
A-LEVEL

History

Component 2G The Birth of the USA, 1760–1801

Mark scheme

7042

June 2017

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 2017

A-level

Component 2G The Birth of the USA, 1760–1801

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying George Washington’s military leadership. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO2

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

Generic 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**
- 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**

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.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- as a person who had been critical of Washington's military leadership, Conway, in this letter, is addressing Washington directly about what he had/had not said. The source's value therefore, is questionable as Conway may well be unwilling to repeat criticism directly to Washington himself or be attempting to cover his own back
- doubts remain about whether the published version of his initial letter to Gates was in fact forged, or at least altered, which damages the value of the source
- despite the victory at Saratoga (achieved by Gates) the year 1777 was a difficult one for Washington and his army with defeats at Brandywine and Germantown. This was the context for the Conway Cabal, and the vote of confidence in Washington passed by the casting vote of Gouverneur Morris in early 1778
- the flattering tone of the source may make the source less valuable, as the author clearly wanted to mend his relationship with Washington.

Content and argument

- Conway confirms that he did write to Gates and 'found fault with several measures pursued in this army'. From this it is clear that from within the military there were discussions about the difficulties the military were facing and whether they were avoidable. Washington, and his troops in particular, were desperately short of supplies. Late 1777 and early 1778 were a particular low point for the American army which would have stimulated criticism – this suggests there is some value in the source
- Conway claims to hold Washington in high regard 'brave man, an honest Man, and a man of great sense' and is aiming to dismiss the idea that he has been critical of Washington's character. He then states that Washington's only fault is undue 'modesty' which meant that he listened to men who lacked his 'experience or judgment'. In all this he appears to be flattering Washington, which is something he expressly says he won't do, this may cause students to question the value of the source
- Conway denies ever writing that Washington was a 'Weak General', however, he then states that even if he did write it, he simply meant that Washington was too modest to listen to people who were inferior to him. Conway argues that any suggestion he meant otherwise could only come from 'the most malicious people'. There was certainly fear in Washington's camp that there were people conspiring against him, with Conway and Gates as the prime movers. Conway is possibly looking to get Washington to question what the men around him are telling him. This all suggests that there is value in the source in terms of gaining some insight into issues within the camp. Conway's line could be countered by

reference to Washington taking the advice of the French with regards to Yorktown in 1781 which persuaded him to change his plans from attacking New York, suggesting that his willingness to take advice was a positive trait

- The source does not go into specific detail about Washington's military leadership and this could be picked up on as something which limits its value
- the extract ends with Conway reiterating that even those who argue that he has criticised Washington could not make it appear that he questioned Washington's 'bravery, honesty or judgment'. Students may evaluate why, at one of his lowest ebbs as a military leader, would someone be so determined for Washington not to see them as a critic. They may link this to the fear that some had about Washington potentially becoming a military dictator suggesting the source is valuable.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source's author, Thomas Jefferson, had worked closely with Washington but had often been critical of him on some issues (falling out with him in the 1790s) and praising his role in others. This would suggest that the source will be valuable as Jefferson may offer balance and insight
- as the source was to be used by Jones as the basis for a work that will be published, Jefferson is unlikely to be as critical of Washington as he may have been in private, reducing the value of the source to a degree
- the letter is dated 1814, meaning that not only is it written well after the Revolutionary War, but that it also has the benefit of hindsight. It is also written well after Washington's death (1799). Washington was certainly venerated by the American people following his death, meaning that strong criticism of him was unlikely at this point, which may undermine the value of the source
- the emphasis and tone is generally very positive, however, the praise given is often not full-hearted. Jefferson's couching of praise could be valuable to a historian, especially given the context in which the source was written

Content and argument

- Jefferson argues that Washington had a 'powerful', if not of the 'very first order', mind. He praises Washington's ability to listen to a range of suggestions during his war councils and then choosing the best course forward. This is in part praise and seemingly in part to support a suggestion that Washington lacked 'invention or imagination'. Jefferson is arguably damning Washington here with faint praise which is valuable to a historian
- Washington's battle planning is praised as being exceptional and his bravery is highly praised 'He was incapable of fear, meeting personal dangers with the calmest unconcern'. This would certainly match with reports of Washington's behaviour in the war when he shared the danger and hardships with his men and showed no reluctance to fight the British, even when massively outnumbered, for example in New York in 1776 which suggests the source is valuable, although no references to particular engagements are made which limits the value of the source
- Jefferson praises Washington as 'never acting until every circumstance, every consideration, was maturely weighed; refraining if he saw doubt', which perhaps does not fully fit with all Washington's actions in the war, when he does at times engage the British when he would have been better off retreating, and was reliant on the British not driving home their advantage (most notably Howe in 1776 and 1777)

- Jefferson focuses more on Washington's character traits than the specifics of his leadership in the field and this detracts from the value of the source
- Jefferson praises other elements of Washington's character, notably his integrity and sense of justice. The extract ends with very high praise, 'He was, indeed, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man'. Candidates may suggest this high praise does not fully match all the earlier parts of the extract (notably about Washington's mind) and perhaps does not fully meet what they have learnt about Jefferson's attitude towards Washington and other descriptions of Washington's short-comings, making this a less valuable source. Some may be aware that Washington claimed expenses from Congress close to \$450,000 for his spending during the war, which could be used to question his motives.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the extract is Washington's own public reflections on his own time at the head of the army, he is therefore likely to be mindful of his audience and how he is presenting himself, which affects the value of the source
- the extract comes from Washington's resignation address in 1783 after the Revolutionary War has been won and the Peace of Paris agreed. Washington is therefore looking back on a successful campaign which will affect how valuable the source is given the element of hindsight
- Washington is addressing Congress whose supremacy he had accepted during the war and whom he had not openly criticised (even though their demands had caused problems, such as their insistence that he defended New York in 1776). There had, however, been criticism from amongst the ranks of Congress of Washington's military leadership, which in relation to Washington's comments about 'the support of the supreme power of the Union' may undermine the value of the source
- the emphasis and tone of the extract is humble with Washington crediting others rather than taking credit for himself (but giving no examples). This is valuable in giving insight into Washington as a leader, but may also make the source too subjective which undermines its value.

Content and argument

- Washington states that he was hesitant to take the leadership of the army and had 'A hesitancy in my abilities to accomplish so arduous a task'. Washington had certainly never commanded an army of the size of the Continental Army he took command of in 1775. He was also certainly not impressed with the state of the army of which he took command, suggesting the source is valuable
- Washington talks as if victory always seemed assured in the war, but he has been quoted as saying 'I think the game is pretty near up', in December 1776 following a series of setbacks, which may damage the value of the source
- Washington praises 'the assistance I have received from my Countrymen' and states that this 'increases with every review of the momentous contest'. This may well reflect that his view is being coloured by hindsight. It may also, however, be a reflection of the hardship the Colonists suffered during the war – casualty rates in the army were high (until his inoculation programme) and death from disease even higher and the population stood, in the most part, firmly behind the rebellion's cause
- Washington is full of praise for 'the gentlemen who have been working closely with [him]... during the War' and keen that they receive 'favorable notice and patronage of Congress'.

This is possibly what would be expected from a commanding officer in his resignation speech and perhaps fully justified, as although there were a close group of men who worked with Washington, there is little to suggest that any of them were of greater note.

Section B

02 To what extent did Britain neglect the Thirteen Colonies in North America c1760?

[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 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**

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/factors suggesting that Britain neglected the Thirteen Colonies in North America c1760 might include:

- the policy of ‘salutary neglect’ suggests that Britain had little interest in the colonies and simply left them to their own devices prior to the Seven Years War. There was certainly very little attention given to colonial issues in the British Parliament
- there was no single person or agency with overall responsibility for the colonies within the British political system, suggesting that there was a lack of focus on the colonies within the British political system
- the policy of mercantilism followed by the British towards the colonies suggests that they were simply seen as a source of revenue. The laxity with which the mercantilist system was imposed by the British suggests that they did not take a keen interest in the economic development of the colonies
- the lack of legislation in relation to the colonies could be cited in showing neglect
- the political system in the colonies could also be analysed

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Britain neglected the Thirteen Colonies in North America c1760 might include:

- ‘Salutary neglect’ was arguably based on the desire of the British Government not to stir up trouble in the colonies and a lack of legislation and interference did not necessarily imply neglect;
- the Board of Trade played a key role in overseeing government of the colonies; they were overseen by the Parliamentary Committee on Plantation Affairs which then made recommendations to the Privy Council. There was also a secretary of state for the Southern Department as well as involvement in the colonies by the Admiralty, the War Office and the Treasury. All this suggests that there was a keen interest in colonial affairs in Britain
- the fact that numerous acts had been passed to restrict the development of the colonies’ manufacturing, e.g. the Iron Act (1750) and to ensure colonists bought their molasses from British sugar producers such as the Molasses Act (1733), suggest that Britain was not dismissive of the potential economic power of the colonies
- the significance of the colonies was demonstrated by Pitt sending a large number of troops to the American colonies during the Seven Years War, and also the support given to colonists during the Pontiac Rising.
- a shift in policy may also be considered in relation to the debt accrued by Britain during the war and the subsequent attempts immediately after the war to raise revenue from the colonies and to restrict westwards expansion, and also the stationing of 10,000 soldiers in and around the colonies
- there is an argument that policy towards the colonies started to shift from 1748 onwards when Halifax became president of the Board of Trade and began to take a much closer interest in colonial affairs

Students may largely agree with the question, arguing that Britain neglected the distant colonies and their administration of the colonies was amateurish, suggesting a dismissive attitude. On the other hand, students may identify the economic value of the colonies to Britain and the British actions in the Seven Years War as important indications that the British did not completely dismiss the value of the colonies.

- 03** 'Both the colonial elites and movements from below shared similar attitudes to British rule in the years 1763 to 1770.'

Assess the validity of 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 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**

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/factors suggesting that both the colonial elites and movements from below shared similar attitudes to British rule in the years 1763 to 1770 might include:

- the Proclamation Line of 1763 can be seen as something that elites and members of the lower orders shared similar views on, with former militia members and frontiersmen ignoring the line and moving westwards (groups such as the Paxton Boys taking the law into their own hands), and elite-dominated businesses such as the Ohio Company also objecting to the King's ruling
- the Stamp Act was attacked by the Colonial elites and the wider public in equal measure in 1765. It was a combination of elite protest, mob action and a boycott organised by merchants that led to the repeal of the Act
- 'The Sons of Liberty' were a committed group of radicals who looked to rouse public support against the Stamp Act, amongst their membership were both members of the elites and men of more humble origin
- the Townshend measures were attacked by the elites, e.g. 'Letters of a Pennsylvania Farmer' by John Dickinson and a circular letter sent by the Massachusetts assembly. They were also opposed by popular action, including boycotts of British goods and attacks on Customs Commissioners in Boston
- the Boston Massacre is said to have united much of the population of the colonies against the British and gave the cause its first martyrs. The turnouts at the funerals of the victims is useful evidence regarding attitudes of elites and lower orders being similar.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that both the colonial elites and movements from below shared similar attitudes to British rule in the years 1763 to 1770 might include:

- whilst the Sugar Act (1763) provoked colonial assemblies such as Massachusetts, to act and petition the British Government, claiming the Act was an abuse of power and James Otis, a member of the Massachusetts elites, wrote a pamphlet 'The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved' in 1764, for the majority of Americans the Sugar Act was seen as being of little consequence and they complied with it (opposition can also be seen as much more regionally-based)
- the key groups involved in the unrest in Boston 1768 to 1770 were not from the elites but from the classes below, Samuel Adams in particular was skilled at agitating the masses. The day-to-day experience of ordinary people in Boston and their tense relationship with British soldiers also perhaps differed from the way the elites viewed the British presence, with some feeling that the presence of the soldiers helped maintain law and order. The battle of Golden Hill is a good example of opposition from below which does not come from Boston
- whilst many of the elites benefited from the importing of British luxuries and the mercantilist system in general, many ordinary Americans' opportunities for work were improved by the boycott of British goods
- some of the violence was linked to the economic depression and hardships of ordinary Americans rather than elites' concerns over British taxes and impositions
- there was not a fully unified position amongst the colonists by 1770, many of the elites were alarmed by mob actions and the boycott of British goods was no longer holding.

Students may argue that the degree of similarity between the attitudes of elites and movements from below varied over time, for example, comparing the reactions to the Sugar Act to that of the Stamp Act. Whilst it was true that many in the elites opposed the imposition of British taxes, just as the movements from below did, many were uncomfortable with the mob violence that took place. Students may contrast the similarity of attitudes towards British actions with differences in attitudes on how the colonists should respond. More sophisticated answers may argue that elites tended to oppose British rule on the basis of principle whereas the opposition from below was based much more on how British rule affected them in a practical sense. Credit should also be given to those who consider loyalist attitudes amongst the elites and lower orders.

- 04** ‘The development of the new Republic in the years 1783 to 1789 was hindered by inter-state disputes.’

Assess the validity of 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 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**

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/factors suggesting the development of the new Republic in the years 1783 to 1789 was hindered by inter-state disputes might include:

- the Federalists v anti-Federalists debate could be considered regarding inter-state disputes if the right examples are chosen: such as Delaware which ratified quickly and unanimously, and Rhode Island which rejected the Constitution on a number of occasions before finally ratifying.
- the divide between small states and large states was a key divisive issue at the formation of the new Republic and before compromise was reached over representation certainly hindered its creation.
- the issue of slavery was a key division between states at the time of the formation of the new nation. The issue was potentially divisive but compromise was eventually reached although some of the northern states which were moving towards the abolition of slavery remained uneasy
- the new nation's economic problems, such as rising debt and the flow of specie (gold and coined money) out of the country, were clearly made worse by disagreement between states. Rhode Island's love of paper money did not go down well with states such as Massachusetts which refused to print paper money. Robert Morris had endless problems trying to get agreement on tariffs which the southern states generally opposed.
- disputes over trade, exemplified by southern opposition to the Jay-Gardoqui Treaty, and the fact that states such as New York continued to collect tariffs on goods 'imported' from other states
- Land/boundary disputes between states lingered on, although the Northwest Ordinances dealt with many problems associated with lands in the west, and ironically the dispute between Maryland and Virginia over the Potomac River led to the Annapolis Convention.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the development of the new Republic in the years 1783 to 1789 was hindered by inter-state disputes might include:

- the Articles of Confederation had created a weak government in the first place which hindered the development of the Republic, which inter-state disputes exacerbated
- the Federalists v anti-Federalists debate was the most fiercely fought during the ratification of the Constitution but essentially within states, rather than between states, and delayed the ratification.
- the Elitists v Democrats was a key division at the time of the formation of the new nation. The key focus in this debate was the extent to which the states should extend the franchise and whether it should go to all free men or only to property owners. The debate also focused on whether there should be one-house legislatures or two-housed legislatures. This demonstrates that there were other barriers to the formation of the new Republic
- it can be argued that the new nation's economic problems, such as rising debt (unable to pay off soldiers in 1783) and the flow of specie out of the country, can be seen as the most significant barrier to the new nation's formation as a secure republic, which to some extent was a legacy of the War
- Shays' Rebellion in 1787 suggests that the main threats to the development of the nation were economic problems and potential breakdown of law and order which Congress could

do little to prevent under the Articles, though it could be argued that the rebellion speeded up the development of the Republic because it convinced members of the elite that a stronger constitution was needed, though this can also be counter-argued on the grounds that a stronger constitution may well make life tougher for debtors.

- Poor relations with Spain (eg closed the Mississippi/West Florida/southern opposition to the Jay-Gardoqui Treaty) , France (was owed money from War, and restricted American trade) and Britain (eg trade restrictions/soldiers kept in forts) highlighted the weakness of the new Republic.

Students may well agree with the view that the greatest barrier to the development of the new Republic was the disagreement over the division of power between federal and state governments along with other internal debates. However, they are likely to demonstrate that it was not only internal disputes that hindered the development of the new Republic. Students may argue that economic matters and relations with Spain, Britain and France were highly significant. Students may argue that when combined, these factors were close to or possibly greater problems in the development of the new Republic.