CORE

Metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

Provided by ScholarBank@NUS

CHANGING WHILE STANDING STILL: OPERATIONAL DEVELOPMENT DURING TRENCH WARFARE PERIOD OF THE KOREAN WAR, 1951 – 1953

DEVAN J. SHANNON

(B. Sci.), USMA, 1999

A THESIS SUBMITTED

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF HISTORY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE

2012

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is my original work and it has been written by me in its entirety.
I have duly acknowledged all the sources of information which have been used in the thesis.

This thesis has also not been submitted for any degree in any university previously.

DeVan J. Shannon
August 2012

Acknowledgments

When this project began, I knew that I would owe a huge debt to many people that I did not know yet. This was defiantly the case as I waded into this project. First I would like to thank Professor Brian P. Farrell for his constant support and professional guidance. Without his understanding and dedication to shepherding this sometimes lost Ranger, this project would not have reached its Ranger objective. Dr. Ian L. Gordon and Dr. Barbara Watson Andaya from the National University of Singapore and Dr. Shannon A. Brown from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces were helpful throughout the development of this project and taught me so much about the many perspectives within the discipline of History.

I would also like to thank several archivists Jeffrey Kozak from the George C. Marshall Foundation, Elizabeth J. Dubuisson from the Combined Arms Research Library, Briquet Magali Anne Rose from the National University of Singapore Library, and James Tobias from the Center for Military History. Each was extremely helpful in finding unique documents from their varied collections. Without their assistance this project would not have the depth and breadth it has. Along with these archivists, I would like to thank my classmates at National University of Singapore and many others who I have bored with talk about this subject. Their support and honest critiques, as this project developed, were essential.

I want to thank my family for their constant support in this endeavor. My brother Stuart was extremely helpful in providing his literary expertise and honest critiques of this project throughout. My parents, Jerry and Julie, supported my studies through their prayers and encouragement. Last, my wife Sally and daughter Aoife believed in me and pushed me through to complete this project. To them I am eternally grateful.

Lastly, while the success of this thesis is due to those mentioned above; all errors and omissions are mine alone.

Table of Contents

Declaration i

Acknowledgements ii

Table of Contents iii

Summary iv

Chapter One: Introduction 1

Chapter Two: The New Global Situation 28

Chapter Three: Blood and Sprockets 42

Chapter Four: Korean War Trench Warfare: Small Unit Tactics, Precision Fires, and Special Operations 72

Chapter Five: Korean War Trench Warfare: Coalition Operations and Republic of Korea Armed Forces 105

Chapter Six: Conclusion 123

Bibliography 129

Summary

Dynamic leaders and great battles tend to dominate the study of military history. But operational concepts nest tactics and contain the techniques that military leaders use to achieve success in combat. Once developed, operational concepts and their supporting tactics are refined by each successive generation and become that countries way of war. This thesis focuses on the development of operational concepts during the trench warfare period of the Korean War (June 1951 – July 1953) and proposes that these operational concepts were the foundation of the operational concepts the U.S. Army employed for the rest of the Cold War.

The operational concepts of the Korean War trench warfare period emerged because of factors removed from the Korean battlefield. These factors, primarily atomic weapons and the perceived strength of the U.S.S.R., forced Eighth Army commanders to develop new operational concepts when they faced an unexpected situation. Instead of prosecuting an offensive maneuver war prosecuted through battles of annihilation, similar to the first year of the war, Generals Matthew B. Ridgway, James A. Van Fleet, Mark W. Clark, and Maxwell D. Taylor were ordered to fight a defensive and limited war of attrition.

This thesis studies U.S. Army operational concepts developed during the Korean War trench warfare period and their effect on subsequent U.S. Army doctrine, equipment, and training, to wage Cold War. The five interrelated operational concepts explored in this thesis include Small Unit Tactics (SUT), precision fire support, special operations, combined operations, and the development of Foreign Internal Defense (FID) as a valid force multiplier, through the development of the Republic of Korea Armed Forces. These five operational concepts bundled U.S. Army concepts that traditionally supported offensive warfare and instead they became the main effort during the defensive and limited war of attrition in Korea. These operational concepts were a clear departure from those the Army employed during WWII. Their influence was long lasting, reflected in their current place in

U.S. Army doctrine, Unified Land Operations that includes a heavy emphasis on defensive and stability operations and now includes wide area security as an Army core competency equal to combined arms maneuver.

Through the study of these five operational concepts and their development over the two years of the Korean War trench warfare period it became clear that the options available to U.S. ground commanders were extremely circumscribed, forcing them to do things differently. That something different was to bundle minor tactics into new operational concepts. This fused five operational concepts into a coherent battle doctrine designed to achieve the strategic goals of the U.S. and its allies: to sign an armistice and frustrate the Communist aim to destroy the ROK. This thesis defines five operational concepts that the U.S. Army developed and effectively used to force the communists to sign an armistice. These five concepts remain a crucial component of how the U.S. Army fights but not always how it plans to fight.

Chapter 1: Introduction

War is nothing but the continuation of policy with other means.
-Carl Von Clausewitz, 10 July 1827[1]

The final two years of the Korean War was a period of static and defensive attritional warfare. From June 1951 through August 1953, the U.S. Army developed operational concepts designed to achieve defensive attritional goals in a limited war. This change in operational concepts constituted the U.S. Army's adjustment to the U.S. government's national strategy of Containment. This enforced period of static defensive attritional warfare forced the U.S. Army to adjust its operational concepts in order to employ tactics to fight in a defensive strategic paradigm.

During this static period, the U.S. Army experimented with and developed various operational concepts to counter Chinese communist advantages in manpower and initiative. These operational concepts allowed the U.S. Army to retain a tactically offensive focus while conducting an operational attritional and strategically defensive conflict in Korea. General Matthew B. Ridgway stated, "I constantly reminded the field commanders of our essential aim – to deal out maximum damage at minimum cost."[2] Gaining ground did not support the strategic and operational goals of the U.S. government. General Ridgway, upon assuming command of all United Nations (U.N.) forces in April 1951, wrote a letter of instruction to all his commanders stating: "You will direct the efforts of your forces toward inflicting maximum personnel casualties and materiel losses on hostile forces in Korea… Acquisition of terrain in itself is of little or no value.[3]"

To kill more effectively in Korea, the U.S. Army developed five operational concepts. It improved Small Unit Tactics (SUT) at the regimental level and below and built effective infantry teams. Commanders integrated land and air based firepower into a coherent,

---

[1] Carl Von Clausewitz, *On War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, ed. 1989), 69.
[2] Matthew B. Ridgway, *The Korean War* (Garden City: Da Capo Press, 1967), 117.
[3] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 167.

responsive and effective precision fire support (FS) system. The U.S. Army developed and employed special operations capabilities designed to counter communist insurgency tactics. The Army also improved its ability to lead a coalition. And the Eighth Army through the Korean Military Advisory Group (KMAG) improved the capability and capacity of the Republic of Korea Army (ROKA) using Foreign Internal Defense (FID) concepts. This allowed the ROKA to fight as an equal and take responsibility for defending the Republic of Korea (ROK).

By applying these five operational concepts, the U.S. Army adapted to the defensive national strategy of Containment, as well as the operational concepts used by the Chinese Peoples Volunteers Force (CPVF) and the Korean People's Army (KPA). The communist forces, according to Walter Hermes, "had over twice as many battalions in Korea as the UNC had and a considerable edge in the number of guns as well."[4] With these advantages and a more offensive strategy, the communist forces maintained the initiative along the Main Line of Resistance (MLR) throughout the trench warfare period.

Even with these advantages, after the summer of 1951, Eighth Army limited the ability of communist forces to conducting offensive operations along the MLR. Communist leaders decided when to focus on the peace process and when to fight over hilltops forward of the MLR. U.S. leaders took a long time to appreciate that communist leaders would sacrifice men on fights over hill tops for the perceived strategic advantage. After the armistice Ridgway mused, "Perhaps we should have foreseen that, in Communist style, they would consider these people expendable, and of value only to the extent that they might contribute to the final triumph of Communism."[5] The battle of Boulder City, 24-27 July 1953, exemplified the

[4] Walter G. Hermes, *U.S. Army in the Korean War: Truce Tent and Fighting Front* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965), 510.

[5] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 208.

willingness of communist leaders to expend men in a test of wills the very day the armistice went into effect, on 27 July 1953.[6]

This strategically defensive, operationally attritional, international limited conflict waged under the banner of the U.N., was an event that lacked clarity, or even a name. The Korean War, the Forgotten War, Truman's Police Action, or the War to Resist America and Aid Korea are some of the names used to refer to the events that occurred on the Korean Peninsula from 25 June 1950 through 27 July 1953. The inability to agree on appropriate terminology is attributed to the Korean War being something new and disturbing that did not fit into the understanding of many Americans. This conflict was a hybrid. The Korean War combined a war of national unification with a proxy war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, in which both super powers limited the scope and objectives of their forces. Unlike the totality of WWII, this was a limited war.

In the late 1940's, the Korean Peninsula was one of several places around the globe where the U.S. and Soviet Union were in conflict and supported different proxies. For the U.S. and its U.N. allies, the fighting in Korea was a peripheral, limited, defensive and attritional conflict. Clausewitz defined defensive limited war in the following terms: "The defender's purpose…is to keep his territory inviolate, and to hold it for as long as possible. That will gain him time, and gaining time is the only way he achieve[s] his aim."[7]

The reality of this type of war clashed with the traditional U.S. view of warfare held by most Americans. This American view of war was best articulated by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, who defined the goal of warfare as "Victory, immediate and complete!"[8] Paraphrasing MacArthur's understanding of the American attitude toward war, General

---

[6] Pat Meid and James M. Yingling, *U.S. Marine Operations in Korea, 1950-1953, Volume V: Operations in West* Korea (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), 383-397. Lee Ballenger, *The Final Crucible: U.S. Marines in Korea, Vol. 2: 1953* (Dulles: Potomac Books, Inc., 2001), 240-264.

[7] Clausewitz, *On War*, 614.

[8] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 144.

Ridgway wrote, "Americans are not inclined by temperament to fight limited wars… it would be like standing up for sin against virtue."[9]

Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower viewed Korea and East Asia as a distraction from the major theater of Cold War struggle: Europe.[10] But the Korean War stood out then and now as the only place where the U.S., Soviet Union, Peoples Republic of China (PRC) and their allies engaged in direct armed conflict. Despite every major and many minor powers involvement, neither side wanted to escalate the conflict.

General Omar N. Bradley, when testifying to the U.S. Senate, on the administration's decisions with respect to the PRC and their involvement in Korea, stated that to expand the conflict in Korea to a greater war with the PRC was: "[T]he wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy."[11] U.S. strategy of containment was focused on rebuilding Europe and Japan and not fighting a land war in Asia against the Chinese.[12] The USSR was viewed as the leader of global communism and the focus of U.S. efforts.

The Korean War brought into question U.S. Army principles. It questioned the way the U.S government, and specifically the U.S. Army, planned for, trained for, and fought wars. In 1950, the U.S. Army planned to fight the next war based on its experiences during WWII. These plans and the principles of war behind them were influenced by classical military theorists such as nineteenth-century Carl Von Clausewitz and Antoine-Henri Jomini.[13] *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), the U.S. Army's primary doctrinal manual, defined war in a way

---

[9] Ibid., 144.

[10] Ernest R. May, *American Cold War Strategy: Interpreting NSC 68* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1993), 48. Harry S. Truman Library & Museum, "A Report to the National Security Council – NSC 68: United States Objectives and Programs for National Security," under "Ideological Foundations of the Cold War," http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/coldwar/documents/pdf/10-1.pdf#zoom=100 (accessed March 12, 2012).

[11] Omar N. Bradley, Testimony to the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, May 15, 1951, to the Committee on Foreign Relations, Military Situation in the Far East, 82d Cong., 1st sess. *Cong. Rec.*, part 2: 732 .

[12] Melvyn P. Leffler, *The Spector of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994), 95 and 96.

[13] John I. Alger, *The Quest for Glory: The History of the Principles of War* (Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982), xvii-xxiii and 160-170. John I. Alger, *The West Point Military History Series, Definitions and Doctrine of the Military Art: Past and Present* (Wayne, New Jersey: Avery Publishing Group Inc., 1985), 8-11.

similar to Clausewitz's definition: "Force…is thus the means of war; to impose our will on the enemy is its object. To secure that object we must render the enemy powerless; and that, in theory, is the true aim of warfare."[14]

Two of the U.S. Army's Principles of War were "The Objective" and "The Offensive." These were two of the nine U.S. Army Principles of War found in *Field Manual 100-5 Operations* (1949).[15] This manual defined U.S. Army operational concepts before the Korean War and through the first year of fighting. *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949) stated:

> The Objective: The ultimate objective of all military operations is the destruction of the enemy's armed forces and his will to fight. The selection of intermediate objectives whose attainment contributes most decisively and quickly to the accomplishment of the ultimate objective at the least cost, human and material, must be based on as complete as possible knowledge of the enemy and theater of operations.[16]

FM 100-5 Operations (1949) reinforced "The Objective" with the principal of "The Offensive:"

> The Offensive: Through offensive action, a commander preserves his freedom of action and imposes his will on the enemy. The selection by the commander of the right time and place for offensive action is a decisive factor in the success of the operation…a defensive should be deliberately adopted only as a temporary expedient while awaiting an opportunity for counteroffensive action.[17]

Americans viewed war as the last tool of statecraft, and if war was declared, the nation should fight with all its might to end the conflict as quickly as possible.[18] According to *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), war would and should be fought in a rapid, decisive and total manner using all weapons at the U.S. Army's disposal.[19] *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949) articulated General Bradley's views on how the U.S. Army should fight future wars. The operational

[14] Clausewitz, *On War*, 75.

[15] Department of the Army, *Field Manual 100-5 Operations* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1949), 21- 23. The nine U.S. Army principles of war are The Objective, Simplicity, Unity of Command, The Offensive, Maneuver, Mass, Economy of Force, Surprise, and Security.

[16] Ibid., 21, paragraph 97.

[17] Department of the Army, *Field Manual 100-5 Operations*,21 & 22, paragraph 100.

[18] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 69-71.

[19] Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), 4-1, 4-2.

concepts in the field manual were the distilled lessons from WWII and represented a doctrine the U.S. Army could use in future combat. *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949) was premised on an offensive strategy focused on maneuver, designed to annihilate the designated enemy, and occupy their key terrain.

The U.S. Army prepared for war with the goal of forcing unconditional surrender on its enemies. This strategy was based on U.S. history and drew clear goals for the Army.[20] Unconditional surrender, as articulated by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt during WWII, allowed the U.S. Army to focus all its effort to achieve a clear military goal. This clarity allowed the Army to employ its complete panoply of military might against an enemy.[21] These direct and clear cut concepts were designed to support a specific offensive national strategy. U.S. doctrine did not consider that changes in military technology, like the atomic bomb, could force radical changes in national strategy. But in retrospect the change began on 6 and 9 August 1945, when the U.S. employed atomic weapons to end WWII in the Pacific. The world changed again on 29 August 1949 (coincidently, the month the U.S. Army published *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949)) when the Soviet Union detonated its first atomic device, and became the second atomic state.

These factors concerned U.S. strategists in the Truman administration, at a time when the capabilities and intentions of the Soviet Union remained problematic.[22] In late 1949 and early 1950 a small group of senior State and Defense Department officials prepared an

---

[20] Steven T. Ross, *American War Plans, 1945 – 1950: Strategies for Defeating the Soviet Union* (London: Frank Cass, 1996), 151-153. OPLAN *Offtackle* was the first Operations Plan constructed with political guidance, *NSC 20/4*. The plan is a straight forward re-play of the Allied ETO invasion of Western Europe but it would continue through the Soviet Union until the Soviets surrendered. The planned war would take between 12 and 24 months to enter its final phase, a massive two pronged invasion of Europe using massive armored and airborne strikes into the heart of Russia.

[21] Williamson Murray and Allan R. Millett, *A War to be Won: Fighting the Second World War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 521.

[22] Harry S. Truman Library & Museum, "Ideological Foundations of the Cold War," http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/coldwar/index.php?action=chrono (accessed March 12, 2012).

important document, *NSC 68*, delivered to President Truman on 7 April 1950.[23] This National Security Council (NSC) document outlined four courses of action to deal with the Soviet Union. Before it even arrived on Truman's desk, the policy and security leadership agreed on the fourth course of action. The documents official title – *NSC 68: United States Objectives and Programs for National Security* (14 April 1950) – was designed to avoid offending any part of the U.S government. *NSC 68* designed a national strategy, Containment, to defeat the Soviet Union and its satellites, because they objected to the U.S. world system envisioned in the U.N. Charter.

NSC 68's four courses of action included:

> a. Continuation of current policies, with current and currently projected programs for carrying out these projects (the status quo Truman Doctrine); b. Isolation; c. War; and d. A more rapid building up of the political, economic, and military strength of the free world than provided under (a), with the purpose of reaching, if possible, a tolerable state of order among nations without war and of preparing to defend ourselves in the event that the free world is attacked.[24]

The authors of the document, primarily Paul H. Nitze, Director of the State Department Policy Planning Staff, believed that current government policies were not enough to stop the Soviet Union. He and the core of the NSC staff viewed the fourth option as necessary to preserve the victory of WWII and the goals outlined in the U.N. Charter.[25] Truman, in contrast, preferred the current policies as outlined in the first option.[26] Truman's assessment was that the Soviet threat was overblown and he proposed cutting defense spending from $14.3 billion to $13.5 billion for fiscal year 1951.[27] He thought that NATO, limited military aid, an atomic deterrent and the Marshall Plan was enough to stop Joseph Stalin and the

---

[23] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 14; Harry S. Truman Library & Museum, "Ideological Foundations of the Cold War," http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/coldwar/index.php?action=chrono (accessed March 12, 2012).

[24] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 61.

[25] Leffler, *The Spector of Communism*, 94-96. May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 71 and 79-81.

[26] Leffler, *The Spector of Communism*, 96. May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 13 & 14.

[27] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 3.

Soviet Union's design.[28] Truman believed that his anti-Communist policies would stop the designs of the Soviet Union; the authors of *NSC 68* disagreed.

In April 1950, Truman tabled *NSC 68* and asked for additional analysis directly from members of his cabinet who supported additional military cuts. Ernest May defined the situation Truman faced in May 1950: "In the face of a united bureaucracy warning that the world risked enslavement, a president already under attack from the right could not afford simply to do nothing."[29] *NSC 68* and U.S. national strategy remained at a crossroad.

But Truman's thinking changed after 25 June 1950, when Soviet trained, advised and equipped Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) forces crossed the 38th parallel in T-34 tanks and invaded the Republic of Korea (ROK).[30] This action by the KPA abrogated the U.N. created diplomatic system designed to deal with the contested sovereignty on the Korean peninsula.[31] The KPA invasion posed a challenge to the U.S., and its commitment to collective security. This provoked the commitment of U.S. forces in Korea.[32]

On 30 September 1950, after two months of war, President Truman approved *NSC 68*, and it became U.S. national strategy.[33] Though modified by successive U.S. presidents, "*NSC 68* laid out the rationale for U.S. strategy during much of the Cold War."[34] This strategy required a supporting defensive military strategy, in direct contradiction to the U.S. Army's WWII thinking. U.S. Army officer and historian T.R. Fehrenbach wrote, "[The

---

[28] Ibid., 14, 65-68.

[29] Ibid., 14.

[30] James F. Schnabel and Robert J. Watson, *The History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, Volume III, The Korean War, Part I* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1979), 36-65; Walter S. Poole, *The History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, Volume IV, 1950 – 1952* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986), 3-9 & 20-24; David Rees, *The Korean War: History and Tactics* (London: Orbis Publishing, 1984), 104; James and Wells, *Refighting the Last War*, 186.

[31] James F. Schnabel, *United States Army in the Korean War: Policy and Direction: The First Year* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990), 38-40 & 61-71; Roy E. Appleman, *United States Army in the Korean War: South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu (June—November 1950)* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961), 19-27.

[32] D. Clayton James and Anne Sharp Wells, *Reflecting the Last War: Command and Crisis in Korea 1950-1953* (New York: Macmillan, 1993), 140.

[33] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 14.

[34] Ibid., vii.

Eisenhower administration] would, after a year or two, adopt Containment, and continue virtually unchanged, every foreign policy of the Truman Administration."[35] This strategy was more complicated and far reaching than just the simple military Containment of the Soviet Union and other communist states.

The center piece of the Containment strategy was:

> The frustration of the Kremlin design requires the free world to develop a successfully functioning political and economic system and a vigorous political offensive against the Soviet Union. These, in turn, require an adequate military shield under which they can develop. It is necessary to have the military power to deter, if possible, Soviet expansion, and to defeat, if necessary, aggressive Soviet or Soviet-directed actions of a limited or total character.[36]

NSC 68 describes the military as a defensive shield. Furthermore, it describes politics and economics as the offensive agents of this strategy. The U.S. and free world forces would act as the shield to protect the development of the free world political and economic system. In 1950 the free world included the British Commonwealth, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members, and nations aligned with the U.S. against communism.

The strength of the free world's economic and political system would act as *NSC 68*'s offensive capability. Free world political and economic systems were the sword pointed at the ideological heart of the communist political and economic system. This new militarily defensive strategy stood in direct opposition to the U.S. Army role stated in *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949) and the Joint Chiefs of Staff Operations Plan *Offtackle* prior to the Korean War.[37] The U.S. Army viewed its role as the nation's sword designed to annihilate enemies,

---

[35] T. R. Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War: A Study in Unpreparedness* (Washington, D.C.: Brassey's, 1994), 418.

[36] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 71; Harry S. Truman Library & Museum, "A Report to the National Security Council – NSC 68: United States Objectives and Programs for National Security," under "Ideological Foundations of the Cold War," http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/coldwar/documents/pdf/10-1.pdf#zoom=100 (accessed March 12, 2012).

[37] Ross, *American War Plans*, 103-119. Leffler, *The Spectrum of Communism*, 125-130.

not as the shield of freedom defensively holding the line against Communist infiltration on the frontier of the free world.

NSC 68 articulated a new way of war where victory was defined as an enemy forced to conform "with the purposes and principles set forth in the U.N. Charter."[38] This Cold War strategy would require a conflict of undetermined length to break the political and economic will of the Soviets. With Truman's September 1950 adoption of *NSC 68*, the U.S. Army was required to support redefined U.S. government non-military objectives. Instead of focusing on breaking an enemy's military will to resist after a declaration of war, future military struggle would support the greater political and economic struggle between the free world and communist systems. *NSC 68* stated:

> The only sure victory lies in the frustration of the Kremlin design by the steady development of the moral and material strength of the free world and its projection into the Soviet world in such a way as to bring about an internal change of the Soviet system.[39]

The operational design to execute a defensive long term national strategy required the free world to hold Western Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Western Pacific, and Japan while preventing further Soviet expansion. This required a different conception of military conflict. Into this strategic policy debate, the Korean War rudely interjected the reality of "Containment." The Korean War drew up a "butcher's bill" (cost of the policy in terms of human lives and material) of requirements in "blood and treasure." The cost of Containment in Korea was not cheap. In terms of "blood" it would cost the U.S. and its allies several hundred thousand military casualties (a combination of wounded and dead, mostly South Koreans).[40] In terms of "treasure" the estimated total cost Walter Hermes cites is $83 billion

---

[38] Ibid., 78. NSC 68 quotes paragraph 19 from NSC 20/4 to articulate the national objectives, aims and goals (in a word strategy).

[39] Ibid., 80.

[40] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 501. David Rees, *The Korean War: History and Tactics* (London: Orbis Publishing, 1984), 122-125. David Rees, *Korea: The Limited War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964), 434 and 440-444. Gordon L. Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle: United States, U.N., and Communist Ground, Naval, and Air Forces, 1950 – 1953* (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2002), 209.

as calculated by Raymond E. Manning for the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, 1956.[41] This was the cost of Containment; to use "military power to deter…aggressive Soviet or Soviet-directed actions of a limited or total character."[42]

Containment policy articulated in NSC 68 stated:

> "In "Containment" it is desirable to exert pressure in a fashion which will avoid so far as possible directly challenging Soviet prestige, to keep open the possibility for the [Soviet Union] to retreat before pressure with a minimum loss of face and to secure political advantage from the failure of the Kremlin to yield or take advantage of the openings we leave it."

Despite the strategic shift articulated in *NSC 68* "Containment Strategy," however, the essence of the Korean War turned out to be ground combat.[43] The last day of the Korean War saw one of the most immense exchanges of fire power between the two forces.[44] After three years of fighting the Chinese and Korean communists,[45] much of it brutal and hand-to-hand, the U.S. Army officially claimed there were no important lessons learned during the three years of combat in Korea.[46] Robert A. Doughty wrote in his review of Korean War doctrine, "[A] special bulletin from the Army Field Forces originally entitled "Lessons Learned" was soon re-titled "Training Bulletin."[47] However the drastic Army reforms of the 1950s, development of new equipment, and the rewriting of U.S. Army Field Manuals demonstrate the opposite.

This thesis connects global conditions and the Containment strategy to the U.S. Army development of operational concepts during the Korean War. Both WWII and Viet Nam dominate the historical study of 20th Century American warfare in ways dissimilar to the

---

[41] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 501.

[42] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 71.

[43] Ibid., 41 & 42.

[44] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 490 & 491; John Toland, *In Mortal Combat: 1950-1953* (New York: Harper, 1991), 575 & 576; Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 448.

[45] Xiaobing Li, Allan R. Millett, and Bin Yu, trans. & eds., *Mao's Generals Remember Korea* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansa, 2001), 22-29.

[46] Michael J. Varhola, *Fire and Ice: The Korean War, 195-1953* (Mason City: Savas Publishing Company, 2000), 274-276.

[47] Robert A. Doughty, *The Evolution of U.S. Army Tactical Doctrine, 1946-76* (Fort Leavenworth: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979), 12.

study of the Korean War. This thesis argues that the Korean War inherited WWII operational concepts, changed them to adapt to a defensive attritional condition, and these changes shaped how the U.S. Army went on to approach the Cold War. The Korean War was the U.S. Army's first limited war fought under a defensive military strategy using attrition to achieve U.S. national goals. The Army developed operational concepts to adapt to the limited U.S. military goals outlined in the national Containment strategy and the challenge presented by the Chinese Communist enemy they fought.

Chapter Two examines the conditions and environment that shaped the Korean War. The conditions in which the U.S. and its remaining allies found themselves in 1950 were different than those imagined in the fall of 1945. These conditions were starker and more confrontational than expected after the end of WWII, and included the rapid development of a Soviet atomic capability and a divided U.N. The passage of the *National Security Act of 1947* changed the structure of the U.S. defense and foreign policy establishment. This organizational change affected the way the U.S. government conducted its external and internal operations and demoted the U.S. Army from the head of the War Department to one of many equals within the U.S. government security apparatus.

The formulation of U.S. policy within this new military-political framework created a different type of U.S. grand strategy. The disintegration of the WWII alliance focused the National Security Council (NSC) on the transition of the Soviet Union from ally to enemy, and the spread of communism and communist inspired revolutions. The theoretical disconnect between the strategy articulated in *NSC-68* and the operational concepts outlined in *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949) created a gap between U.S. national strategy and the operational concepts the U.S. Army planned to use when the Korean War broke out.

This gap is best understood using the strategic – operational – tactical cross walk, to match the desired strategic goals articulated by the Truman doctrine and *NSC 68*, to potential

and actual operations desired, and the tactical capacity and capabilities of the U.S. Army. Conservative U.S. Army doctrine, as codified in the U.S. Army keystone manual, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), was written prior to the Korean War and adoption of *NSC 68*. This keystone manual focused on a military repetition of WWII.[48] Starting with V-E and V-J Day U.S. forces in the field dealt with shortages and conducted missions similar to containment. In Greece, China, Viet Nam, the Philippines, Korea, and Germany, U.S. Army soldiers grappled with containing communist aggression with inadequate doctrinal or institutional support.[49] Within this institutional transition the U.S. Army was thrust into the Korean War, which it eventually fought within the constraints of the Containment strategy. Because of the change in U.S. strategic objectives in early 1951, the U.S. Army had to change its operational concepts while fighting a revolutionary Chinese foe.

Chapter Three focuses on Communist tactics and the two critical ingredients necessary to wage modern war: men and material. During the Korean War, U.S. forces expended vast quantities of material but harbored their manpower. This dynamic expenditure of steel in the effort to reduce casualties reached its peak during the trench warfare period of the war, June 1951–July 1953.

From July 1950 until May 1951 the U.S. Army employed operational maneuver in accordance with *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), focused on offensive operations and battles of annihilation. The larger strategic picture, outside the Korean Theater of Operations (KTO), was fluid and changed from month to month. The greatest operational challenge during this period was the introduction of communist Chinese infantry formations into the conflict.

The development of U.S. soldiers and their equipment played a major role during the trench warfare period that ensued. During the Korean War the U.S. Army experimented with individual instead of unit based rotation policies. The majority of the new units created

[48] Ross, *American War Plans*, 3-20.
[49] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 291.

during the Korean War were sent to garrison Europe or the United States. During the conflict, the U.S. Army also learned how to maximize the use of its equipment beyond design specifications. Experimentation, adoption, and better employment of military equipment became an essential part of the Korean conflict. This included the introduction of modified and new tanks, new fire support systems and procedures, new personal support equipment, and other experimental technologies such as helicopters and armored personel carriers, all of which supported the change in operational concepts to adapt to a defensive attritional battlefield against a revolutionary Chinese enemy.

Chapter Four and Five focus on the operational concepts developed during the trench warfare period, 1951-1953. These operational concepts were developed to employ the manpower and equipment available to the U.S. Army to achieve the strategic defensive goals through attrition of the enemy. To fight against a tenacious Chinese communist enemy, under the specter of Soviet intervention, and the constraints of Containment, the U.S. Army employed five operational concepts. Chapter Four breaks down the three concepts internal to the U.S. Army while Chapter Five deals with the two concepts that involved the Army working with allies and the Koreans.

The three operational concepts that involved internal U.S. Army changes during the Korean War were small unit tactics, responsive precision fire support, and the employment of special operations. The two other operational concepts involved the way the U.S. Army would lead coalition operations and build local armies. In no document, manual, or book does it state that these were the five operational concepts that achieved U.S. military goals during the Korean War. Nor were these concepts ever coherently adopted in any one document after the war or taught at U.S. Army schools. Instead, the U.S. Army adopted many of these changes through the adoption of updated versions of *FM 100-5 (1954)* and other supporting manuals, specifically the various revision of the *Infantry* series of manuals.

Nevertheless, these five operational concepts were manifested through the decisions, missions, and doctrine that developed during and after the Korean War. These five operational concepts allowed the U.S. Army to remain tactically offensive while achieving strategically defensive goals.

The sixth chapter of the work is its conclusion. It explains how this thesis places the Korean War and its operational concepts in the perspective of an unfinished conflict unique in history. It was the one conflict where the nations of the Free World directly fought the PRC backed by the Soviet Union. It was a conflict where the final U.S./U.N. goal was not to liberate enemy territory but to maintain the status quo and convince the enemy to stop fighting. The battles in the hills of Korea along the 38th parallel trained a generation of American officers in the art of soldiering, stripped of glamour and revolutionary operational concepts.

Since the signing of the armistice in 1953, one-year unaccompanied tours in Korea, north of the no smile line,[50] trained fifty years' worth of soldiers and officers in the same soldiering arts. Each year new "turtles" would learn to adapt to the unforgiving Korean terrain and weather and learn to work with the hardy Korean people.[51] The tactical lessons learned and re-learned fighting the CPVF and KPA along the 38th parallel during the trench warfare period of the Korean War established the operational concepts that the U.S. Army continued to use throughout the Cold War.

[50] South Korea is divided into multiple military areas; Area One is right below the DMZ. The US Army 2nd Infantry Division was stationed in Area One from the signing of the armistice until 1954 and then returned in 1965 to the present.

[51] Turtle is a common soldier term for new arrivals in the KTO. The 2nd Infantry Division transient barracks at Camp Casey, where new soldiers used to stay before being assigned a unit, was called the turtle farm.

Literature Review

> *...All of the heroism and all of the sacrifice, went unreported. So the very fine victory of Pork Chop Hill deserves the description of the Won-Lost Battle. It was won by the troops and lost to sight by the people who sent them forth*
> – S.L.A. Marshall, Pork Chop Hill 16-18 April 1953[52]

Like the battle of Pork Chop Hill and heroism of the men that manned the MLR during the trench warfare period, the operational concepts developed and successfully employed were not embraced by the U.S. Army leadership as a desired model to contain communism. Similarly, analysis of operational concepts developed during the Korean War is an underdeveloped part of military history. Part of the Cold War or post-WWII narrative the Korean War is rarely the focus, but instead usually an event in a long list of events that shaped the period before the Viet Nam War and after WWII.[53] The Korean War is also downplayed as a factor in the study of longer term interaction between the states involved in it. For example John King Fairbank's work on U.S./Chinese relations, *The United States and China*, devotes only five pages to the period. Wars tend to affect the way states interact in the future. But not one word in Fairbank's book deals with the interaction between the U.S. and China during the war or the lessons learned from the Korean War.[54]

In U.S. Army circles the Korean War is often referred to as a limited victory and Viet Nam as a loss. In the 1963 work *This Kind of War: A Study in Unpreparedness,* T.R. Fehrenbach speculated that one can learn from losses but it is unclear what an army can learn from a tie? After the armistice was signed, many asked what the Korean War accomplished, "Despite the claims of the enemy, there had been no victory… in Korea. At best the outcome could be called a draw."[55] These thoughts are part of the historical and political reflections

[52] S.L.A. *Marshall, Pork Chop Hill* (New York: Berkley, 2000) 15.
[53] Jeremy Black, *Introduction to Global Military History: 1775 to the present day* (New York: Routledge, 2005) 172-210. The Korean War is one of the 10 events discussed as part of the Cold War. Black establishes the Korean War as the point where the Cold War turns hot.
[54] John King Fairbank, *The United States and China* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), 387-388.
[55] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 498.

about the Korean War but are tempered by the continued success of the Republic of Korea (ROK) in comparison to their cousins in the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea (DPRK).

From the late 1980's, the study of the Korean War expanded. New interest spurred by the publication of memoirs, battle and unit studies, and declassified documents, brought greater clarity to Korean War scholarship. An example is, *The Darkest Summer* by Bill Sloan that focused on the 1st Provisional Marine Brigade and its actions during the battle for the Pusan Perimeter. Sloan argues that the Marines performance in the Pusan perimeter and the Inchon landing saved the Marine Corps as a distinct organization within the U.S. Armed Forces. A memoir of battle and of the prisoner of war (POW) experience is found in *Valleys of Death* by Colonel William Richardson and Kevin Maurer.[56]

A similar work, *Forgotten Warriors*, by T. X. Hammes, contributes to the history of the U.S. Marine Corps' during the conflict and situates the Korean War within the Marine Corps' narrative.[57] In similar fashion, *On Hallowed Ground* by Bill McWilliams provides a detailed study of the valor and ingenuity demonstrated during the 6-12 June 1953 battle of Pork Chop Hill, one of the last battles of the war.[58] Likewise, Lee Ballenger's detailed two volume work on the Marine Corps' during the trench warfare period adds detail and humanity to the actions of small units during the truce tent period. Both *The Outpost War* and *The Final Crucible* demonstrate that both sides fought bitter battles up to the last day of the conflict.[59] At the heart of these detailed unit studies is a question: was the Korean War worth the sacrifice? The common conclusion was that the war was fought poorly with great sacrifice in

---

[56] Bill Sloan, *The Darkest Summer: Pusan and Inchon 1950: The battles that saved South Korea – and the Marines – from extinction* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2009); William Richardson with Kevin Maurer, *Valleys of Death: Memoir of the Korean War* (New York: Berkley Caliber, 2010).

[57] Thomas X. Hammes, *Forgotten Warriors: The 1st Provisional Marine Brigade, The Corps Ethos, and The Korean War* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2010).

[58] Bill McWilliams, *On Hallowed Ground: The Last Battle for Pork Chop Hill* (New York: Berkley Caliber Books, 2004).

[59] Lee Ballenger, *The Outpost War: U.S. Marines in Korea, Vol. 1: 1952* & *The Final Crucible: U.S. Marines in Korea, Vol. 2: 1953* (Washington: Potomac Books, 2000 & 2001).

lives lost. Yet, the cost was justified because it halted communism and gave the ROK the opportunity to become a free nation.

Some books focus on specific events or units that figured prominently in the Korean War. Andrew Salmon's *To the Last Round* is a good example. Salmon's detailed study of the British 29th Infantry Brigade's April 1951 battle along the Imjin River, known as the Battle for Gloster Hill, brings a new perspective and context to the Gloucestershire Regiment's sacrifice.[60] On Hill 235, the British Gloucestershire Regiment was destroyed while holding back the CPVF 63rd Army. The actions of the 29th Brigade were credited with slowing Marshal Peng Dehuai's Fifth Phase Offensive or Spring Offensive. Salmon writes as a journalist historian focused on a story he felt was not fully told. In telling the story of the 29th Brigade he argues that the British and other U.N. forces contributed more to the Korean War than is commonly understood.

Salmon's and William Johnston's *A War of Patrols: Canadian Army Operations in Korea*, add depth and detail to the Commonwealth contribution to the Korean War. They also support the literature on the British, Canadian, Australian, New Zealand, South African, and Indian Commonwealth experience during the Korean War. Johnson argues in his book that the first rotation of Canadians, the "Special Force," was as good as the professional units that contributed to the second and third rotations of Canadian troops during the Korean War. He also argues that the British Commonwealth Division was better than the U.S. Army divisions and equal to the U.S. Marine Corps division in Korea. This careful study of the contributions of Commonwealth forces during the conflict supports a broader understanding of the Korean War as a U.N. war against communist aggression.[61]

---

[60] Andrew Salmon, *To the Last Round: The Epic British Stand on the Imjin River, Korea 1951* (London: Aurum 2009); See also: William T. Bowers and John T. Greenwood, *Combat in Korea: Passing the Test April-June 1951* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2011), 151-158.

[61] William Johnston, *A War of Patrols: Canadian Army Operations in Korea* (Toronto: UBC Press, 2003).

Other writers attempted to encapsulate the entire Korean War in a single volume. The most well-known is T.R. Fehrenbach's *This Kind of War: A Study in Unpreparedness* now re-titled, *This Kind of War: The Classic Korean War History*.[62] Due to its high profile, the publisher changed the name when it was reprinted in 1994, to reflect its position within the field of Korean War studies. Originally published in 1963, Fehrenbach's central argument concerned the American people's lack of understanding about the war in Korea and American delusions about the conduct of future wars. He argued that the Containment strategy needed a new type of army, a professional army, trained and prepared to fight limited defensive attritional wars. Fehrenbach stressed that the future of American warfare would consist of limited wars such as Korea and not global wars like WWII.

Two popular historians of WWII with wide readerships, Max Hastings and John Toland, contributed to the field of Korean War history in their separate works *The Korean War* and *In Mortal Combat: Korea, 1950-1953*.[63] The iconic cover of Hastings work, depicting a shell shocked soldier, is one of the most recognized images associated with the Korean War. Hastings' book, published in 1987, was influenced by revisionist studies of the Korean and Viet Nam Wars. He concluded that the Korean War was misunderstood and poorly fought at all levels, but was a legitimate conflict fought for a valid reason that resulted in a free ROK.[64] Toland takes a similar view, but his book, written in 1991, right after the demise of the Soviet Union, concludes that "those who fought and died in that war did not fight and die in vain."[65]

In contrast, two substantive official histories on the Korean War from an allied perspective were written by Robert O'Neill, *Australia in the Korean War, 1950-53, Volume I: Strategy* and *Diplomacy* and *Volume II: Combat Operations* and Anthony Farrar-Hockley *Official History, The British Part in the Korean War, Volume I: A Distant Obligation* and

[62] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*.
[63] Hastings, *The Korean War*; Toland, *In Mortal Combat*.
[64] Hastings, *The Korean War*, 338-344.
[65] Toland, *In Mortal Combat*, 596.

Volume II: An Honourable Discharge.[66] Both O'Neill and Farrar-Hockley give depth and perspective to a conflict dominated by the American and Korean perspective. Each author demonstrates the effort and commitment of the various U.N. contingents who performed acts of valor in defense of Korea equal and sometimes greater than their American and Korean comrades.

The most recent serious studies of the Korean War come from Allan R. Millett. Two volumes of his planned three volume work are currently in print, published in 2005 and 2010 respectively, and the third is a work in progress. Dr. Millett, a colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, is considered the dean of Korean War studies, because of his attention to detail and insightful use of new or underutilized sources. As Jongsoo Lee wrote in *The American Historical Review* about Millett's second volume on the Korean War, "Millett makes a significant contribution to this crowded field by providing what is both a comprehensive military history and a sophisticated treatment of the war's diplomatic and political aspects. Eschewing a particular characterization of the war, Millett emphasizes its complexity."[67]

Several of Millett's works focus on the Korean War: *Their War for Korea: American, Asian, and European Combatants and Civilians, 1945-1953*; *The War for Korea, 1945-1950: A House Burning*; and *The War for Korea, 1950-1951: They Came from the North*.[68] He also assisted the Korean Institute of Military History in producing their three volume revised

---

[66] Robert O'Neil, *Australia in the Korean War, 1950-53, Volume I: Strategy and Diplomacy* and *Volume II: Combat Operations* (Canberra: The Australian War Memorial and the Australian Government Publishing Service, 1981 and 1985). Anthony Farrar-Hockley, *Official History, The British Part in the Korean War, Volume I: A Distant Obligation* and *Volume II: An Honourable Discharge* (London: HMSO, 1990 and 1995).

[67] Jongsoo Lee, "Allan R. Millett. *The War for Korea, 1950-1951: They Came from the North*," *The American History Review* 117 (February 2012): 180.

[68] Allan R. Millett, *Their War for Korea: American, Asian, and European Combatants and Civilians. 1945-1953* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004) Allan R. Millett, *The War for Korea, 1945-1950: A House Burning* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005); Allan R. Millett, *The War for Korea, 1950—1951: They came from the North* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2010).

official history of the Korean War.[69] Millett argues that the Korean War was a complex and important event that most historians fail to understand.[70] He takes in a variety of elements such as faith, political beliefs, culture, and balances them with various military factors from both sides to gain a more distilled understanding of an event. This approach provides depth and a different level of understanding to the Korean War which itself was a clash of a multitude of different cultures, ideas, and perspectives.

In contrast, there exists a small but active revisionist group of historians led by Bruce Cumings that focuses on Korea and the Korean War. Cumings' two scholarly works *The Origins of the Korean War: Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes, 1945*-1947 and *The Origins of the Korean War, Volume II: The Roaring of the Cataract, 1947-1950* are the bases for much of his later popular works.[71] Each book calls into question many parts of the traditional Korean War narrative, including the common understanding that the DPRK started the war on 25 June 1950.[72] Cumings argues, "The beginning of the Korean War was in 1931-32, after Japanese forces invaded the northeast provinces of China and established the puppet state of Manchukuo."[73] While most of his earlier critiques focused on the causes of the war and reason for the conflict, in later works he began to question the legitimacy of the regime created by the U.S. in South Korea.

In *The Korean War: A History* a popular history of the Korean War, Cumings summarizes the arguments put forth in his two scholarly writings. He identifies linkages between the early leadership of the ROK government, Army (ROKA) and the former

---

[69] Korea Institute of Military History, *The Korean War: Volume One, Volume Two & Volume Three* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000, 2001, & 2001).

[70] Millett, *A House Burning*, 2.

[71] Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War: Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes, 1945-1947*and *Volume II: The Roaring of the Cataract, 1947-1950* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981 and 1990).

[72] Bruce Cumings, *The Korean War: A History* (New York: Modern Library, 2011), 5-12. Cumings describes the lead up to the beginning of the war and attributes the North Korean, Korean People's Army (KPA), attack on 25 June 1950 as a reaction to South Korean actions on the border starting in 1949 and the provocative visit by John Foster Dulles to the border a week before the KPA "counterattack" on 25 June 1950.

[73] Cumings, *The Korean War*, 44. He discusses this idea in detail in the section called Origins and Beginnings, 43-47.

Imperial Japanese colonial administration that ruled Korea until August 1945.[74] In articulating the North Korean view, Cumings notes: "To the North Koreans it is less the Japanese than the Korean quislings that matter: blood enemies. They essentially saw the war in 1950 as a way to settle the hash of the top command of the South Korean army, nearly all of whom had served the Japanese."[75] The other issue prominent in revisionist history is the accusation that the U.S. and ROKA forces committed more atrocities than the KPA before and during the war. Cumings draws attention to these arguments in *The Korean War: A History* and *North Korea*.[76] In the words of Allan R. Millett, Cumings' "eagerness to cast America's officials and policy in the worst possible light, however, often leads him to confuse chronological cause and effect and to leap to judgments that cannot be supported by the documentation he cites or ignores."[77]

Other revisionist historians stay closer to the traditional narrative. William Stueck, Don Oberdorfer, and Charles K. Armstrong produced books focused on the Korean people, cultural, and politics behind the Korean War. Stueck's two major works, *The Korean War: An International History* and *Rethinking the Korean War: A New Diplomatic and Strategic History,* bring out the complexity of the conflict.[78] Stueck argues that the Korean War was "a substitute for World War III. What we mean is that in its timing, its course, and its outcome, it had a stabilizing effect on the Cold War."[79] He states that "As the crisis intensified, American leaders turned reflexively to multinational institutions. In December (1950) the United States took the lead in forming the NATO military command, appointing General Eisenhower as its first head."[80]

---

[74] Cumings, *The Korean War*, 37-58.
[75] Cumings, *The Korean War*, 44-45.
[76] Bruce Cumings, *North Korea* (New York: The New Press, 2004); Cumings, *The Korean War*.
[77] Millett, *A House Burning*, 321
[78] William Stueck, *The Korean War: An International History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); William Stueck, *Rethinking the Korean War: A New Diplomatic and Strategic History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).
[79] Stueck, *Rethinking the Korean War*, 1.
[80] Ibid., 224.

Don Oberdorfer and Charles Armstrong take a cultural and political approach towards understanding the Korean people, their aspirations, and the actions of different Korean leaders and groups involved in the creation of the two Korean states.[81] Don Oberdorfer's work, *The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History* explains the perspective of the two Korean states but focuses more on developments in South Korea due to the Korean War. Oberdorfer argues that the memory of the horror of the Korean War and the threat of destruction from their northern cousins created a unified southern Korean culture that was stronger and more resilient than before the war.[82]

Charles Armstrong's *The Korean Revolution: 1945-1950,* analyzes the creation of the DPRK. Indicting his affiliations in the field of Korean history, Armstrong thanks Bruce Cumings in the first sentence of his acknowledgments.[83] Armstrong views "North Korea [as] an ideal microcosm for understanding the phenomenon of Marxist-Leninist state socialism."[84] He asserts that:

> "A major source of the DPRK's strength and resiliency, as well as many of its serious flaws and shortcomings…lies in the poorly understood origins of the North Korean system."[85]

Armstrong argues that the DPRK's ability to resist change emanated from the system created during the founding of the DPRK, a system that fused classic Korean narratives, Marxist-Leninist certainty, and mass organization unparalleled in the communist world. These revisionist works enhanced the field of Korean history by adding a different understanding of the "Hermit Kingdom."[86]

Other authors grappled with the tactical and operational issues of the war and where it fits in the history of the U.S. Army. Two of David Rees' works on the Korean War, *Korea:*

---

[81] Don Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History* (Indianapolis: Basic Books, 1997); Charles K. Armstrong, *The North Korean Revolution, 1945 – 1950* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003).
[82] Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, 10.
[83] Armstrong, *The North Korean Revolution*, xi.
[84] Ibid., 1.
[85] Ibid., 1.
[86] Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, 4.

The Limited War and *The Korean War: History and Tactics* deal with Korea as a new type of war and some of the changes that resulted.[87] Paddy Griffith's *Forward into Battle: Fighting Tactics from Waterloo to the Near Future* does not focus on Korean War tactics but deal with the result of changes in the Army after Korea and influenced the U.S. Army that fought in Viet Nam.[88] In contrast Stephen E. Pease's *Psywar: Psychological Warfare in Korea: 1950-1953* deals specifically with psychological warfare and how it was employed in Korea against a communist force that was heavily indoctrinated and used similar psychological warfare tactics.[89] D. Clayton James and Anne Sharp Wells *Refighting the Last War: Command and Crisis in Korea 1950-1953* take on the issues of command and the challenges that U.S. commanders faced adapting to limited war with limited means.[90] Each of these authors contribute to understanding the changes that occurred during and after the Korean War and place this war as different from the previous world wars and sets the stage for conflicts throughout the Cold War.

William T. Bowers' three volume *The Line: Combat in Korea, January-February 1951, Striking Back: Combat in Korea, March-April 1951* and with John T. Greenwood *Passing the Test: Combat in Korea, April-June 1951* offer an in depth look and analysis of the Eighth Army and how it grappled with the CPVF.[91] These three works offer a unique analysis of the Eighth Army adaptation to the CPVF "man over machine" concepts and includes intense firsthand accounts of those who fought. Bowers and Greenwood link the actions of squads

---

[87] David Rees, *The Korean War: History and Tactics* (London: Orbis Publishing, 1984) and *Korea: The Limited War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964).

[88] Paddy Griffith, *Forward into Battle: Fighting Tactics from Waterloo to the Near Future* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1981).

[89] Stephen E. Pease, *Psywar: Psychological Warfare in Korea: 1950-1953* (Harrisburg: Stackpole Books, 1992).

[90] D. Clayton James and Anne Sharp Wells, *Refighting the Last War: Command and Crisis in Korea 1950-1953* (New York: Macmillan, 1993).

[91] William T. Bowers, *The Line: Combat in Korea, January-February 1951* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2008); William T. Bowers, *Striking Back: Combat in Korea, March-April 1951* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010); William T. Bowers and John T. Greenwood, *Passing the Test: Combat in Korea, April-June 1951* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2011).

and platoons to the greater struggle and emphasis the importance of the individual soldier and small unit to the greater success of the Eighth Army.

When reviewing Korean War literature, one type is hard to ignore: the official histories written for various nations' militaries. In the field of official Korean War histories, the U.S. Navy and Air Force each commissioned a single volume on the war that detailed their contributions to the conflict. The U.S. Air Force official history claims that airpower achieved the U.N. military objectives.[92] This assertion was harshly disputed by Ridgway in his own work *The Korean War*.[93] The U.S. Marine Corps commissioned a five volume set on the conflict that focused on the crucial role of the Marine Corps. Three of the five volumes examined the maneuver period. The fourth volume, *The East-Central Front*, focused on the period from the summer of 1951 through February 1952. The fifth volume, *Operations in West Korea*, covers March 1952 through July 1953. Each of these official histories provides great detail on U.S. armed forces contributions during the Korean War.

The U.S. Army has produced more works on the Korean War than any other service and continues to support the writing of new monographs on different aspects of the conflict. These works provide a detailed accounting of the U.S. Army during the entire conflict in contrast to other works that tend to focus on just the first third. The U.S. Army Center of Military History commissioned the writing of four chronological volumes that cover the period before 25 June 1950 until the end of hostilities. Then it published three histories focused on the contributions and changes in medical services, logistical operations, and combat support.[94] These official histories examine technical changes that transformed rear area operations during the war. Due to the desegregation carried out during the Korean War,

---

[92] Robert F. Futrell, *The United States Air Force in Korea, 1950 – 1953* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981), 647, 672, and 694.

[93] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 75-76, 82, & 244.

[94] Albert E. Cowdrey, *United States Army in the Korean War: The Medics' War* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986); Terrence J. Gough, *U.S. Army Mobilization and Logistics in the Korean War* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987); John G. Westover, *Combat Support in Korea* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955).

the U.S. Army examined the segregated 24th Infantry Regiment and its performance prior to the unit casing its colors (ceasing to exist) after desegregation in 1951.[95] Most recently, in 2009, the Center for Military History published a history of the 65th Infantry Regiment, a Puerto Rican regiment similar to the 24th Infantry Regiment. In *Honor and Fidelity: The 65th Infantry in Korea, 1950-1953*, Gilberto N. Villahermosa explores the challenges faced by the 65th due to language and cultural barriers that resulted in tactical failures and relief of its commander and senior officers.[96] The story of the 24th and 65th Infantry Regiments is an important part of the desegregation of the U.S. Army and the challenges faced implementing that policy in combat. The theme that runs throughout all these works is that the Korean War was different and each books grapples with the differences.

Despite these numerous works on the Korean War, relatively little was written about the doctrinal changes the U.S. Army went through as it fought a static war in Korea from 1951-1953, resulting in a drastic revision of *FM 100-5 Operations* (1954) and almost all the supporting manuals.[97] The U.S. Army did produce a book for soldiers that analyzed nineteen small unit actions that occurred throughout the war. This book was disseminated to soldiers, and the case studies were designed to serve as examples of soldiers in modern combat. *Combat Actions in Korea* served as a soldiers' primer on how to fight outnumbered and at night against Communist forces.

To ensure the Korean Military Assistance Command (KMAG) was not forgotten, the U.S. Army commissioned, *Korean Military Assistance Command: KMAG, In Peace and War,* to record its efforts. The U.S. Army also created two lengthy pictorial histories of the conflict that showed the war in all its different forms. These official histories provided an

---

[95] William T. Bowers, William M. Hammond, & George L. MacGarrigle, *Black Soldier, White Army: The 24th Infantry Regiment in Korea* (Washington D.C.: United States Army, 1996). The process of dissolving a unit is called, casing of the unit colors. In the future the U.S. Army could re-activate the unit and uncase its colors.

[96] Gilberto N. Villahermosa, *Honor and Fidelity: The 65th Infantry in Korea, 1950-1953* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2009).

[97] Doughty, *The Evolution of US Army Tactical Doctrine*.

intuitional answer to the questions of what happened and why. As a whole, these books provide context, but do not discuss what affect the war in Korea had on the organization, training, and doctrine of the U.S. Army.

This thesis contributes to the existing literature concerning the U.S. Army in the Korean War by examining the development of operational concepts it used during the conflict. The U.S. Army was forced to adapt to its new role as the shield of the free world, as outlined in *NSC 68*. This made the Korean War the first test of the validity of the Containment strategy, focused on using the military as a defensive tool to protect the nation's offensive economic and political capabilities. These adaptations, the operational concepts that the U.S. Army developed, provide an insight into how the U.S. Army adapts to change. The study of the operational and doctrinal changes that occurred during the trench warfare period enhances the understanding of the Korean War's place in U.S. Army development.

Chapter 2: New Global Situation

The new global situation that developed in the late 1940's included a dramatic shift in global conditions. This shift produced dramatic changes in U.S. strategy, and eventually, how the U.S. Army fights. This change crystallized with the outbreak of hostilities on the Korean Peninsula in late June 1950. To understand the development of operational concepts during the Korean War, it is necessary to understand the disconnect that developed between U.S. national strategy and U.S. Army operational concepts prior to the start of the war. It is then possible to analyze the development of U.S. Army operational concepts during the Korean War. This change in concepts would remedy the gap between U.S. strategy, Containment, and prewar U.S. Army operational concepts.

The U.S., in coordination with the Soviet Union, U.K., and the Republic of China (ROC) created the U.N. with the signing of its Charter on 26 June 1945.[1] From the summer of 1945 to the outbreak of the Korean War in the summer of 1950, a world where the Big Three, the United States, the United Kingdom and Soviet Union, would solve the world's problems through negotiations disintegrated. Instead, the U.S. and its allies found themselves in a bi-polar world fighting a constant political, economic and at times military conflict with the communist bloc, led by the Soviet Union. This was different from the world U.S. leaders imagined and tried to build through the U.N. Charter.[2]

The rapid development of a Soviet atomic capability, the need for a unanimous vote by the Security Council to employ the legitimacy of the U.N., and the spread of militant communism changed the perspective of U.S. leaders. Internal U.S. government changes

[1] Harry S. Truman Library & Museum, "Truman and the U.N." http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/un/large/ (accessed March 22, 2012).

[2] Mary E Glantz, *FDR and the Soviet Union: The President's Battle over Foreign Policy* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005), 162, 166 & 184; Melvyn P. Leffler, *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917 – 1953* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994), 38-59; Ross, *American War Plans*, 3-10; Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 13; James F. Schnabel, *United States Army in the Korean War, Policy and Direction: The First Year* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990), 41-43; May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 2.

created new tools for the U.S. government to use to achieve its strategic goals. The passage of the *National Security Act of 1947*, enhanced in 1949, created the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), U.S. Air Force (USAF), Department of Defense (DoD), the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS), the Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, National Security Resource Boards (NSRB), and National Security Council (NSC) changed the U.S. security structure.[3]

Winston Churchill raised the collective call to arms in his "Sinews of Peace" speech describing an "Iron Curtain" that had fallen across Eastern Europe in 1946.[4] Churchill was the first major figure to label the Soviet Union as no longer a partner in preserving the global peace.[5] Eleven days earlier, on 22 February 1946, George F. Kennan, in the "Long Telegram" articulated many of Churchill's concerns.[6] It was not until the article, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," by George F. Kennan as Mr. "X," and the buildup of demonstrated Soviet intransigence that U.S. leaders began to take the problem seriously.[7] Both Kennan and Churchill argued that the U.S. and its allies needed to adjust to the changed world. Their central argument was that the U.S. and Soviet Union were now in competition to shape different global systems.

The Korean War was the first war fought when both sides possessed atomic capabilities. With the advent of atomic weapons, U.S. and Western European leaders feared that another total war would destroy the planet in an atomic holocaust.[8] Military leaders viewed a war with atomic weapons as militarily possible. Political leaders did not view it as politically or morally feasible.[9]

---

[3] National Security Act of 1947, Public Law 253, 80th Cong., 1st sess, http://intelligence.senate.gov/nsact1947.pdf. (July 26, 1947, accessed March 5, 2012), 495-510.

[4] Winston Churchill, "Sinews of Peace," Speech, Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, March 5, 1946, http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1946/s460305a_e.htm (accessed March 30, 2012).

[5] Winston Churchill, "Sinews of Peace," Speech, Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, March 5, 1946, http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/1946/s460305a_e.htm (accessed March 30, 2012).

[6] George Kennan, Long Telegram, http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/coldwar/documents/episode-1/kennan.htm. (Moscow to Washington, February 22, 1946).

[7] George Kennan, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct" in *Foreign Affairs* 25 (July 1947): 566-582.

[8] Schnabel, *Policy and Direction: The First Year*, 289 & 290.

[9] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 69-71.

NSC 68 codified the shift in the "Truman Doctrine" from limited engagement to containment of the Soviet Union, designed to stop communist expansion through intensive U.S. engagement and support of the free world.[10] At present we do not have a similar document that enumerates Stalin's strategy for the Soviet Union in the post-WWII period. Despite the lack of documented strategy, the actions of Stalin from August 1945 until his death in 1953 demonstrate a desire to expand the reach of the Soviet Union through the creation of dependent communist states.[11]

The Soviet Union's actions in Korea exemplified Soviet strategy in regions "liberated" by the Red Army. Strategically Stalin wanted to buy time through various maneuvers short of war while the occupied satellite states were integrated into the Soviet system.[12] In contrast, Truman's America rested on three pillars: economic superiority, political legitimacy based on over 150 years of democratic rule, and military dominance through the control of atomic weapons. The corner stone of America's deterrent power was its unmatched military reach, and the ability to employ its atomic arsenal against any nation. This situation changed in August 1949 when the Soviets detonated their own atomic device.[13] This technological achievement was enhanced by the military and political victory of Mao Zedong and his Chinese communists when they defeated U.S. client Chiang Kai-shek and establishing the People's Republic of China (PRC) on 1 October 1949.[14]

Before WWII ended, various Korean factions began to fight over what their nation should become. The politics on the Korean Peninsula immediately fused with the developing superpower conflict between the U.S. and Soviet Union. The temporary arrangements

---

[10] *NSC 68* (April 1950) is considered the actualizing document related to *NSC 20/4* (November 1948) which laid out the threat of the Soviet Union to the US and its allies and goals of the U.S. government. *NSC 68* states how the U.S. Government will accomplish the goals stated in *NSC 20/4*. NATO was created in 1949 as part of the reaction to the issues raised in NSC 20/4 and the growing Soviet threat in Europe.

[11] Zubok & Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War*, 13, 29, 74-77 & 277.

[12] Andrei Lankov, *From Stalin to Kim Il Sung: The Formation of North Korea, 1945-1960* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2002), 1-48; Zubok & Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War*, 32, 33 & 39; Leffler, *The Specter of Communism*, 38-43.

[13]Leffler, *The Specter of Communism*, 91.

[14] Jung Chang and Jon Halliday, *The Unknown Story: Mao* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005), 322.

designed at the end of the war with Japan brought the forces of both powers onto the Korean Peninsula.[15] Each of their political agendas accompanied their military forces to Korea.

The division and occupation of Korea provides an example of each superpowers plan for the post-WWII world. After the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in August 1945, Brigadier General George Lincoln, Colonel Charles Bonesteel and Colonel Dean Rusk, were tasked to create a plan on how to divide Allied occupational duties in Korea. The atomic bomb, coupled with the swift invasion of Manchuria by the Soviet Red Army, forced a snap decision with respect to the division of the Korean Peninsula. The task of disarming and repatriating Japanese civilians and military forces was the primary military task envisioned by these planners. In due course, a Joint Commission would determine the political future of Korea. Huddled over a *National Geographic* map of Korea, on the night of 10-11 August 1945 at the U.S. Army Operations Division office, they decided to divide the Korean Peninsula at the 38th Parallel between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.[16]

The first twelve months of occupation saw two visions of Korea coalesce under the two powers responsible for the de-colonization and creation of a Korean state. The Soviets created a communist Korean state, controlled by Korean guerrillas who fought the Japanese in the 1920s and 1930s in Manchuria. These guerrillas found refuge in the Soviet Union. From 1941-1945 they planned and trained to take over Korea after the expulsion of the Japanese.[17] These were the iron disciplined and Soviet supported Korean Communists led by Kim Il Sung. They were assisted by the Soviet Union and later the PRC.[18] In contrast, the U.S. occupation in South Korea set off a bloody and fractious period where numerous political parties fought for control, legitimacy, and support from the United States Army Military Government in Korea (USAMGIK) and the Korean people in the south. Unlike the

---

[15] Spector, *In the Ruins of Empire*, i-iii & 264-276.
[16] Stueck, *Rethinking the Korean War*, 11-12.
[17] Cumings, *The Korean War*, 43-58.
[18] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 8-10; Cumings, *The Korean War*, 5-6; Armstrong, *The North Korean Revolution*, 107-112, 166-169, 201-210, & 231-239.

guidance from Stalin, the guidance to Lieutenant General John R. Hodge, USAMGIK commander, from Washington D.C. was vague and unhelpful.

Under Soviet occupation, Kim Il Sung became the leader of the North Korean Workers Party in December of 1945, followed by his appointment as Chairman of the North Korean Provisional People's Committee (NKPPC) on 8 February 1946.[19] Kim was supported by Korean guerrillas trained and based in Siberia. To accomplish the creation of a Korean communist state, it was essential that Kim create a "United Front" that mimicked Soviet policy in Manchuria and Eastern Europe. Chinese influenced Korean Communists from Yen'an were trained and supported by Mao. Soviet influenced and trained Korean Communists from Manchuria were led by Kim. Last there were local Korean Communists, who operated underground during the Japanese occupation. The "United Front" also included the leftist faction of Korean Democratic Party in the north and the Young Friends Party. Each represented different parts of Korean society but were later infiltrated by Kim's communists and purged once he had enough leverage to squeeze out the original leaders of these "friendly parties".[20]

South of the 38th Parallel, the Imperial Japanese Government initiated a ceasefire on 15 August 1945 and formally surrendered on 2 September. But it was not until 8 September that XXIV Corps of the U.S. Tenth Army under command of General Hodge arrived at Inchon, Korea. Hodge received the formal surrender of Governor-General Abe Nobuyuki the following day, 9 September 1945.[21] XXIV Corps and its divisions came from fighting in Okinawa and the Philippines and were preparing to invade Japan.[22] From 15 August, until the arrival 7th Infantry Division and the XXIV Corps headquarters on 8 September, the

[19] Armstrong, *The North Korean Revolution*, 69-70; William T Bowers, *Combat in Korea: January-February 1951* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1951), 1.

[20] Armstrong, *The North Korean Revolution*,107-135.

[21] Millett, *A House Burning*, 57 & 58; James and Wells, *Refighting the Korean War*, 172.

[22] Gordon L. Rottman, *Okinawa 1945: The Last Battle* (Long Island City: Osprey Publishing, 2002), 17, 34, 84-88.

Japanese allowed Yo Un-hyong to establish the Committee for the Preparation of Korean Independence, which included local Communists under Pak Hon-Yong. On 6 September, they established a People's Republic of Korea.[23] On 9 September businessmen and conservatives formed the Korean Democratic Party.[24] The divide between left and right was thus established in Seoul as the Americans arrived.

Throughout Hodge's occupation (9 September 1945 – 15 August 1948), various Korean factions fought for legitimacy, authority, and control. Former nobles, land lords, former Japanese régime government workers, capitalist, rightist democrats, and intellectuals coalesced around Syngman Rhee. Right wing groups gained indirect control of the Korean National Police (KNP) and nascent ROKA through the control of volunteers for both forces.[25] The right wing political leaders began to suppress the socialists, communists, and other leftist groups using the KNP and purges of the ROKA.[26]

The U.N. Interim Assembly approved an American resolution to hold Korean elections in May 1948 with or without the participation of Kim and his government north of the 38th parallel. Leaders in Pyongyang knew that an election supervised by the U.N. and USAMGIK would lead to their defeat and a loss of legitimacy for their fledgling communist state. Instead, Kim offered a new Soviet style unification constitution, at a protest conference, in Pyongyang from 19-29 April 1948.[27] Kim supported civil unrest through the Kangdong Institute in the form of communist attacks on the KNP, government officials, and rightists on Cheju-do Island in April 1948.[28] The 10 May election boycotted by Kim and condemned by

---

[23] Millett, *A House Burning*, 44-46.

[24] Ibid., 47 & 48.

[25] The Republic Army of Korea was known as the Constabulary until the establishment of the Republic of Korea in 1948.

[26] Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 9-12; Korean Institute of Military History, *The Korean War: Volume One*, 66, 73, 75 & 76; Millett, *A House Burning*, 77, 82, 83, & 188.

[27] Millett, *A House Burning*, 139-142, 150-151.

[28] Millett, *A House Burning*, 142-148; Korean Institute of Military History, *The Korean War: Volume One*, 31-35.

the Soviet Union brought about the creation of the ROK, on 15 August 1948) and the DPRK, on 9 September 1948.[29] These two antagonistic states divided the Korean Peninsula.

Despite setbacks, the Truman administration supported the U.N. In early 1950 the Soviets boycotted UNSC meetings because of the U.S. refusal to allow Mao's PRC to assume the "China" Security Council seat from Chiang's rump Republic of China. With Stalin and Mao's support, Kim gambled on an all-out military invasion designed to destroy the ROK government in one month. The Soviets were absent when the issue of the 25 June 1950 DPRK invasion of the ROK came before the UNSC.[30] The U.S. seized this opportunity to reinforce a collective response with the legitimacy of a UNSC mandate; the U.S. and its allies condemned the aggression and struck a forceful diplomatic blow against Soviet policy.

Through UNSC Resolutions, the DPRK invasion was denounced as an act of aggression, member states were authorized and encouraged to send support, specifically military forces, to defend the ROK. U.S. leadership, supported by its allies, ensured the swift passage of the resolutions. These resolutions pitted the legitimacy of U.N., led by the U.S., against the communist powers on the Korean peninsula.[31] This was a colossal diplomatic blunder by the Soviet Union, which they would never repeat during the remainder of the Cold War.

The challenge of aggression in Korea was met by the rapidly evolving American security policy making machinery. Changes within the U.S. government revamped the policy making and implementing branches of the U.S. government.[32] Previously, U.S. foreign policy depended on the personality of the President, with priority given to the State Department to help him define U.S. foreign relations and policy priorities. Dr. Charles A. Stevenson articulated the gravity of the change by quoting then Senator John Chandler

---

[29] Korean Institute of Military History, *The Korean War: Volume One*, 28-31.

[30] U.N. Security Council, "Security Council Resolutions 82, 83, 84, & 85" (New York: 25 June – 31 July 1950), http://www.un.org/documents/sc/res/1950/scres50.htm (accessed March 24, 2012); Zubok & Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War*, 64; Schnabel, *Policy and Direction: The First Year*, 100-103.

[31] U.N. Security Council, "Security Council Resolutions 82, 83, 84, & 85," New York: 25 June – 31 July 1950, http://www.un.org/documents/sc/res/1950/scres50.htm (accessed March 24, 2012).

[32] Collins, *Lightning Joe*, 333-335.

Gurney (R-SD), "It is now within our power to give the President the help he so urgently needs, and replace the security organization of 1798 with the organization of 1947."[33]

In *NSA 1947*, the U.S. Army was downgraded in status with respect to strategic planning within the U.S. government. Now the Department of the Army, no longer the senior Department of War, was only one part of a coordinated defense team. The Army and Navy were no longer autonomous departments of the U.S. government. But this change in governmental structure did not immediately alter the way the Army thought about warfare. Nor did it influence the Army's vision of its substantive role in national defense, or the way the Army thought the nation should fight future wars. The Army remained convinced that only U.S. ground forces could ensure victory over any future opponent. Despite the passage of the *National Security Act of 1947*, its effect on how the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) would fight future wars remained unclear. [34]

NSC 68 provided an answer: the free world would use its political, economic and psychological capabilities as offensive weapons to defeat similar Soviets capabilities. In contrast, the military power of the free world would serve as a "force in being," that would provide a shield of deterrence against overt Soviet aggression.[35] This was a novel, untried strategic concept, based on collective security in times of peace. It required the nations of the free world to create a standing global military defense system.

This Cold War strategy of protracted employment of political, economic, and psychological weapons to achieve national objectives was a decisive break with past American strategies. Previous American strategies focused on the use of overwhelming military power to annihilate enemies. President Roosevelt's "unconditional surrender" was

---

[33] Charles A. Stevenson, "Underlying Assumptions of the National Security Act of 1947," *Joint Forces Quarterly* 48 (1st quarter 2008): 131.

[34] *National Security Act of 1947,* Public Law 253, 80th Cong., 1st sess., July 26, 1947 (accessed March 24th, 2012), 497-499: Sec. 102.

[35] Truman Presidential Library, *NSC 68*, http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/coldwar/documents/sectioned.php?documentid=10-1&pagenumber=1&groupid=1, 54-59.

the apogee of this American strategy. To successfully implement the Containment strategy of Cold War, the U.S. and free world powers would need a credible military capability in being. But there was a fundamental problem: an adequate free world military shield did not exist in the summer of 1950.

The strategy of Containment articulated a need for defensive attritional warfare on any future battlefield to check communist aggression. *NSC 68* required the U.S. military to fight defensively to protect the free world economic and political order, if the forces in did not deter Soviet aggression. Defensive attritional tactics represented the antithesis of the Army operational concepts in 1950. The prevailing Strategic-Operational-Tactical Crosswalk prior to *NSC 68* connected national strategy to a military strategy in a specific theater of war. It then connected that strategy to the operational concepts used by units that would swiftly defeat an enemy – and this was both simple and long standing. The U.S. military followed pre-established concepts articulated in OPLAN *Offtackle*, which was designed to fight a war as quickly and decisively as possible.[36]

The U.S. Army assimilated atomic weapons into their panoply of weapons in the same fashion that they integrated radar, the combustion engine in the form of tanks and trucks, radios, machine guns, and aircraft. All these weapons would, in the view of Army leaders, support the infantry, the core of the Army.

On 4 February 1949, Bradley, soon to become the first Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in August of 1949, gave a speech on "Creating a Sound Military Force". The speech was published as the lead article in the premier Army journal, *Military Review*, in May 1949. Bradley outlined his vision of how the Army would fight a future war within the design of the

[36] Ross, *American War Plans*, 110-118.

National Security Act of 1947.[37] Bradley's vision of a future war was divided into three stages.[38]

Bradley made it clear the armed forces would fight in a way similar to WWII, with more atomic bombs. In the summer of 1950 the new bureaucratic machine, DoD, and its older core component, the U.S. Army, were not focused on fashioning a defensive shield to protect the free world. Instead, the DoD was focused and designed to annihilate the perceived enemy, the Soviet Union, in a swift and offensive war of annihilation.[39]

In support of this decisive offensive paradigm, the Army, in August 1949, published its updated doctrine, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949). It standardized how the Army would conduct operations in the next war. The idea of defensive attritional warfare was not included. Neither were ideas of limited war, coalition war, or the importance of building local armies.[40] Some change occurred when the U.S. Army worked to codify lessons from WWII. As Doughty noted in his study of U.S. Army doctrine from 1946-1976, "The requirement for closely coordinated and effective firepower emerged as one of the primary lessons of World War II."[41] The Army also recognized the need to provide its forces with a doctrine for "Special Operations," in the form of two new manual *FM 31-20 Operations Against Guerrilla Forces* and *FM 31-21 Organization and Conduct of Guerrilla Warfare*, both written before the war but not published until after it started. This was a continuation of pervious doctrinal developments. When *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949) defined "Special Operations" it focused on unique terrain, not unique missions, except Partisan Operations,

---

[37] Omar N. Bradley, "Creating a Sound Military Force," in *Military Review 24* May 1949), 3-6.
[38] For a complete description of Bradley's three stages, please read: Bradley, "Creating a Sound Military Force," 4.

[39] Ross, *American War Plans*, 110-118.
[40] Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), 4-10.
[41] Doughty, *The Evolution of US Army Tactical Doctrine*, 3; for an in-depth look at the desert tactics used during WWII, please refer to Paddy Griffith, *World War II Desert Tactics* (Great Britain: Osprey Publishing, 2008).

which received eight paragraphs of explanation. These technical, tactical, and doctrinal changes were just starting as the Korean War began.

The operational concepts taught at the Command and General Staff College in 1949-1950 did not focus on implementing the strategic ideas envisioned in *NSC 68*. Rather, the U.S. Army system was designed to repeat the success of WWII through the employment of amphibious, airborne and armor concepts directed at an aggressor state, supported by conventional and atomic bombs. These operational concepts were designed around an offensive maneuver war that would include a series of battles designed to annihilate the enemy on his territory, to destroy his war making capability, capture key terrain and destroy the enemies will to resist. When the Korean War began, these were operational concepts the U.S. Army executed until they were ordered to stop. This intra-governmental disconnect between the proposed national strategy, Containment, and U.S. Army operational concepts was revealed as the Korean War developed.

In contrast, the DPRK used a Soviet designed plan, led by Soviet T-34 tanks, and supported by Soviet 122mm artillery pieces, to cross the 38th parallel into the ROK.[42] The KPA did not drive south of the 38th Parallel to wage limited warfare. They aimed to unify the Korean Peninsula under Kim's communist government in a month. Their battle plan was created by Soviet advisors and advised down to the division level, by Soviet officers, during the initial assault. Based on their uniforms, equipment, and tactics the KPA was a Korean clone of the Red Army.[43]

The invasion of the ROK by the DPRK forced Truman to commit American forces in defense of the ROK. Ridgway described the ROKA defense against the KPA, "It was as if a few troops of Boy Scouts with hand weapons had undertaken to stop a Panzer Unit."[44] In

---

[42] Armstrong, *The North Korean Revolution*, 238 & 239; Korea Institute of Military History, *The Korean War, Volume One*, 102-132.

[43] Schnabel, *Policy and Direction: The First Year*, 36-39 & 61.

[44] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 17.

September 1950 the Inchon landing was about to execute and General Walton H. Walker's mixed U.S./Korean/Commonwealth Eighth Army was holding the Pusan perimeter and preparing to breakout. After four years of bureaucratic wrangling, this dire military situation forced the long debate over national strategy to a conclusion. On 30 September 1950, *NSC 68* was approved and became national strategy.[45] But what the strategy of Containment meant in practice still remained unclear.

NSC 68 focused on a defensive and attritional strategy centered on Europe, not Asia. It also planned to attain U.S. aims in a generally peaceful environment that would avoid armed conflict. The Strategic-Operational-Tactical cross walk for the Containment strategy was more complex than the previous strategy derived from *NSC 20/4* and conceptualized in OPLAN *Offtackle,* which focused on a campaign against the Soviet Union.[46] *NSC 68* stated the operational areas that it expected the military shield to defend: everywhere not under the control of the Soviet Union or its satellites.[47] *NSC 68* tasked the DoD "to provide an adequate defense against air attack on the United States and Canada and an adequate defense against air and surface attack on the United Kingdom and Western Europe, Alaska, the Western Pacific, Africa, and the Near and Middle East, and on the long lines of communication to these areas."[48] This identified a problem: instead of focusing on attacking the enemy controlled area, the DoD had to plan to conduct defensive military operations across the globe.

From September 1950 until June 1951, the Army continued to operate under the logic of previous strategic concepts: when the U.S. Army fought, it would annihilate its enemy. To adjust to the nation's new strategy, the U.S. Army wrote a new cornerstone doctrinal manual

[45] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 14 & 15; James and Wells, *Refighting the Last War,* 176.
[46] Ross, *American War Plans*, 110-112.
[47] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 40; Truman Presidential Library, *NSC 68*, 21 & 22.
[48] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 72; Truman Presidential Library, *NSC 68*, 55.

and supporting manuals, while fighting the Korean War and soon after the signing of the armistice.[49] The Army also adjusted programs of instruction for its school system.[50]

In the first year of the Korean War, the U.S. Army executed offensive and defensive maneuver based operational concepts as prescribed in *FM 100-5 (1949).* One of the reasons the U.S. Army was able to come to terms with the KPA and later the CPVF concerned the strategy and operational concepts they both employed. From June 1950 through June 1951, both Communist forces planned to win the war through swift battles of annihilation, albeit through the application of different offensive operational concepts and nested tactics. Both CPVF and Eight Army operational concepts and objectives changed after June 1951.

The defense of the Pusan perimeter followed U.S. Army defensive doctrine; it was focused on building up combat power while reducing the enemy's combat power followed by a breakout. The combined Inchon amphibious turning movement and breakout from the Pusan perimeter were clear examples of prevailing U.S. Army defensive and offensive operational doctrine. The concept of an amphibious flanking movement that sever enemy lines of communication came directly from *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), Chapter Eleven, Section Twelve: Joint Amphibious Operations.[51]

When the Eighth Army retreated during the Chinese Second Phase Offensive, it was not pretty but the reasons for this retreat were sound and complied with *FM 100-5 Operations*.[52] Leadership characteristics, personal and forceful, exhibited by Walker in the Pusan perimeter and Ridgway in command of the Eighth Army followed leadership guidance put forth in *FM 100-5 Operations*.[53] Coordinated firepower, combined arms maneuver, limited retrograde movements designed to degrade the enemy, technical superiority, and a focus on the

[49] Department of the Army, *100-5 Operations* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954).

[50] Mark W. Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), 24-30.

[51] Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations*, 233-237.

[52] Ibid., 161-172.

[53] Ibid., 17-20.

offensive summarized the operational concepts employed by the Eighth Army during the first year of combat operations in Korea.[54]

These offensive operational concepts largely disappeared from the battlefield during the last two years of combat. This second phase, marked by protracted trench warfare along the Main Line of Resistance (MLR), required a different set of operational concepts. These operational concepts were developed by the U.S. Army to fight the limited and defensive attritional war prescribed by national security policy. This required the U.S. Army to rewrite its entire doctrine, while it tripled in size. To execute the strategy of Containment, after the Korean armistice, required operational concepts similar to those the Army developed to defend the ROK from 1951-1953.

The operational concepts developed after 1951included a focus on small unit tactical operations, refinement of fire support into a tool of the small unit leader, the standardization of special operations in direct support of the tactical commander, employment and support of coalition forces, and the use of advisors to train, advise, and assist local forces. These innovations became the operational concepts of the second two years of the Korean War.

The U.S. Army adjusted its operational concepts the hard way, through combat. It experimented and tested new equipment and tactics in an attempt to restore the status quo ante. U.S. soldiers and Marines fought side-by-side with their Korean and U.N. allies to force the communist powers to accept the status quo ante, and then shouldered the military shield and defended the Korean De-Militarized Zone (DMZ). This experience reshaped the U.S. Army's approach to battle and created a different operational approach, tailored to wage the Cold War.

---

[54] Doughty, *The Evolution of US Army Tactical Doctrine*, 3-5.

Chapter 3: Blood and Sprockets

[The U.S. Army] could not fight its way out of a paper bag.

Omar N. Bradley
March, 1948[1]

The primary concern of any tactical commander is the enemy; he designs his plans to counter his enemy's tactics, in this way the enemy always gets a vote. Throughout the Korean War, U.S. Army commanders adjusted to the tactics of their enemy, and restraints imposed by higher direction. To develop the best tactics, there are several other considerations. These considerations include the doctrine of the force, training of the soldiers, and equipment available. The two greatest constraints placed on a commander are usually the quantity/quality of his men and the equipment/material resources available. The "blood and sprockets" or "men and machines" provide the raw materials available to a commander. Men and machines often affect the design of operational concepts as much or more than the strategy imposed by political superiors. To grasp the operational concepts employed during the static period of the Korean War, it is important to understand the enemy and his operational concepts along with the U.N. forces and tools available (men and machines) to the Eighth Army commander.

Eighth Army and the CPVF/KPA

When the Korean War started, the U.S. armed forces, either in Japan or the U.S., were not prepared to fight the mechanized KPA.[2] The U.S. Army and Marine Corps' were both undermanned and ill equipped. Many of the U.S Army's best weapon systems, developed at the end of WWII, were not supplied to U.S. soldiers stationed in Japan. Soldiers in Japan had started to transition from occupation duty to combat training in the summer of 1949. They

---

[1] Blair, *The Forgotten War*, 8.

[2] Jonathan M. House, *Combat Studies Institute, Research Survey No. 2, Toward Combined Arms Warfare: A Survey of 20th-Century Tactics, Doctrine, and Organization* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984), 146-150; Wilson, *Maneuver and Firepower*, 227; John K. Mahon and Romana Danysh, *Army Lineage Series, Infantry, Part I: Regular Army* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), 76-78.

were not equipped with the newest tanks and anti-tank weapons, weapons viewed as unnecessary for the mission in Japan.[3] These units were also not trained to the standards necessary to fight a combined arms enemy.[4] Budget cuts, personnel shortages, directed social changes (the Doolittle Board and forced integration) uncertainty within the ranks, and the lack of a clearly defined mission all hindered the U.S. Army between the end of WWII and the beginning of the Korean War.[5]

In spite of these conditions, the U.S. Army and Marine Corps quickly deployed major elements of six divisions, the 24th Infantry Division (ID), 1st Calvary Division, 2nd ID, 7th ID, 25th ID, and the 1st Marine Division, to the Korean Peninsula.[6] The first, the 24th ID, landed units within ten days, and the other five arrived and, with their ROKA counterparts, regained the 38th parallel in about 90 days.[7] Both the U.S. Army and KPA operational concepts were based on maneuver and decisive battle. Through innovative leadership and superior material, the Eighth Army defeated the KPA with offensive maneuver operational concepts it developed during WWII.

The Pusan Perimeter defined this type of maneuver warfare in the defense. In describing the defense, Lieutenant General Walton Walker, commander of the Eighth U.S. Army, stated:

> There will be no more retreating, withdrawal, or readjustment of the lines, or anything else you want to call it… If the enemy gets into Taegu you will find me resisting him in the streets and I'll have some of my trusted people with me and you had better be prepared to do likewise. Now get back to your division and fight it! I don't want to see you back from the front again unless it's in your coffin.[8]

---

[3] Blair, *The Forgotten War*, 28.

[4] Ibid., 28; Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 66, 68, 291-299.

[5] Ibid., 6-29.

[6] Roy E. Appleman, *U.S. Army in the Korean War: South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961), 605 & 606. In three months, June 25th to September 30th the U.S. Armed forces went from having a 500+ man training mission (KMAG) in Korea to fielding a three Corps size combined Army that integrated the ROKA into a coherent fighting force of 229,772.

[7] Appleman, *South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu*, 600-606. Kevin Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies: The North Korean and Chinese Soldiers in the Korean War* (Novato, California: Presidio Press, 2001), 139 and 140.

[8] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 108 & 135.

Once the KPA advance was stopped and the Eighth Army adequately supplied, they pushed the KPA back beyond the 38th Parallel in concert with the Inchon landing by X Corps.

The Korean battles fought from the arrival of Task Force Smith on 1 July 1950, through to the U.N. advance to the Yalu River, the subsequent retreat back to the 37th Parallel, and the establishment of the MLR mostly north of the 38th Parallel, were fought and won with the tactics prescribed in *FM 100-5 Operations*.[9] As Roy K. Flint states in *America's First Battles, 1776-1965*, "The tactical defeats endured by the officers and men of the 24th Division were rooted in the failure of the Army… to prepare itself during peacetime for battle."[10] A lack of training, not doctrine or operational concepts, failed the U.S. Army in the first few weeks of the Korean War. After receiving a few more weeks of training at the hands of the KPA, the Eighth Army struck back. The first year of the Korean War was warfare as taught at Ft. Benning or Ft. Leavenworth.[11]

The U.S. soldiers who fought these battles were not tutored in the ideas of containment and limited war. Ridgway wrote, "You must understand that I was thinking as I had right from the start, in terms of attack."[12] Many soldiers who remained in the U.S. Army or were called back into service were veterans of WWII. The young officers that commanded platoons and companies were trained in the tactics of the offensive, based on the 1944 or 1949 Field Manuals. These veterans seasoned the under strength divisions of the Eighth Army.[13] Men like Corporal Leo M. Brennen joined 2nd Platoon, Able Company, 34th Infantry Regiment, on 12 August 1950 as a squad leader during the defense of the Pusan Perimeter. Brennen was a typical veteran of WWII in the Pacific. He immediately took point for the

---

[9] Ibid., 59-65 & 598-606; Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), 80-172.

[10] Charles E. Heller and William A Stofft, *America's First Battles, 1776-1965* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1986), 266.

[11] Command and General Staff College, *Schedule Regular Course 1949-1950*; Command and General Staff College, *Program of Instruction for the Regular Course 1948-1949*, 5; Command and General Staff College, *Program of Instruction for the Regular Course 1950-1951*, 2.

[12] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 104.

[13] Ibid., 33-36.

company assault that took place on the same day he arrived in the unit. His task was to lead the company's lead squad, soldiers he did not know, to retake a hill top along the Naktong line that a previous KPA assault took on 6 August. For a veteran of WWII called back to service, this was another day fighting for another hill.[14]

To such men, from the rank of Corporal through General, the U.S. Army and Marine Corps were focused on offensive operations. Find the enemy. Fix the enemy position with infantry, artillery and air attach. Finish him with flanking armor, artillery barrage, infantry assaults and supporting attack aviation. Speed, mobility, and shock effect were their tools. Every effort was focused to gain deep penetrations and encircle the enemy, cutting off his lines of supply. This was the doctrine the U.S. Army used to fight and win battles.[15] The breakouts from the Pusan Perimeter, coupled with the amphibious landing of Operation CHROMITE, were classic examples of applied U.S. Army doctrine. As Roy Appleman wrote about the landing, "Control of the seas gives mobility to military power. Mobility and war of maneuver have always brought the greatest prizes and the quickest decisions to their practitioners."[16] These operational concepts proved very useful during the first year of the war, the war of maneuver.

Communist tactics during the war varied, as the conditions in which they fought changed. The first phase of the KPA offensive, from 22 June 1950 through 22 September 1950, was dictated by Soviet advisors.[17] It was characterized by a fusion of combined arms, Soviet maneuver tactics, and a popular uprising led by guerrilla cadres. The combined arms mechanized assault incorporated armored spearheads, supported by mechanized field artillery

---

[14] Russell A. Gugeler, *Combat Action in Korea* (Honolulu: University Press of the Pacific, org. 1954, reprinted 2005), 23-25.

[15] Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), 80-119.

[16] Appleman, *South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu*, 488.

[17] Kevin Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies: The North Korean and Chinese Soldiers in the Korean War* (Novato: Presidio Press, 2001), 45; Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle*, 185-189.

and close air support, with aggressive infantry assaults that employed encirclements, to outflank ROKA forces.[18]

The guerrilla cadres that attempted to start the "general uprising" operated in the ROK prior to the invasion. These communist cadres combined cells associated with the outlawed South Korean Labor Party (SKLP) and communist cells in the ROKA. The ROKA cells conducted a series of mutinies that began in 1947. These mutineers led an insurgency from the mountainous regions of the ROK. These mutineers were supported by graduates from the Kangdong Institute, located in the DPRK just north of the 38th Parallel. The Kangdong Institute cadre infiltrated ten groups into South Korea starting in 1949 and ending in March 1950, to prepare the people for liberation.[19] The "general uprising" that was supposed to occur after the June 1950 invasion was a failure, due to aggressive ROK counter-insurgency operations prior to the June 1950. In contrast, the Soviet trained, equipped, and advised KPA was successful up to the Naktong River. At the Naktong River, U.S. and ROKA forces countered the KPA and held the line that became the Pusan Perimeter.

For the first time, the Eighth Army faced T-34 tanks. M-24 Chaffee light tanks based in Japan were initially employed against the KPA and were ineffective. The U.S. Army reacted and shipped M-26 Pershing tanks, along with upgraded M4A3E8 Sherman tanks equipped with 76mm high velocity main guns, to Korea. The first M-26 tanks arrived at Pusan from Ft. Knox on 7 August 1950. The M4A3E8 tanks were shipped directly from Japan and Okinawa and arrived in July and August 1950. These tanks, supported by close air support (CAS), and massive artillery dominated the KPA armored units.[20]

The initial failure of U.S. Army anti-armor weapon systems extended down to the bazooka's used by infantry heavy weapons companies. Quickly after arriving in Korea,

---

[18] Schnabel, *Policy and Direction: The First Year*, 36-40, 61, 77-79, & 111-114; Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 45-47 & 71-79.

[19] Millett, *A House Burning*, 104, 188, 192, 201-209; Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 71-75.

[20] Donald W. Boose Jr., *US Army Forces in the Korean War, 1950-53* (Long Island City: Osprey Publishing, 2005), 50-57.

Army leaders realized that the M9A1 2.36 in. rocket launcher (bazooka) was ineffective against T-34 tanks, so the Army replaced it with the M20 3.5 in. "Super Bazooka," which arrived in Korea in July 1950.[21] KPA 122mm and 76mm artillery pieces outranged and outshot the ROKA's shorter M3 105mm howitzers. To counter the skilled KPA gunners and their Soviet artillery systems, the Army deployed a wide array of towed and self-propelled artillery that ranged from light M2A1 105mm towed howitzers to the heavy M43 8in Howitzer Motor Carriage (HMC) self-propelled howitzer.[22]

Air power was an important part of the KPA plan but the swift introduction of USAF combat aircraft eliminated the KPA aviation advantage. The KPA fielded approximately 180 aircraft, which consisted of 60 YAK/PO2 trainers, 40 YAK-3/7B/9/11 fighters, 70 IL-10 attack bombers and ten reconnaissance planes. In contrast, the fledgling ROK Air Force (ROKAF) had twelve liaison-type aircraft and ten AT-6 advanced trainers.[23] On 26 June 1950, the day after the KPA invasion, KMAG released ten F-51 fighters to the ROKAF. The ROKAF did not have any pilots trained on these aircraft but they pilots that had trained on Imperial Japanese Army aircraft that would provide the core of the future ROKAF.[24]

In contrast, the U.S. Far East Command's (FEC) subordinate U.S. Air Force element, U.S. Far East Air Forces (FEAF) was a modern air force with a total of 1,172 aircraft of various types. Only 553 of these aircraft were part of operational units, most were F-80C jet interceptor aircraft. The remainder consisted of various bombers, reconnaissance, and cargo support units.[25] On 27 June FEAF simultaneously helped to evacuate U.S. and other foreign nationals from Seoul, destroyed elements of the KPA Air Force and providing limited CAS to

---

[21] Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 71.

[22] Boose, *US Army Forces in the Korean War, 1950-53*, 50-57.

[23] Schnabel, *Policy and Direction: The First Year*, 39 & 40; Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 105 & 106; Futrell, *The United States Air Force in Korea*, 17-19 & 68; Korean Institute of Military History, *The Korean War: Volume One*, 44-51.

[24] Futrell, *The United States Air Force in Korea*, 68; Millett, *They Came from the North*, 142.

[25] Robert F. Futrell, *The United States Air Force in Korea*, 5-13 & 58-60.

ROKA forces.[26] As U.N. ground forces began to support the ROKA, FEAF took control of the air and never lost that advantage. Dominance of the air was critical in containing communist forces along the MLR during the last two years of the conflict. Throughout the conflict, FEAF tested and employed its newest aircraft against its Soviet counterparts and developed many of the air to air combat, precision bombing and CAS concepts still in use today.

U.N. dominance of the air and sea facilitated the rapid build-up of U.N. combat power. U.N airpower also hindered the KPA's ability to conduct logistical operations during day light. CAS doctrine was an inter-war development, but was not an U.S. Air Force priority prior to the Korean War despite the desire of the U.S. Army.[27] The Eighth Army combined arms team used FEC's dominance of the air and sea to cover its flanks while it conducted deep penetrations into KPA lines. Defeating the KPA was a matter of building up enough of the correct forces with the correct equipment. By the end of August 1950, the Eighth Army had enough equipment and was building up the man power necessary to go on the offensive. The breakout on 22 September 1950 completed the Eighth Army's transition from the defense to the offense.[28]

The KPA was forced to abandon their maneuver combined arms doctrine after September 1950. In the battles along the Naktong River, the majority of KPA tanks, planes and artillery were destroyed by U.N. aircraft, tank and anti-tank capabilities.[29] The Inchon landing cut the KPA supply lines and forced them to retreat along mountain trails, under pressure from the Eighth Army and FEAF.

Without the proper tools, the KPA was forced to return to guerrilla tactics and await Soviet or Chinese intervention. Coupled with the loss of equipment, the KPA's loss of

---

[26] James and Wells, *Refighting the Last War,* 160; William T. Bowers, *Combat in Korea: Striking Back March-April 1951* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2010), 3.

[27] Doughty, *The Evolution of US Army Tactical Doctrine*, 2-12.

[28] Appleman, *South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu*, 379-391, 502-508, 542-544, & 548-559.

[29] Ibid., 600-604.

skilled military technicians hindered its rebuilding and forced a change in KPA operational concepts. Not every KPA soldier killed or captured during the retreat north was a technical expert, but the loss of 100,000 of the 135,000 man invasion force and most of its equipment severely hampered its rebuilding. Appleman in, *South to the Naktong North the Yalu*, estimated that approximately 30,000 KPA officers and soldiers eventually made it back to North Korea in October and November 1950, based on U.S. and KPA sources.[30] Mahoney, in his detailed study of the KPA and CPVF, *Formidable Enemies*, states that the 1st Guerrilla Corps included the remnants of the 2nd, 4th, 7th, 9th, 10th, & 27th Divisions composed of ten thousand plus soldiers.[31] It was assessed that only three-quarters of these soldiers were armed, but only with small arms. The KPA tanks, trucks, and artillery that made them a combined arms force were either destroyed or left behind during their long retreat to the mountains north and east of Pyongyang.[32]

The KPA retreat lasted until the beginning of the Chinese Second Phase Offensive on 25 November 1950. The retreat focused on a KPA retrograde movement of soldiers to secure areas in the North Korean mountains, along the Chinese and Russian border. There the KPA would regroup, rearm, and prepare to counterattack as part of the KPA 1st Guerrilla Corps formed in October 1950.[33] As directed by the PRC and DPRK leadership, many KPA officers and soldiers turned guerrilla and linked up with partisan groups already in South Korea. Communist tactics changed when the Chinese People's Volunteer Force (CPVF) entered the Korean conflict. When the CPVF crossed the Yalu River in mass on 19 October

---

[30] Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 142-143; Appleman, *South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu*, 600-604

[31] Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 142. David Rees, *The Korean War: History and Tactics* (London: Orbis Publishing, 1984), 86.

[32] Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 139-143.

[33] Ibid., 142-143.

1950 it brought different offensive operational concepts designed to defeat a road bound army.[34]

Despite the destruction of the Soviet supported KPA by the Eighth Army and FEAF, the People's Republic of China's (PRC) armed forces, the People's Liberation Army (PLA), believed they possessed superior operational concepts that could defeat the Eighth Army.[35] Their operational construct was called "man over weapons". It was based on their experience against the U.S. trained and equipped Republic of China (ROC) Guomindang (GMD) army.[36] The Chinese communist forces were regular PLA units using the cover name, Chinese People's Volunteer Force (CPVF), so officially the PRC was not involved in the war. Chairman Mao Zedong and Marshal Peng Dehuai assessed that they could destroy the Eighth Army faster than they destroyed the GMD in 1948 and 1949. With a strong base in Manchuria and a better trained and equipped force than they possessed during the Chinese Civil War (1946-1949), Mao was confident that the CPVF could destroy the Americans, who were viewed as over reliant on technology.[37]

Marshal Peng's CPVF fought differently than its KPA counterparts. The KPA had tried to conduct a combined arms lighting war, which planned to unify the Korean Peninsula in a month. KPA operational concepts were based on Soviet operational concepts and assisted by Soviet advisors. In contrast, the CPVF employed operational concepts based on 25 years of communist Chinese insurgent warfare within a Chinese context.

From the launch of the CPVF First Phase Offensive on 25 October, through the collapse of the Second Phase Fifth Offensive around 22 May 1951, the CPVF used the Chinese

[34] Ibid., 46, and 74-79.

[35] Rees, *The Korean War*, 86.

[36] Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 46.

[37] Peng Dehuai, *Memoirs of a Chinese Marshal: The Autobiographical Notes of Peng Dehuai (1898-1974)* (Honolulu: University Press of the Pacific, 1984), 473-477; Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 26-28, 36-38, 46, & 74-79. Li, Millett, & Yu trans. & eds., *Mao's Generals Remember Korea*, 42-46 & 67-70; Chief of Army Field Forces, *Training Bulletin No. 1, 12 March 1951* (Fort Monroe, 1951), 2-5; Chief of Army Field Forces, *Training Bulletin No. 2, 11 April 1951* (Fort Monroe, 1951), 1-4.

operational concept "man over machine." This concept focused on deception, encirclement, infiltration, concentration of forces at a decisive point, and close quarters combat, conducted at night.[38] This operational concept was based on PLA success against GMD troops during the last phase of the Chinese Civil War (1946-1949).[39] These tactics worked well during the First and Second Phase Offensives. During the Third Phase Offensive the CPVF gained ground but failed to destroy any large U.N. formations. The Fourth and two Fifth Phase Offensives were a disaster for the CPVF and forced them to change how they fought the Eighth Army.[40]

The First Phase Offensive launched on 25 October 1950 against ROKA forces and parts of the 1st Calvary Division achieved its objective; it crippled the ROK II Corps at the Battle of Onjong.[41] The Second Phase Offensive on 25 November was supposed to destroy the U.S. 2nd or 25th Infantry Division, instead they were mauled badly.[42] This forced the Eighth Army to retreat to the vicinity of the 38th Parallel, trading land for time.[43] As Peng recorded in his memoir, most likely the success on 1 November against the 8th Calvary Regiment:

> Only once did our troops wipe out an entire U.S. regiment and none of its men was able to escape; this took place in the Second Campaign. Otherwise our troops were able to wipe out only whole U.S. battalions. If a U.S. battalion encircled in the night were not wiped out while it was still dark, the Americans had the means to rescue it the following day.[44]

Chinese offensive battles required a great amount of manpower and maneuver area to conduct flanking, infiltration, penetration and encirclement operations supported by partisan forces, to defeat their enemy. The biggest difference between the KPA/CPVF tactics and the

---

[38] Chief of Army Field Forces, *Training Bulletin No. 1, 12 March 1951*, 2-5; Chief of Army Field Forces, *Training Bulletin No. 2, 11 April 1951*, 1-4; Gugeler, *Combat Actions in Korea*, 166-181.

[39] Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 46-48; Li, Millett, & Yu trans. & ed., *Mao's Generals Remember Korea*, 30-37.

[40] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 328-334; Peng, *Memoirs of a Chinese Marshal*, 480-481.

[41] Appleman, *South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu*, 673-680.

[42] Billy C. Mossman, *U.S. Army in the Korean War: Ebb and Flow, November 1950 – July 1951* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990), 51-60 & 105-127.

[43] Gugeler, *Combat Actions in Korea*, 45-52; Appleman, *South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu*, 673-680, 769 & 700; Mossman, *Ebb and Flow, November 1950 – July 1951*, 83.

[44] Peng, *Memoirs of a Chinese Marshal*, 481.

tactics the U.S. and its allies used in Europe was the Communists dependence on infiltration, partisan forces, and light infantry night attacks.[45] During the trench warfare period of the Korean War, the combined CPVF/KPA employed night based reconnaissance, infiltration, focused artillery and skilled infantry assaults on Eighth Army positions as their main effort.[46]

The Eighth Army adjusted to "man over weapons" operational concepts. It adopted defensive and offensive operational concepts by modifying its tactics. The 2nd Infantry Division monthly Command Reports specify command directed changes focused on improving platoon, company and battalion defensive positions and the integration of fire support, during the Fourth and Fifth Phase offensives.[47] The *Training Bulletins* published in 1951 disseminated information on how to improve the SUT skills of the U.S. Army to counter CPVF night infiltration and massed assaults. The areas stressed were defense of a position from night attack, coordination of Infantry-Armor operations, convoy procedures, integration of Infantry-Artillery-Armor-Anti-Aircraft Artillery massed fire tactics, and Patrol Missions.[48] Ridgway stated in *The Korean War*:

> The system of maintaining close contact with support units, of advancing on phase lines, and of buttoning up at night to prevent infiltration, kept us from falling into traps the enemy laid for us and enabled us to blunt the power of his final massive assault when it came.[49]

The Eighth Army also came up with a mobile defensive concept called "fight and roll." I Corps is credited with first employing the "fight and roll" concept, where forces would occupy a series of heavly defended locations and force the CPVF to fight for each position. This tactic were implemented across the Eighth Army with great success during the CPVF

---

[45] Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 71-79. Mahoney describes KPA/CPVN assault tactics from June 1950 through June 1951 as focused on close combat, infiltration, deception, and surprise through skillful use of light infantry assault units.

[46] D.M. Giangreco, *Artillery in Korea: Massing Fires and Reinventing the Wheel* (Fort Leavenworth: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2003), 1.

[47] 2nd Infantry Division, *Command Report May, June & July 1951*.

[48] Chief of Army Field Forces, *Training Bulletin No. 1-8, 12 March -16 November 1951* (Fort Monroe, 1951).

[49] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 119.

Fourth and Fifth Phase Offensives. Doughty in *The Evolution of US Army Tactical Doctrine, 1946-76*, describes this concept:

> Under the concept of "fight and roll," the defender remains in their position as long as possible—until the enemy had paid the maximum price and before the defensive positions were engulfed by the attackers. After the highest possible cost was levied against the enemy, a rapid and orderly preplanned withdrawal was conducted to a previously prepared defensive position. Although the defender might be forced to occupy as many as five or six subsequent positions, it was "inevitable"… that the surging mass would eventually halt. The I Corps' description of the "fight and roll" defense stated: "[Enemy] Units will be decimated, command and control channels lost and equipment gone. The mass becomes a struggling, chaotic mixture of the remnants of many broken units."[50]

Fight and roll was effectively employed during the Fifth Offensives First and Second Phases, once the CPVF attack culminated, units of the Eighth Army used their superior mobility and shifted to the offensive.[51] In about six months (November 1950 to May 1951) the U.N. forces adapted to CPVF operational concept of man over weapons. The U.N. forces ability to shift from defensive to offensive operations during the Fifth Phase offensives, confounded CPVF soldiers and commanders. Bin Yu writes in *Mao's Generals Remember Korea*:

> Many CPVF units were completely surprised by the blitzkrieg-style U.S. counterattacks and encirclement operations, tactics that were very different from their (U.S.) cautious movements during the Fourth Campaign.[52]

During the five offensives the CPVF conducted from October 1950 through June 1951, it faced continuous logistical problems. During their previous wars, Chinese communist forces gained most of their supplies from their better equipped enemies.[53] This was not the case when fighting the Eighth Army after the CPVF Third Phase Offensive. Using conventional bombs and napalm, FEAF destroyed abandoned U.N. heavy equipment. These swift interdictions by U.N. aircraft hindered CPVF logistics. The CPVF logistical system

---

[50] Doughty, *The Evolution of US Army Tactical Doctrine*, 10.

[51] Gugeler, *Combat Action in Korea*, 183-191; Peng, *Memoirs of a Chinese Marshal*, 480.

[52] Li, Millett, & Yu trans. & ed., *Mao's Generals Remember Korea*, 22.

[53] Charles R. Shrader, *Communist Logistics in the Korean War* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1995), 173-177; Li, Millett, & Yu trans. & ed., *Mao's Generals Remember Korea*, 24.

was continually harried by U.N. aircraft, naval gunfire and long range artillery.[54] This pressure on CPVF logistics forced the Central Military Commission (CMC) to create a standardized logistical system. To support the massive CPVF armies, the PLA deployed tens of thousands of support troops.[55] The Korean War taught the PLA the importance of efficient logistics in fighting a conventional war, the PLA would relearn this lesson when they fought the PAVN in 1979.

After the end of the Fifth Offensive Second Phase in late May 1951, Mao authorized Peng to change the operational concepts of the CPVF. In traditionally cryptic form, Mao called the new operational concept "eating sticky candy."[56] In June of 1951, the CPVF troops were in retreat and the operational concept of "man over weapons" was in tatters. Peng began to establish a defensive line and implemented Mao's new operational construct of "chewing sticky candy."[57] The Eighth Army moved steadily forward across the 38th Parallel at the end of May 1951. Then the war took a drastic change. The JCS cabled Ridgway, now U.N./FEC Commander, with new instructions that placed clear boundaries on the Korean War and prepared the commander for a negotiated end to the conflict.[58] This ended the pursuit phase for the Eighth Army. The Eighth Army continued to apply military pressure though Operation PILE DRIVER, which advanced the U.N. lines slowly north until November 1951, trying to force the CPVF/KPA to stop the war.[59]

For the next two years the CPVF/KPA learned how to eat Eighth Army flavored sticky candy. Mao's operational concept of "eating sticky candy" involved a steady degradation of Eighth Army forces through the conduct of limited night attacks designed to incrementally push the Eighth Army south, through the destruction of company and battalion size units and

---

[54] Li, Millett, & Yu trans. & ed., *Mao's Generals Remember Korea*, 22-24.

[55] Ibid., 129-138.

[56] Ibid., 36 -37.

[57] Peng, *Memoirs of a Chinese Marshal*, 481- 482.

[58] Matthew B. Ridgway, *Soldier: The Memoirs of Matthew B. Ridgway* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956), 218-220; Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 180-182.

[59] Toland, *In Mortal Combat, 1950-1953*, 471-474.

occupation of their positions. Peng described the application of this tactic, "In such an attack, a part of the enemy–usually a battalion–was wiped out. We fought many such battles – around four or five per month… Thus our troops won the initiative on the battlefield."[60] Peng exaggerates; most of the CPVF attacks were against platoon and company positions and resulted in mixed results.

To accomplish this operational concept, Peng focused first on the security of his forces through the construction of an extensive series of underground fortifications that extended across the 150 mile long width of the Korean Peninsula and along the coasts because of the concern that the Eighth Army might conduct amphibious operations. He bolstered these defenses with the addition of depth; CPVF field fortifications extended a minimum of ten miles to their rear. These extensive and mostly underground fortification system protected Peng's forces.[61] Once secure behind this defensive barrier, the CPVF could then focus on night operations that targeted limited objectives that they could capture within the hours of darkness.

This created a narrow window for CPVF/KPA operations. As soon as darkness ended the cost in lives and material became too great for the communists to maintain contact. From July 1951 through July 1953, the CPVF dramatically increased its capability to employ artillery and mortars, in conjunction with night infantry assaults.[62] The CPVF/KPA skillfully used coordinated artillery and night infantry assaults in attempts to push the U.N. line south and inflict unacceptable levels of casualties on U.N. forces. Through these attrition tactics Peng planned to break the will of the U.N. leadership and force them to accede to communist

---

[60] Peng, *Memoirs of a Chinese Marshal*, 483.

[61] Ibid., 481-482.

[62] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 477-478;499-500; McWilliams, *On Hallowed Ground*, 276-279; Pat Meid and James M. Yingling, *U.S. Marine Operations in Korea, 1950 – 1953: Volume V, Operations in West Korea* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), 514-519, 525-526.

demands.[63] This communist operational construct of "eating sticky candy," forced the Eighth Army to adapt and adjust or suffer unacceptable losses.

In the summer of 1951, after Van Fleet's successful repulse of the Fourth and Fifth Phase Offensives, the Truman administration decided it was time to end the conflict in Korea. Informal conversations between George Kennan and Soviet Ambassador to the U.N. Jakob Malik started a peace process. On 5 June 1951 Malik told Kennan that his government wanted a peaceful conclusion to the conflict as quickly as possible. Yet, his government would not take part in the ceasefire negations directly; instead that was the role of the Chinese and North Koreans.[64] Despite Malik's statements desiring "peace," the leader of the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin, did not want to end the war in Korea. Instead he wanted to rehabilitate the "peace" image of international communism. Armistice talks would serve this purpose and help to control the Americans, on a stage that played to Soviet strengths.[65]

In the summer of 1951 neither the PRC nor DPRK were willing to end the war. They still believed in a military victory through attrition over U.N. forces, by late 1952 this changed with the PRC focused on securing the DPRK and weakening the ROK. What Ridgway and Van Fleet feared the most came true. The communist powers would use the armistice talks to check future U.N. advances and take the initiative. Using the decreased military pressure to build up their defenses and increase their military capabilities. Despite reservations, George Kennan advised the Truman administration to "grasp the nettle" and push for armistice negations in good faith.[66]

---

[63] Peng, *Memoirs of a Chinese Marshal*, 480-484; Chief of Army Field Forces, *Training Bulletin No. 8, 16 November 1951* (Fort Monroe, 1951), 11.

[64] Toland, *In Mortal Combat, 195-1953*, 471-472.

[65] Chang & Halliday, *The Unknown Story: Mao*, 365-372. They write; "Stalin told Mao, "[A] truce is now advantageous." This did not mean Stalin wanted to stop the war. He wanted Mao's soldiers to inflict more damage on the U.S., but he saw that engaging in talks could be expedient, and seeming to show an interest in peace would help the Communists' image."

[66] Toland, *In Mortal Combat,* 471-474. Toland writes, "General Ridgway sent his commanders a warning to avoid any letdown among the troops. "Two things should be recalled. One is the well-earned reputation for duplicity and dishonesty possessed by the USSR; the other is the slowness with which deliberative bodies such as the [UN] Security Council produce positive action."

The JCS 31 May 1951 directive effectively halted the war of maneuver and began the war of attrition. After a year of fighting and tactical innovation, the Eighth Army had adapted offensive and maneuver concepts to overcome both KPA and CPVF concepts. The Eighth Army held the line and restored the boundary of the Republic of Korea (ROK) roughly along the 38th Parallel. Now it had to adapt to a new mission. While in a defensive stance, the Eighth Army was directed to force the communist forces, through static attrition, to sign an armistice that recognized the line of contact.

In July 1951, the U.S. and its U.N. allies wanted to end the war where it started, roughly along the 38th Parallel. Stalin's goals revolved around weakening the U.S. economically and politically. He believed a protracted war would show U.S. weakness to the rest of the world. Mao desired to continue the war so that he could win military industrial capability concessions from Stalin. Mao also wanted to become the recognized leader of all communist activity in Asia. He convinced Stalin to allow him to direct Communist operations in Japan, the Philippines, Viet Nam, Malaysia, Burma, and most importantly Indonesia. [67] The war in Korea gave Mao leverage over Stalin in these negotiations.

Until Mao achieved an organic modern China's armament industry, he would not end the war in Korea. Chang and Halliday quote a cable Mao set Stalin on 1 March 1951, "The Chinese army had already taken more than 100,000 casualties… and is expecting another 300,000 this year and next." "To sum up, Mao was ready to persist in a long-term war, to spend several years consuming several hundred thousand American lives, so they [U.N.] will back down… But Stalin must help him build a first-class army and arms industry."[68] These decisions set in motion two years of brutal attritional warfare along the MLR. Neither the U.N. nor CPVF/KPA gained or lost an appreciable amount of territory.

---

[67] Zubok & Constantine, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War*, 66-72.
[68] Chang & Halliday, *The Unknown Story: Mao*, 367-377.

To demonstrate to the world that the U.S. desired peace, restrictive rules of engagement were placed on the Eighth Army commanders during the two years of negotiations. Only if the MLR faltered could Eighth Army conduct large scale operations, as occurred in June and July of 1953 to stop the last CPVF offensive. The commander for most of this period, 14 April 1951 to 11 February 1953, was General James A. Van Fleet (West Point Class of 1915). Van Fleet was followed in command by General Maxwell D. Taylor (West Point Class of 1922), who commanded through the armistice on 27 July 1953.

Before negotiations began in July 1951, Ridgway sent instructions that limited the scope of combat that Van Fleet could conduct. In that letter of instruction, dated 25 April 1951, the authorized limit of advance was the Wyoming Line. The focus of military operations was "inflicting maximum personal casualties and material losses on hostile forces in Korea… acquisition of terrain in itself is of little or no value." Ridgway instructed Van Fleet to limit U.N. casualties, as much as possible.[69] As two years of negotiations progressed, so did the restrictions on Eighth Army operations.

Van Fleet was directed to go no farther north than his current line of contact. He could not conduct any amphibious landings to flank and encircle the enemy. Over time any offensive operation using a battalion of infantry required approval from the U.N. commander, which was rarely given. Even to retake a piece of ground with a force larger than a company required approval from the U.N commander.[70] These restrictions greatly hindered the operational concepts Van Fleet could employ to bring pressure on the communist forces.

These restrictions and CPVF "eating sticky candy" operational concepts defined the options available to Van Fleet and his subordinate commanders. Such changes in U.S. war

[69] Ibid., 164-168;183.

[70] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 176 & 293. Ridgway directed Van Fleet to assume an "active defense." This order was also communicated to the JCS in MSG, CX 57143, CINCFE to JCS, 12 NOV 51, DA-IN 18285. Clark placed further restriction on combat operation in July of 1952, requiring his approval before any unit battalion or larger conducted an offensive maneuver. This was placed in writing to Van Fleet in a Memo on 26 July 1952; Memo, Crawford for CofS, 26 July 1952, no subject, in UNC/FEC, Command Report, July 1952, CinC and CofS, Supporting Docs, tab 26.

aims did not come suddenly. On 20 March 1951 a message from the JCS to then U.N. commander, MacArthur, stated that ground forces were not to cross the 38th Parallel again, and that the U.S. and its allies were looking at options to end the fighting.[71] As Ridgway explained, the main issue that led to MacArthur's recall revolved around his frustration with officials in Washington, who in his view, refused to fight the communists. MacArthur saw the future of world power shifting toward Asia. Specifically he saw the battle for Korea as the central battle against world communism. MacArthur believed that the U.S. needed to win the battle against Communism in Asia, not Europe.[72] Ridgway paraphrased this:

> The future of the world, MacArthur believed, would be decided in Asia… What [MacArthur] envisioned was no less than the global defeat of Communism, dealing Communism "a blow from which it would never recover" and which would mark the historical turning back of the Red Tide.[73]

The conflict over strategic priorities was at the heart of the 1951 public debate in which MacArthur and Truman represented two different perspectives on how and where to fight communism. *NSC-68*, supported by the Department of State and Defense and now Truman, outlined a defensive and attritional strategy that focused on building up the political and economic system of the free world. *NSC-68* was premised on a rejuvenated and allied Western Europe. American foreign policy leadership was concerned about the possibility of the Soviet Union opening a second front and conquering Western Europe. A spearhead of sixty Soviet divisions, based in Eastern Europe in the 1950s, could wash across Europe like a mechanized Red Wave. These sixty Soviet divisions in Eastern Europe dominated the thinking of U.S. and Western European policy makers.[74] Ridgway wrote:

> They (the U.S.) could not afford to lose the industrial skills, manpower, the technology, the mills and factories, the quickly exploitable raw materials, the

---

[71] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 238.

[72] MacArthur believed that in regard to winning the battle against Communism in Asia, "there is no substitute for victory." See: Paddy Griffith, *Forward into Battle: Fighting Tactics from Waterloo to the Near Future* (New York: Ballantine Books: 1981), 163.

[73] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 143-156.

[74] May, *American Cold War Strategy*, 25-40.

> badly needed air bases, and above all the close ties of blood and culture – all these persuaded Washington that Europe must come first and Asia second. The loss of Western Europe would promptly and decisively tip the scales of the Cold War in the Soviets favor.[75]

While serving as Second Army commander during the first year of the Korean War, Van Fleet realized that the focus on Europe was deeply imbedded in Washington D.C. and the Pentagon. Van Fleet recalled "Europeanists" officers in Washington D.C. denigrating the conflict in Korea and resenting MacArthur.[76] Korea reopened the divide between European and Asia focused officers and brought the debate between a defensive or offensive strategy against the Soviets into public debate.[77]

The conflict between the military commander in the field and political/military leaders in Washington increased as the strategy of Containment and limited war gained ascendency in Washington. Washington political/military leaders were concerned that U.S. actions could start World War III. MacArthur did not see the global conflict in these terms and voiced his opinion in a public manner. His actions were viewed as a direct affront to Truman, who relived MacArthur of his commands, recalled him, and forced him to retire.[78] The debate between a military victory and a diplomatic settlement ended. The Eighth Army began the defensive attritional process to convince its Communist opponents to end hostilities in Korea.[79]

When the NSC assessed Asia's position in global security, it was within the perspective of protecting and integrating Japan, not with defending or developing Korea or other Asian countries.[80] While the war in Korea continued, the JCS built the U.S. Seventh Army into a shield to protect Western Europe. Building the armies of Western Europe and the Seventh

---

[75] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 147.

[76] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 230.

[77] James F. Schnabel and Robert J. Watson, *The History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, Volume III The Korean War, Part I* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1979), 460-467.

[78] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 153-157.

[79] Schnabel and Watson, *The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, Vol. III The Korean War, Part I*, 477-482.

[80] Ross, *American War Plans*, 141-142.

Army were given priority for quality men and fielding new equipment.[81] *NSC-68* outlined a military shield to protect Western Europe and other U.S. allies. To build a military shield, it was necessary to build up military forces in Western Europe.[82] In order to fund the military shield and wage the Cold War it was as necessary to gain public support as it was to build military capacity and capability.[83] The ongoing Korean War and the CPVF/KPA refusal to agree to an armistice continued to get in the way of the JCS plans

Blood: The Men

At the beginning of the Korean War it was necessary to send large quantities of veterans from WWII to Korea. These were not enough to fill MacArthur's divisions, so he employed Koreans through the Korean Augmentation to the U.S. Army (KATUSAs) program to fill the personnel gaps in U.S. Army units sent to fight in Korea.[84] Once the crisis of the first few months passed, the U.S. Army produced enough soldiers to replace the reservists but not the KATUSAs. It was considered necessary to return these double veterans back to civilian life. These demands played a part in the formalization of the individual rotation program in April of 1951.[85] This was a system that rotated individual U.S. soldiers instead of U.S. Army units.

The individual rotation program for U.S. military personnel was approved by Ridgway before he became U.N. & Far East Commander, in April 1951.[86] This policy developed into

---

[81] Ingo Trauschweizer, *The Cold War U.S. Army: Building Deterrence for Limited War* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008), 20-22,24-29; Ross, *American War Plans*, 123-124,137-143.

[82] Ridgway, *Soldier*, 237-242.

[83] Steven Casey, *Selling the Korean War: Propaganda, Politics, and Public Opinion 1950 – 1953* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 25-40,67-78; Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 56-61,110-112.

[84] Wilson, *Maneuver and Firepower*, 226,239-240; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 341-342,370; Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 34-35,221. Wilson wrote that the T/O&E that U.S. Army Infantry Divisions in June of 1950 allocated a total of 18,804 Soldiers. Most divisions had between 12,500 and 13,650. Under the original KATUSA program, each U.S. Infantry Division would receive 8,600 KATUSAs. KATUSA strength in each division never reached that level. Hermes writes about requests by Clark and Van Fleet requesting an increase of authorized KAUSA levels. After two years of war, each U.S. Division in Korea was still authorized 2,500 KATUSAs. Approximately 20-25% of the soldiers in a U.S. Army Infantry Company were KATUSAs.

[85] Mossman, *Ebb and Flow*, 365; Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 346-348; Hermes, T*ruce Tent and Fighting Front*, 186 & 187.

[86] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 241.

a complex system of points assigned to each soldier, based on how long they served in Korea and where the soldier served in Korea. More points were awarded to infantry and other soldiers assigned to battalions serving along the MLR. Fewer points were given to support personnel and staff at Brigade and Division headquarters. The fewest points were given to support troops and others not assigned to units along the MLR. Point values were assigned based on relative danger of the soldier's assignment.[87] Infantry soldiers assigned along the MLR might only spend nine months in Korea, if their unit was on the MLR the entire time. An infantry soldier assigned to the Eighth Army staff might serve twelve or more months. Other support soldiers served as long as eighteen months to earn their 36 point ticket back to the U.S.[88] A separate unit based system was created later for U.N. units.

From the U.S. Army perspective the rotation system was a net positive: officers and soldiers with recent combat experience were rotated to newly established units and infuse them with combat experience. Rotation also allowed the entire U.S. Army to gain combat experience. It was a public relations victory; families knew how long their loved ones would serve in Korea.[89]

The negative aspects of this system were more glaring but localized to Korea. Rotation had a mixed effect on the morale of soldiers and officers. Soldiers knew there was an end to their service in Korea, but the closer to their thirty-sixth point a soldier got, the less inclined they were to risk their thirty six point ticket home.[90] Individual rotation degraded unit cohesion and the overall combat effectiveness of the Eighth Army. Instead of units training together and then fighting as a team, units became a collection of individuals with varying levels of experience and commitment to the unit and mission based on their number of points.

---

[87] Mossman, *Ebb and Flow*, 365.

[88] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 346-348.

[89] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 221; Marshall, *Pork Chop Hill*, 2,5; Braim, *The Will to Win*, 263-264; Casey, *Selling the Korean War*, 302-303.

[90] John A. Sullivan, *Toy Soldiers: Memoir of a Combat Platoon Leader in Korea* (Jefferson: McFarland & Company, 1991), 115-117; Wilson, *Maneuver and Firepower*, 224.

This system affected infantry units along the MLR the most. These units garrisoned the outposts, conducted the combat patrols, and took the casualties. Every day after the rotation system was established the Eighth Army bled to maintain this hard earned combat experience.[91]

Commanders struggled to maintain the combat skills and offensive spirit of their soldiers and junior officers. To counter these effects, the Eighth Army continually rotated units and employed a complex Rest and Recreation system. A regiment would normally only spend six weeks on the line and then rotate into a two to three week training cycle.[92] The creation of the individual rotation system in Korea outlasted the war. It continues through to the present in U.S. forces assigned to the ROK, and served as the model for the rotation of soldiers during the Viet Nam War.

For all the advantages and problems of the individual rotation policy, the major issue that faced the Eighth Army remained a lack of manpower. The shortage of men required the continuation of the KATUSA program. KATUSAs started untrained Koreans infused into U.S. Army units and over time improved into valuable members of each unit.[93] Unlike their American counterparts there was no rotation home for the KATUSAs, so those that survived developed a great deal of combat skill.[94] In the April 1953 battle for Pork Chop Hill, out of fourteen King Company soldiers that fought and survived the entire battle, seven were KATUSAs.[95]

The integration of Koreans into the U.S. Army as combatants was unique to Korea and the Korean War. The number of KATUSAs in a unit varied throughout the war and helped fill out and maintain the strength of U.S. Army and eventually other U.N. forces.

---

[91] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 263-264,298-300; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 186-187.
[92] Ibid., 263-264; 2nd Infantry Division, *Command Reports September, October, November 1951; April, May, June, July 1953*.
[93] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 148-149, 164; Braim, *The Will to Win*, 277-278.
[94] Sullivan, *Toy Soldiers*, 25.
[95] McWilliams, *On Hallowed Ground*, 109.

Approximately 20-25% of the soldiers in a U.S. Army infantry company were KATUSAs. KATUSAs also helped familiarize U.S. Army soldiers with the Koreans they were fighting for, which also had mixed results.[96] As with the rotation policy, the KATUSA policy continues to this day, with modifications. It serves the same purpose of filling out under strength units assigned to the Eighth Army in Korea. Currently each nine-man infantry squad has at least one KATUSA, with an average of four to six KATUSAs per infantry platoon.[97] As the Korean War continued, it remained a fight to keep Eighth Army units at required combat strength and readiness.

Van Fleet and his subordinate commanders had to adapt their operational concepts to this individual rotation process, the shortage of trained soldiers and the lack of additional combat units to counter the growth of CPVF/KPA forces. The personnel rotation policy, coupled with the adoption of the Containment strategy, hampered effective defensive operational concepts. CPVF/KPA operational concept of "eating sticky candy" challenged the Eighth Army's daylight focused concepts and forced Eighth Army to become night fighters. The other factor that affected Eighth Army concepts was the military equipment available to prosecute the conflict.

Sprockets: Equipping Eighth Army to defend

The equipment that soldiers in Korea used varied as the war progressed. As experimental equipment was introduced into the conflict, U.S. units developed ways to employ them in a defensive conflict. New weapons were developed because of the Korean War build up. Much of the individual equipment used was WWII vintage or upgrades. The

---

[96] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 277- 278; John K. Mahon and Romana Danysh, *Army Lineage Series Infantry Part I: Regular Army* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), 87.

[97] This is based on the authors experience in Korea from 2000-2002 as an Infantry platoon leader with the 1-506 IN BN (AASLT) and conversations with officers currently serving in the ROK. When the author served along the DMZ, squad strength, including KATUSAs, rarely was up to the authorized nine men. Each squad hovered between six and eight men. Without those four to six KATUSAs many platoons would lose about 15% of their combat power.

individual weapon systems remained the M-1 (Garand), M-1 carbine family (M-1, M1A1, M2, & M3), the M1928A1 Thompson submachine gun, and the M1918 Browning Automatic Rifle (BAR).[98] The M2 and M3 were developed at the end of WWII and were supposed to replace the M1928A1, but when the Korean War started this exchange was not complete, and the M1928A1 remained in use throughout the war. The deficiencies of the M-1 and M-1 carbine family during the Korean War resulted in the decision to design a new rifle for the U.S. Army infantry soldier. This resulted in the development of the M-14 and M-16 weapon systems that are still in use today. The primary side arm of the U.S. armed forces was the M-1911 .45 caliber pistol.[99]

The M-1 and M-1 carbine were the primary weapons taken on patrol during the trench warfare period of the war. The M-1 was a more dependable weapon but the carbine had a greater volume of fire.[100] M-1 carbines used a twenty or thirty round external magazine unlike the M-1 Garand which used an eight round internal clip. The M-1 Carbine fired in semi-automatic or automatic mode. The M3 variant included both day and night scopes. It was the first U.S. rifle to use a night vision device, referred to as a sniper scope or "snooperscope." It was developed for WWII but saw limited use at the end of the war in Europe, specifically in Airborne and Ranger units. The M-3 was also sent to the Pacific for use in the Philippine and Okinawa campaigns.[101]

During the trench warfare phase, night patrols became the primary activity of infantry units, the M-3 with night scope was a desired weapon within a patrol and for outpost duty.[102]

---

[98] Leroy Thompson, *The M1 Grand* (Long Island City: Osprey Publishing, 2012), 33-37, 60-66; Robert R. Hodges Jr., *The Browning Automatic Rifle* (Long Island City: Osprey Publishing, 2012), 61-63, 66-68.

[99] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 461-466; Leroy Thompson, *The Colt 1911 Pistol* (Long Island City: Osprey Publishing, 2011), 50-53; Leroy Thompson, *The M-1 Carbine* (Long Island City: Osprey Publishing, 2011), 60- 61.

[100] Thompson, *The M1 Carbine*, 4-7, 26-35, 52-56; Mahon and Danysh, *Infantry Part I: Regular Army*, 78-85; John Miller Jr., Owen J. Carroll and Margaret E. Tackley, *Korea: 1951-1953* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956), 264, 308, 310.

[101] Thompson, *The M1 Carbine*, 4-7, 26-35, 52-56.

[102] Thompson, *The M1 Carbine*, 31-33, 56-61; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 188-190, 369, 372.

This weapon, like other weapons, was constantly upgraded and tested on combat patrols. Lieutenant Sullivan recounted a patrol, 14-15 February 1953, where his men were ordered to take a new version out on an ambush patrol and provide feedback.[103] The Korean War forced the Army to develop soldier portable night vision capabilities to assist in night fighting.

The biggest change in soldier equipment was the fielding and mandatory wear of flak jackets. The M1952A flak vest was a great innovation that added weight to the soldiers load but protected him against the two biggest threats in Korea, artillery and grenade fragments. The armored vest or flak vest M1952A, Navy and Army variant, was adopted by Eighth Army in the fall of 1952.

The use of the flak vest by front line troops reduced fatal chest wounds by 60 to 70 percent, according to numerous Army Medical Department studies conducted during the Korean War.[104] The use of the M1952A body armor reduced the severity of the remaining chest wounds by 25 percent. Along with saving lives it was noted that body armor increased the individual soldier's sense of safety and willingness to fight.[105] The extensive use of body armor in the last year of the Korean War began to change the way the Army and Marine Corps viewed the equipping of infantry soldiers. Fighting outnumbered, in a limited attritional war, of undetermined length, the U.S. Army's most precious resource became trained soldiers. No longer were infantry soldiers disposable, they became indispensable.

One weapon that dominated the Korean War was artillery. During the Korean War more artillery rounds were fired by the U.S. Army than it fired during WWII.[106] Eighth Army used five types of artillery and four types of mortars. The volume and accuracy from

---

[103] Sullivan, *Toy Soldiers*, 102-103. Sullivan describes the use of the infrared "Snooperscopes" designed to help soldiers fight at night.

[104] Cowdrey, *The Medics' War*, 211.

[105] Ibid., 210-211, 254; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 372.

[106] House, *Toward Combined Arms*, 150-154; Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 439; Marshall, *Pork Chop Hill*, 145- 146. Marshall remarked; "Never at Verdun were guns worked at any such rate as this."

improved artillery tubes and accurate fire direction systems made the difference during many defensive attritional hill fights in Korea.[107] Fehrenbach quotes S.L.A. Marshall:

> While the enemy had an estimated number of field guns equal to those of the U.N., it was the American volume of fire, hurled without stint or counting, and its superior placement, that enabled the U.N. to win almost all the hill battles from Heartbreak to Pork Chop.[108]

In Van Fleet's "opinion, by WWII standards, his Army's artillery was short by some 70 battalions." It was his intent to "expend steel and fire, not men."[109] Van Fleet demanded massive increases in the per day artillery tube expenditure. For example, in May 1952, 710 active tubes fired 102,000 total rounds of artillery and in July 1953, 900 tubes fired 375,000 total rounds of artillery to stop the last CPVF offensive. Daily rates of fire per-gun were increased from WWII rates of 50 rounds a day to 300 rounds a day for a 105mm howitzer.[110] For example, "in one operation, the 38th Field Artillery Battalion fired 11,600 rounds in 12 hours, a rate of one round per minute per 105mm howitzer."[111]

Korea was also the first time the field artillery arm employed the grid reference targeting system, which increased the accuracy and speed of fire missions. This simplified system enabled any infantrymen to call accurate fire missions.[112] The Korean War was also the first war where the USAF was a separate service. This caused issues with respect to CAS. The Korean War was the first war to employ the newly created USAF Tactical Air Control Parties (TACP), which were sent down to companies and platoons, to provide close air support terminal guidance.[113]

Operation SMACK, a January 1953 experiment in air-armor-artillery-infantry coordination, demonstrated the strengths and weaknesses of air power and massed fire in

---

[107] John J. McGrath, *Fire for Effect: Field Artillery and Close Air Support in the U.S. Army* (Fort Leavenworth Kansas: Combat Studies Institute, 2010), 87-90; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 510; Li, Millett, & Yu trans. & ed., *Mao's Generals Remember Korea*, 148; House, *Toward Combined Arms*, 152-153.
[108] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 439.
[109] Giangreco, *Artillery in Korea: Massing Fires and Reinventing the Wheel*, 11.
[110] Ibid., 12.
[111] Doughty, *The Evolution of US Army Tactical Doctrine*, 11.
[112] Ibid., 3.
[113] Ibid., 3, 9- 10.

support of an infantry assault in daylight on a prepared position. The assault on Spud Hill used one infantry company minus (two platoons). That company received massive amounts of artillery preparation and close air support along with direct fire from tanks during the assault. Despite 224,000 pounds of bombs, 12,000 rounds of artillery, 4,500 rounds of mortars, and over 100,000 rounds of machine gun fire, the infantry assault was a "fiasco" and Spud Hill was not taken due to a lack of infantry to drive the final assault.[114] Despite this setback, the Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps continued to improve its fire support systems. These changes increased the precision and integration of U.S. Army fire support systems. But fire support alone could not dislodge a well-entrenched enemy. Only quantities of good infantrymen could perform this task.

Two other weapons systems employed and refined during the Korean War, were helicopters and armored personnel carriers (APC). The Korean War was the first combat test of the helicopter and APC. Both systems were experimented with during WWII but never employed in combat. The U.S. Marine Corps took the lead with the development of helicopter tactics, with the full support of Ridgway and Van Fleet.[115] Both generals saw the utility and potential and requested Army transport helicopters for Korea. Despite the need, Army transport helicopters did not arrive in Korea until 1953. In contrast U.S. Army command and medical evacuation helicopters were extensively used throughout the conflict starting in late 1950.[116]

An example of the early use of command helicopters was when X Corps Commander, Major General Ned Almond, used his helicopter as a mobile command and control platform

[114] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 385-389.

[115] Paul M. Edwards, *Combat Operations of the Korean War: Ground, Air, Sea, Special and Covert* (Jefferson: McFarland & Company, 2010), 38, 109-110, 114, 116, 118, 121, 125-126, 129. From the summer of 1951 through 1953 the Marine Corps experimented with different ways to use helicopters on the battlefield. These experiments ranged from moving wounded to hospital ships, land assault troops from ships to land, moving supplies across rivers to forward positions, and inserting Marines into patrols.

[116] Cowdrey, *The Medics' War*, 163-165. The first helicopter evacuation unit arrived in early 1951, the second in March, and two others would arrive in the following months of 1951.

during the 23 May 1951 Task Force Gerhardt counterattack to regain the Soyang River crossing. With his knowledge of the battlefield, Almond landed next to the lead tank element and ordered them to start movement. Task Force Gerhardt fought through and quickly captured or destroyed several Chinese units and regained twelve miles of mountainous terrain.[117] By using helicopter reconnaissance, Almond could interact directly with his commanders and use his authority to modify plans and take advantage of a fortuitous situation.

As outposts increased along the MLR, secure movement of men and supplies to them became a problem that helicopters helped solve, but helicopters had to land just short of the MLR. Movement from the MLR to the outposts required a new way to use armored forces. New and old tanks were used in innovative ways to support the infantry and conduct long range attacks on CPVF positions. The Korean War saw the first extensive use of heavy tanks, the M-26 Pershing, followed by the M-46, M-47, and M-48 Patton tanks by the U.S. Army.[118] Though 200 of the test variant of the M-26, the T-26E3, saw limited action starting in February 1945 in Europe, it was deemed "too little, too late" to have any effect or gain experience with the weapon system.[119] These tanks increased the fire power, maneuverability, and protection available to the infantry-armor team. These tank positions became a critical factor along the MLR. Instead of leading armored spearheads they became high-powered snipers that could destroy enemy bunkers and machine gun positions across no man's land.[120]

The M-39 was the first APC in combat. It was designed to carry supplies and personnel to forward positions. Its drawback was its lack of overhead cover. Later, the experimental T-18E1, with an enclosed top, was developed. Major General Arthur G. Trudeau, commander

---

[117] Gugeler, *Combat Actions in Korea*, 185-191.

[118] Steven J. Zaloga, *T-34-85 vs. M26 Pershing, Korea 1950* (Long Island City: Osprey, 2010), 56-76; Steven J. Zaloga, *M26/M46 Pershing Tank 1943-53* (Long Island City: Osprey, 2000), 22, 35-42.

[119] Zaloga, *M26/M46 Pershing Tank 1943-53*, 22.

[120] Ballenger, *The Final Crucible*, 2*: 1953*, 165, 202-209.

of the 7th Infantry Division, advocated for the employment of APCs in support of infantry operations. He convinced Eighth Army to allow him to conduct field tests of the T-18E1. The M-39 was used during the April 1953 battle for Pork Chop Hill. Both M-39's and T-18E1's provided the critical support link between Hill 200 and Pork Chop Hill during the July 1953 battle.[121] APCs proved capable of protecting and transporting soldiers from the MLR to outposts under attack. Simultaneously, they were used to evacuate casualties and resupply the forces in the outpost. The June 1953 battle of Pork Chop Hill was more of a siege, and the APC was crucial in breaking that siege and bringing re-supply to the position. Trudeau's advocacy and their performance during both battles for Pork Chop Hill ensured their further development after the Korean War. These developments resulted in the M-59 and then the M-113 APC, used so extensively in Viet Nam, though developed for use in support of NATO.[122]

Fighting in the Korean War was dynamic with operational concepts continuing to change during each period of the war. The "man over machine" concept the CPVF initially presented U.N. forces with several challenges. As Eighth Army adapted to overcome Communist "man over machine" concepts, the Communist created the operational concept of "eating sticky candy" to thwart Eighth Army adaptations. The give and take of the first year of the Korean War demonstrated the caliber of the opponents. Offensive war of movement favored the better equipped and supplied Eighth Army. This was demonstrated during the pursuit that followed the failure of the Second Phase of the Fifth Offensive in May of 1951.

The options available to Van Fleet in May 1951 were limited by JCS directives, the resources available in men and equipment, and the operational concepts employed by Peng and the CPVF/KPA. As General J. Lawton Collins, U.S. Army Chief of Staff (1949-1953), later wrote:

---

[121] McWilliams, *On Hallowed Ground*, 102, 196-200, 279, 285, 350.
[122] Mahon & Danysh, *Infantry Part I: Regular Army*, 94, 106.

> During this period (June 1951 – July 1953) the main purpose of the U.N. operations was to keep the pressure on the enemy and to inflict maximal casualties on the Chinese and the North Koreans in order to force an agreement that would end the fighting.[123]

To achieve this operational goal Van Fleet could neither advance nor retreat. The U.S. Army *would not* provide him with any additional units. He was also ordered to minimize U.N. casualties. The communist forces refused to give battle and focused on limited night assaults that would only target U.N. squad, platoon or company size positions. Within these constraints, Van Fleet changed the operational concepts employed by his army in order to achieve the required goal: an end to the fighting along the MLR.

The situation that faced Van Fleet in July 1951 demanded innovative leadership to keep his army combat capable, while conducting a defensive and attritional limited war. Van Fleet's army was outnumbered fighting a war it was not designed or equipped for. To overcome these challenges, Van Fleet and his subordinate commanders adopted different operational concepts to accomplish their mission. These concepts employed by Van Fleet and his subordinates changed the way the Eighth Army fought the last two years of the Korean War. They were supported by new and innovative weapons and support systems.

The greatest challenge was to modify and employ weapon systems designed for mobile offensive warfare. The most important of these was the U.S. soldier. Van Fleet needed to harness them to conduct effective defensive attritional warfare. To do this required operational concepts that allowed Eighth Army to apply pressure on the CPVF/KPA while not gaining ground, limiting U.S. casualties, and not provoking the Soviets to either enter the Korean War or start a second front in Europe. This was the balance the Eighth Army managed, starting from June 1951.

[123] J. Lawton Collins, *War in Peacetime: The History and Lessons of Korea* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969), 306.

Chapter 4: Korean War Trench warfare: Small Unit Tactics, Precision Fires, and Special Operations.

On 12 November 1951, General Van Fleet was ordered to end the methodical advance of Operation PILE DRIVER and assume the "active defense" along the Eighth Army's current front line. He was authorized by General Ridgway to commit forces up to a division size formation to take control of an enemy outpost or adjust his defensive line. From his current limit of advance, Van Fleet was required to convince the CPVF/KPA to cease combat operations.[1] Ridgway's order to Van Fleet nailed the Eighth Army's feet in place for the duration of the Korean War.[2]

In contrast, Peng Dehuai convinced Chairman Mao Zedong that his forces could not defeat the Eighth Army using "men over weapons" operational concepts.[3] Unable to convince Stalin to commit his Red Army to the fight in Korea, Mao directed Peng to conduct an operational concept called "eating sticky candy." This concept was focused on weakening the political will of the free world so it would abandon the Republic of Korea.[4]

Van Fleet's challenge was to end the war, minimize casualties and secure the ROK roughly along the Main Line of Resistance (MLR).[5] During Van Fleet's tenure as commander of the Eighth Army, April 1951 to February 1953, he and his subordinate commanders developed defensive attritional concepts that allowed Eighth Army to hold the MLR outnumbered by the CPVF/KPA forces. When Van Fleet handed over command to

---

[1] James F. Schnabel and Robert J. Watson, *The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, Volume III, The Korean War, Part I*, 477-495, 501-503; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 73, 176; Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 164- 168. Ridgway's Letter of Instruction to Van Fleet on April 25th, 1951 lays out these instructions and was followed up by Ridgway's November 12th, 1951 directive to Van Fleet to assume the "active defense" in Msg., CX 57143, CINCFE to JCS, 12 NOV 51.

[2] David Rees, *The Korean War: History and Tactics* (London: Orbis Publishing, 1984), 67.

[3] Peng Dehuai, *Memoirs of a Chinese Marshal*, 481- 482; Li, Millett, & Yu, trans. & eds., *Mao's Generals Remember Korea*, 32-36; Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 46.

[4] Zhang, *Mao's Military Romanticism*, 83- 84, 154- 155; Zubok & Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War*, 65-69.

[5] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 164-168; Braim, *The Will to Win*, 261-264, 284.

General Maxwell D. Taylor in February 1953, Taylor refined Van Fleet's operational concepts throughout the remainder of the Korean War.

Van Fleet and Taylor employed three internal U.S. Army operational concepts that changed how the Eighth Army fought along the MLR. These were: improved small unit tactics, precision fire support, and special operations. Van Fleet adapted to the restrictions on offensive action. First he increased command emphasis on small unit tactics, especially "patrolling."[6] Second, he increased all forms of fire support down to the small unit leaders, this built on his previous directives and liberal use of firepower beginning in May and June of 1951.[7] Third, Eighth Army was confronted by a persistent communist guerrilla force south of the 38th Parallel and a refugee population willing to take the fight north. To counter communist special operations and employ their own, Far East Command (FEC) and Eighth Army created a full spectrum special operations capability. This force focused on special operations designed to apply indirect pressure on CPVF/KPA forces, especially their flanks and supply lines. Special operations were designed to force Peng to divert manpower and resources away from the front lines to protect his flanks and rear.[8] These three operational concepts defined Eighth Army operations in Korea during the static period from June 1951 to 27 July 1953.

Before the Korean War, the U.S. armed forces hotly debated the relative value of each service and the nature of future armed conflict.[9] This debate, in simplest terms, concerned the importance of men versus machines. The advocates of machines, in the form of advanced technology, resided mainly in the U.S. Air Force and Navy while the defenders of the primacy of the soldier came largely from the U.S. Army and Marine Corps. One can view the Korean War as a test case for these two perspectives on warfare. As Chief of Staff of the

[6] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 264.
[7] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 265, 300; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 67-71;
[8] Frederick W. Cleaver et al., *UN Partisan Warfare in Korea, 1951-1954* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956), 9-11, 31-34.
[9] Blair, *The Forgotten War*, 6-17.

Army, Ridgway challenged Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "He [Ridgway] disputed the contention that improved weapons constituted a reason for reducing military manpower."[10] In contrast, the Korean conflict was written off as irrelevant by the advocates of air power and atomic technology, because these technologies were not fully employed due to political restrictions.[11] But the importance of the soldier was supported by the numerous small unit actions, and increased use of CAS, during combat operations from the summer of 1951 through July 1953.[12]

Van Fleet's operational changes were influenced by stark realizations concerning the nature of the struggle between the communists and the free world. The first realization concerned basic numbers. Communist combat formations outnumbered the free world formations by a ratio of two to one in Korea.[13] Besides their population advantage, it was apparent that the communists were willing to spend the lives of their people more freely. Stalin told Zhou Enlai in 1952, Mao's number two, "The North Koreans have lost nothing, except for casualties."[14]

The second operational realization concerned the nature of the battlefield. During the Korean War the battlefield expanded to include what is now understood as Special Operations. Special Operations in the form of propaganda, psychological operations, civil action, and partisan forces operating deep in the enemy's rear were an established part of

---

[10] Ridgway, *Soldier*, 323-332; Robert J. Watson, *History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Volume V: The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, 1953 – 1954* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986), 32-37.

[11] Futrell, *The United States Air Force in Korea, 1950-1953*, 708-711; Bernard Brodie, *Strategy in the Missile Age* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), 314-318 & 348-357; John J. McGrath, *Fire for Effect: Field Artillery and Close Air Support in the U.S. Army* (Fort Leavenworth: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2010), 93, 103-105.

[12] McGrath, *Fire for Effect*, 93-96; Ridgway, *The Korean War*, vi & viii.

[13] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 367- 368, 512; Boose, *U.S. Army Forces in the Korean War, 1950 – 53*, 18-35, 67-88; Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle*, 163-169, 175-182, 209-212.

[14] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 511 & 512; Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 87-90, 100, 188; Zubok & Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War*, 70-72. Zubok and Pleshakov conclude from Soviet and Chinese records that, "Stalin was determined to fight until the last drop of blood shed by Chinese and North Korean soldiers."

communist doctrine.[15] Korean and to a lesser degree Chinese soldiers quickly discarded their uniforms and became guerrillas once caught behind U.N. lines and resulted in approximately 8,000 guerrillas operating behind Eighth Army lines in November 1951.[16] This realization militarized most U.S. activities in Korea and resulted in counter-guerrilla operations like RATKILLER.

The third realization concerned the world that the U.S. wanted to create and protect with its military shield. Operationally the U.S. military alliance required increased coordination, integration, and standardization. Each member of the U.N. Command arrived at a different level of readiness. The Turks were well trained soldiers, but required a complete change of equipment and were then organized along U.S. Army T/O&E for a Regimental Combat Team. In contrast, the Thai Battalion required intensive training along with a complete issue of clothes and equipment and reorganization into a U.S. T/O&E style unit.[17] The new official relationships, NATO and later SEATO along with numerous bi-lateral alliances, required a drastic upgrading of the military forces of the weaker states, so that all forces could work effectively together against the Communists.[18] This understanding forced the U.S. Army to change the way it fought and to integrate other U.N. forces into the Army system.

Small Unit Tactics

Small Unit Tactics (SUT) is a term used to describe U.S. military actions by units below the regiment or brigade level; where the battalion, company, platoons or squad serves as the unit that conducts a combat mission. Due to their size, these units focus on specific tactical tasks within a limited geographical area. Their tasks are divided into defensive and offensive

---

[15] Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 142-143; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 182-183.

[16] Paik Sun Yup, *From Pusan to Panmunjom: Wartime Memoirs of the Republic of Korea's First Four-Star General* (Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books, Inc., 1992), 179-194; Millett, *A House Burning*, 204 & 244; Millett, *They Came from the North*, 382; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 76, 182-183, 345- 346.

[17] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 10-21.

[18] Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 314-330; Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 184-188.

missions. In the defense, these units can conduct positional or active defense. In the offense, they can conduct planned or hasty attacks, raids, reconnaissance patrols, ambushes and movement to contact. The heart of small unit tactics revolves around the concept of patrolling. This is a tactic performed when a unit is on the offense or defense. Patrolling consists of three types of tactical missions: reconnaissance, ambushes, and raids. During the trench warfare period, the focus of every Eighth Army maneuver unit was patrolling focused on gaining information about the enemy, capturing enemy prisoners, dominating no-man's land, and inflicting damage on enemy units or positions. Aggressive patrolling by every unit on the MLR was one way Van Fleet could apply pressure on the communists.

As the war developed, more restrictions were placed on the conduct of offensive operations. In July 1952, the new FEC and U.N. Commander, General Mark W. Clark, reserved authority to authorize any operation of battalion size or greater.[19] Only he could authorize an operation that involved a battalion or greater forces. The last of these major operations was Operation SHOWDOWN in October 1952.[20] The operation was too costly for Clark's taste and future battalion or larger operations were shelved. Clark's view was that the best way to punish the enemy was to allow the Communists take the offensive into the teeth of U.N. firepower.[21]

Prior to the Korean War, patrolling tactics supported U.S. Army offensive and defensive operations. They were not considered the primary task of an infantry unit but a supporting task. At the beginning of the Korean War the Army had just published an updated field manual for infantry companies.[22] *FM 7-10 Rifle Company Infantry Regiment* (October 1949) covered squad, platoon and company operations.[23] Similar to *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949),

[19] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 293.
[20] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 288-289; Edwards, *Combat Operations*, 73- 74;
[21] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 293, 310-318.
[22] Department of the Army, *FM 7-10 Rifle Company Infantry Regiment* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1949).
[23] Ibid., iii-v.

the rifle company manual describes the tactical role of the rifle company in offense, defense, and retrograde operations.[24] As with *FM 100-5 Operations*, the focus of the rifle company was to attack, and to support larger units in the attack. Defensive operations were defined as temporary: designed to gain time, degrade the enemy offensive capability, and support the buildup of combat power before the army returned to offensive operations. Smaller units (Squads, Platoons, Companies, & Battalions) supported maneuver warfare through patrolling, and performed defensive tactics to prepare for the next major attack.[25] In the last two years of the Korean War this relationship switched and patrolling became the primary task of every unit stationed along the MLR. For example, in January 1953 IX Corps dispatched 2,668 platoon sized night patrols.[26]

By November 1951, U.S. Army operational doctrine focused on offensive maneuver missions lost validity in Korea because of the order to go on the "active defense," and later "General Clark wanted the U.N. Command to confine itself to patrolling and let the enemy do the attacking."[27] *FM 7-10 Rifle Company Infantry Regiment* underwent extensive amendment at the end of 1952; the Army recognized the need for a revised tactical doctrine for its rifle companies.[28] Some of the major doctrinal changes emphasized the proper conduct of raids, employment of squad snipers, detailed fire support planning, and the incorporation of close air support (CAS) into company fire support plans. Previously the planning of CAS was the responsibility of regiment and battalion headquarters, but during and after the Korean War it became the responsibility of company commanders.[29] Only company commanders and platoon leaders could effectively call CAS during CPVF/KPA

---

[24] Ibid., 184-335.

[25] Department of the Army, *FM 7-10 Rifle Company Infantry Regiment* (1949), 311-324; Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), 120.

[26] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 369.

[27] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 293.

[28] Department of the Army, *FM 7-10 Rifle Company Infantry Regiment (1949)*, Change 3, December 1952 included pages 1-42.

[29] Ibid., 21-42.

night assaults or Eighth Army raids on CPVF/KPA strong points. Regimental and battalion commanders could only provide support to their company commanders and platoon leaders engaged with the enemy.

To deal with the perceived bottomless pit of communist manpower, the U.S Army concluded that it needed to increase the quality and quantity of firepower throughout its formations. The CPVF/KPA forces also needed more firepower, but for a different reason, because they could not break through U.N. lines. Communist leaders solved their firepower dilemma through traditional means: they built more fire support units.[30]

In contrast, the U.S. Army increased the lethality of each battalion by replacing rifles with additional automatic weapons. In 1952 the U.S. Army increased the number of automatic rifles (Browning Automatic Rifle or BAR) in its platoons from three to six, allocating two BAR's per squad and one sniper system per squad with night scope. Due to supply reasons most units had only two sniper systems per platoon.[31] In May and December 1952, and April 1953, changes to the Army Table of Organization and Equipment increased the size of the rifle platoon from 41 to 45 soldiers and authorized an increase in weapon systems. Each battalion also increased the number of M1917A6 Light Machine Guns (LMG) from 13 to 21, doubling the number of LMGs in each platoon.[32] The additional automatic weapons increased each platoons potential volume of fire during engagements.

During combat patrols, or raids in current military terminology, platoons were augmented with special weapons, like the M2-2 flamethrower and M20 75mm recoilless rifle, to knockout communist bunkers and machine-gun positions. Near the end of the war, battalion weapons platoons added M27 105mm recoilless rifles to their set of weapon

---

[30] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 284, 510; Meid & Yingling, *Volume V: Operations in West Korea*, 509- 510; Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle*, 176-181.

[31] Mahon & Danysh, *Infantry, Part I: Regular Army*, 80-82; E.B. Edwards, *Training Memorandum No. 11, 14 March 1953* (Fort Sill: The Artillery Center, 1953), 1- 2.

[32] Mahon & Danysh, *Infantry, Part I: Regular Army*, 80-82; Boose, *US Army Forces in the Korean War, 1950 – 53*, 25-28.

systems. After the Korean War these were replaced with the more effective M40 106mm recoilless rifle as the primary U.S. Army battalion anti-tank system, until the fielding of BGM-71 TOW systems in the 1970s.[33] To increase the firepower of each platoon position, additional light, medium, and heavy machine guns were attached to infantry platoons that manned outposts. The increase in machine guns at the lowest level increased the requirement for ammunition to feed the guns.

Mortar systems proved indispensable and were upgraded throughout the Korean War. The M2 60mm mortar was replaced by the improved trigger capable M19 60mm mortar. M1 81mm mortars were replaced by the longer ranged M29 81mm mortar. Similarly, the M2 4.2in Mortar was replaced by the longer ranged M30 4.2in Mortar. These new mortar systems increased the range, accuracy, and lethality of each company, battalion and regiment's indirect fire capability.[34] Improved mortar systems facilitated increased organic fire support to units on patrol.

By summer 1951, the Army recognized the need to strengthen the leadership of junior officers and non-commissioned officers (NCO) in the employment of SUT, particularly patrolling in the form of reconnaissance, ambushes and raids.[35] The Chief of Staff of the Army transferred the Ranger Training Command to the Infantry School, and renamed it the Ranger Department, on 10 October 1951.[36] After the Korean War, Ridgway set the goal of a Ranger qualified officer in each infantry company and a Ranger qualified NCO in every

---

[33] Ibid., 80, 85, 93-95, 101-105; Boose, *US Army Forces in the Korean War 1950—53*, 50-51.

[34] Boose, *US Army Forces in the Korean War, 1950 – 53*, 25-28; Rudolph W. Stephens, *Old Ugly Hill: A G.I.'s Fourteen Months in the Korean Trenches, 1952-1953* (Jefferson" McFarland & Company, 1995), 49 & 50; Gugeler, *Combat Actions in Korea*, 210-213, 222-226; Ballenger, *The Final Crucible*, 83-86.

[35] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 388-389.

[36] Mahon & Danysh, *Infantry, Part I: Regular Army*, 85; Gordon L. Rottman, *U.S. Army Rangers and LRRP Units, 1942- 87* (Long Island City: Osprey Publishing, 1987), 26, 26, 48- 49; Bank, *From OSS to Green Berets*, 172.

infantry platoon.[37] This remained the goal of the U.S. Army but was rarely achieved, due to the high failure rate in the Ranger course.

During the Korean War, the primary way to learn patrolling skills consisted of training exercises behind the MLR, rehearsals prior to patrols, and combat patrols in no-man's land.[38] During the "war of patrols," 1951 to 1953, the harshest graders of patrol leaders were the inscrutable CPVF. The institutionalization of Ranger school was designed to increase the Army's ability to conduct SUT patrol activities, at night. The course taught junior officers and NCOs leadership skills and honed their combat techniques in the execution of reconnaissance, ambush, and raid patrols during day or night. As an institutional change, Ranger school was a long-term fix to the Army's deficiency in patrol skills.

Due to battlefield attrition and the rotation system, most junior officers only served four to six months in company level positions before they were rotated into staff jobs, or KMAG billets. This hindered the development of capable patrol leaders. The rotation policy applied to the regular soldier and NCOs, but soldiers stayed with their units for the duration of their tour.

For example, the 65th Infantry Regiment rotated 8,700 men, 1,500 of them NCOs, between January and September 1952, and only received 435 trained NCO replacements. Colonel Cordero, the regimental commander, reported that out of 811 authorized NCO positions in the upper three grades (master sergeant, sergeant first class and sergeant) he had only 381 within his command. This situation forced commanders to grow their own NCOs; these internally developed NCOs were soldiers that demonstrated leadership potential.[39] High rates of turnover, along with the high casualty rate of among junior officers and NCOs

---

[37] Rottman, *US Army Rangers and LRRP Units 1942- 87*, 48-51; Alfred H. Paddock, Jr., *U.S. Army Special Warfare: Its Origins*, (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002), 126-128; Bank, *From OSS to Green Berets*, 171- 172.

[38] Stephens, *Old Ugly Hill*, 68-72, 101, 137-140, 143-145.

[39] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 302- 303.

during combat operations, created the largest hurdle to increasing the patrolling proficiency of the U.S. Army during the Korean War.[40]

S.L.A. Marshall described the rotation system on the MLR in April 1953:

> On the American side, men moved in and out as if the fighting line operated on a conveyer belt. No one stayed long enough to graduate in the fine art of deception.[41]

There were two ways off the "conveyer belt" as a casualty or once a soldier earned the required number of points. While on the MLR, most units were constantly shifting positions. A battalion would normally spend about six weeks on the MLR and then rotate back to regimental or division reserve position for two weeks. During those two weeks the companies would receive replacement soldiers, and conduct individual and collective training that culminated in a company live fire attack with support arms. After these training weeks off the line, the battalion would return and cycle through the MLR for approximately six more weeks. Battalions and regiments were also rotated to perform other tasks, including securing POW camps and key infrastructure throughout South Korea.[42] This shifting of tasks diminished the patrolling skills of each infantry company.[43]

While on the MLR, companies rotated through various positions. The MLR consisted of three parts: the COPL (Combat Outpost Line), the MLR itself, and reserve positions behind the MLR. The area behind the MLR was where support units and headquarters operated. Each battalion manned one to three outposts in front of the MLR; this constituted their

---

[40] McWilliams, *On Hallowed Ground*, 146-148.

[41] Marshall, *Pork Chop Hill*, 7.

[42] 2nd Infantry Division, *Command Report, April 1953* (College Park: National Archives and Records Administration, 1953), Box 05, File 19b, RG 407, 4-6, 18- 19; Sullivan, *Toy Soldiers*, 23-29; John Nolan, *The Run-Up to the Punch Bowl: A Memoir of the Korean War, 1951* (Charleston: Xlibris Corporation, 2006), 130-135; Stephens, *Old Ugly Hill*, 79-83; 9th Infantry Regiment, *Command Report, April 1953* (College Park: National Archives and Records Administration, 1953), Box 07, File 10, RG407, 2-4; 38th Infantry Regiment, *Command Report, May 1953* (College Park: National Archives and Records Administration, 1953), Box 06, File 11, RG407, 2-5.

[43] By the year 1951. The United Nations had almost 140,000 North Korean and 20,000 Chinese POWs. See Stephen E., Pease, *Psywar: Psychological Warfare in Korea 1950-1953* (Harrisburg: Syackpole Books, 1992), 145.

section of the COPL. These outposts developed into platoon and company size fortified hilltops.

The larger outposts had fortified squad sized supporting positions that controlled avenues of approach to the primary fortification and the MLR. Platoons would rotate between positions on the MLR and the COPL every three to seven days, based on the company and battalion schedule. Therefore an average platoon would spend one third of its time on the MLR occupying an outpost if its battalion had three points on the COPL. As the war developed, not all battalions occupied three points; some only maintained one outpost and focused the rest of their platoons on patrolling.[44]

Due to Van Fleet's patrolling requirements, each subordinate unit maintained a patrol schedule and reported them in their monthly command reports. Each patrol consisted of a platoon or smaller force tailored to the requirements of the patrol. Because of the number of patrols in a regimental sector, patrol routes and missions were controlled at the regimental level, and supervised by battalion commanders. Each company on average conducted one patrol a night. This patrol assignment was rotated between the company's three rifle platoons. Most patrols were screening patrols that were focused on detecting CPVF/KPA patrols and night attacks, but a select number were combat patrols.[45] In modern terminology, screening patrols were either reconnaissance patrols or ambush patrols. Combat patrols were raids focused on communist outposts or the opposing MLR. When a unit served as a local reserve they were usually tasked with conducting specialty patrols for that command.[46]

Van Fleet pushed to increase patrolling across the entire MLR. Therefore every night in the no-man's land between the U.N. and communist forces there were hundreds of U.N. and

---

[44] Sullivan, *Toy Soldiers*, 31-39, 84-93; Nolan, *The Run-Up to the Punch Bowl*, 154-157; Stephens, *Old Ugly Hill*, 58-72, 84-91; Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 419-424; Marshall, *Pork Chop Hill*, 16-18, 224; 9th Infantry Regiment, *9th Infantry Regiment Command Report, September 1952*, Box 07, File 09, RG407, 3-7.

[45] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 370-374.

[46] Ballenger, *The Final Crucible*, 52; Gugeler, *Combat Action in Korea*, 236- 237.

Communist patrols conducting reconnaissance, ambushes, and raids on each other.[47] In the summer of 1951 the Army patrolled mainly during the day, but as the fronts became fortified in late 1951 most of the patrols began taking place at night. Some patrols still took place during the day, while others would last longer than one period of darkness. As the two MLRs and COPLs crept closer together, and the communists increased their firepower, it became catastrophic to conduct almost any missions in daylight.

One of the major deficiencies of the 1948 and later 1953 TO&E was the lack of sizable specialized reconnaissance capability within the U.S. Army units. Neither Eighth Army headquarters nor its corps headquarters possessed organic reconnaissance capability based on the 1948 or 1953 TO&E. To solve this deficiency, Eighth Army created within the Miscellaneous Division of Eighth Army G-3 Operations Attrition Section. Within the Miscellaneous Division, Eighth Army created the 8086 Army Unit (AU) that conducted special reconnaissance and other special operations missions.[48] Reconnaissance units were organic to division and below units. By TO&E, each division had one reconnaissance company and each regiment had one reconnaissance platoon. A battalion had an intelligence section that consisted of an intelligence officer and two squads of two men each, who were supposed to perform both reconnaissance and analysis tasks for the battalion.[49] This structure provided a specialized capability to support Army divisions, but not the capacity to conduct enough patrols to dominate no-man's land, or collect the specialized information needed by U.S. commanders.[50]

---

[47] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 180, 183, 205, 369, & 372; Stephens, *Old Ugly Hill*, 101, 133, 134, 152, 155; Nolan, *The Run-Up to the Punch Bowl*, 170-181; Marshall, *Pork Chop Hill*, 149-232; Gugeler, *Combat Action in Korea*, 236-245.

[48] Boose, *US Army Forces in the Korean War 1950-1953*, 18-20; Michael E. Haas, *In the Devil's Shadow: U.N. Special Operations during the Korean War* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2000), 8, 13, 32-36; Cleaver et al., *U.N. Partisan Warfare in Korea*, 1-3, 29-43.

[49] Boose, *US Army Forces in the Korean War 1950-1953*, 18-28.

[50] Ballenger, *The Final Crucible*, 26-27, 43-45, 87-108; Meid & Yingling, *Volume V: Operations in West Korea*, 549-562. The Marine Corps had a similar TO&E with respect to reconnaissance capability but as the war progressed it created ad hoc units and internal training to increase its reconnaissance and sniper capability.

Through sheer volume of patrols, Eighth Army soldiers increased their capability to patrol at night. Only a small portion of the enlisted soldiers remained in the Army after their two-year conscription and those that did were shipped back to the U.S. to serve as trainers for the next iteration of conscripts.[51] *Training Bulletin No. 8,* November 1951, listed ten specific weaknesses of the U.N. forces that were found in a CPVF document. This CPVF critique of U.N. soldiers focused on their weaknesses in individual and collective soldier skills. They criticized the U.N. forces dependence on vehicles, fire support, and lack of physical fitness to cope with Korean terrain. Van Fleet stated that the errors noted by the CPVF "indicate practices that are to be avoided in future actions."[52]

During the first few months of fighting between the CPVF and U.N. forces, the CPVF saw a willingness on the part of U.N. forces to abandon their equipment and an inability to effectively conduct operations at night.[53] Despite this initial assessment, by the end of the Korean War, according to Bin Yu, a PLA veteran, CPVF commanders found it harder and harder to attack U.S. positions, either outposts or along the MLR as the war went on. The CPVF improved its forces to adapt to U.S. firepower and maneuverability, but Bin Yu relates the assessment of CPVF leaders, that the U.S. Army also "improved steadily and significantly."[54]

In 1954, the U.S. Army Infantry School published its own *Lessons from Korea*. The Infantry School report noted deficiencies in the infantry soldiers similar to those noted in the 1951 CPVF assessment. The Infantry School found 37 areas that infantry units could improve upon. The report focused on the need to improve basic soldiering skills, train soldiers to correctly operate and employ infantry weapon systems, operate at night, conduct proper patrolling, incorporation of all forms of fire support, and the need for realistic training.

---

[51]Ibid., 426 & 427; Stephens, *Old Ugly Hill*, 168-174;

[52] Chief or Army Field Forces, *Training Bulletin No. 8*, *16 November 1951* (Fort Monroe: Army Field Forces, 1951), 11.

[53] Ibid., 11.

[54] Li, Millett, & Yu, trans. & eds., *Mao's Generals Remember Korea*, 23.

During and after the Korean War, the Infantry School focused on improving the patrolling skills of infantry soldiers and leaders. They also added a helicopter unit to the Infantry School, to support incorporating helicopters into its training of infantry soldiers.[55] SUT skills were an identified weakness of the U.S. Army throughout the Korean War, and were the focus of post-war training.

Fire Support

Fehrenbach described the last two years of the Korean War as a protracted artillery duel.[56] In many ways this was correct, but it glosses over the nature of the Clausewitz style duel that occurred between the Eighth Army and CPVF/KPA forces. From the U.S. perspective the U.S. Army and Marine Corps continued to refine the concept that Ridgway described as "Find, Fix, Fight, and Finish." In current military terminology the fight was dropped to become "Find, Fix and Finish," or the three F's.[57] The finding and fixing of the CPVF/KPA forces was the responsibility of patrols and outposts that lured out communist units. The finishing was a predominantly direct and indirect fire responsibility of the heavy weapons along the MLR, artillery behind the MLR, and the CAS capability of U.S. Air Force, Navy, and Marine aviation units. The close relationship between the infantry small unit leader, their Forward Observer (FOs) teams, and the various fire support units melded into a purer form of combined arms.

Based on John J. McGrath's study of the development of fire support, a lesson learned from WWII, the company Fire Support Officer (FSO) concept was formalized and implemented during the Korean War.[58] This gave each company commander his own FSO to help him with his company fire support plan. The November 1950 changes to *FM 7-10 Rifle*

---

[55] The Infantry School, *Lessons from Korea* (Fort Benning: 1954), 1-19.

[56] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 426-428.

[57] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 89. Ridgway wrote; "I repeated to commanders as forcefully as I could, the ancient Army slogan: "Find them! Fix them! Fight them! Finish tem!""

[58] McGrath, *Fire for Effect*, 87.

Company Infantry Regiment dealt with the correct employment of internal infantry company assets; it focused on 60mm mortars and 57mm recoilless rifles, and the development of squad leaders.

The December 1952 changes to *FM 7-10 Rifle Company Infantry Regiment*, focused on order preparation and the synchronization of fires, in support of company attack or defensive operations. They included an entire new section to the supporting fires appendix dealing with the characteristics, capabilities and employment of CAS.[59] In *Training Bulletin No. 8*, November 1951, the employment of tanks in support of infantry in the defense was highlighted, advising infantry commanders on how to employ tanks in their defensive positions to maximize their capability.[60] Each of these changes indicated a shift in the employment of fire support and the closer relationship between different types of soldiers in the U.S. Army.

Lieutenant General Edward M. Almond, as Commandant of the Army War College, produced a paper titled *Battle Employment of Artillery in Korea* (February & March 1952) and conducted a *Conference on United Nations Military Operations in Korea*, in the same month, with the faculty and students of the U.S. Army War College.[61] He took this briefing to the Artillery Center at Fort Sill and other U.S. Army schools, to advocate increased synchronization of fire support and CAS. *The Battle Employment of Artillery in Korea* dealt with how he integrated all forms of fire support during the Battle of Soyang River (16-23 May 1951), and gives advice on how the field artillery branch should continue to develop.[62]

---

[59] Department of the Army, *FM 7-10 Rifle Company Infantry Regiment* (1949, w/ changes 1, 2 & 3 December 1952), 1-20, 1-153.

[60] Chief of Army Field Forces, *Training Bulletin No. 8, 16 November 1951*, 7.

[61] Edward M. Almond, *Conference on United Nations Military Operations in Korea, 29 June 1950 – 31 December 1951* (Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 1952), 1-64; Edward M. Almond, *Battle Employment of Artillery in Korea* (Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 1952), 1-9, please see supporting charts on page 18.

[62] Almond, *Battle Employment of Artillery in Korea*, 1-9.

In his cover letter to the Commandant of The Artillery School, Almond stated that he was most concerned with creating an effective way to deal with the "vastly superior massed ground forces that our battle units must oppose in the future."[63] Using his Korean War experience against the CPVF, Almond wrote:

> I am confident that the combination of conventional artillery, including anti-aircraft, the tank, combat aircraft, guided missile and rocket, the defensive mine and surface controlled searchlights constitute the means, together with radio and radar communications equipment, by which this support of the infantry elements of combat can and must be provided.[64]

In a separate memorandum to the students of the U.S. Army War College Almond asked for constructive comments on his concepts. The first paragraph argued that, "Success in ground battle not only envisages well trained infantry but the highest type of integrated fire support for the infantry, produced in the most effective manner." Almond used the term artillery in the broadest sense, defined as "explosive and casualty effecting projectiles delivered in adequate amounts to have the desired destructive effects on the enemy."[65]

During the Battle of the Soyang River, Almond did not have the traditional amount of artillery support and stated that the twenty artillery battalions in the X Corps were "meager by WWII European standards."[66] This was a similar complaint Ridgway and Van Fleet made about the artillery available to the Eighth Army. Van Fleet was of the opinion that in the summer of 1951, he was short by seventy plus battalions of artillery.[67] In concert with Van Fleet, Almond viewed part of the solution as an increase in the number of rounds fired per artillery tube. During the Battle of the Soyang River, the 38th Field Artillery Battalion, a 105mm towed howitzer unit, fired 11,891 rounds in a twenty-four hour period (night of 18-19

---

[63] Edward M. Almond to Arthur M. Harper, Carlisle Barracks, 8 March 1952, Edward M. Almond Papers, Army War College, Pennsylvania.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Edward M. Almond, *Integrated Supporting Fires in Ground Combat, 1 March 1952* (Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 1952). A one page memorandum from General Almond to the students and faculty concerning the ideas expressed during the conference extract.

[66] Almond, *Battle Employment of Artillery in Korea*, 5.

[67] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 228.

May 1951), a record. This record was beaten later in the year during the Battle for Bloody Ridge (August 1951). At Bloody Ridge, the 15th Field Artillery Battalion fired 14,200 105mm rounds in a twenty-four hour period.[68] Capacity to fire innumerable artillery rounds supplanted the need to increase the number of artillery tubes and artillery battalions stationed in Korea.

The point was not only the volume of fire but also the way fire support was used. The "box barrage" or what became known as "box me in" fire was used to great effect during the Battle of Soyang River. "Box me in" fire became the standard operating procedure throughout the Eighth Army. In Almond's presentation he also mentioned the use of VT or proximity fuse artillery fired on top of friendly positions.[69] The "box barrage" tactic that Almond advocated constituted the majority of the shells that the 38th Field Artillery Battalion fired during that engagement. 2,000 105mm VT rounds were dropped on Company K, of the 38th Infantry Regiment in the first eight minutes.[70] This barrage was designed to destroy the attacking CPVF forces that broke through K Company's wire. These fires continued for the next four hours as the company commander and his FO shifted fires in front of and on different parts of their own position. Almond did not shelter the audience with respect to the risks being taken in Korea. By 1954 when the Army published *Combat Actions in Korea*, calling in VT fire on your own fortified position become the norm if attacked by overwhelming numbers, and it used K Company as an example.[71] This adjustment demonstrated the dramatic shift that occurred in the practical use of fire support.

Almond stated that his presentation "will not deal with a most important method of fire support to the infantry – that of close tactical air support – except for the radar controlled

---

[68] Almond, *Battle Employment of Artillery in Korea*, 5.
[69] Ibid., 3.
[70] Gugeler, *Combat Action in Korea*, 180.
[71] Ibid., 178-181.

airplane bomber."[72] During the time of this presentation and soon after it was given, Van Fleet challenged the USAF over CAS and forced some changes but never to his staisfaction.[73] The Air Force gave CAS the lowest priority among all air missions. [74] Both U.S. Army and Marine Corps commanders were frustrated by the way the U.S. Air Force employed its assets and Van Fleet voiced their dissatisfaction with a formal complaint in December 1951.[75] In another direct attack on U.S. Air Force doctrine, Almond charged:

> The present air doctrine prescribes that interdiction is most effective against transportation facilities such as railroads, vehicles and marshaling yards. It is realized that this is a very important aspect of war but, as demonstrated in Korea, is believed that close support bombing is equally and sometimes of greater importance. Once the enemy has concentrated his forces near the front, then is a most appropriate time to shift the preponderance of bombing effort to close support missions… Highly effective interdiction and neutralization can better be accomplished by bombing the enemy when he concentrates near the front prior to an attack.[76]

This was heresy to the U.S. Air Force. That Almond advocated the use of bombers, to include B-29s, in support of ground forces under the control of Army MPQ-2 radar system operators, was unacceptable to the Air Force. But by May 1951, the situation was so grave, with Almond's artillery tubes burning up shooting more rounds than they were supposed to, that the Fifth Air Force finally allocated B-29 and B-26 bombers to support ground forces. Using 500 lbs. bombs armed with a VT fuse, these bomber aircraft conducted night bombing raids on troop concentrations in front of X Corps positions, under the direction of X Corps radar operators. The largest bombing run occurred on the night of 22-23 May, when 22 B-29s bombed CPVF concentrations preparing to conduct a night attack. Almond confirmed

---

[72] Almond, *Battle Employment of Artillery in Korea*, 1.

[73] Allan R. Millett, "Korea, 1950-1953," in *Special Studies: Case Studies in the Development of Close Air Support*, ed. Benjamin Franklin Cooling (Washington, D.C.: Office of Air Force History, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990), 381-383.

[74] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 289-292.

[75] House, *Toward Combined Arms Warfare*, 153; Meid & Yingling, *Volume V: Operations in West Korea*, 510-517.

[76] Edward M. Almond, *Battle Employment of Artillery in Korea (1950-1951)*, 8.

that the proven accuracy of the MPQ-2 radar allowed the use of bombers on targets as close as 500 yards from friendly positions.[77]

Almond also encouraged the development of new forms of rocket and missile artillery. These new rockets and missiles would augment traditional tube artillery, CAS, and other direct fire weapon systems. Almond also stressed speed, mobility and flexibility in the employment of fire support platforms, as well as the creation of integrated fire plans at all levels. In his conclusion he stressed that "the complete integration of all types of supporting fires is essential to the success of the ground battle."[78] Almond's fire support concepts were used with great effect to halt the CPVF's Second Phase Fifth Offensive, and set an example for what was possible in terms of coordinated fire support.

The image of Eighth Army artillery firing enumerable shells in support of outposts is generally true despite some shortages and restrictions in 1952. Eighth Army dominated the artillery duel until the winter of 1952-1953, when the number of Communist tubes surpassed the number of U.N. tubes.[79] The only U.N. increase in tubes from 1952 to 1953 was the creation of additional ROKA artillery battalions, added to ROKA divisions. From the start of the war, each ROKA division possessed one 105mm towed artillery battalion. Through the efforts of Van Fleet, Ridgway and Clark, the U.S. Army supplied and trained the ROKA with two additional 105mm battalions and one 155mm battalion, bringing them to four artillery battalions in each division, three 105mm battalions and one 155mm battalion.[80]

Even with this increase, the number of U.N. artillery tubes did not keep up with the increase in communist artillery tubes.[81] But what Eighth Army forces lacked in tubes they made up for in quantity and quality of rounds fired from each tube. Eighth Army forces also

---

[77] Almond, *Battle Employment of Artillery in Korea*,6-9.
[78] Ibid., 9.
[79] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 510.
[80] Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 172- 173; Braim, *The Will to Win*, 275-276; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 344, 360; Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 217-219; Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 182-184.
[81] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 510.

shifted their artillery pieces to maximize support to units in contact. Evidence of this was demonstrated during the Communist third phase of their "Final Offensive," which started in July 1953 and ended with the initiation of the armistice at 2200 hours, 27 July. The communists fired 705,000 rounds of artillery in support of numerous assaults on Eighth Army outposts and the ROKA sector of the MLR. This was a massive number of rounds fired along the 155 mile long front in support of the twenty plus division offensive. But in contrast the Eighth Army fired a staggering 4,711,120 artillery rounds to stop this last communist offensive and hold the MLR.[82]

Almond's fire support concepts were applied during the many raids and platoon defenses conducted by Eighth Army forces during the last seven months of the war. For example, the 5th Marine Regiment raided Hill 15 "Detroit" on the 25 February 1953 with Fox Company minus. This was an excellent example of a small infantry unit operation. The raid took 68 minutes and employed two infantry platoons. The total time of the raid included movement to the objective, actions on the objective, and completion of the planned withdrawal. To accomplish this minor raid with less than a company of infantry, the 5th Marines' employed artillery, tanks, and CAS systems. Preparatory fires, isolation fires during the assault, and covering fires during the planned withdrawal immersed the two assaulting platoons during the raid. The varied fire support during this operation included 11,881 round of artillery fired by the 11th Marines (FA) and 1st Royal Canadian Horse Artillery. These units fired a combination of 105mm, 155mm, and 25lbs guns.[83] CAS strikes from Marine Corsairs dropped 500lbs bombs, napalm canister, rockets, and conducted gun runs on communist positions. Direct fire weapons included the heavy weapons company which fired 200+ 75mm recoilless rifle rounds on and around the target area. More than 700 90mm tank rounds were fired on target in support of the raid, and all heavy machine gunners

---

[82] Giangreco, *Artillery in Korea*, 16; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 477- 478.
[83] Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle*, 64-65, 137- 138.

along the 5th Marine section of the MLR, engaged targets in support of the raid.[84] This was one of several small raids regularly conducted up and down the MLR by various Eighth Army units during this period of trench warfare. This use of fire support was not just for raids against communist positions. It was also part of the defensive system that Eighth Army forces employed to hold the MLR and the outposts in no-man's land.

The first of three stages of the "Chinese Final Offensive 1953" occurred from 13-26 May. It was focused on training new CPVF armies in Korea (1st, 16th, 23rd 24th, 46th, 54th, Armies & the 33rd Division). These forces needed to learn how to chew Eighth Army "sticky candy." Their goals were to capture fortified Eighth Army outposts. From these positions, the CPVF planned to conduct their major push in late June and early July. The communist military headquarters chose fifty-six Eighth Army positions to attack. These targets ranged from platoon to battalion size outposts in front of the MLR.[85] This represented the highest development of the "eating sticky candy" operational concept that Mao directed Peng to adopt in summer 1951. Each of the fifty-six outposts was a piece of Eighth Army "sticky candy" the CPVF intended to chew up.

The actions in and around squad OP (Outpost) Snook on the night of 15-16 May 1953 demonstrated that the precision fire support concept applied and was effectively employed at the smallest level. It was no longer a battalion and higher function but the smallest unit in the U.S. Army, the squad, which could call down hell on an attacking CPVF unit.[86] A squad size element from Third Platoon, Able Company, of the 17th Infantry Regiment, led by Sergeant George Transeau, manned OP Snook during the night of 15-16 May. The CPVF attacked OP Snook with 40 to 50 soldiers at 2304 hours. Members of the squad fought in close combat with the CPVF. Through the use of wire communication, Transeau initiated the fire support

[84] Ballenger, *The Final Crucible*, 83-86.

[85] Korean Institute of Military History, *The Korean War: Volume Three*, 584-593.

[86] Department of the Army, *FM 7-10 Rifle Company Infantry Regiment* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December 1952), 394-401.

plan for his position. From 2304 through 2400 hours, fire support units consisting of two Quad-50s, a platoon of 4.2in mortars, four 60mm mortars, and a battery of 105mm howitzers fired in support of the squad outpost. As the CPVF forces pulled back, flares assisted Transeau in continuing to call in fire on withdrawing CPVF.[87] This was a small contact between a CPVF platoon size unit and a U.S. Army squad. Despite the small number of U.S. Army forces engaged, higher command, supported its squad leader and swiftly employed all available fire support in and around the outpost.

In support of the need for additional fire support training, in 1954, the Infantry School determined that, on average, units were not employing fire support enough and "greatly increased the emphasis on fire support planning."[88] The same Infantry School study referenced the observations made by Almond's X Corps studies. These observations were made during Almond's time in command of X Corps, October 1950 through July 1951.[89] These actions demonstrated the U.S. Army's adoption of the tactical concept of synchronized fire support systems to protect U.S. Army positions, no matter how small.

Eighth Army forces faced several challenges during the trench warfare period of the Korean War. In terms of combat forces they were greatly outnumbered along the MLR. The U.N. forces in July 1953 included eighteen plus ROKA divisions, eight U.S. divisions (1st MARDIV, 2nd ID, 3rd ID, 7th ID, 24th ID, 25th ID, 40th ID and 45th ID) and one Commonwealth Division for a total of twenty-seven divisions.[90] The 24th Infantry Division was brought back to Korea from Japan starting on 3 July 1953 to bolster security in rear areas.[91] Normally two to three U.S. divisions and four to six ROKA divisions were kept off

---

[87] Marshall, *Pork Chop Hill*, 222-232.

[88] The Infantry School, *Lessons from Korea, 1954*, 2 & 3.

[89] Ibid., 2- 3, 11-13.

[90] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, Map IX, 57, 77, & 513; Boose Jr., *U.S. Army Forces in the Korean War, 1950 – 53*, 20, 56, 57, 66-87; Meid & Yingling, *Volume V: Operations in West Korea*, 573; Mahoney, *Formidable Enemies*, 111-137; Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle*, 9, 21-32, 60-65, 135-142, 150-156; Anthony Farrar-Hockley, *An Honourable Discharge*, 435-440; Korean Institute of Military History, *The Korean War, Volume Three*, 692 & 693.

[91] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 472.

the line for training or on other missions, such as securing POWs. At the time of the cease-fire, July 1953, there were eighteen U.N. divisions holding the MLR.[92] In contrast, the communist forces positioned approximately twenty-eight divisions along the MLR. This force consisted of six to seven KPA divisions and twenty-one to twenty-two CPVF divisions. Total communist forces included approximately nineteen KPA divisions and numerous separate brigades plus fifty-seven CPVF divisions, along with numerous support elements echeloned in-depth.[93] The lopsided manpower advantage and willingness to spend lives on the part of the CPVF was highlighted by the last communist offensive from May to July 1953. During this offensive they poured over twenty divisions into the U.N. line, the majority into an area initially held by less than five ROKA divisions.[94]

Operational initiative was ceded to the communists once Ridgway directed his forces conduct an "active defense;" the JCS affirmed that decision in JCS Message 86804. This message stated the acceptability of the current frontline trace as a possible demarcation line between the two Koreas.[95] The willingness to sacrifice lives to achieve military objectives gave communist commanders an added advantage. One of the ways Eighth Army commanders adapted to this challenge was in the use of fire support systems. Through the incorporation of every available weapons system into their fire support plans, and their willingness to expend innumerable rounds to save men, the U.N. command sacrificed steel instead of men. Van Fleet's guidance made this clear, "We must expend steel and fire, not men."[96] The U.S. Army learned through these engagements, changed its T/O&E, and

[92] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, Map VIII, 374.

[93] Korean Institute of Military History, *The Korean War, Volume Three*, 692; Farrar-Hockley, *An Honourable Discharge*, 436; Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle*, 176-182.

[94] Korean Institute of Military History, *The Korean War: Volume Three*, 584-593; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 465-477.

[95] Ibid., 176, 293. JCS 86804 stated, "Ground action could still continue even though gains and losses would not be of significance to location line…" Ridgway used the term "active defense" in his 12 November 1951 directive to Van Fleet.

[96] Giangreco, *Artillery in Korea*, 11.

improved its doctrine during and after the Korean War. This resulted in a force with increased firepower and potential lethality.[97]

Development of Special Operations during the Korean War

The development of special operations forces during the Korean War created for the first time standardized U.S. Army Special Operations units. Special operations were tainted after WWII by the image of the OSS and its leader Brigadier General William "Wild Bill" Donovan. On Truman's order, in September of 1945 the OSS was shut down and replaced several months later by the temporary Central Intelligence Group (CIG).[98] The CIG was a bureaucratic orphan without a strong leader or defined place in the U.S. government hierarchy. Even though the War Department received the authority to conduct covert operations after the OSS was eliminated, it gave this up by default to the temporary CIG and its successor organization the CIA, because the U.S. Army did not possess the desire or specific TO&E units designed to conduct these missions.

Creating permanent Special Operations units and fighting the Korean War were closely linked. Like many other parts of the *NSC 68* expansion of the DoD, the creation of a permanent Special Operations capability had its genesis in WWII. At the beginning of the Korean War, U.S. Army leaders discovered a need for Special Operations capabilities (psychological warfare, special reconnaissance, unconventional warfare, and special support capabilities) that they possessed during WWII.[99] MacArthur requested trained units with both artillery and special capabilities that the U.S. Army no longer possessed.[100] Trained special operations personnel in the fields of partisan/unconventional and psychological

[97] The Infantry School, *Lessons from Korea, 1954*, 9, 10, 15- 16.

[98] Douglas Waller, *Wild Bill Donovan: The Spymaster Who Created the OSS and Modern American Espionage*, (New York: Free Press, 2011), 330-352.

[99] Haas, *In the Devil's Shadow*, 7-13; Mike Guardia, *American Guerrilla, the Forgotten Heroics of Russell W. Volckmann: The Man Who Escaped from Bataan, Raised a Filipino Army Against the Japanese, and Became the True "Father" of Army Special Forces* (Philadelphia: Casemate Publishers, 2010), 163-168.

[100] Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 23-28; Braim, *The Will to Win*, 228-231.

warfare were two of the areas in which Far East Command (FEC) and Eighth Army were lacking.[101] Recognition of this operational requirement brought together a unique group of individuals who created the institutions now known as the U.S. Army J.F.K. Special Warfare Center, U.S. Army Special Forces Command and the 4th Military Information Support Operations Group.[102]

The men responsible creating what became the U.S. Army Special Operations Command were brought together under the Army Office of the Chief of Psychological Warfare (OCPW). The four men with the most influence in the creation of a standing U.S. Army Special Operations capability were Brigadier General Robert McClure, Lieutenant Colonel Russell Volckmann, Colonel Wendell Fertig and Colonel Aaron Bank.[103] The creation of the OCPW as a separate office that reported directly to the Army Chief of Staff occurred in January 1951, carved out of a place within the U.S. Army Staff for Special Operations. OCPW established the Psychological Warfare Center at Fort Bragg in May 1952. The Psychological Warfare Center created the institution that would train all U.S. Army Special Operations forces. It produced the 10th Special Forces Group (deployed immediately to Bad Tolz, Germany) the 77th Special Forces Group (based at Ft. Bragg for worldwide deployment) and additional Psychological Warfare units in November 1953. This created permanent U.S. Army Special Operations units for the first time in Army history. During the Korean War, the U.S. Army authorized Special Operations units while the U.N.

[101] Paddock, *U.S. Army Special Warfare*, 89-104.

[102] U.S. Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center was originally named the Psychological Warfare Center, U.S. Army Special Forces Command was created from the 10th Special Forces Group Headquarters element that remained at Ft. Bragg to generate more Special Forces units, and the 4th Military Information Support Operations Group which grew from 6th Radio Broadcasting and Leaflet Group, the original Psychological Warfare unit based at Ft. Bragg with responsibility to train other Psychological Warfare units.

[103] Bank, *From OSS to Green Berets*, 154-155, 170.

Command created parallel provisional special operations capability, in Korea, supported by operators trained at Ft. Bragg.[104]

The men involved with the founding U.S. Army Special Operations were familiar with Asia and Korea when they went about their task to create the Psychological Warfare Center and Special Forces. OCPW received full reports on all partisan operations ongoing in Korea.[105] Though McClure served in the ETO during WWII, he spent most of his early years in the U.S. Army assigned to units in the Philippines and China. He was the senior of seven trained Psychological Operations officers in the U.S. Army when the Korean War began. McClure was instrumental in the development and employment of psychological operations units during the Korean War.[106] While he shepherded the creation of the Psychological Warfare Center (a military school for both Psychological Warfare and Special Forces that became the Special Warfare Center in 1955), the creation of permanent psychological operations units and Special Forces units, he also supported and advised the psychological warfare effort in Korea.[107]

Lieutenant Colonel (later Brigadier General) Russell Volckmann was one of McClure's first additions to the Special Operations sub-directorate of OCPW. During the first six months of the Korean War, Volckmann served as the executive officer for the Special Activities Group – Far East Command (SEP-FEC).[108] This unit was the initial FEC attempt to create a partisan unit and conduct partisan operations in the DPRK. SEP-FEC would later become Combined Command Reconnaissance Activities Korea or CCRAK, which would supervise United Nations Partisan Forces Korea (UNPFK), which later changed into the

---

[104]Ibid., 154-184; Paddock, *U.S. Army Special Warfare*, 89-112; Alfred H. Paddock Jr., "Major General Robert Alexis McClure Forgotten Father of US Army Special Warfare," http://www.psywarrior.com/mcclure.html (accessed May 21, 2012).

[105] Paddock, *U.S. Army Special Warfare*, 121.

[106] Paddock, *U.S. Army Special Warfare*, 93-104.

[107] Herbert A. Friedman, "The American PSYOP Organization During the Korean War," entry posted 16 January 2006, http://www.psywarrior.com/KoreaPSYOPHist.html (accessed May 21st, 2012).

[108] Guardia, *American Guerrilla*, 165-168.

United Nations Partisan Infantry Korea (UNPIK), all working in a convoluted manner for both FEC and Eighth Army.[109] These provisional units were responsible for conducting special operations throughout the Korean Theater of Operations (KTO).

While recovering from an injury at Walter Reed Hospital, Volckmann was propositioned to join OCPW's Special Operations (SO) office by McClure; Volckmann was then transferred to the newly created OCPW SO.[110] Volckmann's previous special operations experience began during the fall of Bataan in 1942. He spent all of WWII in the Philippines on the northern island of Luzon, building a 22,000 man Philippine insurgent force to fight against the Imperial Japanese Army.[111] After WWII, Volckmann helped write the U.S. Army's first field manuals on Operations against Guerrilla Forces and Guerrilla Warfare (FM 31-20 & 31-21).[112] These were written in 1949 but not published until February and October 1951 respectively. These were the first manuals in the special operations category that dealt with what was then known as partisan operations, now called unconventional warfare.[113] Because of his work with SEP-FEC, he was familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of that organization.

Colonel Fertig, like Volckmann, fought in WWII as a guerrilla leader in the Philippines but on the southern island of Mindanao. As a supportive senior officer he served in several senior positions within OCPW and as the first deputy at the Psychological Warfare Center.[114] The most well known member of OCPW was Colonel Aaron Bank. He served in the OSS during WWII, in both Europe and Indo-China. He was fighting in Korea as an operations officer in the 187rd Regimental Combat Team (Airborne), when he was reassigned in February 1951 to OCPW as the head of the Special Operations sub-directorate. There he

---

[109] Ben S. Malcom with Ron Martz, *White Tigers: My Secret War in North Korea* (Ontario: Brassey's, 1996), 177.

[110] Paddock, *U.S. Army Special Warfare*, 191.

[111] Guardia, *American Guerrilla*, 146; Aaron Bank, *From OSS to Green Berets*, 165.

[112] Mike Guardia, *American Guerrilla*, 160-164.

[113] War Department, *FM 21-6 List of Publications for Training*, 18.

[114] Bank, *From OSS to Green Berets*, 170; Paddock, *U.S. Army Special Warfare*, 140-143.

joined Volckmann and others to fight a bureaucratic campaign within the Pentagon to create a standing special operations capability within the U.S. Army.[115]

Before the Korean War, the U.S. Army experimented with the idea of special operations in a variety of ways. As early as *FM 100-5 Operations* (1939), the U.S. Army understood that guerrilla warfare and combating guerrilla warfare were operations it might conduct.[116] In each subsequent addition of *FM 100-5 Operations* the Army grappled with the idea of special operations, but it remained poorly defined. Each update of the manual, the only document in U.S. Army doctrine that dealt with special operations, increased the scope of special operations, to thirteen different types by the 1954 version.[117] The different types of special operations included Combat in Fortified Areas, Combat in Towns, Operations at River Lines, Night Operations, Combat in Woods, Combat at a Defile, Jungle Operations, Desert Operations, Mountain Operations, Operations in Deep Snow and Extreme Cold, Airborne and Amphibious Operations.[118]

Guerrilla Warfare was the only Special Operation type not defined by its physical characteristics. Each of the *FM 100-5 Operations* manuals retained the duality of guerrilla warfare and combating guerrilla warfare as two parts of the same operational concept. In these manuals, the U.S. Army defined the perspective of the guerrilla/partisan and the forces that would conduct counter guerrilla/partisan warfare. For the first time in *FM 100-5 Operations* (1954), because of the publication of *FM 31-21Organization and Conduct of Guerrilla Warfare*, a supporting manual was referenced and the description of guerrilla warfare shortened.[119] The 1954 edition did this for each of the thirteen types of Special Operations. *FM 100-5 Operations* (1954) was the last operations manual to list fighting in

---

[115] Bank, *From OSS to Green Berets*, 154-183.
[116] Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1939), V-VI, 228-231.
[117] Ibid, V-VI & 228-231; Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1941), III-V, 238-240; Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1944), V-IX , 284-286; Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1949), III-IV, 231-33; Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1954), 1-3, 171-173.
[118] Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations (1954)*, 150-169, 173-196.
[119] Ibid., 173, paragraph 379.

different terrain or conditions as special operations.[120] In subsequent manuals guerrilla/partisan warfare became a stand - alone chapter named unconventional warfare.[121] With the creation of the Psychological Warfare Center, the U.S. Army shifted the responsibility for Psychological Warfare and Special Forces doctrinal development to the Psychological Warfare Center, now the U.S. Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School at Fort Bragg.

As with the other operational concepts examined in this study, the Korean War and the urgency it created facilitated experimentation with and institutionalization of special operations concepts developed during WWII. McClure, in a memorandum to General Collins in August 1951, expressed his concern that opportunities in Korea to experiment with different techniques and equipment, such as helicopters to spread psychological messages were missed.[122] The OCPW Chief and his staff viewed Korea as an opportunity to test special operations concepts.

Through OCPW's urging, fifty-five newly trained Special Forces officers and nine enlisted Special Forces NCOs were requested by FEC and sent to Korea in the spring of 1953.[123] This initial deployment created a situation of too few Special Forces troops, not trained for operations in Korea, arriving too late in the war to apply their skills. By spring 1953, when the Special Forces troops arrived, CCRAK was focused on shutting down UNPIK units, not expanding them.[124] From May to July of 1953, UNPIK was required by

---

[120] Ibid., 1-3, 150-210.

[121] Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962), 1-3, 127-135; Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations of Army Forces in the Field* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), I-II, 11-1-11-6.

[122] Paddock, *U.S. Army Special Warfare*, 100. As the subject matter expert in message dissemination, General McClure wrote a letter to the FEC G-2 offering advice and equipment that could improve his PSYOPS.

[123] Ibid, 110. It reported to 10th Group Headquarters that FECOM poorly utilized the Special Forces officers and NCOs sent to Korea. Instead of sending Operational Detachment Alpha's, as they were trained, FECOM requested trained individuals. This was a learning point for Special Forces commanders with respect to their conventional counterparts who doesn't always know what they are asking for with respect to Special Forces.

[124] Malcom, *White Tigers*, 186-188, 198-200.

Eighth Army to recover and demobilize over 22,000 Korean guerrillas in North Korea.[125] By the time of the armistice, the U.S. Army had created an institutional special operations capability. The Psychological Warfare Center and the 10th and 77th Special Forces Groups provided the U.S. Army a special operations institution along with T/O&E units capable of conducting special operations.

The Korean War partisan warfare effort became a tool used to protect the fledgling Psychological Warfare Center and its Psychological and Special Forces units. As the armistice was signed, the U.S. Army funded and directed the Operations Research Office (ORO) to conduct a study of the U.N. partisan effort. The report were finished in November 1955 and released for publication as a secret U.S. Army document in June 1956. The study concluded that "the decision to employ Korean partisans in guerrilla warfare role… were sound." The report found deficiencies in the training of the officers chosen to lead the partisan teams; it also found command errors in the employment of these forces by Eighth Army and FEC.[126]

Many of these errors were attributed to the lack of trained guerrilla advisors, limited knowledge of guerrilla doctrine at all levels, and the failure to clearly determine the goals Eighth Army and FEC wanted the guerrillas to accomplish.[127] The report recommended three things that could support success in future limited wars. First, it recommended that all U.S. Army officers and specifically field grade officers should receive training in guerrilla warfare and its proper application. Second, the study recommended doctrinal changes to *FM 31-21* that included considerations for conducting guerrilla warfare in a limited war environment. Third, it recommended that Special Forces personnel should receive greater amounts of training in language, habits, culture and customs. It also recommended that one method to

---

[125] Ibid., 183-193; Frederick W. Cleaver et al., *UN Partisan Warfare in Korea, 1951-1954* (Chevy Chase: Operations Research Office, 1956), 142-146.
[126] Cleaver et al., *UN Partisan Warfare in Korea, 1951-1954*, 2.
[127] Ibid., 2-3, 23- 24.

enhance this training would include assigning Special Forces personnel to MAAGs as trainers of foreign units.[128] This report helped validate the need for a permanent special warfare center and the three under strength Special Forces Groups. The advice on guerrilla warfare in a limited war environment was incorporated into the 1958 edition of *FM 31-21 Guerrilla Warfare and Special Forces Operations*.[129]

One of the major benefits of the Korean War with regard to Special Operations concerned the number of regular Army officers exposed to partisan warfare. The next two Army Chiefs of Staff, Ridgway and Taylor, were heavily exposed to the challenges of commanding a joint, combined partisan force in a limited war environment. Ridgway mentioned the partisan operations in his book *The Korean War*.[130] Clark, who took over for Ridgway as U.N. Commander, devoted an entire chapter in his book praising psychological and partisan warfare in the Korean War. Clark laid out the CPVF/KPA psychological warfare techniques and used his writing to help discredit some of their techniques, while praising the work done by U.S. Army Psychological Warfare units. In dealing with guerrilla operations, he also bragged about the ability of CCRAK's evasion and escape network that recovered downed pilots. Clark supported the retention of special operations capabilities:

> Full details of our guerrilla war against the Communists in North Korea must remain secret, for in North Korea many of the partisan tactics that will have to be used in any future war with the Communists were developed and refined. Partisan warfare, important in the war against the Axis powers, probably will be even more important in any future war with the Communists because the Reds have demonstrated an ability to harness whole populations to their war effort. The free world will have to combat this by developing guerrilla elements which, in case of war, can sap the strength of the populations used by the Communists.[131]

---

[128] Ibid., *1951-1954*, 4, 23- 24.

[129] Department of the Army, *FM 31-21 Guerrilla Warfare and Special Forces Operations* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958), 1- 2.

[130] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 221.

[131] Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 205-219, quote on 210.

Taylor's actions as Army Chief of Operations (G-3), Eighth Army Commander, Army Chief of Staff and Chairman of the JCS demonstrated his support for Special Forces. He was the Army G-3 that signed off on the creation of the Psychological Operations Center, 10th Special Forces Group TO&E and their facilities at Fort Bragg.[132] While he served as Eighth Army commander, Special Forces troops arrived in the KTO.[133] As the Army Chief of Staff he approved the expansion of an additional Special Forces Group based in Asia, the 1st Special Forces Group based in Okinawa.[134] And while serving as Chairman of the JCS he oversaw President Kennedy's planned expansion of Special Forces in 1963.[135]

In 1952 the Army changed the way it prepared for and fought wars. No longer would it raise special units in an emergency and just as quickly disbanded when the threat passed. The protracted struggle against communism and the crisis caused by the Korean War created an environment hospitable to the institutionalization of special operations in the U.S. Army. Taking advantage of the Korean situation, with support from Secretary of the Army Pace, a group of highly capable special warfare advocates created an institutional and operational capability that was combat tested in Korea.

The U.S. Army could now use its special operations units to fight against communism globally. The U.S. Army spent over twenty years prior to 1952 pondering partisan/guerrilla warfare, and occasionally experimented with different possible organizations to execute the operational concept. UNPIK was the last experiment before the U.S. Army settled on Volckmann and Bank's Special Forces concept. No longer could the Army wait for a special unit to train up for a special mission after a crisis began. It needed a partisan/guerrilla and psychological warfare forces ready to conduct missions before a crisis developed. The

---

[132] Bank, *OSS to Green Berets*, 172-174, 181- 182.

[133] Malcom, *White Tigers*, 198- 199.

[134] Shelby L. Stanton, *Green Berets at War: U.S. Army Special Forces in Southeast Asia, 1956-1975* (Novato: Presidio Press, 1985), 1-9.

[135] Bank, *OSS to Green Berets*, 172-174, 181- 182; Paddock, *U.S. Army Special Warfare*, 120-127, 155-157.

Korean War demonstrated the special operations forces truths: Special Operations Forces cannot be mass produced and competent Special Operations Forces cannot be created after an emergency occurs.[136]

[136] U.S. Army Special Operations Command, "SOF Truths," USASOC web site, http://www.soc.mil/USASOC%20Headquarters/SOF%20Truths.html (accessed May 21st, 2012).

Chapter 5: Korean War Trench warfare: Coalition Operations and Republic of Korea Armed Forces

With the U.S. Army, through Far East Command and Eighth Army, taking the military lead in fighting the Korean War, the Army had to devise operational concepts to allow for the employment of coalition partner forces and the Republic of Korea Army (ROKA). While the refining of internal changes to how the U.S. Army would fight an attritional defensive war was important, so was the development of operational concepts on how the U.S. Army would lead coalition operations and the ROKA. Eighth Army, through Van Fleet's leadership, decided to integrate most coalition units into the U.S. Army command and logistical system as fourth battalions/regiments attached to U.S. Army units, normally divisions, and supported the creation of the 1st Commonwealth Division for Commonwealth units.[1] With a shortage of manpower and the desire to have the Koreans take the lead, it was necessary to build the capability and capacity of the ROKA to stand as equals on the MLR. To accomplish this force generation mission, Van Fleet increased the number of advisors that would coach, teach, and mentor the ROK Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps.[2]

Leading Coalition Operations

The U.S. Army fought the Korean War as the leader of a U.N. Command (UNC). The ROK and twenty-one other nations served under the U.N. Command that prosecuted the Korean War. With the establishment of the U.N. Command, led by a U.S. Army general, the concept of coalition warfare changed. Instead of segregating each nation's unit to a different section of the MLR, the U.S. Army integrated the units of different nations into one army, the Eighth Army.

---

[1] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 67-71; William J. Fox, *History of the Korean War: Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations* (Office of the Chief of Military History, June 1952), 187- 188.

[2] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 272-277.

In 1950, the U.N. actualized the concept of collective security through the authorization of an army to fight a war to defend the ROK. The Eighth Army that took the field in Korea was supported by the world's most powerful state and by four of the five UNSC members. Though six years prior, the U.S. led the successful invasion and subsequent liberation of Europe, and General Dwight D. Eisenhower served as the Supreme Allied Commander, the U.S. Army did not possess a doctrine to execute coalition warfare.[3]

The proposition that the U.S. Army would lead, much less dominate, an international coalition, despite its WWII experience, was not a concept the leadership of the U.S. Army or government wanted to entertain.[4] With the U.S. atomic monopoly and the world still devastated by WWII the U.S. Army and Navy were cut down to levels near those of the 1930s. There was an understanding among high ranking officers, based on their WWII experience, that it was best to give allies their own battle space adjacent to U.S. formations.

These allied units would operate under their own command, using their own concepts and supported by their own logistics systems. Therefore when the call went out to send forces to rally under the U.N. flag and defend the ROK, the U.S. Army was not prepared to integrate and employ such forces.[5] Almost sixty years after the Korean War, the U.S. Army still does not have a doctrine for coalition warfare.[6] Despite another decade of coalition warfare in Iraq and Afghanistan the DoD still struggles with how to fight as the leader of a

[3] War Department, *FM 21-6 List of Publications for Training* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1945), 14-18.

[4] Blair, *The Forgotten War*, 12; Omar N. Bradley and Clay Blair, *A General's Life: An Autobiography* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983), 464-467, 487-505; Wedemeyer, *Wedemeyer Reports!*, 430-432, 435-440; Schnabel & Watson, *The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, Volume III: The Korean War, Part I*, xi-xiii.

[5] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 499-504; Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 1-35, 51-56, 64-76.

[6] Robert W. RisCassi, "Doctrine for Joint Operations in a Combined Environment: A Necessity," *Military Review* 75 (January-February 1997): 1-14.

coalition. Doctrinal harmonization within NATO comes closest and serves as the model for a Multi-National Combined Forces Commands.[7]

Despite the lack of doctrine, the U.S. Army led a combined force that included the ROK and contingents from twenty other nations through three years of war.[8] Four of these only sent medical personnel and were considered neutral; the majority of their medical assistance went to wounded U.N. soldiers and ROK civilians.[9] At first, these U.N. forces were employed in an ad hoc fashion. They were attached and detached from Eighth Army units based on need and the fluid situation.[10] Through 1951 and 1952, Ridgway and Van Fleet worked with the leaders of each national contingent to create a system that employed, supported and rotated each U.N. contingent.[11]

The largest participating force, besides the U.S. Army and the ROKA, was the Commonwealth Force that included ground, air and/or naval units from the U.K., Canada, Australia, India, and New Zealand. South Africa, also a Commonwealth member, contributed a fighter squadron that was incorporated into the 5th Air Force.[12] Because Commonwealth forces used similar doctrine, equipment, common language and culture, it was agreed, after much wrangling and a year of fighting, that they would form the 1st British Commonwealth Division (1st BCD).[13] This was not a simple endeavor but it did create a

---

[7] NATO Public Diplomacy Division, "Backgrounder: Interoperability for Joint Operations," http://www.nato.int/docu/interoperability/interoperability.pdf, (accessed May 17, 2012), 1-3; RisCassi, "Doctrine for Joint Operations in a Combined Environment: A Necessity," 124. General RisCassi, former U.N. Commander-Korea, writes in 1993; "In truth, we have not had, or do we yet possess a commonly agreed doctrine for forming or fighting as part of military coalitions…under its absence we will have to address each new coalition on an ad hoc basis. Also in its [doctrine] absence; we have no comprehensive doctrinal base to create the means or tools to improve our ability to participate in, or lead, coalition operations."

[8] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 4, please see Chart 2 and Chart 5.

[9] Ibid., Chart 5, 202, 205, 208. Sweden, Denmark, Norway, & India all provided medical support.

[10] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 52-57; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 204- 205.

[11] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 67-68, 204. In September 1950 Ridgway authorized the creation of the U.N. Reception Center at Taegu where U.N. forces received training and equipment prior to integration with a U.S. Army Regiment/Brigade or Division. The British Commonwealth combat forces had their own training areas and system in Korea.

[12] Futrell, *The United States Air Force in Korea, 1950-1953* , 232; Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle*, 146- 147.

[13] Farrar-Hockley, *An Honourable Discharge*, 59-61, 207-214; Johnston, *A War of Patrols*, 138-149.

multi-national division inside a larger multi-national army. The creation of the 1st BCD allowed the members of the Commonwealth to handle many of their Commonwealth issues internally and present a united front when working with the U.S. Army dominated U.N. command.[14] Despite this force using many of its own weapons, it still depended on the U.S. Army for much of its basic logistical support.

The 1st BCD consisted of U.K., Canadian and Australian infantry and support formations. New Zealand provided an artillery regiment approximately the size of a U.S. Army artillery battalion.[15] To round out the force, an Indian medical unit was incorporated to support the medical needs of the division.[16] The other U.N. units, mostly battalion size, were permanently attached to specific U.S. Army regiments as fourth battalions.[17] The exception was the Turkish Brigade, which served as the 25th Infantry Divisions' fourth regiment from 3 August 1951 through 27 July 1953.[18]

Dealing with the contributors to the U.N. Command was a U.S. Army responsibility. The 1st Marine Division remained separate except for added responsibility it assumed for the 1st ROK Marine Regiment.[19] The only reason U.N. units were detached from their parent U.S. Army division after the fall of 1951 was when those divisions (1st Cavalry & 24th Infantry Divisions) in December 1951 & January 1952 respectively were rotated to Japan and replaced by two National Guard divisions.[20]

---

[14] Jeffrey Grey, *The Commonwealth Armies and the Korean War* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1988), 132-149; Johnston, *A War of Patrols*, 138-149; Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle*, 125-147; Farrar-Hockley, An *Honourable Discharge*, 437 – 440.

[15] Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle*, 125-138.

[16] Farrar-Hockley, *An Honourable Discharge*, 207-217.

[17] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 221; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 68- 69.

[18] Rottman, *Korean War Order of Battle*; Boose, *US Army Forces in the Korean War 1950 – 1953*, 79, 84. The Turkish artillery battalion was attached to the Third Infantry Division in January through April 1953 but the rest of the Turkish Brigade remained with the 25th Infantry Division.

[19] Meid & Yingling, *Volume V: Operations in West Korea*, 529-531; Ballenger, *The Outpost War*, xii.

[20] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 202-24. The 24th ID was brought back to Korea in July 1953 to bolster security in the Korean Communications Zone.

U.N. forces supplied to the U.N. Command were mostly volunteers and professional soldiers.[21] This differed greatly from the ROKA and U.S. Army soldiers, who were mostly conscripted into service.[22] These professionals also differed from their opponents, the CPVF/KPA, who were also conscripted into service.[23] The one exception was the U.K. contingent; it was a mix of professionals and national service men.

The French Battalion consisted of volunteers and was one of the best units to go through the U.N. Reception Center. This battalion consisted of three volunteer companies representing the three ground services of the French Army: the Troupes de Marine (colonial army), metropolitan troops from France proper, and parachutists/legionnaires.[24] In similar fashion the Dutch, Belgium, and Luxembourg elements were volunteers, most with WWII and colonial experience. Many of the Dutch soldiers came from the failed Dutch attempt to regain control of Indonesia.[25] No matter which country they came from, the troops and officers of the European contingents were generally of the highest quality and willing to fight.

As Allan Millett stresses in his book *The War for Korea, 1950-1951: They Came from the North*, reasons for sending forces to fight in Korea, beside the Americans and Koreans, were complicated. Official reasons for involvement of each contingent stressed a desire to resist communism, uphold the principles of the U.N., and assist a fellow nation under attack.[26] Besides these stated reasons lay other complicated national interests. Each country needed or wished to exert influence on their relationship with the U.S. and ensure continued

---

[21] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 5-38, 40-49.

[22] Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 422-424; Stephens, *Old Ugly Hill, 152—1953*, 13-15; Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 145-151; Millett, *A House Burning*, 213.

[23] Allan R. Millett, *The War for Korea, 1945-1950: A House Burning*, 103-105, 193-198; James F. Schnabel, *United States in the Korean War, Policy and Direction: The First Year*, 36-38, 233, 234.

[24] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 23-25, 58-60; Millett, *They Came from the North*, 261.

[25] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 21-23.

[26] Millett, *They Came from the North*, 256-258.

U.S. military support.[27] The European contributors wanted to ensure such support for the newly created NATO Alliance. The Asian contributors (Thailand, Philippines, Australia and New Zealand) wanted to ensure that the U.S. did not abandon them and their ongoing fights against communism. During the Korean War, Thailand and the Philippines both fought local Communists or separatists and worked to recover from WWII. Despite different motives, all these nations placed their armed forces under the direct control of the U.S. Army through the U.N. Command and Eighth Army.[28]

The U.N. imprint of legitimacy given to the Korean War supported the coalition's actions. From the U.S. perspective the U.N. authorization for the military endeavor and broad military support from other nations solidified their leadership of the global community.[29] What the U.N. resolutions did not do was meld these U.N. units into a coherent fighting force. To forge this U.N. force was the responsibility of the Eighth Army.[30] Without direction from Washington or their own capitals, the commanders on the ground adapted and improvised to create a formidable unified force.

The U.S. Army adjusted to the challenge, by creating internal systems to deal with integration issues that arose with U.N. Forces.[31] Eighth Army made allowances for each U.N. unit's quirks. It solved the logistical problem and integrated the U.N. contingents into Eighth Army's logistical system.[32] The costs to support the U.N. contingents were tabulated throughout the Korean War as a running debt and then negotiated by the U.S. State Department after the armistice.[33] While the different U.N. contingents fought, Uncle Sam would foot the bill. Except for select units, mainly the 1st BCD, the U.S. Army supplied all

---

[27] Ibid., 258-266.

[28] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 1-5, 51-53.

[29] Millett, *They Came from the North*, 257.

[30] Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 221; Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 67-72; Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 304-314.

[31] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 9- 10.

[32] Ibid., 136, 137, 194 – 211.

[33] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 70- 71.

the equipment U.N. elements used, with minor exceptions.[34] Language problems were a constant irritant throughout the conflict. English was the official language of the U.N. Command but the U.S. Army was required to field translators and advisors to each U.N. unit, to ensure proper communication of orders and commanders intent.[35] Besides the French and Turks most of the NATO units possessed enough English speakers.[36] The non-European units were mixed in their performance and required a greater number of advisors, translators, and command supervision.[37]

Each U.N. unit arrived in Korea at a different level of readiness. To solve the training problems encountered during the arrival and reception of U.N. units Eighth Army established the U.N. Reception Center at Taegu. It was a centralized facility designed to prepare the various contingents to fight in Korea and work with the Eighth Army and its systems.[38] With respect to the doctrinal issues, the various U.N. units were allowed to use their own doctrine within their unit. When they worked with their U.S. Army headquarters, various local accommodations were made.[39]

From the U.S. Army perspective there was only one major problem the U.S. had with the other U.N. contingents. Clark wrote, "We just never had enough of them."[40] When necessary, the U.S. provided liaison teams to assist with fire support and coordination of additional support units.[41] The tragic stand of the 1st Battalion, The Gloucestershire Regiment on Hill 235, on 25 April 1951, during the CPVF Fifth Offensive First Phase, and the failure of the rescue mission helped standardize Eighth Army operations. The destruction of a British battalion and the failed rescue changed U.S. Army policy toward its U.N.

---

[34] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 136, 137, 195-211
[35] Ibid., 84-96.
[36] Ibid., 11-15, 23-24,
[37] Ibid., 5-8, 16-20, 29-34, 57, 60-68
[38] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 67-72.
[39] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 69-76.
[40] Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 223.
[41] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 84-97 and charts.

contingents.[42] Ridgway made it clear to all Eighth Army commanders that the destruction of a U.N. unit was unacceptable.[43] Farrar-Hockley quotes Van Fleet telling Almond on the 10th of May, "Give when you are pressed hard. I don't want units cut off and I want you to handle UN units very carefully to avoid their being cut off."[44] Farrar-Hockley assess that The Glosters were lost due to poor judgment on the part of the American Division Commander, General Soule. As the war continued into its second year, the issue of rotation was raised by U.N. units. After consultation with the U.N. contingent commanders and their home ministries it was decided by Van Fleet that they would rotate as complete units and not as individuals.[45] Respect between U.N. and U.S. units grew, as they became permanent fixtures within U.S. regiments after the summer of 1951.[46]

Despite the valor of the various U.N. units and the cohesion built over two years of close relationships between U.S. and U.N. units, institutionally the U.S. Army did not change despite its new role as presumptive leader and organizer of future U.N. or Coalition missions. Clark wrote in his 1954 book, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, about his experience as the U.N. Commander. He stated bluntly the need for greater standardization among the allies who "are going to have to join forces to fight the common fight against aggressors in the future."[47] Instead the Eighth and Seventh Armies came up with informal ways to conduct combined operations that never reached the level of doctrine.

From the political perspective, the U.N. force that fought the Korean War was a success. As Winston Churchill noted to Clark; "The armistice marks the first victory of collective

---

[42] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 250-253; Salmon, *To the Last Round*; Farrar-Hockley, *An Honourable Discharge*, 111-136.

[43] Mossman, *Ebb and Flow, November 1950 – July 1951*, 410-429; Fehrenbach, *This Kind of War*, 304-314. As Ridgway told Brigadier General Brodie (Commander, 29th British Imperial Brigade), "the Gloster battalion should not have been lost."

[44] Farrar-Hockley, *An Honourable Discharge*, 135-136.

[45] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 203-205.

[46] Stephens, *Old Ugly Hill*, 90-94.

[47] Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 226.

resistance over aggression."[48] At the strategic level, the creation of permanent military coalitions was an essential part to the Containment strategy. This goal transcended the Truman and Eisenhower administrations. Military coalitions were viewed as a successful and relatively cheap diplomatic tactic, which supported the execution of the Containment strategy.

In 1949 the Truman administration helped create NATO. In the Pacific, soon after Clark called for a Pacific Treaty Organization or PATO, the U.S. and its Asian allies created the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) on 8 September 1954 in Manila. The building of mutual defense treaty organizations hit its height in the 1950's with the creation of CENTO, the Central Treaty Organization, in Baghdad on 24 February 1955.[49] Even after the creation of NATO, SEATO, and CENTO, the U.S. Army did not change how it organized its tactical formations, doctrine or trained its officers to better integrate allied units or lead a coalition.[50] As an operational concept, leading coalitions was something the U.S. Army would do but not plan for.

In terms of changes in operational concepts wrought by the war in Korea, the most decisive was the creation of NATO and the Seventh Army, half a world away. The NATO military alliance created a combined military headquarters and organized regular exercises that employed NATO units under its command.[51] After 60 years NATO still lacks a coherent doctrine. Despite this flaw, NATO is a tested and combat effective alliance with the U.S. Army at its heart. Unlike in Korea, the U.S. Army and NATO units were not supposed to integrate at the regiment/brigade level but operate as unique divisions. Only at Corps and

---

[48] Ibid., 318.

[49] Damien Fenton, *To Cage the Red Dragon: SEATO and the Defense of Southeast Asia 1955-1965* (Singapore: NUS Press, 2012), 7-28; Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 324 – 327. The biggest difference between the PATO idea and SEATO was the exclusion of Japan and the ROK from the organization and the inclusion of Pakistan, which never fit well, into the SEATO Alliance.

[50] Command and General Staff College, *Schedule Regular Course 1954-55*, 2-7.

[51] Ridgway, *Soldier*, 237-243.

higher levels did U.S. forces combine with other NATO units.[52] The 1952 Cold War phrase attributed to Lord Ismay described the purpose of NATO, "Keep the Russians out, keep the Americans in, and the Germans down."[53] In this regard, the Korean War ensured the U.S. Army stayed and helped build NATO into a formidable political and military alliance.

Ridgway wrote in 1956:

> It was my task to overcome… the ancient hatreds and mistrusts that had rent Europe for a thousand years; to mold the fighting force of thirteen nations into one great organization for the defense of freedom… Mine was to get them [Europeans] to do what they promised to do… to collect on these I.O.U.'s these pledges to provide men and guns, planes and tanks, and money, for a European defensive force.[54]

Minor changes were made to the U.S. Army CGSC Program of Instruction in August 1950 that included almost doubling the number of hours spent on other militaries, from eight to fourteen. The additional hours focused on an introduction to the French military system into the 1201 instruction hour course.[55] By 1954, these classes on friendly militaries were no longer broken down into just British and French but were renamed Military Forces of Other Nations, and lasted 19 of 1231 academic hours in CGSC.[56] All U.S. Army service schools increased the number of foreign students in the 1950's. Bringing foreign students to U.S. military schools continued throughout the Cold War and into the present day under the Security Assistance Training Program currently managed by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.[57] The U.S. Army decided that the easiest way to train other armies was the same way it trained Americans. U.S. Army manuals were translated into numerous languages and used as the basis of instruction when U.S. advisors taught other armies.

---

[52] Trauschweizer, *The Cold War U.S. Army*, 20-47.

[53] Octavian Manea, "Lord Ismay: Restated," *Small Wars Journal*, November 18, 2010, http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/lord-ismay-restated, (accessed May 20th, 2012).

[54] Ridgway, *Soldier*, 237-240.

[55] Command and General Staff College, *Program of Instruction for Regular Course* (1950), 2; Command and General Staff College, *Program of Instruction for Regular Course 1948-1949*, 3.

[56] Command and General Staff College, *Program of Instruction for Regular Course, 1953-54*, 2; Command and General Staff College, *Program of Instruction for Regular Course 1954-55*, 2.

[57] U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, *Security Assistance Training Field Activity (SATFA)*, http://www.tradoc.army.mil/g357/satfa/index.htm , (accessed May 17, 2012).

Similar to the Romans and British before them, the U.S. Army tried to turn other armies into local versions of the U.S. Army. The training and equipping of U.N. contingents at the U.N. Reception Center in Korea accelerated this method for organizing, training and equipping other militaries. All non-Commonwealth U.N. units were eventually organized in accordance with U.S. T/O&E. Most U.N. units were battalion size and used T/O&E 7-95 (Separate Battalion), in the case of the Philippine Battalion Combat Team T/O&E 7-15 (Battalion Combat Team) was used, and the Turkish Brigade used T/O&E 7-11N (Regimental Combat Team) because it was the only non-British brigade/regiment size formation.[58]

With respect to coalition warfare, the U.S. Army continued to change and adapt throughout the Korean and performed its duty as the coalition leader in war and peace from the first shots of the Korean War to the present. Although NATO was created before the Korean War began, not until 19 December 1950, six months after the start of the Korean War, did Eisenhower become Supreme Allied Commander in Europe.[59] He was tasked to build a unified military headquarters and turn the concept of the NATO treaty into a force in being.[60] U.S. Army soldiers continued to work with allies throughout the Cold War. Coalition and Multi-national formations became the U.S. Army method of choice to conduct military operations, even without a doctrine, throughout the Cold War.[61] The U.S. Army trained its allies and worked with them as if they were Americans.

KMAG and the Building of the Republic of Korea Armed Forces

Similar to working with coalition partners, working with host nation partners became a necessity for the U.S. Army during and after the Korean War. Through the deployment of a

---

[58] Fox, *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations*, 194-211, see Appendix A.

[59] Bradley & Blair, *A General's Life*, 542.

[60] Ridgway, *Soldier*, 235-240; Trauschweizer, *The Cold War U.S. Army*, 24-28. Stueck, *The Korean War*, 5-6, 43, 71, 73-74, 199, 248-350.

[61] RisCassi, "Doctrine for Joint Operations in a Combined Environment: A Necessity", 1-5.

small number of U.S. Army trainers, the Korean Military Assistance Group (KMAG) was able to multiply the number of capable ROKA troops able to fight against communist forces. From 1950-1953, every branch of the U.S. Armed Forces trained a counterpart in the Republic of Korea Armed Forces. Each branch of service trained and developed their Korean counterpart in their own way and patterns for creating an armed force from scratch emerged.[62] The Eighth Army, through KMAG, led the way and established schools to train Korean soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. Once units were formed, equipment fielded, and individual training completed, an advisory unit would mentor the new Korean unit. Then the Korean unit was attached to a U.S. Army unit and would operate under the command of that unit for a test period.[63] Once the ROKA unit was combat tested a liaison element would remain with the unit after it took its place on the line and joined a ROKA division.[64]

In 1950, before the Korean War began, KMAG was a 500 man unit focused mainly on ROKA development and counterinsurgency. The ROKA was designed with enough capability and capacity to defend its border and quell insurgency but nothing more.[65] As the war progressed and the lines stabilized, Van Fleet saw it as his primary task to create a larger and more capable ROKA. His goal was to create ROKA units capable enough to occupy the majority of the MLR and replace American and U.N. troops. In a post-conflict environment, the ROKA was required to fend off any future CPVF/KPA surprise attack once U.N. forces were re-deployed.[66] To accomplish these tasks, KMAG grew from 500 men into an organization of 1,953 men who trained, advised, and assisted the creation of a 590,911 man, twenty divisions, ROKA.[67] To accomplish the task, the ROKA required funds, equipment

[62] Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 46-66, 155-165.
[63] Ibid., 141-151, 164-177.
[64] Paik, *From Pusan to Panmunjom*, 204-207.
[65] Appleman, *South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu*, 12-18, 40-42.
[66] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 272-278.
[67] Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 178 & 179.

and, most important, capable trainer/advisors that could work with their Korean partners. Of the three elements Van Fleet needed to build the ROKA, he was deficient in all three.

It is hard to imagine that building the ROKA was not the number one priority of the DoD and Department of State. The U.S. Army was focused on several major endeavors, the Korean War being the most violent but not the most important.[68] Rearming Europe and building the U.S. Seventh Army was the number one priority of the Army. During the Korean War sixteen Military Assistance Advisory Commands (MAAGs) spread out across the free world. Each MAAG focused on training and equipping a different ally to confront communism.[69] If an officer, usually a combat veteran from Korea, served as an advisor he had many options. To serve in the ROK again, possibly getting shot, while living in substandard conditions, was not as appealing as advising the re-building of the Belgium and Luxemburg armed forces as part of MAAG BELLUX.

To build the ROKA, Van Fleet supervised the increase of KMAG from 500 to almost 2,000 soldiers before he left Korea in February 1953. To build KMAG, he took combat tested NCOs and officers off the line and rotated them into KMAG positions.[70] This solution, bringing combat soldiers to serve as members of KMAG, had several benefits. First, the officer or soldier coming off the line was a proven quantity and understood combat in Korea. Second, bringing them from the line after serving six or eight months was an incentive because they would finish their tour in relative safety at the ROK training center at Kwanju.[71] Third, the point system off the line was much slower and KMAG would retain an officer or

---

[68] Braim. *The Will to Win*, 275; Watson, *The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, 1953 – 1954*, 201-209. During the Korean War, military aid to South Korea came out of Branch funds but competed for scarce physical resources that were earmarked for Europe. During the Korean War, 79.3% of all military aid went to Europe and 11.6% went to all of Asia and the Pacific; see Table 13, page 202.

[69] Chief of Army Field Forces, *Training Bulletin 1-8* (Fort Monroe: 12 March – 16 November).

[70] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 272, 277.

[71] Allan R. Millett, "The South Korean Army's American Godfather," *MHQ : The Quarterly Journal of Military History*, 17, 2004, 26-37.

soldier for a longer duration.[72] But there were also several deficiencies with this plan. The biggest problem was a lack of trained trainers. The other glaring deficiency was the deficit of Korean language skills. These challenges were mostly overcome through the use of interpreters and on the job training, where a trainer would start out as an assistant and after a cycle of training move up to become the primary instructor.[73]

In dealing with the funding and equipment issue, the KMAG commanders, Syngman Rhee and Van Fleet worked constantly to convince FEC, the U.S. Army and the JCS of the need to expand the ROK armed forces. They argued that the ROK Armed Forces were a good long-term investment; they would save American lives and cost less than sending Americans to fight in Korea.[74]

By the end of 1952, Van Fleet, with the support of Clark, convinced the JCS to continue to expand the ROK Armed Forces.[75] President Eisenhower agreed to increase the ROKA to twenty combat divisions with additional increases to the ROK Air Force and Navy in 1953.[76] The re-establishment of the Korean Military Academy (KMA) with support from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point created the foundation for a future professional officer corps. This was coupled with the creation of a consolidated group of branch schools under the ROK Replacement Training and School Command (RTSC) that focused on training soldiers and officers in military technical skills. The Korean Army Training Center (KATC) at Kwangju established the infrastructure for conducting unit level training within the ROKA. Under the initial leadership of Colonel Champeny and then General Ryan these schools and

---

[72] Hermes, *Truce Tent and Fighting Front*, 207-214; Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 148-151; Braim, *The Will to Win*, 272-273, 277.

[73] Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 180-182.

[74] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 275-276; Collins, *War in Peacetime*, 314-318.

[75] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 274-277.

[76] Watson, *The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, 1953- 1954*, 233.

facilities continued the U.S. Army's practice of training other armies the way it trained Americans.[77]

As Clark wrote in 1954, "We must, when necessary, develop Asian armies to fight shoulder-to-shoulder with our men in battles against Communist aggression."[78] This understanding extended into the systems Eighth Army created within the Korean Armed Forces. In Ridgway's 22 July 1951 reply to the Department of the Army request for an estimate on what was needed to build a competent and effective ROKA, he made it clear that the ROKA needed to become similar to the ideal of the U.S. Army, based on the West Point motto of Duty, Honor & Country. He also outlined a nine-point plan focused on individual, collective, unit and leadership training supervised through KMAG.[79]

The impetus behind the effort to build the ROK Armed Forces is often credited to General Van Fleet. Both of his superiors, Ridgway and Clark, gave him the lion share of the credit for prioritizing the training and expansion of the ROKA.[80] Part of this process included select officers who attended military schools in the U.S. mostly to the Infantry School and the Artillery School. Starting in 1951 the number of students attending these schools steadily increased. In 1952, several batches of 250 ROKA officers attended the Infantry and Artillery Schools.[81] To augment the KATC, which provided basic training, Van Fleet directed the creation of Field Training Command (FTC). FTC created four camps where ROKA Divisions rotated into Corps reserve and would go through nine weeks of unit refresher training.[82] FTC focused on individual, squad, platoon, company and battalion level

---

[77] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 273-275; Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 168-186; Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 172-182; . Millett, "The South Korean Army's American Godfather," 26-37.

[78] Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 178.

[79] Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 169-177.

[80] Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 185; Ridgway, *The Korean War*, 218; Braim, *The Will to Win*, 347- 348.

[81] Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 179-181.

[82] Paik, *From Pusan to Panmunjom*, 162.

small unit tactics.[83] The honing of these skills through hands on training and numerous live fire exercises increased the lethality and competence of ROKA units.

When the U.N. forces began to withdraw in 1955, the ROKA possessed twenty fully equipped divisions with their full complement of artillery, tanks, and technical units.[84] The Korean Military Academy and Korean Command and Staff College were fully operational and supported by their U.S. Army counterparts. Most important, KMAG remained in Korea to continue to mentor and develop the ROK Armed Forces.[85] The experience in Korea made it clear to the U.S. Army that in future limited wars they would depend on local troops to carry much of the burden. This was a crucial element of the revised Eisenhower doctrine of 1957.[86]

The use of military advisors became an essential operational concept of the U.S. Army in engaging and containing communist expansion. Clark wrote about the need to train and equip the free nations of Asia and not let their potential capability "dissipate." He stated:

> Our American men would have to fight in any big test between communism and freedom…as in Korea, their ranks would have to be bolstered with men of other nations so that the manpower advantage the Communists have would be greatly reduced…I am merely pointing out that there are available vast numbers of men in free nations who can fight, are willing to fight and who fight at much less cost than do our American soldiers. These men must be prepared in great numbers by the free world to take their places in the war of the two worlds which threatens.[87]

Van Fleet supported this idea through the report he produced at the request of Eisenhower in 1954.[88] Eisenhower called him back to service and sent him to assess the situation in Asia with respect to the status of U.S. and local forces. His report focused on the

---

[83] Sawyer, *Military Advisors in Korea*, 181.

[84] James A. Van Fleet, *Report of the Van Fleet Mission to the Far East, 26 April – 7 August 1954* (Washington, D.C., 1954), I-1- I-5, II-1-II-5.

[85] Ibid., I-4. The Van Fleet Report is broken into different sections by country and is not sequentially numbered.

[86] Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Eisenhower Doctrine on the Middle East" (a message to the U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C., January 5th, 1957), http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1957eisenhowerdoctrine.html.

[87] Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 178- 179.

[88] Van Fleet, *Report of the Van Fleet Mission to the Far East, 26 April – 7 August 1954*, 1-5 "Explanation of Approach to Survey."

U.S. advisor program and the planned development of the Republic of Korea, Japan, Formosa and the Philippines as part of U.S. defense policy. Only in the case of Japan did Van Fleet not recommend an expansion or maintenance of the current advisor program.[89] Before he went on this mission for Eisenhower, Van Fleet wrote an article for *Readers Digest* advocating the buildup of local forces as a cheaper and more effective alternative to the deployment of U.S. forces.[90] Eisenhower supported these ideas and most of Van Fleets' report was enacted. Commenting on the article in a letter to W. Bedell Smith, Eisenhower wrote that "I must say that I agree with his main argument completely." Smith replied, "Like you, I agree with General Van Fleet's main argument completely and I doubt he has exaggerated very much."[91] In the spring of 1956, Van Fleet spoke to the Advanced Infantry Officer Course at Fort Benning and expanded on his ideas with respect to training the armies of free world nations fighting communism.

> We should advise and equip the soldiers of those nations who are willing to fight to retain their freedom. This advisory service is difficult, dirty, and not well rewarded. However, it is vital. We should not, in any circumstance, fight another countries war for them![92]

This was one of the major operational concepts followed by the Eisenhower administration despite the rhetoric about Mutually Assured Destruction. Korea was not the first time advisors were used. But it, along with the experience in Greece, demonstrated the ability of local forces to shoulder much of the burden in defending themselves. These nations needed properly trained, equipped, and supported forces from the U.S. Army. In Korea, the roughly 2,000 KMAG advisors helped build one of the world's largest and most capable armies while engaged in battle. At the end of the fighting, the ROKA held two-thirds of the

---

[89] Van Fleet, *Report of the Van Fleet Mission to the Far East, 26 April – 7 August 1954*, Van Fleet addresses U.S. advisor effort in the training section of each country report.

[90] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 343-346.

[91] Dwight D. Eisenhower to W. Bedell Smith, Washington, D.C., January 16th, 1954, *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower,* Volume XV, document #688, http://www.eisenhowermemorial.org/presidential-papers/first-term/documents/668.cfm .

[92] Braim, *The Will to Win*, 345.

MLR and proved it could fight and hold outnumbered against a massed CPVF assault, if supported by U.S. Army advisors and firepower. The deployment of a few hundred advisors to help a country fight against communist aggression proved a useful tactic in a world of limited war. The U.S. Army, through its actions, decided it was cheaper to advise and equip local forces than to commit large numbers of U.S. Army forces, Viet Nam being the exception. In most instances this continued throughout the Cold War. The burden of advising and assisting these under-developed armies fell to U.S. Army Special Forces.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

General Van Fleet focused Eighth Army on conducting operations he was authorized to conduct. Constant patrolling and intensive small unit live fire training kept his force combat ready and became his calling card. He directed extensive use of targeted artillery against suspected and known communist positions using every weapon system at his disposal. With an expanded special operations capability, Eighth Army tormented and tied down large numbers of CPVF/KPA troops through the employment of over 20,000 partisans and focused psychological operations.[1] Eighth Army continued to develop its coalition forces and created an integrated coalition army. Through KMAG, the ROK Armed Forces went through a dramatic build up. By July 1953, ROKA troops controlled two-thirds of the MLR. These operational concepts, developed through trial and error, served as the tools to force the communists to sign the armistice.

The adoption of these five operational concepts – small unit tactics, fire support, special operations, combined operations, and building host nation capability through the employment of advisors – changed the way the U.S. Army fought the Korean War, and how it viewed its role as the shield of the free world. Through the Korean War the U.S. Army learned to fight a defensive war of attrition. These operational concepts changed Army doctrine and practice during and after the war, creating a U.S. Army focused on defending both Europe and Asia. Officially the U.S. Army claimed not to learn anything from the Korean War.[2] Despite these statements, the U.S. Army conducted a total review of its training and doctrine that resulted in a new primary doctrine in 1954, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1954), and supporting manuals that specifically dealt with the new doctrinal concept "limited war."[3] The U.S. Army conducted a decade (1954-1962) of organizational experimentation and weapons development after the

---

[1] Malcom, *White Tigers*, 186.

[2] Chief of Army Field Forces, *Training Bulletin No. 2, 11 April 1951*, Cover Page; Doughty, *The Evolution of U.S. Army Tactical Doctrine*, 12; The Infantry School, *Lessons from Korea* (Fort Benning: The Infantry School, 1954), 2.

[3] Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations* (1954), 6.

Korean War that resulted in not one but two major reorganizations of the Army division, and fielded an array of weapon systems that included the M-14 rifle, M-16 rife, M-72 grenade launcher, M-60 medium machine gun, the UH-1 and CH-47 helicopter series, M-113 APC, and numerous other weapon systems.[4] The U.S. Army that emerged from the Korean War was better trained, organized, and equipped to fight outnumbered and under adverse conditions.

These operational concept changes owe as much to the restrictions placed on the Eighth Army as the enemy it fought. Peng's CPVF were a formidable and respected opponent. The tactic of "eating sticky candy" supported by massive numbers of Chinese soldiers deployed to fight in Korea forced to the U.S. Army to fight in conditions it would normally avoid. Night, mountain, and extreme cold operations were each considered special operations in the 1949 and 1954 Army *Operations* manuals. These were the conditions that the CPVF chose to fight in because they stripped away many of the U.S. Army's advantages in fire power and material. Instead of backing down, as Mao expected, the U.S. Army met the challenge and developed new technologies and operational concepts to counter the darkness, rugged terrain, and extreme cold. As the only war where the PLA and the U.S. Army engaged in direct combat, the Korean War demonstrated that neither massive manpower nor superior technology could replace well trained and well equipped infantry soldiers. Without additional equipment and training the CPVF could not break through the Eighth Army line. Likewise, all the artillery and close air support the Eighth Army fielded could not replace trained infantry units.

Korea and the war fought on that peninsula changed the U.S. Army and the way it employed its forces. The U.S. Army learned the most from the Korean War in the Infantry and Field Artillery branches. Both the Infantry and Field Artillery re-focused their efforts

[4] Wilson, *Maneuver and Firepower*, 263-286; Mahon & Danysh, *Infantry Part I: Regular Army*, 87-111.

and improved their skill sets. Infantry training at Ft. Benning focused on training infantrymen to kill and work as a team focused on killing. Live fire training was pushed as an important part of buddy team, squad and platoon development.[5] The emphasis on patrolling at the Infantry School continued, and firing rates in the Viet Nam War almost doubled in comparison to the improvements in individual soldier firing rates during the Korean War from the WWII benchmark.[6] Fire support systems continued to improve and fire support planning fused all fire support weapon systems. Integration of fire support and a desire to maximize fires later hobbled the U.S. Army's ability to maneuver, because it became fixated on attrition through the application of fire power.[7] Precision fire support became a driving focus for not just the artillery arm but also the U.S. Air Force. Laser guided, optically guided and GPS guided munitions proliferated in the desire for greater precision. The Korean War enhanced the U.S. Army's training of battalion and below infantry units and improved fire support plans designed around the unit in contact. These were two operational concepts the U.S. Army was willing to officially learn, through doctrinal change and demonstrated operations.

In the field of special operations, specifically Special Forces and Psychological Warfare, these operational concepts remained as an enduring capability of the U.S. Army. The Infantry, Armor and Field Artillery branches hesitantly accepted special operations as a necessary evil, but jealously guarded their best junior officers and NCOs and discouraged them from walking over the fence to join special operations units. The employment of Special Forces went from an anomaly to the preferred initial entry operational concept for the U.S. Army. The secret buildup of 1st Special Forces Group on Okinawa in 1956 and

---

[5] Clark, *From the Danube to the Yalu*, 23-28; James A. Van Fleet, *Report to the Secretary of the Army, March 26, 1962* (Lexington: Van Fleet papers, 1962), 1-5, see Enclosure 1,; Dave Grossman, *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society* (New York: E-Rights/E-Reads, Ltd. Publishers, 1995), 252-257; The Infantry School, *Lessons from Korea, 1954*, 4-10.

[6] Grossman, *On Killing*, 252-257; S. L. A. Marshall, *Commentary On Infantry Operations and Weapons Usage in Korea, Winter of 1950-51* (Chevy Chase: Operations Research Office, 1951), 4-5.

[7] Doughty, *The Evolution of U.S. Army Tactical Doctrine, 1946 – 76*, 12.

activation in 1957 balanced the global footprint of U.S. Special Forces. 10th Group remained in Europe, 1st Group in Asia and 7th Group at Ft. Bragg prepared for world wide deployment.[8] After the Korean War, the employment and maintenance of special operations units as an essential part of the Containment strategy was solidified. Special operations operators, in conjunction with their CIA counterparts, took the lead in America's engagement with other militaries, and countered similar Soviet advisors and their KGB partners. Unconventional warfare was grudgingly accepted as an acceptable operational concept the U.S. Army would train, plan for, and employ, after the Korean War.

With respect to equipping, training and leading allies and host nation armies, the U.S. Army grudgingly accepted these responsibilities, but did not enthusiastically embrace them as part of its mission, or validate them with doctrine and supporting institutions. The U.S. Army expanded the MAAG program as directed by the NSC as a cost saving tactic designed to enhance U.S. and allied security. In Eisenhower's special message that accompanied his 5 May 1953 funding request for the Mutual Defense Assistance Program:

> This amount of money judiciously spent abroad will add much more to our nation's ultimate security in the world than would an even greater amount spent merely to increase the size of our own military forces in being.[9]

Each MAAG trained and equipped their counterpart and spread U.S. Army doctrine and American way of war to more and more countries. KMAG remained in Korea and continued the development of the ROK Armed Forces into a more formidable and professional force.[10] After the Korean War, NATO continued to develop but the U.S. did not create a combined doctrine or formalize best practice with respect to integrating allied forces.[11] The U.S. Armed Forces, through regular training exchanges and exercises like REFORGER, TEAM SPIRIT, and COBRA GOLD worked to enhance inter-allied interoperability. Through these

---

[8] Stanton, *Green Berets at War*, 1-7; Paddock, *U.S. Army Special Warfare*, 155-157.

[9] Watson, *The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, 1953 – 1954*, 208.

[10] Van Fleet, *Report of the Van Fleet Mission to the Far East*, I-4.

[11] NATO Public Diplomacy Division, "Backgrounder: Interoperability for Joint Operations," http://www.nato.int/docu/interoperability/interoperability.pdf, (accessed May 17, 2012), 1-3

exercises the U.S. Armed Forces developed ways to work with each of its treaty allies, but never codified them into doctrine. During the Cold War, the DoD focused its doctrinal energy on the development of U.S. Armed Forces Joint doctrine.[12] The U.S. Army, during the Korean War, developed a set of very lethal operational concepts designed to fight limited defensive wars of attrition.

After three years of combat in Korea the U.S. Army emerged as a different institution. During the conflict, it learned how to fight outnumbered, outgunned, at night, and hold ground. The U.S. Army claimed its doctrine was sound but its training system was not. To ensure the soundness of its doctrine, the Army re-wrote all of its manuals. To rectify this deficiency, the various training facilities implemented changes focused on enhancing soldier skills. In 1953 & 1954 as Chief of Staff of the Army, General Ridgway fought to retain the balanced force built during the Korean War.[13] The U.S. Army accepted the need to maintain a wide number of operational capabilities: to fight either limited or general war.[14] This included infantry units proficient in small unit tactics. It embraced the need for integrated fire support responsive to the infantry soldier in the furthest out-post. Special operations created an official space within the U.S. Army. It became a critical part of the U.S. Army and its members were the first to give their lives in America's next major war, Viet Nam.[15]

---

[12] Department of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, FM 110-5, JAAF, AFM 1-1 *Joint Action Armed Forces* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1951), ix; Department of Defense, *Joint Pub 1-01.1 Compendium of Joint Publications, 23 April 1999* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1999), iii, A-1, A-3, B-1=B-7. Appendix A is titled, "Jointness: Warfighting American Style." At the beginning of the Document, the then Chief of Staff of the Army, General John M. Shalikashvili is quoted stating, "Clearly much progress has been made…in improving the joint warfighting posture of our military forces. But much remains to be done…we must give joint doctrine the attention it deserves and we must get it right."

[13] Watson, *The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, 1953 – 1954*, 33-34, 56: Ridgway, *Soldier*, 323-332. Because of General Ridgway's disagreement with Defense Secretary Wilson he did not serve a second two year term as Chief of Staff of the Army.

[14] Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations (1954)*, 4-8; Department of the Army, *FM 100-5 Operations (1962)*, 3-14.

[15] Roger Jones, "Army Marks 50 Years since First Vietnam Casualty," The Official Homepage of the United States Army, entry posted October 22, 2007, http://www.army.mil/article/5692/army-marks-50-years-since-first-vietnam-casualty/ (accessed July 9, 2012). Captain Harry G. Cramer Jr., was 1st Special Forces Group, Operational Detachment Alpha Commander in charge of a Military Training Team in Nha Trang

Fighting as a coalition and the development of local armies continued as a practice but was never elevated to doctrine during the Cold War. As Korean War historian William Stueck concluded, "Never again would the United States get caught being as unprepared as it was in June 1950."[16]

training South Vietnamese Special Forces cadre when Viet Cong mortar rounds landed near their training area during an exercise.

[16] Stueck, *The Korean War: An International History*, 349.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Government Documents

2nd Infantry Division Command Reports: May 1951-July 1953. Korean War Project, Box 05; File 07a-21; General Records of the United States Army, Second Infantry Division RG407, NARA, College Park.

9th Infantry Regiment Command Report: June 1952- July 1953. Korean War Project, Box 07; File 08-10; General Records of the United States Army, 9th Infantry Regiment RG407, NARA, College Park.

38th Infantry Regiment Command Report: May – August 1953. Korean War Project, Box 06; File 11; General Records of the United States Army, 38th Infantry Regiment RG407, NARA, College Park.

Almond, Edward M. *Conference on United Nations Military Operations in Korea, 29 June 1950 -- 31 December 1951.* James A. Van Fleet Paper; Box 87, Folder 15, George C. Marshall Foundation, Alexandria, 1952, 64.

Board on Officer-Enlisted Man Relationships. *Officer-Enlisted Man Relationships.* Report of the Secretary of War, War Department, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1946, 23.

Bradley, Omar N. "Creating a Sound Military Force." Edited by H. R. Emery. *Military Review* (Command and General Staff College) 29, no. 2 (May 1949): 112.

Center of Military History. *Korea - 1950.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997.

Chief of Army Field Forces. *Training Bulletin No. 1, 12 March 1951.* Lesson Learned, Army Field Forces, U.S. Army, Fort Monroe, Virginia: Army Field Forces, 1951, 14.

—. *Training Bulletin No. 2, 11 April 1951.* Combat Information, Army Field Forces, U.S. Army, Fort Monroe: Army Field Forces, 1951, 16.

—. *Training Bulletin No. 3, 17 July 1951.* Combat Information, Army Field Forces, U.S. Army, Fort Monroe: Army Field Forces, 1951, 13.

—. *Training Bulletin No. 4, 11 August 1951.* Combat Information, Army Field Forces, U.S. Army, Fort Monroe: Army Field Forces, 1951, 17.

—. *Training Bulletin No. 5, 27 September 1951.* Combat Information, Army Field Forces, U.S. Army, Fort Monroe: Army Field Forces, 1951, 16.

—. *Training Bulletin No. 6, 18 October 1951.* Combat Information, Army Field Forces, U.S. Army, Fort Monroe: Army Field Forces, 1951, 15.

—. *Training Bulletin No. 7, 1 November 1951.* Combat Information, Army Field Forces, U.S. Army, Fort Monroe: Army Field Forces, 1951, 12.

—. *Training Bulletin No. 8, 16 November 1951.* Combat Information, Army Field Forces, U.S. Army, Fort Monroe: Army Field Forces, 1951, 15.

Cleaver, Frederick W., George Fitzpatrick, John Ponturo, William Rossiter, and C. Darwin Stolzenbach. *UN Partisan Warfare in Korea, 1951-1954.* Technical Memorandum ORO-T-64 (AFFE), Operations Research Office, US Army Center of Military History, Fort McNair: The Johns Hopkins University, 1956, 198.

Command and General Staff College. *Program of Instruction for Regular Course, 1946 – 1947.* Subject and Study Assignment, Command and General Staff College Archives, Department of the Army, Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, 1946, 106.

—. *Program of Instruction for Regular Course, 1947 - 1948.* Program of Instruction, Command and General Staff College Archives, Department of the Army, Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, 1947, 149.

—. *Program of Instruction for Regular Course, 1948 - 1949.* Program of Instruction, Command and General Staff College Archives, Department of the Army, Fort Levenworth: Command and General Staff College, 1948, 130.

—. *Program of Instruction for Regular Course, 1950 - 1951.* Program of Instruction, Command and General Staff College Archives, Department of the Army, Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, 1950, 111.

—. *Program of Instruction for Regular Course, 1953 - 1954.* Program of Instruction, Command and General Staff College Archives, Department of the Army, Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, 1953, 128.

—. *Program of Instruction for Regular Course, 1954 - 1955.* Program of Instruction, Command and General Staff College Archives, Department of the Army, Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Stff College, 1954, 126.

—. *Schedule: Regular Course, 1949 - 1950.* Schedule, Command and General Staff College Archives, Department of the Army, Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College Archives, 1949, 23.

—. *Schedule: Regular Course, 1951 - 1952.* Schedule, Command and General Staff College Archives, Department of the Army, Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, 1951, 23.

—. *Summary of the Regular Course, 1952 - 1953.* Summary, Command and General Staff College Archives, Department of the Army, Fort Leavenworth: Command and General Staff College, 1952, 31.

Department of State. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1948, General: The United Nations.* Vols. 1, Part II. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Department of the Army. *FM 100-5 Operations.* Washington D.C.: Department of the Army, 1949.

—. *FM 100-5 Operations.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954.

—. *FM 100-5 Operations.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

—. *FM 100-5 Operations.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

—. *FM 1-02, MCRP 5-12A OPERATIONAL TERMS AND GRAPHICS.* 2010 edition with changes supersedes 2004 edition. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Department of the Army, 2010.

—. *FM 22-100 Command and Leadership for the Small Unit Leader.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953.

—. *FM 31-20 Operations Against Guerrilla Forces.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1951.

—. *FM 31-21 Organization and Conduct of Guerrilla Warfare.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1951.

—. *FM 7-10 Rifle Company Infantry and Airborne Division Battle Groups.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959.

—. *FM 7-10 Rifle Company Infantry Regiment.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1949.

—. *FM 7-40 Infantry Regiment.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950. Eisenhower, Dwight D. *President Eisenhower: The Eisenhower Doctrine on the Middle East, A Message to Congress, January 5, 1957.* Edited by Paul Halsall. November 1998. http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1957eisenhowerdoctrine.html (accessed September 25, 2011).

Kennan, George. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." Edited by Hamilton Fish Armstrong. *Foreign Affairs* (Council on Foreign Relations) 25, no. 4 (July 1947): 566-582.

Marshall, S. L. A. *Commentary on Infantry Operations and Weapons Usage in Korea, Winter of 1950-51.* Project Doughboy, Operations Research Office, The Johns Hopkins University, Chevy Chase: Operations Research Office, 1951, 147.

The Infantry School. *Lessons From Korea, 1954.* Lessons From Korea, The Infantry School, U.S. Army, Fort Benning: The Infantry School, 1954, 20.

Van Fleet, James A. "Report of the Van Fleet Mission to the Far East." Special Report to the President of the U.S.A., James A. Van Fleet Papers; Box 102, Folder 18-45, Box 103, Folder 1-14, George C. Marshall Foundation, Alexandria, 1954.

Van Fleet, James A. "Report to the Secretary of Army." Review of U.S. Army Reseve

Training Act Report for the Secretary of the Army, James A. Van Fleet Papers; Box 103, Folder 36, George C. Marshall Foundation, Alexandria, 1962.

War Department. *FM 100-5 Operations.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1944.

—. *FM 100-5 Operations.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1941.

—. *FM 100-5 Operations.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1939.

—. *FM 21-6 List of Publications for Training.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1945.

Printed Memoirs

Bank, Aaron. *From OSS to Green Berets.* New York, New York: Pocket Books, a division of Simon & Schuster, 1986.

Bradley, Omar N., and Clay Blair. *A General's Life: An Autobiography.* New York, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1983.

Clark, Mark W. *From the Danube to the Yalu.* New York, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.

—. *War in Peacetime: The History and Lessons of Korea.* Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.

Malcom, Ben S., and Ron Martz. *White Tigers: My Secret War in North Korea.* Washington D.C., District of Columbia: Brassey's, 1996.

Nolan, John. *The Run-Up to the Punch Bowl: A Memoir of the Korean War, 1951.* Charleston, South Carolina: Xlibris, 2006.

Paik, Sun Yup. *From Pusan to Panmunjom: Wartime Memoirs of the Republic of Korea's First Four-Star General.* First Memories of War edition 2007. Translated by Bruce K. Grant. Dulles, Virginia: Potomac Books, 1992.

Peng, Dehuai. *Memoirs of a Chinese Marshal: The Autobiographical Notes of Peng Dehuai (1898-1974).* Honolulu, Hawaii: University Press of the Pacific, 2005.

Richardson, William J., and Kevin Maurer. *Valleys of Death: A Memoir of the Korean War.* Edited by Nancy Richardson Patchan. New York, New York: Berkley Caliber, 2010.

Ridgway, Matthew B. *Soldier: The Memoirs of Matthew B. Ridgway*. New York, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.

—. *The Korean War.* Charleston, South Carolina: Da Capo Press, 1967.

Stephens, Rudolph W. *Old Ugly Hill: A G.I.'s Fourteen Months in the Korean Trenches, 1952-1953.* Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 1995.

Sullivan, John A. *Toy Soldiers: Memoir of a Combat Platoon Leader in Korea.* Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 1991.

On-line Collections

Almond, Edward M. *Conference on Battle Employment of Artillery in Korea-1952.* Review of Artillery in Korea, Army War College, Morris Swett Technical Library Digital Library , Carlisle Barracks: Combined Arms Research Library Digital Library, 1952, 31.

Bradley, Omar Nelson. *Number: 1967.* May 15, 1951. http://www.bartleby.com/73/1967.html (accessed November 6, 2011).

Churchill, Winston. "Winston Churchill and the Sinews of Peace Address." *History and Politics Out Loud.* Edited by Jerry Goldman. Northwestern University. March 5, 1946. http://www.hpol.org/churchill/ (accessed 11 21, 2011).

Kennan, George. "National Security Archive." *The George Washington University.* February 22, 1946. http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/coldwar/documents/episode-1/kennan.htm (accessed March 12, 2012).

National Security Council. ""U.S. Objectives with Respect to the USSR to Counter Soviet Threats to U.S. Security," NSC 20/4, 23 November 1948." *Mount Holyoke Website.* Edited by Vincent Ferraro. Mount Holyoke College . November 23, 1948. http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/coldwar/nsc20-4.htm (accessed November 21, 2011).

—. "NSC 68: United States Objectives and Programs for National Security." *Mount Holyoke Website.* Edited by Vincent Ferraro. Mount Holyoke College . April 14, 1950. http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/nsc-68/nsc68-1.htm (accessed November 21, 2011).

NATO Parties. "Basic Texts." *NATO.* NATO. April 4, 1949. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm? (accessed November 21, 2011).

Public Law 253, 80th CONG.,1st SESS . "U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Statutes, National Security Act of 1947 (as originally enacted)." *U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.* HeinOnline. July 26, 1947. http://intelligence.senate. gov/nsact1947.pdf (accessed March 5, 2012).

Ridgway, Matthew B. "Korea, 1951, LtGen Matthew Ridgway: "Why We Are Here"." *Military History Network milhist.net.* Edited by Patrick G. Skelly. October 06, 2005. http://www.milhist.net/global/whywearehere.html (accessed September 23, 2011).

Roosevelt, Franklin D. "Documents with Commentaries: 1-1 Cairo Communique, December

1, 1943." *Birth of the Constitution of Japan.* National Diet Library . December 1, 1943. http://www.ndl.go.jp/constitution/e/shiryo/01/002_46shoshi.html (accessed November 21, 2011).

United Nations Security Council. "SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS - 1950." *UN Home Page.* Information Technology Section, UN Department of Public Information. June & July 25, 27, & 7, 1950. http://www.un.org/documents/sc/res/1950/scres50.htm (accessed November 21, 2011).

USFK Public Affairs Office. *United Nations Command.* USFK Public Affairs Office. November 1, 2011. http://www.usfk.mil/usfk/content.united.nations.command.68 (accessed November 21, 2011).

Secondary Sources

Official Histories

Appleman, Roy E. *U.S. Army in the Korean War: South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu.* Edited by Stetson Conn. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

Bowers, William T., William M. Hammond, and George L. MacGarrigle. *Black Soldier, White Army: The 24th Infantry Regiment in Korea.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996.

Cowdrey, Albert E. *U.S. Army in the Korean War: The Medics' War.* Reprinted 1990 by Univeristy Press of the Pacific. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986.

Doughty, Robert A. *The Evolution of US Army Tactical Doctrine, 1946-76.* Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

Farrar-Hockley, Anthony. *The British Part in the Korean War, Volume I: A Distant Obligation.* Vol. 1. 2 vols. London: HMSO, 1990.

—. *The British Part in the Korean War, Volume II: An Honourable Discharge.* Vol. 2. 2 vols. London: HMSO, 1995.

Fox, William J. *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations.* History of the Korean War, Military History Section, Headquarters, Far East Command, U.S. Army, Fort McNair: Office of the Chief of Military History, 1952, 246.

Fox, William J. *Inter-Allied Co-Operation During Combat Operations Annex.* History of the Korean War, Military History Section, Headquarters, Far East Command, U.S. Army, Fort McNair: Office of the Chief of Military History, 1952, 177.

Futrell, Robert F. *The United States Air Force in Korea, 1950-1953.* Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

Giangreco, D. M. *Korean War Anthology, Artillery in Korea: Massing Fires and Reinventing*

the Wheel. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2003.

Gough, Terrence J. *U.S. Army Mobilization and Logistics in the Korean War.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987.

Gugeler, Russell A. *Combat Action in Korea.* 2005 Reprint of the 1987 verion of the 1970 modified reprint of the 1954 original work. Honolulu, Hawai'i: University Press of the Pacific, 1987.

Hermes, Walter G. *U.S. Army in the Korean War: Truce Tent and Fighting Front.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

House, Jonathan M. *Combat Studies Institute, Research Survey No. 2, Toward Combined Arms Warfare: A Survey of 20th-Century Tactics, Doctrine, and Organization*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984.

Johnston, William. *A War of Patrols: Canadian Army Operations in Korea.* Vancouver, British Columbia: UBC Press, 2003.

Korea Institute of Military History. *The Korean War, Volume One.* 1st Paperback Edition 2000. Edited by Han Kook Chae, Suk Kyun Chung and Yong Cho Yang. Translated by Hee Wan Yang and Won Hyok Lim. Vol. 1. 3 vols. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.

—. *The Korean War, Volume Three.* Edited by Han Kook Chae and Yong Jo Yang. Translated by Sung Kyu Cho, Sang Jin Choi, Joa Soo Kim, Uk Sup Yoon, Yeung Yeup Yoon and Sung Gyung Kim. Vol. 3. 3 vols. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.

—. *The Korean War, Volume Two.* Edited by Han Kook Chae, Suk Kyun Chung and Moon Sik Son. Translated by Sung Jin Cho, Sang Jin Choi, Joa Soo Kim, Uk Sup Yoon, Yeung Yeup Yoon and Won Hyok Lim. Vol. 2. 3 vols. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.

Mahon, John K., and Romana Danysh. *Infantry, Part I: Regular Army.* Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

McGrath, John J. *Fire for Effect: Field Artillery and Close Air Support in the US Army.* Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2010.

Meid, Pat, and James M. Yingling. *U.S. Marine Operations in Korea, 1950-1953, Volume V: Operations in West Korea.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Miller, John, Owen J. Carroll, and Margaret E. Tackley. *Korea, 1951-1953.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956.

Millett, Allan R. "Korea, 1950—1953." In *Special Studies: Case Studies in the Development of Close Air Support*, edited by Benjamin Franklin Cooling, 345-410. Washington, D.C.: Office of Air Force History, U.S. Government Printing Office,

1990.

Mossman, Billy C. *U.S. Army in the Korean War: Ebb and Flow November 1950-July 1951.* First Printing. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990.

O'Neill, Robert. *Australia in the Korean War 1950-1953, Volume I: Strategy and Diplomacy*. Canberra: The Australian War Memorial and the Australian Government Publishing Service, 1981.

—. *Australia in the Korean War 1950-1953, Volume II: Combat Operations*. Canberra: The Australian War Memorial and the Australian Government Publishing Service,1985

Poole, Walter S. *History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, Volume IV, 1950 - 1952.* Vol. 4. Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998.

Schnabel, James F. *U.S. Army in the Korean War: Policy and Direction: The First Year.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990.

Schnabel, James F., and Robert J. Watson. *History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, Volume III, 1951 - 1953, The Korean War, Part Two.* Vol. 3. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1998.

—. *The History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, Volume III, The Korean War, Part I.* Vol. 3. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1979.

Stanton, Shelby L. *U.S. Army Order of Battle: Korean War (Draft).* Order of Battle, U.S. Army Center of Military History, U.S. Army, Fort McNair: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 214.

Villahermosa, Gilberto N. *Honor and Fidelity: The 65th Infantry in Korea, 1950-1953*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2009.

Watson, Robert J. *History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Volume V: The Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Policy, 1953 - 1954.* Vol. 5. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986.

Westover, John G. *U.S. Army in Action Series: Combat Support in Korea.* Facsimilie Reprint, 1987. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955.

Books

Alger, John I. *The Quest for Victory*. Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982.

—. *The West Point Military History Series, Definitions and Doctrine of the Military Art: Past and Present*. Wayne New Jersey: Avery Publishing Group Inc., 1985.

Andrew, Christopher, and Vasili Mitrokhin. *The World Was Going Our Way: The KGB and the Battle for the Third World.* New York, New York: Basic Books, 2005.

Armstrong, Charles K. *The North Korean Revolution, 1945-1950.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Ballenger, Lee. *The Final Crucible: U.S. Marines in Korea, Vol. II, 1953.* Vol. II. II vols. Dulles, Virginia: Potomac, 2001.

—. *The Outpost War: The U.S. Marines in Korea, Vol. 1: 1952.* Dulles, Virginia: Potomac Books, 2000.

Blair, Clay. *The Forgotten War: America in Korea, 1950-1953*. New York, New York: An Anchor Book, 1989.

Barris, Ted. *Deadlock in Korea: Canadians at War, 1950-1953.* Toronto, Ontario: Macmillan Canada, 1999.

Black, Jeremy. *Introduction to Global Military History: 1775 to the present day.* New York, New York: Routledge, 2005.

Bowers, William T. *The Line: Combat in Korea, January-February 1951.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2008.

—. *Striking Back: Combat in Korea, March- April 1951.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2010.

Bowers, William T. and John T. Greenwood. *Passing the Test: Combat in Korea, April-June 1951.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2011.

Braim, Paul F. *The Will to Win: The Life of General James A. Van Fleet.* Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press, 2001.

Brodie, Bernard. *Strategy in the Missile Age.* Eighth Printing 1991. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Casey, Steven. *Selling The Korean War: Propaganda, Politics, and Public Opinion 1950 - 1953.* New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Chang, Jung, and Jon Halliday. *Mao: The Unknown Story* . New York, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005.

Clausewitz, Carl Von. *On War.* First Princeton Paperback printing, 1989. Edited by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Cumings, Bruce. *The Origins of the Korean War: Liberation and the Emergence of Separate Regimes, 1945-1947*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981.

—. *The Origins of the Korean War:Volume II, The Roaring of the Cataract, 1947--1950*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990.

—. *North Korea: Another Country.* New York, New York: The New Press, 2004.

—. *The Korean War: A History.* 2011 Modern Library Paperback Edition. New York, New York: The Modern Library, 2010.

Donald W. Boose, Jr. *US Army Forces in the Korean War 1950 - 53.* Edited by Dr. Duncan Anderson, Marcus Cowper and Nikolai Bogdanovic. Vol. Battle Orders 11. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2005.

Dreyer, Edward L. *China at War 1901 - 1949.* Singapore, Singapore: Longman Singapore Publishers, 1995.

Evanhoe, Ed. *Dark Moon: Eighth Army Special Operations in the Korean War.* Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press, 1995.

Fairbank, John King. *The United States and China.* Fourth. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Farrar-Hockley, Anthony. *Notes on the Successive Strategies Employed During The Korean War*. Paper prepared for "The Korean War: An Assessment of the Historical Record," Washington D.C.: Georgetown University, July 24 & 25 1995.

Fehrenbach, T. R. *This Kind Of War: The Classic Korean War History.* First Brassey's Edition 1994. New York, New York: Brassey, 1963.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War, Revised and Expanded Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

—. *The Cold War*. New York: Allen Lane an imprint of Penguin Books, 2005.

Goldstein, Donald M., and Harry J. Maihafer. *The Korean War: The Story and Photographs.* First paperback edition 2001. Dulles, Virginia: Potomac Books, 2000.

Goncharov, Sergei N., John W. Lewis, and Li Tai Xue. *Uncertain Partners: Stalin, Mao, and the Korean War.* 10th Printing of the original work in 2003. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Goulden, Joseph C. *Korea: The Untold Story of the War.* First McGraw-Hill paperback edition 1983. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 182.

Granfield, Linda. *I Remember Korea: Veterans tell their Stroies of the Korean War, 1950 - 53.* Edited by Virginia Buckley. New York, New York: Clarion Books, 2003.

Grey, Jeffrey. *The Commonwealth Armies and the Korean War: An Alliance Study.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

Griffith, Paddy, *Forward into Battle: Fighting Tactics from Waterloo to the Near Future.* New York: Ballantine Booke, 1981.

—. *World War II Desert Tactics.* London: Osprey Publishing, 2008.

Guardia, Mike. *American Guerrilla, The Forgotten Heroics of Russell W. Volckmann: The Man Who Escaped from Bataan, Rasied a Filipino Army Against the Japanese, and Became the True "Father" of Army Special Forces.* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Casemate Publishers, 2010.

—. *Shadow Commander: The Epic Story of Donald D. Blackburn Guerrilla Leader and Special Forces Hero.* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Casemate Publishers, 2011.

Haas, Michael E. *In the Devil's Shadow: U.N. Special Operations During the Korean War.* Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press, 2000.

Hammes, Thomas X. *Forgotten Warriors: The 1st Provisional Marine Brigade, the Corps Ethos, and the Korean War.* Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2010.

Hastings, Max. *The Korean War.* New York, New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc, 1987.

Heller, Charles E. and William A. Stofft. *America's First Battles, 1176-1965*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1986.

Huston, James A. *Guns and Butter, Powder and Rice: U.S. Army Logistics in the Korean War.* Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania: Susquehanna University Press, 1989.

James, D. Clayton and Anne Sharp Wells, *Refighting the Last War: Command and Crisis in Korea 1950-1953.*New York: Macmillan, 1993.

Jian, Chen. *China's Road to the Korean War: The Making of the Sino-American Confrontation.* New York, New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Knox, Donald, and Alfred Coppel. *The Korean War: Uncertain Victory, The Concluding Volume of An Oral History.* Edited by Kathleen Rucker. Vol. 2. 2 vols. New York, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1988.

—. *The Korean War: Uncertain Victory, The Concluding Volume of An Oral History.* Edited by Kathleen Rucker. Vol. 2. 2 vols. New York, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1988.

Lankov, Andrei. *From Stalin to Kim Il Sung: The Formation of North Korea 1945-1960*. New Brunswick, New Jersy: Rutgers University Press, 2002.

Leckie, Robert. *Conflict: The History of the Korean War, 1950 - 53.* 1996 First De Capo Press edition. New York, New York: De Capo Pess, 1962.

Lee, Jongsoo. "Allan R. Millett. The War for Korea, 1950-1951: They Came from the North."

The American Historical Review (The University of Chicago Press) 117, no. 1 (February 2012): 180-181.

Leffler, Melvyn P. *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1994.

Li, Xiaobing, Allan R. Millett, and Bin Yu, . *Mao's Generals Remember Korea.* Translated by Xiao Bing Li, Allan R. Millett and Bin Yu. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2001.

Mahoney, Kevin. *Formidable Enemies: The North Korean and Chinese Soldier in the Korean War.* Novato, California: Persidio Press, 2001.

Malkasian, Carter. *The Korean War 1950 - 1953.* 10th Impression 2010. Edited by Rebecca Cullen. Vol. Essential Histories 8. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2001.

Marshall, S. L. A. *Pork Chop Hill.* Berkley mass-market edition, June 2000. New York, New York: The Berkley Publishing Group, 1956.

May, Ernest R., ed. *American Cold War Strategy: Interpreting NSC 68.* New York, New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1993.

McWilliams, Bill. *On Hallowed Ground: The Last Battle for PORK CHOP HILL.* Berkley Caliber trade paperback edition: October 2004. New York, New York: The Berkley Publishing Group, 2004.

Millett, Allan R. *The War for Korea, 1950-1951: They Came From The North.* Vol. Second. Three vols. Lawrence, Kansas: Univeristy Press of Kansas, 2010.

—. *The War For Korea, 1945 - 1950: A House Burning*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2005.

—. *Their War for Korea: American, Asian, and European Combatants and Civilians, 1945-53.* Washington, D.C., District of Columbia: Brassey's, INC., 2002.

—. The South Korean Army's American Godfather. *MHQ: The Quarterly Journal of Military History*, 17, 2004, 26-37.

Oberdorfer, Don. *The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History.* Indianapolis, Indiana: Basic Books, 1997.

Owen, Joseph R. *Colder Than Hell: A Marine Rifle Company at Chosin Reservoir.* 1st Edition. New York, New York: Ballantine Books, 1996.

Paddock, Alfred H. *U.S. Army Special Warfare: Its Origins.* Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 2002.

Peace, Stephen E. *Psywar: Psycological Warfare in Korea 1950-1953.* Harrisburg: Stackpole Books, 1992.

Peters, Richard, and Xiao Bing Li. *Voices from the Korean War: Personal Stories of American, Korean, and Chinese Soldiers.* Translated by Xiao Bing Li and Walter Byung Jung. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2004.

Rees, David. *Korea: The Limited War*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.

—. *The Korean War: History and Tactics.* London: Orbis Publishing, 1984.

Rice, Douglas. *Voices from the Korean War: Personal Accounts of Those Who Served.* Bloomington, Indiana: iUniverse, Inc., 2011.

RisCassi, Robert W. "Doctrine for Joint Operations in a Combined Environment: A Necessity." Edited by George L. Humphries. *Military Review* (U.S. Army Command and General Staff College) 77, no. 1 (January-February 1997): 14.

Ross, Steven T. *American War Plans, 1945-1950*. London: Frank Cass,1996.

Rottman, Gordon L. *Inch'on 1950: The last great amphibious assault.* Campaign Vol. 162. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2006.

—. *Korean War Order of Battle: United States, United Nations, and Communist Ground, Naval, and Air Forces, 1950 -1953.* Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishing, 2002.

Salmon, Andrew. *To The Last Round: The Epic British Stand on the Imjin River, Korea 1951.* Aurum Press Paperback Edition 2010. London: Aurum Press, 2009.

Shrader, Charles R. *Communist Logistics in the Korean War.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1995.

Sloan, Bill. *The Darkest Summer: Pusan and Inchon 1950: The Battles that Saved South Korea - and the Marines - from extinction.* New York, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2009.

Spurr, Russell. *Enter The Dragon: China's UndeclaredWar Against the U.S. in Korea, 1950-51.* New York, New York: Newmarket Press, 1988.

Stanton, Shelby L. *Green Berets at War: U.S. Army Special Forces in Southeast Asia 1956-1975.* Novato, California: Presidio Press, 1985.

Stevenson, Charles A. "Underlying Assumptions of the National Security Act of 1947." Edited by David H. Gurney. *Joint Forces Quarterly* (NDU Press), no. 48 (January-March 2008): 129-133.

Stueck, William. *Rethinking the Korean War: A New Diplomatic and Strategic History.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Univeristy Press, 2002.

—. *The Korean War: An International History.* Third Printing, and first paperback, with corrections, 1997. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1995.

—. *In Search of Essences: Labelling the Korean War*. Paper prepared for "The Korean War: An Assessment of the Historical Record," Washington D.C.: Georgetown University, July 24 & 25 1995.

Todd, Lewis Paul, and Merle Curti. *Triumph of the American Nation.* Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1986.

Toland, John. *In Mortal Combat: Korea, 1950-1953.* New York, New York: William Marrow and Company Inc., 1991.

Varhola, Michael J. *Fire and Ice: The Korean War, 1950-1953.* Mason City, Iowa: Savas Publishing Company, 2000.

Whiting, Allen S. *China Crosses the Yalu: The Decision to Enter the Korean War.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1960.

Wolfe, Daniel. *Cold Ground's Been My Bed: A Korean War Memoir.* New York, New York: iUniverse, 2005.

Yu, Bin et al. *Mao's Generals Remember Korea.* Edited by Xiao Bing Li, Allan R. Millett and Bin Yu. Translated by Xiao Bing Li, Allan R. Millett and Bin Yu. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2001.

Zaloga, Steven J. *Defense of Japan 1945.* Edited by Marcus Cowper. Vol. Fortress 99. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2010.

—. *T-34-85 VS M26 Pershing: Korea 1950.* Vol. Duel 32. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2010.

—. *M26/M46 Pershing Tank 1943-53*. New Vanguard Vol. 35. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2000.

Zhang, Shu Guang. *Mao's Military Romanticism: China and the Korean War, 1950 - 1953.* Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1995.

Zubok, Vladislav, and Constantine Pleshakov. *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War: From Stalin to Khrushchev.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1996.