



---

# A-level HISTORY 7042/1L

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

---

Mark scheme

June 2022

Version: 1.0 Final



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

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

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

#### **Copyright information**

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

Copyright © 2022 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## Level of response marking instructions

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

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

### Step 1 Determine a level

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

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

### Step 2 Determine a mark

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

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

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

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

**Section A**

- 0 1** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the postwar economy of West Germany.

**[30 marks]***Target: AO3*

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

**Generic Mark Scheme**

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

**Indicative content**

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

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

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

- the main argument of Extract A is that Ludwig Erhard was the key driving force behind the FRG's impressive economic growth of this period
- Erhard's free-market policies, such as abandoning price controls and reducing taxation, laid the foundations for the 'German miracle'
- in addition to Erhard's free-market policies, the success of the 'social market economy' was based on a commitment to welfare and policies promoting social cohesion
- economic growth was uneven and wage rates low, which had the potential to cause social problems, but this was pre-empted by effective social policies.

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

- Erhard was a significant figure in influencing the economic recovery of western Germany whilst it was still under Allied occupation. His free-market and currency reforms steered the West German economy away from the Nazis' centralised control system, but also from the decentralised system of smaller economic concerns favoured by the Americans
- Erhard's policies balanced the principles of free trade with government intervention and stimulation when necessary. For example, he instigated government-sponsored work creation schemes, provided generous grants for large-scale construction projects and provided significant subsidies for agriculture
- the FRG created an effective system of welfare and support for the less well-off in order to maintain social cohesion. The Equality of Burdens Law helped those who had lost most in the war, refugees were helped to integrate into west German society, and pensions were substantially increased
- wage levels were kept low to aid the economic recovery, but this did not result in labour unrest due to the government's influence on 'co-determination' between employers and unions. Overall economic growth and improving living standards, coupled with worker participation in management decisions, led to 'social peace'
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that whilst government policy clearly played a role in the FRG's 'economic miracle', West Germany did enjoy some significant advantages in this period too. For example, there was no expenditure on armaments unlike most of their major economic competitors, and wartime destruction enabled new industrial plants to be rebuilt with the latest technology.

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

- the main argument of Extract B is that there was a range of reasons behind the West German economic miracle, which was based on the strength of its own resources in a favourable international context
- after the war, West Germany had a large skilled labour force, industrial expertise, and significant resources
- the international context of American assistance to Europe, the creation of new economic bodies to promote co-operation and growth within Europe, and the advent of war in Korea, all served to create opportunities for the West German economy to grow
- the FRG exploited this favourable context to achieve remarkable growth rates.

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

- West Germany did have a plentiful source of skilled labour in this period. As the war closed, millions of refugees poured into West Germany fleeing eastern Europe. Up to 1961, a steady stream of skilled and educated workers moved to the FRG from East Germany. After the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961, the West German labour force was augmented by ‘guest workers’ from Turkey, Yugoslavia and other countries
- German industry had been leading the world in many areas before the war and this industrial strength was quick to rebound in the years after 1945. Companies such as Krupp, Thyssen, Siemens and Bayer all quickly re-established themselves
- financial assistance to Europe from the USA, in the form of the Marshall Plan, significantly benefited the West German economy. It enabled government investment in industry, and the general boost to the European economy stimulated demand for West German exports, which was further stimulated by the Korean War
- Adenauer’s policy of co-operating with France to create a strong west European axis reaped economic rewards through the trading advantages created by the ECSC and the EEC
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that not enough emphasis is placed on the role of Adenauer’s and Erhard’s policies in creating an effective ‘social market economy’ within the FRG in this period, which were also central to the ‘economic miracle’.

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

- the main argument of Extract C is that the government had a significant amount of control over the economy of West Germany, which was not as much of a free-market economy as Erhard or the Americans would have liked
- government control or ownership of significant industries and banks was aimed at balancing economic growth with social cohesion
- significant elements of the pre-war economy were retained, in particular leading personnel, as well as co-operation between large corporations to set prices and divide up the market
- if Erhard’s policies had been followed more fully, the West German economy would have been quite different.

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

- as part of the ‘social market economy’, the government of the FRG did play an active role in managing the economy, for example, government subsidies to heavy industry, banking controls and work-creation schemes
- a key aim of the ‘social market economy’ was to protect workers’ rights to ensure social cohesion, for example, the Co-determination Law (1951), the creation of the German Confederation of Trade Unions and regulations to ensure fair labour relations

- laws to prevent the establishment of monopolies, eg the 1957 Anti-Trust Law, had many loopholes which did not prevent large corporations acting as cartels or monopolies to control the market, which was not the sort of free-market economic system espoused by Erhard
- in challenging the extract, it could be argued that it downplays the significance of Erhard in creating the conditions for West Germany's 'economic miracle'. He promoted the principles of the free market, thus freeing up West German businesses from the stifling control they had experienced during the Nazi period
- in addition, Erhard was not just a pure free-marketeer. He realised the need for some government intervention to promote both economic growth and positive labour relations, eg in his support for government subsidies of heavy industry.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'Opposition in the Reichstag had little impact on Bismarck's policies in the years 1871 to 1890.'

Assess the validity of this view.

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

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

**Generic Mark Scheme**

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



## Indicative content

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

**Arguments supporting the view that opposition in the Reichstag had little impact on Bismarck's policies in the years 1871 to 1890 might include:**

- Bismarck's priority, in the years 1871–78, was to consolidate the unity of the new German Reich, which he was able to achieve easily despite opposition from the Catholic Centre Party and national minority groups, as well as unease from some Conservative deputies too
- Bismarck's decision to introduce protective tariffs in 1878/79 met with strong opposition from liberals within the Reichstag, however, he was able to overcome this opposition fairly easily by engineering a new alignment with the Centre Party over this issue
- despite not having the consistent support of a majority of Reichstag deputies in the years 1878 to 1887, Bismarck was able to manufacture majorities in favour of both his anti-socialist laws and his policies of 'state socialism'
- Bismarck pursued a range of policies to restrict the rights and separate identities of the national minorities who now lived within the German Reich, despite opposition from their representatives in the Reichstag
- between 1887 and 1890, Bismarck was able to manufacture a 'Kartel' of parties in support of his policy to increase taxation to fund an expansion of the military. To overcome initial opposition in the Reichstag, he called an early election in 1887, which was won by parties aligned with his patriotic and nationalistic policies.

**Arguments challenging the view that opposition in the Reichstag had little impact on Bismarck's policies in the years 1871 to 1890 might include:**

- the National Liberals and other parties opposed Bismarck's proposal for a permanent settlement of the military budget in 1874, eventually forcing him to agree to the Septennial Law. In the same year, liberal opposition also forced Bismarck to water down his proposed Press Law
- opposition from the Catholic Centre Party, and from the representatives of Catholic national minorities, eventually forced Bismarck to abandon the Kulturkampf in 1878
- Bismarck found the Reichstag difficult to manage between 1878 and 1887 following his split from the National Liberals. He was never able to engineer a stable coalition of parties in favour of his policies in these years and the pace of legislation slowed
- increasing opposition from the SPD in the Reichstag contributed to both Bismarck's anti-socialist legislation after 1878 and his policies of 'state socialism' after 1883
- opposition to Bismarck's proposal of a permanent anti-socialist law in 1890 resulted in the defeat of his policy, and ultimately contributed to his resignation in the same year.

Overall, students may conclude that Bismarck was clearly the dominant force in German politics of this period. Although he had to secure Reichstag approval for new laws, he was able to achieve this, more often than not, through skilful management of and negotiations with the different parties. At times, the parties were able to come together to force concessions from the chancellor but these tended to be temporary, or relatively minor, victories, which did not detract from Bismarck's overall political dominance and his ability to enact his policy priorities.

**0 3** 'In the years 1890 to 1914, a culture of militarism dominated Germany.'

Assess the validity of this view.

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

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

### Generic Mark Scheme

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

## Indicative content

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

**Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1890 to 1914, a culture of militarism dominated Germany might include:**

- Kaiser Wilhelm II was well-known to love the traditions, rituals and uniforms of the military, which in turn became more significant due to the Kaiser's influence. The emergence of *Weltpolitik* as the guiding ambition of government policy and the Zabern Affair, both testify to the pervading influence of militarism at the top of German society and government
- the aristocratic elite maintained their social and political dominance in this period, partly through their continued dominance of the officer corps of the military. Ambitious upper middle-class families would often seek a commission for their sons to enhance their social status
- the size and popularity of the Navy League and Army League provide clear evidence of wider support for the military and an expansionist foreign policy. In addition, many middle and working-class men were members of the reserve military forces, which was a commitment that garnered significant social respect and status
- the significant increase in the size of both army and navy in this period attests to the widespread support for militarism and its burgeoning influence. At the outbreak of war in 1914, even the SPD rallied behind the war effort, joining the *Burgfriede* and voting for war credits
- militarism played a significant role in the culture of Germany in this period, eg through literature, parades on Sedan Day and the new memorial to the German states' role in the defeat of Napoleon. An automatic deference to the authority of army officers was a common occurrence.

**Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1890 to 1914, a culture of militarism dominated Germany might include:**

- the army's actions in the Zabern Affair and the Kaiser's subsequent public support for the military led to a significant level of outrage in the Reichstag and wider public opinion. Clearly, the culture of militarism and automatic deference to the army had limits
- throughout this period, the SPD continued to grow significantly in size and influence. The party consistently opposed expansions of the military budget until the outbreak of war. In 1912, the SPD became the largest party in the Reichstag, indicating a significant degree of support for their opposition to the influence of militarism
- in addition to the growth of the SPD, there was a very significant wider expansion of socialist societies and trade unions. The priorities of these groups were focused on improving the standard of living of the working classes, not on Germany's military strength and glory
- government policy also sought to ameliorate the conditions of working-class Germans through a series of social welfare reforms, in particular those introduced by Caprivi 1890–94, and by Posadowsky-Wehner 1900–06. The Kaiser's desire for *Weltpolitik* and military expansion clearly had to be balanced with a concern for the living standards of ordinary Germans
- it could be argued that a more dominant influence on German society in this period was the impact of urbanisation and industrialisation. The benefits of these were felt by many in higher real wages, new technologies and leisure activities. Others, however, suffered from overcrowded, insanitary living conditions and low paid, insecure employment.

Overall, students may argue that militarism was clearly a significant influence on German society in this period as it was founded on a strong tradition of Prussian military success, coupled with the continuing social and political ascendancy of an aristocratic elite which also dominated the military. However, society was also clearly changing in ways which were challenging the social and political fabric of Germany, especially through the growing influence of socialism. Ultimately, the forces of militarism had

to resort to an expansionist foreign policy, leading to war in 1914. In this way, whilst militarism could be seen to have won out in 1914, it was ultimately to result in the destruction of the social and political system the elites had been trying to preserve.

**0 4** To what extent was the weakness of democracy in Germany, in the years 1914 to 1934, due to economic problems?

**[25 marks]**

*Target: AO1*

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

### Generic Mark Scheme

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

**Indicative content**

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

**Arguments supporting the view that the weakness of democracy in Germany, in the years 1914 to 1934, was due to economic problems might include:**

- the economic impact of the First World War, not least in the form of the heavy reparations bill, undermined the strength of Weimar democracy from the outset. The campaign against the Young Plan of 1929 demonstrates the long-term impact of reparations on Weimar democracy
- in 1923, the Ruhr occupation and hyperinflation caused significant economic stress to the Weimar Republic causing many Germans to lose faith in democratic government. Many in the middle classes never forgot the savings lost in 1923, which partly explains the strength of support for Hitler after 1929
- the over-reliance of the Weimar Republic on US loans from 1924 onwards, ultimately destabilised democratic government after 1929 when those loans were recalled, thus causing Germany to suffer more than any other country during the Depression
- the response of Weimar governments, from 1930 onwards, to the economic crisis moved further and further away from democratic rule. Under Brüning, use of Article 48 became the predominant method of enacting government policy, thus bypassing democratic processes
- the unemployment crisis, from 1930 onwards, was a significant factor in the rise of the Nazis who promised solutions to Germany's economic problems. This was a major factor both in increasing the Nazi share of the vote and in the passing of the Enabling Act in 1933.

**Arguments challenging the view that the weakness of democracy in Germany, in the years 1914 to 1934, was due to economic problems might include:**

- during the First World War, the constitution of the Kaiserreich limited the amount of influence the democratic parties could bring to bear on government policy. The appointment of Hindenburg and Ludendorff as supreme commanders in 1916 cemented the dominance of the aristocratic and military elites – an influence that was hard to eradicate after 1918
- the continuing influence of the traditional right-wing elites after 1918 was seen in the Ebert-Groener Pact, the actions of the Freikorps, the support of Ludendorff for the putsches of 1920 and 1923, the lenient sentence given to Hitler in 1923, and the election of Hindenburg in 1925. All of these provide evidence of strong anti-democratic sentiment amongst right-wing opinion
- right-wing belief in the 'Stab-in-the-back' myth, and hatred of the Treaty of Versailles, also undermined the strength of the new democratic republic. Political assassinations by groups such as Organisation Consul were frequent up to 1923. Hitler made great use of this nationalist resentment in his propaganda, seeking to undermine Weimar democracy
- faith in democracy was not secure throughout this period. Many thought of it as un-German and preferred an authoritarian style of leadership, as had existed before and during the war. Article 48 of the Weimar constitution was a concession to this viewpoint. Furthermore, the prevalence of unstable coalition governments as a result of proportional representation further eroded faith in democracy
- it could be argued that Hitler's rise to power from 1929 was based as much on the power of Nazi propaganda and terror, both emphasising democracy as 'weak', as it was on economic factors. In addition, the Nazis exploited the widespread fear of communist revolution to win votes and dismantle the Weimar constitution.

Overall, students may conclude that the main crises of democracy in this period – between 1919 and 1923 and then 1929 to 1933 – coincided with the two most turbulent economic phases experienced by Germany in these years, ultimately resulting in the collapse of democracy by 1934. Therefore, it could certainly be argued that economic problems were the most significant cause of the weakness of democracy in this period. However, it could also be argued that faith in democracy within Germany was

never firmly established and all the economic problems did was cause this to be highlighted in starker relief in certain years. Adherence to a more nationalistic, authoritarian style of government remained a strong current running through German politics in these years and, therefore, it could be argued that democracy was always weak and the economic crisis of 1929–34 merely pushed it over the edge.