

SECTION A

Answer Question 1. Write your answer in the space provided.

Study Sources 1 and 2 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 How far could the historian make use of Sources 1 and 2 together to investigate the abilities of Winston Churchill as a wartime political leader in the years 1940–45?

Explain your answer using both sources, the information given about them and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(25)

Historians can make use of sources 1 and 2 together to investigate the abilities of Winston Churchill as a wartime political leader in the years 1940–45, especially in terms of Churchill's personality and the way in which he took responsibility as a leader during the Second World War.

Source 1 is produced by Tom Hopkinson, a magazine editor during the war. The fact that he was an editor might distance him from military affairs, but at the same time it can also mean that he would have had access to ^{a range of} many different opinions coming from various groups of people. This is in fact hinted at in the source because he is aware of the 'criticism of Churchill' that is taking

The source was published in 1982, almost 40 years after the Second World War ended, which means Hopkinson could have ~~might be expected to make in more objective tone as with his~~ had the advantage of hindsight ~~experience managing a professional as of the event overall event~~ as well as the results of the war. This can also mean that he ~~could have~~ ^{in order} ~~might have~~ been selective in the information that he used ~~since he~~ to build up a stronger argument in favor of ~~is aware of the what happened for~~ his 'left-wing news'. Hopkinson claims in the source that the 'more popular criticism' coming from the British public was that Churchill was the 'only possible war



leader, but that he was failing to share the burden sufficiently with others'. From this opinion, ~~the~~ it can be suggested that Churchill ~~was~~ did take full responsibility of what had to be done, which is indeed an important quality ^{needed by} ~~of a leader~~ a leader, but he is doing so in an overwhelming manner. This is supported by the 'insider criticism' coming from higher positions in the military and the government that he is 'taking far too much upon himself'. From this, it can be deduced that Churchill was very responsible and hard-working, but lacked the ability to ~~share~~ work with other people ~~for~~ ~~to~~ achieve efficiency. The source also points out that Churchill ~~was~~ ^{to be} 'let down by commanders in the field' while others ^{some named} ~~needed~~ him to be ~~the~~ ~~cause of setbacks~~ the one letting down other commanders by being the 'cause of continuing setbacks'. The fact that 'confidential meetings' took place without Churchill ~~shows that~~ suggest that he really needed more communication with other leaders of the war without fully

^{This argument can be given weight as Churchill} relying on himself. ~~Churchill was quite stubborn when with his opinions~~ was really quite stubborn with his own opinions ^{these} and no other commanders dared ~~and~~ ~~randomly~~ ~~when he came up with ideas in a pretty random~~ go against him.

~~manner, but~~ However, Alan Brooke was known to be the only one who ~~should~~ could stand against Churchill and Churchill never refused rejected Brooke's advice. This point shows that he was not totally a leader who worked by himself, but ^{his overwhelming responsibility and desire to work alone as a leader,} ~~some 1 is useful in telling the~~ leaders about ~~the views of the majority towards Churchill during the war.~~

~~for~~ Some 2 is produced by General Eisenhower who became Allied Supreme Commander in Europe in 1943. He had direct political access to Churchill, which means that ~~he~~ he was ^{maintained} ~~probably~~ ~~close to~~



Churchill a close relationship with Churchill and hence knew more about him than other people. The fact that he was also a military leader shows that he probably could understand Churchill more than others did, ~~as they served~~ hence he could be softer on him compared to the criticisms of other generals of the public. However, if Churchill really was Eisenhower felt like Churchill was really not a good leader, he would have been able to spot more of his weaknesses and failures with his direct access to him. The source was produced in 1968, ~~only~~ 3 years after the ~~first~~ ^{second} world war ended; ~~maybe Eisenhower tried to~~ just now that Churchill brought about British victory, Eisenhower might have been trying to add to his fame despite his previous failures and criticism. Eisenhower claims that Churchill was an 'inspirational leader' who was 'devoted to winning the war and discharging ~~the~~ his responsibility as Prime Minister'. Although the source overall is written in a very positive tone that shows Eisenhower's respect and admire towards Churchill. Although it was 'difficult to get him to change his mind', he 'never failed to respect' and 'never once lost his friendly attitude'. This points out that Churchill ^{was a very} ~~had a~~ ~~very~~ sociable person, as it supported by the fact that he liked to socialize with other people which sometimes became the reason for clash between him and Alan Brooke. The fact that he successfully 'persuaded' Eisenhower is also supported by the fact that Churchill was a great orator who played a great role in raising the morale of the population during the war. Eisenhower points out that he was 'keen' to learn and that he himself



Sources 1 and 2 together are very useful in investigating the abilities of Churchill as a wartime political leader in the years 1940-45 because ~~be~~ they together show his personality and the way in which he worked with other people during the war. Source 1 and 2 have ~~different~~ very different views about Churchill as a leader, but it is important that they both agree on the point that he ~~was~~ took great responsibility, worked hard and was stubborn when it came to changing his opinions. ~~Although~~ Source 1 shows criticism against him due to his lack of agreement with other leaders, which shows ~~has~~ one of his greatest weaknesses as a leader. However, this can also be viewed in a positive light in the sense that he had the courage and strength to push through his ~~ideas~~ difficult ideas ~~in~~ despite disagreements.

P 5 0 6 1 7 A 0 5 2 4

Sources 1 and 2 together are useful to historians investigating the abilities of Winston Churchill as a wartime political leader in the years 1940-45 in the sense that it clearly showed his lack of flexibility when working with others and his great desire for victory which drove him to work exceptionally hard. ~~However~~, The two sources show opposing opinions about Churchill, but they essentially ~~show~~ display a similar ~~aspects~~ points about his strengths and weaknesses ~~about the~~ ~~as~~ as a leader. However, both sources are written in hindsight after the Second world war finished, which means that it doesn't contain views about him during the war without being aware of the final result of his decisions. In conclusion, sources 1 and 2 together are useful to a large extent to investigate Churchill's ability as a leader in the Second world war except for the lack of variation in the time frame in which the sources were written.

