**Source Analysis Sheet - Source Title:** *Iroquois helicopters, Vietnam, August 1967*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source Number (circle): | Source Type: | Source Creator (author): | Date of creation: |
| **1 2 3 4**  **5 6**  optional optional | **a b c d**  other (specify): | *Coleridge, Michael* | *26th August, 1967* |
| Briefly summarise the **content** of this source:  (What is it about? What does it describe? Who is involved? What places or historical events does it refer to?) | | Briefly summarise the **context** of this source:  (Where and when was this source created? Is it a **primary or secondary source**? What happened before it was created? What effect did it have?) | |
| *This source is a photograph depicting armed soldiers and military helicopters. The soldiers are crouched on the side of an unsealed road amidst low-to-the-ground vegetation that does not seem to be supplying any cover. Three helicopters seem to be landing in convoy while soldiers await their landing, perhaps to board. They are heavily armed and are wind-swept from the force of the rotor blades – perhaps this accounts for their crouching. They do not seem to be hiding, nor do their facial expressions suggest that they are fearful. From the Australian War Memorial we know this is a scene of action from the Vietnam War involving Australian and US Army personnel.* | | *This photograph is a primary source taken approximately five years into the war in Vietnam, near the village of Lang Phuoc Hai. According to the information supplied by the Australian War Memorial, it depicts members of 5 Platoon, B Company, 7RAR. United States Army Iroquois helicopters are landing to take Australian soldiers back to Nui Dat after completion of Operation Ulmarra, the cordon-and-search by 7RAR of the village. A cordon-and-search is a military operation in which a border is placed around a certain area so it can be searched for weapons or insurgents. The photographer, Mike Coleridge, was an enlisted soldier and an ex-gunner, tasked with recording the war on film.* | |
| Who was the intended **audience** of this source?  (Who was it delivered to? Who was it created for?) | | What was the intended **purpose** of this source?  (What caused it to be created?) | |
| *Mike Coleridge’s biography on the Australian War Memorial site reveals that “the army was geared to providing the print media and TV with black-and-white images” which tells us that his images were for publication on the Australian home front. This means non-military personnel were intended to see these images in newspapers and on television news programs reporting on the war.* | | *An army signal dated 8 Sep 1967 reveals that the army later decided to repay Coleridge for his own investment in colour photography stock because they saw potential for “colour documentary” and also “footage on news in colour for B+W duplication and distribution to TV channels”. The images were intended to document the war on nightly news programs and in future war documentaries.* | |
| What in this source is **fact**?  How do you know? What **evidence** do you have? | | What in this source is **opinion**?  Is there more than one **perspective** to examine? | |
| *Because of the bibliographical detail recorded on the Australian War Memorial site, we know that this primary source was taken by an Australian soldier on location in Vietnam during the height of the Vietnam War. We know the names of the soldiers in the image, we know the date it was taken and the military operation it captures and we have considerable primary information about the photographer and the intended purpose and audience.* | | *Given that this is a photograph, the space for other opinions and perspectives come in the framing of the shot – what is outside this image? And the exclusions – we are in Vietnam but we only see Australians and Americans – where are the local populace? We know a military operation has just taken place – was it carried out justly? Were there losses of life on either side? How do the Vietnamese (who are excluded from the image) feel about recent events?* | |
| Considering your conclusions about fact and opinion in your source above, would you describe this source as **reliable** for use by an historian? Why or why not? | | Given **all** of the data that you’ve now gathered about this source, would you say this source would be **useful** to an historian? Why or why not? | |
| *Because of the highly verifiable information on the Australian War Memorial site and the fact that this became such an iconic image depicting Australian soldiers’ involvement in the Vietnam War, this source is extremely reliable for use by an historian. Names of soldiers provided allows for further investigation of details as does the provided biographical information about the creator of the source and his relationship to, and role in, the army.*  *That said, there would certainly be other perspectives to consider including investigation of the perspective of Vietnamese witnesses and perhaps the possibility of images taken or created by Vietnamese people depicting a conflicting perspective.* | | *Given the integrity of this source it would certainly be useful to an historian in helping them understand the atmosphere, conditions and landscape of the Vietnam War, the weaponry and military vehicles used and the mode of transportation of soldiers. It also gives a limited insight into the make-up of the Australian fighting force –this image depicts young, white men that would fit a stereotype of what the ideal Australian looked like at the time, perhaps explaining why the image became so iconic. It is a relatively peaceful image of war which would again have contributed to its iconic status but it glaringly lacks any Vietnamese people despite being taken within Vietnam which makes it quite a one-sided record of history.* | |
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