

MAY 2007

11. Analyse the methods used and the conditions which helped in the rise to power of one ruler of a single-party state. This question requires candidates to select one single-party state, and first establish and analyse the methods used by the aspiring leader to obtain power. Methods could include: choice and use of an ideology; how support both inside the country, and from foreign sources, was obtained; the appeal of the leader; propaganda; whether legal or violent methods were used. Candidates must also consider how the conditions in the chosen country were ripe for a new regime, for example a lost war, poor economy, weak government *etc.*

12. Evaluate the successes and failures of one ruler of a single-party state. Candidates should be well prepared and well informed for this question. They need to state their ruler and analyse all aspects of his rule, giving judgment on which policies, actions *etc.* were successful and which were failures. Expect accurate chronology and some wider assessment for the top bands. Domestic and foreign policies should be considered. Better candidates might point out the difference between success for the country as a whole, and success for the ruler. No doubt the most popular choices will be Castro, Hitler, Lenin, Mao, Mussolini and Stalin.

14. Compare and contrast the influence outside their own countries of Hitler and Mao. Mao took power in China in 1949 after waging a guerrilla campaign and winning a Civil War against Chiang Kai-shek. Hitler came to power in 1933, when he was made Chancellor. He committed suicide in 1945, when the Russians captured Berlin. The question is limited to material outside the two leaders' own countries. For comparison, both had some influence outside their countries before they came to power, Mao as an exponent of Communism and Hitler in Europe with his Nazi party. Both were well-known leaders for their chosen ideology, communism and fascism, and both were involved in conflicts: Korea, Vietnam and the Second World War. Both won support overseas by using propaganda. For contrast, Mao sent aid and advisers to many African and Asian countries whereas Hitler "took over" European countries. Hitler fought the Second World War on his own behalf, and as its main figure and instigator. Mao's involvement in Korea and Vietnam was less clear-cut.

15. Examine the status of women in two single-party states, each chosen from a different region. The word "status" suggests role and position in society. Candidates could consider equality – or lack of it – in political rights, government, education, employment, family life, sport, religion, as well as health care and child support. Specific evidence and examples are required for the higher bands. **[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations. **[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative case studies. **[11 to 13 marks]** for explicit examination of specific details. **[14 to 16 marks]** for structured, analytical examinations of the status of women in the chosen states. **[17+ marks]** for balance and/or different interpretations. **N.B.** If only one state or one region is used, mark out of **[12 marks]**.

NOVEMBER 2007

11. "A vigorous foreign policy played a vital part in the maintenance of power of single-party regimes." With reference to two examples, explain to what extent you agree with this statement.

Candidates should focus on the aims of foreign policy in both states chosen and illustrate answers by reference to the pursuit of such aims. Was foreign policy a means to win domestic support, gain international respect, seize economic resources to aid in the strengthening of the prestige of the single-party regime, or was foreign policy meant to distract the population from a lack of internal offerings – or both at different times?

Since the question asks "to what extent" candidates should also be aware of other factors which were necessary to maintain the regime – whether it be domestic economic policies, control of the media, education, repression/purges, social reform programmes, propaganda *etc.* Popular choices are likely to be Mussolini and Hitler where knowledge of foreign policy is likely to be greater – but successful challenges to the question could be made by reference to regimes which were less prominent in terms of an active foreign policy (e.g. Franco) or

in cases where though active, foreign policy was largely unsuccessful in meeting its aims, even though the ruler/ regime remained strong (e.g. Nasser).

If only one example is used mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalized responses.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive answers with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment and some recognition of other factors.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, focused and well-supported answers which reveal awareness and evidence of other factors.

[17+ marks] for perceptive/insightful responses which provide full and convincing substantiation of foreign policy's role in relation to other factors.

12. To what extent was ideology an important factor in the rise to power of one of the following: Lenin; Mussolini; Nyerere?

Candidates should identify the key points associated with the ideology of the chosen leader.

Which sections of the population were especially attracted to such elements – and why? What were the circumstances which allowed the appeal to become so widespread? Was it the case that the ideology of the chosen example was seen as a replacement for existing ideologies which were perceived as inadequate for the state/population? And did the ideology of either of these leaders remain constant during the struggle for power, or was it a case of ideology being compromised by pragmatism?

“To what extent” provides opportunities for the candidate to identify and explore other factors which may account for the rise to power of the leader: war weariness; material/economic suffering; disillusionment with existing political systems; errors/inadequacies of preceding regimes; collusion of vested interests for whatever motive (e.g. fear of the alternatives) in times of crisis; the use of violence/intimidation/bribery.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalizations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive accounts with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit reference to aims and role played by ideology but lacking adequate coverage of other factors/circumstances.

[14 to 16 marks] for balanced treatment and analysis in which ideology is clearly identified and its relative status in the rise to power is examined.

[17+ marks] for structured, detailed and thoughtful responses which evaluate convincingly the

extent to which ideology vis-à-vis other factors was responsible for the rise of the chosen leader.

13. By what methods, and with what success, did single-party rulers in power establish totalitarian regimes? Reference should be made to two examples, each chosen from a different region.

“Totalitarianism” should be understood as being more than just the existence of a one-party state. Effective or successful totalitarianism – the attempt to control every aspect of the population and its life in the interests of the party/leader (i.e. in the areas of social, cultural, economic, religious, educational as well as political life) should be considered.

Methods by which single-party rulers attempted to establish effective totalitarian regimes should be well known but the extent to which totalitarian goals were realised (or even realisable) requires examination – and substantiation. A thematic approach rather than end-on or sequential treatment is likely to provide more satisfactory answers.

If only one example or one region is used mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalized comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narratives/descriptive answers with implicit assessment.

[11 to 13 marks] for balanced responses with explicit comment on the nature and success of the chosen regimes. Not all implications considered.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured, focused and balanced responses with good supporting detail/historical knowledge.

[17+ marks] for balanced treatment and perceptive explicit analysis supported by accurate and relevant substantiation.

14. Compare and contrast the economic and social policies of one left wing and one right wing single-party ruler.

The emphasis is on economic and social policies.

For economic policies candidates could examine issues such as: central planning; command economy; autarkic aims and reasons for these; agricultural and industrial policies and their emphases; employment; extent of success/failure of such policies etc.

For social policies: role of women, education, health, youth programmes, religion etc.

Thematic structure, rather than end-on or sequential treatment is likely to produce better responses.

If only one single-party ruler is addressed the maximum award is [7 marks].

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate, general responses.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive responses with implicit comparisons/contrasts.

[11 to 13 marks] for more explicit commentary. May be an imbalance between treatment of economic and social policies.

[14 to 16 marks] for informed and balanced responses with explicit treatment of similarities

and differences. [17+ marks] for structured and thoughtful responses showing a detailed knowledge of types of policies in both examples.,

15. Analyse the conditions which led to the establishment of either Perón's regime in Argentina or Nasser's regime in Egypt.

Whichever is chosen candidates need to identify and critically comment on those conditions –social, economic, political – which provided the background, and opportunities, for the coming to power and establishment of the chosen regime. For Perón: consideration of circumstances leading to the 1943 coup d'état; power base of Perón within the Ministry of Labour and Social Security; building of support amongst workers through programme of paid holidays, medical insurance, pensions, security from arbitrary dismissal. Election to presidency in 1946 after surviving (with trade union support) an attempt to remove him from the ministry in 1945. Slogans of "social justice" and "economic independence" led to popular support.

For Nasser: consideration of circumstances leading to the 1952 coup by "Society of Free Officers", which overthrew dissolute King Farouk and a corrupt "parliamentary system" that had failed to solve inequitable land distribution system or achieve full sovereignty for Egypt (imperialist presence of British in Canal Zone). Military rule through Revolutionary Command Council imposed under General Naguib. Naguib removed 1954 for supposed collusion with Muslim Brotherhood. Nasser became president – purges of army to ensure future loyalty to Nasser.

[0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalized responses.

[8 to 10 marks] for descriptive answers with implicit analysis.

[11 to 13 marks] for more explicit analysis and adequate detail.

[14 to 16 marks] for structured and detailed analytical responses.

[17+ marks] for responses indicating a structured and detailed knowledge base and evidence of perceptive analysis

MAY 08

11. Compare and contrast the rise to power of *two* rulers of single party states, each chosen from a different region.

Areas to compare and contrast could include: ideology, aims and personal attributes of the person seeking to become ruler; nature of the situation, type of existing government, *etc.* within the state that is being targeted; composition of his supporters; methods used to gain

power, such as legal or peaceful; the extent of foreign backing. Actual details will depend on the choice of rulers, and better responses will be in a comparative format.

[0 to 7 marks] for general comments or if only one ruler or one region is addressed.

[8 to 10 marks] for sequential accounts with implicit comparison.

[11 to 13 marks] for adequate specific evidence and explicit comparison.

[14 to 16 marks] for good knowledge in a comparative structure.

[17+ marks] for detailed analytical comparison and contrast.

12. To what extent was *either* Mussolini, between 1922 and 1945, *or* Nasser, between 1954 and 1970, successful in achieving his aims?

Candidates need to state the aims of their chosen leader and assess the extent to which these

aims were realised. Mussolini was appointed prime minister of Italy in 1922 by King Victor Emmanuel II, he assumed the title *Duce* (leader) and remained ruler (although from winter 1941–2 he was virtually Hitler's pensionary) until his murder in 1945. His first aim was to become leader of Italy, which he achieved, and as prime minister of a coalition, he aimed for full Fascist control of government. This was established by 1928–9. It could be argued whether he aimed to become a totalitarian ruler, and to what extent he did become one. He aimed to restore Italian greatness at home and acquire an empire through his foreign policy. Both domestic and foreign policy need to be assessed for his successes and failures, and a final verdict given. Candidates will probably agree that finally he paid the price of his aims and ambitions.

13. In what ways did *one* ruler of a single-party state try to use education to support his regime?

Education was used by rulers of single-party states in the following ways:

- as propaganda to achieve support for his rule and policies;
- to stir up opposition for enemies at home or abroad, especially in times of war;

- to ensure the curriculum teaches what he wants and omits what he dislikes;
- to shape the minds of children for his support later;
- to turn children against their parents;
- to train children in professions and occupations that are needed;
- to improve literacy and modernize the country.

Candidates are usually well informed with the education policies of Hitler and Mao, and to a lesser extent Stalin. Specific details of the above should be given as evidence.

Stronger candidates will probably assess, or at least conclude with a verdict on how successful the chosen ruler was in using education to support his regime.

15. Assess the importance of foreign policy for rulers of single-party states.

This is an open-ended question as no set number of rulers are demanded, but it does stipulate rulers not ruler, so more than one is required. It could be more satisfactory to assess two or three in depth, or to answer it thematically with reference to those to whom it was important and those who thought that it was better to concentrate on domestic policies. Both Mussolini and Hitler used their ambitious/aggressive foreign policies to retain support at home; Lenin, Stalin and Mao claimed to put improving conditions for their own people first, although the Cold War could be said to have changed this. It could be asserted that peace, in order to concentrate on home affairs,

is also a form of foreign policy. What candidates must do is produce factual evidence to support their argument.

11. Analyse the rise to power of *either* Hitler *or* Lenin.

This should be a popular question and candidates should have no trouble in explaining the post-war situation in Germany, support for the Nazi party, the aims and actions of Hitler, and the mistakes of the politicians that led to his acquisition of office. Similarly Lenin's views, publications, and actions, before and after the two 1917 Russian Revolutions, which led to his leadership of the Bolshevik party then of Russia/USSR should also be well known. Allow candidates to analyse events up to 1934 for Hitler. For Lenin answers would not be expected to go beyond the outbreak of the civil war. Well analysed and accurate historical details are needed for high marks.

12. Compare and contrast the regime of *one* right wing and *one* left wing single-party state.

Candidates should select their states; probably the regimes of Hitler, Mussolini, Peron and perhaps Franco, will be popular choices, for right wing regimes; and Castro, Lenin, Mao and Stalin, for left wing single-party states, but accept others.

Areas for both comparison and contrast could include: form of government and administration (law, order, terror, censorship); economic policies including direction of labour; education; propaganda; the arts. There should be much material for both comparison and contrast whichever regimes are chosen. Foreign policy should be included where relevant.

13. With reference to at least *two* rulers, assess the importance of social and economic policies for rulers of single-party states.

Social and economic policies were important for rulers of single-party states to win and maintain peoples' support, and thus remain in power. Candidates must select at least two states, but more examples can be used, especially if candidates choose a thematic approach, which could be very successful. Areas that could be assessed for their importance are: economic development as well as standard of living and elimination of poverty (employment, workers' rights, trade, industry and wages); education and training; youth groups; incentives such as holidays, cinema, theatre, the arts and free health care. A verdict should be reached on the overall importance of social and economic measures and policies.

15. To what extent was the ruler of *one* single-party state successful in achieving his aims?

This is a straight-forward question that demands that candidates should select one ruler of a single-party state, express his aims and assess how they were implemented and thus show to what extent the ruler succeeded in achieving them. "To what extent" also requires that failure to achieve some or all aims should also be examined. Able candidates could also query "successful" by asking for whom, the ruler or the country. Specific material will depend on ruler chosen. All aspects of his rule, including the aim "to stay in power", could be made relevant; but rise is not asked for.

[0 to 7 marks] for vague generalisations.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative of rule with implicit aims and success.

[11 to 13 marks] for explicit explanation of aims, success and failure.

[14 to 16 marks] for answers focused clearly on aims, success and failure.

[17+ marks] for perceptive analysis of aims, related policies, success and failure.

NOVEMBER 2008

11. To what extent did the following aid the rise to power of either Lenin or Mussolini: (a) the First World War (b) weakness of the existing regime (c) ideological appeal?

The structure for the essay is clearly established in the question. Candidates are required to examine the three main areas and assess the significance of each. For the First World War the impact of the war itself on the chosen state can be extended to also consider the aftermath of the war and the impact of peace treaties/settlements on the situation and the ways in which immediate post-war economic and political developments affected the support provided to either Mussolini or Lenin. Whether war was a "mighty accelerator" for the collapse of the existing regime (and how/why), as well as the ways in which the aspiring leader took advantage of the situation need addressing. Weaknesses of the existing regime: the paucity or inappropriateness of political/economic/social reform could be investigated, along with the errors of existing regimes in failing to fulfill the expectations of either the general population or important sections within the population. The question of ideological appeal requires identification of the main strands of the selected ideology and consideration of how important it proved in garnering support, or whether ideology was largely abandoned or altered by the leader in the quest for power. This could raise the question of whether ideology or pragmatism was predominant – or a mixture of both. "To what extent" also allows for other factors to be mentioned (for example collusion of vested interests, fear of the alternatives, use of violence, etc.) though the three main areas noted in the question should form the main areas for treatment. [0 to 7 marks] for inadequate generalized responses. [8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive accounts with implicit analysis. [11 to 13 marks] for adequate knowledge and more explicit analysis. [14 to 16 marks] for sound knowledge, clear and explicit analysis of the importance of the three areas. Not all areas dealt with in a balanced manner. [17+ marks] for detailed knowledge and a balanced and focused treatment of the areas indicated. Other factors are also noted. The answer reveals evidence of insight and/or historiographical detail. N.B. If only one of the main areas is addressed mark out of a maximum of [7 marks]. If only two of the areas are addressed mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

12. Analyse the methods used to eliminate opposition by two single-party rulers, each chosen from a different region.

The question focus is on “single-party rulers”, that is to say rulers in power; it is not based on a ruler’s rise to power. Therefore, for example, Stalin’s succession dispute with Trotsky is not really relevant. Popular choices are likely to be Hitler, Stalin (but see note above), Mao and Castro. Whichever rulers are chosen, candidates should be able to specify a variety of types of opposition and then identify and make critical comment on the differing methods whereby the ruler eliminated/neutralized the threat from such institutions/groups/individuals. Elimination can be taken to mean not just the physical liquidation of opposition (real or imagined) but also the removal of the grounds for opposition to the ruler due, for example, to popular policies being implemented. Methods may include: the use of force/purges; repression by the secret police with arbitrary arrests/random punishment creating an atomized society; use of censorship; control over education/youth; propaganda; adoption of policies/programmes in domestic and foreign policy which may appeal to much of the population; exiling of opponents; re-education programmes; accommodation of vested interest groups (church/army), etc. There is much to choose from but answers dwelling on the use of force alone are unlikely to result in awards in the higher bands. [0 to 7 marks] for inadequate responses. [8 to 10 marks] for narrative/descriptive responses with implicit analysis. [11 to 13 marks] for adequate knowledge and explicit analysis. [14 to 16 marks] for balanced, focused responses with explicit analysis. Not all implications addressed. [17+ marks] for detailed accurate knowledge and focused analytical treatment. Answers reveal insight and/or good historiographical knowledge. N.B. If only one ruler is addressed, or one region, mark out of maximum of [12 marks].

13. Compare and contrast the treatment of either women, or religious groups, in two single-party states, each chosen from a different region.

The attitude towards, and treatment of, women in the single-party states forms the basis for comparison/contrast. Did the single-party state improve the opportunities for women or not? How/why is this the case? Depending on the states selected areas for consideration could be: the state’s policies in relation to the social and political status of women, the role of women in the economy, education, involvement in political leadership. Were women subject to discriminatory treatment in relation to civic/legal rights – e.g. marriage, divorce, inheritance – or did the state attempt to restore/establish some form of equal gender treatment, even if only on paper? Alternatively, if the candidate chooses religious groups, the answer should specifically identify the religious groups – whether Churches and/or religious minorities in the single-party state – and examine the ways in which their position was affected. The treatment of, and relationship of the regime to, established religions like Catholicism, Orthodox Christianity, Christian missionaries, Judaism, Buddhism, or Jehovah’s Witnesses could be examined. Did the regime repress, collaborate with, or co-opt these groups? How and why was this done? The answer does require specific detail to allow for successful comment and subsequent comparison/contrast. [0 to 7 marks] for weakly supported / generalized coverage. [8 to 10 marks] for sequential or end-on narratives with implicit reference to treatment. [11 to 13 marks] for explicit comparison of treatment of women or religious groups in two states. May be unbalanced. [14 to 16 marks] for balanced, structured comparisons with sound supporting material. [17+ marks] for full comparison based on detailed specific knowledge. N.B. If only one single party state is addressed, or one region, the maximum award is [7 marks].

14. Assess the global impact of one left-wing and one right-wing leader of a single-party state.

Popular choices here could be Mussolini, Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Mao, Castro, or Ho Chi Minh. No doubt choosing Hitler will result, in some cases, in the provision of narrative/descriptive accounts of the origins of the Second World War. Hopefully some candidates will deal more thematically with the task but probably a sequential/end-on treatment will prove more popular. The impact of ideology and its appeal outside the borders of the state could be considered. Attempts to imitate a leadership style (both left and right) could be seen in the growth of Soviet style putsches in post-First World War Germany and Hungary. Similarly the impact of / attempt to imitate socialist developments in the Americas could be linked to Cuban/Soviet influence post-1945. For right-wing leaders reference could be made to the growth of fascist movements in the inter-war years in Spain, Austria, etc. Attempts to forcefully export ideology by the leaders could also be examined – the consequences being

either global conflict, as in the Second World War, or regional/limited wars, as in Abyssinia. An area for investigation could be the expansion of the leader and the regime's political and economic influence, e.g. the post-1945 expansion of the Soviet Union in Europe and Asia, and attempted expansion in the Americas. The content/impact obviously depends on the regime selected [0 to 7 marks] for generalized responses lacking sufficient specific details. [8 to 10 marks] for narratives with implicit assessment. [11 to 13 marks] for explicit assessment and adequate knowledge of the global impact. [14 to 16 marks] for balanced, analytical answers focused on the regional/global impact of two regimes. [17+ marks] for detailed knowledge, balanced treatment and depth of assessment. N.B. If only one regime is addressed mark out of [12 marks].

15. "Charismatic appeal rather than successful domestic policies enabled single-party leaders to maintain power." With reference to one of the following, to what extent do you agree with this statement: Castro, Nasser, Perón?

A useful starting point could be a definition/explanation of what is understood by the term "charismatic appeal". What characteristics are associated with such a leadership style? What, if any, were the reasons for the magnetism of the leader and what qualities enabled him to impress followers? To cope effectively with the demands of the question the candidate should identify and evaluate the importance of domestic policies implemented by the leader. These could include policies of economic/agrarian reform, social policies favouring specific groups in the population, policies/ methods of control (for example propaganda/education/indoctrination, etc.) "To what extent" also offers the possibility of identifying other factors, which might have helped in the maintenance of power, e.g. an energetic foreign policy, aid from foreign supporters. [0 to 7 marks] for inadequate/generalized responses. [8 to 10 marks] for descriptive accounts with implicit judgment. [11 to 13 marks] for more explicit judgment and adequate detail. [14 to 16 marks] for balanced, focused responses with explicit judgment and sound detail. [17+ marks] for detailed knowledge, balanced analysis/judgment and possibly awareness of other factors and/or different interpretations

MAY 2009

"The aims and policies of single-party state rulers rarely followed their declared ideology." To what extent do you agree with this assertion?

The number of rulers to examine is not stated, but as the plural is used, more than one would be expected. A thematic approach would probably be preferable. Points for consideration could be: a discussion on "declared ideology"; what was the ideology of the ruler being discussed? Did he believe in it, or was he using it to obtain support; did ideologies have specific aims and policies associated with them; was it easier to follow one ideology more closely than another; were there differences between left and right wing ideologies? Consideration of policies adopted for reasons of pragmatism, or expediency is relevant here.

N.B. If only one single-party state ruler is addressed, mark out of a maximum of **[12 marks]**

Evaluate the domestic policies of *either* Hitler or Nasser.

All aspects – political, social, economic, religious and cultural could be addressed. Candidates could also consider, in whose interests were the policies designed: to benefit the state, or keep the leader in power? They could also judge successes and failures, and for whom? Much should be known about both rulers; but do not expect that all issues will be covered.

Hitler became Chancellor of Germany in 1933 and committed suicide in 1945. War time domestic issues would of course be relevant, but a high mark could be obtained without reference to them. Nasser was prime minister of Egypt from 1954 to 1956 and president from 1956 to 1970.

For what reasons, and with what success, did rulers of single-party states use foreign policy to maintain their power? At least *two* rulers should be considered.

The demands of the question require candidates to consider why rulers used foreign policy to maintain their power and position at home, and how successful they were. For reasons, the following points could be considered: to divert attention away from problems at home; to win prestige and glory, and thus enhance the ruler's reputation at home; lack of foreign involvement could also be considered as a means of concentrating all resources and energy on domestic policies and improvements, and thus maintaining power without an active foreign policy. Alliances/treaties could be considered as methods to ensure the security of the single-party states and rulers.

The degree of success attained will depend on the rulers chosen. Often rulers, e.g. Hitler and Mussolini used foreign policy successfully, at least partially so, then perished as a result of it. At least two rulers are required, but rather than taking just two examples, a thematic approach using several rulers to illustrate points made could prove a successful approach.

Note that different regions are not required, so Hitler and Mussolini or even Lenin and Stalin could be used together. Castro would be a suitable choice. If only one ruler is considered mark out of **[12 marks]**.

15. In what ways did *two* rulers of single-party states, each chosen from a different region, (a) use, and (b) misuse, the arts and education?

The clearest way to answer this question is to select two rulers, from different regions, then answer (a) for both, then (b) for both. Probably Hitler and Mao will be a popular combination.

(a) The arts could be used to protect and preserve national culture, and obtain internal and external prestige. Education was important for the economy, trade, industry etc., and generally an educated population was the aim of most rulers.

(b) The arts were misused as propaganda: racial; political and nationalist. Often they were censored, and artists were persecuted if they did not follow official views. Education was misused when it became a tool for inculcating propaganda to enhance the ruler's personality cult/aims and policies. The distortion of facts was frequent.

Actual details will depend on rulers chosen, but specific evidence, is essential for good marks.

N.B. if only one ruler is addressed mark out of **[12 marks]**.

11. "Unpopular rulers or governments, and their overthrow, were responsible for the formation of the majority of twentieth century single-party states." To what extent do you agree with this assertion?

Candidates need to understand and address the four demands of this question: unpopular rulers/governments; the nature of their overthrow; "to what extent" other factors led to single party states; and to give their verdict/conclusion on the quotation.

The question gives rulers in the plural, so candidates who only give one example will not score well. The question should probably be answered thematically. Candidates should have no problem with finding examples upon which to base their evidence. No doubt Castro, Hitler, Lenin and Mao will be used. Stalin, however, is not a valid choice.

12. Evaluate the methods used by *either* Lenin between 1918 and 1924 or Mussolini between 1922 and 1939 to consolidate his rule.

The question requires candidates to evaluate policies of Lenin or Mussolini that were intended to consolidate their rule and keep them in power. Domestic and foreign policies would be relevant for both these rulers, and they should be well known. There must be some depth of detail and evaluation or analysis for the top bands.

15. For what reasons, and with what results, did rulers of single-party states both support and censor the arts?

Evidence, ideally, is needed from more than one state, and that a thematic approach is more likely to score well, but no particular number of states is asked for. An in-depth analysis of one state might be worth more than a simplistic general survey of many states.

For reasons for supporting the arts (all art forms would be valid), candidates could mention: propaganda; for prestige; to win support and praise from the public at home; to foster nationalism and develop national culture; to deflect criticism from unpopular measures.

Reasons for censoring the arts could include: to stop personal criticism, or criticism of the government/state (for example in plays, films and cartoons); to eliminate “foreign” and unwelcome art forms and styles; to punish artists who did not support the regime and stop the public supporting them.

Results of both support and censorship were similar: a distinct and recognisable style of art; poverty for those artists that did not comply, and wealth and favour for those who did; stifling of originality; widespread use of the arts for propaganda and support for the ruler and the regime; lack of variety and foreign influence in the arts.

Specific details must be used, and to reach the top bands answers should include evidence from more than one single-party state.

NOVEMBER 2009

11. Assess the importance of economic distress and ideological appeal in the rise to power of *one* left-wing and *one* right-wing single-party ruler.

Popular examples are likely to be Lenin, Stalin, Mao and Castro as left-wing rulers, and Mussolini, Hitler and Franco as right-wing rulers. Perón is also acceptable as a right-wing leader. Approaches are likely to be either end-on sequential treatments of the two leaders or they will deal thematically with economic distress and ideological appeal. The latter approach might provide better structured responses.

The conditions for each area should be well known and historical knowledge/evidence is essential to convincingly substantiate the response.

Economic distress is often the twin of political unrest/extremism and the link between these two needs to be established in terms of examination of the material circumstances of the population. Economic crisis encouraged support for radical alternatives to an existing system which proved unable to meet the challenges of any such economic crisis – or may indeed be responsible for causing such a crisis.

The main characteristics or elements of the ideology need to be identified before a convincing assessment of its appeal can be undertaken.

N.B. If only one ruler is referred to, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

13. Examine *either* the role of education *or* the treatment of minorities and religious groups in *two* single-party states

Single-party regimes attempted to control education for a variety of purposes. Indoctrination of youth for example occurred within the formal school systems established under the control of the state and also in the various youth movements established outside of the primary/secondary/tertiary educational institutions. Whether the aim was to promote the ideology and belief system of the particular movement or to promote the cult of the individual (personality), candidates need to provide sufficient historical detail to substantiate the answer.

Not all efforts at controlling education were meant exclusively for political purposes however, and not all efforts were necessarily focused on youth. Literacy programmes and the development of training in science and technology *etc.* were implemented to aid in the growth of economic development.

The treatment of minorities and religious groups could include the ways in which such minorities (ethnic, socio-economic – *e.g.* Kulaks in the Soviet Union, cultural – *e.g.* Catalans, Basques in Spain) were targeted (and why) and dealt with under the regime.

Religious groups were often perceived as barriers to the single-party's aim of full totalitarian control and accordingly were discriminated against – or ferociously persecuted. No doubt the issue of Anti-Semitism will prove popular in the case of those dealing with Hitler's Germany, but there were others worthy of consideration (Catholics, Lutherans/Evangelicals, Jehovah's Witnesses *etc.*)

N.B. If only one state is dealt with, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

14. “Successful domestic policies kept single-party regimes in power.” With reference to *two* single-party states, each chosen from a different region, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates should identify the areas of domestic policy to be investigated and comment critically on the extent to which such policies or programmes endeared the regime to the general populace – and why/why not.

Relevant areas could include: policies relating to agrarian reform; industrial development; reduction of unemployment; provision of education and welfare programmes; housing; medical provisions, *etc.*

Whether such programmes were indeed successful and constituted a sufficient basis for the maintenance of the regime in power could be questioned, and the role of propaganda, the use of terror/violence and the appeal of a dynamic foreign policy might be considered.

N.B. If only one state or one region is dealt with, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

15. Analyse the nature and extent of internal opposition *and* the methods used to deal with this opposition by *one* of the following single-party rulers: Lenin; Hitler; Mao.

Answers should focus on the period “in power”. This can be taken to mean the period of consolidation following the seizure of power by the ruler (or his appointment by semi-legal means) and the subsequent period of single-party rule until the demise of the chosen leader.

For “nature and extent”, candidates could identify the types of opposition which the ruler faced: religious; political; military; perceived challenges from groups or individuals within the leader's own party, and how widespread or significant this opposition was (*i.e.* “extent”) in terms of numbers or impact.

The “methods” used to counter opposition obviously vary according to the leader but themes/areas for investigation could include: war (*e.g.* Russian Civil War); use of the secret police/agents provocateurs; propaganda; purge; mobilisation of youth (*e.g.* China's Cultural Revolution); the distraction of a population by targeting scapegoats or introducing programmes of reform to win over popular support *etc.*

13. Analyse the conditions that enabled *one* left-wing leader to become the ruler of a single-party state.

Candidates should analyse the conditions of the state before the left-wing aspirant succeeded in obtaining power, and how these conditions strengthened the appeal of the left-wing party. For conditions of the state, the following could be considered: an unpopular regime, with social and economic problems; an autocratic, corrupt or incompetent ruler or government in power and its weaknesses; an unpopular war. The ability of the aspiring leader to take advantage of these conditions could be examined in terms of analyzing the appeal of the ideology and/or pragmatism of the leader.

14. Discuss (a) the ideology, and (b) the support, of *one* right-wing ruler of a single-party state.

This should also be a popular question, using a ruler such as Hitler, Mussolini or Franco. Candidates will probably focus more exactly on the set question if they address (a) and (b) separately, but do not penalize those who answer them together.

For ideology, candidates need to explain the ideology of their chosen ruler, and analyse its importance, help *etc.* in **maintaining** power.

For support, candidates could refer to the degree to which popular or sectional support (military, religious, economic) was gained as a result of policies or programs instituted by the regime. Opposition movements *i.e.* indicating lack of support for the single-party state are also legitimate areas for comment

17. Examine the role of education in *one* single-party or authoritarian state.

Candidates will probably choose one of the following states for their answer to this question: Nazi Germany; USSR under Stalin; or China during Mao's regime, but any other single-party state would be valid.

Rulers of single-party states used education for a variety of purposes and in a variety of ways. Education was used to indoctrinate children to believe in and support the ruler, whose ideology was emphasized. Teachers had to belong to the ruling party, and teach according to the ideology. Text books were often changed in order to ensure support for the leader. His cult of personality was fostered.

Often candidates confuse propaganda with education. There were elements of propaganda in education, but education must be assessed (rather than sweeping unsubstantiated generalizations about propaganda being expressed) for a satisfactory answer.

Education was used to improve the economy and standing of some single-party states. This could involve an increase in literacy and teaching more maths, science and technology, thus enabling leaders to point out the benefits they had introduced.

18. In what ways, and to what extent, was propaganda important in the rise and rule of Hitler?

Hitler used propaganda in his rise to power and in maintaining his position. He was helped by his Minister of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda, Goebbels, who master-minded most of the campaigns, especially during the war years when propaganda increased considerably in order to hide the truth and keep the support of those at home. Propaganda took the form of manipulating the media, for example the press, radio and film industry. Posters were displayed and rallies stage-managed. Goebbels was a successful orator, and he as well as Hitler preached the Nazi ideology, which included stressing Nazi beliefs and policies, demonizing opponents and, after 1939, promoting the war and hiding defeats.

Candidates should also express their views on the importance of propaganda in relation to other factors. It is clear that votes for Hitler increased when propaganda was targeted to certain areas, but fear and the use of terror, for example, also played a part in Hitler's rise and rule.

N.B. Since the questions asks "*to what extent*", there needs to be consideration of factors other than propaganda in order to reach the higher mark bands.

13. Analyse the circumstances that helped *one* right-wing leader to become the ruler of a single-party state.

This will probably be a very popular question, as candidates are usually knowledgeable about the rise of single-party state rulers.

Some circumstances that could be included are: a weak unpopular government in power; lack of law and order during or after a war; the emergence of alternatives to the existing government; poverty and a weak economy; the political ambitions of powerful supporters; fears of civil war or revolution.

Expect arguments to be well-supported by specific evidence.

14. Discuss (a) the support for, and (b) the ideology of, *one* left-wing ruler of a single-party state.

The use of the word “ruler” means that the leader is already in power. Material on the leader’s rise to power would not be relevant except perhaps in a brief introduction, or noting that those who supported the rise had continued to support him while in power.

For (a) support, candidates could consider some of the following: political supporters; racial, ethnic or religious support; what the leader offered in exchange for support; the use of propaganda in winning and maintaining support; support of the armed forces; appeal to a certain class; foreign support.

For (b) ideology, candidates need to name and define the ideology (for example, Communism, Socialism, Marxism) and assess to what extent the ideology was followed and used or adapted to suit the needs or wishes of the ruler in order to keep him in power.

If only (a) or (b) is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [14 marks]. Do not demand that the two are equally discussed, but there should be some balance, so reserve [6 marks] for the weaker section.

15. Examine the role of the media in *one* single-party or authoritarian state.

The main areas for candidates to examine are the press, radio and television, and film as they were the chief means of mass communication in the twentieth century. Some others might be relevant, such as posters. Candidates should show how the media was used as propaganda for obtaining and maintaining support for the authoritarian leader. Censorship may also be addressed. Sometimes candidates equate the media with propaganda but whereas the media was a tool of propaganda, it is not synonymous with propaganda. The media was also used as a means of indoctrination. Specific examples and details of media use and its effects on the population should be included. Unsupported generalizations will not score well.

17. In 1924 Hitler wrote: “The masses of the population are more affected by rhetoric than by any other force. All great movements are popular movements”. To what extent do you agree with this assertion?

There are various ways to address this question; although many candidates will understand it to require an analysis of Hitler’s methods to win the mass of the German population to his cause. They could explain and analyse the following: the strength of the Nazis’ populist policies; the mass rallies stage-managed by Goebbels; the use of radio messages; the numerous posters and the enthusiasm they engendered. Candidates may also argue that Hitler’s regime was based more on terror and force than on rhetoric, even though Hitler was a persuasive orator.

The question may also be addressed with reference to other political movements and may argue that they were successful because of force carefully planned military campaigns or political coups. An analysis of how rhetoric was used effectively may be included but other factors may be considered to agree or disagree with the quotation.