

Gallipoli campaign essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The cartoons represent the rather relaxed attitude of the ANZACs. The cartoon on the right shows this, because he is casually smoking. The smile also represents their positive outlook towards war. The cartoons show the unconventional nature of the ANZACs. They were poorly equipped and were often described as 'scruffy'.

However, the cartoon on the right represents their resourcefulness, because the soldier shown has fixed his cigarette. The cartoons are useful for giving us a view of how the ANZACs saw themselves, and they seem to be rather proud of their appearances and characteristics. However, despite the useful opinions shown in the cartoons, the source is not very useful for describing specific events in the Gallipoli campaign. The source is relevant to many descriptions that have been made of the ANZACs, which means that it is trustworthy. It was also written by an ANZAC who was at the Gallipoli campaign, and therefore he would have had first-hand knowledge of the campaign. However, the fact that they were drawn by an Australian artist makes them less trustworthy, because he may have wanted to present the ANZACs in a good light.

Source B is a British description of the ANZACs. It demonstrates their desire to join the army, and the strong comradeship amongst the men. It gives information on the skill of the New Zealanders and the individualism of the Australians. The source is useful for describing the enthusiasm and skill of the ANZAC forces.

It gives information on when they joined the army and the ability of the soldiers. However, this extract is only part of a book that covers the whole of

WWI. Therefore it does not give a detailed insight into the soldiers and the failure of the campaign. The source is trustworthy because it is a factual book.

The author was British, so there would have been no reason for him to be one-sided or give exaggerated details. All of the information given agrees with my own knowledge, which means that it is probably correct. However, the fact that the book was published a long time after the war means that the author may have been persuaded by other's opinions and viewpoints. He was also not at the campaign, and therefore he has had to rely on evidence given to him by other historians or soldiers.

Source C describes the spirit and bravery of the Australians, although not the New Zealanders. A useful aspect of this source is that it was written by someone who was there at the time, so the knowledge he is presenting is first-hand. However, the source is very limited in its usefulness. There are many exaggerations in this source, such as "absolutely unaffected by bullets", which is very unlikely. The source also says that the Australians' attitude was that "they must get on with it". Many other sources suggest that there was a lot of waiting on the beaches when the troops landed.

The source also describes nothing of the failure and poor leadership which led to confusion amongst the ANZACs. There is no evidence of any particular event, and no mention of dates. This source appears to be someone's opinion, and therefore it is not as useful as fact. The source seems to be rather untrustworthy.

Charles Bean was an Australian war correspondent, and therefore he would have wanted to magnify the skill and bravery of the Australian soldiers. This is probably the reason for the exaggerated nature of the source. I believe that source B is the most useful for describing the part played by the ANZAC soldiers at Gallipoli. It is less exaggerated than the other sources, and also less one-sided. The account is more factual, providing more detail about the ANZACs, including a date and a quote from an ANZAC soldier.