



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

AS History 1041

HIS1K

Unit 1K

Russia and Germany, 1871–1914

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

June 2011

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1K: Russia and Germany, 1871–1914

Question 1

01 Explain why Caprivi resigned 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 Caprivi resigned in 1894.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Caprivi was to a large extent dependent on the Kaiser. Wilhelm wished to develop a personal government and at first believed that Caprivi would assist in doing this. However when Caprivi displayed a mind of his own and followed policies that the Kaiser was not happy with, for example refusing to introduce an Anti-Socialist Subversion Bill in 1893, the Kaiser was personally insulting towards Caprivi and undermined his

government. By 1894 the Kaiser's superficial Liberalism had worn off and he was no longer sympathetic to Caprivi's aims of conciliation and reform

- Caprivi also had to work with the different groups in the Reichstag and although he did manage to pass some social reform he did not achieve many of his aims. Problems with an Education bill led to his resignation as Prime Minister of Prussia and an Army Bill was opposed in the Reichstag in 1892. The Bill was only passed after dissolution and new elections in which the Conservatives did well
- Caprivi's economic policies caused opposition from powerful landowners. The Agrarian League was set up in 1893 to oppose his reductions in tariffs. The Conservative press attacked Caprivi, and he was blamed for the continuing rise of Socialism
- Caprivi had also reduced the number of years served by conscripts in the army, this alienated another important and Conservative section of opinion.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might show that Caprivi was reliant on the support of the Kaiser; as Wilhelm's commitment to Liberalism faded so did his support for the Chancellor. Wilhelm's move to the right also meant that Conservative opposition to the Chancellor became more influential. Candidates should be able to assess the overall difficulty of being a Chancellor without consistent support in the Reichstag and the difficulty of relying on the backing of the Kaiser.

Question 1

- 02** How far were domestic policies in Germany controlled by the chancellors in the years 1894 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.

Factors suggesting that German chancellors controlled domestic policies might include:

- the Kaiser predominantly interfered in foreign affairs, giving Chancellors some degree of independence in domestic policies. Chancellors also had the advantage that the Reichstag could not dismiss them. They did not need a majority to stay in office, instances of Chancellors being able to ignore Reichstag censure, such as Bethmann-Hollweg being able to ignore the Reichstag over the Zabern incident could be mentioned
- Hohenlohe remained in office for six years despite the Kaiser's lack of support towards the end of his term, he was also able to restrain Wilhelm in some ways as the Kaiser talked wildly of changing the constitution and stopping workers voting but did not attempt to do it, this can be attributed to Hohenlohe's influence
- Bulow did demonstrate a degree of independence, he ended the reactionary policies followed by Hohenlohe and his policy of Sammlungspolitik was distinctive, rallying German people together. Bulow did restore tariffs to the pre 1892 level but resisted pressure from the Agrarian League to put them higher. He was mostly able to rely on Conservative support in the Reichstag and mostly upon the Kaiser who said 'I leave things to him and know that everything will be alright'. On his resignation Bulow was able to put forward Bethmann-Hollweg as his successor
- Bethmann-Hollweg stayed in power despite not being the Kaiser's first choice, and although he was not particularly inventive in policy was an effective administrator.
- despite the rise of Socialism chancellors were able to maintain control and conduct business in the Reichstag throughout this period.

Factors suggesting that they had little control might include:

- the Chancellor in Germany was dependent on the support of the Kaiser, without this they quickly fell from power. Wilhelm also had the tendency to undermine his Chancellors, either by calling them names, (Hohenlohe) or by acting without their knowledge for example, 'The Daily Telegraph incident'
- although Wilhelm was predominantly interested in Foreign affairs he did attempt to follow reactionary domestic policies, this was especially important during the government of Hohenlohe when the Subversion Act was passed in 1894 and anti union legislation in 1899. The Kaiser's support for the army was a key factor in the censure of Bethmann-Hollweg over the Zabern incident
- the Chancellors also had to contend with the opposition parties in the Reichstag. The Socialist party continued to grow throughout this time period and the governments also had to deal with opposition from other parties such as the Centre party which opposed both Hohenlohe's reactionary laws and Bulow's restoration of tariffs in 1902
- interest groups outside parliament also existed, The Agrarian League was influential and caused some problems for Bulow, the army also played a key role which was shown most clearly in the Zabern incident.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that German Chancellors faced certain key difficulties that were caused by the nature of German government and society. The Emperor was in a position to exert authority because he was able to appoint Chancellors and they remained dependent on his support. Candidates should be aware that Chancellors were able to have more influence over domestic policies both because of the constitution and because of Wilhelm's inclinations. Some reference should be made to the Chancellors' relationship with the Reichstag; candidates may interpret this as a strength or a weakness.

Question 2**03** Why did the tsarist regime want to develop Russian industry in the 1890s?*(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 tsarist governments wanted to develop Russian industry in the 1890s

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the role of Witte was a key factor. Although other Finance Ministers had attempted to develop Russian industry in the previous decades, Witte was really the driving force behind Russian attempts to modernise in the 1890s. He believed that the tsarist regime had to modernise if it was to survive, otherwise the country would become dependent on foreign goods, and would be weaker internationally
- political opposition and unrest undermined the regime. Modernisation, although it carried its own risks, would increase wealth, and strengthen both the finances and the control of the regime.
- Russia lagged behind the other European powers and needed rapid industrialisation in order to compete. Memories of defeats in the Crimean War and the danger of conflict in

the Balkans meant that the government was keen to develop resources, despite the dangers of industrialisation.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might explain that the role of government was vital in promoting the modernisation of Russia and that Witte was the key figure in doing this.

Question 2

- 04** How successful was the tsarist regime in solving Russia's economic problems in the years 1906 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 tsarist governments were able to solve Russia's economic problems might include:

- Russia industrialised rapidly in the years 1906 to 1914, much of the work having been done prior to this time period by Witte. He did not remain in office after the crisis of 1905 was over but his work such as putting Russia on the gold standard and attracting foreign investment continued to help the Russian economy grow
- by 1914 Russia was the world's fifth largest industrial power and the fourth largest producer of coal, pig iron, and steel, it was also a key producer of petroleum. The economy grew at the rate of 8.5% between 1908 and 1914
- new industries developed, consumer goods, cars, and food processing
- the railway network continued to grow, and was the second largest in the world by 1913, this helped lead to the development of new industrial centres
- mining and textiles continued to develop
- Stolypin's reforms went some way towards modernising agriculture which was vital if the rapidly growing industrial population was to be fed. He brought in reforms to satisfy the land hunger of the peasants such as the Peasants' Land Bank in 1906. Peasants were given the chance to consolidate and improve their holdings. Peasants were allowed to leave the Mir and there was redistribution of land and the opening up of areas such as Siberia and the Steppes
- there were improvements in the efficiency of farms, machinery and artificial fertilisers were introduced. Co-operatives in villages helped peasants get access to tools and new equipment
- agriculture was able to produce grain for domestic consumption and for export. Products such as eggs, butter, livestock and dairy goods became available for some workers in towns
- there was some attempt to improve workers' conditions, reforms provided health and accident insurance for some workers.

Factors suggesting that these problems were not solved might include:

- although the Russian economy grew, much development was still needed. Russia was still a backward country in comparison with western powers. In 1912 it produced only 5.6% of the world's pig iron and only 3.6% of its steel. In 1910 only 30% of Russia's total national production was industrial, a low figure even compared to Austria-Hungary's 47%
- much of Russia's development was dependent on foreign investment which resulted in huge debts
- although the railway network grew rapidly it was still behind that of the developed nations. 1908 to 1913 saw a very slow rate of growth in the rail network. Communications and transport in Russia remained inadequate
- foreign trade showed that Russian exports were predominantly agricultural
- Russia failed to develop new industries very quickly and remained dependent on textiles and mining
- agricultural reforms were limited, consolidation was a slow process and less than 10% of peasant holdings had been improved by 1915. Land transfers slowed down by 1914, and many peasants remained very conservative
- poverty and unrest continued both in the countryside and the towns, the process of industrialisation produced social strains that the government was unable to cope with.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness of the economic problems that faced Russia in this time period. They will be able to give a balanced appreciation of both the successes and failures of the governments at that time.

Question 3

- 05** Why did Bismarck wish to keep peace between Russia and Austria=Hungary at the Congress of Berlin in 1878? (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and 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 Bismarck wished to keep peace between Austria-Hungary and Russia at the Congress of Berlin

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Bismarck wished to maintain friendly relations with both Russia and Austria-Hungary. The Dreikaiserbund had been signed to achieve this. Crisis in the Balkans might force him to take sides. He wished to avoid this situation and therefore offered himself as the 'honest broker' in order to diffuse the situation
- the Congress of Berlin was also an opportunity for Bismarck to put himself at the centre of the diplomatic stage, and to put the humiliation of the 'War in Sight' crisis behind him
- Bismarck's main aim in foreign policy was to continue the isolation of France. A conflict between Austria-Hungary and Russia in the Balkans might well give France the chance to gain an ally, and if Germany took sides on the issue it was possible that one of these countries would become hostile to Germany

- Bismarck had no interest in a change in the balance of power in Europe, he was satisfied with the situation as it was. Any Balkans conflict could change the balance of power and he did not wish this to occur.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might explain how Bismarck did not wish to alienate either side in the conflict because of the likelihood that this would provide France with an ally. Candidates may also prioritise, putting forward the view that either maintaining the balance of power or the need to isolate France was the most important reason.

Question 3

- 06** How far were the worsening relations between Germany and Russia in the years 1890 to 1909 due to tensions in the Balkans? (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.

Factors suggesting that tensions in the Balkans were responsible for worsening relations between Germany and Russia in the years 1890 to 1909:

- tensions in the Balkans in the years before 1890 had led to a deteriorating relationship between Germany and Russia, e.g. the Balkans Crisis of 1885–1886 when Russia and Austria-Hungary came very close to war and Bismarck had to warn the Austrians that Germany would not go to war over the issue. The Dreikaiserbund was due for renewal in 1887 but was not continued because of this issue
- the failure to renew the Reinsurance treaty by the new Kaiser because it seemed to conflict with German obligations to Austria-Hungary left Russia isolated and ripe for an alliance with Republican France, leaving Germany encircled by possible rivals
- Russia's defeat in the Russo-Japanese war led to her attention turning back to the Balkans and increased hostility towards Austria-Hungary
- Austria-Hungary's takeover of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908 further led to a decline in relations
- overall the possible conflict between Austrian and Russian interests in the Balkans meant that it was impossible for Germany to remain on good terms with both powers.

Factors suggesting that other issues might be responsible might include:

- Germany's introduction of tariffs damaged relations but had nothing to do with the situation in the Balkans. Financial motivation was a key factor in the increasingly friendly relations between Russia and France
- the relationship between Russia and France was a key factor in worsening relations between Russia and Germany. French loans to Russia and the Russian anger at the imposition of German tariffs show that economic factors were important in causing problems in the relationship. French ships visited Russia and military negotiations were underway by 1891
- colonial tensions with France, (such as the two Moroccan crises) led to strain in the relationship between Germany and France's ally Russia
- Germany's feeling that she was encircled by enemies led to growing tension. The alliance network was not totally based on the relationship between Austria-Hungary and Germany
- in this period it was possible for Austria and Russia to agree over problems such as issues in the Ottoman Empire, e.g. the Murzsteg Agreement.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that the relationship between Russia and Germany was affected by a range of factors, and that although conflict between Russia and Austria-Hungary in the Balkans made it difficult for Germany to sustain friendly relations with both powers, there were other factors working on the relationship.

Converting marks into UMS marks

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

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