**Secondary Source Assignment**

In order to understand secondary source articles, it is important to analyze them to determine whether they are a reliable source. This assignment focuses on Alexander the Great and his accomplishments/hidden motives.

**Procedure**

1. This is an individual assignment
2. This assignment should be 1-2 pages double-spaced and typed.
3. Be sure to read the “Alexander the (not so great)” article and answer the following questions.
4. **Analysis:** Answer the following questions about your source
	1. Who produced this document? When? Why?
	2. What purpose was this intended to serve?
	3. What impact was this meant to have?
	4. Who was the intended audience?
	5. What is the author’s point of view? What does the document tell us about the values, beliefs and/or assumptions of the author?
	6. Is there any missing information that should have been included?
	7. Any other information you found interesting
5. **Critical Discussion:** Discuss the following critical thinking questions
	1. What was the most significant and surprising piece of information presented by the author?
	2. Does this document raise any questions in your mind about the legitimacy of secondary sources? Are there any biases in this document? Is this information consistent with other articles?
	3. Was Alexander the Great truly one of the greatest emperors in history? Or was he simply overhyped? Explain.
	4. Taking the perspective of someone in his army, was the mutiny justified?
6. **Conclusion:** write a conclusion that summarizes your thoughts.
7. Submit this assignment through Microsoft Teams

**Evaluation**

Analysis /10

Critical Discussion /10

Conclusion /5

Mechanics /5

 Overall /30

**Alexander the (not so) Great**

There are countless books and films about Alexander the Great noting his grandeur, his energy and, of course, his leadership. However, there are three objectives he did not reach, that are essential when we evaluate any leader: what legacy did he leave behind? How did he perform in the position or how did he benefit from it? How did he define his mission and then set about achieving it?

Alexander (born in 365 BC) did not perform satisfactorily in any of these areas. His shortcomings as a leader were that he left things worse or, at best, exactly the same as they were before. Alexander simply served himself as he pleased, with a narcissistic leadership style. He satisfied his own military passions rather than carrying out his obligations as a statesman.

Alexander’s story is one of a person who had it all. One can liken his behavior to that of supremely talented Hollywood stars who become famous at an early age but then struggle to deal with premature success.

Not that he didn’t get a particularly stellar start in life. Alexander’s father Philip II chose the greatest teachers of the time to develop his physical strength and his knowledge of literature and philosophy; Alexander was an avid learner.

Alexander’s lust for power was fulfilled when his father was assassinated by his own general. No one knows if the general had been egged on by Alexander, his mother Olympia, or perhaps both of them. But as a result, Alexander was proclaimed king when he was just 20 years old.

Alexander’s management style alternated between cruelty and generosity: he destroyed Thebes and pardoned Athens, maybe as a result of the respect he had for the city acquired from his studies.

Acclaimed by the Greek states, they provided him with the troops and resources to undertake a triumphant military expedition against the Persian army. Aware of the precarious loyalty of Athens, Alexander left one-third of his troops in Greece and set out on his crusade.

He had no idea what he would find in Asia. If he had known, he wouldn’t have tried to conquer it with just 23,000 men. I believe what drove him to Asia was a dream of glory.

His victories aroused the admiration of contemporaries and of future generations. He conquered Damascus, Sidon, Tiro, all of Egypt, Babylonia and Persepolis; he founded Alexandria and defeated Darius, and made it to the Himalayas.

Before his death at just 32 years old, Alexander murdered Cleitus, the friend who had saved his life, when Cleitus reminded him that his victories belonged to his father because he had left Alexander with a formidable army.

Alexander focused intently on what was ahead, never looking back. His leadership style was that of a heroic general more than a statesman. He had prodigious hardware, but tempestuous software.

 **Ogders Berndtson - 2020**