



Question 20: Compare and contrast the methods used to maintain power in two authoritarian states, each from a different region.

[Topic 10: Authoritarian states (20th century)]

20

Both Mao and Hitler used similar methods to maintain their grip on power throughout their rules. Both relied heavily on the use of terror as a means of controlling the population, however they did use it in differing ways. Likewise, both used propaganda and reeducation to try to create a loyal population and they had themselves idolised in culture. Finally, it is worth considering their economic policies as a means of satisfying the population, however neither had particularly successful economies.

Particularly early on in their rules, both Mao and Hitler made use of terror tactics to suppress opposition, however Mao did so on a far larger scale. Immediately after coming to power, Mao launched an invasion into Tibet and within 3 months had suppressed all opposition. At the same time he launched the Campaign Against Counterrevolutionaries in 1950. This resulted in the death of 700,000 so-called enemies of the state.

Similarly, in 1956 he launched the Hundred Flowers Campaign, which resulted in the round-up and imprisonment of over 500,000 political opponents or 'rightists' as Mao called them. It is events like these that have led Revisionist historians to justifiably claim that Mao's regime was built "fundamentally around terror" (Huang and Halliday).

~~Contrasting~~ Contrastingly, he also used more widespread campaigns such as that against landlords in 1957 and the Cultural Revolution, in which he relied upon the mass population carrying out acts of terror to force the population into submission. For example, 2 million landlords

- 2 -

were murdered by peasants in the 1951 campaign. Hitler, on the other hand, simply used more systematic terror to retain his grip on control. Like Mao, there was a wave of terror immediately after he came to power. He used the Enabling Act to suppress the Communist KPD party - 100,000 leading Communists were rounded up in a matter of months. Likewise, he intimidated other parties with the SA, 2 million men strong by 1934, such as by murdering the conservative party floor leader. Throughout Hitler's rule, terror was used continuously but, once again in the same way as Mao, he used more of it towards the end. Millions were imprisoned in concentration camps and 11 million Jews, socialists and opponents were executed in extermination camps. Therefore, it is clear that both Mao and Hitler relied heavily on the use of terror to stamp their authority on their nations. Both felt it necessary to consolidate power, but also increased terror once they felt more threatened towards the end of their rules.

As well as using terror, both Mao and Hitler relied on the developments of a personality cult and fanatical population - however they achieved these with differing levels of success. Mao undoubtedly managed to create an extreme cult around his personality. Events such as the Korean War were used to show his indispensability as a leader. This was enhanced by his infamous slogans and posters around China. His little red book of quotes was commonly used to show people's appreciation. Moreover, his word was taken as law even while lying sick on his death bed; as such his power of the country was clear to see. And while Hitler did attempt to achieve the same, he did so with less success. Undoubtedly his successful foreign policy early on helped enhance his status as a genius, a tactician and crucial leader. However, the concept of Führerprinzip was not bought into by all. Whereas Mao had a fanatical youth who followed his word, as seen in the Cultural Revolution with the Red Guard attacking teachers and even family, Hitler still faced



04AX02

- 3 -

opposition from youth movements and even some conservatives. Groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates and the White Rose Group illustrate his failure to achieve god-like status like Mao. As a result, Hitler's use of terror was clearly crucial.

Similarly, Mao and Hitler tried to use education to alter the population's thinking and help them retain power. Mao invested heavily in schools, increasing literacy rates from 50% up to 70% by 1970. In doing this, he was able to indoctrinate far more youths than would have otherwise been possible. On top of this he forced artists to create propagandist work - claiming they had a duty to educate. In order to affect the adults, he created the Anti-Movements in the 1950s which aimed to educate the Chinese on what was acceptable. Furthermore, he used thought reform camps to re-educate intellectuals, for example 6000 underwent thought reform in 1957. The success of this policy is highlighted by the lack of genuine opposition faced by Mao during his rule - however the criticisms during the Hundred Flowers Campaign suggest he failed to fully reeducate intellectuals. Meanwhile Hitler created the Hitler Youth, whose membership reached 8 million in 1939, and overhauled the school syllabus to control the students' thoughts. P.E. was given 15% of all teaching time, while History and German were emphasised. Nevertheless his failure here is reiterated by the numerous rebel groups and opposition he faced, such as from religious groups and Communists.

Finally, Mao and Hitler had ideologically driven, disastrous economic policies which convey the importance of their use of terror and indoctrination. Mao's great leap forward resulted in coal output falling from 270 million tonnes to just 220 million, while steel fell from 9 to 7 million tonnes. In addition, the socialist farming techniques adopted and collectivisation



04AX03

-4-

resulted in famine and up to 45 million deaths. These failures show the success of Mao to create a society in which he was largely untouched by great atrocities like this, thanks to his repression and fanatic youth. Meanwhile, Hitler enjoyed a little more success with unemployment falling from 6 million to 500,000 (although the 500,000 figure is questionable) and an increase in industrial output of 60%. However, he achieved this by running a huge deficit. Moreover, his agricultural policies were catastrophic and he failed to reach autarky - 1.6 million tonnes of grain were still imported in 1939. The Reich Farm Estate also failed to boost productivity. Finally, unemployment only reached such a low point due to conscription and heavy state investment, hence the figure overstates his success. As a result, Hitler must also be praised for his ability to restrict opposition and maintain power despite appalling economic performance, hence the importance of his terror and reeducation must be stressed.

Overall, therefore, it is clear Mao and Hitler relied upon their use of terror in maintaining power. However, Mao also successfully indoctrinated the youth to such an extent that his image remained untouched by disasters like the ~~Great~~ Great Leap Forward. Meanwhile, Hitler relied for long periods on the Hitler Myth - as Ian Kershaw argues - however ultimately had to fall back on terror as a result of the limited success of his rule. As such Ian Kershaw's argument of the Hitler Myth simply cannot apply to the latter stages of his rule. Finally, ~~both~~ both dictators' economic policies failed in achieving beneficial results and hence cannot be credited with helping them maintain power. Thus the Maoist argument that Mao provided well for the Chinese people is clearly flawed. Ultimately, Hitler relied on terror at key moments while Mao enjoyed greater success with indoctrination, but still had to fall back on terror when he felt threatened.



04AX04

ANSWER BOOKLET
LIVRET DE RÉPONSES
CUADERNILLO DE RESPUESTAS
4 PAGES / PÁGINAS



International Baccalaureate
Baccalauréat International
Bachillerato Internacional

Question 23: To what extent did economic interests rather than ideology lead to the breakdown of the grand alliance between 1943 and 1949?

[Topic 12: The Cold War: Superpower tensions and rivalries (20th century)]

2 3

In reality, economic interests played a minor role in the breakdown of the grand alliance up to 1949, while its importance in dealing with Germany must be recognised, the key reasons for a breakdown in relations came as a result of ideology. Events in Europe were driven by ideology, from creating mutual distrust, to leading Truman and Stalin into making certain policy decisions.

Nevertheless, the role of economic interests at post war conferences and in Germany must be recognised. Certainly, at Yalta and Potsdam, when the allies were discussing Germany, their economic interests were important in driving disagreement. While the west wanted to rebuild Germany economically, Stalin was determined to keep ~~her~~ ^{her} weak in order to protect the USSR against future attack. As such, the USSR wanted to extract vast reparations from Germany. This was also in an effort to help the USSR rebuild after the damage done by the war. It was this key ~~stain~~ division that led to a breakdown in the 4 Power Allied Control Council in 1947, as the West refused to fulfil the economic obligations to the ~~the~~ USSR in the form of reparations. As such the ~~issue~~ problem of economic interests certainly did provoke disagreement. This was reflected in Stalin's outrage at the reforms made in West Germany in 1947 when the UK and USA formed Bizone and introduced the Deutschmark currency. Once again he believed this violated agreements at Potsdam, hence he reacted aggressively with the Berlin Blockade. ~~Thus it could be argued key~~

-2-

economic disagreements forced the break down in the alliance.

Similarly, it could be argued that policies led by the Truman administration ~~caused~~ provoked anger within the USSR due to ~~the~~ the economics behind it. The Marshall Plan - giving \$13 billion of aid to European countries, could be viewed solely as an economic policy ^{to boost trade.} As a result, the strong reaction it provoked from Stalin could be considered against the US's economic policies. However, it is the ideology and politics that lay behind Marshall Aid that caused such great problems. Marshall Aid was administered soon after the Truman Doctrine was declared by Truman ~~and~~ which aimed to protect "liberated people from oppression". Moreover, it was given with strings attached such as democratic elections and trade with the USA, thus was impossible to be adopted by Communist countries. As a result, Marshall Aid ~~was~~ ^{seemed to be} an ~~ideologically~~ ideologically driven policy with the goal of preventing the spread of communism, hence it caused outrage in the USSR. Nevertheless, as J.L. Gaddis has pointed out, the Marshall Aid did not cause any real harm to the USSR, rather it was Stalin's own paranoia which ~~was~~ caused him to react with such aggression. This is backed up by the fact that Marshall Aid was actually offered to all countries, including eastern European countries and was strictly financial aid. ~~Because~~ Because of this, Stalin's own aggressive actions and paranoia must be taken into account when examining the breakdown in relations.

Stalin led an undeniably aggressive and expansionist foreign policy ~~with~~ with the aim of spreading communism. His policies were undoubtedly ideologically driven - the Orthodox argument that Stalin was aggressive is undoubtedly accurate. Following the end of World War Two, Stalin began an ~~aggressive~~ aggressive takeover of Eastern Europe. Through the use of rigged elections and



04AX02

- 3 -

coups, he swept through Eastern Europe installing Communist governments. For example in Czechoslovakia the Foreign Minister Jan Masaryk was pushed out a window as the government building was stormed. Elsewhere, elections gave results of 99% wanting to join the USSR. Not only were these Communist friendly governments installed, he also sought to exercise control over them through the creation of Cominform and Comecon. These political and economic alliances forced the smaller nations to coordinate domestic policies with the USSR and follow approved economic policies. As a result, this political takeover of Eastern Europe into his sphere of influence conveys the ideological nature of his expansion and hence puts ideology at the heart of the breakdown in relations. When comparing Stalin's policies with those of Truman, it becomes apparent the difference in aggression and physical contribution between the two - Stalin retained 2 million Red Army troops in Eastern Europe during this period. Through this the importance of Stalin's expansionist ideology becomes clear, as well as the importance of a mutual distrusting of one another's ideologies. Nevertheless, Truman's policies were clearly less directly ideological, rather it was Stalin's extreme interpretation of their ideological background that caused an issue.

Finally, the long running distrust as a result of ideology must be considered. Since the west's intervention in the Russian Civil War in 1920, through to their failure to open up a second front in World War Two ~~until~~ until 1944, Stalin believed he had clear evidence of the West hoping to destroy Communism. This was fuelled by their inability to reach an agreement against the Nazis in 1938-9. On the other hand, the West distrusted Communism as a result of its apparent brutality and economic failures. This was supported by ~~the~~ Stalin's inaction during the Warsaw Rising of 1943 and the murdering of the Tsar's family back in 1917. This long running mutual distrust caused added friction between the



04AX03

- 4 -

sides and, once the war was over, provided plenty of reason for the grand alliance to break down.

Overall, therefore, it is clear ideology played a far more crucial role in determining the outcome of the grand alliance.

As Gaddis suggests, it was Stalin's ideological interpretation of the Marshall Plan that caused him to be so angered by the aid.

Elsewhere, it is clear ideology drove the policies of Stalin in Eastern Europe and the declaration of the Truman Doctrine. These events were undoubtedly exaggerated by the long running distrust between the two sides as a result of their opposing ideologies. Nonetheless, the breakdown in communications over reparations in Germany and the disagreements over economic policy in their respective zones certainly contributed to the Berlin Blockade; ~~and~~ it catalysed the ~~event~~ descent into the Cold War.



04AX04