

Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in History (6HI01) Paper C

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2016

Publications Code 43880

All the material in this publication is
copyright © Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

6HI01 C - The British Empire: Colonisation and Decolonisation

Introduction

General Comments - 6HI01

The June 2016 6HI01 examination session produced a wide variety of responses and overall the majority of candidates were able to produce organised responses with at least some sound analysis and relevant supporting material. Most candidates produced responses within Levels 3-5 but there were a few candidates who misunderstood questions or who provided responses with predominantly irrelevant material. Examiners commented on the quality of argument in many of the Level 5 responses and there were many interesting responses to read. Centres and their candidates are once again to be commended on the hard work and effort that clearly goes into the preparation for the 6HI01 examination.

Please note: 6HI01 is standardised across the Option papers and so it is recommended that Centres read the reports and exemplification for all of the Options as comments made generally apply to all papers. In the case of Option E and F exemplification, where there are identical questions, this is particularly the case.

General Comments - Option C

As this qualification draws to a close it is worth noting once again that it has been a pleasure to see this option develop over the years, and to see both centres and their candidates grow in confidence in approaching the broad range of topics available. Most centres either choose a combination from topics 1-3 or study topics 6-7 but a few centres study topics from both the early and later parts of the course timespan. Several centres in the past few sessions have begun to study topic 4. As usual most candidates were well prepared and many were able to select and deploy relevant supporting material to great effect in answering their chosen questions. In the higher Levels, examiners noted some outstanding answers commenting on the quality of the responses. Most candidates achieved at Level 3 or above but there were also some very weak responses. As in previous years, centres are to be commended for their efforts in producing candidates with such sound knowledge and understanding. The examining team commented on how much the candidates appear to enjoy studying Option C, and that responses from across the range Levels showed evidence of engagement and interest.

The Origins of the British Empire, c1680-1763

Q1. This was the more popular of the two questions. Higher level responses were able to discuss the relative importance of the consumption of slave-produced goods to other factors in the growth of British trading interests across the time period. Some responses referred to British trading interests in general while others referred to specific trading companies, with either approach being valid. Most responses referenced the consumption of sugar but fewer broadened this out to other products such as tobacco, cotton etc. Weaker responses tended to discuss the given factor in relation of the growth of British influence or the expansion of the Empire.

Q2. Most candidates had a good understanding of the role of European rivalry in the expansion of the British Empire although weaker responses described rather than analysed the role of the given factor. Some weaker responses also described the European wars of the period rather than explaining their influence on the growth of Empire in the specified region. Overall many of the responses, although well focused on the given factor, were limited by the failure to select material relevant to North America and the West Indies; these responses tended to include material on India in particular. Some higher Level responses argued that, although European rivalry did lead to territorial gains and the *asiento*, the main reason for the expansion of Empire was trade, and in particular the slave trade.

Relations with the American Colonies and the War of Independence, c1740-89

Q3. Most answers were able to provide a balance between the events before and after 1763 but more responses could have highlighted the significance of 1763 as a watershed year. There was a tendency for answers to be descriptive and so many fell into the Level 3 category. There were, however, some very good answers which made sophisticated distinctions, particularly regarding the separation of 'political' and 'economic' factors in the question. A significant number confused the Treaty of Paris (1763) with the Peace of Paris (1783).

Q4. This was the more popular of the two questions and most candidates seemed to understand the question well. Indeed, there were some very good responses and many that were both well focused and detailed. The vast majority concentrated on the role of the French and disappointingly very few considered the roles of the Spanish or the League of Armed Neutrality. Many responses remained in Level 4 because, although detailed and relevant, the development of other factors tended to be dealt with separately with links and inter-relationships only being confined to the conclusion.

The Slave Trade, Slavery and the Anti-Slavery Campaigns, c1760-1833

Q5. As in previous years, the slavery topic was the most popular on the paper. Question 5 was a popular choice but many candidates struggled to develop a convincing argument. There was tendency to simply describe the development of the slave trade and the workings of the 'triangular trade'. Many responses found it difficult to develop sufficient supporting material to discuss the given factor - the growth of British industry - effectively. There were also a significant number of responses which transposed the elements of the question - discussing the influence of slavery upon industry rather than vice versa. Higher level responses were able to show the inter-relationships between the workings of the triangular trade and the growth of British industry with some suggesting that it was the investment of the profits from British industry that was the driving force behind the rapid development.

Q6. There were many good answers and most candidates were aware that the question was focused on the abolition of slavery rather than the slave trade. There were some responses which dealt with the role of individuals and events before 1807 but significantly fewer than in previous sessions where 1833 was the question focus. Most responses had some understanding of the disunity within the abolitionist cause after 1807 and were able to discuss the differences between those who supported 'gradual' and those who supported 'immediate' abolition. The role of women in the abolition of slavery was well developed. Higher level

responses often referred to the role of the reformed parliament and/or the influence of economic factors in achieving abolition.

Commerce and Conquest: India, c1760-c1835

Q7. In recent series several centres have begun to study the India topic. Most candidates are very well prepared and are able to deploy well selected knowledge to substantiate arguments. Most responses achieved at least Level 3 with the majority of responses being found in Levels 4 and 5. Most responses were able to discuss the different responses of traditional Indian rulers to the expansion of British power and to suggest that responses often changed over time. Some of the best responses suggested that there were different reactions in different geographic areas or were dependent on their proximity to the centre of East India Company operations.

Q8. There were no responses to this question.

Commerce and Imperial Expansion, c1815-70 There were no responses to Q9 or Q10.

Britain and the Scramble for Africa, c1875-1914

Q11. This was the more popular of the two questions. The best responses were able to establish the extent to which international rivalry explained the expansion of British influence in relation to other factors such as economic factors, men-on-the-spot and metropolitan influence. Most responses focused more on the Nile Valley than on East Africa. Responses in some cases were detailed but lacking focus. Some weaker responses had a tendency to simply narrate anything the candidate knew about Africa in that period in general.

Q12. Most responses were able to establish a line of argument covering the majority of the time period. Some responses suggested that, after initial apathy towards imperial expansion, popular support grew steadily under the influence of popular culture and mass circulating newspapers until there was a decline in support as a result of events during the Boer War. Other response suggested that in the 1880s and 1890s there was a rapid increase in popular support which peaked in the early months of the Boer War before declining rapidly in reaction to atrocities reported during the later stages of the War. Some candidates, however, did exaggerate the effects of the Boer War on the general trend in popular support for Empire in the latter part of the time period.

Retreat from Empire: Decolonisation in Africa, c1957-81

Q13. This was by far the more popular of the two questions. Most candidates were aware of the general influences driving the British retreat from Empire in the 1950s. However, many responses did not focus on the reasons for the rapid retreat after 1957 but discussed longer-term influences. The best responses focused on the events and influences which speeded up the retreat from Empire in the late 1950s such as the international and domestic response to the Suez crisis, the growing cost of dealing with active independence movements, the failure of the Central African Federation and the decision of other European imperial powers to abandon colonial rule.

Q14. Only a few candidates attempted this question but those who did were able to provide a variety of reasons as to why most territories had managed to achieve black majority rule by 1969 in comparison to South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. There was some excellent knowledge shown of the situation in Southern Rhodesia. Reasons suggested included the lack of a significant white minority, the relative lack of economic importance of certain colonies, the ability of the British government to respond to events and the relative strength of the independence movements in West and East Africa in particular.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Well-reasoned conclusions which refer to the criteria used to establish the line of argument being developed provide evidence for substantiated judgements on the question asked.
- Candidates should read the question carefully and acquaint themselves with the focus of the question, taking particular regard of the timescale.
- Candidates should be prepared to select and deploy their knowledge and understanding for the question set, not the question they hope for, and, indeed, they should always be prepared for the unexpected.

Example of Level 5

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2 Question 3
 Question 4 Question 5 Question 6
 Question 7 Question 8 Question 9
 Question 10 Question 11 Question 12
 Question 13 Question 14

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~Foreign~~

PLAN: Foreign intervention = primary factor.

American leadership (W.) → leadership from front
~~Colonial~~ British weaknesses / failures (Howe, Burgoyne)
→ Familiarity of the land

Foreign intervention was indeed largely responsible for the success of the American colonists in the War of Independence. It provided the colonists with extra military ^{power} and distracted Britain with conflicts elsewhere. There were, however, other, ^{significant but} less important factors which secured success of the colonists. These were the strength of Washington's leadership, the colonists' territorial advantage and British leadership mistakes ~~and~~ and ~~also~~ the fact they were fighting a war away from home.

As stated, foreign intervention was largely responsible for the success of the American colonists in the War of Independence in 1778, ~~perhaps most~~ encouraged by British defeat at Saratoga, France joined the ^{cause} ~~war~~.



(This page is for your first answer.) and with the Treaty of Commerce and Defence Alliance France provided America ~~the~~ Washington with troops and supplies, of which the Continental Army often lacked. ~~Other~~ ~~foreign~~ The Spanish and Dutch provided similar support by way of the 'League of Armed Neutrality', effective from 1780-2. What ~~France~~ ~~was~~ foreign intervention did so crucially, however, was to transform the conflict between ^{just} Britain and the colonists into a worldwide war. ~~British~~ ~~naval~~ ~~strength~~ ~~and~~ ~~resources~~ were thus spread thin across the Empire as it tried to defend its other colonial possessions, including the West Indies, Gibraltar, Africa and India, including the 'mother land' itself. This meant that, by 1780, only 29% of British troops were serving in America; a shocking and astounding figure. This was to have decided consequences: in Yorktown ¹⁷⁸¹, for example, de Grasse and Washington's combined force outnumbered Cornwallis's army in a ratio of 2:1. Had ~~British~~ ^{employed} military force not been ~~directed~~ elsewhere, Cornwallis may well have had a force large enough to resist at least resist defeat. ~~By~~ ^{The aftermath} of Yorktown, combined with the British ~~pre~~ depending its colonial possessions across the Empire, was to decide Britain's, and the American Colonists', fate. Thus this is owed to foreign ^{con},



(This page is for your first answer.) but especially French intervention.

There were, however, other factors which were partly responsible for the American success, though their significance was less than foreign intervention. British military mistakes helped to secure their defeat. Howe, for instance, missed several opportunities between 1776-7 to fully destroy the Continental Army. In the battle for New York and Long Island (1776), with Washington's ~~sustained~~ having poorly decided to defend the entire city, and sustaining heavy losses, Howe could easily have attacked and destroyed Washington's Army. Instead, the Continental Army was able to withdraw to the mainland under the cover of thick fog. Howe similarly failed to seize opportunity in Philadelphia (1777) and, for the third time, once Washington had retreated to Valley Forge in 1777. ~~Other~~ Howe's cautiousness ensured that Britain would not win the war, at least not in 1776-7. However, it must be noted that Howe could ill-afford to inflict devastating defeats upon the Continental Army, for, after all, had the British won, they would have to govern the colonies.

Other British weaknesses lay in the very nature of the campaign, wherein Britain was situated 2800km



(This page is for your first answer.) away from the ~~new~~ colonies. This brought with it issues in communication ^{and} logistics. Lord Germain, for example, Secretary of State for the Colonies in Britain, failed to reconcile the plans of Burgoyne and Clinton in the Saratoga Campaign of 1777. ~~No~~ This was owed not so much to Lord Germain, but the fact letters of correspondence took weeks to reach the generals in America; ^{this was} too late for Clinton's move, the employment of ~~the~~ 30,000 Hessian soldiers ^{arguably} ~~was~~ ^{unwise} was a decision made in Britain, and although by ~~1778~~ ^{the} late 1770s they provided Britain with 1/3 of its troops, they were less devout to the British cause and alienated neutrals and loyalists alike due to their savage tendencies. In addition, Lord North, Prime Minister, ~~was~~ was an uninspiring leader who failed to galvanise his generals. This marked a strong contrast with the leadership under Washington. Britain's logistical ^{and} ~~communication~~ ^{difficulties}, as well as its leadership, ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~not~~ ~~not~~ proved to be a distinct ^{ship} disadvantage, though not decisive, disadvantage to Britain. The only ^{committed} ~~helped~~ American success.

Washington's leadership was impressive for someone ^{who} ~~that~~ was no military genius. This enabled the American colonists to continue fighting and the



(This page is for your first answer.) so that when the French intervened in 1778, there was still a cause worth fighting for. He was inspiring, and above all else, a skillful tactician who was (remarkably) able to coordinate the disparate elements of ^{the} the new 'national government' as well as his Continental Army. Though forced to fight a defensive campaign, he managed to sustain morale, even after the dreadful winter at Valley Forge, 1777-8 wherein 3,000 died from disease and more deserted. Washington, then, kept America in the fight, ~~and~~ crucially, the ~~march to Yorktown~~ ~~defeat~~ ~~at Saratoga~~ ~~and the~~ ~~march~~ ~~to~~ ~~Yorktown~~ ~~was~~ particularly impressive, though this really owes more to the might of the navy and troops supplied by French intervention.

Americans' familiarity with the terrain was a great advantage. So, when Burgoyne pressed south to Albany, encumbered by an enormous baggage train (of champagne and clothes), militia, ~~men~~ with their knowledge of geography, were able to pick off stragglers and block roads and bridges, impeding Burgoyne's path. The situation became so desperate that, after defeat at Freeman's Farm and a failed reconciliation plan with Clinton, Burgoyne was



(This page is for your first answer.) forced to surrender. This was to be a crucial victory as it initiated the most significant reason for American success: French intervention.

Foreign intervention was largely responsible for American colonists' success in the War of Independence. It forced Britain to fight a worldwide conflict and forced Cornwallis's surrender at Yorktown, after which, Britain ceased offensive operations in America. Less significant factors include British mistakes, distance from home and American leadership and territorial advantages.



Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer . Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice. If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2 Question 3
Question 4 Question 5 Question 6
Question 7 Question 8 Question 9
Question 10 Question 11 Question 12
Question 13 Question 14

(This page is for your second answer.) The

~~best~~ INTERCONNECTED

- British industry: A new area of manufacturing - shipbuilding
- ~~domestic~~ demand
- needs of plantation.

The growth of British industry was indeed significant to the rapid development of the slave trade. It was not, however, any more or less significant than ^{increasing} ~~growing~~ British demand for slave goods, ~~the~~ or the needs of the plantation system in America and the West Indies. These factors were all interconnected under the triangular trade system.

The growth of British industry ~~was~~ undoubtedly ~~a~~ contributed to the rapid development of the slave trade. As ^{and manufacturers} factory owners produced more ^{goods} goods such as textiles, ~~woolens~~ and ~~the~~ copper, they needed a new export market to absorb their increased output.



(This page is for your second answer.) The necessity of the new export markets of colonial and African markets ^{was} ~~was~~ made more important as a result of increasing economic nationalism. This was the 18th century idea that the key to ~~wealth~~ ^{wealth} was economic self-sufficiency. The Colonial and African markets were ~~obviously~~ ^{obviously} clearly important ~~in~~ ^{to} the ^{British} growing ~~British~~ ^{woollen} industry as, between 1699 and 1774, woollen exports to Europe declined in value from £1.9 million to £1.6 million. Over the same period, exports to colonial and African markets increased in value from £185,000 to £1,148,000 ^{of} ~~British~~ ^{also} industry and, indeed, industrialisation, was fuelled by the availability of cheap commodities such as sugar and cotton, made possible by the slave trade. ~~This~~ ^{This} made up ~~also~~ a third of the leg of the all important triangular trade system. ~~So~~ ^{So} Evidently, the growth of British industry ~~helped~~ ^{helped} contributed to the rapid development of the slave trade, however, it alone cannot be described as the primary reason for the slave trade's growth.

~~The~~ ^{The} needs of the plantation system ~~also~~ ^{also} ~~the~~ ^{contributed} contributed to the rapid development of the slave trade. ~~The~~ ^{Plantation} needs increased ^{in part} as a result of the ~~the~~ growing British industry, as it required more slaves.



(This page is for your second answer.) to ~~produce~~ cultivate the commodities required by industries, like cotton, for example. The slave trade provided plantation owners with a constant supply of free and efficient labour, ~~this was~~ the ^{main} use of slaves was far more efficient than the previous system of indentured servitude as slaves ~~were~~ were more accustomed to the heat and could also be forced to work even 24 hours a day, unlike indentured servants. So indentured servitude was neither as widespread nor ~~as~~ efficient as slavery could be. ~~the~~ The slaves were integral ^{too} as they were necessary for the transition of subsistence based production to export production of cash crops - which the growing ^{British} industries ~~rely~~ heavily relied upon, as well as ordinary British. The efficacy of slavery can be seen through Martinique's population statistics in 1678, there were 2450 white and 5000 slaves, but by 1770, the former figure was 17,000 and the latter ~~at~~ more than 70,000 - a staggering increase. ~~to meet~~ ~~up~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ needs of plantations helped the slave trade to develop so rapidly as it provided the plantation owners with free workforce increased efficiency and higher profits. The needs of the plantation systems however ~~must~~ must be set against demand for slave goods by ^{growing} British industry and ordinary people.



(This page is for your second answer.) Increased demand for slave goods encouraged the slave trade to rapidly develop. ~~And~~ ~~from the~~ Not only did growing British industry require them, but ordinary people too. Slave goods such as ~~the~~ coffee and indigo were seen as fashionable, and so demand flourished, particularly amongst the upper classes. However, it was the cheap commodities ~~made possible~~ ^{provided} by the slave trade which was to have the greatest effect on the growth of the slave trade. In 1700, the average consumption of sugar was 4 pounds per person; a century later, ~~the~~ ^{the same} figure was 18 pounds. The increased ~~pop~~ demand is linked to the needs of the plantation system as they required more slaves to sustain the increased demand for cash crops. Demand for slave goods was thus part of the interconnected cycle that was the triangular system of trade which caused the slave trade to rapidly develop.

The slave trade also developed so rapidly as a result of increased involvement within. Many types of groups, ~~were~~ and cities, were involved due to the ~~increase~~ prosperity the slave trade brought. In fact, it was said that, between the ~~17~~ 1750s and 1807, every mayor of Liverpool and abroad was with the slave trade. John ~~Robertson~~ Thomas Leyland was



(This page is for your second answer.) one such individual. He saw his profits increase so much that his wealth became the basis of a bank. John Taylor profited in a similar way. Liverpool as a city prospered enormously, like Bristol, ~~Manchester~~ and London. Its niche market of direct and illegal trade with the Spanish Empire, especially Havana and Cartagena de Indias, enabled it to compete with the aforementioned cities. In addition, since ^{Liverpool merchants} it paid their crews less than that their goods ~~were~~ could be sold in the African and colonial markets for 12% less, and still return with an equal profit. ~~Link~~ Canal links with Manchester, too, provided Liverpool with goods like copper, textiles and brass for re-export. ~~It did~~ ^{the way} Ordinary workers benefited as the slave trade provided various jobs to them - rowing in factories, manning slave ships etc. It is clear here to see that increased involvement is linked to growing industry as Liverpool workers help to fuel the industrial revolution. ~~With~~ The increased wealth also permitted ~~the~~ citizens to buy more slave goods, contributing to the cycle that was triangular trade. This helped the ~~the~~ slave trade grow so rapidly.

Growing British industry was indeed important, but it was the interconnected cycle that was the triangular



(This page is for your second answer.) trade system, with all the
unmentioned factors, which caused the slave
trade to develop so rapidly.



Example of Level 4

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2 Question 3
 Question 4 Question 5 Question 6
 Question 7 Question 8 Question 9
 Question 10 Question 11 Question 12
 Question 13 Question 14

(This page is for your first answer.)

Pre 1763:

- Strengthening relations
- Salutory neglect (political)
- economics (- protected markets)
 - Capital + finance.
 - Subsidies
 - Merchant ships $\frac{1}{3}$
- Iron Act 1750
- Navigation Acts
- 3.2%

Post 1763

- Stamp Act (1765)
 - Stamp Act Congress
 - House of Burgesses
 - 5/20 of Patrick Henry's resolutions
- Tea Act (1773)
 - Save British interest on the expense of colonists.

Political + economic
tension began to
emerge.

After 1763.



(This page is for your first answer.)

Before 1763 tensions between ~~the~~ Britain and the colonies were almost non-existent. Colonists enjoyed political freedom whereas economically they benefited greatly. 1763 marked the end of the Seven Years War and Britain acquired a national debt of \$137 million. This caused a successive implementation of laws and taxes that caused political ~~problems~~ and economic tensions which culminated in the Declaration of Independence in 1775.

Before 1763, the relationship between the colonists and British can only be seen as strong due to the very little political and economic tensions. Politically, Britain adopted the policy of salutary neglect, where the colonists were left to their own devices. This resulted in little political tensions between Britain and the colonists as laws implemented were not enforced, such as the Molasses Act. The colonists just continued to smuggle goods with very little grievances. In addition the colonists rather had their own problems, there was social tensions between the rich and poor and many land disputes between ~~the~~ the colonies. The colonies were far from being united



(This page is for your first answer.) and there was no talk of independence within the colonies. This was a product of the policy of salutary neglect. However this quickly changed post-1763 as colonists slowly united under the growing political and economic tensions as the British abandoned Salutary neglect. Pre-1763 colonists enjoyed profound economic benefits that there was little to complain about, resulting in ~~no~~ very little economic tensions. The colonist enjoyed a protected market under the mercantilist school of thought of the British, and sustained a 3.2% annual economic growth. Although the British had implemented laws such as the Navigation Acts and the Iron Act of 1750 which banned the export of colonial iron outside the empire, surprisingly there was little ~~of~~ ~~economic~~ economic and social tensions as for one the economic benefits far outweighed the limitations, the colonists always had markets with demand and reaped benefits such as subsidies and stable capital and credit, and two, due to salutary neglect the laws weren't enforced so little tensions occurred. Therefore it is clear that pre 1763 economic and social tension were almost non-existent between the colonists and



(This page is for your first answer.) Britain.

However, this quickly changed after 1763. The Stamp Act of 1765, affected virtually everyone, which required a stamp to be affixed to up to 50 items including even playing cards. The significance of this act is that it marked the point at which widespread social and economic tensions occurred. Surely social and economic tensions occurred between British and merchants after the Sugar Act of 1763 and Grenville's anti-smuggling laws, but the Stamp Act resulted in widespread tensions as it affected everyone. The Stamp Act Congress denounced the Act as it had 'a tendency to subvert the rights and liberties' of the colonies. Economically the colonists boycotted whilst politically they demanded representation in Parliament. ~~the~~ This marked an end to the salutary neglect and marked the start of social as well as economic tensions. The Stamp Act was repealed in 1766 and the Declaratory Act was passed which asserted the parliament had authority to levy taxes upon the colonists ~~to~~ 'in all cases whatsoever.' Again social tensions are present after the



(This page is for your first answer.)

~~1773 Tea Act~~ 1767 Townshend Duties
where 5 ~~encouraged~~ colonist were shot after
British soldiers ~~opened~~ open fired after being
attached with snowballs, ^{in the Boston Massacre, 1770,} the Americans now
had martyrs and socially many began to shift
towards anti-British intervention but not to
the extent of considering independence. Whereas
economically colonist boycotted in 1768 against
the Townshend duties and again against the
Tea Act and the Coercive Acts respectively.
Furthermore the Boston Tea Party 1773,
resulted in the loss of £10,000 worth of tea.
for the British building economic tensions. Therefore
it is evident that ^{political} ~~social~~ and economic
tensions emerged after 1763.

In conclusion, it is clear that pre-1763
there was ~~very little~~ ^{political} ~~and~~ very little
~~and~~ economic tensions due to salutary
neglect as economically they benefitted whereas
politically they were free and could cope with
being British without direct intervention. However
this quickly changed after 1763 as the
successive taxation marked the end of salutary
neglect and ~~opened~~ ~~caused~~ ^{political and}



(This page is for your first answer.)

economic tensions emerged.



Example of Level 3

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer . Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice. If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2 Question 3
Question 4 Question 5 Question 6
Question 7 Question 8 Question 9
Question 10 Question 11 Question 12
Question 13 Question 14

(This page is for your second answer.)

It could be argued that the main reason for the rapid development ^{of the slave trade} in the years 1760-1800 was due to the growth of British industry, for example Britain was becoming ^{one of} the wealthiest countries in the world and was bringing in a lot of money through trade and therefore more people were participating in ~~the~~ slavery to earn money. On the other hand that other reasons such as ~~island~~ ^{consumer desire} were the reason slavery grew.

Firstly ~~in~~ the ~~year~~ growth of the British industry could be said to have been the reason for the ~~so~~ rapid development of the slave trade. The country's economy had grown massively and therefore ~~the~~ Britain was looking for more ways to trade,



(This page is for your second answer.) the slave trade was therefore a very convincing proposition for British industries as they could use the triangular trade to send their goods to Africa to ~~and~~ trade for slaves and then sell slaves to Americas, therefore making a healthy profit. The growth of British industry and the sheer amount of products being exported meant that British industries were looking to send their products all over the world and trade with these different countries, therefore Africa was a good deal for them as by selling ~~slaves~~ trading and selling slaves there was a huge profit, therefore growth of the slave trade was due to the growth of ~~consumer~~ ~~goods~~ British industry.

More people were getting involved with the slave trade, especially cities like Liverpool during these years. New business such as banks and insurance companies meant that more people would get involved as they could take loans out to fund a voyage and insure it ~~through~~ the to make sure they did not lose



(This page is for your second answer.) out on money if their voyage failed. These new opportunities meant that not just the wealthiest people would take part in the slave trade as people saw as a chance to make a lot of money in this trade. Due to the growth in industries it meant that people would use the slave trade for their own individual gain.

On the other hand it could be said that the growth of the slave trade was due to consumer gain. Many people in Britain had grown fond of a new exotic products from the west Indies and America such as ~~some~~ Tobacco and Sugar, due to growing demand in these products and ~~the~~ more people in England being able to afford them it meant that more and more of these products were being produced. This meant a growth in the slave trade as people in the colonies needed slaves to do the manual labour to produce these goods and also meant more ~~slaves~~ goods were



(This page is for your second answer.) ^{traded} being ~~product~~ ~~to~~ to Africa from Britain in return for more slaves and therefore more ^{exotic} products to meet the desires of the British consumer. Therefore the ~~the~~ needs of the British consumer for Exotic products lead to the growth in the slave trade.

The Triangular trade was very easy ~~to~~ and accessible ~~which~~ ~~to~~ for people to get involved with and the high profits made on these voyages made this a very appealing way for people to make money. This resulted in a growth in the slave trade as people used it for personal gain, ~~as~~ ~~the~~ lack of quality products in Africa meant that Africans were eager to trade with Britain to get better quality tools and equipment and in turn trade slaves with them. This shows how the accessibility of the Triangular trade and the eagerness of the Africans to trade slaves for British products ~~and~~ meant that ~~a~~ British merchants made a handsome profit and that the slave trade



(This page is for your second answer.) grew due to this method of trade.

In conclusion there are several reasons as to why the slave trade grew, the growth in British industry was a contributory factor, as was the accessibility of the triangular trade, however the main reasons for the rapid development of the slave trade was due to the ~~real~~ needs of the British consumers for exotic goods and also people using the slave trade for personal economic gain.



