



A-level HISTORY 7042/1L

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

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 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

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

Copyright © 2019 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

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.

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

Section A

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to Bismarck's ability to control the Reichstag in the years 1871 to 1890. **[30 marks]**

Target: A03

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.

Extract A: In their identification of Williamson’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- the main argument is that opposition from the Centre Party to the government and Bismarck was strong and contributed to him losing control of the Reichstag
- the universal franchise and the emergence of vigorous political parties, such as the Centre Party, made the Reichstag more assertive and powerful than Bismarck had originally envisaged
- the growth of the Centre Party in the 1870s marked a major political defeat for Bismarck
- the changing political alignments of 1878–80 benefited the Centre Party further and, although Bismarck enjoyed their support on certain issues, he could not rely on them as a political ally in the 1880s.

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

- it could certainly be argued that the power of the Reichstag turned out to be greater than Bismarck had envisaged. He was forced into concessions to the National Liberals over the Press Law and the military budget, and he was forced to call off the Kulturkampf due to opposition from the Centre Party and even some Protestant Conservatives
- Bismarck launched the Kulturkampf in the early 1870s to reduce the influence of the Catholic Church within society and politics, however, the Centre Party grew in support and representation in the Reichstag, which indicated the failure of Bismarck’s policy
- Bismarck was able to win the support of the Centre Party in 1878/79 over the issue of protective tariffs, however, they regularly opposed him throughout the 1880s as the memory of the Kulturkampf still lingered
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that to portray Bismarck as losing control of the Reichstag in the 1880s is an exaggeration. He was still able to renew the anti-socialist laws through to 1890, and he was also able to introduce state welfare policies
- Bismarck was able to manipulate the 1887 election in order to create a right-wing Kartell comprising the Conservative Parties and the National Liberals. Between 1887 and 1890, this *Kartell* held a majority in the Reichstag, which undermines the argument that he had lost control of the Reichstag due to opposition from the Centre Party amongst others.

Extract B: In their identification of Craig’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- the main argument is that opposition to the government from the Socialists gained in strength despite Bismarck’s attempts to crush them, and eventually the influence of the Socialists in the Reichstag contributed to his downfall
- Bismarck was successful at first in eliminating the ideological threat of socialism but the party was determined to fight back, which they did successfully
- the Socialists were able to increase their representation in the Reichstag throughout the 1880s, which enabled them to become more disruptive
- Socialist opposition contributed to Bismarck’s loss of control of the Reichstag in 1890.

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

- Bismarck was paranoid about potential opposition from the Socialists. The initial impact of the anti-socialist laws in 1878 disrupted the SPD and other socialist organisations as many activists were arrested or fled abroad, many publications were closed down and socialist meetings were banned
- the SPD became effective at working around the restrictions placed on them, e.g. smuggling newspapers into Germany, holding secret meetings and having the same candidate stand in several constituencies for Reichstag elections
- the SPD certainly increased its share of the vote and the number of seats won between the 1878 election and the 1890 one, when they won 35 seats. By 1890, party membership was over 1.5 million
- it was the defeat of his right-wing *Kartell*, and his failure to make the anti-socialist laws permanent in 1890, that contributed to Bismarck's downfall, as the new Kaiser was dismayed that his chancellor had lost control of the Reichstag
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that Bismarck always over-estimated the strength of opposition from the Socialists throughout this period and that, even in 1890, they only had 35 seats in the Reichstag making them the fifth largest party. Therefore, opposition from the Socialists was never as strong as Bismarck feared.

Extract C: In their identification of Feuchtwanger's argument, students may refer to the following:

- the main argument is that there was tension and conflict between Bismarck and the National Liberals in the 1870s, but he was able to defeat them over the issue of tariffs after which they became a compliant party and abandoned any opposition to the government
- Bismarck refused to consider any ministerial responsibility to the Reichstag, which the Liberals would have wanted
- the Liberals were able to force concessions from Bismarck over the Press Law in 1874
- the introduction of protective tariffs marked the defeat of the National Liberals, after which the party split and ceased being an opposition party.

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

- Bismarck had to compromise with the National Liberals in the 1870s as he required their support for the consolidation of the new Reich and for the Kulturkampf. He conceded to some of their demands over the proposed Press Law and also agreed to give the Reichstag scrutiny of the military budget every seven years
- the National Liberals initially opposed the introduction of protective tariffs in 1878/79, but ultimately the party split over the issue with the more left-wing liberals leaving to join the Progressives in supporting free trade. The remainder of the National Liberals accepted the introduction of tariffs and supported the government throughout the 1880s, especially in the *Kartell* of 1887 to 1890
- in opposition to the extract, it could be argued that the National Liberals were broadly supportive of the government in the 1870s as they backed the Kulturkampf and the unity of the Reich. Even over the issue of protection, the majority of the National Liberals ended up supporting the introduction of tariffs
- in opposition to the claim that the National Liberals became a 'docile governmental party', it could be argued that they were always uneasy about supporting the anti-socialist laws due to their commitment to freedom of speech and, when Bismarck suggested making the laws permanent in 1890, the National Liberals opposed him, contributing to his downfall.

Section B

02 'German society was fundamentally changed as a result of the First World War.'

Assess the validity of this view in the context of the years 1900 to 1929.

[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 German society was fundamentally changed as a result of the First World War might include:

- many more women entered the workforce during the war and levels of female employment remained higher in the 1920s. Women were given formal equality under the Weimar Republic, including the vote. Contraception was more widely available
- unions gained greater influence during the war and workers enjoyed above average pay rises, which continued into the post-war period. After 1918, unions were given greater recognition and some control over pay and conditions. In the Weimar years, the welfare state expanded significantly, e.g. generous benefits for war victims, widows and orphans
- the war weakened the strength of the middle-classes as inflation eroded the value of their salaries and their standard of living declined. The continuing inflation in the post-war period, most notably the hyper-inflation of 1923, further damaged the financial position of many middle-class Germans
- the downfall of the monarchy and the creation of a republic due to the war changed the status of the aristocracy. All titles and legal privileges were removed and the demilitarisation following the Treaty of Versailles reduced the social influence of the Prussian Junker aristocracy
- the Treaty of Versailles contributed to the economic problems of the early Weimar years, which had significant consequences on society, not least the hyper-inflation of 1923. However, this ultimately led to greater assistance from the Allies through the Dawes Plan and helped to stimulate greater prosperity in German society from 1924.

Arguments challenging the view that German society was fundamentally changed as a result of the First World War might include:

- tension between the industrial elites and the working classes was ever present throughout the period. In the 1920s, the rich employers resented the higher taxation needed to fund the welfare state and they resisted some of the changes to working hours and industrial arbitration
- the aristocracy maintained its hold on the land and retained an elite social status through education, marriage and leadership of the military
- there were limitations to the 'emancipation' of women in Germany in the 1920s. There remained a social expectation that women stopped working when they got married. Many peasant women were largely unaffected by their supposed 'emancipation'
- pre-war anti-Semitism did not disappear despite the contribution made by German Jews to the war effort. The anti-Semitic prejudice of the Pan-German League, the Nazis and the DNVP remained a constant feature of the right-wing of politics
- other factors could be identified as more significant in the development of German society in this period other than the war, for example the degree of industrialisation which led to significant urbanisation and greater tension between workers and employers.

In reaching an overall judgement, students might argue that in many respects German society was largely unaltered by the impact of the First World War. The traditional aristocracy, the army and the wealthy industrial elite all effectively maintained their social dominance. In contrast, successive Weimar governments sought to improve the social and economic conditions of the working classes through an extensive welfare state and generous pay settlements; however, this often led to tension and conflict with the privileged classes who resented having to fund these changes. Therefore, by 1929 German

society was still divided by a rigid class hierarchy beset by tension between the privileged elites and the working classes – a tension which would have been familiar to many Germans before 1914.

- 03** ‘The recovery of the economy under the Nazis in the 1930s was more impressive than the recovery of the West German economy after the Second World War.’

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

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

Arguments supporting the view that the recovery of the economy under the Nazis in the 1930s was more impressive than the recovery of the West German economy after the Second World War might include:

- the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment from roughly 6 million in 1933 to less than 0.5 million by 1939 through specific measures aimed at creating jobs, e.g. public works schemes, subsidies and the creation of the RAD. Creating employment in West Germany after the war was easier due to the need for reconstruction and demand for exports from abroad
- the Nazis achieved an economic recovery in the 1930s without any direct assistance from foreign countries, whereas the economy of West Germany benefited significantly from foreign assistance, not least currency reform and the injection of Marshall Aid money from 1948
- the 'economic miracle' of the 1950s owed a lot to the foundations laid by the Nazi regime in the 1930s. For example, advances in management, communications, vehicle manufacture, chemicals and light engineering under the Nazis underpinned much of the economic growth after the Second World War
- the West German economy after the war benefited from the destruction of much of the pre-war infrastructure which enabled industry to make use of the latest technological innovations. The Nazis, by contrast, had to work within the confines of existing infrastructure.

Arguments challenging the view that the recovery of the economy under the Nazis in the 1930s was more impressive than the recovery of the West German economy after the Second World War might include:

- the Nazis' reliance on rearmament to drive the economic recovery of the 1930s was inherently unstable, causing over-heating and a worsening balance of payments by 1939. In contrast, the recovery of the West German economy after the Second World War proved more sustainable and stable, and did not have to rely on rearmament as a key driver of growth
- the Nazis reduced unemployment, partly through manipulating the figures and artificially restricting access to the workforce for certain citizens. Jews were sacked from government employment. Many women were sacked or forced out of the workplace. In contrast, the economic growth of the 1950s led to the additional employment of thousands of *Gastarbeiter*
- the Nazis used compulsion in order to boost the economy. Those labelled 'workshy' were sent to concentration camps. Many young men were forced to spend six months in the RAD, where pay was minimal and conditions limited. Unions were banned. No such compulsion existed in the 1950s, when positive relations with workers and unions were maintained
- the Four Year Plan, under Goering, did not meet its targets and by 1939 one third of raw materials were still being imported into Germany. The Plan was also impeded by bureaucracy, inefficiency and political in-fighting. In contrast, the economy of the 1950s was very efficient which contributed to a favourable balance of trade
- in the 'social market economy' in the 1950s, relations between the government and businesses were carefully balanced. The free market was able to operate within the framework established by the government. Under the Nazis, the relationship between government and business became increasingly strained as the Nazis pursued the political goal of rearmament, often at the expense of the free market and the independence of industry.

In reaching a final judgement, students may argue that although the Nazis were able to claim tremendous success in bringing about an economic recovery in the 1930s, the nature of the economy that they created was unstable and some historians have argued that its weaknesses drove Hitler to war

earlier than originally planned. By contrast, although the West German economy received significant help from the occupying powers to kick-start its recovery after the Second World War, the way that the economy was managed in line with Erhard's 'social market' principles meant that the economic recovery was built on firmer foundations; not least positive relations between the government, businesses and unions, which were definitely lacking in the Nazi period.

04 How effectively was democracy established in West Germany in the years 1949 to 1969?

[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 democracy was effectively established in West Germany in the years 1949 to 1969 might include:

- the Basic Law of 1949 created a constitution which enshrined civil rights, which were to be guarded by a Federal Constitutional Court. As a result, Germans enjoyed freedom of speech, assembly and movement throughout this period
- the structure of government created by the Basic Law contained a number of safeguards to prevent radical political change. The '5 per cent rule' prevented smaller, extremist parties from gaining a foothold in the Bundestag, and anti-democratic parties could be banned, as happened to the right-wing SRP in 1952 and the KPD in 1956
- the position of chancellor was more stable after 1949 than it had been during the Weimar years. The chancellor could only be removed by a vote of no confidence in the Bundestag
- coalition governments in this period were usually stable. Adenauer was expert in forming and maintaining coalitions and the stability of the three-party system was shown in 1966 when Kiesinger was able to form the 'Grand Coalition' with the SPD
- the rehabilitation of former Nazis into the new regime could be argued to have benefited the stability of the new democracy. Former Nazi officials had experience of government, and reduced the risk of an influential group of right-wing opponents to the new system emerging.

Arguments challenging the view that democracy was effectively established in West Germany in the years 1949 to 1969 might include:

- the apparent stability of the democratic state which emerged under Adenauer's leadership could be put down to a significant degree of apathy amongst the electorate – the so called 'Ohne Mich' attitude. Therefore, stability was not well-established but achieved almost by default
- the spectacular economic growth of the 1950s and early 1960s could be said to have been far more important to the stability of the new democracy rather than any genuine attachment to the political system for the majority of West Germans. When the economy hit a downturn in the mid-1960s, there was a growth in support for the newly formed right-wing NPD
- the *Der Spiegel* Affair and the Schwabing Riots in 1962 revealed weaknesses in the new 'chancellor democracy' which had emerged under Adenauer. The heavy-handed police action brought back memories of the Nazi past. Student protests and a press outcry revealed that fears of an overly authoritarian government lurked just beneath the surface
- the wave of student protests and extra-parliamentary opposition in the mid-1960s gave a clear impression that the democratic system which had emerged since 1949 did not represent the views of the younger generation; especially in the context of the formation of the 'Grand Coalition', which some protestors equated to a one-party state, and the participation of former Nazi Party members in the government, including the chancellor – Kiesinger – himself
- there was criticism of the 'Grand Coalition' in 1968 when they amended the constitution to enable an elected committee to take emergency measures in the event of civil unrest. Students, left-wingers and intellectuals protested against the perceived threat to parliamentary democracy.

In reaching a final judgement, students may argue that, for much of the period, West German democracy appeared firmly established as Adenauer created a stable 'chancellor democracy' based around his ability to form and maintain coalitions, as well as build up support for the CDU/CSU. The inability of extremist groups to gain a foothold due to the constitutional restrictions, and the willing participation of ex-Nazis, also strengthened the new democracy. However, the economic downturn of the mid-1960s and the simultaneous outburst of extra-parliamentary opposition revealed that the foundations of West

German democracy were not as firmly established as it had appeared. Ultimately, however, by the end of 1969 the APO had peaked and the election of Brandt's SPD government took much of the heat out of the student protests, indicating that democracy was firmly established and that the unrest of the mid- to late-1960s was a temporary hiatus.