



A-level HISTORY 7042/1L

Component 1L The quest for political stability: Germany, 1871–1991

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity, you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the development of the German economy in the years 1919 to 1939.

[30 marks]*Target: AO3*

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**
- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- the main argument of Extract A is that there was significant continuity in the nature of the German economy in this period, which was predominantly a free-market capitalist system
- from 1919, German industrialists effectively worked towards gaining greater influence over an economic system which promoted their interests in relation to the state and the unions
- Hitler did a deal with the leading industrialists, offering them a programme of tax cuts, production stimulus and destruction of the trade unions
- there was no significant change to the free-market capitalist system under the Nazis.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- German industrialists embarked on a process of cartelisation after 1919 in order to maintain prices, reduce harmful competition and rationalise production. After 1924, the Stinnes–Legien agreement began to breakdown and the industrialists adopted a more confrontational policy with the unions, eg using lockouts
- Hitler was able to attract funding and support from leading industrialists, such as Thyssen and Hugenberg, after 1929 as they perceived him to have the potential to smash the unions and bring about an industrial recovery based on rearmament
- from 1933, Hitler abandoned the more socialist aspects of Nazi ideology and eliminated the trade unions. By 1939, workers' hours were longer but wages no higher. German industrialists had benefited significantly from the Nazis' economic policies
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that the strength of influence of German industrialists in the Weimar years is somewhat exaggerated. Weimar governments significantly expanded the welfare state, recognised trade unions and introduced compulsory industrial arbitration tribunals
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that the Nazis moved away from free-market capitalism as their grip on power and the economy strengthened. The Four Year Plan extended political control and interference in the economy, which was often resented by German industrialists.

In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:

- the main argument of Extract B is that the tendency in German economic policy throughout this period was moving away from a capitalist model
- how Germany's long-term economic future could be secured was made more severe by the loss of W.W.1 and impact of the Depression
- suggested solutions to Germany's economic problems in the 1920s were often anti-capitalist
- Nazi economic policy was a threat to liberal capitalism
- under the Nazis, there was a growth in state expenditure and a desire to control the economy to avoid future crises.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- there were many political parties in the 1920s who advocated anti-capitalist economic policies to overcome Germany's problems. These were both left-wing (communist) and right-wing (NSDAP and others). Support for these parties increased in times of economic difficulties
- Nazi economic policy can be portrayed as anti-capitalist in the sense that the Nazis always aimed for significant state control of economic activity in order to pursue their grandiose schemes of conquest and expansion of the 'master race'. Anti-capitalism was often associated in Nazi propaganda with anti-Semitism
- the Nazis created jobs and economic growth in the 1930s through state funding and direction of economic activity, eg through public works schemes, rearmament and the Four Year Plan. These policies are not in essence the operation of a free-market capitalist economy
- in opposition to the interpretation, it could be argued that the economic policy of Weimar governments was essentially capitalist in that it allowed significant freedom of action to German industrialists and businesses, in addition to securing significant funding from US loans
- in opposition to the interpretation, it could be argued that Hitler relied on the traditional capitalist, industrial elite to deliver his rearmament programme. Hitler's destruction of the trade unions was welcomed by the capitalist industrialists who also continued to benefit from state orders during the Four Year Plan.

In their identification of the argument in Extract C, students may refer to the following:

- the main argument of Extract C is that the economy of the Weimar Republic was structurally weak and ultimately failed, whereas Nazi policy was very successful in turning around the German economy
- demands for higher wages and the spiralling cost of the welfare state fatally undermined the Weimar economy, especially after 1929
- the Nazis successfully reduced unemployment, essentially eradicating it by 1938
- by 1939, the German economy was strong and self-sufficient.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- from 1919, the Weimar Republic set about creating an extensive welfare state which offered generous war pensions, unemployment relief and national insurance. In addition, workers were encouraged to campaign for higher pay through their unions and arbitration tribunals. By 1929, this had created costs which were difficult to manage for German industry and the state
- after 1929, the increasing cost of unemployment relief and the Depression caused the collapse of the Weimar Republic, which proved unable to resolve the problems. The Nazis came to power on the back of promises to create jobs and economic recovery
- Nazi economic policy did create jobs and reduce unemployment significantly. Deficit financing, public works schemes, conscription and rearmament, all served to reduce unemployment and enable German industry to recover from the Depression
- in opposition to the interpretation, it could be argued that the picture of the German economy before 1929 that is presented is rather too bleak. Stresemann's leadership had brought about a significant economic recovery after 1924, largely based on US loans. It was very bad luck for Germany that the Wall Street Crash caused this supply of investment to dry up rapidly after 1929
- in opposition to the interpretation, it could be argued that the impression given of the Nazi economy is rather too positive. Unemployment had certainly been reduced but statistics were manipulated, and the levels of rearmament had caused significant imbalances in the economy and some historians argue that the decision to go to war in 1939 was influenced by the need for the conquest of further sources of raw materials – hardly the self-sufficient economy that is portrayed in the extract.

Section B

0 2 'In the years 1878 to 1914, the chancellors of Germany responded effectively to the challenge of socialism.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1878 to 1914, the chancellors of Germany responded effectively to the challenge of socialism might include:

- Bismarck's anti-socialist legislation, from 1878 to 1890, disrupted the activities of socialist societies and trade unions, forcing many activists abroad
- Bismarck's hardline stance – portraying socialists as enemies of the state – influenced the SPD to become a more moderate, democratic party rather than a revolutionary threat
- Bismarck introduced a range of 'state socialist' welfare policies in the 1880s, demonstrating that the government could respond constructively to the demands of the socialists
- chancellors, after 1890, continued to introduce progressive welfare legislation in response to the demands of the socialists, eg Caprivi's 'New Course' (1890–94), and social security insurance and payment of Reichstag deputies under Bülow (1900–06), which further influenced the SPD to act in a moderate and democratic manner
- several chancellors used patriotic feeling as a tool to undermine the influence of the SPD. Bismarck in 1887 and Bülow in 1907, both fought elections on a patriotic theme in which the SPD lost seats. In 1914, the patriotic feeling surrounding the outbreak of war influenced the SPD to vote in favour of war credits to fund military spending.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1878 to 1914, the chancellors of Germany responded effectively to the challenge of socialism might include:

- during the period of the anti-socialist laws, 1878–90, support for the SPD continued to grow and the party won 35 seats in the 1890 election, up from 9 seats in 1878. The Reichstag voted against making the anti-socialist laws permanent in 1890, contributing to Bismarck's downfall
- further attempts to introduce anti-socialist legislation by Hohenlohe, in 1894 and 1899, were defeated in the Reichstag
- the increasing representation of the SPD in the Reichstag caused repeated difficulties for Bülow, between 1900 and 1909, in his attempts to increase taxation to fund the Kaiser's ambitious plans for military expansion
- between 1890 and 1912, the SPD increased its vote share and representation in the Reichstag significantly, becoming the largest party in the Reichstag in 1912. In 1913, Bethmann-Hollweg increasingly relied on imperial decree rather than having to deal with the opposition he faced in the Reichstag led by the SPD
- by 1914, membership of trade unions was over 3 million and strike action was increasingly frequent. The expanding number of socialist societies, festivals and rallies also attested to the growing influence of socialism within the working classes, much to the frustration of the ruling elites.

Overall, students may conclude that the growth in the vote share won by the SPD, and their rise to become the largest party in the Reichstag by 1912, could be considered clear evidence of failure on the part of the German chancellors, who consistently sought to limit and undermine their influence. Opposition towards government policy from the SPD, which was increasingly problematic from 1900, could further add to this impression of failure. However, alternatively, students may conclude that, given the industrialisation and urbanisation of Germany in this period, the growth of support for socialism and the SPD was inevitable in these years and that the chancellors were proactive in developing policies which effectively managed this emerging challenge to the existing social and political order. The creation and expansion of social welfare policies could be seen in this light, and these had success in encouraging the SPD to pursue democratic rather than revolutionary methods to achieve their aims.

0 3 'Very little was done to confront the legacy of Nazism in West Germany in the years 1945 to 1969.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that very little was done to confront the legacy of Nazism in West Germany in the years 1945 to 1969 might include:

- denazification in the western zones was limited in its extent between 1945 and 1949. Mass internment was rapidly abandoned and arbitration panels cleared the majority of those investigated for their Nazi past in the interest of maintaining political and economic stability
- a ‘collective amnesia’ pervaded West German society in the 1950s, as the majority preferred to forget about the horrors of the Nazi years, and most of those who had participated in the Nazi regime argued that they had been following orders or had simply joined the party to maintain their jobs
- a significant number of civil servants after 1949 had previously been Nazi party members, including many who had been dismissed in the original denazification process but who were subsequently reinstated. In addition, the educational establishment remained heavily influenced by those who had served during the Nazi period
- Adenauer made few public statements regarding the Nazi period, and his own chief aide – Hans Globke – was a former Nazi who had written the official commentary on the Nuremberg Laws. In addition, during Adenauer’s chancellorship, there was very limited activity investigating Nazi war crimes
- the chancellor from 1966 to 1969 – Kiesinger – was a former member of the Nazi Party, as was the President of the FRG – Heinrich Lübke.

Arguments challenging the view that very little was done to confront the legacy of Nazism in West Germany in the years 1945 to 1969 might include:

- in 1952, Adenauer negotiated reparations for the Jewish victims of the Nazis with the Israeli government, demonstrating an acceptance of German responsibility for the horrors of the Holocaust
- changes within the legal system demonstrate that action was being taken to confront the legacy of Nazism, for example, in 1958 the Central Office of Justice Departments was established to investigate Nazi war crimes, and in 1965 the statute of limitations for murder was extended to enable further prosecutions for crimes committed under the Nazi regime
- the Auschwitz Trials, from 1963 to 1965, were a clear attempt to publicly confront those who were responsible for some of the worst atrocities of the Nazi period
- the wave of student protest from 1966 to 1969 was in part inspired by a desire for West German society to face up to the Nazi past more openly and was a direct challenge to the ‘collective amnesia’ of past generations. This included the protests against the 1968 Emergency Laws, which were likened to Hitler’s Enabling Act by campaigners
- President Lübke was forced to resign in 1969 due to the outcry over his participation in the Nazi regime.

Overall, students may argue that West Germany is often depicted as suffering from a ‘collective amnesia’ about the horrors of the Nazi past in the years after 1945. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that the goal of political and economic stability was much more of a priority than an open and honest confrontation with the crimes of the recent past. It proved relatively easy for those who had been part of the Nazi system, at varying levels, to sweep uncomfortable truths about their past actions and beliefs under the carpet. However, once political and economic stability had been achieved by 1963, coupled with the ending of Adenauer’s time as chancellor, there was a gradual awakening and growing acceptance of the need to face up to the legacy of Nazism in the mid- to late-1960s. This was in part driven by the desire of a new, younger generation to question and interrogate the legacy of their parents’ generation. Therefore, by 1969, much more had been achieved than in the period 1945–63. However,

taking the period as a whole, it could justifiably be concluded that 'very little' had been done to confront the legacy of Nazism.

0 4 To what extent did West German society change in the years 1969 to 1991?

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that West German society changed in the years 1969 to 1991 might include:

- there was a significant growth in consumer affluence and spending. For example, the number of West German households owning a car, television and washing machine increased dramatically. Coupled with the growth of 'white-collar' jobs at the expense of 'blue-collar' ones, this led to more and more Germans regarding themselves as middle class
- increasingly, availability of contraception and abortion enabled millions more women to enter the workforce. Half of the workforce was female by 1989. Improved educational opportunities meant more women were able to access professional careers. Furthermore, easier access to divorce meant many women were able to extricate themselves from unhappy marriages
- Brandt's government, from 1969, introduced a range of social welfare reforms including a rise in pensions and benefits, an increase in educational opportunities, job creation schemes, factory legislation and social housing. The increased government spending on welfare was largely maintained over the next two decades, particularly benefiting those from less affluent sections of society
- there was a significant increase in attempts to confront the legacy of Nazism. Willy Brandt visited Warsaw and knelt before the memorial to the Warsaw Rising. Many books and television programmes were made regarding the Nazi past and schools began teaching the subject more widely, including organising many more visits to concentration camp sites
- growth in concerns about the environment developed from the 1970's
- the social impact of reunification by 1991 was significant. An initial wave of optimism and euphoria soon gave way to concerns over the social and economic consequences of reunification, such as resentment of increased taxation in the West to pay for reconstruction in the East. Reunification also led to signs of increased nationalism in the West.

Arguments challenging the view that West German society changed in the years 1969 to 1991 might include:

- West German women still tended to work in low-paid, low-status jobs. The vast majority of part-time jobs were done by women. Therefore, there were significant limitations to the social change experienced by women in relation to employment. Women were also still less likely than men to go to university or to work in managerial roles
- traditional class divisions remained significant within German society. Members of the traditional aristocratic elites continued to enjoy prominence in business, politics and education
- immigrant communities, especially the Gastarbeiter, continued to experience discrimination and were often the first to be laid off in times of economic difficulty. They did not benefit as much as others from the growing affluence of the period and largely remained a worse off, marginalised class
- the influence of far-right, neo-Nazi ideology continued within West German society. There were open reunions of former SS officers well into the 1980s. A neo-Nazi group planted a bomb at the Oktoberfest in Munich in 1980, and anti-Semitic attacks remained a problem
- the popularity of American culture, music and fashion, which had been growing in the 1960s continued through the years after 1969. Youth subcultures and protest groups, which had also emerged in the 1960s, remained a feature of West German society after 1969.

Overall, students may conclude that West German society unsurprisingly experienced significant modernisation in this period, in line with other western countries. Liberalisation of women's rights, education and culture were important features of social change through the period. However, there were

limits to the extent of this change. Traditional groups who had dominated West German society for decades retained prominence, and class divides persisted. In addition, there were limits to the emancipation of women and to the integration of immigrants. Any supported judgement is viable in relation to the extent and significance of change/continuity in this period.