



ENQUIRY 8

HOW DID BRITAIN RESPOND TO THE KOREAN WAR? AN EVIDENTIAL AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL APPROACH

A three-lesson enquiry by John Marrill

ENQUIRY OUTLINE

SUMMARY

The enquiry seeks to use British responses to the Korean War as a means to examine, in greater depth than might usually be the case, who ran Britain, for what purposes and by what means in the early Cold War years. The enquiry considers the responses of the Labour and Conservative governments of the period and institutions wielding power and influence that were not subject to the electoral process, such as the Civil Service and the army, which Hennessey (2013) has dubbed the 'permanent state'. The enquiry will use both primary sources and wide-ranging scholarship. The latter will facilitate considerations of the purpose of disparate scholars when writing history.

KEY AREAS OF FOCUS

- The responses of the Labour and Conservative governments of the period to the Korean War and the motives and intentions behind these responses.
- The position and influence of the 'permanent state' on policy in Korea.
- Differing scholarly responses to all of the above issues.

TARGET AGE RANGE

The lessons are designed for use with Key Stage 5, although the content and skills are relevant to some GCSE courses.

SCHOLARLY RATIONALE

Different historians have taken different approaches to analysing the decision-making process behind British entry into the Korean War.

Recent 'New Cold War' historiography is paying closer attention to British influence on the US in the early years of the conflict. Kent (2005) argues that Britain encouraged US anti-communism and consequent 'containment' of the USSR. Britain wanted to protect its imperial interests but was not strong enough to do so. It therefore tried to co-opt the US into an anti-Soviet crusade, enabling British interests to be protected and forging a closer US–British relationship. Dockrill (1986) highlights how British intervention in Korea was motivated by a need to sustain the close relationship that had been developed with the US, founded on anti-communism, as Washington was insistent that Britain supply ground troops as part of the UN forces and so London complied.

John Marrill is Subject Leader for Modern History at Strode's College, England. John has a particular interest in exposing students to lesser-known narratives and alternative perspectives on the Korean War and in how historical accounts of the war have been created.

However, the approach of the likes of Dockrill is at odds with the scholarship of contemporary leftist historians of British foreign policy. For example, Curtis (2003) questions British foreign policy through judicious interrogation of Britain's motivations and its support for undemocratic regimes such as that of Syngman Rhee. Curtis argues that policies that are referred to by many historians as being 'national' or 'imperial' are invariably policies that also serve the interests of the British elite and/or its associated corporations.

Curtis (2003) also argues that there was a shared mindset between governments, the military and the Civil Service, to a great extent based on the fact that these elites generally came from very similar backgrounds, had the same schooling and consequently had a similar take on what Britain's role in the world should be. In a similar vein, Hopkins (2001) has focused on the actions of Britain's 'permanent state'. Hopkins highlights the influence of British Ambassador to the USA Oliver Franks on British entry into the Korea conflict.

Huxford's recent work (2018) has moved on to analysing the media response to British intervention in the Korean War and has also considered the treatment of dissenting voices who challenged the intervention. Huxford acknowledges the critique of British motivations offered during the conflict by one of these dissenters, the British Communist Party leader Pollitt (1951), where he notes an economic motivation for US–UK combat. However, contemporary historiography is yet to consider applying Hermann and Chomsky's (1988) *Manufacturing Consent* position to the study of the Korean War, regarding the media's role in supporting governing elite interests and marginalising dissent, even though such a line has been applied to other conflicts. This study will allow A-level students the capacity to engage with these ideas.

A similar situation can be seen with Gramsci (2005), an Italian neo-Marxist, and his seminal theory of 'hegemony'. He argues that the media plays a key (super-structural, i.e. overarching) role in reinforcing the current economic system and the pre-eminence of the elites, by depicting events in a fashion beneficial to these elites.

REFERENCES

- Curtis, M. (2003) *Web of Deceit: Britain's real foreign policy*, Vintage, p. 5
- Dockrill, M. L. (1986) 'The Foreign Office, Anglo-American relations and the Korean War, June 1950–June 1951' in *International Affairs*, 62, No. 3 1986, p. 460.
- Gramsci, A. (2005) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hennessey, T. (2013) *Britain's Korean War*. Manchester University Press.
- Herman, E. and Chomsky, N. (1988) *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. Pantheon.
- Hopkins, H. (2001) The price of Cold War partnership: Sir Oliver Franks and the British military commitment in the Korean War, *Cold War History*, 1, no. 2, pp. 28–46
- Huxford, G. (2018) *The Korean War in Britain: citizenship, selfhood and forgetting*. Manchester University Press, pp. 149–50.
- Joyce, P. (2013) *The State of Freedom: a social history of the British state since 1800*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 188.
- Pollitt, H. (1951) *Negotiate Now*. London: Communist Party, p. 3.

CURRICULAR RATIONALE

This enquiry is unashamedly ambitious – venturing into intellectual territory that most A-level classes never visit.

This enquiry seeks to advance students' command of governance and elite power structures in Britain during the early stages of the Cold War, through a study of British responses to the Korean War. In the process, students will engage with original source material and consider what historians see as the purpose of their discipline and what influences their approach.

The resource is relevant to many options within A-level history courses that focus on British government and foreign policy, for example:

- Edexcel Paper 1, Option 1H: Britain transformed, 1918–97
- AQA 2S The Making of Modern Britain, 1951–2007
- OCR History Unit Y113: Britain 1930–1997, with this latter including a designated focus on the Korean War

Moreover, some A-level modules have historical interpretations-focused bullet points, to which this enquiry readily applies, e.g. AQA unit 1G 'Challenge and transformation: Britain, c1851–1964', ensuring a relevant (however artificial the dichotomy might be) skills focus.

Yet extensive perusal of A-level textbooks and other resources pertaining to modern British history suggests that while diverse leftist scholarship relating to this period has permeated academia, it receives minimal attention at post-16 level (and arguably even less at Key Stage 3 or 4). This resource aims to rectify this situation. By accessing the radical questioning approaches of historians such as Curtis, Herman and Chomsky and Gramsci to a study of British responses to the Korean War, the resource will enable learners to ask penetrating questions about elite power in Britain during the early years of the Cold War, which they would otherwise probably not get access to, and so advance their historical understanding.

Furthermore, by bringing such scholarship into the history classroom, the resource aims to foster deeper analysis of what lies behind the construction of historical works, how the types of sources utilised affect the decisions that historians make, and how historians differ regarding what they see as the purpose of their scholarship. Such interrogation of source context and the historian's methodology is actually something that examiners demand learners engage with, the Edexcel A-level coursework module being one example.

SCHEME OF WORK

OVERVIEW

It is envisaged that this sequence of three lessons will be taught at A-level, although some lessons might also be applicable for GCSE.

In the first lesson, primary sources are used to develop understanding of the 1950–51 Labour government response to the outbreak of the Korean War and the policies of the successor Conservative government. The lesson will also introduce the ways in which leftist historiography has focused on continuities between the foreign policy of Labour and the Conservatives.

In Lesson 2, some of the same primary documents, augmented by others, will be used to draw attention to the position of the Civil Service and the military regarding British entry into the conflict; such a focus may well be novel for students, given that the influence of these players is rarely addressed in the A-level classroom. Historiography pertaining to the influence of the 'permanent state' will also be introduced, which will facilitate questioning of 'Who runs Britain?' and 'In whose interest?'

(Our intention had been that we then have a lesson and media sources examining how the media represented dissenting voices. Indeed, it was written. However, the fees that we were being asked to pay for reproducing even these shortened newspaper extracts meant that we had to ditch that lesson. However, we have included some notes that might help you explore that issue at the end of the notes for Lesson 8.2.)

In the final lesson, students will be introduced to 'mainstream' historiography on Britain and the Korean War. Students will be asked to consider how this differs from the scholarship that they have been given access to in the previous lessons but also to consider why. This will enable them to conclude the enquiry by making judgements on how historians differ with regard to an analysis of elite power in Britain and what they view as the purpose of their discipline, as well as what influences the approach that historians take.

Lesson	Key content
<p>Lesson 1:</p> <p>What was the response of the Labour and Conservative governments 1950–53 to the Korean War?</p>	<p>Students use government documents to complete a data capture, looking at the responses to the Korean War of the Labour government in 1950 and the Conservative government in 1951–53.</p> <p>Leftist historiography pertaining to continuities in British foreign policy post-World War II is then introduced as part of the same activity, and the activity is concluded by learners writing about what the likes of Curtis argue is motivating both Labour and Conservative governments.</p>
<p>Lesson 2:</p> <p>What was the response of the Civil Service and the military to the outbreak of the Korean War?</p>	<p>Students use government documents to complete a Venn diagram looking at Civil Service and military responses to the outbreak of the Korean War.</p> <p>Then students complete a data capture, looking at the apparent influence of the government, Civil Service and military respectively with regard to specific decisions or highlighted in specific documents.</p> <p>Historiography pertaining to the influence of the ‘permanent state’ is then introduced, and learners finish the lesson by creating a visual representation, with reference to government, Foreign Office and military, that conveys their roles in the decision to go to war in Korea.</p>
<p>Lesson 3:</p> <p>How do specialist historians approach the responses of the British elites to the Korean War?</p>	<p>A range of ‘mainstream’ historiography pertaining to the Korean War, e.g. Dockrill, Hopkins and Huxford, is introduced. Students are asked to note what the emphasis of this work is and then to contrast this with the more ‘radical’ scholarship that they have encountered in the previous lessons.</p> <p>Students then conclude the enquiry by completing a card sort, which gets them to consider why the scholars might be at odds with each other and which has much attention to context.</p>

LESSON 8.1 BREAKDOWN: WHAT WAS THE RESPONSE OF THE LABOUR AND CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENTS 1950–53 TO THE KOREAN WAR?

STARTER (SLIDES 1–5)

After introducing the overall enquiry and the lesson sequence, **Slide 4** features a brief video newsreel about the start of the Korean War in 1950. Watch it and simply highlight that Britain participated as part of the UN forces.

Slide 5 offers a timeline of key events to summarise British involvement across the three years of the conflict.

Draw attention to key issues raised by the timeline by asking:

- What did Britain commit to initially? (Britain initially only committed to marine presence.)
- When did the Cabinet U-turn with regard to Britain contributing ground troops to the UN war effort?
- What was the significance of the Battle of the Imjin River? (It was the most famous/significant military engagement by British forces, but this was not a success.)

ACTIVITY 1: WHAT WAS THE RESPONSE OF THE LABOUR AND CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENTS 1950–53 TO THE KOREAN WAR? (SLIDES 6–12)

For the data capture using primary sources, you can either use the transcripts provided in Resource sheet 8.1A or, if you prefer this activity to have more of the feel of a trip to the National Archives, you can use the photographs/facsimiles, as shown on **Slides 8–12**, which are at a readable size in Resource sheet 8.1B.

Students work in groups and use this pack of five government sources to complete the data-capture task using Resource sheet 8.1C. They need to infer from the documents why the Labour government agreed to enter the Korean War in 1950 and why the Conservatives maintained this commitment from 1951.

Key factors that will come to light will include:

- forging closer ties with the US
- perceived British national interest

The students should note the considerable continuity across the two governments despite their supposedly markedly different positions.

Slide 7 also asks learners to note the shifts in British policy – which are most notably away from focusing on her own empire, to instead focusing on the relationship with the USA. This is evidenced in Document 2, for example, which gives the British reasoning for not sending ground troops to Korea, that this might not be of benefit to British interests in Hong Kong. However, by Document 3, the British position has shifted concerning ground troops because this policy benefits closer ties with the US.

PLENARY: MARK CURTIS INTERPRETATION (SLIDE 13)

Slide 13 introduces a source from Curtis identifying continuities in British foreign policy post-World War II, irrespective of which party is in government. Ask learners to read and then compare his interpretation with the impression that they gain from the primary sources/government documents.

They should conclude that:

- This source is complementary to (agrees with) the primary documents, in that it notes that national interest, global standing and a desire to retain close ties with the US do drive British foreign policy.

BEFORE YOU START

You will need:

- Lesson PowerPoint 8.1

And either:

- Resource sheet 8.1A (Transcript documents 1–5)
- Resource sheet 8.1B (Facsimile documents 1–5)
- Resource sheet 8.1C (Data-capture sheet for Activity 1)

- However, it is at odds with the primary documents in noting that British policies are also driven by meeting the needs of corporations/gains for the economic elites.

PLENARY (SLIDE 15)

Students can be asked how Curtis would explain their previous findings regarding continuities of foreign policy across Labour/Conservative governments. They should be able to infer that, irrespective of who is in power, British foreign policy serves elite economic interests/corporations, which is the major theme of the enquiry.

LESSON 8.2 BREAKDOWN: WHAT WAS RESPONSE OF THE CIVIL SERVICE AND THE MILITARY TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE KOREAN WAR?

BEFORE YOU START

You will need:

- Lesson PowerPoint 8.2

And either:

- Resource sheet 8.2A (Transcript documents 1–6)
- Resource sheet 8.2B (Facsimile documents 1–6)
- Resource sheet 8.2C (Venn diagram recording sheet for Activity 1)
- Resource sheet 8.2D (Data-capture table for Activity 2)
- Colouring pens for Activity 2

STARTER (SLIDES 1–4)

Using the link on **Slide 4**, show the short clip from the 1980s British comedy *Yes Minister*.

The question asks: What does it suggest about the power of the civil servant?

Use the class discussion to set up the theme of the lesson as an interrogation of the so-called 'permanent state' (i.e. the non-elected powers that sit alongside and behind elected government) and its influence on policy decisions.

ACTIVITY 1: WHAT WAS RESPONSE OF THE CIVIL SERVICE AND THE MILITARY TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE KOREAN WAR? (SLIDES 5–12)

This activity builds strongly on the last lesson in both theme and pedagogy. Students work in groups and use another pack of government sources – this time to complete a Venn diagram on the response of the Civil Service (in this case the Foreign Office) and the military to the outbreak of the Korean War and potential British intervention.

Once again, you have a choice of transcripts or photographs/facsimiles (Resource sheet 8.2A or 8.2B). The sources are also shown on **Slides 7–11**.

The Venn diagram is available as Resource sheet 8.2C, which might work best enlarged to A3 to ensure that the central area has room to write in.

Slide 12: Choose students to share their completed (or in progress) diagrams. The central area of their charts should be full while the distinctive areas on each side should be relatively empty. Certainly, students should infer from the sources that there is much commonality in the responses of the foreign Office (FO) and military leaders. The military share the FO's concern about Britain's imperial possessions and close ties with the US. Similarly, Franks, at the FO, champions the need for ground troops to ensure close ties with the US, including averting a potentially negative economic impact.

ACTIVITY 2: CONSIDERATION OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE CIVIL SERVICE AND THE MILITARY ON THE KOREAN POLICY VS. THAT OF THE GOVERNMENT (SLIDE 13)

Students now revisit the same sources (plus one extra from Lesson 8.1) and use the data-capture table (Resource sheet 8.2C) to consider the relative influence of each of these elite players. They should find that government ministers most certainly do not dominate the decision-making.

Finally, students can return to annotate their Venn diagram to highlight the influence of the different players. Add reference to specific documents that provide evidence of this.

ACTIVITY 3: JOYCE ON THE PERMANENT STATE (SLIDES 14–15)

Introduce the Joyce source to examine WHY there is commonality across the different elite power bases.

Students should appreciate how the shared background/values of the elite players can help to explain their shared mindset and how they are therefore all influential as they are promoting shared agendas. It is possible to introduce the construct of a British military-industrial complex here.

Slide 15 then takes you back to *Yes Minister* to compare/contrast Joyce on the ‘permanent state’ vs. the take of *Yes Minister*. Themes might be similar but the tone/emphasis is very different to Joyce. *Yes Minister* clearly lampoons the apparently immense influence of the Civil Service, but is this a critique of elite power?

PLENARY (SLIDE 16)

Students communicate their understanding of Joyce’s position by constructing a visual representation (it could be a cartoon or any type of image, depending on what the students are comfortable doing) that conveys the nature of the relationship between government, the Civil Service and the military.

NB They might disagree with Joyce’s position; if so, they could represent how *they* see the relationship but be ready to explain why they see it differently from Joyce.

Slide 16 provides a link to the political cartoon gallery if they are looking for inspiration. You will also have your own favourites that you can show now to help get them started.

RESEARCH TASK

As explained above, our intention had been to next examine how the media supported the elites, particularly in the way in which they represented dissenters. In the end we could not afford the reproduction fees that we were being charged to include these sources in the printed publication or the online material, so we dropped the lesson.

However, some of you may be lucky enough to hold a personal or an institutional subscription for one of the media archives. Some schools and college libraries have the subscription without the history department being aware of it.

If you do have access then we suggest that you look at a range of publications (left-leaning such as the *Daily Mirror* and right-leaning such as the *Daily Mail*) and examine their representation of dissenters such as:

- Monica Felton
- Hewlett Johnson, ‘The Red Dean’
- Alan Winnington

Here are some articles to start your research:

Monica Felton was a Labour Party member and chair of the Stevenage new town development corporation. She took part in a visit to North Korea organised by the Women’s international Democratic Federation. On her return, she alleged that the UN forces had committed atrocities both by bombing and by presiding over massacres of civilians. For representative comment, see for example:

- *Daily Mirror* 26/08/52 ‘Shopping with Monica’ by Cassandra
- *Daily Mirror* 19/06/1951 ‘Mrs Felton’s passport did not include Korea’
- *The Times* 11/05/53 ‘Mrs. Felton’s “help to the Queen’s enemies”’

Alan Winnington was a British communist based in Beijing who covered the Korean War for *The Daily Worker*. For representative comment, see for example:

- *Daily Mail* 08/03/55 'A word on treason'

Hewlett Johnson was a Church of England priest who visited China with his wife Nowell and brought back allegations of American 'germ warfare'. For representative comment, see for example:

- *Daily Mail* 10/07/52 'The scandal of the Dean'

LESSON 8.3 BREAKDOWN: HOW DO SPECIALIST HISTORIANS APPROACH THE RESPONSES OF THE BRITISH ELITES TO THE KOREAN WAR?

BEFORE YOU START

You will need:

- Lesson PowerPoint 8.3
- Resource sheet 8.3A (Specialist and non-historians' sources for Activity 1 and 2)
- Resource sheet 8.3B (Card sort and recording sheet for Activity 3)

STARTER (SLIDES 1–3)

The Korean War is now attracting the attention of specialist historians. One example is Grace Huxford (who has also been an influential part of this Teacher Fellowship programme and contributed an article to this publication).

Draw attention to her methodology as well, through using the blurb for her book:

Using Mass Observation surveys, letters, diaries and a wide range of under-explored contemporary material, this book charts the war's changing position in British popular imagination and asks how it became known as the 'Forgotten War'. It explores the war in a variety of viewpoints – conscript, POW, protester and veteran – and is essential reading for anyone interested in Britain's Cold War past.

ACTIVITY 1: HOW DO SPECIALIST HISTORIANS APPROACH BRITISH RESPONSES TO THE KOREAN WAR? (SLIDES 4–10)

Students work in groups and, using a series of extracts from leading Korean War historians Dockrill (1986), Hopkins (2001) and Huxford (2018), they complete the first two columns of the data-capture sheet, which considers the focus of those historians' research and their methodology.

The table is available on Resource sheet 8.4A (page 1).

They should be able to identify that:

- **Dockrill's** focus is high politics, British decision-making regarding Korea, the motivations for participation and British imperial/geopolitical concerns as a whole, especially the importance to British foreign policy of a close relationship with the USA. Dockrill's sources are British governmental sources, and learners may voluntarily pick up on the overlap between the documents that Dockrill utilises and the very sources that they have engaged with in previous lessons.
- **Hopkins'** focus covers similar ground, but he is most specifically concerned with the influence of the British Ambassador to the US, Franks, on Britain's Korean War policy. Hopkins' sources are clearly also of the same nature as Dockrill's and so have equivalent familiarity to the students.
- On the other hand, **Huxford** is interested in looking at Britons who dissented against the governmental line over Korea, the responses to these individuals of both the elites and the broader public, and also cultural memories of the conflict. Huxford's methodology also differs from the other specialist historians in being more broad-ranging, clearly including secondary sources and also a war office film, contemporary to the period that she is focusing on.

ACTIVITY 2: HOW DOES SPECIALISTS' WORK CONTRAST WITH SCHOLARS ALREADY ENCOUNTERED? (SLIDES 11–12)

Students are given interpretations (including some that they have already seen in previous lessons) from Curtis, Joyce, Gramsci and Herman and Chomsky (on Resource sheet 8.3A (page 5)) and they are to contrast the emphasis of these 'non-specialist' scholars with those of the 'mainstream' Korean War scholars. The final column of the table captures the interpretations of these scholars.

Learners should appreciate that questioning of elite interests/power inherent in the non-specialist sources is not a concern for the specialist historians of the Korean War.

Similarly, while Huxford discusses elite responses to dissenters and even acknowledges Pollitt's claim, which is in tune with Curtis et al.'s logical questioning of why such vitriol is directed at Felton, for example, the unpacking of why Pollitt may well have a point is missing.

Through this critique, we are again seeking to offer learners access to higher-order thinking/more holistic understanding by questioning Huxford's position.

ACTIVITY 3: WHY MIGHT SOME SCHOLARS CRITIQUE ELITE POWER AND OTHERS NOT? (SLIDE 13)

To engage with the aforementioned issues more fully, students complete a card sort (Slide 14 and Resource sheet 8.3B) in answer to this question, which will get them to consider differing views regarding the purpose of historians and all manner of contextual issues.

The cards suggest that the production of historical works is influenced by funding, which can encourage elite interests to be championed. This can lead to questioning of whether historians see their role as bolstering accepted societal structures or not. Discussion can also focus on different fields of history and how where scholars fit into these may impact on their work, a debate that potentially can be opened out to consider subjects across the curriculum. The cards also suggest the significance of age, academic experience and renown impacting in myriad ways on the works that historians/scholars produce. These are all healthy topics of debate for a holistic historical discourse within the post-16 classroom and potentially at Key Stage 4 as well. Of course, the cards also demand consideration of the influence of scholars' political/ideological leanings upon their work, although this is something usually more widely addressed.

PLENARY (SLIDE 15)

Finish by completing a paragraph-long answer to the question:

What do elite responses to the Korean War teach us about Britain in the early Cold War years and what do scholarly responses to these developments teach us about the construction of history?

LESSON 8.1 (continued)

Plenary

An historian's interpretation of British foreign policy post-WWII

'The view has long been held that Britain "has lost an empire and not yet found a role", in the famous words of US Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, several decades ago. Yet Britain's real role is easily discovered if we are concerned to look... Britain's role remains an essentially imperial one: to act as junior partner to US global power; to help to organise the global economy to benefit Western corporations; and to maximise Britain's (that is, British elites') independent political standing in the world and thus remain a world power.'

From M. Curtis – *Web of Deceit* (2003)

Discuss

How would Curtis explain the continuity between the positions of Labour and the Conservatives that you have seen in the documents relating to British intervention in the Korean War?

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.1 13

LESSON 8.2

Lesson 8.2

What was response of the Civil Service and the military to the outbreak of the Korean War?

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.2 2

Lesson 8.2 Overview

Lesson 8.2

What was response of the Civil Service and the military to the outbreak of the Korean War?

Content covered in this lesson:

- Civil service and military responses to the Korean War
- Comparison of the responses of these institutions to those of the governments
- An historian's interpretation regarding the British 'permanent state'

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.2 3

The influence of the Civil Service, as represented in a British comedy series from the 1980s

Starter

What does this film clip suggest about the power of civil servants?

'Sir Humphrey Appleby: the consummate civil servant' (YouTube) from Yes Minister, Series 3 Episode 6: 'The Whiskey Priest'

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.2 4

What was the response of the Civil Service and the military to the outbreak of the Korean War?

Document 2: Military discuss intervention in Korea

Document 3: Military discuss intervention in Korea

Document 4: Foreign Office correspondence on Korea

Document 5: Government minutes on ground forces being sent to Korea

Document 6: Foreign Office correspondence on Korea

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.2 5

Activity 1 discussion

How much commonality is there between the positions of the Foreign Office and the military regarding British involvement in the Korean War?

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.2 12

Activity 2

1. Data capture: Look at the sources again (including one extra repeated from last lesson). Fill out your own copy of this table (Resource sheet 8.2D).
2. Consider the relative influence of the military, the Civil Service (Foreign Office) and the government over Korean War policies. Who seems to have the most influence?

DOC & group	Position re: intervention in Korea	Position re: use of combat troops	Level of influence and why?
1 (additional) Govt			
2 Military			
3 Military			
4 Civil Service			
5 Govt			
6 Civil Service			

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.2 13

LESSON 8.2 (continued)

An historian's interpretation of British civil servants and politicians

P. Joyce, *The State of Freedom: a social history of the British state* (2013)

'... the purpose and identity of the civil servant as a "statesman" – a man of the state who in actual practice was little different in outlook and character from leading politicians: and little different in the degree to which he held power. I also consider the occupational culture and ethical stylisation of the politician. Shared outlook, social background and education united the two. Therefore, in uniting the term "governing classes" it is these people that we should have in mind, for contrary to some understandings, and to the doctrine of the separation of politics and administration, it was in both figures that the real business of government took place. The high bureaucrat, just as much as the politician, was involved in making state policy.'

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.2 14

Why is there commonality across elite power bases?

Activity 3

1. Read the source on the previous slide. How would Joyce explain the continuities between the state actors' positions, as well as their levels of influence on policy?
2. Now watch this clip from 'Yes Minister'. To what extent is Joyce's interpretation of the Civil Servant akin to that presented in *Yes Minister*?
3. How can you explain any differences?

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.2 15

LESSON 8.3

Enquiry 8 overview: How did Britain respond to the Korean War? An evidential and historiographical approach

Lesson 8.1

What was the response of the Labour and Conservative governments 1950–53 to the Korean War?

Lesson 8.2

What was response of the Civil Service and the military to the outbreak of the Korean War?

Lesson 8.2

How do specialist historians approach the responses of the British elites to the Korean War?

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.4 1

Lesson 8.3 Overview

Lesson 8.2

How do specialist historians approach the responses of the British elites to the Korean War?

Content covered in this lesson:

- What research focus is taken by specialist historians of the Korean War?
- How does their work contrast with scholars already encountered?
- Why do some scholars critique elite power and others not?
- What do elite responses to the Korean War teach us about Britain in the early Cold War years and what do scholarly responses to these developments teach us about the construction of history?

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.4 2

Starter

- Grace Huxford is a leading scholar on the Korean War.
- This is an area capturing historians' attention at this very moment.
- She is Senior Lecturer in Modern History at the University of Bristol.

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.4 3

How do specialist historians approach British responses to the Korean War?

Activity 1

Data capture. Use specialist Sources 1–3 to complete the first two columns of this table (Resource sheet 8.3A).

Historian	Whose responses do they focus on?	What types of sources do they use?	How does the emphasis of his work differ from the historians/scholars you have already encountered in this enquiry?
Dockrill (1986)			
Hopkins (2001)			
Huxford (2018)			

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.4 4

Specialist historian: Michael L. Dockrill

Source 1: Extract from

M. L. Dockrill (1986) 'The Foreign Office, Anglo-American relations and the Korean War, June 1950–June 1951' in *International Affairs* (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944–), 62, no. 3, pp. 459–476.

Published by: Oxford University Press on behalf of the Royal Institute of International Affairs

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2617887>

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.4 5

Specialist historian: Michael Hopkins

Source 2: Extract from

Hopkins, M. (2001) 'The price of Cold War partnership: Sir Oliver Franks and the British military commitment in the Korean War' in *Cold War History*, 1, no. 2, pp. 28–46.

DOI: [10.1080/713999922](https://doi.org/10.1080/713999922)

Exploring and Teaching the Korean War | Lesson 8.4 7

LESSON 8.3 (continued)

Specialist historian: Grace Huxford

Source 3:
Extract from

Huxford, G. (2018) *The Korean War in Britain: citizenship, selfhood and forgetting*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.



How does the work of specialist historians contrast with scholars already encountered?

1. Now complete the final column of the data capture using Sources 4–7 (shown on the next slide)
2. What are the key differences in emphasis between the specialist historians and the other scholars regarding the elites?

Why do some scholars critique elite power and others not?

Activity 3

1. Using the cards on Resource sheet 8.3B (and Slide 14), fill out this table on reasons for the differing approaches of scholars to elite power.
2. What conclusions can you draw from this activity?

Scholar	Experience/desire for career progression	Ideology/political views	Area of specialism	Funding body	publisher	Given their context, how engaged with elite power is this scholar likely to be?
Huxford						
Dockrill						
Hopkins						
Curtis						
Joyce						
Chomsky						
Gramsci						

Articles by Hopkins have appeared in the following journals: <i>Cold War History</i> , <i>Intelligence and National Security</i> , and <i>Journal of Transatlantic Studies</i> . All journals are associated with right-wing scholarship.	Curtis has noted that, in spite of being a well-respected historian, he has not been invited to appear on any BBC programmes for many years.	Hopkins has been funded by the Wilson Center, which is arguably a body used to promote US foreign policy interests and is certainly extremely critical of leftist movements, both historically and currently.	Dockrill focused on diplomatic history and was based in the War Studies department of his university. Both are deemed bastions of right-wing scholars.	The Royal Institute of International Affairs is the other name for Chatham House. Chatham House is an NGO that aims to promote debate on international affairs.
Curtis is middle-aged and does not currently have an academic post.	Hopkins and Dockrill have authored texts together.	She focuses on social history, which is often the preserve of leftist historians.	Cold War history, which is Hopkins' specialist area, is dominated by right-leaning works.	Her 2018 book on the Korean War in Britain was the first she had published.
Curtis's views place him on the left of the political spectrum.	His most famous works were completed in the 1920s during his imprisonment by the Fascist dictator Mussolini.	Joyce is an extremely long-serving academic who works at the University of Manchester.	Joyce is a social historian, which is often the preserve of leftist historians.	Chomsky is in his 80s, has decades of renown in various fields of academia and has been voted the world's leading intellectual.
Each year, Chatham House awards a prize to those deemed to have made a significant contribution to improving international relations. In 2013, this was awarded to US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.	Gramsci was a Marxist.	She completed her PhD from Warwick University in 2015.	Chomsky's work is never reviewed by the mainstream media in Britain.	Chomsky is an anarchist.

Plenary

How do you think the issues that you've engaged with in this lesson relate to school textbooks?

Write a paragraph in answer to the following question: What do elite responses to the Korean War teach us about Britain in the early Cold War years and what do scholarly responses to these developments teach us about the construction of history?

Expand this to an essay for homework if you wish.