



A-level HISTORY 7042/1L

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

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 1 L / M S

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.

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 © 2023 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 political developments in Germany in the years 1966 to 1989.

[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 governments in Germany in these years were centrist in nature, and that there was little difference between the main parties
- the Grand Coalition of 1966–69, set the tone for the next two decades by pursuing successful centrist economic policies
- Schmidt was popular with conservative voters (despite being the SPD leader) as he was regarded as a safe pair of hands to deal with the economic problems of the 1970s
- Kohl pursued the same policies as Schmidt after 1982, focusing on economic growth, constructive relations with the GDR and law and order.

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

- the Stabilisation Law (1967) contributed significantly to the economic recovery under the Grand Coalition. In addition, investment in infrastructure projects, subsidies for agriculture, and tax increases were balanced against other public spending cuts, therefore achieving an effective combination between the economic priorities of both left and right
- Schmidt was very much on the right of the SPD and had little time for socialist ideology. He formed an effective partnership with the conservative-minded FDP leadership and pursued orthodox anti-inflationary economic policies, including public spending cuts and a VAT rise, to deal with the economic problems caused by the oil crises of the 1970s
- after 1982, Kohl continued subsidies for agriculture and industry as well as a relatively high level of welfare spending. Kohl also continued with Schmidt's firm stance against violent protest and the pursuit of constructive relations with the GDR, eg inviting Honecker to the west in 1987 and co-operating on scientific, environmental, nuclear security matters
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that there were greater differences of opinion between the left- and right-wing parties than the extract suggests. Brandt increased social welfare spending far higher than the CDU/CSU approved of and this was a recurring criticism of the SPD from the right – both from the FDP and CDU/CSU – through the 1970s and 1980s
- furthermore, in 1982, Kohl spoke of the need for a 'moral change' and set out to give the impression that his new government was embarking on a different direction of travel compared to Schmidt's administrations. He restricted public spending, cut taxes and spoke of a return to Erhard's free market principles.

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

- the main argument of Extract B is that there were clear divisions between left-wing and right-wing opinion within politics throughout this period
- Brandt's 'Ostpolitik' was popular during the Grand Coalition and gave him the opportunity to break from Kiesinger and form his own coalition with the FDP in 1969
- Conservatives consistently opposed the Ostpolitik and public spending policies of the socialist chancellors of the 1970s
- tension over economic policy resulted in the downfall of Schmidt's coalition government in 1982 and the new chancellor, Kohl, signalled a 'change of course' for his new government.

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

- the Grand Coalition suffered from internal tensions. SPD members complained that the CDU/CSU were holding back welfare reforms and that they were reluctant to pursue a policy of détente with the GDR. The 1969 election saw a return to partisan campaigning
- Brandt's 'Ostpolitik' and social welfare policies caused difficulties within the FDP-SPD coalition with some deputies defecting to the CDU/CSU who consistently opposed his policies in the early 1970s. As a result, Brandt only narrowly survived a no-confidence vote in 1972
- the conservative-minded FDP became increasingly reluctant to support Schmidt in the late 1970s and early 1980s, principally over economic policy. They found more in common with Kohl's CDU/CSU and formed a new coalition government with them in 1982
- Kohl spoke regularly in 1982 and 1983 of the need for a 'moral change' within German politics and portrayed his new coalition as representing a renaissance of the more free-market policies previously implemented by Erhard during the 'economic miracle' of the 1950s
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that, for all of the rhetoric around a 'change of course' in 1982, in practice government policy continued in a very similar vein. By the 1980s, the CDU/CSU had come to recognise the benefits of 'Ostpolitik' and relatively high welfare spending was an unchallengeable feature of the German economy.

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

- the main argument of Extract C is that this was a period of polarisation between the established centrist political parties and radical, left-wing opposition
- the New Left of the 1960s was a movement of the younger generation questioning the values and record of their parents' generation
- the most extreme left-wing groups committed acts of terrorism, but the government's response was criticised by some on the New Left as being too heavy-handed and authoritarian
- issues of environmentalism and nuclear power/weapons caused more opposition from the left in the 1970s and 1980s, increasingly dominating the political agenda.

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

- in response to the creation of the Grand Coalition, there was a significant increase in student protest, especially the creation of the APO in 1968. This radical opposition was inspired by concerns about the lack of opposition in parliament, the 1968 emergency laws, and the trials of Eichmann and Auschwitz guards which had raised debate about the Nazi past
- the government took firm action to deal with the terrorist threat of the Red Army Faction in the 1970s, arresting and imprisoning many of the leading members and refusing to recognise them as political prisoners. Some on the radical left criticised the government for being too authoritarian

- in the 1970s, a wide range of pressure groups were formed to campaign on issues concerning the environment and nuclear power. Several of these groups came together to form the Green Party in 1980. The party was able to communicate its views both within and outside parliament, eg protests against nuclear weapons in West Germany in the 1980s
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that whilst gaining a lot of media attention, the actions of the 'New Left' could not really be described as a polarisation of West German politics in this period as the vast majority of voters remained committed to the established, centrist parties. Therefore, this was more a period of consensus than polarisation
- furthermore, the argument that the issues promoted by the Greens and the New Left in the 1980s dominated the political agenda could be challenged. It could be argued that the political agenda was more focused on relations with the GDR and economic matters in this period.

Section B

0 2 'In the years 1871 to 1890, Germany became more socially and economically divided.'

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 1871 to 1890, Germany became more socially and economically divided might include:

- it could be argued that the urbanisation and industrialisation of this period created greater class divisions between the proletariat and the capitalist classes and ruling elite. The rise of the SPD, and the harsh government response, was a political expression of this intensifying class division
- urbanisation and industrialisation also led to the emergence of a much larger and more assertive middle class, however the traditional, land-owning ruling elite were very reluctant to accept the enriched upper middle class as social equals, increasing tension
- Bismarck's Kulturkampf stoked divisions between the Protestant majority and Catholic minority. The rise of the Centre Party was a political representation of the desire of persecuted Catholics to stand up for their rights in a Protestant-dominated state
- as Germany industrialised, the dichotomy between life in urban and rural areas became wider. For example, life on the large estates of East Elbian Junkers became increasingly out-dated in comparison to the fast-growing cities
- the introduction of protective tariffs in 1878/79 aimed to protect the interests of the land-owning elites and rich industrialists. The higher cost of living resulting from these tariffs harmed the working classes causing greater social tension and division.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1871 to 1890, Germany became more socially and economically divided might include:

- from 1871, in conjunction with the National Liberals, Bismarck pursued a number of policies of further unification, which brought the disparate states of the new empire closer together, eg the abolition of internal tariffs, a national postal service, a single court system
- the development of the railway network increased links between cities and states within the new empire. It also increased social and economic links, especially trade and migration, between rural and urban areas
- the expanding size, wealth and influence of the upper middle classes was beginning to break down social barriers at the top of society. Rich industrialists were starting to have more links with the imperial government and court, and sons of the upper middle classes were beginning to enter the officer corps of the military
- increasing welfare provision in the 1880s demonstrated that the richer, ruling classes were aware of and felt sympathy for the tough lives of the proletariat
- it could be argued that German society was already divided in 1871 and was no more divided by 1890. The rural-urban divide, class divisions and the separate identities of the states making up the new empire all existed in 1871 and little had changed by 1890.

Overall, students may conclude that this was a period of increasing class division as industrialisation brought about greater tension between the proletariat, middle class and the traditional ruling elite. Social tensions were further inflamed by some of Bismarck's policies. Alternatively, it could be concluded that economic change brought with it greater social interaction between different classes, which actually reduced divisions to an extent. For example, there was greater interchange between rural and urban areas, through trade and migration; increasing social interaction between the traditional aristocracy and the upper middle classes; and the conservative, aristocratic state even began implementing social welfare legislation to ameliorate conditions for the proletariat.

- 0 3** To what extent did opposition in the Reichstag influence Kaiser Wilhelm II's government, in the years 1890 to 1914?

[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 opposition in the Reichstag influenced Kaiser Wilhelm II's government in the years 1890 to 1914 might include:

- Caprivi was forced to negotiate with the parties in the Reichstag in order to increase the size of the army, eg he reduced military service to two years. Furthermore, Conservative opposition to his 'New Course' and the increase in seats won by the SPD in 1893, contributed to his resignation as chancellor in 1894
- opposition to Hohenlohe's anti-subversion bill (1894) and anti-union bill (1899) forced these proposals to be abandoned. Instead, the government resorted to the nationalistic 'Sammlungspolitik' and 'Weltpolitik' in order to minimise liberal and socialist opposition
- increasing support for the SPD and progressive liberals, influenced several policies after 1900, eg an extension to accident and health insurance, the introduction of the secret ballot and payment for Reichstag deputies
- Bülow was forced to resign in 1909 following the defeat of his finance bill, which had aimed to plug the budget deficit and fund military expansion, and the fall-out from the Daily Telegraph interview. Opposition came from all of the major parties in the Reichstag
- following the 1912 election, there was a left of centre majority in the Reichstag comprising of the SPD and progressive liberals. It was now very difficult for the government to gain approval for its policies in the Reichstag, which could be one reason why a war, to unite the country behind patriotic feeling, was an increasingly attractive option by 1914.

Arguments challenging the view that opposition in the Reichstag influenced Kaiser Wilhelm II's government in the years 1890 to 1914 might include:

- from 1897 in particular, the Kaiser and his leading officials prioritised an expansion of the armed forces and an imperialistic foreign policy. They were largely able to achieve these goals despite significant opposition in the Reichstag from the SPD and left liberals
- Bülow proved to be quite adept at managing the parties in the Reichstag to support government policy, eg the 'Blue-Black Bloc' in favour of renewed tariffs on agriculture after 1902, and then the 'Bülow Bloc' after the 1907 election, which he manipulated by inflaming patriotic sentiment
- in 1913, the Reichstag passed a vote of no confidence in the chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, however the Kaiser and Chancellor simply ignored this and sought to bypass the Reichstag as much as possible
- following the Zabern Affair in 1913, the Reichstag condemned the conduct of the army and the Kaiser's support for their actions in Alsace. However, the Kaiser again was able to ignore the storm of protest and continued to give the Army his full backing
- in 1914, even the SPD voted in favour of the funding necessary for the conduct of the war effort and all parties signed up to the political truce of the 'Burgfriede'.

Overall, students may argue that the constitution of imperial Germany necessitated that the Kaiser's government negotiated with the parties in the Reichstag, all of whom at some point opposed policies brought before them. Therefore, opposition within the Reichstag was significant and the policies enacted by the government were formulated, to some degree, in response or as a solution to this opposition. However, alternatively, it could be argued that the priority of the Kaiser's government was always the expansion of Germany's military and imperial power and that this was achieved by 1914 in spite of opposition in the Reichstag.

- 0 4** 'The growth of extremist right-wing movements, in the years 1919 to 1939, was due to the impact of the First World War on Germany.'

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 the growth of extremist right-wing movements, in the years 1919 to 1939, was due to the impact of the First World War on Germany might include:

- the ‘stab-in-the-back’ myth was promoted by those on the extreme right to deflect blame for Germany’s defeat away from the Army and onto socialist and Jewish politicians. This myth was constantly reinforced by Hitler and the Nazis through the 1920s and 1930s
- the Treaty of Versailles was deeply unpopular in Germany and the extreme right-wing gained strength from this resentment, eg support for the Kapp Putsch or the assassinations of Erzberger and Rathenau by Organisation Consul
- resentment of reparations payments strengthened extreme right-wing opposition, eg the campaign against the Young Plan. Reparations also contributed to the hyper-inflation of 1923, which undermined support for the democratic government and turned many towards the extreme right-wing in the long-term
- Hitler referenced resentment towards the Treaty of Versailles repeatedly in his public declarations, such as the 25 Point Plan, Mein Kampf and his speeches, which contributed significantly towards his increasing popularity
- Hitler’s actions against the treaty, once in power, further strengthened his popularity. Rearmament and the remilitarisation of the Rhineland – actions in direct contravention of the treaty – were seen by many Germans as restoring strength and pride after the humiliation of 1919.

Arguments challenging the view that the growth of extremist right-wing movements, in the years 1919 to 1939, was due to the impact of the First World War on Germany might include:

- fear of communism could explain the strengthening of extremist right-wing movements more than the impact of the war. The rise of the KPD in Germany sparked fear in many Germans. Initially, this was manifested through the Freikorps, and later through the rise of the Nazis, who were regarded by many as the only party who could stand up to communism
- support for Weimar democracy appeared strong in the mid-1920s. Therefore, it could be argued that the extreme right-wing was relatively weak until the impact of the Wall Street Crash in 1929. The Nazis skilfully exploited the desperation of millions of unemployed Germans to win a far greater vote share in 1930 and then again in 1932
- the apparent economic success of the Nazis’ policies after 1933 convinced many Germans that Hitler had the right ideas for restoring prosperity to Germany, thereby strengthening support for his brand of extremist ideology
- the roles of terror, censorship and propaganda in the Nazi dictatorship could also be used to explain the strengthening influence of extremist right-wing ideology. Opposing views were silenced and conformity to the regime’s ideology was enforced.

Overall, students may conclude that the First World War was the key influence in the growth of extremist right-wing movements in this period as the injustice of Versailles, in particular, was constantly referenced by extreme right-wing leaders as a central motivation for their actions and to mobilise their supporters. Alternatively, students may argue that the growth of extremist right-wing movements after 1919 may be due to a number of coinciding factors such as the rise of communism, the creation of a democracy and, later, an economic depression after 1929, among which the impact of the war was just one other factor.