

AS-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS1J: The Development of Germany, 1871–1925
Mark scheme

1041
June 2015

Version 1: 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 Assessment Writer.

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

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 2015

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1J: The Development of Germany, 1871–1925

Question 1

01 Explain why Bismarck introduced the Kulturkampf in the early 1870s. **[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 introduced the Kulturkampf in the early 1870s, including:

- Catholics were loyal to Austria in 1866 and were typically Grossdeutsch followers. The newly unified Second Reich represented the ascendancy of a Protestant Prussian government. Bismarck felt Catholics may still look to Austria for leadership
- Pope Pius IX's decree of Papal Infallibility issued in 1870 assumed Catholics to be loyal to the Pope first and their national state second

- Bismarck was concerned about the potential strength of the Centre Party. He feared the Centre Party would encourage civil disobedience among Catholics whenever the new state made policies that conflicted with the beliefs of the Church, and that it could become an obstacle to his control of the Reichstag
- Bismarck wished to gain favour with the National Liberals who traditionally saw the Catholic Church as an old enemy which preached against a modern society based upon national identity
- Bismarck believed that the influence of Catholicism would hold back economic growth in the newly unified Empire. He was particularly concerned about Catholic influence over education which did not embrace modern ideas of science and technology
- Catholic clergy in ethnically Polish regions of Prussia taught students in Polish rather than German which infuriated Bismarck who aimed to strengthen the unity of the new German Reich linguistically.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that Bismarck's key aim in domestic policy in the years 1871–1878 was to unify and consolidate the new Reich. The Catholic minority threatened the unity of the new Reich in a number of ways; thus, by persecuting a minority group like the Catholics, Bismarck hoped to strengthen feelings of national identity and unity.

Question 1

- 02** How successful was Bismarck in strengthening the unity of Germany in the years 1871 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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful' questions, the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting Bismarck was successful in strengthening the unity of Germany include:

- his alliance with the National Liberals from 1871 to 1878 enabled him to introduce a range of measures to promote the unity of Germany, including a new currency, the Reichsbank, abolition of internal tariffs, single legal code and court system and a postal service
- the abandonment of the Kulturkampf in the late 1870s enabled Bismarck to form a new alliance with the Catholic Centre Party in favour of protection and the Anti-Socialist Laws, which overcame some of the hostility which had existed during the Kulturkampf
- the Anti-Socialist Laws initially reduced the strength of the SPD and resulted in the departure from Germany of some of the more extreme socialist elements. Although still perceived as a threat by Bismarck in the 1880s, the SPD was an increasingly moderate party prepared to work within the constitution
- Bismarck's policies of state socialism were a constructive attempt to win over working class opinion to the government
- Germanisation in the Polish areas of the east was successful in suppressing the Polish language, expelling 34,000 Poles, and encouraging the purchase of Polish farms by Germans
- in Alsace-Lorraine, Bismarck pursued more conciliatory policies allotting 15 Reichstag seats for the region and appointing moderate and humane governors. In addition, hundreds of thousands of pro-French citizens left the region with Bismarck's encouragement.

Factors suggesting that Bismarck was not successful in strengthening unity include:

- the Kulturkampf was a failure. Instead of suppressing the influence of Catholicism in Germany, Bismarck caused greater opposition to the government in the 1870s from the increasingly assertive and successful Centre Party. In the 1880s, although more reconciled with Bismarck, the Centre Party continued to oppose his policies regularly
- Bismarck's split from the National Liberals in 1878 ended his alliance with the party most in favour of policies of national unification
- the Anti-Socialist Laws and State Socialism both failed to suppress the growth of socialism from 1878 to 1890. In 1890, the SPD won 35 seats in the Reichstag
- Bismarck's resignation came partly due to his failure to restrict the growth of socialism together with the new Kaiser's attitude that he could promote unity more successfully than Bismarck by winning over the working classes
- persecution of the national minorities did little to promote their integration into the new Reich. The French in Alsace-Lorraine and the Danes in Schleswig-Holstein consistently elected deputies who represented their separate national identities.

Good answers may show an awareness that Bismarck was successful to a degree in promoting further unity in Germany, famously remarking that 'In 1871, I had an empire, but by 1879 I had a nation'. There were however inherent tensions within the new Germany along religious, political and ethnic lines which were difficult to overcome and Bismarck's rather confrontational attitude served as much to widen these divisions as to heal them.

Question 2

03 Explain why the Anti-Socialist Laws were not renewed 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 the Anti-Socialist Laws were not renewed in 1890.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- Bismarck tried to introduce a permanent anti-Socialist law in 1890 but, following the election of that year, his right-wing 'Kartell' of parties lost its majority and he was unable to push a new anti-Socialist law through the Reichstag.
- the new Kaiser, Wilhelm II, wanted to pursue a more conciliatory policy towards the socialists and working classes. He aimed to be the 'People's Kaiser'. As a result, Wilhelm was happy to receive Bismarck's resignation and appointed Caprivi in his place
- Caprivi embarked on a 'New Course' of greater state-led welfare provision designed to wean the workers away from supporting the SPD

- the Anti-Socialist Laws from 1878 to 1890 had failed to curtail the growth of the SPD. In 1890, the SPD won 35 seats and nearly 1.5 million votes. The laws were clearly not having the desired effect of restricting the growth of socialism in Germany
- the Kaiser used his disagreement with Bismarck over the anti-socialist legislation in order to assert his desire for greater personal rule in Germany. By not renewing the Anti-Socialist Law he was signalling a clear break from the years of Bismarckian dominance in Germany.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that Bismarck's dominance in Germany was faltering in 1890 with both the Reichstag and the new Kaiser proving to be beyond his control. Bismarck desperately attempted to cling onto his political vision for Germany through a renewal of the Anti-Socialist Law but in 1890 his political power was not strong enough to achieve this and the Kaiser allowed the law to lapse as a symbol of his personal rule and the beginning of his 'New Course'.

Question 2

- 04** How successful was the Kaiser's government in limiting the influence of the SPD 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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful' questions, the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting that the Kaiser's government was successful in limiting the influence of the SPD include:

- the SPD became increasingly moderate in these years. This was partly a result of Caprivi's 'New Course' which convinced many in the party that social reform could be achieved through the Reichstag and the existing constitution. Therefore, the SPD preferred to pursue gradual change and did not seize upon opportunities such as the Daily Telegraph Affair (1908) and the Zabern Affair (1913) to demand sweeping constitutional concessions from the government
- in 1907, Bülow fought the 'Hottentot Election' on the issue of patriotic feeling and support for the government's imperialist policies. The SPD lost nearly half of their seats (from 81 to 43)
- the three-class voting system in the Prussian Landtag was retained throughout this period. In 1908, the socialists gained 23% of the vote but only 7 seats. This worked to limit the influence of the socialists in Germany's largest and most important state
- the SPD voted in favour of the increased army budget of 1913. The SPD were unwilling to appear unpatriotic in the increasingly nationalistic atmosphere up to 1914. This would appear to be a success for the domestic aspect of Weltpolitik whereby the Kaiser's government aimed to rally support for its policies through promoting patriotic feeling
- in 1914, the SPD voted to accept the political truce (Burgfrieden) and voted for the funds necessary to fight the war.

Points suggesting that the Kaiser's government was not successful in limiting the influence of the SPD include:

- in 1912, the SPD won 110 seats in the Reichstag becoming the largest party for the first time. This caused something of a constitutional deadlock within Germany as the government found it increasingly difficult to pass its legislation through the Reichstag
- Caprivi's 'New Course' was welcomed by a significant proportion of the working classes and SPD, however it did little to limit the growth of the SPD who won 44 seats in 1893, up from 35 in 1890. This contributed to Caprivi's downfall in 1894
- the government's new policy of Sammlungspolitik after 1894 also failed to curb the growth of the SPD. An Anti-Subversion Bill was defeated in the Reichstag in 1894, and an Anti-Union Bill suffered the same fate in 1899. Following Bülow's decision to raise the level of protective tariffs in 1902, the SPD gained 81 seats in the 1903 election
- the SPD were able to force a number of concessions from the government. In 1904, the government introduced the secret ballot. In 1906, Bülow agreed to a small tax on legacies and the payment of MPs. In 1913, funds for the new army budget were raised through a 'defence tax' on property which the SPD supported.

Good answers may show an awareness that, whilst the Kaiser's government retained control of Germany in these years due to the nature of the constitution, the country was becoming increasingly divided between left- and right-wing opinion. The influence of the SPD grew significantly in these years and the main course of action the government pursued was in using patriotic fervour to overcome these divisions with the consequence that Germany was launched on the path to war.

Question 3

05 Explain why the Weimar Republic faced opposition from the right wing in 1919.

[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 Weimar Republic faced opposition from the right-wing in 1919.

Students may refer to some of the following factors:

- many on the right-wing of politics chose to believe the ‘Stab-in-the-back’ myth which aimed to place the blame for Germany’s defeat in the war onto the new socialist-led government rather than onto the army.
- those on the right-wing were horrified at the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, which the new Weimar government signed in June 1919.
- much right-wing opinion had been dismayed by the abdication of the Kaiser and was very concerned by the creation of a democratic republic through the new constitution of 1919
- right-wingers were unhappy that the new head of state was a socialist and that the SPD were the largest party in the newly-elected Reichstag.

- right-wing opinion was concerned that the new government would not have the political will or authority to crush the Communist threat.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that from the outset the new republic was bound to face opposition from right-wing opinion within Germany which sought to associate the new socialist-led democratic government with the defeat in the war. This was hugely compounded by the humiliation of Versailles, which caused more moderate right-wing opinion to shift against the republic. Overall, the right-wing were ideologically opposed to the new government and the circumstances of 1919 provided them with significant ammunition against it.

Question 3

- 06** How far was the stability of the Weimar Republic undermined by right-wing opposition 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.

Students should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views.

Factors suggesting that the stability of the Weimar Republic was undermined by right-wing opposition between 1919 and 1925 might include:

- the Kapp Putsch succeeded in forcing Ebert and his government to flee Berlin for Dresden in March 1920. When Ebert called on the army to crush the uprising, General Seeckt refused to order his soldiers to fire on the Freikorps units
- between 1919 and 1923, 354 assassinations were carried out by right-wing extremists such as Operation Consul. These included the murders of prominent politicians such as Erzberger (1921) and Rathenau (1922). 326 of the right-wing murderers went unpunished and just one was convicted
- the judicial system was dominated by judges of right-wing sympathies. Just one of the 705 people brought to trial for the Kapp Putsch was punished. In 1923, Hitler was allowed to use the courtroom to publicise his nationalist agenda and was given the most lenient sentence possible following the Munich Putsch.
- right-wing sentiment was pervasive in the civil service (as witnessed during the Kapp Putsch); in education; and not surprisingly in the military. The strength of right-wing feeling in the middle and upper classes was a serious obstacle for the new government to overcome.
- Support for the Kapp and Munich Putsches from such a high-profile figure as General Ludendorff only strengthened the respectability of anti-republican beliefs.

Factors suggesting that the stability of the Weimar Republic was not significantly undermined by right-wing opposition include:

- the Kapp Putsch did not turn into a serious long-term threat to the authority of the Weimar government. Divisions between the different groups supporting the putsch and the uncompromising opposition of the working classes through the general strike in Berlin ensured that Kapp fled the country after just four days and the government returned.
- following the assassination of Walther Rathenau in June 1922, 700,000 people protested on the streets of Berlin in a show of support for the Republic. Soon after, the government was able to pass a law against those involved in extremist paramilitary violence. Opposition from public opinion and stiff penalties contributed to a reduction in the number of assassinations after 1922.
- by 1923, the army was prepared to act against right-wing uprisings, such as the Munich Putsch, in order to defend the Republic
- economic recovery from 1924 onwards created a significant increase in popular support for the Weimar government. In the elections of May and December 1924, over 60% of the population voted for pro-republican parties. In January 1925, the right-wing DNVP agreed to join the coalition government
- the election of President Hindenburg in 1925 was an indication that a lot of right-wing opinion had been reconciled to an acceptance of the democratic constitution.

Alternatively, candidates may seek to balance the impact of right-wing opposition against other factors which undermined the stability of the Weimar Republic, for example:

- Left-wing opposition challenged the new government, e.g. the Spartacist Rising (1919), the Red Rising in the Ruhr (1920) along with several other outbreaks of communist-inspired violence, especially during the hyperinflation of 1923.
- The impact of reparations and the loss of land due to the Treaty of Versailles harmed the economic stability of the new republic.

- The French invasion of the Ruhr in 1923 undermined the stability of the new republic both politically and economically, not least because it contributed to the rise of hyperinflation in 1923, partly due to the government's policy of passive resistance.

Good answers may show an awareness that right-wing opposition was an ever-present thorn in the side of the Weimar government in the years 1919 to 1925. However, the seriousness and violence of this threat diminished through the period with the years 1922–1924 proving to be something of a turning point in reducing the levels of outright violent opposition. Despite the appearance of greater stability that the election of President Hindenburg suggested, there was still a significant amount of anti-republican feeling just below the surface amongst those who respected Hindenburg for his anti-democratic and authoritarian past.

Alternatively, candidates may assess the relative significance of factors which undermined the stability of the Weimar Republic, for example, right-wing opposition was more serious than that from the left-wing as the government could rely on the support of the army and the Freikorps (up to 1920) to crush communist uprisings. However, the economic factors undermining the stability of the Weimar republic could be considered the most damaging of all as the hyperinflation of 1923 caused many moderate Germans to lose faith in Weimar democracy and it also stimulated more right-wing opposition such as the Munich Putsch.

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