



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

AS History 1041

HIS1J

Unit 1J

The Development of Germany, 1871–1925

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner 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 examiners 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 examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner 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, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Principal 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and 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 and colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b): AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2012

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1J: The Development of Germany, 1871–1925

Question 1

- 01** Explain why Bismarck maintained a political alliance with the National Liberals in the Reichstag between 1871 and 1878. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Bismarck depended on support from the Liberals after unification.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- since 1862, many (though not all) Liberals had identified closely with Bismarck as the man capable of bringing about the unification they desperately wanted. Thus it was easy for him to keep their support in the 1870s

- the Reichstag had limited but significant powers under the new constitution and there was not enough voting strength from Conservatives to give Bismarck a majority
- Bismarck was under pressure from powerful industrial and agricultural interests to bring in tariffs to protect German goods from foreign competition; but Bismarck was happy to support the Liberal policy of free trade, partly because he admired the economic policies of the Liberal, Rudolf Delbruck
- having an alliance with the National Liberals divided the Liberals and reduced the strength of their opposition against his other policies
- Bismarck wanted to attack Catholicism in Germany and to weaken the new Catholic Centre Party through his 'Kulturkampf', which was launched in 1873. This policy was supported by Prussian Junkers and also appealed to anticlerical Liberals
- Bismarck's alliance with the National Liberals ended in 1878 as they had become more demanding, e.g. for positions within the Cabinet, and he wanted to launch an anti-socialist campaign and protective tariffs both of which many Liberals were uneasy about.

To reach the higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that the alliance with the National Liberals was one of political convenience for Bismarck as it allowed him to consolidate the Empire and his own position of power within the Reichstag.

Question 1

- 02** How successful was Bismarck in dealing with the rise of the SPD in the years 1878 to 1890? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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.

In a 'How successful' question, students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest Bismarck was successful in controlling the Reichstag against others which do not.

Factors suggesting Bismarck was successful might include:

- his alliance with the Liberals avoided the danger of the SPD and the Liberals from forming a united front against him in the Reichstag. Hostility to socialism also appealed to Kaiser Wilhelm I and the right-wing elites, even though they did not really like or trust Bismarck
- the Anti-Socialist laws introduced in 1878 provided a comprehensive package of measures that helped to intimidate the leadership of the SPD, who avoided adopting extreme left-wing policies
- Bismarck's later policies of 'killing socialism with kindness' (the introduction of State Socialism from 1883) had a similar effect in slowing the rise of voter support for the SPD
- it can be argued (though it is difficult to prove) that voting support for the SPD was less than it would have been without Bismarck's policies
- Bismarck controlled the Reichstag effectively and limited opposition from all sources, not only the SPD. In the 1887 elections, Bismarck's Kartell, of German Conservatives, Free Conservatives and National Liberals, won 220 seats, allowing him to push through a new seven year military budget. By 1890, the SPD had only 35 seats in the Reichstag.

Factors suggesting Bismarck was not successful might include:

- from the time the various small socialist parties merged into one national party, the SPD, in 1875, Bismarck himself was always genuinely worried about the 'socialist threat'
- as industrialisation forged ahead in the 1870s and 1880s, trade union membership rose steadily and Bismarck's policies did little or nothing to stop this
- voting support for the SPD went up in every Reichstag election. In 1875 there were half a million votes for the SPD. By 1890 this had trebled
- Bismarck found it difficult to control the Reichstag anyway, even without the rise of the SPD. His supporters in the German Conservatives and Free Conservatives only had 85 seats in the Reichstag and he needed the support of the Centre Party to scrape by
- the SPD grew despite the anti-socialist laws. Almost twice as many people voted for them in 1887 as in 1878. It has been argued that repressive laws actually strengthened loyalty to the SPD and the 'socialist culture' of newspapers, clubs and trade unions. 'State Socialism' can be seen as an admission that the 1878 laws had failed
- state socialism also backfired on Bismarck (indeed it was only passed by the Reichstag in a watered-down form due to Radical opposition to state subsidies) and by 1890 there were 35 SPD deputies in the Reichstag, compared with none in 1875.

Good answers are likely to show awareness that many of Bismarck's policies were opportunistic and had mixed success and that he later backed away from them. The SPD certainly continued to gain strength despite his policies but he may well have succeeded in indirect ways.

Question 2

03 Explain why Wilhelm II appointed Caprivi as Imperial Chancellor in 1890. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Wilhelm chose Caprivi in 1890.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- Bismarck had been removed because of personal and policy differences and the Kaiser needed a new Chancellor
- Wilhelm did not want another dominant personality like Bismarck – Caprivi was chosen as a docile ‘yes man’
- the Kaiser was eager to commence his ‘New Course’ policies and Caprivi was chosen to lead this
- Caprivi was a typical aristocratic Conservative but was also thought to be acceptable to the moderate political parties in the Reichstag.

To reach the higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might the key factor colouring everything else was Wilhelm’s desire to strike out on his own and to be loved by the whole German people.

Question 2

- 04** How successful were right-wing elites in Germany in maintaining their political dominance in the years 1890 to 1914? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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.

In a 'How successful' question, students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest Kaiser Wilhelm and the ruling elites were successful in maintaining their dominance inside Germany against others which do not. The term 'right-wing elites of Germany' requires more than just the Kaiser himself. This might include the roles of Wilhelm's Chancellors, Caprivi, Hohenlohe, Bulow and Bethmann-Hollweg, and at least some of the following: the landowning Junker elites and the Army; Tirpitz and the Navy; the great

industrialists; and the right-wing leagues such as the Pan-German League, the Colonial League and so on.

Factors suggesting the elites succeeded in maintaining dominance might include:

- Wilhelm's favourite advisers, such as his best friend, Count Philipp zu Eulenburg, enabled the Kaiser to establish a 'personal rule' in the 1890s. Wilhelm controlled all major political and military appointments. He was never reliant on another individual for support and his Chancellors were all aristocratic Conservatives loyal to Wilhelm and his regime
- the armed forces had massive political influence. The Army officer class was dominated by Junker conservatives and government spending was dominated by the needs of the Army. Admiral Tirpitz was a dominant influence within the regime. From 1898 the Navy Laws led to massive spending on warships (from 1898)
- the regime was eagerly supported by right-wing pressure groups such as the Agrarian League, the Colonial League, the Navy League and the Pan-German League
- the economy was controlled by right-wing industrialists and by East-Elbian landowners in the so-called 'alliance of Steel and Rye'
- in the 1913 Zabern Affair, the regime simply ignored the Reichstag no-confidence vote.

Factors suggesting the elites were unsuccessful might include:

- the Kaiser's power was never absolute. He had to get majorities in the Reichstag (and Prussian Landtag) for legislation
- Socialism continued to grow. In the 1912 elections the SPD made a breakthrough as a significant national force in the Reichstag and became the largest single party in the Reichstag – showing the rise of representative democracy, not 'fig-leaf democracy'
- the Kaiser was an erratic personality who provoked controversy and weakened his own regime. A result of the Eulenburg scandal and the Daily Telegraph affair was that there were moves within the Reichstag to limit the personal power of the Kaiser. There was a huge increase in satirical cartoons criticising the Kaiser and the ruling elites
- all the Chancellors except possibly Bulow were weak and ineffective. After 1905 Wilhelm became so absorbed in foreign policy that he left ministers to deal with domestic policy but he never really gave them authority
- the power of the Army and the Navy caused political opposition. There were constant objections in the Reichstag against the costs of building battleships. The 1913 Zabern Affair can be seen as a major political challenge to a weakening regime – not only the huge row that over the army budget but also a campaign against the Kaiser's 'excessive power'. (A no-confidence vote in the Reichstag was passed by 273 to nil)
- by 1914, there were significant challenges to Conservative dominance and it can be argued that 'Weltpolitik' and military aggression did not show strength and confidence but were ways of distracting attention from internal political difficulties.

Good answers are likely to show awareness that the ruling elites in Germany between 1890 and 1914 had both strengths and weaknesses. Kaiser Wilhelm dictated policy within Germany to a great extent and it has been claimed that all political appointments, all diplomatic moves and all of the bills in the Reichstag were made on his orders. The Kaiser did not rule alone or unopposed, however. He was a powerful and influential figure at the centre of a complicated and sometimes chaotic system of government. Another feature of good answers may be differentiation according to change over time – it can be argued that the rulers were very dominant in the 1890s but were starting to lose control in the years from 1907 to 1914.

Question 3

05 Explain why the Spartacist revolt of 1919 failed. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the uprising was crushed in 1918–1919.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- there were serious divisions between the extremist and moderate wings of the socialist movement. This meant there was no united mass working-class support for revolution
- the SPD moderates, led by Ebert and especially by Gustav Noske, ‘the bloodhound (i.e. police dog) of the revolution’, acted firmly and decisively – the Ebert-Groener Pact gave the new government the military strength it needed
- the Army and the Freikorps possessed heavy weapons and military experience – the home-made fighting units of the rebels never had a chance against professional forces
- the Spartacus revolt was mainly confined to Berlin and never became a national uprising
- many Germans were still patriotic and anti-Communist. There was a genuine fear of being overrun by ‘Bolshevism’ spreading into Germany from the Russian Revolution.

To reach the higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might conclude that the most important reason why revolt failed was the depth of anti-Communist feeling that not only weakened support for violent revolution but also pushed natural political enemies like Ebert and the army generals to work together.

Question 3

- 06** How successful was the Weimar Republic in gaining support within Germany in the years 1919 to 1925? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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.

In a 'How successful' question, students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest that the Weimar Republic was successful in gaining support (or at least acceptance) within Germany against others which do not.

Factors suggesting Weimar succeeded in gaining support might include:

- a democratic constitution was established giving important rights to women and social groups previously excluded, such as Jews and national minorities. Emergency powers under Article 48 of the constitution enabled the government to deal with extremists on the right and the left. (It is a myth that Proportional Representation was destabilising for the Republic, for example – the results of the 1919 election were not greatly different from that held in 1912 under the old electoral system)
- political unrest was overcome. Weimar governments were able to overcome separatist movements. The Ebert-Groener Pact meant that left-wing uprisings had little impact. From the right, the 1920 Kapp Putsch was defeated and the 1923 Munich Putsch was a local uprising easily crushed by the Bavarian authorities without help from Berlin. After 1923 there were no further attempts at violent revolution
- political stability was reinforced by the improving economic situation from late 1923. Schacht and Stresemann played important roles in bringing political stability to Germany. The currency was stabilised by the Rentenmark. Foreign policy aided stability through the policy of fulfilment and the Locarno Pact of 1925. Access to foreign loans through the 1924 Dawes Plan helped economic growth and thus political contentment. Weimar governments were responsive to the people and addressed issues such as housing and welfare reform. All this led to increased support and at least passive acceptance
- the 1924 elections strengthened the moderate parties (and this trend continued in the elections of 1926 and 1928 as economic recovery went further)
- the role of the President was important. Ebert was a stabilising force in the immediate post-war crisis and provided continuity as President until his death in 1925. The election of Hindenburg as President in 1925 reassured right-wing conservatives and made the Republic appear more 'respectable' and legitimate in the eyes of mainstream opinion.

Factors suggesting the Republic did not succeed in gaining support might include:

- the problems associated with the Weimar Constitution and proportional representation which meant that all governments were short-lived coalitions. The moderate political parties never got enough support to form stable governments
- some historians argue that the relationship between the two directly elected institutions the Reichstag and the President resulted in the destabilisation of the political system. This was because the President had the power to appoint and dismiss Chancellors and other ministers, dissolve the Reichstag and implement emergency law under Article 48
- anti-republican attitudes were prevalent. On the Left, many people voted Communist and blamed the SPD for betraying the German Revolution. On the Right, the activities of the Freikorps and other private armies and political assassinations such as Erzberger and Walter Rathenau got widespread public backing. Elections showed extensive support for parties promoting these anti-republican attitudes
- political stability was heavily dependent on economic stability; there was deep instability in the immediate aftermath of war and during the hyperinflation in 1923. It can be argued that there was a long-term loss of faith in the Republic among the middle classes because of the collapse of the currency
- the invasion of the Ruhr undermined support for the Republic because it made the government look helpless against France and the Versailles treaty
- what happened after 1929 showed that the apparent support for Weimar in the 'Golden Years' of prosperity in the mid-1920s had been only skin-deep.

Good answers may show the ability to differentiate change over time – arguing, for example, that 1923 was a turning point for the Weimar Republic. Between 1919 and 1923 the Weimar Republic was beset by political instability and crisis but between 1923 and 1925 Germany became increasingly politically and economically stable due to the work of Stresemann and

Schacht. Another feature of good answers will be depth of definitions and comment – perhaps showing awareness of the differences between positive support and passive ‘acceptance’.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion