

# History: gallipoli assignment

[History](#)



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

1. How useful are the views of Anzac soldiers at Gallipoli suggested in Sources A, B and C. Explain your answer.

Source A seems to tell us that the Anzac soldiers were unprofessional and lazy in their duties. The first cartoon portrays a soldier unprofessionally dressed, also the soldier is yawning, which gives me the impression that he is lazy. Furthermore at the top of the cartoon it says 'The Hopeless Dawn', this suggests that the artist believes the Anzac soldiers are unprofessional in their duties. At the bottom of the cartoon it says 'Standing Tall 4. 30 am', even though these are the early hours of the morning this would not be acceptable for a soldier to do. Overall the first cartoon depicts the Anzac soldiers as 'Hopeless', hence I believe that according to this source the views of the Anzac soldiers at Gallipoli were not very useful. The cartoon could possibly have been biased or it could have been propaganda.

The second cartoon is unclear about what it is representing, the cartoon shows an Anzac soldier smoking. The soldier looks scruffy, hence maybe the aim of the artist was to give us the message that the Anzac soldiers were young, inexperienced and scruffy. However surely this cannot be accurate for each Anzac soldier, as there must have been some well trained Anzac soldiers. My first impression of this cartoon would be to disregard the views of the Anzac soldiers, but after further attention, this cartoon only shows one soldier hence it may be misleading. In addition the cartoon may be biased or it may be propaganda.

Source B is from a book written by John Keegan, John Keegan is a well known and trusted historian. Thus I would trust his information. Keegan seems to

praise the Anzac soldiers, he makes them seem like an elite bunch that everyone would like to be a part of. He talks of the fact that some of the Anzac soldiers could be considered as the best soldiers in the world. He tells us that being an Anzac soldier was a position in high demand. From John Keegan's point of view, I would trust the views of the Anzac soldiers because Keegan speaks of the Anzacs in high regard. Also, any information that Keegan would write is probably correct.

Source C rates very highly the spirit of the Anzacs. It informs us of the extreme determination the Anzacs had. They must have been trained very well in order to be confident whilst commencing in battle, we are also told of their extreme courage whilst beginning to fight. However this information may be very unreliable as it may be biased towards the Anzacs' side.

2. Source H suggests that poor planning and Winston Churchill were responsible for what went wrong at Gallipoli. Is there sufficient evidence in Sources D to J to support this interpretation? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Source D suggest that 'lightheartedly' attacks and the lack of attention paid to the people in charge were to blame on why the campaign failed. It also suggests that the intelligence and hard work of the Turks was also a factor that affected the failed campaign. The fact that the trenches became 'congested' was also a reason why the campaign failed according to source D. Also amateur decisions and disregarding decisions were what made the campaign fail. There is sufficient evidence to support the fact that poor planning was responsible for what went wrong at Gallipoli. Nevertheless the

information was written some time after the campaign, so maybe a few important details were left out due to forgetfulness.

Source E is very critical of the organisation of the army. It does not stop criticising the organisation of the soldiers, it also talks of the laziness of some of the army. It also says that the generals gave patchy instructions and a lot of the orders were left up to the minor soldiers to sort out. If this is true, it must have given the British army a poor reputation, as it shows the laziness and apathy of the generals in the army, not soldiers in the minor ranks but generals. If the evidence in source C was true then I believe poor planning was to blame for the unsuccessful campaign. Also I believe that Winston Churchill should have given the army a kick up the backside when he found out about their apathy. Hence he is just as much to blame. These are my opinions based on the fact this information is true, it may not be true.

Source F shows the extremely poor planning of the British, they have set up so they will attack facing Turkish mines, this is silly as they could try a different alternative. The British decide to attack the narrows, this was one of the best defended areas, lined with forts and mines. These expeditions were 'decided upon and organised with insufficient care', if more attention had been paid to organise these attacks maybe the results would not have been so disastrous. Source F contains sufficient evidence to show that poor planning was responsible for the Gallipoli failure.

Source G is not so critical of the British army, it gives less critical facts. It is written by A. J. P. Taylor (a well known British historian). It tells us that maybe the soldiers' apathy was not to blame, but the environment the battle

was fought in was impossible to win. I believe this source is biased as it is written by a British historian, maybe trying to save the British reputation.

Source H is very critical of the British armies lack of organisation and Winston Churchill. It is taken from a GCSE textbook, hence I believe that there would be no biased information or any lies. It must have correct information, as it would not feed its GCSE pupils lies. It talks of the total lack of organisation of the British army, which was due to Winston Churchill's errors of judgement. It also unearths some information that Britain were slightly arrogant and decided to underestimate their task, obviously they paid for this mistake, as the campaign failed. They used hardly any intelligence in the area prior to the attack, and they applied poorly trained tactics. I believe this source provides sufficient and correct evidence to support the interpretation that poor planning and Winston Churchill were responsible for what went wrong at Gallipoli.

Source I shows us an overview of the poor planning of the Allied Expeditionary Forces. They have planned poorly, this may be due to the apathy of the generals/leaders or the failure of Winston Churchill to inflict discipline on his generals. Poor planning and arrogance are the main concerns, of why the campaign failed.

In general there is more than enough sufficient evidence to suggest that poor planning and Winston Churchill were responsible for what went wrong at Gallipoli. Only one or two sources were in favour of Winston Churchill, which I believe were biased. Hence it is correct to penalize Winston Churchill and inapt planning for causing the failure of Gallipoli.