



**General Certificate of Education
January 2011**

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 meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting 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 candidates' 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 © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres 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 candidates. 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 candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates 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. Candidates 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 candidates 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 candidate 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 candidates 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 candidates' 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*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate 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 candidate 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

January 2011

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1J: The Development of Germany, 1871–1925

Question 1

01 Explain why there was industrial expansion in Germany in the 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 candidates 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 industry grew in Germany post unification.

Candidates may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- the industrial might of Prussia which pushed forward unification through “coal and iron” according to John Maynard Keynes, transferred its industrial power to the new Reich

- the growing rail network which by 1870 consisted of 8,560 km of track helped to shrink Germany making it easier for raw materials to be transported quickly and cheaply to industrial production sites
- Raw materials in abundance, coal in the Saar valley vital for powering the new steam engines, the Ruhr valley was rich in coal and iron ore, whilst in Silesia there were zinc and iron deposits.

and some of the following short term/immediate factors:

- unification provided a direct stimulus to an economy that already possessed a secure basis for industrial expansion. Territory gained from France, Alsace and Lorraine contained Europe's largest deposits of iron ore. The indemnity from France of 5 billion francs over a period of 3 years allowed greater investment into industry
- the German banking system, in particular the creation of the Reichsbank which dominated commerce and industry by providing loans and stimulating long-term investments
- adoption of free trade policies encouraged by Bismarck's political alliance with the National Liberals between 1871–1878
- the development of industrial cartels which agreed price fixing, agreements on the levels of production and the sharing of markets allowed industry to make huge profits, some of which were reinvested in further industrialisation.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might conclude that whilst the new Reich was rich in the raw natural resources necessary for industrialisation, the economic growth in the immediate post-unification period was primarily stimulated by the indemnity from France.

Some candidates will stray beyond the 1870s to include new industries such as chemicals and electric power. A certain flexibility can be allowed here, as long as the answer is mostly focused on the 1870s.

Question 1

- 02** How successful were Bismarck's policies in restricting the growth of Socialism 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 candidates 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.

Candidates 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 Bismarck's policies towards the Socialists were successful in restricting their growth might include:

- the anti-socialist law of 1878 immediately crippled the organisation of the party by banning any groups or meeting aimed at spreading socialist principles. 45 newspapers were outlawed as were trade unions. The legislation was enforced rigorously and at first the SPD vote fell from 493 000 in 1877 and 12 seats in the Reichstag to 312 000 in 1878 and 9 seats
- the introduction of the anti-socialist law in 1878 allowed Bismarck to gain a majority in the Reichstag, which in turn enabled him to pass tariff reform in 1879. By doing so Bismarck broke with the liberals and consolidated the forces of conservatism within the Reich
- the introduction of State Socialism through the 1883 Health Insurance Law, 1884 Accident Insurance Law and the 1889 old age pensions scheme followed the paternalistic trend in Germany. State Socialism was designed to wean the working classes from revolutionary socialism by offering them a modest stake in the Empire. In the longer term Bismarck's policy proved to be successful as State Socialism led to a gradual transformation in the attitude of the SPD to the state, so much so that in 1914 the SPD supported the empire at war.

Factors suggesting that Bismarck's policies towards the Socialists were not successful in restricting their growth might include:

- the anti-socialist law of 1878 did not ban the SPD from standing for the Reichstag or state governments. The growth of the SPD in the Reichstag from 12 seats in 1877, to 24 seats in 1884, to 35 seats in 1890. Thus despite the anti-socialist law of 1878 and the attempt to "kill socialism with kindness" through welfare schemes support for the SPD continued to gain momentum. In 1890 the SPD received over a million votes. From within the Reichstag the SPD were able to oppose Bismarck's policy proposals
- the anti-socialist law in reality strengthened the socialist cause. The SPD developed social and cultural activities which bound members together. Persecution by the state helped a 'fortress mentality' of the German working class to develop
- State Socialism was dismissed as 'crumbs from a rich man's table' and the SPD whilst approving of the ideas behind the measures rejected the actual bills until amendments were made
- the issue of socialism in Germany was ultimately Bismarck's downfall. During the 1889 nationwide miners' strike Kaiser Wilhelm II favoured a policy of further social reform to woo the working classes from the SPD, whilst Bismarck wanted to pursue a more aggressive policy. The Reichstag opposed Bismarck's plans and following an ultimatum from Wilhelm, Bismarck was forced to resign.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that Bismarck's approach to the socialists used the 'carrot and the stick' approach. Repression through the anti-socialist law (the stick) whilst initially successful was undoubtedly a long term failure, reflected in the sharp growth in support for the SPD. However, in the longer term the creation of State Socialism (the carrot), whilst not suppressing support for the SPD, did lessen the revolutionary fervour of the majority of socialists in Germany.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why Caprivi was replaced by Hohenlohe as Chancellor of Germany in 1894. (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 candidates 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 Hohenlohe was appointed Chancellor in 1894.

Candidates may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- Hohenlohe was a Bavarian aristocrat. He therefore represented conservatism and the status quo which appealed to the ruling elite whose power had been consolidated by the constitution of 1871 and the rule of Bismarck
- Hohenlohe was a well respected statesman who had spent a lifetime in state service
- the failure of Caprivi's reforms to gain the support of the conservative ruling elite e.g. the Prussian School Bill and the Army Bill, which meant that he was forced to resign in 1894 leaving the position of chancellor vacant
- Kaiser Wilhelm was determined to play an active political role and wanted Chancellors who would be pliant to his demands

and some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- Wilhelm's belief that Hohenlohe would be easy to manipulate because of his advanced age
- Hohenlohe posed no political threat to the Camarilla because as a Catholic and a Bavarian he did not have as much political influence as the Prussian Junkers
- Hohenlohe was anti-socialist and was prepared to work push through the Kaiser's anti-Subversion Bill directed at the SPD through the Reichstag (the issue which caused Caprivi to resign).

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might conclude that ultimately Hohenlohe was appointed in 1894 as a stop-gap/figure-head for the German government. He was an acceptable face of the Conservative establishment who did not have the power and influence to challenge the growing authority of the Camarilla or the Kaiser's desire for 'personal rule'.

Question 2

- 04** How far was the political stability of Germany threatened by the growing influence of the army 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 candidates 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.

Candidates 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 army threatened the political stability of Germany might include:

- the issue of the Army Bills and the Reichstag is a reoccurring theme in this period. In 1892 Caprivi dissolved the Reichstag following the rejection of his Army Bill. The following election, fought on military issues, resulted in a swing to the political right. Caprivi's attempts to make the Army Bill more palatable through concessions to the left resulted in him alienating the Camarilla, which in turn led to his resignation in 1894
- in 1909 the Bulow Bloc fell apart following another unsuccessful attempt to raise money for the military
- the Army Bill of 1913 cost 435 million Reichsmarks in order to expand the army's size from 544,00 to 870,000. This resulted in a special defence tax on property which in turn alienated the propertied classes
- Wilhelm's regime was badly dented by the political scandals of 1908 (Eulenburg Affair and Daily Telegraph Affair) and as a result the army assumed an even more influential role within government, ultimately destabilising Germany
- the Zabern Affair of 1913 illustrated the increasing influence of the military on domestic political matters. The Kaiser's refusal to dismiss the commanding officers highlighted how the army was above the rule of law and responsible to the Kaiser alone. Bethmann-Hollweg's refusal to side with politicians against the army led to a vote of no-confidence in the Reichstag against him by 293 votes to 54. This illustrated the weakness of the Reichstag and that the Chancellor's authority stemmed from the Kaiser as Bethmann-Hollweg remained in office until 1917.

Factors suggesting that other factors threatened the political stability of Germany might include:

- the determination of the Kaiser to follow 'personal rule' and the political scandals of 1908 which resulted in the army gaining more political prominence, ironically in an attempt to create political stability
- the impact of industrialisation and the social upheaval which resulted in a growing working and middle class who wanted greater political representation than was granted to them by the 1871 constitution. It can be argued that it was the political elites' fear of socialism which destabilised Germany politically
- there were other pressure groups on the political right which generated as much political instability as the army, the Pan-German League, Navy-League etc.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that whilst the issue of funding a growing army was a destabilising political issue throughout the period, the real political threat to stability from the army came after 1908 when the Kaiser's personal authority had been undermined by a series of political scandals which arose from his desire for personal rule.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why Hindenburg was elected President of the Weimar Republic in April 1925.
(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 candidates 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 Hindenburg was elected President in 1925.

Candidates may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- as a general in the First World War and one of the Empire's silent dictators during 1916-1918, Hindenburg represented a vital link with German's authoritarian past. His election was largely an expression of nostalgia, for the strength and stability of Germany's imperial regime. He was seen as the man to control democracy and keep it in check
- Germany's left wing was fatally divided between the more moderate SPD and the more radical KPD. Ebert's period as President had widened this political division further with the KPD feeling betrayed by Ebert's use of the Frei-korps to put down the Spartakist uprising in Berlin in 1919. These divisions were to prove fatal following Ebert's death in 1925.

and some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- the death of Ebert in February 1925 which led to the calling of elections for the role of President of the Republic
- following the death of the socialist President Ebert the KPD failed to support the SPD candidate for the Presidency Wilhelm Marx. The failure of the left to work together meant that no candidate won more than 50% of the vote in the first round of elections. A second round was held and Hindenburg put himself up for nomination, he won the most votes and was duly elected President.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might understand how the election of election of Hindenburg was a reflection of the growing political stability of the Republic and also a yearning for an Ersatzkaiser.

Question 3

- 06** How far was the Weimar Republic weakened by extremist political opposition in the years 1919 to 1923? (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 candidates 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.

Candidates 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 Weimar Republic was weakened by extremist opposition might include:

- The Kapp putsch seriously challenged the Republic, mainly because of the stance of the Reichswehr which refused to fire upon fellow soldiers. Ebert's government were forced to leave Berlin for Dresden
- the Spartacist uprising in January 1919 threatened a communist revolution. When it was violently quashed by the Freikorps it stimulated a series of strikes and clashes between the workers and the Freikorps, creating a virtually civil war within the new Republic between the forces of the Left and Right in 1919. By the end of June 1920 three different governments had fallen due to the political violence. Between the end of June 1920 and November 1923 a further four governments rose and fell
- assassinations of political figures such as Erzberger and Rathenau by the extreme right illustrated the total rejection of the democratic system which the Republic represented. However the real damage to the Republic was done by the lenient sentences that were given to right wing plotters in comparison to those on the left. This proved that the anti-Weimar stance of the extreme right was favoured by the judiciary.

Factors suggesting that the Weimar Republic was not weakened by extremist opposition might include:

- Ebert's use of the forces of the right (the Freikorps and the Army through the Ebert-Groener pact) to quash the political extremism of the left. Therefore the conservative forces of Germany were willing to tolerate the Republic as long as it prevented the 'greater evil' of Communism
- the splits and divisions of the extreme left between the USPD and the KPD weakened its attempts to overthrow the Republic
- Extremist right-wing opposition was halted through a combination of worker resistance (Kapp) and weak leadership (Munich)
- Ebert's use of Article 48 and the strength of the Weimar Constitution to suspend citizen rights in times of emergency so as to stabilise the political situation
- it can be argued that other factors weakened the Weimar Republic such as the impact of World War One, the Treaty of Versailles and the issue of reparations which led to the occupation of the Ruhr and the subsequent financial collapse
- ultimately the Weimar Republic survived the years of crisis through the resolute action of Stresemann and Schacht, which brought financial and subsequently political stability to Germany.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that by the end of 1923 extremist opposition had been overcome and that the Weimar Republic entered a period of relative economic, political, social and cultural stability widely known as the 'Golden Years'.