



AS

History

The Birth of the USA, 1760–1801

7041/2G The origins of the American Revolution, 1760–1776

Mark scheme

7041

June 2016

Version: 1.0 Final

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk.

June 2016

The Birth of the USA, 1760–1801

AS History Component 2G The origins of the American Revolution, 1760–1776

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the attitude of colonists to the ‘Intolerable’ Acts of 1774? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- produced by merchants (mainly) in a similar colony to Massachusetts, very soon after the announcement of punitive legislation against Boston by the British government
- New York was not directly affected by this legislation, and enjoyed better relations with the 'mother country' on balance. To some extent, New York and Boston were rivals, and New York might actually benefit from British punitive action against Boston
- although some terminology suggests identification with Massachusetts ('concern', 'sister colony'), the overall tone is measured rather than emotive.

Content and argument

- sympathy and support for the Bostonians is expressed, at least verbally, mainly at the outset of the extract. As a fellow American colony, New York felt definite affinity with her New England neighbours as they were hit with the Intolerable Acts after the Boston Tea Party
- towards the end of the first paragraph, a cautious approach is advocated: 'what exactly ought to be done... is very hard to determine'. The immediate crisis had been caused by Boston and did not directly affect New York, whose merchants enjoyed quite lucrative trade with Britain, which they did not wish to jeopardise
- in the second paragraph, a policy of procrastination is clearly advocated (a congress of deputies should meet before any action, unanimity would be necessary, etc).

Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- similar time and situation to Source A, but Rhode Island was geographically closer to Boston and more likely to come under the influence of Boston
- as a handbill, it would need to be a striking document in order to capture the attention of the man in the street

- tone is quite emotive throughout. The title of the handbill ('Join or Die'), reference to the Stamp Act as an evil monster, phrases like 'infinitely more alarming and dangerous', 'generals of tyranny' (referring to Britain), and the prospect of the colonists ending in 'slavery'.

Content and argument

- emphasises at least twice on the need for strength, unity and resistance. Proximity to Boston made it diplomatically more sensible to express firm support, especially after New York had taken a more restrained line
- an appeal is made for European support on the basis of 'freedom'. The attempt to involve Europe indicated recognition that the colonies might lack the resources to succeed alone, whilst the emphasis on 'freedom' (denial of by Britain) might be embarrassing to Britain, with its reputation as a constitutional monarchy
- readers are warned that the threat from Britain is not simply to Boston or Massachusetts, but to the whole of the American colonies.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students could demonstrate some perception of the context and the aims of each source. Source A is more measured, but that probably reflected the self-interest of merchants who enjoyed good trade with Britain, and might well be able to take economic advantage from Bostonian difficulties. Source B is less subtle, with no apparent hidden agenda, but arguably lacks insight and depth, and is little more than a rant against British policy and domination.

Section B

- 02** 'British attitudes towards the American colonies changed as a result of the Seven Years War.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Arguments suggesting that British attitudes towards the American colonies changed as a result of the Seven Years War might include:

- Britain had built up a high National Debt as a result of the war, and felt it was appropriate to recover some of this from the colonists since, from the British viewpoint, the war had been fought primarily to protect them. The traditional British policy towards the colonies ('salutary neglect') meant little revenue for Britain who failed to appreciate the importance attached by the colonists to their relative freedom from British control
- having acquired substantial new territories in Canada, with a potentially hostile 'French' population, it would require an increased military presence in North America to ensure continued control, and it was appropriate that the colonists should fund this to some extent since it was essentially for their protection, provoking a change in policy
- relations between British forces and native American Indians had fluctuated somewhat during the war. Britain was anxious to stabilise the situation, and to this end sought to restrict westward expansion by the colonists, especially after the outbreak of Pontiac's rebellion – showing a change in policy.

Arguments challenging the view that British attitudes towards the colonies changed as a result of the Seven Years War might include:

- 'Salutary neglect' was very much an unofficial policy, and Britain therefore felt no need to consult the colonists about any proposed changes. Indeed, it had never been a universal policy, and there was a tradition of low-level mercantile taxation stretching back before the war (eg the Molasses Act of 1733) – showing attitudes had not changed
- much of the immediate post-war legislation was justifiable in the context of the times: the Proclamation Line was a sensible response to Pontiac's rebellion, the Quartering Act was necessary to fund barrack supplies for British troops defending the colonies and the Currency Act was an attempt to stabilise colonial currency (which would benefit the colonists as well as British lenders)
- there was general support and sympathy for the colonists in Britain, since they were essentially 'people like us'
- the colonists paid significantly less taxation than British taxpayers, and this remained the case even after the tax increases of the mid-1760s. Some legislation, strongly opposed by American propagandists, actually benefitted the colonists financially (eg the Sugar Act, which actually reduced the duty on molasses from 6d to 3d). The British now saw the need for greater control but the real change in British attitudes towards the colonists came because of the hostile colonial undercurrent towards the 1763/1764 legislation and the violent response of the colonists to Stamp Act of 1765.

Good responses should explain that there was no fundamental change in British attitudes towards the colonists at the end of the war, and there were justifiable/understandable reasons for the legislation of 1763 onwards. It was the actions of a small number of colonial agitators, building on the perceived liberties that seemed to have evolved earlier in the century, that effectively changed the situation in North America.

- 03** ‘The American colonists were mainly responsible for the deterioration of Anglo-colonial relations in the years 1765 to 1770.’

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

Arguments suggesting that the American colonists were mainly responsible for the deterioration of Anglo-colonial relations in the years 1765 to 1770 might include:

- there were various prominent colonists (eg Sam Adams of Boston) who were increasingly unwilling to tolerate what they perceived to be continued mistreatment by Britain. The refusal of 'Patriots' like Adams and Jefferson to accept the retention of the duty on tea (when all other Townshend Duties were repealed in Feb-March 1770) inspired the protest meeting in Boston which led to the 'Boston Massacre'
- rioting broke out in the colonies against the Stamp Act (1765), starting in Massachusetts in August 1765 when a crowd destroyed the house of tax collector Andrew Oliver, with violence then spreading throughout the colonies
- the Stamp Act Congress (Oct 1765) saw 37 delegates from 9 colonies meet in New York to draw up a set of petitions denying Parliament's right to tax them. The 'Sons of Liberty', the main public manifestation of reform movements 'from below', emerged during the Stamp Act crisis as groups determined to take local action as necessary against the British
- influential writings followed, notably 'Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania' by John Dickinson in 1767–8; Dickinson, typical of the colonial elites, argued that Britain had no right to levy any taxation, internal or external, in the colonies leading to a deterioration of relations.

Arguments challenging the view that the American colonists were mainly responsible for the deterioration of Anglo-colonial relations in the years 1765 to 1770 might include:

- Britain still firmly believed that the colonists should contribute financially to the high debts incurred during the French and Indian Wars, and for their continuing defence needs. The Stamp Act was widely condemned in the colonies as an attempt to tax them internally without any form of political representation. It was British failure to acknowledge this that changed relations
- whilst the Stamp Act was sensibly repealed following colonial agitation, it was insensitively replaced by the Declaratory Act (1766), which asserted Britain's right to levy internal taxation if she wished, illustrating that it was the British who were responsible for the deterioration of relations
- Townshend's Duties (1767) imposed a range of customs duties which the colonists regarded as highly provocative. Britain sensibly opted to repeal most of these duties in early 1770, but the insistence of all (including the new, relatively conciliatory PM, Lord North) to retain the duty on tea infuriated the colonists
- British troops opened fire on a relatively small group of protestors, killing 5 ('Boston Massacre', March 1770).

Good answers are likely to be balanced, accepting that a combination of factors resulted in the deterioration of relations by 1770. Emphasis should be placed on the determination of some leading colonists to exploit any possible opportunities, and the failure of a series of relatively benign British governments to appreciate the intensity of the feelings held in the colonies. Colonial resistance came both from the social elites, who resented the insensitivity of the British, and the broader reform movements, who resented the increased taxation.