study of Gulf War photographs from three major U.S. news magazines, indicated that news photographs provide the index that emphasizes the news. Griffin (2004c), in his study of the Iraq War photographs, mentioned that the photographs, as a “symbolic and thematic markers” for the articles, served to connect the readers’ memories to the pre-existing interpretative schema of news narratives. Therefore, instead of just illustrating the events, the photographs actually symbolized the events by providing the frames of “cultural mythology or social narratives” (Griffin, 2004c) that lead readers to interpret other information. Griffin (2004b, 2004c) saw that a similar pattern was repeated in the pictorial coverage of the Iraq War and concluded that photojournalism seems still to serve “nationalist mythology and ritual news frames.”

A valid question then would be: What did readers see in *Life's* Korean War photographs? What narrative themes or cultural myths did *Life* use to present these particular images of the Korean War to Americans and other audiences? According to the concept of Barthes' myth, mentioned above, this study examines how *Life* magazine developed the mythical themes or cultural narratives about the Korean War, and what *Life* tried to communicate to its readers through using these myths.

Picturing Conflicts

Media critics and researchers have long argued that news content is influenced by economic, political, social, and ideological constraints (Hall, 1982). These constraints might intensify during times of potential or actual international conflicts.

The influences of economic, political, social, and ideological constraints on media content could be explored best by comparing the news accounts of the same political issue, for example, from the viewpoint of two or more countries. Such a comparison is helpful because each country has a specific position in the world and a different view of the world. Mollenkopf and Brendlinger (1996) examined how ideological differences affect press coverage by comparing the Canadian and U.S. news versions of the military build-up against Iraq during the Gulf War. With a content analysis, the study compared *The New York Times* with *The (Toronto) Globe and Mail*, and the U.S. newsmagazine *Time* with the Canadian magazine *Maclean's*. Although the United States and Canada share some common aspects in their geography, economics, politics, and social conditions, these two countries actually differed significantly in the way they reported the Persian Gulf crisis. The U.S. media had a more anti-Iraq and pro-intervention tone than

the Canadian media did, which could be explained by the United States' active involvement in the Gulf War..

The influences of economic, political, social, and ideological constraints on media content was explored by tracing the changes of the news accounts of the same issue through time. Aima (1999), using a quantitative content analysis, examined *Time's* coverage of Saddam Hussein from 1979 to 1998. The study adopted the propaganda model devised by Herman and Chomsky, which states that governments of western democracies can devise methods of exploiting the economic, ideological and professional set-up of news organizations in order to turn them into propaganda tools. The study indicated that Saddam was considered "the villain" to be removed even if by an assassination that would be sanctioned by the U.S. government. In 1982, however, President Ronald Reagan took Iraq off the list of terrorism-supporting states and supported Iraq to keep a balance between the Iran and Iraq in their war. Although Saddam was known as the "Butcher of Baghdad" during the 1980s because he dropped chemical bombs on the Kurdish nation, it was not until U.S. foreign policy turned hostile to Saddam that *Time* magazine criticized him by using this title. The study pointed out that U.S. foreign policy had influenced the nature of the coverage of Saddam Hussein, resulting in a failure of the surveillance function of the media.

The view that the dominant ideology of society influences war coverage in U.S. magazines is not new. The view has been applied not only in the coverage of the Gulf War but also during the Vietnam War. It is always useful to look back at history in order to understand the exact context of a phenomenon.

Landers (1997) compared the coverage of U.S. military operations in Vietnam by *Newsweek*, *Time* and *U.S. News & World Report* from 1965 to 1973. By pointing out the influence of media on public opinion, especially of “interpretive journalism” of the weekly news magazines on public opinion, the study indicated that in the Persian Gulf War there was severe military censorship on media because of the bitter experience in the Vietnam War, where media control was absent. He cited Willenson (1987), who said, “Journalists were blamed for having undercut the war effort [in the Vietnam War] by creating an image in the United States that is at odds with the reality on the ground” (pp. 168-170).

Landers’ study showed that at the beginning of the war, the three magazines were skeptical about war strategy and tactics, but they rarely criticized the integrity of the U.S. military regarding discipline problems, drug use, and poor morale among the troops, while describing U.S. military personnel favorably throughout the entire war. These findings resonated with Hallin’s study (1989) that pointed out that the journalists described American combatants as the “good guys” (p. 10), receiving the affection of the local people in Vietnam. Landers also found that little attention was given to the devastation of a terrain due to the military’s use of chemical defoliants, or to civilian casualties by bombing, or to the treatment of Vietnamese refugees. The study concluded that the media during the Vietnam War were not controlled to the extent that they were actually blamed for contributing to losing the war, but the author did find a tendency to stereotype U.S. soldiers as heroes and to avoid mentioning the Vietnamese’s harsh living conditions.

While the studies above examined the verbal depiction of international conflicts, there was also a study of visual coverage. Kamhawi (2002), using framing effects theory and content analysis, examined both the verbal and the visual content in the television news coverage of Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The study adopted a concept of media frame defined as a “script” or “schema” (Lodge & Hamil, 1986) and as “a frame of reference” (Scheufele, 1999), where the frame presents news events in order to help audiences interpret them. The study also adopted the distinction of episodic” and “thematic frames.” An episodic frame is defined as a frame where news is “centered on the event isolated in any context,” and a thematic frame is the one where news can be provided with “background and context” such as causes and solutions.

Kamhawi (2002)’s study found that the news gave violent and irresponsible images of Palestine protesters by providing little or no context. The study also found that the news presented the conflict as being between two equal powers rather than mentioning the fact that the Palestinians’ living conditions had grown worse and their economy was being torn apart under occupation. The author also indicated that in these photographs the responsibility for the conflict was given to the Palestinians while the human side of the conflict was illustrated through portrayals of Israeli soldiers. The study’s findings confirmed the idea that the presentation of international events on American television news has often been criticized as reinforcing “preexisting American assumptions” and interests through “oversimplification” and “stereotyping.”

Although most of the studies of visual coverage of international conflicts were about TV network news, there was a study of three major U.S. magazines using quantitative analysis of the photographic coverage of the Gulf War. Griffin and Lee

(1995) conducted a visual content analysis by examining photographs from *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News & World Report* during Desert Storm. The writers pointed out that the Gulf War was an ironic case because it is considered one of the most effectively censored and controlled media events in modern history. At the beginning of the war at least, readers were given the impression that television was providing them with an opportunity to witness the war firsthand. They found limited pictorial history and a great emphasis on U.S. military technology, while actual combat scenes, destruction and casualties of the war, demonstrations against war, and civilian wartime life in Saudi Arabia were limited or absent. They also found that the pictorial coverage personalized the war by contrasting Bush and Hussein in visuals. By avoiding images of bloodshed, editors presented a “clean” war. The study concluded that the photographs the three magazines published mirrored the preexisting and symbolic war imagery rather than providing pertinent visual information.

Picturing the Invasion of Iraq

Lule (2003) conducted the rhetorical analysis by examining the U.S. news media’s reporting of the Iraq War 2003 as seen on the NBC Nightly news in the six weeks before the war started. He started his study by reworking a quote from Susan Sontag’s book *Illness as Metaphor* and *AIDS and Its Metaphor* that speaks about the idea that metaphoric language shapes thought and has profound significance: “War is the night-side of life, a more onerous citizenship” and “My point is that war is not a metaphor, and that the most truthful way of regarding war is one most purified of, most resistant to, metaphoric thinking” (p. 179). Lule questioned what metaphors were used and what the interpretations and implications of the metaphors were in news language concerning the

rationale for war with Iraq in 2003. The author found that the media used metaphors by the “lexical choice” on the semantic level such as “countdown,” “shutdown,” “target,” and “deadline,” all of which are used to signify the inevitability of war. He also found the media’s use of metaphor by choice of the relationship of words in syntactic level such as the dramatization and personalization of the process of the war. He indicated that the reporting did not deal with verifying claims, establishing legalities, or assessing outcomes and aftermaths. By quoting Lakoff, saying, “Metaphors can kill” (Lakoff, 1991), Lule concluded that the media failed to provide debate about the war by giving the voice only to U.S. government.

Based on his previous study of the Gulf War in 1991, Griffin (2004c), examined the pictorial coverage of the Iraq War 2003 published in *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News & World Report*, three major magazines in the United States. In his research, the primary question was “Do pictures drive news as is so often assumed, or are they incorporated into pre-existing news frames and narratives, serving to prompt, confirm and dramatize dominant news scenarios?” In this case, he found that the photographs of the Iraq War repeated the prominent patterns of the pictorial portrayals he studied from the Gulf War in 1999. Griffin indicated that the main theme “The Road to Baghdad,” however, seemed to have been limited by preventing the publication of photographs that did not clearly support the “official story.” As a result, he showed that the overall photographic coverage was presented within the “narrative/myth of American rescue and supremacy.” He indicated that presenting only the pictures that support the U.S. government’s position in favor of the invasion of Iraq fed that myth. The absence of divergent images that might raise questions or doubts about the official version of the U.S. government’s rationale to

invade Iraq caused him to conclude that photojournalism still seems to serve nationalist mythology and ritual news frames rather than to evoke news narratives by providing new information.

Picturing the Korean War

Regarding the Korean War, relatively little research has been done. Lee (1978) content-analyzed written articles about the Korean War, published in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *Pusan Ilbo*, and *Taegu Shinbo* during the first 16 days of the war (June 25 – July 10, 1950) to examine how South Korean and U.S. newspapers differed in reporting it in terms of themes. He found that South Korean newspapers' war coverage contradicted the real situations, by describing them more favorably to the Allied forces. On the other hand, the U.S. newspapers' war coverage more accurately reflected the situation. Lee concluded that the South Korean newspapers' reporting on the Korean War was less balanced perhaps because of their relatively short history and the South Korean government's control on the press due to its unique situation confronting North Korea.

Sherer (1988) conducted visual research on the coverage of the Korean War and the Vietnam War. Sherer produced a content analysis of the photographs of the Korean War and the Vietnam War, which were published during the Chinese intervention and the Tet offensive, respectively. For these periods, American soldiers were in similar situations where they were confronted with major enemy offensives. His study looked at three major news magazines in the United States: *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *Life*. He asked if combat photography conveys to the viewer some sense of reality of a particular war or if it is consistent over time by sharing common themes. He found that while the soldiers were portrayed in actual combat in 37.5% of the photographs of the Vietnam War, only

4.5% of the Korean War photographs showed the soldiers in actual combat. He concluded that although the situations in two wars during the periods were the images of the two wars, which were somewhat similar situations, differed in an important perspective. That is, the American public saw more of the brutal side of combat during the Tet offensive in Vietnam than during the Chinese intervention in the Korean War. While the visual depiction of the Vietnam War included more photographs of dead and wounded as well as of people in immediate life threatening situations, the visual depiction of the Korean War was a more sanitized version of combat with a more contemplative view of people both shocked by and safe from the combat experience (pp. 755-756).

Although Lee's study showed that the U.S. print media conducted relatively more accurate reporting than its South Korean counterpart, it was limited to written coverage without exploring visual coverage. Sherer's study showed the difference in the visual depictions of the Korean War and the Vietnam War, but his study was limited by the duration of the study – seven weeks for the Korean War and the five weeks for the Vietnam War. Therefore, this present study attempts to explore the salient frames by expanding the time period of the study, and moreover by examining the mythical themes presented in the photographic images of the Korean War as published in *Life*.

Research Questions

Based on the literature review above, this study proposes the following research questions:

RQ1: How much of the coverage actually portrayed combat and combat related activity and events in *Life*'s photographs of the Korean War?

RQ2: What nation is the most salient and how is each nation portrayed in *Life's* photographs of the Korean War?

RQ3: How much of the coverage portrayed civilian casualties and destruction?

RQ4: What mythical themes were used in *Life's* photographs of the Korean War?

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study combines quantitative and qualitative methods. The first method is a quantitative content analysis of the sampled photographs of the Korean War, presented in *Life* magazine from July 1950 through August 1953. The content analysis aims to examine the salience and absence of categories from the visual representation of the war. The second part of the study, which uses a qualitative method, is an ideological analysis of 17 selected photographic packages from the same period. The ideological analysis aims to complement the findings of the content analysis by offering a more thorough interpretation of the mythical themes and their related ideologies of the coverage.

Justification for selecting *Life* magazine

The criteria for choosing to examine photographs of the Korean War from *Life* magazine for examination are as follows: first, the United States, at that time, had not yet fully entered the age of television. The television news had little immediacy because it was days later that the film footage from Korea arrived in newsrooms in New York. In addition, the television news shows that aired only fifteen minutes a night could be too short to influence the public; the print media was still the main source of coverage for the Korean War (Halberstam, 2007, p. 3).

Second, *Life* was one of the most popular American magazines in the twentieth century, the most important picture magazine of its day, and was at the height of its popularity in the 1940s and 1950s (Kozol, 1994, p. viii). Its circulation reached over 5,200,000 at the time of the Korean War (*Life*, 1951, July 2, cover). *Life* was a success

from its beginning. By 1939, the circulation had reached more than 2 million, and in the late 1940s it was read by approximately 22.5 million people, “21 percent of the entire population over ten years old” (Doss, 2001, pp. 2-3). The popularity of the picture magazine had a huge impact on the American public and on photojournalism history in the areas of politics, foreign affairs, and culture.

Third, *Life* was issued weekly with better-scaled and higher quality photographs of the war than other magazines and newspapers at that time. *Life* was the first all-photography news and features magazine in the United States, placing more emphasis on photographs than words. With the development of technology such as small cameras and fast film, *Life* could give readers what they wanted in a “visual age” (Harris, 1970, p. 7): more photographs.

When Henry Robinson Luce, the founder of the Time Inc., started *Life* in 1936, he aimed at a new kind of picture magazine. He stated his goals for the new magazine as follows:

To see life; to see the world; to eyewitness great events; to watch the faces of the poor and the gestures of the proud; to see strange things—machines, armies, multitudes, shadows in the jungles and on the moon; to see man’s work—his paintings, towers, and discoveries; to see things thousands of miles away, things hidden behind walls and within rooms, things dangerous to come to; the women that men love and many children; to see and to take pleasure in seeing; to see and be amazed; to see and be instructed.

Thus to see, and to be shown, is now the will and new expectancy of half mankind.

To see, and to show, is the mission now undertaken by a new kind of publication, The Show-Book of the World, hereinafter described. (Luce, 1936)

Even more, *Life* fascinated the public with its revolutionary editing style and photo essays. Luce wanted to “edit pictures into a coherent story—to make an effective mosaic out of the fragmentary documents which pictures, past and present, are” (Elson,

1968, p. 278. As cited in Doss, 2001, p. 2). Luce and the editors of *Life* considered photography as "a new language, difficult, as yet unmastered, but incredibly powerful and strangely universal" (Wainwright, 1986, p. 443; Doss, 2001, p. 11)

In these contexts, *Life*'s imagery achieves its status as historical and cultural sources to study the ideologies of American society and media. Luce, ambitiously stated, "A hundred years from now the historian should be able to rely largely on our Picture Magazine instead of having to fumble through dozens of newspapers and magazines" (Wainwright, 1986, p. 29). Although his grandiose vision could be considered as the expression of his proud belief in *Life*, his statement does not seem to be a mere boast. *Life* still provides scholars with a rich and historical source to understand American society, but in a rather critical way, which may be different from what Luce envisioned.

Historian Wendy Kozol (1994) explored the concept of domesticity shown in *Life* as an American ideology in the 1950s and 1960s. By analyzing *Life*'s coverage in terms of gender, race, and class, she argued that the magazine idealized a white male middlebrow ideology of social and cultural unity in America, ignoring conflicts among different social groups at that time. Historian Erika Doss (2001) also pointed out that *Life* presented American ideals of "nationalism, capitalism, and classlessness, a sense of confidence, optimism, and exceptionalism, and the sure belief that the American way was the way of the world" (p. 11).

This perspective of America as the ideal was exactly what Luce described as American purpose and identity. In his essay "American Century," he wrote:

We have some things in this country which are infinitely precious and especially American—a love of freedom, a feeling for the equality of opportunity, a tradition of self-reliance and independence and also of co-

operation . . . It now becomes our time to be the powerhouse from which the[se] ideals spread throughout the world. (*Life*, 1941, p. 65)

In fact, Luce himself had a direct hand on much of *Life*'s presentation of the ideals of American national identity (Doss, 2001, p. 13). *Life*'s coverage mirrored the values of Luce, who had a religious background—his parents were Presbyterian missionaries in China—and an upper-middle class background. Many of the *Life*'s editors who were Ivy League-educated white males and “professional-managerial class” (Doss, 2001, p. 14) shared Luce's ideals.

For Luce and *Life*'s editors, pictures were the most effective and powerful language for mass communication to spread these ideals, to enlighten and instruct the public, and even direct public opinion (Doss, 2001, p. 11). Wilson Hicks (1952), *Life*'s picture editor from 1937 to 1950, mentioned *Life*'s ambition to spread “the body of beliefs and convictions upon which the magazine was founded.” He added, “It stood for certain things, it entered at one the world-wide battle for men's minds” (p. 85). Knowing the power of photographs, *Life*'s editors put their stamp on picture editing. Hicks stated about his role, “Having determined the story he wishes to tell, the editor selects those pictures which relate themselves most readily and effectively to other pictures in developing the story's theme or advancing its action . . . In addition to answering the question, ‘*Does the picture say what it is intended to say?*’ the editor asks and answers another question, ‘Does it say what I want to say?’” (p. 60). *Life* presented American identity, not always just as it was, but as they would have liked it to be.

Content Analysis

This study attempts to examine how *Life* magazine framed the Korean War by content-analyzing photographic images of the Korean War that were published in the magazine from July 1950 through August 1953.

Content analysis is frequently used in media research because it is a useful method for investigating the content of the media, such as the number and types of categories of media accounts (Wimmer & Dominick, 2000). Content analysis is defined as “any systematic procedure devised to examine the content of recorded information” (Walizer & Wienir, 1978, p. 343). Content analysis is “a method of studying and analyzing communication in a systematic, objective, and quantitative manner for the purpose of measuring variables” (Kerlinger, 2000, p. 544).

Sampling

The reason for designating the period of the study, from July 1950 through August 1953, is that the war started on June 25, 1950 and ended on July 27, 1953. *Life* ran its first coverage on the Korean War in the July 10, 1950 issue and its last in the August 10, 1953 issue. During this time period, *Life* published the total of 165 issues and 1,933 photographs about the Korean War.

In this time period, a stratified sampling was used. This type of sampling is considered as the most appropriate for weakly magazines. Riffe, Lacy, and Drager (1996) found that selecting one issue randomly from each month was the most efficient sampling method for inferring a year’s content. Through this sampling method, 399 photographs in 26 issues are analyzed for the study.

Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis is an individual photograph. According to Stempel III (1989), an individual photograph is a basic unit of visual communication that can be exclusive and independent (p. 127).

Variables and Coding Categories

To explore the portrayal of the Korean War in *Life* magazine, this study developed two variables: (a) Main Subject and (b) Nation. The two variables were coded for every photograph from the selected issues during the period.

To answer the research questions, this study set up the categories for the dominant subjects in the photographs by primarily following the categories formulated in the study of the photographic images of the Gulf War by Griffin and Lee (1995). They conducted a content analysis of the Gulf War photographs published in *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. World & Report* to explore what the public actually saw from the Gulf War. For the content analysis, they used 36 categories, combining “Main Subject” and “Nation.” This present study, by eliminating some categories and adding others, consisted of a total 14 categories for “Main Subject” and 8 for “Nation.” The detailed list of categories is in Appendix 1.

Regarding “Main Subject,” this study, following the lead of Griffin and Lee (1995), defines “combat” as “pictures of actual combat activity such as troops, tanks, or armored vehicles advancing in combat zones, artillery or naval guns firing, planes taking off from aircraft carrier decks or airports, bombing images, anti-craft fire, the launching of missiles, soldiers forming defensive lines, retreating from battle, or evacuating wounded” (Griffin & Lee, 1995, p. 819). “Arsenal” is defined as all non-combat

illustrations of planes, ships, tanks, missiles, or other weapons systems. “Troops” includes the photographs of soldiers in non-combat situations. “Political leaders” is defined as photographs of political figures such as presidents, senators, congressmen, U.N. delegates, etc. “Military leaders” is defined as photographs of generals. “Military casualties” includes the photographs of soldiers either wounded or dead. “POW” is defined as photographs of prisoners of war whether they are being captured, locked up in camps, being released, or coming home. “Destruction” refers to pictures of bombed out or burning buildings, pieces of scorched scud missile debris, etc. “Civilian casualties” includes pictures of civilians either wounded or killed. “Civilian life” is defined as photographs of civilians who are not combatants. “Media” is defined as photographs of reporters or photographers. “Public demonstration” includes pictures of people protesting against the war or against a truce. “Historical photographs” includes photographs that show the historical background of the nations that were involved in the war.

Regarding “Nation,” this study assigns one of the eight categories to a photograph according to the nationalities of subjects shown in the photographs. When two or more countries are represented, “Nation” is assigned according to the main subjects in terms of the size of the subjects. When the subjects of two or more different countries are presented equal in terms of size, the captions of the photographs are considered to figure out the main subject(s).

Statistical Procedures

The simple frequencies and percentages were calculated for each category in the cross-tabulation of “Main Subject” and “Nation” in order to examine the categories in

terms of those that were more salient than others as well as which categories were absent in the visual representation of *Life's* Korean War coverage.

Inter-coder Reliability

The inter-coder reliability test was administered on 10% of photographs selected randomly from all the photographs published during the time period. Cohen's *kappa* (1960) was 0.87 for "Main Subject" and 0.84 for "Nation." According to Landis and Koch (1977), values of *kappa* from 0.61-0.80 reflect "substantial" agreement and values above 0.81 represent "almost perfect" agreement (p. 165). The inter-coder reliability for this study satisfied this standard.

Ideological Analysis

This study, in addition to quantitative content analysis, also includes an ideological analysis of the photographs of the Korean War, as presented in *Life* from July 1950 through August 1953. Using an ideological analysis, this study asks what mythical themes are used in the photographic coverage of the Korean War and how these themes are related to the dominant ideologies of American society.

Ideological criticism is defined as "any kind of criticism that bases its evaluation of texts or other phenomenon being discussed on issues, generally of a political or socioeconomic nature that are of consuming interest to a particular group of people" (Berger, 2000, p. 71). From a Marxist perspective, ideological criticism purposes to point out the hidden ideological messages that shape the consciousness of the receivers (Berger, 2000, p. 73).

The term *ideology* traditionally refers to “a systematic and all-inclusive sociopolitical explanation of what goes on in a society” (Berger, 2000, p. 71). Mueller (1973) also defines ideologies as “integrated belief systems which provide explanations for political reality and establish the collective goals of a class or group” (pp. 101-102). Since the ideologies are closely associated with the interest of a class or group, they often function to prevent the group from seeing the real condition of society and to maintain their idea of the status quo. Because ideology is everywhere and even unconscious sometimes, its effect can mask the real condition of society. Mannheim (1936) stated the following about these characteristics of ideology:

The concept of “ideology” reflects the one discovery which has emerged from political conflict, namely, that ruling groups can in their thinking become so intensively interest-bound to a situation that they are simply no longer able to see certain facts which would undermine their sense of domination. There is implicit in the word “ideology” the insight that in certain situations the collective unconscious of certain groups obscures the real condition of society both to itself and to others and thereby stabilizes it. (p. 40)

Berger (2000) explains the concept further by adding that people usually do not know that they hold ideological beliefs, but “everyone has ideological beliefs” (p. 73).

The term *hegemony* refers to winning of an ideology. Made popular by the Italian Marxist thinker Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937), it refers to the notions that “ideological domination is invisible because it is all-pervasive” (Berger, 2000, p. 74). Berger (2000) pointed out “People are full of illusion about themselves and their possibilities” (p. 75). The ideological domination is even achieved with subtlety because the ruling ideology is constantly reasserted as an unquestioned consensus by discourse rather than being imposed by political and economic power (Hall, 1982).

Mass media and other forms of communication, therefore, are effective ways for a dominant ideology to permeate a society. Marxist critics argued that “the media and other forms of communication that are used in capitalist nations are dominated by a bourgeois ruling class in order to generate false consciousness in the masses, or in Marxist terms, the *proletariat*” (Berger, 2000, p. 73). And the media contents help shape the consciousness of the receivers of the messages and organize their lives. The task of all ideological criticism is then to point out the deceptive reality of the hidden ideological messages.

Literature Review of Ideological Analysis

The critical and cultural studies in media, based on the concepts of ideology and hegemony, has attempted to reveal the hidden ideological messages of media contents constructed in a specific culture. Originating from its interest in working-class subordination, cultural studies has expanded into the areas of youth, alternative subcultures, gender, and ethnicity (McQuail, 2000, p. 50; Graeme, 1990, p. 33, 61).

In an ideological analysis, gender is one of the great concerns. Goodman (1999), adopting cultural studies and ideological analysis, examined how the issue of gender was represented in the ideological messages in a popular magazine in America. He explored how the cartoons in the humor section of *Life* magazine reflected suffragist and anti-suffragist ideologies and why certain suffragist and/or anti-suffragist ideologies were reflected and others ignored during the women’s suffrage movement. The analysis showed that the cartoons obviously supported the prevailing ideology during the period, such as separation the spheres of Victorian values, republican motherhood, and domesticity. The purpose, use, and nature of humor, the editorial content of *Life*, and the

performance by male cartoonists helped subvert suffragists' counter-hegemony by mocking suffragists and supporting anti-suffragist ideologies. The study pointed out that about 100 years after the women's suffrage movement, media still maintain some anti-suffragists' ideologies by fostering the feminine myth that women are self-sacrificing, self-denigrating, passive, dependent, nurturing, beautiful, and pure. Thus, the dominance of anti-suffragist ideologies in the cartoons suggests that the dominant ideology is continually renewed, reinforced, defended, and constructed—all of which are required to maintain the status quo of society.

Ethnicity is also one of the major concerns of an ideological criticism. The ideological messages on the issue of ethnicity might be even more intensified during the international conflicts. Brennen and Duffy (2003), adopting cultural materialism and ideological critique, compared the *New York Times*' rhetorical strategies used to portray Japanese Americans after Pearl Harbor with those used to depict Muslim and Arab-Americans following September 11. Cultural materialism considers "cultural artifacts [to be] explicit practices of communication created within a historically specific society and produced under particular social, economic, and political conditions" (Brennen & Duffy, 2003, p. 3). Therefore, cultural materialism places "cultural artifacts within a specific context in order to illustrate a text's connection to a culture's dominant ideology" (p.3)

Brennen and Duffy used Cormack's five categories of analysis—content, structure, absence, style, and mode of address—to show that the concept of the "Other" is used to frame both groups in the name of national security. Regarding content, they focused on the selection of vocabulary such as "Japanese nationals," "Japanese aliens," and "suspicious enemies." Regarding structure, the juxtaposition of the headlines including

the security problem and the Japanese “round-up” was analyzed. They also focused on the absence of defining what constitutes the criteria for “selected” or “key” Japanese. They found that civil liberties issues did not protect Japanese Americans.

The study indicated that as soon as the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 happened, they were compared with Pearl Harbor, but there has been *no* overt identification of Muslim and Arab-Americans as the Other as occurred in the internment of Japanese citizens during World War II. Instead, issues of unity and diversity have been emphasized. However, racial profiling is a hot issue, and the police have arrested 600 individuals claiming fear and public safety as rationales for such searches and detentions. Concluding that Muslim and Arab-Americans were in this way objectified as the “Other,” the study further concluded that “fear may be seen as an ideological strategy used by a government to ensure the obedience of its citizens” (p. 13).

Another study explored the manifestation of ideological messages during the actual wartime, but explored the manifestation in terms of visuals in this case. Moriarty and Shaw (1995) analyzed representation and symbolism of Gulf War photographs published in *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News & World Report*. For the analysis, the study combined several qualitative methods such as ideological framing, semiotics, and rhetorical analysis with a quantitative content analysis. The study showed that 35% of the Gulf War photographs they examined depicted war equipment, which supported the critics who claimed that the Gulf War was “a war of technology” (p. 5). The authors suggested the possibility that some of the operational shots such as those of missiles above Tel Aviv and Ridyah could convey the fantasy of war as an electronic game. The study also found that maneuvers and training operations, rather than combat, dominated

the Gulf War photographs. The authors suggested that the lack of real combat photographs gave the public the idea of “a depersonalized war” (p. 5), associated with the idea of war as a game. Another finding was that anti-war protestors were not fairly represented, in that they were given less coverage than war supporters were, and had their irrational actions emphasized as opposed to the peaceful aspects of the supporters (p. 5). The authors also found that the “good versus evil” framing (p. 6) was used in the depiction of U.S. leaders and soldiers against Iraqi leaders and soldiers, and that the depiction of the cost of war, such as destroyed buildings and human casualties, was extremely limited. Finally, the study concluded that the pictorial coverage of Gulf War in the three American news magazines supported military ideology and hindered the public from facing the reality of the war by emphasizing technological superiority and patriotism and by using the theme “good versus evil.”

Although the study by Moriarty and Shaw included many interesting findings of the Gulf War photographs using ideological analysis and other qualitative research methods, they did not analyze much about the photographs’ visual components such as composition, camera angles, the use of various lenses, and the use of color in the photographs. This study attempts to improve on the study of the photographic coverage of war by adding a discussion of these aspects of the photographs.

Sampling

Due to the characteristics and requirements of qualitative analysis, it is not possible to examine a large number of photographs individually. Therefore, this study analyzes 17 selected photographic packages from the issues of the magazine from July 1950 through August 1953.

First, this study selected only the photographic packages that include 10 or more photographs grouped in a single article, following one subject or place. Each shorter article presented under one section banner is considered to be one individual article. The photographic packages with a number of photographs are considered to represent more important events and themes than single images. For the coverage of the three years of the Korean War, there were total of 71 photographic packages that met these conditions.

This number of photographic packages, however, was still overwhelming for a qualitative study. Therefore, in order to reduce the number of photographic packages, this study secondly divided the entire three years of the war into five periods according to the major events during the Korean War. The five periods and the number of photographic packages for each period are the following: “The United States enters the war,” 19 photographic packages; “MacArthur’s Inchon landing,” six packages; the “Chinese intervention,” 20 packages; the “Stalemate,” 24 packages; and the “Armistice,” two packages.

For the third step, this study developed seven dominant themes representing the Korean War in *Life* through its duration. These themes are the following: (a) “Victory in the air,” (b) “Defeat on the ground,” (c) “Unready/Unpopular war,” (d) “MacArthur as a hero,” (e) “Good versus evil,” (f) “Paternalism/Humanitarianism,” and (g) “Tragedy of Korea.” Some miscellaneous themes such as media were categorized into “Other.” Each theme also has sub-themes. The theme “Victory in the air” includes (a) “American superiority in air power” and (b) “American pilots as heroes.” The theme “Defeat on the ground” is defined as (a) “American inferior ground power,” (b) “American casualties,” (c) “Low morale for war,” and (d) “American soldiers coming home as survivors not as

heroes.” The theme “Unready/Unpopular war” includes (a) “American political leader’s indecisiveness,” (b) “American military leaders’ disagreement with political leaders,” (c) “American troops’ unpreparedness,” (d) “Shortage of American military supplies,” and (e) the “American public’s disfavor for the war.” The theme “Good versus evil” contains (a) “U.S. soldiers as good guys,” (b) “Communist POWs well-treated by the U.N.,” (c) “U.N. POWs badly-treated by the Communists,” (d) “Communists’ malicious propaganda.” The theme “Paternalism/Humanitarianism” includes (a) “A weak South Korean political leader,” (b) “Inadequate South Korean troops,” and (c) Korean orphans. The theme “Tragedy of Korea” contains (a) “Korean refugees,” (b) “Korean civilian casualties,” and (c) “a Guerilla war.” The theme “Other” includes war photographers and correspondents, reverse striptease of American military clothes,³ the farewell of an American soldier to his girlfriend, etc. (see Appendix 2).

For the fourth step, this study assigned a theme or themes to each photographic package and made a chart to figure out which theme was dominant for each period (see Appendix 3). In this process, some problems appeared in the definitions of themes for the photographic packages.

The first challenge was that one photographic package did not always have only one theme. In photojournalism tradition, there are two types of photographic packages: a photo story and a photo essay. A photo story is represented as “a visual narrative that achieves coherence and continuity through layout of interrelated pictures, captions, text and headlines.” The images are interrelated and need each other, having a beginning, a middle, and an end. A photo essay “sets out to explore a situation or express a point of view. Each photo makes its own point, and together they make a larger, more significant

statement. The essay can be a concept, and can advocate or take a point of view.” One image can be taken out without weakening the statement.

For the Korean War photographs in *Life* magazine, some photographic packages had characteristics more like a photo story, following the narrative of one theme. Others had characteristics more like a photo essay, illustrating several events, therefore jumping from theme to theme. If most of the photographs in a photographic package represented one theme, the package was assigned to only one theme. If photographs in a package had several different themes of similar importance, the package was assigned to the several themes.

The second challenge was that there were some photographic packages that represented anti-themes. For example, the photographic package titled “Sycamore, Ill. Backs Truman.” Published in the July 10, 1950 issue, presented the theme of Americans’ war support, which is the opposite of the theme “Unready/Unpopular war.” The eight main themes have been marked with “●” and the anti-themes have been marked with “○” (see Appendix 3).

The third challenge was that some themes appeared throughout several periods. For example, “Victory in the air” and “Defeat on the ground” appeared through all the periods, especially in the first and the third ones. In order to resolve the problem, the fifth step in this study was to count the number of photographic packages that represented each theme and anti-theme, and calculate the number of photographic packages that represent a dominant theme for each period by subtracting the number of packages representing a main theme from the number of packages representing an anti-theme. This study not only counted the number of photographic packages of a specific theme but also

looked at the relative importance of visual images in photographic packages. For example, in the photographic package titled “Sycamore, Ill. Backs Truman,” published in the July 10, 1950 issue, 13 of the total of 14 photographs in the article were simply mug shots. Because this style of photograph does not have much visual narrative, this package was considered to be less important visually.

Although most of the themes appeared through all the periods, this study could determine dominant themes for each period by using the processes above. The themes “Victory in the air” and “Defeat on the ground” were dominant for the first period called “America enters the war;” “MacArthur as a hero” for the second period called “MacArthur’s Inchon landing;” “Defeat on the ground” and “Unready/Unpopular war” for the third period called “Chinese intervention;” “Good versus evil,” “Paternalism/Humanitarianism,” and “Tragedy of Korea” for the fourth period called “Stalemate;” and the summary of the Korean war coverage for the fifth period called “Armistice.”

For the final step, this study selected some photographic packages that were considered to represent the dominant theme or themes for each period. However, the analysis was not limited to only the selected packages for each period, but included other single photographs that represent the theme or themes but that appeared in other periods. For example, David Douglas Duncan’s photo essay, published in the July 10, 1950 issue, was in the first issue that reported on the war. Single photographs like this one were taken from photo essays and were analyzed for other periods.

From the first period of “America enters the war,” three photographic packages were analyzed under the theme “Victory in the air” and four photographic packages were

analyzed under the theme “Defeat on the ground.” From the second period of “MacArthur’s Inchon landing,” two photographic packages were analyzed for “MacArthur as a hero.” From the third period of “Chinese intervention,” four photographic packages were analyzed for “Defeat on the ground.” From this period, one photographic package was analyzed for the anti-theme of “Unready/Unpopular war.” And another photographic package was analyzed for the theme “MacArthur as a hero,” and combined into the second period. From the fourth period, “Stalemate,” two photographic packages were analyzed for the theme “Good versus evil,” one for the theme “Paternalism/Humanitarianism,” and one for the theme “Tragedy of Korea.” From the fifth period of “Armistice,” one photographic package was analyzed that summarized the magazine’s Korean War coverage (see Appendix 3). The complete list of the 17 photographic packages analyzed for this study is presented in Appendix 4.

Cormack’s Method of Ideological Analysis

In addition to analyzing the above-mentioned photographs, this study also analyzes headlines and subheads that accompany the photographic packages as a part of the total photographic layout. Written articles are not analyzed, but cited when information is needed to understand the story behind the photographs. However, the focus of the analysis is on the photographs. By taking this approach, this study also assumes that readers, when given texts combined with images, are first attracted to and receive meaning from the images.

To analyze the Korean War photographs, this study employs Cormack’s method of ideological analysis. Cormack’s method (1995) consists of five categories: content, structure, absence, style, and mode of address.

Regarding content, this paper examines the judgments and the vocabulary found in captions, headlines, and subheads as well as characters and actions within the photographs. Judgments, the first element of content, consists of explicit statements such as assertions, opinions, denials, etc., representing obvious and self-conscious beliefs and values. The second element of content is vocabulary, which is meant to be “the choice of descriptive language” (Cormack, 1995, p.28), such as the use of adjectives. The third aspect of content is character, such as stereotypes. The last element is actions, which are the activities of the subjects. According to Cormack, “the ideological importance of these four sub-categories of content is that they are used to express a view of reality” (p. 29).

Regarding structure, Cormack stated that “content does not stand alone and part of the meaning of any element of a cultural product derives from its position within the whole artifact” (Cormack, 1995, p. 29). One type of the structure can be termed “diachronic structure” (p. 29), which means the “order of delivery” (p. 29), including the opening and closing elements. This order can be related to the importance of the elements arranged in a text. The order of delivery also carries meaning of the whole text as well as that of each element. Especially in a photo package, the arrangement of photographs is significant because the order creates the flow of the photo story or photo essay, in which the position of each photograph contributes to give meaning to the whole story. Using the “diachronic structure,” this study evaluates the arrangement of a series of photographs in the packages by noting the leading photographs and the closing photographs. Another type of structure, “synchronic structure” (Cormack, 1995, p. 30), is presented through the distinctions made by the text. Using “synchronic structure,” this paper examines the

“binary oppositions between two elements, such as good and bad, old and young, male and female, dark and light, capitalist and communist, powerful and weak, etc” (p. 29).

With regard to absence, elements that are left out of the photographs—whether consciously or unconsciously— are discussed as well. According to Cormack (1995), this category is difficult to deal with because its scope is infinite and its argument includes an evaluative judgment. However, its ideological importance is crucial because it can help construct a mythic view by avoiding certain aspects of events and therefore presenting other aspects as unproblematic (pp. 31-32).

Regarding style, which is “the ways in which the content is made to cohere,” (Cormack, 1995, p. 32) the examination is of the composition, the use of colors, the use of darkness and brightness, the use of contrast, the use of wide or telescope lens, and the use of camera angle. All these elements influence the meaning of the photographs significantly.

The last category of Cormack’s ideological analysis is mode of address, which is “the way in which the cultural product ‘speaks’ to us” (Cormack, 1995, p. 33). The first mode of address is *direct/indirect address* (p. 33). Unlike fictions where message senders speak to an audience indirectly, news contents such as *Life*’s photographs, use direct address. In direct address, therefore, the ideological positioning is more obvious, and the audience and the cultural producers are assumed to share an ideological position. The second mode of address is *specific/general address* (p. 33) where messages aim to reach a specific or general audience. Although *Life* magazine was one of the popular magazines in America during the 1940s and the 1950s (Kozol, 1994, p. viii), its readers were white middle-class (p. vii). The third mode of address is *unified/fragmented mode of address*

(Cormack, 1995, p. 34). While most cultural products have a unified address focused on one particular point, some cultural products with a fragmented address tend to undermine any ideological constraints.

These five categories are only the beginning of analysis, and how they work in a particular text or event should be studied in each cultural product. (Cormack, 1995, p. 35). In terms of Hall, these five elements can function as signs and symbols in cultural texts such as photographs to stand for and represent things and concepts to other people. These signs and symbols can be interpreted as having cultural meanings, and these meanings and values are produced by the work of representation (Hall, 1997). As Cormack (1995) indicated, “in order to develop the analysis to demonstrate why such ideological forces may be at work, it must be linked on the one hand to the cultural position of the makers of the text, and on the other, to the intended audience” (p. 35). According to Hall (1997), the cultural meanings not only exist in people’s minds, but these meanings also go on to organize and regulate social practices and influence people’s conduct. In other words, the media presentation not only reflects the events or people in the world, but also constructs a version of reality for the world.

CHAPTER 4

CONTENT ANALYSIS RESULTS

Content Analysis

In an attempt to examine the question of which categories are salient ones in the visual representation of the Korean War, this study content-analyzed a total of 399 sampled photographs published in *Life* from July 1950 through August 1953 of the Korean War. This study examined 281 photographs from the first year of the war, July 1950 to June 1951; 25 photographs from the second year, July 1951 to June 1952; and 93 photographs from the third year, July 1952 to August 1953.

Visual Framing of the Korean War

1. Main Subject

In terms of the “Main Subject,” the dominant three categories among 14 named categories were “Troops in non-combat situations” (21.8%, 87 photographs), “Combat” (17.5%, 70 photographs), and “Civilian life” (14.5%, 58 photographs). These three categories represented more than half of all 399 photographs. The least represented categories were “Military leaders” (2.8%, 11 photographs), “Arsenal” (2.5%, 10 photographs), “Destruction” (1.3%, 5 photographs), “Public demonstration” (0.5%, 2 photographs), and “Civilian casualties” (0.3%, 1 photograph). These five categories constituted only 7.4% of all the 399 photographs. The frequency and percentages of the photographs in terms of the main subject are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Frequency and percentages of nations and subjects

	US	Allied	USSR	China	South Korea	North Korea	Japan	Other	Total
Arsenal	10 (2.5%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10 (2.5%)
Troop	73 (18.3%)	—	—	—	6 (1.5%)	—	7 (1.8%)	1 (.3%)	87 (21.8%)
Political leaders	16 (4.0%)	2 (.5%)	5 (1.3%)	2 (.5%)	3 (.8%)	—	—	2 (.5%)	30 (7.5%)
Military leaders	10 (2.5%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 (.3%)	11 (2.8%)
Military casualties	23 (5.8%)	—	—	—	2 (.5%)	2 (.5%)	—	1 (.3%)	28 (7.0%)
POW	18 (4.5%)	—	—	3 (.8%)	—	1 (.3%)	—	2 (.5%)	24 (6.0%)
Combat	60 (15.0%)	1 (.3%)	4 (1.0%)	—	4 (1.0%)	—	—	1 (.3%)	70 (17.5%)
Destruction	2 (.5%)	—	1 (.3%)	—	—	2 (.5%)	—	—	5 (1.3%)
Civilian casualties	—	—	—	—	1 (.3%)	—	—	—	1 (.3%)
Civilian life	39 (9.8%)	—	—	—	18 (4.5%)	—	—	1 (.3%)	58 (14.5%)
Media	10 (2.5%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10 (2.5%)
Public demonstration	—	—	—	—	2 (.5%)	—	—	—	2 (.5%)
Historical photos	—	—	—	—	36 (9.0%)	—	—	1 (.3%)	37 (9.3%)
Other	17 (4.3%)	—	—	—	6 (1.5%)	2 (.5%)	—	1 (.3%)	26 (6.5%)
Total	278 (69.7%)	3 (.8%)	10 (2.5%)	5 (1.3%)	78 (19.5%)	7 (1.8%)	7 (1.8%)	11 (2.8%)	399 (100.0%)

It is not clear how many photographs are required to represent combat situations in a war, but it is interesting to compare the portrayals of the Korean War and the Gulf War, especially because this study adopted almost the same categories for this content analysis as Griffin and Lee's study (1995) of the visual representation of the Gulf War in three major U.S. news magazines. They found that the pictures of "Combat" constituted only 3% of all the photographs. Griffin (2004c) also found a similar result in his study of the Iraq War photographs. Compared to these, the Korean War photographs in *Life* seem to better reflect the reality of war with more "Combat" photographs.

It is interesting to note that "Civilian life" was the third most frequent category in the Korean War portrayal—because it was one of the categories least presented in the Gulf War and the Iraq War in the two studies (Griffin & Lee, 1995; Griffin, 2004c) mentioned above. The characteristics of "Civilian life" photographs are described in more detail in the section of "Main Subject and Nation Cross-Tabulated" (see pages 59, 60, and 69).

"Arsenal" was one of the five least represented categories in Korean War photographs. It is also interesting to note that this category was the most frequent one in the Gulf War and the Iraq War. This might be explained by the fact that U.S. military weaponry used during the Korean War was limited and not much different from that used during World War II. One of the rare exceptions was helicopters, used for transportation, reconnaissance, evacuation, and rescuer work. However, these helicopters were small so they could hold only one or two people other than the pilot (Moeller, 1989, p. 264). After World War II, the United States tried to rebuild its economy and focused its attention on the consumer economy. The Truman administration reduced the military budget for

several years. At the outbreak of the Korean War, the production of military weapons was not fully mobilized under the U.S. government's definition of "Police action."

"Destruction," "Public demonstration," and "Civilian casualties" were almost absent in Korean War photographs. The characteristics of the three categories are described in more depth with the consideration of the "Nation" variable in the section of "Main Subject and Nation Cross-Tabulated" (see pages 61-62).

2. Nation

In terms of the representation of nations, not surprisingly the United States dominated, constituting 69.7% with 278 photographs out of a total of the 399 photographs coded (see Table 1). Other nations were much less represented except for South Korea, which constituted 19.5% or 78 photographs of the total of 399 photographs coded.

Among all the other nations represented, the Allied forces were the least shown (0.8%, 3 photographs). Such a drop in representation could be explained by the United States' having a dominant role at that time in the United Nations. The United States decided to enter the Korean War on June 25, 1950, the same day that North Korea invaded South Korea across the 38th parallel. It was also this same day that President Truman of the United States went to the United Nations to get its approval to intervene even without a U.S. Congressional declaration of war. The United States provided about 50% of the ground forces, and South Korea provided most of the remainder. The United States also provided 86% of the naval power and 93% of the air power (Lafeber, 1997, p. 105).

Photographs of the Soviet Union, China, and North Korea were significantly underrepresented, constituting only total of 5.6%, having 22 photographs. This low rate is understandable given that photographers could hardly be expected to cross over to the enemy side, risking their lives.

3. Main Subject and Nation Cross-Tabulated

The main subject and the nation are cross-tabulated to examine more detailed categories of the Korean War photographs in *Life*. The most frequently occurring categories in the cross-tabulation were “U.S. troops” (18.3%), “U.S. combat” (15%), “U.S. civilian life” (9.8%), and “South Korean historical photos” (9%) from the total of 399 photographs. Although the category of “South Korean historical photographs” placed in the fourth most frequent category, the data were skewed in that all 36 “South Korean historical photographs” were published in only one issue coded for this study. When the proportion of this category was calculated from the population of the Korean War photographs published in *Life* during the three years, which was 1,933 photographs, the “South Korean historical photographs” category was almost absent, constituting an extremely small portion (0.02%).

3-1. Within Nation

Since the most represented nations in Korean War photographs in *Life* were the United States (69.7%, 278 photographs) and South Korea (19.5%, 78 photographs), and other nations hardly appeared in the sample, this part of the analysis mainly focuses on the photographs of the United States and South Korea. The photographs of North Korea are discussed in conjunction with those of South Korea.

Among the total of 278 photographs of the United States, the most frequent categories were “Troops” (26.3%, 73 photographs), “Combat” (21.6%, 60 photographs), and “Civilian life” (14%, 39 photographs). This indicates that for *Life* and its readers, soldiers were the greatest concern whether they were in combat or non-combat situations. Although political leaders—constituting 5.8%, having 16 photographs in this case—decide whether to go to war or not, and military leaders—constituting 3.6%, having 10 photographs in this case—contrive strategies for combats, it is always soldiers who fight, struggle, are injured or die, and sometimes return home with bittersweet memories of war.

When one considers that “U.S. civilian life” photographs were of ordinary Americans being interviewed about their opinion on the war and also of American youngsters about to be drafted, it seems the second greatest concern in the photographs from the United States was American public opinion on the home front. In a democratic country like the United States, public support of war might be indispensable for conducting as well as winning a war. This interest in public reaction to going to war, however, could be used for propaganda if it is focused on only one side of the government’s rationale for the war.

“Military casualties” (8.3%, 23 photographs) and “POWs” (6.5%, 18 photographs) received moderate concern from *Life* and its readers compared to the other categories of the U.S. photographs. Despite the U.S. military censorship of the photographs of U.S. casualties, *Life* photographers in Korea seemed to feel that they had to convey the reality of the war where U.S. soldiers were dying. Since July 1951 when the United Nations and North Korea began to talk about a truce, the great concern was the repatriation of the POWs from both sides. Peace talks were delayed because of the

different expectations on this issue. North Korea demanded that at least the majority of the North Korean prisoners be returned to its side of the DMZ, while the United Nations insisted that only those who wanted to go back to North Korea should do so. A more detailed characteristic of the photographs of U.S. POWs is explored in Chapter 5, which compares the photographs of U.S. POWs with those of Communist POWs.

Among a total of 78 photographs of South Korea, the most frequent categories were “Historical photographs” (46.2%, 36 photographs) and “Civilian life” (23.1%, 18 photographs). As shown at the beginning of “Main Subject and Nation Cross-tabulated” section, the data of “Historical photographs” were skewed (see page 59). Therefore, the category that appeared most in the photographs of South Korea was of “Civilian life,” which was the photographs of South Korean refugees, desperately heading to the south. This reflects that South Korea’s miserable situation at that time, which was one of the U.S. government’s rationales for entering the war.

“Troops” (7.7%, 6 photographs) and “Combat” (5.1%, 4 photographs) from South Korea received less concern from *Life* editors and its readers. Among the other categories of the photographs of South Korea. The South Korean Army did not have a significant role in fighting against North Korean and Chinese troops. When North Korea invaded, South Korean troops, who were ill-prepared and ill-equipped, were amazed, outnumbered and overwhelmed by communist forces. It looked for a while as though they had lost their will to fight. A more detailed characteristic of the photographs of South Korean troops is explored in Chapter 5.

“Military casualties,” “Civilian casualties,” and “Destruction” of South Korea were hardly shown, having only a few photographs: two for “South Korean military

casualties,” one for “South Korean civilian casualties,” and none for “South Korean destruction.” In contrast to the visual representation in these categories, South Korea suffered huge casualties and destruction during the war. The South Korean Army suffered approximately 50,000 dead, 176,000 wounded, and 80,000 missing in action or POWs (South Korean POWs). South Korea suffered half a million civilian deaths or missing as a result of the war (Moeller, 1989, p. 444, Note 83).

Considering the war’s disastrous impact on Korea, these categories were severely underrepresented. These results resonate with Sherer’s findings (1988) that the visual depiction of the Korean War, compared with that of the Vietnam War, focused more on either “a sense of desperation and/or discomfort in a non-life threatening situation or on a sense of relative safety from the combat experience” (p. 755). Sherer’s study, however, did not distinguish the subjects (i.e. Americans, allies, enemies, civilians, etc.⁴) in terms of this portrayal so that it did not compare which subject was represented in a less life-threatening situation.

In this sample, there was only 1 photograph of South Korean civilian casualties and 2 of South Korean military casualties while there were 23 photographs of U.S. military casualties. As a result, Koreans were portrayed in much less life-threatening situations than American soldiers. This would seem to give a distorted sense of reality to the war, and suggest that South Korean soldiers and civilians, unlike U.S. soldiers, suffered only discomfort not the deadly threats of war or that Korean casualties were not important compared to American casualties.

North Korea was represented with “Military casualties,” “POWs,” “Destruction,” having only two, one, and two photographs respectively. Since “Destruction” in North

Korea was also shown in the images of U.S. aerial bombing that were coded into “Combat” category in “Main Subjects,” North Korean portrayal showed its soldiers killed or captured and its facilities destroyed by bombing, which are signs of U.S. victory. There were no photographs of North Korean “Arsenal,” “Troops,” and “Combat.” This might be because it was difficult for *Life* photographers to get an access to North Korean troops. It also could reflect the United States’ underestimation of North Korean forces’ ability at the beginning of the war and their quick failure that required Chinese intervention into the war. North Korean “Political leaders” and “Military leaders” were absent. This could be because the United States considered North Korea a puppet of the Soviet Union, not an independent force that caused the war. There were no photographs of North Korean “Civilian life” and “Civilian casualties,” which was not a concern of *Life*.

The Soviet Union, which provided weapons to North Korea, was represented with its “Political leaders” (50%, 5 photographs) and “Combat” (40%, 4 photographs), reflecting its assumed influence. The United States believed that the Soviet Union was controlling North Korea’s attack on South Korea. Although North Korea desperately needed the Soviet Union’s approval for the invasion and was given Stalin’s word on weapon supplies, Stalin turned out to be a precipitator not an organizer of the war.

China was represented with its “Political leaders” (2 photographs) and “POWs” (3 photographs), also reflecting its practical influence on the war. China provided soldiers to North Korea and its intervention to the war was a deathblow to the U.S. forces in Korea.

3-2. Within Main Subject

This study found that the United States was the nation predominantly represented in all the main subjects except “Destruction” (0.5%), “Civilian casualties” (0%), “Public

demonstration” (0%), and “Historical photographs” (0%) from the total of 399 photographs.

Within “Arsenal,” “U.S. arsenal” category was the most frequently represented, constituting 100 %, with 10 photographs out of the 10 “Arsenal” photographs. It can partly be explained by the fact that the South Korean arsenal was very poor and that the United States provided most of the military weapons including 86% of the naval power and 93% of the air power (Lafeber, 1997, p. 105). However, the enemy’s arsenal, such as of the Soviets and Chinese were still severely underrepresented. When the North Korean Army crossed the border, it was well-equipped with 242 tanks, including 150 Soviet-made T-34 tanks, approximately 180 aircrafts including 40 YAK fighters and 70 attack bombers, which the Soviet Army had left when they withdrew from North Korea in 1949. Despite the United States’ confidence in its air power, Soviet’s YAKs were strong enough to shoot down U.S. jet fighters.

Within the category “Troops,” the “U.S. troops” category was the most frequently represented, consisting of 83.9%, having 73 photographs out of the total of 87 “Troops” photographs. The category of “U.S. troops” was also the largest one among all the cells in the cross-table, consisting 18.3% out of the total of 399 photographs coded for the study. The second most frequently represented nation in “Troops” was the “Japanese troops” category, which made up 8% representation, having 7 photographs out of the total of 87 “Troops” photographs. However, the data were skewed in that all 7 of these “Japanese troops” photographs were published in only one of the issues of *Life* magazine that was coded for this study. If it is assumed that there were 421 photographs of “Troops” out of the total of 1,933 photographs because “Troops” would take 21.8% out of the total 1,933

photographs, the proportion of “Japanese troops” in “Troops” category would be merely 0.02% out of 421 “Troops” photographs.

The third most frequently represented nation in the “Troops” category was “South Korean troops,” which consisted of 6.9%, with 6 photographs out of the total of 87 “Troops” photographs. There were no photographs of “Allied troops,” “Soviet troops,” “China troops,” or “North Korean troops.” However, the category of “Other troops,” coded for the troops captioned as “Reds,” including Chinese and North Korean troops, consisted of 1.1%, with 1 photograph out of the total of 87 “Troops” photographs.

Within “Political leaders,” the category of “U.S. political leaders” was the most frequently represented, consisting 53.3%, with 16 photographs out of the total of 30 “Political leaders” photographs. The second most frequently represented nation was “Soviet political leaders” which consisted of 16.7%, having 5 photographs out of the total 30 “Political leaders” photographs. This proportion reflected *Life’s* understanding of the Soviet influence behind North Korea’s invasion of South Korea although the Soviet influence had been secretly attained. In fact, it was the Soviets’ approval that Kim Il Sung, North Korea’s leader, wanted the most when he thought that he was ready to attack South Korea. The Soviet Union, however, did not want the responsibility for the invasion. In April 1950 when Kim went to Moscow to persuade Joseph Stalin to approve Kim’s plan, Stalin said to Kim that he was on Kim’s side but Kim could not expect his help if the United States entered the conflict: “If you should get kicked in the teeth I shall not lift a finger. You have to ask Mao for all the help” (Goncharov et al., 1993, pp. 144-145). Despite Stalin’s hidden hand on North Korea, the United States understood the war as a contest between the liberal Western world and the evil Communist world represented by

the Soviet Union. China had just become a Communist country.

The third most frequently represented nation in the “Political leaders” category was “South Korean political leaders,” which made up 10%, with 3 photographs out of the total of 30 “Political leaders” photographs. “Allied political leaders” and “Chinese political leaders” were less represented than the above three: 6.7% for each of the categories, each having 2 photographs out of the total of 30 “Political leaders” photographs. China’s influence in the war was significantly underestimated, especially by *Life* magazine, which then led to the United Nations’ bitter retreat after Chinese intervention in the war on November 1950. There were no photographs of “Political leaders” for North Korea or Japan. In *Life* and other American media, North Korea was understood as a mere puppet of the Soviets, not an independent country that operated on its own will and strength.

Within the “Military leaders,” the category of “U.S. military leaders” was the most frequently represented, consisting 90.9%, with 10 photographs out of the total of 11 “Military leaders” photographs. The only photograph that was not in this category was the one of a Chinese General and a North Korean General in a cease-fire talk, published in the July 30, 1950 issue of *Life*. Among the 10 photographs of “U.S. military leaders” 7 photographs were of General MacArthur, 1 of General Walton Walker, 1 of Major General Orvil A. Anderson, and 1 of General James Van Fleet. Not surprisingly, General MacArthur was represented the most prominent in terms of the size as well as the number of photographs.

Within “Military casualties,” the category of “U.S. military casualties” was the most frequently represented, constituting 82.1%, with 23 photographs out of the total of

28 “Military casualties” photographs. Each of “South Korean military casualties” and “North Korean military casualties” had 2 photographs, each constituting 7.1%. One photograph was coded as “Other military casualties,” which included Communist military casualties. There were no photographs of military casualties from other nations.

Within “POWs,” the category of “U.S. POWs” was the most frequently represented, constituting 75%, with 18 photographs out of the total of 24 “POWs” photographs. There were 3 photographs of “China POWs,” 1 of “North Korean POWs,” and 2 of “Other POWs,” which include Communist military casualties. There were no photographs of POWs from other nations.

Within the “Combat,” the category of “U.S. combat” was the most frequently represented, constituting 85.7%, with 60 photographs out of the total of 70 “Combat” photographs. The category of “U.S. combat” was also the second largest one among all the cells in the cross-table, consisting of 15% out of the total of 399 photographs coded for the study. There was 1 photograph of “Allied Combat,” 4 of “Soviet Combat,” 4 of “South Korean Combat,” and 1 of “Other Combat.” Four photographs of “Soviet Combat” were mostly of Soviet tanks and airplanes in combat zones, which suggests that the Soviet supported North Korea with their military weapons, especially tanks and airplanes.

Within the “Destruction” category, there were two photographs of “U.S. Destruction,” one of “Soviet Destruction,” and two of “North Korean Destruction,” making the total of five. The photographs of “U.S. Destruction” and “Soviet Destruction” portrayed the pieces of scorched scud missile debris and destroyed weapons in non-combat zones. The photographs of “North Korean Destruction” portrayed the bombed out

or burning buildings and facilities by the United States' air bombing. This portrayal was meant to emphasize the United States' superior air power, not North Korea's suffering. There were no photographs of "South Korean Destruction," which might have been common because of the air bombing of both sides. The destruction of South Korea did not seem to be a great concern to *Life* editors and their readers even though one reason the United States entered the war was to save South Koreans. The destruction of South Korea seems to have been ignored or considered collateral damage.

Only 1 "Civilian casualties" photograph among the total of 399 photographs coded was of a wounded Korean woman, who was photographed by David Douglas Duncan and published in the September 11, 1950 issue of *Life*. The caption reads: "A Korean mother nurses her child while South Korean medics bandage a shell wound of her" (Duncan, "The durable ROKs," p. 54). This picture was coded as into "Civilian casualties" category because in the caption she was the subject in the main clause and South Korean medics were the ones in the subordinate clause. It, however, was basically the photograph of South Korean soldiers, not of civilian casualties because the article was about South Korean troops who turned out to be durable despite their unsuccessful efforts in combat. The title reads: "The durable ROKs: South Korea's troops show guts and shortcomings in an unsuccessful attack on Red-held hill 626" (p. 52). In the full-bleed photograph, the last one in the article, the Korean mother sits on the backyard of a house—maybe her farmhouse—breast-feeding her child, while the blood drops from her injured head to her breast. The caption does not say how she was injured.⁵ Two South Korean medics in their neat uniforms stand behind her, bandaging her wound, one holding the bandage and the other cutting it with scissors. No other medical gadgets are

seen. Even if the photograph hints at the South Korean soldiers' abilities, what the soldiers were doing in the photographs seems to be just simple work.

Within the "Civilian life" category, the number of the photographs of "U.S. civilian life" (67.2%, 39 photographs) more than doubled that of the photographs of "South Korean civilian life" (31%, 18 photographs). The category of "U.S. civilian life" was also the third largest one among all the cells in the cross-table, consisting 9.8% out of the total of 399 photographs coded for the study. The photographs of "U.S. civilian life" were of Americans who were interviewed on the streets about their opinion on the war or who were about to be drafted. The former ones were usually used to represent Americans' supporting the war, and latter ones were used to represent the worries and anxiety as well as the pride Americans felt. The photographs of "South Korean civilian life" were of Korean refugees who were fleeing to the south. The interest about American public's reaction to military mobilization overran the interest in South Korea refugees in *Life's* photographs.

Both photographs of "Public demonstration" were of South Koreans. One photograph, published in the December 8, 1952 issue of *Life*, was of South Korean students who paraded in Seoul in a warm-up for the welcoming for Dwight D. Eisenhower, the president-elect at that time. This picture, which was "the picture of the week," ran a full-bleed page. This image reflects the hope of South Koreans as well as Americans' that the United States would do better dealing with the Korean issue with Eisenhower as president. The other one, published in the June 8, 1953 issue of *Life*, was of South Koreans who angrily protested against the United Nations' truce proposal, insisting that the U.N. keep fighting for the unification of Korea.

Summary

“U.S. troops,” “U.S. combat,” and “U.S. civilian life” were the dominant categories in the visual representation of the Korean War in *Life* magazine. The United States was the nation dominantly represented, which might be natural when one considers that *Life* was an American magazine and the United States was the leading nation in the United Nations at the time they decided to help South Korea. The detailed categories above might reflect American concern about U.S. soldiers’ activities whether in combat or non-combat situations, and also about American public opinion on the issue of war mobilization whether war supply production or draft. Although there were a reasonable number of combat photographs, soldiers were portrayed more in non-combat situations than in combat situations.

North Korea, the Soviets, and China were underrepresented in all categories. This might be because it was difficult for *Life* photographers to gain access to the enemy side. Among its rare visuals, the Soviet Union was represented with its “Political leaders” and “Combat,” reflecting its assumed critical influence at the start of the war—which was not quite true. The Soviet Union provided weapons to North Korea. China was represented with its “Political leaders” and “POWs,” also reflecting its practical influence on the war. China provided soldiers to North Korea. North Korea was portrayed as a puppet of the Soviet Union, without any photographs of “Political leaders.” Its “Military casualties” and “Destruction” portrayed U.S. victory.

South Korea was second in portrayals. This was because the United States went to the war with the rationale of saving South Korea. South Korea was represented with its “Civilian life,” that is its refugees. “Military casualties,” “Civilian casualties,” and

“Destruction” of South Korea were almost absent. It could give a distorted sense of the reality of the war and portray South Koreans as having suffered some discomfort but not the deadly threats of the war.

CHAPTER 5

IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Ideological Analysis

An ideological analysis explored the question of what mythical themes were used in *Life's* photographic coverage of the Korean War and how these themes were related to the dominant ideologies of war in American society. This study identified seven mythical themes represented in 17 photographic packages throughout the five periods of the war. The absence of some narratives in visual representation of the war is discussed as well.

The Development of Themes

1. The United States Goes to the Korean War Only to Retreat (July 1950 to August 1950)

Summary of Events

At the dawn of Sunday, June 25, 1950, the North Korean Army launched a surprise attack across the 38th parallel, the border between North and South Korea, with the claim that South Korean troops had crossed the border first. The North Korean Army was well-prepared with its enlisted 135,000 men (“In depth: The Korean War,” n.d.). These men included elite soldiers who had fought with Chinese Communists in the Chinese Civil War for several years and had just come back to join the North Korean Army. The Army was also well-equipped with 242 tanks, including 150 Soviet-made T-34 tanks, approximately 180 aircrafts including 40 YAK fighters and 70 attack bombers, which the Soviet Army left behind when they withdrew from North Korea in 1949.

Compared to the North Korean Army, the South Korean forces were ill-prepared with only 98,000 men (“In Depth: The Korean War,” n.d.) and ill-equipped with little arsenal that had been provided by the United States. South Korea’s poor weaponry was partly to blame: the United States left little of it when the United States withdrew from Korea in June 1950, worrying that Syngman Rhee, the South Korean president, would attack North Korea if he were given more military strength than necessary (“The Korean War: Setting,” n.d.). The South Korean military had no tanks, attack planes, or any other anti-tank weapons (Stueck, 1995, p. 11; “U.S. Fights,” 1950, *Life*, p. 32).

With their superior military power, the North Korean Army captured Seoul, the capital of South Korea, on the afternoon of June 28, only three days after the beginning of the war. North Korea’s hope to reunite Korea within three weeks seemed to be going as planned until the United States and the United Nations intervened and expanded a small Asian country’s civil war into the first international conflict in the Cold War era.

On the same day the war started, U.S. President Harry S. Truman called on the United Nations Security Council instead of obtaining a declaration of war from Congress,⁶ which he regarded as “too alarmist and time-consuming when time was of the essence” (“Korean War,” n.d.). On June 27, the United Nations unanimously passed a resolution to help South Korea. This decision was reached because the Soviets were temporarily absent, having boycotted the Security Council until Communist China was admitted to the United Nations Security Council in the place of the Republic of China. On July 7, President Truman appointed General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, who had been American Commander in Asia, as U.N. Commander-in-chief for Korea. Sixteen

U.N. member countries including the United States responded to the U.N.'s call with military support and four responded with medical support.

While the United Nations was preparing to send more troops, additional arsenal equipment, and other military supplies, the limited U.S. troops, who were already in South Korea and Japan, were struggling to defend the country. U.S. airpower support was relatively successful in bombing Communist bases in North Korea. The U.S. Army's weapons from World War II, however, were limited and outdated. There were not enough U.S. bazookas and recoilless rifles to effectively defend against Russian-built tanks of North Korea ("U.S. Fights," 1950, p. 32). The Russian T-34 tanks outran the U.S. tanks in a topographically rough country like Korea ("The U.S. Tries," *Life*, 1950, p. 13). By August, outnumbered and outgunned, the South Korean and the U.S. troops were cornered in Pusan, a small area in the southeast end of Korean peninsula. The casualty number for U.S. soldiers reached 3,000 and 11,000 were wounded by the end of August ("Seoul and Victory," *Life*, 1950, p. 29). By September, with the arrival of additional American supplies and air support, they barely managed to hold on to the Pusan Perimeter until MacArthur's Inchon landing on September 15, 1950.

Dominant Themes

During the first period of analysis, all seven themes appeared in *Life's* the visual representation of the Korean War. Two of them were dominant: (a) "Victory in the air (U.S. airpower superiority)" and (b) "Defeat on the ground." Among the total of 18 photographic packages that contained 10 or more photographs from this period, 8 photographic packages presented either or both of the two themes (see Appendix 3). Another 8 of the 18 photographic packages presented the theme "Unready/Unprepared

war” and the rest of them represented the other themes. The theme “Unready/Unprepared war” is discussed along with the theme “Defeat on the ground” because these two themes are closely related to each other. Among the eight photographic packages analyzed for this period, three photographic packages presented only the theme “Defeat on the ground.” Two photographic packages presented both the themes “Victory in the air” and “Defeat on the ground,” and the other two photographic packages presented the theme “Victory in the air” and the counter-theme⁷ of “Defeat on the ground”. One photographic package presented only the counter-theme of “Defeat on the ground.”

The first story from Korea published in *Life* magazine was delivered in an article by staff photographer David Douglas Duncan (see Photographic package 1). A U.S. Marine combat photographer during World War II, Duncan arrived in Korea just after the North Korean invasion, and he stayed there through the whole period of the Korean War.⁸ In the July 10, 1950 issue of *Life*, under the title “U.S. gets into fight for Korea: An eyewitness report in words and pictures” (p. 19), Duncan portrayed the “first five days” (p. 20) of the Korean crisis, summarizing as well as prognosticating most of all themes that would be presented through the whole period of the war. All of the seven themes, except “Unready/Unprepared war,” were presented in Duncan’s photo essay. As his photo essay summarized the themes of the Korean War during its critical stage, the dominant two themes of his photo essay were “Victory in the air (U.S. airpower superiority)” and “Defeat on the ground.”

1) Victory in the Air: U.S. Pilots as Heroes and U.S. Airpower Superiority

Following the sudden North Korean invasion, the first available and most powerful military means the United States employed was the airpower, where they were

housed in Japan since the end of World War II. At the outbreak of the war, President Truman ordered MacArthur to transfer munitions to the South Korean Army, while using air cover to protect the evacuation of U.S. citizens. In fact, the United States was doing much better in the air than on the ground. It was also U.S. air power along with naval power that contributed the most to the success of General MacArthur's Inchon landing during the second period of the war.

One of the two themes that were dominant for the first period of the Korean War was "Victory in the air." This theme was represented with three sub-themes: (a) "U.S. pilots as heroes," (b) "Well-trained and well-organized U.S. Air Force," and (c) "U.S. superiority in airpower technology."

This image of a pilot as an independent hero has a long tradition in American culture. Michael S. Sherry (1987), in his book *The Rise Of American Air Power*, explored how the fantasy of American strategic air power developed and has persisted in the present nuclear balance of terror. One of the cultural assets that helped develop this myth was the image of aviators as knights of the air. The airplane, even before its invention, had existed in people's imagination as being not only a weapon but also "the instrument of flight, of a whole new dimension in human activity" (p. 2), which expands the biological limits of human beings and knits together people in the world. Flight also resonated with religious symbols especially in Christian mythology, such as "Christ's ascension" (p. 2) in the Western World. Moreover, aviators' individuality and the masculine ability of controlling machinery were celebrated in the 1930s when the anxieties about the debilitating effects of a machine civilization increased. Therefore, the airplane was considered an instrument of American ideals, such as frontier spirit,

individualism, independence, and religious purity, and aviators were fantasized as nice guys and heroes that realized these ideals.

Duncan's photo essay, the first coverage of the Korean War was published in the July 10, 1950 issue of *Life*, and carried photographs with this sub theme: "U.S. pilots as heroes." On the second page of the article, Duncan's report begins with the subtitle: "The first five days: *Life* photographer David Douglas Duncan gives his story of battle from first air victories to MacArthur's dramatic visit to front" (see Figure 2). Despite the first photograph of a U.S. wounded soldier on the first page (see Figure 1), this subtitle of the article looks to emphasize a more positive perspective of the war in Korea—belief in U.S. airpower superiority. The article states that the U.S. Air Force had knocked down six North Korean planes by the time of writing. Duncan just took his first pictures of the Korean War when two F-80s landed, flashing over in double rolls, a symbol of combat victory.

In the first of the photographs printed on the second page, a victorious young pilot is sitting against the wall in the squadron ready room, the look on his face showing fatigue from the last air fight, and the seriousness of preparing for the next flight (see Figure 2). The caption reads: "Victorious pilot, Lieut. Charles B. Moran who shot down first Yak, waits in room to fly again." The strong chiaroscuro in black and white on his face, made by the harsh sidelight coming in directly through the window, gives him a dramatic aura and emphasizes his manly profile. The photographer used no flash, but only ambient light from the window to make this so-called Rembrandt lighting, which gives a contrast of light and darkness. The diagonal line made by his body posture also gives a dynamic feeling to the image. The photographer could have taken this picture in

front of the pilot, not from the side, if he had wanted to avoid including the legs of the fellow pilot, which is compositionally somewhat distracting. However, if he had chosen that angle, he would have lost the pilot's gaze toward an empty space, which seems to show that the pilot is contemplating the next flight while he is recovering from the last one. The window on the upper right corner of the image seems to show that he soon has to leave into the air where he will fight again. He has an air of a rugged and lonely hero, a kind of John Wayne in the American culture. The pilot was a hero, as the article says of him "who shot down the first enemy plane of the Korean War" (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 20). The photographer, in the article, says, "Something in his face made me grab a quick shot" (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 20). The theme "Victory in the air (U.S. airpower superiority)" is obvious with the caption and the written article, but there is also a touch of apprehension in his facial expression and his body posture, conveying the possibility of another story behind the obvious one. Even the photographer said, "I still am not sure what I saw in his face and his slouched body" (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 20).

A photograph on the third page of the article carries the same theme, but with a more cheerful image than the above one (see Figure 2). This is a full-size photograph of a U.S. pilot celebrating his victory with a fellow soldier. The caption reads: "Winner in combat against the North Korean Air Force, Lieut. Robert T. Wayne of Garden City, N.Y., uses hands to show crew chief, Sgt. Jim Brothers, how he shot down two Russian-made Yak fighters near Seoul. He is getting out of his F-80 jet fighter after returning to a U.S. Air Force base in southern Japan." In the picture, the pilot, still on the top of his fighter, is shown looking up into the sky. The photographer used a low angle, which is usually employed to illustrate someone in a higher position of power. The low angle also gives a

clear background to the image, which makes the pilot look distinct from the sky. He looks proud and confident with a smile on his manly face and with strong, muscled arms exposed from the sleeves of his uniform rolled up above his elbows. His right hand mimicking his plane looks like an eagle, a symbol of American national identity, representing power, beauty, and independence. The diagonal line between the pilot and his crew gives a dynamic feeling to the image. Between them is the magnificent fighter plane on which their names are painted.

The photograph represents the pilot as an individual, a knight of the air, by showing his name painted on his airplane. His individuality is also emphasized by being alone in the picture. Although another pilot is in the picture, only his back is shown. He is an admirer of the pilot, listening to stories of his heroic adventure in the sky.

According to Sherry (1987), another cultural asset that helped develop the fantasy of American strategic air power was the image of the airplane as an effective and even benign weapon in wartime. It was believed that bombers would “diminish the evils of war” because they would “deter or shorten war itself by making it too horrible for intelligent citizens to entertain or endure” (p. 5). That is, a decisive war leads to fewer casualties, thus, air power, ironically, might humanize war by its horror. “The greatest destroyer is the greatest philanthropist” (p. 5). Furthermore, the concept of strategic “precision bombing”—destroying only production systems and “terrorizing the whole population” (p. 30) without killing them—was adopted in order to differentiate American bombers’ humane purpose from Nazi’s indiscriminate bombing.

The traditional value of individual heroism and the modern value of scientific, rational destruction combined without conflicting with each other.

The sub theme “U.S. pilots as heroes” combines with the other sub theme “U.S. superiority in airpower technology” in the July 17, 1950 issue of *Life*, which carried a cover photograph of a U.S. pilot and inside, an article about U.S. air power (see Photographic package 2). The issue titled “War by jet and by GI: It stirs pride of U.S. but exacts a payment,” carried two articles with photographs for each article: one was Duncan’s article with words and photographs on the successful U.S. air attack and the other was Carl Mydans’ report with photographs on the bloody U.S. defense efforts. While the U.S. Army defense forces were struggling on the ground, the U.S. Air Force attack forces had some small victories in spite of the fact that they had limited manpower and facilities. Although the two stories had the same number of pages--five, and the same number of photographs—15 photographs for each—Duncan’s photographs were printed first and were on *Life*’s cover.

The cover of the issue carries a photograph of a U.S. pilot with the title “U.S. JET PILOT AFTER SHOOTING DOWN A YAK” (see Figure 6). The caption that appears on the issue’s Table of Contents page reads:

Less than two hours before this picture was taken in Japan, Captain Raymond E. Schillereff, 34, an F-80 jet pilot, shot down a North Korea fighter near Seoul. This happened on the 2nd day of the fighting. Captain Schillereff, here wearily drinking out of a cup bearing his name and squadron insignie, was one of the first Americans to report a dogfight victory. In World War II he was an F-51 pilot, shot down four German planes. His wife and three children are in Japan; his parents live in Seattle. (“Contents,” 1950, *Life*, p. 25)

Although the explanation says that he is “wearily drinking,” he has a smile of unexaggerated confidence and proud on his victory with air fighters on the background. The cup bearing his name and squadron insignie emphasizes his pride over his victory. U.S. air fighter planes are in the background. The cup bearing his name and squadron

insigne further emphasizes his pride in being a jet pilot in U.S. Air Force. He is relaxing from the last dogfight. This image is one more of the sub theme “U.S. Pilots as heroes”

Inside the issue, Duncan’s article on U.S. jet fighters carries more photographs under the title “Thunderbolts along my spine.” The subtitle reads: *Life’s* David Douglas Duncan describes jet fighter strike which he photographed from combat plane at 600 mph.” Duncan became the first photographer who had ever ridden a jet plane in a combat mission (Duncan & Mydans, 1950, *Life*, p. 28).

Duncan’s photographs, along with his written article, show how successful the U.S. Air Force was: “enemy planes had nearly disappeared from the skies” after it started attacking ground targets, such as tanks, ammunition trucks, and troop trains, although during the first week of the war “the American flyers had taken a heavy toll of Russian-made planes from North Korea” (Duncan & Mydans, 1950, *Life*, p. 28).

Actually, later in September when General MacArthur launched the Inchon landing, an aerial campaign of Air Force, Navy, and Marine planes, with their 5,000 sorties, provided an apparent support to soften up the invasion area and to cut enemy communications. During this climax of the bombing campaign, U.N. planes attacked the North Koreans with 46,000 rockets, 16 million rounds of 50-caliber machine-gun ammunition and 24,000 tons of bombs (“Planes Pave,” 1950, *Life*, p. 36).

The images of the air attack by the U.S. Air Force are dominant in Duncan’s photo package: 8 of 14 photographs are of the actual U.S. air attack on ground targets; 1 of them is of Captain Raymond E. Schillereff, the jet pilot on the cover page of the issue, with his family in Japan, 3 of them are of U.S. Air Force in an office room, 1 is of the pilot

of Duncan's airplane, and 1 is of Duncan, the photographer himself on the air jet. These images construct the sub theme "U.S. superiority in airpower technology."

The first page of the article shows the powerful and successful impact of U.S. Air Force, by carrying the most dominant photograph in the article, in terms of content and size, which is a 7-by-13 inch image of a jet firing on ground targets (see Figure 7). The caption reads: "Rocket-firing jet attacks ammunition trucks on a Korean road. White spots below plane mark trail left by propulsion bursts of the 5-inch projectiles as they scream toward the target far below." The jet goes into its dive for the target and the mission is successfully completed.

The five photographs on the second page show how this powerful and successful result was possible (see Figure 8). This was shown with the sub themes such as "Well-trained and well-organized U.S. Air Force" and "U.S. superior airpower technology" along with other miscellaneous sub-themes such as "War correspondent as a hero" and "U.S. soldier as a nice family guy."

The first photograph on the page shows Duncan, the photographer, on the jet. Duncan became the first photographer who had ever ridden a jet plane in a combat mission. The caption reads: "Photographer Duncan flew mission described here in the front seat of a T-33, which is designed for jet instruction. F-80s carry only pilot." War correspondents have often been characterized as heroes because they risk their lives covering war; war photographers have been admired for their courage because they have to be right there at the battlefield to take photographs of combat while writers can collect information after the battle is over. In the case of Duncan, even if he had not wanted to,

he had to be on the mission to take the photographs of the jet's actual firing and of the explosion of the targets on the ground.

The photograph on the lower left corner of the page shows a victorious pilot spending time with his family. The caption reads: "Family life at F-80 base in Japan makes it a new kind of war. Here Captain Raymond E. Schillereff (cover), one of first to shoot down a Yak, plays with sons Dean, 6, and Wayne, 3. In the background are wife Marjorie and Stephen, 1." Schillereff is not only an excellent pilot but also a good husband and a good father. Although pilots are characterized as heroes in the sky, they sometimes confront criticism for possibly killing civilians with their firing and bombing. Although airpower was considered to be humane as well as economical, there was a horror about indiscriminate firing or bombing because everything looks the same from the sky. Cherishing family values and loving children make a pilot look like a caring person. The emphasis on family value and love for children adds a humanitarian light to airpower's technological aspect. Here the noble human spirit integrates with mighty technological power. The one goes with the other, not conflicting with each other.

The United States' successful air power was also explained with the images of the well-trained and well-organized U.S. Air Force. The impression of indiscriminate firing or bombing by jet fighters can also be lessened by emphasizing the U.S. Air Force's ability to bomb strategically, or use "pinpoint bombing," which is available only with a well-organized command system and well-trained pilots. The fourth and fifth photographs on the page offer evidence for the former. The caption of the fourth photograph reads: "In operation room group commander Samways (left) synchronizes watch with Capt. Ray Lancaster, the operation office, before a jet mission. The caption of

the fifth one reads: “Board of strategy includes (left to right) Colonel Robert Witty, chief of staff; Brig. General Edward Timberlake, acting commander, 5th Air Force; Colonel John Howe, vice-commander; Capt. James Patton, bomber operations.”

Not only the U.S. Air Force command system but also the pilots were well-organized. The article describes Colonel Samways’ briefing with other pilots before taking off for attack. It also adds how well the pilots were trained by saying “The four jets started letting down from that roofless world where they live. Samways moved right in behind the leader, so close that it seemed we were tied to his tailpipe. The jet ahead banked and turned and drove down through fast opening holes through the clouds. We followed so closely, matching every turn with a turn, each sweep and dive with another, that it became impossible to think of the two jets as not being flown by a single hand” (Duncan & Mydans, 1950, *Life*, p. 30). This is shown in the first photograph on the third page. Four jet fighters fly as one in a formation. This kind of teamwork is essential for victory, especially in a war where a random mistake or error could jeopardize the team’s survival.

The successful result of firing by jets is portrayed in the second photograph on the third page (see Figure 8) and in a series of six photographs of explosion on the next spread (fourth and fifth pages) (see Figure 8). For the former one, the caption reads: “Attacking a tank, lead jet sprays ground with machine-gun fire (below). Picture was made from second plane, which was going over 600 mph. Note rockets have not been fired. They were released on a second pass and tank was blown up.” The caption for the latter one reads: “First published photos of combat strafing by U.S. jet fighter plane show

F-80 hitting ammunition truck, which explodes (top). Last of this gun camera sequence was taken as pilot flew through smoke and debris.”

However, the possibility that firing or bombing civilians by mistake took place might have been realized. The article says:

Suddenly we broke out through the bottom of the clouds and there were the carefully ruled fields and rain-soaked hills spread before us. Out of that whole vast panorama, only one microscopic pinpoint meant anything. It was a village, and at an intersection at the edge of the village here was a clump of trees just where the roads jointed. A tank crouched turtlelike behind those trees. We were going over 600 miles an hour but I didn't know it. (Duncan & Mydans, 1950, p. 30)

This statement might have been intended to emphasize the U.S. jet pilots' ability of pinpoint firing or bombing, but as the article says, the targets were so close to the village, “at the edge of the village.”

During the Korean War, the roads of retreat also were filled with Korean refugees heading toward the south. They were often caught in firing between North Korean and the U.N. troops. And they were exposed to air bombings. It seems almost impossible that U.S. jet fighters and bombers would have been able to discern these refugees from enemy soldiers, especially when North Koreans advanced in the guise of civilians. Although a lot of South Koreans left their villages to flee south, there were people who did not or could not leave. Some South Koreans stayed at home because they thought it would be over soon and others such as old people or pregnant women stayed at home because they thought they did not have the strength to walk such a long way and did not want to be buried in a place away from home.

Even among the countries belonging to the United Nations there was criticism of American bombing in Korea. Some leading Indian and Pakistan newspapers that

subscribed to British press syndicates for Korean War coverage reported the United States' savage war against the Asian nation. A *Life* correspondent in India reported that it was said, "in order to cover up the cowardice of their roadbound, luxury-loving troops, American commanders ordered indiscriminate air strikes to 'obliterate' Korean towns..." ("We Worry Our Allies," 1951, *Life*, p. 32). A correspondent in Paris reported that the crowd "in Champs-Élysées district movies—where the proletariat did not go—hissed and shouted obscene oaths at 'les Américains' during newsreels that showed U.S. jets firing rockets at Korean villages." It also reported that "both right- and left-wing newspapers editorials pointed out that the bombing and scorched-earth tactics in Korea, the chasing back and forth of civilians in front of armies, could be a preview of what might happen in Europe soon" ("We Worry Our Allies," 1951, *Life*, p. 33). Europe was already aware of the danger of bombing with its experiences during World War I and II.

This indiscriminate firing or bombing Korean civilians, however, was not reported in the photographs of *Life*. Werner Bischof, a Magnum photographer for *Life*, photographed the victims of American bombing, but they were not published in *Life*. His pictures of the victims of American bombing were even criticized by his fellow photographer from Magnum as "too soft" to sell to *Life*, more than ever a cheerleader for American aggression in the Far East" (Kershaw, 2003, p. 223). Despite the rather propagandist aspect of his photographs, it does not seem that they fit the fantasy of American airpower as effective and benign weapon.

Despite the possible horror of indiscriminate bombing, the fantasy of air power as an effective and even benign weapon developed later into the image of the atomic bomb as an acceptable or even desirable weapon to end a war, ignoring the real danger of the

bomb (Sherry, 1987). While liberal newspapers such as the *New York Times*, the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, and the *San Francisco Chronicle* opposed this idea, some conservative newspapers agreed with it. *Time* cited the *Denver Post* who said that they “saw no moral issue in the use of the bomb . . . Mr. Truman had indicated that the atomic bomb will not be dropped until such time as this country is in grave danger . . . that is today” (“Keep Your Shirts On,” 1950, *Time*, p. 18). An editorial in *Life* stated, “We not only risk all-out atomic war, but we positively invite it” (“This Way to Peace,” 1951, *Life*, p. 36).

The image of atomic power as an economic way for power supply and of a miraculous tool for medical care also was suggested in *Life*. The July 24, 1950 issue of *Life* carried an article by Lewis L. Strauss, a former member of Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), of his support for the President’s recent decision to develop an H-bomb under the U.S. government’s guidance. He argued that the United States had to secretly develop an H-bomb to maintain the lead in an armament race in a cold war, saying, “we must be strong if we expect to preserve our way of life” (“Some A-Bomb,” 1950, *Life*, p. 81). He criticized the theory of disarmament as a morally ideal justification, and insisted “if our country is subjected to a new and more horrible Pearl Harbor with atomic bombs or hydrogen bombs, or our national existence seriously endangered by some other new and terrible form of warfare, then and under those circumstances we would be justified in using every weapon we possessed to insure the preservation of our freedom and our way of life” (p. 90).

The interest in the atomic bomb continued, but sometimes with its horror recognized. The editorial in the August 28, 1950 issue of *Life*, introduced *The Effects of Atomic Weapons*, a best-seller published by the Department of Defense and the Atomic

Energy Commission, and demanded the U.S. civil defense program to prepare for the possibility of atomic attack on the U.S. territory. The article titled “B-47 swings air war balance to offense” in the December 4, 1950 of issue, talked about U.S. airpower with great speed, radar bombing, and atom planes carrying atom bombs (p. 157).

The use of the atomic bomb along with bombers, however, was still considered as necessary if not preferred. The January 1, 1951 issue of *Life* ran a special section on “America’s assets,” which ran almost 70 pages. It was a response to Truman’s proclaiming of a national emergency and his calling Charles E. Wilson of General Electric to mobilize the war industry. One article titled “U.S. reaches for its arms” reminded readers of Franklin Roosevelt’s “arsenal democracy” speech during World War II, and insisted that the United States was ready for full mobilization because of its industrial growth, including steel and of atomic power, as well as human resources and spiritual assets. Its lead picture showed a new B-36D with twin jets added under each wing so the craft could carry an A-bomb. The following articles were about each area of mobilization. One of them, titled “Atomic progress,” talked about “the great creative capacities of the atom’s energy, long overshadowed by the spectacular and terrifying nature of the bomb” (“Atomic Progress,” 1951, *Life*, p. 23). It explained that “the constructive by-products of atomic energy” could provide cheap electricity and contribute to medicine, industry, and agriculture with the use of radioisotopes. Another article was about General Electric, “Biggest producer.” The subtitle read: “GM typifies U.S. genius for size plus efficacy.” The article presented all the great products of the company, such as cars, tank transmissions, airplane turbo-jet engines, heating equipment, electric

refrigerators, and diesel engines, and finally showed a full-bleed photograph of aircraft propellers.

In February 1951, the Atomic Energy Commission tested A-bombs in Nevada, for the first time in the United States since the original Alamogordo explosion in 1945. (“Atomic Tests,” 1951, *Life*, p. 25).

Although the use of the atomic bomb was not preferred in the Korean War, it always had been a consideration of the U.S. government—whether with Truman or with Eisenhower. It was also a consideration of the U.S. military, especially General MacArthur. In November when China, worrying about the United States’ invasion on its mainland, intervened in the Korean War, MacArthur insisted on employing the atomic bomb on the Manchurian border. Truman remarked on this possibility in a press conference on November 30, 1950 (Truman, 1950a).

Historian Bruce Cumings (1997) argued that Truman’s allusions as to the possibility of using the atomic bomb was “a threat based on contingency planning to use the bomb, rather than the faux pas so many assumed it to be” (pp. 289-292). He also noted that the United States was close to using nuclear weapons in April 1951 in Korea. Nonetheless, the atomic bomb was not used in Korea. It was not, however, because the U.S. government cared about Koreans, but rather because the power of Chinese troops decreased thereafter (Cumings, 1997). Furthermore, European nations pressed the United States not to use the bomb. These nations were acting out of fear that Russia could take all of Europe if the United States went to war with China (Schnabel, 1992, p. 289).

The fantasy of American airpower as an economical, yet benign weapon was based on the culturally heroic image of pilots and the belief in the ability of the American

Air Force to perform pinpoint airstrikes. This myth kept *Life* from showing its readers Korean civilian casualties caused by American air strikes. It may also have been responsible for furthering U.S. government interest in the possibility of atomic bombing in Korea..

2) Defeat on the Ground

The other theme dominant for the first period of the Korean War was “Defeat on the ground.” This theme was represented with its sub-themes: (a) “U.S. inferiority in ground power technology,” (b) “U.S. casualties,” (c) “Don’t know why we fight,” and (d) “Soldiers coming home as survivors but not as heroes.”

At the outbreak of the war, the U.S. government was so confident with U.S. air and naval superiority that it decided that sending ground troops was not needed immediately. However, General Omar Bradley, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs at that time, later admitted that he had underestimated the North Korean forces; “No one believed that the North Koreans were as strong as they turned out to be” (Donovan, 1996, p. 199). Despite the relatively successful U.S. air and naval support, the U.S. Army was suffering a high number of casualties due to its old weapons and ammunition shortages as well as low morale. Ninety-seven percent of the U.S. casualties were of Army and Marine ground troops (Ridgway, 1986, viii).

Duncan’s photo essay, the first coverage about the Korean War, was published in the July 10, 1950 issue of *Life*. It begins with a photograph of a U.S. military casualty as a lead photograph among 19 images in the article (see Figure 1). The photograph’s caption reads: “An American casualty, PFC. Thomas Merante, was hit by strafers at South Korean airport.” In the picture, the wounded soldier grimacing in pain is carried in a

blanket by his fellow soldiers. Although this picture does not express the chaos of the battlefield—it might be because the picture was taken after the firing ended—, this image was a kind of “A picture that no American enjoys seeing” (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 19). The message of this picture as lead photograph was not just “U.S. gets into fight for Korea,” but actually “We are being defeated and are bleeding.”

This defeat was mainly because the United States’ was unprepared for the war in the training of its troops as well as in producing military weaponry and supplies. Despite the United States’ confidence in its air power, the North Korean Air Force was also well equipped with Soviet-made Yaks. The U.S. Army did not have effective weapons against them. Three pictures on the fourth and fifth pages in Duncan’s photo essay show the damage that North Korean fighters did to South Korean and the U.S. troops and their response to it (see Figure 3).

The first photograph across the two pages is of a U.S. transport shot down by North Korean fighter. The caption reads: “Victims of a Russian-built plane that strafed Suwon airfield, an American C-54 transport, which had landed unload supplies for South Korea’s Army, noses over in a fiery heap.” The U.S. transport is burning and spurting little “orange”⁹ flames and smoke. The sun set in the background makes a silhouette of the plane, which gives a feeling of tragic solemnity.

The second photograph on the fourth page shows the cause of the disaster above: ineffective U.S. anticraft weapon. The caption reads: “Anticraft weapon is towed behind a balky truck pushed by Korean infantrymen. Multi-barreled 50-caliber gun was flown in from American base in Japan to protect Suwon from Red air attack.”

At the outset of the war, the United States had been transporting ammunitions such as tanks, planes, anti-tank and anticraft weapons, but it was slow and limited. In June 1950, the United States was not prepared to wage war. Public sentiment against a large standing military establishment and the desire to produce consumer goods forced the government to reduce defense expenditures after World War II. America's policy of containment of communism and its increasing dependence on the atomic bomb and strategic air power caused a significant reduction in the strength of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. As a result, there were few trained units available for immediate commitment in Korea when the North Koreans invaded ("The Korean War: Setting," n.d.).

The theme "Defeat on the ground" was repeated in Carl Mydans' photographs in the July 17, 1950 issue of *Life* (see Photographic package 2). In the second week of the Korean War, which was called a police action by the United Nations, the outnumbered U.S. Army was struggling against Communist forces in the "muddy fields" while the U.S. Air Force, despite its small size, was achieving some success in the "clean air" (Duncan & Mydans, 1950, p. 27). At the outbreak of the war, there were only four divisions in Japan ready to fight, and at home, there were seven including two airborne and one armored available for combat. President Truman had told congressional leaders, "We are going in with what it takes." He also called for a draft of men 19 through 25 and was expected to ask for an extra two billion dollars, which would bring the total military appropriation close to 17 billion dollars (Duncan & Mydans, 1950, p. 27).

Mydans' photographs on the bloody U.S. defense efforts near Ch'onan was titled: "Mydans goes to the fighting: Infantry war is grim as ever." One sentence of the

introduction summarizes the situation: “. . . Carl Mydans was covering the foot soldiers’ war, the war of the shock-absorbing GIs who grabbed their sleep by the roadside as they could and lived again, or died, in the mud of strange and hostile country” (Duncan & Mydans, 1950, p. 33).

The dominant photograph on the first page of the article shows the fatigue of U.S. soldiers (see Figure 10). The caption reads: “Exhausted and unshaven American infantrymen sleep on ration boxes and rocky roadside.”

The next spread—the second and third page—of the article shows U.S. military casualties and a retreating South Korean soldier (see Figure 11). The first and dominant photograph of the spread is of a dead U.S. soldier surrounded by fellow soldiers. This was the first photograph of a dead U.S. soldier’s body that was printed in *Life* during the Korean War. The magazine had printed a photograph of a wounded U.S. soldier in the July 10, 1950 *Life*, the very first issue of the Korean War coverage. The caption reads: “The blanketed corpse of an infantry lieutenant lies across the straw-camouflaged jeep in which his men brought him back from front.” The dead soldier is covered with a blanket except for his feet in combat boots. His worn and muddy boots showing underneath the blanket say that he was a foot soldier, and tells how he probably died. He lies in the straw-camouflaged jeep that looks like a crib decorated with straw where Jesus was born, but for the soldier only to die there. The reader’s eye goes over his dead body to his boots and stay on them, since they are in sharp focus in the center of the picture. Then the eye follows the direction of his tilted left boot to the soldier on the right side of the photograph, making a diagonal line with the helmets of other soldiers. Among the soldiers surrounding the body, the eye-catching figure is a young soldier who is staring

nowhere in particular, with a cigarette in his mouth. It is not only because he is in focus with the dead soldier's boots, but also because of the intense expression in his eyes. His face shows more the signs of fatigue, shock, and frustration rather than sorrow and condolence. It seems that for him there is no emotion left even to mourn his comrade's death, only frustration from the muddy war that they do not know why they are fighting.

A letter to the editor about the photograph reads, "Your picture of a dead lieutenant and his men—especially the face of the last boy on the right—seems to portray combat as the young soldier sees it better than any photograph I have seen. In his eyes and the expression of his face are skepticism, horror and a sudden grownup look from the realization of death" ("Letters to the Editors," *Life*, 1950, August 7, p. 7). There was tragedy, but no glory for the dead in this kind of war. No reason to fight, no glory in dying.

On the same spread, the third and fourth photographs show wounded U.S. soldiers receiving medical treatment in the field (see Figure 11). The caption reads for each: "Pants gone and arm bound, GI lets comrade probe for wounds"; "His helmet gone and foot wounded, Sergeant gets bandage in jeep."

However, not all the dead and wounded were lucky to be brought back from the front and treated by their comrades, like the ones shown in the above photographs. The written article by *Time-Life* correspondent Frank Gibney, who accompanied Mydans, commented on the worst—when North Korean troops attacked the U.S. platoon five minutes after Gibney and Mydans left: "Once more the American ammunition was exhausted" and "Once more, wounded had to be left behind" (Duncan & Mydans, 1950, *Life*, p. 33). The best thing that a U.S. lieutenant who had to leave his wounded men

could do was to hand them grenades. The only thing that a U.S. soldier who had to leave his wounded buddy could do was “to prop him up in the middle of the road where he could raise his hands to surrender,” but it was hard to see him “cut in half by the Reds’ tommyguns while his hands waved feebly in the crisp summer air” (Duncan & Mydans, 1950, *Life*, p. 33).

While U.S. infantrymen struggled to hold on the defense lines, which were shown in a series of photographs on the next spread (fourth and fifth pages) (see Figure 12), South Korean soldiers were retreating with Korean refugees. The caption of the last photograph on the third page reads: “Footweary Korean soldier retreats southward with shoes in hands” (see Figure 11). If not for his uniform and his rifle on his shoulder, the soldier would not look at all different from the refugees in front of him. The shoes in his hands are not even combat boots. He is walking alone without his troops, who are all scattered along the route to retreat. For South Korean troops, there seems no camaraderie, no leadership, no organization, and no will to fight.

The situation on the battlefield was getting worse for U.S. soldiers, too. The July 24, 1950 issue (see Photographic package 3), the third issue of *Life* since the beginning of the war, carried another photograph of a dead U.S. soldier¹⁰ as a lead for the article, titled “Why are we taking a beating?” (see Figure 14). This time, however, the dead U.S. soldier was not even covered with a blanket, but exposed on a street. The caption reads: “Face down on a Korean roadside lies the body of an American soldier who was captured by Communist, trussed up and then murdered.”

How, then could *Life* publish so many photographs of U.S. casualties if these images are “A picture that no American enjoys seeing” (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 19)? The

first picture of the first report ever from Korea was of an American wounded soldier. The first U.S. dead body, even though it was covered, was shown in the second issue of *Life* since the breakout of the war. And the next issue finally printed out a photograph of a dead U.S. soldier exposed on a road. It may not be surprising because the situation on the battlefield was so bad. It may be, however, surprising because it is usually considered that the images of our casualties do not help promote war to the public. During World War I, the American photojournalist Jimmy Hare mentioned on the censorship that did not allow civilian photographers to take pictures of dead bodies: “Photographs seem to be the one thing that the War Office is really afraid of” (Gould & Greffe, 1977, p. 123).

Part of the answer on why *Life* could run the U.S. casualty photographs mentioned above could be found in the history of U.S. military censorship rules. The censorship on journalists’ reports, especially photographs of war casualties, has been an issue in almost all wars in American history since World War I. The military censorship of the press was the most stringent during World War I and the least stringent during World War II. For the first six months of the Korean War, General MacArthur avoided imposing official censorship because he thought that the journalists’ self-censorship with “voluntary press code” worked well (Moeller, 1989, p. 279). It is true that the situation in Korea was “grim” (Duncan & Mydans, 1950, *Life*, p. 33) with many U.S. casualties. However, many photographers in Korea avoided making brutally honest images of U.S. military casualties with blood and mutilated bodies because they believed that they could show the reality of war without the graphic images that could be “unconsciously intrusive, bordering on the obscene”¹¹ (Moeller, 1989, p. 306). However, a few months later, the conflict between the press and the military got worse. After December 1950 when the

Chinese intervened, every photograph and caption was censored in Korea before being sent to the United States or the entire roll of film was sent to the Department of Defense before it went on to the photo agencies (Moeller, 1989, p. 279). Therefore, the press had been relatively free to print the photographs of U.S. casualties before the official censorship was imposed in December 1950.

Part of the answer could be found in the case of a specific photograph of U.S. Marines' dead bodies during World War II. In February 1943 during World War II, *Life* photographer George Strock had photographed GIs who died in combat on Buna Beach in New Guinea. The U.S. censors allowed the story to be published in the magazine, but not the photographs of American dead bodies because they thought the realities of war through visual evidence would demoralize civilians far more than words could. A few months later, however, the government decided to let the photographs be published in order to reduce citizens' criticism of rationing, low wages and manpower controls on the home front. The government also hoped to promote War Bond sales by showing the ordeal faced by American soldiers. On September 20, 1943, *Life* printed the picture on a full page with an editorial about the dead soldiers and the decision to print the photograph. It was so successful that the Bond sales exceeded the overall goal, and people changed their view of casualty photographs. As Goldberg (1991) indicated, "The tough pictures that had been withheld to keep morale high were now brought out of hiding for the very same reason" (pp. 195-199).

By publishing the photographs of U.S. casualties in the July 24, 1950 issue, *Life* may have intended to promote the Korean War in the same way the U.S. government did during World War II. Under the photograph of the soldier's dead body, an article analyzed

the reason for American defeat in Korea: America was unprepared for war due to the U.S. government's reduction of the military budget. The article cited a lieutenant saying, "Why don't you tell them how useless it is?" and "Why don't they send over something we can really fight a war with?" The article criticized Defense Secretary Louis Johnson and President Truman for the U.S. defeat and casualties, and insisted that the government should make total mobilization of military industry and draft.

Life's criticism of President Truman and his idea of limiting the war was not surprising in light of the conservative, anti-communist position of Henry Luce, the magazines' owner. *Life's* critical tone was already clear in the editorial of July 17, 1950. Citing an article of war support from the residents of Sycamore, Illinois ("Sycamore, Ill," 1950, *Life*) and citing national newspapers' editorials, *Life* insisted that Americans were ready and willing to mobilize for the war, but the government was not aware of it. The article read, "Popular response to Korea means the U.S. has mobility to act" ("A Restored Position," 1950, *Life*, p. 40). An article in the July 24, 1950 issue, *Life* also said that if America's "creeping mobilization" did not work, "the President could still take hard steps and ask Congress for price and wage controls, rationing, compulsory allocation of strategic materials, even a labor draft" ("The Nation Begins," 1950, *Life*, pp. 30-31).

Whether *Life's* intention of promoting the war in Korea was effective or not, readers seemed to praise *Life's* decision to publish the photographs of U.S. military casualties in a way to show the reality of the Korean War. A few weeks later, *Life's* readers reacted very well to the photograph. A letter to the editor read, ". . . It was a nerve-touching familiarity with all the various aspects of ground fighting that hurts . . ." Another reader wrote, ". . . I think it would be good psychological medicine if the picture

of the murdered soldier could be hung over the desk of every American—as a shocking reminder that national security can never be bought cheaply.” Another one wrote, “I hope you will continue to speak out frankly and that other magazines and newspapers follow your lead.” Only one reader reacted negatively. He wrote, “I certainly dislike *Life*’s method of exploiting a picture of a dead GI to further a political end . . .” (“Letters to the Editors,” *Life*, 1950, August 14, p. 6).

The photograph of a dead U.S. soldier was followed by Carl Mydans’ photographs and text on the next four pages (see Figure 15 and Figure 16). The title reads, “It’s one ration. Save it, boys.” The American soldiers on their retreat south suffered from a shortage of food, men, and equipment. Only one ration was distributed per day per soldier. Troops had to leave their wounded buddies on the roadsides on their way out. Their Pershing and Sherman tanks were easily outgunned by Russian T-34s (“The U.S. Tries,” 1950, *Life*, p. 13). Of four bust shots of American soldiers on the fourth and fifth pages, the most eye-catching is the last one. It shows a U.S. soldier “trapped with his infantry unit for 24 hours.” There is an expression of exhaustion on his face. The American soldiers do not seem to know why they fought in this war. No glorious purpose, no glorious sacrifice.

Photographer Duncan cabled a message to *Life* before he joined the 1st Marine Brigade on September 4, 1950. The cable read: EYEM GOING BACK THIS TIME TRYING GIVE YOU STORY WHICH IS TIMELESS NAMELESS DATELESS WORDLESS STORY WHICH SAYS VERY SIMPLY QUIETLY “THIS IS WAR” (see Photographic package 5). This story was published in the issue of September 18, 1950 of *Life*, under the title “This is War,” the same title he used for his book *This is War!*,

published June 25, 1951, on the first anniversary of the start of the Korean War. For this story, he followed the brigade's most forward unit, Company B, 5th Regiment for 36 hours as it fought over ridges to drive the North Koreans back across Naktong River.

The story begins with a photograph of a corporal, “who is out of ammunition and has lost all but two of his squad, crying in anger and frustration” (p. 41) (see Figure 22). This photograph has no additional caption or comment. Tears stream down the corporal's cheek, which is clearly in focus, with a narrow depth of field and standing out from the clean background. He stares into space as if he is saying something to himself or is speaking to God, but without any response. His hand waves fleetingly in the air. Even in this photograph of him, it seems that Duncan is looking down on the officer with the desperate feeling that he could not do anything for him. These feelings of frustration and anger were what most of the U.S. soldiers also felt in the Korean War. They could not fight in the way they wanted because their weapons were inferior to the Russian-made weapons of North Korea, and there was a shortage of ammunition and supplies.

The photographs on the other pages in the article illustrate the fighting and the feelings. The photographs in the next two spreads show how the troops advanced to one more “nameless” ridge, knocked out a Soviet-built T-34, attacked North Korean troops with hand grenades, and fronted North Koreans' counterattack (see Figure 23). One soldier diving for cover looks on a faceless enemy corpse with revulsion while other soldiers passed by it without any notice.

The combat was grim and obscure just like the photograph taken with a camera whose lens was smeared by torrents of rain (see Figure 24). Air support could not help them in the rain, communications failed, and ammunition ran out (see Figure 25). The

haunted eyes of Captain Francis (“Ike”) Fenton reveal his frustration when he learned he was out of ammo. One of his men,¹² after being shot, said to him, “God, captain, don’t let them fall back” (p. 46).

Although U.S. soldiers succeeded in holding up the defense line, all that was left of Company B were wounded soldiers. The last picture in the story is of a wounded Marine, crying with the pain from his shoulder, with a worried and frustrated expression on the face of a fellow soldier behind him (see Figure 25). The caption reads: “A wounded Marine is about to be taken away in a jeep.” His young face is smudged with dirt and tears, his head is tilted, and his mouth is open as he cries. He touches his wounded arm with his right hand while he clenches his left fist on his upper chest in order to help endure or reduce his suffering, but his efforts seem to be in vain. His crying face is just of a young man who was too young to understand why he was fighting. There was no hero with resolution who was willing to sacrifice and was able to endure this pain with resolution. This last photograph of a wounded soldier supports the photograph of the corporal in that both carry the feeling of suffering and frustration in tears.

As Duncan simply put it in his telegraph message, his pictures showed the essence of the Korean War and probably of all wars in human history. In his book *This is War!*, he wrote:

It is simply an effort to show something of what a man endures when his country decides to go to war, with or without his personal agreement on the righteousness of the cause. This book is an effort to completely divorce the work “war” as flung dramatically down off the highest benches of every land, from the look in the man’s eyes who is taking his last puff on perhaps his last cigarette, perhaps forever, before he grabs his rifle, his guts and his dreams—and attacks an enemy position above him.” ... I wanted to show what war did to a man. I wanted to show something of the comradeship that binds men together when they are fighting a common peril I wanted to show the way men live, and die, when they know Death is among them, and

yet the still find the strength to crawl forward armed only with bayonets to stop the advance of men they have never seen, with whom they have no immediate quarrel, en who will kill them on sight if given first chance. I wanted to show something of the agony, the suffering, the terrible confusion, the heroism, which is everyday currency among those men who actually pull the triggers of rifles aimed at other men known as “the enemy.” I wanted to tell as story of war, as war has always been for men through the ages. Only their weapons, the terrain, the causes have changed. (Duncan, 1951, In Explanation section, ¶ 2)

A few weeks later, a letter to the editor said, “David D. Duncan should be elected ‘Photographer of the Year.’ Many photographers have tried, but none have ever shown war with such terrible realism” (“Letters to the Editors,” *Life*, 1950, October 9, p. 4).

2. MacArthur’s Inchon Landing and Recapturing of Seoul (September 1950 to November 1950)

Summary of Events

South Korean and U.S. troops under the command of General Walton Walker managed to hold up the defense line near Nakdong River using U.S. military supplies that had arrived in Pusan, a small area in the southeast corner of Korea. During this time, General MacArthur and his X Corps successfully launched an amphibious landing at Inchon, the west area near Seoul, on September 15, 1950. However, by September, the North Korean Army, concentrating on the Pusan Perimeter, was stretched too wide and was already cut off from supplies and communications by the U.S. aerial campaign on railroads, bridges, and North Korean war production industries. On September 28, the U.N. troops recaptured Seoul. Encouraged by the success, the United States changed its goal from saving South Korea to reuniting the Korean peninsula under the South Korean government. The U.N. forces advanced across the 38 parallel into North Korea in early

October 1950 and captured Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea, on October 19. This rollback policy seemed successful until the Chinese Army, worried that U.N. forces would attack them along the Yalu River, the border between North Korea and China, intervened out of fear that the U.N. forces would attack China along the river.

Dominant Themes

1) MacArthur as Victorious Hero

The dominant theme of this period of the Korean War was “MacArthur as a hero” of victory. His power and ability as U.N. Commander in chief was prominently shown at the Inchon landing on September 15, 1950. His image as a war hero as well as a god-like figure in Asia, however, began to appear already at the beginning of the war.

Duncan’s photographs in the July 10, 1950 issue of *Life*, the very first coverage of the Korean War, shows a U.S. military leader and a South Korean political leader: four photographs of General MacArthur and one of Syngman Rhee, president of South Korea. (see Figure 5).

On July 29, 1950, President Rhee, with U.S. ambassador John J. Muccio, visited Suwon airport to see U.S. military leaders. A photograph of the event, shown as the fourth photograph on the eighth page of the article has a caption that reads: “KOREA’S PRESIDENT Rhee gets warm greeting from General Willoughby, on MacArthur’s behalf.” At the same moment General MacArthur flew from Japan to Suwon airport to look around the battlefield, an event that is shown in the first three photographs on the same page. Although President Rhee and General MacArthur were at the same place at the same time, they did not meet each other. Instead, General Willoughby greeted Rhee.

Was MacArthur too busy to see Rhee in his scouting the battlefield or did he think it was not necessary or that Rhee was not worthy of his time? Although the photographer expressed his “admiration for Rhee’s composure” in the article (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 26) and described Rhee as “a scholarly old gentleman” with “tenderness rare even among Orientals,” Rhee was a mere political leader in a small Asian country whose troops could not defend him or his people from enemy’s attack. Although the caption of the photograph indicates Rhee as the subject, his face is barely shown in the picture itself. Like his troops and his people, Rhee is just a man who needs U.S. protection to exist. It is interesting to observe that the description about him changed through the stages of the war: “a scholarly old gentlemen” with “tenderness” to “one supremely stubborn old man” (“One Old Man,” 1953, *Life*, p. 19) later.

In contrast, General MacArthur was described as a hero. On the ninth page, his full-size photograph shows him standing in front of an airplane on whose nose the name of “Bataan” is painted. The name “Bataan” clearly focused on in the image tells that he was a hero in World War II. The caption reads: “Visit over, MacArthur prepares to board plane for return to Japan.” It is not sure if this photograph was an environmental portrait or a candid shot. Either way, he looks very confident with his hands clasped behind his back in the very center of the photograph. His eyes, with his chin slightly uplifted, gaze at the same direction as the airplane does, between the horizon and the sky. With his eyes in the shadow of his cap, he seems to look not at any specific object, but at his goal and his ideal of the war. The photograph was also taken from below with a low angle, which is usually used to portray someone in power by making him look taller and bigger than he really is. The shiny silver airplane behind him expresses U.S. military technology,

especially airpower, which was MacArthur's favorite means of war along with navy. Although Duncan, with a little sarcasm,¹³ described MacArthur's posture as "arrogance and almost exasperating belligerence"¹⁴ that delighted Duncan, it could be that attitude of MacArthur's that Americans loved and wanted to see at a time of chaos like the Korean crisis.

General MacArthur did not always agree with Truman's foreign policy in Asia, or on how to fight the war in Korea. Truman wanted to avoid a total war, which might have drawn in the Soviets, resulting in a possible World War III. Truman also worried that the more the United States became involved in Asia, the weaker they would be in Europe. In contrast, MacArthur strongly believed that Communism had to be contained in Europe as well as in Asia and that there could be no negotiation with Communists. He believed that fighting the war more aggressively in Korea would be like fighting Europe's battle, saying "... If we lose the war to Communism in Asia, the fall of Europe is inevitable" (Halberstam, 2007, p. 601; "Tattoo for a Warrior," 1951, *Life*, p. 29). When China entered the war later in November 1950, MacArthur insisted that the United States should take the initiative even if it meant bombing China.

Unlike Truman, MacArthur was portrayed as a warrior. This image seems to resonate with an ideal of "American manhood" that "manly" character is "a prerequisite for full citizenship and political leadership" and that war is the best way to rebuild "civic virtue necessary for democracy" (Hoganson, 2000, p, 10) against the nation's feminization and male degeneracy (p. 13). The martial ideal based on physical power of men has often been expressed in the form of American chivalry in the verbal and visual rhetoric during the wartime in America (Hoganson, 2000, p, 10). In the rhetoric, other

countries have been portrayed as vulnerable women or children needing the U.S. assistance for their rescue from aggressive and savage enemies or for the civilization from their own savageness (Hoganson, 2000, p. 46). Although MacArthur once expressed his disfavor of war as a real soldier, his martial ideal seems to be obvious.

MacArthur was not the only one who conceived this American ideal. MacArthur's vision was exactly the same as Henry R. Luce and *Life's* editors' idea of U.S. foreign policy. One of *Life's* editorials in 1950, in support of MacArthur's visit with Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa in August, said that MacArthur "sent throughout the people of Asia a current of new faith and hope that U.S.-U.N. and not the Hammer and Sickle would win the Struggle for the World including Asia" ("MacArthur's Detractors," 1950, *Life*, p. 28). It added, "Hooray for him!" The popularity of General MacArthur reached to the highest point with the success of the Inchon landing.

The October 2, 1950 issue of *Life* carried an article on MacArthur's Inchon landing that took place on September 15, 1950 (see Photographic package 6). The successful landing changed the course of the war from the United Nations' desperate retreats and defense of the Pusan Perimeter to a U.N. offensive. The title of the article was "THE INVASION: The pattern of the war is changed as U.N. forces strike the red rear." Photographer Mydans was chosen by General MacArthur to accompany him during the invasion. Hank Walker also accompanied the Marines when they hit the beach. General MacArthur expected that the U.S. soldiers could come back home by Christmas, saying, "The war is over. The Chinese are not coming... The Third Division will be back in Fort Benning for Christmas dinner" (Halberstam, 2007, p. 388).

This article carried 21 photographs. Four photographs were of U.S. Marines on a

mission to land, one was of sea-air bombardment, seven pictures were of General MacArthur, six were of U.S. Marines on the mission after landing, two were of U.S. infantrymen, and one photograph was of North Korean POWs. Despite the many images of U.S. Marines, the main character was General MacArthur, portrayed as a war hero.

The story begins with an almost full-page photograph of U.S. Marines looking at the beach at Inchon (see Figure 26). The caption reads: “Crouched in landing boat, assault Marines look through the flying spray at the bombardment of beach where they are about to land.” Although the Marines are the main characters in the caption, they are not in sharp focus. Their image is blurred. The photograph was taken from the back of the Marines without showing their faces with the exception of one who was positioned farthest from the camera. Therefore there was no need for all of the Marines to be in focus. Rather the focus is more on a white arrow on the landing boat seen through the bombardment. The wedge-shaped line made by the Marines provides a frame through which readers’ eyes go toward the smoke from the bombs and artillery fire. Even the small white arrow on the head of the landing boat draws readers’ eyes to the beach. Here, the Marines become the background to a successful bombing that was a part of General MacArthur’s Inchon landing.

An illustration on the next two pages shows how the landing was achieved with the U.S. naval and air supports (see Figure 27), and another image shows the Marines about to land (see Figure 28). The caption reads:

Scaling sea wall, an assault wave of the 5th Marine Regiment climbs out of its landing craft at Red Beach. Carrying only light combat packs, Marines ran or rolled into the nearest ditches as Red machine guns opened up on them. But as wave after wave swept over the sea wall, the Marines beat down the defenders and pushed into the burning and exploding city. By nightfall the beachhead was secure.

The solemn atmosphere with smoke in the sky and the grainy print of the photograph reminds one of Robert Capa's famous images of the amphibious landing of American troops on Normandy, France, during World War II. The heroic image of the Marines in this Korean War photograph is taken from a low angle. The camera that looks up the Marines from the floor of the landing craft makes them look as if they are climbing up to the sky. However, like the photograph on the previous page, this photograph does not show the Marines' faces, in contrast to Robert Capa's photograph of Normandy landing which did show a soldier's face when he advanced in the water toward the beach. Two additional small photographs of the Marines on the next page are also taken from the back of the subjects, their faces not shown. They are faceless and nameless. They are anonymous.

It is interesting to note that the faces of the Marines were also not visible in Rosenthal's photograph of the Iwo Jima flag-raising event during World War II. The writer Paul Fussell (1982) argues that the anonymity and group effort explain the enormous power of the image: "Because the war was the common cause, no ordinary person in it has a right to appear as anything but anonymous . . . 'Stars' are not wanted" (p. 230). He calls the Rosenthal's photograph an "emblem of the common will triumph" (p. 232). The Marines in the photograph, however, were identified later by newspapers and were represented as heroes to American public, and were used for war bond campaigns of the U.S. government.

Unlike Iwo Jima, there was no glorious flag-raising even after the Inchon landing in the Korean War. Duncan's photograph of flag-raising in Korea was published very small in the October 9, 1950 issue of *Life* (see Figure 35). Duncan (1951), later in his

book, wrote: “Men of Captain Bob Burrow’s company raised a small American flag over the highest rooftop upon the highest hill—but even as it was tied into place the sound of firing down the hill attracted their attention . . . and the flag-raising became just a statement of fact—a minor incident in another day” (unpaginated, in The City section, ¶ 36.). While the Marines during World War II were heroes, there were no such romantic heroes in the Korean War except for General MacArthur (Moeller, 1989, p. 253).

Showing U.S. soldiers without recognizable faces is different from the way of showing General MacArthur in his close-up, presenting him as a hero. One example of “MacArthur as a Hero” is the photograph of the general on the next page, a full-page close-up, clearly focused in on his face (see Figure 29). The subtitle reads: “MacArthur watches landing and spends a spirited day ashore.” In the photograph, he stands out from the background where Admiral Doyle is behind him and out of focus. The caption reads: “MacArthur, with rear Admiral Doyle behind, watches progress of landing.” The tight framing of his face provides a statement on MacArthur’s character, rather than illustrating the situation. MacArthur’s photograph was taken from his right side at 45 degrees angle and from a slightly low angle, as he looked forward. This camera angle is appropriate to show his eyes, without showing them under his cap. This camera angle is also appropriate to show where his eyes are directed. His eyes, slightly lifted, seem to be looking at his visions of the war, not just the “progress of landing.” He is someone who can look farther than anyone else along the path of the war. A little bit anxious, his eyes look determined, telling of his prudence, strength, and confidence.

Readers might wonder, then, why his face and especially his eyes are not at the very center of the photograph, but are placed a slightly low angle in the frame. It is not

likely that it was to show Admiral Doyle in the same frame with him. A more plausible explanation of the composition might be to show the importance and symbolism of MacArthur's cap and its unique insignia on it at the center of the photograph.

MacArthur was famous for his atypical military look such as his "scrambled egg" cap and corncob pipe. His cap especially expressed not only his uniqueness and individualism but also his passion for and his authority in Asia. This so-called "cap," which was decorated with no metal emblems but only the embroidered braid of the emblem of the US Armed Forces and an eagle, with laurels on its visor and the sides of the cap, was a gift from the Philippines (Janssens, 1995, p. 388, Note 14).

MacArthur, accepting the request of President of the Philippines Manuel L. Quezon to help create a Philippine Army, served as Field Marshall of the Philippines in 1937. He also became Allied Commander to the Philippines in December 1941 when the Japanese attacked across a front in the Pacific during World War II. With Japan's attack on the Philippines, however, President Roosevelt ordered MacArthur to relocate in Australia in March 1942 against his will. When he arrived in Australia, MacArthur made his famous speech, "I came out of Bataan and I shall return" ("MacArthur the Man," n.d.). In April 1942, Bataan fell into Japanese hands and more than 5,000 Filipinos and 1,000 Americans died there in the Bataan Death March (Harry, 1995). Three years later, MacArthur kept his promise and came back to the Philippines. MacArthur wore the unique cap to stand out from other generals, and to show the Filipinos that he had not forgotten them.¹⁵

Therefore, the emphasis on MacArthur's cap in the photograph could be interpreted as his resolute expression that he would not give up Korea like he did not give up the

Philippines. Photographer Mydans might know the symbolic importance of the general's cap because he had been with MacArthur when he landed at Lingayen Gulf on his return to the Philippines in World War II. Moreover, Mydans had been personally chosen by the general to accompany him on the Inchon landing ("The Invasion," 1950, *Life*, p. 29).¹⁶ The portrayal of MacArthur as a determined military leader in a heroic light might not be a coincidence.

On the next page of the article, are six more photographs of General MacArthur: three show him on the bridge of his command ship, the U.S.S. *Mount McKinley*, on the day of landing; the other three are of him going ashore on the next day (see Figure 29). The first three pictures are presented as a sequence: command order, attack, and victory. The first and the third photographs show a rich expression on his face: being an intrepid commander shouting orders in a risky but effective mission and being a soldier's man "laughing like a boy and cracking jokes" ("The Invasion," 1950, *Life*, p. 29). These two images are juxtaposed by being on the each side of the second photograph of him, which only shows his back head. In the other three photographs, he is pictured driving to the front lines, and looking over Communist prisoners and dead bodies. One might think he is making certain of his victory.

The next spread carries photographs taken by Hank Walker of U.S. Marines landing and advancing to Kimpo airport at Inchon (see Figure 30). Interestingly, almost all nine photographs show the Marines from a long distance or from the behind, therefore not showing their faces. Only one photograph shows a U.S. soldier and a South Korean soldier from the front, but even their faces are hardly recognizable because the image is so small. In this victory they did not need to be shown as individuals. It was enough for

them to be portrayed as U.S. troops who backed MacArthur's victory. MacArthur was the only hero in the Korean War based on this sample from Life magazine.

The theme "MacArthur as a hero" was repeated in another photographic package on the United States' recapturing of Seoul, the capital of South Korea, 12 days after the successful Inchon landing¹⁷ (see Photographic package 7). The photographs in this package, taken by Walker, Duncan, and Mydans, were published in the October 9, 1950 issue of *Life*. The title reads: "Seoul and victory: Here is record of way South Korea was retaken." Almost none of these photographs of U.S. soldiers show recognizable faces. The only photographs showing recognizable faces of U.S. soldiers are of casualties. In contrast, General MacArthur is the one person who is distinguishable in these images.

The first page of the photographic package shows U.S. Marines taking Seoul railroad station (see Figure 32). The caption reads: "In a rubble-strewn square in Seoul, a Marine covers for other scouts as they advance cautiously to take main railroad station." Just like the first photograph in the article on Inchon landing in the October 9, 1950 issue of *Life* (see Figure 26), this photograph shows a Marine out of focus in the foreground and Seoul railroad station clearly focused in the background. The line made by the soldier in the foreground and his gun directed to another soldier in the middle ground provides a frame that draws readers' eyes to the railroad station, a military target and the most important subject in the photograph.

The next spread consists of four photographs of U.S. troops and one of North Korean dead (see Figure 33). The first image on the spread shows X Corps commander General Almond and his men examining enemy positions across the Han River. They are photographed from behind and the light of dawn from the front makes a silhouette. The

commander's fatigue cap tells who he is, but everyone else is anonymous. Where they will advance is more important than who they are.

The second picture of the spread shows amphibious U.S. Marine tractors crossing the Han River. The caption reads: "Crossing Han River Marine amphibious tractors carry troops of 5th Regiment's support waves. Although the small village on the opposite bank is still burning from the preliminary bombardment, a crowd of white-clad Koreans has gathered on the bank to welcome the amtracs which are already lumbering ashore." In this picture, the Marines look small.

The only photographs in this group that show U.S. soldiers' faces are of U.S. military casualties. The third photograph on the third page of the article shows a corporal looking at his picture in the September 18, 1950 issue of *Life*, which showed tears running down his face (see Figure 33). The caption reads: "Corporal Leonard Hayworth sees his picture in Sept. 18 *Life* story. Next morning he was killed in action."¹⁸ The first picture of him was a full-page image, yet his name was not mentioned. Now in the issue of *Life*, he has a name. He is recognizable first because his face is clearly shown. Second, readers who saw his first picture will now recognize him. He is someone they had seen before. In the next spread, only two photographs—the second and the third ones—of U.S. wounded show their faces in a recognizable manner (see Figure 34) In the Korean War, it seems that ordinary soldiers are remembered for their "simple courage" and sacrifices while some military leaders, such as General MacArthur, are remembered for heroic victories and "high-level planning" ("Salute to Our Warriors," 1950, *Life*, p. 38).

Another example of presenting "MacArthur as a hero" is a bust shot on the eighth page (p.36) of the article (see Figure 36). It shows Mac Arthur's profile clearly, lit by the

light from a window of his plane. This picture is not about what he does, but about who he is. The caption reads: “General MacArthur, his carefully combed hair resembling a cardinal’s skullcap, ponders the campaign in the cabin of his private plane. In these solitary, contemplative moments the general smokes a long, handsome pipe. But out chatting with the troops on the front lines he puffs on his famous old and battered corn cob.”

The article above the photograph says, “It was MacArthur’s decision whether or not to cross the parallel and how to do it” after the fall of Seoul. The original goal of the United Nations was to retake South Korea from North Korean invasion, but now the course of the war changed and it was a good opportunity to advance to the north for Korean unification. However, this chance also contained the danger that China could intervene with the fear that the United States could invade China. The moment in the photograph above was where General MacArthur had to decide what to do with the Korean War.

Here, he is portrayed as the only person who has the power and ability to decide this matter. His carefully combed hair says that he is a discreet and precise person to make an elaborate plan for the future in this significant moment. MacArthur’s plan for the landing was very risky. Inchon was not a good place for landing with its treacherous tides, mud flats, and narrow channel that could cause U.S. ships to get stuck and make them easy targets for the enemy’s attack. MacArthur himself said that the Inchon landing was the most difficult one he had ever known in U.S. forces history. The article, however, emphasizes that his Inchon landing was not a spontaneous one, but elaborately conceived

as early as July 1950 (“The Invasion,” 1950, *Life*, p. 29; “Salute to Our Warriors,” 1950, *Life*, p. 38).

His hair resembling a cardinal’s skullcap even gives him a devout and godly light. He ponders the campaign while looking down through the window like a god looking over the human world beneath him. It is a solitary moment. There is no one who can decide instead of him. But he is not only a “solitary and contemplative” man who smokes “a long, handsome pipe,” but also a practical man who puffs on his famous “old and battered corn cob.” This could mean that he has not only an acute and theoretical knowledge about the war itself but also a rich experience forged in real battlefields throughout his long career. One of the editorials on the next page, titled “Salute to our warriors” says:

MacArthur’s greatness lies in his mastery of strategy, in his knowledge of all arms of the services and in his ability to merge the arms into a single hard-hitting team. Rather than fight the enemy man for man on his own terms, he shaped his offensive around elements the Reds did not have—a navy, an air force and a highly developed amphibious technique” (p. 38).

The editorial adds that the X Corps, with its Marines, attacked with the precision of clockwork.

As seen in the photographs above of MacArthur, he was portrayed as a person who stood up for the values of individualism, acuteness, self-reliant strength, and practicality, which are the characteristics of American pioneers. The frontier myth is deep-rooted in American ideology. This ideology expresses the idea that the United States’ spirit of freedom and successful development is related to the territory expansion into the unknown free land and that this advance can be achieved with self-reliant individualism in high regard. Regarding the attributes of American frontiers, Turner

(1963) said, “coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and inquisitiveness; that practical, inventive turn of mind” and “that restless, nervous energy; that dominant individualism” (p. 57).

In the text of the article, General MacArthur is portrayed as a heroic frontiersman, who desires to advance to Manchuria, the border between China and North Korea and desires to wipe out Communism to expand American freedom and justice even into Third World countries. In the photograph and caption, he appears to have all characteristics of American frontiersmen such as individualism, acuteness, self-reliant strength, and practicality that might enable him to achieve his as well as an American missionary goal. And this goal looks to be achieved by his big success of Inchon landing and recapturing Seoul where “his Eighth Army had killed 73,000 Reds and captured 15,517 others” (“Seoul and Victory,” 1950, *Life*, p. 36). His success is shown in the next photograph of North Korean prisoners marching while guarded by the U.S. Marines.

MacArthur was portrayed continually as warrior and hero in the pages of *Life*. He was described as having “profound ideological differences with President Truman and the Fair Deal” (“Why Not,” 1950, p *Life*, p. 36). He approved of “the Republican philosophy, which we conceive to be freedom of enterprise, as against the Democratic philosophy, which we conceive to be statism” (p. 36). *Life* insisted, “President Truman, Louis Johnson, Dean Acheson and the Democratic party did not win for us in Korea” (p. 36). *Life* said that the United States was winning because of American soldiers, American industry, and General MacArthur.

The theme of “MacArthur as a hero” did not vanish even after U.S. troops’ “bug-out” since Chinese intervention to the war and even when he was removed by President

Truman on April 11, 1951. President Truman fired MacArthur for his insubordination, saying that the general had been unable “to give his whole-hearted support” to the policies of the government and the U.N. “It is fundamental, however, that military commanders must be governed by the policies and directives issued to them in the manner provided by our laws and Constitution” (Truman, 1951; “Tattoo for a Warrior,” 1951, *Life*, p. 29).

An editorial in *Life* criticized President Truman’s removal of MacArthur, referring to it as “a calamitous error” (“The Role of MacArthur,” 1951, *Life*, p. 42) and insisted that MacArthur had “a role of greatness” in the perils of the United States and the world. The article defined MacArthur’s greatness as follows: “MacArthur is a man of the West, a man of Asia and an American” (p. 42).

The April 30, 1951 issue of *Life* ran an article about MacArthur’s return to the United States (see Photographic package 12). The article’s title, “An old soldier fades away into new glory,” was the “never-to-be-forgotten closing words” (p. 23) of his speech before a joint meeting of Congress. In the article, the first photograph across two pages presented him as a hero even though he was not winning the war in Korea and had been stripped of his position in Asia (see Figure 56). MacArthur sits on a car in parade and waves his hand to the crowd while paper rains from the sky to welcome him. The low camera angle and the backlight effect from the over-exposed sky behind him emphasize his glorious, heroic image. Other photographs show MacArthur giving a speech (see Figure 56), visiting a memorial cemetery in Hawaii, and receiving a welcome from important political figures and from a crowd in America (see Figures 57, 58, 59, and 60). Even his family, and especially his son were treated as a hero (see Figure 59).

In contrast, President Truman was portrayed being booed by a crowd at a baseball game. A photograph of the hooting and jeering crowd is placed right above the photograph of Truman, giving the impression that the booing is pouring down directly on Truman's head (see Figure 61). In the two photographs, Truman is the same size as the spectators in the front line. A photograph of MacArthur laughing at a party on the opposite page even gives a feeling that he enjoys the situation that Truman faces. The full-page photograph of MacArthur seems to show that he is a big man while Truman is a small man. MacArthur was a symbol of the will to win, which was lacking "in Washington, in the State Department, in the Pentagon, at the White House—and among the other countries of the free alliance" ("A Will to Win," 1951, *Life*, p. 40).

2) The "Other Side's" Death: Naked North Korean POWs and Dead

North Korean POWs and North Korean dead were often shown naked. In the October 2, 1950 issue of *Life*, the article about MacArthur's Inchon landing carries a photograph of a naked North Korean POW (see Figure 31). The caption reads, "Naked Red is taken back for questioning after being stripped and searched for concealed weapons."

Another photograph showing a naked North Korean is in the article published on October 10, concerning the recapturing of Seoul. The photograph shows burned North Koreans on the field (see Figure 33). The caption reads, "Burned Reds are victims of flame throwers which the Marines used at close range to throw back several desperate Red counterattacks near the Han River." Four of them in the front are shown naked with their clothes burned and two others in the back are still in their clothes. The parts of their clothes left on their bodies as well as their boots still remaining on their feet say that they

were burned, not just naked. Is this kind of image to show the violence of U.S. Marines using flame throwers at close range to human beings? Or is it to tell the inevitable reality of war? It is hard to say. The caption, however, seems to say that it was unavoidable reality of war. The North Koreans were “desperate.” Also, the expression “victims” says that the unavoidable reality of war was not desired by anyone. It may be more important to note that this kind of image does not give dignity to the “other side’s” death. This study has already pointed out that there was no glory shown in the death of U.S. soldiers in the Korean War. However, their death still retains their dignity without showing them naked or bloody, which cannot be seen in the photographs of dead North Koreans.

3. China Intervenes and the United Nations Retreats to the 38 Parallel (November 1950 to June 1951)

Summary of Events

When the United Nations approached the Yalu River, the border between China and North Korea, China warned that it would intervene to protect its national security. Truman, however, did not consider it seriously, regarding the warning as “a bold attempt to blackmail the United Nations.” (Ransom, 1963, p. 157).

Despite the lack of heavy fire weapons, the Chinese People’s Volunteer Army (PVA) with its 180,000 soldiers (Hickey, 2001, August 1)¹⁹ successfully attacked U.N. forces with their infiltration tactics, night marching, and camouflage skills. In late November 1950, U.N. forces suffered 15,000 casualties in sub-zero temperatures and had to make the longest retreat in American military history (Cohen & Gooch, 1990, pp. 165-195). In December 1950, U.S. soldiers and Korean civilians in North Korea were

evacuated from Hungnam Harbor and shipped to Pusan with their weapons and supplies. When they left, U.S. forces blew up industrial facilities to prevent the Communists from using them.

In January 4, 1951, Seoul was captured by the Third Phase Offensive—the so-called Chinese Winter Offensive—of North Korean and Chinese troops. During this time, Lieutenant General Matthew Ridgway had replaced General Walker who was killed in an accident. Forced by the Chinese military into retreat, the U.S. troops returned to the 38th parallel, where they had crossed the border. In response, MacArthur insisted on using an atomic attack against China, but President Truman wanted the United Nations to sign a ceasefire. MacArthur was relieved of his command by President Truman for his insubordination in April 1951 and replaced with General Ridgway. After a few months of fighting, the front was stabilized around the 38th parallel and peace talks between the two sides started on July 10, 1951.

Dominant Themes

1) Defeat on the Ground

1-1) Don't Know Why We Fight

The theme “Defeat on the Ground” was emphasized more in this period than the first period, as the U.S. troops began another retreat after the Chinese intervention in the war. After the successful Inchon landing, General MacArthur predicted, “the boys... will be back for Christmas” (“Once More” 1950, *Life*, p. 33). “The boys,” however, were in hell, retreating in the bitter, 25-below-zero weather of North Korea at that time.

Duncan's photographs in the December 25, 1950 issue of *Life*, tells a story of "the boys" living in hell—not boiling but freezing—on Christmas (see Photographic package 9). This photo story titled "There was a Christmas" has more of a story telling narrative than other photographic packages that simply illustrate reported events. Its layout reflects a beginning, middle, and end, follows a single topic, maintaining coherence and continuity through the layout of interrelated pictures, captions, text, and headlines. This photo story also emphasizes its artistic characteristic rather than its journalistic one. For its artistic elements, Duncan's photographs were not overwhelmed by a text, but rather had just two small notes made by the photographer. The notes appear in large letters with lots of white space on the page, which reflects a more artistic type of layout. About a half of the pages carry full-page photographs to give each more power. The story-telling and artistic characteristics of the layout could appeal more to readers' emotions.

Despite the grim situation in Korea, editorials and written articles of *Life* still tried to persuade readers that this war was worth fighting. One of them was an editorial in the issue with Duncan's Christmas in Korea. The editorial titled "The blessing of God" had this subtitle: "In each troubled heart, and in the rightness of our cause, we shall find his sustaining presence and his guiding hand" ("The Blessing of God," 1950, *Life*, p. 20). It added that Americans as a people were blessed by God, "in the justice of our cause," "in plenty," "in strength," "in the courage," "in our freedom," and "in our heritage" (p. 20).

Ironically, however, in *Life's* war photographs, such as Duncan's pictures of Christmas in Korea, there was no "rightness of our cause" ("The Blessing of God," 1950, *Life*, p. 20) or "MacArthur's greatness" ("The Invasion," 1950, *Life*, p. 38) in the "embattled hills, the snows, or the smoke over the burning towns of Korea" ("The

Blessing of God,” 1950, *Life*, p. 20). There was no glory in death on the roadsides during a humiliating retreat.

The first small note on Duncan’s photo story was the second page title:

THERE WAS A CHRISTMAS in Korea, although it was all over before the 25th of December. It was a cold and bitter Christmas, but Americans can be more thankful for it than for all their parties and presents. It took place in the valley of the shadow of death, through which Marines and soldiers fought their way from the Changjin Reservoir to a haven on the Japan Sea. This is the story of the incredibly gallant Marines, who fought fantastic odds but brought out their equipment, their wounded and their dead. This is what it was like for those who survived unhurt, for those who were wounded and pulled through and for those whose Christmas is now forever.

The opening photograph on the opposite page is a full-bleed bust shot of an exhausted U.S. soldier looking up at the sky (see Figure 44). The caption reads, “This is the face of a man who eats frozen rations in the snow and who may be interrupted at any moment to run, to fight or to die.”

In his book *This is War!*, Duncan (1951) explained the situation when he took the picture: “A Marine kept prodding with his spoon, trying to break loose a single, frost-coated bean from the others in his can. He could neither move it nor long continue to hold the spoon between his gloved but rigid fingers. He found one bean, and slowly raised it to his mouth. He stood unmoving, waiting for it to thaw.” Duncan asked the Marine, “If I were God and could give you anything you wanted, what would you ask for?” The marine “continued to stand motionless, with empty eyes. Then his lips began to open slightly, and close, as though the effort of a word was too great. He tried again, and failed. He stood just looking into his glove holding the can. He tried once more . . . as he tried his eyes went up into the graying sky, and he said, ‘Give me tomorrow’” (Duncan, 1951,

unpaginated, in “Retreat, Hell!” section, ¶ 18; Higgins, 1951, p. 196). The Marine’s face looks so young, probably between 17 and 20 years old. All he wanted was survival.

This type of photograph, which is a tight close-up with a cleared background using a narrow depth of field, focused on the eyes of the subject, emphasizes a subject’s character, expressing who he is rather than what he does. It is a very intimate moment between the soldier and the photographer as well as between the soldier and readers. This close-up also gives readers a feeling that they are just in front of the soldier in the scene, watching him as he is desperately but also emotionlessly looks at the sky. In his book *This is War!*, Duncan (1951) explains the reason why he did not include any captions for the photographs in his book but only included an introductory text: “Asking you to read the story in their faces and hands and bodies, as they were feeling it themselves at the moment of impact, is only fair to them—and is asking more of you than ever before has been asked of the picture-viewing audience” (unpaginated, in Explanation section, ¶ 5).²⁰

Readers may feel they can almost touch the Marine. His young face is the face of a neighborhood boy. The caption does not reveal his name. Duncan (1990) said, “I never asked his name, so today he belongs to countless American families” (unpaginated, in Explanation section, ¶ 10).²¹ Readers may feel that they know the soldier in the photograph. His face, however, shows something that is unfamiliar to the readers at home. In this way, readers in the U.S. grew to understand the horror, pain, anger, and frustration of war in a remote area. The more distant a war is, the more tangible proof is needed to help people understand the reality of the war (Moeller, 1989, p. 313). This one picture told more about the war than any other combat photograph. It was the photograph that

was most widely reprinted of all the images from the photo story (Moeller, 1989, p. 313). Six months later, this picture, with a text from Duncan's *This is War!*, was reprinted as 7 inches by 10 inches in the "What's in a picture" section of the June 25, 1951 issue of *Life*.

This style of photograph was the same one used in the photograph of a frustrated corporal with tears on his face, also taken by Duncan for the September 18, 1950 issue of *Life* (see Figure 22). Duncan was always interested in the faces of human beings. He wrote, "Except . . . for myself—life is a constantly flowing river of time-expression-passion-promise-tragedy . . . and a vast array of elements beyond and human anticipation or sense of timing or design, no matter how deft the shutter finger or sensitive the eye. Life remains static for no one." He added, "This is why I shoot as I do—waiting, always waiting. For that fleeting touch of magic on the face of life itself . . . and it will always elude me" (as cited in Halstead, 2004).

Duncan was not the only one, however, who believed that the reality of the war could be delivered better by showing soldiers' faces than by showing shooting and bombing in combat. Walker showed four sergeants in a similar manner, but with the soldiers' smiling faces in the September 11, 1950 issue of *Life*. In the December 11, 1950 issue, he also showed a major corporal, "cold and exhausted after three days and nights without sleep" (p. 34) (see Figure 38). Mydans also showed an African-American corporal, covered with dirt and sweat, in the August 21, 1950 issue (see Figure 19). If World War II was the first war where U.S. soldiers had been photographed in close-ups, "in Korea the close-up became the signature of the war" (Moeller, 1989, p. 313).

The rest of the photographs in Duncan's photo story show how the American soldiers had "to run, to fight or to die," as presented in the caption of the first image. The

photographs on the second, third, and fourth pages are of the Marines running in retreat (see Figure 44 and Figure 45). The most painful challenge was the freezing and windy North Korean winter. The Marines, with their heads bent, walked along the leeward side of a hill to hide themselves from the bitter cold. They made a fire to warm themselves despite the risk of attracting the enemy's attention in the dark. Their vehicles were wrecked on the slippery roads of snowy mountainous areas. They followed a long and narrow road in mountains that did not seem to end.

The Marines seem to just try to survive in a war that had no purpose for them. Their faces on the fifth and sixth pages look somewhat indifferent (see Figure 46). These images are the same kind as the one on the first page of the photo story, of the Marine who just wanted “tomorrow” (see Figure 44). They had come through too much to have any feeling left. The second small note by Duncan reads, “EYES of men who have looked at undiluted hell are not pleasant to meet soon after. These are the faces of a General named Lemuel Shepherd and some other brave men. There is no fear in their faces and no great hatred. They were simply fighting their way out and hoping to stay alive.” Instead of expressing fear and hatred, the general's eye are intense and haunting and asking why—why they are fighting, why they are retreating, and why they cannot even feel fear and hatred.

As the U.S. troops retreated, they destroyed excess supplies to keep the enemy from using them. They were approaching Hamhung, a port city, from where they could escape to the south. Some of them lived, but some of them were buried (see Figure 47). The last photograph of the story is a full-page print of some Marines who were given tomorrow—at least for a while—and some who were not. The caption reads, “Near the

end of the road soldiers look but do not stop as they pass the bodies of men killed in the last Chinese ambush. These dead were picked up later.” In the foreground a dead soldier lays face-down on the ground, out of focus. In the middle, in focus, a soldier looks over his shoulder at the dead bodies of U.S. Marines, as if he could not take his eyes off them. He might have already seen similar scenes with dead U.S. soldiers as the one in the photograph before. What made him not take his eyes off of them? Where his gaze rested, another dead soldier lay with his right arm cut off. The photograph showed a soldier facing the reality of war that readers would face later.

It is interesting to note that this photograph was later reproduced on a 22-cent stamp, but was significantly altered. The vertical shot of the original photograph was severely cropped below the knee of the soldier in the middle, cutting the image in a half and making it horizontal. In his book *Photo Nomad* published in 2003, Duncan presented the photograph surrounded with the stamps. On the opposite page, he wrote, “North Korea 1950 December –40 F: Years later a 22-cent stamp/bargain/censored/maybe ‘no casualty’ wars were born. Look under that trooper’s feet. For about a quarter America was reminded of a war in Korea” (p. 193).

A few weeks after Duncan’s photographs were published, letters to the editors of *Life* carried six readers’ responses to Duncan’s photographs, followed by the editor’s note and a smaller version of Duncan’s photograph of a Marine with frozen rations. The first letter was from Edward Steichen, a director of the Department of Photography at the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Steichen, who was also a military photographer during World Wars I and II, wrote: “David Douglas Duncan’s wonderful photographs of Marines in Korea (“There Was a Christmas,” *Life*, Dec. 25) have set a new high of war

photography. I want to join in the richly-merited cheers coming from many photographers for these deeply moving photographs.” The letters from ordinary readers delivered similar reactions. A woman from Georgia wrote: “You have had many great stories in your magazine, but “There Was a Christmas” is your masterpiece for all time.” Another letter commented: “Congratulations to David Douglas Duncan for photographing war as it really is—tragic, pathetic, insane! And my gratitude to *Life*’s editors for publishing such photographs often, so that we may never forget to work and pray for deliverance from war.” Another reader stated: “Thank you for your remarkable coverage of the Korean war, particularly Mr. Duncan’s heartrending photos. I wonder how many of our diplomats and politicians could meet the eyes of these boys?” A man from Wyoming wrote:

The scenes of the Marines retreat in your Christmas issue moved me strongly as I am a veteran of World War I and have one son who served four years with the Marines in World War II. The indifferent attitude of the nation in general toward its fighting men in distant lands stirs me to an anger beyond words, maybe these pictures of gaunt, frozen, undaunted men will stir that tiny spark of national pride and indignation which seems to be smothered in the cold, dead ashes of business and politics as usual. (“Letters to the Editors,” *Life*, 1951, January 15, p. 10).

Life’s Korean War photographs were distributed to Associated Press member newspapers, (*Life* was a member as well), for publication after the magazine was displayed on newsstands. Duncan’s photographs of Marines on Christmas in Korea appeared on the first pages of many of the nation’s newspapers on December 24 and Christmas Day, 1950. The most widely reprinted was the close-up of the Marine with frozen rations²²(see Figure 44). The *Houston Post* found the photograph “more appropriate today...than a picture of a Christmas tree or a little child.” The *San Francisco Chronicle* captioned the picture: “What d’You Mean, ‘Merry’?” and noted that “for

perhaps 200,000 Americans the holiday season brought no festivities...their suffering—and their absence from home—cast a gloomy shadow across the nation’s merry making. Their fellow countrymen wondered how, without sounding like fools, they could wish brothers, husbands and sons in Korea ‘good cheer.’” An editorial in the *Detroit Free Press*, after running eight columns of the pictures, said: “In the whole history of the photographic art a camera lens has never produced masterpieces to surpass those portraying the freezing, fighting retreat to Hungnam . . . As sheer composition of mass and line they are eligible for space in any museum where great pictures are hung . . . Automatically, all prizes offered for the outstanding photography triumphs for this year should go to the man who took them, David Douglas Duncan of the *Life* magazine staff” (“Letters to the Editors,” *Life*, 1951, January 15, p. 10).

1-2) Soldiers Coming Home As Survivors But Not As Heroes

In early 1951, while U.N. forces were fighting against Chinese and North Korean forces across the 38th parallel, 1,166 U.S. Marines came home without cheering. Many of the Marines were back because they had been wounded twice, but 690 of them were the first troops to return under the new Marine rotation plan that would bring veterans of Korea home for leaves and then assign most of them to training cadres. Photographs by Wayne Miller sketched the welcoming in the March 19, 1951 issue of *Life* (see Photographic package 11).

The first page includes two photographs of a corporal: one of him lugging his rifle as he passed by a North Korean corpse, which was photographed by Duncan and published in the article titled “This is War” in the September 18, 1950 issue of *Life*; The second photograph was of the same subject. But the corporal has now become a Sergeant,

and is carrying his valise in San Francisco harbor in March 1951 (see Figure 52). He was one of the Marines who were wounded twice in Korea. The two pictures are printed side by side, having the same compositions in the frames but in the different settings, like many photographs of before and after. In both pictures, he advances with a fellow soldier in his background. The differences are his uniforms, the items in his right hand—a rifle and a valise, and the scenery—brittle field grass in Korea with a corpse on it and the concrete of a wharf in San Francisco harbor. He looks much younger without his cherished moustache that had to be shaved off. His constantly running nose had caused it to freeze. This symbol of authority and honor was gone. It is interesting to note that he is still portrayed as burdened with his body bent, valise in hand.

Two more soldiers were portrayed in the same style of before and after photographs (see Figure 53). Their pictures also ran in *Life* when they were stationed in Korea. The photographer, Miller, might have taken this type of before-and-after photographs on purpose. In the first set of photographs, a sergeant (the second and third pictures on page 36), takes the same pose, sitting and looking at something in front of him: in one he is observing the activities of enemy tanks across the Han River; in the other he is observing the rippling performance of a tap-stripper. In the second set of photographs, a corporal is the subject (the fourth and fifth pictures on page 36). His pose is also the same in the two photographs standing with his foot on something: ammunition boxes in one and on a rail in the other. In their before-and-after photographs, everything is different except the soldiers in the photographs. These soldiers did not celebrate the first night of their return to liberty among a crowd, but rather alone with a few strangers.

Some family members waited for the soldiers, controlling tears of joy. But in another photograph, a mother left the harbor after a long and vain search for the Marines who might give her the details of his son's death in Korea. In the photograph on the upper right side on the next page, most of the Marines hardly show their emotions (p. 37). The article says, "The Marines were neither bored nor excited by the welcoming ceremonies arranged for them—the Marine band, the speeches from officials who stood near a World War II sign of welcome painted on the dock shed, the motorcade through the city streets" (p. 35). In the photographic package, there are no photographs of that kind of celebration. Instead, the Marines are shown being welcomed by relatives only. The article says, "Only a few of them waved at girls from the cars, and even on liberty that night, prowling through the night-spots, they were on their reserved behavior" (p. 35). There were no cheers for the Marines as well as no cheers for the crowd. There was only the "wonderful feeling of relief and utter joy at being home and in the arms of their people" (p. 35) (see Figure 54).

4. Stalemate (from July 1951 to July 1953)

Summary of Events

No one predicted that the peace talks that began on July 10, 1951 would last for two years. While hostilities between two sides continued, the talks were halted over issues such as the position of the armistice line and repatriation of prisoners.

In January 1953, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who had criticized the war in Korea, was inaugurated as U.S. president. He warned the Communists that the United States would use nuclear weapons to end the war. The situation then suddenly changed in March 1953,

when Soviet leader Joseph Stalin died.

On July 27, 1953, an armistice was finally signed between North Korea and the United States, with South Korean President Syngman Rhee refusing to sign. The front line between North and South Korea was agreed on as the armistice line: the 38 parallel, the border between the two sides before the war began. War prisoners of each side were returned in Operation Big Switch.

Dominant Themes

This period showed three dominant themes: (a) “Good versus evil,” (b) “Paternalism/Humanitarianism,” and (c) “Tragedy of Koreans.” Although these three themes were shown throughout most of the periods of the war, they were best represented during this period.

The theme “Good versus evil” was best represented in the photo essays of the prisoners of war of the both sides that compared their treatment of prisoners (see Photographic packages 14 and 16). The theme “Paternalism/Humanitarianism” was more dramatically represented in a human-interest photo story of a Korean orphan (see Photographic package 13). The theme “Tragedy of Korea” was also shown in a human-interest photo story about an ex-guerrilla fighter (see Photographic package 15).

Although these three themes in *Life* were analyzed separately in different photo essays or stories, they are closely interrelated in that they are illustrating that the good and righteous United States, with a just and humanitarian purpose, went to the war to save helpless South Korea from the immorality of evil Communism. These mythical themes were exactly what the U.S. government and *Life* magazine wanted to spread throughout the war.

1) Good versus Evil

One of the themes in this period was “Good versus evil” and it was suggested with three sub-themes: (a) “U.S. soldiers as good guys”; (b) “Well-treated Communist POWs,” and (c) “Badly treated U.S. POWs.” The first one was briefly shown in the first period of the war, and the second and the third were commonly shown in the fourth period.

1-1) U.S. Soldiers as Good Guys

First, “U.S. soldiers as nice guys” appeared in the July 10, 1950 issue of *Life*, the first coverage of the Korean War. The second image on page 20 shows a U.S. soldier who tries to help a foreign refugee evacuated from Korea, which illustrates the theme “U.S. soldiers as nice guys” (see Figure 2). In the photograph, due to the photographer employing a large depth of field, the official seal of the U.S. Air Force is clearly in focus above the heads of the U.S. soldier and the Swiss nun. The caption reads: “Friend in need, a GI tries high school French to help a Swiss nun arriving as a refugee in Japan.” That is the meaning of this image on the first level. One of the missions of the U.S. Air Force at the beginning of the war certainly was to help U.S. citizens safely evacuate from Korea to Japan.

What else, then, might this image say to readers? The GI is trying to communicate with a Swiss nun to help her with his limited French. He came here for no other reason than to help people in trouble. The nun is just a helpless woman in need, in the middle of a chaotic crisis in a foreign country. The GI is a nice, friendly, and chivalrous man. He is listening to her and even lowers himself to her level. He is not at all an authoritative or arrogant savior. The article says, “Some of the receiving GIs would have qualified very

well as diplomats from the way they handled the people who came to their little desks with nothing but identification cards and strangely soft voices. There was no crowding. None of the refugees was ever rushed into the next processing line, and none was left alone for more than seconds at a time” (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 20). She is not even an American, but Swiss. He is a friend of the whole world. In addition, helping a nun gives his mission a religious light. The purity, sacrifice, and divine characteristics of the nun shed the same light on him.

The United States performs this kind of mission not only with its mighty military power shown in the air, but also with sophisticated and civilized communication ability even in French. The article says that the refugees “with little more than the clothes on their bodies” and with “shotguns” remind you of “early settlers who escaped Indian attacks with only their muskets and their nightshirts” (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 20).

It was a just mission for the United States to save the civilized world from savages, with its chivalry as well as its might. During the president’s news conference on November 30, 1950, Truman said, “We have committed ourselves to the cause of a just and peaceful world order through the United Nations. We stand by that commitment” (Truman, 1950a). In his radio and television report to the American people on the national emergency on December 15, 1950, he also said:

In June the forces of Communist imperialism burst out into open warfare in Korea . . . Then, in November, the Communists threw their Chinese armies into the battle against the free nations. By this act they have shown that they are now willing to push the world to the brink of a general war to get what they want . . . That is why we are in such grave danger. The future of civilization depends on what we do-on what we do now, and in the months ahead.” He continued, “No nation has ever had a greater responsibility than ours has at this moment. We must remember that we are the leaders of the free world. We must understand that we cannot achieve peace by ourselves,

but only by cooperating with other free nations and with the men and women who love freedom everywhere. (Truman, 1950b).

That is, American mission was to save and protect “civilization” and “freedom” against the Communist imperialist attempts to dominate the world.

The sub-theme “U.S. soldiers as good guys” finds its resonance in the photographs of U.N. allied forces (see Photographic package 10). *Life*'s February 26, 1951 issue ran only one article about the approximately 25,000 soldiers from other U.N. nations. Mydans' photographs accompanied the article, titled “Other U.N. troops: They also serve.” Half of the photographs showed the portraits of individual soldiers (see Figure 50) and the rest of them showed what they were doing in their spare time (see Figure 51). Their activities reflected the characteristics of their countries and peoples: British soldiers drank tea; Dutch soldiers wore Dutch wooden shoes for comfort; Turkish soldiers danced; Puerto Rican soldiers participated in a Catholic service; and French soldiers made bread.

It is interesting to note that the final photograph was a full-bleed page of “a Turkish sentry standing watch under a Korean moon” (see Figure 51). The text of the article ended with a description of the legendary success and sacrifice of a Turkish brigade in the war. In fact, Turkey suffered more than 700 casualties²³ (“The Turkish brigade,” n.d.), the fourth highest, following South Korea, the United States, and the United Kingdom. In fact, in the Western World Turks were famous for their fierce slaughter throughout the history of war. The article added a Turkish general's quote of centuries before “when the Turks caught the Chinese behind their Great Wall and slaughtered them like animals” (p. 105).

The article, however, seemed to feel the need to shed a humanistic light on the Turks by showing one photograph of them dancing and another of them enjoying a comic book with a Korean girl. The old image of Turks as brutal and merciless barbarians did not fit the United Nation's picture of the Korean War, therefore, the old image was neutralized with this kind of photograph. The last photograph of a Turkish sentry also gave a positive nuance of courage without brutality. Behind a Turkish sentry is a moon, the symbol of Turkey also shown in their national flag.

A letter to editors in the March 19, 1951 issue of *Life*, said, "It is most encouraging to know the other countries are sharing the brunt of the Korean war" ("Letters to the Editors," *Life*, 1951, March 19, p. 12). By showing allies focused on the same mission as Americans, this photographic package suggests not only that the United States was supported by other U.N. nations, but also that the purpose of the United States' in Korean War was righteous.

1-2) Communist POWs Well Treated by the U.N.

The war continued, in spite of halted peace negotiations and with little change of territory. One of the biggest issues was repatriation of prisoners, whose numbers were rising on both sides. The Communists had demanded that the majority of their countrymen be returned, forcibly if necessary, to Communist territory, but the United Nations insisted that the prisoners themselves could choose whether or not to return. Meanwhile the portrayal of POWs in *Life* presented the theme "Good Us versus Evil Others." The Communist prisoners-of-war were portrayed as being well- treated by the generous U.N. and the United States. In contrast, the U.N. and the United States

prisoners-of-war were portrayed as being badly treated, even brainwashed by immoral Communists.

Along the different views on repatriation of prisoners between both sides, the tension between core Communists and converters grew in Kojé Island, one of the camps where 170,000 prisoners lived under the U.N. guard. Within a month there were two riots where 90 prisoners and one U.S. soldier were killed. The March 31, 1952 issue of *Life* ran a photo essay about Communist prisoners-of-war in Kojé Island, and the title was “Prisoners’ island: Tension and tedium rule Kojé’s barbed-wire world.” (see Photographic package 14). The photographs were taken by Werner Bischof, who was covering the war for Magnum, concentrating on the victims of American bombing. The photo story shows how well Communist POWs were treated in the camp, being generously provided with material supplies such as food, lodging, medical care, and sanitary facilities, as well as religious freedom and leisure time.

The photo story begins showing a group of prisoners in the camp’s sick-call line (see Figure 67). The caption reads: “Blanket-bundled and miserable, sick Chinese prisoners wait to consult a prison doctor.” These sick Chinese prisoners were offered medical care, which was generous of their enemies. The picture shows them in clean clothes and with clean blankets.

The second photograph across two pages is of POWs doing laundry. The caption reads: “Washday at Kojé drapes the barbed-wire fence with U.S. Army issue clothing. Prisoners dress largely in GI uniform, about \$50 worth being issued to each prisoner on arrival. The POWs are constantly washing and scrubbing themselves, using strong yellow GI soap and lugging buckets of hot water from the kitchens.” They were offered clothes

and sanitary supplies. The sunlight passing through clothes gives a hopeful feeling. Bischof's choice of lighting in the photograph might be considered more a statement of hope than a mere coincidence. Almost all the photographers are aware of the important role of lighting in creating special feelings and atmosphere in their photographs. Bischof, originally trained as a painter, might have known it even better. The picture looks beautiful in this light.²⁴

The three photographs on the next spread show POWs who became anti-Communists and chose to stay in South Korea instead of returning to North Korea or going to China. Other two photographs are of "hard-core Red fanatics, who by torture, intrigue and relentless preachment spread the gospel of communism" (p. 94). The other is of the tension from conflicts between both sides in the camp (see Figure 68).

In the two pictures on the right page, the "hard-core Red fanatics" desperately try to hide themselves from the camera, probably out of fear. Being photographed in a POW camp could bring dishonor on their return to North Korea or China. The article says, "2,600 stiff-necked North Korean officers cleave to communism, cut Red insignia from beer cans, lustily sing Red marching songs, study Russian, chalk-talk battle strategy and snub their captors" (p. 94).

Despite such violent pressure from "hard-core Red fanatics" on other POWs, there were more POWs who did not want to return than the ones who did. Among them were Chinese converts—although U.N. officers sometimes doubted their sincerity—who danced celebrating a festival near their homemade "Statue of Liberty," shown in the third photograph on the spread. They seem to accept the concept of freedom, one of the values that Americans most cherish, which is represented in "Statue of Liberty." They even

learned how to square dance. They are portrayed enjoying their freedom and having leisure time even in the prisoner camp. Despite all the entertainment opportunities in the camp, the masks on the prisoners' faces may suggest their uncomfortable status. Bischof himself, in fact, was bothered by the more formal "re-education of prisoners of war." In his writings, he often extolled democracy. However, Bischof expressed his strong opposition to this forced kind of "political exercise," although he avoided using the term brainwashing (Zimmer, September 2, 2001). Originally from Switzerland, he was freer from the anti-Communist ideology in the United States.

The article says that 6,000 Koreans and 13,000 Chinese, "more emphatically democratic," signed anti-Communist petitions, sometimes in blood, most of them asking not to be sent back to the Communists. The first photograph is of one of the about 1,000 prisoners who had "tattooed themselves crudely but indelibly with anti-Communist slogans" (p. 94). This shows a firm will to stay, emphasized by his sinewy arm in front of his body in the harsh light and shadow.

The POWs also enjoy religious lives. The caption on the lower left corner reads: "Church call finds this Korean enlisted man absorbed in the Bible beside chapel tent. Five Christian missionaries and a Buddhist hold services for the POWs."

The ninth photograph of the article, appearing on the next page (p. 97), is of former North Koreans waiting in the chow lines, wearing cap bands with the slogan "bravely oppose communists" (see Figure 69). South Korean flags are in the background. They were not faithful Communists anyway. The article says that about 38,000 of the 170,00 prisoners were Korean civilians who were pressed into the Communist armies or

merely uprooted by them. They did not even give up their faith as Communists because they never had it.

The Communist POWs were shown as well-treated, provided not only material supplies, but also some freedom. The article says that they were offered an American education program where they could learn “language, history, manual crafts, modern farming, and, finally, the difference between democracy and totalitarianism” (p. 96). They worked a little bit just to relieve the tedium of doing nothing. The caption of the 13th photograph on page 97, used in a full-bleed, mentions that “prisoners were not forced to do the work, but were paid only in extra food.” A six-year-old prisoner who served Communists as a messenger, even got two bowls of chow for himself, probably without doing any work (see Figure 70). His young age also tells how evil the communists were using a child in the war. However, this picture also could be read as a remark on the ironic situations in the war where a six-year-old boy could be a prisoner in a camp.

As seen above, some of Bischof’s photographs on the prisoners of war in Koje camp, such as the ones of Chinese POWs’ square dance and of a child POW, could be interpreted in either way: well-treated Communist POWs or the disturbing situations in the war. In fact, Bischof was covering the Korean War, concentrating on the victims of American bombings. Robert Capa,²⁵ one of the founding members of Magnum and one of greatest war photographers—perhaps the greatest war photographer at that time—described Bischof’s photographs of bombing victims as “‘too soft’ to sell to *Life*, more than ever a cheerleader for American aggression in the Far East” (Kershaw, p. 223). Nonetheless, despite the complexity and the overall tone of Bischof’s photo essay on Communist POWs, it emphasized the former. The article says that the prisoners were

“flotsam of war and pawns in a mortal contest between communism and democracy” (p. 92) and the majority of them chose democracy. It was a victory of democracy against evil Communism.

1-3) U.N. POWs Badly-Treated by the Communists

While Communist POWs were shown as well-treated by U.N. forces, U.N. POWs were shown as badly-treated by the Communists. The May 11, 1952 issue of *Life* ran a photo essay about U.N. POWs in North Korean prisoner camp (see Photographic package 16). The article, titled “Secret photos from the Red Koreans of 1950—Some GIs not on exchange list,” included photographs that arrived at *Life* a week before. The article said that they were taken near Seoul on July 18, 21, and 22 of 1950 and were hidden for nearly three years. The name of the photographer had not been released because pictures were taken under perilous circumstances and showed the first American soldiers taken captive by Communists during the first month of the war. The article added that what had happened to them since the Communists retreated and prison camps were established was not known. Only one of them had come home so far.

The first photograph shows how badly American captives were fed in the camps (see Figure 77). The caption reads: “Guarded by Korean Reds, captured Americans munch bits of bread and stare over truck tail gate as they move north on July 18, 1950.” When reminded that Communist captives were offered enough food by the United Nations, the different treatment shown here was made more obvious. Later, the April 27, 1953 issue of *Life* ran an article about a planned exchange of POWs. The article contained a photograph of General Dean whose weight dropped to 130 after being captured (“Big Exchange” 1953, *Life*, p. 30).²⁶ U.S. prisoners were crammed together to

sleep in a small room, which was shown in the lower left corner on page 30 (see Figure 79). They almost look like dead bodies, all together with one another. This image is reminiscent of photographs of the Nazi's massacre of the Jews during World War II.

Not only did the American captives suffer physically, but also mentally. The captives, most of them exhausted and some of them seriously wounded, suffered humiliation, and were forced to act as Communist puppets (see Figure 78 and Figure 79). They were made to march carrying banners praising the Communist cause and then to listen while some read speeches denouncing the cause for which they fought and suffered. One American prisoner at the front center of the march looks as if he has been wounded and not taken care of.

The May 25, 1953 issue of *Life* reported that some GIs suffered a brainwashing ordeal (Brinkley, 1953, *Life*). Although it was true that U.S. POWs suffered the lack of food, housing, and medical care, the story about U.S. POWs brainwashed was rather exaggerated. Carlson (2002), in his book of the interviews with U.S. POWs, argued that this myth was created by American media and scholars in McCarthyism, especially by the Hollywood movie *Manchurian Candidate*, where a brainwashed U.S. soldier in Korean War tries to assassinate the U.S. presidential candidate.²⁷

2) Humanitarianism / Paternalism

Another theme from this period was "Paternalism/Humanitarianism." This theme was briefly represented in the single photographs of South Korean political and military in previous periods, and most dramatically represented in a photo story of a Korean orphan in this period. This study first analyzed the photographs of South Korean political leaders and troops during the first period of the war, but later focused more on those of a

Korean orphan in order to explore how the flow of the photographs developed to construct the image of the United States as a humanistic and paternalistic presence in Asia and the world.

2-1) Weak South Korean Troops

The weak South Korean troops who needed American supervision appeared in Duncan's photo essay in the July 10, 1950 issue of *Life*. The third picture on page 20 shows a South Korean pilot learning how to fly an airplane, another photograph that delivers the "Humanitarianism or Paternalism" theme. The caption reads: "KOREAN PILOT listens as an American explains instruments of P-51 newly given to Korean air force" (see Figure 2). Although the South Korean pilot is in his neat uniform and is attentive to the American, he looks somewhat lost in front of all complicated mechanics. At the breakout of the war, South Korea had no tanks and virtually no military aircraft. The article says that the South Korean pilots would be "in the air within another 24 hours" even though the American instructor "had to polish them up on so much basic technique and field operation controls" (Duncan, 1950a, p. 20). The South Korean pilots do not even speak English. The article says that they "all burst out in delighted laughter" (Duncan, 1950a, p. 20) when a Korean translator said there is no problem on central-tower conversation because they will communicate with different colors of flash for landing and turning away. Duncan, the photographer, wondered, "whether their war would be the same" (Duncan, 1950a, p. 20). The photograph seems to say that South Korean troops are not trained and therefore are not prepared for technological war. They are not good enough to defend themselves. South Korea is not yet ready to be an independent country. The United States helped to free Korea from Japan in 1945 and

helped South Korea establish its government in 1948. The United States actually helped in the birth of South Korea and now assists in its development through its tutelage. The U.S. mission in Korea is to help its child nation to defend itself against evil communism. A reader who spent two years as a U.S. cavalryman in Korea wrote a letter to the editors that “I just hope our GIs are as lucky as we were and come back all in one piece. And I hope the poor gooks in South Korea will some day be able to have a free and peaceful country like we have” (“Letters to the Editors,” *Life*, 1950, July 31, p. 2).

Another photograph in the same photographic package illustrates a similar theme. The picture is of South Korean soldiers running away because of an air-raid alarm (see Figure 3). The caption reads: “Air-raid alarm sends Korean troops scurrying away from American transport which has just landed at Suwon. This time no bombs fell because U.S. fighter planes chased off the attacking Yaks.” In the picture, South Korean soldiers run ahead with U.S. soldiers behind. In addition, the South Korean soldiers are running away with bigger movements of their arms and legs than American soldiers. They look more scared and more cowardly than the American soldiers in the picture. Just as is true in this picture, South Korean troops were often portrayed “scurrying away” from enemy attacks in many photographs in other *Life* issues. While American troops might have responded in a like manner, only the South Korean troops were portrayed in photographs as “scurrying away,” the choice of words giving the impression that the South Korean troops are small, vulnerable, and dependent, like children who need someone else to protect them.

The situation was desperate for South Korean troops who were unprepared and ill-equipped, and whose meager weapons could not defend them from the Soviet tanks

and Russian-made Yaks. A photograph on page 25 in the same photo essay shows South Korean troops running to hide from North Korean air attack (see Figure 4). The caption reads: “A jeep loaded with Korean soldiers stops and men run for cover as North Korean planes raid Suwon, several blocks away smoke billows up where a Communist bomb has landed.”

The caption of the next photograph reads: “Retreating soldiers of the Korean army are calm as they halt on the highway 20 miles south of Seoul. After the capital fell, they seemed to be a disintegrating force, lacking in leadership. Unlike northern troops, many of whom fought with China’s Reds in Manchuria, their ranks held few veterans.” The South Korean Army and police forces, packed to bursting in vehicles, are in their pretty neat uniforms and are strangely calm. They have “little evidence of panic yet less of leadership” and seem to be “caught in the crush of masses of voiceless” (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 24). They did not even have a chance to actually fight against the North Korean soldiers because they were so stunned by the North Korean tanks, they did not know how to fight them. Even though they confronted North Korean troops on the battlefields, their American-made outranged field guns were not powerful enough to reach the North Korean batteries. As a result, nearly all field guns were lost when South Korean soldiers were cut off or captured by North Korean soldiers. They even lost their willingness to fight throughout their bewilderment. The article says, “There was little evidence of panic, yet less of leadership.” It adds, “It was not that they were all turning tail and running away. It was more as though they thought that this chaotic disintegration was happening to someone else’s army” (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 24). They had neither ability nor morale to fight.

However, the article put the blame on the U.S. Army's inability and the U.S. government's unpreparedness for this chaos. The article says, "It really was not their [South Koreans'] fault. They just were no men of the machine age. But the U.S. Army major who jack-rabbed through those same streets in his jeep with a tank on his tail was a machine-age man, and he also did nothing but get the hell out of the way" (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 24). South Korean soldiers were not even mature enough to take the responsibility for their own fate.

2-2) South Korean Orphan

The theme "Paternalism/Humanitarianism" was most dramatically presented in a human-interest story of a Korean orphan (see Photographic package 13). While the peace talks between the two sides were faltering, the July 23, 1951 issue of *Life* ran a story about a five-year-old Korean orphan who lost his parents during the war. The story with a text and photographs by Michael Rougier, was titled "The little boy who wouldn't smile" and subtitled "The problem was to bring Kang Koo Ri to life again—and even a grin was perhaps too much to ask."

In the midst of the confrontation between Chinese and U.N. forces, Kang's village had already been destroyed by artillery and probing patrols from the both sides. Only the charred ruins of houses remained. Although some villagers left southward, others stayed, like Kang's family. Many of them were wounded or sick; others were dead from starvation or the incessant artillery. When the U.S. troops, to prepare against the Chinese Spring Offensive, went to the village to clear out all the civilians, Kang was found naked and crouched against the wall, with his mother's dead body beside him. His mother's face was covered with maggots and flies and began to decay in his house that was still intact.

When he saw the soldiers coming in his house, his first reaction was to turn to the wall and raise his hand to his head. The five-year-old boy already seemed to know what to do with soldiers regardless whose side they were on. He was then carried to a U.N. camp and became a sort of mascot, like many other orphaned children picked up on the streets by GIs. Camp children were offered medical care, food, and clothes. They were taken care of by GIs until they left unwillingly and tearfully, for an orphanage. The article says that the orphanage was subsidized by the South Korean government, but the main support was derived from American Army chaplains who donated money, food, and clothing (p. 94).

What then is the importance of this photographic story? This photographic story could be read simply as a heartrending story about a war orphan, who had always been in conflict zones. It could also be read as an analogy of a helpless nation in Asia, which was in chaos, without medicine and food and without leadership, such as parents, but which could be saved with the mercy, generosity, and military strength of the United States.

The first photograph is of Kang with food in front of him after being taken to the U.N. regimental command post (see Figure 62). The caption reads: “His eyes clouded by nightmare memories and his small face drawn by hunger, Kang Koo Ri looks up as soldiers offer him his first meal.”²⁸ His thin neck sticks out of a big jacket because of malnutrition. He refused the food, however, saying that it would make him sick because he had not eaten for a long time. A normal five-year-old child would never know such a thing without that experience. He is looking ahead, but his eyes are empty despite a hint of determination. He is positioned slightly on the right side of the photograph, which leaves less space in front of him than in the back. In this type of composition, viewers are

directed nowhere since their gaze is cut off by the edge of the frame. This composition is often used by photographers to express that the subject in the picture is without direction, or boxed in a depressing situation without exit. In contrast, the empty space, especially the empty chair behind him, implies that he has no one to take care of him. Only the white spots in his eyes tell that he might be alive after all this.

Not only does he not have someone who takes care of him, but “bewildered and speechless” (p. 92), he cannot mingle with other children in the camp (see Figure 63). However, while Kang still would not smile, the other children are already comfortable and happy in the camps and orphanages where they were transferred. Although the article says that the children lost their parents by the Communists’ attack or the either side’s air bombing, it is American soldiers who are taking care of them. The children even burst into tears and got depressed when they had to leave GIs for an orphanage. One of them, hanging on the neck of a GI, yells for “Papa-san” and asks him, “When you come back?” (p. 94) (see Figure 65). The article says, “The GIs had given them the best life that they had known, and they all felt that no matter where they were going life would not be so good” (p. 94). Their cowboy clothes given to the children by GIs, shown in the photograph on the lower side of the page, were the objects of envy to ragged and dirty children on streets (see Figure 65).

Despite all the caring, however, Kang would not smile (see Figure 64). The article says that the most important job of everyone in the orphanage was to make him smile—it was “as if his return to health and life were dependent upon it” (p. 98). When Kang is asked what he would like to do most of all, he says that he would like to “play with the

machinery of the 'jeepu.' And very suddenly Kang did smile for the first time, and everyone in the room was happy for him" (p. 98) (see Figure 66).

Beyond the described importance of Kang and his story as revealed in the *Life* photographs, one could take his story to be symbolic of what South Korea was experiencing around that time during the war. One could interpret the story as follows:

Korea was liberated by the United Nations from a long period of domination by Japan in 1945 at the end of World War II. Kang was also saved by U.S. soldiers from the horrible situation. The United States became a parent to South Korea, encouraging its birth. The South Korean government was established under the U.S. supervision in 1948 and it was only three years old when the Korean War broke out in 1950. Kang was four years old when the war broke out. Other Asian countries, such as Japan and the Philippines, had been under the U.S. tutelage for a long time, but South Korea did not want a long trusteeship by the United States, in spite of its role in establishing the South Korean government. Similarly, Kang refused the food offered by U.S. soldiers and was not happy in the camp at the beginning.

South Korea was orphaned when the United States withdrew from the Korean peninsula in 1949. It was orphaned again in January 1950 when United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson said America's Pacific defense perimeter was made up of the Aleutians, Ryukyu, Japan, and the Philippines, implying that America might not fight for Korea. At the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, it could be orphaned again in the Cold War era politics when the United States called the Korean crisis not "a war" but "a police action" and when General MacArthur, defender of Asia as *Life* called him, was removed in April 1951 from his command in Asia. Symbolically, the only way to bring South

Korea “to life again” would be with the help of the U.S. military, just as Kang was helped toward recovering his smile, from wanting to play with the machinery of the “jeepu.” The message could be that with the generosity, mercy, and military strength of the United States, South Korea could be saved from the evil of Communism.

As Klein (2003) pointed out, parenthood or paternalism provided an ideology for the United States when it tried to reshape the international order in the Cold War era after World War II. According to her, America’s benign and beneficial image represented in American cultural works helped legitimate America’s global expansion, especially in Asia that started to be decolonized from European imperialism. This American image of non-imperialist internationalism could be even contrasted to the image of the Soviet Union—the evil power—in its aggressive attempt to conquer Asia by violence and savageness. Kang’s photo story could be one example of this American ideology or myth.

This photo story of a pitiful South Korean orphan aroused emotional reactions from *Life*’s readers. Several weeks later, a letter to the editors read: “The Little Boy Who Wouldn’t Smile” is one of the finest articles I have ever read.” Another letter said, “This is one of the most unforgettable series of pictures to come out of this or the last war . . .” Another one commented, “The picture of the little Korean boy who wouldn’t smile impressed me so profoundly that I burst into tears . . .” The Korean ambassador even wrote a letter, “Michael Rougier captures all the poignancy of our children. Our country today is a nation of lost children, but my movement is doing everything it can do build orphanages and minister to these innocent waifs.” The other said, “My heart went out to Kang Koo Ri. I want desperately to send him gifts from time to time. Is this possible? The editors of *Life* answered, noting that contributions could be sent on to American

Relief for Korea or other institutions (“Letters to the Editors,” *Life*, August 13, 1951, pp. 8, 11). Weeks later, a woman from New York, who sent a letter with a picture of Kang taken by her son-in-law in Korea, wrote: “My son-in-law in Korea had his picture taken with Kang Koo Ri, “The Little Boy Who Wouldn’t Smile.” The gifts in background are a small portion of those received through *Life* magazine’s appeal for Korean orphan. Note the difference in the boy’s facial expression” (“Letters to the Editors,” *Life*, September 10, 1951, p. 17). In the small photograph, he is looking at a picture book with a smile on his face.

3) Tragedy of Koreans: Inhuman Brutality of Civil War

The theme “Tragedy of Korea” has three sub-themes: (a) “South Korean refugees,” (b) “South Korean civilian casualties,” and (c) “a guerrilla war.” This theme began to appear in the single photographs of Korean refugees at the beginning of the war, and was more deeply explored in the photo story of the guerilla war at the fourth period of the war. The sub-theme “South Korean civilian casualties” was almost absent in *Life*’s visual representation of the Korean War.

This study initially analyzed the photographs of Korean refugees at the first period, but later focused more on those of a guerilla war in order to examine how the accumulative representation of the photographs constructed the image of Korean tragedy and how the reality of the Korean tragedy was twisted with an emphasis on some matters and an absence on other matters.

3-1) Korean Refugees

Duncan's photographs of Korean refugees, printed in the July 10, 1950 issue of *Life* show how desperate the situation was for Korean civilians (see Figure 4). While Seoul, the capital of South Korea, was captured by North Korean troops, South Koreans fled aimlessly southward with their pathetic belongings. Despite the danger of being bombed in the daylight, either by the North Korean or by the U.S. Air Forces, they lined up and headed south. The article says that the first striking image the photographer saw when he arrived to Suwon by airplane was the South Korean civilian refugees on the roads and trains. It says, "The roads were the first thing to strike us. They were black with people heading south. Then three trains appeared crawling along the single track, all headed south and crowded and covered with refugees" (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 20).

Duncan's photographs show the South Korean refugees from the ground and up-close. Showing this view could represent the photographer's sympathy for the refugees. The photographer even expresses in the article the shame and frustration of his inability to help them. He says, "When I came upon an ancient couple serenely sitting while their eldest son strained to pull them to safety, I felt nothing but shame at being bigger than all three and yet helplessly tied to the tiny camera in my hands" (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 24). Duncan (1951), later in his book *This is War!*, added, "And I wondered whether my pictures would real make difference" (unpaginated, in Korea 1950 section, ¶ 18).²⁹ In the article in *Life*, Duncan also expresses his respect to the refugees: "These were not poverty-stricken peasants headed from an uncertain past to a less certain future but the entire people of that section of Korea where life had been casual and full-stomached. Yet even with that life being demolished around them and the knowledge that at the end of

the road south there lay nothing by the sea, they still were making their flight in quiet dignity, and I warmed to their pride” He adds, “They presented a pathetic but now everyday picture, different from others made in Greece, Palestine, India or China only in the fact that they were all rather well dressed and spotlessly clean” (Duncan, 1950a, *Life*, p. 24).

The first photograph on the sixth page is of a South Korean refugee family. The caption reads: “Aged Korean couple are pulled by their son.” In the background of the refugees is a village that looks just like the one they left behind. Most Korean peasants were like this family. They had been living in their villages for several generations, even some never leaving their villages. Now they were uprooted from their homes and their pasts.

The second photograph on the page is of South Korean refugees waiting for a train. The caption reads: “At Suwon Station refugees leave by train.” A dismayed South Korean woman stares at the destination sign while other refugees fill the train. She may not make it this time, but will have to wait for the arrival of another train, which cannot be guaranteed.

The caption of the last picture from that spread reads: “Fleeing civilians straggle southward near Suwon, fearing the approach of Red tank columns, which also terrified many southern troops. More of the civilian refugees moved by night than day, carrying food and their most precious belongings. They cheered when they heard U.S. bombers overhead.” The striking element in this picture is that at the first glance, these people do not look like refugees. Rather, they look like people who are going to a fair or the kind of local market that opened once a week in rural areas in Korea, except for the fact that there

are so many on the road at the same time. At that time, it was not unusual for women to carry their harvest to sell on their heads, so the sight is not a strange one. The refugees are in a pretty good shape, wearing neat clothes.³⁰ Some men are even wearing their western-style business suits with ties and some children are wearing their school uniforms, indicating that they were from cities like Seoul rather than rural areas. Still, it is striking to see that they are wearing such formal dress when they are fleeing in a crisis. Their dress may tell us that they did not know that the war would last so long: three years and a month. When the news of the North Korean attack broke out, most of South Korean civilians had no idea where to go, or even if they should flee. Since there had been small and frequent firing between North Korean and South Korean soldiers along the 38 parallel, but so far, no serious invasion, South Korean civilians thought it could be one of the small exchanges of fire. In the picture, they are not carrying many of their belongings, but probably only some food and clothes, in quantities that still seem small for any journey. The lack of food later resulted in many Korean refugees dying of starvation.

3-2) Guerilla War

Since the Korean War was basically a civil war between the nations of North Korea and South Korea, the brutality on each side left severe scars among family members, local communities, and the nation itself. For over 500 years Korea had been a country with one blood, one language, and one culture. At the end of World War II, it was divided into North and South Korea, but even after the establishment of the separate governments, Koreans were allowed to cross the border for business and other purposes. The sudden breakout of this war, however, divided the two Koreas forever, geographically and emotionally. Sometimes two brothers from one family had to aim

their guns at each other, fighting for opposing sides. Some villagers who helped or were forced to help one side were accused and killed for their cooperation with the enemy when the other side's troops entered the village. Koreans were experiencing the fratricidal war and the brutality to each other was severe in a guerilla war where no distinctive front line existed.

Most of *Life* magazine's photographs of the Korean War focused on the experiences of American soldiers in a strange and small land in Asia that they could not even identify on a map before the war broke out. Although some photographs, published in an episodic manner, showed Korean refugees fleeing the war, no photographs showed Koreans caught in the middle of the tragedy of the fratricidal war, except the photographs of Margaret Bourke-White, published in the December 1, 1952 issue of *Life*.

Bourke-White was the first woman photographer at *Life* to cover the Korean War ("A Gallant Woman," 1952, *Life*, p. 23). Despite the wonderful work of her male colleagues, she felt "that there was an important area which no one had covered: the Korean people themselves" (Bourke-White, 1963, p. 329) and asked *Life* to send her on assignment to Korea. She wanted to focus on ordinary people's struggles in their lives. She wrote, "Here was a civil war with friend against friend, and brother against brother. Here was a war of ideas which cut through every village and through the human heart itself" (Bourke-White, 1963, p. 332).

Her photographs, titled "The savage, secret war in Korea," showed aspects of the guerilla war in a thematic manner: Koreans killing each other, North Korean captives waiting in trials and for execution, and families torn apart (see Photographic package 15). For the story of "a war within a war" (p. 25), she went to Cholla Provinces, southwest

Korea, following guerilla-hunting members of the South Korean National Police. After MacArthur's Inchon landing and the crossing of the 38th parallel to the north, North Korean troops fled north, but some of those left behind organized guerilla bands in the territory under U.N. control. They attempted to disrupt U.N. communications lines, sabotage harvests, keep the countryside in turmoil, and tie up South Korean manpower. The South Korean National Police killed 13,000 out of an original force of 40,000 guerillas in 13 months, captured thousands more, and converted many to the South Korea's side. And now the Cholla Provinces were a hotbed of the guerilla warfare (p. 25).

The opening photograph, which is of a dead guerilla carried by South Korean police, is the most shocking picture among all the photographs (see Figure 71). The caption reads: "Down from the mountains volunteer Korean police wearing grenades Ridgway-style, bring the trussed body of a guerilla to be identified." Four South Korean police members carry the stiffened body of a dead guerilla like a game animal. The guerilla corpse is dragged on a pole with a rope around its neck and the other rope around its feet. There is no expression of horror on the young faces of the South Korean police members and there is no dignity for the North Korean dead. They killed enemies for their own survival. They would have hunted animals for the same reason. And this hunt was celebrated. The article says, "When it is too difficult to bring the corpses back only the grisly heads are retrieved, not as trophies but to be identified and the names checked against lists of known guerillas" (p. 25). The caption of the photograph, however, when it was reproduced in the August 3, 1953 issue of *Life*, reads: "WAR WITHIN A WAR: A dead guerilla was the prize of South Korean police who fought throughout the war against Red terrorists working far behind the battle lines" ("No Whistles," 1953, *Life*, p.

17). This principle of “dead enemy as trophy” was evident since the picture of the dead Spaniards on the Cuban beach during the Spanish-American War, but Bourke-White’s photograph of a dead guerilla in the Korean War went even further (Moeller, 1989, p. 320). South Korean police and volunteers brought the guerillas’ body parts such as ears and heads as evidence that they really killed them (Goldberg, 1986, p. 334). Bourke-White actually photographed a guerilla’s severed head, but it never appeared in *Life* magazine.³¹ In the close-up, the head is hanging by its hair from an arm that comes into the frame from the right side. On the left behind, a South Korean soldier with a large ax over his shoulder smiles proudly at their prize.³² It is even more shocking in that the smiling face of the South Korean soldier did not seem evil, but ordinary—the face of a simple, naïve farmer.

Most of the South Korean police volunteers were teenagers from small towns, just as many of North Korean guerillas were. While the regulars went guerilla hunting or fended off raids on fields and towns, the unpaid volunteers guarded supply routes. In the first picture of the story, the South Korean volunteer police—especially the ones at the front left and back left of the photograph—were so young that they looked just past the age of playing with toy guns (see Figure 72). The flowers on the hats of the young volunteers even look absurd as if they should be worn while were playing in the fields of their hometown. Bourke-White noted later, “I came to think of this as a conflict between children” (Bourke-White, 1963, p. 338).

Another photograph of Bourke-White that stood out in the story was of an ex-guerilla’s return to home (see Figure 74). Lim Churl Jin, a 29-year-old South Korean, joined North Korean troops in the summer of 1950 when they overran the southeast

corner of Cholla Provinces. He served as an ordinance officer for a guerilla group for two years, making bullets and grenades out of beer cans filled with metal pieces and glass. His older brother, head of a conservative association, had to hide himself after his defection. Churl Jin, however, became homesick, ill, and disillusioned with Communism, surrendered to South Korean police, and was returned to his village where he had a reunion with his family.

Churl Jin was the exact subject Bourke-White was looking for to illustrate visually and dramatically “the cleavage in a family torn apart by the war of ideas” (Bourke-White, 1963, p. 348). The four photographs of Churl Jin, under the subtitle of “Emotional welcome for an ex-guerilla,” follow his path home, but more importantly follow his complex emotions as he meets with his family members. His wife is pictured with his younger son who is crying into the arm of a strange father he had never seen. The older brother who might have been accused for Churl Jin’s defection is there, as well as Churl Jin’s mother, who believed that her son was dead. His wife welcomed him, exclaiming, “My husband has come home.” His older brother, with tears and anger, cried bitterly, “What crime have you committed—you have been working against our country!” On the collar of his clothes is a badge that might be from his association. He might have worn it as a symbol of his loyalty to South Korea. Churl Jin, head bowed, said doggedly, “My old crime was wiped out by my surrender.” They, however, still would not look at each other. The last full-bleed photograph of the story shows Churl Jin and his mother on a road. The caption reads: “A mother’s broken lullaby is sung to Churl Jin, sitting on ground and clutched by his mother as she rocks to and fro. He had come upon her in a rice field outside town and when she saw him, she cried, ‘Is it a dream? You cannot be

my son. My son is dead.’ He answered, ‘Mother, it is Churl Jin.’” It is a heart wrenching moment where his mother sings a lullaby to her son, who might forever be a baby in her eyes. Mothers’ love toward their children is a theme that is never exhausted through generations in all cultures. This moment even resonates with the Biblical story of prodigal son, which is well known in the Christian world.

This was a perfect moment that Bourke-White was looking for. She later wrote:

In a whole lifetime of taking pictures, a photographer knows that the time will come when he will take one picture that seems the most important of all. And you hope that everything will be right. You hope the sun will be shining, and that you will have a simple and significant and beautiful background. You pray there won’t be any unwanted people staring into the lens. Most of all, you hope that the emotion you are trying to capture will be a real one, and will be reflected on the faces of the people you are photographing. (Bourke-White, 1963, p. 356)

She mentioned that she was crying so hard that she could scarcely take the photograph. She also noted that this was one of her favorite photographs through all her career and that after India, the Korean story was the most human she ever did. When she was asked by her *Life* colleague how the Korean War assignment differed from her others, she said, “This time my heart was moved” (Memo for Cal Whipple, 1956. As cited in Goldberg, 1986, p. 336).

The next spread of the photo story shows other North Korean captives like Churl Jin, but the ones who did not have enough luck like him (see Figure 75). The article says that the South Koreans kept “coaxing their guerilla foes to surrender with offers of clemency”(p. 32) because the guerillas had been told that they would be killed if they were captured by South Koreans. In fact, whether they surrendered or were captured, they were tried by a military tribunal and were sentenced according to the degree of their cooperation with North Koreans. Some were sent to a jail sentence or a rehabilitation

course or even freedom, but many “tough, diehard Communists” were sentenced to death. The first photograph on the spread shows one who won her freedom from the trial and the other three photographs show ones who might be shot. A woman captive in the center of the second photograph expresses her toughness through staring eyes and the cynical expression of her mouth on her tilted face. But the other captives in the rest of the photographs in the spread seemed to give themselves up in fear of execution. In the third photograph, lit by a harsh light, the face of a captive who was recaptured from his escape floats like a ghost. His blank face with his eyes staring in the dark makes him look as if he is already dead.

Another death was that of a South Korean police member shot by guerillas (see Figure 76). His village was so poor that his casket was decorated with a paper top instead of an elaborate wooden one. The only thing his family and neighbors could do for the “hero” was to bury him high on a hill so he could ascend to Paradise easily. His family was left among the mourning. There was no glory for this Korean hero: he was merely a young man killed by his fellow countryman who was in turn killed by him. Somewhere in North Korea, another mother would be crying for her son’s death.

Bourke-White’s picture story showed the terror, brutality, anger, grief, and absurdity that were ignored by other of *Life*’s photographers. Howard Sochurek, who himself was one of the main photographers at *Life* for the Korean War, said, “I think it was a tremendous slap in the face to the rest of us who thought we knew the story. We’d been concentrating on the obvious, the front line, the fighting. Here was maybe a greater story that we’d missed” (“Howard Sochurek,” 1984. As cited in Goldberg, 1986, p. 338).

Although Bourke-White herself and her colleagues highly praised her photo story in Korea, the story did not seem to receive much attention from *Life* readers. No letters to the editors were printed in *Life*. It was a very different response when compared to the huge reaction of readers to the Korean orphan story, published in the July 23, 1951 issue of *Life*. Readers might have felt that they could do something for the orphan, but not much for the North Korean captives or South Korean police members. Although both photo stories captured the emotional moments of Koreans' suffering in the war, the latter presented a more complicated problem that individuals could not help solve. Another possible and more important explanation of the contrasting responses could be that the Korean orphan story appealed to the theme "Paternalism/Humanitarianism" which could in turn provide Americans with a rationale for fighting in Korea. The Korean guerilla war story provided no such rationale. Although Churl Jin's story could be interpreted as the unfulfilled promises of Communism,³³ the horror of a dead guerilla's corpse treated like an animal may have exceeded readers' tolerance level. The inhuman brutality by South Korean police to North Korean guerillas and vice versa might be too horrible for Americans, who would not seem to want to be involved. They had been in Korea already, however, in the early 1950s and would be in Vietnam several years later.

Despite Bourke-White's sincere interest in the horrible and tragic reality in Korea, presented in her photographs, there still remains a question about her photo story on Churl Jin. Although her moving story of an ex-guerilla returning home captured the tragedy of Koreans caught in the middle of civil war, this study found it to have a propagandistic tone: the story of a regretful ex-guerilla who returned home thanks to the South Korean government's generosity.

Bourke-White later said that when she heard about Churl Jin from a Korea police chief in a prisoner camp, she asked the police chief if she could take Churl Jin home and the chief gave them a ride, accompanying them as her guide and interpreter. The drive took two days. This kind of involvement on the part of a photographer could have changed the flow of the story and would not be allowed in photojournalism ethics today. At that time, however, it was not considered a breach of ethics.³⁴ On the other hand, one might wonder what would have happened if a western photographer and a South Korean chief had not escorted him home in a police jeep.

When Churl Jin stepped inside the courtyard of his home, “in a few minutes, as though they sprang out of the ground, friends and relatives flocked in to welcome him” (Bourke-White, 1963, p. 353). In the background of the picture several women are smiling. How could it be possible? Did they already know he was coming? If they had seen him entering the village, they would have followed him, but would not have appeared as if by magic. Bourke-White, however, said that she extracted a promise from South Korean police that no one should inform the Nim family that they were on the way because the whole value of her mission depended on the element of surprise. She said the promise was kept. The fact that the mother was not at home when they arrived seems to support that view. She was visiting relatives in a village five miles away. They found Churl Jin’s mother just before the sunset on her way back home.

If Churl Jin had not been given a ride, the story would have unfolded differently, but maybe not too differently. It would have taken many more days for him to get home, and he would have seen his mother against a different background, not the beautiful light

on rice paddies before the sunset. The way he held his mother, however, probably would have been almost the same.

There could be another area of doubt about the chief's escorting to the village. If he had not been accompanied by the chief, Churl Jin could have confronted the hostility of the villagers because he voluntarily served two years for North Korean guerilla group. But more importantly, the chief's escort with him has a propagandistic nuance of human generosity of the South Korean government and further of the U.N. toward North Korean captives. In the photograph of Churl Jin and his mother, he seems as if he is a little bit aware of the camera by not looking at his mother, but turning himself slightly away from her. It may have been difficult to look straight at her, because of how he had hurt her and worried her. It could also have been because he felt he needed to show his face to the camera.

It is not known if South Korean government or the U.N. used these photographs as a propagandist tool to coax guerillas into giving up without fear of being killed when they surrendered. However, it is obvious that her photo story cleared Bourke-White's name of some suspicions put on her by McCarthyites.

In the 1930s Bourke-White had been accused of participating in left-wing related activities. The FBI had been keeping a file on her political activities since the 1940s and in the 1950s she was not free from the suspicion placed on her by both Joe McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee. Although her statement submitted to Un-American Activities Committee reaffirmed her belief in democracy and her opposition to dictatorship of either the left or the right, the accusation was not dismissed. In September 1951, Westbrook Pegler, a renowned columnist, condemned her for being sympathetic

towards Communism. Going to Korea was her chance to clear her name from that accusation (Goldberg, 1986, pp. 326-331). When Bourke-White began a lecture tour right after her return from Korea, a local branch of the American Legion, self-appointed guardian of the anti-Communist forces, tried unsuccessfully to block her appearances. (*New York Times*, 1952, October 9, 80:4; 1952, October 19, 36:1). Within a year of her photographs being published, Bourke-White had told thousands of Americans about “the rigorous life of a Communist guerilla” and about “what friends the United States had made in Korea” (Goldberg, 1986, p. 340). Her lectures were a great success and she called it “a nationwide, 100% victory” (Goldberg, 1986, p. 340) in overcoming the charges and her reputation of being a Communist sympathizer.

Despite Bourke-White’s interest in the suffering of Koreans and the grim and brutal reality of the guerilla war, Churl Jin’s photograph, which she considered the most important of her life, was more important to her in bringing “the ultimate triumph over the Communists” (Goldberg, 1986, p. 340). As Goldberg (1986) pointed out, the photograph was “itself a kind of loyalty oath freely offered in rebuke to Westbrook Pegler” (p. 338). A human story of the returning of a prodigal son was a subtle propaganda in the Korean War. The Korean War was still being presented simply as a just war against evil Communism.

5. Armistice, But Not the End of War (July 1953)

The armistice was intended only to be temporary. The official document said that it was aimed at a ceasefire “until a final peaceful settlement is achieved,” but the settlement never came. The Geneva Agreements in 1954, at which the Korean peninsula

was discussed, failed to resolve the issue, and the Korean border has remained fixed in time ever since (“The Korean War armistice,” 2003, July 22).

The August 10, 1953 issue of *Life*, the final one before the signing of the armistice, ran an article titled “No whistles, no cheers, no dancing” with 10 photographs that summarized the Korean War (see Photographic package 17): one of them was of President Eisenhower saluting at a Marine base; one of them was of Panmunjom (see Figure 80); eight of them were chosen from photographs already published in *Life*. The eight photographs included: “Roadside sleepers,” “War orphan,” “Combat jump,” “Red surrender,” “War within a war,” “Inchon invasion,” (see Figure 81) “Race to Seoul,” and finally, “Winter retreat” (see Figure 82). The five total pages of coverage seemed rather slight to sum up the entire three-year war. Only the final photograph, taken by David Douglas Duncan and originally published in the December 25, 1950 issue of *Life*, was reprinted in a full-bleed, just as it was in the original issue. The Korean War was summarized into feelings of exhaustion, some victories, Korea’s tragedy, and finally the U.S. military disaster in Asia. In the war that did not end and was not won, there were “no whistles, no cheering, and no dancing” for Korea (*Life*, 1953, August 10, p. 15).

Themes That Were Absent and Related Themes: Korean Civilian Casualties, Anti-Communism, and Humanitarianism/Paternalism

1) Atrocity of Communists

The brutality of the Communists was described with civilian casualties caused by the North Koreans’ mass killing when they retreated north after MacArthur’s successful Inchon landing. A photo package titled “Hard-hitting U.N. forces wind up war” in the

October 30, 1950 issue³⁵ portrayed this atrocity. Two photographs show dead bodies: one of South Korean dead and the other of a South Korean man burying dead civilians.

The caption of the former—the fourth picture on the page—reads, “Mass murders of ‘political prisoners’ were exposed by the U.N. advance. At Taejon, where some 600 civilian victims plus about 35 Americans were found, Koreans search for relatives before the bodies are covered in grave dug by bulldozer.” The civilian casualties were so many that a bulldozer had to be used to bury them. In the photograph, the civilian casualties are already laid on the ground next to the dug grave. The caption of the latter image reads: “Taejon man stuffs nose with willow leaves against the stench as he buries civilian killed by Reds.” The look of indifference on his face shows numbness.

2) Friend or Foe: Collateral Savagery of the U.S. Troops on Korean Civilians

Korean civilian casualties, however, were caused not only by North Korea’s mass murder of South Koreans, but also by the American troops’ inability to distinguish friend and foe from Koreans and their ignorance of Korean lives. Journalist Harrison E. Salisbury, in the forward of Duncan’s *This is War!*, indicates, “It was not a pretty war. No war is, but Korea seemed uglier than most. There were atrocities on both sides—authenticated ones, many carried out by North and South Koreans. But Americans were not immune as victims or as perpetrators. Some mass killings made My Lai look like kindergarten” (Duncan, 1951, unpaginated, in Forward section, ¶ 35).³⁶ However, these atrocities by American troops were not displayed in *Life*’s pages.

Under the main title “U.S. counters mass with mobility,” a small article with photographs and text by Carl Mydans, titled “Refugees get in way,” mentioned the difficulty American soldiers had in distinguishing friend from foe among refugees. The

article added, “And always among them are Communists in disguise who turn around and shoot Americans in the back.” (Osborne, Duncan, Bell, & Mydans, 1950, *Life*, p. 22).

In the issue of *Life* where Mydans’ article was published, John Osborne (1950a) reported on this problem in his article titled “Report from the Orient: Guns are not enough.” He wrote that the lack of communication between American troops and Koreans led to the Koreans’ becoming victims of the extreme savagery at the hands of American troops. The subtitle reads: “Korea teaches us that to save Asia we must know about the people.” The article began by defining this story as “the ugly story of an ugly war, perhaps the ugliest that Americans have ever had to fight” (p. 77). It finally concluded that Americans must learn how to communicate with the Asian people to win wars in Asia, saying “. . . war against the Communists in Asia cannot be won—not really won-by military means alone” (p. 77) and “. . . machines still can’t talk to people, not as we must learn—and learn very soon—to talk to the people of Asia” (p. 85).

The article defined savagery as follows:

. . . utmost savagery. This means not the usual, inevitable savagery of combat in the field but savagery in detail—the blotting out of villages where the enemy *may* be hiding; the shooting and shelling of refugees who *may* include North Koreans in the anonymous white clothing of the Korean countryside, or who *may* be screening an enemy march upon our positions, or who *may* be carrying broken-down rifles or ammunition clips or walkie-talkie parts in their packs and under their trousers or skirts. (p. 77)

The article, which seemed to admit the atrocities done to Korean civilians by U.S. soldiers, skillfully escaped the responsibility of the savagery, however, and directed it toward the South Korean police.

The article began saying that U.S. soldiers were “magnificent” (p. 77) despite their defeat and retreat during the first weeks due to the shortage of arms and other

supplies. The U.S. soldiers, who were in their teens and early 20s, recently trained, and scared, “became strong men and good soldiers—fast” “in a land and among a people that most of them dislike, in a war that all too few of them understand and none of them want” (p. 77). The article said, “Much of this war is alien to the American tradition and shocking to the American mind” (p. 77). The Korean War was “alien to the American tradition” because it was a guerilla war where the frontlines were sometimes so wide and vague. The Korean War was “alien to the American mind” because it was a war where they had to fire at civilians, even at children. When U.S. soldiers confronted refugees, U.S. soldiers had difficulties to distinguish friend or foe among them. To Americans, all Koreans looked similar in their white clothing, and at times North Koreans filtered south disguising themselves as refugees. The article says how American soldiers felt: “Here, on our side, there is only a palpable fear, almost a hatred, of the unknown and unknowable” (p. 82). It says that firing on civilians did not fit the American tradition and mind. Despite their reluctance, they were *forced* to do it. Due to the U.S. leaders’ ignorance of the situation in Asia, the troops did not have adequate staff or officers who could talk to Koreans.³⁷

Responsibility for the savagery was also directed at the brutal South Korean police Marines—but not South Korean Army—upon whom the U.S. soldiers relied for “contact with the population and for ferreting out hidden enemies” (p. 77). The South Korean police were portrayed as badly treating South Korean civilians and as voluntarily and actively committing this savagery on civilians:

They *murder* [emphasis added] to save themselves the trouble of escorting prisoners to the rear; they murder civilians simply to get them out of the way or to avoid the trouble of searching and cross-examining them. And they extort information—information our forces need and require of the

South Korea interrogators—by means so brutal that they cannot be described. Too often they murder prisoners and civilians before they have had a chance to give any information they may have.” (p. 77)

U.S. soldiers were portrayed as trying to avoid using their guns to Korean civilians, but South Korean police and Marines were portrayed intentionally using brutal force on civilians. The author wrote, “Seeing all this, I believed what I had been told by many of our soldiers of their finding clumps of civilian dead back in the hills, shot where they had been caught out of sight of our units” (p. 82).

Although *Life* had no photographs of Korean civilian casualties killed by the U.S. military, it did happen. Mydan’s photographs of Korean refugees (Osborne et al., 1950) and Osborne’s article on the savage atrocities (1950a) seem to be reactions to such killings. The killing of Korean civilians by U.S. troops, however, was hidden for nearly 50 years until The Associated Press reported it in a Pulitzer Prize-winning story in 1999. (Choe, Hanley, & Mendoza, 1999).

On July 26, 1950, a month after the outbreak of the war, the 7th U.S. Cavalry Regiment fired at refugees at No Gun Ri, a village 100 miles southeast of Seoul. The refugees who approached the American lines on that day were South Koreans ordered out of their villages by American soldiers who warned them that North Koreans were coming. The mass killing lasted for three days after American planes’ strafing on the refugees. Estimates vary on the number of dead: the U.S. military’s estimates ranged from under 100 to “hundreds” dead; Korean survivors say that about 400, mostly women and children, were killed (Choe, Hanley, & Mendoza, 1999).

The No Gun Ri incident was not just "an unfortunate tragedy" by panicky soldiers acting without orders, as the Pentagon concluded after its inquiry. It was a deliberate

killing. American troops were ordered to shoot any Korean civilians approaching their positions in the battlefield because of the fear of Communist troops' infiltration in the guise of civilians. The letter of U.S. Ambassador John J. Muccio later showed the decision that was made a night before the No Gun Ri incident: "If refugees do appear from north of US lines they will receive warning shots, and if they then persist in advancing they will be shot" (Hanley & Mendoza, 2006).

3) Anti-Communism, Humanitarianism/Paternalism, and Atrocities on Korean Civilians

In an editorial titled "A mighty job," published in their July 10, 1950 issue, *Life* supported President Truman's "historic" decision to intervene in the Korean crisis, saying that the decision was to protect Asia as well as the United States from evil Communist aggression that sought Communist monopoly in the world (p. 35). For *Life*, the United States' action against Communism was considered to be humanitarian and paternalistic, a shared mission for the world.

The editorial criticized the American government's "lack of policy and failure of policy in Asia" up until this courageous "decision" ("A Mighty Job," 1950, *Life*, p. 35). It also insisted on the reinstatement of Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa as the United States' ally. The editorial says that the United States learned two lessons from the Communist success in Chinese mainland: one was that there is no government in Asia, which is "strongly established—let alone 'good' by our civics textbook standards"; the other was that the United States "*can* find governments which are a) anti-Communist, b) pro-American or pro-democratic, c) aiming to develop their countries along democratic lines" (p. 35).

According to the editorial, no country in Asia had the ability to establish its government from chaos by itself based on American civic standards. Rather, the view was that the Asian countries had to be built according to American civic standards of anti-Communism and pro-democracy which could be achieved with American help. The editorial said that the “mighty job” of the United States was first: “to make clear—as was begun on June 27—that the armed might of the U.S. will protect them against all outside communist aggression”; second, “to work with them to help them build up their political economies against the dangers of chaos and overthrow from within” (“A Mighty Job,” 1950, *Life*, p. 35). Here, American “good,” anti-Communism, pro-Americanism, and democracy were easily equated under the U.S. mission of “our constructive, brotherly relations with the people in Asia” who are “now living in a state of disorder” (p. 35).

This mindset of the U.S. foreign policy was not new, but had been rather deeply rooted in American culture since the nation’s birth. Historian Michael H. Hunt (1987), in his book *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy*, explored the origins of U.S. foreign-policy ideology. He defined three core ideas relevant to foreign affairs as “national greatness,” “racial hierarchy,” and “counterrevolution” (pp. 18, 159), and argued that “these fundamental propositions of American foreign policy are rooted in the process of nation building, in domestic social arrangements broadly understood, and in ethnic and class divisions” (p. 16).

According to Hunt (1987), American greatness, the capstone idea of U.S. foreign-policy, was represented early in Paine’s words saying that “We have it in our power to begin the world all over again” (Paine, 1776, p. 57) with a commitment of liberty, the

republican virtue of public interest, and Puritan notion of the “chosen people” (Hunt, 1987, p. 20).

Racial hierarchy, the second element in the ideology, defined American attitudes toward other peoples (Hunt, 1987, p. 18). The idea that places Anglo-Saxon on the top in the racial hierarchy was inherited from their European ancestors, especially from Elizabethan myths about blacks (p. 90). This idea was used to justify subordination of “inferior people” (p. 90) with regard to their need for new land and commercial markets, betraying their common humanity.

The antagonism to revolution, shaped by American elites’ fear for violent subversion of the old system (Hunt, 1987, p. 98), appeared as anti-Communism in America (p. 112), especially in the Cold War era. This idea has led to America’ ignorance about the causes of revolution in other countries that are based on their economic, political, and cultural conditions such as the problems of peasantry, prolonged and exhaustive wars, and resentments engendered by foreign rule. Americans’ judgment of the revolutions abroad was based on their American Revolution experience that was believed to be done without violence (p. 96). Americans even enhanced the notion of national greatness based on racial hierarchy because they believed that only they succeeded in carrying out moderate revolution without violence.

The combination of these three ideas of American foreign policy was presented in the United States’ containment and development policy in Asia. The containment policy was meant to stop the domino effect of nations moving toward Communism. The development policy was intended to provide long-term immunity against communism by

a legitimate process of social change supervised by Americans who consider themselves superior to dark-skinned people of the Third World (Hunt, 1987, p. 160).

In this sense, *Life's* hero, MacArthur, was a perfect example to have realized these ideas of U.S. foreign policy. *Life* suggested MacArthur's ruling of Japan after the end of World War II, as an exemplary case for the successful American mission in Asia and in the world. An article titled "'My dear General': Letters of MacArthur and Prime Ministers reveals how occupied Japan is ruled" was published in the issue of November 27, 1950 of *Life*. It shows that the United States' paternalism is deeply rooted in American ideologies.

The article celebrated MacArthur's "philosophy and the history of the Occupation" presented in his letters, and defined him as "the only American in history who has been the absolute ruler of a nation has used his power" ("My dear General," 1950, *Life*, p. 127). It introduced MacArthur's conviction that "democracy knows no limitations of race or nationality—that what is good and works in a Western democracy will be good and will work in Japan after a period of tutelage" (p. 127).

At this time, the United States actually seemed to believe in their "constructive, brotherly relations" ("A Mighty Job," 1950, *Life*, p. 35) because it denied that it was an imperialist power. In fact, the United States vigorously opposed such an ideology when it built its country through the war against England, one of the most powerful imperialist nations in the 18th century. The editorial said, "They are also nations of real people with not only the ordinary human want of all people, but also valuable and interesting traits of character and of culture, with ways of life which need to be changed but by no means in our image but according to their own inspiration and aspirations" (p. 35).

The editorial titled “Ideals and action” in the September 11, 1950 issue of *Life*, urging larger scale mobilization of war for President Truman’s decision regarding Korea, summarized President Truman’s “Report to the Nation” on the Korean War:

What Harry Truman said, in effect, was that the terms of the American proposition, which stresses individual freedom under law, are good for the world; and the foreign policy of the U.S. is to uphold them whenever and wherever it can. As the President put it, ‘Against the futile and tragic course of dictatorship, we uphold, for all people, the way of freedom—the way of mutual cooperation and international peace. We assert that mankind can find progress and advancement along the path of peace.’ (p. 56)

The editorial added, “No nation in Asia (or elsewhere) need fear U.S. ‘imperialism,’ for such imperialism is nonexistent. Soviet imperialism, on the other hand, is an obvious fact” (p. 56).

Another editorial, expressing its expectation of the United Nations’ role to act against Communist aggression, said, “The U.S. is now saying that it has no ambitions to use its strength for anything except to achieve world justice, which is certainly true...” (“Action of Faith,” 1950, *Life*, p. 34).

However, this American “brotherly” relationship with the world, especially with the Third World, has actually been manifested as “Paternalism” in a horrible and violent way. Ironically it has been done under the name of “Humanism” in American history, by ignoring the very “traits of character and of culture” (“A Mighty Job,” 1950, *Life*, p. 35) of other countries and by imposing American standards of freedom, democracy, and justice (Renda, 2001).

Mary A. Renda (2001), in her book about the U.S. occupation of Haiti, pointed out that U.S. paternalism provided the ideological machinery of the occupation. It was based on assumption that Haitians were, yet, in the early stages of their evolutionary

development as a people. It posited that Haiti would come into its own as a nation only after a period of tutelage under the guiding hand of that paternal figure known affectionately as Uncle Sam. The discourse of civilization and savagery and the metaphors of fatherhood were two sides of the same paternalist coin. However, paternalism, rather than mitigating against violence, reinforced and extended it in the war against Cacos and in the routine conduct of the occupation.

This humanitarian/paternalistic mission of America based on brotherly relationship was also distorted in Korea. U.S. soldiers called all Koreans—North Koreans or South Koreans, soldiers or civilians—“gook.” “Gook” was “the universal GI word for any and all Koreans” (Osborne, 1950a, *Life*, p. 82). U.S. soldiers not only did not know why they were fighting in a small Asian country, but also did not—or did not want to—understand the people for whom they were fighting. They struggled with the chasm of language and culture between Koreans and themselves. They were, “in a land and among a people that most of them dislike[d], in a war that all too few of them understand [understood] and none of them want[ed]” (Osborne, 1950a, *Life*, p. 77). A letter to the editors pointed out, “As long as American officers and men use the derisive term “gook” to describe the Korean people, understanding and goodwill cannot be achieved. Americans who represent this country overseas, be they civilian or military, must give up this attitude of contempt for everything foreign and show respect and understanding for the customs and traditions of others . . .” (“Letters to the Editors,” *Life*, 1950, September 11, p. 12). It is both interesting and sad to note that South Korean soldiers serving with GIs at the time referred to North Koreans as “goddam gooks.” (“Ideals and Action,” 1950, *Life*, p. 56).

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the visual portrayal of the Korean War, presented in *Life* magazine from July 1950 through August 1953, by adopting the theoretical framework of framing and cultural studies and by combining two methodologies: a quantitative method and a qualitative method. With a quantitative content analysis of the sampled 399 photographs, this study attempted to explore how the Korean War photographs of *Life* magazine framed the Korean War by emphasizing some aspects and omitting others. With an ideological analysis of the selected 17 photographic packages, this study also attempted to explore what mythical themes were used in the photographic coverage of the Korean War and how these themes are related to the dominant ideologies of American society and culture.

In the recent circumstances of international politics such as the Iraq War, North Korea's nuclear crisis, and the end of the Cold War, this study has importance in providing a newer and more balanced view of the Korean War by recovering the "forgotten war" in American history and American media history. This study also has importance in attempting a more interpretative examination of visual construction of news events and features, which has been studied less often than the verbal construction of news.

The results and analysis of the two methods combined suggest that while the Korean War was represented as America's military tragedy and America's disillusionment

with war in general, Americans still viewed the war was still justified. The huge casualties, attributed to the American troops' unpreparedness and low morale, may have also been justified by the idea of a just war against the evils of Communism. Americans seemed to see a humanitarian purpose in saving South Korea. The analysis also suggests that Koreans' suffering was mitigated, viewed as uncomfortable but not deadly.

In other words, *Life's* photographs portrayed the Korean War as follows: The Korean War resulted from North Korea's invasion of South Korea and was controlled by the Soviet Union—the evil power—in an aggressive attempt to conquer Asia by violence and savagery; and the United States entered this war in order to save South Korea. However, the United States was not ready to fight, and the Korean War ended with “no cheers and whistles” but only with a huge number of American casualties.

The findings of the content analysis show that *Life's* visual portrayal of the Korean War fell into three dominant categories—“U.S. troops,” “U.S. combat,” and “U.S. civilian life.” Showing the United States' dominance in the photographs might be an expected finding when one considers *Life's* status as one of the most popular magazines in America and the United States' critical role in the Korean War. Yet the three dominant categories suggest that *Life's* greatest concern was for U.S. soldiers, whether in combat or non-combat situations, and America's mobilization for the war. This concern for soldiers might be because the soldiers were America's sons, brothers, or husbands whom America cares about the most. It is always the soldiers who fight, struggle, are injured or die, sometimes return home if they are lucky, and live the rest of their lifetime with bittersweet memories of war. The concern for the public opinion on the issue of war

mobilization suggests that public support of war might be indispensable for conducting as well as winning a war, especially in a democratic society like the United States.

“Military casualties” received moderate concern from *Life*. Despite the U.S. military censorship of the photographs of U.S. casualties, *Life* photographers in Korea seemed to feel that they had to convey the reality of the war where U.S. soldiers were dying. The photographers, however, avoided making brutally honest images of U.S. military casualties with blood and mutilated bodies because they believed that they could show the reality of war without the graphic images that could be “unconsciously intrusive, bordering on the obscene” (Moeller, 1989, p. 306).

“POWs” also received moderate concern from *Life*. Since July 1951 when the United Nations and North Korea began to talk about a truce, the great concern was the repatriation of the POWs from both sides. Peace talks were delayed because of the different expectations on this issue. North Korea demanded that at least the majority of the North Korean prisoners be returned to its side of the DMZ, while the United Nations insisted that only those who wanted to go back to North Korea should do so.

“Arsenal” was one of the five least represented categories in Korean War photographs. It is also interesting to note that this category was the most frequent one in the Gulf War and the Iraq War. This might be explained by the fact that U.S. military weaponry used during the Korean War was limited and not much different from that used during World War II (Moeller, 1989, p. 264). After World War II, the United States tried to rebuild its economy and focused its attention on the consumer side of the economy. In fact, the Truman administration reduced the military budget for several years. At the

outbreak of the Korean War, the production of military weapons was not fully mobilized under the U.S. government's definition of "Police action."

The findings also show that U.S. soldiers were portrayed more in non-combat situations than in combat zones, although there were a reasonable number of combat photographs. It is not clear how many photographs would be required to represent combat situations in a war, but it is still interesting to note that soldiers were portrayed in combat zones more often in the photographs of the Korean War (17.5%) than in those of the Gulf War or the Iraq War (3%) (Griffin & Lee, 1995; Griffin, 2004c). This finding suggests that the Korean War photographs in *Life* seem to better reflect the reality of war with more "Combat" photographs than the photographs in the two wars mentioned above. When it is considered that camera technology saw great development in the times of the Gulf War and the Iraq War, this finding is much more interesting. During the Korean War, General MacArthur imposed severe censorship starting in December 1950, when the Chinese intervened in the Korean War. Every photograph and caption was censored in Korea before being sent to the United States or the entire roll of film was sent to the Department of Defense before it went on to the photo agencies (Moeller, 1989, p. 279). However, unlike what went on during the Gulf War and the Iraq War, there was no pool system during the Korean War. Photographers were relatively free to travel around in combat zones.

The findings of the content analysis also show that while North Koreans, the Soviets, and Chinese were underrepresented in all categories, their portrayals explain how *Life* photographers and editors saw the roles of each nation in the Korean War. The Soviet Union was portrayed as having played a critical role—the organizer of the war—in

North Korea's invasion of South Korea, which was only partly true. Chinese influence on the war was also portrayed, but as being less important than that of the Soviet Union. North Korea was portrayed as a puppet of the Soviet Union. South Korea was mostly represented thru its refugees. Although the portrayal of Korean refugees conveyed Koreans' suffering, it was limited because of the absence of portrayals of Korean civilian casualties and the destruction that followed.

The dominant categories—"U.S. troops," "U.S. combat," and "U.S. civilian life"—of the content analysis resonate with and were explored in great detail in the themes in the ideological analysis: (a) "Victory in the air," (b) "Defeat on the ground," (c) "MacArthur as a hero," and (d) "Unready/Unpopular war." With only small and short victories, the Korean War was portrayed as a U.S. military tragedy where the United States was lacking military supplies, manpower, and even morale.

In the Korean War, there were no romantic war heroes except for jet pilots and General MacArthur. Duncan's close-up shots of American soldiers struggling emphasized their disillusionment of the war by focusing on their facial expressions. His photographs suggest that unlike in World War I or World War II, war could no longer be viewed as a heroic activity and that there is no hero in the romantic sense. This feeling would increase in the Vietnam War later.

On the other hand, the portrayal of jet pilots as heroes and the emphasis on the U.S. Air Force's pinpoint airstrike ability hindered *Life* and its readers from seeing Korean civilian casualties caused by those American air strikes. This attitude provided an ideology that made the atomic bomb an acceptable weapon, even though it was not used in the Korean War. MacArthur also became a hero and a martyr who tried to turn

America's belief in power a reality. MacArthur was portrayed as a person who stood up for "American manhood" and the "martial ideal of citizenship and political leadership" (Hoganson, 1998, p. 26) that have often provided rationales to justify white male superiority in the United States and the U.S. control over other countries, especially in the Third World. MacArthur's perspective resonated with the editorial tone of *Life* whose owner, Henry R. Luce, himself was a strict conservative, republican, and anti-Communist.

This ideological analysis also suggests how America's involvement in the Korean War was justified: (a) "Good versus evil" and (b) "Paternalism/Humanitarianism."

Although the methods the United States used to fight the war were unsuccessful, the war was defined as a just war to save helpless South Korea from the aggression of evil Communism. As Hunt (1987) pointed out, three American ideologies such as American greatness, racial hierarchy, and counterrevolution worked in the politics and rhetoric in the Korean War. The theme "Good versus evil" was represented in the photographs of nice American soldiers and the other U.N. soldiers, well-treated Communists POWs (photographed by Bischof), and badly treated U.S. POWs. The theme "Paternalism or Humanitarianism" was prominent in a photo story of a Korean orphan (photographed by Rougier). The orphan was portrayed as being saved and taken care of by American soldiers thanks to their generosity and power.

The missing categories in the content analysis—Korean civilian casualties and destruction—were further explored in the theme "Tragedy of Korea" in the ideological analysis. Not only was the portrayal of Koreans' suffering limited—with rare portrayals of Korean civilian casualties and destruction—but also it was misrepresented in that there were no photographs in the sample of American troops' atrocities involving Korean

civilians. American troops firing on civilians and American Air Force's bombing on civilians apparently were not considered desirable coverage and did not fit into the United States' rationale for the war—saving South Korea from evil Communism. Koreans' tragedy of a family torn apart in the civil war was even distorted into a narrative that showed the United States' moral victory against Communism—such as in the story of an ex-guerilla fighter's return home (photographed by Bourke-White).

While Duncan's photographs of American soldiers did a good job of showing the grim reality of the war, the photographs by Rougier, Bischof, and Bourke-White seemed to present an idealized and romanticized version of the war that could provide the United States with the rationale for the war.

Conclusion

The Korean War began on June 25, 1950 and ended with an armistice on July 27, 1953. It ended with “no whistles, no cheers, no dancing” (“No whistles,” *Life*, 1953, August, 3, p. 15) but with huge casualties on both sides. Despite the enormous cost of the Korean War, it was not recorded as a war but a “police action” or the “Korean Conflict.” It has been largely forgotten in American history and Americans' collective memory as well.

However, the Korean War has not yet ended officially. Danger and tension continue 55 years after the armistice and 17 years after the end of the Cold War. The United States' government has been talking recently about the possibilities of a war against North Korea (Bradsher, 2003; Carter, 2003, ¶ 6) in the midst of the international circumstances surrounding the United States' war against Iraq as well as North Korea's nuclear crisis.

After the 9/11 attack, President George W. Bush called Iraq, Iran, and North Korea the “axis of evil” that threatens “the peace of the world” (Bush, 2002). When the United States went to war against Iraq in 2003, it was said that North Korea was next, implying another Korean War. North Korea is continually suspected to possess nuclear weapons or, if not, at least the potential ability to develop them. The North Korean government even insisted that it produced the weapon in order to prevent the United States’ attack on it. Reflecting the world’s concern on this issue, the six-party talks on North Korean nuclear crisis – involving the United States, South Korea, North Korea, China, Japan and Russia – began on August 27, 2003, in Beijing.

Considering these current events in the international politics, this study questioned how the Korean War was portrayed in the photographs of *Life* magazine and how this portrayal is related with American ideologies of war at that time and even now.

The media help people make sense of the world and themselves by providing a frame to interpret the events and phenomena in the world. This framing process is achieved by *selection* where media make some aspects salient and others omitted (Entman, 1993). In order to organize enormous amounts of information and package them effectively for their audiences, journalists adopt frames as journalistic devices that become institutionalized (Tuchman, 1978; Gitlin, 1980). These frames not only organize information but also “promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described” (Entman, 1993, p. 52).

Especially when the media faces a complicated situation such as a war, journalists tend to use familiar narratives that have been shared by society throughout history to help

the public understand the situation more easily (Lule, 2001; Zelizer, 1993). Journalists often use mythical narrative themes consciously or unconsciously to construct the reality and it is through this narrative discourse that a ruling ideology is constantly reasserted as an unquestioned consensus (Hall, 1982).

Photographs have a great power to construct the reality of events and to reinforce specific ideologies on how one perceives the world because of their mechanical accuracy. Photographs are believed by the public not to tell a lie and the constructed reality in the photographs are often taken-for-granted.

If visual media's framing and mythical narratives of certain events have such power whether explicitly or implicitly, one might wonder if the American collective memory that possibly has been made by *Life*'s visual representation of the Korean War has some influence on American perception of going to another war with North Korea.

The Korean War was an arena where American ideologies of war and the reality conflicted each other. The Korean War was portrayed partly in terms of disillusion of U.S. soldiers, reflecting a harsh reality in Korea. Unlike World War I and World War II, the Korean War overall was not a glorious war to Americans. Even though the U.S. government made a strong effort to sell the war as a just war against evil Communism, the country was not fully mobilized. As seen in the close-ups of U.S. soldiers taken by Duncan, Mydans, and Walker, in the war, there were no romantic heroes or glamorous sacrifices but only confused young men who did not know why they were fighting in a strange land. This skepticism would increase in the Vietnam War 20 years later.

The Korean War was also portrayed partly in terms of "Good Us versus Evil Others" and "Humanitarianism/Paternalism" in the Cold War politics where the United

States tried to reshape the world order by expanding into Asia and Europe. This portrayal might need more attention than the former one because it can reinforce existing ideologies without raising questions. Despite the doubt about the war, the concepts of a just war against Communism still remained in Bischof's photographs of well-treated Communist POWs. The mythical theme of paternalistic and humanitarian purpose of the war—to save South Korea from the evil of Communism—was also shown in Rougier's human-interest photo story of a Korean orphan who represented a helpless South Korea waiting for the mercy of the United States. Unfortunately this purpose did not always work in reality. Korean refugees were murdered by U.S. troops out of fear of infiltration from North Korean troops. They were “gooks” in the eyes of American soldiers. However, these atrocities of American soldiers on Korean civilians were absent in *Life*'s visual portrayal of the Korean War. South Koreans' suffering was underrepresented as well. The suffering of a torn country was even distorted into the United States' moral victory on evil Communism in Bourke-White's human-interest photo story of an ex-guerilla fighter.

Readers are reminded of the way that Norman Rockwell, a famous illustrator, portrayed America for the *Saturday Evening Post* from 1916 to 1963. Mendelson (2004) mentioned that Rockwell “created the visual vocabulary that feature photography continues to draw on, which communicates the values and the idea of what it means to be an American” (p. 175). The myths and values of an America as “we would like it to be” (Mendelson, 2004, p. 176) were also reconfirmed by the photographs of Bischof, Rougier, and Bourke-White in *Life* during the Korean War. Americans find their identity and their justification for the Korean War in the images of well-treated Communist POWs in the U.N. camps, of Korean orphans saved by U.S. soldiers, and of a regretful ex-guerilla

fighter in American military's generosity. They can be happy within the ideal images that the media produce. This is what Barthes (1957/1972) meant when he wrote about a myth that it "establishes a blissful clarity" by "abolishing the complexity of human acts" and organizing a world "without contradictions" and "wallowing in the evident" (p. 143).

Although the use of mythical narrative themes has an advantage in making the public understand complex situations more easily and quickly, it can also make the public take some situations for granted and not raise questions or doubts about them (Barthes, 1957/1972). These portrayals could give a distorted sense of the reality of the Korean War, which could make people consider another war in Korea more acceptable in the international circumstances of North Korean nuclear crisis.

Now 55 years after the Korean War, the concept of evil Communism at that time was replaced by "axis of evil." North Korean leader Kim Jung Il is criticized to be a menace to the world peace with his crazy attempt to develop nuclear weapons. He is also criticized as a dictator who suppresses his people's human rights and even neglects their dying from the shortage of food. The U.S. government seems to adopt the same myths of "Good Us versus Evil Others" and "Humanitarianism or Paternalism" from the Korean War to the current situations of North Korean nuclear crisis.

Limitations and Further Research

This study has some limitations and raises some questions for a future study. First, this study examined the visual portrayal of the Korean War only in *Life* magazine.

Although *Life* was the most popular photograph magazine with its large circulation at that time, it might not be fair to say that *Life* represents America's visual print media as a whole. *Look* magazine was also popular. To include other weekly news magazines as well

as newspapers could expand the scope of this study. Even to compare the visual portrayals of the Korean War among different news magazines and newspapers could give a richer understanding of the visual portrayal of the war in the United States and the related ideologies of war in the United States.

Second, this study could be extended to focus on news magazines and newspapers from other countries such as South Korea, North Korea, the Soviet Union, China, and other U.N. allies. This could give an opportunity to compare the similarities and the differences in the visual representations of the Korean War according to the different degrees of the involvement in the war and of the political positions of the countries.

Third, this study could be expanded to compare the visual portrayal of the Korean War with that of other wars that the United States has been involved in, such as the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, and the Iraq War. The United States went to these wars with its justification of world peace and the salvation of the civilized world. Looking at the common thread as well as the changes in the visual portrayals of the wars could help understand not only each war itself, but also American ideologies, some of which are maintained constant and some of which evolve throughout these wars.

FOOTNOTES

¹ When compared to the Vietnam War where the U.S. military casualties reached over 56,000 for 13 years, over 36,000 U.S. military deaths for only three years of the Korea War was huge.

² Although U.S. President Truman called the conflict as a “police action” to avoid the confrontation with the Soviet Union, it was a war in fact. The use of the term was considered by the Korean War veterans as the degradation of their sacrifice (Halberstam, 2007). In June 2007, New York passed a legislation that made June 25 Korean War Veterans Day (Johnson, L. (2007, July 5). Pol honors ‘forgotten.’ *New York Daily News*: 01 Suburban. Retrieved on November 1, 2007 from [Hhttp://proxy.msl.missouri.edu:2228/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?risb=21_T2613984448&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T2613984451&cisb=22_T2613984450&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=151550&docNo=1H](http://proxy.msl.missouri.edu:2228/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?risb=21_T2613984448&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T2613984451&cisb=22_T2613984450&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=151550&docNo=1H)).

³ This photographic package shows a U.S. soldier putting on his clothes step by step in order to show how many clothes U.S. soldiers had to wear in the cold weather in Korea.

⁴ Sherer’s (1988) study had more categories under the subject variable such as “weapons/equipment” and “military targets” (p. 755).

⁵ Duncan (1951), later in his book *This is war!*, wrote about the situation: “Near the crude little farmhouse which served as an aid station for the wounded, I found two young corpsmen bandaging a silent, taut-faced peasant woman who had ignored the Army’s warning and stayed upon her land. An exploding Communist shell had driven fragments deep into her head and now she squatted, unflinching and tearless, while the corpsman’s probing fingers tried to remove the pieces of steel, and her infant son snuggled up close to her body and nursed for his breakfast. Bandaged and leaning warily against the wall of the gut, she seemed uncertain of which way to turn. Then a neighbor approached and, over my shoulder, mumbled a few words. Her head flew back and total anguish flamed behind her eyes. Her other son had just died from the same shell burst” (unpaginated, in Korea 1950 section, ¶ 57).

⁶ President Truman was later criticized for not obtaining a declaration of war from Congress before sending U.S. troops to Korea. He was accused for violating the spirit and the letter of the U.S. Constitution.

⁷ A counter-theme is a theme that contradicts a theme. For example, the counter-theme of “Defeat on the ground” is “Victory on the ground.” Counter-themes sometimes appeared but were not dominant.

⁸ David Douglas Duncan was one of the two photographers—the other one was Carl Mydans—who stayed in Korea during the whole period of the Korean War. Duncan was “the most celebrated war photographer in Korean War” (Bettel-Becker, 2005, p. 40). The July 24, 1950 issue of *Life* introduced him as a “new star reporter now covering Korea” (p. 16) and published the photographs he took for his previous assignments in other print media. Duncan was the primary rival to Robert Capa’s title of the world’s greatest war photographer. Capa, who was one of the Magnum founders and covered five wars before he died in Indochina in 1954, did not cover the Korean War.

⁹ It is an expression by the photographer, David Douglas Duncan. Readers cannot see the “orange” flames because the photograph is black and white.

¹⁰ This photograph was credited to U.S. Army Photo. *Newsweek*, in the issue of July 24, 1950, during the same week *Life* printed the picture, published a similar photograph from International Photos of the same soldier, but from a different angle.

¹¹ Moeller had an interview with David Douglas Duncan on November 14, 1986.

¹² The wounded soldier was Sergeant Leonard Young. He was one of the two Marines to whom Duncan dedicated his book (Duncan, 1951, unpaginated, in The Hill section, ¶ 30 and 31).

¹³ Duncan, as a Marine during World War II, pointed out that his “prejudiced Marine heart—influenced by the traditional coolness between the Marines and MacArthur—was pumping so that I could feel it under my fingerprints holding the camera” (*Life*, July 10, 1950, p. 26). He even described that MacArthur “seemed buoyant, his eyes possessed that same luminous brilliance which I had sometimes seen in the faces of fever patients (*Life*, July 10, 1950, p. 26).

¹⁴ Although Duncan, in the article, portrayed MacArthur’s posture as “arrogance and almost exasperating belligerence” when he described the general in the third photograph, this posture seems to appear more obviously in the full-size photograph on the ninth page, where he stands in front of his airplane.

¹⁵ The Philippines showed their affection for MacArthur in a groundbreaking ceremony for a statue of MacArthur’s cap in Cagayan de Oro city on February 1, 2008. MacArthur stopped by the city formerly known as the Macabalan before he left for Australia on March 13, 1942. Made of fiberglass and steel, the statue is the world’s biggest cap as recorded in the Guinness Book of World Records. It is eight meters in diameter and five meters in height (“Gen. MacArthur marker,” February 4, 2008). Retrieved from <http://www.pia.gov.ph/?m=12&fi=p080205.htm&no=46H>

¹⁶ MacArthur was very popular in the United States, receiving the media’s attention during the World War II. This made him a welcome subject for journalists and photographers by showing him on the beach with or shortly after the first wave of troops during the invasions (Janssens, 1995, p. 385).

¹⁷ *Life* changed the spelling from Inch'on to Inchon in its October 9, 1950 issue. This study uses Inchon.

¹⁸ David Douglas Duncan, an ex-Marine from World War II, dedicated his book *This is war!* to two U.S. Marines. One of them was Corporal Leonard Hayworth.

¹⁹ Some sources said that 300,000 Chinese troops entered the Korean War. See John W. Mason's *The Cold War, 1945-1991* (1996), p. 19.

²⁰ He said this in the section "In explanation" of his book.

²¹ This book, originally printed in 1951, was reprinted in 1979 and 1990. In the 1990 copy, Duncan added this comment in the section "In explanation."

²² A year later, a woman from Massachusetts sent a letter to editors with a photograph of the marine at his wedding after coming home. *Life* ran Duncan's picture and the wedding picture together. The letter wrote, "You might be interested in Cpl. Donald Ostergard, for *Life*'s David Douglas Duncan took his picture ("Christmas in Korea," *Life*, Dec. 25, 1950). He was one of the GIs who headed the Yalu, looked across to Manchuria and was caught behind the line at the Reservoir. He came home in October, was married in November and had his 20th birthday this month. Here is a snapshot of his wedding. He is at Fort Jackson, S.C. teaching techniques of combat warfare. Corporal Ostergard did not own up to *Life*'s picture until he came home. He did not want to worry his folks then he thought he would never see one again. He thought it a terrible picture of him, but this is no offense to Mr. Duncan. I think he will be more surprised to see it on your Christmas gift announcement card than when he first saw it in *Life*" ("Letters to the Editors," 1951, December 24, *Life*, p. 3).

²³ A note from an editor of *Life* in "Letter of editors" section said that most recent reports on U.N. battle casualties (including dead, wounded, missing in action and prisoners of war): Turkey, 948; United Kingdom, 892; France, 374; Australia, 265; Philippines, 150; Netherlands, 106; Greece, 66; Canada, 30; New Zealand, 7.

²⁴ Henri-Cartier Bresson, one of the founding members of Magnum, commented on Bischof's pictures in India in 1951 that "despite his deliberate disregard of his training in his urgency among the starving populace, his innate abilities show through in all the images." He added that Bischof's photographs are "structured above all around light," which has a symbolic potential (Zimmer, 2001, September 2).

²⁵ Robert Capa did not go to the Korean War. Kershaw (2003) indicated that it was perhaps because he was shaken by a near miss in Tel Aviv. Capa did not seem to feel strong enough to risk his life in Korea. He once said, "In a war you must hate somebody or love somebody... you must have a position or you cannot stand what goes on." However, Kershaw suggested another possible reason Capa did not go to Korea: no desperate need for money at that time. He concluded, "Watching an imperial power kill peasants was not yet worth the risk" (p. 244).

²⁶ The article is not included in the photographic packages for this study's analysis.

²⁷ The *Manchurian Candidate* is originally a novel written in 1959 by Richard Condon. It was adapted into films in 1962 and 2004.

²⁸ This picture of Kang in eight-by-nine size was reprinted in the section of "What's in a picture" in the December 31, 1951 issue of *Life*. The note reads: "Sometimes only to see is to know. What words could convey the tragic poise of this small boy's face . . . this fixity of the eyes, this old-man set of jaw? Kang Koo Ri was found orphaned, naked in a Korean hut. For a moment a war had singled him out, whirled devastatingly around him, and then had gone away, having robbed a child of his mother, his father, his brother, and his smile. It had happened many times before. But hardly ever had the camera conveyed with such eloquence and power what war can do to a child. Sometimes only to see is to understand" ("What's in the Picture," *Life*, 1951, p. 90).

At the bottom of the note with *Life*'s logo is the *Life*'s motto: ". . . to see life . . . to see the world . . . to eyewitness great events."

²⁹ His comment appeared in the section "Korea 1950."

³⁰ This subtle detail could not have been recognized by the photographer at that time because he did not mention about it although he described the South Korean refugees in his article. This detail could not also have been recognized by American readers at that time and even now.

For the researcher, looking at the photographs of Korean civilians was like doing a photo-elicitation to herself. Photo-elicitation, originated from a fieldwork technique in visual sociology and adapted into photojournalism by Dr. Cynthia Zoe Smith, is a research method to help better understand the sources of research (or photographs) by giving them their own voices. In this method, a researcher (or photographer) shows his/her photographs to his/her subjects and let them freely talk about which elements appeal to them and why in order to "produce information that is more deeply grounded in the phenomenology of the subject," which "otherwise go unnoticed" (Harper, 1988, p. 65). This method, with the information from the subject, can shed a new light on images "that the photographer might have considered, from his or her own cultural perspective, too 'boring' or 'common place' even to considering" (Harper, 1986, p. 26).

For the researcher, looking at the photographs of Korean civilians inevitably produced a lot of emotions such as sympathy, sadness, and even anger. As a Korean, I have grown up listening to my mother and aunts who sometimes talked about their experiences when they fled from North Korea to south during the Korean War. My mother, the youngest sibling and seven years old at that time, remembers that most of the time she was on her mother's back while her third older sister, who was nine years at that time, had to walk with no help. So tired and frustrated, her third older sister once ran onto a road to die during North Korean bombing. My mother's second older sister almost missed her family in a huge crowd when they took a train toward the south. My mother's oldest sister had to disguise herself as a man with charcoal not to be raped by North Korean soldiers.

When the researcher look at this typical photograph of refugees, she felt a great sorrow on their pathetic situations where they even did not know how bad the situation was.

³¹ This picture was printed later in the book *Century*, published in 1999 (Bernard (ed.), 1999, p. 578).

³² The abrupt composition of the photograph is unusual for Bourke-White as Goldberg pointed out in her book, *Margaret Bourke-White: A Biography* (1986). The juxtaposition of the severed head and a cropped arm in the close-up is surrealistic in that it makes the head look like it is floating in the air. Goldberg (1986) said about the composition, “She generally leaned on classical principles of balance and containment in her compositions, even for scenes of horror, a legacy of her training in Clarence White’s school and of her view-camera approach to composition. The ambiguous space of this Korean picture, and especially spatial disjunction, and raw immediacy of the so-called snapshot aesthetics of some 35 mm photographers” (p. 335).

³³ Bourke-White said that Churl Jin was disillusioned with the Communists because they promised him the farmers would get a better life, but rather than working for it, they treated villagers badly by beating them up, seizing their food, and burning their houses (Bourke-White, 1963, p. 351). One of female captives Bourke-White met said that she joined the Communists because they promised her an education as well as a position of increased dignity in the community, which was fulfilled for a while (Bourke-White, 1963, p. 342).

³⁴ Eugene Smith staged the scene when he photographed a Japanese girl Tomoko, whose body was crippled by mercury thrown into the sea of a fishing village Minamata, Japan. On a chilly afternoon in December 1971, he set the time he photographed, considering the perfect lighting in the bathroom where Tomoko’s mother bathed her daughter (Maddow, 1985, p. 72-73).

³⁵ This photographic package has more than 10 photographs, but was not included in this study’s ideological analysis because the theme—“Victory on the ground,” which is an anti-theme of “Defeat on the ground”—of the package was not minor compared to the main theme—“MacArthur as a hero”—during the second period of the war.

³⁶ This book, originally printed in 1951, was reprinted in 1979 and 1990. In the 1990 copy, the forward by Harrison E. Salisbury was added.

³⁷ Duncan (1951), in his book *This is war!*, indicated that integrating South Korean soldiers into U.S. Army could help not only make them fight with American leadership and companionship, but also solve “the great social and political problem raised by the violence with which so many of the civilian refugees had been met by the retreating and harassed Americans” (unpaginated, in Korea 1950 section, ¶ 74).

Appendix 1

Coding List for Content Analysis

A. Main Subject

1. Arsenal
2. Troops
3. Political leaders
4. Military leaders
5. Military casualties
6. POWs
7. Combat
8. Destruction
9. Civilian casualties
10. Civilian life
11. Media
12. Public demonstrations
13. Historical photos
14. Other

B. Nation

1. US
2. Allied
3. USSR
4. China
5. South Korea
6. North Korea
7. Japan
8. Other

Appendix 2

List of Themes for Ideological Analysis

1. Victory in the air
 - 1) American pilots as heroes
 - 2) Well-trained and well-organized U.S. Air Force
 - 3) American air superior air power

2. Defeat on the ground
 - 1) American inferior ground power
 - 2) American casualties
 - 3) No morale for war
 - 4) American soldiers coming home as survivors not as heroes

3. Unready/Unpopular war
 - 1) American political leader's indecisiveness
 - 2) American military leaders' disagreement with political leaders
 - 3) American troops' unpreparedness
 - 4) Shortage of American military supplies
 - 5) American public's disfavor for the war

4. MacArthur as a hero

5. Good v. evil (justice v. immoral)
 - 1) U.S. soldiers as good guys
 - 2) Communist POWs well-treated by the U.N.
 - 3) U.N. POWs badly-treated by the Communists
 - 4) Communists' malicious propaganda

6. Paternalism (tutelage) / Humanitarianism
 - 1) U.S. soldiers as good guys
 - 2) South Korean political leader
 - 3) South Korean troops
 - 4) South Korean orphan

7. Tragedy of Korea
 - 1) South Korean refugee
 - 2) South Korean casualty
 - 3) Friend or foe (guerilla war): inhumane savagery

8. Other
 - 1) Media
 - 2) Korean winter uniform
 - 3) Farewell of an American soldier to his girlfriend

Appendix 3

Theme(s) for Each Photographic Package for Ideological Analysis

1. The United States Goes to the Korean War Only to Retreat (July 1950 to August 1950)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1950.07.10.	U.S. gets	●	●		●	●	●	●	●
	Sycamore			○					
	Korea							●	
1950.07.17	War by	●	●						
	The home			●					
1950.07.24.	Why are		●						
	The U.S.			●					
	Washington			●					
	Yanks hit			●					
1950.08.07.	Silver city			○					
1950.08.14.	Communists		●	●					
1950.08.21.	U.S. counters	●	○					●	
1950.08.28.	Japan				●				
1950.09.04.	Big pipeline			○					
1950.09.11.	Peripatetic		○						
	The ROKs						○		
1950.09.18.	This is war		●						
	War in the	●	○						
Total		4	5-3	5-3	2	1	1-1	3	1

● theme

○ anti-theme

* The titles of the photographic packages analyzed for this study were marked in bold letters.

2. MacArthur's Inchon Landing and Recapturing of Seoul (September 1950 to November 1950)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1950.09.25.	MacArthur				●				
1950.10.02.	The invasion				●				
	Girl war								●
1950.10.09.	Seoul				●				
1950.10.30.	Hard hitting		○						
1950.11.06.	Camera		○						
Total			-2		3				1

- theme
- anti-theme

* The titles of the photographic packages analyzed for this study were marked in bold letters.

3. China Intervene and the United Nations Retreat to 38 Parallel (from November 1950 to June 1951)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1950.11.20.	Aggressive		○						
1950.11.27.	Speaking								●
1950.12.11.	Once more		●	●					
1950.12.18.	Sycamore			○					
1950.12.25.	There was		●						
1951.01.08.	We walk		●					●	
1951.01.15.	We head		●					●	
1951.01.29.	Recruits			●					
	The medal								●
1951.02.19.	GIs become		○						
1951.02.26.	Other U.N.			○					
1951.03.19.	Marines come		●						
1951.04.09.	Airborne			○					
1951.04.16.	The youngsters			●					
1951.04.23.	Tattoo			●	●				
1951.04.30.	The old soldier			●	●				
1951.05.07.	Reds shove		●						
1951.05.14.	MacArthur			●	●				
1951.05.28.	Face of		○						
1951.06.04.	Red attack		○						
Total			6-4	6-3	3			2	2

● theme

○ anti-theme

* The titles of the photographic packages analyzed for this study were marked in bold letters.

4. Stalemate (July 1951 to July 1953)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1951.07.09.	Sunday		● ○						
1951.07.23.	Ridgway		● ○						
	The little boy						●		
1951.10.08.	How to			●					
1951.10.22.	But it is			●					
1951.12.10.	In sided	●	●						
1952.03.31.	Prisoners'					●			
1952.04.14.	Speaking					●			
1952.05.19.	Red China's					●			
1952.09.15.	Marine and								●
1952.10.27.	Korean War		●						
1952.11.10.	Christmas			●					
1952.12.01.	A savage							●	
1952.12.08.	New administration			○					
1952.12.15.	A man and			○					
1953.03.30.	Marine's view								
1953.04.13.	Peace talk					●			
1953.04.27.	Big exchange					●			
1953.05.04.	The prisoners					●			
1953.05.11.	Photos reveal					●			
	Into eager		●						
1953.05.25.	Valley Forge					●			
1953.06.22.	One man						●		
1953.06.29.	Empty camps						●		
Total		1	4-2	3-2		8	3	1	1

● theme

○ anti-theme

* The titles of the photographic packages analyzed for this study were marked in bold letters.

5. Armistice But Not the End of War (July 1953)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1953.08.03.	No whistles		●						
1953.08.10.	How the truce		●						
Total			2						

- theme
- anti-theme

* The titles of the photographic packages analyzed for this study were marked in bold letters.

Appendix 4

List of the Photographic Packages for Ideological Analysis (In Chronological Order)

1. U.S. gets into fight for Korea. (1950, July 10). *Life*, 29(2), pp. 19-27.
Photographs and article by David Douglas Duncan (with introduction by an editor).
2. War by jet and by G.I. (1950, July 17). *Life*, 29(3), pp. 27-39.
David Duncan photographs jet strike at 600 MPH (“Thunderbolts along my spine”).
pp. 27-32.
Photographs and text by David Douglas Duncan (with an introduction by an editor).
Carl Mydans accompanies infantry into fighting (Mydans goes up to the fighting).
pp. 33-37.
Photographs and text by Carl Mydans (with an introduction by an editor).
* Photograph by Ralph Crane from Black Star. pp. 39-39.
3. Why are we taking a beating? (1950, July 24). *Life*, 29(4), pp. 21-25.
Photographs and text by Carl Mydans (with an introduction by an editor).
4. U.S. counters mass with mobility. (1950, August 21). *Life*, 29(8), pp. 14-23.
Photographs and text by David Douglas Duncan and Carl Mydans.
Text by John Osborne and James Bell.
5. This is war. (1950, September 18). *Life*, 29(12), pp. 41-47.
Photographs and text by David Douglas Duncan (with an introduction by an editor).
6. The invasion. (1950, October 2). *Life*, 29(14), pp. 23-33.
Photographs by Carl Mydans and Hank Walker.
7. Seoul and victory. (1950, October 9). *Life*, 29(15), pp. 29-37.
Photographs by Hank Walker, David Douglas Duncan, and Carl Mydans.
Text by David Douglas Duncan (and an editor).
8. Once more “We got a hell of a beating.” (1950, December 11). *Life*, 29(24), pp. 32-45.
Photographs by Hank Walker and text by Roy Rowan (with an introduction by an editor). pp. 32-37.
Photographs by Jun Miki, A.P., U.S. Air Force, Alfred Eisenstaedt, Ralph Morse, George Skadding, INT., Mark Kauffman, Geroge Skadding, Joe Clark, Ralph Crane, Wallace Kirkland, Thomas D. McAvoy, David E. Scherman; Mark Kauffman; Mark Kauffman, pp. 38-45.

9. There was a Christmas in Korea. (1950, December 25). *Life*, 29(26), pp. 8-19.
Photographs and text by David Douglas Duncan, pp. 8-15.
Photographs by Hank Walker, pp. 16-19.
10. Other U.N. troops: They also serve. (1951, February 26). *Life*, 30(9), pp. 104-107.
Photographs by Carl Mydans.
11. Marines come home from the front. (1951, March 19). *Life*, 30(12), pp. 35-39.
Photographs by Wayne Miller.
12. An old soldier fades away into new glory. (1951, April 30). *Life*, 30(18), pp. 22-33.
Photographs by Bill Stahl for New York Daily Mirror, Carl Mydans, Joe Scherschel, Wayne Miller, Hank Walker, Acme, A.P., Mark Koffman, New York Daily News, Lisa Larsen, Edward Clark, Los Angeles Examiner from International, Leonard McCombe, Lisa Larsen, Michael Rougier, Ben Price for New York Herald Tribune, Leonard McCombe, and Peter Stackpole, George Skadding, and Peter Stackpole.
13. The little boy who wouldn't smile. (1951, July 23). *Life*, 31(4), pp. 91-94, 97-98.
Photographs and text by Michael Rougier.
14. Prisoners' island. (1952, March 31). *Life*, 32(13), pp. 92-98.
Photographs by Werner Bischof.
15. A savage, secret war is waged in Korea. (1952, December 1). *Life*, 33(22), pp. 25-35.
Photographs text by Margaret Bourke-White.
16. Photos reveal some GIs not on exchange list. (1953, May 11). *Life*, 34(19), pp. 27-31.
No name.
17. No whistles, no cheers, no dancing for Korea. (1953, August 3). *Life*, 34(5), pp. 15-19.
Photographs by Mark Kauffman, A.P., Carl Mydans, Michael Rougier, Howard Sochurek, Hank Walker, Margaret Bourke-White, Hank Walker, David Douglas Duncan.

Appendix 5

Photographic Packages for Ideological Analysis (In the Same Order as in Appendix 4)

The photographs analyzed for ideological analysis could not be included because of copyright issues. The list of the figures mentioned in the study and their corresponding pages from *Life* magazine is in this appendix.

1. U.S. gets into fight for Korea. (1950, July 10). *Life*, 29(2), pp. 19-27.
 - Figure 1 p. 19.
 - Figure 2 pp. 20-21.
 - Figure 3 pp. 22-23.
 - Figure 4 pp. 24-25.
 - Figure 5 pp. 26-27.

2. War by jet and by G.I. (1950, July 17). *Life*, 29(3), pp. 27-39.
 - Figure 6 cover page.
 - Figure 7 p. 27.
 - Figure 8 pp. 28-29.
 - Figure 9 pp. 30-31.
 - Figure 10 pp. 32-33.
 - Figure 11 pp. 34-35.
 - Figure 12 pp. 36-37.
 - Figure 13 pp. 38-39.

3. Why are we taking a beating? (1950, July 24). *Life*, 29(4), pp. 21-25.
 - Figure 14 p. 21.
 - Figure 15 pp. 22-23.
 - Figure 16 pp. 24-25.

4. U.S. counters mass with mobility. (1950, August 21). *Life*, 29(8), pp. 14-23.
 - Figure 17 pp. 14-15.
 - Figure 18 pp. 16-17.
 - Figure 19 pp. 18-19.
 - Figure 20 pp. 20-21.
 - Figure 21 pp. 22-23.

5. This is war. (1950, September 18). *Life*, 29(12), pp. 41-47.
 - Figure 22 41.
 - Figure 23 pp. 42-43.
 - Figure 24 pp. 44-45.
 - Figure 25 pp. 46-47.

6. The invasion. (1950, October 2). *Life*, 29(14), pp. 23-33.
 - Figure 26 p. 23.
 - Figure 27 pp. 24-25.
 - Figure 28 pp. 26-27.
 - Figure 29 pp. 28-29.
 - Figure 30 pp. 30-31.
 - Figure 31 pp. 32-33.

7. Seoul and victory. (1950, October 9). *Life*, 29(15), pp. 29-37.
 - Figure 32 p. 29.
 - Figure 33 pp. 30-31.
 - Figure 34 pp. 32-33.
 - Figure 35 pp. 34-35.
 - Figure 36 pp. 36-37.

8. Once more “We got a hell of a beating.” (1950, December 11). *Life*, 29(24), pp. 32-45.
 - Figure 37 pp. 32-33.
 - Figure 38 pp. 34-35.
 - Figure 39 pp. 36-37.
 - Figure 40 pp. 38-39.
 - Figure 41 pp. 40-41.
 - Figure 42 pp. 42-43.
 - Figure 43 pp. 44-45.

9. There was a Christmas in Korea. (1950, December 25). *Life*, 29(26), pp. 8-19.
 - Figure 44 pp. 8-9.
 - Figure 45 pp. 10-11.
 - Figure 46 pp. 12-13.
 - Figure 47 pp. 14-15.
 - Figure 48 pp. 16-17.
 - Figure 49 pp. 18-19.

10. Other U.N. troops: They also serve. (1951, February 26). *Life*, 30(9), pp. 104-107.
 - Figure 50 pp. 104-105.
 - Figure 51 pp. 106-107.

11. Marines come home from the front. (1951, March 19). *Life*, 30(12), pp. 35-39.
 - Figure 52 p. 35.
 - Figure 53 pp. 36-37.
 - Figure 54 pp. 38-39.

12. An old soldier fades away into new glory. (1951, April 30). *Life*, 30(18), pp. 22-33.
Figure 55 cover page.
Figure 56 pp. 22-23.
Figure 57 pp. 24-25.
Figure 58 pp. 26-27.
Figure 59 pp. 28-29.
Figure 60 pp. 30-31.
Figure 61 pp. 32-33.
13. The little boy who wouldn't smile. (1951, July 23). *Life*, 31(4), pp. 91-94, 97-98.
Figure 62 p. 91.
Figure 63 pp. 92-93.
Figure 64 p. 97.
Figure 65 pp. 36-37.
Figure 66 pp. 38-39.
14. Prisoners' island. (1952, March 31). *Life*, 32(13), pp. 92-98.
Figure 67 p. 92-93.
Figure 68 pp. 94-95.
Figure 69 pp. 96-97
Figure 70 p. 98.
15. A savage, secret war is waged in Korea. (1952, December 1). *Life*, 33(22), pp. 25-35.
Figure 71 p. 25.
Figure 72 pp. 26-27.
Figure 73 pp. 28-29
Figure 74 pp. 30-31.
Figure 75 pp. 32-33.
Figure 76 pp. 34-35.
16. Photos reveal some GIs not on exchange list. (1953, May 11). *Life*, 34(19), pp. 27-31.
Figure 77 p. 27.
Figure 78 pp. 28-29.
Figure 79 pp. 30-31
17. No whistles, no cheers, no dancing for Korea. (1953, August 3). *Life*, 34(5), pp. 15-19.
Figure 80 p. 15.
Figure 81 pp. 16-17.
Figure 82 pp. 18-19.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Life Photographic Packages (For an Ideological Analysis: In Alphabetical Order for Each Year)

1950

Duncan, D. D. (1950a, July 10). U.S. gets into fight for Korea. *Life*, 29(2), pp. 19-27.

Duncan, D. D. (1950b, September 18). This is war. *Life*, 29(12), pp. 41-47.

Duncan, D. D., & Mydans, C. (1950, July 17). War by jet and by G.I. *Life*, 29(3), pp. 27-39.

Duncan, D. D., & Walker, H. (1950, December 25). There was a Christmas in Korea. *Life*, 29(26), pp. 8-19.

Mydans, C. (1950, July 24). Why are we taking a beating? *Life*, 29(4), pp. 21-25.

Once more "We got a hell of a beating." (1950, December 11). *Life*, 29(24), pp. 32-45.

Osborne, J., Duncan, D. D., Bell, J., & Mydans, C. (1950, August 21). U.S. counters mass with mobility. *Life*, 29(8), pp. 14-23.

Seoul and victory. (1950, October 9). *Life*, 29(15), pp. 29-37.

The invasion. (1950, October 2). *Life*, 29(14), pp. 23-33.

1951

An old soldier fades away into new glory. (1951, April 30). *Life*, 30(18), pp. 22-33.

Marines come home from the front. (1951, March 19). *Life*, 30(12), pp. 35-39.

Other U.N. troops: They also serve. (1951, February 26). *Life*, 30(9), pp. 104-107.

Rougier, M. (1951, July 23). The little boy who wouldn't smile. *Life*, 31(4), pp. 91-94, 97-98.

1952

A savage, secret war is waged in Korea. (1952, December 1). *Life*, 33(22), pp. 25-35.

Prisoners' island. (1952, March 31). *Life*, 32(13), pp. 92-98.

1953

No whistles, no cheers, no dancing for Korea. (1953, August 3). *Life*, 34(5), pp. 15-19.

Photos reveal some GIs not on exchange list. (1953, May 11). *Life*, 34(19), pp. 27-31.

* **Note:** Most of the photographic packages include introductions by *Life* staff even when they were written by other authors.

Life Articles and Editorials

1950

Action of faith. (1950, November 6). *Life*, 29(19), p. 34

A mighty job. (1950, July 10). *Life*, 29(2), p. 35.

A restored position. (1950, July 17). *Life*, 29(3), p. 40.

Chinese Communists enter Korean War. (1950, November 13). *Life*, 29(20), pp. 43-44.

Contents. (1950, July 17). *Life*, 29(3), p. 25

Duncan, D. D. (1950, September 11). The ROKs proves to be durable fighters (The durable ROKs). *Life*, 29(11), pp. 52-55.

Five fecund years (1950, July 31). *Life*, 29(5), p. 31.

Hard-hitting U.N. forces wind up war. (1950, October 30, 1950). *Life*, 29(18), pp. 21-25.

Ideals and action. (1950, September 11). *Life*, 29(11), p. 56.

Letters to the editors. (1950, July 31). *Life*, 29(5), pp. 2, 4.

Letters to the editors. (1950, August 7). *Life*, 29(6), pp. 7-8, 10, 12, 17.

Letters to the editors. (1950, August 14). *Life*, 29(7), pp. 6, 8, 11.

Letters to the editors. (1950, September 11). *Life*, 29(11), pp. 8, 11-12, 16, 18.

Letters to the editors. (1950, October 9). *Life*, 29(15), pp. 4, 6, 8, 11.

MacArthur's detractors. (1950, August 21). *Life*, 29(8), p. 28

Osborne, J. (1950a, August 21). Report from the Orient: Guns are not enough. *Life*, 29(8), pp. 76-85.

Osborne, J. (1950b, November 27). "My dear General": Letters of MacArthur and Prime Ministers reveal how occupied Japan is ruled. *Life*, 29(22), pp. 127-139.

Planes pave way for the landing. (1950, September 25). *Life*, 29(13), pp. 36-39.

Salute to our warriors, (1950, October 9). *Life*, 29(15), p. 38.

Some A-bomb fallacies. (1950, July 24). *Life*, 29(4), pp. 81-90.

Sycamore, Ill, backs Truman. (1950, July 10). *Life*, 29(2), pp. 30-31.

The blessing of God. (1950, December 25). *Life*, 29(26), p. 20.

The nation begins "creeping" mobilization. (1950, July 24). *Life*, 29(4), pp. 30-31.

The U.S. tries to catch up on tanks. (1950, July 31). *Life*, 29(5), pp. 13-19.

U.S. fights delaying actions and sets up two defense lines. (1950, July 17). *Life*, 29(3), p. 32.

Why not swap horses? (1950, October 23). *Life*, 29(17), p. 36.

1951

Atomic progress. (1951, January 1). *Life*, 30(1), pp. 22-35.

Atomic tests light up for states. (1951, February 12). *Life*, 30(7), pp. 25-27.

A will to win. (1951, May 14). *Life*, 30(20), p. 40

Letters to the editors. (1951, January 15). *Life*, 30(3), pp. 10, 12-13.

Letters to the editors. (1951, March 19). *Life*, 30(12), pp. 9-10, 12, 15-16, 18.

Letters to the editors. (1951, August 13). *Life*, 31(7), pp. 4, 6, 8, 11.

Letters to the editors. (1951, September 10). *Life*, 31(11), pp. 17, 20.

Tattoo for a warrior. (1951, April 23). *Life*, 30(17), pp. 29-38.

The role of MacArthur. (1951, April 23). *Life*, 30(17), p. 42.

This way to peace. (1951, March 12). *Life*, 30(11), p. 36.

We worry our allies. (1951, January 22). *Life*, 30(4), pp. 32-33.

What's in the picture. (1951, December 31). *Life*, 31(27), p. 90

1952

A gallant woman joins men who report war. (1952, December 1). *Life*, 33(22), p. 23.

Korean Mansei. (1952, December 8). *Life*, 33(23), p. 37.

1953

Big exchange gets under way. (1953, April 27). *Life*, 34(17), pp. 27-31.

Brinkley, W. (1953, May 25). Valley Forge GIs tell of their brainwashing ordeal. *Life*, 34(21), pp. 108-110, 113-116, 121-122, 124.

Life on the newsfronts of the world. (1953, June 8). *Life*, 34(23), p. 41.

One old man against the truce. (1953, June 22). *Life*, 34(25), p. 19.

Secondary Sources

Acheson, D. (1969). *Present at the creation: My years at the State Department*. New York, Norton, Inc., (pp. 355-358). Retrieved November 16, 2007, from <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/acheson4.htm>

Adoni, H., & Mane, S. (1984). Media and the social construction of reality: Toward an integration of theory and research. *Communication Research*, 11(3), 323-340.

Aima, A. (1999, August). *The framing of Saddam Hussein: U.S. foreign policy and coverage of Iraq in Times Magazine, 1979-1998*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, New Orleans, LA.

All POW-MIA Korean War Casualties. (n.d.). Retrieved November 16, 2007, from http://www.aiipowmia.com/koreacw/kwkia_menu.html

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and the ideological state apparatuses. In *Lenin and Philosophy, and other essays* (pp. 127-186). New York: Monthly Review Press.

- Barrett, T. (2000). *Criticizing photographs: An introduction to understanding images* (3rd ed.). New York: The McGraw-Hill Company, Inc.
- Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies* (A. Lavers, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang. (Original work published 1957).
- Barthes, R. (1977). Rhetoric of the image. In S. Heath (Ed. & Trans.) *Image, music, text* (pp. 32-51). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barthes, R. (1981). *Camera lucida* (R. Howard, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang. (Original work published 1980).
- Barthes, R. (1982). The photographic message. In S. Sontag (Ed.), *A Barthes reader* (pp. 194-210). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Berger, A. A. (1998a). *Seeing is believing: An introduction to visual communication*. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Berger, A. A. (1998b). *Media research techniques* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, London: Sage Publications.
- Berger, A. A. (2000). *Media and communication research methods: An introduction to qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Berger, J. (1972). *Ways of seeing*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Doubleday.
- Berkowitz, D. (2005). Suicide bombers as women warriors: Making news through mythical archetypes. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(3), 607-622.
- Bernard, B. (2002). *Century: One hundred years of human progress, regression, suffering, and hope*. London: Phaidon.
- Blair, C. (1987). *The forgotten war: America in Korea, 1950-1953*. New York: Times Books.
- Bourke-White, M. (1963). *Portrait of myself*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bradsher, K. (2003, March 3). Threats and responses: Korean peninsula; North Korea says a U.S. attack could lead to a nuclear war. *The New York Times*, p. A14.
- Brennen, B., & Duffy, M. (2003). 'If a problem cannot be solved, enlarge it': An ideological critique of the 'Other' in Pearl Harbor and September 11 New York Times coverage. *Journalism Studies*, 4(1), 3-15.

- Bush, G. W. (2002, January 29). The President's State of the Union address. *The White House*. Retrieved November 17, 2004, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>
- Carey, J. (1988). *Communication as culture: Essays on media and society*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Carlson, L. H. (2002). *Remembered prisoners of a forgotten war: an oral history of the Korean War POWs*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Carter, J. (2003, September 1). U.S.-North Korea war seems "strong possibility." *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2003-09-01-carter_x.htm
- Chaffee, S. H. (1991). *Communication concepts I: Explication*. London: Sage.
- Choe, S. H., Hanley, C. J., & Mendoza, M. (2006, May 29). War's hidden chapter: Ex-GIs tell of killing Korean refugees. *The Associated Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.pulitzer.org/archives/6350>
- Chung, H. S. (2005). Hollywood goes to Korea: Biopic politics and Douglas Sirk's *Battle Hymn* (1957). *Historical Journal of Film, Radio & Television*, 25(1), 51-80.
- Cohen, E. A., & Gooch, J. (1990). *Military misfortunes: The anatomy of failure in war*. Free Press.
- Cormack, M. (1995). *Ideology*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Cumings, B. (1981). *The origins of the Korean War, Vol. I*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Cumings, B. (1990). *The origins of the Korean War, Vol. II*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. Princeton University Press.
- Cumings, B. (1997). *Korea's place in the sun: a modern history*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- D'Angelo, P. (2002). News framing as a multiparadigmatic research program: A response to Entman. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 870-888.
- Donovan, R. J. (1996). *Tumultuous years: the presidency of Harry S. Truman, 1949-1953*. Give 'em hell Harry series. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Doss, E. L. (2001). *Looking at Life magazine*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

- Duncan, D. D. (1951). *This is war! A photo narrative in three parts*. New York: Harper.
- Duncan, D. D. (2003). *Photo nomad*. New York: Harper. National Geographic.
- Doughty, D. (1993). Constructing Palestinians: Visual rhetoric and work organization in a news magazine documentary. *Visual Sociology*, 8(2), 4-20.
- Dupuy, R. E., & Dupuy, T. N. (1984). *Military heritage of America*. Fairfax, Va: Hero Books.
- Elson, R. T. (1968). *Time, Inc.: The intimate history of a publishing enterprise, 1923-1941*, vol. 1. New York: Atheneum.
- Entman, R. M. (1991). Framing U.S. coverage of international news: Contrasts in narratives of the KAL and Iran Air incidents. *Journal of communication*, 41(4): 6-27.
- Entman, R. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*. 43(4), 51-58.
- Fahmy, S. (2007). "They Took It Down": Exploring Determinants of Visual Reporting in the Toppling of the Saddam Statue in National and International Newspapers. *Mass Communication & Society*, 10(2), 143-170.
- Fears, L. (1995, August). *Comparing portrayal of women in black and white magazines*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington, D.C.
- Fiske, J. (1989). *Reading the popular*. Boston, MA: Unwin and Hyman.
- Gaily, H, A. (1995). *The war in the Pacific: From Pearl Harbor to Tokyo Bay*. Novato, CA: Presido Press.
- Gamson, W. (1991). *Talking politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gen. MacArthur marker to vie for a Guinness world record. (2008, February 4). The *Manila Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.manilatimes.net/national/2008/feb/04/yehey/prov/20080204pro5.html>
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Goffman, E. (1979). *Gender advertisements*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

- Goldberg, V. (1986). *Margaret Bourke-White: A biography*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goldberg, V. (1991). *The power of photography: How photographs changed our lives*. New York: Abbeville.
- Goncharov, S. N., Lewis, J. W., & Xue, L. (1993). *Uncertain partners: Stalin, Mao, and the Korean War*. Studies in international security and arms control. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.
- Goodman, J. R. (1999, August). *The women's suffrage movement through the eyes of Life magazine cartoons*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, New Orleans, LA.
- Gould, L. L., & Greffe, R. (1977). *Photojournalist: The career of Jimmy Hare*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Griffin, M. & Lee, J. (1995). Picturing the Gulf War: Constructing an image of war in Time, Newsweek, and U.S. News & World Report. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 72(4), 813-825.
- Griffin, M. (2004a). Photos from Abu Ghraib: No pictures, no story? *MESSAGE: Internationale Fachzeitschrift für Journalismus* 3, 2-7.
- Griffin, M. (2004b). Picturing America's "War on Terrorism" in Afghanistan and Iraq: Photographic motifs as news frames. *Journalism: Theory, Practice, Criticism*, 5(4), 381-403.
- Griffin, M. (2004c, May). *Picturing the invasion of Iraq: Photos as news frames*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Hagaman, D. (1993). The joy of victory, the agony of defeat: Stereotypes in newspaper sports feature photographs. *Visual Sociology*, 8(2), 48-66.
- Halberstam, D. (2007). *The coldest winter: American and the Korean War*. New York: Hyperion.
- Hall, S. (1973). The Determination of News Photographs, In S. Cohen and J. Young (Eds.), *The Manufacture of News: A reader* (pp. 176-190). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hall, S. (1980a). *Culture, media, language*. London: Hutchinson & Co.

- Hall, S. (1980b). Cultural studies: Two paradigms. *Media, Culture and Society*, 2(2), 57-72. Reprinted in R. Collins et al. (Eds.) (1986), *Media, culture and society: A critical reader* (pp. 33-48). London: Sage Publications.
- Hall, S. (1982). The rediscovery of ideology: Return of the repressed in media studies. In M. Gurevitch et al. (Eds.), *Culture, Society, and the Media* (pp. 56-90). London: Methuen.
- Hall, S. (1985). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post-structuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2(2), 91-114.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Hallin, D. C. (1989). *The "uncensored war": The media and Vietnam*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hallin, D. C., & Gitlin, T. (1993). Agon and ritual: The Gulf War as popular culture and as television drama. *Political Communication*, 10(4), 411-424.
- Halstead, D. (2004 May). *Photo nomad: The legend continues*. Retrieved from http://www.digitaljournalist.org/issue0405/halstead_ddd.html
- Harper, D. (1986). Meaning and work: A study in photo-elicitation. *Current sociology*, 34(3): pp. 24-46.
- Harper, D. (1988). Visual sociology: Expanding sociological vision. *The American sociologist*, 19(1): pp. 54-70.
- Harris, N. (1970). *The land of contrasts: 1880-1901*. New York: G. Braziller.
- Hedgecoe, J. (2002). *The photographer's handbook* (3rd ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Hanley, C. J., & Mendoza, M. (2006, May 29). U.S. policy was to shoot Korean refugees. *The Washington Post, The Associated Press*. Retrieved from The Washington Post Online: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/05/29/AR2006052900485.html>
- Hickey, M. (2001, August 1). *The Korean War: An overview*. Retrieved November 16, 2007, from BBC Web site: http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/worldwars/coldwar/korea_hickey_04.shtml
- Hicks, W. (1952). *Words and pictures; An introduction to photojournalism*. New York: Harper.

- Higgins, M. (1951). *War in Korea: The report of a woman combat correspondent*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday.
- Hoganson, K. L. (1998). *Fighting for American manhood: How gender politics provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hunt, M. H. (1987). *Ideology and U.S. foreign policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- In depth: The Korean War. (n.d.). *BBC news*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/spl/hi/asia_pac/03/the_korean_war/html/default.stm
- Howard Sochurek. (1984, June 25). Interview by Vicki Goldberg..
- Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Janssens, R. V. A. (1995). "What future for Japan?": U.S. wartime planning for the postwar era, 1942-1945. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Johnson, L. (2007, July 5). Pol honors 'forgotten.' *New York Daily News*: 01 Suburban. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu:2228/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?risb=21_T2613984448&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsURLKey=29_T2613984451&cisb=22_T2613984450&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=151550&docNo=1
- Kamhawi, R. (2002, August). *Television News and the Palestinian Israeli conflict: An analysis of visual and verbal framing*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Visual Communication Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Miami Beach, FL.
- Keep your shirts on. (1950, December 18). *Time*, p. 18
- Kerlinger, F. N. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kershaw, A. (2003). *Blood and champagne: the life and times of Robert Capa*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books/St. Martin's Press.
- Klein, C. (2003). *Cold War orientalism Asia in the middlebrow imagination, 1945-1961*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kobre, K. (2000). *Photojournalism: The professionals' approach* (4th ed.). Boston: Focal Press.

- Korean War. (2008). In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved July 18, 2008, from Encyclopaedia Britannica Online: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/322419/Korean-War>
- Kozol, W. (1994). *Life's America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kratzer, B. (2003, August). *An ideological critique of the American frontier myth in the photography Arthur Rothstein and Alan Berner*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Kansas City, MO.
- Lafeber, W. (1997). *America, Russia and the Cold War, 1945-1996* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Humanities, Inc.
- Landers, J. (1997, August). *War stories: Coverage of U.S. military operation in Vietnam by Newsweek, Time and U.S. News & World Report, 1965-1973*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Chicago, IL.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). *Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf*. Retrieved October 4, 2004, from The University of Oregon, Philosophy Department Web site: <http://philosophy.uoregon.edu/metaphor/lakoff-l.htm>
- Lakoff, G. (2003, March 18). *Metaphor and war, again*. Retrieved October 4, 2004, from AlterNet Web site: <http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=15414>
- Larson, P. (1991). Textual analysis of fictional media content. In K. B. Jensen & N. W. Jankowski (Eds.), *A handbook of qualitative methodologies for mass communication research* (pp. 121-134). London: Routledge.
- Lester, P. M., & Ross, S. D. (2003). *Images that injure: Pictorial stereotypes in the media* (2nd ed.). Westport, Conn.: Praeger.
- Lee, T., Ryan, W. E., Wanta, W., & Chang, K. (2004). Looking Presidential: A Comparison of Newspaper Photographs of Candidates in the United States and Taiwan. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 14(2), 121-139.
- Lodge, M. & Hamil, R. (1986). A partisan schema for political information processing. *American Political Science Review*, 80, 505-519.
- Luce, H. R. (1936, June 8-29). "Prospectus for *Dime, Show-Book (Life)*."
- Luce, H. R. (1941, February 17). American century. *Life*, p. 65.
- Lule, J. (1988). The myth of my widow: A dramatisitic analysis of news portrayals of a terrorist victim. *Political Communication and Persuasion*, 5(2), 101-120.

- Lule, J. (1989). Victimage in *Times* coverage of the KAL flight 007 shooting. *Journalism Quarterly*, 66(3), 615-620, 778.
- Lule, J. (1993). Murder and myth: *New York Times* coverage of the TWA 847 hijacking victim. *Journalism Quarterly*, 70(1), 26-39.
- Lule, J. (2001). *Daily news, eternal stories: The mythological role of journalism*. New York: Guilford.
- Lule, J. (2003, August). *War and its metaphor: News language and the prelude to war in Iraq, 2003*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Kansas City, MO.
- Lynch, D. J. (2003, December 23). DMZ is a reminder of stakes in Korea crisis. *USA Today*: 11A. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu:2228/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?risb=21_T2614121105&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T2613984451&cisb=22_T2614121108&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&selRCNodeID=4&nodeStateId=411en_US,1,2&docsInCategory=1&csi=8213&docNo=1
- MacArthur the man. (n.d.). Retrieved from MacArthur Museum Brisbane Web site: <http://www.macarthurmuseumbrisbane.org/Pages/MtheMan.html>
- Maddow, B. (1985). *Let truth be the prejudice: W. Eugene Smith, his life and photographs*. New York City: Aperture: Viking Penguin.
- Mannheim, K. (1936). *Ideology and Utopia*. London, K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & co., Ltd.; New York, Harcourt, Brace and company.
- McQuail, D. (2000). *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory* (4th ed.). London: Sage.
- Memo for Cal Whipple from Jo Sheehan. (1956, April 23). *Time Inc. Archives*.
- Mendelson, A. (2004). Slice-of-life moments as visual "truth": Norman Rockwell, feature photography, and American values in pictorial journalism. *Journalism History*, 29(4), 166-178.
- Moeller, S. D. (1989). *Shooting war: Photography and the American experience of combat*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publisher.
- Mollenkopf, J. E., & Brendlinger, N. (1996, August). *Comparing Canadian and U.S. press coverage of the Gulf crisis: The effects of ideology in an international context*. Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Anaheim, CA. Retrieved from <http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind9612b&L=aejmc&T=0&P=947>

- Moriarty, S., & Shaw, D. (1995). An antiseptic war: Were news magazine images of the Gulf War too soft? *Visual Communication Quarterly*, 2(2), 4-8.
- Mueller, C. (1973). *The politics of communication: A study in the political sociology of language, socialization, and legitimation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mueller, J. (1989). *Retreat from doomsday: The obsolescence of modern war*. New York: Basic Books.
- Newton, J. H. (1998). The burden of visual truth: The role of photojournalism in mediating reality. *Visual Communication Quarterly*, 5(4), 4-9.
- Paine, T. (1776/2006). *Common sense: addressed [sic] to the inhabitants of America*. New York: Cosimo Classics.
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10(1), 55-75.
- Perlmutter, D. D. (1998). *Photojournalism and foreign policy*. Westport, CN: Praeger Publisher.
- Perlmutter, D. D. (1999). *Visions of war: Picturing warfare from the Stone Age to the cyber age*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Price, V., Tewksbury, D., & Powers, E. (1997). Switching trains of thought: The impact of news frames on readers' cognitive response. *Communication Research*, 24(5), 481-506.
- Ransom, H. H. (1963). *Can American democracy survive cold war?* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Ridgway, M. B. (1986). *The Korean War: How we met the challenge: How all-out Asian war was averted: Why MacArthur was dismissed: Why today's war objectives must be limited*. New York, N.Y.: Da Capo Press.
- Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Drager, M. (1996). Sample size in content analysis of weekly news magazines. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 73(3), 635-644.
- Rosenblum, B. (1978). Style as social process. *American Sociological Review*, 43(3), 422-438.
- Salwen, M. B., & Stacks, D. W. (1996). *An Integrated approach to communication theory and research*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Scheufele, D. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49(1), 103-122.

- Schnabel, J. (1992). *United States Army in the Korean War - Policy and Direction: The First Year*. AD-a353 574. [United States]: Army center of military history washington dc. Retrieved from <http://www.history.army.mil/books/pd-c-15.htm>
- Sherer, M. (1988). Comparing magazine photos of Vietnam and Korean Wars. *Journalism Quarterly*, 65(3), 752-756.
- Sherry, M. S. (1987). *The rise of American air power: The creation of Armageddon*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Snyder, S. (1996, August). *Women's magazines and the construction of feminine identity-page "Somewhere between average and perfect": Women's magazines and the construction of feminine identity*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Anaheim, CA.
- Sontag, S. (1977). *On photography*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Sontag, S. (1990). *Illness as metaphor and AIDS and its metaphor*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sontag, S. (2003). *Regarding the pain of others*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- South Korean POWs. (n.d.). Retrieved November 16, 2007, from <http://www.aiipowmia.com/inter27/in250107skoreapw.html>
- Stempel, G. H. (1989). Content analysis. In G. H. Stempel, & B. H. Westley (Eds.), *Research methods in mass communication* (2nd ed., pp. 124-136). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Stueck, W. (1995). *The Korean War: An international history*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Stueck, W. (2002). *Rethinking the Korean War: A new diplomatic and strategic history*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- The Korean War armistice. (2003, July 22). *BBC news*. Retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/2774931.stm>
- The Korean War: Setting the stage and brief overview. (n.d.). Retrieved from United States of America Korean War Commemoration Web site: <http://korea50.army.mil/history/factsheets/overview.shtml>
- The Turkish brigade. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.korean-war.com/turkey.html>
- Truman, H. S. (1950a, November 30). President's news conference. Retrieved from <http://trumanlibrary.org/publicpapers/viewpapers.php?pid=985>

- Truman, H. S. (1950b, December 15). Radio and television report to the American people on the national emergency. Retrieved from <http://trumanlibrary.org/publicpapers/viewpapers.php?pid=993>
- Truman, H. S. (1951, April 11). Statement and order by the President on relieving General MacArthur of his commands. Retrieved from <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/publicpapers/index.php?pid=289&st=It+is+fundamental%2C+however%2C+that+military+commanders+must+be+governed+by+the+policies&st1=>
- Tucker, S., & Kim, J. (eds.). (2000). *Encyclopedia of the Korean War: A political, social, and military history*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio Inc.
- Tuckmann, G. (1978). *Making news*. New York: Free Press.
- Turner, J. F. (1963). *The significance of the frontier in American history*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co. (Originally published in 1893).
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). The interdisciplinary study of news as discourse. In K. B. Jensen & N. W. Jankowski (Eds.), *A handbook of qualitative methodologies for mass communication research* (pp. 108-120). London: Routledge.
- Vettel-Becker, P. (2005). *Shooting from the hip: Photography, masculinity, and postwar America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wainwright, L. (1986). *The great American magazine: an inside history of Life*. New York: Knopf.
- Wanta, W. (1988). The effects of dominant photographs: An agenda-setting experiment. *Journalism Quarterly*, 65(1), 107-111.
- Walizer, M. H., & Wienir, P. L. (1978). *Research methods and analysis: Searching for relationships*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Willenson, K. (1987). *The bad war: An oral history of the Vietnam War*. New York: New American Library. pp. 168-170.
- Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2000). *Mass media research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson, Wadsworth.
- Wright, T. (2004). *The photography handbook*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
- Zelizer, B. (1993). Journalists as interpretive communities. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 10(3), 219-237.

Zimmer, W. (2001, September 2). Art; A wide world of photography. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C07E6DD1230F931A3575AC0A9679C8B63&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=all#>

VITA

Sun-A Kim was born February 26, 1968, in Seoul, Korea. She has received the following degrees: a B.A. in French Literature from Ewha Womans University in Seoul, Korea (1990); a M.A. and a Ph. D. in Journalism from the University of Missouri-Columbia (2005 and 2008).