The Failure at Gallipoli: who was to blame?

Mission: to analyse + evaluate historical sources then consider who was most to blame for the failed Gallipoli campaign.

A

‘In truth it is unfair to blame the British for the slaughter at the Turkish position at Nek in 1915. Instead it was mostly the fault of two Australian incompetents (fools) - Brigadier General Hughes and Colonel Antill. Hughes was a commander who didn’t command and Antill was not but he did. The ordinary soldiers at Gallipoli were indeed lions led donkeys but not all donkeys were British. General Bridges of the Australian division died after needlessly exposing himself to shellfire while General Johnston was to blame for delaying an attack on a poorly defended Turkish position. When he finally decided to attack the Turks had reinforced their defences and the Kiwis were needlessly slaughtered’.

By journalist Saul David, article in the Daily Telegraph (a British newspaper) published in 2015

B

“There were no terrible ‘if’ moments when the whole campaign could have been won. In reality, the landing had no chance as it was doomed from the outset. The strategic conception was wrong. The available resources were not there and the troop numbers were almost equal on both sides. The Turks had 60,000 fighting troops – bayonets, as they used to call them in those days – and the Allies had 70,000. The British already knew from the Western front that you needed two to three times the number of attacking forces to have any chance of even breaking into a well-defended enemy in trenches, let alone breaking through.”

Ashley Elkins. Chief Historian at Australian War Museum

C

“We tend to look at it from the Allied side but the Turks certainly had something to do with our defeat. There’s a risk of overlooking the very effective and courageous resistance of the Turkish army. They were very capable, they had many tricks up their sleeves that the Australians had to learn that they were experienced and hardened soldiers – more so than most of the Australians. They had very experienced officers who knew how to command in combat. That was something Australia also had to learn.”

Internet Article - Brendan Nicholson. Austrailmwar.com.au

D

‘Still, it is worth remembering that British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill was only responsible for the naval aspects of the operation. The beach landing strategy came from Lord Kitchener and Ian Hamilton. There were benefits elsewhere from keeping the Turks occupied at Gallipoli. For instance, they were never able to launch a successful attack on the Suez Canal. There were also long-term benefits as well. The campaign highlighted the weaknesses of cooperation between the Allies in 1915, teaching Churchill and others valuable lessons. Of course, some of the blame must be laid at Churchill’s feet, and Churchill realised that. He accepted his fate and left government to command a battalion on the Western Front. The experience tested his character and his judgment, but ultimately made him a better leader.

Warren Dockter - British Telegraph Newspaper.

**Mission:** to analyse + evaluate historical sources then consider how communist ideas helped create the Russian revolution in October, 1917.

**A**

‘The world is run by capitalists who own the banks and the factories. They make huge profits and become very rich. The people who work in these factories have to put up with terrible working conditions and they receive very little of the profits—instead this goes to the owners. Eventually, these workers will not accept the situation any longer and there will be a revolution. The workers will join together, rise up and take power for themselves. This will lead to a communist society in which a workers’ government will share out the wealth fairly. There will not be a division between rich and poor.’

An extract from Karl Marx’s manifesto, published in Germany in 1848.
The extract has been translated and simplified.

**B**

‘Democracy for the minority is only democracy for the rich – that is the democracy of capitalist society. If we look more closely into the machinery of capitalist democracy, we see this everywhere - exclusion of women, the peasant and in the technique of the representative institutions, in the actual obstacles to the right of assembly (public buildings are not for paupers (poor people) and in the purely capitalist organization of the media we see restriction after restriction upon democracy. These restrictions, exceptions, exclusions, obstacles for the poor seem slight, especially in the eyes of one who has never known want himself and has never been in close contact with the oppressed (trampled) in their life. 99 out of 100, bourgeois publicists and politicians come under this category) yet still, they squeeze out the poor from politics, from active participation in democracy’.

From a letter sent by Vladimir Lenin from Finland to Russia, c July 1917.

**C**

“The workers have taken control of the factories and run them by committees. The peasants have been told to share out the land between themselves. Our government has taken control of the banks and the wealth of the rich people has been confiscated. No political parties are allowed except the Communist Party. All newspaper are under out control. However, we are encouraging all classes of people to have access to the finest theatre and music. Women are equal to men and everyone is now called ‘Comrade’. The Tsar and his family have been shot. Russia is now know as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic. (USSR)

Speech by Vladimir Lenin, Bolshevik revolutionary July 25th, 1918.
Did Most Romans Enjoy The Games?

**Mission:** to analyse and evaluate historical sources to gain a better understanding about how Romans felt about the games.

---

A

"I went to the games one day hoping for some excitement. I was bitterly disappointed. It was really butchery (lots of killing). Men were thrown to lions and to bears there was no escape for them. "Kill him! burn him alive" was the cry: "Why is he such a coward? Why won't he rush (run) on the steel? Why does he fall so meekly (easily)? Why won't he die willingly?" Unhappy that I am I can now choose not to go again. Why must I look on such a scene as this? Do not, my Lucilius, attend the games, I pray you. Either you will be corrupted or if you show disgust, be hated by the crowd. So stay away."

A letter from Petronius to his nephew Lucilius, AD 62. Petronius was a Roman writer and author.

---

B

The Romans loved gladiators. They loved the men, the weapons, the fighting and the blood. The great amphitheatres of Rome, like the Colosseum, were always full with people, who watched men fight bloody battles, both with each other and with a dazzling array of wild and dangerous animals. It’s not hard to imagine the excitement.


‘All of the lions were killed as they came out of the floor. It was not very exciting, as the lions did not fight like they do when let out of cages. Many of them unwilling to attack, were killed with arrows without a fight.’

A Roman writer explain what he saw when 100 lions were let into the arena. cAD 60

---

C

All the previous fighting had been merciful by comparison. Now we have pure murder. The gladiators have no protective covering; their entire bodies are exposed to the blows. No blow falls in vain. This is what lots of people prefer to the regular contests, And it is obvious why. There is no helmet, no shield to stop the sword. Why have armour? Why bother with skill? All that just delays death. In the morning, men are thrown to lions and bears. At mid-day they are thrown to the spectators themselves. No sooner has a man killed, than they shout for him to kill another, or to be killed. The final victor is kept for some other slaughter. In the end, every fighter dies. And all this goes on while the arena is half empty. You may think that the victims committed robbery or were murderers. So what? Even if they deserved to suffer, what’s your compulsion to watch their sufferings? Seneca, the Younger (born 4BC) was a Roman senator and philosopher. tells of a visit he once paid to the arena in a letter to a friend.

---

D
A Look At Livy: the Roman Historian

Mission: to analyse and evaluate historical sources and consider how Titus Livy’s work helps us learn about the Romans.

I have set myself the task of writing a complete history of the Roman people from the very beginning of its existence. I do not know for sure if I did this well. Unless, I am wrong, there has never been any nation (country) greater in power, with a purer morality (behaviour), or more fertile (rich) in good examples than in Rome; or any state in which greed, or poverty have been kept away for so long. However, in these latter (more recent) years money has brought greed with it, and the unlimited opportunity for pleasure has created in men a passion for destroying themselves and everything else through self-indulgence (greed) and depravity (bad behaviour). But we should much prefer to start with favourable omens (signs) and if we follow the ideas of poetic writing it is pleasanter (nicer) to start by writing kind things for the gods and goddesses.

An extract from the book ‘Ab Urbe Condita’ by Titus Livius (Livy). Livy was a Roman historian and writer. Book written c 29 BC

Livy was a special Roman historian because he played no part in politics or government. This was a disadvantage (not good) for him and his work because his exclusion from the Senate meant he had no personal experience of how the Senate (government) worked. This lack of knowledge shows itself from time to time in his work. It also stopped him from having first hand access to important (primary) sources such as records of Senate meetings, and texts of treaties and new laws. Also, if he had been a priest (holy man) he would have more inside information of great historical value and been able to look at the many documents and records of the priestly colleges. The special thing about his books was the fact that he saw and wrote about personal (people) history and what was moral (right and wrong).

www.britannica.com/biography/Livy: 2013

Above all, when thinking about Livy’s choice of sources of information, we should remember that he is not an original researcher; his aim was to use reliable facts taken by others and put them into an accurate, reliable book. We can attack his choice in failing to directly use and the earliest written evidence (primary sources); but one can also applaud (say well done) to him for the astute (clever) choice of sources which were the best available for his writing style and patriotic (favourable to Rome) approach, and which were also easily accessible and easier to read and understand.

Article: Livy’s use of sources by modern historian Ben Walsh. 2015
### Source Skills Part 1 - Analysis

**Mission:** to understand the basic Content and Origins of source A

#### Study Source A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Who created the source:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is their job, role or position:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where is the person who made the source from:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who is it for / to / audience:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When was the source created (year)</strong></td>
<td>this is in the _____ century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When (tick 2):</strong> BCE</td>
<td>CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When / type of source (tick 1):</strong> Primary</td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What / type of source:</strong> letter, speech, diary, other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What does the source say:** (Summarise in your own words rather than copy out lines)

**The MAIN point of the source is:**

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

**The source also tells us:**

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

**Furthermore it shows:**

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

**Finally the source reveals:**

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

**What:** is the overall TONE of the source. (write one word / emotion to show how the writer feels)

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________
### Mission: to evaluate the source A

Now that you have analysed source A you are going to evaluate source A.

**Analysis** = to study the source very carefully.

**Evaluation** = to judge the source and decide if it is reliable or not.

To help with your evaluation remember the COP method ... and when evaluating the content look out for the ‘bias indicators’. For example a reliable source will use more facts than opinions or have calmer, clear language rather than extreme or strong words.

---

### Use the COP method to evaluate (judge) if the source is more reliable or unreliable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unreliable</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
<th>Content 1 (what)</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>Purpose of the source: consider the motive, the ‘why’ it was created</th>
<th>Other reasons for / against reliability? Is the source corroborated by source D?</th>
<th>Finally, give source A an overall judgement for its reliability by circling below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses opinions</td>
<td>Could the person know things others do not?</td>
<td>Do the person have a good character or reputation?</td>
<td>Uses facts</td>
<td>Does the person have an important job or role?</td>
<td>The person was not there, but they can be written with less emotion and using more information not available at the time.</td>
<td>Is the source corroborated by source D?</td>
<td>Unreliable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One sided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Softer Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exaggerates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespectful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where a person comes from may influence the reliability of a source. For example, a German in 1942 may be biased towards a Jewish person.</td>
<td>Think national, regional or political bias.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the person have motive or a reason to lie?</td>
<td>Does the person have a reason to tell the truth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could it be propaganda and / or persuasion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Content** = what the source says

**Origin** = who, when, where

**Purpose** = why, motive, reason

---

Now use the COP method to evaluate (judge) if the source is more reliable or unreliable.

---

Study Source **A**

**Content** 1 (what) - read the source carefully and look for ‘bias indicators’ eg. opinion, fact, exaggerates.

Point: The content makes the source MORE likely to be reliable ☑ LESS likely to be reliable ☐

Explain: ____________________________________________________________

Evidence from source: “________________________________________________________________________________________

---

**Origin** (provenance) of the source: consider the who, when and where.

Point: The origin makes the source MORE likely to be reliable ☑ LESS likely to be reliable ☐

Explain: ____________________________________________________________

---

**Purpose** of the source: consider the motive, the ‘why’ it was created

Point: The purpose makes the source MORE likely to be reliable ☑ LESS likely to be reliable ☐

Explain: ____________________________________________________________

---

Finally, give source A an overall judgement for its reliability by circling below.

Unreliable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Reliable
Source Skills 3 - Comparing / corroboration

How similar are sources B and C?

Introduction: ‘The sources are similar to (a limited, some, a large) extent’.

- **Content 1**: are the MAIN messages of the content similar / corroborated or not? Remember PEEL - support your point with explanation, examples and “evidence” from both sources.

  A key similarity between source B and C is

  An example from the source B ...

  This is also reflected in source C ...

- **Content 2**: look for sub content / information that is similar or different. Remember PEEL - support your point with explanation, examples and “evidence” from both sources.

- **Origins**: are the origins (who, where, when) of the sources similar or different?

  The source origins are / are not similar ...

- **Purpose**: are the motives (why created) of the sources similar or different?

  The motives of the sources are / are not similar ...