



**General Certificate of Education
January 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

January 2011

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1K: Russia and Germany, 1871–1914

Question 1

01 Explain why Bismarck broke with the National Liberals 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 broke with the National Liberals in 1878.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- there were economic problems in Germany by the late 1870s, this is sometimes known as the 'Great Depression'. Following unification the German economy had experienced something of a boom, and had largely followed the liberal policy of 'Free Trade'. Bismarck had worked with the National Liberals because in the early years of the new

German state they appeared to have the same goals, and the policy of 'Free Trade' appeared to be successful. However, with economic problems there was a growing impetus towards protection from both business and agrarian interests. The National Liberals would not have accepted protection whereas the Conservatives were in favour of tariffs

- Bismarck wished to maintain support in the Reichstag but in the 1878 elections the National Liberals lost seats which made them less useful politically. Bismarck was a Prussian landowner, which some people have argued made him inherently conservative, as well as support for protection the Conservatives were also likely to support his attack on socialism
- by the late 1870s Bismarck was ready to abandon the Kulturkampf, in which he had been supported by the National Liberals. The Kulturkampf had not been popular with many Conservatives and its abandonment meant that gaining Conservative support for other policies was more possible
- Bismarck's campaign against socialism included repression of the SPD and increased state intervention in working and living conditions. The National Liberals were highly unlikely to support either of these two strands of policy as they were opposed to state intervention, and also strongly in favour of individual freedoms and liberties.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might explain how the above factors combined to make it necessary for Bismarck to look to the Conservatives for political support, rather than continue to work with the National Liberals.

Question 1

- 02** How far was economic growth in Germany in the years 1879 to 1914 due to the policies of German governments? (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 the importance of the role played by German governments might include:

- the 'Great Depression' had led to calls for protection from landowners and industrialist. Tariffs on foodstuffs and on imported industrial goods were introduced, possibly assisting the recovery of the German economy by the early 1880s. Caprivi amended these to reduce the tariffs on imported foodstuffs and to gain favourable rates for German exports in a series of trade treaties with Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Italy amongst others. This reduced the price of food within Germany, benefiting the domestic economy, and helped to expand export markets. Policy after 1902 saw a further reorientation of tariff policy, protecting both agriculture and certain industries from foreign competition
- governments passed laws allowing cartels, the number of which grew, particularly in the 1880s. These organisations allowed German industry to benefit from working together, and to influence government policy, which gave them a safe home market enabling German companies to sell cheaply in export markets. Cartels also influenced government policy on the arms industry and on the development of colonies
- the banking system helped the German economy to grow. This could be credited to the German government, and provided a stream of investment for industry, in particular the development of transport networks most notably the railways which grew dramatically at this time
- the government provided an excellent education system, in particular technical education, which assisted the growth of new industries in Germany. Literacy rates amongst workers were much higher than in many other European powers. Many universities specialised in scientific and technical research which assisted the development of new industries such as chemicals and electrics in Germany
- state socialism including sickness and unemployment insurance, medical treatment and old age pensions led to a higher living standard and promoted industrial development
- government promotion of 'Weltpolitik' stimulated economic growth, new markets were developed overseas and the German merchant fleet expanded rapidly. Germany's share of the world market almost equalled Britain's by 1914. Military expansion, especially the naval building programme after 1897 promoted further economic development.

Factors suggesting that other factors played a key role or that government policy was not always successful might include:

- the growth of population in Germany was a key factor in economic growth, also the flood of workers into the towns was a vital factor in industrial development but not one that was planned for by governments. This led to poor conditions, such as overcrowding and poor sanitation. Despite government efforts to introduce state socialism conditions remained poor in many areas leading to the increased popularity of socialism. German industry was also able to grow rapidly because it had a large domestic market
- Germany was able to develop because of the supply of raw materials within its geographical boundaries. There is no evidence that government policy helped to increase these resources through colonial expansion as the number of colonies gained remained small and of little economic value in the years before 1914
- the banking system used private capital to fund industrial loans and transport development
- government policy was often detrimental, military expenditure led to high taxation and to a deficit budget. It can be claimed that the Germany economy was facing problems by 1914
- agriculture in Germany failed to develop in the same way as industry. This led to some discontent from many landowners who campaigned to increase tariffs on foodstuffs further.

Higher level answers are likely to show an awareness that the role of the government in achieving economic growth was considerable but that others factors also played a part. They may also challenge the view that all government policy had a beneficial impact.

Question 2**03** Explain why there was revolution in Russia in 1905. (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 there was revolution in Russia in 1905.

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

- Russian peasants and workers suffered great hardships in the years leading up to 1905. Conditions in the factories were very poor, with long hours and low wages. Living conditions were extremely bad for many industrial workers who suffered from overcrowding and poor sanitation. There were frequent food shortages which affected both workers and peasants. There was also peasant discontent about the shortage of land and because the organisation of peasant life after emancipation led to a lack of control over how they farmed their land. Redemption payments meant that many suffered from debt
- Russia was an autocracy which gave the people no legitimate way of improving these conditions. Nicholas was determined to maintain the autocracy. Workers in particular were targeted by revolutionary groups who aimed to overthrow the regime. Strikes and protests were common, as was repressive action by the government in response

- an economic downturn in the early years of the 1900s as well as harvest failure in 1901/2 had led to an increase in the number of strikes and protests.

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

- from 1904–1905 Russia was involved in an unsuccessful war against Japan. This had two consequences; firstly Russian failure was a humiliation that led to increased unrest at home, secondly the number of troops involved in the conflict meant that the regime was less able to use repression against opposition. Anger at the war also led to mutinies within the armed forces for example that on the Potemkin on the Black Sea.
- the Bloody Sunday massacre of 22 January 1905, which saw imperial troops shoot an estimated 1000 protesters outside the Tsar's Winter Palace led to increased anger and resentment against Nicholas himself. An increasing number of strikes reflected this anger
- Nicholas himself made the situation worse by failing to respond to the massacre with concessions at an early stage. He was reluctant to give away any autocratic power
- revolutionary groups, though slow to react, took some advantage of the situation. Liberal groups demanded an elected assembly.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might explain how long term discontent was exacerbated by the particular conditions of 1905.

Question 2

- 04** How successful was the tsarist regime in restoring political stability in Russia 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 Russian governments were successful in restoring political stability in Russia in the years 1906 to 1914 might include

- reforms were passed, the number of primary schools nearly doubled between 1905 and 1914. Expenditure, through the Zemstva, on health and poor relief almost doubled. Workers saw an increase in living standards due to a boom in industry, the number of savings accounts grew. There were fewer strikes from 1907 until 1911/1912, and the membership of Trade Unions and of extremist political parties fell
- although the Tsar had to make concessions in October 1905, by 1906 order was restored. The Tsar issued the Fundamental Law reasserting his autocratic power. Nicholas also retained the power to direct foreign policy and to appoint and dismiss ministers
- when the Dumas proved difficult Stolypin was able to dissolve them and change the franchise. The third Duma (1907-1912) was elected on this limited franchise and the deputies were moderates, able to work with the regime. Reforms were passed, including improvements in the treatment of workers and educational reforms
- Stolypin used a mixture of reform, particularly in the countryside, and repression to control disorder. Martial law was introduced and Stolypin's necktie was used to punish revolutionaries. However he realised that more than repression was needed and introduced agrarian reforms to improve the lives of the peasants and to maintain food supplies.

Factors suggesting that the regime was not successful in restoring political stability might include

- although the number of strikes declined from 1906 this could be viewed as a temporary feature, as from 1911 onwards strikes began to increase. It could be said that repression was a key factor in the lessening of opposition. By 1914 the country was again gripped by strikes. Reaction to the killing of strikers in the Lena goldfields in 1912 created protests in support all over the country
- the first and second Dumas were troublesome for the Tsar and his ministers. They included many radicals such as the Kadets who issued the Vyborg Manifesto calling for civil disobedience when the regime refused their demands for reform. Stolypin was forced to limit the franchise in order to achieve a Duma that he could work with
- violence and extremism continued despite Stolypin's repression. He himself was assassinated in 1911 leaving the Tsar without an effective minister.

Higher level answers are likely to show awareness that the regime did have some success in restoring political stability to Russia, but are also likely to show an awareness of changes over time and an appreciation that the regime was not completely successful

Question 3

05 Why did Wilhelm II introduce *Weltpolitik*? (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 Wilhelm II introduced a policy of *Weltpolitik*.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Wilhelm II wished to make sure that Germany had a bigger role in world affairs. The Kaiser took a close interest in foreign policy and his appointments such as von Bulow to the foreign ministry showed his desire to increase Germany's influence. By the late 1890s Wilhelm was exercising more influence on government and both the imperial constitution and his own personality gave him a greater role to play in foreign policy. Some commentators have speculated that family rivalry etc spurred the Kaiser on to increase German influence
- German industry was demanding the development of foreign markets and the acquisition of colonies. Cartels had a great deal of political influence and they put forward concerns that in order to continue economic growth Germany would need greater supplies of raw material and markets for industrial goods. For many that meant acquiring colonies or at

least expanding foreign trade through informal influence. Many powerful interests believed that Germany, in von Bulow's words, needed "it's place in the sun"

- Weltpolitik was a way of dealing with pressures within Germany. The rise of socialism continued despite repression after the fall of Caprivi those around the Kaiser began to believe that the divisions within German society could be overcome by promoting patriotism. The policy of Weltpolitik, although it appeared to be a greater focus on foreign policy was closely linked to the idea of Sammlungspolitik, the gathering together under a common policy, or again in von Bulow's words, "only a successful foreign policy can help to reconcile, pacify, rally, unite".

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might link together the increased role played by the Kaiser by the late 1890s and the appointment of von Bulow at that time. They may also link domestic and foreign policy to explain the development of Weltpolitik at that time.

Question 3

- 06** How far was *Weltpolitik* the cause of growing tension between Germany and the other European powers in the years 1897 to 1911? (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 *Weltpolitik* was the cause of growing tension between Germany and the other European powers in the years 1897 to 1911 might include:

- the impact of Germany's attempt to develop world interests on relations with Great Britain. Although not strictly in the time period, the Kaiser's attempts to intervene in world affairs in both the Kruger telegram and in Delagoa Bay, may have already damaged relations between Germany and a country, which at that stage appeared a natural ally
- the development of the German navy had a considerable impact on the relationship between Germany and Great Britain. The naval building programme began in 1897 and continued until 1912. Relations with Britain showed a decline through this period as the naval race between the two powers developed. In 1898 and in 1901 attempts were made to forge an alliance between Britain and Germany, however by 1904 Britain had entered the Entente Cordiale with France, possibly as a result of the threat of German naval development. Continued naval rivalry led to poor relations up to 1911, and agreements between Britain and France to use their navies together against the German threat. However relations between Germany and Britain improved with the slowing of German naval building after 1911
- Germany's interference in Morocco led to closer ties between Britain and France and was followed by the Triple Entente between Britain, France and Russia in 1907
- the second Moroccan crisis in 1911, linked to concern about Germany's continued naval building strengthened the relationship between Britain and France.

Factors suggesting that *Weltpolitik* was not responsible for growing tension between Germany and other European powers might include,

- despite the Kruger telegram, Delagoa Bay and the beginning of German naval development, Britain was still willing to consider alliance with Germany in both 1898 and in 1901. The alliance was not made because of the reluctance of both powers to run the risk of being dragged into conflict on the others behalf
- the Entente between Britain and France was the result of improved relations following the low point of the Fashoda crisis, and the reluctance of both powers to become involved in the Russo-Japanese war. It was essentially a colonial agreement and by no means a military agreement directed against Germany
- the Russo-Japanese war and the defeat suffered by Russia can be seen as a vital factor in the changing relationship between Russia and Britain. Russia's interests were directed away from the east and rivalry with Britain, back to the Balkans and conflict with Austria-Hungary. Britain was able to sign an Entente with a Russia that no longer represented a great colonial threat. The agreement with Russia remained only a colonial treaty and was not officially directed against Germany. This can be shown by the lack of support given to Russia over Bosnia in 1908
- the relationship between Britain and Germany was cordial after 1911, involving co-operation over the Balkan wars and colonial issues.
- the alliances between France and Russia and between Germany and Austria-Hungary, which had remained consistent regardless of Germany's imperial and naval policies, can be considered the greatest cause of tension between the powers.

Higher level answers are likely to show an awareness that although *Weltpolitik* had an impact on the relationship between Germany and the other powers this impact was limited and that there were other factors working on the relationship.