

## Assessment!

- I can infer that the picture shows that the soldiers are the enemies and the crowd are helpless people. I know this because the soldiers are holding their sabers and are slicing their swords into the crowd. This make them kill the crowd. I also infer that artist feels sorry for the crowd as whilst he thinks that the soldiers aren't very protective to the people. I know this because the emotion and the expressions on their faces of the crowd and the troops. The troops are all angry and negative but the crowd are all scared, worried, sad due to fact that they are going to die. <sup>Source C</sup> gives the overall impression that it shows the troops are murderers because the speech that a child said was, "All my mummy wanted to see was Mr Hunt." Not to get killed in a massacre.
- I can infer that the article is ~~negative~~ negative to the people. I know this because the article said about them that if they didn't attacked the troops, none of this would happen. Also it infers that the troops are the ~~best~~ heroes of the day. I know this because the article said, "They charged in their for ~~our~~ set dgence. Also it said that the people started the 'bloodshed'. Source E gives an overall that the troop are not the murderers because in the article, there was no evidence that the people were in danger. It was li a civil war between the army and the civilians.

	Useful	Limited
What it tells you, or doesn't tell you?	The cavalry injured people The crowd injured people The cavalry was patient. (cut off limbs of people and attacked kill the crowd.)	Doesn't tell us how or why it happened. How many people were in the crowd. How many people died or got injured.
Whether its reliable or not. who wrote it, when, why, what type of source is it?	Samuel Bamford wrote it in 1839 to show people who don't know about the massacre. It is structured like a diary <del>about the troops or soldiers</del>	It is written by someones opinion. It makes the soldiers/cavalry look great. It is likely to present it like this.

Useful - the cavalry sabres cuts away the held up hands and defenceless heads. Hands ~~and~~ cut off and trampled. Not many killed or injured in the thousands of people.  
(knowledge)

Limited - It has no evidence about why it happened. It says <sup>said</sup> that the amount of people <sup>was</sup> in the crowd. It could of been 10, 100, 1,000, 1000 or 1. The text said the injures - hands cut, heads fell, trampled - but not the amount of people who was injured or worse... killed!

Useful - Someone who wrote it was in the crowd. It does say what year he wrote it. He wrote it to show people who doesn't know about the massacre.

Limited - It was written by his opinion. It might, it might not be true. Some parts of the description made the troops look great. It makes the crowd sound like they were at fault. It was likely to present it like the description is on source D. Other people could ~~wrote~~ write it like that but their opinions.

4a I would follow up the point 'The Cavalry's sabres were wielded to cut a way through naked held up hands and defenceless heads.'

b I would ask the question 'How many people were injured during the St Peterloo massacre in 1819.'

c I would use 'Source G' to find out more about this detail.

d This would help me because in the article, it said 'A few necessary actions of the troops has led... to some deaths and many injuries injuries.' This tells me that not many people died but the majority of the crowd was injured and seriously injured.

3 ★ In conclusion, the evidences from source D is more than half in-accurate. ~~This~~ because the style the writer write was his opinion and anyone could of done this. Also it has no description about anything happening which are key parts - apart from the kill

- WWW: Several inferences are made, which are securely supported with the source.

- clear impressions and +/- to utility

- some consideration of what is needed for further investigations

16<sup>th</sup> October 2015

Assessment:

Did the troops commit murder?

Perspective - for people

~~from~~

Source C:

inference

evidence

inference (evidence?)

overall impression

In source C, I can infer that there was families, <sup>in danger,</sup> in the picture. I know this <sup>who is married,</sup> because in the picture, there is 2 children, a mother and a father in the crowd full of terrified people. I can also infer that it's a massive event because the picture has small spaces and it shows the perspective of people. Source C gives the overall impression that the artist thinks that the crowd is innocent and that the troops are guilty because he/she made the troops look evil as the expression on the family's face shows that they're petrified and also the little boy is saying that ~~were~~ <sup>they're</sup> not guilty, don't kill mummy. The artist supports the protesters and the troops is being judged by

Source E:

inference

explanation

~~inference~~

inference

evidence

overall impression

impression

Use of

own

contextual

knowledge

In source E, I can infer that the owner of the Courier newspaper are very rich people because since they got the vote, they wouldn't want the parliament to change the rule so they made the protesters look guilty. I can also infer that ~~some~~ <sup>some</sup> people got hurt. I know this because in the article, it ~~was~~ <sup>said</sup> bloodshed, and it means many people was hurt. Source E gives the overall impression that some people supported the troops because the ~~the~~ editor stated "The cavalry charged in their own defence." The quote is showing us that the ~~soldier~~ <sup>soldiers</sup> are doing the right thing as they were sent by the authorities and that the protesters are guilty because the one of the law is that there can't be more than 50 people in one place however, there is more than 200 in one place so they broke the law.

— Considered overall impression, relating to an context  
 WWW - Clear inferences with evidence to support.

E BI In places you could have given some more examples of evidence to support your inference

What is the purpose of autobiography;

objektive  
emotive

In some ways, Source D is useful as it presents us a range of different information. For instance, it tells us that the Cavalry were involved and had weapons, "The Cavalry's Sabres were wielded to cut a way through naked held up hands and defenceless heads." It also tells us that ~~terr~~ petrified families were there and that people were injured as the weaver quoted "Chopped heads and wound gaping skulls" and also said "Womens and tender youths were trampled."

Context  
(Strength)

Also, it is reliable in some ways. For example, the author witnessed the ~~the~~ scary event and shared his/her thoughts. "The crowds fled with screams, prayers and pleadings." It makes us readers upset that the weaver went through all that.

Not  
addressing  
Provenance  
(Strength)  
Confidence

However, Source D is mostly limited because there are lots of things it doesn't tell us, for ~~example~~ <sup>instance</sup> it doesn't tell us what the protest <sup>is about</sup> and if it doesn't tell us, how could we trust him? Also it doesn't explain how many people were there and how many was injured or killed because the way he ~~wrote~~ <sup>said</sup> that, it sounds like everyone was killed, it sounds like it's been exaggerated. "Over the field were strewn caps, bonnets, hats, shawls and shoes... trampled, torn and bloody." This way the weaver described the event, it sounded like everyone in the crowd were innocent and that they were all killed, as it sounds like it's been exaggerated.

Content  
(Limitation)

← \* Could you use your own contextual knowledge here, to prove this is exaggerated? (How many people in fact?)

Secondly, there are ranges of reasons why it isn't reliable, for instance, it was written 20 years after the event, in 1839. Also, this person was a weaver so he is one of the protestors, which is subjective because since he was one of the crowd he made the crowd seem innocent and the Cavalry's look evil. "Naked held up hands and defenceless heads." Another reason is that this worker used exaggerated language for emotive language because 'naked held up hands'

Age  
Provenance  
(limited)

makes the readers think that the crowd is innocent and that they didn't do anything wrong which makes us really emotional and can't help but feel sorry for them and side with them. Another example is that the purpose of this writing was to sell because this piece of writing was written in full details so it makes us think we should support the crowd.

Yes!

Therefore, Source D doesn't give an amazing impression, but a weak impression and we can't trust it fully because it's not that reliable.

4.

Keep conclusion on whole issue of utility.

I would follow up the point of violent injuries, "Chopped heads and wound-gaping skulls" because I want to know the kind of injuries.

If I could, I would ask the question, What kind of injuries was there?

I would use the hospital records to find out more about source D and not the newspapers because the hospital has the records of the injuries that occurred after the events like Thomas Blumstone, who's both arms broke and was unlikely to walk again. I wouldn't use the newspapers because the rich people runs that business and that means that they could vote so they wouldn't add the negative stuff that occurred.

further enquiry

WWW: You considered strengths and limitations and, for each of these, content and provenance (who and when made + purpose). Although provenance was only don't effectively for ~~limitations~~: limitations.

Your consideration of further enquiry was well developed with valid justification for what you would use.

EBI: Your comments on reliability, when you considered its strengths, clearly showed that we do get an insight into the experiences of a protester and why. <sup>anecdote</sup> (what it is) affects reliability.