

History

Answers and commentaries A-level (7042)

2G The Birth of the USA, 1760— 1801

Marked answers from students for questions from the June 2022 exams. Supporting commentary is provided to help you understand how marks are awarded and how students can improve performance.

Contents

The below content table is interactive. You can click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

Question 1	3
Question 3	13

Answers and commentaries

Please note that these responses have been reproduced exactly as they were written by the student.

This resource is to be used alongside the A-level History Component 2G The Birth of the USA, 1760–1801 June 2022 Question paper and inserts.

Question 1

With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the problems facing the new nation created in 1783.

[30 marks]

Mark scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**

A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/2G THE BIRTH OF THE USA – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

L1: The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**

Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Student responses

Response A

Source A is of good some for an historian studying the problems facing the new nation created in 1783. In this extract, Paine talks about a key issue facing the United States, that being the issue of foreign policy. Paine mentions how because there was not a strong national government uniting the states that the 'world [...] will not be impressed merely by the name.' In other words, without a strong national government, the world will not respect the United States as a nation, thus may continue to harass the young nation. Paine's beliefs would be proven by the young nation's relations with the United Kingdom and with Spain. The United Kingdom had relinquished its control over much land around the Great Lakes, however, British soldiers continued to garrison forts in this relinquished territory. However, when John Adams was granted audience by King George III in 1785, the King told Adams that because Congress lacked authority over the States, and could not control them, Britain would not negotiate with Congress. Spain, meanwhile, blocked US access to the Mississippi river, which it had been granted in the Treaty of Paris, and demanded harsh terms for the US to gain access. As such, Paine's arguments concerning the problems that a weak national government would cause in terms of foreign policy are of very good use to an historian studying the the problems facing the new nation. However, Paine's earlier arguments in the extract detract from the value of this source. Paine greatly underemphasises the severity of other problems facing the young nation. Paine argues that 'the debt is small, compared to what America has gained', that America could now direct its own economic policy and that 'America has gained a great ally in France.' However, at the end of the Revolutionary War, American debt totalled to \$41 million dollars, with \$33 million being domestic and \$8 million being foreign. Congress lacked any means of raising revenue, and as such, this debt would be a major issue facing the new nation. On top of this, America was shut out of many markets, notably the Spanish market, and still heavily reliant on Britain for much trade. Finally, France would largely ignore its American ally, and would not support the new nation, despite their formal alliance. In the aftermath of independence, Franco-American relations deteriorated significantly. Thus, whilst Paine's concerns over the issues that a weak national government will cause for the nation's foreign policy are of great use to an historian studying the problems facing the new nation, Paine's underemphasis of other issues detracts somewhat from the value of this source.

The provenance of Source A somewhat detracts from its value to an historian studying the problems facing the new nation in 1783. This publication was written in April 1783, very shortly after the war had been won. This means that many issues, including those that Paine himself minimised, were not yet apparent, thus Paine could not write about how the issues had effected the new nation, but only about how he believed they would effect the new nation. On top of this, the source is a publication, intended for public consumption. This means that Paine is likely to be very one-sided. Paine was likely trying to make the new government look in a more secure position than it actually was, to inspire confidence in it. This can be seen, as Paine's tone in this publication is overall very positive about the new nation's situation, not wanting to make the nation seem weak. Only in the latter half of the extract does Paine adopt a more serious tone, concerning the one issue he truly sees for the nation. Nonetheless, the author, Thomas Paine, was very politically active, thus he likely understood the position of the new nation well, adding somewhat to the Source's value. Overall, the provenance slightly detracts from the Source's value, being written in 1783, before some issues could become apparent, and having been written to convince people of Paine's viewpoint. However, the fact that

A-LEVEL HISTORY – 7042/2G THE BIRTH OF THE USA – ANSWERS AND COMMENTARIES

the author was an important, politically active, figure adds to the Source's value for an historian studying the problems facing the new nation created in 1783.

Source B is of some, but little value to an historian studying the problems facing the new nation created in 1783. In Source B, Hamilton writes about how that now the war was over, the new government should respect the rights of those who had been loyalist during the war. He specifically mentions the clause in the Paris Peace Treaty which stated that the American government should return seized property to loyalists, and respect their rights as citizens. As much as 55% of the American population may have, to some extent, been loyalists during the American Revolutionary War, and of those, many thousands joined loyalists militia, or otherwise supported the British during the war. As such, the presence of such a large group, who had not wanted independence from Britain, could potentially cause issues for the new government. Hamilton argues that they should be given 'not only protection, but also participation in government privileges.' Although Congress would encourage State governments to return seized property, this rarely happened, and loyalists did often face discrimination. However, loyalist dissatisfaction did not end up becoming a large issue for the new government, as the revolts that the new government did face, such as Shay's Rebellion in 1786-87, were largely from dissatisfied revolutionaries. Nonetheless, with loyalists making up such a large portion of the population, their opposition to government would be a large problem for the new nation, thus Hamilton was correct that they posed a threat, even if his beliefs would not be proven. As such, Hamilton's beliefs about loyalists is of little value to an historian studying the problems facing the new nation. Although there was a large loyalists population that could have opposed the American government, they did not end up being a large issue for the new government, and Hamilton's pleas were largely ignored.

The provenance of source B, by and large, detracts from the value of the source. The source was published in a newspaper in 1784. This means that the purpose of the source was to convince as many people as possible to support Hamilton's views on the treatment of loyalists, thus is likely very one-sided. The source is also written in January 1784, when the issue of loyalists was still unresolved, and the new government was yet to see if they would be an issue. However, the author being Alexander Hamilton, detracts somewhat to the Source's value. Hamilton was very influential over early American politics, an ardent Federalist, Hamilton believed in the need for a strong national government, largely dominated by the elite, although the fact that Hamilton was such an influential figure adds somewhat to the Source's value, Hamilton's own personal convictions as a Federalist, mean that this Source is likely one-sided, as Hamilton's ideal government would need strong popular support across all of society, thus winning over loyalists was vital for Hamilton's own personal ends. Thus, overall, the provenance of source B detracts from the value of the source, as due to Hamilton's own personal convictions, and the nature of the source as a newspaper article intended for public consumption, means that this source is likely very one-sided.

Source C is of great value to an historian studying the problems facing the new nation created in 1783. In his letter, Washington argues that the nation is near crisis, as the states, described as 'disunited' are 'refusing compliance with the central government under the Article of Confederation.' This was something that was seen in the early United States. Many states continued to exercise powers that they had relinquished under the Articles of Confederation, and Congress had no power to prevent this. States began adopting their own fiscal policies, which caused major issues for the new nation, as debt payment became difficult, and states whose fiscal policies failed, such as southern states who printed large amounts of paper money, would have a great negative impact on investors in other states. Whilst there was cooperation to an extent, the States had agreed on

Western Land policies with the Land Ordinances of 1784 and 1785, and no State was able to put in place oppressive duties, as if they did, merchants would simply import through other states, this lack of unity was causing significant issues. On top of this, Washington argues that the States had 'violated the Peace Treaty', but that Congress was powerless to deal with this. This is also true. The Peace Treaty had stipulated that the US government would encourage American debtors to pay their debt to UK holders in full, however, State governments refused to do so, which was a key reason behind British occupation of forts in the Great Lakes region. Thus, Washington's arguments in this extract are of great use to an historian studying the problems facing the new nation.

The provenance of Source C also adds to its value. The source is a private letter from George Washington to John Jay. Both Washington and Jay held similar views in regards to the issues facing the new nation, thus Washington, not needing to convince Jay of anything, is likely expressing his honest opinions in this letter, adding the source's value. The fact that this was a private letter, never intended for public consumption, further implies that these are likely Washington's earnest views. Furthermore, being written in late 1786, the problems facing the new nation had already become apparent, thus the content of this letter is based upon events that had already taken place, and the issues brought up were very apparent. Because of this, Washington is writing about issues that were happening, not what he thought would happen, adding to the Source's value. Furthermore, Washington was arguably the single most influential figure over American politics during this period, thus his opinion on the issues facing the new nation are of great importance. Thus, overall, the importance of Washington as a political figure, the nature of this source and the date it was written, add greatly to the value of this source to an Historian studying the problems facing the new nation created in 1783.

This is a Level 5 response

The response clearly attempts to assess the value of the sources in relation to content and provenance. It shows good to very good understanding of the content of Sources A and B and excellent understanding of the content of Source C. The content is closely interrogated by the deployment of excellent and appropriate own knowledge. The evaluation of provenance is detailed with references supported by knowledge, to author, date and context. The conclusions as to overall value are somewhat tentative and contentious but are fully supported by some convincing detail.

Response B

Source A is ~~less useful or~~ valuable in discussing the problems facing the new nation ~~because~~ because it minimises the ~~the~~ dire ~~issues~~ of economic issues facing the country after the war. The ~~new~~ Paige uses a hopeful tone when giving the overall message that the American success from the war of independence ~~outweighed~~ outweighed the new problems that arose. This is ^{less} valuable because it demonstrates that the lack of acknowledgment for new problems that exacerbated tensions within the new nation. This is supported by the National debt being \$41 million dollars growing exponentially. ~~and~~ What worsens this fact was that due to the currency being weak the payment of this war debt was hindered thus leading to high inflation. This makes the source less valuable because ~~it~~ the only thing "America had gained" was pressure on finding solutions to pay the war debt. The source states that there was no foreign power to ~~the~~ monopolise its commerce which ~~so~~ shows the extent of the financial ~~issues~~ issues faced because ~~was~~ resulting from the war America had lost its trading ~~power~~ benefits with Europe and the British Empire. This point is highly valuable because it explains that there was a reduced ~~the~~ income coming in to America thus not stimulating the economy. This is significant ~~as~~ because as a new nation an important requirement is for money to spend it. Without it would mean the vulnerability to foreign powers and the inability to offer support domestically. What makes the source less

Concerning is the fact it was written by Thomas Paine because of his background ~~to~~ in history leading to this point. As he was a key figure in the American Revolution, providing ideological inspiration, he is of the perspective that the outcome of the ~~the war was necessary and these the problems~~ war was necessary for the greater good. This makes the source less valuable because, ~~as supported by the text,~~ he insinuates that the problems were necessary despite the detrimental affect towards the American economy.

Source B is highly valuable in discussing the problems ~~faced by~~ facing the New Nation because it highlights the domestic issues regarding America post war of independence. Hamilton's overall message is that despite eradicating the foreign British threat, ~~other~~ American faced the new problem of a budding domestic ~~the~~ enemy with the ~~beauty~~ remaining loyalist population in America; ultimately threatening success of the new nation. Hamilton uses a forbidding tone that gives the ~~implic~~ ~~that~~ ~~a~~ negative problem for the future if the loyalist problem is not solved. By stating that the loyalists "Should not be made to face loss or damage" suggests tensions between the loyalists and nationalist Americans. This is supported with reference to the Treaty of Paris⁽³³⁾ which specifies the need rule of returning loyalist ~~the~~ property. This makes the source highly valuable because it demonstrates the dissent between the American people. Moreover the argument that there ~~there~~ was a threat of ~~the~~ ~~creation~~ ~~of~~ ~~a~~ ~~domestic~~ ~~enemy~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~new~~ ~~nation~~ ~~is~~ ~~clear~~ ~~from~~ ~~the~~ ~~text~~ ~~itself~~.

threat, can be legitimised by the fact that the British had not withdrawn from this frontier post. The ~~press~~ ^{inclusion} presence of "enemies against the US government" there is apparent, further making this source more valuable as it recognises the presence of the loyalist population. The ~~contribution~~ ^{contribution} of the British ~~and~~ ^{remaining} British and the loyalist is threatening to ~~conceal~~ ^{weaken} and ~~the~~ ^{the} nation not prepared for another war thus demonstrating a problem the new nation faced after the 181783. Although this argument can be ~~weakened~~ ^{weakened} by the fact that this ^{article} ~~speech~~ was sold to the New York Star. As ~~it was~~ ^{it was} New York had a very small population of loyalists so the inclusion of the source would already be in favour of Hamilton's defence of American policy towards the loyalists. Perhaps if this ~~speech~~ ^{article} was produced in a Southern State like Georgia would this source be ~~even~~ ^{even} more valuable as it would ~~not~~ ^{give} it the purpose to reduce tensions with the ~~the~~ ^{the} loyalists and further reducing the ~~a~~ ^a problem that the new nation faced.

Source C is also valuable in showing the problems the new nation faced because it ~~not~~ ^{implies} that America overall was weakened and there were problems in every section of society and politics. This is supported by Washington's urgent tone which makes the source more valuable because it demonstrates that the problems facing the

new nation was an urgent cause for amelioration. The overall message ~~was~~ is that America is on the verge of "Crisis". The Source states that the "States will not carry out measures" for their own good" which implies an element of anarchy against the weak central government resulting from the Articles of Confederation (81). This is supported by Shays's Rebellion of 1786 when farmers refused to pay the increased taxes until after the agricultural depression. This was significant because it ~~highlighted~~ highlights the social upheaval resulting from the economic and financial problems. This makes the Source valuable because it demonstrates how there was ~~an~~ unrest within the country. Moreover the Source states ~~that~~ that there was a need for a "strong + effective authority" which ~~proves~~ suggests \cup politically also notes American weakness. This makes the Source valuable because it supports the point that overall America was in a crisis as the union had ~~weakened~~ weakened in a direction which effects seeped into all levels of society. Furthermore the Source highlights the "anticipation" for revolution which again ~~trif~~ shows the extent to which America was ~~at~~ the problems faced by the new nation ~~made~~ pushed ~~and~~ America to a breaking point making the Source highly valuable as it demonstrates the ~~instability~~ overall instability of the nation.

This is a Level 3 response

The response attempts to assess the value of all three sources. The content of the sources is generally understood, less so in Source A and more so in Source C. There is some attempt to consider the provenance of the sources in relation to the author, but this is the weakest part of the answer. Comments made on the authors lack developed contextual knowledge and are assertive in approach. The dates and nature of the sources are not explored in any detail. For example, little is made of the fact that Source C is a letter to a close friend and what might be the significance of this.

Question 3

To what extent was tension, in the years 1770 to 1774, the result of British, rather than colonial actions?

[25 marks]

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**

Student responses

Response A

Overall, the extent that tension in the years 1770 to 1774 was the result of British, rather than colonial actions is very limited. This is because colonial actions drove the increase in tensions largely from 1770 to 1772, and it was only after this that the British actions contributed to the tension that colonial actions had already built up.

One could argue that the extent to which tension was the result of British actions rather than colonial ones is extremely limited as there is strong evidence to suggest that the colonies exacerbated situations, contributing largely to increased tensions. Firstly, one could point to how the colonies responded to the Boston Massacre that occurred on the 5th of March in 1770. While it was the British who fired, killing 5 Bostonians, this only happened because most of the people put pressure on the soldiers, backing them into a corner, resulting in the subsequent gun fire. This point is made even stronger as the colonies then exacerbated the tension this event caused through Paul Revere making an engraving that made the situation look far worse than it actually was, causing colonial unrest and thus building resentment towards Britain, increasing tensions. Furthermore, the Boston Gazette spun the story

in such a way to make it look like the British were trying to, "Quell the spirit of liberty" - further angering the colonists and thus their resentment towards the British, widening tensions to come out from a singular event. Another situation that the colonists can be seen causing tension as opposed to the British can be seen with the Burning of the Gaspee that occurred in Rhode Island in the summer of 1772. Since the colonies actively went out of their way to hunt the Gaspee ship into open water and then looted and burnt it, it was a clear sign of colonial violence against the British, raising tensions between them as Britain was upset at what had occurred. Furthermore, the colonies even seemed to hand the culprits in, despite their being wealthy towns, causing tensions to increase as the colonies were actively persecuting the British from enjoying the laws, resulting in the colonies rather than Britain being responsible for the tensions caused. Another great fact that could be pointed to which demonstrates that it was largely the colonies who increased tensions rather than the British as the colonies build up large amounts of resentment unnecessarily therefore. For example, in February 1770, an 11 year old was killed by a suspected British, infers ignorance. While this may seem like it was the British building tensions, the spirit of liberty needlessly turned the boy's funeral into a political demonstration which 5000 people attended for the sole purpose of increasing anti-British sentiment within the colonies, resulting in the colonies being more likely to react to events in the future which would subsequently increase tensions between America and Britain as the Americans would be seen by the British as doing things out of proportion. Therefore, overall, the argument for the ~~colonies~~ extent to which the British caused tensions to rise being limited is a strong one as there is plenty of evidence to suggest that it was the colonies who took part in actions to outrage the British

while needlessly building anti-British sentiment themselves - particularly in the years 1770 to 1772.

On the other hand, one could make the argument that the extent to which British actions caused tension rather than colonial ones is large due to the British often aggravating the colonies which provoked a response - particularly in the years 1773 and 1774. Firstly, one could point to how the British was responsible for causing the Battle of Golden Hill which occurred in New York on the 17th of January 1770. Since it was the British who needlessly started, humbly denouncing the colonists as people who thought their liberty depended upon a piece of wood - they were the one who ignited the two-day battle. Thus the British could be argued to have increased tensions as they were the cause of direct conflict between Britain and America which unavoidably increased tensions as they had battled each other directly. Another event that one could argue Britain caused, subsequently increasing tensions, can be seen with the introduction of the Tea Act on the 27th of April 1773. While it is true that this was not implemented out of malice to the colonies, but rather to save the near bankrupt British East India Trading Company, having been familiar with how the colonies reacted to previous taxes (Sugar Act and Townshend Acts), the British had provoked the colonies which eventually resulted in the Boston Tea Party occurring on the 16th of December 1773, increasing tensions between the two massively. While it was the colonies who dumped 342 tonnes of tea worth £10,000 into the sea, aggravating the British - they only did so because of a British action and subsequently the ~~increase~~ tension that the Boston Tea Party caused lies solely on British actions causing it, strengthening the argument that British actions were the main cause of tension. Furthermore,

one could point to how Britain introduced the Coercive Acts - something that increased tensions massively. Since it has already been established that the British were to blame for the Boston Tea Party, since these acts were introduced in response to the Tea Party (done by the colonists) - the tension caused by the Coercive Acts still lies with the British. For example, through introducing the Boston Port Act which closed the port of Boston, making the main port be in Marblehead until the damaged tea had been paid for, anti-British sentiment increased, causing tensions. This is because people had to send gold and money to Bostonians to help those that were starving as a result of the Port's closure, noting the British seem like the bully who supposedly oppressed the colonists, causing tensions to increase. Furthermore, through introducing the Intolerable Administration of Justice Act, British soldiers could now be tried in Britain not America. The fact that this was dubbed as the "murder act" by the colonists since it was believed that the British could now get away with murder highlights just how much tension this British action caused between the two. Furthermore, since this Act was also seen as taking away their right of Englishmen (Clause 39+40 of the Magna Carta protect the right to justice), further discontent built up towards the British, overall increasing tensions as the colonists hated Britain more. Consequently, overall, there seems to be a strong argument for the extent to which tension was caused by Britain being large as in the years 1773-1774, they undertook actions which directly opposed the colonists, overall increasing tensions between the two as the colonists grew in their hatred towards Britain.

In conclusion, the extent to which British actions in the years 1770 to 1774 caused tension is limited, while there is evidence of this increasing tensions in the years

1773 - 1774, The tension that caused only built up the tension already established through colonial actions in the years 1770 - 1772 and so Britain cannot be said to have caused the tension that already exists. Nonetheless, it would be fair to agree that by 1773, Britain did contribute to the tension, they just weren't the main cause of it.

This is a Level 5 response

The response demonstrates an excellent understanding of the demands of the question. The introductory paragraph sets out a clear argument to be developed. In support of the argument to be advanced, precise and well-selected materials are deployed with control and extensive, supported comment. A balanced response is also offered in relation to Britain's responsibility with equally appropriate supporting evidence. Whilst some of the judgements may be challenged (especially around events in Boston), the supporting information and the consistent focus on the question make this an impressive response.

Response B

Throughout the years of 1770 to 1774, British authority ~~the~~ broke down completely, with many ~~an~~ American colonies being in open rebellion by this period. The reason for this could be attributed to British aggression, due to the violation of American rights, and ~~imposed~~ the brutal behaviour of British soldiers in America both in 1770. However due to the widespread anti-British aggression that was present in this period, as well as the refusal to accept ~~fair~~ the fair tea act, it would be more valid to disagree with the titular statement, and propose that tension in these years were a result of American colonial actions.

In some regard, the British could be seen to be responsible for some of the

~~In some~~ the British can be seen to hold responsibility ~~for~~ in causing tension in this 1770-74 time period, this can be clearly evidenced by the fact that Britain implemented repressive measures, through the 1774 Coercive acts, which led to massive increases in tensions between the Americans and British, as they instead supported American liberties.

This argument is reinforced by the fact that Britain had the opportunity to decrease tensions between America and Britain, in response to these actions, a massive tension evolved, such as a nationwide strike in 1774, with mutual in both economic activities being undermined and an upheaval in tensions. The colonies where activities had broken down in 1774. The argument that Britain was responsible for the tension in tensions could be further evidenced by the fact that in 1774, Britain had the opportunity to repeal all legislation that was offensive to Americans but instead searched. Thus, as a result of the unaddressed response policy, Britain can be seen to have been the biggest perpetrator of tensions from 1770-74.

However, tension was mainly caused by Americans, this can be seen that by the fact that the co-ercive acts were implemented not as a result of British choice to suppress American liberty, but as a result of American aggression in the 1773 Boston Tea Party. Therefore, in this regard, Americans can be seen to be guilty of the rise in tensions as they through the

destruction of property in response to the 1773 Tea Act, where over 100,000 lbs of tea was destroyed. Furthermore, it can be argued that the Tea Act, which was in response to the 1773 Tea Act, was unjustified, as the Tea Act was actually believed for the Americans, who were not able to pay a decreased price for tea. Taken together, this it is clear that Britain was not the sole reason for the events that occurred there, but American aggression and rejection of the tea act is also to blame.

One could argue in favour of the British position, and argue that tensions in this 1770-74 period were as a result of British actions, namely the March of 1770 Boston Massacre. However, this argument is weak and unconvincing, as it was proven that the British soldiers involved in this attack were in fact provoked by Americans, who were at fault for the events which led to the attack. The American side in this controversy shows in Boston in this period could further be proven by the widespread use of propaganda

In this period, this is clearly evidenced by the fact that the sons of Liberty utilised any deaths that occurred in this period as anti-British demonstrations, used to instil anti-British hate, despite in some cases the Americans being perpetrators or victims. Thus, the argument that Britain was responsible for tension in the 1770s has to be checked at its source, anti-British sentiment, and deteriorating relations. Thus, the argument that Britain was responsible for tension can be seen to be only partially false

in the Boston 1770 period, where it was actually American harassment of British soldiers, fuelled by propaganda which led to the deaths in tension around the time of the Boston Massacre.

Overall, the British could be to blame for the increase in tension from 1770 to 74, as widespread repressive measures in response to the tea party led to the overall deterioration of British rule and authority. However, leading up to this period, it was actually Americans that were the main aggressors, as can be seen in Boston. Thus, as these repressive measures were actually decided to re-establish control, due to massive American dissent.

as can be seen, in the Asian Treaty.
Therefore, although the scholar's argument
could be argued to be valid, it
is more valid to argue that the
Baton's were a cause, but the main
cause of tensions in tensions were as
a result of American action, not
Britain.

This is a Level 3 response

The response shows understanding of the question as demonstrated in the introduction which sets out an argument to be advanced. It demonstrates an understanding of some key developments (but lacks some range of issues) in the period to substantiate the overall argument and is generally, consistently focused on the question. It does lack some specificity of detail, for example, failing to provide an exact summary of the terms of the Coercive Acts, and whilst there is balance of argument, the lack of precise detail and development, the tendency to write generalised comment and the somewhat clumsy structure, undermine the response.

Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at aqa.org.uk/7042

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: history@aqa.org.uk

T: 0161 958 3865

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA Education (AQA) is a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334) and a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

